

Annual Work Plan Report (Monitoring)

Name of Report: 2010-2011 Safe, Equitable & Inclusive Schools Report

To: John Malloy, Director of Education

From: Executive Council
Lead Superintendent (Safe Schools) Pam Reinholdt

Date: December 12, 2011

Organizational Alignment

- **Strategic Direction: Equity Matters.** HWDSB will provide safe, inclusive and respectful learning environments for all staff and students.
 - **Annual Operating Plan:** Create equitable school environments. Develop and implement inclusive practices within schools.
 - **Director's Performance Appraisal:** Provide safe, equitable and inclusive learning environments for each student.
-

Overview/Context

(includes a brief comment on where we were at in the previous year's report in terms of "Next Steps" if possible and attach previous year's Action Plan with Monitoring and Review Completed)

As with all HWDSB reports, the Safe and Equitable Schools Report has been built upon the fundamental beliefs of:

- ✓ we will serve each student (Achievement Matters);
- ✓ we will provide an engaging program to meet each student's interests and to improve student achievement (Engagement Matters); and
- ✓ we will provide access to programming that meets each student's needs (Equity Matters).

The goal of a safe, equitable and inclusive school (SE&IS) strategy is to encourage school practices that promote a caring and safe school culture—a culture that models and reinforces socially responsible and respectful behaviours, so that learning and teaching can take place in a safe and caring environment. (Mather, 2001). HWDSB schools need to create and maintain environments that foster a sense of belonging, enhance the joy of learning, and honour diversity. A safe, caring and equitable school is a place where all partners—students, staff, parents, and community members—treat others fairly, with respect and kindness, and act in a socially responsible way towards all members of the school community, including students with special education needs. It is an inclusive community where diversity is affirmed within a framework of common values, and where all members participate in decision making and cooperate to promote the well-being of all. (Caring and Safe Schools in Ontario, MOE, 2010)

The focus for the SE&IS work is based on several Ministry of Education documents and resources including:

- The Ontario Education Act (Part X111: Behaviour, Discipline, and Safety),
- Keeping Our Kids Safe at School (Responding and Reporting to Incidents),

13-2

- Safe Schools: Creating a Positive School Climate,
- Caring and Safe Schools in Ontario (Supporting Students with Special Education Needs Through Progressive Discipline K-12),
- Realizing the Promise of Diversity, Ontario's Equity and Inclusive Education Strategy.

The co-ordinated efforts of Safe Schools, Equity, Special Education, HWDSB Mental Health Strategy, and Program have all impacted the work in the area of Safe, Equitable, and Inclusive Schools.

The 2010-2011 school year focus continued to be on prevention and intervention, with a particular emphasis on research-based effective programs and strategies such as Peer Mediation and Roots of Empathy. Restorative Justice practices shifted from awareness training across the system, to in-school support for implementing the strategies into the curriculum and everyday practice. As part of our partnership, we participated in leading the two-day training sessions as requested by the five partners. In-depth training was provided for several staff groupings.

On-going training is essential in addressing SE&I schools. Several items in the 2010-2011 work plan addressed this area. We continued with the implementation of progressive discipline strategies and collaboratively working with Student Services to address the needs of exceptional pupils. This requires continuous work to better understand mitigating circumstances and the attributes of each exceptionality, as well as Mental Health issues.

Bullying Prevention and Intervention remained a focus area:

- Focus groups were conducted which included students who were bullied, as well as some who self-identified as bullies, and some who were bystanders.
- Three workshops were provided for school staff on dealing with cyber-bullying and the different strategies for dealing with gender-based bullying.
- Training for Bill 157 continued throughout the past year. This information provides us with valuable insight as we create our work plan for 2011-2012.

The SE&IS survey was rewritten and was implemented in the new format this past spring.

Work continued on policy updates, as well as two new brochures for parents. The Police/School Board Protocol was also updated and awareness training has been provided.

What We Did

(Highlights of actions taken based upon previous year's plan)

Schools are required by legislation to complete the SE&IS survey every two years. One-half of our schools conducted the survey in 2010-2011. (formerly 2 surveys: Safe Schools Survey and Equity Survey). This survey has a grade 4 to 8 version, and a grade 9 to 12 version. The secondary survey questions require active parental consent, which may have resulted in the fewer number of responses from secondary students. We learned from this that a longer time for completion of the survey is required to allow schools time to follow-up on the consent forms not being returned.

In 2010-2011 the SE&IS survey was completed by a total of 9532 students in HWDSB. The purpose of the SE&IS survey is to inform the Board of the diversity of our student population and ensure that the Board continues to support learning in safe, equitable and inclusive environments.

13-3

The SE&IS survey provides us with student voice—the collective perspective of students within HWDSB. The survey affords students with an opportunity to influence their experiences at school and provides a means for us, as a system, to engage students and respond to what they are saying. The survey asked questions about student equity (e.g., culture, faith), students' sense of belonging at school, students' experiences with bullying/harassment, and students' plans following graduation (secondary students only). The data collected from this anonymous survey is used to make decisions about instructional practice, programs, and services that are available to students.

