MEDIA RELEASE: Friday, April 26, 2013, 4:30 p.m.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Tuesday, April 30, 2013
2:30 p.m.
(Immediately following Administration & Finance Committee)
Regional Council Chamber
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

Please note time change

1. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

2. DELEGATIONS

3. REQUEST TO REMOVE ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA

4. MOTION TO APPROVE ITEMS OR RECEIVE FOR INFORMATION

   a) P-13-051, Waterloo Region Museum – 2012 Highlights and Plans for 2013 (Information) 1
   b) PH-13-017, Quarterly Charged/Closed Food Premises Report (Information) 10
   c) PH-13-018, Waterloo Catholic District School Board School Nutrition Policy (Information) (Attachment distributed separately to Councillors only) 11
   d) Memo: 2011-2012 Community Labour Market Analysis 14
   e) Memo: Child Care Fee Subsidy Online Application 35
   g) Memo: Canada Learning Bond Forums 37
   h) Memo: Complex Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and Developmental Trauma Conference (Brochures distributed separately to Councillors and Senior Staff) 39
   i) Memo: Won’t You Be My Neighbour: Crime Prevention, Social Capital and Neighbourhood Cohesion in Waterloo Region 41
j) Conestoga College Partners Enhancing Practice Leadership **Team Award** to Region of Waterloo Children’s Services

**REGULAR AGENDA RESUMES**

5. **REPORTS** – Social Services
   a) **SS-13-015**, Funeral Rates
   b) **SS-13-016**, Immigration Partnership – Waterloo Region

6. **OTHER BUSINESS**
   a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information **Tracking List**

7. **NEXT MEETING** – May 28, 2013

8. **ADJOURN**
RECOMMENDATION:

For Information

SUMMARY:

Many highlights mark the first 12 month season at the Waterloo Region Museum in 2012. Attendance and facility usage at Waterloo Region Museum reached almost 69,000 people, an increase of approximately 20% as compared to 2011. Earned revenues from admission, education programs, facility rentals, retail, food service and memberships rose by approximately 65% as compared to 2011 (Attachment 2).

The museum partnered with many community organizations to host the first Waterloo Region Heritage Fair in May and a First Peoples’ Festival and a Forest Festival in October.

The museum received a Canada Green Building Council Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) Silver Standard designation for environmental design in the museum building.

The Waterloo Region Museum anticipates significant increases in attendance and earned revenues in 2013, in conjunction with the museum’s hosting of travelling exhibits such as CIRCUS! Science under the Big Top. The target attendance for 2013 is 80,000 (see Attachment 1) and earned revenues are targeted to increase by 25% over 2012 (see Attachment 2).

The trending of attendance and earned revenues in 2012, and as projected in 2013, reflect the projected outcomes included in the Waterloo Region Museum Business Plan prepared in 2007.

REPORT:

2012 Highlights

The year 2012 marked the 55th anniversary of providing public education and historical preservation of buildings and artifacts at the campus of historical facilities known as the Waterloo Region Museum, including Doon Heritage Village, the Waterloo Region Hall of Fame, Waterloo Region Curatorial Centre, and the Waterloo Region Museum.

Attendance and Public Engagement

Attendance in 2012 totalled 68,631 representing an increase of 20% as compared with attendance in 2011 (Attachment 1).
During the 2012 calendar year 24,060 students, teachers and parent volunteers participated in the museum’s curriculum-based education programs, representing the highest attendance for education programs in the history of the museum. Unfortunately, the cancellation of extracurricular activities, including field trips, by elementary and secondary school teachers resulted in the cancellation of several school visits in December.

Museum staff work closely with Curriculum and Learning Consultants and Superintendents responsible for communication at both local school boards to develop and promote programs that relate directly to the Ontario school curricula. Special initiatives in 2012 included:

- hosting Waterloo Catholic District School Board (WCDSB) professional development sessions on First Nations, Métis, and Inuit curriculum and sensitivity;
- hosting a Waterloo Region District School Board (WRDSB) professional development day for Secondary School history teachers, including presentations on the museum’s new education programs;
- hosting WRDSB Eco-School Day Awards ceremony and activities; and
- communication with officials in neighbouring school boards to distribute education program materials to their schools.

