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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,



| Appendix 1 <br> Program Viability Committee |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Principal Elementary Dual Track | Randy Morassut - Tom Thomson Erin Bedard - George Kennedy |
| Principal Elementary Single Track F.I. | Loui Silvestri - Sunningdale Colette Ruddock - E. J. James |
| Principal Elementary Single Track English | Sean McCarthy - West Oak Dallas Tulk-LaPrade - J. M. Denyes |
| System Principal Elementary Program | Terri Blackwell |
| System Principal Student Success | Doug Bothwell |
| System Principal French Language | Robert Hamilton |
| Superintendent Elementary Programs | Tricia Dyson |
| Superintendent Secondary Programs | David Boag |
| Superintendent at large | Rob Eatough <br> Julie Hunt-Gibbons |
| Principal English High School | Gerard Herlihey - Abbey Park |
| Principal French Immersion High School | Karen Hartman - Nelson |
| Trustees | Joanna Oliver Richelle Papin Kim Graves |
| Committee Chair | Stuart Miller |
| Support | Dom Renzella Aimmie Kellar |
| Director | David Euale |

HALTON DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD PLANNING DEPARTMENT PROJECTED ENROLMENTS FOR OCTOBER 31, 2015 OFFICIAL BURLINGTON ELEMENTARY PROJECTION

|  | PROGRAM | JK | SK | GR. 1 | GR. 2 | GR. 3 | GR. 4 | GR. 5 | GR. 6 | GR. 7 | GR. 8 | SPED | BODIES | OTG CAP |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALEXANDER'S | ENG | 49 | 46 | 24 | 29 | 34 | 33 | 46 | 50 | 48 | 55 | 0 | 414 | 575 |  |  |
| ALEXANDER'S | FI | 0 | 0 | 44 | 48 | 38 | 48 | 43 | 37 | 35 | 36 | 0 | 329 | 575 | 65\% | 44\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BRUCE T. LINDLEY | ENG | 37 | 41 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 18 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 354 |  |  |
| BRUCE T. LINDLEY | FI | 0 | 0 | 30 | 23 | 36 | 25 | 25 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 | 354 | 67\% | 47\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHARLES R. BEAUDOIN | ENG | 32 | 50 | 11 | 11 | 25 | 22 | 24 | 32 | 32 | 27 | 0 | 266 | 704 |  |  |
| CHARLES R. BEAUDOIN | GIF | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 28 | 17 | 46 | 34 | 27 | 0 | 167 | 704 |  |  |
| CHARLES R. BEAUDOIN | FI | 0 | 0 | 44 | 51 | 46 | 49 | 45 | 39 | 36 | 30 | 0 | 340 | 704 | 80\% | 44\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLARKSDALE | ENG | 41 | 52 | 20 | 13 | 18 | 22 | 15 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 | 550 |  |  |
| CLARKSDALE | FI | 0 | 0 | 45 | 57 | 63 | 43 | 37 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 289 | 550 | 69\% | 59\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| JOHN WILLIAM BOICH | ENG | 66 | 70 | 41 | 48 | 38 | 56 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 53 | 8 | 584 | 681 |  |  |
| JOHN WILLIAM BOICH | FI | 0 | 0 | 42 | 33 | 42 | 28 | 37 | 21 | 27 | 17 | 0 | 247 | 681 | 51\% | 30\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAPLEHURST | ENG | 27 | 30 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 15 | 13 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 138 | 519 |  |  |
| MAPLEHURST | FI | 0 | 0 | 46 | 35 | 45 | 37 | 36 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 | 519 | 87\% | 62\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ORCHARD PARK | ENG | 35 | 42 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 37 | 18 | 34 | 28 | 5 | 269 | 512 |  |  |
| ORCHARD PARK | FI | 0 | 0 | 52 | 49 | 59 | 50 | 43 | 35 | 27 | 10 | 0 | 325 | 512 | 74\% | 55\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PINELAND | ENG | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 19 | 34 | 34 | 0 | 132 | 650 |  |  |
| PINELAND | FI | 0 | 0 | 100 | 103 | 105 | 93 | 63 | 60 | 68 | 38 | 0 | 630 | 650 | 100\% | 83\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOM THOMSON | ENG | 36 | 39 | 9 | 11 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 274 |  |  |
| TOM THOMSON | FI | 0 | 0 | 64 | 58 | 72 | 50 | 40 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 330 | 274 | 88\% | 69\% |

