

## **Report No. 1 Ad Hoc Committee on Governance**

January 10, 2001

To the Chair and Members of  
the Toronto District School Board:

A meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance convened this day at 4:40 p.m. in the Main Committee Room, 155 College Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Brian Lenglet presiding, pending the election of the Chair.

The following committee members were present: Trustees Donna Cansfield, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Shelley Laskin, Sheine Mankovsky and Nellie Pedro. Other trustees present were Pauline Ling, Patrick Rutledge and Kathleen Wynne.

Regrets were received from Trustees Gerri Gershon and Sheila Ward.

The Committee decided to report as follows:

### **1. Election of Committee Chair**

For the information of the Board, the Committee elected Trustee Sheine Mankovsky as Chair of the Committee.

### **2. Executive Committee**

At its meeting on January 10, 2001, the Committee discussed the establishment of an executive committee of the Board as referred to the Committee by the Board on December 13, 2000. It was decided to seek a legal opinion<sup>1</sup>. The matter was not discussed at the Committee's scheduled for January 24, 2001, due to lack of quorum.

### **3. Work Plan re Governance Issues**

The Committee heard staff presentations or received background information on the following topics:

- (a) The Education Act
- (b) Report of the Royal Commission on Learning, a short version and Volumes I to IV
- (c) The Education Improvement Commission (EIC)
- (d) *From Hope to Harris: The Reshaping of Ontario's Schools*
- (e) *Effective School Board Governance*, by Maureen E. Reid, as presented at CAPSLE Conference, April 30-May 2, 2000

• \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> This document will be maintained in the Office of the Secretariat for a limited time.

The Committee is developing a focused work plan for inclusion in its next report to the Board.

#### **4. Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance will be held February 1, 2001, at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheine Mankovsky  
Chair of the Committee

**Received February 14, 2001**

## **Report No. 2 Ad Hoc Committee on Governance**

February 1, 2001

To the Chair and Members of  
the Toronto District School Board:

A meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance convened this day at 5:45 p.m. in the Main Committee Room, 155 College Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Sheine Mankovsky, Chair.

The following committee members were present: Trustees Sheine Mankovsky, Donna Cansfield, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Gerri Gershon, Shelley Laskin and Sheila Ward. Other trustees present were: Paula Fletcher and Patrick Rutledge.

Regrets were received from Trustee Nellie Pedro.

The Committee decided to report as follows:

### **1. Presentation on Governance**

For the information of the Board, the Committee heard a presentation by Judy Watson, President of the Ontario Federation of Home and School Associations, on governance and particularly on the policy governance model. Following the trustees' retreat in March, the Committee will meet again to review governance issues

### **2. Chairs' Advisory Committee**

As requested by the Board on December 13, 2000, the Committee reviewed the proposal for the creation of an Executive Committee.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Governance **RECOMMENDS**:

- (a) That a Chairs' Advisory Committee be established and that the membership consist of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board and the Chairs of the four standing committees;
- (b) That the Chairs' Advisory Committee meet at the call of the Chair, or the Vice-Chair as requested by the Chair;

- (c) That the Chairs' Advisory Committee advise the Chair as requested; and
- (d) That, at the next regular meeting of the Board, notice be given of revisions to the bylaws.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheine Mankovsky  
Chair of the Committee

**Adopted February 14, 2001**

**Report No. 1  
House Committee**

**(Not adopted)**

January 23, 2001

To the Chair and Members of  
the Toronto District School Board:

Meetings of the House Committee were held on December 20, 2000, January 11, 2001, and this day at 155 College Street from 4:07 p.m. to 5:02 p.m. The following committee members were present: Trustees Cansfield (Chair), Cary-Meagher, Hill and Rutledge.

The following members were also present: Trustees Atkinson and Pedro.

The Committee decided to report as follows:

**1. Trustees' Services Office Establishment (not adopted by the Board, see page 86)**

The Committee reviewed the services to the trustees provided by the four administrative assistants in Senior Administrative Services, Trustees Services.

The House Committee **RECOMMENDS:**

- (a) That the establishment of the Trustees' Services office be expanded from four to five persons;
- (b) That the Vice-Chair of the Board and staff co-ordinate a consultation process involving all trustees and staff of Senior Administrative Services, Trustees Services and that such consultation lead to the development of a posting for the position;
- (c) That up to three trustees, as co-ordinated by the Vice-Chair of the Board, be involved in the interview process.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Cansfield  
Chair of the Committee

**Not adopted, February 14, 2001**

**Blank Page**

## **Report No.1**

### **Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee**

January 31, 2001

To the Chair and Members of the  
Toronto District School Board:

On November 22, 2000, the Board approved the re-establishment of the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee. The Steering Committee held four meetings on the following dates: January 8, January 11, January 16 and January 22, 2001.

On January 8, 2001, the following Committee members were present: Trustees Sheila Cary-Meagher (Co-Chair), Judi Codd (Co-Chair), Irene Atkinson, Paula Fletcher and Shelley Laskin. Other trustees present included Donna Cansfield, Shelley Carroll, Bruce Davis, Scott Harrison, Pauline Ling, Nellie Pedro, Patrick Rutledge and Kathleen Wynne. The following staff were present: Sandra Best, Nancy Gale, Catherine Moraes, Gary Parkinson, Sheila Penny and David Percival.

On January 11, 2001, the following Committee members were present: Trustees Sheila Cary-Meagher (Co-Chair), Judi (Co-Chair), Irene Atkinson, Paula Fletcher and Shelley Laskin. Other trustees present included Pauline Ling, Nellie Pedro and Kathleen Wynne. The following staff were present: Sandra Best, Nancy Gale, Catherine Moraes, Gary Parkinson and Sheila Penny.

On January 16, 2001, the following Committee members were present: Trustees Sheila Cary-Meagher (Co-Chair), Judi Codd (Co-Chair), Irene Atkinson and Shelley Laskin. Other trustees present included Nellie Pedro and Kathleen Wynne. The following staff were present: Deborah Hume Cutajar, Catherine Moraes, Sheila Penny and David Percival.

On January 22, 2001, the following Committee members were present: Trustees Sheila Cary-Meagher (Co-Chair), Judi Codd (Co-Chair), Paula Fletcher and Shelley Laskin. Regrets were received from Trustee Irene Atkinson. Trustee Kathleen Wynne was also present. The following staff were present: Nancy Gale, Lloyd McKell, Catherine Moraes, Gary Parkinson, David Percival and Sheila Penny.

#### **Organization of the Report**

The report is organized into two sections. The first section (Section A) provides a summary of the deliberations of the Steering Committee on a range of issues including:

- Questions for clarification
- The mandate of the committee
- The communication action plan
- The playground fundraising initiative
- The process for consultations with the local design teams and the actual design team process
- The city-wide playground replacement meeting.
- Timing of disbursement of funds to schools.
- Retreat to discuss playground replacement.

- A request from Tom Malcolm re William McCordic School.
- Alternative facilitators for playground learning environment project (or ward-specific process for playground replacement).
- Parent involvement on the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee.
- Structure and Composition of the Steering Committee – staff involvement.

The second section (Section B) presents recommendations on several matters for the Board's consideration and approval.

## SECTION A: INFORMATION ITEMS

The Steering Committee discussed the following matters

### **1. Questions for Clarification**

For the information of the Board, individual trustees identified for clarification, several questions pertaining to the implementation of the plan and the recommendations (see Board Minutes of November 22, page 761) to design and replace playgrounds in the Toronto District School Board. Staff had an opportunity to answer questions.

### **2. Mandate of the Committee**

The Steering Committee reviewed the following mandate that was approved by the Board on November 22, 2000:

That the Board re-establish the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee to consider the equitable allocation of any funds raised centrally through fundraising, the allocation of any Board funds for future phases, and provide ongoing leadership for the development of exemplary playground learning environments (Board Minutes page 774).

For the information of the Board, clarification of the phrase *ongoing leadership* in the above mandate was considered necessary so that the committee could address its role in providing follow-up during the construction of the playgrounds and follow-up through to the completion of Phase I of the project.

For the information of the Board, the following was considered but a formal vote was not taken:

- (a) That the Board re-establish the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee as a special committee.
- (b) That the Director of Education be requested to examine ways of how the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee could collaborate with other Board committees.

Note: As a result of further discussions regarding the nature of the Steering Committee a formal recommendation concerning this matter is presented in Section B.



### 3. Communication Action Plan

The Steering Committee received a written report on the status of implementation of the strategies contained in the Communication Action Plan (approved by the Board on November 22, 2000, Minute page 772) to keep parents, school councils and the community informed and support the design, construction and funding for the development of exemplary playground learning environments. A critical path was added to the Communication Action Plan<sup>1</sup> and it was reviewed for the committee.

To date, two *Playground Progress Reports* have been forwarded to parents and the community by the communications office. Staff advised that it is necessary to forward a third *Playground Progress Report* to the community. A draft of this report will be presented to the committee at a future meeting for review and approval prior to distribution to stakeholders. A Communications Binder containing copies of the information that was sent to parents and the community was forwarded to all trustees.

### 4. Playground Fundraising Initiative

#### The Fundraising Campaign

The Steering Committee received updates on the playground fundraising campaign including the actions that have been initiated by Business Development staff to launch the initiative and the external funding sources with whom partnerships have already been developed.

In addition, the Steering Committee received a strategic report from Business Development staff, presenting a Preliminary Funding Analysis and Strategic Plan for the fundraising initiative and requesting direction and approval before proceeding with the initiative. During discussion, a concern was expressed that potential donors were determining decisions about who will be the beneficiary of their donations.

For the information of the Board, Business Development staff advised that it would be useful for the Board to reaffirm its commitment to implementing the fundraising initiative, at this time. This matter was referred to the next meeting of the Steering Committee for further discussion.

#### Letter of Understanding with Evergreen Foundation

The Steering Committee considered a Letter of Understanding between the TDSB and the Evergreen Foundation. The purpose of the Letter of Understanding is to allow the Board to maximize its fundraising potential for the playground replacement and renewal plan.

For the information of the Board, staff presented a further report to the Steering Committee clarifying several issues in the Letter of Understanding.

● \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> Documents attached to this report will be maintained in the Office of the Secretariat for a limited time.

## **5. Consultations with the Local School Community, Design Teams and the Design Team Process**

The Steering Committee received oral reports from Facility Services staff on consultations with the local school community design teams/facilitators and the design team process which are already in progress to replace play structures for Category A (see page 168) schools.

For the information of the Board, individual trustees expressed concern:

- That the vision for the design of the playgrounds is not in accordance with the needs of the majority of the affected school communities.
- About the consultants' costs (\$880,000) associated with Phase I of the process.
- That budget limitations and a sound business case were not addressed.
- That in-house staff would be used to keep track of the business management areas of the project.
- That a critical path was not prepared for the project.
- That the individual emphasis of the school communities has not yet been determined.
- That although the Board might be able to provide schools with some extra funds for playground replacement, many schools will not be able to raise the funds that they will need because the cost will be greater than what is being anticipated or proposed.

In order to reduce and/or control costs, it was suggested that:

- ten templates could be used as opposed to 110;
- the design team facilitators could be asked to conduct one community meeting or community meetings for families of schools;
- a cap could be placed on the local school budget;
- the allocation of funds to Category A, B and C schools could be reviewed.

## **6. City-wide Playground Replacement Meeting**

For the information of the Board, the Steering Committee participated in the city-wide playground replacement meeting that was held on January 9, 2001, at Central Technical School, which was sponsored by Facility Services. The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Update the community on the playground plan and answer questions.
- Consult with parents and school staff directly on their playground needs.
- Ensure parents and staff have the opportunity to plan the playgrounds they want.
- Discuss timelines for beginning work.
- Hear an overview of plans to date.
- Meet with design facilitators and decide what process communities may want to follow.

## **7. Timing of Disbursement of Funds to Schools**

The Steering Committee approved the following resolution:

That the matter of an additional \$3 million to be allocated to schools for playground equipment replacement in the 2001-02 school year be referred to the Budget Committee for consideration at its first meeting.

For the information of the Board, the Budget Committee considered the above recommendation on January 23, 2001.

## **8. Retreat to Discuss Playground Replacement**

The Steering Committee approved a recommendation to hold a retreat on January 20, 2001, at 155 College Street, Toronto, Ontario, to discuss matters related to playground replacement and renewal. All trustees, appropriate staff from Facility Services, Communications and Business Services were invited to attend as well as parents on the local school community design teams. Lloyd McKell, Central Co-ordinator – Student and Community Services, was the facilitator.

Several key issues that were identified by the Steering Committee were addressed at the retreat including:

- A commitment statement.
- The Project Management Plan.
- The allocation of project development and management funds.
- Community input into the approval process.
- Other project management issues.
- Child care issues.
- Ward-specific process for playground replacement.

For the information of the Board, at a meeting following the retreat, the Steering Committee reviewed its discussion and/or decisions concerning the commitment statement, the Project Management Plan and ward-specific process for playground replacement. Recommendations concerning these three matters are presented in Section B of this report. Members of the Steering Committee agreed to respond to the other matters contained in the retreat document in writing, for consideration at the next Steering Committee meeting.

## **9. Request from Tom Malcolm re William J. McCordic School**

The Steering Committee considered a communication from Tom Malcolm presenting a list of concerns and requests on behalf of William J. McCordic School about meeting the needs of students with disabilities in Category A playground learning environment.

In response to the communication, staff explained that Student and Community Services and Facility Services staff are currently engaged in designating sites to meet the needs of the disabled and identifying a prioritized project list to better enable existing school facilities to meet those needs.

For the information of the Board, staff undertook to bring back a report to a future meeting, detailing which schools on the Category A list support special program needs and are designated sites, for further discussion. In particular, staff undertook to bring back a report on William J. McCordic School, Hollywood Public School and Cameron Public School.

#### **10. Alternative Facilitators for Playground Learning Environment Project (Or ward-specific process for playground replacement)**

At the retreat on January 20, 2001, Trustee Cary-Meagher brought to the attention of the Steering Committee a request from parent council representatives of eight of ten schools with playground learning environment projects in ward 16, to seek an alternative process for the replacement playgrounds in her ward.

In order to accommodate a ward-specific process, Facility Services indicated that it would consider alternative design facilitation proposals for the project, provided they meet the qualifications identified for consultants in the Board's request for proposal of November 22, 2000. Accordingly, Facility Services have presented to the Steering Committee a draft communication to the principals and school advisory council chairs of the ten schools concerned, setting out the criteria for selection of design facilitators, for consideration and approval.