The museum’s partnership with the Alzheimer Society Kitchener Waterloo continues in presenting Gather at the Gallery, a program aimed at people with early stage dementia and their families.

The museum partnered with the Ontario Historical Society and the Waterloo Historical Society, which celebrated its 100th anniversary in 2012, to organize and host a conference and awards banquet in June with speakers and participants from across the province.

One of the goals of the Waterloo Region Museum is to serve as a centre for community gatherings, including private functions such as marriages and wedding receptions. In 2012, 17 ceremonies and 28 wedding receptions were held in the village’s Church and/or the Grand Foyer of the museum.

**Earned Revenues**

Increased attendance has resulted in increased earned revenues from admission, education programs, facility rentals, retail and food service, as shown in Attachment 2. Earned revenues in 2012 increased by more than 65% as compared to 2011, with growth in all areas of the museum’s operation.

**Volunteers**

Last year, more than 900 individuals volunteered more than 16,000 hours at the Waterloo Region Museum – greeting visitors, engaging visitors in the buildings in the living history village, gardening, promoting the museum, preserving artifacts, maintaining reproduction costumes, and serving on the board of the Friends of Waterloo Region Museum. A large number of volunteers support the Waterloo Wellington Children’s Groundwater Festival and EcoFest by serving on organizing committees, and demonstrating and teaching at each of the events’ activity centres.

The Friends of Waterloo Region Museum make a significant contribution to the life of the museum each year. The public programs the Friends co-hosted with the museum in 2012, notably the Story Telling Series and Starry Night, help to increase the two organization’s visibility in the community and engage new audiences. The Friends made financial donations to the First Peoples’ Festival and toward the purchase of reproduction clothing worn by staff and volunteers in the living history village.

The museum hosted four museum studies interns from Fleming College, two each from the Collections Conservation and Management Program and the Museum Management and Curatorship Program. Each intern’s full-time 15 week placement, allowed them to complete hands-on tasks as well as special research projects tied to the museum collection and exhibit programs.
Marketing

Marketing of the museum and its exhibits and events utilizes all local media outlets (print, radio and television), social media sites such as Facebook and Twitter, and promotional partnerships.

The museum’s marketing mix also includes: Attractions Ontario; City of Cambridge – leisure guide; City of Kitchener – leisure guide; City of Waterloo – leisure guide; CityParent; Drayton Entertainment; Exchange Magazine; Grand Magazine; Kitchener Waterloo Symphony; Ontario Tourism; Parent-Child Guidebook; Princess Cinema; Regional Tourism Organization 4; SNAP; Waterloo Region Catholic School Board; Waterloo Region District School Board; and Waterloo Region Tourism Marketing Corporation.

Whenever possible, the museum’s promotional material recognizes all of the museums owned and operated by the Region. For example, in 2012 several print ads were coordinated to cross-promote Waterloo Region Museum (including Doon Heritage Village), Joseph Schneider Haus and McDougall Cottage, and promotional trade show banners with a consistent format were created for each site.

Use of the museum’s website (www.waterlooregionmuseum.com) increased 40% in 2012. In July the museum introduced a monthly e-newsletter sent to subscribers to inform them about upcoming events and activities. The Waterloo Region Museum website includes links to the other two Regional museums, plus all other local museums, galleries and archives.

The museum took the lead on several community marketing partnerships:

- created and then partnered with other area museums and attractions, Waterloo Region Tourism Marketing Corporation and the Waterloo Region Record to launch Passport To Play to promote tourism in Waterloo Region. Other participants in 2011/2012 included: Cambridge Butterfly Conservatory, Castle Kilbride, City of Waterloo Museum, Homer Watson House and Gallery, Joseph Schneider Haus, The Mennonite Story and Historic Mill Museums, and Themuseum. In 2012/13 Cambridge Galleries, the Kitchener-Waterloo Art Gallery and the Canadian Clay and Glass Gallery have joined the partnership.
- entered into a partnership with Regional Tourism Organization 4 (RTO 4) and their online booking service for attractions, accommodations and dining, that allows independent travelers to select, create and pay for a travel package online. The museum has also developed promotional packages directly with several area hotels and through Waterloo Region Tourism Marketing Corporation (WRTMC).

