**PUBLIC SESSION AGENDA**

### 1.0 – Opening

1.1 Welcome, Call to Order and Roll Call  
1.2 Approval of the Agenda  
1.3 Declarations of Possible Conflict of Interest

### 2.0 – Communication to the Board

2.1 Delegations  
2.2 Presentations  
2.3 Acknowledgement of Delegations by Chair

### 3.0 – Ratification / Action

3.1 Minutes of the Regular and Special Meetings  
   3.1.1 Halton District School Board Meeting, June 17, 2015  
3.2 Approval of Business Transacted in Private Session  
3.3 Order Paper  
3.4 Action Items  
   3.4.1 Program Viability Report (S. Miller) – Report 15081  
   3.4.2 Truth and Reconciliation Report – (T. Ehl Harrison) – Report 15083  
   3.4.3 Capital Priorities Report (L. Veerman, D. Renzella) – Report 15092  
   3.4.4 Draft Policy – Trustee Expenses (K. Graves) – Report 15085  
   3.4.5 Policy Schedule Amendment –Trustee Honoraria (K. Graves) – Report 15086 (revised)

### 4.0 – Communication to the Board

4.1 Student Trustee Reports  
4.2 Information Items (including Notices of Motion and future actions)  
   4.2.1 Notices of Motion  
   **For Action: Board Meeting September 2, 2015**  
   4.2.2  
   **For Information**  
   4.2.3 Administrative Building Update (G. Cullen) – Report 15100  
   4.2.4 Administrative Procedures Update (D. Euale) – Report 15101  
4.3 Committee Reports  
4.4 Director’s Report  
4.5 Communications from the Chair  
4.6 Trustee Questions and Comments  
   **5 mins.**  
   **10 mins.**

### 5.0 – Adjournment

5.1 Motion to Adjourn
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Regrets J. Sahi, S. Schneider

Agenda Item 1

1.1 Call to Order
The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m. noting the absence of the two student trustees due to exam schedules.

M15-0116 A. Grebenc / J. Gray
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board move into Private Session. Carried Unanimously.

The Board rose from Private Session at 7:24 p.m.
The Chair called the Public Session to order at 7:36 p.m.

1.2 Approval of the Agenda
M15-0117 A. Grebenc / L. Reynolds
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board approve the agenda for June 17, 2015 as distributed. Carried Unanimously.

1.3 Declarations of Possible Conflict of Interest
The Chair reminded Trustees of the requirement to declare any potential conflicts of interest. D. Danielli indicated she would refrain from voting on Item 4.2.4, should it come to a vote this evening.

Agenda Item 2

2.1 Delegations
There were no delegations

2.2 Presentations
There were no presentations.

2.3 Acknowledgement of Delegations by the Chair
There were no delegations or presentations.

Agenda Item 3

3.1 Approval of the Minutes
M15-0118 R. Papin / L. Reynolds
Be it resolved that the minutes for the Meeting of the Halton District School Board for June 3, 2015 be approved as amended. Carried Unanimously.

3.2 Ratification of Business Transacted in Private Session
The following motions were ratified from Private Session.

M15-0119 A. Collard / A. Harvey Hope
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board approve the revisions to the Banking Services Agreement (September 1, 2012 to August 31, 2017) with the Royal Bank of Canada (RBC). Carried Unanimously.

M15-0120 A. Collard / A. Grebenc
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board appoint the architectural firm of Snyder Architects Inc. to prepare the design and tender documents, and supervise construction for the project to replace and rebuild Martin Street P.S. with a 740 pupil place JK-8 facility Carried Unanimously.

M15-0121 A. Collard / A. Harvey Hope
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board appoint the architectural firm of Hossack & Associates Architects Inc. to prepare the design guidelines for new elementary schools as detailed in Request for Proposal 14-36. Carried Unanimously.
THAT subject to Ministry approval and Board approval of the specific project that the Halton District School Board appoint the architectural firm of Hossack and Associates Architects Inc. to prepare the design and tender documents (Phase 2) for the proposed new elementary school, ERA127 (Milton #10) to be built in Milton using the guidelines developed.

Carried Unanimously.

M15-0123  A. Collard / L. Reynolds

Whereas the Halton District School Board values the end of year reporting of our students' achievements, Therefore, be it resolved that the Halton District School Board approve the request of the Director to spend up to $100,000 to support the production of abbreviated report cards or mark summaries for elementary students over the summer. Funding for this project to be from contingency.

Carried Unanimously.

3.3 Order Paper
The Chair called attention to the Order Paper.

3.4 Action Items
3.4.1 Director’s Summer Authority
D. Euale spoke to Report 15079 and responded to trustee questions.

M15-0124  J. Oliver / J. Gray

Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board delegate authority during the summer months of 2015 to the Director of Education with regard to awarding tenders for capital projects, or other emergent business matters as required.

Be it resolved that the Director of Education report on any capital projects awarded, or other decisions made through delegated authority, to the Board at the end of summer 2015.

Carried Unanimously.

Agenda Item 4

4.1 Student Trustee Reports
There was no student trustee report, as the student trustees had sent their regrets as they were studying for exams.

4.2 Information Items (including Notices of Motion)
4.2.1 Notices of Motion
There were no notices of motion.

For Action: June 24, 2015.

4.2.2 Program Viability Report
S. Miller spoke to Report 15081, and responded to trustee questions.

4.2.3 Board Recognition Report
T. Ehl Harrison spoke to Report 15082, and responded to trustee questions.

M15-0125  A. Collard / J. Gray

Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board waive the rules to deal with this matter immediately.

R. Papin  yes        A. Harvey Hope  no
L. Reynolds  yes        K. Graves  no
J. Gray  yes
D. Danielli  yes
A. Collard  yes
K. Amos  yes
T. Ehl Harrison  yes
A. Grebenc  yes
J. Oliver  yes  Carried.
M15-0126  T. Ehl Harrison / J. Gray
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board implement a recognition program as outlined in Report 15082, reflecting our vision and values; and
THAT the required By-Law amendment and Policy be developed.  
Carried Unanimously.

4.2.4  Board Leadership and Team Development
D. Danielli reiterated her intent to refrain from any decision-making regarding this item, but offered to respond to trustee questions if required.
Discussion ensued regarding the source of funding, the purpose of the trip and suggested wording for a revised motion when it returns on June 24

4.2.5  Truth and Reconciliation Report
T. Ehl Harrison spoke to Report 15083, and responded to trustee questions.

4.2.6  Capital Priorities Report
L. Veerman and D. Renzella spoke to Report 15092, and responded to trustee questions.

4.2.7  Community Planning Partnerships Policy
K. Graves spoke to Report 15095, and responded to trustee questions.

M15-0127  K. Graves / J. Gray
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board waive the rules to deal with this matter immediately.  
Carried Unanimously.

M15-0128  K. Graves / L. Reynolds
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board post the draft Community Partnership Policy, as appended to Report 15095, on the Board website for a period of at least 25 days, soliciting public input, and that the policy and any input return to the Board for consideration at a Board meeting in October 2015.  
Carried Unanimously.

4.2.8  Draft Policy – Trustee Expenses
K. Graves spoke to Report 15085, and responded to trustee questions. Revisions were suggested for when the report returns next week.

M15-0129  R. Papin / A. Grebenc
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board extend the meeting beyond 10 p.m.  
Carried Unanimously.

4.2.9  Policy Schedule Amendment – Trustee Honoraria
K. Graves spoke to Report 15086, and responded to trustee questions. Revisions were suggested for when the report returns next week.

For Information
4.2.10  Gifted Accommodation
M. Zonneveld spoke to Report 15087, and responded to trustee questions. J. Oliver indicated she would like to discuss the ongoing issue of gifted accommodation to the Program and Accommodation Committee in the new school year.

4.2.11  Administrative Procedures Update
D. Euale spoke to Report 15088, and responded to trustee questions.

4.3  Committee Reports
D. Danielli spoke to the recent OPSBA AGM and discussions regarding community hubs. She also indicated she’d be sending information regarding the upcoming Central West OPSBA meeting.
L. Reynolds spoke to today’s meeting of the Centre for Skills Development and Training.
J. Oliver expressed her appreciation to her colleagues for the nomination to be Chair of the Program and Accommodation Committee. She indicated the matter of a program of an elite athlete programs will receive further consideration by the Program and Accommodation Committee.
T. Ehl Harrison spoke to her attendance at the recent environmental committee discussing active transportation and communicating those issues to parents.
D. Danielli also offered her congratulations to J. Gray as a member of the Central West policy team. She also notified trustees of the Children’s Mental Health conference in April.

T. Ehl Harrison spoke to her delight that the Outdoor Education Experiential Funding will continue.

K. Amos spoke to October’s PIC Conference at White Oaks Secondary School.

4.4 Director’s Report

D. Euale offered congratulations to the 60 schools (4 bronze, 30 silver, 24 gold and 2 platinum), who achieved Ontario EcoSchools Certification this school year, including the 9 additional schools that have achieved certification for five or more years. He indicated this is a significant accomplishment reflecting school-wide teamwork and leadership from students, staff and community members; energy conservation; waste minimization, school ground greening; environmental lessons and field trips directly connected to the Ontario Curriculum; and/or environmental stewardship projects and events.

D. Euale also offered his congratulations to Ruth Teszeri for receiving the 2015-16 award for Excellence and Innovation in Mathematics Education from the Ontario Mathematics Coordinators Association, recognizing the leadership Ruth has provided to students in classrooms, to math coaches, to cross-panel collaboration and AQ teaching to instructional staff.

D. Euale commented on the success of Hawthorne Village Public School in its efforts as part of the 2014 Terry Fox Run, placing in the top 25 schools in Ontario in its fundraising efforts for cancer research. A total of 84 Halton elementary schools participated in the Terry Fox Run in 2014.

D. Euale indicated the Halton District School Board has been awarded The Scholastic Partnership Award of the Year based on a nomination submitted by Big Brothers/Big Sisters Canada. The School Board will be presented the award at a National Awards Function on June 25th, 2015 at the Bank of Montreal Institute for Learning (IFL). The Scholastic Partnership Award is given to a school, school board or university that has contributed to a local agency’s mission and vision. The award is based on the long standing and growing partnership with the Halton District School and BBBS of Halton. D. Euale indicated BBBS Halton has served an estimated 2,430 children and youth during a period of 14 years within 46 public schools in Oakville, Milton and Halton Hills – starting from one single school based program to six school based programs including ISM, Homework Club, ACC, GLOW, Go Girls and Game On. Each year, the Homework Club alone benefits from over 300 high school mentors.

D. Euale invited S. Miller to share the selection of Syed Izhar, a Dr. Frank J. Hayden Secondary School student as a member of the CIMA Cricket Across the Pond (CAP) program this summer. Izhar is one of 12 cricketers representing school boards from Hamilton to Durham who will be traveling to Sri Lanka this summer as the All Star GTHA school cricket team.

4.5 Communications from the Chair

K. Amos offered congratulations to the students and staff at White Oaks Secondary School for being named as the 2014-15 winners of the Premier’s “Exceptional Schools” Award. The Premier’s Awards recognize exceptional and innovative work being done in schools to create a safe and accepting school environment. The students, teachers, principals, parents/guardians and other community members at White Oaks Secondary School are being recognized for working together to foster a positive school environment that supports student achievement and well–being.

K. Amos also talked about the emotional Futures program graduation held today at White Oaks, offering her congratulations to the students. She also commented on the questionnaire posted on the Board’s website for public input into the Director search process, indicating it would remain active for the next seven days.

K. Amos offered her congratulations to Chris Lillis from Hamilton Video and Sound for his efforts in instigating technology in the Board room — an innovative effort in school boards. She also extended her congratulations to Jeff Bowman for working through the implementation of the Board room technology.

4.6 Trustee Questions and Comments

L. Reynolds reminded trustees of the rescheduled date for the Special Athletes Track Meet, this Friday.

A. Grebenc spoke to the recent Clarksdale Fun Fair, and the mock “Pan Am” games held at CH Norton.
J. Oliver highlighted her recent family of schools meeting, and discussions regarding active transportation at the Region involving municipal and school board partners. She indicated she would work to bring a motion to have a further discussion at the Board or at a committee level to determine how resources could support the success and sustainability of efforts in this area.

J. Gray asked T. Dyson for information regarding how Halton is dealing with the implementation (training) of teachers with respect to the Health and Physical Education curriculum.

J. Gray complimented the school administrators at Acton District High School for their efforts in acquiring the “Community Matters” (Safe School Ambassadors) program for their school. She also expressed her anticipation at celebrating the successes of Halton District School Board retirees at tomorrow night’s Celebrating Service event.

A. Harvey Hope expressed her appreciation to senior staff re their efforts in addressing the elementary report card issue.

K. Amos recognized B. Smith and Y. Obeng, as this was their last meeting before moving to new endeavours.

Agenda Item 5
M15-0130  A. Grebenc / L. Reynolds
Be it resolved that the Board adjourn at 11:02 p.m.  Carried Unanimously

