

ICAC MEETING MINUTES
Thursday October 11, 2012
9:30AM – 12:30PM
5050 Yonge Street, Committee Room A

In attendance-

John Weatherup, Colleen Costa, Tyler Johnson, Sheila Cary Meagher, Shaila Kreshne (for Jann Houston), Nancy Vogel, Howard Kaplan, Leslie Johnston, Laurie Green, Ricardo Francis, Aim Mujib, Chris Penrose, Bob Spencer, Chris Glover.

Regrets-

Donna Quan, David Clandfeld, Elizabeth Addo

Staff- Manon Gardner, Vicky Branco, Janice Gillespie

Guests-

Kemp Rickett, Emilee Holt-Staffel

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
2. **Draft Agenda approval** — moved by H. Kaplan seconded by Laurie Green – approved unanimously.
3. **Previous Meeting Minutes approval-** September 12, 2012

Discussion

Q: How is EQAO used for OFIP or LOG?

A: This question was asked in the past and it is still unclear. David Canfield presented last ICAC and is not here to answer the thinking on the slide

Q: Does OFIP money only go to MSIC Schools?

A: LOG and OFIP are separate. All schools benefit from OFIP however there is a percentage of OFIP money that supports summer school. During (Ontario Focus Intervention Program) the school year a pocket of OFIP money is managed by Con Ed for a tutoring program across the system. If the money hasn't been spent by June then there are identified programs like summer school where CON ED justifies using it towards.

Q: How does a school qualify to get the OFIP money?

A: Based on EQAO scores. The MoE gives each school \$15,000.00 and has nothing to do with LOI We used to have “In the middle” to bring them up to “Level 3”. This support has gone down over the years. Needs based on EQAO.

Q: How many are schools are model schools?

A: About 13.

Q: That is money that is above and beyond LOG?

A: Yes.

Q: We had a table of this before that demonstrated all funds to schools. Is this is a public document for the schools to see?

A: No, it is public information.

Q: I would request that it be made easily accessible; it's another case of public info that is not

accessible.

A: Yes

CORRECTION P.6 #7. pt 6&7

Clarification of rumor that it has been practice

Howard Kaplan moves that minutes as amended and be passed. Laurie Green seconds the move. Approved unanimously.

**4. ICAC Coordinator Report-
Update on Action Items**

Action Item:

- ICAC members interested in working together to formulate a “draft” ICAC response to the Youth Action Plan- Chris

Discussion

Chris Penrose-If people are still interested

- Chris has been touch with Susan McIsaac CEO of United Way
<http://www.unitedwaytoronto.com/aboutUs/team.php>
- The question is about timelines
- The issue is within 20 recommendations they are only police related
- Susan met with Alvin Curling
- Would still be helpful to have a letter from ICAC
- Chris can draft a letter and he can send the letter and get it approved and sent from ICAC.

Action Item:

Chris Penrose to draft a letter and send to ICAC members for edits and approval.

Action Item:

Communication between MSIC and City of Toronto Ombudsman’s office

Vicky Branco and Manon Gardner have a meeting scheduled with Fiona Creer for Nov 2, 2012. They will report back at next ICAC meeting.

Action Item:

Suggestion that a TDSB Human Rights Officer also attend CPAC meetings

Vicky Branco and Manon Gardner have a meeting scheduled with TDSB Human Rights Officer for October 24, 2012, they will report back at next ICAC meeting.

Action Item:

Social Determinants of Health (SDoH) update-

- There was experience where links have been hacked and we are working to find a way to monitor the links and make sure links are appropriate before we officially launch the SDoH.

Q: Does TDSB have any fire walls?

A: Yes we have fire walls. But once we post a link it is like a hole in that wall.

We are working on – “terms of reference and agreement. Because of the previous incident, the system is coming up with a process to resolve that.

Question from the ICAC members:

How can ICAC be involved in the Special Education Consultation process?

Discussion:

- Special Education Department are holding town hall meetings and are requiring special written submission. This is not very inclusive of many MSIC families.
- At the first town hall meeting at Runnymede they did allow people who did not have written submissions to speak
- It would be nice to make a statement but it's not a nice statement that a written statement is required.
- Should that be a discussion with Sandy Spyropoulos?
- The Runnymede session was half-staff and half parents.
- There are places like Rosedale that are accessible and more toward the center of the city.

Q: I'm wondering if the requirement is a submission if individuals can access someone who can assist them in meeting that format required by TDSB.

A: They did accommodate them at that session – and took them without written submissions.

