

R. Campbell Question Ideas for the Working Group Mon 11-11-7

As recently invited by its co-chairs, I'm pleased to provide some questions for possible working group (WG) consideration with respect to some of the matters it may wish to see addressed in its forthcoming report. I do not at all assume that the working group will in fact necessarily decide to take the time to address these questions in its report however, and I expect that it will make of these questions only what it wishes to. Neither do I assume that these questions will be particularly new to the group as, frankly, I'm really not quite sure where the working group is right now in its deliberations, and what it may indeed already have considered or still intend to consider. And, it is possible too that in fact at least some questions may be most naturally addressed by OCDSB staff in their own separate report to the Board. In any event, in all respects, the working group will continue to proceed as it wishes I thoroughly expect, and I unconditionally salute all members of the working group for their volunteer dedication.

A) Scope Questions

Most major changes at least currently under consideration seem mainly to be driven by Capital Ward issues. Some concerns initially contemplated in the Somerset Ward on original mandating seem more or less to have been set aside or perhaps assigned to the future or maybe on examination found not to be issues of import. The WG focus seems primarily to be on alleviating FAPS pressure with some other Capital Ward changes. Viscount Alexander PS subplanning areas were identified but VAPS (JK-6 ENG/EFI) was not involved, York Street PS (JK-8 ENG) was not involved, Elgin rebuild size may not have been extensively discussed, facility utilization north of the Queensway does not seem to have been extensively discussed. I note that major renovation for all of Mutchmor, Viscount and Elgin are amongst the Board's short-listed top ten capital priorities submitted last year to the Ministry. I continue to hear discussion about reopening or using McNabb or Fisher Park for spec ed classes or other purposes.

A-1) Does the WG believe that it has addressed Somerset Ward issues for the next few years as well then or does it foresee the need for a future accommodations review in the Somerset Ward area, and perhaps adjacent Rideau-Vanier Ward areas. If so, then does it have any recommendations for what to look at there when that time comes?

A-2) Did the WG consider requesting a remandating to extend its timeline, to make interim recommendations, to expand / contract / adjust its membership, or to narrow or alter its focus of work?

A-3) With respect to whatever recommendation(s) the working group makes for the Capital Ward area writ large (i.e. so perhaps including consideration of Glashan), how many years past 2015 does the working group expect its recommendation(s) to be able to hold for?

A-4) Bearing in mind that the WG could have asked for a change to mandate or supports from the Board at any time; but knowing what you know now, would you have asked for a different or the same mandate or process or staff support or information supply or other WG supports? Do you have any suggestions for the Board on how it might look to improve such processes and supports right at their inception in future?

A-5) Did the entire WG sign off on all aspects of the report and its recommendations and if not then what differences in view remain and why or what do they turn on?

B) Option Set Questions

Early on the WG seemed to agree that a pivotal tension was that between program strength concerns and ease of local access / community building concerns. As well, a lot of ideas have been presented by various parties and, with the idea of applying capital dollars for additional option grease, many

C-5) One scenario sees the Mutchmor site with 6 classrooms and one with 11. Are fewer than 6 or more than 11, or between 6 and 11, feasible as well? How do these other possibilities, if they exist, affect scenario facility utilization and catchment and programming option considerations?

C-6) The Board has about \$15m essentially non-replenishing dollars in a capital account for major renovations, additions or new schools. The Board has already identified to the Ministry a top ten of capital priorities it needs to see funded, including Mutchmor's renovation, Elgin rebuild, Viscount Alexander extension. We have some suburban schools bursting with portables as well as other pressing capital needs. What is not Ministry funded needs to come from our capital pot for this purpose, or be funded out of special Ministry capital funds aimed at providing for all-day kindergarten space needs. And, we may be entering upon some years of provincial austerity for school boards with respect to capital projects. Has the WG determined that its school wing addition proposals will be adequately covered with Ministry all-day kinder funding or has it identified what the costs are of various options and the funding sources for them? In light of the fact that there is unused school capacity to the north of the Queensway and elsewhere, has the WG considered offering a 'Plan B' with appropriate pros and cons?

C-7) None of the major scenario seem to contemplate consolidation as an option for ENG SK-3 or ENG 4-6 provision. Yet, ENG programming strength, as expressed in student number terms at least, seems often to be stated to be a matter of concern. It seems as if stressing non-accommodation review-related ideas for strengthening student numbers at existing sites may be a common recipe across these scenario then. If so, what suggests then to the working group as more than hopeful speculation that weak numbers will not persist, and at what point (e.g. triple grade class) does it become problematic? Or, are there really no circumstances under which the working group would recommend consolidation of a JK-6 program option of any kind across neighbourhoods?