HALTON DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD PLANNING DEPARTMENT PROJECTED ENROLMENTS FOR OCTOBER 31, 2015
OFFICIAL BURLINGTON ELEMENTARY PROJECTION


|  | PROGRAM | JK | SK | GR. 1 | GR. 2 | GR. 3 | GR. 4 | GR. 5 | GR. 6 | GR. 7 | GR. 8 | SPED | BODIES | OTG CAP |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PROGRAM | JK | SK | GR. 1 | GR. 2 | GR. 3 | GR. 4 | GR. 5 | GR. 6 | GR. 7 | GR. 8 | SPED | BODIES | OTG CAP |  |  |
| ANNE J MACARTHUR | E | 67 | 66 | 26 | 25 | 37 | 33 | 22 | 51 | 36 | 81 | 8 | 452 | 791 |  |  |
| ANNE J MACARTHUR | FI | 0 | 0 | 77 | 103 | 103 | 60 | 54 | 35 | 31 | 25 | 0 | 488 | 791 | 75\% | 52\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E.W. FOSTER | E | 25 | 30 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 328 |  |  |
| E.W. FOSTER | FI | 0 | 0 | 50 | 65 | 61 | 66 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 285 | 328 | 91\% | 74\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IRMA COULSON | E | 78 | 92 | 47 | 49 | 46 | 39 | 52 | 58 | 49 | 52 | 0 | 562 | 745 |  |  |
| IRMA COULSON | FI | 0 | 0 | 72 | 92 | 74 | 60 | 51 | 41 | 28 | 25 | 0 | 443 | 745 | 61\% | 44\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MARTIN STREET | E | 21 | 23 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 282 |  |  |
| MARTIN STREET | FI | 0 | 0 | 35 | 24 | 34 | 36 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 282 | 92\% | 64\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PL ROBERTSON | E | 106 | 126 | 40 | 50 | 50 | 76 | 49 | 70 | 42 | 69 | 14 | 692 | 818 |  |  |
| PL ROBERTSON | FI | 0 | 0 | 52 | 66 | 57 | 33 | 21 | 22 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 269 | 818 | 57\% | 28\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ROBERT BALDWIN | E | 37 | 49 | 13 | 11 | 16 | 17 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 426 |  |  |
| ROBERT BALDWIN | FI | 0 | 0 | 68 | 72 | 49 | 43 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 287 | 426 | 84\% | 65\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIGER JEET SINGH | E | 115 | 127 | 42 | 48 | 67 | 58 | 63 | 82 | 82 | 79 | 8 | 771 | 782 |  |  |
| TIGER JEET SINGH | FI | 0 | 0 | 85 | 65 | 69 | 54 | 43 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 348 | 782 | 67\% | 31\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PROGRAM | JK | SK | GR. 1 | GR. 2 | GR. 3 | GR. 4 | GR. 5 | GR. 6 | GR. 7 | GR. 8 | SPED | BODIES | OTG CAP |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GEORGE KENNEDY | E | 33 | 35 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 584 |  |  |
| GEORGE KENNEDY | FI | 0 | 0 | 80 | 68 | 68 | 55 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 334 | 584 | 90\% | 71\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ROBERT LITTLE | E | 33 | 37 | 19 | 22 | 25 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 400 |  |  |
| ROBERT LITTLE | FI | 0 | 0 | 36 | 40 | 34 | 36 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 400 | 65\% | 48\% |

## APPENDIX 3

SK to Grade 1 French Immersion Historical Progression, From 2014 / 2015 LTAP - April 10, 2015

|  | Grade | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Burlington | SK | 1125 | 1113 | 1179 | 1217 | 1224 | 1185 | 1351 | 1214 |
|  | 01F | 313 | 309 | 346 | 369 | 386 | 409 | 461 | 393 |
|  |  | 28\% | 28\% | 29\% | 30\% | 32\% | 35\% | 34\% | 32\% |


| Oakville | SK | 1067 | 1034 | 1088 | 1177 | 1142 | 1267 | 1239 | 1171 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 01F | 303 | 324 | 355 | 439 | 404 | 549 | 522 | 505 |
|  |  | 28\% | 31\% | 33\% | 37\% | 35\% | 43\% | 42\% | 43\% |


