

**ICAC Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday March 3, 2011**  
**9:30 am – 12:30 pm**

**In attendance:**

Janice Gillespie, Jann Houston, Ester Saltzman, Lisa Heggum\*, Peter Mallouh, Darcy MacCallum, Lesley Johnston, Sejal Patel, Laurie Green, Nanci Goldman, Chris Penrose, Bob Spencer, Aim Mujib\*\*, Alejandra Bravo, Laurie Green, David Clandfield\*, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Jann Houston

\* approved as new ICAC members at this meeting

\*\* approved as new ICAC Community Co-chair at this meeting

**Regrets:**

Tanya Senk, Don Dippo, Nathan Gilbert, George Martell, Huma Umar, Trustee Chris Glover, Trustee Maria Rodrigues, Trustee Chris Tonks

**Guests:**

Saida Sabrie, Gary Lochhead, Amanda Street-Bishop, Caitlin French, Amanda Street-Bishop,

**Staff:**

Marjolein Winterink, Vicky Branco, Manon, Gardner, Cassie Bell

1. **Approval of ICAC Draft Agenda** – J. Houston moved that LOI update be added to item #4 (as 4.b)-seconded by J. Gillespie, approved unanimously
2. **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes (February 8, 2011)** – moved by L. Johnston, seconded by L. Green, approved unanimously
3. **Meeting Minutes “Action Items”** –
  - (iv) ICAC Co-ordinator requests ICAC members send suggestions for research symposium
  - (v) Research Symposium – discussion with Toronto Public Health (TPH) to clarify “ask” at City of Toronto re: involvement in symposium; Jann Houston will follow up with Harvey Lowe at City
4. **ICAC Co-ordinator’s Update** –
  - > **Handouts**
    - “B.C. Principals call for end to controversial FSA testing”
    - “Toronto Star Editorial – ‘Don’t leave poorer students behind’”
    - OHIP Postcards
    - Youth Support Services Fair (March 7, 2011)
  - a) New ICAC members:
    - > **Mr. Aim Mujib** - candidate for ICAC Community Co-chair
      - Mr. Mujib is happy to be in Canada, and happy to be here!
      - Current Co-chair of George Webster Elementary School’s School Council
      - George Webster ES is launching its brand new pediatric clinic March 31<sup>st</sup> – all are welcome!
      - Clinic will serve 800 kids!
      - *Moved to approve Mr. Mujib as ICAC Community Co-chair – L. Johnston, seconded by L. Green, approved unanimously*
    - > **Ms. Alejandra Bravo** – Maytree Foundation

- Maytree focuses on integration of newcomers and leadership development
- Mitigating how race and poverty intersect detrimentally
- School involvement key part of newcomer experience

> **Ms. Lisa Heggum** – Children’s Youth Advocate, Toronto Public Library

- New in role as Advocate
- Currently sharing role at ICAC table with colleague Cheryl Skovronek
- Happy to represent TPL
- Pleased that she has two children in TDSB schools in daycares

> **Professor (Emeritus) David Clandfield** – Retired Principal of New College, University of Toronto

- Member of ‘Education Action Toronto’
- Written articles for “Our Schools, Ourselves” magazine
- Former Toronto Board of Education Trustee
- Co-chair previous iteration of “inner city committee”

*All three candidates moved for approval by N. Goldman, seconded by R. Spencer, approved unanimously. Thanks given to all for volunteering to participate in ICAC.*

**4. b) LOI Update** – Laurie Green

- Items remaining from previous LOI review by Senior Policy Advisor, Peter Gooch
- Concerns about reflecting race in re-formatted LOI
- Impact of resource allocations through LOI, including learning outcomes
- How is index being used and who is using it? What resources are attributed to the LOI and where are they ‘landing’?
- Procedures (contingent to LOI Policy) indicated biennial survey be done to report on impact and outcomes of LOI allocations with results reported to Board and to ICAC
- Staff add that there is not currently a person filling Peter Gooch’s role, but staff could speak to Rob Brown (Research Department) regarding survey – request should be made in writing (see below)
- Current Trustee debate re: LOI staffing allocations (Office Assistants and Vice Principals) – pushback for “equal” allocations
- Staff and Principals however, agree on and recommend *equitable* distribution of these staff according to the LOI

**Motion** – (moved by N. Goldman, seconded by A. Bravo)

*The ICAC respectfully requests that the TDSB review Section 4.5 of the LOI procedures document passed by the TDSB in 2009 and update the committee on the following –*