C-8) If an additional MFI program goes in to the Glebe at some site under some option then what demographic or other non-speculative differences does the WG believe subsist such that ENG4-6 numbers there will not come to mirror those at Hopewell? Or, again, are lower Junior division numbers such as this not a great concern either neighbourhood? Or, does the WG recommend taking another look at ENG4-6 at some re-review point in the future? Anyway, what is the WG thinking around these issues generally?

C-9) All scenario contemplate all Glebe 7-8 going to Glashan presumably in part for double track programming strength reasons there but how does it balance this against similar Hopewell 7-8 strength concerns then? Or, in the end, does the WG believe that decent Intermediate programs can be had with 200 or fewer students properly managed, that MFI or other programming is necessary to retain at Hopewell for some reason and given Hopewell space issues? How does this work? What narrative can the WG supply to help us understand this?

C-10) None of the scenario seem to contemplate the use of option areas much really it seems. While suburban areas may not allow for walking to more than one school, several downtown areas indeed do. While administratively or bureaucratically messy, then can make sense too. Has the WG methodically considered the application of option areas (under scenario 1 for EFI in the Glebe, for Int pgm, for ENG pgm, etc., etc.)?

C-11) Why does the line drawn for scenario 1 take the route it takes as opposed to other possible routes? Why is this the best route?

C-12) What grandfathering provisions does the WG recommend with respect to whatever scenario it recommends and why?

C-13) Do all scenario options fully factor in additional staff and visitor parking needs if any?

Jennifer McKenzie <jennifermck@sympatico.ca>

Mon, Nov 7, 2011 at 4:28 PM

To: Gisele Durocher <gisele@firstclass.com>, barbarajmassey@gmail.com

Cc: Karyn Ostafichuk <Karyn.Ostafichuk@ocdsb.ca>, Marc Labelle <Marc.Labelle@ocdsb.ca>, Michael Carson <Michael.Carson@ocdsb.ca>, rob.campbell@ocdsb.ca, SusanM MacDonald <SusanM.Macdonald@ocdsb.ca>, walter.piovesan@ocdsb.ca

The chairs have requested my and Rob's input to the area review committee. This has seemed a bit unusual to me, (and I initially responded as such) as this is an advisory committee to the board and we would normally receive your unvarnished perspective as input to what is ultimately our decision as trustees. I truly value the hard work of the committee and believe the process that has been followed to date as overseen by the co-chairs and supported by the staff has been a good one. Please take and use as is helpful.

With thanks,
Jennifer

Intermediate Student Move from Hopewell to Glashan

1. Principals are allocated staff for their schools based on the total enrolment of the school and can hire and assign staff according to the particular needs of the school. Elementary teachers are (arguably) trained to be generalists. Even with 150 or so intermediate students fewer, Hopewell will be one of the largest schools in the system and therefore their principal will still have one of the largest latitudes to staff according to the unique needs of the school of all the elementary schools across the entire system.
2. Of thirty nine K-to-8 schools, Hopewell currently has the second highest intermediate population in the system (see list below). Even with 150 or so grade 7 and 8s fewer, it will still be in the middle of the pack in terms of intermediate cohort size.
3. Instrumental music programs run across the intermediate school list with little correlation to the size of the intermediate population. For example, Fisher Park has the largest intermediate population in the system and has no instrumental music program at present. Only six intermediate schools do not have instrumental music programs (there is a motion passed to rectify this). It has much more to do with community and staff will and advocacy than with cohort size. Also, several 6-7-8 schools allow their grade 6's to join the music program.
4. Glashan has one of the smallest grade 7 and 8 populations of the intermediate-only schools (see list below).
5. Glashan is the second smallest intermediate school. Its staffing challenges will be enormous, particularly with the loss of LFI.
6. If Glashan were to wither and die as a school, the social effect on residents of the Glebe neighbourhood (and other adjacent areas) would be potentially dire. We all need to keep schools and families in the Centretown

area. A strong and vibrant and mixed downtown core is vital to the health of the entire city. If you would like several American examples of where they have allowed their inner city core to deteriorate in such a way, and the important role that schools play, please let me know.

