

SPECIAL BOARD / COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

AGENDA (Revised)

**Tuesday, May 3, 2022
at 7:00 pm
Teams Live Broadcast**

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

1.1 INDIGENOUS LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are unlearning and relearning on the traditional and unceded lands of the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish) and səliwətał (Tsleil-Waututh) Nations.

1.2 MOTION TO APPOINT ACTING SECRETARY TREASURER

That, to ensure the meeting is constituted in accordance with the School Act, the Board of Education appoints Shehzad Somji as the Secretary Treasurer for the meeting.

1.3 OPENING REMARKS

The meeting is being live-streamed and the audio and visual recording will also be available to the public for viewing after the meeting. The footage of the meeting may be viewed inside and outside of Canada.

2. MOTION TO DISSOLVE THE BOARD MEETING INTO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

That the Board dissolve itself into the Committee-of-the-Whole

3. DELEGATIONS RE BUDGET 2022-23 DISCUSSION

Delegations are estimated to begin approximately at 7:00 PM.

3.1 Delegations

- 3.1.1 Su-Laine Brodsky
- 3.1.2 Kyla Epstein

4. 2022-2023 DRAFT ANNUAL BUDGET UPDATE

Attachments:

- Appendix A – 2022-2023 Draft Preliminary Annual Budget
- Appendix B – Budget Proposal – Health and Safety Manager
- Appendix C – Trustee Proposals
 - C.1 Trustee Parrott Proposals (multiple)
 - C.2 Trustee Reddy Proposal – Notice of Motion: 2022-2023 Budget Proposal Regarding Anti-Racism In Service Training
 - C.3 Trustee Wong Proposal – Increase Library Support to Schools

5. MOTION TO RISE AND REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

That the Committee-of-the-Whole rise and report.

6. MOTION TO RECONVENE THE BOARD MEETING

That the Board meeting be reconvened.

7. BUSINESS FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

8. ADJOURNMENT

Running Head: GIFTED EDUCATION EQUITY

The Challenges of Achieving Equity within Public School Gifted and Talented Programs

Scott J. Peters
Professor of Assessment and Research Methodology
University of Wisconsin – Whitewater
800 W. Main St. Whitewater, WI 53190
262-472-5407
peterss@uww.edu

Word Count: 8579

Keywords: Giftedness, Identification, Underrepresentation, Equity

Final version published March 26, 2021 in *Gifted Child Quarterly*

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00169862211002535>

ABSTRACT

K-12 gifted and talented programs have struggled with racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, native language, and disability inequity since their inception. This inequity has been well documented in public schools since at least the 1970s and has been stubbornly persistent despite receiving substantial attention at conferences, in scholarly journals, and in K-12 schools. The purpose of this manuscript is to outline why such inequity exists and why common efforts to combat it have been unsuccessful. In the end, poorly-designed identification systems combined with larger issues of societal inequality and systemic, institutionalized racism are the most likely culprits. I end the manuscript with a hierarchy of actions that could be taken – from low-hanging fruit to major societal changes – in order to combat inequity in gifted education and move the field forward.

The topic of this manuscript, and this special issue overall, is equity within K–12 gifted and talented services and why that equity has been so elusive for the field. Throughout this manuscript, I use the terms equity (or more correctly inequity), disproportionality, and underrepresentation all to refer to the same observation—that student subgroups are disproportionately represented in K–12 gifted and talented programs. Specifically, students who are Black, Latinx, and Native American are disproportionately underrepresented compared to their representation in the overall K–12 student population. Students served through special education and English language learner programs and students who are from low-income households are also disproportionately underrepresented. Students from some Asian (e.g., Chinese, Korean) and White demographic groups are disproportionately overrepresented.

Although the pattern of disproportionalities is largely understood in the field, it is also important to emphasize that the topic is nuanced. For example, in a 2013 meta-analysis, Petersen found that boys were more likely to be identified as gifted than girls, particularly during pre-adolescences, and that these findings held regardless of race, ethnicity, or socio-economic status (SES). Similarly, among the lowest-income students, Black and White students have a similar probability of being identified as gifted (Grissom et al., 2019). However, hidden within these ethnic/racial categories is a wide diversity of experiences and backgrounds: “Black” is likely to capture recent, voluntary immigrants from the Caribbean as well as refugees from Somalia. Likewise, “Asian” will include Hmong farm workers in rural Wisconsin who are homeless and speak English as a second language as well as children of tech sector employees in Fortune 100 companies. These diverse individuals live in diverse places—some with widely-available gifted education services (e.g., Virginia) and others with very few (e.g., South Dakota). The intersectionality of ethnicity/race, education, family income, geography, cost of living, and the

degree to which an individual feels welcome and represented in a particular community are all factors that contribute to both academic achievement outcomes and gifted identification.

A host of research has documented disproportionate representation in gifted programs (Peters et al., 2019a; Shores et al., 2020; Yoon & Gentry, 2009). Many gifted education scholars and practitioners have lamented that the field has long known about the state of affairs and that the focus needs to be more on solutions (e.g., Gentry et al., 2019). I could not agree more with that sentiment and I applaud the editors of *Gifted Child Quarterly* and the guest editors for devoting an entire special issue to this topic with the goal of moving the field forward. Countless scholars such as Alexinia Baldwin (2005), Donna Ford (1998) and Mary Frasier (1991), among many others, have devoted their careers to calling for change. Despite these valiant efforts, too little has changed.

Before explaining the dominant barriers to greater equity within gifted education, a few disclosures are in order. I write this article as one of the more privileged human beings on the planet. Both of my parents were college graduates. I have a Ph.D. (which was free thanks to a graduate assistantship throughout the completion of my doctoral degree). I grew up in an upper-income household in the suburbs. I went to summer camp every year, never giving a moment's thought to the cost. I am a White, male, protestant, tenured full professor. Having a partner who is a physician affords me even more financial privilege. My awareness and acknowledgement of this privilege do nothing to decrease it. Instead, I try and remember that with privilege comes the responsibility to help those who are less privileged, while also being aware that I will never understand how a person of color experiences the world or what it is like to live in abject poverty. These beliefs are what motivate much of my work in gifted and talented and advanced education and what motivated this manuscript.

The Context of Underrepresentation

The concept of classical test theory (CTT: Lord & Novick, 1968) underlies much of educational and psychological measurement. CTT posits that a latent construct, known as an individual's "true score," can never be directly observed. Instead, it can only be measured through its proxy known as the "observed score." For example, an individual's true creativity can never be directly observed. Any observed score that a student receives on a test of creative thinking will always include measurement error. That error can apply to all test takers equally, or it can be group specific. Group-specific error is the equivalent to the colloquial conception of assessment bias. If a test measures quantitative reasoning well for boys but less well for girls, this is a case of assessment bias. Importantly, it is only when that lower score is due to construct-irrelevant, group-specific factors that bias is present (Camilli, 2006; Osterlind & Everson, 2009). A fair test will yield essentially equal observed scores and the same valid inferences in the presence of equal true scores.

This discussion brings up an uncomfortable question for the field of gifted education: is it reasonable to expect that all students, regardless of their prior education and opportunity, have the same true score on every construct that might be measured in the gifted identification process? The *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education, 2014) make clear that group differences on test scores should be evaluated and scrutinized for potential bias, but that "differences in outcomes do not in themselves indicate that a testing application is biased" (p. 54). The first question when discussing underrepresentation in gifted education is whether the cause of disproportionality is

differences in observed scores due to assessment bias, or differences in true scores due to some children not having had the opportunity to develop their talents.

Imagine two children in an eighth-grade mathematics class. Both have mastered the same algebra skills, but one receives a B on the final exam while the other receives an A. This scenario is a case of unequal observed scores (the grades) despite equal true scores (both students have mastered the same skills). This outcome might occur in a case where the student who received the B is not a native speaker of English and was not clear on what some of the test questions were asking. The fact that language proficiency resulted in a lower grade despite similar knowledge of mathematics is a perfect example of assessment bias.

Alternatively, imagine two different children in eighth-grade mathematics. One came into school that year having spent the summer with her grandfather who happens to be a retired engineer. The first child comes into school that year having mastered more mathematics concepts and ends up scoring higher on the screening assessment used for gifted and talented identification. This outcome is *not* a case of assessment bias because the two students at this point in time have mastered different amounts of the material. Any reasonable person would rightly point to this as unfair; it was not the other student's fault that they do not have a grandfather who was an engineer. *But the cause of the true score difference is not relevant to the question of whether or not an assessment is biased.* A test with reliable scores that yield valid inferences will result in unequal outcomes in the context of an unequal society. This concern is why the first step in determining whether an assessment or identification process is biased is to decide if equal true scores are a reasonable presumption. Of course, a third possibility is that some tests used for academic identification do have some level of bias (although most systematic reviews show this not to be the case; see Kuncel et al., 2001; Sackett et al., 2008), but that

unequal opportunities have also caused group-specific differences in true score that are the major drivers of inequity in gifted education.

Interacting with the concepts of validity and assessment bias is the concept of institutional racism, which refers to systematic policies that provide for differential or unequal access to opportunities due to race (Morgan et al., 2018). This construct is especially relevant to gifted and talented education because such services often are made available based on local policies. A student might lack learning opportunities due to systematic, institutionally racist housing policies, and because of this lack of opportunities, the student may obtain lower scores on the assessment tools used for gifted and talented identification. These lower scores can be both valid indicators of the student's level of mastery and also reflective of institutional racism.

To further illustrate the concept of otherwise valid assessments highlighting the effects of institutional racism, consider the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 2010-2011 (ECLS-K:2011).. In 2015, the percentage of Black students in Grade 4 who scored "advanced" on the NAEP science test rounded to *zero*. Three percent of Asian American students scored advanced. Similarly, Reardon and Portilla (2016) reported nationally representative ECLS-L: 2011 reading achievement differences at kindergarten entry between White and Hispanic students of 0.56 of a standard deviation (on the birth cohort of ECLS). Are these achievement disparities across racial groups due to the NAEP and ECLS-K assessments being biased against Black and Hispanic students, or put another way, are these tests less-valid measures of science and reading achievement for Black and Hispanic students than they are for White or Asian students? It is possible that bias is part of the explanation, but what is more likely is that these differential rates

of achievement reflect real differences in opportunity to develop skills in science and reading that are a result of larger, systemic issues in American society.

As I outline in greater detail below, my explanation for the continuing inequity in gifted education is as follows: (a) inequality in society and institutional racism prevent students from certain demographic groups from developing their talents, (b) efforts within the field to address inequity have focused on the wrong causes, and (c) too often, the efforts that are taken to mitigate inequity actually work to exacerbate it by eliminating advanced learning opportunities in diverse schools. In addition to outlining the evidence behind this argument, I end the paper with recommendations for what it would take to make real, lasting changes to the status quo in order to improve equity within the field. Some of these efforts are small and doable within the short term, whereas others require major cultural changes and substantial societal investment.

Why is There Inequality in Gifted Education and Why is it so Hard to Address?

- 1. America as a society is a very unequal place. Inequality of access and opportunity translate to unequal levels of school readiness, academic achievement, and measured cognitive ability, such that expecting equality of almost any educational outcome would be illogical.*

Some life experiences foster human development whereas others hinder it, and different demographic groups are not exposed to either type at equal rates. What makes this all the more complicated is that some demographic groups (e.g., White) experience few adverse childhood experiences in some places, but far more in others (e.g., high rates of intimate partner violence in rural Appalachia: Shannon et al., 2015). Some students have every positive learning opportunity; others not only lack those opportunities but also are exposed to a host of negative life experiences. In the following section I summarize some of the research on these differential rates

of exposure and the impact that they have, all of which can reasonably be described as aspects of inequality and institutional racism.

Negative Life Experiences

Poverty. In 2016, one out of every five American children lived in poverty (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2019). Only nine Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) nations have higher child poverty rates than the US: Brazil, Chile, China, Costa Rica, India, Israel, South Africa, Spain, and Turkey (OECD, 2019). Moreover, there are large ethnic/racial differences in poverty rates in the US. In 2016, one out of every three Black or Native American children lived in poverty. Rates for Hispanic, Asian, and White children were 28%, 11%, and 11% respectively. Because poverty has wide-ranging negative effects on human development (Mani et al., 2013), these unequal rates of poverty lead to achievement gaps as well as longer-term differences in academic outcomes. Consider the kindergarten students of the last 30 years. From 1985 to 2000, approximately 33% of Black children were raised in a high-poverty neighborhood compared to approximately 1% of White children (Sharkey, 2013). Even if two children are identical aside from one being Black and living in concentrated poverty and the other being White and living in the suburbs, the differences in opportunities and available resources will result in achievement differences.

Geographic place is especially relevant for migrant and seasonal farmworkers who travel frequently throughout the year, 44% of whom also have children (Rosenbaum & Shin, 2005). Ninety percent of this group reported speaking or reading little to no English, and in 2000, migrant and seasonal workers reported a median income roughly \$6,250—\$35,000 lower than the median for U.S. workers as a whole. Not only is this extreme poverty a negative predictor of educational and health outcomes for the children of migrant workers, but it also coincides with

an uninsured rate of 90%, compared to an overall uninsured rate of 22% for low-income children in the U.S. Common negative health outcomes include severe asthma, Vitamin A deficiency, chemical poisoning, and high levels of mental health problems (Winkelman et al., 2013).

Differential exposure to negative environmental factors, including poverty, are one cause of lower levels of academic achievement and measured cognitive ability. There is no such thing as a *pure* measure of innate ability. Even tests of intelligence or academic ability are influenced by life experiences (Cronbach, 2002; Ritchie & Tucker-Drob, 2018).

One of the most direct ways in which poverty harms a child's development is related to the neighborhoods where individuals who are poor live. Because of how schools are funded, families experiencing poverty are also less likely to attend well-funded schools (Kelly, 2020). But poverty also suppresses brain development. Hair et al. (2015) found that children living in families below the poverty line had grey matter development in their frontal and temporal cortexes that were 8% to 9% below developmental norms. These developmental differences accounted for up to 20% of later academic achievement gaps. Experimental evidence by Chetty et al. (2016) showed that the children of families who moved from high- to low-poverty neighborhoods had higher incomes a decade later and increased rates of college attendance in comparison to their peers who did not move. Chetty et al. (2019) further noted that the geographic areas with the smallest Black-White outcome disparities were those with low poverty, low levels of racial bias, and high rates of father presence. Unfortunately, fewer than 5% of Black children grew up in these circumstances.

Lead Exposure. As recently as the year 2000, Black children in Chicago showed blood lead levels (BLL) five times greater than their White peers. Although these rates have been dropping for decades, by 2012, 75% of Chicago neighborhoods in the top quintile of BLL were

predominantly Black (Sampson & Winter, 2016). An extensive research base has documented the negative effects of BLL on measured IQ (approximately 2.6 pts lower due to excessive BLL: Schwartz, 1994) and school academic achievement (Zhang et al., 2013). Zhang et al. found that after controlling for potential confounding variables, children with elevated lead levels had twice the odds of scoring less than proficient in Grades 3, 5, or 8 than children with low lead levels. In a natural experiment, Hollingworth et al. (2020) found that the transition from leaded to unleaded fuel by racetracks had the same effect on nearby students' achievement as a family gaining \$9,000 more in income, reducing the child's class size by 10, or increasing per-pupil spending by \$2,500 per year. Further, these effects were larger for impoverished or non-white families. Lead exposure is incredibly toxic, has a real, negative impact on measured intelligence and school achievement, and is far more common in children from Black families. Lead literally impairs brain function and is a potent example of a toxin physically suppressing children's ability to develop their potential.