Recorder  Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion #</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| M12-0119 | Be it resolved that the new Burlington NE high school, (SRA #101 Alton), provide Grade 9 & 10 English programming in 2013-14, add Grade 11 in 2014-15 and add Grade 12 in 2015-16.  
Be it resolved that the new Burlington NE high school, (SRA #101 Alton), provide Grade 9 & 10 French Immersion programming in 2013-14, add Grade 11 in 2014-15, & Grade 12 in 2015-16.  
Be it resolved that Grade 11 and 12 English program students within the SRA #101 (Alton) boundaries, attending Nelson, Robert Bateman, Lester B. Pearson and/or M.M. Robinson High Schools in 2013-14, continue to attend these high schools until graduation and transportation be provided subject to the Board’s Transportation policy.  
Be it resolved that Grade 11 and 12 French Immersion program students within the SRA #101 (Alton) boundaries, attending Nelson and M.M. Robinson High Schools in 2013-14, continue to attend these high schools until graduation and that transportation be provided subject to the 'French As A Second Language' policy of the Board.  
Be it resolved that due to the 'grandfathering' provision in the Alton Elementary Boundary Review recommendation #4 (see below), the new boundary for French Immersion students residing in north Headon Forest (directing them to M.M. Robinson HS) will begin as of September 2016.  
Transportation will be provided subject to the ‘French As A Second Language’ policy of the Board. | Senior Admin                                         |
| M12-0204 | Be it resolved that.... the Board develop a governance process to monitor School Generated Funds including School Council Funds and school businesses, and refer this item to the Policy, By-law & Governance Committee.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Policy, By-law & Governance Cmte                     |
| M13-0007 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board support consistent (annual) and adequate ICT funding of an additional $910,000 resulting in $2,010,000 toward this plan; and THAT the Board support additional School Program staffing of 2.0 FTE starting 2013-14, increasing to 3.0 FTE starting 2015-16 to support student and staff learning in effective use of assistive and instructional technologies.                          | Superintendent of Business / Chief Information Officer |
| M13-0073 | Be it resolved that in recognition of the role of SEAC and the motions passed at the SEAC Meeting of April 2, 2013 and conversations at the table this evening, that the Halton District School Board defer the Assessment of Gifted Entry/Gifted Screening Process Review, and that the Board direct the Director to:  
1. develop and implement a consultation plan to seek input from SEAC, parents of gifted students, teachers and school staff on improving our gifted assessment process. | Director of Education                                |
| M13-0171 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board approve a structure for Board policy that includes governance policies and framework policies as per the appendices to Report 13083.                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | PB&G Committee                                      |
| M13-0172 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board approve a structure for administrative procedures and supporting guidelines, implementation handbooks, and protocols as contemplated in Report 13083.                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Director of Education                                |
| M14-0039 | Be it resolved that the Community Funding of Facilities Enhancements be referred to Policy, By-law and Governance Committee for the development of a Framework Policy governing this admin procedure.                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | PB&G Cmte                                           |
| M14-0158 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board consider the following option related to the establishment of a second entry point (Grade 5) for French Immersion:  
Option C (Defer the decision on second French Immersion entry point): Defer the decision regarding a second French Immersion entry point until we have implemented Primary Core French.                                                                                   | Director of Education                                |
| M15-0015 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board refer the Trustee Code of Conduct policy to the Policy, By-law & Governance Committee.                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | PB&G Chair                                          |
| M15-0017 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board refer the Policy Development & Review Policy to the Policy, By-law and Governance Committee.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | PB&G Chair                                          |
| M15-0023 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board use a portion of the "Board Leadership and Team Development" account to cover the registration, accommodation and transportation costs for the Student Trustee Mentor accompanying the Student Trustees to the OSTA/AECO conference in Ottawa from February 26 to March 1, 2015; and  
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board use a portion of the "Board Leadership and Team Development" account to cover the registration and accommodation costs of the OPSBA Central West Regional Vice Chair for the OPSBA 2015 AGM. | Chair of the Board                                   |
| M15-0024 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board use a portion of the Board Leadership and Team Development account to cover the registration and accommodation costs for the HDSB OPSBA Voting Member(s) for the OPSBA AGM.                                                                                                                                                                     | Chair of the Board                                   |
| M15-0026 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board approve the approach to the Close the Gap initiative as outlined in Report 14199; and THAT specific projects be undertaken as follows, funded subject to these cost estimates and budget availability:  
1. Support for installation of classroom projection equipment (IT Plan), $100,000  
2. Library Services, $500,000 over 2 years  
3. Special Education rooms, $600,000 over 2 years  
4. Specialty Classrooms, $600,000 over 2 years  
5. Electrical upgrade and air conditioning in secondary schools, second and third floor areas, $3,600,000  
6. Electrical upgrade and air conditioning in elementary schools, second and third floor areas, $4,700,000 | Superintendent of Facility Services                  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion #</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| M13-0274 to M13-0287 | Be it resolved that effective in the 2014-15 school year, the Halton District School Board introduce 40 minutes/week of Primary Core French beginning in Grade 1 in 24 Halton District School Board schools, with a commitment for a full roll-out by 2017-18, with an annual review of the roll-out to be brought back to trustees each year, and;  
(a) THAT schools selected for the initial phase of this program represent a variety of school organizations (K-8, K-6, Dual Track, Single Track English, large and small enrolments) across the four geographic areas within the Halton District School Board, (Halton Hills, Milton, Oakville, Burlington).  
(b) THAT students in these schools will receive the following minutes of Core French instruction between Grades 1-8:  
   - 40 minutes / week Grades 1-3  
   - 120 minutes / week Grades 4  
   - 160 minutes/week Grade 5  
   - 200 minutes / week Grades 6-7-8 (Appendix 5)  
(c) THAT no later than June 2018, the Halton District School Board will assess the impact of this Primary Core French experience in relation to student engagement, student attitude, English proficiency and the impact on Grade 1 French Immersion uptake associated with these schools.  
(d) THAT under the leadership of the System Principal for French Second Language, School Programs and Human Resources, the Halton District School Board will develop a long-term recruitment and staff development plan to ensure the Halton District School Board hires and retains the highest quality French teachers available and that this plan is shared with the Board of Trustees.  
(e) THAT the Halton District School Board continues to provide staff development programs that include teaching strategies, modifications and accommodations to address students with diverse learning needs and students who arrive in Halton without prior experiences in either French Immersion and Core French.  
(f) THAT the Halton District School Board develop and implement a 5-year plan whereby all Halton District School Board elementary schools with Intermediate Divisions have one classroom dedicated for the teaching of Grade 7-8 Core French (Appendix 6), whereas if it will not require additional portables.  

Wherein a triple grade configuration has been possible (due to 23 or fewer students enrolled in three consecutive grades), the School Superintendent will consider and may recommend for Board approval one of the following strategies;  
- staff as a Grade 1-2 blended class;  
- staff as a Grade 1-2-3 blended class;  
- redirect the Grade 1 students to a neighbouring school for their program and;  

THAT prior to the analysis being undertaken, study parameters will be established jointly by the Halton District School Board and the Halton Catholic District School Board; and  

THAT the Halton District School Board undertake a bell time analysis study for current Halton District School Board families, with a review of the effects of this procedure be undertaken by September 2014.  

THAT the Halton District School Board introduce 40 minutes/week of Primary Core French beginning in Grade 1 in 24 Halton District School Board schools, with a commitment for a full roll-out by 2017-18, with an annual review of the roll-out to be brought back to trustees each year, and;  

THAT prior to the analysis being undertaken, study parameters will be established jointly by the Halton District School Board and the Halton Catholic District School Board; and  

THAT the cost of undertaking a bell time analysis study be provided to trustees for approval.  

Be it resolved that effective in the 2014-2015 school year, the Halton District School Board:  

a) establish and communicate a consistent Grade 1 French Immersion February registration deadline for current Halton District School Board families, with a review of the effects of this procedure be undertaken by September 2014.  

b) allow students who have not been in Senior Kindergarten within the Halton District School Board, register in Grade 1 French Immersion up to the first week of school.  

c) communicate and implement the assessment and admission procedure for students with French proficiency arriving in Halton after the registration deadline.  

d) All elementary schools that offer Grade 1 programming must host a Grade 1 Information Evening that includes information about English program, French Immersion program and Special Education placements. If the home school does not offer French Immersion, the school their students would be directed to for French Immersion cannot host their Grade 1 Information Evening at the same time. The Special Education presentation is to be scripted by the Board’s Special Education department, to include a description of all elementary Special Education placements.  

M15-0071 | Be it resolved that Halton District School Board support HSTS utilizing a third-party consultant to undertake a bell time analysis study for elementary and secondary schools, in order to find route efficiencies and determine the financial impacts or cost savings, and;  

THAT prior to the analysis being undertaken, study parameters will be established jointly by the Halton District School Board and the Halton Catholic District School Board; and  

THAT the cost of undertaking a bell time analysis study be provided to trustees for approval.  

M15-0090 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board refer the “Board Recognition Program” to the Policy, By-law and Governance Committee.  

M15-0101 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board direct the Chair to invite the City of Burlington and the recipients of this letter, to meet to discuss options and concerns regarding election polling stations at schools.  

M15-0119 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board approve the revisions to the Banking Services Agreement (September 1, 2012 to August 31, 2017) with the Royal Bank of Canada (RBC).  

M15-0120 | Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board appoint the architectural firm of Snyder Architects Inc. to prepare the design and tender documents, and supervise construction for the project to replace and rebuild Martin Street P.S. with a 740 pupil place JK-8 facility.  

Superintendent of Business  
Superintendent of Business  
Chair of the Board  
Superintendent of Business  
Superintendent of Facility Services  
Director of Education
M15-0121
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board appoint the architectural firm of Hossack & Associates Architects Inc. to prepare the design guidelines for new elementary schools as detailed in Request for Proposal 14-36.

M15-0122
THAT subject to Ministry approval and Board approval of the specific project that the Halton District School Board appoint the architectural firm of Hossack and Associates Architects Inc. to prepare the design and tender documents (Phase 2) for the proposed new elementary school, ERA127 (Milton #10) to be built in Milton using the guidelines developed.

M15-0123
Whereas the Halton District School Board values the end of year reporting of our students’ achievements, Therefore, be it resolved that the Halton District School Board approve the request of the Director to spend up to $100,000 to support the production of abbreviated report cards or mark summaries for elementary students over the summer. Funding for this project to be from contingency.

M15-0126
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board implement a recognition program as outlined in Report 15082, reflecting our vision and values; and
THAT the required By-Law amendment and Policy be developed.

M15-0128
Be it resolved that the Halton District School post the draft Community Partnership Policy, as appended to Report 15095, on the Board website for a period of at least 25 days, soliciting public input, and that the policy and any input return to the Board for consideration at a Board meeting in October 2015.

M11-0213
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board approve the Operating Plan for any given year prior to approval of the budget for that same year

M11-0216
Be it resolved that the Special Education Plan be brought to the Board in each year prior to approval of the budget for that same year.

M12-0088
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board direct the Director to provide a full and complete list of all HDSB policies and administrative procedures noting:

a) whether or not the policy/administrative procedure has been adopted by board motion,

b) the date that the policy/administrative procedure was last reviewed,

c) the date that the policy/administrative procedure is next scheduled to be reviewed and

d) whether or not the policy/administrative procedure suggests an impact to the roles and/or responsibilities of trustees or board of trustees (directly or through referenced policy or admin procedure).

AND THAT recommendations are brought before the Board by February 2016, to be considered for implementation in Spring 2016;

AND THAT SEAC members be invited to participate in the review.

M15-0059
Be it resolved that the Director direct staff to conduct a review of the Educational Assistant allocation process that considers the extent to which the process:

• is driven by individual student needs

• considers the health, safety, educational and social needs of students

• informs and involves parents

• involves the Student Services and Equity and Inclusion departments

AND THAT recommendations are brought before the Board by February 2016, to be considered for implementation in Spring 2016;

AND THAT SEAC members be invited to participate in the review.

M15-0043
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board initiate a committee to examine program viability in both the English program and the French Immersion program and to make a recommendation to the Board no later than June 2015. The committee will be chaired by the Associate Director and will be composed of the Superintendent of Program, Superintendent of Student Success, System Principal of French Program, System Principal of School Program, Principals of dual track elementary schools, elementary single track English schools, elementary single track French Schools, French Immersion programs in High School, single track English programs in high schools and three trustees who currently sit on the French advisory committee.

PENDING REPORTS – JUNE 24, 2015

MONTH & DATE

MOTION & DATE

RESOLUTION

PRESENTATION DATE

M11-0213
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board approve the Operating Plan for any given year prior to approval of the budget for that same year

Spring Annually

M11-0216
Be it resolved that the Special Education Plan be brought to the Board in each year prior to approval of the budget for that same year.

Spring Annually

M12-0088
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board direct the Director to provide a full and complete list of all HDSB policies and administrative procedures noting:

a) whether or not the policy/administrative procedure has been adopted by board motion,

b) the date that the policy/administrative procedure was last reviewed,

c) the date that the policy/administrative procedure is next scheduled to be reviewed and

d) whether or not the policy/administrative procedure suggests an impact to the roles and/or responsibilities of trustees or board of trustees (directly or through referenced policy or admin procedure).

June / Sept. 2012

Review of policies undertaken (on-going)

M15-0059
Be it resolved that the Director direct staff to conduct a review of the Educational Assistant allocation process that considers the extent to which the process:

• is driven by individual student needs

• considers the health, safety, educational and social needs of students

• informs and involves parents

• involves the Student Services and Equity and Inclusion departments

AND THAT recommendations are brought before the Board by February 2016, to be considered for implementation in Spring 2016;

AND THAT SEAC members be invited to participate in the review.

February 2016

M15-0043
Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board initiate a committee to examine program viability in both the English program and the French Immersion program and to make a recommendation to the Board no later than June 2015. The committee will be chaired by the Associate Director and will be composed of the Superintendent of Program, Superintendent of Student Success, System Principal of French Program, System Principal of School Program, Principals of dual track elementary schools, elementary single track English schools, elementary single track French Schools, French Immersion programs in High School, single track English programs in high schools and three trustees who currently sit on the French advisory committee.

June 2015
TO: The Chair and Members of the Halton District School Board
FROM: Stuart Miller, Associate Director
RE: Program Viability re: English and French programming

Warrant:
This report summarizes the work of the Program Viability Committee (PVC) which was created and implemented as per Board motion M15-0043. This motion called for the creation of a committee to examine and make recommendations with respect to program viability in French and English programming offered in Halton’s elementary and secondary schools. In addition the PVC undertook its work with the assumption, as per motion M13-0274, “…that all schools with a primary division will have implemented a Primary Core French program by 2018.

Included in this report are two recommendations. The first provides for alternative scenarios regarding the delivery of French Immersion, which will be brought to the public for consultation in the Fall of 2015. The second recommendation references a communication plan to be presented to the Board no later than the end of September 2015.

RECOMMENDATION 1:

Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board present the following options for the delivery of French Immersion to the public in the Fall of 2015 for the purpose of receiving feedback, considerations and comments. Feedback will be brought to the Board for consideration in the delivery of French Immersion programming:
1. Option 1: Grade 1 (early) French immersion remains a 50% French 50% English delivery model, but entry to FI will be capped. The method of capping would be determined at a later date.
2. Option 2: Grade 1 (early) French Immersion remains at 50% French and 50% English, however all FI programs will be delivered in single track FI schools. French Immersion will be phased out of dual track schools and no new dual track schools will be considered. The location of the single track schools will be determined at a later date.
3. Option 3: French Immersion will commence at a later entry point (mid entry); Grade 4. This will result in the delivery model of FI moving from a 50% model to at least a 80% French Immersion model. In addition the delivery of FI will occur in dual track schools only.
4. Option 4: French Immersion will commence at a later entry point (mid entry); Grade 4. This will result in the delivery model of FI moving from a 50% model to at least a 80% French Immersion model. In addition the delivery of FI will occur in single track FI schools only.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board initiate a community consultation/feedback process with the process and the method of consulting and communicating to the public coming to the Board of Trustees before the end of September 2015 for information.

Background:
At the Board meeting of March 4, 2015 the Board of Trustees were provided an interim report (Board Report 15044) on the implementation of Primary Core French. This program had been implemented in 24 schools and the focus of the report was an update on both its implementation and its efficacy. The primary theme of the report was that the
program was positive and was having the desired outcome of exposing primary students to the French language at grade 1. It also indicated there had been a slight decrease (approximately 5%) in French Immersion uptake, in particular in single track English schools. As a result the Board passed the following motion:

**M15-0042:**

> Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board expand the Primary Core French program to an additional minimum of 12, up to a maximum of 15 elementary schools for September 2015 and that upon a motion passing the Program department will make a recommendation as to which schools will provide the program.

Although there had been a decrease in FI uptake, it was clear this was not sufficient to address the demands FI uptake was placing on the English program in several schools. It is understood this data was only for one year, however the pressure a high FI uptake was placing on the English Program persisted.