Early French Immersion at First Avenue and Mutchmor

1. The mix of EFI to English has shifted and the larger population program should go into the school with the larger capacity in my view.
2. I am loath to put capital dollars into expanding a school unless it is already in line for significant renovation funding. I could be persuaded that a possible addition at Mutchmor is tied to a long overdue refurbishment but the other two buildings have seen renovations in recent years.
3. I understand the arguments against dual track schools but also understand the arguments for them. In this case, with the two Glebe schools situated so closely together, separate English and EFI programs could make sense. It would be nice if they considered themselves twinned and supportive of each other, perhaps by sharing or exchanging staff, programs or ideas to make kids feel comfortable at either school.

Other Options perhaps not fully considered

1. Other than options of better utilizing empty space at Mutchmor, the committee might consider sending the southernmost section of First Avenue's catchment area to Hopewell (4 or 5 classrooms worth). Then send 4 or 5 classroom's worth of Intermediate students from Hopewell to Glashan. I am not sure that I have heard this explored in great depth yet and did hear some favourable comments about how close Hopewell is to the Glebe and kids could easily walk there during early public consultations. *This approach requires no (or much less) renovation.*
2. I hope the committee will consider minimizing busing as a strong factor and reducing the associated increase in traffic by moving older students further from home as they can walk more easily and are ready to expand their horizons. Keep younger kids as close as possible to their community school.
3. Putting an additional MFI program at Mutchmor is problematic as each program at Hopewell and Centennial looks too small to be split. The whole program would therefore have to be moved. Also potentially detrimentally impacts on English 4,5,6 class sizes in the Glebe. Not sure if the committee has fully considered this?

Jennifer McKenzie
OCDSB Trustee for Kitchissippi and Somerset Wards

Numbers copied from March 2011 Enrolment Report on board website –
compiled quickly, should be verified

School with Intermediate grades		Grade 7 Cohort size	Grade 8 Cohort size	Relative grade 7 and 8 Cohort size
K to 8 Schools				
Carleton Heights	Eng	22	21	#39
	Total	22	21	
Elizabeth Park	Eng	21	23	#38
	EFI	5	5	
	Total	26	28	
Blossom Park	Eng	27	36	#37
	MFI			
	Total	27	36	
Heritage	Eng	18	21	#36
	EFI	14	17	
	Total	32	38	
Dunning Foubert	Eng	20	27	#35
	EFI	13	14	
	Total	33	41	
Terry Fox	Eng	26	19	#34
	EFI	18	12	
	Total	44	31	
York	Eng	37	39	#33
	Total	37	39	
Fallingbrook	Eng	21	22	#32
	EFI	17	18	
	Total	38	40	
Steve MacLean	Eng	25	25	#31
	EFI	23	17	
	Total	48	42	
Glen Cairn	Eng	47	44	#30
	Total	47	44	
Castlefrank	Eng	50	41	#29
	Total	50	41	

Huntley Centennial	Eng	29	38	#28
	EFI	19	17	
	Total	48	55	
Maple Ridge	Eng	35	30	#27
	EFI	30	14	
	Total	65	44	
W E Johnston	Eng	64	66	#26
	Total	64	66	
Pinecrest	Eng	73	50	#25
	Total	73	50	
Sawmill Creek	Eng	33	39	#24
	EFI	25	27	
	Total	58	66	
Avalon	Eng	41	38	#23
	EFI	20	26	
	Total	61	64	
Hawthorne	Eng	65	43	#22
	G. Eng.	12	13	
	Total	77	56	
Metcalf	Eng	77	69	#21
	Total	77	69	
Castor Valley	EFI	47	65	#20
	LFI	12	27	
	Total	59	92	
Trillium	Eng	18	21	#19
	EFI	20	28	
	LFI	22	30	
	Total	60	79	
A. Lorne Cassidy	Eng	48	42	#18
	EFI	22	29	
	Total	70	71	
Bridlewood	Eng	65	67	#17
	G. Eng	12	13	
	Total	77	80	
Featherston	Eng	55	55	#16
	MFI	30	21	