This past year, we worked with E-BEST and safe schools teams to utilize evidence-based practices in helping schools use the data collected via the SE&IS survey. SE&IS workshops brought school teams together to collaboratively work with their data and develop an action plan for the year. The workshops focused on 1) reviewing school and Board level data from the survey, 2) learning about evidence-based practices, 3) the selection of practices to be incorporated into each school's improvement plan, and 4) sharing student focus group data with schools to provide them with strategies which students indicated will reduce the incidence of bullying at school. At the first SE&IS workshop, time was provided to each safe school team (parents, students, staff and administrators) to work with the data to select strategies for their school. Members of the SE&IS team and E-BEST were on hand to provide assistance when needed and to help school teams determine how they could implement at their schools. Several months later, a second workshop brought school teams back together to review progress made with regards to the strategies they implemented. School teams were given the opportunity to network with other teams who had used the same strategies. The feedback received about the SE&IS workshops was positive, with participants appreciating the support and dedicated time to review the data and make plans for the coming year.

Last year we learned through feedback that schools were anxious to implement Restorative Justice (RJ) practices and language; however, they needed more support in the “how to” of this strategy. With less time needed for system training, the special assignment teacher was able to work in a few schools directly this past year to assist administrators and teachers with implementation. Schools concentrated on concrete applications of Restorative Justice practices, including connections to curriculum, student leadership, relationships, and communication.

Although much work has been done collaboratively between Special Education/Student Services and SE&IS, understanding mitigating circumstances balanced with appropriate consequences continues to be an area of continued focus. The Making a Difference document (as noted in the *Mental Health Strategy Report: June 2011* and available at www.cymhin.ca) includes materials to support educators with regard to various mental health issues, and has been very useful for teachers and administrators. The document continues to be revised and shared as new information becomes available. This document is supported through the Student Support Leadership Initiative (SSLI), a Ministry of Education (EDU) and Ministry of Children and Youth Services (MCYS) collaborative of community members including HWCDSB, with Contact Hamilton as the 'lead' agency and HWDSB managing the funding. The Mental Health Strategy Steering Committee and the Board's Health and Safety Officer have worked together to support schools through the provision of strategies and processes for responding to behaviour. A committee addressing student behaviour has developed and begun to implement online training/information modules to support staff and administrators to better understand behaviours.

As of October, 2011, there are active Positive Space Groups in 14 of our secondary schools: Westdale, Westmount, Hill Park, Ancaster, Orchard Park, Saltfleet, Sherwood, Sir Winston Churchill, Delta, Sir John A. MacDonald, Highland, Glendale, Parkside, Waterdown. Given that there were 3 Positive Space Groups in June 2009, this number represents more than a fourfold increase in the number of Positive Space Groups across the district within a span of two years. Schools that do not have an active group are being supported in their development and

implementation. Membership in Positive Space Groups ranges from 4 students in one school, to over 40 in another. Members may be LGBTQ youth or their allies. Most groups meet at least once a week, usually during the lunch period. Activities include discussions, movies, raising awareness of homophobia and LGBTQ issues, or students just coming together in a safe and comfortable setting. Positive Space teachers/leads participated in a 3-day diversity and equity leadership institute in support of their work and they continue to meet as a network during the school year.

For the last 2 years, the Positive Space Teacher/Leads at Sir Winston Churchill, with support from their administrator, have organized and hosted a Day of Difference event that is open to all Positive Space Group members as well as other interested students across the system.

To support the activities of Positive Space Groups, a Draft Positive Space Group Guide has been developed. The Equity Department has also provided each group with funds in the amount of \$200 for the 2010-11 school year. As well, consultants have visited a number of the groups to provide support.

A number of policies and documents have undergone review this past year. The five local School Boards and Hamilton Police Service worked together to write the new Police/School Board Protocol (Based on the Provincial Model for Police/School Board Protocols - 2011). The Protocol was in-serviced at the awareness level in September of 2011. Superintendents with school supervision responsibilities will work with schools to address issues as they arise. Three policies (Bullying Prevention and Intervention, Promoting Positive Student Behaviour and Progressive Discipline, and Code of Conduct) continue to be revised. An information pamphlet is being printed to inform parents of the updated Arrival Check Policy and the Appropriate Dress information. Using funding from a Ministry grant, the Bullying information pamphlet for parents and students was translated into Arabic, Cambodian, Chinese, Karen, Serbo-Croatian, Somali, Urdu, and Vietnamese.

What We Learned

(Include data that measures progress and include previous year's data as a comparison if possible)

We continue to support schools in a number of areas related to safe schools.

We have learned that schools need time to review, analyze, and use data from the surveys. The knowledge mobilization model used in 2010-2011 will be used again for those schools that complete the SE&IS survey in 2011-2012. The model also supports parent and student engagement in the SE&IS work.

The SE&IS survey not only provides information for each school, but also provides information to us as a system. With regards to a sense of belonging, the majority of respondents (64%) indicated their school was a friendly and welcoming place, though 10% reported rarely or never feeling this way about their school. Overall, 55% of students reported that they enjoy being at school and 72% feel accepted by adults in their school. Verbal bullying is the most common form of bullying reported by students and over 1000 students are the victims of bullying at least once a week. Bullying was reported to take place most frequently on the playground, in hallways, during recess and in the lunchroom/cafeteria. 81% of students did agree that it is their responsibility to help when they see bullying at their school.