SPECIAL EDUCATION CONSULTATIONS DATES are as follow:

Oct. 2 - passed

Oct. 11th

Nov. 1st

Nov. 8th

Action Item: Emilee to email flyer to ICAC members -FLYER COMING FROM Manon

5. Bob Spencer – Tabled presentation on Heritage/International Languages

Bob Spencer would like to defer his presentation due to David's absence.

The committee would like to invite Professors Jim Cummins and Prof. Chumac to the committee.

We need a letter of invitation sent to them from ICAC.

Motion-

Prof R. Chumak and Jim Cummins to be officially invited to join work group. Moved by George Martel, seconded by Laurie Green – approved unanimously.

Action Item: Emilee will compose an invitation in consultation with B. Spencer

Further discussion:

Q: What is the name of the program in the past?

A: The official name was: “International Languages”

- I wonder if it would be appropriate to solicit staff support to see what the situation is. We had a model from legacy board. What is the array of support?

Action Item:

Manon Gardner to request update from Karen Falconer for the following areas for next ICAC meeting.

1. A list of all schools receiving Heritage Language instruction?
2. Which type of instruction do they offer?
3. Before, after school, part of the day What is the funding source?
3. What are the estimated costs to running these classes?
6. Is there specific curriculum for the classes?
7. What are the qualifications of the instructors?

6. Presentation – Student Nutrition Survey Mr. J. Weatherup, CUPE 4400 and Tyler Johnson

Presentation:

Healthy Learning Healthy Living

It's more than saving cafeterias eating.

Its about changing the culture of food for our students

Transforming cafeterias into something new.

The goal is “Teaching Kitchens”.

These types of kitchens are primarily in Spec Ed schools now

We would like to change all cafeterias to teaching kitchens

To change ambiance/furniture in cafeterias and engage students

Currently a cookie is \$1.20. This is very expensive for students.

At survey it was found that students have \$5. Average to spend per day

Facebook group is now set up

Recruiting youth ambassadors

Q: Is this at the primary level?

A: It's at the secondary level right now. We hope to integrate 7&8, then elementary.

Q: You gave the example of a cookie of \$1.20 cookie and \$5 per kid I'm wondering if we are forcing ourselves into a situation where we are not going to be able to provide these meals.

A: When I was a kid \$5 was a lot of money. McDonalds has a snack menu now. And kids aren't buying a whole meal. How much are they getting from their parents? We will also ask parents “How much are you giving your kids?” in the next survey.

Q: Are you looking for partners to cut costs?

A: We don't want to turn it into a soup kitchen. We have pillars set up. See “6 Pillars” in presentation.

Discussion

- How to have good structure in this financial climate?
- Success Beyond Limits, students were talking about food and quality of food – would prefer to go hungry than take part in the snack program- even within our program the budget is big – but we got feedback that they would rather walk in unsafe neighbourhoods than go hungry.
- MPP went through a welfare diet. \$970 a month.
- Referred to Common Ground CoOp
- The 2nd largest processing centre for food in N.America is Toronto
- The grocery industry freaked out because their receipt dropped 2% with the welfare cuts.
- There is a huge supportive group in Local Foods Plus
- We are in the process of selecting 3 Pilot schools

Q: Are they model schools?

A: No, not necessarily.

Q: Speaking about the “have not’s” not about the “have's” and about how the “have's are going to subsidize the have not’s. And how is everybody supposed to be brought up to an equitable level.

A: This is a program that is for all schools, but we don't know what it will look like at different schools.

Action Item:

Emilee to send it out power point to all ICAC members.

6. ICAC Fees and Fundraising Subcommittee (ICAC FFS) Update and Next Steps –

This motion takes us back in some ways to where we started a few years ago where we started with the fees and fundraising discussion.

As the budget process is gone through asking that staff demonstrate how LOG is spent and how it is benefitting those most in need.

When Craig Snider was here in May he spoke about how reporting was changing for example; Tsunami Relief monies/ field trips. It would give us a better idea how money is spent. So we present this today the main issue is around this: LOG and how that is coming in and how it is being spent.

David’s work has answered a number of concerns – has found \$18 million directly but it is actually

close to \$120 million discrepancy. There is a massive inequity.

Q: Does fundraising impact LOG allocation to schools?

A: TDSB gets around \$143 million is LOG. And overall \$44 Million in fundraising across TDSB.

Q: In terms of fundraising they raise it for their own communities for their own kids. We want to raise the issue for disparities. How do we approach that without having a decrease in fundraising?

A: We are not going to have a decrease in fundraising with this motion. We are just asking to acknowledge that there is an inequity with this motion. Hopefully a solution will be using the LOG for the purpose which it is intended to level the playing field.