	Total	85	76	
Alta Vista	Eng	26	35	#15
	EFI	16	19	
	LFI	28	19	
	Total	79	87	
Stonecrest	Eng	35	56	#14
	EFI	39	31	
	MFI	5	12	
	Total	79	99	
Katimavik	Eng	27	32	#13
	EFI	73	43	
	Total	100	75	
Queen Elizabeth	Eng	63	65	#12
	EFI	15	14	
	MFI	12	12	
	Total	90	91	
Vincent Massey	Eng	41	50	#11
	EFI	38	34	
	G. EFI	13	12	
	Total	92	96	
Stephen Leacock	EFI	59	54	#10
	LFI	40	43	
	Total	99	97	
W O Mitchell	Eng	43	53	#9
	EFI	44	52	
	Total	87	105	
D.R. Kennedy	Eng	52	51	#8
	MFI	47	53	
	Total	99	104	
Emily Carr MS	Eng	50	62	#7
	EFI	46	46	
	Total	96	108	
Henry Larsen	Eng	29	32	#6
	EFI	40	37	
	LFI	38	25	
	G. EFI	13	11	
	Total	120	105	

D. A. Moodie MS	Eng	88	105	#5
	EFI	23	20	
	Total	111	125	
Jack Donohue	Eng	67	90	#4
	EFI	42	22	
	Total	109	112	
Broadview	Eng	35	53	#3
	EFI			
	LFI	37	62	
	G.Eng	20	24	
	G. EFI	24		
	Total	116	139	
Hopewell	Eng	35	34	#2
	EFI	85	74	
	MFI	26	24	
	Total	146	132	
Roberta Bondar	Eng	93	121	#1
	EFI	40	58	
	Total	133	179	
Intermediate only Schools				
J.H. Putman MS	Eng	23	22	#10
	EFI	82	59	255
	Total	105	81	
Rideau Valley MS	Eng	55	62	#9
	EFI	36	23	325
	LFI	11	10	
	Total	102	95	
Fielding Drive MS	Eng	69	50	#8
	EFI	49	34	405
	Total	118	84	
Sir W Churchill MS	Eng	85	84	#7
	EFI	38	38	487
	LFI	12	8	
	Total	135	130	
Goulbourn MS	Eng	107	80	#6
	EFI	33	35	446

	LFI	25	12	
	Total	165	127	
Glashan MS	Eng	83	112	#5
	LFI	41	24	326
	G. Eng	25	25	
	Total	149	161	
Henry Munro MS	Eng	91	77	
	EFI	57	36	#4
	LFI	23	24	477
	G.Eng	6	14	
	Total	163	168	
Cedarview MS	Eng	111	109	#3
	EFI	75	73	630
	LFI	11	8	
	G. Eng	12	13	
	Total	209	203	
Greenbank MS	Eng	67	90	#2
	EFI	58	45	467
	MFI	56	65	
	LFI	28	24	
	G. EFI	12	13	
	Total	221	237	
Fisher Park MS	Eng	68	64	#1
	EFI	78	80	515
	G. EFI	20	23	
	Alt	84	98	
	Total	250	265	
7 to 12 school				
Longfields- Davidson Heights				

Although an addition is feasible at First Avenue PS, it poses more challenges and has more negatives than constructing an Addition to Mutchmor PS.

The first challenge is the proximity to an NCC Park and Patterson Creek. As the foundations of the new addition will be below the floodplain, soil conditions may be a challenge with construction or may add to the construction costs. The setback from NCC lands would also require consultation with NCC, which has been slow, from experiences that some of our consultants have had, on other projects. This could delay the design and construction of the building. Depending on setbacks, a minor variance may be required, which could delay the project even more.

The second challenge is parking. The site is very limited, and an additional number of parking spaces will be required. This will either take away from play space, or require an exemption (which would take time and is highly unlikely)

The third challenge is that the Addition would significantly impact on the available space for play areas for the students. Mutchmor has far more play yard and would not have as much impact to the students' outdoor play areas. First Avenue PS has very limited yard space, and this would create a challenge for the construction activity. As there is limited space at First Ave PS for staging of construction equipment, materials and access for deliveries, this would increase the cost of construction due to the difficulty of building in such a tight space.

The fourth challenge is that First Ave PS main building is constructed with large mass masonry walls and foundations. This makes it extremely difficult and expensive to renovate. Doors and openings are more challenging due to the thickness and weight of the building components. Renovations would not be as effective as those in Mutchmor, using the same construction dollars.

The Mutchmor PS addition has other benefits in that the building envelop will be improved on the west side of the building, through the use of an atrium design between the old and new wing. This will also provide additional congregation areas, that will be available to the students, despite the weather or time of year. The addition at Mutchmor will also provide a much needed elevator that would improve accessibility at the school. (First Ave PS already has an elevator)

Although both schools would benefit from investments into their facilities, Mutchmor still has a steam boiler whereas First Ave has already had an upgrade. Mutchmor is a higher priority for mechanical work, so investment in that school would be more beneficial as far as District priorities. Mutchmor would benefit from economies of scale due to the construction activity associated with a new addition, where more could be done with the same amount of dollars invested.