We have learned through our focus group research, that students in grades 5-12 have very important things to tell us about what will work to reduce bullying in our schools. Their ideas map onto those elements which research tells us are the most important to consider when planning prevention and intervention. Strategies that students tell us will work include visibility of adults, consequences for repeat incidents of bullying, providing opportunities for students to build relationships with their peers, and offering information sessions that reflect delivery models

that they believe will be most effective. This information helps us, as a system, to support schools in areas related to addressing bullying issues, developing welcoming and caring environments for students, and providing strategies for by-standers to anonymously report bullying.

We have learned that although participants indicate through feedback surveys that they enjoy and are excited by the RJ and practices awareness training, more work is required to actually implement the practices as they relate to progressive discipline. Support is also needed to demonstrate how RJ can address implementation of student engagement, equity, character attributes, and classroom management.

Formal RJ Circles held at schools in cases where potential expulsions existed, conducted by Gateway staff, resulted in 9 students being either diverted to long-term suspensions, or receiving a shortened suspension. Students participating in RJ circles realize the impact of their behaviours on others; there has been very limited recidivism of the behaviours for these students and they continue to be engaged in the school setting. 'Circles' are also used daily at the Gateway program, and 3 formal circles at the program were used to repair harm to the community. Our school community officers and John Howard staff are also actively involved in formal circles.

We have learned that the practice of RJ has had a positive impact for students and has been used successfully as part of the progressive discipline implementation.

Schools have been working to provide alternatives to suspensions and expulsions. New resources were provided to consider alternatives for exceptional students and to better understand the exceptionalities. As well, Safe Schools, Equity, and Student Services worked together to provide pro-active alternatives for staff who work with exceptional pupils. This has resulted in a further reduction in the number of exceptional students being suspended or expelled.

We learned that schools needed follow-up to provide clarity after the large in-service related to Bill 157 and the Secure Schools Policy directive. Schools are conscientious about implementing Bill 157. A review with all employees who work directly with students of the duties to respond and report to bullying is required annually beginning in the 2010-2011 year. A DVD is available for administrators to use with staff.

We have also learned that working with community partners assists in creating safe, orderly, caring schools and healthy communities. As a member of the following committees, we are able to enhance the initiatives within the safe schools portfolio:

- City of Hamilton Strategic Road Planning Committee- focus is on road safety for drivers and pedestrians.
- Police/School Board Liaison Committee – HPS and all area school boards; focus is on issues related to schools on communities, developing strategies, and working collaboratively on joint initiatives from our respective Ministries.
- Safe, Equitable and Inclusive Schools – focus is on incorporating equity initiatives into safe schools work.
- Canadian Safe Schools Network – focus is on providing provincial forum for sharing best practice, providing conferences and training; HWDSB assists in providing support, workshops at a provincial level.
- Student Support Leadership Initiative(SSLI) – approx. 20 partners; focus is on providing a community strategy to address Mental Health issues; funded and mandated by the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Child and Youth Services; Contact Hamilton manages the project; HWDSB manages the funding.

13-6

- Hamilton Coalition for Bullying Prevention and Intervention –more than 20 community partners; focus is working collaboratively toward a “bully-free Hamilton”
- Threat Assessment Development Committee – sub-committee of the Student Support Leadership Initiative; education and health partners
- Hamilton Children’s Network: comprised of 35+ community, health, and education providers to consider how we can collaboratively sustain the SSLI work when the funding expires next year.

Progress on “Next Steps” that were outlined in 2009-2010 Safe Schools Report to Guide the Work for this past school year 2010 – 2011

The data from the 2009–10 SE&IS Report indicated that there was need to continue training on several safe schools topics. Training focused on continuing work related to Bill 157 (Bullying Prevention and Intervention), and Restorative Justice. Some support for integrating the language and approach of RJ in the curriculum and in classroom management strategies was also provided.

We also continued with in-service and resources, provided collaboratively with other departments related to exceptionalities and mitigating circumstances to address the higher percentage of exceptional students receiving suspensions and expulsions. Peer Mediation and Positive Space Groups continued to be implemented in schools.

Work Plan	Actions	Timelines	Progress 2010-2011
Policy Review *Review all policies with a projected review date of Sept. 2010-June, 2011 *Review Appropriate Dress Policy *Review Arrival Check Policy	*Convene safe schools advisory committee *Develop timelines based on “projected review” date *Book dates for Policy Review Committee	Nov. 2010–June, 2011 May/June 2011	*3 policy revisions in progress *Arrival Check and Appropriate Dress Info for parents being printed
Enhance Data Collection to Provide System Direction Develop and Implement School Climate Survey Conduct Focus Groups re: Student Voice re: what we, as a system, can do to address Bullying	*Collaborate with E-Best, Equity, Violence Prevention social Worker to develop new survey * consult with appropriate groups for input *randomly select secondary schools (victims and perpetrators of bullying) to participate; analyze	*complete by end of Jan. 2011 for implementation in Feb., 2011 Nov. to March, 2011	*Safe and Equitable Survey developed and implemented in Spring, 2011 *Focus groups conducted, findings summarized, plan to be developed in 2011-2012