For the information of the Board, members of the Steering Committee agreed to meet informally to refine the communication and report back.

#### **11. Parent Involvement on the Playground, Learning Environment Appeals Committee**

The Steering Committee discussed the issue of membership on the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee. A concern was expressed regarding the parameters for membership established by the Board on November 22, 2000 (see Minute page 770) and the lack of a process for involving parents.

For the information of the Board, the matter of parent representation on the Playground Learning Environment Appeals Committee will be addressed at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

#### **12. Structure and Composition of the Steering Committee**

##### Staff involvement

The Steering Committee discussed what was the role of staff and how staff should report to the committee. Staff undertook to present written reports to the Steering Committee.

For the information of the Board, the following motion was tabled for consideration at a future Steering Committee meeting:

### Tabled Motion

Trustee Laskin moved: That Gary Parkinson, Sheila Penny, David Percival, Nancy Gale and Catherine Moraes be appointed to the membership of the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee.

## SECTION B: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD APPROVAL

### **13. Type of Committee and Reporting Process**

The Steering Committee discussed whether it is a steering committee or a committee of the Board and the intention of the Board was clarified.

The Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee **RECOMMENDS:**

- (a) That the Board reaffirm that the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee is a steering committee.
- (b) That the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee report to the Business and Facilities Committee.

### **14. Structure and Composition of the Steering Committee**

#### Parent Involvement

The Steering Committee discussed how it should be structured to include representation from the community, what process could be used to select parents and how many parents should be invited to participate on the steering committee. The Steering Committee decided:

- To advise parents who attend the city-wide playground meeting that a process to involve them is being determined and they will be informed of the details at a later date.
- To ask the Lloyd McKell, Central Co-ordinator – Student and Community services, to develop a process and guidelines to select and involve parents on the steering committee.
- That the parent involvement process would be shared with the local school community design teams in the 110 affected schools for feedback.
- That parents would be selected from the local school community design teams, ward councils, the newly formed Parent-Community Network and the Child Care in Schools Advisory Committee.
- That the selection of parents would be based on a proportionate representation model that is equitable and they would be called parent resource persons.
- That the number of parent resource persons to be appointed to the steering committee would be determined at the retreat on January 20, 2001.
- That one or two parent(s) would be appointed to the steering committee to be parent resource persons “At Large”.
- That a reporting mechanism utilizing e-mail would be put in place for the parent resource persons to report back to the local school community design teams. Assistance would be provided to the parent resource persons in setting up their e-mail to facilitate this reporting activity.

Following the retreat on January 20, 2001, the options for the parent selection process were presented to the Steering Committee. The proposal will be considered by the Steering Committee at a future meeting.

The Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee **RECOMMENDS**:

- (a) That the parent involvement process used to select parents for the Ministry of Education Regional Forum on January 27, 2001 be adapted to design a process for the purpose of selecting parents for involvement on the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee;
- (b) That the Parent-Community Network be requested to appoint a representative to the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee at their first meeting; and
- (c) That the Child Care in Schools Advisory Committee be requested to appoint a representative to the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee.

## 15. Child Care Issues

The Steering Committee discussed several matters surrounding the issue of child care both at its formal meetings and at the retreat.

A concern was expressed about the difficulties which some schools are experiencing (e.g., Pauline Public School) with regard to the shared use of playgrounds. Staff undertook to bring forward a list of Category schools that are experiencing such difficulties.

The Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee **RECOMMENDS**:

- (a) That Trustees Codd and Fletcher meet with child care staff in the TDSB and appropriate staff from Facility Services to review how the process for replacement of day care play equipment funded through the City of Toronto Children's Services is proceeding at TDSB schools;
- (b) That the Board initiate a meeting where the TDSB and the City of Toronto can explore the means for collaboration on a "whole site approach" for those schools with day care that are funded by the City.

## 16. Commitment Statement

There was agreement to add wording to the commitment statement endorsed by the Board on November 22, 2000 regarding playground replacement and renewal, to limit conflicting interpretations among various stakeholders. Lloyd Mckell, Central Co-ordinator – Student and Community Services, prepared a draft statement that combined suggestions from the retreat with the Board's statement. This statement of commitment was refined further at a Steering Committee meeting following the retreat (see page 171).

The Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the Toronto District School Board reaffirm its commitment to play structures as an essential component of a safe and exemplary playground for elementary schools.

## 17. The Project Management Plan

At the retreat on January 20, 2001, staff presented the Project Management Plan. Staff discussed the organizational chart, sequence of work, timelines and reporting on the progress of the work.

At a meeting following the retreat, the Steering Committee reviewed the key issues and information that emerged from the discussion and the first and second points were amended. During the discussion, individual members expressed concern:

- About trustees becoming members of the local school community design teams.
- That the Steering Committee did not have the technical or management expertise to perform the general management functions that are required to coordinate the playground replacement and renewal project.

The Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee **RECOMMENDS**:

- (a) That representatives of the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee hold an informal meeting with the Chair of the Board, Sheila Penny, Nancy Gale and Catherine Moraes to review the current playground replacement and renewal project in order to determine how it is going to unfold and whether any assistance is needed with the coordination of the project;
- (b) A report be brought back to the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee.

### PLAYGROUND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT APPEAL PROCESS (Items 6 to 9)

## 18. The Appeal Process

The Playground Learning Environment report of November 22, 2000 established an appeal process and criteria for schools omitted from the Category A project list (see page 172).

The Steering Committee considered information listing a group of twelve schools that meet the criteria that have requested a formal appeal. And a group of four schools, of which the first three have requested a formal appeal but do not meet the criteria as set out in the Board report, but believe they have extenuating circumstances that makes them eligible as a Category A school. The fourth school (Weston Memorial Public School) meets the criteria of a Category A school but has not formally requested an appeal.

The Steering Committee agreed that:

- (a) In the future, when a list of schools is brought forward to the committee regarding appeals, the following information be included by staff:
  - A line showing the value of the equipment that was lost from each site.
  - A line showing whether or not more than one set of play structures was lost.
  - A line showing how much funding the city has given for child care.
- (b) A master list of all Category A schools indicating the components listed in (a) would be provided to give the bigger picture.

Subsequently, the background information (outlined above) on the designation and funding allocations was forwarded to trustees.

The Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee **RECOMMENDS** that for the purpose of follow-up, Weston Memorial Public School be added to the list of Category A schools although a formal appeal was not submitted, as it clearly meets the established criteria.

With the permission of the Steering Committee, Trustee Laskin undertook to contact the school on behalf of Trustee Hill and advise to submit a formal appeal.

## 19. Appeal Request: First Nations School of Toronto

The Steering Committee was informed that Facility Services received a letter from Trustee Fletcher concerning the appeal by First Nations School of Toronto, regarding the school's eligibility as a Category A school.

The Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee **RECOMMENDS**:

- (a) That the Board approve the appeal by First Nations School of Toronto with the proposed allocation of \$25,851 (in accordance with the previously approved formula) for the replacement value for their playground and the school be added to the list of additional schools to be included in the Category A project list for immediate implementation; and
- (b) That the requests for a formal appeal from George Webster Elementary School, Parkdale Collegiate Institute and Pauline Jr. Public School be approved for forwarding to the Appeals Committee when this is established by the Board.

## 20. Playground Learning Environment Appeals Committee

The Steering Committee discussed the establishment of the Playground Learning Environment Appeals Committee and a staff report pertaining to the appeals.

At its meeting on November 22, 2000, the Board approved recommendations as set out in the report entitled Playground Learning Environments. Included in those recommendations was a project plan to address the rebuilding of 110 school playgrounds that had at least 80% of playground equipment play events removed or that had none to begin with.

The Playground Learning Environments report set out an appeal process for schools omitted from the project list. An amount of \$280,000 was approved as a contingency to address appeals. Appeals have been received for the following 13 schools that meet the approved selection criteria. The proposed allocations following are in accordance with the previously approved formula set out in November 22, 2000 report.

<u>School</u>	<u>Allocation</u>
Bessborough Drive ES	\$20,492
Cordella Jr PS	\$28,020
George Syme CS	\$30,363
Iroquois Jr PS	\$19,186
Jesse Ketchum PS	\$26,628



John Ross Robertson Jr PS	\$20,867
Keeleisdale PS	\$20,867
Oakridge Jr PS	\$29,370
Perth Avenue Jr PS	\$29,370
Portage Trail PS	\$31,184
Rawlinson Community School	\$28,345
Weston Memorial JPS	\$20,270
First Nations School of Toronto, Jr & Sr	\$25,851
Total	\$336,908

### Options and Implications

Since appeals by the aforementioned schools meet the selection criteria for the approved Category A project list, The Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee recommending that these 13 schools proceed immediately to be implemented along with the other 110 Category A schools. The Steering Committee believes that to delay approval of these appeals, until the Appeal Committee is established, will unnecessarily delay the rebuilding of playgrounds on these sites.

### Key Financial Implications

The total of allocations identified above amounts to \$ 56,908 above the budgeted contingency of \$280,000. Additional professional fees of \$104,000 for design facilitation services will be charged to the project management budget of the 2000/2001 Renewal Grant.

### Implementation Strategy

The Project Manager for the Playground Learning Environment Project will assign a design facilitator to work with the Local School Community Design Committee for each listed school to implement the project plan as outlined in November 22, 2000 report.

The Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee RECOMMENDS

- (a) That the Board establish the Playground Learning Environment Appeals Committee as soon as possible;
- (b) That notwithstanding the Board's resolution of November 22, 2000, and without prejudice, the thirteen schools named in Recommendation (c) be included in the list of Category A schools that are currently involved in a rebuild of their playgrounds; and
- (c) That funding allocations for Bessborough Drive ES, Cordella Jr PS, George Syme CS, Iroquois Jr PS, Jesse Ketchum PS, John Ross Robertson Jr PS, Keeleisdale PS, Oakridge Jr PS, Perth Avenue Jr PS, Portage Trail PS, Rawlinson Community School, Weston Memorial JPS and First Nations School of Toronto, Jr & Sr be approved for immediate implementation.

## 21. Playground Equipment Request for Proposal (RFP) Vendor List

Staff presented a playground equipment RFP vendor list to the Steering Committee for consideration and approval. Staff also requested approval to create a Playground Equipment Standards Committee with membership from all stakeholders including two or three trustees.

During discussion, the feasibility of using templates was discussed. Staff explained what was involved in developing the templates, how the templates were going to be used by the affected schools and clarified issues related to the use of different types of materials, e.g., wood, plastic.

It was indicated that Military Trail Public School has already bought their playground equipment and would like to know how they should proceed.

The Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee **RECOMMENDS**:

- (a) That the playground equipment Request for Proposal (RFP) Vendor List be received;
- (b) That the playground equipment that was purchased by Military Trail Public School be installed by the Board;
- (c) That the Board approve the establishment of a Playground Equipment Standards Committee consisting of representation as follows: District-wide Co-ordinator of Physical Education, South Region Athletics Administrator - Health and Physical Education; TSAA (a school principal); the Central Co-ordinator - Student and Community Services; two child care advisors, the Standards and Compliance Co-ordinator, the Maintenance Ground Team Leader; a representative from the Maintenance and Construction Skilled Trades Council; a representative from the Special Education Advisory Committee, the Structural/Civil Co-ordinator; and the Manager – Standards Compliance and the Environment (who will act as chair) and three representatives from the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee;
- (d) That Trustees Cary-Meagher, Codd and Laskin, be the representatives for the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee; and
- (e) That any other interested trustees (to a maximum of three) indicate to the co-chairs of the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee their willingness to serve on the Playground Equipment Standards Committee. (Trustee Pedro has advised that she would like to serve).

## 22. Supply of Playground Equipment Proposal: Request for Proposal (RFP)

Staff presented a draft supply of playground equipment proposal RFP to the Steering Committee for consideration and approval.

The Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the draft RFP for the supply of playground equipment in the affected schools in the Toronto District School Board<sup>1</sup> be approved.

• \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> This document will be maintained in the Office of the Secretariat for a limited time.

**23. Allocation of Project Development and Management Funds, from Report on Retreat, January 20, 2001 (as approved by the Board, see page 77)**

The following decision was made at the Board meeting held on February 14, 2001:

That the information concerning the administration of the Project Development and Management funds be explained in a protocol and made available as soon as possible to the appropriate schools and stakeholders.