Miro Vala, P.Eng.
Supervisor Design & Construction Services
Ottawa Carleton District School Board

Centretown Glebe Old Ottawa South Study Summer 2011 Questions

We are writing with our final pre-summer request for information. We have asked for some of this information in the past. However, for much of it the answers are unclear. We are hoping that over the summer, staff will seek further guidance from the Board and if necessary the Ministry.

The Committee's mandate is in part to, "...where possible, provide long-term accommodation stability to students and the larger community, make effective use of District facilities and improve student access to viable programming and appropriate instructional resources."

Viable Programming

Jennifer Adams described a strong program as one that ideally has two classes per program per grade. She also stated that this ideal has been difficult to achieve with classes capped at 20, and that split classes do in fact work. The best indicator of achievement is the teacher. What she did not address was the concept of viable programming. As a committee, we are having difficulty interpreting what is meant by viable programming. Given that our mandate speaks to improving access to "viable programming" direction is needed on the meaning of this term. If we as a committee are to make a recommendation based on viable programming, we need a clear definition of what that means.

As you work to provide us with a definition, please consider the following points:

- How many children enrolled in a program is required for the program to be considered "viable"? Does "viable" relate to entire program or to average class size in program? We discovered on the Board's website, a power point presentation created during the French Language review. This document indicates that LFI classes of 15 students and elementary classes of 10 were considered not viable. Can these numbers be used to define viable, if not why not?
- What guidance has been provided from this Board to determine program viability in other processes?
- What guidance has the Ministry provided on the meaning of the term, "viable program"?
- How have other ARCs or Accommodation Study Committees defined the term "viable"?

The following is intended to address the questions raised in the 4 queries above.

The Ministry of Education requires Board's across Ontario to meet targets for Board averages, maximum class size averages and other targets such as primary class size limits of 20 students per class. There are no class size minimums from a regulatory standpoint.

The issue of program viability remains within the purview of individual school boards.

The Board's 2006 Draft Capital Plan did incorporate criteria to be used for planning purposes in which to identify potential areas of concern in the context of program viability. Program viability issues were identified, if an elementary grades 1-6 program had an average of less than 10 students per grade or in the case of intermediate programs, an average of less than 15 students per grade.

These 'guidelines' do continue to be used by planning staff as a starting point for discussing concerns with program viability.

The OCDSB is a school district that has a wide range of sizes of elementary schools as well as a number of program choices for students in elementary schools. While it is preferable for teacher planning and flexibility of student placement to have schools and programs with more than one class per grade level, many schools have programs with split classes throughout. Viability is a concern when schools have such small enrollments that triple grading would be required. Although possible from a program delivery standpoint, some communities would prefer to avoid triple grading.

Long-term accommodation stability

Jennifer Adams also spoke about the Board's need to better market the English program. She attributed some of the increase in EFI enrolment to the board's success at marketing and supporting EFI. Unfortunately, this seems to have been at the detriment of English. Part of our mandate is to look at long-term stability. For us to make a recommendation that is long term with respect to English programming in the study area, we need to know what the board's long term plans are for English.

Specifically,

- What are the Board's plans in relation to English programming at schools with low grade enrolments such as Alta Vista, Dunning, Foubert, Elgin, Elmdale, Fallingbrook, Featherston, Heritage, Hopewell, John Young, Manor Park, Osgoode, Rockcliffe Park, and Trillium (Oct 2010 enrolments)?

We would like to know if the Ministry provides guidance as to how to deal with school low English program enrolments, often caused by high EFL enrolment.

- What permission has been granted to the OCDSB under ss.8(1)25 of the Education Act (excerpt below), and what, if any, terms and conditions were imposed on the OCDSB when the permission was provided?

8. (1) The Minister may,

...

discretion to establish French-language programs for English-speaking pupils

25. permit a board to establish for English-speaking pupils programs involving varying degrees of the use of the French language in instruction, provided that programs in which English is the language of instruction are made available to pupils whose parents desire such programs for their children and impose terms and conditions on the permission; R.S.O. 1990, c. E.2, s. 8 (1), par. 25; 2011, c. 1, Sched. 3, s. 1 (2).

When the Education Act refers to French language programs, it is referring to French as a first language programs. i.e. French language programs for students with French language rights. The OCDSB does not offer French language programs. It offers two French as a second language programs – Core French and French Immersion.