Adverse Childhood Experiences. Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) are traumatic events that occur in childhood and are linked to mental health problems, substance abuse, or negative educational outcomes (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020). Results from a sample of more than 214,000 adults studied from 2011–2014 indicated that compared to their White peers, Black and Hispanic individuals experienced higher rates of sexual abuse, intimate partner violence, parental separation or divorce, and incarcerated household members (Merrick et al., 2018). Overall, individuals who identified as Black, Hispanic, or multiracial, or those who were unemployed, made less than \$15,000 per year, or who identified as LGBTQ reported significantly higher levels of ACEs than comparison groups. Individuals who had experienced

four or more ACEs had five times the incidence of depression with 44% of this risk factor being attributable to the high incidence of exposure to ACEs (Merrick et al., 2019).

It is not surprising that exposure to abuse or violence has a negative effect on children, although some research has found that Black or Hispanic children are more resilient to ACEs than their White peers (Schilling et al., 2007). Koenen et al. (2003) studied a sample of 1,115 twins to isolate the effect that domestic violence has on measured IQ. When compared to mothers who reported no domestic violence, low, medium, and high levels of domestic violence were associated with a less-than one, five-, and eight-point suppression in measured IQ, respectively. Although only ~4% of the variance in IQ could be directly attributed to the exposure to domestic violence, a further 29% was attributable to the non-shared environment of the two twins, further highlighting the importance of environment on cognitive ability. Even in cases of identical twins, domestic violence resulted in lower IQ, a clear case of an environmental factor decreasing an individual's innate potential.

Police Violence. In one of the most-relevant and timely examples of the negative effects specific ACEs can have, Ang (2021) analyzed data from more than 700,000 high school students in one large, urban district from 2002 to 2017. Eighty-six percent of students in this district identified as either Black or Hispanic, 69% qualified for subsidized meals, and fewer than 10% of the students' parents were college educated. Ang found that student proximity to police violence had a significant and persistent negative effect on school attendance, GPA, high school graduation, college attendance, and mental health. In the three semesters following a police shooting, average GPAs decreased by 0.04, 0.08, and 0.07 points, respectively, and rates of students diagnosed as having emotional-behavioral disorders also increased. Even more illustrative of the trauma caused by this form of violence, the effect on student GPA was worse

when it was a police-involved killing rather than a criminal homicide, and the effect was also worse if the victim was unarmed. Students who lived nearby were twice as likely to report feeling unsafe outside of a school the year after a killing. These findings are all the more consequential because the effects were negligible for White and Asian students, further highlighting the negative burden that some students carry because of their ethnicity/race.

All of the negative experiences listed thus far are (a) disproportionately experienced by students of color and (b) can result in differences on many cognitive or school-related outcomes. Imagine a child who is screened for gifted and talented identification in Grade 3. Had she grown up in the absence of the forms of institutional racism described thus far, her true score might very well have resulted in an observed score that got her identified. But ability, aptitude, or potential do not just lay dormant in the face of negative environmental factors. Some children in a third-grade screening will not be identified because their potential has withered due to lack of opportunity and a host of negative life experiences. As I will discuss later on, combatting this source of inequity will take much more than different kinds of gifted identification protocols.

Positive Life Experiences

Prenatal Care. Not only do environmental inputs come into play before children start school, but they can have an effect even before children are born. In an analysis of all births in 2016, Osterman and Martin (2018) found that 1.1% of White mothers received no prenatal care compared to 3% of Black mothers, 3.3% of Native American mothers, and 2.1% of Hispanic mothers. Even for those who do receive care, White mothers were far more likely to start that care in the first trimester (82.3%) compared to Black, Native American, or Hispanic mothers (66.5%, 63%, and 72% respectively). Relatedly, data collected on births in California from 2005 to 2014 showed that Black women were nearly 2.5 times as likely to give birth to a low

birthweight infant compared to White women (Ratnasiri et al., 2018). Low birthweight has a substantial, negative impact on school outcomes (Chatterji et al., 2014).

Prenatal care is a useful example of the barriers that can prevent someone from accessing resources. There are many factors that go into a person attending prenatal care visits: having health insurance to pay for it, having transportation to go to the numerous appointments, knowing that prenatal care exists and is important, and having access to a healthcare provider with whom you feel comfortable. Even the most well-meaning and motivated parents in the world will not attend prenatal visits if they do not know they exist, cannot afford them, have no transportation to attend them, or feel judged or discriminated against by their provider. None of these is the fault of the individual. Instead, they reflect broader societal perspectives on whether prenatal care and access should be universally available.

Parental Expenditures on Education. Particularly prior to children beginning formal, public education, most of the education they receive comes through what their parents or caregivers can provide. Even when this education comes in the form of something like formalized childcare, it is still made available based on parental resources. Kornrich (2016) tracked parental spending on children from 1972 to 2010. In 1980, parents in the bottom 20% of family income reported spending just under \$1,000 per child on things like childcare, enrichment, books, games, toys, and babysitting. For the same year, parents in the top 10% reported spending approximately \$3,500 on the same things, a difference of \$2,500 or 3.5 times as much their lower-income peers. In 2008, the spending for families in the bottom 20% remained unchanged at approximately \$1,000 per child. For families in the top 10%, those expenditures had risen to almost \$9,000 per child. As disparate as these investments are, likely

they are gross *underestimates* of what some people are paying in terms of early learning and enrichment for their children.

The Economic Policy Institute maintains an interactive database of childcare costs by state as well as other costs such as housing and college (<https://www.epi.org/child-care-costs-in-the-united-states/>). In my home state of Wisconsin, as of July 2019, the average cost for a year of childcare for an infant was \$12,567. The cost for a four-year old was \$10,197 and both of these childcare costs were more than average annual college tuition or what the average family spends on a year of housing. These numbers represent a concrete example of differential opportunity to learn that is directly related to family income. Some children are born into homes with abundant resources and are then immersed in highly-enriched learning environments for the first four years of their lives, years that are very important in a child's development (National Research Council, 2015). Others have fewer opportunities either because opportunities cost money or because opportunities are not available in their communities. The end result is a population of students that begins formal education with a wide range in their achievement readiness (Reardon & Portilla, 2016), gaps which are very difficult to close (Reardon, 2011).

Family income, parental education, and cultural capital also play more direct roles in the gifted identification process. The 2014–2015 State of the States Report (National Association for Gifted Children, 2015) indicated that the most common time for gifted identification to occur was following a parent or teacher referral. This point means that parents with the cultural capital to advocate for their student's identification are more likely to have a student who is identified as gifted. The myriad ways that parents are able to insert themselves into the identification process may help explain the substantial SES differences in identification rates documented by Grissom et al. (2019). Card and Giuliano (2016) found that a system in which all students are screened or

considered for gifted identification—thereby removing parental advocacy as a component in the gifted process—is far more equitable. This option will be discussed below.

Childcare Access. Differences in parental income and expenditures play out as differences in access to and enrollment in high-quality, early childhood education. Children from Black families are enrolled in full-day pre-school programs at the highest rate (42% as of 2017) compared to their Hispanic (23%) or White (29%) peers (Bassok et al., 2016). Children from White (27%) and Hispanic (23%) families have similar levels of enrollment in part-time preschool, but the same cannot be said for Black (14%) children. Further, Hispanic children have the highest levels of no preschool enrollment.

Bassok et al. (2016) analyzed both waves of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS-K:1999 and ECLS-K:2011) to evaluate differences in early childhood educational experiences between 1998 and 2010. One of the most-striking findings was that 7% *fewer* of the lowest-income children were in formal, center-based childcare in 2010 than were in 1998. Instead, in 2010 there was a 6% increase in *parental care* that was not mirrored at any other income level. Although children can have wonderful learning experiences while at home with a parent, these experiences can also be more variable if the parent is caring for multiple children, is trying to work while caring for a child, or does not have the education or training to provide their child with developmentally appropriate early learning experiences.

Summary. Demographic group membership is associated with different rates of exposure to both positive and negative life experiences in the U.S. Students of color, particularly those in urban centers, are more-likely to be exposed to lead or police violence, whereas White or Asian students are more likely to come from higher-income families and be the recipients of high levels of parental spending on their development. These differences in exposure to

environmental factors mean that the field of gifted education should not expect proportionality in its service populations. The field should strive for greater equity in all areas of education and should take action to make it happen, but equal outcomes will not occur in the face of such unequal inputs.

2. *Thus far in the history of the field, most of the efforts to combat disproportional representation have focused on solving the wrong problem.*

Although assessment instruments are convenient targets to vilify, there is no compelling evidence suggesting that they play a major role in underrepresentation in gifted and talented education programs. Thus, blaming tests for underrepresentation is neither useful nor accurate and distracts us from focusing on the underlying cause. (Erwin & Worrell, 2011, p. 84)

Many solutions to disproportionality have been proposed, some have been evaluated empirically, and few have shown any effect at scale. Many of these efforts have focused on using alternative methods to locate or identify students for gifted programs. Examples of such efforts include a push to use nonverbal tests (e.g., Naglieri & Ford, 2003) and wider use of teacher rating scales (Hunsaker, 1994; Peterson, 1999) as well as performance-based identification systems (e.g., Teacher Observation of Potential in Students; Harradine et al., 2013). All of these alternative methods fall under the “use different tests” approach (Peters & Engerrand, 2016), because they all involve moving away from traditional measures of academic ability or achievement.

In an extreme application of this approach, the University of California System has dropped the ACT and SAT from its admissions process over concerns of ethnic/racial disproportionality in the student body, despite a 228-page task force report showing that using

such tests, in fact, helped *increase* Black, Hispanic, and Native American enrollment. Instead, the University of California system plans to develop a *different test* for use in admissions decisions. The problem is that doing so does nothing to combat longstanding, societal contributions to disproportionality, such as children's lead exposure in low-income neighborhoods. None of the different test efforts combat what the UC report noted as the vast disparities in quality of California's K–12 schools. None of them undo the effects of racism or the neurodevelopmental effects of poverty. In short, they do not address the root causes of the problem. Instead, they attack the mirror that is simply a reflection of the inequality in American society.

Two other approaches to increasing equity in gifted education have shown greater success despite still not addressing the underlying problems of inequality and institutional racism. In universal consideration (Lee et al., 2020; Plucker & Peters, 2016), all students are assessed for gifted and talented service eligibility rather than relying on any kind of two-phase system wherein students are only considered if they are first referred or nominated. In research by McBee et al. (2016) and Card and Giuliano (2016), equity improved as a result of universal consideration or its related cousin, universal screening. Similarly, Peters et al. (2019b) and Carman et al. (2018) found that using building norms in the identification process greatly improved the diversity of students identified as gifted. Building norms are a form of local norms in which students are identified based on how they compare to all other students in the same grade level at their school, rather than to a national norm. This method works to improve equity by changing the focus of gifted education. Instead of identifying the highest performers in the nation, the highest performers within each building are identified, resulting in serving the students most in need of additional challenge in that particular building. Although these efforts

do not directly mitigate the effects of institutional racism any more than different tests do, they do result in increased access and opportunity in the identification process.

Universal consideration helps mitigate underrepresentation by *missing* fewer students. In cases where students must first be nominated before being tested for gifted eligibility, some students are not identified simply because they were never nominated in the first place. These are students whose observed scores are high enough for them to be identified, but because of barriers in the identification process, they are never considered. These system-based challenges do contribute to underrepresentation in identification, but fixing these systems will not fully close the gap because such fixes will only help catch students whose scores have not been suppressed by ACEs or lack of opportunities as described above. Similarly, even if nonverbal tests reduce the level of English language proficiency necessary to do well on a test, this only solves the problem of one type of assessment bias and not the underlying barriers caused by larger societal inequality. Even in systems of universal consideration, underrepresentation still exists because of the systematic inequality discussed earlier. Truly mitigating differential identification rates across groups requires interventions to address score gaps that arise out of differential exposure to both positive and negative life experiences.

It is important to emphasize that schools should be responsive to the culture of the students they serve. The gifted and talented offerings in Elgin, Illinois are a good example of responsiveness where, due to a large ELL population, the district offers dual-language gifted services (Wells, 2020). Similarly, helping teachers reflect on their own implicit biases and helping schools design systems that are less exclusionary are both good ideas. These changes have led many researchers within the field to develop rating scales that might help make identification decisions less culturally loaded (e.g., Gentry et al., 2015). The lingering issue is

that although potentially valuable, none of these efforts addresses the root cause of disproportionality in K–12 gifted and talented programs and services: the underlying inequality of opportunity and institutional racism that exists within schools and within society more broadly.

3. *Too often, cutting gifted services is seen as the equitable approach.*

Many in the field of gifted education have been confronted with the myth that gifted kids will make it on their own—that they require no special services in order to flourish. It is important to understand that although some gifted kids likely *will* make it on their own without gifted education in public, K–12 schools—that is, the gifted kids who have the most cultural, social, and economic capital—there are many other gifted kids who will not. Excellence gaps (Plucker et al., 2013) provide an excellent example of this Matthew effect (Ceci & Papierno, 2005). Despite relatively spartan services across the country for all advanced learners, including a complete absence of national policy, advanced achievement rates for Asian and White students and upper income students have been climbing for years.

According to the 2017–2018 United States Office of Civil Rights data, only 9% of schools in South Dakota have any of their students served by a gifted program. Despite this fact, in 2019, 9% of South Dakota students who were *not eligible* for free or reduced-price lunch (FRPL) scored in the advanced range on the Grade 4 NAEP for mathematics compared to 2% of students who were eligible for FRPL. The number of students not eligible for FRPL scoring advanced has grown for decades; in 2000, zero students eligible for FRPL scored advanced compared to 4% of students not eligible. These same excellence gaps exist between White students and underrepresented students of color. Clearly, some students are doing fine on their own, but not all students are. Too many districts with majority-minority student populations see

gifted or advanced learning programs as racist, elitist, or just not important, so they offer fewer of them (see Gentry et al., 2019, for an example of gifted education in Title I schools; see Morton & Riegle-Crumb, 2020, for an example of who has access to eighth-grade algebra).

What growing excellence gaps show is that offering less gifted education does not translate into greater equity. When a child needs something that is not provided by the school, if parents cannot provide it via their own resources, the child simply goes without. If a child whose parents are used to spending \$20,000 a year on her education is going underchallenged in school, then her parents will open-enroll her in a different district. Welsch et al. (2010) documented that open-enrolling parents tend to be higher income. Alternatively, these parents will pay for an online learning program or a private tutor. When the children of high-SES parents need something, the parents will get it. When those children are underchallenged in school, the parents have the means to assure they are challenged outside of school. Conversely, when a student who lives in poverty is underchallenged in a school that focuses solely on remediation, she is likely to remain underchallenged, thus exacerbating excellence gaps and disparities in gifted identification.