Respectfully submitted,

Judi Codd  
Co-Chair of Committee

Sheila Cary-Meagher  
Co-Chair of the Committee

**Adopted, as amended, February 14, 2001**

Playground Equipment: Category A Schools

Schools that had at least 80% of school playground equipment play events removed  
or had none to begin with

<u>Ward</u>	<u>Use</u>	<u>Child Care in School?</u>	<u>Shared or Exclusive Use</u>	<u>City Funding of Child Care Playground?</u>	<u>Child Care Funding Amount \$</u>	<u>Status of Day Care Project</u>	<u>Facility</u>	<u>Total Amount</u>
1	JM	Y	n/a	N	0		Albion Heights JMS	20525
1	JM	N	n/a	N	0		Elmbank JM Academy	28099
1	J	N	n/a	N	0		John D Parker JS	27695
1	JM	N	n/a	N	0		North Kipling JMS	29149
3	JM	N	n/a	N	0		Islington JMS	27832
3	JM	Y	E	Y	12,125	3	Park Lawn JMS	20501
4	J	Y	E	Y	11,462	AP	Blacksmith PS	28971
4	J	N	n/a	N	0		Chalkfarm PS	29046
4	J	N	n/a	N	0		Gosford PS	28600
5	J	Y	E	N	0		Ancaster PS	25525
5	J	Y	E	N	0		Calico PS	27610
5	JM	Y	E	Y	12,700	AC	Faywood Arts-Based Curr School	20525
5	J	N	n/a	N	0		Summit Heights PS	19392
5	J	Y	E	Y	8,630	AM	Tumpane PS	28407
6	J	N	n/a	N	0		Bala Avenue Community School	28380
6	J	N	n/a	N	0		Charles E Webster Jr PS	28659
6	J	N	n/a	N	0		Dennis Avenue Community School	27444
6	J	N	n/a	N	0		Harwood Jr PS	26049
7	JM	Y	S	N	0		Fern Avenue Jr & Sr PS	25920
7	J	Y	S	N	0		Garden Avenue Jr PS	24877
7	J	Y	S	N	0		Howard Jr PS	20501
7	JM	Y	n/a	N	0		Humbercrest PS	21581
7	J	Y	E	N	0		Indian Road Crescent Jr PS	26045
7	J	Y	S	N	0		Keele Street Jr PS, Mountview Alternative	26718
7	JM	Y	n/a	N	0		Runnymede Jr & Sr PS	22949
7	JM	Y	n/a	N	0		Swansea Jr & Sr PS	21619
8	J	Y	S	N	0		Allenby Jr PS	20928
8	J	Y	E	Y	63,183	AC	Baycrest PS	27433
8	J	Y	S	N	0		North Preparatory Jr PS / Alternative Primary School Jr	19378
9	JM	N	n/a	N	0		Alexander Muir/Gladstone Ave Jr & Sr PS	29184
9	J	Y	S	N	0		Brock Jr PS	28230
9	J	Y	n/a	N	0		Carleton Village Jr PS	30570
9	J	Y	S	N	0		Dovercourt Jr PS	27199

## Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee, Report No. 1, January 31, 2001

Ward	Use	Child Care in School?	Shared or Exclusive Use	City Funding of Child Care Playground?	Child Care Funding Amount \$	Status of Day Care Project	Facility	Total Amount
9	J	Y	E	Y	8,740	AC	Fairbank Memorial Community School	27694
9	J	N	n/a	N	0		Pauline Jr PS	28116
9	J	Y	S	N	0		Regal Road Jr PS	27757
9	J	N	n/a	N	0		Shirley Street Jr PS	27419
10	J	Y	S	N	0		Charles G Fraser Jr PS	27470
10	J	Y	S	Y	60,000	AC	Clinton Street Jr PS	25879
10	J	N	n/a	N	0		Dewson St JPS	27829
10	JM	N	n/a	N	0		Essex Jr & Sr PS / Hawthorne II Bilingual Alternative School Jr	27900
10	JM	Y	S	N	0		Givins / Shaw Jr & Sr PS	27477
10	J	Y	n/a	N	0		Huron Street Jr PS	20424
10	JM	Y	E	Y	9,881	AP	King Edward Jr & Sr PS	27719
10	JM	N	n/a	N	0		Lord Lansdowne Jr & Sr PS	27131
10	J	Y	E	N	0		Montrose Jr PS / Delta Alternative School Sr	25472
10	J	Y	S	Y	42,000	C	Ogden Jr PS	27656
10	J	Y	E	N	0		Ossington / Old Orchard Jr PS	26436
10	JM	Y	S	N	0		Ryerson Jr & Sr PS	31026
11	J	Y	S	Y	60,000	3	Brown Jr PS	20362
11	J	Y	E	Y	4,975	AD	Cottingham Jr PS	18754
11	J	Y	n/a	N	0		Davisville Jr PS	19373
11	JM	Y	E	N	0		Deer Park Jr & Sr PS	20078
11	JM	Y	S	Y	50,000	3	Forest Hill Jr & Sr PS	20213
11	J	Y	S	N	0		Maurice Cody Jr PS	20126
11	J	Y	E	Y	100,000	IP	McMurrich Jr PS	26979
11	J	N	n/a	N	0		Metro School for the Deaf	26274
11	J	Y	S	N	0		Oriole Park Jr PS	19200
11	J	Y	S	N	0		West Preparatory Jr PS	20765
12	J	Y	E	N	0		Cameron PS	19426
12	J	Y	S	N	0		Hollywood PS	19368
12	J	Y	S	N	0		Lester B Pearson PS	19392
12	J	N	n/a	N	0		Steelesview PS	19430
13	J	Y	S	N	0		Bedford Park Jr PS	20712
13	J	N	n/a	N	0		Blythwood Jr PS	19685
13	J	Y	E	Y	6,932	AP	Denlow PS	19872
13	J	Y	E	Y	5,816	AM	Dunlace PS	19747
13	J	Y	E	Y	1,300	AD	John Fisher Jr PS	20227
13	J	Y	S	N	0		Rolph Road ES	19694
14	JM	N	n/a	N	0		Park Jr & Sr PS	31046
14	J	Y	S	N	0		Regent Park / Duke of York Jr PS	30047
14	J	Y	S	Y	50,000	AC	Rose Avenue Jr PS	31535
14	J	Y	E	N	0		Rosedale Jr PS	19219
14	J	N	n/a	N	0		Sprucecourt Jr PS	29687

Ward	Use	Child Care in School?	Shared or Exclusive Use	City Funding of Child Care Playground?	Child Care Funding Amount \$	Status of Day Care Project	Facility	Total Amount
14	J	Y	E	N	0		Whitney Jr PS	20016
14	JM	N	n/a	N	0		Winchester Jr & Sr PS	29301
15	J	N	n/a	N	0		Blake Street Jr PS / East Alternative School of Toronto	28335
15	J	Y	S	N	0		Dundas Jr PS / First Nations School of Toronto Jr & Sr	29240
15	J	Y	E	Y	50,000	AD	Frankland Community JS & Community Centre	20107
15	J	Y	S	N	0		Jackman Avenue Jr PS	21312
15	J	N	n/a	N	0		Leslieville Jr PS	28016
15	J	Y	S	N	0		Morse Jr PS	27848
15	J	Y	S	N	0		Pape Avenue Jr PS	26686
15	J	Y	S	N	0		Roden Jr PS	28475
15	J	Y	S	N	0		Wilkinson Jr PS	26883
15	J	Y	E	N	0		William Burgess ES	25243
15	J	Y	S	N	0		Withrow Avenue Jr PS	21115
16	J	N	n/a	N	0		Adam Beck Jr PS	19608
16	JM	Y	S	N	0		Bowmore Road Jr & Sr PS	28045
16	J	N	n/a	N	0		Crescent Town ES	28877
16	JM	Y	S	N	0		Duke of Connaught Jr & Sr PS	29889
16	JM	Y	S	N	0		Earl Beatty Jr & Sr PS and Community Centre	26263
16	J	Y	E	N	0		Kew Beach Jr PS	19834
16	J	N	n/a	N	0		Secord ES	30404
16	J	Y	S	N	0		Victoria Park ES	24517
16	DH	N	n/a	N	0		William J McCordic School, Jr & Sr	24320
16	J	Y	n/a	N	0		Williamson Road Jr PS	20774
17	J	Y	E	Y	2,733	AC	Brian PS	20064
17	J	N	n/a	N	0		Cherokee PS	24658
17	J	Y	E	N	0		Ernest PS	27284
17	J	N	n/a	N	0		Kingslake PS	27806
17	J	Y	E	N	0		Roywood PS	26116
17	J	Y	E	N	0		Shaughnessy PS	19253
18	JM	N	n/a	N	0		Clairlea PS	19291
20	J	Y	n/a	N	0		Glamorgan Jr PS	29326
20	J	N	n/a	N	0		North Bridlewood Jr PS	19411
20	J	N	n/a	N	0		Sir Samuel B Steele Jr PS	20059
21	JM	Y	n/a	N	0		Fleming PS	20630
22	JM	Y	E	N	0		Meadowvale PS	19522
22	J	Y	E	N	0		Poplar Road Jr PS	19181

Statement of Commitment

Playground Replacement and Renewal in the TDSB

(Based on discussion at Retreat of January 20, 2001)

The Toronto District School Board believes that school playground environments provide the opportunity for schools and communities to enhance the physical, social, intellectual and psychological development of all children through individual and group play:

- (a) A commitment to the provision of safe and exemplary playground learning environments.
- (b) A commitment to ensure that the selection of a particular playground model and its component parts is the responsibility of the local school community operating through a local design team concept, on the understanding that the model selected conforms to the appropriate legal requirements and to the standards established by the Board regarding exemplary playground learning environments.
- (c) A commitment to seek alternative funding partners and to explore internal budgetary resources where possible, in order to support the establishment of safe and exemplary playground environments.
- (d) A commitment to address this matter with communities and to provide opportunities for parents, students and community members to participate fully in the process for the establishment of safe and exemplary playground environments in their local schools
- (e) A commitment to distribute centrally generated funds for playground learning environments in an equitable manner
- (f) A commitment to play structures as an essential component of a safe and exemplary playground for elementary schools.

Playground Equipment: Appeals

## Schools not on the Category A list

<u>Ward</u>	<u>Use</u>	<u>Child Care in School?</u>	<u>Shared or Exclusive Use</u>	<u>City Funding of Child Care Playground?</u>	<u>Child Care Funding Amount \$</u>	<u>Status of Day Care Project</u>	<u>Facility</u>	<u>Total Amount</u>
18	J	N	n/a	N			Oakridge Jr PS	<b>29370</b>
9	J	Y	S	Y	\$10,000	AD	Perth Avenue Jr PS	<b>28629</b>
6	J	Y	S	N			George Syme CS	<b>30363</b>
6	J	N	n/a	N			Cordella Jr PS	<b>28020</b>
9	J	Y	E	N			Rawlinson Community School	<b>28345</b>
21	J	N	n/a	N			Iroquois Jr PS	<b>19186</b>
13	JM	Y	S	N			Bessborough Drive ES	<b>20492</b>
8	J	Y	S	N			John Ross Robertson Jr PS	<b>20867</b>
6	J	Y	S	Y	\$175	AP	Keelesdale PS	<b>27704</b>
6	JM	N	n/a	N			Portage Trail PS	<b>31184</b>
14	JM	N	n/a	N			Jesse Ketchum PS	<b>26628</b>
								290787
							Budget	280000
6	J	N	n/a	N			Weston Memorial	<b>20270</b>
7	SS	N	n/a	N	0		Parkdale CI	<b>15000</b>
15	J	Y	S	N	0		First Nations School of Tor. J&S	<b>25851</b>
16	J	Y	S	N	0		George Webster ES	<b>30211</b>
9	J	N	n/a	N	0		Pauline Jr PS	<b>31150</b>



## **Report No. 1**

### **Trustees' Communications Committee**

January 15, 2001

To the Chair and Members of  
the Toronto District School Board:

The members of the Trustees' Communications Committee met this day at 155 College Street, Toronto, at 4:40 p.m., with Brian Lenglet, Comptroller, Board Services, presiding.

The following members were present: Trustees Judi Codd, Paula Fletcher, Elizabeth Hill, Pauline Ling and Nellie Pedro.

Trustees Irene Atkinson, Sam Basra, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Scott Harrison and Kathleen Wynne were also present.

The committee decided to report as follows:

#### **1. Election of Chair**

For the information of the Board, Trustee Hill was elected chair of the Trustees' Communications Committee.

#### **2. Protocol for Media Releases and Student Trustees and SuperCouncil Communications (as amended by the Board, see page 77)**

The Committee considered a report of the officials providing an overview of the work of the Trustees' Communications Committee in the past and presenting a protocol for media releases and policy for student trustee communications.

##### Overview

With financial and editorial support, Trustee may prepare and distribute newsletters to their respective communities. The newsletters will inform communities regarding the role of the Board and the Trustee, Board policy, practices and decisions, Ministry directives and educational and school events and initiatives. Newsletters will promote in a positive manner, Toronto District School Board students staff and programs and be developed in accordance with the following procedures" [committee minutes May 22, 1998].

In May 1998, the Editorial Board for Trustee Newsletters established the first procedures for the production of trustee newsletters. The committee set a limit of two newsletters per year, the cost at \$120,000 per issue, distribution through Metroland, and guidelines for content, and design standards.

The first editions of trustee newsletters were produced in the fall of 1998. All newsletters were magazine style (8 ½ x 11), two-colour (standard Board green) and had common content for the inside two pages. The common inside pages were translated and made available for trustees to distribute to their communities. Distribution to all households was handled through Metroland.

In December 1998, the Editorial Board became the Trustee Communications Steering Committee. The committee met five times and actions included:

- developing a new mandate for the committee [Appendix B]
- establishing a policy for Trustee Constituency Communications [Appendix C]
- approving the Display and Distribution of Material to Students & Parents policy [Appendix D]
- recommending changes to the content of *Board Highlights* (published after each Board meeting)
- developing two production procedures for the fall 1999 and spring 2000 editions of Trustee newsletters. Additions to the original policy included the use of generic photos, the use of Canada Post for household distribution, individualized writers for Trustees' personal content, translations for specific paragraphs, and expanded distribution to city libraries. The costs are reported in Appendix E.

### Outstanding Issues

There were some outstanding issues arising from the minutes of the March 22, 2000 meeting. The following is submitted for the committee's information and action.

#### (a) Communicating the TDSB Budget Plan for 2000-2001

That a Budget Kit Information Kit for communicating the TDSB budget information be developed; the kit would include general information on the TDSB financial picture and a video explaining school-based budgeting."...."That Budget Fact Sheets be developed as budget information is finalized and that where appropriate, materials be adapted for each ward.

A series of fact sheets on school-based budgeting and a video were to be produced for Trustees to use during May 2000 school council meetings. Communications produced draft Fact Sheets and a Power Point presentation. However, financial data was not available in time to meet production deadlines and this issue was referred to the next meeting of the committee. Since that time, much of the budget information has changed and with the election of a new Board, staff recommend that this item be placed on the agenda of the next committee meeting with both Finance and Communications staff in attendance.

That articles on the General Legislative Grant, the TDSB Budget 2000-2001, and school-based budgeting be developed for Trustee newsletters.

This item was completed for the spring 2000 edition of Trustee newsletters.

#### (b) Problems with Focus Books for Grade 8, 9 and 10

This item was raised at committee and clarification was required. Staff believe that this item was in reference to the TDSB secondary course books entitled *Futures* and *After 8* produced by the Guidance department for all Grade 8 and secondary school students. Former boards had different templates for the individual school page. The template selected did not have the school's trustee listed on the information sidebar. The complete listing of trustees appears on the inside back cover. Communications staff have related this request to the Guidance department so that future editions will contain the trustee name on the individual school page.

(c) Protocol for Trustee Incumbents in 2000 Municipal Election

This item remains outstanding as the committee has not met since the March 22, 2000 meeting.

(d) Protocol for Press Releases from Trustees

A draft protocol was prepared in April 2000. Since the committee has not met since March 22, 2000, this item remains outstanding. Currently, only the Board as a whole, the Chair, or the Director of Education can issue media releases on behalf of the TDSB.

Should Trustees choose, they can set up their own account with a news wire service. Canada News Wire can establish either a group account or individual accounts to be administrated through the Trustees' Services office. The cost for transmissions is \$55.00 per 100 words and there are no initial set-up costs.