Further on long term accommodation stability:

- What factors, from a Board and staffing perspective, ought to be considered in establishing accommodation stability?

Accommodation stability is predicated on the assumption of maintaining equitable access to a variety of viable programs in a healthy/safe accommodation environment; within schools that have sufficient and flexible instructional space.

- What factors have been considered in other ARCs or accommodation studies as contributing to long term stability? *See above*
- How long is “long-term”? Can the committee consider a shorter period of time and recommend a further review within a specified period?

Student accommodation occurs within a very dynamic environment, responding to changes in demographics, student choice, program choice, capital funding, etc., each occurring within a changing regulatory environment (provincial education policies & school board policies). A period of 5-10 yrs could very well be long term. A 5 year horizon is likely our most useful short –medium term outlook given that current births are a significant determinant of JK enrolment 4 yrs hence.

The committee has sufficient flexibility to recommend subsequent reviews to occur in a timely manner.

Student access to viable programming

Jennifer Adams also spoke to the level of bilingualism achieved by students in MFI and EFI.

- Could the Board please provide more detail on these studies.

Please see the attached Executive Summary from the Board's French as a Second Language Review.

In relation to the Committee's mandate to improve access to programming, what are the Board's plans in relation to MFI?

- What is the Board's policy in relation to the creation of new MFI sites?

The approved objectives of the FSL Review as approved by Board on January 27th, 2007 are:

- *Improve the effectiveness of delivery and instruction for FSL programs*
- *Ensure that students throughout the District have equitable access to FSL programs;*
- *Ensure that FSL programs have viable and sustainable enrolments; and,*
- *Ensure that FSL programs are cost effective.*

Board at its meeting of 27 January 2009 in which it considered the expansion to French Immersion Programs for Implementation 2009 -2011 approved the following motion:

C. THAT the further expansion of French Immersion programming be considered on a site-by-site basis as the demand presents.

ARC

Finally, we keep hearing that our review is similar to an ARC and that it would be easy to transform the review into an ARC if the need arises. As such, we reviewed the ARC policy. We found we have the general mandate and reference criteria established by this policy but we don't have the school valuation information. This information might help us as committee to better understand the needs of each of the schools.

- Please provide SIP information for each of the schools.

School information has been provided by staff.

Accommodation Working Committee

Brainstorming Session – October 19th

Brainstorming session seeking possible solutions to low program enrollment in English programs and access to MFI.

Communication and marketing

Issue: Many parents of young children are neither accessing information about the school board nor gaining information about the difference in program offerings.

Ideas:

Describe the different programs:

- What kind of information can the Board supply to differentiate the programs - differences can be presented in a non-value laden way, for information - eg. In primary grades, much time spent on learning French in EFI – what is that time being spent on in ENG? Teachers say gives opportunity to examine concepts in greater depth, do more creative thinking, access the curriculum in more depth - true through high school - recommend that Board staff consult with teachers - parents can then decide which program will engage their child more – match learning style to program.
- English delivery may be more flexible.
- Larger pool of English teachers.
- Outcome for French language is higher for Immersion students – what about other outcomes – other subjects?
- Tell parents how child's time is spent. Communicate the differences between the programs with respect to time spent in which language and which subject matter and which grade – ie. Math always in English, junior EFI 50% taught in English...
- Give parents an idea of the similarities between the programs – what is taught the same? Show commonalities.
- Examine the quality of communication materials – what are the outcomes for students? Is there one additional thing that Board can point to that is better in terms of outcome for ENG students?
- Demonstrate long term differences as the kids go through the paths and show how all choices are good educational choices.
- Study outcomes by program choice and inform people of study results
- Focus on positives of English – low class sizes and increased depth – higher order thinking skills – strength of English teachers
- Talk about programs in terms of educational objectives - engagement of children – focus on differences that meet needs
- Explain the differences and identify the commonalities?
- Show that both English and Immersion programs do not adversely affect academic achievement.

- Don't pit one against the other – so when showing the positive outcomes of English programming, do not demonstrate at the detriment of immersion.