As a result the Board passed the following motion:

**M15-0043**

> Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board initiate a committee to examine program viability in both the English program and the French Immersion program and to make a recommendation to the Board no later than June 2015. The committee will be chaired by the Associate Director and will be composed of the Superintendent of Program, Superintendent of Student Success, System Principal of French Program, System Principal of School Program, Principals of dual track elementary schools, elementary single track English schools, elementary single track French Schools, French Immersion programs in High School, single track English programs in high schools and three trustees who currently sit on the French advisory committee.

As a result of the first motion, primary core French was expanded to an additional 15 schools bringing the total to 39 elementary schools implementing the program for September 2015.

The second motion resulted in the creation of the Program Viability Committee (PVC) comprised of the members prescribed in the motion. (Appendix 1).

Moreover the work of the PVC was to be undertaken with the following underlying assumption:

All elementary schools with a primary division will provide for a Primary Core French Program as per Board motion of M13-0274 (November 20, 2013). Full implementation will be by June 2018.

To date the PVC has met a total of seven times for a total of 19 hours. In addition to the committee members, the Director of Education was present at the majority of meetings. Furthermore the Research Department was a resource at every meeting. There was also a Steering Committee comprised of the Associate Director, two Family of School Superintendents, two Program Superintendents and the Senior Manager of Planning. The steering committee’s role was to set the agenda and prepare materials for the larger PVC meeting.

The initial work of the PVC was to identify and determine the challenges/pressures a high uptake in French Immersion was placing on the system and in particular the elementary English program.

**Challenges Identified**

1. Impact on English program enrolment as a result of high French Immersion uptake.

The uptake of French Immersion, from Kindergarten to Grade 1 continues to be high.

- In 2013 to 2014, 37% of Kindergarten students moved into French Immersion;
- In 2014-2015 the uptake was 36%, and,
- We are projecting the same for 2015/2016.

It is important to note these percentages do not include new registrations to the neighbourhood that enter directly into the Grade 1 French Immersion program. This results in significantly higher uptake rates in numerous neighbourhoods. This past September, Halton had 28 schools where the uptake was over 40%, fourteen of these schools had uptakes over 60%. (See Appendix 2 for a list of dual track schools). Appendix 3 indicates uptake by regions of Halton.
2. French Language proficiency: As a Board we currently do not measure French language proficiency. However the fact that FI students graduate from Grade 12 have demonstrated with 10 credits (1100 hours) is a testament to language acquisition.

3. Ability to recruit sufficient numbers of qualified and fluent elementary French teachers:
   - 88% of surveyed principals (53 of 60) are hiring up to three French teachers per year;
   - One-quarter of our schools must use supply teachers during the process of finding a French teacher to hire;
   - 40% of our schools continue to face challenges in hiring French teachers;
   - Over 80% of principals report it is difficult to find a French teacher in a timely manner; and,
   - When faced with interviewees who are lacking in either French proficiency, or strong pedagogy, the principals repost and keep looking.

The conclusion one could draw from this data is that principals are devoting a significant amount of their time to ensuring they have enough French teachers to staff their schools.

See Appendix 3 for recruitment numbers. The Board is placing considerable resources into recruiting French Qualified teachers for elementary schools

4. Ability to sufficiently recruit staff for French Immersion in secondary schools: In all secondary schools, in order to achieve the FI certificate, students enrolled in FI must acquire 10 credits in subjects with French being the language of instruction. These subjects can and are in a variety of subjects and are generally taught by subject specialists. The subjects on offer to FI students may be limited by the number of subject specialist teachers who are also fluent in French. If the current uptake of FI in elementary schools continues and carries on through secondary school it may pose a challenge to secondary schools in two ways a) the ability to recruit sufficient qualified subject specialists fluent in French and b) the ability to offer broad subject choices to FI students

Addressing the challenges:
The committee received a presentation on quality classroom instruction and all it entails. It was determined this would be the lens to examining the challenges. Any recommendation made would be through the lens of quality instruction and how this is supported by the numbers of students in a given program and the make-up of those classes.

As a result three objectives of the PVC were established:
   1. Maintain efficient and effective English and French Program Streams
   2. Ensure students in both streams have equitable access to quality programming
   3. Ensure the sustainability of both program streams.

In addition to a lens of quality instruction, the PVC established criteria (Appendix 5) to measure English and French program viability. The intent was to determine which model would best represent the most criteria in a way that would allow for both choice and program viability.

The PVC looked at a number of reports and was provided synopses on reports by other Boards and/or research related to French Immersion delivery challenges and language acquisition.

These included, but are not limited to:
   a) Peel District School Board: Final report of the French Immersion Review Committee Elementary
   b) Report of the French Second Language Task Force; New Brunswick
   c) Ottawa District School Board
   d) European models on second languages

The resulting discussion led to the development of various scenarios of French Immersion program delivery for elementary students. Secondary French Immersion program will be impacted by any of the scenarios that may ultimately be chosen, but at this time there is no recommendation to change delivery at the secondary level. With the current uptake of FI at elementary, there will be an impact on FI at secondary, as it will exacerbate greatly the ability to recruit FI teachers and in particular subject specific teachers.
It is important to note the recommendations are primarily related to French Immersion delivery, yet the committee’s purpose was to examine program viability in both English and French. However, it is the delivery of FI that is having an impact on English program delivery and therefore it needs to be considered as part of the solution to ensure viability of both programs. This point was a constant and was reiterated several times throughout the process.

The scenarios developed and examined in a more fulsome way are attached (Appendix 6).

**Rationale:**
The recommendations for the four options to be shared with the public were the result of deliberations by the PVC. It is recognized at this point these options are going to the public for consultation/feedback. Depending on the feedback and the considerations brought forward by the public, the final recommendation presented to the Board of Trustees may be one of the above or a hybrid of one of the above. The final recommendation(s) will be the result of public consultations and will be presented to the Board in the Fall of 2015.

One of the difficulties the PVC had to consider was the expansion of Primary Core French program to all elementary schools. This program was approved in part, to respond to the increased uptake in FI and parent demand for second (French) language instruction. The data shows a slight decrease in FI uptake from those schools that have Primary Core French and in particular, for those where the students are directed to a single track FI school. The difficulty in this is that the data is limited (only for one year) and at this point it is insufficient to reliably conclude whether the expansion of the Core French program is having an impact on the uptake in the FI program.

This was a dilemma for the PVC as it appeared as though a consideration to change FI delivery may be premature. However, the potential consequence of allowing this program the time to evolve and expand over the next three to four years may result in exacerbating the difficulties the Board is currently having with smaller English program cohorts in many of the dual track schools (Appendix 2). It very could very likely result in the morphing of more dual track schools into single track FI schools and all the accompanying issues that come with it such as possible triple grading or moving English students to different schools.

Although there were individuals on the PVC suggesting the the Primary Core French program be allowed more time in order to better assess the impact of the implementation, the prevalent opinion was that other options need to be explored.

The PVC examined several options and hybrids for elementary FI delivery, but has recommended the following to be presented to the public. They all assume full Primary Core French implementation and they are meant to compliment, not replace that program.

The PVC considered increasing the number of minutes/week in Primary Core French. It is currently 40 minutes per week. This could be increased, but it would have to be done in such a way that it does not impact the literacy or numeracy programs for students in Grades 1-3. Adding minutes in French may require reducing minutes in another subject or teaching another subject in French. Consequently, for the purposes of this report, there is no recommendation for an increase in the number of minutes/week, however it may form part of a final recommendation to the Board.

**Option 1**
In this option, Grade 1 (early) French Immersion remains a 50% French 50 % English program, but admittance to FI program in Grade 1 will be capped. This option is quite simply about controlling of the number of students able to enrol in FI in Grade 1 and therefore ensuring viable numbers in the core English program. There are several different methods of capping. At this point the committee is not making a recommendation with respect to the method. However, if this were a final recommendation to the Board the method of capping would be included. The different methods would be made available to the public in order that they could provide feedback.

**Implications of Option 1**
Capping limits the number of students able to enrol in FI. It unquestionably maintains control of the program and ensures the Board has sufficient quality and fluent teachers to staff the program and that the numbers in the English stream remain viable. It also ensures viability of the English program. Depending on the method of capping employed it may also ensure schools currently providing the FI program may not have to undergo any boundary changes.
However, the HDSB’s mission statement indicates “challenge and choice” for students. By capping, “choice” would be limited for French Immersion. In addition, the method of capping would likely be contentious regardless of the method chosen. An example would be using a lottery to determine placement. Although this would allow all those who wanted to enter the lottery to enter, for those students who were unsuccessful it would result in them not having the opportunity for an FI program, due to means beyond their control.

**Option 2**
In this option, Grade 1 (early) French Immersion remains at 50% French and 50% English. However, all FI programs will be delivered in single track FI schools. The FI program will no longer be delivered in dual track schools. The location of the single track schools will be determined at a later date. This option is not dissimilar to capping. By creating only FI in single track schools, it results in a form of capping. When the school is at capacity, no more students can be admitted. It also results in controlling the number of students enrolled in FI, thereby ensuring viable numbers in the English stream.

**Implications of Option 2:**
Similar to Option 1, this option does limit the choice of some students who would want to enrol in FI, but are unable due to the finite capacity of the FI school. In addition, the process by which students would be admitted to the school would have to be determined. It might also result in some form of lottery or a specific registration day. The consequences of a lottery are mentioned above, while a specific registration day may result in parents lining up at schools to register their children into FI. As well, with the creation of new single track FI schools, the existing English programs in those schools would be transferred to other schools and students would be redirected to these other English program schools. By creating additional FI single track schools, more students will need to attend schools outside their current designated school catchment. Also, there are certain areas where there are insufficient schools with pupil places available to accommodate a single track FI school and associated redirections (Milton). The adoption of option 2 may result in some very complex boundary reviews.

**Option 3**
This option would involve French Immersion commencing at a later entry point (mid entry); Grade 4. This will result in the delivery model of FI moving from a 50% model to at least a 80% French Immersion model. In addition the delivery of FI will occur in dual track schools only. More specifically, students would enrol to a middle immersion entry FI program. It would commence in Grade 4 and would be available in dual track schools only. It would result in the FI program having a minimum of 80% of the school day in French. It allows parents and teachers more time to determine if the FI program is suitable for their children’s learning needs. In addition mid-entry FI program allows for student voice. The students themselves could have input into the decision.

It is believed the mid-entry (Gr 4) following three years of Primary Core French coupled with an increased intensity of FI instruction in the classroom, may limit the number of students choosing FI and allow for better informed family decisions. This will certainly allow for the viability of the English program prior to Grade 4, but may, due to lower uptake ensure it beyond Grade 3

**Implications of Option 3**
In order for this option to address the challenge of high FI uptake it requires fewer students choose FI in Grade 4. The challenge the Board currently has around staff recruitment will most certainly be exacerbated if the uptake of FI remains as it is now. The increased intensity coupled with the expansion of primary core French will result in the need for a greater number of qualified French teachers. This would be very difficult in the competitive environment for French teacher recruitment. This option may just be delaying the issues until Grade 4. It may create the same issues that some dual track schools are currently experiencing, but not until Grade 4.

This option would also result in the repatriation of students to their home or neighbourhood schools for the English program (Grades 1 to 3). In some cases, this will result in some schools having enrolments exceeding their OTG (on the ground) capacity. As well, this option would result in the phasing out of single track FI schools, (primarily in Oakville).
The implementation of this option will necessitate the requirement for the Board to undertake school boundary reviews for many communities in Halton.

**Option 4**
This is the same as option 3 except FI program delivery will only occur in designated single track FI schools. This would have the same impact as option 2 as it would limit enrolment into the FI program based on the overall capacity of the school. This would ensure both viability in the English program and the appropriate levels of staffing in the FI program.

**Implications of Option 4:**
The implications for option 4 are the same/similar to option 3. Moreover, a number of school boundary reviews may have to be undertaken as the determination as to where the single track schools would be placed would have to occur. In addition, the same situation for option 2 may occur as a method for acceptance into FI would have to be determined. Similar examples (lottery or first come first serve) as identified in previous options could be considered. Similar to option 2, there are certain areas where there are not a sufficient number of schools with pupil places available that could accommodate a single track FI school and associated redirections (Milton). It would also have to be determined if those schools which become single track FI become Grade 4-8 schools or they offer Grades 1-3 in English and then only French in Grades 4-8.

**Conclusion:**
The Program Viability Committee studied many strategies of ensuring program viability, especially in the elementary panel. It is very complex with no solution that can completely satisfy all stakeholders. The recommendations brought forward to the Board of Trustees are intended to garner input that will inform any final recommendation with respect to French Immersion delivery that will support viability in both our English and French programs. It is recognized that FI is an optional program and the core program of Ontario is English. However with the expansion of Primary Core French coupled with an addressing of the recruitment and uptake issues currently facing the Board, the students in HDSB will all have the opportunity to be exposed to a second language in a more fulsome way and yet allow for program viability in both English and French programing.

The primary purpose of this report is to present to the Board of Trustees four possible remedies to the challenges of providing a viable English and French Immersion program for Halton students. All of them are devoid of some detail with respect to implementation. Subsequent to public consultations and prior to a final recommendation to the Board on the delivery of elementary FI, these details will be fully and completely determined and presented.

**Respectfully submitted,**

__________________________
Stuart Miller

__________________________
David Euale

Associate Director

Director of Education
## Appendix 1

### Program Viability Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Elementary Dual Track</td>
<td>Randy Morassut – Tom Thomson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erin Bedard – George Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Elementary Single Track F.I.</td>
<td>Loui Silvestri - Sunningdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colette Ruddock – E. J. James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Elementary Single Track English</td>
<td>Sean McCarthy – West Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas Tulk-LaPrade – J. M. Denyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Principal Elementary Program</td>
<td>Terri Blackwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Principal Student Success</td>
<td>Doug Bothwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Principal French Language</td>
<td>Robert Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent Elementary Programs</td>
<td>Tricia Dyson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent Secondary Programs</td>
<td>David Boag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent at large</td>
<td>Rob Eatough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Hunt-Gibbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal English High School</td>
<td>Gerard Herlihey – Abbey Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal French Immersion High School</td>
<td>Karen Hartman - Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>Joanna Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richelle Papin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim Graves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Stuart Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Dom Renzella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aimmie Kellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>David Euale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2

### HALTON DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD PLANNING DEPARTMENT

#### PROJECTED ENROLLMENTS FOR OCTOBER 31, 2015

**OFFICIAL BURLINGTON ELEMENTARY PROJECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>JK</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>GR.1</th>
<th>GR.2</th>
<th>GR.3</th>
<th>GR.4</th>
<th>GR.5</th>
<th>GR.6</th>
<th>GR.7</th>
<th>GR.8</th>
<th>SPED</th>
<th>BODIES</th>
<th>OTG</th>
<th>CAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALEXANDER'S</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXANDER'S</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE T. LINDLEY</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE T. LINDLEY</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES R. BEAUDOIN</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES R. BEAUDOIN</td>
<td>GIF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES R. BEAUDOIN</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARKSDALE</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARKSDALE</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN WILLIAM BOICH</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN WILLIAM BOICH</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPLEHURST</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPLEHURST</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORCHARD PARK</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORCHARD PARK</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINELAND</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINELAND</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM THOMSON</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM THOMSON</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>Overall FI Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALEXANDER'S</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXANDER'S</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE T. LINDLEY</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE T. LINDLEY</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES R. BEAUDOIN</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES R. BEAUDOIN</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARKSDALE</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARKSDALE</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN WILLIAM BOICH</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN WILLIAM BOICH</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPLEHURST</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPLEHURST</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORCHARD PARK</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORCHARD PARK</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINELAND</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINELAND</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM THOMSON</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM THOMSON</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Projected Enrolments for October 31, 2015
### Official Burlington Elementary Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>JK</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>GR.1</th>
<th>GR.2</th>
<th>GR.3</th>
<th>GR.4</th>
<th>GR.5</th>
<th>GR.6</th>
<th>GR.7</th>
<th>GR.8</th>
<th>SPED BODIES</th>
<th>OTG CAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HERITAGE GLEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade FI Ratio</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall FI Ratio</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES W. HILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade FI Ratio</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall FI Ratio</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OODENAWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade FI Ratio</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall FI Ratio</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALERMO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade FI Ratio</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall FI Ratio</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILGRIM WOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade FI Ratio</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall FI Ratio</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade FI Ratio: FI Ratio for Grade 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and SPED bodies.