School district officials think they are mitigating inequality by reducing their advanced course offerings when, in reality, they are more likely having the opposite effect. The problem in education is similar to the one in childcare or healthcare in America. If a family has the resources, then they can receive excellent childcare or the highest-quality healthcare. If they live in poverty, which a disproportionate number of children of color do, they do not have access to the same opportunities. In childcare, the result is large disparities in kindergarten readiness (Magnuson & Waldfogel, 2005; Reardon & Portilla, 2016). Similarly, unequal access to

advanced learning results in large and growing excellence gaps both in the form of academic achievement and also in underrepresentation in gifted and talented services.

To be clear, some gifted services should go away – at least in terms of only allowing *gifted* students to participate. Too often services that would benefit many students are restricted to a few, not because others would not benefit, but simply because the others are not *identified* as gifted. Parents have shared stories of students being denied access to creative problem-solving programs because their nonverbal ability scores were not high enough. Similarly, I have worked with districts where a third-grade student was denied any gifted services in mathematics, despite having mastered high-school level mathematics content, simply because although he was academically advanced in the subject, he did not qualify as gifted using the state criteria. Such practices are needlessly inequitable and illogical, but they should not damn all advanced learning opportunities.

What Needs to Happen?

Combatting inequity in gifted education requires mitigating both access gaps and opportunity gaps. Addressing these gaps should be done at multiple levels, which can be divided into three categories: low-hanging fruit, longer-term commitments by schools, and major societal changes. Low-hanging fruit are things that can be done with today's students and with the least cost, at least when compared to the other options. Some of these efforts go beyond mitigating opportunity gaps and, instead, are focused at just improving identification systems in general (i.e., reducing assessment error). Longer-term commitments are efforts that need to be taken to develop prerequisite skills earlier on in school so that more students from disadvantaged backgrounds are identified for and successful in advanced learning opportunities. And finally,

major societal changes are the big hurdles and governmental investments that would be needed to truly close the opportunity gaps that are at the heart of inequity in gifted education.

Low-Hanging Fruit

Low-hanging fruit for increasing equity within gifted and talented programs should start with reframing what it means to be gifted and then screening all students who might benefit from advanced learning opportunities. In short, this option involves universal consideration with local, building-level norms, especially early on in school (Worrell & Dixon, 2018). Gifted and talented services should be seen as a path to challenge students who are not being challenged through existing services. Since most services are provided at the school level, the goal should be to identify those students in every building who are most likely to go underchallenged (Peters & Borland, 2020). Local norms not only align better with the goal of gifted programs, but they also have dramatic effects on equity. Carman et al. (2018) found that applying building norms in in one of the largest school districts in the country would nearly eliminate underrepresentation for Hispanic students and those classified as English language learners, while also dramatically narrowing identification gaps for Black students or those eligible for FRPL. Implementing building norms also carries a powerful message—that there are gifted kids in *every* school, not just in wealthy schools in the suburbs. Local building norms could be implemented tomorrow in most states, with some (e.g., Illinois, New Jersey) already including them in state definitions.

Although using building norms represents an easier path to improving equity than eliminating institutional racism, there are challenges to their implementation. As described above, the parents with the most social capital are likely the ones most involved with school policy decisions and also the ones most likely to have their students identified under the current paradigm. Peters et al. (2019b) showed that building norms would result in fewer White and

Asian American students identified—though they would still be disproportionately overidentified—under a building norms system. In addition to costing more money because far more students are tested, universal consideration and local norm policies bring out concerns of “watering down” services or no longer serving students who are *truly* gifted (Peters et al., in press). Although these are very real challenges that will require dedicated and open communication on the part of schools, they are far simpler than the major societal changes needed to bring equity to gifted education.

Universal consideration is important for another reason; it bypasses the teacher nomination phase in the identification process (Fish, 2016). The most common time for gifted identification to take place is following a parent or teacher referral (National Association for Gifted Children, 2015). Starck et al. (2020) found that teachers are just as likely to hold pro-White implicit and explicit biases as anyone else. Grissom and Redding (2016) found that Black students who were in classrooms with same-race teachers were more likely to be identified as gifted. Rather than try to eliminate the potential for bias in teachers, an alternative solution is to remove teachers from the identification process altogether via universal consideration. Universal consideration has been useful in college admissions. For every 1,000 students from low-income families who scored college-ready prior to 2007, the universal (consideration) ACT policy identified another 480 in the state of Michigan (Hyman, 2017). Similarly, Project EXCITE used multiple data points collected on all students in order to identify talent that might not be evident to a teacher asked to provide recommendations (Olszewski-Kubilius et al., 2017). Harradine et al. (2014) described using the USTARS Teacher Observation of Potential in Students for teachers to rate all students. Having teachers rate all students avoided the errors that result from selective teacher ratings (when only some students are rated) and also reduced some potential

rater bias through the inclusion of a structured rubric. Too often, students are missed not because they would not benefit from a gifted service, but rather because they were never considered in the first place. Universal consideration combats that particular source of error, which disproportionately disadvantages students from traditionally underrepresented groups.

Universal consideration also means that alternative pathways are eliminated if they only serve to exacerbate inequity. Allowing parents to obtain outside testing or putting in place policies that allow parents to override universal consideration data to place their child in the talent pool only serve to make inequity worse. Families should not be able to access a back door to gifted identification by virtue of their cultural or socioeconomic capital.

Longer-Term Actions by Schools

Low-hanging fruit will not solve the problem because, as noted earlier, they actually do nothing to actually combat the root causes of disproportionality. In addition to these efforts, schools and communities need to frontload early learning experiences for students who come from less-privileged backgrounds. Ceci and Papierno (2005) made clear that closing any kind of opportunity or achievement gap will involve providing an intervention to some students (the disadvantaged students) and not to others. Plucker and Peters (2016) described such efforts as frontloading, where interventions are provided early on in school, targeted toward a specific group with the goal of overcoming opportunity gaps and repaying an education debt.

Such efforts are not a new concept in gifted education. In their 2017 *Gifted Child Quarterly* Paper of the Year on Project EXCITE, Olszewski-Kubilius et al. described an intervention to increase the number of Black students taking advanced coursework in high school by starting frontloaded, talent development interventions in third grade. Similarly, the Fairfax County, Virginia school district runs an entire Young Scholars program to nurture talent and

prepare students for rigorous coursework (Horn, 2015). Young Scholars has also been implemented through the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education program in Kentucky, Oklahoma, and throughout New England. Because some students are not exposed to the kinds of opportunities necessary to develop their potential at home or before starting formal education, Young Scholars tries to provide such opportunities as part of K–12 school.

Finally, the Elgin, Illinois school district operates an Access to Inquiry and Meaning program in targeted buildings in order to develop the potential in students who have not yet had opportunities to do so (Wells, 2020). Gifted specialists implement weekly thinking skills lessons in targeted second- and third-grade classrooms to develop student potential so that more of these students will benefit from additional advanced coursework later on. This work is not easy, nor is it cheap, but it is what is required to make real, lasting dents in inequity. On a positive note, as evidenced by the states and districts above, gifted education researchers have been engaging in these frontloading programs for more than a decade. The field of gifted education has implemented programs to actually mitigate opportunity gaps and this is an area in which past successes can serve as a model for more schools.

The challenge with frontloading is that it can be seen as a doubling of the workload of a gifted and talented department or teacher. Can gifted and talented resource specialists who are already focused on challenging students who were already underchallenged take on the task of frontloading learning experiences for a new set of students? This challenge is why such efforts are not considered low-hanging fruit and why too often equity efforts have focused on trying to find the *right* test that solves the problem of gifted identification. Gifted resource teachers are finite. If the goal is challenging students who, often because of privileged upbringing, are underchallenged while at the same time developing the potential of less-privileged students to

close equity gaps, then additional resources will be needed. Educators value equity, but are pulled in two different directions with regards to advanced learning. An investment of staff and money is required for K–12 schools to make a dent in disproportionality in gifted education. Because advanced or above-grade level learning is such a low priority for schools and one that carries considerable costs, such efforts have not taken off in most K–12 systems.

Major Societal Changes

A much more radical interpretation of equal opportunity might call for equalizing the conditional of the development of talent throughout society so that all children enjoy the same material and cultural advantages. (Hartigan & Wigdor, 1989, p. 33)

All of the efforts to mitigate inequity in gifted education described so far are band-aids on a larger problem – treatments for the symptoms, but not the disease. The disease consists of societal inequality, unequal access to the kinds of opportunities that advance human development, and systemic, institutional racism. That there should be proportionality in gifted education given the current state of inequality is a perfect example of a noble lie – something nearly everyone wants to be true, because it will not require anyone or anything to change or make any personal sacrifices, but due to the massive inequalities and institutional racism in society, it simply is not.

Grissom and Redding (2016) found that after controlling for mathematics and reading achievement, the gap in gifted identification between White and Hispanic and White and Asian students all but disappeared. The disproportional overrepresentation by Asian students and disproportional underrepresentation by Hispanic students was almost completely explained by achievement differences. However, as noted earlier, these gaps remained for Black students. What this says is that there is room to improve existing identification systems, such as the low-

hanging fruit of removing teacher referrals from the identification process, but that such low-hanging fruit will not completely close the gaps because many of them are due to differences in achievement. These differences are not due to biased assessments of achievement, but rather stem from larger societal inequality.

Large-scale societal changes will be required to achieve lasting equity within gifted education. For example, reductions in childhood poverty and lead exposure as well as increases in access to high-quality early childhood education (Garcia & Weis, 2017) would be long-term efforts aimed at reducing barriers, as would improving access to healthcare (Ickovics et al., 2014). Reducing exposure to negative stressors, such as adverse childhood experiences, police violence, and concentrated poverty are the long-term efforts most likely to result in greater equity of representation in gifted and talented services. Major societal changes should also include diversifying the teacher work force. Although universal consideration might remove teacher bias from the identification process, it does nothing to provide culturally-responsive talent development opportunities to the students of color who are now the majority of the American K–12 public school population (de Brey et al., 2019).

Cashin (2014) described how American schools typically do the opposite of what is needed to achieve equity by clustering high-poverty students together with less-experienced, overworked teachers and fewer resources. This system only serves to exacerbate inequity. In his book, *Toward Excellence with Equity*, Ferguson (2007) outlined four input goals necessary to what he describes as “youth development” – key policy targets to further excellence with equity: “High-quality parenting, high-quality teaching, high-quality youth peer cultures, and high-quality community supports” (pp. 289–290). Although targeted at youth development, these are also the kinds of major cultural changes needed in society to produce educational equity.

Less any reader think that a major social change is impossible, it has actually happened before¹. In 1965, the American poverty rate for people over age 65 was close to 30%. It fell steadily for the next 30 years and has been close to 10% ever since. Compare this to the poverty rate for children, which has been close to 20% since the early 1980s (Burkhauser et al., 2019). What caused this precipitous drop in the poverty rate for seniors? In 1965, the Social Security Act was passed establishing Medicare and Medicaid, thereby eliminating a major life stressor in lack of access to healthcare that was also a major driver of poverty among the elderly. Such major societal changes have happened before and can happen again. Although inequity in gifted education is not just about poverty, reducing poverty will increase access to learning opportunities while also reducing a number of negative life stressors. Providing access to high-quality early learning experiences to all children, regardless of race, income, or social class, while also reducing negative environmental factors that are disproportionately experienced by some demographic groups is the pathway most likely to result in narrowed racial disparities, including those seen in gifted education.

Conclusion

A final victory is an accumulation of many short-term encounters. To lightly dismiss a success because it does not usher in a complete order of justice is to fail to comprehend the process of achieving full victory. It underestimates the value of confrontation and dissolves the confidence both of a partial victory by which new efforts are powered. (King, 1968, p. 13).

The field of gifted education has never been more focused on equity. Equity is a major topic at conferences and in scholarly journals. The field also has had successes in using

¹ Credit to Jonathan Plucker for first using this example

frontloading of experiences to reduce excellence gaps (e.g., Robinson et al., 2018) and ways to miss fewer students through expanded identification systems. In just the last 10 years, major progress has been made. But the field of gifted education should avoid false dichotomies: the existence of disproportionality does not make gifted services inherently racist, nor should ongoing inequity be seen as acceptable. Scholars in the field are much more aware of the problem of inequity and substantial efforts are being expended to try and mitigate the issue. The most important requirement in moving these efforts forward is that they focus on the actual problems – that is, inequality, systemic racism, and the lack of access to talent development opportunities. Gifted education has had a number of small-scale successes in improved identification practices and in frontloading opportunities to equalize opportunities. Hopefully, these successful practices are pitstops on the road to a final victory.

References

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. American Educational Research Association.
- Ang, D. (2021). The effects of police violence on inner-city students. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 136(1), 115–168. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjaa027>
- Baldwin, A. (2006). Identification concerns and promises for gifted students of diverse populations. *Theory Into Practice*, 44(2), 105–114.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4402_5
- Bassok, D., Finch, J. E., Lee, R., Reardon, S. F., & Waldfogel, J. (2016). Socioeconomic gaps in early childhood experiences: 1998 to 2010. *AERA Open*, 2(3), 1–11.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858416653924>
- Burkhauser, R. V., Corinth, K., Elwell, J., & Larrimore, J. (2019). *Evaluating the success of President Johnson's War on Poverty: Revising the historical record using a full-income poverty measure* (National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 26532).
<https://www.nber.org/papers/w26532>
- Camilli, G. (2006). Test fairness. In R. L. Brennan (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (4th ed.; pp. 221–256). American Council on Education/Praeger.
- Card, D., & Giuliano, L. (2016). Universal screening increases the representation of low-income and minority students in gifted education. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(48), 13678–13683. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1605043113>
- Carman, C. A., Walther, C. A. P., & Bartsch, R. A. (2018). Using the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT) 7 Nonverbal Battery to identify the gifted/talented: An investigation of

- demographic effects and norming plans. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 62(2), 193–209.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986217752097>
- Cashin, S. (2014). *Place, not race*. Beacon Press.
- Ceci, S. J., & Papierno, P. B. (2005). The rhetoric and reality of gap closing: When the “have-nots” gain but the “haves” gain even more. *American Psychologist*, 60(2), 149–160.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.2.149>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020, April 3). *Preventing adverse childhood experiences*.
<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/childabuseandneglect/aces/fastfact.html>
- Chatterji, P., Kim, D., & Lahiri, K. (2014). Birth weight and academic achievement in childhood. *Health Economics*, 23(9), 1013–1035. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.3074>
- Chetty, R., Hendren, N., Jones, M. R., & Porter, S. R. (2020). Race and economic opportunity in the United States: An intergenerational perspective. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(2), 711–783. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjz042>
- Chetty, R., Hendren, N., & Katz, L. F. (2016). The effects of exposure to better neighborhoods on children: New evidence from the moving to opportunity experiment. *American Economic Review*, 106(4), 855–902. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/aer.20150572>
- Cronbach, L. J. (Ed.). (2002). *Remaking the concept of aptitude: Extending the legacy of Richard E. Snow*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- de Brey, C., Musu, L., McFarland, J., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., Diliberti, M., Zhang, A., Branstetter, C., & Wang, X. (2019). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic groups 2018* (NCES 2019-038). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/>

- Erwin, J. O., & Worrell, F. C. (2011). Assessment practices and the underrepresentation of minority students in gifted and talented education. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 30*(1) 74–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282911428197>
- Ferguson, R. F. (2007). *Toward excellence with equity: An emerging vision for closing the achievement gap*. Harvard Education Press.
- Fish, R. (2016). The racialized construct of exceptionality: Experimental evidence of race/ethnicity effects on teachers' interventions. *Social Science Research, 62*, 317–334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2016.08.007>
- Ford, D. Y. (1998). The underrepresentation of minority students in gifted education: Problems and promises in recruitment and retention. *The Journal of Special Education, 32*(1), 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002246699803200102>
- Frasier, M. M. (1991). Disadvantaged and culturally diverse gifted students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 14*(3), 234–245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016235329101400305>
- Garcia, E., & Weiss, E. (2017). *Reducing and averting achievement gaps*. Economic Policy Institute. <https://files.epi.org/pdf/130888.pdf>
- Gentry, M., Gray, A. M., Whiting, G. W., Maeda, Y., & Pereira, N. (2019). *Gifted education in the United States: Laws, access, equity, and missingness across the country by locale, Title I school status, and race*. Gifted Education Research and Resource Institute, Purdue University. <https://www.education.purdue.edu/geri/new-publications/gifted-education-in-the-united-states/>
- Gentry, M., Peters, S. J., Pereira, N., McIntosh, J., & Fugate, C. M. (2015). *HOPE Teacher Rating Scale: Involving teachers in equitable identification of gifted and talented students in K–12* [Measurement Instrument]. Prufrock Press.

