

Connecting GTA Teachers
Regional Planning Team Meeting
 Monday, January 26, 2009
 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
 Humber ITAL, Residence Conference Room

MEETING NOTES

Participants:

Joe Andrews, Humber	Kizzy Bedeau, George Brown
Vince Burzotta, Toronto CDSB	Chris Coleman, (Coordinator)
Tina Cotrupi, Toronto CDSB	Cesare DiDonato, Halton CDSB
Ron Dorcas, York CDSB	Christine German, Halton DSB
Ken Harrison, Humber (Chair)	Greg Hurst, Upper Grand DSB
Salim Jamal, York Region DSB	Jane Jenner, Sheridan
John Lavelle, Peel DSB	Dave Lewis, Halton DSB
Elizabeth MacGregor, Peel DSB	Janice McCaskill, Toronto DSB
Susan McPhedran, Upper Grand DSB	Catherine Moynihan, Toronto CDSB
Michelle Ouellette, Dufferin-Peel CDSB	Michelle Rao, Georgian
Carol Ray, Humber	Laura Rogers, Toronto DSB
Craig Shelswell, EDU	Kim Taylor-Reed, York Region DSB
Dale Thorington, Centennial	Mary Vesia, Humber
Victoria Warbuck, Seneca	

1. Welcome and Introductions

Ken Harrison welcomed participants and a round of introductions was made.

2. Agenda Check

A check of the Agenda was made, and a couple of items added under new business.

Agenda items 6-9 were postponed, awaiting further information.

3. Review of Previous Meeting Notes

The [CGTAT Meeting Notes for Monday, December 15, 2008](#) were accepted.

CGTAT meetings are recorded and a rough transcript becomes the basis for the meeting notes. A draft of the notes is posted at <http://cgtat.org> as soon as possible after a meeting, usually within a week.

4. 'Pathways to Partnerships' Conference Update

- This is a regional conference between the CGTAT and Golden Horseshoe Regional Planning Teams by invitation.
- Although one member from each regional planning team across the province is invited, this is not considered a provincial conference.
- Interest is high. Invitations have been sent out.
- The deadline for registering is Friday, February 13, 2009.
- Twelve committee members met by teleconference on Friday, January 23. Started to firm up the agenda and the workshops that are running.
- For more information, see [Appendix A](#) below.

- A form was circulated to identify the Lead for each board or college.
- Each organization (i.e. board or college) has been allocated three rooms. Each organization can send three people, or up to six people if they are willing to double up.
- The conference committee is looking for people to present model dual credit programs that could be used as exemplars:
 - College delivered
 - Team-taught delivered at a high school
 - Team-taught delivered at a college
 - Apprenticeship type DCP
- Looking for presentations on projects involving pathways and interesting Activity projects.
- School boards/colleges would benefit more by having six people attend the whole conference than by having more than six attend parts of the conference.
- This is intended to build teacher-to-teacher partnerships, so it would be inappropriate to invite students.

5. SCWI's Phase 13 RFP (Request for Proposals)

- SCWI's RFP for Phase 13 was received minutes before this meeting started. Hard copies were distributed. Electronic copy (PDF) is available in the [SCWI RFPs/Proposals section of the CGTAT website](#).
- SCWI announced teleconference training sessions this week to look at the RFP. Highlights of the CGTAT session are available at the same address.
- Appendix A of the RFP gives Benchmark figures that will be used by the Co-Management Team to determine costs and allocate funds based on the Number of Students we submit.
- At first glance, some of the Benchmarks do not seem to cover the funding required. For example, on doing some math on a College-Delivered DCP, with the numbers we have been consistently using in terms of the cost of faculty, cost of the room space (a Tech lab), approximately \$100 per textbook, some student fees we have to pay, the amount required is well over \$16,000. That's without any Coordination at all. The Benchmark is only \$15,000. Interesting, that course could be a Team-Taught Tech course, but under the Benchmarks, Team-Taught Tech course isn't there. Form 4 does not give the freedom to say it's a Team-Taught Tech course. The Benchmark is for 20 students, but we all know we haven't been able to guarantee that we hit those maximums. So if one or two students are lost, will there be a claw-back? If there is a claw-back, some of the costs can't be covered.
- The original thought was that 'they' would determine the actual costs over the next couple of years, but now they have suddenly become very explicit.
- **Issue:** The turn around time seems very short - February 23. Once again, it does not allow us to plan collectively around what proposals go forward. **Proposed** that in our submission for Phase 13 that we include an Activity that would do some analysis of Activities and Programs to determine past successes and reflect upon future goals.
- **Issue:** There's been no "heads up", no prior consultation; no rationale for the Benchmarks.
- **Issue:** Appendix A of the RFP seems to indicate major cuts to our funding. Why do the amounts differ between teaching a course in a high school and teaching it at a college. There is no recognition of additional materials or anything else needed to teach the course. Using the number of 20 students, there is a \$4,000 to run a program that two years ago we were getting \$100,000 for.
- **Issue:** The assumption seems to be that all the meetings regarding coordination would be attended only by the school boards and not the college partners. The funding does not seem to acknowledge the need for the colleges to work collectively and collaboratively with their board partners, or even that it goes on. Those who have run DCPs know that it takes an equal amount of time and effort in order for it to work.
- **Issue:** Why are there two different funding models – flat rate per course for some of the models and a fixed cost plus variables for others, mainly apprenticeship.
- There is a note in the RFP that every RPT will do at least one apprenticeship delivery.