The museum participated in the Ontario Motor Coach Association Marketplace aimed at motor coach tour operators. The museum also hosted a familiarization tour for motor coach operators from Ontario, New York and Ohio.

Exhibits and Collections Preservation

The exhibit Coming of Age located at the north end of the museum’s long term gallery opened in March. The exhibit looks at the universal aspects of growing up during the teenage years such as fashion, home entertainment, local hangouts, music and slang.

The Waterloo Region Hall of Fame, located in the Waterloo Region Museum, inducted six individuals and one organization in 2012. The museum developed interpretive panels including the exhibition of associated objects for each inductee. Artifacts from the Waterloo Region Museum collection were lent to the City of Waterloo Museum and Joseph Schneider Haus for their exhibit programs.

The Waterloo Region Museum continues to attract high quality donations of artifacts. In total, 46 individuals, families and local businesses donated several hundred artifacts to the museum in 2012,
valued in excess of $13,000. In addition, funds previously donated for this purpose were used to purchase 65 artifacts.

Noteworthy acquisitions in 2012 include:

- In 1901, the Ontario Sugar Company of Toronto planned to build the first sugar beet mill in Canada in either Dunnville or Berlin, ON. Berlin was chosen and a mill was built, beginning operations in 1902. In its first year, the factory produced six million pounds of sugar from sugar beets. The Berlin Sugar Beet Company closed in 1923. The museum acquired a set of eight black and white glass slides showing the interior of the mill including mill workers, equipment and piles of sugar beets.

- Waterloo Region’s industrial history includes many shoe and boot manufacturers. Getty & Scott Ltd., formed in 1899 and incorporated in 1906, was located in Galt. The company was known for their Classic shoe line for women and children. The museum acquired a wood advertising sign that includes a colour image of the factory dating from 1906 to 1912.

- The first Canadian S.S. Kresge department store opened on King Street West in Kitchener in 1928. The museum acquired a weight scale vending machine that sat in front of the store through the 1970s. The art deco designed machine dispensed small paper tickets printed with your weight, your lucky numbers, some words of wisdom, and a photo of a movie or recording star.

  Fashion conscious teens in the 1960s and 1970s in Waterloo Region wore locally-made Ingo sweaters; the museum acquired two Ingo sweaters. Ingo Knitwear was founded by Ingo Schoppel in 1959. Schoppel and his small staff, including family members, first knit all of their sweaters in their home. In 1965 the company moved to a factory in Waterloo. In the early 1990s, Ingo Knitwear went bankrupt but Schoppel formed Ingo Inc. which is still in operation as of 2012.

- Aeryon labs donated an Aeryon Scout™ small Unmanned Aerial System (sUAS) mock-up to the museum. In 2007, Aeryon Labs Inc. was founded in Waterloo. The Scout provides immediate aerial imagery and data to military, public safety, and commercial users for a diverse array of applications.

The museum maintains its database of more than 45,000 artifacts, documenting the collections on exhibit in the museum, the living history village and in storage in the Waterloo Region Curatorial Centre. The museum’s catalogue records are provided to Artefacts Canada, a national on-line database of artifacts from museums across the country administered by the Department of Canadian Heritage (www.chin.gc.ca). Through the Artefacts Canada database, the public and other museums have access to the Waterloo Region Museum collection.

Facilities

The museum re-erected a train station semaphore, or signal pole, at the north end of the Petersburg Train Station, following the restoration of the semaphore.

Plans for 2013

Attendance and Public Engagement

The museum’s attendance target for 2013 is 80,000 guests. The museum’s target for attendance by casual visitors represents an increase of 33% to 40,000 people, representing one-half of the museum’s total visitation. Much of this increase will be from attendance at travelling exhibits such as CIRCUS! Science under the Big Top.
Visitor statistics for the months of February and March, while *CIRCUS! Science under the Big Top* has been on exhibit at the museum has met staff expectations. Noteworthy is that during March Break 2013, visitation was 7,000 guests as compared to 800 during the same nine day period in 2012.