- Grissom, J. A., & Redding, C. (2016). Discretion and disproportionality: Explaining the underrepresentation of high-achieving student of color in gifted programs. *AERA Open*, 2(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858415622175>
- Grissom, J. A., Redding, C., & Bleiberg, J. F. (2019). Money over merit? Socioeconomic gaps in receipt of gifted services. *Harvard Education Review*, 89(3), 337–369. <https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-89.3.337>
- Hair, N. L., Hanson, J. L., Wolfe, B. L., & Pollak, S. D. (2015). Association of child poverty, brain development, and academic achievement. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 169(9), 822–829. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.1475>
- Harradine, C. C., Coleman, M. R. B., & Winn, D. C. (2014). Recognizing academic potential in students of color: Findings of U-STARS~PLUS. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 58(1), 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986213506040>
- Hartigan, J. A., & Wigdor, A. K. (1989). *Fairness in employment testing: Validity generalization, minority issues, and the General Aptitude Test Battery*. National Academy Press.
- Hollingworth, A., Huang, M., Rudik, I. J., & Sanders, N. J. (2020). Lead exposure reduces academic performance: Intensity, duration, and nutrition matter. *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 28250*. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w28250>
- Horn, C. V. (2015). Young Scholars: A talent development model for finding and nurturing potential in underserved populations. *Gifted Child Today*, 38(1), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217514556532>

- Hunsaker, S. K. (1994). Adjustments to traditional procedures for identifying underserved students: Successes and failures. *Exceptional Children*, 61(1), 72–76.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/001440299406100107>
- Hyman, J. (2017). ACT for all: The effect of mandatory college entrance exams on postsecondary attainment and choice. *Education Finance and Policy*, 12(3), 281–311.
https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP_a_00206
- Ickovics, J. R., Carroll-Scott, A., Peters, S. M., Schwartz, M., Gilstad-Hayden, K., & McCaslin, C. (2014). Health and academic achievement: Cumulative effects of health assets on standardized test scores among urban youth in the United States. *The Journal of School Health*, 84(1), 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12117>
- Kelly, M. G. (2020). The curious case of the missing tail: Trends among the top 1% of school districts in the United States, 2000–2015. *Educational Researcher*, 49(5), 312–320.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20922999>
- King, M. L., Jr. (1968). *Where do we go from here: Chaos of community?* Beacon Press.
- Koenen, K. C., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Taylor, A., & Purcell, S. (2003). Domestic violence is associated with environmental suppression of IQ in young children. *Development and Psychopathology*, 15(2), 297–311. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954579403000166>
- Kornrich, S. (2016). Inequalities in parental spending on young children: 1972 to 2010. *AERA Open*, 2(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858416644180>
- Kuncel, N. R., Hezlett, S. A., & Ones, D. S. (2001). A comprehensive meta-analysis of the predictive validity of the graduate record examinations: Implications for graduate student selection and performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(1), 162–181.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.1.162>

- Lee, L. E., Ottwein, J. K., Peters, S. J. (2020). Eight universal truths of identifying students for advanced academic interventions. In J. H. Robins, J. L. Jolly, F. A. Karnes, & S. M. Bean (Eds.), *Methods and materials for teaching the gifted* (5th ed.; pp. 61–80). Prufrock Press.
- Lord, F. M., & Novick, M. R. (1968). *Statistical theories of mental test scores*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Magnuson, K. A., & Waldfogel, J. (2005). Early childhood care and education: Effects on ethnic and racial gaps in school readiness. *The Future of Children*, 15(1), 169–196.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2005.0005>
- Mani, A., Mullainathan, S., Shafir, E., & Zhao, J. (2013). Poverty impedes cognitive function. *Science*, 341(6149), 976–980. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1238041>
- McBee, M. T., Peters, S. J., & Miller, E. M. (2016). The impact of the nomination stage on gifted program identification: A comprehensive psychometric analysis. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 60(4), 258–278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986216656256>
- Merrick, M. T., Ford, D. C., Ports, K. A., Guinn, A. S. (2018). Prevalence of adverse childhood experiences from the 2011–2014 behavioral risk factor surveillance system in 23 states. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 172(11), 1038–1044. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2018.2537>
- Merrick, M. T., Ford, D. C., Ports, K. A., Guinn, A. S., Chen, J., Klevens, J., Metzler, M., Jones, C. M., Simon, T. R., Daniel, V. M., Ottley, P., & Mercy, J. A. (2019). Vital signs: Estimated proportion of adult health problems attributable to adverse childhood experiences and implications for prevention – 25 states, 2015 – 2017. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 68(44), 999–1005. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6844e1>
- Morgan, J. D., De Marco, A. C., LaForett, D. R., Oh, S., Ayankoya, B., Morgan, W., Franco, X., & FPG’s Race, Culture, and Ethnicity Committee. (2018, May). *What racism looks like:*

- An infographic.* Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. <http://fpg.unc.edu/sites/fpg.unc.edu/files/resources/other-resources/What%20Racism%20Looks%20Like.pdf>
- Morton, K., & Riegle-Crumb, C. (2020). Is school racial/ethnic composition associated with content coverage in algebra? *Educational Researcher*, 49(6), 441–447.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20931123>
- Naglieri, J. A., & Ford, D. Y. (2003). Addressing underrepresentation of gifted minority children using the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT). *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 47(2), 155–160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001698620304700206>
- National Association for Gifted Children. (2015). *State of the states in gifted education: 2014 – 2015*. <http://www.nagc.org/sites/default/files/key%20reports/2014-2015%20State%20of%20the%20States%20%28final%29.pdf>
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2019). *Indicator 4 snapshot: Children living in poverty for racial/ethnic subgroups*.
https://nces.ed.gov/programs/raceindicators/indicator_RADS.asp
- National Research Council. (2015). *Transforming the workforce for children birth through age 8: A unifying foundation*. The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/19401>
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P., Steenbergen-Hu, S., Thomson, D., & Rosen, R. (2017). Minority achievement gaps in STEM: Findings of a longitudinal study of Project Excite. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 61(1), 20–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986216673449>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *Child poverty*.
https://www.oecd.org/els/CO_2_2_Child_Poverty.pdf
- Osterlind, S. J., & Everson, H. T. (2009). *Differential item functioning*. Sage Publications.

- Osterman, M., & Martin, J. A. (2018). Timing and adequacy of prenatal care in the United States, 2016. *National Vital Statistics Reports*, 67(3), 1–14.
https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr67/nvsr67_03.pdf
- Peters, S. J., & Borland, J. H. (2020). Advanced academics: A model for gifted education without gifted students. In T. L. Cross & P. Olszewski-Kubilius (Eds.), *Conceptual frameworks for giftedness and talent development* (pp. 289–316). Prufrock Academic Press.
- Peters, S. J., & Engerrand, K. G. (2016). Equity and excellence: Proactive efforts in the identification of underrepresented students for gifted and talented services. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 60(3), 159–171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986216643165>
- Peters, S. J., Makel, M. C., & Rambo-Hernandez, K. (in press). Local norms for gifted and talented student identification: Everything you need to know. *Gifted Child Today*.
- Peters, S. J., Gentry, M., Whiting, G. W., & McBee, M. T. (2019b). Who gets served in gifted education? Demographic proportionality and a call for action. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 63(4), 273–287. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986219833738>
- Peters, S. J., Rambo-Hernandez, K. E., Makel, M. C., Matthews, M. S., & Plucker, J. A. (2019b). The effect of local norms on racial and ethnic representation in gifted education. *AERA Open*, 5(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858419848446>
- Petersen, J. (2013). Gender differences in identification of gifted youth and in gifted program participation: A meta-analysis. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 38(4), 342–348.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2013.07.002>

- Peterson, J. S. (1999). Gifted—through whose cultural lens? An application of the postpositivistic mode of inquiry. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 22(4), 354–383.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/016235329902200403>
- Plucker, J., Hardesty, J., & Burroughs, N. (2013). *Talent on the sidelines: Excellence gaps and America's persistent talent underclass*. University of Connecticut, Center for Education Policy Analysis.
- Plucker, J. A., & Peters, S. J. (2016). *Excellence gaps in education: Expanding opportunities for talented students*. Harvard Education Press.
- Ratnasiri, A. W. G., Parry, S. S., Arief, V. N., DeLacy, I. H., Halliday, L. A., DiLibero, R. J., & Basford, K. E. (2018). Recent trends, risk factors, and disparities in low birth weight in California, 2005–2014: A retrospective study. *Maternal Health, Neonatology and Perinatology*, 4(15), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40748-018-0084-2>
- Reardon, S. F. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. In G. J. Duncan & R. J. Murnane (Eds.), *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances* (pp. 91–115). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Reardon, S. F., & Portilla, X. A. (2016). Recent trends in income, racial, and ethnic school readiness gaps at kindergarten entry. *AERA Open*, 2(3), 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858416657343>
- Ritchie, S. J., & Tucker-Drob, E. M. (2018). How much does education improve intelligence? A meta-analysis. *Psychological Science*, 29(8), 1358–1369.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618774253>

Robinson, A., Adelson, J. L., Kidd, K. A., & Cunningham, C. M. (2018). A talent for tinkering:

Developing talents in children from low-income households through engineering curriculum. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 62(1), 130–144.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986217738049>

Rosenbaum, S. & Shin, P. *Migrant and seasonal farmworkers: Health insurance coverage and access to care*. The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation. <https://www.kff.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/migrant-and-seasonal-farmworkers-health-insurance-coverage-and-access-to-care-report.pdf>

Sackett, P. R., Borneman, M. J., & Connelly, B. S. (2008). High stakes testing in higher education and employment: appraising the evidence for validity and fairness. *American Psychologist*, 63(4), 215–227. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.4.215>

Sampson, R. J., & Winter, A. S. (2016). The racial ecology of lead poisoning: Toxic inequality in Chicago neighborhoods, 1995–2013. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research in Race*, 13(2), 261–283. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X16000151>

Schilling, E. A., Aseltine, R. H., Jr, & Gore, S. (2007). Adverse childhood experiences and mental health in young adults: a longitudinal survey. *BMC Public Health*, 7(30), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-7-30>

Schwartz J. (1994). Low-level lead exposure and children's IQ: A meta-analysis and search for a threshold. *Environmental Research*, 65(1), 42–55. <https://doi.org/10.1006/enrs.1994.1020>

Shannon, L., Nash, S., & Jackson, A. (2016). Examining intimate partner violence and health factors among rural Appalachian pregnant women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(15), 2622–2640. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515579508>

- Sharkey, P. T. (2013). *Stuck in place: Urban neighborhoods and the end of progress toward racial equality*. University of Chicago Press.
- Shores, K., Kim, H. E., & Still, M. (2020). Categorical inequality in Black and White: Linking disproportionality across multiple educational outcomes. *American Educational Research Journal*, 57(5), 2089–2131. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219900128>
- Starck, J. G., Riddle, T., Sinclair, S., & Warikoo, N. (2020). Teachers are people too: Examining the racial bias of teachers compared to other American adults. *Educational Researcher*, 49(4), 273–284. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20912758>
- Wells, A. (2020). *Achieving equity in gifted programming*. Prufrock Press.
- Welsch, D. M., Statz, B., & Skidmore, M. (2010). An examination of inter-district public school transfers in Wisconsin. *Economics of Education Review*, 29(1), 126–137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2009.07.008>
- Winkelman, S. B., Chaney, E. H., & Bethel, J. W. (2013). Stress, depression and coping among Latino migrant and seasonal farmworkers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 10(5), 1815–1830. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph10051815>
- Worrell, F. C., & Dixon, D. D. (2018). Recruiting and retaining underrepresented gifted students. In S. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *Handbook of giftedness in children* (2nd ed; pp. 209–226). Springer.
- Yoon, S., & Gentry, M. (2009). Racial and ethnic representation in gifted programs: Current status of and implications for gifted Asian American students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 53(2), 121–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986208330564>
- Zhang, N., Baker, H. W., Tufts, M., Raymond, R. E., Salihu, H., & Elliott, M. R. (2013). Early childhood lead exposure and academic achievement: Evidence from Detroit Public

Schools, 2008–2010. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(3), e72–e77.

<https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2012.301164>

Preprint

E.4 Gifted

Definition

A student is considered gifted when she/he possesses demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of exceptionally high capability with respect to intellect, creativity, or the skills associated with specific disciplines. Students who are gifted often demonstrate outstanding abilities in more than one area. They may demonstrate extraordinary intensity of focus in their particular areas of talent or interest. However, they may also have accompanying disabilities and should not be expected to have strengths in all areas of intellectual functioning.

Identification and Assessment

Early identification of students who are gifted is an important element in planning and delivering appropriate educational programs for these students. Some gifted students whose abilities are not identified and addressed early may exhibit secondary emotional and behavioural difficulties. District screening and identification procedures should be in place to ensure consistency of access to programs designed to support gifted students. Every effort should be made to ensure that screening and identification procedures are unbiased with respect to language, culture, gender, physical ability, learning or other disability.

No single criterion should be established for access to or exclusion from services for students who are gifted. Rather, identification and assessment should be carried out using multiple criteria and information from a variety of sources, all of which are valid components for identification. These should include several of the following:

- teacher observations including anecdotal records, checklists, and inventories;
- records of student achievement including assignments, portfolios, grades and outstanding talents, interests and accomplishments;
- nominations by educators, parents, peers and/or self;
- interview of parents and students; and
- formal assessments to Level C of cognitive ability, achievement, aptitude and creativity. A student who is talented in areas other than academics should also have an assessment of intellectual abilities, as it is important information for educational planning.

Planning and Implementation

Districts should provide differentiated services to meet the diverse needs of the exceptionally capable learner. Since students who are gifted form a heterogeneous population, their individual needs, experiences, aptitudes and interests vary.

Programs for students who are gifted often require a blend of opportunities available both in the school and in the community. The more extraordinary the abilities of the student, the more necessary it becomes to expand the options beyond the regular

E.4 GIFTED

classroom. Differentiated curriculum opportunities need to be designed and programming needs to be varied and flexible (classroom-based, school-based, district-based). Since no single program modification model can provide strategies that will apply to content, process, product, pacing, and learning environment, teachers of gifted students will need to draw from one or more models in order to provide an appropriate educational program that meets the individual needs of the student. This should be reflected in the student's IEP.