Q: What is “substantially more”? What kinds of recommendations are going to go the board?

A: Yes we will want to define “substantially more.”

Q: Are these figures accurate – are there more discussions? Is there still lack of clarity?

A: There will still be discussion. There still lack of clarity.

Amendment: An additional motion to clarify what “substantially more' means definitively.

- It shouldn't go to the board so open ended, we can have staff opinion on what it means. We shouldn't bring it to the board that way.
- We should go forward with something as time is marching on if we keep working on the detailed amount.
- Item 4. that the committee continue to research the details.
- It could be a bit cart before the horse so it needs to be transparently broken down.
- Transparency. This as it stands is perfect. The more we press further down the line – the less we'll be able to get. Further investigation will not help. Powers that be are also looking for information. So pressing down \$50 million could be higher and we won't know. So let's move it.
- Opportunity = Access! If you want to define the amount. How do you decide? What are the priorities? What is the rationale? There needs to be a redefinition for access to the money. (LOS)
- Where does the board use that LOI to apply the LOS?
- How do we operationalize the LOS?
- Strategy going forward: The next PSSC, Oct 30th
- We want to get this to the board before December.
- We do need to talk about who is going to speak.
- It is important we present Oct. 30. it will produce a request for formal reports. Once the budget process starts everyone is so panicked – we have to get ahead that train.

Motion For ICAC to bring to PSSC meeting on Oct. 30, 2012

Motion-

Whereas revenues from school-based fundraising and charitable foundations supporting individual schools are known to be in the order of \$40-50 million and are unevenly distributed to the disadvantage of schools with low income, racialized populations,

Whereas in accordance with the Ministry of Education 2012-13 Technical Paper the Demographic Component of the Learning Opportunities Grant is meant to provide “funding based on social and economic indicators [low income, recent immigration, low parental education, lone parent] that are associated with a higher risk of academic difficulties. The Demographic Allocation supports boards in offering a wide range of programs to improve the educational achievement of these students. Examples of programs include breakfast programs, homework clubs, reading recovery, and resource withdrawal”,

Whereas Inner City Advisory Committee believes that the Ontario Ministry of Education must mandate the use of the Demographic Allocation of the Learning Opportunities Grant (LOG) more clearly to the funding of programs that overcome the adverse educational effects of social and economic disparities in accordance with the express hopes of the Ministry's Technical Paper,

The Inner City Advisory Committee recommends that:

1. Until the Ministry makes this change, the Toronto District School Board allocate substantially more money as a proportion of the Demographic Allocation of the LOG to support inner city school needs

And,

2. The upcoming annual budget exercise include the amount generated by the Learning Opportunities Grant as a separate item and show the various expenditure lines in the Board's budget to which that amount is allocated.

Bob Spencer moves the amendment and wishes the motion to go forward to PSSC. Laurie Green seconds the move. Approved unanimously.

Action Item:

ICAC will have to put in a request for deputation– Leslie Johnson will follow up.
ICAC has a 5 minute presentation with Programs with Q&A.

Action Item:

Craig Snider has promised to have materials from meeting (finance) in 3 weeks. Manon Gardner to request an update from Craig Snider re: LOS criteria and the 5 categories.

7. MSIC Resource Team Update –

'CAT 4' assessment has been completed in every school now waiting for results

'Resiliency' test results will be coming out soon. Once we have all the data we will do a presentation at

ICAC.

Q: Could we make sure there is a report for PSSC for January?

A: Yes.

Q: What is the difference between these and EQAO and CAT4?

A: CAT4 is completed from grades 2-9. EQAO is for students in grade 3, 6, 9, 10

- Only model schools do CAT – right now we are funding it.
- It does give us the information we need to support more students

Q: Can we look at the CAT tests?

A: Yes.

Action Item:

Request Maria Yau to do a presentation at an ICAC meeting on results of CAT4 and Resiliency data and impact on MSIC Schools.

We started our modules:

The coaches assigned to MODEL SCHOOLS are presenting the modules to Principals and teachers from each school. MoE has asked to come

PIAC Poster

Model Schools will be presenting at this event.

8. Trustee Update

Due to time move to next meeting

9. Business Arising

City Agenda:

How do City Budget cuts impact students? Food child care/ Full Day Kindergarten?

We pulled in Toronto public libraries before– A number of parents were able to speak.

We would like to repeat the same action - “Kids Count” poster and a petition and a web site.

Budget is released on NOV 29.

Meeting adjourned

Next ICAC Meeting

Wednesday December 5, 2012

9:30 am – 12:30 pm

5050 Yonge Street, Committee Room A