*a) the current state of the biennial research component on random samples of schools chosen based on their placement on the LOI to evaluate 1) school based allocations including the types of resources schools are receiving based on the LOI, the value of these resources, how they are used and the benefit to student learning and 2) the use of resources allocated to Families of Schools*

*b) A description of the outcome measures used to determine student learning*

*c) The impact of the LOI on the MSIC program*

*d) The process, if any, of correlating the criterion of race with the LOI, as well as the impact of removing the (previously included) criteria of housing and mobility*

*e) A backgrounder of previous LOI review recommendations, including definition of LOG, LOI (historical and current), be provided to both trustees and ICAC*

*(Responsibility: Senior Staff and TDSB Research Department)*

## **5. ICAC Fundraising and Fees Subcommittee Update – Lesley Johnston**

- Wonderful that Toronto Star covered issue so broadly
- Disparities across system and province highlighted
- Next steps? PSSC (Programs and School Services Committee) and Trustee Laskin's motion regarding feasibility study (LOG to offset student fees for neediest students) as well as a review of procedure to make requesting mitigation of fees as sensitive and respectful of students and parents as possible
- Staff indicated that report is not ready yet as they have been asked to also look at corporate role in fundraising as well (dates regarding Ministry consultations not confirmed yet); staff thanked ICAC Fees and Fundraising Sub-committee (FSS) who worked on this issue
- Ministry guidelines on fees coming out soon, but no definite dates yet; need clarity on this
- Suggestion to ask sub-committee to look at all fees collected and to consider formula to re-distribute equitably
- Suggestion to look at the Toronto Foundation for Student Success (TFSS) and all the programs it supports (i.e., nutrition, backpacks etc.); how much is TFSS subsidizing and where do bulk of fundraising dollars go? Needs to be looked at more closely
- Trustees in amalgamated board (i.e., TDSB) seem to feel they only serve *their* ward, not every child in the system; article seems to imply fundraising as a form of social justice
- Suggestion to consider other funding streams as well (some of which were unmentioned in Toronto Star article), for example, Urban Priority High School grants (UPHS), Urban Diversity Strategy funding (UDS) etc.; need to consider all funding streams and supports before making generalized recommendations
- Caution to consider uniqueness of each school population, including SES (Social Economic Status); middle class schools might balk if fundraising dollars are redistributed to other, poorer schools

**MOTION:** (moved by L. Green, seconded by D. Clandfield, approved unanimously)

*Be it moved that-*

*1) The ICAC Fees and Fundraising subcommittee (FFS) pursue the schedule of the additional opportunities for consultation with the MOE regarding school fees, fundraising and corporate partnerships through direct communication (Responsibility: ICAC Co-ordinator in coordination with ICAC FFS members)*

*2) The ICAC FFS follow up regarding the outcome of Trustee Shelley Laskin's motion regarding the subcommittee's recommendations to PSSC (Responsibility: Staff)*

*3) The ICAC FFS compile information from the TDSB regarding the specific allocation of resources from all different jurisdictions/funding streams available (UPHS, UDS, Student Success, etc.)*

4) The ICAC FFS meet to review the above information and formulate a strategy to present to ICAC re: equitable recommendations to present to the board regarding student fees, fundraising and, eventually, corporate partnerships

(Responsibility: Staff, ICAC FFS and ICAC Co-ordinator)

## 6. Survey and Presentation - Sejal Patel of “CRICH” (Centre for Research in Inner City Health) at St. Mike’s Hospital, Toronto

- Sejal Patel is a Strategic Fellow with St. Michael’s Hospital
- The City has been working with the Centre for Research in Inner City Health (CRICH) at St. Michael’s Hospital on the “Community Partnership Strategy”
- After extensive consultations, gathered 51 great ideas about the things that the City could pay attention to so that it knows how well community services are working for residents in Toronto neighbourhoods
- Currently asking Toronto residents, community service organizations, funders, businesses, and others to tell us which of these ideas are the most important in this survey
- City will use these opinions to help decide what work needs to be done to ensure Toronto has community services that work well

**Q:** Will results of survey impact city funding?

**A:** Don’t know, but contact to ask at city is Sarah Rix who works with the Community Partnership Strategy; ICAC members do not have to complete survey now; Sejal will liaise with ICAC Co-ordinator to forward any outstanding copies of survey by due date, March 15<sup>th</sup>