Pending the approval of a protocol, the Communications department provided a media list to Trustees' Services staff with both local and major news contacts (radio, television, and print) so that Trustees could contact the appropriate media organization directly depending on their news item. This may be a more cost efficient method than a news wire account.

Communications Mechanism for Student Trustees

This item has been addressed through the establishment of a student web page on the new TDSB web site. The Communications department hired three students over the summer to develop content specifically geared for students. An elementary and a secondary page were created. In addition, a new page for the Student SuperCouncil with an electronic student forum board called TDSB Sound Off was created.

The Communications department also developed a draft Student Trustee Communications policy Working with the student governance advisors, the Communications department has assisted the Student SuperCouncil with various letters, petitions and newsletters.

The Trustees' Communications Committee **RECOMMENDS** (as amended by the Board, see page 77):

- (a) That the matter of communicating the TDSB budget plan be referred to the next meeting of the committee;
- (b) That the item Problems With Focus Books for Grade 8, 9 and 10 be received;
- (c) That the Protocol for Media Releases (see page 177) be approved;
- (d) That the Student Trustees and SuperCouncil Communications policy (see page 178) be approved.

### **3. Protocol for Trustee Web Site Pages**

The Committee considered a protocol for trustee web site pages.

The Trustees' Communications Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the Protocol For Trustee Web Site Pages (see page 181).be approved.

### **4. *The Essential Guide to the Toronto District School Board***

The Committee received the document, *The Essential Guide to the Toronto District School Board*.

The Trustees' Communications Committee **RECOMMENDS** that *The Essential Guide to the Toronto District School Board* be approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Hill  
Chair of the Committee

**Adopted, as amended, February 14, 2001**

Protocol for Media Releases

1. From time to time, the Board may direct that media releases on particular issues be prepared and issued through a news wire service or to particular news organizations.
2. The Chair of the Board or the Director of Education can issue media releases on behalf of the Toronto District School Board.
3. Media releases issued on behalf of the Board must be in keeping with the TDSB's mission statement and cannot contravene Board motions, policies, or procedures.
4. Media releases issued by the Board will be forwarded to all trustees via email or voice mail alert prior to their release to the media.
5. Unless otherwise directed by the Board, the Chair and the Director are spokespersons for Board media releases. The Chair may designate a committee chair or another trustee as spokesperson. The Director may designate a staff member as spokesperson.
6. Individual Trustees may wish to issue media releases under their own name. Trustee Services' staff will keep an updated media contact list with phone and fax numbers so that Trustees can contact the appropriate media organization directly.
7. The Communications department is responsible for providing an updated media list to the Trustees' Services office.
8. The Communications department is responsible for providing a template with instructions for individual Trustee media releases to Trustees' Services office staff.

Student Trustee and SuperCouncil Communications Policy  
(as amended by the Board, see page 77)

**1. Statement**

- 1.1. The TDSB student trustees and executive members of the SuperCouncil are elected by their peers to represent TDSB secondary students at the Toronto District School Board. They, therefore, have a right and a responsibility to communicate with TDSB secondary students on a regular and effective basis.
- 1.2. Student trustee and SuperCouncil communications, (hereafter referred to as “student communications”) such as newsletters, brochures, flyers, or electronic postings on the TDSB web site that have mass distribution and are paid for with Board funds, will adhere to the following policy.
- 1.3. This policy does not apply to agendas, minutes, or other governance documents required by the SuperCouncil or education office student councils that are subject to different procedures.

**2. Definition**

- 2.1. This policy applies to written and electronic communications sent by student trustees and SuperCouncil members to all secondary school students, student councils, or any other mass distribution. These communications include newsletters, brochures, announcements, and other forms of written communications. It also applies to any electronic posting on the Student page of the TDSB web site.

**3. Content and Design**

- 3.1. Student trustees and SuperCouncil members are responsible for the content of their communications in consultation with the student governance administrative leader or staff advisors. Student trustees and SuperCouncil members are entitled to access copy from Board reports, documents and other TDSB publications unless otherwise copyrighted.
- 3.2. Student communications that are produced and paid for by the Board and intended for mass distribution to TDSB secondary students shall not contain criticisms of other trustees, staff or statements that could cause the Board embarrassment or liability.
- 3.3. Student communications must abide by all TDSB policies and procedures.
- 3.4. All student communications must contain the TDSB logo and adhere to the graphics standards established for TDSB communications. The SuperCouncil logo should also be used on all of its communications.

#### 4. Approval

- 4.1. All written and electronic materials must have the approval of the student governance administrative leader or designate prior to publication.

#### 5. Communications Vehicles

- 5.1. SuperCouncil Web Page The TDSB Web site will include a page for the SuperCouncil to communicate with TDSB students.
  - 5.1.1. A staff contact from Information Technology Services will be appointed to liaise with the students who are uploading items to the student Web page.
  - 5.1.2. Students are responsible for items posted on this site, subject to the terms of this policy.
- 5.2. Student-to-student communication In a school board the size of the TDSB, it is necessary to provide alternate methods for students to communicate with each other.
  - 5.2.1. A dedicated phone line with voice mail is available for SuperCouncil communications.
  - 5.2.2. A mailbox on Outlook is available (supercouncil@tdsb.on.ca) to facilitate student-to-student communications.
  - 5.2.3. The student phone number and email address has been communicated to all secondary students.
- 5.3. Governance Structure The Communications and Public Affairs Office in consultation with the SuperCouncil executive and the student governance administrative leader will develop a method to communicate the new governance structure to TDSB secondary students.
- 5.4. SuperCouncil Newsletter *The Student Voice* is a newsletter distributed to all secondary students each year. There will be two issues of *The Student Voice* per school year.
  - 5.4.1. One issue will be published in the spring to help promote the student conference and elections. The second issue can be scheduled for the fall.
  - 5.4.2. Distribution of *The Student Voice* will be done through TDSB internal mail.
- 5.5. Promotion The SuperCouncil Communications Officer will liaise with the Communications and Public Affairs department to promote the activities of the SuperCouncil and education office student councils.
- 5.6. Media relations - As elected representatives of TDSB students, student trustees and SuperCouncil members communicate in an articulate, professional and effective manner.

Student trustees and SuperCouncil members are responsible for any comments made in public or to the media.

- 5.6.1. The Communications and Public Affairs Office will be available to assist student trustees or SuperCouncil members with media training and prior to any public/media statements.

## **6. Support and Resources**

- 6.1. The TDSB will provide the appropriate staff support and resources to achieve the terms of this policy.
- 6.2. The student governance administrative leader, in consultation with staff advisors and SuperCouncil members, will prepare a budget each fall for student communications and promotion activities. A copy of this budget will be forwarded to relevant TDSB departments for project planning.



Protocol for Trustee Web Site Pages

9. Each trustee shall have his or her own page on the TDSB web site at [www.tdsb.on.ca](http://www.tdsb.on.ca).
10. Each trustee is responsible for the content of his or her own page.
11. Content shall adhere to Board policies and procedures. Content shall not contain criticisms of other trustees and staff or statements that could cause the Board embarrassment or liability.
12. Design standards shall adhere to the principles established in the Style Guidelines (Web Site) available on the Board's intranet site.
13. Trustees may use photographs of students in which individual students are not identifiable.
14. Trustees must take the responsibility of getting written consent from parents or guardians for the use of any photographs in which a student can be identified. For safety and security reasons, it is recommended that trustees use extreme caution when publishing photographs of students on the Web site.
15. The Communications department is responsible for the administration of the TDSB Web site. Identified staff in the Trustees' Services office are responsible for posting all materials to the trustees' individual pages.

**Blank Page**

## **Report No. 10, Special Education Advisory Committee**

December 18, 2000

To the Chair and Members of the  
Toronto District School Board:

A meeting of the Special Education Advisory Committee convened this day at 7:08 p.m. in Room 101, 45 York Mills Road, Toronto, Ontario, with Sandra Dell presiding.

The following Committee members were present: Sandra Dell (Chair), Trustee Shelley Carroll, Merle Fedirchuk, Liz Fisher, Trustee Elizabeth Hill, Susan Kelsall, Anna Leppik, Trustee Pauline Ling, Anne McCauley, Robert Perkins (for Debbie Philips), Catherine Stewart and Gail Thomson.

Regrets were received from Nancy Figueroa, Derryn Gill, Dianne Hooper, Gordon McClure, Mara Meikle, Debbie Philips and Cay Shedden.

The Special Education Advisory Committee reports as follows:

### **1. Data on Special Education Programs and Services in the TDSB**

SEAC discussed the need to have data on special education programs and services in the Toronto District School Board (TDSB), which it could use to advocate more effectively for the needs of exceptional pupils.

For the information of the Board, staff undertook to bring back a report giving a profile of the needs of students within the various special education programs across the TDSB to a future SEAC meeting. The report would include data/information on the resources that are available to meet the needs of exceptional pupils, the resources are required to adequately meet the needs of exceptional pupils and what gaps exist.

### **2. New Delivery of Service Model Implemented by the Easter Seal Society of Ontario**

For the information of the Board, The Easter Seal Society of Ontario has implemented a new delivery of service model throughout the province. The design of the new model is participatory. It consists of the establishment of District Councils in each community, consisting of parents, volunteers and SEAC representatives. The District Councils will be reporting directly to the organization.

### **3. Snow Removal at Special Education Sites**

SEAC expressed concern about the lack of prompt snow removal during winter from the driveways of special education sites in the TDSB and the safety hazard this presents for drop off and pick up of exceptional pupils. SEAC requested that:

For the information of the Board, staff undertook to take the following requests under advisement:

- The removal of snow at designated special education sites be considered as a priority during the winter.
- The driveways of special education sites be kept uncongested to facilitate safe and easy drop off and pick up of exceptional pupils by school buses.

#### **4. Program/Policy Memorandum 127: Accommodations, Deferrals and Exemptions for the Grade 10 Literacy Test**

SEAC reviewed Program/Policy Memorandum 127: Accommodations, Deferrals and Exemptions for the Grade 10 Literacy Test.

SEAC expressed concern:

- That some special education students who are taking courses under the *Ontario Secondary Schools, Grades 9 to 12: Program and Diploma Requirements (1999)*, are not being given a fair and equal opportunity to complete the secondary school literacy test requirements for their secondary school diploma.
- About the design of the “Student Report Card” and the lack of choices to indicate the student’s success and/or potential for dropout in/from the special education placement/program.

#### **5. Events and Activities of Local SEAC Associations**

For the information of the Board, representatives of the local SEAC Associations outlined below, presented the following reports:

##### Brain Injury Association of Toronto

- A copy of a video entitled *Teens Talking to Teens*, which was produced by Sunny Hill Health Centre for Children, is available. The video features three teen survivors of brain injuries talking about their feelings and their new life. Any one who is interested in viewing the video can contact Merle Fedirchuk at the Brain Injury Association of Toronto.
- In March 2001, Ontario Brain Injury Association, in collaboration with Brock University, will be releasing a workbook for teachers as an aid to helping them work effectively with survivors of brain injury. The workbook will be a part of the module that is being prepared for teachers which will contain practical information and useful strategies for use in the classroom with students who have acquired brain injury.
- A memo from York University providing information on Project ADVANCE, a six-week summer institute, which prepares students with specific learning disabilities for success in their university studies, was circulated to members of SEAC, for information.

##### The Association for Bright Children (ABC) of Ontario

- A copy of the fall issue of *ABC Newsmagazine* was made available to members of SEAC.

The Association requested that the following matters be clarified:

(a) The status of recruitment of educational assistants and/or special education teachers in the TDSB.

Staff explained that Board personnel is working in partnership with the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) to establish a teacher internship program to help students obtain Part One of the Special Education Certification. The internship will involve placement with some of the Board's expert itinerant teachers.

For the information of the Board, SEAC decided to forward a letter to College of Teachers outlining its concerns about the certification of special education teachers. A draft letter will be presented to the Board for approval in January 2001.

(b) If the TDSB has considered combining the classifications for educational assistants?

For the information of the Board, staff informed SEAC that this matter is being looked at and it will be reviewed on an ongoing basis.

Learning Disabilities Association

A national conference, Destination Success: Learning Disabilities in Post Secondary Education, will be held at the Delta Chelsea hotel, Toronto from February 26 to March 1, 2001. The Learning Disabilities Association is hosting the conference in partnership with Georgian, Cambrian and Conestoga Colleges and the University of Guelph. The conference will focus on the following three transitions' which students with specific learning disabilities may face:

1. The important transition from secondary to post-secondary education and ways to help students and families make this transition.
2. Success strategies for post-secondary education, the ways in which students with specific learning disabilities can be successful in post-secondary programs.
3. The transition from college/university to the workplace or to further education beyond their post-secondary programs.

Presentation proposals are currently being accepted.

Toronto Association for Community Living

On January 30, 2001, the Toronto Association for Community Living, in collaboration with personnel from the Toronto District School Board and the Toronto Catholic District School Board, provided a training session on inclusion, for special education consultants.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Dell  
Chair of Committee

**Received February 14, 2001**

**Blank Page**

## Report No. 1, Special Education Advisory Committee

January 12, 2001

To the Chair and Members of the  
Toronto District School Board:

A meeting of the Special Education Advisory Committee convened this day at 7:33 p.m. in the Board Room, 155 College Street, Toronto, Ontario.

The following Committee members were present: Sandra Dell, Andre e Duquette, Merle Fedirchuk, Liz Fisher, Derryn Gill, Trustee Elizabeth Hill, Anna Leppik, Trustee Pauline Ling, Terry Lustig, Anne McCauley, Gordon McClure, Robert Perkins, Kim Rac and Gail Thomson. Alternate member present: Debbie Philips.

Regrets were received from Trustee Shelley Carroll, Susan Kelsall and Mara Meikle.

The Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) reports as follows:

### 1. Chair Pro Tem

For the information of the Board, Dave Rowan, Superintendent of Special Education, presided as Chair Pro Tem pending the election of the SEAC Chair for 2001.

### 2. Election of SEAC Chair and Vice-Chair for 2001

In March 1997, SEAC agreed that a new Chair and Vice-Chair would be elected/appointed on an annual basis, in accordance with the TDSB bylaws. At its meeting of December 15, 1999, the following additional guidelines for the election/appointment of SEAC Chairs and Vice-Chairs were approved by the Board:

- (a) A SEAC Chair or Vice-Chair can be elected to the same position for not more than three (3) consecutive years.
- (b) In the event that a Community/Association representative is elected to the position of Chair of SEAC, then a trustee should be elected for the position of Vice-Chair. Conversely, if a trustee is elected to the position of Chair, then a Community/Association representative should be elected for the Vice-Chair position (Minute page 762).