Early in 2013, the museum has experienced a challenging period for education program visitation, which may impact attendance in school programs. The cancellation of extracurricular activities including field trips by public elementary and secondary schools has resulted in reduced bookings for school visits over the winter months, and in the traditionally busy months of May and June. The decision in late March by the Elementary Teachers’ Federation of Ontario to allow their members to resume extracurricular activities has resulted in increased education program bookings for the remainder of this school year.

Staff has planned numerous events, workshops and activities for the 2013 season with a continuing emphasis on new community partnerships, audience development and in association with the museum’s exhibits. Noteworthy among these partnerships is the museum’s involvement in the community-wide recognition of World Refugee Day in June; this partnership involves many community organizations engaged in refugee support. The museum will host a reception and speakers on June 18 in honour of World Refugee Day.

In February, the museum partnered with CityParent to host the CityParent Family Show, a free one-day trade show with entertainment, exhibitors and seminars for children and families. The museum will host the Forever Young Lifestyle Show in September with products and services geared to seniors.

The Waterloo Historical Society will unveil a commemorative plaque near the entrance to the museum, celebrating their 100*th* anniversary. The unveiling will take place on Saturday, May 18 to coincide with International Museum Day.

The museum will partner with *Building Stories*, an on-line national inventory of historic buildings developed and maintained by the Heritage Resource Centre and the Computer Systems Group at the University of Waterloo, to create a mobile app tour of the museum and buildings in the living history village. The app, which is free to download, is compatible with BlackBerry, iPhone and Android devices. The tour will offer value-added information about each building for visitors; the museum anticipates launching the app in August.

**Earned Revenues**

The earned revenue target for 2013 is $515,000 representing an increase of 25% over 2012. Much of this increase will be from increased earned revenues during travelling exhibits such as *CIRCUS! Science under the Big Top*.

Earned revenues for the months of February and March, while *CIRCUS! Science under the Big Top* has been on exhibit at the museum, have exceeded staff expectations. Noteworthy is that during March Break 2013, as compared to March Break 2012, total earned revenues were $56,000 as compared to $7,500 – an increase of 750%.

On an ongoing basis, staff review fees charged for programs that generate earned revenues such as admission, education programs, facility rentals, retail and food service, taking into account the local market, competition and industry standards. The museum reviewed fees as part of preparation of the 2013 operating budget, and recommended an increase to the fee charged for rental of the Grand Foyer for private functions. Regional Council approved this fee increase, effective January 1, 2014, in concurrence with approval of the 2013 Operating Budget and the Fees & Charges By-law. The museum will review fees again as part of the preparation of the 2014 operating budget.
Marketing

Membership in the Region of Waterloo museums (Waterloo Region Museum, Joseph Schneider Haus and McDougall Cottage) has increased dramatically since the beginning of 2013. As of April 1, 2013 paid memberships total 709 families and individuals, representing an astounding 160% increase from the 270 paid memberships at the beginning of the year. The increase in membership is a direct result of up selling by the museum’s guest services staff during the exhibit CIRCUS! Science under the Big Top and the prospect of return visits to see the living history village and museum exhibits that are planned in the future. The museum has targeted to reach 1000 paid memberships by the end of 2013.

Museum memberships also offer the benefit of complimentary reciprocal admission at other museums and galleries, e.g. the Bruce County Museum in Southampton was added as reciprocal admission partner in 2012. The museum is investigating how to best manage this larger membership base so that communication with members, renewal notices and payments can be processed efficiently.

Recognizing the importance of the education market, the Waterloo Region Museum and Joseph Schneider Haus are participating in the American Association for State and Local History Visitors Count! survey of teachers and students. Implementation of the survey was originally planned for the fall of 2012 and winter of 2013, but the cancellation of extracurricular activities by elementary and secondary school teachers resulted in too few survey responses about the Region’s museums. The survey will continue through the 2013/14 school year; the results will help establish benchmarks for the Region’s museums and compare our performance to museums across North America. The Region’s museums will use these results to adjust programs and marketing to meet the education audience needs.