Deliver the information in other formats:

- Market the English program.
- Enhance website and make it clear for new parents. Entire communication review about program differences – what information is on the website? How accessible is it? Consult with staff, principals, teachers and Board.
- Identify resource people who can be a point of contact for parents with pre-schoolers who are soon to enter the system and are looking for information about programs. The resource people could be from the board, community centre, immigration services, parents with some training.
- Offer joint information nights where all programs are discussed in a neutral location with principals from all schools, and teachers from all programs.
- Ensure message gets to families earlier than JK – approach 3rd party daycare providers – other programs.
- Teacher and school staff training on the differences of the programs – tied to perceptions of parents - parents are informed by school staff and teachers - teachers also need to be included in positive and informed communication so when parents turn to school staff they get consistent and accurate information (Information about ALL programs – not just school's own offerings)
- Update school pamphlet outlining programs and students outcomes – distribute these to community centres and schools – make it available in all languages.

Core French

Issue: Perception that children will only learn French if in FI program.

Comment: Speaking a second or third language is part of being an educated person – is an advantage for all programs.

Ideas:

- Review and improve core French program and show positive outcomes. If outcomes of core French are high, perception should change over time. Market the outcomes.

Board Policy

Issue: Board policy can make it more challenging to deliver programming in an efficient way

Ideas:

- JKs go to school closest to them – creates a sense of connection to a neighbourhood school
- Parents planning to send children to MFI should be allowed to send child to closest MFI school in their catchment area starting in kindergarten – not have

to wait for a transfer in grade 4 when network of friends is more difficult to leave.

- Cross-boundary transfers should be more flexible and more transparent. Once the program is small it becomes more of a challenge to make it attractive – no options for parents within OCDSB. Board should allow for greater option areas for parents to choose programs between schools. Choice should be allowed so that parents don't leave the board. If programs become too small board has to take action based on established goals.
- Let all English schools offer MFI
- Allow more flexibility for children to move between programs. EFI intake not frozen for sk only.
- Examine new immigrant trends – ensure ALL people have access to all programs. Lack of information may impact access.
- Merge EFI and MFI programs. Studies have shown pedagogically children learn best in own language at young age. Board French review concluded language proficiencies closely tied to instructional hours. Hence the longer a child spends in a French setting, the higher their French proficiency. "MFI learning outcomes could approximate those of the EFI programs if a sufficient amount of French instructional hours were delivered." (final Report: Review of FSL Programs, Elementary Phase, page vi)
- It appears that the number of programs offered represents a challenge for planning purposes. It has also been suggested that the outcomes for EFI and MFI programs are equal. There is also potentially other research that may or may not suggest that learning in the mother tongue in Primary grades is important to outcomes (this being something suggested by someone else). Eliminating the EFI program would have the effect of strengthening a weakened English program.
- Consider putting CAPs on programs.

Integrated Classrooms

Issue: Many English and MFI Programs in schools throughout board have low enrolments thus impacting program quality since teachers cannot deliver curriculum effectively for tiny cohorts when split or triple classes prevail.

Ideas for the classroom:

- In grade 7/8 mix EFI and MFI classes – since students have similar French levels, it is the same curriculum, and the same mix of English and French.
- In junior grades - integrate between EFI/MFI or MFI/ENG - merge students in classes where language of instruction is the same, have teachers work as buddies to ensure curriculum integration for subjects taught separately. This will offer larger peer group thus increasing the sense of community school.
- Note – Schools in board are already mixing streams in some situations eg. EFI with split $\frac{3}{4}$ classes - 4s go to a different class for math in ENG or in a $\frac{2}{3}$ split – 2s go to a different class for ENG

Goal Setting

Issue: The OCDSB offers many programs in the district with much choice but this can challenge the organization of schools and delivery of strong programs.

- Board needs to determine their over-arching objective and:
 - Deliver the message
 - Set goals around program offerings
 - Measure achievement of goals
- Look at capacity to effectively meet the demand for EFI
 - Supply of qualified teachers?
 - Availability of professional development for French teachers.
 - Ability to make school a French environment – non-teaching staff
- What's the message? Who's communicating it and what's the goal?
- Find the root cause – why are people choosing EFI in such great numbers?
 - Perceptions need to be reviewed - are people choosing EFI because they want to learn French? Are there other reasons - misperceptions?
 - How do new immigrant families fit into the system. Can they access EFI? How are they informed of the programs?
- First principle of this Board should be to offer a quality ENG program - Require a series of remediation steps to support programs with low enrollment
 - Communications
 - Goal setting for schools where eng is shrinking and then remediation steps put in place to address low numbers - eg. Communication, strong teachers, etc. (Similar to remediation following low EQAO results.)
 - And if ENG numbers get so low then Board steps in and caps EFI and MFI in that community or school - until English program numbers are healthy again
- Goal setting is important in any organization in order to influence behaviour and measure the success of failures of specific campaigns. Goals need to be based on something achievable. What is the optimal split of English/Immersion programmes? Was 60/40 optimal vs the current 40/60? What split would give a full class of English students in every grade? Is that optimal?
- Having set a goal, interventions can then be created in order to measure against that goal. Many of these interventions will be included in the report such as improving the overall perception of the English program (this can be a goal in and of itself measured by a survey before intervention and survey after, and hopefully the outcome will be improved enrollment). Each school should be measured on the same basis as well as grades so that the impact of the communication can be reflected. I.e. If Grade 1 parents all believe the programs are equal and yet the grade 2 to 8 parents do not, this is still a successful intervention as the most important intervention will occur in JK/SK and it will take time for that to be reflected across all grades.