#### Election of SEAC Chair

The Special Education Advisory Committee **RECOMMENDS:**

- (a) That the Board waive its implementation of guideline (a) for an additional year; and
- (b) That the Board approve the appointment of Sandra Dell to the position of Chair of SEAC for 2001, subject to the approval of recommendation (a).

SEAC elected Sandra Dell to the position of Chair for 2001, subject to the Board's approval of recommendation (a).

#### Election of SEAC Vice-Chair

For the information of the Board, SEAC has postponed the election of a Vice-Chair for 2001, until its meeting on February 12. It is being anticipated that all trustee representatives on the committee will have the opportunity to participate in this process.

### **3. Appointment of Additional Association to the Membership of the TDSB SEAC for 2001-2003**

Ontario *Regulation 464/97* requires that every district school board appoint twelve (12) representatives of local associations and one alternate for each representative. At its meeting held on December 6, 2000, the Board appointed representatives and alternates from eleven (11) local associations to the membership of the TDSB SEAC.

The VIEWS for the Visually Impaired Association has had representation on the TDSB SEAC for the past three years. At the deadline for the Call for Nominations for membership on the TDSB SEAC for 2001 to 2003, it appeared as though the association had not submitted a nomination. However, following clarification, it was determined that a nominee had been submitted with the necessary profile, which meets the criteria established in *Regulation 464/97*.

Accordingly, the Special Education Advisory Committee **RECOMMENDS:**

- (a) That the Board approve the appointment of the VIEWS for the Visually Impaired Association to the TDSB SEAC membership for the term 2001 to 2003;
- (b) That Terry Lustig be appointed to SEAC as the Association's representative.

### **4. Communication from SEAC to Ontario College of Teachers**

At its meeting held on December 18, 2000, staff clarified a question from the Association for Bright Children of Ontario concerning the status of recruitment of educational assistants and/or special education teachers in the TDSB.

SEAC applauds the Board for its plan to implement an internship program in partnership with the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) to help teachers obtain Part One of the Special Education Certification. Notwithstanding the Board's initiative, SEAC deems it necessary to forward a letter to Ontario College of Teachers outlining its concerns about the certification of special education teachers.



The Special Education Advisory Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the Board approve the letter from SEAC<sup>1</sup>, outlining its concerns about the certification of special education teachers, for forwarding to Ontario College of Teachers.

## **5. SEAC Representative on Parent-Community Network**

For the information of the Board, SEAC has endorsed the request of Debbie Philips, alternate representative for the Down Syndrome Association of Toronto, that she continue to represent SEAC on the Parent-Community Network. There were no other volunteers.

## **6. Orientation Session for New Members**

For the information of the Board, staff has proposed providing an orientation session on key special education matters, for the new trustees on SEAC. Staff will be discussing this matter further with the Director of Education.

## **7. Events and Activities of Local SEAC Associations**

For the information of the Board, representatives of the local SEAC Associations outlined below, presented the following reports:

### Brain Injury Association of Toronto

On February 8 and 9, 2001, there will be a workshop Teaching Exceptional Children for educators and parents at the Bloorview MacMillan Centre.

On February 8, 2001, the Paediatric Acquired Brain Injury Community Outreach Program (PABICOP) is presenting A Day With Dr. Roberta DePompei at St. Joseph's Health Centre in London, Ontario. Dr. DePompei is a well-known expert in speech language and communication problems in children and adolescents. She has a particular interest in Acquired Brain Injury and the resultant cognitive communicative disorders. Video-conferencing can be arranged upon request.

- In mid-February, the paediatric subcommittee of the Provincial Acquired Brain Injury Advisory Committee will be sending a delegation to the Minister's Advisory Council to ask that the association's request that children and youth in Ontario (approximately 10,000) who have a recognized disability secondary to acquired brain injury be recognized as a category of an exceptionality, be given consideration. Letters of support can be forwarded directly to the Minister's Advisory Council.

• \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> A copy of this letter will be maintained in the Office of the Secretariat for a limited time.

Spina Bifida and Hydrocephalus Association

Application forms for the Dr. E. Bruce Hendrick Scholarship for postsecondary students with spina bifida and/or hydrocephalus are now available from the office of the Spina Bifida and Hydrocephalus Association at 69 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Dell  
Chair of Committee

**Adopted February 14, 2001**

**Report No. 2  
Business and Facilities Committee  
(Public Session)**

February 22, 2001

To the Chair and Members of  
the Toronto District School Board:

A meeting of the Business and Facilities Committee convened at 5:09 p.m. on Thursday, February 22, 2001, in the Main Committee Room at 155 College Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Sheila Ward, Chair of the Committee, presiding.

The following members were present: Trustees Sheila Ward (Chair), Paula Fletcher, Pauline Ling and Patrick Rutledge.

Regrets were received from Trustee Nellie Pedro.

The following trustees were also present: Trustees Irene Atkinson, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Judi Codd, Christine Ferreira, Gerri Gershon, Kathleen Wynne and Student Trustee Ryan Hicks.

The Committee decided to report as follows:

**1. Bruce Junior Public School (as amended by the Board, see page 91)**

For the information of the Board, the Committee briefly reviewed information concerning the program and community services review of Bruce, Morse, Duke of Connaught and Leslieville, January 2001. The information package will be available at the meeting on February 28, 2001.

This information package relates to the recommendation of the Committee: "That the Board allow partial leasing as a solution for undercapacity schools and that Bruce Public School and Bathurst Heights Secondary School remain open and that sufficient lessors be found." The Board then referred the matter with the following instructions:

That the matter of Bruce Public School remaining open and finding sufficient lessors, be referred to the next meetings of the Business and Facilities Committee and the Program and School Services Committee for consideration and recommendation to the Board.

**The decision of the Board (see page 91) is that Bruce School remain open and that suitable lessors be found and that, based on the strong letters of support and commitment to pursue funding and the offer of funding for a feasibility study from the Atkinson Foundation, that the proposal of the Bruce School Council to pursue the creation of an Early Childhood Development Care and Parenting Centre for Bruce be accepted.**

## 2. Contract Awards

The Committee considered a report of the officials recommending the awarding of contracts for products and/or services used by schools and administrative departments.

The recommended suppliers and the term of each contract are attached (see page 214, Contracts Requiring Business and Facilities Committee Approval, and page 215, Contracts Requiring Board Approval). The amounts shown are based on the estimated annual consumption unless indicated otherwise. Actual amounts depend on the volume of products/services actually used during the term of the contract.

### Tendering Process and Evaluation

Purchasing and Distribution Services, where possible, invited bids from a minimum of three firms. Requirements expected to exceed \$100,000 were also posted on two electronic bulletin boards (MERX and ETN) to facilitate broader public access.

The lowest cost bid is accepted where quality, functional, safety, environmental and other requirements are met. Every effort is made to include input from the users in the development of specifications and the evaluation process. Teachers and other school staff are invited to participate in the selection of products used in the classroom.

Copies of all bids received and detailed information regarding all recommended awards are available in the Purchasing and Distribution Services Department.

For the information of the Board, the contracts presented in on page 214, to be effective on or about March 1, 2001, were approved by the Business and Facilities Committee, according to the Purchasing Policy.

The Business and Facilities Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the contracts presented in the report (see page 215), to be effective on or about March 1, 2001, be approved.

## 3. Bulk Purchase of Natural Gas in the Deregulated Natural Gas Market

The Committee considered a report of the officials requesting approval to issue a request for proposal and contract award to establish a new natural gas bulk purchase contract.

Since 1987 the Toronto District School and its predecessor boards embarked on direct bulk purchase agreements for Natural Gas from Natural Gas producers, in an effort to benefit from economies of scale in the deregulated natural gas market. This practice of bulk purchase continues to provide substantial savings for the TDSB.

The early contractual gas purchase agreements were primarily based on a fixed price mechanism and generated savings of an average of \$3.5 million dollars per year. Successive purchasing strategies were employed over the years to meet TDSB needs.

Today, the state of the art procurement strategy is employed to position TDSB in the natural gas market place, generating an average saving of \$5.6 million per year. The procurement strategy stipulates specific contract price terms, such as index base contracts that can be "swapped" (in part or in whole) to a fixed price for a portion or all of the remaining contract term through a

competitive price "swap" mechanism. This strategy allows TDSB to create a natural gas purchase portfolio which contains a mix of price mechanisms (fixed and indexed) and contract duration; target an average gas purchase price; and take advantage of future market price declines. The utility of this strategy was fully realized during the recent wave of surging natural gas market prices. Here is how Facility Services Energy Management Unit utilized the competitive price 'swap' mechanism to position TDSB's (8,500 gigajoule per day) natural gas portfolio from index prices to fixed prices:

- (a) One year fixed price (November 1, 2000 to October 31, 2001)  
3,500 gigajoules per day at \$4.86 per gigajoule
- (b) Fixed winter price component (November 1, 2000 to March 31, 2001)  
1,500 gigajoules per day @ \$6.54 per gigajoule
- (c) Forward fixed price on item (b) (April 1, 2001 to October 31, 2001)  
1,500 gigajoules per day at \$7.67 per gigajoule
- (d) One year collar component with a ceiling of \$7.00 per gigajoule and floor of \$6.78 per gigajoule (November 1, 2000 to October 31, 2001)  
2,445 gigajoules per day
- (e) Fixed component (January 1, 2000 to October 31, 2001)  
1,500 gigajoules per day at \$8.82

On December 11, 2000, two natural gas consulting companies were retained by the Board to evaluate its natural gas portfolio<sup>1</sup>. They concluded that TDSB had a well-balanced natural gas portfolio, which generated an average saving of \$5.8 million compared to the market conditions at that time.

#### Current Situation

Currently, TDSB has a contract with ProGas to supply 3,248,500 gigajoules (86,167,109 m<sup>3</sup>) of natural gas per year at a cost of approximately \$19,500,000. This contract expires on October 31, 2001, and a new gas purchase contract is needed. It is estimated that TDSB will require 3,248,500 gigajoules of natural gas for the period, November 1, 2001 to October 31, 2002 and similar one year periods at a price of approximately \$23 Million in the first period.

In the past, the Board retained the services of a natural gas consulting company to assist in the preparation of Request for Proposal (RFP), provide expert advice on the natural gas market and contract assignment. ECNG provided this service in 1998 and it is retained to deliver this service again.

Facility Services Energy Management Unit has been monitoring the volatility in the market price of natural gas, and over the past week has observed a sustained softening in the index prices of gas (an average of \$8.50/gigajoules compared to \$9.85/gigajoules in previous weeks). The Energy Management Unit working in partnership with TDSB Purchasing Department and

<sup>1</sup> This report will be maintained in the Office of the Secretariat for a limited time.

ECNG, has determined that this is an appropriate time to establish a new natural gas bulk purchase contract.

The consulting company recommends an aggressive natural gas procurement strategy in order for the TDSB to benefit from the current softening in the price of natural gas. To take advantage of this short term softening in the market it is recommended that the RFP be issued immediately and contact awarded prior to February 28, 2001.

There are strong indications that the market price of natural gas will go up from its current price in March and in the summer 2001 as a result of increased demand for natural gas for power generation in the U.S.A., and low natural gas storage levels in Canada and U.S.A. It would therefore be in the Board's best interest to proceed with this procurement strategy.

### Key Financial Implications

Natural gas prices for February 2001 fell due to a wave of mild weather, that has brought some relief to the bitter cold temperatures that have plagued the country all winter. The warm temperatures have also taken some of the fear out of the market since there is potential for a few weeks where net natural gas withdrawals from storage may actually fall shy of last year's level.

Despite the smaller than expected natural gas draw in February 2001, natural gas inventories are still at historically low levels for this time of the year, and remaining normal winter natural gas withdrawals will leave end-March natural gas storage at about 400 billion cubic feet (bcf), which is 32.4% capacity, a record low that could increase natural gas prices through 2001. Also, the weather-sensitive market could get a big boost from forecasts of colder weather before the winter is over.

Therefore, an increase of \$1.00 per gigajoule in natural gas prices, which is a distinct possibility by the end of March 2001 will cost TDSB approximately \$3.5 Million extra per year.

It would therefore be in the Board's best interest to take advantage of the softening natural gas prices in February 2001 which is not expected to last for a long period of time.

The Business and Facilities Committee **RECOMMENDS:**

- (a) That the request to issue an RFP and award contract/s for the purchase of approximately 3,248,500 gigajoules of natural gas per year over a contract period of three years, estimated in the range of \$23 million in the first year with subsequent years pricing to be determined by market conditions, be approved;
- (b) That staff report to the Business and Facilities Committee in February 2002 on the status of the contract.

#### **4. School Closures, Phase Three: An Update**

Consideration of this item was postponed to the next Regular Board meeting.

#### **5. School-based Fundraising Policy**

Consideration of this item was postponed to the next Regular Board meeting.

#### **6. Energy Savings**

Consideration of this item was postponed to the next Regular Board meeting.

#### **7. School Closures, Phase Two: Facility Upgrades to Receiving Schools (as amended by the Board, see page 92)**

Note: Recommendation for expenditure related to the relocation of Ursula Franklin Academy was referred to the Board without recommendation

The Committee considered a report of the officials seeking approval for the Facility Upgrades to Receiving Schools for Phase Two of school closures.

On June 28, 2000, the Toronto District School Board received a report entitled "Pupil Accommodation 2000, and Beyond: School Closure Phase Two, Excess Capacity Reduction" and approved a series of recommendations to close two schools, consolidate two schools and relocate two schools. The Board also approved the postponement of the decision regarding the closure of George B. Little Junior Public School and Heather Heights Junior Public School until after October 2000 to accommodate input from an Area Review Committee for surrounding schools to consider boundary optimization and the placement of moveable programs (see the 2000 Minutes of the Board, pp. 463-470).

On October 4, 2000 the TDSB approved the Implementation Teams for the schools involved in Phase II of school closures.

On October 25, 2000, the Board received a report entitled "Staff Response to the Report of the Expanded Heather Heights Area Review Committee" and approved a series of recommendations to reconfigure student attendance areas, to consider amalgamating administrative and operating services and to remove portables (see the 2000 Minutes of the Board, pages 697-709).