| Milton | SK | 464 | 559 | 659 | 814 | 901 | 996 | 1081 | 1197 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | O1F | 120 | 151 | 156 | 235 | 341 | 340 | 435 | 440 |
|  |  | $26 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $37 \%$ |


| Halton Hills | SK | 452 | 481 | 439 | 415 | 467 | 441 | 444 | 459 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 01F | 95 | 107 | 104 | 89 | 112 | 91 | 101 | 106 |
|  |  | $21 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $23 \%$ |


| Overall | SK | 3108 | 3187 | 3365 | 3623 | 3734 | 3889 | 4115 | 4041 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 01F | 831 | 891 | 961 | 1132 | 1243 | 1389 | 1519 | 1444 |
|  |  | 27\% | 28\% | 29\% | 31\% | 33\% | 36\% | 37\% | 36\% |

Number of Permanent and LTO
French Teachers hired annually

|  | LTO French | Permanent <br> French | Total French <br> (Excluding <br> Occasionals) |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Projected | $2014-2015$ | 30 | 35 | 65 |
| Historical | $2013-2014$ | 34 | 44 | 78 |
| Historical | $2012-2013$ | 23 | 31 | 54 |
| Historical | $2011-2012$ | 15 | 52 | 67 |
| Historical | $2010-2011$ | 15 | 39 | 54 |
| Historical | $2009-2010$ | 1 | 13 | 14 |

2014-2015 Recruitment Results for 2015-2016 School Year

| Permanent Pool |  | Occasional Pool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Internal | Externa <br> I | Offered <br>  <br> Secondary | Elementary Only | Secondary Only |
| 23 | 26 | 24 | 87 | 4 |
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## 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

Program Viability Committee: Program Scenarios for Consideration Spring 2015

| Scenario 1: <br> Status Quo | - English program (FDK-8) <br> - Core French program starting in grade 1 ( $40 \mathrm{~min} /$ week) <br> - Early FI starting in grade 1 (50\%) <br> - Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only) <br> - Single \& Dual Track FI models incorporated <br> - No capping |
| :---: | :---: |
| Scenario 2: <br> Status Quo with FI Limitations in Dual Track | - English program (FDK-8) <br> - Core French program starting in grade 1 ( $40 \mathrm{~min} /$ week) <br> - Early FI starting in grade 1 <br> - Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only) <br> - Single \& Dual Track FI models incorporated Dual Track only in schools of 600+, schools less than 600 subject to 'morphing policy' <br> - No capping |
| Scenario 3: <br> Status Quo with Capping | - English program (FDK-8) <br> - Core French program starting in grade 1 ( $40 \mathrm{~min} /$ week) <br> - Early FI starting in grade 1 (50\%) <br> - Late Fl starting in grade 7 (Burlington only) <br> - Single \& Dual Track FI models incorporated <br> - Capping of enrolment into FI (e.g., lottery) |
| Scenario 3a: <br> Status Quo with Capping in Dual Track \& Increased Primary Core | - English program (FDK-8) <br> - Core French program starting in grade 1 ( $120 \mathrm{~min} /$ week) <br> - Early FI starting in grade 1 (50\%) <br> - Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only) <br> - Single \& Dual Track FI models incorporated <br> - Capping in Dual Track Schools |
| Scenario 4: <br> FI Middle Entry | - English program (FDK-8) <br> - Core French program starting in grade 1 ( $40 \mathrm{~min} /$ week) <br> - Middle Entry FI starting in grade 4 ( $80 \%$ ) ( min of 30 students per grade per program) <br> - Late Fl starting in grade 7 (Burlington only) <br> - Single \& Dual Track FI models incorporated <br> - No capping unless required in Dual Track schools subsequent to implementation |
| Scenario 4a: <br> Single Track FI only with Middle Entry | - English program (FDK-8) <br> - Core French program starting in grade 1 ( $40 \mathrm{~min} /$ week) <br> - Middle Entry FI starting in grade 4 (80\%) (min of 30 students per grade per program) <br> - Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only) <br> - Single Track FI models only <br> - No capping |
| Scenario 4b: <br> Dual Track FI only with Middle Entry | - English program (FDK-8) <br> - Core French program starting in grade 1 ( $40 \mathrm{~min} /$ week) <br> - Middle Entry FI starting in grade 4 ( $80 \%$ ) ( min of 30 students per grade per program) <br> - Late FI starting in grade 7 (Burlington only) <br> - Dual Track FI models only <br> - No capping |


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


[^0]:    * 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