Exhibits and Collections Preservation

Exhibits that will be hosted at the Waterloo Region Museum in 2013 include:

- **CIRCUS! Science under the Big Top** – from the Ontario Science Centre. This exhibit opened on Feb. 9 and is open through Sunday, May 5.
- **Torn from Home: My Life as a Refugee** – from the Lied Discovery Children’s Museum, augmented with local stories about refugees who have settled in Waterloo Region, opens on Saturday, June 1 through Monday, Sept. 2.
- **Trees: Inside and Out** – from the Arbor Day Foundation opens on Tuesday, October 1 through Sunday, Jan. 5, 2014.

Smaller exhibit installations, researched and designed by the museum, that have or will be installed this year include:

- Drive In movie theatres – located in the Christie® Theatre.
- Opera and opera houses – located in the Christie® Theatre.
- Ceva Romanesc – the 2013/14 community highlight exhibit in the museum’s long term gallery includes artifacts, interpretive text and six videos on the Romanian culture in Waterloo Region.
- Waterloo Region Hall of Fame 2013 Inductees – feature exhibits on each of the eight 2013 Hall of Fame inductees. From April 28 through spring 2014.
- Mackenzie King – Mackenzie King was inducted into the Waterloo Region Hall of Fame in 1972. A special Hall of Fame interpretive panel is being developed to recognize Canada’s longest serving Prime Minister.
- War Memorial – on the mezzanine of the long term exhibit gallery, in conjunction with the Waterloo Region Hall of Fame; this video installation lists all war dead from Waterloo Region along with photographs from each of the world conflicts.
The museum’s artifact database is reaching the end of its useful life. In conjunction with Joseph Schneider Haus and Information Technology Services, the museum is investigating replacing our databases with one integrated product that meets current museum and information technology standards. This integration may include the Region of Waterloo Archives, so that historical information can be searched simultaneously and shared from all three collections.

The museum is a recipient of an annual Community Museum Operating Grant (CMOG) from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport. In 2010, 2011 and 2012 the museum’s policies, procedures and actions were reviewed by the Ministry. To remain in compliance with the Ministry’s Community Museum Standards and to continue to be eligible for CMOG, the museum will be reviewing and updating its exhibition policy and developing a process for evaluating exhibits.

Facilities

Capital projects and major maintenance projects planned in 2013 include:

- construction of a modern greenhouse located near the Region of Waterloo Curatorial Centre to support the heritage gardens in the living history village;
- replacement of the front doors of the Freeport United Brethren Church;
- repairs to selected timbers in the Shuh Barn, located at the Peter Martin Farm; and
- replacement of the chiller and associated HVAC upgrades at the Region of Waterloo Curatorial Centre.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Area municipal staff is informed of events and activities at the Waterloo Region Museum, and will receive a copy of this report.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Supporting initiatives that promote and enhance arts, culture and heritage are directly related to Growth Management Focus Area 2, Action 2.4.2: Provide opportunities to optimize the use of Regional cultural facilities, with a focus on the new Waterloo Region Museum.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The initiatives listed for 2012 and 2013 are funded through approved budgets administered by Planning, Housing and Community Services.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Capital projects at the Waterloo Region Museum are administered by Corporate Resources, Facilities Engineering.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 – Waterloo Region Museum Annual Attendance
Attachment 2 – Waterloo Region Museum Earned Revenue

PREPARED BY:  Tom Reitz, Manager/Curator, Waterloo Region Museum
APPROVED BY:  Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
## Attachments 1 - Waterloo Region Museum Annual Attendance

### TOTAL ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>35,736</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>24,060</td>
<td>19,757</td>
<td>18,816</td>
<td>20,256</td>
<td>18,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Visitors</td>
<td>53,725</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>30,582</td>
<td>27,421</td>
<td>19,825</td>
<td>16,751</td>
<td>15,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Clients:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,989</td>
<td>9,517</td>
<td>9,294</td>
<td>4,542</td>
<td>3,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings – External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,049</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings – Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,860</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>89,461</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>68,631</td>
<td>56,695</td>
<td>47,935</td>
<td>41,549</td>
<td>38,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Business Plan for the Waterloo Region Museum was completed in August 2007 by TCI Management Consultants, to accompany the Region of Waterloo's application to Cultural Spaces Canada. The Business Plan projected attendance over seven calendar years, i.e. 2010 through 2016.