Regardless of how services are delivered, there are some common elements that characterize an individualized program appropriate for a student who is gifted:

- it is different in pace, scope, and complexity, in keeping with the nature and extent of the exceptionality;
- it provides opportunities for students to interact socially and academically with both age peers and peers of similar abilities;
- it addresses both the cognitive and affective domains;
- it incorporates adaptations and/or extensions to content, process, product, pacing and learning environment; and
- it goes beyond the walls of a school and into the larger community.

Supplemental services for a gifted student should contain some of the following elements, but are not limited to these:

- independent guided education;
- specialist teachers in resource centres or resource rooms;
- district and community classes;
- special groupings which provide opportunities for learning with intellectual peers;
- mentorships;
- consultative services to assist teachers in expanding experiences in the regular classroom;
- accelerating/telescoping/compacting some or all of the student's program;
- opportunities to challenge courses when appropriate; and
- opportunities to take enriched courses and to participate in Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, or honours courses.

It is important to recognize the individual characteristics of school districts and their communities in designing services for gifted students. For example, students who are gifted may benefit from the use of information technology, which will increasingly facilitate access to information sources not readily available in all communities.

Evaluation and Reporting

It is expected that districts and schools will include gifted students in regular evaluation and reporting. If there are extensive program modifications, evaluation should be based on the degree to which the individual learning outcomes are achieved. Reports of student progress should be based on the instructional objectives and procedures outlined in the student's IEP. Reports should indicate the

E.4 GIFTED

adaptations and modifications made to the student's educational program, as well as performance relative to widely held expectations. All personnel directly involved in the ongoing educational program should report on student progress.

Personnel

Teachers

The ministry expects that with sufficient training and experience classroom teachers will be capable of including most students who are gifted, and providing a program in which they can be successful, provided that specialized support is available when needed. Inservice training opportunities and a collaborative team approach are recommended to support and encourage the development of the necessary skills and understandings which the classroom teacher may require.

Support teachers with specialized training and experience in gifted education may serve as helping teachers/consultants, and may work in resource centres or with specialized cross-school groupings or special courses. Teachers with responsibility for supporting programs for gifted students should fulfill the qualifications described for learning assistance (see Section D.1 Learning Assistance Services).

In addition, these qualifications should include coursework in:

- the nature of giftedness and the needs of gifted students; and
- strategies for meeting the educational and affective needs of gifted students.

Date: May 3, 2022

ITEM 4.0

TO: Board of Education

FROM: J. David Green, Secretary-Treasurer
Shehzad Somji, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer

RE: 2022-2023 Draft Preliminary Budget Report

Reference to Education Plan:

Goal 1: The Vancouver School Board will improve student achievement, physical and mental well-being, and belonging by ...

- *Ensuring the alignment among school, district, and provincial education plans.*

Goal 2: The Vancouver School Board will increase equity by ...

- *Improving stewardship of the district's resources by focusing on effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.*

INTRODUCTION:

This report provides information about the 2022-2023 draft preliminary budget, which has a balanced operating fund. The draft preliminary operating fund budget is balanced with the appropriation of prior years' surpluses in the amount of \$10,753,451. The attached 2022-2023 Draft Preliminary Annual Budget (Appendix A) is in the PSAB format for submission to the Ministry and as such contains the budget for all funds – operating, special purpose and capital. This report is provided for information and discussion.

BACKGROUND:

The draft preliminary budget for the operating fund has been presented at Committee of the Whole meetings of the Board on April 4, 2022 and April 12, 2022. As the budget development process unfolds the draft operating fund budget changes as new information becomes available, as assumptions are revised, as staffing and student enrolment numbers are reconciled and as revenues and costs are reviewed.

The District's operating fund divisional budget to the end of March 2022 was published on the District website on April 22, 2022 for the purpose of providing trustees the opportunity to propose additions to the budget. Trustees were asked to provide their proposals for inclusion in the agenda of this meeting.

Some were provided at a budget workshop for trustees on April 27, 2022. Budget proposals have come forward from Trustees Parrott, Reddy, and Wong. As the draft preliminary budget presented with the report has a balanced operating fund, any changes made from this point forward will have to be accompanied with cost savings to maintain the balanced budget position.

The following schedule illustrates the draft operating fund budget for the previous two Committee of the Whole Meetings and the one presented in this report:

	Presented at April 4th CoTW	Presented at April 12th CoTW	Changes	May 3rd Balanced Budget
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Revenues				
Provincial Grants				
Ministry of Education	482,758,695	482,758,695	5,013,326	487,772,021
Other	62,249	62,249	-	62,249
Federal Grants	2,478,912	2,478,912	242,014	2,720,926
Tuition	19,853,038	19,853,038	870,210	20,723,248
Other Revenue	12,122,989	12,122,989	-	12,122,989
Rentals and Leases	4,891,153	4,891,153	45,865	4,937,018
Investment Income	2,889,214	2,889,214	384,619	3,273,833
Total Revenue	525,056,250	525,056,250	6,556,034	531,612,284
Expenses				
Instruction	447,274,781	446,775,399	(888,753)	445,886,646
District Administration	22,147,553	21,902,528	(123,165)	21,779,363
Operations and Maintenance	67,177,561	67,053,815	(168,667)	66,885,148
Transportation and Housing	3,190,375	3,190,375	482	3,190,857
Total Expense	539,790,270	538,922,117	(1,180,103)	537,742,014
Net Revenue (Expense)	(14,734,020)	(13,865,867)	7,736,137	(6,129,730)
Required Prior Year Surplus Appropriation	14,734,020	13,865,867	(3,112,416)	10,753,451
Net Transfers (to) from other funds				
Tangible Capital Assets Purchased	(1,790,218)	(1,790,218)		(1,790,218)
Capital Leases	(2,833,503)	(2,833,503)		(2,833,503)
Transfer from Local Capital Reserve	4,623,721	4,623,721	(4,623,721)	-
Total Net Transfers	-	-	(4,623,721)	(4,623,721)
Budgeted Surplus (Deficit), for the year	-	-	-	-

ANALYSIS:

While there have been revisions to the draft preliminary operating fund budget since the April 12, 2022 Committee of the Whole meeting based on the ongoing review of revenues and costs, there are two significant changes in the operating fund budget since the April 12, 2022 Committee of the Whole

meeting. These are a reassessment of the assumption used for inflation and the funding impact of the reconciliation of teacher staffing and student enrolment. The following schedule illustrates the changes made to the draft preliminary operating fund budget since the April 12, 2022 meeting.

Status Quo Deficit - April 12, 2022	\$ 13,865,867
Adjustment to February Enrolment Projection	(4,652,150)
Revised International Student Program Enrolment	(1,248,676)
Change in Inflation	(1,399,585)
SEA Alignment	(931,160)
Update in VLN and Summer School Programming and Enrolment	(814,735)
Change in Interest Income	(384,619)
2.7% CPI Increase on Rentals	(45,865)
SLP/Psychologist College Fees	30,000
ESA 5-Day Sick Leave	450,000
AIRS & Cafeteria Renovation by Restricted Surplus	440,000
Elementary Make-up Prep Time	451,407
Health & Safety manager	141,652
LIT Supervisors	227,594
Remove Transfer from LCR	4,623,721
Revised Deficit	<u>\$ 10,753,451</u>

Change in Inflation and Interest Income

When the assumptions used in the development of the 2022-2023 budget were first presented in January, the general inflation assumption was that costs would increase by 4.3%. There was also a projection of interest based on an interest rate of 2.15%. When the Bank of Canada raised the central bank interest rate in March and April, adjustments to the District's projected interest income were made in the amended budget and in the 2022-2023 budget. The projection for interest income for 2022-2023 has been further increased, as illustrated above due to indications from the Bank of Canada that interest rates will continue to increase through 2022-2023. The purpose of increasing interest rates by the Bank is to get inflation under control. It is a basic economic principle that inflation will slow down as interest rates increase and the inflation factor in the draft preliminary operating fund has been lowered from previous drafts of the budget, resulting in lower supplies and services costs in the budget than previously presented. This change, in part, is structural in that departments will have to operate more efficiently.

Reconciliation of Staffing and Enrolment

Throughout the budget development process, the last major work that was required is the reconciliation of staffing that have been assigned to schools by the Employee Services Department and staffing that has been allocated by formula in the budget by the Finance Department. Associated with this is ensuring that the student FTEs that are in the budget reconcile to the students, by grade, that are in schools to which staffing has been allocated. Students are entered in MyEdBC, the Ministry database for student

enrolment, by the schools they are registered in. At the time that staffing is reconciled, the Finance Department reviews the student enrolment in MyEdBC to see how closely it compares to what is in the budget, which initially is based on the February projections submitted to the Ministry, and the students that are in the staffing allocation by the Employee Services Department which is based on the number of students schools are indicating they have. One of the challenges in the budget development process is that the number of students in schools is not finally determined until they show up in schools in September. As a result, the number of students that schools are saying they have registered usually does not agree with the number of students in MyEdBC at the end of April when staffing is assigned to schools.

The February enrolment projections that were submitted were conservative, considering the uncertainty around the enrolment decline in the past two years during the pandemic. Comparing those projections, which were used in the budget to forecast most of the Ministry funding, to the students in MyEdBC on April 28, 2022, revealed that, at the secondary level (Grades 8-12), the students registered in schools were about 90 fewer than the February projection and at the elementary level (Grades K-7) there were about 600 more students in MyEdBC than the students in the February Ministry submission.

The number of secondary school students that the Employee Services Department had in the teacher staffing allocation was about 30 more than the February projection. Based on that the Finance Department was satisfied that the teacher staffing assigned to schools by the Employee Services Department agreed to the staffing in the budget.

The number of elementary school students that the Employee Services Department had in the teacher staffing allocation was even higher than the approximately 600 more students in MyEdBC on April 28, 2022 about 30 more than the February projection. Because of that the Finance Department can account for more students on the funding side without having to assign more teacher staffing. This additional funding, amounting to approximately \$4.6 million, will enable the District to balance the budget, still with an appropriation of surplus, without having to transfer funding from the Local Capital Reserve. This additional funding represents most of the \$5.0 million increase in Ministry funding shown in the table on page 2 of this report.

MANAGEMENT COMMENTS:

At the April 12, 2022 Committee of the Whole meeting there were three items that had been removed from the version that had been presented at the April 4, 2022 meeting. For the reasons provided below, these have now been incorporated in the draft preliminary budget presented tonight. These three items are:

Elementary Make-up Prep Time	\$ 451,407
Health & Safety Manager	141,652
LIT Supervisors	227,594
	<u>\$ 820,653</u>

Elementary Make-up Prep Time

The provision of elementary make-up prep time is a contractual obligation of the District, being part of the teacher collective agreement. As such, management is recognizing that obligation and including a cost in the draft preliminary operating fund budget.

Health & Safety Manager

Attached to this report is a budget proposal for this position (Appendix B). There is an initial investment in terms of cost that has the potential to provide ongoing savings in future years in the form of lower WorkSafeBC costs. Senior Management has identified this strategy as an initial step in addressing the structural deficit in the budget and has included the initial one-year cost in the balanced operating fund budget. In future years the cost of this position will be offset by rebates, freeing up money in the budget.

LIT Supervisors

The presentation of this at the April 12, 2022 Committee of the Whole meeting was incorrect. These positions were created and included in the approved budget for 2020-2021 using departmental savings and COVID funds. The positions were carried forward in the amended budget for 2021-2022 but when that budget was used as the starting point for the development of the 2022-2023 budget, there was a short fall of approximately \$71,000 because there was no more COVID funding for the period from July 2022 to October 2022. Consequently, this should have been presented as requiring \$71,000 in the 2022-2023 budget. These positions provide essential technical support for staff and students and are responsible for Cloud security and related applications, Office 365 functions, and privacy matters.

TRUSTEE PROPOSALS:

As stated in the introduction section of this report Trustees were asked to provide their proposals for inclusion in the agenda of this meeting. Some were provided at a budget workshop for trustees on April 27, 2022. Budget proposals have come forward from Trustees Parrott, Reddy, and Wong. These proposals are attached to this report as Appendix C.

RECOMMENDATION:

This report is provided for information.

Attachments:

Appendix A – 2022-2023 Draft Preliminary Annual Budget

Appendix B – Budget Proposal – Health & Safety Manager

Appendix C – Trustee Proposals

Appendix C-1 – Trustee Parrott Proposal

Appendix C-2 – Trustee Reddy Proposal

Appendix C-3 – Trustee Wong Proposal

Annual Budget

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

June 30, 2023

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

June 30, 2023

Table of Contents

Bylaw	1
Annual Budget - Revenue and Expense - Statement 2	2
Annual Budget - Changes in Net Financial Assets (Debt) - Statement 4	4
Annual Budget - Operating Revenue and Expense - Schedule 2	5
Schedule 2A - Annual Budget - Schedule of Operating Revenue by Source	6
Schedule 2B - Annual Budget - Schedule of Operating Expense by Object	7
Schedule 2C - Annual Budget - Operating Expense by Function, Program and Object	8
Annual Budget - Special Purpose Revenue and Expense - Schedule 3	10
Schedule 3A - Annual Budget - Changes in Special Purpose Funds	11
Annual Budget - Capital Revenue and Expense - Schedule 4	15

*NOTE - Statement 1, Statement 3, Statement 5, Schedule 1 and Schedules 4A - 4D are used for Financial Statement reporting only.

ANNUAL BUDGET BYLAW

A Bylaw of THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 39 (VANCOUVER) (called the "Board") to adopt the Annual Budget of the Board for the fiscal year 2022/2023 pursuant to section 113 of the *School Act*, R.S.B.C., 1996, c. 412 as amended from time to time (called the "*Act*").

1. The Board has complied with the provisions of the *Act*, Ministerial Orders, and Ministry of Education Policies respecting the Annual Budget adopted by this bylaw.
2. This bylaw may be cited as School District No. 39 (Vancouver) Annual Budget Bylaw for fiscal year 2022/2023.
3. The attached Statement 2 showing the estimated revenue and expense for the 2022/2023 fiscal year and the total budget bylaw amount of \$664,554,991 for the 2022/2023 fiscal year was prepared in accordance with the *Act*.
4. Statement 2, 4 and Schedules 2 to 4 are adopted as the Annual Budget of the Board for the fiscal year 2022/2023.

READ A FIRST TIME THE 30th DAY OF MAY, 2022;

READ A SECOND TIME THE 30th DAY OF MAY, 2022;

READ A THIRD TIME, PASSED AND ADOPTED THE 30th DAY OF MAY, 2022;

(Corporate Seal)

Chairperson of the Board

Secretary Treasurer

I HEREBY CERTIFY this to be a true original of School District No. 39 (Vancouver) Annual Budget Bylaw 2022/2023, adopted by the Board the 30th DAY OF MAY, 2022.