Work Plan	Actions	Timelines	Progress 2010-2011
	results; *develop plan to address issues identified		
Implement Ministry Directives *Review Police/Board Protocol *On-going support for Bill157 *Implement Bullying Awareness Week (3 rd week of November)	*Collaboratively with HPS, HWCDSB, French Boards *develop appropriate implementation strategies re: changes *develop communication strategy with Corporate Communications *An on-line Q&A and a DVD on the Ministry website will be used as a reference for annual review of Bill 157, as well as training new staff *develop improved tracking system for 'Delegation of Authority' *convene student/staff committee to plan recognition of the week, provide schools with ideas, strategies for celebrating the week, that can be used throughout the year *work collaboratively with the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Community Coalition to plan an evening for parents (Nov. 18, 2010)	* pending notification from MOE *Nov.2010 – Feb. 2011 Oct. 2010 June, 2010 – Nov. 2010	*Police/Board protocol written *Stage 1 in-service completed for Administrators, Managers, Social Workers, Executive Council, Executive Assistants, School Resource Officers *Training provided for secondary occasional teachers *models shared with schools Completed and sent to schools *Student /Staff committee organized, promoted, and assisted with suggestions and supports for schools; *students organized a bullying poster campaign; *Panel of Parents and Students who experienced RJ as a resolution to bullying (100+ parents attended)
On-going School Supports *Provide models for schools re RJ implementation (prevention) in	*Special assignment teacher to work with schools to assist teachers to share successful strategies in online conference area	Sept. 2010 to May, 2011 Jan. – June 2011	*On-line conference for RJ leads established; *Six schools worked with special assignment teacher to

Work Plan	Actions	Timelines	Progress 2010-2011
classrooms and as an alternative for progressive discipline			implement RJ language and approaches
*continue RJ training as requested	*training for mentoring EA's, Student Success system team, Student Success school leads, Character Networks staff, and some elementary EAs.	Oct.-2010-April 2011	*Training completed and being applied
*Continue expansion of peer mediation *Continue support (financial) for Roots of Empathy	6 schools requested training	*on-going throughout 2010-2011	*6 new schools implemented peer mediation

DATA COLLECTION

Data collection provides schools and the system with information that helps us to focus our work for the upcoming year. At the system level, we provide direction, resources, supports, and training that will assist schools and their communities to enhance our safe, caring, and orderly environments. The work also supports our school leaders and staff to help students build healthy relationships, positive interactions, decision-making skills, and coping strategies.

Suspension and expulsion rates continue to decrease. Alternatives to suspension, and in some cases expulsion, include progressive discipline measures, prevention and early intervention strategies, restorative practices, support services either within the Board or through community supports, and program modifications and accommodations.

Overall, we are seeing improvements in the total number of students suspended, the number of suspensions being given, and suspensions by gender, with the exception of a slight increase in female suspensions in secondary.

The categories of infractions for suspensions show improvement in most areas; however, there are increases in some areas. In secondary, these are bullying, physical assault, and robbery. There are small increases in threatening bodily harm and uttering threats; and a larger increase in swearing and physical assault. Schools are able to consider their own data to determine concerns for their specific schools and to establish plans to address these concerns, with support from the Board where needed.

Overall, we continue to make slight gains in the number of identified students who are being suspended. More work is yet to be done to implement the training modules that have been developed, and program delivery models continue to be reviewed to better serve our students.

GATEWAY PROGRAM:

13-9

The Gateway data is included in numbers on others charts. It is separated here for the purposes of monitoring the program and to provide an overview of the number of students who accessed the program.

The Gateway program provides academic and social/emotional supports for students who are on long-term suspension (6 to 20 days) and for students who are expelled from all schools of the Board.

During the 2010-2011 school year, 85 students were enrolled at Gateway. This number included students who carried forward in the program from June, 2010, long term suspended students, and the 33 students expelled from all schools in the 2010-2011 school year. Two students graduated from Gateway in June, 2011 (1 from grade 8 and one from grade 12). Forty-four (44) students returned to regular programming at either their home school or a different school within HWDSB, and 19 students went to Alternative Education within HWDSB or were non-attending. Total number of credits earned by students at Gateway in 2010-2011 was 147.5.

We have learned that better facilitation of data collection is needed so that we may know more about students enrolled in the Gateway Program. In collaboration with E-BEST, we will develop and implement a new system for gathering data about our students who are suspended and/or expelled. The system will allow us to track such information as attendance, credit accumulation, graduation, destination following the Gateway program and recidivism. While this data will be collected outside of the Student Information System in 2011-2012, the goal will be to incorporate this data collection in the new Student Information System in 2012-2013.

Program Category	Number of Students		
	08-09	09-10	10-11
# of Students attending on a 6 to 10 day suspension	11	13	12
# of Students attending on a 11 to 20 day suspension	15	16	10
# of students attending on 20 day pending expulsion – became 20 suspension	11	12	9
# of Students attending on an expulsion	49	56*	53
# of Students attending on intervention	10	4	1

Panel			
# of Students attending in the Elementary Panel	27	21	18
# of Students attending in the Secondary Panel	69	80	67

Gender			
# of Students attending --Male	77	83	65
# of Students attending --Female	19	18	20

Category—Special Education Students in Program			
# of Special Education Students - BEHAVIOURAL	10	0	0
# of Special Education Students - COMMUNICATIONS LD	0	0	0

SAFE SCHOOLS WORK PLAN FOR 2010-2011

Essential Component	Strategies	Evidence	Implementation and Monitoring
Knowing Our Students			
*Skill Building through an Equity Lens	*RHVP (Reduce Homophobic Violence Period)- a program to address homophobic violence and hate crimes	*Presentations by HPS and JHS to grade 9 classroom	*SOSAs and L& L to be introduced to program and to monitor completion of presentations
*Peer Mediation Implementation	*Social worker to model training to build capacity with consultants	*Increase number of schools using peer mediation	*Support for peer mediation school 'leads' 2 meetings per year to share best practice
*Provide Leadership experiences for inclusion of all groups of students as per focus group feedback	*leadership camp for building relationships; collaboratively planned with student engagement , safe schools, and student leadership	*Develop instrument to determine success of program	*Consultants, key leaders, and students plan, implement