- **Issue:** The “Guiding Principles” (page 4) says, “Dual credit programs must be based on partnerships, collaboration and accountability between school boards and public postsecondary institutions.” Needs clarification. For example, a carpentry apprenticeship program taught by Local 27 which is not technically a college, but is an MTCU approved delivery agent. Is the word ‘college’ limited to one of the community college?
- **Issue:** Re page 2 of the RFP, we would like to get a better idea of the number of students in the province targeted for this year.
- **Issue:** We hear that the mark for a DCP will become part of an average on a report card for a secondary student. Right now, it is a separate mark. In some cases, if a student does well on a DCP, it could be an advantage. But, if a student does not do well –these are “at risk” students – it could actually be a disadvantage, placing them even further at risk. We must “do no harm”; recruit only students with the ability to succeed, give them at least adequate support, etc.
- **Issue:** What happens if we are unable to recruit the minimum number of students? Should we establish a “go-no-go” point? Cancel the program?
- **Issue:** What happens if we recruit extra students? Do we get extra money? If it’s a flat rate, we won’t.
- **Issue:** Can we get a breakdown/rational of the Benchmarks mainly for auditing purposes.
- We need to connect with SCWI to clarify some of these issues/concerns – sooner rather than later.
- **Issue:** What does the word ‘Interim’ mean exactly?
- **Issue:** With the DCP for Level 1 Apprenticeship, it is only York Region and York Catholic that has that status for their students whereas other boards in this collective are sending their students to the same programming e.g. at Seneca, Humber, etc., and those students are not able to have the additional credits added to their average change, etc. That’s problematic. In that case, we need to be sure that everybody gets their name on the list for the dual credit. That may be where we missed out this past year. We need to be sure we look at those submissions a little more carefully to be sure that the students have the opportunity for dual credit.

6. Process for Submitting Proposals

After the RFP training session a critical path on submitting proposals will be forward to members and posted on the website. Proposals should be submitted to coleman@rogers.com on or before Friday, February 20.

7. Review of the SCWI Phase 12 Reporting Template

The Reporting Template is unavailable at this point. When we get it, we will let you know and post some timelines and procedures re that document.

8. Policy and Operational Issues

Issues, concerns and guideline re DCPs have been compiled. As soon as it is finalized, it will be circulated as a draft. It will not be posted on the website.

9. Roles and Responsibilities of Project Leads and Partners

- This document was distributed with the Agenda for today’s meeting.
- It has changed considerably since the last draft.
- Each project has one person, the Lead, who takes responsibility for the whole project and for communicating that project to CGTAT.
- The Lead may be a person in a board or it may be a person in a college.
- The Lead is responsible for staying in communication with the Partners (main contact people) in the project.
- Lead is responsible for putting together a report or proposal, in communication/collaboration with the Partners. The Partners submit their information to their Lead, not to CGTAT and not to SCWI or the ministry.

- **Change:** When it comes to running the project, Leads and Partners will communicate with each other in order to work out among themselves who is to do what and when. The document is not intended to be an overall job description.
- **Change:** A List of “Time Commitments for Project Leads” has been added to the document.
- **Note:** The “Roles and Responsibilities of Project Leads and Partners” has been added to the [Orientation for CGTAT Reps and Leads](#) document on the CGTAT website.

10. Other Business

SCWI’s Provincial Symposium for Phase 12 will be held at Humber on Tuesday, May 5, 2009.

- The symposium should not duplicate the Pathways to Partnerships Conference.
- It was pointed out that this date conflicts with [Ontario Technology Skills Competition](#) Secondary and Post-Secondary Contests Day, Waterloo ON.

Laurel Schollen provided an update on the College Math Project 2008 which was circulated on hard copy. They will be pursuing a continuation of this project, involving more players and stakeholders and will need to receive funding from somewhere. CGTAT was thanked for their support in sponsoring a forum in each of the years that the project has been underway.