Overall FI Ratio: FI Ratio for all grades combined.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>JK</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>GR.1</th>
<th>GR.2</th>
<th>GR.3</th>
<th>GR.4</th>
<th>GR.5</th>
<th>GR.6</th>
<th>GR.7</th>
<th>GR.8</th>
<th>SPED</th>
<th>BODIES</th>
<th>OTG</th>
<th>CAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANNE J MACARTHUR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE J MACARTHUR</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE J MACARTHUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.W. FOSTER</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.W. FOSTER</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.W. FOSTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRMA COULSON</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRMA COULSON</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRMA COULSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN STREET</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN STREET</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN STREET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL ROBERTSON</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL ROBERTSON</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL ROBERTSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT BALDWIN</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT BALDWIN</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT BALDWIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGER JEET SINGH</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGER JEET SINGH</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGER JEET SINGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE KENNEDY</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE KENNEDY</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE KENNEDY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT LITTLE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT LITTLE</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT LITTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grade 1 FI Ratio**

**Overall FI Ratio**
### SK to Grade 1 French Immersion Historical Progression, From 2014 / 2015 LTAP - April 10, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burlington</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01F</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oakville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01F</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01F</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Halton Hills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01F</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>3108</td>
<td>3187</td>
<td>3365</td>
<td>3623</td>
<td>3734</td>
<td>3889</td>
<td>4115</td>
<td>4041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01F</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>1444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of Permanent and LTO French Teachers hired annually

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LTO French</th>
<th>Permanent French</th>
<th>Total French (Excluding Occasionals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2014 - 2015</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical 2013 - 2014</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical 2012 - 2013</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical 2011 - 2012</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical 2010 - 2011</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical 2009 - 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2014 - 2015 Recruitment Results for 2015 - 2016 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Pool</th>
<th>Occasional Pool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Externals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* External applicants on the Permanent Pool also hold occasional appointments

** Those on the Permanent Pool will be given priority placement for Permanent and LTO positions

Preference will be given to internal applicants
Appendix 5

Criteria to Measure Program Viability

Program Viability Committee Mandate:

The HDSB is committed to ensuring quality programming and optimal learning experiences for all students.

Does the FI model provide for program viability in English and FI according to the following criteria?

- Sufficient number of highly skilled teachers to staff elementary (and secondary) English and French programs across the system
- Viable student enrolment in English and FI programs within each school and/or across the system
  - Distribution of overall enrolment across schools to maximize quality programming
  - Accommodation of students in permanent school facilities and minimal use of portable classrooms for optimal learning experiences for all students
  - Reduce need for triple-grading
- Stable, long-term boundaries for schools and programs
- Sufficient resources to support learning for all students
- Fiscal responsibilities (e.g., transportation, program materials)
- Minimize the travel distance for students in English and French Immersion programs
| Scenario 1: Status Quo  | - English program (FDK-8)  
|                       | - Core French program starting in grade 1 (40 min/week)  
|                       | - Early FI starting in grade 1 (50%)  
|                       | - Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only)  
|                       | - Single & Dual Track FI models incorporated  
|                       | - No capping  

| Scenario 2: Status Quo with FI Limitations in Dual Track  | - English program (FDK-8)  
|                                                           | - Core French program starting in grade 1 (40 min/week)  
|                                                           | - Early FI starting in grade 1  
|                                                           | - Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only)  
|                                                           | - Single & Dual Track FI models incorporated  
|                                                           | Dual Track only in schools of 600+, schools less than 600 subject to ‘morphing policy’  
|                                                           | - No capping  

| Scenario 3: Status Quo with Capping  | - English program (FDK-8)  
|                                     | - Core French program starting in grade 1 (40 min/week)  
|                                     | - Early FI starting in grade 1 (50%)  
|                                     | - Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only)  
|                                     | - Single & Dual Track FI models incorporated  
|                                     | - Capping of enrolment into FI (e.g., lottery)  

| Scenario 3a: Status Quo with Capping in Dual Track & Increased Primary Core  | - English program (FDK-8)  
|                                                                            | - Core French program starting in grade 1 (120 min/week)  
|                                                                            | - Early FI starting in grade 1 (50%)  
|                                                                            | - Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only)  
|                                                                            | - Single & Dual Track FI models incorporated  
|                                                                            | - Capping in Dual Track Schools  

| Scenario 4: FI Middle Entry  | - English program (FDK-8)  
|                            | - Core French program starting in grade 1 (40 min/week)  
|                            | - Middle Entry FI starting in grade 4 (80%)  
|                            | (min of 30 students per grade per program)  
|                            | - Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only)  
|                            | - Single & Dual Track FI models incorporated  
|                            | - No capping unless required in Dual Track schools subsequent to implementation  

| Scenario 4a: Single Track FI only with Middle Entry  | - English program (FDK-8)  
|                                                      | - Core French program starting in grade 1 (40 min/week)  
|                                                      | - Middle Entry FI starting in grade 4 (80%)  
|                                                      | (min of 30 students per grade per program)  
|                                                      | - Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only)  
|                                                      | - Single Track FI models only  
|                                                      | - No capping  

| Scenario 4b: Dual Track FI only with Middle Entry  | - English program (FDK-8)  
|                                                    | - Core French program starting in grade 1 (40 min/week)  
|                                                    | - Middle Entry FI starting in grade 4 (80%)  
|                                                    | (min of 30 students per grade per program)  
|                                                    | - Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only)  
|                                                    | - Dual Track FI models only  
|                                                    | - No capping  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4c: FI Middle Entry with Capping | English program (FDK-8) | Core French program starting in grade 1 (40 min/week)  
Middle Entry FI starting in grade 4 (80%) (min of 30 students per grade per program)  
Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only)  
Single & Dual Track FI models incorporated  
Capping in Dual Track Schools |
| 5: Regional Single Track FI Centres | English program (FDK-8) | Core French program starting in grade 1 (40 min/week)  
Early FI starting in grade 1 (50%)  
Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only)  
Regional Single Track FI schools only  
Limited sites and therefore capping in place (e.g., lottery) |
| 5a: Regional Single Track with Middle Entry | English program (FDK-8) | Core French program starting in grade 1 (40 min/week)  
Middle Entry FI starting in grade 4 (80%)  
Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only)  
Regional Single Track FI schools only  
Limited sites and therefore capping in place (e.g., lottery) |
| 6: Grade 1 FI Entry with increased FI Intensity | English program (FDK-8) | Core French program starting in grade 1 (40 min/week)  
Early FI starting in grade 1 with increased intensity (e.g., 100% to begin with gradual decrease over grades)  
Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only)  
Single & Dual Track FI models incorporated  
No Capping |
| 6a: Grade 1 FI Entry with increased FI Intensity and capping | English program (FDK-8) | Core French program starting in grade 1 (40 min/week)  
Early FI starting in grade 1 with increased intensity (e.g., 100% to begin with gradual decrease over grades)  
Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only)  
Single & Dual Track FI models incorporated  
Capping of enrolment into FI (e.g., lottery) |
| 7: French Immersion for All | English program (FDK-8) in selected sites | Early FI at all sites starting in grade 1  
Single & Dual Track FI models incorporated |
| 8: Core French Only with Increased Intensity | English program (FDK-8) | Core French program starting in grade 1 (40 min/week)  
Single & Dual Track FI models incorporated |

**Note:** There are numerous components which the PVC may wish to look at independently. One of these components is the Primary Core French intensity. Currently it is 40 min./week. This could be increased if required (e.g., 50 min./week).
TO: The Chair and Members of the Halton District School Board
FROM: Tracey Ehl Harrison, Trustee Wards 1 & 2 Oakville
RE: Acknowledgement of the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission

RECOMMENDATION

Whereas the work of the National Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) regarding residential schools in Canada concluded its work in June 2015, resulting in 94 far reaching Calls to Action, including a number specifically focused on education;

Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board:

i) Foster and continue to develop a culture where all students gain knowledge of residential schools and their effects on Aboriginal communities of Canada and see themselves as contributors to reconciliation.

ii) Report annually on our actions.

iii) (At least) Annually during a Board meeting recognize the history of our area and give respect and honour to its First Peoples, by including in the Chair’s welcome, "We would like to acknowledge that we are on the traditional territory of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation."

iv) Correspond with the Ministry of Education, urging collaboration with Aboriginal communities and the Ontario Public School Board Association to include treaty education, the history and legacy of residential schools and the impact of the Indian Act in curriculum in a way that gives voice to First Peoples. Recognizing that this will take time, also requesting that the Ministry immediately provide school boards with resources to develop and share best practices that support reconciliation.

Rationale:
In June 2015, National Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) concluded 7 years of work focused on giving voice to the history of residential schools in Canada. The first paragraph of the Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future reads:

“For over a century, the central goals of Canada’s Aboriginal policy were to eliminate Aboriginal governments; ignore Aboriginal rights; terminate the Treaties; and, through a process of assimilation, cause Aboriginal peoples to cease to exist as distinct legal, social, cultural, religious, and racial entities in Canada. The establishment and operation of residential schools were a central element of this policy, which can best be described as “cultural genocide.” (p. 1)

The report contains some 94 calls for action; far reaching recommendations about child welfare, health and healing, language, education, culture, art, sport, citizenship, justice, reconciliation and rights to achieve real, measurable, lasting and equitable relationships. “The ultimate objective must be to transform our country and to restore mutual respect between peoples and nations.” (p. 237)
There are a number of Calls to Action specifically related to education, including:

- **#57)** We call upon federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal governments to provide education to public servants on the history of Aboriginal peoples, including the history and legacy of residential schools, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Treaties and Aboriginal rights, Indigenous law, and Aboriginal–Crown relations. This will require skills-based training in intercultural competency, conflict resolution, human rights, and anti-racism. (p. 271)

- **#62)** We call upon the federal, provincial, and territorial governments, in consultation and collaboration with Survivors, Aboriginal peoples, and educators, to:
  i. Make age-appropriate curriculum on residential schools, Treaties, and Aboriginal peoples’ historical and contemporary contributions to Canada a mandatory education requirement for Kindergarten to Grade Twelve students.

- **#63)** We call upon the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada to maintain an annual commitment to Aboriginal education issues, including:
  i. Developing and implementing Kindergarten to Grade Twelve curriculum and learning resources on Aboriginal peoples in Canadian history, and the history and legacy of residential schools.
  ii. Sharing information and best practices on teaching curriculum related to residential schools and Aboriginal history.
  iii. Building student capacity for intercultural understanding, empathy, and mutual respect.
  iv. Identifying teacher-training needs relating to the above. (p. 289 - 290)

York University Professor Susan Dion, an aboriginal expert on First Nations education, said education is key to reconciliation “because we need to know what we’re reconciling about — and at this point, Canadians aren’t really sure. You may not be responsible for what happened but you’re responsible for knowing the history, and the impact it had on all Canadians.”

Although it may take the Federal Government many years to implement the far-reaching calls to action, and recognizing that developing curriculum is the responsibility of the Provincial Ministry of Education, it is critical that all, current and future, Halton District School Board students see themselves as an important part of reconciliation. The Halton District School Board Multi-Year Plan is based on “inspiring and including”, with many of the student, staff and system goals reflecting this vision. First Nations, Métis and Inuit students must see themselves and their history reflected accurately and honourably in Halton District School Board schools.

Reconciliation calls for personal, community and national action. As noted in the TRC report, “People need to get to know each other. They need to learn how to speak to, and about, each other respectfully. They need to learn how to speak knowledgeably about the history of this country. And they need to ensure that their children learn how to do so as well.” (p. 364)

Although, in its 2015-2016 funding announcement of Grants for Student Need and Education Programs – Other (EPO), funding was targeted to support First Nation, Métis and Inuit students and to implement the First Nation, Métis and Inuit Education Policy Framework, the Ontario Public School Boards’ Association, through its First Nation Trustees Council, continues to advocate for stronger content on the impact of the Indian Act, the significance of treaties, and the history and legacy of Canada’s residential schools in Ontario’s curriculum. Both the Toronto and Peel District School Boards have passed motions recently related to honouring First Nations, Métis and Inuit history.
The Survivors of residential schools acted with courage and determination. We should do no less. It is time to commit to a process of reconciliation. By establishing a new and respectful relationship, we restore what must be restored, repair what must be repaired. (NationTalk, June 2, 2015)

School Boards, schools, communities, families and individuals play an important part in reconciliation. In 2014, the Halton District School Board unanimously supported the Ontario Public School Board Association’s Charter of Commitment --- First Nations, Métis and Inuit Education, which clearly articulates a need for curriculum that is inclusive of First Nations, Métis and Inuit histories, cultures, and perspectives, both traditional and contemporary. The Halton District School Board has taken important steps to build understanding and capacity through conferences, training and other activities. It is important that this capacity building continue and be expanded to foster meaningful conversations and learning throughout the system.

Respectfully submitted,

T. Ehl Harrison, Trustee
Oakville, Wards 1 & 2
TO: The Chair and Members of the
Halton District School Board

FROM: David Euale, Director of Education
Lucy Veerman, Superintendent of Business Services

RE: Ministry of Education Request for Capital Priorities - 2015

Warrant:
On May 26, 2015, the Ministry of Education issued Memorandum 2015:B12 requesting school boards to submit their capital priorities for projects that need to be completed up to and including the 2018/2019 school year. This report identifies the capital projects recommended by staff to be submitted to the Ministry of Education for Capital Priorities funding.

RECOMMENDATION:

Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board approve the projects as identified in Report 15092 to be submitted to the Ministry of Education as part of the request for Capital Priorities.