Appendix 11

Prior to the last meeting, each school and community centre was asked to prepare to speak for two minutes to share the views from their perspectives. The following comments were recorded by the co-chair at the AWC's last meeting:

Glebe Community Association – don't want to take sides between schools - shares concerns about viability of the ENG program – GCA can be a part of that – strong EFI program and concerns about splitting - supports adding capacity in the Glebe

GCA – don't want to take sides between schools - shares concerns about viability of the ENG program – GCA can be a part of that – strong EFI program and concerns about splitting - supports adding capacity in the Glebe

Centennial - one of quietest voices – concerns for our school not as critical – glad to have a voice – wants to keep programs so they remain strong and viable for community – are under capacity so wanted to keep MFI – not, not to give anything up but to stay strong - supports walkability - chose ENG for his son – used to have to bus to HW - want to be a dual track school - comments overall: children are resilient - need to pick what is best for schools that are here - not sure would support MFI in the Glebe at this time – would like to see changes to catchment changes for 7&8 to Glashan for 2012

HW – had full range of programs – only school in entire community – managing with some overcrowding – may have gotten off to wrong foot – thrilled with both options – intermediate program concerns (diversity and quality)

OOECA – both options are same for OOE – no difference – feel underrepresented in study - don't feel that the concept of neighbourhood schools applies to them - wants to keep optional area

OOSCA – priority was to maintain a strong community school means a facility that would include multiple tracks - walkable – but also a space that includes strong programs in intermediate program - have felt that we are rushing

CCCA – remarkable process – with respect to the options – both serve objectives of strong schools in Centretown – Somerset school concerns will only come to a head when do another process with Elgin rebuild and consideration of new builds in centretown - with respect to options 1 or 2 – don't feel appropriate to vote – concerns about impact of a new MFI program on other MFI programs but understand community desire for it.

Elgin – clear preference to stay dual track – possible concern about low numbers – but will be addressed in rebuild - personally concerned about \$\$ in option 2 – concerns about fragmentation of MFI program - kids will adapt

DCA – haven't provided a lot of input to date – impressed with attempts to define a community school and a strong program – are one and the same thing – community schools need to be walkable – don't want to be bussing – scenario 2 is a much stronger scenario for strengthening and MFI is essential to put it in conjunction with English – let's test the theory

Cambridge – both options are viable – address overcapacity, cohorts together, the mfi program, importance of an English program and multiple programs within a community – both options have staying power – choice option 2 with the caveat that Board needs to enhance the eng and mfi program - compromise was needed

FA - were at the centre from the beginning – both options give us more space so have achieved what we were looking for – EFI in the Glebe – have to consider the results of FA survey – parents of 308 children out of 473 – results were representative of all areas in the Glebe – option 1 indicated 42% and 66% for option 2 – building at FA was 88% - feels we need more time to explore option 3

MM – Glebe has two neighbourhood schools – both are viewed as neighbourhood schools – identities of the schools are defined by programs they offer not by location – therefore makes sense for Glebe schools as a unit to offer all program to all in the neighbourhood - significant amount of synergies between gifted and English programs – gives us 2 classes per grade – offers more depth to teachers – there is a feeling among parents and teachers – that the introduction of an EFI program might create feelings of marginalization – MFI – a lot of problems getting kids to go to MFI at HW and then kids have trouble integrating – for kids who remain and the kids who leave

Glashan – options show that Glashan is supported – need more kids to benefit – have French immersion now – want to keep it and the teachers – want to keep the balance – suggests that HW could do creative staffing to retain valued intermediate specialists – would favour option 2 because better address concerns in Glebe – concerns about low numbers at new FA and low English numbers in Elgin and HW and risk of program of MFI dilution