The Implementation Teams, approved October 4, 2000, completed their work with respect to changes to School Attendance Areas and recommendations were presented to the Board at its regular meeting on December 13, 2000. The newly approved Attendance Areas defined the receiving schools and the potential need for improvements to accommodate students who will be relocated. The fourteen named receiving schools included six schools receiving students, two schools consolidating, two schools relocating and four schools impacted by boundary optimization and grade restructuring. (See page 216, Schools Receiving Students/Programs From School Closure, Phase Two).

As a result of a Board motion approved January 31, 2001 which required a program review of schools affected by the Bruce Public School closure, the Scope of Work exercise at the identified

receiving schools; Duke of Connaught, Leslieville and Morse was put on hold. Subsequently at a Board meeting February 7, 2001 it was requested that the preliminary Scope of Work at these identified receiving schools begin. Staff are initiating that process.

### Project Scope

The need for improvements, as a one time expenditure to implement Phase - Two School Closure, has been estimated to be in the range of \$10.9 million. Significant renovations, in excess of \$500,000, are required at four schools where; whole school programs are consolidating from two buildings into one or where whole school programs are being relocated into existing schools with low utilization rates.

### Essex Junior and Senior Public School/

#### Hawthorne II Bilingual Alternative Junior School Program \$553,200

Hawthorne II Bilingual Alternative Junior School with 162.5 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) students and 8.5 FTE teaching staff is presently located in the 59,417 square foot west building and will be relocated to the existing 88,790 square foot east building effective September 2001. The existing design and technology room and science lab located in the west building will be incorporated into the east building by the construction of a secure barrier on the second floor immediately west of these two rooms.

The eastern most gymnasium in the west building will be physically isolated from the rest of the west building and used exclusively by Essex-Hawthorne School Community and the Child Care Centre.

#### Carleton Village Junior and Senior School \$698,700

Carleton Village Junior School, south building, with 289.5 FTE students and 38.0 FTE teaching staff is to be consolidated to the 100,803 square foot Carleton Village Senior north facility. Significant renovations are required to accommodate a Kindergarten and junior school program. New classroom space, minor office modifications and computer drops are to be provided.

The parking lot located on the south building site will provide parking for the consolidated Carleton Village Junior and Senior School on the north school site.

#### The City School \$585,000

The City School with 108.0 FTE students and 7.5 FTE teaching staff is presently located in the 100,803 square foot Carleton Village Senior north facility and will be relocated to the 62,607 square foot Waterfront School.

Significant renovations are required to locate a secondary school facility within an existing junior school program. Separate entrances, classrooms, libraries, speciality program areas, washrooms and administrative facilities are being provided. The existing gymnasium will be shared.



Ursula Franklin Academy     \$4,886,000

Ursula Franklin Academy with 370.8 FTE students and 26.0 FTE teaching staff is presently located in the 204,529 square foot Ursula Franklin Academy facility and will be relocated to the renovated 477,567 square foot Western Technical Commercial School. Western Technical Commercial School is also home to TheStudentSchool with 170.0 FTE students and to a tenant, York University. Renovations to the existing building will provide separate entrances, classrooms, speciality program areas, libraries, cafeterias, and administrative facilities. Swimming pools, gymnasiums, the auditorium and athletic fields will be shared.

Significant upgrades, almost 50% of the construction budget, are required to update and refurbish existing mechanical and electrical systems.

Upgrades at Seven Receiving Schools     \$1,579,300

Improvements of a much smaller scale are planned at the remaining seven sites and the construction cost is estimated at \$1,579,300. These projects provide additional classroom space, program upgrades and address some critical maintenance, health and safety and related building code compliance upgrades.

A summary of project costs by receiving school and by project category i.e., program improvements, critical building maintenance, health and safety/building code, learning environment enhancement, maintenance or future improvement is outlined on page 217: Recommended Capital Upgrades to Receiving Schools: Phase Two of School Closures. Building reports including a detailed Scope of Work by category, building floor plans and photographs are a separate document.<sup>1</sup>

Project Schedule

All of the recommended improvements in the eleven receiving schools, with the exception of the major construction project at Western Technical Commercial School, are scheduled for completion by September 2001.

Funding

As a core value expressed in its mission statement, the TDSB has a commitment to provide safe, nurturing and positive learning environments that support student achievement. Ongoing school facility revitalization is required to meet that goal.

The second phase of school closures will occur as outlined on June 30, 2001. There is an urgent need to proceed with the Facility Upgrades to the eleven named sites for an estimated total cost of \$10,886,700.

It is proposed that these projects be funded, reaching to a limited extent into the Capital Reserve, as follows:

2000/2001 Lease Revenue	\$ 5,000,000
Interest from the Capital Reserve	2,500,000
Capital Reserve	<u>3,963,300</u>
Total	\$11,463,300

<sup>1</sup> This document will be maintained in the Office of the Secretariat for a limited time.

The Business and Facilities Committee **RECOMMENDS** (as amended by the Board, see page 92):

- (a) That a budget in the amount of \$11,463,300 (as adjusted per note below) for facility upgrades at the eleven named receiving schools resulting from the second phase of school closure be approved;
- (b) That the above amount of \$11,463,300 be funded as follows: \$5,000,000 from lease revenue, \$2,500,000 from interest from the Capital Reserve and \$3,963,300 from the Capital Reserve;
- (c) That the work on the proscenium of the west gymnasium of the Hawthorne facility be put on hold pending further information about the lease;
- (d) That the firewall as shown on the diagram of the second floor of the Hawthorne facility as A5 be moved to the top of the stairwell;
- (e) That the following job categorized as Future Improvement be changed to Program Improvement for immediate completion:
  - (i) Sir Sandford Fleming Academy: Item 26 (Rooms 220, 216, 214, dampers for exhaust fans and draft covers); Item 28 (security cameras in parking area); Item 30 (Room 215 extension of projection booth); Item 31 (computer drops in all department work rooms); Item 34 (Room 214 display boards on window wall); and Item 35 (Room 214 greenhouse bay window);
  - (ii) Downsview Secondary School: Item 20 (replacement of windows, in consultation with the trustee); Item 24 (wiring, lighting and sound in the auditorium and stage).
- (f) That Ursula Franklin Academy be a barrier-free school.

## **8. School Facilities Revitalization Master Plan (as amended by the Board, see page 92)**

The Committee considered a report of the officials seeking approval of a student/program-centred school facilities revitalization (SFR) master plan through the development and implementation of a multi-year funding allocation to address some of the Toronto District School Board's urgent school facilities upgrading needs to meet the program needs of students over the next five years.

Currently the TDSB (the Board) operates 557 schools in approximately 570 facilities. Prior to approval of Phase One of school closures effective June 30, 2000, there were 565 operating schools including approximately 580 facilities. The funds the Board currently receives from the Province under the new funding formula for renewal purposes is less than half of what is required to maintain building systems and building envelopes for the Board's 44,000,000 square feet of operating instructional space. The Board's initiatives in excess space reduction, with respect to boundary adjustments/optimization and program co-ordination are essential to school facility revitalization. The goal of reducing operating space to 42,000,000 square feet will enable the Board to address some urgent facility upkeep needs. However, funding for the long-term

accommodation needs to ensure a responsive and vibrant education system is inadequate. Under the new funding formula, the Board does not qualify for new pupil place funding and consequently, in areas of severe overcrowding, the Board must develop and implement creative, cost-effective solutions. At the same time, the Board must find other creative funding solutions for program upgrades to improve academic deficiencies and major renovations and the replacement of obsolete facilities.

In addition, the TDSB currently has over 750 portable classrooms, which is temporary accommodation in its inventory, that is over and above the Board's 2,000,000 square feet (permanent accommodation) of unfunded space and is, therefore, not funded under the current funding formula. While it is the intention of the Board to significantly reduce the number of such units through boundary optimization and program co-ordination, there are some area-specific regions in the city where the overcrowding and the use of portables can only be addressed with facility upgrades and additions.

The Board is currently funded by the Province at a 250+-year cycle of renewal of its facilities. As previously stated, the Board receives no funds from the Province for new pupil spaces as a result of growth and the Board anticipates renewed growth over the next 20 years. This anticipated growth will be a result of residential intensification, the conversion of industrial lands ("brown fields") to residential development (a direction of the City's new Official Plan), and some remaining green field development in northeast Scarborough, namely Morningside Heights.

Over the last few years of its existence, the former MTSB maintained a Capital Program of approximately \$70 million annually. This amount was augmented by the permanent improvement budget allocated to each legacy board based on the square footage and age of its facilities which was based on an industry standard of a minimum of \$1.50 per square foot per renewal cost. A capital program of this magnitude provided the legacy boards with at least a 70-year replacement cycle for its inventory of 565 operating schools, while at the same time allowing the legacy boards to address urgent new pupil spaces to replace temporary accommodation (a summary of projects, categories and cost for the 1996-98 Composite Capital Program is provided, see page 118). The Board must now attempt to reduce the cycle created by the new Provincial funding from a 250+-year cycle to at least a 100+-year renewal cycle to provide a good viability of program offerings to its students. While the cycle will be improved modestly, as a result of excess capacity reduction (current school closures), the majority of the funding will need to be raised through the creative use of some of the Board's current facility/site assets and/or by achieving recognition of the need for an improved cycle of renewal by the provincial government.

Currently well over 70 percent of the approximately 44,000,000 square feet of instruction space is over 35 years old. This percentage will remain constant even with the reduction of 2,000,000 square feet over the next few years resulting from school closures. Moreover, the aspect of aging facilities has been a concern during the last few years of budget restraints (prior to amalgamation), resulting in a deferral of building maintenance and program upgrades.

### School Programs Remain the Focus of the Toronto District School Board

The strength of public education in Toronto has always been its student programs and the Board is determined to maintain that focus despite provincial underfunding. Students in highly populated urban areas such as Toronto need and deserve clean, well maintained buildings with attractive surroundings, including playgrounds, as much as, and arguably more, than less densely populated areas.

Specialty rooms require up-to-date equipment and furniture to ensure that students acquire the necessary skills to further their education and to be successful in the world of work. Until the Province recognizes the underfunding of facility renewal, the Board is left with attempting to use existing funds creatively and maximizing its revenue from other sources such as leasing closed schools to provide the necessary program and facility upgrades and to address new pupil places.

The goal of maintaining “islands of excellence” in densely populated neighbourhoods goes beyond the instruction in the classroom. The message to children and staff through our facilities must continue to be that public education is valued and the Board’s schools reflect that message.

### The Need for a School Facilities Revitalization Master Plan

If the Board does not develop and implement a viable School Facilities Revitalization Master Plan, however modest in funding and scope, student programs will be impacted negatively. Such issues as the continuous overcrowding in secondary and elementary schools, and program deficiencies in aging facilities and badly deteriorating school facilities are affecting program delivery to students.

### Revitalization Master Plan Components

Staff proposes the development of a School Facilities Revitalization Master Plan with its core value based on the Board’s Mission Statement. The TDSB is committed to providing a safe, nurturing and positive learning environment that supports student achievement. Ongoing school facilities revitalization is required to meet that goal. School facilities revitalization has six main components or categories:

1. New Pupil Places: new schools and additions in area specific regions
2. Renovation/Replacement: major projects that involve the wholesale renovation and/or total replacement of buildings whose condition has deteriorated to unsafe, unacceptable levels
3. Renewal: renovations that support ongoing program needs and the planned replacement of major building systems, including code compliance issues
4. Program Upgrades: upgrades required to deliver changing program needs
5. Barrier-Free: provide barrier-free access in order to maintain equity of access to TDSB facilities
6. Upgrades to Receiving Schools : resulting from school closures

Note: There is a strategic linkage/alliance between program upgrades, program co-ordination and upgrades to receiving schools.

Listed below are the above-noted components or categories providing an outline of the principle factors to determine each respective category, as well as priority listing as determined by a specific set of criteria for each category.

(a) New Pupil Places

New pupil places are categorized as such because they translate into new schools, additions, relocatable units or stand-alone portable classrooms. Such projects or the need for portables are usually a result of new residential developments. These developments are in the form of subdivisions, official plan amendments or rezoning amendments, which end up increasing the housing units in an area, thereby increasing the student population in designated schools or areas.

New pupil places can also result from natural growth in existing areas, where the student population has increased due to an increase in the birth rate, immigration or enrolment shifts of school-age students from one area to another.

Based on an analysis of existing accommodation pressure areas across the city with respect to new pupil places, two components of new pupil places category are the primary contributing factors:

- (a) Major overcrowding in elementary and secondary schools across the city (schools with nine or more portables); and
- (b) Approved subdivisions for major residential developments in three area-specific locations in the city.

Overcrowded Schools

Staff has reviewed a variety of possible accommodation solutions that could be implemented in respect to 16 overcrowded schools across the city, and has concluded that some already have reasonable accommodation solutions in place in the form of multiple unit portapaks with built-in washrooms. Although not ideal, it is far better than stand-alone portables and is, in fact, a low cost solution that might have to be implemented in additional schools due to constraints in funding for permanent additions. Other solutions, such as program consolidation and relocation, as well as boundary optimization, will be utilized to provide solutions to other schools across the city. For the purposes of this report, only the schools with 14 or more portables will be addressed.

Listed below are eight schools with 14 or more portables on site.

<u>School</u>	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Ministry Rated Capacity</u>	<u>FTE Oct/2000</u>	<u>Utilization Rate</u>	<u>Portables on site</u>
Thornccliffe Park ES <sup>1</sup>	13	566.5	1141.0	201.4%	34
Valley Park ES	13	545.0	1026.0	188.3%	19

George Webster ES <sup>2</sup>	16	344.0	586.5	170.5%	16
Crescent Town ES <sup>2</sup>	16	224.0	566.5	252.9%	16
York Mills CI	13	1044.0	1443.5	138.3%	15
Secord ES <sup>2</sup>	16	633.0	769.0	121.5%	14
L'Amoreaux CI <sup>2</sup>	20	912.0	998.8	109.5%	14
Albert Campbell CI	21	1617.0	2051.0	126.8%	14

<sup>1</sup>Has a 16-unit portapak plus 18 stand-alone units

<sup>2</sup>1 portapak unit

Four of the eight schools above have portapaks in good condition on site and therefore do not have the same degree of accommodation urgency. Two of the remaining four are secondary schools. All the ramifications of the double cohort year (2003) and secondary school reform are not yet fully quantified. However, preliminary long-term enrolment projections have indicated that there will be an enrolment decline in the secondary panel as a result of secondary school reform. In addition, at least one of these secondary schools could be involved in some aspect of program co-ordination.