Issue: Definition and clarification of a Dual Credit is required.

- Does a DCP have to be a high school credit and a college credit? Or, can it be a high school credit and non-credit experience at a college, e.g. a college preparatory course, or a course not attached to a program?
- At this point students with special needs seem to be excluded from dual credit type programs. What is the equivalent at a college of a vocational credit?
- This is a dual CREDIT program. Coop courses and ‘K’ Courses (Alternative Courses, e.g. KGW Exploring the World of Work, KHD Social Skills Development, etc.) are not credit-bearing. Perhaps this is something that should “Activity-based”?
- Can a dual credit be attached to a diploma certificate? Something outside an academic situation in a college? Trying to “think outside the box”.
- This item might be added to our list of issues about dual credits.

11. Next Meeting

Monday, February 23, 2009

Humber ITAL, North Campus ([maps and floor plans](#))

Residence Conference Room

12:00 – 2:00 Main Meeting

2:00 – 4:00 Room available for pre-arranged board/college partnership meetings

Appendix A

SCWI 'Pathways to Partnerships' Conference Committee Teleconference Meeting Notes, January 23rd, 2009

In attendance:

Dave, Christine, Lawrence Alvarez, Sarah Zamin, Michelle Rao, Cathy Lihou-Perry, Dale Thorington, Jane Jenner, Michelle Murray, Ken Harrison, Joan Powell

Potential College Key Note Speakers: Colleges Ontario? VPs, Cheryl Simpson or VPs of other colleges, possibly just stick with Barry O'Connor, Grant Yeo? **David Armstrong?**

Former president of Fleming, Brian Desbiens – consultant to do review work, Michelle will try to get some information, Ken recommends he is a fabulous speaker, Dave will follow up to invite Brian

David Armstrong will be invited to open and close the conference

Ministry Update: Teleconference with Phil Hedges and Mary Smart

- Communication to the Ministry and invitation to Ministry representatives
- Concerns from the Ministry, fiscal responsibility, Ministry can't pay for staff to attend, so budget will cover attendance
- Phil Hedges will help with workshop
- David Armstrong to speak as well
- Issues regarding the conference from RPT chairs, Ken – Mary connected regarding what is being covered by the conference, times are tight, be responsible with money
- Ministry advocating that any event be run at Ministry or at a college or board site
- Not a provincial conference, Fern costs are very reasonable, under \$400 per person, explanation seemed to be reasonable
- Bill Daggett – current advisor to USA Government educational department, inspiring, globally knowledgeable, perspective on education around the world, timely message, advisor with our Ministry of Education
- Ministry recommendations will be taken into account, seemed satisfied with outcomes
- Budget – keep Ken and Sarah posted

Registration Update

- Concern – Registration form, regarding who people will be sending, ensuring that messaging is attempting to get the proper people to the table
- Two fold, connecting as regional planning teams, also going down to the classroom
- Messaging at each RPT to ensure that leads understand our intent
- Sign-up sheet will be circulated at RPT meetings to confirm organization lead contacts for the conference registration

What's New with College Information Session & High School Information Session

Audience

- Michelle and Rosa, discussions on the workshop, understand audience and understanding of college
- What will the participants depth of understanding of college?
 - Student success teachers, guidance folks, guidance are probably more aware than most people regarding what is happening in colleges
 - Range of understanding, but not as aware as we should be
 - **Include the basics about college**, beneficial to start from the beginning and work our way up
 - Things have changed over the number of years, college can lead to many other pathways, what are the possibilities offered by colleges – update on what college looks like today, many types of programs, awareness
 - Trades and articulating to universities, bulk of what is done in college is often looked over, showing all potential pathways, student centered approach, prep programs
 - Michelle and Dale to work together, Jane to review
 - General population, so many people of different ages, demographics of who attends colleges

High School Session

- High School audience – what is new in high schools versus the basics of high schools, Student Success initiatives, a lot of college faculty not aware of some of the new initiatives and changes in curriculum at secondary schools
- New diploma requirements, what experiences and qualifications students have when they get to college
- Highlight the college math project, impact having on curriculum in high school, overview as well as workshop, how this is changing what is offered
- Dave will put out similar information outline for details

Presentation Details

- Should each college on the two regional planning teams be represented or can a few people who have been picked represent?
 - 8 or 10 people doesn't make for a good format, instead have contacts from each college to know what is being presented
- Create overview from today in terms of what will be presented, send to RPTs for feedback
- Make sure it links to the workshops that are having over the day, include links to workshops where possible