Knowing Our Staff			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Continue professional learning for staff related to Bill 157 to promote clarity and consistency *Support for schools to implement Safe Schools Plan, including anonymous bullying reporting *Provide training for new administrators and social workers who have not yet been trained *Continue support for elementary and secondary EAs and Character Networks teachers *continue to build capacity for facilitators 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *scheduled sessions for 'instructional' segment of cluster meetings *Schools have a plan and are implementing the plan *Training sessions completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Follow-up with schools during school visits *SOSAs and L&L monitor plan in place; requirement of anonymous reporting mechanism *participation in online conference, strategies used in classrooms

Knowing Our Parents and Community			
*Implement Bullying Awareness Week (3 rd week of November, 2012)	*Information evening for parents	*Forum planned for Nov. 16, 2012 at Westdale with Dr. Tracy Vallaincourt	*In collaboration with Hamilton Coalition for Bullying Prevention and Intervention
*Bullying Awareness Evenings for Parents	*3 evenings planned for parents (2 in Sept, 1 TBD)	Increased awareness of issues, prevention, intervention *attendance at sessions	* Monitored by Lead Safe Schools SO and Social Worker – Violence Prevention
*Conduct parent interest survey to determine need for support group for parents of children/youth who have been bullied	*Information pamphlet to parents, by cluster, sessions would run once per week for 8 weeks, topics to be generated by the group	*parent involvement, feedback at end of sessions	*implemented by Social Worker-Violence Prevention

Policy Development and Review			
*Complete 3 policies currently in progress	*PWSC process	Policies completed Jan. -Feb. 2012	SOSA and Safe Schools Principal Advisory
Suspension Policy, Expulsion Policy	*PWSC process	Mar./-May, 2012	SOSA and Safe Schools Principal Advisory
<i>** Bill 13 –Accepting Schools Act & Bill 14 – Anti-Bullying Act, may require policy review/development this year</i>		<i>** pending legislation</i>	

SUSPENSION / EXPULSION TOTALS

School Year	Total Suspensions	# of Exceptional Student Suspensions	Total Expulsions
2007-2008	6,110	577	59
2008 -2009	5,524	556	46
2009-2010	4,916	511	40
2010-2011	4,407	500	37 (33 from all schools in the board; 4 from his/her own school)

SUSPENSION DATA *(includes 1 suspension, 2 suspensions, and more than 2 suspensions)

	Elementary		Secondary		Total	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
Total number of students	31,396	31,225	17,618	17,277	49,014	48,502
Number of suspensions	2,611	2,393	2,305	2,128	4,916	4,521
Number of students suspended *	1,315	1,245	1,500	1,407	2,815	2,652
Percentage of students suspended	4.2%	4.0%	8.5%	8.1%	5.7%	5.5%

Number of Students Receiving One, Two, Three or More Suspensions

Panel	# of Students Suspended 1x			# of Students Suspended 2x			# of Students Suspended 3x or more		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Elementary	581	170	751	203	40	243	225	26	251
Secondary	692	304	996	175	62	237	132	42	174

Total Suspensions by Gender

	Elementary		Secondary	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
Male	2,207	2030	1,746	1,552
Female	404	363	559	576
Total	2,611	2393	2,305	2,128

Total Suspensions by Category

Category	Elementary			Secondary		
	08-09	09-10	10-11	08-09	09-10	10-11
Bullying	97	108	65	22	16	27
Physical Assault	16	12	21	23	18	23
Robbery	6	12	6	6	8	13
Possession of Weapon	16	26	19	25	22	14
Influence of Alcohol	2	2	0	62	36	29
Possess Alcohol/Drugs	25	21	11	207	176	155
Trafficking	0	4	0	5	8	4
Alcohol to Minor	0	0	0	1	1	0
Swearing	174	144	154	130	187	177
Threaten Bodily Harm	6	8	10	5	3	2
Utter Threat	118	83	98	67	43	36
Vandalism	47	47	43	36	28	13
Sexual Assault	9	6	4	0	0	0
Other Board-set infraction	2,406	2,138	1,962	2,013	1,759	1,635
TOTAL	2,922	2,611	2,393	2,602	2305	2,128

Suspensions: Identified (Exceptional) Students

(extension of, and included in, information above)

	Elementary		Secondary		Total	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
Number of identified students	1,868	1,849	1,945	1,901	3,813	3,750
Number of identified students suspended	263	248	248	252	511	500
% of identified students suspended	14.1%	13.4%	12.75%	13.3%	13.4%	13.3%

Number of Suspensions by Exceptionality for Identified Students (elem & sec combined)

Exceptionality	Number of Suspensions		
	08-09	09-10	10-11
Autism	8	4	10
Behaviour	101	97	84
Deaf/HOH	2	0	1
Blind/Low Vision	3	1	1
Language Impairment	11	20	3
Speech Impairment	3	3	2
Learning Disability	282	252	264
Mild Intel Disability	129	121	120
Developmental Disability	5	2	3
Physical Disability	2	2	1
Giftedness	8	7	7
Multiple Except	2	2	4
Total	556	511	500