As a result of the foregoing analysis, it can be demonstrated that Thorncliffe Park ES and Valley Park MS emerge as additions (new pupil places) with the highest priority within the TDSB.

### Approved Subdivisions

Currently there are three major subdivisions approved, with two in the east region and one in the south region.

Listed below are the names of the subdivisions, their location, number of reserved school sites, anticipated pupils and registration date.

<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u># of School Sites</u>	<u>Anticipated Pupils</u>	<u>Anticipated Start Date</u>
Railway Lands	10	Between Front and Lakeshore, from Skydome to Spadina	1	300-400 elem. 100 sec.	2002/3
Morningside Hts	21	Neilson and Finch Ave E	2	850 elem. 400-500 sec.	2001/2
Port Union Village	22	Port Union and Lawrence Ave E	1	600 elem. (238, Oct/2000)	under construction

With respect to these three large developments, there is an urgency in securing a school site primarily in the Morningside Heights development.

In the case of the Railway Lands, the former Toronto Board, the Metropolitan Toronto School Board and the Metropolitan Separate School Board were able to secure a school site and

development levies in the early planning stages that amount to several million dollars, which should adequately take care of the projected accommodation needs for the area.

With respect to the Port Union Village development, the Board has recently secured a joint-use site with the Toronto Catholic District School Board and, although most of that subdivision has been built out, with 238 existing students from that area currently attending Charlottetown Jr PS and Joseph Howe Sr PS, it is anticipated that within five to 10 years the build out will be completed and the subdivision will be more mature, therefore, the need for a school in the development could be justified by that time.

The Morningside Heights subdivision has only received OMB approval last fall and registration is anticipated sometime this year. This area will have up to 2800 new homes and there are two school sites reserved in the development: a single site in the south for public school purposes, and one joint-use site in the north for Catholic and public school purposes. Due to existing severe accommodation shortages in the Malvern community, the Board will be required to secure at least one site in the south of the development. Currently, staff is investigating the possibilities of acquiring this site. The building of a school on this site is at least two to five years in the future.

(b) Renovation/Replacement

When Does a Building Need to be Replaced?

The Facility Condition Index (FCI) is a widely accepted industry standard for establishing a building performance benchmark. The FCI is a ratio of the amount of accumulated deferred renewal maintenance when compared to the replacement value of a facility asset. For example, if a facility has accumulated deferred renewal maintenance of \$50,000 and has a replacement value of \$1,000,000 its FCI will be 5%.

$$\text{FCI} = \frac{\text{Accumulated Deferred Renewal Maintenance}}{\text{Current Replacement Value}}$$

Common industry standards for FCI indicate that a facility is in Good Condition if its FCI is less than 5%, in Fair Condition if its FCI is between 5% and 10% and in Poor Condition if its FCI is greater than 10%. When a building's FCI exceeds 30% its building condition criteria is considered Critical.

When a building's condition FCI exceeds 30%, unplanned component failures will occur. Maintenance spending will be high. The facility will look worn with signs of deterioration and functionality will be compromised. These facilities will convey a poor public image.

Where Does the TDSB Stand Today

The average age of TDSB facilities today is 44 years. The average Facility Condition Index (FCI) of TDSB facilities today is Fair, between 5% and 10%. Given current Renewal funding levels, within ten years, half of TDSB's portfolio will be approaching a FCI of 30%, the Critical building threshold.

Through the Renewal Study, Facility Services staff has assembled Facility Condition Index ratings for all TDSB facilities. Currently, eight TDSB facilities have a FCI in excess of 30%. Another seven facilities have a FCI in excess of 25%. These facilities are as follows:

	<u>FCI</u>
Downsview Public School	40.6%
Bannockburn Public School*	35.6%
Claude Watson School for the Arts	34.6%
Hardington Public School*	34.4%
ALPHA Alternative School Jr and Sr (Oasis Alternative)	34.3%
Summit Heights Public School	31.7%
Cartwright Public School*	30.3%
Glen Rush Public School*	30.2%
Lillian Public School	29.9%
Richview*	29.3%
Franklin Horner*	28.4%
Anthony Public School*	27.9%
Jones Avenue Adult New Canadians	25.6%
Champlain Public School*	25.6%
Whitfield Public School*	25.5%

\* closed facilities

The details of the existing building condition information that led to these FCI ratings are currently being tested to confirm the accuracy of the FCI's for the facilities listed above and to determine if there are other facilities with FCI's showing below these levels that should be brought forward.

### Proposals

It is proposed that a "funding" source be identified to establish a replacement program for a minimum of three facilities annually, in the order of \$30 million, to re-establish a building replacement cycle. At this level of funding, this modest beginning would establish a replacement cycle for TDSB buildings of 190 years. It is further proposed that an additional \$30 million per year be sought to decrease the replacement cycle to a more reasonable 100 years. (See Facility Services Information Binder, Tab R, issued February 3, 2001 for a complete list of TDSB Facility FCI ratings).

#### (c) Renewal

##### What Renewal is Expected to Fund

Under the current funding model the Renewal Grant must fund all building needs beyond routine maintenance including:

*Conservation Maintenance:* Planned Replacement of Major Building Components; i.e., Roofs, Windows, Boilers



*Compliance:* Planned Programs to Address Regulatory Requirements; i.e., Gas Pipe Testing, Electrical Safety Inspections, Elevator Inspections; Health and Safety; Emerging Health and Safety Issues

*Emergency:* Building Emergencies and Failures

*Portables:* Movement and Upgrades

*Playgrounds:* Equipment Replacement and School Site Upgrades

*Program Upgrades:* Facility Changes to Support Program Needs, i.e. Science Labs, Libraries, Classroom Changes

### Understanding TDSB's Renewal Need

Today's reality of a significant backlog of deferred renewal maintenance, an aging building stock with many buildings approaching an age where major building components will require replacement and a renewal funding formula based on enrolment rather than actual facility needs led to a comprehensive renewal study. A school building condition model was developed, existing building condition data was assembled and validated through school visits and surveys by technical and maintenance staff. This information has been compiled in a database as follows:

### Summary of Current and Future Renewal Events

	<u># of Events</u>	<u>\$ Value of Events</u>	<u>\$ Value of Approved Events</u>	<u># of Approved Events</u>
Critical	458	\$37,254,715	0	0
Poor	5,029	\$269,975,476	0	0
Fair	9,468	\$422,838,576	0	0
Good	69,618	\$4,016,640,069	0	0
Total	84,573	\$4,746,708,838	0	0

### What Did We Learn?

TDSB has an asset base of some \$5.5 billion based on the replacement value of the total facility inventory of 48.8 million square feet. The study identified 85,000 project "events" over the next 25 years. It also documented a current deferred renewal maintenance backlog of \$310 million or 6% of TDSB building portfolio value.

The renewal requirements for the next 25 years have been estimated by building discipline as follows:

### 25-Year Cost Totals by Discipline

Data demonstrates a significant renewal need in the next 12 to 15 years. These needs far exceed what has been managed in the past, but are consistent with the age profile of TDSB facilities.

Many facilities are quickly approaching an age that will require major building systems to be replaced.

### Industry Standards for Renewal

To keep facilities in Good condition the industry proposes a renewal funding allocation of 2-4% (based on current replacement value of \$5.5 billion). In the TDSB this equates to an annual program of between \$110 and \$220 million. The breakdown of that 2-4% is proposed as follows:

- 1.5% - 2.5% of replacement value for major component replacement
- 0.5% - 1.5% of replacement value for program upgrades
- significant catch-up funding to address the backlog of Renewal Maintenance
- significant routine maintenance funding and preventative maintenance practices

### TDSB Renewal Needs Given Current Funding Levels

The cumulative cost of renewal, documented through the renewal study, has been plotted against the current renewal funding level as illustrated below:

### Cumulative Event Costs versus Cumulative Base Funding

Various levels of funding have been assessed to determine the optimal amount for the TDSB portfolio:

- (a) Backlog Funding: A funding level of \$130 million per year is proposed to keep pace with projected renewal needs over the next 25 years.
- (b) Proposed TDSB Renewal Funding Strategy

### Conclusions

It is evident that the current annual renewal funding is inadequate to address renewal maintenance let alone compliance, health and safety, emergency, portables, playgrounds or program upgrades needs. Alternative funding sources and business structures will have to continue to be explored to provide funds to maintain facilities of sufficient condition to meet the education delivery requirements of the TDSB. Alternative funding sources currently under development include:

- generating revenue from the disposition (sale/lease) of TDSB properties
- energy management initiatives

### Proposals

In the Short Term:

- Obtain Approval on the 2000/01 Renewal Budget Allocation Plan in the February Cycle of Board (See Facility Services Information Binder, Tab M - How the Renewal Allocation was Derived and the Recommended 2000/2001 Renewal Program Allocation)

- Receive the 2000/01 Renewal Project List drawn from the \$310 million Backlog List in the February Cycle of Board (See Facility Services Information Binder, Tab N - How Renewal Projects Were Prioritized and the 2000/2001 Renewal Project List)

In the Long Term:

- Prepare a Submission for Consideration by the Ministry of Education on the Inadequacy of Renewal Funding and the Impact of this Funding Level on the Quality of Educational Facilities
- Continue to Seek and Grow Alternative Funding Sources

(d) Program Upgrades

Where the TDSB is Today

Program upgrade projects involve renovations required to existing facilities to support changing curriculum needs. A significant number of TDSB facilities, given their age, are experiencing functional obsolescence. Curriculum delivery has changed significantly in the areas of science, family studies, design and technology, and information technology. School programming at a secondary level is moving away from utilizing many of the traditional shop spaces currently found in secondary schools. How libraries deliver resource material is shifting. Information technology is permeating and supporting the classroom. Administrative offices and guidance areas need to be refurbished.

Current Financial Reality

All former Area Boards identified funding sources for program upgrades. They identified, prioritized and constructed program upgrade projects.

The only available current funding source for program upgrades is the Renewal Grant, and to a limited extent the Capital Reserve. Since amalgamation, program upgrades have been identified, and funded on a case-by-case, high needs basis. No consolidated TDSB-wide program upgrade project plan has been identified to date.

Establishing a TDSB Facility Program Standard

In order to understand the need for program upgrades across the TDSB and to establish a prioritized project list and building program; it is necessary to first ask the questions: "What is the TDSB facility program standard? What spaces are required in school facilities? What should these spaces contain to support current program needs?"

Before assessing TDSB facilities, we need to establish that standard or benchmark by analyzing previous facility standards, including the Capital Grant Plan and Ceiling Cost Formula and then develop the TDSB standard. Facility Services, working in consultation with Instruction and Student and Community Services staff will evolve the TDSB Facility Program Standard.

With the TDSB Facility Program Standard in hand, functional deficiencies can be identified on a school by school basis. Facilities can be ranked according to a Facility Program Index and a prioritized list addressing the area of greatest need can be developed.

#### Next Steps to Establish a Facility Program Index

- Form a Facility Program Standard Project Team including: Facility Services, Instruction and Community and Student Services Staff
- Develop TDSB Facility Program Standard
- Develop Data Structure
- Review existing Toronto functional data
- Development assessment process
- Prepare Reports

#### Proposals

It is proposed that a prioritized project list for program upgrades be developed for consideration in the 2001-02 budget cycle. It is projected that on an annual basis, \$7 million should be directed to program upgrade projects.

#### (e) Barrier-Free

#### Current Status

Prior to amalgamation all former Area Boards maintained a barrier-free policy. These policies upheld:

- Regulations governing renovations, alterations, additions to new buildings incorporating section 38 of the Ontario Building Code;
- Can/CSA - B651-95 Barrier Free Design;
- Other CSA Standards.

In March 1999, the TDSB adopted a policy outlining basic commitments including "students to have equity of access to learning opportunities." It is currently estimated that to bring all TDSB schools to full barrier-free status would cost in excess of \$120 million. Many older facilities are multi-leveled, with ground floors significantly raised above street level and are highly impractical to renovate.

In light of these realities and the TDSB's commitment to provide equity of access to learning opportunities, a Barrier-free Standards Committee was struck to designate barrier-free sites for each family stream from elementary through to graduation. Student and Community Services, Special Education, and Facility Services staff are currently engaged in designating sites, developing a TDSB design standard for barrier-free, understanding existing facility conditions and identifying a prioritized project list to address the area of greatest need first.

A barrier-free accessibility survey has been developed and an audit of all TDSB facilities has been completed. (See General Binder, Appendix Q - Sample Assessment Survey and Barrier Free Accessibility Survey Results)

### Financial Realities

TDSB has received a one-time grant from the Ministry of Education of \$4 million to fund barrier-free construction. Critical barrier-free needs that arise are being vetted by the Barrier-free Committee and funded from the \$4 million allocation. To date, \$55,300. has been expended.

### Proposals

It is proposed that when the total construction budget has been estimated to accommodate barrier-free accessibility to support designated sites, a meeting with the Ministry of Education be secured to establish an annual, permanently funded barrier-free program.

#### (f) Upgrades to Receiving Schools

### Background

As a response to the estimated surplus capacity of 30,000 student spaces, TDSB approved a plan to implement three phases of school closure over a three-year period. As Closure Implementation Teams complete their work, TDSB has approved redefined attendance areas and designated schools to receive students as a result of closure. This shifting of student population defines the need for improvements at receiving schools. These projects provide additional classroom space, program upgrades, and address some maintenance, health and safety and related building code compliance issues.

The first phase of school closure resulted in 22 receiving schools requiring facility upgrades in the amount of \$9,650,000. The scope of work for the second round of school closure has identified fourteen receiving schools. The facility upgrades identified to date at eleven of the fourteen named receiving schools are estimated to cost \$10,886,700.

It should be noted that these upgrades are a one-time expenditure required to implement closure and that these improvements make a significant contribution to the overall condition of the receiving school buildings.

### Proposals

It is proposed that funding in the range of \$7-9 million be considered for facility upgrades to implement Phase Three of School Closure in the Budget Planning Process for 2002-03.

### Current Funding Sources for School Facilities Revitalization Plan

For the 2001-02 school year, the Board will receive \$38 million in renewal grants for facility upkeep. The Board currently generates approximately \$5.0 million net from existing leases and rentals from approximately 1.2 million square feet (primarily in closed schools). These schools were closed in the 1970s and '80s, primarily in the northern and western areas of the city. It is also anticipated that another 1.3 million square feet from Phases One and Two of school closures

could generate another \$5-6 million annually in leasing revenue for a total of \$10-\$11 million annually. In addition, the Board currently has approximately \$60 million in its reserves for capital improvements, which can only be used for such purposes.

