

ICAC Motion for the Toronto District School Board

1. Whereas, "between 2002 and 2007, more than 1 in 4 (28.7%) children in Canada lived in a low-income family for at least one year. At the same time, 11% of all children in Canada lived in poverty for 4-6 years, a substantial portion of their childhoods" (see *2009 Report Card on Child and Family Poverty in Canada: 1989 – 2009*), and,
2. Whereas, even child poverty has become "colour-coded" or racialized in Toronto given that among ethno-racial groups in the Toronto CMA, "the Low Income Cut-Off rates of child poverty in the year 2000 were roughly one child in ten among European (white) groups; one child in five for East Asian groups; one child in four for Aboriginal, South Asian, Caribbean, South & Central American groups; one child in three for Arab and West Asian groups; and one in two for children of African heritage" (see Children's Aid Society of Toronto. (2008). *Greater Trouble in Greater Toronto - Child Poverty in the GTA.*)
3. Whereas, research clearly demonstrates how poverty is expanding and deepening in Toronto as the gap between the rich and the poor grows, how more families are falling into poverty as the middle class disappears, how poverty has become most entrenched among those living in Toronto's poorest neighbourhoods where the majority of the population are people of colour and/or newcomers to Canada, and how these trends are projected to continue into 2025 (see Hulchanski, *The Three Cities within Toronto: Income Polarization among Toronto Neighbourhoods, 1970-2000* (recently updated to include 2006 census data), and,
4. Whereas, the Government of Ontario has made poverty reduction a priority and has included the Ministry of Education's Learning Opportunities Grant (LOG) as one of the tools to be used to combat poverty stating that the LOG, should be "used by school boards to support programs such as remedial reading, breakfast and lunch programs, tutors, mentoring, summer school, literacy and numeracy programs and homework clubs. The Ministry of Education is exploring how best to align this funding with the number of students in high needs areas"¹, and,
5. Whereas, it was recommended that "the Ministry of Education should 'sweat' the Demographic Component of the Learning Opportunities Grant so that the funds received by the Board are used solely for providing programs to mitigate socio-economic factors affecting marginalized students" (SCSAP Report, Recommendation #62) by the *School Community Safety Advisory Panel Report* (Falconer) and the *Blueprint for Poverty Reduction* report (25 in 5 Network for Poverty Reduction), and,
6. Whereas, the Ministry of Education provides the Learning Opportunities Grant to be allocated "on social and economic indicators that have been associated with a

¹ Ministry of Child and Youth Services. (2009). The First Year Achievements and Success Indicators. <http://www.children.gov.on.ca/htdocs/English/growingstronger/report/2009/firstyear.aspx>.

- higher risk of academic difficulties"², and given this grant has not been sweated by either the Ministry of Education or the Toronto District School Board, and,
7. Whereas, the Toronto District School Board has demonstrated leadership and innovation in this province and across the country by instituting *Model Schools for Inner Cities*, a program which research has proven to be effective in closing both the opportunity and achievement gap for our neediest inner city students because of the fact that concentrated poverty is exponentially more challenging to address than poverty in mixed income neighbourhoods (see Yau, M. (2010). *Model Schools for Inner Cities: Three Year Research Highlights Report*), and,
 8. Whereas, the *Model Schools for Inner Cities* program has already benefited the 100 highest ranked elementary schools on the Learning Opportunities Index (LOI) and given there are at least 50 more elementary and middle schools and 30 secondary schools ranked in the top third of the LOI that require additional resources to close the achievement and opportunity gap they experienced, and,
 9. Whereas, “pockets of poverty” exist in many schools outside of those ranked in the top third of the LOI, and,
 10. Whereas, the *Model Schools for Inner Cities* program has already expanded from 50 schools to 100 schools between 2006 and 2009 without an increase in its \$8.5 million budget (7.2% of the demographic component of the LOG in the 2009-10 budget), and,
 11. Whereas, the inflation rate since the *Model Schools for Inner Cities* program began has been approximately 2% a year (totalling \$700,673) and therefore has reduced the purchasing power by that much, and,
 12. Whereas, it will take sustained resources, time and focused effort to maintain and improve upon the foundational work done in our inequitably resourced school communities thus far (see Yau, M. (2010). *Model Schools for Inner Cities: Three Year Research Highlights Report*),

Therefore, the Inner City Advisory Committee proposes that the following plan be approved by the TDSB to build upon and expand services and programming for students from JK to Grade 12 in our highest LOI school communities (150 on the elementary/middle school LOI, and 30 on the secondary) and in those schools where pockets of poverty exist:

- a) A **2%** increase compounded over the four years since the program began in the basic allocation of \$8.5 million to cover inflationary cost for next year (2010-2011)*, and,

² Ministry of Education. (2009). Ministry of Education Technical Paper 2009-2010. Indicators as of 2004-2005 Allocation Model are: recent immigration, low income cut off (LICO), low education, and lone parent status. See pg 66.

- b) An additional **7.5%** of the Demographic Component of the Learning Opportunities Grant every year for three years beginning in 2011-2012, *on top of the basic \$9.2 million allocation* in order to flow **22%** of the demographic component of the LOG towards the neediest and most vulnerable students in the TDSB as per the stated intention of the LOG, Ontario's Poverty Reduction Strategy, the TDSB's Equity Policy, the School Community Safety Advisory Panel Report, the Blueprint for Poverty Reduction, the Rozanski recommendations, and the "Schools We Need" document (Fullan, 2004)
- c) That the Board envelope the **22% (approximately \$27 million)** of the demographic component of the LOG by 2014 and develop a blueprint to address the needs of our most under-served students while taking into account best practices already established such as *Model Schools for Inner Cities*, Full Service Schools, the Urban Diversity Strategy, etc.

* 2% compounded inflation rate calculation =

$$\begin{aligned} & \$8,500,000 \times 1.02 \text{ (2006-2007)} \times 1.02 \text{ (2007-2008)} \times 1.02 \text{ (2008-2009)} \times 1.02 \\ & \text{(2009-2010)} = \\ & \$9,200,673.3 \end{aligned}$$