EXPULSION DATA

	Elementary		Secondary		Total	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
Total number of students	31,396	31,225	17,618	17,277	49,014	48,502
Total number of students expelled	7	3	31	30 +4 from own school only	40	37
Total number of Identified students expelled	1	1	2	5	3	6
Percentage of students expelled (including Identified)	.0002%	.0001%	.0017%	.0017%	.0008%	.0007%

TOTAL EXPULSIONS BY CATEGORY

Category	09-10	10-11
Possession of a weapon	0	2
Using a weapon to cause or to threaten bodily harm to another person	4	4
Committing physical assault on another person that causes bodily harm requiring treatment by a medical practitioner	9	6
Committing sexual assault	1	0
Trafficking in weapons or in illegal drugs	1	3
Committing robbery	0	0
Giving alcohol to a minor	0	0
Engaging in any other activity that may be established by policy of the Board	25	18
TOTAL	40	37

Elementary Suspension Data by School

School	2007 - 2008				2008 - 2009				2009 - 2010				2010-11			
	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students	% of Enrollment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students	% of Enrollment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students	% of Enrollment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students	% of Enrollment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students	% of Enrollment Suspended	# of Enrollment Suspended
Adelaide Hoodless Alter Ed	3	3	28.6%	1	1	8.3%	11	5	62.5%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
A. M. Cunningham	15	5	1.4%	2	2	0.5%	6	3	0.8%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Adelaide Hoodless	185	77	15.0%	345	95	18.8%	186	62	14.2%	119	48	12.4%	119	48	12.4%	12.4%
Allan A. Greenleaf	29	14	2.3%	7	6	1.1%	20	11	2.1%	10	8	1.6%	10	8	1.6%	1.6%
Ancaster Meadow	0	0	0.0%	9	8	1.3%	6	5	0.8%	7	3	0.4%	7	3	0.4%	0.4%
Ancaster Senior	2	2	0.6%	9	9	2.8%	18	10	3.6%	46	11	3.8%	46	11	3.8%	3.8%
Balaclava	22	8	2.0%	9	6	1.5%	13	11	3.0%	16	9	2.5%	16	9	2.5%	2.5%
Bellmoore	18	15	4.4%	13	8	2.3%	18	11	3.3%	16	7	2.4%	16	7	2.4%	2.4%
Belt Stone	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Bennetto	116	57	10.2%	109	63	11.5%	122	51	10.3%	139	62	12.7%	139	62	12.7%	12.7%
Beverly Central	1	1	0.7%	0	0	0.0%	6	3	1.9%	6	3	1.9%	6	3	1.9%	1.9%
Billy Green	14	12	3.6%	19	12	3.8%	3	2	0.7%	8	5	1.5%	8	5	1.5%	1.5%
Buchanan Park	1	1	0.5%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	2	1	0.6%	2	1	0.6%	0.6%
C. H. Bray	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Canterbury Alter Ed	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	2	2	36.4%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Cardinal Heights	15	10	3.2%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	14	12	4.1%	14	12	4.1%	4.1%
Cathy Weaver	298	111	17.8%	132	60	9.8%	181	69	12.0%	104	52	8.8%	104	52	8.8%	8.8%
C. B. Stirling	56	37	8.8%	33	22	5.5%	56	37	10.0%	20	14	3.9%	20	14	3.9%	3.9%
Central	3	3	2.0%	5	5	3.2%	1	1	0.7%	18	12	7.5%	18	12	7.5%	7.5%
Chedoke	114	46	9.7%	64	36	7.9%	27	14	3.0%	14	12	2.7%	14	12	2.7%	2.7%
Collegiate Avenue	10	7	2.7%	20	13	4.8%	15	14	5.3%	3	2	0.8%	3	2	0.8%	0.8%
Crestwood Alter Ed	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	17	14	31.1%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Dalewood	81	32	7.8%	24	15	3.8%	2	2	0.5%	12	10	2.6%	12	10	2.6%	2.6%
Dr. J. Edgar Davey	94	45	13.5%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	30	24	4.6%	30	24	4.6%	4.6%
Dr. J. Seaton	0	0	0.0%	5	5	1.7%	2	2	0.8%	7	5	1.6%	7	5	1.6%	1.6%
Dundas Central	4	1	0.4%	5	4	1.7%	5	2	2.1%	11	9	2.0%	11	9	2.0%	2.0%
Earl Kitchener	29	11	2.2%	6	5	1.1%	13	10	1.2%	24	7	1.6%	24	7	1.6%	1.6%
Eastdale	8	5	1.2%	10	6	1.4%	14	5	4.4%	6	3	1.5%	6	3	1.5%	1.5%
Eastmount Park	12	10	4.4%	9	7	3.2%	15	9	8.8%	12	8	4.3%	12	8	4.3%	4.3%
Elizabeth Bagshaw	52	21	9.6%	70	23	11.3%	28	16	2.5%	22	18	5.8%	22	18	5.8%	5.8%
Fessenden	121	58	15.2%	17	10	3.1%	14	8	2.7%	1	1	0.3%	1	1	0.3%	0.3%
Flamborough Centre	2	2	0.7%	11	3	1.0%	0	0	0.0%	3	3	1.0%	3	3	1.0%	1.0%
Franklin Road	11	7	2.0%	6	5	1.5%	11	9	0.6%	9	5	1.4%	9	5	1.4%	1.4%
Gatesstone	12	8	2.1%	7	6	1.8%	4	2	2.7%	16	8	1.3%	12	8	1.3%	1.3%
G. L. Armstrong	60	31	7.2%	94	38	10.0%	61	27	7.0%	82	32	9.2%	82	32	9.2%	9.2%
G. R. Allan	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	3	3	0.8%	3	3	0.8%	0.8%
Gibson	91	21	12.6%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Glen Brae	18	15	6.9%	17	13	5.5%	11	7	3.0%	10	6	1.5%	10	6	1.5%	1.5%
Glen Echo	2	2	0.8%	18	8	3.1%	2	1	0.4%	8	4	0.0%	8	4	0.0%	0.0%
Glenwood	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Gordon Price	21	22	4.8%	4	3	0.7%	22	14	3.3%	18	11	2.6%	18	11	2.6%	2.6%
Green Acres	20	9	2.9%	15	7	2.2%	8	4	1.3%	13	12	4.1%	13	12	4.1%	4.1%
Greensville	1	1	0.4%	1	1	0.4%	2	2	1.0%	2	2	1.0%	2	2	1.0%	1.0%
Guy Brown	1	1	0.4%	2	2	0.7%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.3%	2	1	0.3%	0.3%