Secretary Treasurer

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Statement 2

Annual Budget - Revenue and Expense

Year Ended June 30, 2023

	2023 Annual Budget	2022 Amended Annual Budget
Ministry Operating Grant Funded FTE's		
School-Age	48,351,000	48,438,063
Adult	177,000	201,000
Other	1,055,625	813,500
Total Ministry Operating Grant Funded FTE's	49,583,625	49,452,563
Revenues	\$	\$
Provincial Grants		
Ministry of Education	548,849,056	549,652,609
Other	6,131,941	5,607,598
Federal Grants	2,720,926	2,457,164
Tuition	20,723,248	20,983,902
Other Revenue	33,374,002	30,007,777
Rentals and Leases	7,220,701	5,253,306
Investment Income	3,611,273	1,567,857
Amortization of Deferred Capital Revenue	23,504,152	22,524,687
Total Revenue	646,135,299	638,054,900
Expenses		
Instruction	529,421,283	527,390,713
District Administration	22,949,221	24,047,431
Operations and Maintenance	102,433,165	101,985,882
Transportation and Housing	3,321,366	3,252,935
Debt Services	149,115	76,707
Total Expense	658,274,150	656,753,668
Net Revenue (Expense)	(12,138,851)	(18,698,768)
Budgeted Allocation (Retirement) of Surplus (Deficit)	10,753,451	16,790,176
Budgeted Surplus (Deficit), for the year	(1,385,400)	(1,908,592)
Budgeted Surplus (Deficit), for the year comprised of:		
Operating Fund Surplus (Deficit)		
Special Purpose Fund Surplus (Deficit)		
Capital Fund Surplus (Deficit)	(1,385,400)	(1,908,592)
Budgeted Surplus (Deficit), for the year	(1,385,400)	(1,908,592)

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Statement 2

Annual Budget - Revenue and Expense

Year Ended June 30, 2023

	2023 Annual Budget	2022 Amended Annual Budget
Budget Bylaw Amount		
Operating - Total Expense	537,742,014	534,968,181
Operating - Tangible Capital Assets Purchased	1,790,218	3,019,461
Special Purpose Funds - Total Expense	87,407,046	88,800,518
Special Purpose Funds - Tangible Capital Assets Purchased	967,983	783,873
Capital Fund - Total Expense	33,125,090	32,984,969
Capital Fund - Tangible Capital Assets Purchased from Local Capital	3,522,640	3,409,968
Total Budget Bylaw Amount	664,554,991	663,966,970

Approved by the Board

Signature of the person of the Board	DRAFT	Signature of the Superintendent	Date Signed
Signature of the Secretary		Signature of the Treasurer	Date Signed

DRAFT - Not Finalized

April 29, 2022 13:03

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Statement 4

Annual Budget - Changes in Net Financial Assets (Debt)

Year Ended June 30, 2023

	2023 Annual Budget \$	2022 Amended Annual Budget \$
Surplus (Deficit) for the year	(12,138,851)	(18,698,768)
Effect of change in Tangible Capital Assets		
Acquisition of Tangible Capital Assets		
From Operating and Special Purpose Funds	(2,758,201)	(3,803,334)
From Local Capital	(3,522,640)	(3,409,968)
From Deferred Capital Revenue	(97,669,771)	(111,576,765)
From Leases	(4,026,280)	(2,980,480)
Total Acquisition of Tangible Capital Assets	(107,976,892)	(121,770,547)
Amortization of Tangible Capital Assets	32,575,975	32,417,450
Total Effect of change in Tangible Capital Assets	(75,400,917)	(89,353,097)
	-	-
(Increase) Decrease in Net Financial Assets (Debt)	(87,539,768)	(108,051,865)

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Schedule 2

Annual Budget - Operating Revenue and Expense

Year Ended June 30, 2023

	2023 Annual Budget \$	2022 Amended Annual Budget \$
Revenues		
Provincial Grants		
Ministry of Education	487,772,021	485,629,176
Other	62,249	62,249
Federal Grants	2,720,926	2,457,164
Tuition	20,723,248	20,983,902
Other Revenue	12,122,989	9,986,019
Rentals and Leases	4,937,018	3,844,757
Investment Income	3,273,833	1,226,971
Total Revenue	531,612,284	524,190,238
Expenses		
Instruction	445,886,646	443,814,198
District Administration	21,779,363	22,640,273
Operations and Maintenance	66,885,148	65,391,023
Transportation and Housing	3,190,857	3,122,687
Total Expense	537,742,014	534,968,181
Net Revenue (Expense)	(6,129,730)	(10,777,943)
Budgeted Prior Year Surplus Appropriation	10,753,451	16,790,176
Net Transfers (to) from other funds		
Tangible Capital Assets Purchased	(1,790,218)	(3,019,461)
Other	(2,833,503)	(2,992,772)
Total Net Transfers	(4,623,721)	(6,012,233)
Budgeted Surplus (Deficit), for the year	-	-

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Schedule 2A

Annual Budget - Schedule of Operating Revenue by Source
Year Ended June 30, 2023

	2023 Annual Budget \$	2022 Amended Annual Budget \$
Provincial Grants - Ministry of Education		
Operating Grant, Ministry of Education	474,364,156	477,141,704
Other Ministry of Education Grants		
Pay Equity	7,294,124	7,294,124
Funding for Graduated Adults	939,058	1,089,247
Student Transportation Fund	53,423	53,423
FSA Scorer Grant	41,621	41,621
Early Learning Framework		9,057
Budgeted Increase in Summer School Enrolment	427,489	
Budgeted Increase in Regular Student Enrolment	4,652,150	
Total Provincial Grants - Ministry of Education	487,772,021	485,629,176
Provincial Grants - Other	62,249	62,249
Federal Grants	2,720,926	2,457,164
Tuition		
Summer School Fees	626,776	562,723
Continuing Education	576,972	864,892
International and Out of Province Students	19,519,500	19,556,287
Total Tuition	20,723,248	20,983,902
Other Revenues		
Other School District/Education Authorities	1,150,000	1,150,000
Miscellaneous		
Instructional Cafeteria Revenue	1,000,000	1,060,740
Miscellaneous Fees and Revenue	2,544,372	3,344,778
School Generated Funds	7,428,617	4,430,501
Total Other Revenue	12,122,989	9,986,019
Rentals and Leases	4,937,018	3,844,757
Investment Income	3,273,833	1,226,971
Total Operating Revenue	531,612,284	524,190,238

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Schedule 2B

Annual Budget - Schedule of Operating Expense by Object
Year Ended June 30, 2023

	2023 Annual Budget	2022 Amended Annual Budget
	\$	\$
Salaries		
Teachers	235,415,291	236,952,969
Principals and Vice Principals	26,939,165	26,353,765
Educational Assistants	44,098,410	45,218,804
Support Staff	55,845,287	55,154,590
Other Professionals	12,099,274	12,271,782
Substitutes	10,887,982	13,810,384
Total Salaries	385,285,409	389,762,294
Employee Benefits	105,728,290	100,099,235
Total Salaries and Benefits	491,013,699	489,861,529
Services and Supplies		
Services	13,192,023	14,838,688
Student Transportation	3,175,171	3,075,149
Professional Development and Travel	1,112,326	918,804
Rentals and Leases	906,756	550,224
Dues and Fees	1,011,495	901,394
Insurance	1,021,552	903,424
Supplies	17,888,971	16,033,189
Utilities	8,420,021	7,885,780
Total Services and Supplies	46,728,315	45,106,652
Total Operating Expense	537,742,014	534,968,181

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Schedule 2C

Annual Budget - Operating Expense by Function, Program and Object

Year Ended June 30, 2023

	Teachers Salaries	Principals and Vice Principals Salaries	Educational Assistants Salaries	Support Staff Salaries	Other Professionals Salaries	Substitutes Salaries	Total Salaries
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
1 Instruction							
1.02 Regular Instruction	175,513,718	199,934	688,230	5,355,961	179,800	8,618,979	190,556,622
1.03 Career Programs	682,781	107,368		146,367	110,179	28,533	1,075,228
1.07 Library Services	5,642,186	907,106	56,093	159,447	128	274,653	7,039,613
1.08 Counselling	9,212,907	803,142		182	229,931	224,369	10,470,531
1.10 Special Education	23,108,882	2,472,883	38,794,350	408,372	2,986	679,161	65,466,634
1.30 English Language Learning	11,512,113	1,978,524	2,368,542	456,760	192,749	430,844	16,939,532
1.31 Indigenous Education	883,607	260,293	1,331,535	118,819	761	24,174	2,619,189
1.41 School Administration	-	17,913,752	3,261	11,006,043	183,841	46,682	29,153,579
1.60 Summer School	1,456,350	198,149	191,550	201,194	6,198	2,960	2,056,401
1.62 International and Out of Province Students	7,227,123	149,500	173,107	471,586	317,916	233,395	8,572,627
Total Function 1	235,239,667	24,990,651	43,606,668	18,324,731	1,224,489	10,563,750	333,949,956
4 District Administration							
4.11 Educational Administration		1,503,630		455,422	2,115,378		4,074,430
4.40 School District Governance				88,776	732,398		821,174
4.41 Business Administration		149,501		3,568,345	4,864,381	74,890	8,657,117
Total Function 4	-	1,653,131	-	4,112,543	7,712,157	74,890	13,552,721
5 Operations and Maintenance							
5.41 Operations and Maintenance Administration	175,624	295,383	491,742	1,192,457	2,096,499	184,248	4,435,953
5.50 Maintenance Operations				28,565,966	896,819	65,094	29,527,879
5.52 Maintenance of Grounds				3,599,915	169,310		3,769,225
5.56 Utilities							-
Total Function 5	175,624	295,383	491,742	33,358,338	3,162,628	249,342	37,733,057
7 Transportation and Housing							
7.41 Transportation and Housing Administration				49,675			49,675
7.70 Student Transportation							-
Total Function 7	-	-	-	49,675	-	-	49,675
9 Debt Services							
Total Function 9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Functions 1 - 9	235,415,291	26,939,165	44,098,410	55,845,287	12,099,274	10,887,982	385,285,409

DRAFT - Not Finalized

April 29, 2022 13:03

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Schedule 2C

Annual Budget - Operating Expense by Function, Program and Object

Year Ended June 30, 2023

	Total Salaries	Employee Benefits	Total Salaries and Benefits	Services and Supplies	2023 Annual Budget	2022 Amended Annual Budget
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
1 Instruction						
1.02 Regular Instruction	190,556,622	52,563,691	243,120,313	13,381,498	256,501,811	253,258,740
1.03 Career Programs	1,075,228	295,482	1,370,710	210,947	1,581,657	1,578,198
1.07 Library Services	7,039,613	1,930,606	8,970,219	1,255,204	10,225,423	9,556,924
1.08 Counselling	10,470,531	2,889,386	13,359,917	115,552	13,475,469	13,322,573
1.10 Special Education	65,466,634	19,113,495	84,580,129	949,215	85,529,344	90,268,421
1.30 English Language Learning	16,939,532	4,708,363	21,647,895	430,222	22,078,117	21,052,632
1.31 Indigenous Education	2,619,189	754,898	3,374,087	126,056	3,500,143	4,231,438
1.41 School Administration	29,153,579	7,617,960	36,771,539	1,123,319	37,894,858	36,221,478
1.60 Summer School	2,056,401	574,418	2,630,819	28,184	2,659,003	2,329,884
1.62 International and Out of Province Students	8,572,627	2,396,088	10,968,715	1,472,106	12,440,821	11,993,910
Total Function 1	333,949,956	92,844,387	426,794,343	19,092,303	445,886,646	443,814,198
4 District Administration						
4.11 Educational Administration	4,074,430	1,012,686	5,087,116	483,044	5,570,160	6,038,088
4.40 School District Governance	821,174	146,054	967,228	161,275	1,128,503	1,289,667
4.41 Business Administration	8,657,117	2,334,348	10,991,465	4,089,235	15,080,700	15,312,518
Total Function 4	13,552,721	3,493,088	17,045,809	4,733,554	21,779,363	22,640,273
5 Operations and Maintenance						
5.41 Operations and Maintenance Administration	4,435,953	1,195,536	5,631,489	1,678,266	7,309,755	7,339,263
5.50 Maintenance Operations	29,527,879	7,330,031	36,857,910	9,205,706	46,063,616	45,019,108
5.52 Maintenance of Grounds	3,769,225	850,205	4,619,430	868,710	5,488,140	5,271,349
5.56 Utilities	-	-	-	8,023,637	8,023,637	7,761,303
Total Function 5	37,733,057	9,375,772	47,108,829	19,776,319	66,885,148	65,391,023
7 Transportation and Housing						
7.41 Transportation and Housing Administration	49,675	15,043	64,718	3,126,139	3,190,857	
7.70 Student Transportation	-	-	-	-	-	3,122,687
Total Function 7	49,675	15,043	64,718	3,126,139	3,190,857	3,122,687
9 Debt Services						
Total Function 9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Functions 1 - 9	385,285,409	105,728,290	491,013,699	46,728,315	537,742,014	534,968,181

DRAFT - Not Finalized

April 29, 2022 13:03

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Schedule 3

Annual Budget - Special Purpose Revenue and Expense
Year Ended June 30, 2023

	2023 Annual Budget	2022 Amended Annual Budget
	\$	\$
Revenues		
Provincial Grants		
Ministry of Education	61,077,035	64,023,433
Other	6,069,692	5,545,349
Other Revenue	21,051,013	19,809,861
Investment Income	177,289	205,748
Total Revenue	88,375,029	89,584,391
Expenses		
Instruction	83,534,637	83,576,515
District Administration	1,169,858	1,407,158
Operations and Maintenance	2,572,042	3,686,597
Transportation and Housing	130,509	130,248
Total Expense	87,407,046	88,800,518
Net Revenue (Expense)	967,983	783,873
Net Transfers (to) from other funds		
Tangible Capital Assets Purchased	(967,983)	(783,873)
Total Net Transfers	(967,983)	(783,873)
Budgeted Surplus (Deficit), for the year	-	-

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Schedule 3A

Annual Budget - Changes in Special Purpose Funds

Year Ended June 30, 2023

	Annual Facility Grant	Learning Improvement Fund	Aboriginal Education Technology	Special Education Equipment	Scholarships and Bursaries	Special Education Technology	School Generated Funds	Strong Start	Ready, Set, Learn
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
Deferred Revenue, beginning of year	-	-	-	-	502,639	1,846,822	4,348,254	-	-
Add: Restricted Grants									
Provincial Grants - Ministry of Education	2,238,404	1,614,618				8,074,000		608,000	238,050
Provincial Grants - Other									
Other							17,329,719		
Investment Income					5,391	36,936			
	2,238,404	1,614,618	-	-	5,391	8,110,936	17,329,719	608,000	238,050
Less: Allocated to Revenue	2,238,404	1,614,618	-	-	34,822	8,110,936	17,329,719	608,000	238,050
Deferred Revenue, end of year	-	-	-	-	473,208	1,846,822	4,348,254	-	-
Revenues									
Provincial Grants - Ministry of Education	2,238,404	1,614,618				8,074,000		608,000	238,050
Provincial Grants - Other									
Other Revenue					29,431		17,329,719		
Investment Income					5,391	36,936			
	2,238,404	1,614,618	-	-	34,822	8,110,936	17,329,719	608,000	238,050
Expenses									
Salaries									
Teachers						2,139,035			
Principals and Vice Principals						280,640			
Educational Assistants								432,715	
Support Staff	1,654,665	1,248,738				1,132,820	107,812		53,743
Other Professionals						19,543			
Substitutes						81,235	918		5,118
	1,654,665	1,248,738	-	-	-	3,653,273	108,730	432,715	58,861
Employee Benefits	344,107	365,880				995,612	21,802	126,785	16,929
Services and Supplies	239,632				34,822	3,462,051	17,119,570	48,500	162,260
	2,238,404	1,614,618	-	-	34,822	8,110,936	17,250,102	608,000	238,050
Net Revenue (Expense) before Interfund Transfers	-	-	-	-	-	-	79,617	-	-
Interfund Transfers									
Tangible Capital Assets Purchased							(79,617)		
	-	-	-	-	-	-	(79,617)	-	-
Net Revenue (Expense)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Additional Expenses funded by, and reported in, the Operating Fund								141,686	