Background:
Ministry of Education Memorandum 2015:B12– Request for Capital Priorities issued on May 26, 2015 highlights the specific points to be considered by boards in approval of their capital priorities submission.

Memorandum 2015:B12 Highlights/Summary Points:

- Boards are to limit Capital Priority submissions to projects required to open no later than the 2018/2019 school year.
- Boards are to submit their board approved Capital Priorities funding requests for consideration by July 15, 2015
- The business case template has been revised to collect information that will help the Ministry estimate future operating costs.
- Boards will not be required to apply their Proceeds of Disposition to their approved projects.
- Boards must have an updated Ministry approved Capital Analysis and Planning Template (CAPT) in order to receive a Capital Priorities funding allocation.
- Boards are to focus on projects that meet one or more of the needs outlined below:
  1. Accommodation Pressure:
     Projects to accommodate pupils where enrolment is currently or is projected to persistently exceed capacity at a school or within a group of schools, and students are currently housed in non-permanent space (e.g. portables).
  2. School Consolidations
     Projects that reduce excess capacity in order to reduce operating and renewal costs and address renewal needs backlogs. These projects may also provide other benefits such as improved program offerings, accessibility or energy efficiency. Projects linked to an accommodation review must have final trustee decisions on the outcome of the pupil accommodation review by July 15, 2015.
  3. Facility Condition:
     Projects to replace schools that have high renewal needs relative to the cost of an appropriately sized new facility.
4. French language accommodations

Projects to provide access to French-language facilities where demographics warrant. Such projects will only be considered eligible if the board can demonstrate that there is a sufficient French-language population not being served by an existing French-language school facility.

Additionally, it was noted that projects matching the following descriptions should not be submitted as Capital Priorities:

- Projects related to only addressing an accommodation pressure of a specialized or alternative program such as French Immersion.
- Projects that have been previously funded by either the Ministry or the board; and,
- Projects that should be funded through renewal funding, including program enhancements and projects related to only addressing current and/or proposed changes to the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

The Ministry last requested the submission of Capital Priorities from school boards by October 31, 2013. As a result, the Board approved the capital priorities (as identified in Table 1) and the associated business cases were submitted to the Ministry. However, Ministry of Education announcement of funding approvals was not released until March 2014. The Ministry funded 77 Capital Priority projects (including 39 new schools and allocated over $700 million towards their completion.

**TABLE 1 – October 2013 HDSB Capital Priority Submission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Completed for School Year</th>
<th>2014 Funding Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>New Martin Street PS -740 OTG</td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Oakville NE #1 PS – 740 OTG (no site available to purchase at this time)</td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Milton South #10 PS – 740 OTG (no site designated as secondary plan not approved)</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Oakville NE #2 PS – 740 OTG (no site available to purchase at this time)</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Oakville SW #1 PS – 600 OTG</td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Heritage Glen PS –6classroom retrofit/addition (OTG from 661 to 799)</td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Palermo PS – 8 classroom addition (OTG from 718 to 902)</td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Milton SW #1 HS –1400 OTG</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board approved the 2014/2015 LTAP on May 20, 2015. The LTAP included new capital project initiatives for the Board for the 2016/2017 to 2019/2020 time frame (Table 2).

**TABLE 2 - 2014/2015 LTAP Capital Project Initiatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Capital Projects</th>
<th>Completed for School Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alton Village PS (ERA 109) 5 Classroom addition</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakville NE #2 ps (ERA 118)</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton SW #10 PS – 740 OTG (no site designated as secondary plan not approved)</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakville SW #1 ps (ERA 111) Subject to a PAR</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Secondary Capital Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Completed for School Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craig Kielburger SS (SRA 105) 10 classroom addition</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton SW #1 HS (SRA 104) – 1200 OTG</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakville NE #1 HS (SRA 108) – 1200 OTG</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:**

Based on the 2014/2015 LTAP, there are six capital projects that have been identified. However, as outlined in the Ministry SB memo previous projects submitted that did not receive Ministry funding, the Board needs to reconsider whether or not to resubmit based on Ministry comments. As a result, the Oakville SW #1 ps (ERA 111) should not be submitted as part of this year’s capital priorities, given that the Ministry had indicated that the Board needed to undertake a Program and Accommodation Review (PAR) before any consideration is given to fund the new school. At this time, a PAR has not been initiated, as new Ministry guidelines were released on March 26, 2015 and the Board’s new policies have not yet been approved in order to initiate a process.

The Ministry capital priorities request states that projects that are submitted, need to be opened no later than the 2018/2019 school year. Consequently, the Oakville NE #1 HS (SRA 108) can not be included in the capital priorities submission as the proposed opening is for the 2019/2020 school year.

Since the Ministry of Education states that 8 business cases can be submitted, there is an opportunity for the Halton District School Board to identify additional capital priorities. Although submission of additional projects does not guarantee approval from the Ministry, it is prudent for us to include additional projects.

The Ministry has indicated that a Board can submit projects based on facility condition. More specifically, these are projects where schools are replaced that have high renewal needs relative to the cost of an appropriately sized new facility. Assessments by the Ministry on these type of projects is based on the projected operating and renewal savings and the removal of renewal backlog needs relative to the project cost; and priority will be given to projects with the highest expected Internal Rate of Return. The latter will be calculated using the expected cost of the project compared to the expected savings resulting from the project.

The Ministry of Education has a system of inspecting and recording the condition of all of the schools in the Province (Facility Condition Index). This program has used a variety of methodologies over the years but all schools have been evaluated on a consistent scale. It should be noted that this measuring tool is focused on the condition of existing components not on identification of program needs or current standards, i.e. air conditioning if not installed would not be noted as a shortfall. The data collected is used mathematically to generate a Facility Condition Index (FCI). The FCI has been generated to enable building owners to project future maintenance or replacement needs. Therefore, it ages the equipment condition without including any work done during that period of time.

The scale of the FCI is as follows:
- **Good** if less than 5%
- **Fair** if 5 – 10%
- **Poor** if between 10 -30%
- **Critical** if over 30%

The FCI is based on the age, condition and value of the components of the building, therefore it can generate an estimate of the budget needed to replace or update components of the building. Based on the Ministry of Education’s position that a school with an FCI over 65% is Prohibitive to Repair (PTR), the school should be considered for replacement or rebuild. Based on the total cost of events for a five year period, there are two schools that could be considered and they are identified in Table 3.
TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>FCI</th>
<th>Total Cost of Events</th>
<th>Asset Replacement Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookville PS</td>
<td>76.15%</td>
<td>$6,512,816</td>
<td>$8,552,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair PS</td>
<td>74.58%</td>
<td>$6,989,207</td>
<td>$9,371,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ministry of Education is also willing to fund the capital costs associated with the construction of child care spaces in new schools and schools approved for major expansions and renovations. They have stated that the Capital Priorities projects should include the Board’s request for new childcare space. Board staff have met with the Region of Halton Director of Children’s Services to review the opportunities for the placement of these new childcare facilities, and they support the location in the two new schools identified as Milton SW #10 ps and Oakville NE #2 ps. These are locations where the Region has indicated that there are accommodation pressures and service gaps.

Therefore, the priority list of projects to be submitted to the Ministry of Education is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Completed for School Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Craig Kielburger SS (SRA 105) 10 classroom addition</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Alton Village PS (ERA 109) 5 classroom addition</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Milton SW #10 ps – 776 OTG (no site available to purchase at this time) –</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with child care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Oakville NE #2 ps – 776 OTG (no site available to purchase at this time)</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- with child care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Milton SW #1 hs – 1200 OTG (no site available to purchase at this time)</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Montclair PS Rebuild</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,

(signed)

Lucy Veerman
Superintendent of Business Services

(signed)

David Euale
Director of Education
TO: The Chair and Members of the Halton District School Board

FROM: Kim Graves, Chair, Policy, By-law and Governance Committee

RE: Trustee Expense Policy

Warrant
During the past several meetings, the Policy, By-Law and Governance Committee has reviewed and discussed amendments to the Trustee Expense Policy. The proposed policy is appended to this report, and on the recommendation of the PB&G Committee, is recommended for posting on the Board’s website for public input.

RECOMMENDATION

Be it resolved that the Halton District School post the revised Trustee Expense Policy, as appended to Report 15085, on the Board website for a period of at least 25 days, soliciting public input, and that the policy and any input return to the Board for consideration at the first Board meeting in October 2015.

Background
The Halton District School Board’s policy on Trustee Expenses was reviewed at several Policy, By-law and Governance Committee meetings throughout early 2015, culminating in a motion at the PB&G Committee held on Wednesday, June 10, 2015, to recommend the policy be posted on the Board website for public input.

The revisions made by the Policy, By-law and Governance Committee are reflected in the draft policy appended to this revised report, and are shown in bold italics. The Policy, By-law and Governance Committee is recommending the draft policy, accompanied by any public feedback, return to the PB&G Committee in September, with any revisions to the draft policy return to the Board for consideration in October.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Graves
Chair, Policy, By-law & Governance Committee
1. **OBJECTIVE**

   The Board recognizes the need to reimburse trustees for expenses reasonably incurred in carrying out their role as trustee. In addition, the Board recognizes that trustees must be equipped properly so they may consult with and contact their constituents.

2. **DEFINITIONS**

   2.1 **Board**: The Board of Trustees including Members of the Board elected or appointed in accordance with the Ontario Municipal Elections Act, and Student Trustees elected or appointed in accordance with the Ontario Education Act and Halton District School Board Policy. Duties and responsibilities of the Board are defined under the Ontario Education Act, the Ontario Municipal Act, and Ontario Regulation.

   2.2 **Days**: Consistent with Board practice, all references to “days” refer to calendar days, unless otherwise specified.

3. **POLICY STATEMENT**

   The Halton District School Board is committed to an organizational culture that is consistent with the guiding principles which frame our Strategic Plan.

4. **SPECIFIC DIRECTIVES**

   4.1 Trustees, including student trustees, upon their election and in accordance with the limits set out in Schedule 1, shall be equipped with:

   - Computer equipment including peripherals (printer/fax). Additional equipment may be purchased as an office supplies expense per sections 4.5 and 4.6, or acquired in accordance with section 4.3 Exceptions, below.
   - Software in accordance with the Board standard for administrators (Office Suite, CHATT, email etc.).
   - High speed home internet access.
   - A mobile communication device (i.e. Blackberry, iPhone etc.) and communication plan.
   - Trustees can choose to use their personal phone and receive reimbursement up to a maximum of the standard communication plan used by the Board.
   - In addition, trustees (excluding student trustees) may be equipped with a home office phone and fax (land lines).

   4.2 All equipment will be purchased in accordance with the Board’s Purchasing Administrative Procedure. The Chief Information Officer will have authority for determining the computer, peripherals and software, as well as the high speed internet and mobile communication packages provided. The CIO will review the reasonableness of Schedule 1 as needed. Schedule 1 and revisions to Schedule 1 must be approved by the Board.
4.3 Exceptions:

Where a trustee may incur additional costs or ongoing expenses that exceed the limits of Schedule 1 as a result of disability or special need, these expenses will be covered by the HDSB.

Where a trustee must incur additional costs or ongoing expenses due to the geographic location of their residence, or other circumstance beyond their control, such extraordinary expenses must be approved by the Board in accordance with this policy.

4.4 Given the rate at which technology currently depreciates, equipment purchased at the start of the trustee’s term of office will not need to be returned to the Board at the end of the term or upon the trustee’s retirement. However, all service contracts will end commensurate with the end of the trustee’s term. The residual value will be determined by the Chief Information Officer. The residual value if any will be reported on the trustee’s T4.

4.5 In addition, each trustee, on an annual basis, will have access to a $5,000.00 travel, personal professional development and office supplies account. This account may be used to reimburse the trustee for expenses reasonably incurred in carrying out their role as trustee.

4.6 The following expenses are those which are recognized by the Board as appropriate trustee expenses:

- transportation - including mileage at the current Board rate (see 4.8 below);
- professional development / conferences;
- functions whose purpose is the welfare of Halton District School Board students, such as but not limited to those hosted by the Halton Learning Foundation, the Halton Industry Education Council, or Halton Food for Thought;
- meals, reimbursed at the current Board rate;
- office supplies (filing cabinet, stationery, technology etc.);
- constituent meeting expenses (coffee, refreshments);
- mailings, photocopying;
- child care costs for dependent children which would allow trustees to attend scheduled meetings, events and/or functions of the Halton District School Board; and
- other expenses.

4.7 Any other extraordinary or unusual expenses incurred by a trustee in carrying out their role, which they feel should be paid by the Board must be pre-approved by the Board, and will not be charged against the trustee’s account, but rather the Board’s account.

4.8 Trustee claims for travel within Ontario by automobile or public transit to:

- **HDSB sites and events**
- **OPSBA Events and Meetings**
- **Meetings or events which the trustee attends as a representative of the Board**

may exceed $1,000.00 in a fiscal year (pro-rated to $750.00 in the first nine months of the term and $250.00 in the final three months of the term). Any travel expenditure above the $1,000.00 threshold for attending the meetings and events listed above will not be charged against the trustee’s account, but rather the Board’s account.

Travel within Ontario by other modes of transportation (e.g. train, airplane) to the events specified above, up to the amount equivalent to travel by automobile, as verified with appropriate documentation shall be included in the $1,000.00 threshold. These expenses will be submitted to the Board using the HDSB Trustee Transportation Claim Form.

Travel to conferences, meetings or events not specified above shall not be included in the $1,000.00 threshold but may be brought to the Board of Trustees for consideration and will be submitted using the HDSB Trustee Conference Expense Form.

4.9 Where a trustee or trustees incur appropriate expenses as a representative of the Board, they will not be charged against the trustee’s account, but rather the Board’s account. All such expenses must be approved by the Board. For planning purposes, where such expenses are predictable, they should be
approved as early in the fiscal year as possible. Examples include but are not limited to: Ministry of Education/OPSBA trustee orientation and professional development for all trustees; OPSBA AGM for the Board’s OPSBA Director; OSTA-AECO conferences for the Student Trustee Mentor; audit training for members of the HDSB Audit Committee.

Transportation claims will be paid based upon Section 4.8 of this policy.

4.10 Where the approval or allocation of any expense is disputed, the Board is recognized as the final authority for the approval or allocation of that expense.

4.11 Trustees will make best efforts to submit claims for expenses within one (1) month of their occurrence and in the fiscal year in which the expense occurred. Expenses submitted after the fiscal year end cut-off will be reflected in the following fiscal year.

4.12 A monthly statement of an individual trustee’s detailed expenses (conferences, transportation, meals, etc.) shall be provided to that trustee electronically.

4.13 Trustee expenses that are in excess of, or not allowed by, HDSB policy may be claimable on individual trustee personal tax returns using the Board provided T2200 form.