Elementary Suspension Data by School

School	2007 - 2008			2008 - 2009			2009 - 2010			2010-11		
	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students Suspended	% of Enrollment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students Suspended	% of Enrollment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students Suspended	% of Enrollment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students Suspended	% of Enrollment Suspended
Helen Detwiler	49	28	4.6%	34	34	6.0%	68	22	4.1%	44	25	4.8%
Hess Street	82	48	11.8%	71	38	9.2%	65	34	9.2%	42	26	7.8%
Highview	40	26	6.7%	55	31	8.2%	68	31	8.5%	34	21	5.7%
Hillcrest	95	54	11.1%	100	43	8.9%	54	27	5.7%	78	46	9.8%
Holbrook	33	12	5.8%	9	3	1.5%	6	3	1.5%	4	4	1.9%
Huntington Park	39	25	5.7%	28	21	5.0%	86	38	9.1%	40	24	6.0%
James Macdonald	6	5	1.9%	0	0	0.0%	2	2	0.9%	0	0	0.0%
Janet Lee	2	2	0.6%	4	4	1.2%	11	6	1.8%	6	6	1.7%
King George	218	82	30.1%	192	57	21.4%	138	40	16.7%	39	23	11.6%
Lake Avenue	37	28	4.9%	67	41	7.1%	47	29	5.0%	73	54	9.7%
Lawfield	21	18	3.9%	19	13	2.2%	20	13	2.0%	18	16	2.2%
Lincoln Alexander	10	4	1.8%	9	3	1.4%	4	2	1.1%	5	5	3.1%
Linden Park	15	5	2.8%	24	8	5.0%	12	6	4.1%	27	8	5.4%
Lisgar	26	17	6.0%	19	15	5.5%	8	6	2.3%	5	5	2.2%
Mary Hopkins	1	1	0.3%	0	0	0.0%	1	1	0.3%	3	2	0.7%
Memorial - City	353	127	25.3%	157	71	14.9%	47	34	7.2%	43	27	6.3%
Memorial - Stoney Creek	5	4	1.4%	2	2	0.7%	4	4	1.4%	0	0	0.0%
Millgrove	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	1	1	0.7%	2	2	1.3%
Mount Albion	18	12	3.9%	14	8	2.4%	6	6	1.7%	7	4	1.0%
Mount Hope	56	27	11.9%	14	9	4.1%	3	3	1.3%	18	12	4.8%
Mountain View	5	5	1.4%	54	39	11.9%	34	24	7.6%	30	25	8.2%
Mountview	2	2	0.9%	1	1	0.5%	0	0	0.0%	2	2	1.0%
Norwood Park	7	5	1.2%	4	4	0.9%	3	3	0.6%	1	1	0.2%
Parkdale	23	9	4.7%	22	16	8.9%	38	18	11.1%	33	13	8.8%
Pauline Johnson	0	0	0.0%	3	2	0.8%	1	1	0.5%	6	6	2.8%
Prince of Wales	0	0	0.0%	60	40	21.9%	139	74	16.0%	108	50	10.4%
Prince Philip	125	24	13.2%	0	0	0.0%	3	2	1.2%	0	0	0.0%
Queen Mary	84	45	8.7%	95	49	10.1%	123	64	13.2%	158	72	15.1%
Queen's Rangers	0	0	0.0%	23	17	9.5%	58	32	7.8%	48	27	6.2%
Queensdale	11	3	4.3%	10	2	1.4%	0	0	0.0%	1	1	0.7%
R. A. Riddell	19	7	1.6%	10	3	1.7%	3	1	0.6%	0	0	0.0%
R. L. Hyslop	25	13	2.3%	13	11	1.7%	11	7	1.1%	17	14	2.1%
Ray Lewis	17	13	5.5%	10	10	4.7%	8	10	4.9%	6	5	2.7%
Richard Beasley	0	0	0.0%	8	7	1.2%	4	6	1.0%	7	5	0.8%
Ridgemount	10	7	2.2%	29	2	1.3%	15	2	1.3%	12	11	3.3%
Rosedale	56	17	2.6%	18	21	7.4%	0	9	3.3%	2	11	4.4%
Rousseau	1	1	10.3%	1	6	3.9%	0	0	0.0%	1	1	1.4%
Roxborough Park	85	35	0.5%	1	1	0.5%	0	0	0.0%	1	1	0.4%
Ryerson	20	14	14.3%	54	22	9.9%	35	20	10.2%	41	18	9.6%
Sanford Ave.	125	84	4.1%	38	19	5.5%	7	6	1.8%	23	12	3.2%
Sir Isaac Brock	1	1	16.4%	115	86	26.1%	75	46	10.9%	0	0	0.0%
Sir Wilfrid Laurier	82	48	0.6%	2	2	1.1%	10	6	3.4%	19	7	4.0%
Sir William Osler	34	27	9.7%	85	42	8.2%	112	47	9.2%	172	52	10.7%
Spencer Valley	6	3	4.5%	16	14	2.3%	9	7	1.1%	19	13	2.3%
Stinson Street	19	7	1.2%	0	13	5.7%	24	14	6.0%	7	3	1.4%
			3.6%		0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%