The Business Plan projections included in the table above are for the seventh year of the museum’s operation. The museum’s targets for attendance in 2013 suggest that the museum will meet or slightly exceed the consultants’ projections for this step in the museum’s operations, and are in line with meeting projections in year seven.

TCI did not project attendance for “other museum clients”, such as weddings and meetings; this attendance is included in their projection of casual visitors.

Doon Heritage Village was closed in 2009 during construction of the Waterloo Region Museum.

### EDUCATION PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WRDSB</td>
<td>12,444</td>
<td>9,624</td>
<td>9,978</td>
<td>11,958</td>
<td>10,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCDSB</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>2,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Non Board</td>
<td>9,219</td>
<td>8,115</td>
<td>6,515</td>
<td>6,573</td>
<td>5,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,060</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,816</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,256</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,985</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRDSB – Waterloo Region District School Board  
WCDSB – Waterloo Catholic District School Board  
Other/Non Board – includes neighbouring school boards, home schools, and EcoFest

### YOUTH PROGRAMS (included in Casual Visitors attendance above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer fun camps</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum day camp</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,037</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,176</strong></td>
<td><strong>774</strong></td>
<td><strong>956</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,024</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADULT PROGRAMS (included in Casual Visitors attendance above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Tours</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture/Workshop</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,766</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,358</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,566</strong></td>
<td><strong>771</strong></td>
<td><strong>916</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment 2 - Waterloo Region Museum Earned Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business Plan Projection*</th>
<th>2013 Target $</th>
<th>2012 Actual $</th>
<th>2011 Actual $</th>
<th>2010 Actual $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>592,491</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>80,268</td>
<td>59,194</td>
<td>40,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>144,015</td>
<td>85,021</td>
<td>42,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility rentals</td>
<td>41,474</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>76,390</td>
<td>33,361</td>
<td>10,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>59,249</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>12,860</td>
<td>5,546</td>
<td>6,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>148,123</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,677</td>
<td>35,737</td>
<td>23,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food service</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>57,703</td>
<td>32,926</td>
<td>10,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>841,337</strong></td>
<td><strong>515,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>416,913</strong></td>
<td><strong>251,785</strong></td>
<td><strong>134,615</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Business Plan for the Waterloo Region Museum was completed in August 2007 by TCI Management Consultants, to accompany the Region of Waterloo’s application to Cultural Spaces Canada. The Business Plan projected earned revenues over a five year period, i.e. 2010 through 2015.

The Business Plan assumed an increase in earned revenues of 2.5% per year. Earned revenues, year over year, have increased significantly more than projected in the Business Plan.

The Business Plan projections included in the table above are for the fifth year of the museum’s operation. The museum’s targets for earned revenue in 2013 suggest that the museum will exceed the projections for facility rentals; other categories of earned revenues are trending to meet the Business Plan projections.

Although not included as an earned revenue, the Business Plan projection for revenue from grants and donations in 2012 is $68,200. In 2012, actual grants and donations received totalled $110,263, with significant grants and donations from the Province of Ontario (Community Museum Operating Grant), Summer Jobs Service administered by Lutherwood, and the Friends of Waterloo Region Museum.

Doon Heritage Village was closed in 2009 during construction of the Waterloo Region Museum.
TO: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee

DATE: April 30, 2013       FILE CODE: P10-80

SUBJECT: QUARTERLY CHARGED/CLOSED FOOD PREMISES REPORT

RECOMMENDATION:
For information

SUMMARY:
This report is a summary of food premises enforcement activities conducted by Public Health Inspectors in the Health Protection and Investigation Division for the first quarter of 2013.

REPORT:
During the first quarter of 2013 no establishments were charged and no establishments ordered closed under the Health Protection and Promotion Act, Ontario Food Premises Regulation 562.