4.14 Unused portions of an individual trustee’s expense budget, on an annual basis, shall roll-over to the next year. At the end of the term of the Board, unused portions of the trustee expense budget shall be allocated to a Reserve Account for the purpose of future trustee professional development. The use of these Reserve Account funds will be decided by the incoming Board of Trustees by Board resolution. Trustees will receive an annual statement of the Reserve Account within 90 days of the start of the next fiscal year.

4.15 Payment of a trustee’s claims exceeding the total amount budgeted per trustee over the term of the Board, will be decided on a case-by-case basis by the Board of Trustees.

4.16 An annual summary of trustee expenses will be reported as an information item by the Superintendent of Business.

A trustee expense report will be posted to the board's website annually by December 31 following the end of the fiscal year. The report will include expense totals by trustee in each of the following categories:

- Travel (eg. mileage, parking, tolls)
- OPSBA Conferences
- Other Professional Development
- Meeting Expenses (eg. Hospitality)
- Supplies
- Other Expenses (eg. child minding)

Board paid:

- Telecommunications (e.g., monthly service fees)
- Technology (e.g., hardware)
- Board Leadership & Mandatory Training
- Prior Term Reserve for PD
- Travel over $1,000

4.17 Trustee Expenses fall under the Broader Public Sector Accountability Act, 2010 (BPSAA) and must meet the Expenses and Procurement Standards detailed therein.

5. RESPONSIBILITIES

5.1 Board

5.1.1 Approves Schedule 1 prior to the new term of a Board or when changes are recommended by the Superintendent of Education with responsibility for Information Technology/Services.
5.2 Superintendent of Education with responsibility for Information Technology/Services.

5.2.1 Determines and recommends limits in Schedule 1 - Trustee Information and Communications Technology Limits

5.3 Superintendent of Business Services

5.3.1 Provides support for trustee expense reporting;

5.3.2 Reports on trustee expenses.

6. EXTERNAL REFERENCES


7. HALTON DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD REFERENCES


7.2 Schedule 1 - Trustee information technology and communications expense limits, appended Halton District School Board Policy GOV-03H Trustee Expenses

8. REVISION HISTORY

8.1 Revised June 2015 to clarify travel expense covered by the board (4.8), preferred timing of expense claims (4.11), and public reporting details (4.16).

8.2 Final review by PB&G on November 12, 2014 and Board on November 19, 2014 integrating feedback re expenses incurred on behalf of the Board, and the receipt of the annual statement of the Reserve Account to “within 90 days” of the start of the next fiscal year; definition of “days”; recognition of functions whose purpose is the welfare of Halton DSB students as an appropriate trustee expense.

8.3 Revised September 24, 2014 - Policy reformatted and revised for use with Schedule 1 - Trustee information technology and communications expense limits. Revised to ensure that the rights of trustees with special needs or extraordinary circumstances are respected, and where possible to remove barriers to their effective representation of their community. Revised to include the realization of a taxable benefit equal to the residual value of any technology retained by trustee upon their retirement from the school board.

8.4 Revised January 2012 - The original draft of the Trustee Expenses Policy was presented at the December 7, 2011 Board meeting. Revisions were suggested, and the revised version of the policy is attached to this report for the Board’s consideration.

The following Trustees comprised the Trustee Expense Sub-Committee: Amy Collard (Chair), Nancy MacNeill, Don Vrooman, Kathryn Bateman-Olinstead and Ann Harvey Hope. The committee met on three occasions and consulted with the Superintendent of Business. This policy should be reviewed on an ongoing basis to ensure that it reflects any changes to the Broader Public Sector Accountability Act, 2010 (BPSAA).
TO: The Chair and Members of the Halton District School Board

FROM: Kim Graves, Co-Chair, Policy, By-law and Governance Committee

RE: Trustee Honoraria Schedule

Warrant
The Policy, By-Law and Governance Committee has reviewed details relating to the Trustee Honoraria Policy, specifically those relating to the allowable attendance amount. The schedule has been established to identify eligible meetings under the allowable attendance amount, and allows revisions to the schedule “prior to the new term of a Board, or when changes are recommended by the Policy, By-law and Governance Committee.

RECOMMENDATION

Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board’s Trustee Honoraria Policy with reference to the appended schedule, and Schedule 1 as appended to Report 15086, be approved with a retroactive effective date of December 1, 2014.

The Trustee Honoraria Policy has been amended to reference the addition of “Schedule 1”. Schedule 1 reflects allowances for the eligible meetings under the “allowable attendance amount”.

The effective date on Schedule 1 is the start of the current Board’s term of office.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Graves
Chair, Policy, By-law & Governance Committee
1. **OBJECTIVE:**
The Halton District School Board shall pay to its elected board members, a Trustee Honoraria in accordance with the Ontario *Education Act*, and related Ontario Regulations, specifically Ontario Regulation 357/06.

2. **POLICY STATEMENT**
For the term of office in respect of the period from December 1, 2014 or later, the Board will pay to a member an honorarium amount not to exceed the following amount:
   - 100% of the maximum base amount as set out by regulation
   - 100% of the maximum enrolment amount *
   - 100% of the maximum allowable attendance amount **

The policy may be restricted by provincial regulation.

* The enrolment amount will be adjusted on an annual basis to reflect the current ADE (Average Daily Enrolment) of the Halton District School Board.

** See Schedule 1

**Legal References:**
*Education Act,*
Ontario Regulation 357/06
TRUSTEE HONORARIA -- SCHEDULE 1

(effective December 1, 2014; revised June 2015)

Trustees will be entitled to the following: $50.00 for attending any meeting of a committee of the Board that is required to be established by an Act or Regulation made under the Act. The attendance amount is payable for attendance at meetings including:

- Audit
- Parent Involvement
- Special Education Advisory
- Supervised Alternative Learning
- Student Discipline and Suspension/Expulsion Appeals
- Director’s Performance Review
- Pupil Accommodation Review and
- Boundary Review committees.
TO: The Chair and Members of the Halton District School Board
FROM: G. Cullen, Superintendent of Facility Services
RE: Accommodation Study for Long Term Administrative Office Needs – Phase 1 Results

Background
Report 15016 was presented to the Board for information at the February 4, 2015 session. This report presented the proposal to undertake a review of space need, functionality and long term accommodation needs of the administrative centres. Phase 1 consisted of a comprehensive facility needs assessment to accommodate immediate and long term employee growth. Phase 2 will develop options to address future needs. Snyder Architects Inc. was selected to complete both Phases of the study. Snyder Architects Inc. have put together a team with specific areas of expertise to undertake this project. The team members and previous project details are attached in Appendix 1.

The funding for this study was identified through report 13167 in December 2013. A budget of $100,000 was allocated for both Phases. The project remains on budget.

Phase 1 Results
Phase 1 resulted in an analysis of existing building plans, employee work locations, employee home locations, enrolment projections, interviews with senior staff, review of previous reports, review of recent administration facility construction in other Boards and an environmental scan.

The results of Phase 1 have revealed that the current administrative space and functions of the Board is deficient in many respects, which discourages collaboration and innovation making it difficult to maximize productivity and efficiency. The practice of trying to adapt the existing facilities to accommodate growing staffing levels and administrative functions add to the inadequacy of the space and the difficulty of staff performance.

It is clear through the analysis to date that the current administrative centres have limitations and a solution needs to be considered for the long term. The consultant report contains the questionnaire and is attached as Appendix 2.

Due to the lack of specific funding for the administration building we are likely to seek solutions that use existing property either owned by the Board or available to the Board. Purchasing land is not viable at this time.

Phase 2
Phase 2 is based on the findings from Phase 1. Phase 2 will identify shortcomings in the facilities based the building code and Board requirements, identify problems with space planning by department that impact operational deficiencies and calculate the estimated budget to address all shortcomings, be it additions, renovations or construction. The consultant is expected to proceed to undertake Phase 2 over the summer with the goal to providing a final report in the fall of 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerry Cullen
Superintendent, Facility Services

David Euale
Director of Education
ONE: KEY PROJECT PERSONNEL

For this project we have assembled a team of consultants with the knowledge and experience to create a highly successful results, all of whom we have worked on many successful educational projects.

**Architect**

*Snyder Architects*
Doug Snyder - Principal-in-Charge
Avinash Garde - Project Architect

**Special Consultant**

*Ameresco*
Cynthia Clarke - Consultant

**Programming**

*SHS Consulting*
Ed Starr - Partner
Narmadha Rahakuma - Research Analyst

**Structural Engineer**

*YWY Engineering Inc.*
Harvey Yim - Lead Structural Engineer

**Mechanical Engineer / Electrical Engineers**

*DEI & Associates Inc.*
Joseph Bryson - Lead Mechanical Engineer
Jeremy Jackson - Lead Electrical Engineer

**Zoning, Traffic Planning, and Site Services**

*Salmona Tregunno*
Daniel Salmona - Landscape Architect
Snyder Architects, established in 1980, is a full-service planning and architecture firm located in Toronto. The practice has a staff of 20, including three Principals, three Licensed Architects, six Intern Architects and three Construction / Project Managers, and has strong working relationships with specialized consultants in various fields throughout Ontario.

Our services include architecture, master planning, facility studies, programming, interior design, graphic design, and construction management. Major clients include over 15 School Boards in Ontario, Long Term Care municipal, charitable, faith-based and not-for-profits and housing, retirement living and long term care clients.

SA has been delivering innovative architecture for education since 1980. SA designed River Oaks Public School (JK-8), the first fully digital school in Ontario, earning a reputation for built environments that revitalize communities and support the latest pedagogical break throughs.

For over three decades, Snyder Architects has been analyzing and designing supportive environments for the whole person. Adjacencies and user needs are carefully considered to layout and design spaces that lend themselves to relationship building and collaboration in the digital age. We place importance on sustainability and high performance design that reflects the unique identity and culture of an organization. The total value of school construction equals $228 million within the last 5 years.

**Doug Snyder**

Doug Snyder has been a Principal in the firm for 35 years and has overseen nearly 200 municipal projects. Doug is actively involved in providing oversight and backup on all phases of the project, from needs assessment through post-construction, and truly engages in team building. He will be available to attend biweekly meetings. As Project Manager and Construction Having managed more than $228 million of school construction in the last five years alone, Doug has earned a reputation among the local tradesmen, contractors, and clients for his creative approach to problem resolution and for his firm and fair hand.

**Avinash Garde**

Avi brings extensive experience in managing and coordinating multi-disciplinary teams over multiple phases of a project. For this project, he will bring these strengths to managing the development of the design with staff and stakeholders. Over the years, Avi has played a leading role in designing quality educational environments to support academic excellence. Recognized for his listening skills and leadership style, Avi has developed a unique understanding of the various concerns of the multiple stakeholders often involved in complex educational and health care projects.
ONE : KEY PROJECT PERSONNEL

AMERESCO
90 Sheppard Ave. East 7th floor, North York, ON M2N 6X3
t 289.337.4090  w www.ameresco.ca

Since 1988, Ameresco staff has worked with more than forty-five (45) Ontario district school boards in the development of long-term enrolment projections, as well as the development of a variety of strategies related to planning and financing long-term accommodation needs. Their staff was instrumental in the creation of the education sector’s long-term capital planning process in the 1990’s, a process that is still used throughout Ontario today. Within the GTA, they have undertaken detailed long-term accommodation plans on behalf of: DSB Niagara, Hamilton-Wentworth CDSB, Hamilton-Wentworth DSB, Halton DSB, Halton Catholic DSB, Peel DSB, Dufferin-Peel Catholic DSB, Toronto DSB, Toronto Catholic DSB, York Catholic DSB, Durham CDSB. They have been involved in assisting the TCDSB in a variety of site redevelopment strategies (involving public and private sector partnerships), several requiring our experts to provide expert witness testimony as part of expropriation hearings.

Cynthia Clarke was involved in the 2004 Joint Accommodation Opportunities Strategy study undertaken on behalf of the Halton DSB, the Halton Catholic DSB, the Region of Halton and the Province of Ontario (re court facilities) to assess opportunities for a multi-use campus on Highway 25 north of the QEW. Ms. Clarke’s role was to undertake a cost-benefit analysis (including capital and operating costs) of alternative accommodation options and shared business services opportunities and to assist in drafting the final report. Their staff have worked with the Halton DSB on various accommodation matters since 1991.

Their staff has been instrumental in the development of workshops, seminars and symposiums bringing together cross-sector stakeholders to examine opportunities and challenges related to joint-use and multi-use developments. Over the last 10 years, the Ameresco Asset Sustainability Group has successfully undertaken facility conditions assessments and asset planning projects representing more than 2.5 billion square feet of building space, along with energy conservation and building retrofit projects in over 3,000 government sector, institutional, housing, educational and commercial buildings.

Cynthia Clarke

Ms. Clarke’s role is to undertake a cost-benefit analysis (including capital and operating costs) of alternative accommodation options and shared business services opportunities, the development of long-term enrolment projections, as well as the development of a variety of strategies related to planning and financing long-term accommodation needs.

Cynthia has undertaken facility conditions assessments and asset planning projects representing more than 2.5 billion square feet of building space, along with energy conservation and building retrofit projects in over 3,000 government sector, institutional, housing, educational and commercial buildings.
ONE : KEY PROJECT PERSONNEL

SHS CONSULTING
70 East Beaver Creek Road Unit 30 Richmond Hill ON L4B 3B2
t 905 763 7555 w www.shs-inc.ca

SHS Consulting was established in 1999 and is an independent Canadian consulting firm specializing in public policy, research and community development. Working out of offices in Richmond Hill, they employ a full-time team of 10 consultants with backgrounds in community planning, needs assessment, facility development, financial analysis, community consultation and project management. They have conducted a number of facility needs studies and space programming projects. Our development consulting experience, which has seen us manage the development of more than 90 facilities of various types with a total capital cost of over $1 billion across Ontario, has brought us first-hand familiarity with projects of this nature, thereby enhancing our understanding of the data and information required at the need study stage in order to support successful facility development. This experience and other similar projects have brought us strong familiarity with effective methodologies for conducting such needs assessments and successful approaches to working together with clients to develop effective solutions to space planning projects.

The two partners of SHS Consulting, Ed Starr and Christine Pacini, possess 40 and 28 years respectively of professional experience in all of these areas. Their clients have included Boards of Education, the Ministry of Education, over 50 municipalities in all corners of Ontario, numerous service agencies such as the Canadian Mental Health Association and the United Way, a wide range of homes for the aged/long term care facilities and numerous non-profit housing providers.

SHS are highly familiar with the Region of Halton from their work in preparing the Region’s Housing Policy Strategy and from their recent work planning a new continuum of care facility in the community of Halton Hills on behalf of the Bennett Health Care Centre.

Ed Starr

Ed has conducted a number of facility needs studies and space programming projects employing effective methodologies to collect and analyze the data and information required at the need study stage in order to support successful facility development.

He has performed facility planning and development studies for numerous facilities in communities across Ontario. Of particular relevance for this project, SHS Consulting has successfully carried out facility planning and development studies for numerous facilities in communities across Ontario.