\*\*\*\* BREAK \*\*\*\*

## 7. Staff Report – Manon Gardner (Chief Academic Officer (CAO) and Vicky Branco, (Central Co-ordinating Principal (CCP)

- CAO presented hard copy memorandum from TDSB Finance Department to ICAC Community Co-chair for circulation to full committee (following trustees receipt of their board information package)
- Please see attached for soft copy of memorandum
- Information was originally requested by ICAC in fall of 2010 and reported orally at December ICAC; further clarification and details were needed, i.e., memorandum includes provisos re: corporate donations, GICs, scholarships (should *not* be included in fundraising budget lines), etc.
- CCP outlined proposed changes for MSIC program; LOI is refreshed every two years by including up-to-date census data which has impact on LOI (Learning Opportunities Index) [http://zsearchext.tdsb.on.ca/search?site=default\\_collection&client=WWW1\\_frontend&output=xml\\_no\\_dtd&proxystylesheet=WWW1\\_frontend&filter=0&q=LOI](http://zsearchext.tdsb.on.ca/search?site=default_collection&client=WWW1_frontend&output=xml_no_dtd&proxystylesheet=WWW1_frontend&filter=0&q=LOI)
- Steering Committee proposed extending MSIC schools to include up to 125 on the elementary LOI which moves us closer to goal of highest 150 LOI schools in program; requesting feedback from ICAC

### Discussion:

**Q:** Very small percentage of LOG (Learning Opportunities Grant – provincial) (<http://news.ontario.ca/edu/en/2010/03/grants-for-student-needs-2010-11-highlights.html>) gets to MSIC program – suggest adding at least 8.8 – 8.9% to funding (i.e., cost of living increase) to cover increasing number of schools

**A:** If program moves to 125 we can cover 16 new schools as long as \$8.5 million in funding remains stable; CAT4 funding would move over to become schools' responsibility, three "special projects" Community Support Workers (CSWs) would move back out into communities and donations would continue to cover "opportunity" gap

**A:** Reality is that if program stays at top 100 LOI schools, there will be fairly big changes (i.e., movement of schools out of program) due to LOI impact (7 new schools moving in, but 8 middle schools moving out);

- Program sustainability really indicates moving to 125, keeping in mind that next LOI 'refresher' won't happen for two more years giving new schools time to integrate into program
- Income differential between schools numbered just below and just above 100 (i.e., # 92 and #122) for example, on the LOI is miniscule

**Q:** Request for updated LOI (will be circulated to Trustees first) and soft copy of proposed 125 MSIC schools

### **ACTION ITEM**

*Staff to circulate soft copies of new LOI and MSIC schools as soon as feasible*

*(Responsibility: Staff)*

**Q:** Do we lose any schools included now by moving to 125?

**A:** Only one which moves to #126, just beyond the limit of 125, but we will pick up this school in the next shift forward; middle schools also move out, but new ones come in so shift is balanced; "ARC"s (Area Review Committees) will also come into play as board moves ahead

**Q:** Will cluster structure remain the same? What about secondary schools?

**A:** Cluster structure will remain the same and seven secondary schools will be retained in MSIC program, but are not included in 125 figure (125 includes elementary + Model middle schools only); this year MSIC program moved to 105 "Model" schools – there are no longer just 7 Model Schools through sharing of coaches, development of curriculum units, CAT4 etc.

**Q:** Continuity of schools in MSIC program is key – (this is why clusters work so well) - impact of school being in program one year and not next can be detrimental – need to pay attention to this issue

**Q:** Difficult for Steering Committee to make funding suggestions, but feel it is critical that if number of schools involved increases, funding must reflect that to provide flexibility in program to allow for innovation – this has been a successful part of MSIC!