Food premises charges and closures can be viewed on the Food Premises Inspection Reports website Enforcement Actions Page for a period up to 6 months from the date of the charge or closure. Every food premises charged has the right to a trial and every food premises ordered closed, under the Health Protection and Promotion Act, has the right to an appeal to the Health Services Appeal and Review Board.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:
Health and Safe Communities: Support safe and caring communities that enhance all aspects of health.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:
NIL

ATTACHMENTS
NIL

PREPARED BY: Chris Komorowski, Manager, Food Safety, Recreational Water Programs and Cambridge & Area Team

APPROVED BY: Dr. Liana Nolan, Commissioner/Medical Officer of Health
TO: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee

DATE: April 30, 2013

FILE CODE: P13-80

SUBJECT: WATERLOO CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD SCHOOL NUTRITION POLICY

RECOMMENDATION:

For information

SUMMARY:

This report highlights the partnership between Region of Waterloo Public Health and the Waterloo Catholic District School Board pertaining to school nutrition policy and the resultant process evaluation of the Waterloo Catholic District School Board Elementary School Food and Nutrition Policy. Overall, results from the evaluation suggest that most parents, students and educators are aware of and understand the Waterloo Catholic District School Board Elementary School Food and Nutrition Policy. Moreover, despite initial concerns about implementing the nutrition policy, the results indicate that the policy is well supported by the school community and schools found it easier to implement the nutrition policy standards than originally thought.

REPORT:

The Waterloo Catholic District School Board, in partnership with Region of Waterloo Public Health, was one of the first school boards in Ontario to develop and adopt comprehensive school nutrition policies. These policies affect 40,000 students across fifty-one secondary and elementary schools in the Waterloo Catholic District School Board. The Food and Nutrition Policy for Secondary Schools was adopted in 2007 and the Food and Nutrition Policy for Elementary Schools (herein referred to as “the nutrition policy”) was adopted in 2009. These school nutrition policies apply to all food and beverages that are sold and offered at school. They do not apply to foods that are brought from home for a child’s own consumption. These nutrition policies ensure that good nutrition is promoted in theory and in practise throughout the school day. This comprehensive approach engages the entire school community (e.g. students, staff, and parents) in healthy eating.

In 2011, the Ontario Ministry of Education implemented the School Food and Beverage Policy/Program Memorandum 150 (PPM 150) which applied to all schools in the province of Ontario. At this time the Waterloo Catholic District School Board nutrition policy was revised to reflect the language in the Ministry’s policy but maintained the parts of the policy which exceeded those mandated by PPM 150. It is important to note that PPM 150 only pertains to foods that are sold to students and does not include foods that are offered at school or foods that are used as a fundraiser off school property.

Many programs and activities, some of which are on going, helped support and promote the nutrition policy. In particular, Waterloo Catholic District School Board and Region of Waterloo Public Health have collaborated to deliver school nutrition workshops for students from all fifty-one Catholic
elementary and secondary schools. The workshops provided students with support to champion good food practices in schools and raise awareness about the nutrition policy. Other support activities included a presentation for principals to help explain the nutrition policy to staff, training on the nutrition policy standards for teachers, letters to school lunch vendors to ensure that they were in compliance with the standards, initiation of school nutrition teams, networking sessions with the school community, and monthly updates in the school newsletters.

Developing a school nutrition policy is a public health strategy that may positively affect students’ eating habits. Schools have been identified as a key setting for public health strategies that aim to lower or prevent the prevalence of chronic disease. In Ontario, public health units are mandated by the Ontario Public Health Standards to work with school boards to influence the development of healthy policies and the creation or enhancement of supportive environments to address healthy eating. Overall, it is unlikely that chronic disease trends can be reversed without strong school based policies and programs to support healthy eating.

Given the importance of comprehensive school nutrition policies and given that there are no other Ontario examples to learn from, the Waterloo Catholic District School Board and Region of Waterloo Public Health thought it was important to document and evaluate the elementary school nutrition policy implementation process. The evaluation will help Region of Waterloo Public Health staff know how to better support the continued implementation of the nutrition policy and may also be useful to share with other school boards who may be considering adopting and implementing similar policies. This information may also be useful to other public health units interested in pursuing policy initiatives with the school boards with which they work.