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Schedule 3A

Annual Budget - Changes in Special Purpose Funds

Year Ended June 30, 2023

			Classroom Enhancement Fund - Overhead	Classroom Enhancement Fund - Staffing	Classroom Enhancement Fund - Remedies	First Nation Student Transportation	Mental Health in Schools	Changing Results for Young Children	Safe Return to School / Restart: Health & Safety Grant
	OLEP	CommunityLINK							
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Deferred Revenue, beginning of year	89,977	220,884	-	-	-	261	2,967	2,892	-
Add: Restricted Grants									
Provincial Grants - Ministry of Education	616,294	9,581,867	4,037,077	28,674,634		130,248		6,000	
Provincial Grants - Other									
Other									
Investment Income	2,651								
	618,945	9,581,867	4,037,077	28,674,634	-	130,248	-	6,000	-
Less: Allocated to Revenue	618,945	9,802,751	4,037,077	28,674,634	-	130,509	2,967	6,000	-
Deferred Revenue, end of year	89,977	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,892	-
Revenues									
Provincial Grants - Ministry of Education	616,294	9,802,751	4,037,077	28,674,634		130,509	2,967	6,000	
Provincial Grants - Other									
Other Revenue									
Investment Income	2,651								
	618,945	9,802,751	4,037,077	28,674,634	-	130,509	2,967	6,000	-
Expenses									
Salaries									
Teachers	111,495	387,206	189,881	22,539,144					
Principals and Vice Principals		124,472							
Educational Assistants		2,613,871	1,898,033					1,011	
Support Staff	271	233,746	48,702						
Other Professionals		1,386,341	394,255						
Substitutes	53,624		566,747					1,346	
	165,390	4,745,636	3,097,618	22,539,144	-	-	-	2,357	-
Employee Benefits	42,769	1,305,921	826,379	6,135,490				607	
Services and Supplies	404,155	3,751,194	113,080			130,509	2,967	3,036	
	612,314	9,802,751	4,037,077	28,674,634	-	130,509	2,967	6,000	-
Net Revenue (Expense) before Interfund Transfers	6,631	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interfund Transfers									
Tangible Capital Assets Purchased	(6,631)								
	(6,631)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Net Revenue (Expense)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Additional Expenses funded by, and reported in, the Operating Fund		166,779	239,996						

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Schedule 3A

Annual Budget - Changes in Special Purpose Funds

Year Ended June 30, 2023

	Federal Safe Return to Class / Ventilation Fund	Seamless Day Kindergarten	CommunityLINK Other	PRP	CAYA	Assistive Technology AT-BC	PRCVI	Settlement Workers in Schools	Miscellaneous
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Deferred Revenue, beginning of year	-	-	862,445	-	2,149,893	9,690,088	683,597	371,739	975,655
Add: Restricted Grants									
Provincial Grants - Ministry of Education		50,000		2,552,407			2,431,324		
Provincial Grants - Other					3,100,000	3,154,000			
Other			657,575			1,800,000			1,173,162
Investment Income			17,228			105,500		5,894	3,689
	-	50,000	674,803	2,552,407	3,100,000	5,059,500	2,431,324	5,894	1,176,851
Less: Allocated to Revenue	-	50,000	674,803	2,552,407	3,100,000	4,829,531	2,431,324	52,703	1,236,829
Deferred Revenue, end of year	-	-	862,445	-	2,149,893	9,920,057	683,597	324,930	915,677
Revenues									
Provincial Grants - Ministry of Education		50,000		2,552,407			2,431,324		
Provincial Grants - Other					3,100,000	2,924,031		45,661	
Other Revenue			657,575			1,800,000		1,148	1,233,140
Investment Income			17,228			105,500		5,894	3,689
	-	50,000	674,803	2,552,407	3,100,000	4,829,531	2,431,324	52,703	1,236,829
Expenses									
Salaries									
Teachers				1,681,649			199,094		121,394
Principals and Vice Principals				-					
Educational Assistants		38,850	11,067	65,146				8,504	12,076
Support Staff			297,333	114,656	587,215	668,664	729,080	1,497	7,605
Other Professionals			61,917	9,723	240,035	1,058,114	218,757	92	
Substitutes				60,675				463	2,034
	-	38,850	370,317	1,931,849	827,250	1,726,778	1,146,931	10,556	143,109
Employee Benefits		11,150	36,847	509,656	227,939	360,862	320,184	2,906	37,736
Services and Supplies			265,717	110,902	2,044,811	2,741,891	953,709	35,884	190,028
	-	50,000	672,881	2,552,407	3,100,000	4,829,531	2,420,824	49,346	370,873
Net Revenue (Expense) before Interfund Transfers	-	-	1,922	-	-	-	10,500	3,357	865,956
Interfund Transfers									
Tangible Capital Assets Purchased			(1,922)				(10,500)	(3,357)	(865,956)
	-	-	(1,922)	-	-	-	(10,500)	(3,357)	(865,956)
Net Revenue (Expense)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Additional Expenses funded by, and reported in, the Operating Fund		8,070							

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)

Annual Budget - Changes in Special Purpose Funds

Year Ended June 30, 2023

Schedule 3A

	<u>TOTAL</u>
	\$
Deferred Revenue, beginning of year	21,748,113
Add: Restricted Grants	
Provincial Grants - Ministry of Education	60,852,923
Provincial Grants - Other	6,254,000
Other	20,960,456
Investment Income	177,289
	<u>88,244,668</u>
Less: Allocated to Revenue	<u>88,375,029</u>
Deferred Revenue, end of year	<u>21,617,752</u>
Revenues	
Provincial Grants - Ministry of Education	61,077,035
Provincial Grants - Other	6,069,692
Other Revenue	21,051,013
Investment Income	177,289
	<u>88,375,029</u>
Expenses	
Salaries	
Teachers	27,368,898
Principals and Vice Principals	405,112
Educational Assistants	5,081,273
Support Staff	6,886,547
Other Professionals	3,388,777
Substitutes	772,160
	<u>43,902,767</u>
Employee Benefits	11,689,561
Services and Supplies	31,814,718
	<u>87,407,046</u>
Net Revenue (Expense) before Interfund Transfers	<u>967,983</u>
Interfund Transfers	
Tangible Capital Assets Purchased	(967,983)
	<u>(967,983)</u>
Net Revenue (Expense)	<u>-</u>
Additional Expenses funded by, and reported in, the Operating Fund	<u>556,531</u>

School District No. 39 (Vancouver)**Schedule 4**

Annual Budget - Capital Revenue and Expense

Year Ended June 30, 2023

	2023 Annual Budget			2022 Amended Annual Budget
	Invested in Tangible Capital Assets	Local Capital	Fund Balance	
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Revenues				
Other Revenue		200,000	200,000	211,897
Rentals and Leases		2,283,683	2,283,683	1,408,549
Investment Income		160,151	160,151	135,138
Amortization of Deferred Capital Revenue	23,504,152		23,504,152	22,524,687
Total Revenue	23,504,152	2,643,834	26,147,986	24,280,271
Expenses				
Operations and Maintenance		400,000	400,000	490,812
Amortization of Tangible Capital Assets				
Operations and Maintenance	32,575,975		32,575,975	32,417,450
Debt Services				
Capital Lease Interest		149,115	149,115	76,707
Total Expense	32,575,975	549,115	33,125,090	32,984,969
Net Revenue (Expense)	(9,071,823)	2,094,719	(6,977,104)	(8,704,698)
Net Transfers (to) from other funds				
Tangible Capital Assets Purchased	2,758,201		2,758,201	3,803,334
Capital Lease Payment		2,833,503	2,833,503	2,992,772
Total Net Transfers	2,758,201	2,833,503	5,591,704	6,796,106
Other Adjustments to Fund Balances				
Tangible Capital Assets WIP Purchased from Local Capital	3,522,640	(3,522,640)	-	
Principal Payment				
Capital Lease	2,684,388	(2,684,388)	-	
Total Other Adjustments to Fund Balances	6,207,028	(6,207,028)	-	
Budgeted Surplus (Deficit), for the year	(106,594)	(1,278,806)	(1,385,400)	(1,908,592)

Preliminary Budget Proposal | 2022-2023

Budget Proposal Submission Instructions

Thank you for submitting a budget proposal. The Vancouver School Board believes an effective public education system will prepare students to be active, productive, and socially responsible citizens.

This submission template is meant to provide the opportunity to propose an allocation (or re-allocation) of resources in the 2022-2023 budget to support our Vision either at the School Level or the District Level.

Please complete the entries below.

Proposal A1 – Manager- Health and Safety

Allocation of Resources Proposal:

☒ **District Proposal**

☐ **School Specific Proposal** School (if applicable): _____

Key point(s) of contact (Name, title) of Submitter: Collette O'Reilly, Director, Risk Management Safety & Compliance (Pete Nuij- Associate Superintendent)

Identify at least one of the three goals and the objective of the District's Education Plan your submission falls within:

The Vancouver School Board will improve student achievement, physical and mental well-being, and belonging by ...

- Improving school environments to ensure they are safe, caring, welcoming, and inclusive places for students and families.

Explain the above choice:

Health and safety systems have their roots in shared social responsibility and are the foundational element to creating and maintaining a culture of caring and teaching students to live to their full potential. Staff who work with students and support schools must complete their work without risk to their safety in order to improve learning and learning environments. An H&S Manager as a leader is essential for H&S to function effectively and achieve and maintain the operational goal of safe schools and workplaces and continuing to position the district on the forefront of safety within K-12.

Background & Analysis

The addition of an H&S Manager to the department will permit pro-active safety and health initiatives, the District to achieve greater compliance, and the District to achieve and maintain the Certificate of Recognition (COR). In turn, achieving COR will benefit the all functions across the district by reducing hazards faced by staff and students alike, reducing injuries, and reducing costs of WorkSafeBC claim-related Assessments. Approximately \$1.3 million will be saved over a 4 year cycle by achieving COR. These funds can support key functions in other departments.

Please provide a description of how your proposal contributes to improving student learning (150 words max)

As we have witnessed in the past two years, safety is a foundational element to student learning and health. Ensuring staff who work with students and support schools are fully aware of how to complete their work safely is necessary to improving and optimizing student learning and learning environments. H&S support of the school systems as a whole is vital to student learning.

Recommendations

District staff recommend the addition of a permanent 1.0 FTE H&S Manager position and for SMT to commit financially and operationally to seeking COR.

Budget Implications

Achieving COR with WorkSafeBC will produce an annual rebate from WCB Assessments.

Estimated rebate: ~\$490,000 starting in 2024 (for the 2023 year – WorkSafeBC operates on a calendar year) and every year after while COR is maintained.

Budget Impact (\$)				
FTE	Salaries & Benefits	Supplies	Revenue	Total
1.0	\$142,000	\$25,000 (every 4 years)	\$487,000 (rebate on WCB Assessments)	Net savings of \$178,000 end of year 2. Savings of ~\$800,000 in a 4-year cycle

One-time	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ongoing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Trustee Parrott Proposals

	FTE	Unit Cost	Total Cost
1 Teacher librarian not to do prep time, instead do teacher librarian time			
remove librarian prep but need to hire others = \$0 impact			
but need to hire additional FTE to meet ratio	12.26		FTE
<u>Option 1 TTOC</u>			
	12.26	\$ 89,775	\$ 1,100,642
or			
<u>Option 2 Teachers</u>			
	12.26	\$ 111,844	\$ 1,371,213
2 Library Prep to be used for music program?			
if #1 above is implemented - no extra cost as the 12.26 FTE will do doing music			\$0
or			
if #1 above is not implemented - same cost as #1 because need to hire to maintain ratio			
		hire TTOC	\$ 1,100,642
or		hire Teachers	\$ 1,371,213
3 Absence non-enrolling replaced on first day			
	3,555	475	\$ 1,688,625
4 8 safe and caring school added liaisons (1 at each sec)			
	8	\$ 70,760	\$ 566,080
5 Add 5 sec teacher counsellor, placement to be determine			
	5	\$ 127,380	\$ 636,900
6 10 elem counsellor, placement to be determined			
	10	\$ 127,380	\$ 1,273,800
7 Ad hoc committee - Kindergarten teacher need help in classroom as new kids joining K are behind due to COVID			
			staff extra time
Total			
		#1 use TTOC	\$ 5,266,047
		or #1 use teachers	\$ 5,536,618

Date of meeting (May 3, 2022)

TO: Board of Education

FROM: Jennifer Reddy, Trustee

RE: Notice of Motion – 2022-2023 Budget Proposal Regarding Anti-Racism In Service Training

Reference to Strategic Plan:

Goal 4: Provide effective leadership, governance and stewardship.

- *Develop and implement a long term financial planning model.*
- *Implement the recommendations of the Long Range Facility Plan.*
- *Effectively utilize school district resources and facilities.*
- *Support effective communication, engagement and community partnerships.*
- *Advocate for public education.*
- *Implement the recommendations of the Sustainability Action Plan.*

Reference to VSB Policy:

Please indicate if the proposed motion relates to an existing policies from the [Board Policy Handbook](#). You must check one or more boxes.

☐

Relates to Policy No.

☒

This is an action motion and does not change or contradict any existing policies from the Board Policy Handbook.

PROPOSED MOTION:

that the 2022-2023 budget include an additional \$159,311.00 (page 9 of preliminary operating budget) to continue engaging independent experts to design and deliver anti -racism training for all educators with a focus on ongoing anti-Black, anti-Indigenous and anti-Asian racism, race-based data collection, racist history of BC, and race-based incident reporting.

And that this training be at least one full day of in-service training, referencing child rights, VSB policies and procedures on discrimination, hate, racism, SOGI, and incident reporting and response.

And that this training be mandatory for all employee groups (teachers, support staff, principles, senior staff, trustees) in the 2022-2023 school year with continued follow-up to obtain feedback and make needed changes.

RATIONALE:

Whereas:

1. Vancouver continues to experience hate and racist incidents and parent groups such as District Parent Advisory Council (DPAC) and public budget presentation by Nora, Alicia, Christine, and Leona note: re-occurring nature of hate and racist incidents; wide-spread and pervasive racism experienced by all people of colour including Black, Indigenous and Asian communities; importance of race-based data

collection, and; hate and racist incident reporting that needs school-board support while being community-led¹

2. Stakeholder group 2022-2023 budget presentations in support of continued in-service anti-racism training

3. Hate and racist issues are complex and changing such that a status training as a part of on-board only will embed the incorrect theory that anti-racism work is a checkbox rather than a practice

4. Intention and ongoing anti-racist stance by all VSB employees is necessary to ensure the rights and safety of all students and staff

5. The upcoming anti-racism and non-discrimination strategic plan will be a strong foundation and will include previous successful district all-staff inservice training

6. That the two line items for professional and consulting services (2004 and 2066) be transferred in order to cover the cost of this motion

¹ 2022-2023 Committee of the Whole Budget Presentations

Preliminary Budget Proposal | 2022-2023

Budget Proposal Submission Instructions

Thank you for submitting a budget proposal. The Vancouver School Board believes an effective public education system will prepare students to be active, productive, and socially responsible citizens.