**Q:** Buying 'power' of \$8.5 million is now down to equivalent of \$8.0 million, yet we are adding more schools! Need more funding to allow for equitable transition to more schools in program

**A:** Staff confirm that these recommendations will be taken back to Steering Committee table for further discussion with Deputy Director D. Quan

**MOTION:** (Moved by R. Spencer, seconded by J. Houston, approved unanimously)

*Moved -*

- (i) That the number of elementary schools in MSIC program be increased from 100 up to (and including) # 125 on the 2011 updated LOI*
- (ii) That a 5% funding increase be added to overall MSIC funding to support a smooth and equitable transition of new schools included in the MSIC program*
- (iii) That the MSIC Steering Committee also consider the issue of continuity (i.e. avoiding shifts of schools in and out) in the MSIC program and report suggestions back to the ICAC.*

(Responsibility: MSIC Steering Committee- M. Gardner, V. Branco, S. Cary-Meagher, D. Quan, C. Bell)

## 8. ICAC Achievement Gap Work Group (AGWG) Discussion – ICAC and Coordinating Superintendent Jim Spyropoulos

- Super Spyropoulos hopes TDSB’s Achievement Gap Task Force Report will be a ‘call to action’
- Last year, (2010), Executive Officer Lloyd McKell convened a series of consultations to discuss the “achievement gap”
- Preliminary report collated in early fall 2010
- Opportunity for those groups consulted and others to respond to draft report
- Lots of feedback given; intent was to finish “final” report by December, but it has been pushed back; Executive Officer McKell has retired so responsibility for carriage of report is Superintendent Spyropoulos’
- “Final” copy report delivered to Administrative Council (Senior Staff) mid-February
- Report has been circulated internally only so far
- More revisions are needed; don’t want it to be another document saying more of the same things
- Meeting with Deputy Director Donna Quan to put together final report, but EPAC (Equity Policy Advisory Committee) said “no”, report should be first run by all advisory committees (at minimum)
- Key part of report reflects importance of aboriginal strategy, as well as issues of poverty, race, gender etc.
- People anxious to get going with concrete actions, for example, innovative pilot with OISE/UT, documentary film with Sky Works looking at achievement gap issue through eyes of students, teacher training pilot in culturally relevant pedagogy, GLBTQ program and safety issues, etc.
- Need ICAC’s help with feedback on next steps

### **Discussion:**

- Attended ICAC’s Achievement Gap Work Group (AGWG) meeting on this issue; it has been around since the Trefann Court Mothers case in old city of Toronto; MSIC program and drive to equity has its roots from then; discussion needs to be rich and deep – how do we engage “others” in conversation?
- Initial discussion at ICAC AGWG revolved around EPAC’s critique of Draft Achievement Gap Report
- Would be very helpful if advisory committees could get together to discuss draft report – believe they would discover a commonality of interests
- Superintendent Spyropoulos states he does not want to close off ‘achievement gap’ discussion and have it “done and dusted”, but he also does not want to stop progress on concrete projects, such as work with CUS (Centre for Urban Schooling) and CRRP (Culturally Relevant and Responsive Pedagogy) PD
- Would also be interested in having iteration of integration of advisory committees to discuss issue
- ICAC member points out that Trefann Court Mothers’ Report grew over time – there was iteration after iteration of report, making all sorts of ecological connections between schools, parents, kids, teachers; process becomes incredible part of result if people involved participate with open minds; *dialogue must continue*

**Q:** What does “putting more teeth in the report” mean in concrete terms?

**A:** That TDSB partly fund a staff member to work with justice stream to interrupt school to

incarceration trajectory

**Q:** Aren't these small examples of overall concepts ICAC has been trying to address for year? For example, the multiple barriers children and youth face daily in our schools and communities? It is much more complex than "here's the gap, here's what we'll do – solved!"

**A:** Agreed, but this is a golden opportunity for us to make a difference in kids' lives

- Think it is important to delay finalizing report so dialogue can continue, but to continue with pilots at same time as they seem to be making a difference
- Great to have grassroots approach, but feel it is sensible to publish a report so that Board can be held accountable for outcomes
- ICAC member notes that transitions are key – so many kids get lost in process

**Q:** Why not integrate /work off of MSIC program? It has moved issue of equity ahead in Board

**A:** We will – it is mentioned in draft report and is a real success story

**MOTION:** (moved by D. Clandfield, seconded by R. Spencer, approved unanimously)

*Move that –*

*The current process by which the TDSB's Achievement Gap Task Force Report is to be completed and brought to Board for final approval be delayed or deferred so as to give the ICAC Achievement Gap Work Group (AGWG) time to consider and report on its concerns around equity, standardized testing, antiracism, student engagement and critical thinking.*

- Superintendent Spyropoulos concurs and feels it report can be considered "Phase I Interim Report", or something similar to indicate that a broad-based dialogue will continue on issue

**Meeting Adjourned**

**Next ICAC Meeting**

**Tuesday, April 5, 2011**

**2 – 5 pm**

**5050 Yonge St., Boardroom**