Narmadha Rahakuma

Narmadha has strong experience undertaking a variety of research projects that involve need and demand assessments, conducting literature reviews and best practice scans, surveys and interviews, and data projections and analysis. She also has experience in policy and program analysis, statistical analysis, community consultation, and computer applications.
Phase I Report

SPACE NEEDS ESTIMATES AND DIRECTIONS FOR DESIGN

May 2015

in association with:
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Background ........................................................................................................................................... 2  
2.0 Methodology ........................................................................................................................................... 3  
3.0 The Relationship between Office Environment and Employee Performance/Productivity ............... 4  
4.0 Feedback from Interviews with Senior Staff ............................................................................................ 5  
5.0 Lessons Learned from Visit to New Hamilton Wentworth District School Board Education Centre .... 7  
6.0 Adjacencies ............................................................................................................................................... 9  
7.0 Overall Administrative Space Requirements ........................................................................................... 10  
8.0 Locational Principles ................................................................................................................................ 10  
9.0 Summary Comments .................................................................................................................................. 11  

Appendix One: Interview Guide ...................................................................................................................... 12  
Appendix Two: References ............................................................................................................................... 18
1.0 Background

The Halton District School Board (HDSB) operates a school system comprised of 84 elementary and 19 secondary schools spread across a large geographic service area encompassing the communities of Halton Region – the City of Burlington, the Town of Oakville, the Town of Milton, and the Town of Halton Hills. The administration of the Board is carried out by a Board of Trustees and administrative team accommodated in two main facilities located in the southwest area of the City of Burlington, as well as a satellite space in the Milton area.

Current administrative staff total 305 individuals organized into 9 main service areas:

- School Operations
- Facility Services
- Human Resources
- Business Services
- Special Education
- Equity
- Elementary School Program
- Secondary School Program
- Information Services

Student enrolments have been growing steadily over time as the population of Halton Region has continued to expand, giving rise to a steady increase in the staff required to carry out the Board’s administrative responsibilities. Enrolments grew from just under 50,000 students in 2004 to 60,840 in 2014 – an increase of about 30% over the past 10 years. Enrolments are forecast to continue growing for at least the next 20 years in the face of continued residential development occurring across the Region, reaching a projected 74,237 by 2034, representing some 22% growth during this period. HDSB, in fact, is one of Ontario’s few public school boards experiencing growing enrolments.

While enrolments have increased and administrative responsibilities of the Board have grown over time in response to changing legislation and service responsibilities, improvements in technology and efficiencies in service delivery have seen the growth in administrative staff take place at a slower pace than enrolments. Administrative staff have increased from 283 to the current level of 305 over the past 10 years – a growth of 7.8% as compared to enrolment growth of 30% over this time period.

Nevertheless, this growth has placed growing pressure on administrative space available to accommodate the operational functions of the Board. The projections for continued growth in enrolments will place still further pressures on administrative space capacity in the coming years.

The changing roles and responsibilities of public school boards have also contributed to increasing administrative responsibilities and space pressures. Growth in early childhood
education responsibilities, increasing community use of public school facilities for community programs and recent proposals to expand public schools into community hubs are all giving rise to increasing administrative responsibilities and growth in administrative staffing levels. In addition, the growth in enrolments and responsibilities such as Special Education has led to an increasing need for document storage space due to legislated requirements to maintain records for stipulated lengths of time.

While the Board has experienced continued growth in administrative staffing levels and related space requirements over time, there has been little change in the facilities available to accommodate these staff. The two locations in southwest Burlington have been used as administrative centres (the J. W. Singleton Centre and the New Street Education Centre) to accommodate the Board’s operations, including the Board Chambers and Trustee/public functions. A modest satellite space in Milton, at the former E.C. Drury location, is also being utilized for administrative purposes. As administrative staffing levels have increased, the available space has been reorganized and further adapted to cope with the growth, including the accommodation of Board research personnel in portables at the JW Singleton Centre.

The process of adapting existing space to accommodate growth has created working conditions that most staff describe as highly inadequate. Working spaces are cramped, privacy is lacking, environmental systems (i.e. air quality, light, temperature) are outdated and inappropriate and there is insufficient meeting space. Rather than encouraging collaboration and fostering synergy and creativity, which are key elements to the successful operation of a large public school board, staff find that the existing space tends to have the opposite effect. They expect that these shortcomings will intensify as growth continues and the pressures on existing space increase.

In light of the above, this study is being undertaken to identify the current and future administrative space needs of the Halton District School Board.

### 2.0 Methodology

A number of steps have been undertaken to identify current and future administrative space needs of the Halton District School Board, including:

- Discussions/brainstorm sessions with Steering Committee
- Review of previous studies/documentation on the issue
- Review of enrolment projections
- Interviews with senior administrative staff
- Environmental scan on the relationship between office environments and employee performance/productivity
- Visit to Ontario’s newest public school board administrative centre (Hamilton Wentworth District School Board Education Centre)
Below we summarize the results of this research.

3.0  The Relationship between Office Environment and Employee Performance/Productivity

Numerous studies have shown that the quality of working environment in office settings has significant impact on job performance and productivity. For example, a study published in the Journal of Public Affairs, Administration and Management in 2009\(^1\) concluded:

“Analysis of collected data revealed that office design has a substantial impact on the employees’ productivity...There is a direct relationship between office design and productivity...Lighting was found to be the major factor which is affecting the daily and overall productivity of employees in offices.”

Similarly, an article published in the San Francisco Human Resources Examiner\(^2\) in 2012 noted:

“Almost 3 out of 4 employees are not satisfied with their physical work space. Even more troubling for managers who want to attract top talent, nearly 50% of candidates report that an employer’s office environment impacts their willingness to take a job offer.”

A paper prepared in 2011 by Dr. K. Chandrasekar of Alagappy University in India entitled: “Workplace Environment and Its Impact on Organizational Performance in Public Sector Organizations”\(^3\) finds:

“The workplace environment impacts employee morale, productivity and engagement – both positively and negatively...It is the quality of the employee’s workplace environment that most impacts on their level of motivation and subsequent performance. How well they engage with the organization, especially with their immediate environment, influences to a great extent their error rate, level of innovation and collaboration with other employees, absenteeism and ultimately, how long they stay on the job...a poor arrangement of office space wastes time and energy by failing to provide the means for effective work.”

Various other papers, studies and reports on the subject arrive at similar conclusions and findings. Estimates found in the literature on improved productivity arising from more suitable

---

\(^1\) Impact of Office Design on Employees’ Productivity: A Case Study of Banking Organization of Abbottabad, Pakistan; Journal of Public Affairs, Administration and Management, Volume 3, Issue 1, 2009
\(^2\) Does Work Environment Impact Employee Satisfaction; San Francisco Human Resources Examiner, October 8, 2012
\(^3\) Chandrasekar, Dr. K; Workplace Environment and Its Impact on Organizational Performance in Public Sector Organizations; International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems, Vol. 1 Issue 1 Jan. 2011
Guiding principles of particular importance arising from the literature include:

- Environmental quality (ventilation, temperature, lighting) is of critical importance to long term job performance and productivity, as well as overall employee health and morale. Systems should be designed for the roles and responsibilities being carried out at the workplace.
- Properly designed workstations are vital to enhancing productivity.
- Spaces for both formal and informal collaboration/idea exchange are critical to achieve innovation.
- A poor working environment makes it difficult to attract and retain motivated high performing employees.
- Inefficient office design and inadequate space give rise to wasted time and energy, thereby reducing productivity.
- Inadequate space results in increased absenteeism.
- Access to natural light/windows significantly increases job satisfaction and productivity.
- Organizations with strong learning culture have 37 percent greater employee productivity, according to a 2010 study by Bersin & Associates entitled: “High Impact Learning Culture”

### 4.0 Feedback from Interviews with Senior Staff

An interview guide addressing a range of subjects related to administrative space needs was prepared and approved as the tool to assist in interviews with the Superintendents of Education responsible for each service area. Face-to-face sessions were conducted during April and May, 2015. In most cases, the Superintendents had the opportunity to consult with senior staff from their departments in preparing their responses.

The responses received strongly mirrored the themes and messages found in the literature. These are summarized below in point form and provide strong guidance in terms of principles critical to meeting the Board’s space needs:

- The Board’s administrative space should make a statement of the Board’s values (learning, economy, professionalism).
- It is critical to design space that encourages/enhances collaboration/connection/cohesion/creativity and reduces “silo” practices – brings people together “organically”.
- It is important to consolidate staff within their own departments and provide close access to other departments frequently consulted in day-to-day work.

---

4 See interview guide in Appendix
• Productivity would be greatly enhanced with universal access to natural light
• Staff performance and morale would be greatly enhanced with properly planned environmental quality (steady air flow/operable windows, localized temperature control, localized lighting control, proper acoustics/sound attenuation, soothing colours – eg. blues and beiges)
• There should be flexibility in room set-up, furniture layouts
• There needs to be flexibility to adapt to changing policies, practices, regulations (eg. all-day kindergarten had huge impact on services, responsibilities) – eg. potential use as “community hub”
• Most departments require small (up to 5 persons) and medium (5-25 persons) internal departmental meeting spaces equipped with latest audio/visual technology in order to eliminate the practice of using superintendent offices for professional meetings and to enhance the productivity of meetings
• Shared/common (“neutral zone”) larger meeting spaces (40-50 persons) are also required
• The Board needs a suitable space for major meetings/training sessions of 300+ persons; the current space at New Street, which is a former gymnasium, is highly inadequate
• There is a need for shared meeting space for Trustees
• There is a need for meeting space for community/public use
• There is a need for space for public gatherings/social functions
• The Board should enhance the multi-use function of the Board Chamber
• Space should include “hoteling” for mobile staff, especially educational consultants (computer link, shared desk space, locking cabinet/storage); the administrative centre should be fully served by WiFi
• There is a need to plan for future expansion (in accordance with projected enrolment growth) - avoid the practice of trying to adapt inadequate space in piecemeal fashion
• There is a need for a fully accessible building that meets/exceeds AODA requirements – should be “over the top” on this aspect – a leader to set example for community
• Building design should force people to “walk around” as much as possible – discourage sitting in front of computer screen all day long – strong interest in fitness centre
• There is a need for attractive and functional reception areas for visitors to departments and to the Board overall, but there is also a need to control the interface with visitors – ability to keep them out of working staff areas
• There is a need for privacy protection, especially in HR, Special Ed – all staff need the opportunity to be free from distractions
• The Director of Education, in particular, requires an office that protects privacy
• There is a need to “zone” the building for safety purposes – to quarantine spaces, lock doors
• There is a need for an attractive central cafeteria space – multi-functional use, including comfortable areas for informal meetings/collaborations, communal gathering space
• There is a need for daycare space
• There is a requirement for one parking space per staff, plus a modest number of visitor spaces (approximately 30)
• There should be designated parking spaces for HR staff that deal with disabled individuals
• The Board needs to review its document storage strategies – storage requirements will continue to grow due to legislative requirements to retain paper files
• There will be a reduced need for specialized computer environments as technology moves more to “tablet” technology
• There will be a reduced need for printing services due to growing online distribution of materials
• There is a need for a cataloguing and distribution centre
• There is a need for an area to shoot videos

5.0 Lessons Learned from Visit to New Hamilton Wentworth District School Board Education Centre

The newest public school board administrative education centre in Ontario is located in the City of Hamilton and was completed in 2015 by the Hamilton Wentworth District School Board. The Board delivers educational services to approximately 46,000 elementary and secondary students (about 30% below Halton enrolments). The new Education Centre accommodates approximately 400 administrative staff (1 per 115 students), as compared to the 300 administrative staff employed by HDSB (1 per 200 students). The main reason for the different staffing level is the practice of HDSB to outsource all maintenance functions, whereas these are performed directly by HWDSB staff, who are provided space at the Education Centre.

The new Education Centre totals 113,500 sq. ft. and was completed in 2015 at a cost of approximately $32 million. It brought together administrative staff from five former facilities spread across the City. Most of these facilities have now been sold in order to help raise capital to cover the cost of the new Centre. The space per staff at the Education Centre works out to 283 sq. ft. per person – 15.5% higher than the 245 sq. ft. per person currently experienced at HDSB. Unlike Halton, enrolments are declining at HWDSB; therefore, there is not expected to be great pressure to expand administrative staff in the foreseeable future.

In a tour of the recently completed Education Centre, it was pointed out that the key design principles followed in the development of the Centre were:

• Collaborative
• Welcoming
• Flexible
• Maximum exposure to natural light
All offices have floor to ceiling windows, with some screening in meeting spaces. Interestingly, it has been found that productivity has increased due to the presence of offices with windows and glass doors where employees can be observed. Parking has been provided at the ratio of one space per employee plus 40 visitor spaces. On the few occasions where there is insufficient parking available due to a major event, visitors are informed in advance to make alternate arrangements; some overflow parking takes place in an adjacent plaza.

It was found that, due to the increasing use of “tablet” technology, the space and special requirements for computer equipment have been reduced from previous levels. There have been significant savings due to the decline in the need for specialized cooling of computer spaces, for example. Printing facilities have also been reduced due to the increasing use of electronic documents and localized printers.

Great use has been made of flexible room dividers. Major meeting areas have been equipped with the latest audio-visual technology. A total of four computer training labs have also been provided.

The Board Chamber has been designed as a “multi-media” space with a large range of electronic and audio-visual equipment. It has been designed as a bright and very welcoming space with permanent seating for Trustees and senior staff, as well as an audience area of about 50 seats. The room is also used for training sessions on occasion. Its horseshoe design has proved effective for face-to-face Board discussions and debates.

It was reported that there has been a noticeable increase in collaboration and interaction among staff. Productivity has increased due to both the improved working environment and the centralized facility, which brings together administrative staff formerly accommodated in a variety of buildings across the District, thereby reducing time spent on travel. It was suggested that “the psychology of personal contact” has greatly enhanced productivity and that they are finding that a design that enhances informal collaboration and “casual, organic interaction” is critical to effective innovation and sharing of ideas.

The central cafeteria, in particular, is considered an invaluable asset in bringing together staff informally to exchange ideas and foster innovation and collaboration. Similar behaviours have also been observed at other Education Centres familiar to the consulting team, such as the Simcoe District School Board Education Centre in the Barrie area. Whereas the numerous administrative locations operated previously resulted in a lack of interaction and collaboration, it was reported that bringing all staff together in one facility has reduced “silos” and given staff “a greater sense of purpose” in relation to their role in supporting the education system.

The strong use of “hoteling” stations was singled out as a particular departure from past practice and is proving an effective solution for both saving space and accommodating the growing number of “itinerant” staff. These primarily include educational consultants who are regularly on the road visiting schools around the District.
HWDSB has determined that at least a quarter of all administrative staff can be considered itinerant and that these numbers will likely grow as technology changes and working arrangements evolve. The hoteling stations (sometimes called “Google stations” by staff) provide them with a flexible space which can be used at any time and shared with other staff. The space consists of a desk with computer plug-in and a personalized, lockable filing cabinet. They have access to an internal meeting room, printer and other related equipment. The spaces are fully serviced by WiFi, which enables staff to be connected at all times.