Videos

- Kicking off morning, deliver messaging through video, multimedia, anyone have high quality short videos, featuring programs and students
- Entrance, leading up to start time, over meals, some background videos, and featured in the presentations
- Conestoga had a cool video from the perspective of a high school student considering college, on CGTAT website available
- Sheridan, short video clips in media arts and animation programs, hands on type learning in college
- Any videos or media to be sent to
- Video, three-minute day in the life of a college student, Michelle has

- Dual credit sites, students being interviewed regarding what it's like to be in a dual credit program, Michelle has
- Lawrence GBC, produced 2 and a half minute video on dual credit programs
- **Request for contacts to bring any videos that can be featured at the conference to regional planning team meetings next week**

SCWI Projects

- Are SCWI projects part of the what is college workshop? More about overview of what is happening at the college, what is college all about
- Passing mention, a few examples of dual credit programs, SHSM partnerships, ways we are already connecting, here is your regional planning team that represents your board, and here's how to connect with us

General Information

- How to apply to college? No need
- New programs, collated package from all participants for entry package, college dialogue program, ask if there is a standard form already
- OCAS website introduction, what resources and websites are out there to understand college and learn more about it

Demographics

- Who comes to college at what age, and which demographics, average age 22, 30% have some kind of university education, OCAS for provincial statistics, Sarah will email, post-grad programs
- Programs that are unique to the college system, that students need to attend college for
- Oversubscribed programs
- Partnerships with universities
- Pathways through and to college
- College facilities, some photos of the labs, what is available
- College residences

- Student Life – social community, student unions, student government, student development, college as a destination, athletics, all around environment, not just academic, social clubs, supports for students, counseling

Consistent Messaging

- Two RPTs with logos, presentation folders, logos from the RPTs, make up background logos to be used in all workshops
- Videos in Halton, add logos from RPTs
- Folders from Ken and Sarah – each to send 180

Workshop Presenters

A1: High School Curriculum Presentation, Dave coordinating: Dave Graves, Chair of OCTE, presentation on latest technology curriculum, Rasa Pruden on science curriculum, to present new science curriculum, Dave to speak with Laurel on College Math project

A2: Effective Practices in Dual Credit Delivery: Dual Credit Frameworks and Delivery Models, presenters, Dave Armstrong to facilitate the workshop, different approaches, bring up at two RPT meetings, effective and less effective practices, list of all dual credit projects and description as a handout, Ken and Sarah to create lists?, how are students being selected

High school overview can cover some of the students-at risk and discuss it in high school overview

A3: Pathways: Teacher Candidate Project, Reaching Parents / Reaching Students, High Skills High Demand, school boards, in terms, Christine will open it to interested speakers at RPT meetings

A4: Transitions to College and Special Education, Lawrence to update at CGTAT, potentially no longer able to present

A5: Activity Projects – Sarah, Ken – 22 activity projects, Humber’s Camp Choice presentation, 10 activity projects from GBC, profile a number of projects, Destination College, Ken and Sarah will coordinate, themes for activity projects

B1: Dedicated Secondary School Teacher Role: Effective Practices Panel: Mary and Phil teleconference, Phil Hedges will be the moderator, Sarah – C3 and Mohawk Bridge, dedicated teacher role, having someone from Hamilton that worked as a dedicated teacher and how they made it work, Sarah to connect to Phil who will facilitate, keeping positive, potential solutions

B2: Articulation Projects: Linda will contribute to a presentation, workshop at Teacher Candidate Project, Mohawk College articulation, Trudy Heffernan, Linda Basso, Ken suggests differentiating between articulation agreements, by definition

B3: SHSM Workshop: Audrey and Aldo from Ministry will come up for at least the day, will also look after bringing in some exemplary practices

B4: College Bridging Programs:

- PLAR process – college PLAR
- Oversubscribed programs – guidance counselors would like to know how to better prepare students for oversubscribed, additional experiences students can do to prepare
- GH High Skills High Demand project: undersubscribed programs, high demand in community
- Upgrading Programs – what to do with kids with workplace, not proper pre-requisites, Cathy is contacting all colleges in conference
- Special education programs, questions regarding the how-to's in terms of IEPs, Gillian Hall from Halton regarding special ed.
- Handout with overview of key contacts and college programs

Program Sharing Lunch

- Networking lunch, facilitated discussion with some kind of common themes, program area or region
- Dave and Christine will work on something

Pre-conference emails to participants to get people excited – Please send any reminders to put into pre-conference emails to Dave and Christine

Wine and Cheese – made a deal with Fern to sponsor wine and cheese, each participant will receive one ticket and a cash bar will be provided from there, people can then enjoy wine and cheese in display areas

Display areas – registration package space to register displays

Next meeting date to be determined.