This submission template is meant to provide the opportunity to propose an allocation (or re-allocation) of resources in the 2022-2023 budget to support our Vision either at the School Level or the District Level.

Please complete the entries below.

Proposal A1 – Increase Library Support to Schools

Allocation of Resources Proposal:

x District Proposal

☐ *School Specific Proposal* *School (if applicable): All schools in their flex budgets*

Key point(s) of contact (Name, title) of Submitter: Trustee Wong

Identify at least one of the three goals and the objective of the District's Education Plan your submission falls within:

Goal 1: The Vancouver School Board will improve student achievement, physical and mental well-being, and belonging by ...

- Ensuring the alignment among school, district, and provincial education plans.

Goal 2: The Vancouver School Board will increase equity by ...

- Improving stewardship of the district's resources by focusing on effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.

Explain the above choice:

This proposal provides an opportunity for students to become more aware of racism in society which will support their mental health and sense of belonging. As a one-time proposal I feel the benefits will outweigh the additional cost.

Background & Analysis

I would like to propose that we add in the budget a \$1/student increase in library resource funding. One time funding increase (as such, not structural). I think it could be rounded to \$50,000.

This is coming from the Friends of the School Library delegation a couple of months ago. They were specifically focused on anti-racism anti-discrimination related resources.

Their unconfirmed statement was that we currently fund \$5/student. They stated Surrey funds \$6.25/student, West Van \$6.50/student and Langley at \$7/student.

I would like for the additional funding to have a focus on Anti-Racism information for students.

Please provide a description of how your proposal contributes to improving student learning (150 words max)

With the recent adoption of the Board's new Education Plan, the receipt of the Stronger Together Anti-Racism and Anti-Discrimination Engagement 2021 Report and the pending Anti-Racism and Non-Discrimination Strategic Plan it is crucial to have concrete steps towards fostering and increasing a sense of belonging for every student. Having impactful resources reflective of our diverse student, staff and community is a small step to address library resource funding and the Board's educational direction.

Recommendations

Currently, an allocation for library resources is provided to schools in their flex budgets. This proposal would increase that allocation for the 2022-2023 school year and would be part of the flex budget process for schools.

Budget Implications

I would propose that District consulting budgets be reduced by \$50,000.

Budget Impact (\$)				
FTE	Salaries & Benefits	Supplies	Revenue	Total
n/a	n/a	\$50,000	n/a	\$50,000

One-time ☒
 Ongoing ☐

VANCOUVER SCHOOL DISTRICT SPECIAL BOARD / COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

May 3, 2022

 Vancouver
School District

1



INDIGENOUS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Please join me in acknowledging that we are unlearning and relearning
on the traditional and unceded lands of the
xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), and səliwətaʔ (Tsleil-Waututh) Nations



xʷməθkʷəy̓əm
(Musqueam)



Skwxwú7mesh
(Squamish)



səliwətaʔ
(Tsleil-Waututh)

2

Motion to Appoint Secretary-Treasurer

That, to ensure the meeting is constituted in accordance with the School Act, the Board of Education appoints Shehzad Somji as the Secretary Treasurer for the meeting.

3

Live Streaming & Recordings

The meeting is being live-streamed and the audio and visual recording will also be available to the public for viewing after the meeting.

The footage of the meeting may be viewed inside and outside of Canada.



4

Meeting Decorum

It is our Board's responsibility to ensure that our meetings are conducted in a safe and respectful manner.

As a Board of Education for a school district, it is important that we model the behavior that we expect of students in their schools.

Roll Call

ITEM 2

Motion to Dissolve into the Committee of the Whole

ITEM 3.1.1 Delegation

Su-Laine Brodsky

The “Revisioning MACC” Plan: Higher Cost, Higher Inequity

Su-Laine Brodsky, Vancouver Parent

sulaine@sulainebrodsky.com

Presented May 3, 2022

9

Introduction

- Context:
 - VSB has announced a plan to “revision” MACC
 - Current MACC model: Full-time year-round program for gifted students
 - Proposed Enrichment Centre model: 6-week program using teacher referral and/or student self-referral as the sole entry criteria
- About me:
 - Strathcona resident
 - Parent of a child in Kindergarten at Admiral Seymour
 - Parent of a child in Grade 4 MACC at Osler

10

The “revised” program will cost more

	Current MACC Model	Enrichment Centre Model
<i>Additional teaching staff required</i>	0	4 full-time teacher positions
<i>Transport service required</i>	School bus if needed	School bus will be needed to maintain equity of access for less-mobile families
<i>Level of administration required</i>	Low	Higher due to student turnover every 6 weeks

11

What will the VSB get for this extra cost?

- Supposedly, “revisioning” MACC will improve equity
- It is good that the VSB is willing to spend money to improve equity
- However, the proposed plan **will not improve equity** and will probably make it worse

12

The proposed admissions process for Enrichment Centres is highly inequitable

- Assumes that using teacher referral and/or student self-referral *as the only criteria* is a relatively equitable way to identify students with advanced learning needs
- Research does not support this assumption
- Evidence shows that teacher referrals are a strong source of bias, not a solution to bias
- Students with high social confidence are more likely to self-refer
 - Students with high social confidence are less likely to have disabilities, less likely to be ELL, and less likely to have experienced poverty, racism, or bigotry

13

VSB will still be required to identify gifted students after the proposed “revisioning”

B.C. requires districts to identify gifted students and provide them with an IEP and differentiated services

“Early identification of students who are gifted is an important element in planning and delivering appropriate educational programs for these students.”

“District screening and identification procedures should be in place to ensure consistency of access to programs designed to support gifted students.”

“Districts should provide differentiated services to meet the diverse needs of the exceptionally capable learner.”

- *Special Education Services: A Manual of Policies, Procedures And Guidelines*, B.C. Ministry of Education, 2016, pp. 53-55. The quoted pages are in an attached PDF file, or can be downloaded from https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/education/administration/kindergarten-to-grade-12/inclusive/special_ed_policy_manual.pdf

14

VSB's current gifted identification process will remain in place for most of its services at the elementary level

- The VSB's current gifted identification process has significant systemic bias
 - Much of the bias is due to factors under the VSB's control
 - Systemic bias in the VSB's process has increased in the past year
- Under the proposed plan, most services for gifted elementary students will continue to use the current, biased identification process:
 - IEP (300 elementary students)
 - All supports in the regular classroom (~220 elementary students)
 - For comparison: MACC serves 80 elementary students

15

Under this plan, the VSB will be
wasting money on a
counterproductive, superstition-
based initiative

16

Instead: Give priority in funding to evidence-based equity initiatives

- Involve experts on the intersection between gifted education and equity
 - Education faculty at UBC and SFU are glad to help
- Preserve high-quality gifted services such as MACC
 - Defunding gifted services exacerbates inequity
 - See attached article, “The Challenges of Achieving Equity within Public School Gifted and Talented Programs” by Scott Peters
 - MACC is a low-cost, high-impact program
- Implement universal screening for giftedness in Grade 3
 - Robust evidence
 - Canadian examples: Toronto, York, Coquitlam
 - Washington State House Education Committee recently gave unanimous, bipartisan support to Bill HB 1611, *Advancing equity in programs for highly capable students*, which mandates universal screening
 - Evidence also supports using nonverbal tests and building-level norms
 - Consider lowering the cutoff score so that more students are considered gifted

17

ITEM 3.1.2 Delegation

Kyla Epstein

18

ITEM 4

2022-2023 Draft Annual Budget Update

19

2022-2023 Draft Preliminary Budget

	Presented at April 4th CoTW	Presented at April 12th CoTW	Changes	May 3rd Balanced Budget
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Revenues				
Provincial Grants				
Ministry of Education	482,758,695	482,758,695	5,013,326	487,772,021
Other	62,249	62,249	-	62,249
Federal Grants	2,478,912	2,478,912	242,014	2,720,926
Tuition	19,853,038	19,853,038	870,210	20,723,248
Other Revenue	12,122,989	12,122,989	-	12,122,989
Rentals and Leases	4,891,153	4,891,153	45,865	4,937,018
Investment Income	2,889,214	2,889,214	384,619	3,273,833
Total Revenue	525,056,250	525,056,250	6,556,034	531,612,284
Expenses				
Instruction	447,274,781	446,775,399	(888,753)	445,886,646
District Administration	22,147,553	21,902,528	(123,165)	21,779,363
Operations and Maintenance	67,177,561	67,053,815	(168,667)	66,885,148
Transportation and Housing	3,190,375	3,190,375	482	3,190,857
Total Expense	539,790,270	538,922,117	(1,180,103)	537,742,014
Net Revenue (Expense)	(14,734,020)	(13,865,867)	7,736,137	(6,129,730)
Required Prior Year Surplus Appropriation	14,734,020	13,865,867	(3,112,416)	10,753,451
Net Transfers (to) from other funds				
Tangible Capital Assets Purchased	(1,790,218)	(1,790,218)	-	(1,790,218)
Capital Leases	(2,833,503)	(2,833,503)	-	(2,833,503)
Transfer from Local Capital Reserve	4,623,721	4,623,721	(4,623,721)	-
Total Net Transfers	-	-	(4,623,721)	(4,623,721)
Budgeted Surplus (Deficit), for the year	-	-	-	-

20

What's changed from April 12th

Status Quo Deficit - April 12, 2022 \$ 13,865,867

Adjustment to February Enrolment Projection	(4,652,150)
Revised International Student Program Enrolment	(1,248,676)
Change in Inflation	(1,399,585)
SEA Alignment	(931,160)
Update in VLN and Summer School Programming and Enrolment	(814,735)
Change in Interest Income	(384,619)
2.7% CPI Increase on Rentals	(45,865)
SLP/Psychologist College Fees	30,000
ESA 5-Day Sick Leave	450,000
AIRS & Cafeteria Renovation by Restricted Surplus	440,000
Elementary Make-up Prep Time	451,407
Health & Safety manager	141,652
LIT Supervisors	227,594
Remove Transfer from LCR	4,623,721

Revised Deficit \$ 10,753,451

- Enrolment and staffing have been reconciled and finalized
 - + 590 K-12
 - + 119 International students
- Eliminated inflation factor for all Dept. budgets
- Interest rate forecast updated
- Budget for 5-day sick leave provision per Employment Standards Act
- Elementary make up prep time (contractual)
- LIT Supervisors
- Health & Safety Manager
- No transfer from Local Capital

VSB Vancouver School District

21

Elementary Make-up Prep

- Provision under the Collective Agreement
- Recognizing obligation
- Estimated budget ~ \$451,000

VSB Vancouver School District

22

Health & Safety Manager

- Initial investment to implement Certificate of Recognition (COR)
- COR will reduce hazards faced by students and staff
- COR provides annual rebates to employers
- Position will pay for itself from year 2
- Initial investment ~ \$142,000

23

LIT Supervisors

- Incorrect presentation at April 12th meeting
- Positions were approved in 2020-2021 budget using COVID funds and departmental savings
- Provide essential technical support for students and staff
- Responsible for Cloud security and related applications, Office 365 functions and privacy matters
- Need funding in 2022-2023 for July – October as COVID funding has ceased
- Funding required ~ \$71,000

24

Trustee Parrott's Proposals

1. Teacher librarian not to do prep time, instead do teacher librarian time
remove librarian prep but need to hire others = \$0 impact
but need to hire additional FTE to meet ratio 12.26 FTE
Option 1 TTOC

12.26 \$ 89,775 \$ 1,100,642

or
Option 2 Teachers

12.26 \$ 111,844 \$ 1,371,213

2. Library Prep to be used for music program?

if #1 above is implemented - no extra cost as the 12.26 FTE will be doing music

\$ -

or

if #1 above is not implemented - same cost as #1 because need to hire to maintain ratio

hire TTOC \$ 1,100,642

or hire Teachers \$ 1,371,213

3. Absence non-enrolling replaced on first day

3,555 \$ 475 \$ 1,688,625

4. Additional 8 Safe and Caring School Liaisons (1 at each Secondary)

8 \$ 70,760 \$ 566,080

5. Additional 5 Secondary Teacher Counsellors, placement to be determined jointly with VSTA

5 \$ 127,380 \$ 636,900

6. Additional 10 Elementary Counsellors, placement to be determined jointly with VESTA

10 \$ 127,380 \$ 1,273,800

7. Ad hoc committee - Kindergarten teacher need help in classroom as new kids joining K are behind due to COVID

staff extra time

Total #1 use TTOC \$ 5,266,047

or #1 use teachers \$ 5,536,618

VSB Vancouver School District

25

Trustee Reddy's Proposal

that the 2022-2023 budget include an additional \$159,311.00 (page 9 of preliminary operating budget) to continue engaging independent experts to design and deliver anti-racism training for all educators with a focus on ongoing anti-Black, anti-Indigenous and anti-Asian racism, race-based data collection, racist history of BC, and race-based incident reporting.

And that this training be at least one full day of in-service training, referencing child rights, VSB policies and procedures on discrimination, hate, racism, SOGI, and incident reporting and response.

And that this training be mandatory for all employee groups (teachers, support staff, principles, senior staff, trustees) in the 2022-2023 school year with continued follow-up to obtain feedback and make needed changes.

VSB Vancouver School District

26

Trustee Wong's Proposal

I would like to propose that we add in the budget a \$1/student increase in library resource funding. One time funding increase (as such, not structural). I think it could be rounded to \$50,000.

This is coming from the Friends of the School Library delegation a couple of months ago. They were specifically focused on anti-racism anti-discrimination related resources.

Their unconfirmed statement was that we currently fund \$5/student. They stated Surrey funds \$6.25/student, West Van \$6.50/student and Langley at \$7/student.

I would like for the additional funding to have a focus on Anti-Racism information for students.

Next Steps

- **May 18, 2022** – Finance Committee
- **May 19 – 27, 2022** – Staff finalize budget based on May 18, 2022, Finance Committee discussion
- **May 30, 2022** – Three readings and adoption of 2022-2023 budget bylaw.

Structural Deficit Statement

There are many strategies that the Board could consider in addressing the impact of the structural deficit in the District's budget. To implement deficit reducing strategies, the Board must recognize that financial resources are limited and to support students in schools they must be allocated judiciously and as equitably as possible. The funding the District receives is inadequate in supporting the cost structure in the budget. While one could argue that Ministry funding should be increased, the reality is that the cost structure in the budget is too high. This has become particularly evident during the declining student enrolment trend the District is experiencing and has been exacerbated by reduced enrolment in the International Student Program, a program that provides significant non-Ministry funding. In addition, the higher cost associated with maintaining many old buildings and operating more sites than are required to meet the current educational needs of students contribute to the structural deficit.

Failure to address the structural deficit will lead to the eventual inability of the District to create a balanced budget, as required by the *School Act*.

ITEM 5

Motion to Rise and Report from the Committee of the Whole

ITEM 6

Motion to Reconvene the Board Meeting

31

ITEM 7

Business from the Committee of the Whole

32

ITEM 8

ADJOURNMENT

Thank you for your time,

The End