Another key feature of the new Education Centre is a range of meeting spaces. There are:

- Small internal meeting spaces in each department with capacity for 5-15 people
- Shared meeting spaces for Trustees
- Larger centralized meeting spaces (capacity of approximately 40-50 persons) that are for use by any department on a scheduled basis
- Public meeting spaces for meetings by community organizations and meetings between Trustees and the public
- Large meeting spaces for as many as 400 persons for training and other large joint sessions
- Large gathering spaces for social events
- A formal “Administrative Council” meeting space adjacent to the Office of the Director of Education, which is used for meetings of Superintendents of Education and other key functions

It was reported that all are well used and highly important in conducting the business of the Board.

There is full public access to the central areas of the building; working areas have restricted access and can only be accessed through the use of electronic “swipe” cards. Each Educational Superintendent has an attractive private office with an adjacent open concept office for their executive assistant. The entire building is accessible in accordance with the provisions of the AODA.

### 6.0 Adjacencies

During the interviews with Superintendents of Education, several departments identified the need to locate adjacent to other departments to enhance operations and facilitate collaboration. The linkages emphasized in the feedback were as follows:

- Facility Services: Business Services, especially accounting/purchasing
- Information Technology: Business Services, HR, Facilities, Programs
- Equity/Diversity: Programs
- Elementary Programs: Special Ed, Secondary Programs, Equity/Diversity, IT
7.0 Overall Administrative Space Requirements

The feedback from the above research has enabled us to identify overall administrative space requirements, as follows.

HDSB currently accommodates approximately 300 administrative staff at Singleton and New Street in a total of 73,635 sq. ft. (55,150 at Singleton – includes 1800 in portables; 18,535 at New Street). This results in a space/employee ratio of approximately 245 sq. ft. gross per person.

The most up-to-date benchmark comes from the Hamilton Wentworth Education Centre, which was recently completed, has the approval of the Ministry of Education and is being well received by staff and Trustees. As noted earlier, this building has been designed at a space/employee ratio of 283 sq. ft. gross per person.

Using the HWDSB ratio yields a need for approximately 300 x 283 = 85,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area to properly accommodate the current administrative staff. Totalling the projected growth identified by each department during the interviews yields an estimated staffing of approximately 350 administrative staff in 20 years, or growth of about 50 more staff. Over time, it is expected that the space ratio per person for new staff would decline due to the presence of existing major meeting and amenity spaces in the building already. Therefore it is assumed that there would be a need for 200 sq. ft. per additional staff, or 200 x 50 = 10,000 sq. ft. to accommodate expansion. This would bring the total space requirement to 95,000 sq. ft. (85,000 to meet current needs and 10,000 of potential expansion space to accommodate future growth).

8.0 Locational Principles

From the discussions during the interviews, a review of the literature and the findings from the visit to HWDSB, it is clear that the most productive administrative office environment would be one where all administrative functions are centralized in one facility, with the exception of a small satellite office in the Milton area to help service the growing northern portion of the District. The preferred location is one which minimizes travel time and cost for employees, trustees and the
public and results in savings versus current operations. A review of the residential location of staff and the school locations operated by the Board finds that the most central location for the bulk of staff and visitors would be in the Dundas/407/Bronte area. During the HWDSB visit, it was pointed out that there are particular advantages in locating adjacent to a secondary school, including synergies and efficiencies from sharing computer labs, board/meeting rooms, gyms, fitness centre, library and so on. At the same time, however, parking problems are generally greater and there could be additional security issues, so careful consideration would have to be given to such a decision.

9.0 Summary Comments

The research conducted for this study finds that the current space accommodating the administrative functions of the Halton District School Board is deficient in many respects, which discourages collaboration and innovation and makes it difficult to maximize productivity and efficiency. The buildings housing administrative staff present many disadvantages and inadequacies. The practice of trying to adapt these existing facilities to accommodate growing staffing levels and administrative functions in an unplanned and ad hoc manner is adding to the inadequacy of the space and the difficulty of delivering a high quality of staff performance.

These inadequacies are likely to grow as the enrolments continue to increase and further additions to administrative staff are required. An increasing range of mandated service responsibilities of the Board will add to this pressure.

The information gathered through this research provides a series of principles which would form the foundation for the design of a new purpose-built administrative centre. The space need calculations and adjacency and locational criteria provide further direction for consideration in the development of facilities to meet the current and future administrative needs of the Board.
Appendix One: Interview Guide
Introduction

The Halton District School Board is undertaking this study to determine the administrative office space needs for the organization. In order to assist in this process, we have retained a consulting team to assess these needs and recommend practical space planning solutions that will reflect the operational needs of each administrative department based on long term needs.

A key input to this process is a set of interviews with senior staff of each administrative department being conducted by Ed Starr, the functional planner for the consulting team. These interviews will enable staff to provide the consulting team with information on roles and responsibilities of their department, job functions, priorities in space planning, safety, use of technology, relationships with other departments, meeting space requirements, current gaps, anticipated future changes, and so on.

Below we have outlined the range of questions the consultant would like to discuss with you in order to develop an understanding of your department’s current and long term space needs and priorities. He will be contacting your office shortly to arrange an in-person session at a convenient time. We expect the session to take about an hour.

To prepare for the session, we would suggest that you meet with your staff prior to the meeting with the consultant to discuss these questions in order to help provide the required input. Should you have any questions or require any clarification, do not hesitate to contact my office.

We thank you for your assistance in this most important undertaking.

Signed____________________________________________________
Discussion Questions re Departmental Space Requirements

1. Can you please describe the roles and responsibilities of your department.

2. How do you see these roles and responsibilities changing over the next 20+ years?

3. How many staff positions (f/e’s) are currently approved in the department? How has that number changed over the past 5-10 years? What change do you expect in future?

4. Can you please summarize the range of job functions carried out in the department and the number of positions working at each function. Do you anticipate any changes in the nature of the job functions carried out in the department in the long term and can you describe the potential impacts on space requirements?

5. What are the current space requirements (size of space and qualitative aspects of space) for each position. Do you expect these requirements to change in the long term and, if so, in what way?
6. Are there short-term/part-time staff who need to be accommodated in the department from time to time? If so, what are their space requirements and how are they being accommodated at present? Do you see any change in this regard in future?

7. Are there any functions that need to be located in close proximity to each other to enhance operational efficiency? Does your department need to be located in close proximity to any other administrative departments – please describe any such relationships. Do you share any resources with other departments, or see opportunities for sharing in future?

8. How does technology affect your space needs? Can you identify any anticipated changes in your use of technology and the impacts on your space requirements?

9. Do you have any staff who telecommute? If so, please explain how that impacts your department’s space requirements. Do you expect more staff to telecommute in future?

10. Please describe your current and future meeting space needs (in terms of size, frequency of use, nature of meeting space). Do you currently share meeting space with any other departments? Is that a suitable option in future, or is it critical for your department to have its own meeting space?
11. Do you have many visitors to your department and, if so, how are they usually accommodated? How do you see this impacting on your space requirements?

12. Are there any safety issues that are important in your day-to-day operations and how do these affect the size and nature of your space requirements? Are there any special accessibility requirements for your department?

13. Do you know what the vehicle parking requirements are for your department? How do you expect this to change in future?

14. From a design/space quality standpoint, please describe any concerns about your current lighting, air quality, acoustics, office set up (i.e. how do staff interact with their department colleagues – do they prefer more open space, closed space, etc.). Are there any important design priorities we should know about?

15. What challenges/shortcomings/gaps are you facing in your current space and how would you like to see these addressed in any new space that may be developed?
16. If you were to summarize the main priorities of your department with regard to long term space needs, what would they be?

17. Are there any overall principles you believe the Board should follow in the design and development of new administrative space?

18. Are there any other comments you would like to provide?

We thank you for your time and input.
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TO: The Chair and Members of the Halton District School Board
FROM: D. Euale, Director of Education
RE: Administrative Procedure Review Update

Warrant
In keeping with our regular update of Administrative Council’s ongoing review of all administrative procedures, this report is the next in that reporting structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admin Procedure Name</th>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th>Specifics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language/Dialect (ESL/D)</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Appended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,

David Euale,
Director of Education
Definitions: (as defined in: Policies and Procedures for Ontario Elementary and Secondary Schools Kindergarten to Grade 12, 2007, Section 2.5.1)

English Language Learner (ELL) - students in provincially funded English language schools whose first language is a language other than English, or is a variety of English that is significantly different from the variety used for instruction in Ontario’s schools, and who may require focused educational supports to assist them in attaining proficiency in English.

English as a Second Language (ESL) - programs intended for students whose first language is other than English or is a variety of English significantly different from that used for instruction in Ontario schools. Students in these programs have had educational opportunities to develop age-appropriate first-language literacy skills.

English Language Development (ELD) – programs intended for students whose first language is other than English or is a variety of English significantly different from that used for instruction in Ontario schools. Students in these programs are most often from countries in which their access to education has been limited, and they have had limited opportunities to develop language and literacy skills in any language. Schooling in their countries of origin has been inconsistent, disrupted, or even completely unavailable throughout the years that these children would otherwise have been in school. As a result, they arrive in Ontario schools with significant gaps in their education.

The procedures and protocols used to support English Language Learners (ELLs) are articulated in the Ministry document Policies and Procedures for Ontario Elementary and Secondary Schools Kindergarten to Grade 12, 2007. While it is the intent of this procedure to outline the process to be followed in procedures for registering, orienting and delivering English as a Second Language (ESL) program and supports for ELLs, greater detail may be found in the above named document.

Part 1: Procedures for Reception, Orientation and Placement of ELLs and their Families

Reception and the Welcome Centre
The purpose of the Welcome Centre is to welcome newcomer families and help initiate the school registration process. At the Welcome Centre, initial assessments may be conducted, students are registered and families receive information about the Ontario education system and school board and settlement services within the community.
The reception of students at the Welcome Centre will occur as a phase in commencing in 2015-2016 with secondary students, grades 9 through 12. Due to large numbers of elementary students*, registration phase in for grades 1 to 8 will occur as capacity allows.

With consideration of the above timelines, the following students will be enrolled with the HDSB at the Welcome Centre* and may be assessed for English language and first language proficiency using the Ministry of Education Initial STEP Assessment (i.e., Oral, Reading, Writing and Mathematics):

- students who are new to Canada or entering the Ontario school system for the first time and whose first language is not English (or is a variety of English different from the variety used for instruction in Ontario schools),
- any student from a French language school in Canada,
- all International fee paying students,
- all students whose first language is one other than English who are re-entering Canada after an absence of a year or more who have English language needs; or,
- any English Language Learner who is new to the Halton District School Board transferring from another school board or private school.

Note: As the Full-Day Early Learning Kindergarten program provides extensive opportunities for oral language development, Kindergarten students are not considered for ESL remedial or withdrawal support.

The initial STEP assessment data will be provided to the home school administrator to be shared with the school reception team (e.g., administrator, classroom teacher(s), ESL teacher, Guidance Counselor, etc.). The initial assessment will be placed in the student’s OSR to support the student’s program in all curriculum areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary and Secondary Schools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary Students: Program and Support Recommendations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Students: Placement and Support Recommendations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Welcoming School**

“All schools should provide a reception and orientation program that ensures a warm welcome for ELLs and their families. Creating a welcoming and inclusive school environment for ELLs and their families is a whole-school activity requiring the commitment of the administrative team, teachers, support staff, and other leaders within the school community.” Source: *STEP Initial Assessment (2012)*

Part 2: Program for English Language Learners (ELLs)

ELLs new to the Halton District School Board will be provided English as a Second Language support and/or programming:
a) at their local elementary school, for students in grades 1 through 8, and;  
b) in regular classes at their local secondary school (all schools) and/or in congregated ESL classes (at specific secondary schools) for Grades 9 through 12

The STEP Initial Assessment data will be used to identify the support needed by each student.

In Elementary Schools
Students assessed at overall STEP 1, 2 or 3 will receive the intensive support of an English as a Second Language teacher. Students assessed at overall STEP 4, 5 or 6 will receive support from their regular classroom teacher as supported by the ESL teacher.

In Secondary Schools
Students assessed at overall STEP 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 may be placed into an ESL course in lieu of an English course. Students at STEP 5 and 6 may be placed into a regular English course. These decisions are made in consultation with parents and teachers. All students on the STEP continua will receive support from their classroom teachers. Equivalent credits for previous education, whether or not this is supported by documentation, should be awarded in accordance with policy defined in Ontario Secondary Schools, Grades 9-12: Program and Diploma Requirements (1999).

Teachers will use the following documents to design program for ELLs:
- Supporting English Language Learners: A practical guide for Ontario educators Grades 1 to 8
  This document replaces The Ontario Curriculum, Grades 1–8: English as a Second Language and English Literacy Development – A Resource Guide (2001),
- The Ontario Curriculum, Grades 9 to 12: English as a Second Language and English Literacy Development (2007)

The program design will enable students to access the curriculum while learning and improving their English language proficiency.

In Elementary and Secondary Schools
To ensure academic progress of all ELLs in the development of their proficiency in English:
- students will be assessed each fall and spring using the Observable Language Behaviours, and STEP continua for reading, writing and oral language;
- the overall STEP level will be entered into the Board tracking tool; and,
- school staff will ensure ongoing communication with parents of ELLs, e.g., students on the STEP continua may have an ESL support letter sent home at the beginning of each school year.

Academic progress will be reported as per the subject specific Ontario curriculum documents.

Students requiring accommodations and/or modifications will receive these, as appropriate.

Adaptations to program include:
- modified expectations (e.g., modification of some or all of the course/grade level expectations, especially for students in the early stages of learning English or those who require ELD support);
- a variety of accommodations related to instructional strategies (e.g., extensive use of visual cues, graphic organizers, peer tutoring, strategic use of students’ first languages);
- variety of learning resources (e.g., use of visual materials, simplified texts, and bilingual dictionaries); and,
- accommodations related to assessment strategies (e.g., granting of extra time, the use of alternative forms of assessment such as oral interview, learning logs, portfolios, the use of simplified language and instructions).

Part 3: Identification and Involvement of English Language Learners in Large-scale Assessments
English language learners should participate in the Grade 3 and Grade 6 provincial assessments in reading, writing, and mathematics. If an English language learner is working toward an academic or applied Grade 9 mathematics credit, he or she is required to participate in the Grade 9 Assessment of Mathematics. There are no deferrals or exemptions for Grade 9. English language learners are expected to write the Ontario Secondary School Literacy Test when they have acquired the level of proficiency in English required for success on the assessment.

Decisions about exemptions or deferrals will be made according to the requirements articulated in the EQAO administration guide.

Part 4: Special Education Support for ELLs

Where special education needs have been identified in the initial or ongoing assessment, appropriate special education supports will be provided in addition to accommodations related to English as a second language. Ongoing consultation with the student, parents and other school staff, including where available, the Special Education teacher, the ESL teacher and/or a Guidance or Student Success teacher should occur when determining programs and supports for the student.