Elementary Suspension Data by School

School	2007 - 2008			2008 - 2009			2009 - 2010			2010-11		
	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students Suspended	% of Enrolment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students Suspended	% of Enrolment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students Suspended	% of Enrolment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students Suspended	% of Enrolment Suspended
Strathcona	19	4	2.3%	18	5	2.7%	9	8	4.8%	5	4	2.4%
Tapscott	11	8	4.0%	40	14	7.3%	18	7	3.8%	4	2	1.1%
Templemead	24	21	3.4%	33	18	3.0%	10	7	1.2%	60	18	3.2%
Viscount Montgomery	28	19	4.3%	33	24	5.6%	39	23	5.9%	38	15	4.8%
W. H. Ballard	45	30	4.6%	80	40	6.7%	119	59	9.8%	156	64	11.1%
Westview	104	49	14.4%	46	21	6.2%	22	17	5.4%	16	13	4.8%
Westwood	15	6	2.4%	22	11	4.4%	20	6	2.7%	20	11	4.9%
Winona	4	4	0.9%	4	4	0.9%	15	9	1.7%	10	4	0.7%
Woodward Avenue	4	3	1.7%	3	3	1.9%	10	4	3.2%	8	4	3.3%
Yorkview	0	0	0.0%	6	3	1.8%	19	7	4.3%	15	11	7.3%
Total	3691	1777	5.5%	2922	1494	4.7%	2611	1315	4.2%	2393	1245	4.2%

Source: 2010-11 Suspension and Expulsion Reports Submitted to ONSIS

Secondary Suspension Data by School

School	2007 - 2008			2008 - 2009			2009 - 2010			2010-2011		
	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students Suspended	% of Enrollment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students Suspended	% of Enrollment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students Suspended	% of Enrollment Suspended	# of Suspensions Issued	# of Students Suspended	% of Enrollment Suspended
Ancaster	109	69	6.7%	80	59	5.9%	92	75	7.8%	50	41	4.3%
Barton	71	59	6.3%	103	77	8.3%	129	91	9.5%	89	69	8.0%
Delta	276	166	17.2%	362	219	24.3%	179	114	13.8%	171	115	14.6%
Glendale	58	47	4.8%	53	44	4.6%	123	89	9.6%	158	97	10.6%
Highland	112	86	10.3%	113	88	7.9%	57	46	5.7%	75	44	5.8%
Hill Park	197	125	13.1%	245	130	14.0%	190	114	13.3%	142	99	11.7%
Mountain	120	70	23.9%	126	81	32.3%	80	43	20.9%	113	57	30.7%
Orchard Park	171	123	10.2%	222	121	10.3%	114	82	7.0%	83	68	6.0%
Parkside	44	33	5.1%	144	86	13.7%	126	84	13.4%	56	41	7.0%
Parkview	165	77	24.8%	166	84	31.1%	134	68	24.9%	104	61	22.5%
Saltfleet	142	92	7.6%	155	113	9.1%	178	114	9.3%	151	95	8.1%
Sherwood	84	74	6.4%	62	49	4.4%	71	50	4.3%	51	42	3.5%
Sir Allan MacNab	165	118	12.5%	29	26	3.1%	42	37	4.2%	79	65	7.6%
Sir John A. Macdonald	198	129	10.6%	217	131	11.3%	291	157	14.1%	398	228	20.4%
Sir Winston Churchill	254	150	13.1%	189	128	11.0%	243	143	12.1%	214	135	11.4%
Waterdown	106	80	6.2%	157	103	8.3%	95	78	6.3%	58	48	4.2%
Westdale	91	72	5.1%	129	88	6.1%	119	82	5.3%	104	75	4.7%
Westmount	55	48	4.1%	30	25	1.9%	20	17	1.3%	15	13	1.0%
Jackson High Alt Ed	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	17	14	22.8%
Phoenix Alt Ed	1	1	1.7%	0	0	0.0%	20	14	11.0%	0	0	0.0%
Ngage/Turning Point	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	2	2	1.6%	0	0	0.0%
Total	2419	1619	9.0%	2602	1632	9.2%	2305	1500	8.5%	2128	1407	8.1%

Source: 2010-11 Suspension and Expulsion Reports Submitted to ONSIS