It should be pointed out that those school boards in the Province qualifying for new pupil places with a need for a significant building program, get funding from the Province through a debenturing process (a minimum of 20 years) with the Province covering the costs through new pupils places grants associated with the debenture. The TDSB does not qualify for new pupil places as its total capacity exceeds its total enrolment (ADE) by approximately 60,000 pupil places.

#### Annual Funding Required for the Components of a School Facilities Revitalization Master Plan

Listed below are estimated amounts that would be required to adequately fund a School Facilities Revitalization Master Plan, for an aging system with 44 million square feet of instructional space and 300,000 students.

Component	Estimated Annual Amount (in \$ millions)	
1. New Pupil Places	15.0	
2. Renovation/Replacement	30.0	
3. Renewal	100.0	*
4. Program Upgrades	7.0	
5. Barrier-Free	<u>4.0</u>	
	156.0	
Less Funding Available		
Renewal Grants	38.0	
Barrier-Free (one-time grant)	<u>4.0</u>	
Shortfall	114.0	

\*Assumes 44 million square feet of instructional space.

#### Current Funding Sources

1. Existing Lease Revenues	\$5.0
2. Interest from Existing Capital Reserves	<u>\$2.5</u>
Subtotal	\$7.5

#### Anticipated Additional Funding Sources

1. Projected Additional Lease Revenues by 2003	\$10.0
2. Additional Revenues from Interest in Lease Revenues, Commercial Permits and Other Sources	<u>\$1.5</u>
Subtotal	<u>\$11.5</u>
Grand Total	\$19.0

In addition to approximately \$19.0 million annual revenue projected from leasing portfolio by 2003, there will be additional an one-time revenue from the expected sale of administration

buildings and other selective sites. The revenue from such transactions would be placed in the Board's Pupil Accommodation Allocation Reserves Fund (PAARF) (Reg. 446/98).

### Implementation Strategy

In order to implement a SFR program, there are three proposed strategies available to the Board.

1. That the Board direct up to \$20 million from reserves to implement an immediate SFR program and that those funds be replaced in the reserves from the sale of surplus assets of the Board (e.g. administrative building). This funding would immediately address the most urgent and critical accommodation needs of the TDSB commencing the 2002-03 school year.
2. Implement a "pay as you go" basis, commencing the 2003-04 school year. This would involve up to \$15 million from the anticipated leasing revenue stream to allocate to the highest priority projects on the SFR program. Lease revenues from the current 2001-02 school year will be directed to the upgrades to receiving schools as a result of school closures, Phase Two, and additional lease revenue will also be required from the 2002-03 school year for upgrades to receiving schools, Phase Three.
3. Use an annual amount of up to \$10 million from lease revenues commencing the 2004-05 school year to finance a debenture to establish a one-time facilities revitalization plan to address the critical capital needs of the Board over the next five years. This annual amount would fund, based on current market conditions, an estimated \$100 million capital program which would be financed by a 20-year debenture. The amount committed to a one-time program could be subsequently increased if a greater level of secured lease revenue is achieved.

If critical/urgent needs arise that are beyond annual funding capacity, consideration can be made at that time to the use of some of the capital reserves.

Note: For every \$2.0 million allocated of lease revenue based on current long-term rates could support a debenture: total \$ value = \$20.0 million over 20 years @ 6.5%.

### Proposal

Since the Board has only the renewal funding source of \$38 million annually and receives no funding for new pupil places, the Board must attempt to find creative funding solutions to improve academic deficiencies, provide solutions for program upgrades and maintain and replace obsolete facilities.

### Summary of Proposals

It is proposed that the Board direct up to \$20 million from reserves to implement an immediate SFR program and that those funds be replaced in the reserves from the sale of surplus assets of the Board (e.g. administrative building).

It is further proposed that the Board implement a “pay as you go” basis, commencing the 2003/04 school year. This would involve up to \$15 million from the anticipated leasing revenue stream to allocate to the highest priority projects on the SFR program.

It is also proposed that the debenture option could be available to the Board to provide funding for a SFR master plan to meet some of the backlog in new pupil places, renovations/replacement and renewal needs. Approximately \$10 million could be used to finance a 20-year term debenture of up to approximately \$100 million.

Based on the first two proposals whereby the funding for Years One and Two of the SFR program would have the required funding, it is anticipated the debenture option would not be triggered until the 2004-05 school year. At that time, staff would report back to the Board to request the authority to secure such a debenture.

The Business and Facilities Committee **RECOMMENDS** (as amended by the Board, see page 92):

- (a) That, for September 2001, \$20.0 million from the Capital Reserve to fund the School Facilities Revitalization program be approved;
- (b) That for the purposes of new pupil places, the funds referred to in (a) above be used only for Thorncliffe Park and Valley Park elementary schools;
- (c) That an additional \$3 million be allocated for playground replacement and be funded immediately from the Proceeds of Disposition Reserve and that the Board reaffirm its commitment to external central fundraising to support outdoor learning environments and equitability to address children’s needs;
- (d) That staff provide additional information about the leases on the schools listed as having a Facility Condition Index rating of over 30%, specifically the lease revenue, length of lease, lessor and optional programs in the schools and that this information be provided prior to the Regular Board meeting of March 28, 2001.

## **9. Investment in Secondary School Learning Resources, Grades 11 and 12**

Consideration of this item was postponed to the next Regular Board meeting.

## **10. Funds for School Anniversary Celebrations**

The Business and Facilities Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the Board’s Procedure H.005: Funds for School Anniversary Celebrations be revised to read as follows ((c) added):

- (a) Funds will be allocated to the budget of a school commemorating an anniversary of a 25-year interval.
- (b) Elementary schools will be allocated \$500.00.
- (c) Elementary schools will be allocated \$1,000 for a 100-year anniversary.
- (d) Secondary schools will be allocated \$1,000.00.



**11. Appointment to Architect Selection Committee for Thorncliffe Park Elementary School**

The Business and Facilities Committee **RECOMMENDS** that Trustees Codd, Gershon and Rutledge serve on the Architect Selection Committee for Thorncliffe Park Elementary School.

**12. Additional Meeting**

For the information of the Board, the Business and Facilities Committee will hold a meeting on March 22, 2001 at 6:30 p.m

**13. Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee**

For the information of the Board, the Committee decided that the Playground Learning Environment Steering Committee would present its report of meeting held on February 26, 2001, directly to the Board on February 28.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Ward  
Chair of the Committee

**Adopted, as amended, February 28, 2001**

Contracts Approved by the Business and Facilities Committee (see page 192)

User – School/Department	Products/Services Details	Recommended Supplier	Objections	Number of Bids Received	Estimated Annual Amount	Term of Contract	Budget Holder
Distribution Centre Stock for School Use	Classroom Supplies -Blackboard Brushes -Blackboard Compasses -Assorted Chalks -Assorted Erasers -Assorted Rulers	Business Stationers  -3 <sup>rd</sup> successive contract -portion of classroom supplies tender	No	10	\$187,000	1 year plus 2 one year options	Schools
Distribution Centre Stock for School Use	Classroom Supplies -Assorted Scissors -Sharpeners -Assorted Stamps -Assorted Stickers	B and B School Supplies  -3 <sup>rd</sup> successive contract -portion of classroom supplies tender	No	10	\$70,000	1 year plus 2 one year options	Schools
Distribution Centre Stock for School Use	Classroom Supplies -Tongue Depressors -Safety Pins -Measuring Tapes -Assorted Rulers	Baldwin School Supplies  -3 <sup>rd</sup> successive contract -portion of classroom supplies tender	No	10	\$50,000	1 year plus 2 one year options	Schools
Facility Services	Paints and Painter Supplies -90 different items (paints and related supplies)	Sico Paints  -New contract -portion of paint requirements	No	9	\$90,000	1 year plus one year option	Facility Services Schools
Facility Services	Paints & Painter Supplies -90 different items (paints and related supplies)	Color Your World  -New contract -portion of paint requirements	No	9	\$90,000	1 year plus one year option	Facility Services Schools
Facility Services	Structural Repairs -Regal Road Public School (cement fill old coal bunker to prevent collapse of driveway)	Tartu Incorporated  -New contract -Prequalified Contractor	No	5	\$73,000	One time contract	Facility Services
TDSB Community	Printing of “Essential Guide” publication	Delta Group  -New contract	No	2	\$213,000	One time contract	Communications and Public Affairs
Communications and Public Affairs	Distribution of “Essential Guide” publication	Household Marketing Services (via Canada Post)  -New contract	No	1	\$92,000	One time contract	Communications and Public Affairs

Contracts Approved by the Board (see page 192)

<b>User – School/Department</b>	<b>Products/Services Details</b>	<b>Recommended Supplier</b>	<b>Objections</b>	<b>Number of Bids Received</b>	<b>Estimated Annual Amount</b>	<b>Term of Contract</b>	<b>Budget Holder</b>
Nutrition Services	Cafeteria Food and Supplies -Food and supplies used in Board operated cafeterias and nutrition programs	Stewart Foodservice Inc,  -New contract -Previous supplier unsuccessful	No	4	\$690,000	2 years plus 2 one year options	Nutrition Services
Schools	Energy Management Program – Phase 4 -Lamps and ballasts replacement in 150 schools	Paul Wolf Electric  -New contract	No	12	\$2,100,000*	2 year project	Facility Services

\* Total estimated value of contract for the duration of Phase 4 of the Energy Management Program

<u>Schools Receiving Students/Programs From School Closures, Phase Two</u>					
		<u>Receiving Schools</u>	<u>(2000) 100% Ministry of Ed. Capacity</u>	<u>Sept./00 FTE</u>	<u>Potential Student Increase from Closure</u>
<b>A. Closing Schools</b>					
	Bathurst Heights Secondary School	1. Downsview Secondary School 2. Sir Sandford Fleming Academy 3. Vaughan Road Academy	1320.0 723.0	852.0 500.0	80 126
	Bruce Jr. Pubic School	To be determined*	1272.0	707.7	125
<b>B. Consolidating Schools</b>					
	Essex Jr. & Sr Public School/Hawthorne Bilingual Alt. Jr. School Program	4. East Building/Essex Jr. & Sr. PS	693.5	419.0	200
	Carleton Village Jr. & Sr. School South	Carleton Village Jr. & Sr. School North	784.0	288.0	367
<b>C. Boundary Optimization / Grade Restructuring Schools</b>					
	Churchill Heights Public School	5. Churchill Heights PS (Removing 4 portables)	522.5	409.0	
	Willow Park Jr. Public School/Tecumseh Public School	6. 7. George B. Little Jr. PS	614.5	362.5	80
	Woburn Jr. Public School	8. Heather Heights Jr. PS Woburn Jr. PS (Removing 8 portables)	525.0 522.5	231.5 592.5	175
<b>D. Relocating Schools</b>					
	The City School	9. The Waterfront School	449.0	140.0	120
	Ursula Franklin Academy	10. Western Technical Commercial School/The Student School	2655.0	1374.5	350

\*As a result of a Board decision January 31, 2001 requiring a program review, the scope of work process at the identified receiving schools for Bruce Jr. Public School; Duke of Connaught Public School, Leslieville Public School and Morse Public School was put on hold. Subsequently, at a Board meeting, February 7, 2001, it has requested that the preliminary scope of work at the identified receiving schools begin. Staff has initiated that process.

Recommended Capital Upgrades to Receiving Schools: School Closures, Phase Two

Receiving School	A	B	C	D	TOTAL	E	F
Downsview SS	\$366,900	\$197,700	\$0	\$0	\$564,600	\$0	\$731,100
Sir Sandford Fleming	\$267,600	\$5,400	\$124,600	\$28,200	\$425,800	\$86,100	\$395,100
Vaughan Rd. Academy	\$20,100	\$0	\$121,000	\$27,300	\$168,400	\$1,800	\$895,500
Essex PS	\$443,500	\$0	\$39,200	\$70,500	\$553,200	\$26,000	\$17,000
Carleton Village N PS	\$503,500	\$21,500	\$135,900	\$37,800	\$698,700	\$0	\$0
Churchill Hts PS	\$106,500	\$0	\$4,800	\$8,500	\$119,800	\$0	\$28,500
G B Little PS	\$370,500	\$102,500	\$17,500	\$0	\$490,500	\$2,500	\$95,000
Heather Hts. PS	\$22,000	\$0	\$143,000	\$0	\$165,000	\$0	\$22,000
Woburn PS	\$97,500	\$0	\$9,600	\$0	\$107,100	\$0	\$0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,198,100</b>	<b>\$327,100</b>	<b>\$595,600</b>	<b>\$172,300</b>	<b>\$3,293,100</b>	<b>\$116,400</b>	<b>\$2,184,200</b>
Waterfront PS	\$585,000				\$585,000		
Western Tech-Comm	\$4,886,000				\$4,886,000		
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$7,669,100</b>	<b>\$327,100</b>	<b>\$595,600</b>	<b>\$172,300</b>	<b>\$8,764,100</b>	<b>\$116,400</b>	<b>\$2,184,200</b>
Contingencies	\$995,000	\$143,000			\$1,138,000		
Design Fees	\$792,000				\$792,000		
Other Costs*	\$380,000	\$38,000			\$418,000		
Furniture & Equipment	\$100,000				\$100,000		
GST @ 2.24%	\$222,600	\$28,600			\$251,200		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$10,158,700</b>	<b>\$1,304,600</b>			<b>\$11,463,300</b>	<b>\$116,400</b>	<b>\$2,184,200</b>

- Legend: A Program Improvements  
 B Critical Building Maintenance  
 C Health and Safety/Building Code  
 D Learning Environment Enhancement  
 E Maintenance  
 F Future Improvements

\* Asbestos, Permits, Testing, etc.

1996-1998 Composite Capital Program

<u>Project Types:</u>	<u>Number of Projects:</u>	<u>Required Funding (\$):</u>
Additions	14	58,976,000
New schools	2	22,000,000
Replacements	6	51,524,000
Science labs upgrading	2*	13,900,000
Asbestos management	3*	3,000,000
Fire safety upgrading	1*	15,272,400
Barrier free safety	1*	15,927,600
Infrastructure upgrading and technology	12*	29,400,000
Total	41	210,000,000

\* bundled projects including several school sites

Source:  
1996 Composite Capital Program  
1997-98 Composite Capital Program