This evaluation explored perceptions of parents, principals, teachers, and students regarding the nutrition policy implementation process. It did not attempt to determine if the nutrition policy has improved overall student health. Data was gathered through a parent survey, principal interviews, teacher interviews, and student focus groups. Key informant interviews were also held with the Region of Waterloo Public Health nutritionist and Waterloo Catholic District School Board staff person responsible for developing and supporting the implementation of the nutrition policy.

Overall, results from the evaluation suggest that most parents, students and educators are aware of and understand the Waterloo Catholic District School Board Elementary School Food and Nutrition Policy. Moreover, despite initial concerns about implementing the nutrition policy, the results indicate that the policy is well supported by the school community and schools found it easier to implement the nutrition policy standards than originally thought. Several facilitating factors of the policy implementation process were identified; however, there are also various barriers to implementation that are evident. These are outlined in the attached report.

Policy implementation is not a linear process and so while the nutrition policy has been in place for three years, the following are recommendations made in the report for how nutrition policy implementation can continue to be supported.

1. The Waterloo Catholic District School Board and Region of Waterloo Public Health should continue to provide strong support and leadership with respect to the nutrition policy. Two key components of this support should be education and communication. Education for new staff and students and parents needs to be maintained. Communication needs to be ongoing to correct any misconceptions and continually draw attention to the nutrition policy. Furthermore, it is essential to continue to explain and communicate the importance of the nutrition policy to the school community. This will ensure a higher degree of buy in and acceptance. Tailoring the education and communication strategies to the needs of busy staff and parents will be important. Ensuring that there is dedicated support and resources for personnel and nutrition policy monitoring is also crucial.

2. Region of Waterloo Public Health’s interventions related to healthy eating, physical activity, and
mental health need to be integrated. Educators are looking for a comprehensive school health approach as it is more effective and efficient. Opportunely, a recent decision within Region of Waterloo Public Health will see the creation of a team dedicated to a comprehensive school health approach.

3. Region of Waterloo Public Health and the Waterloo Catholic District School Board should continue working with schools to ensure that tasty, nutritious, and reasonably priced food choices are available. They can also provide suggestions for healthy food alternatives to help support policy implementation. Given that the taste of the food is so important to students, schools can involve students (and parents) to determine the most favourable food items that meet policy standards.

4. As a process evaluation, this research has only looked at issues pertaining to the implementation of the nutrition policy. In order to determine if the implementation of the nutrition policy results in positive outcomes on student health, a much more in-depth outcome evaluation would be required after the nutrition policy has been in place for a significant length of time.

ONTARIO PUBLIC HEALTH STANDARDS:

This report provides information related to the compliance with Requirement 3.0 under the Chronic Disease Prevention Standards which states that: The board of health shall work with school boards and/or staff of elementary, secondary, and post-secondary educational settings, using a comprehensive health promotion approach, to influence the development and implementation of healthy policies, and the creation or enhancement of supportive environments to address the following topics:

- Healthy eating;
- Healthy weights;
- Comprehensive tobacco control;
- Physical activity;
- Alcohol use; and
- Exposure to ultraviolet radiation.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Focus Area 4.2: Foster healthy living through information, education, policy development and health promotion.
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Background and Purpose

The Waterloo Catholic District School Board (WCDSB)\(^1\), in partnership with Region of Waterloo Public Health (ROWPH), was one of the first school boards in Ontario to develop and adopt comprehensive school nutrition policies. These policies affect 40,000 students across 51 secondary and elementary schools in the WCDSB. The Food and Nutrition Policy for Secondary Schools was adopted in 2007 and the Food and Nutrition Policy for Elementary Schools (herein referred to as “the nutrition policy”) was adopted in 2009 \(^1\). These school nutrition policies apply to all food and beverages that are sold and offered at school\(^2\). They do not apply to foods that are brought from home for a child’s own consumption. These nutrition policies ensure that good nutrition is promoted in theory and in practise throughout the school day. This comprehensive approach engages the entire school community (e.g. students, staff and parents) in healthy eating.

In 2011, the Ontario Ministry of Education implemented the School Food and Beverage Policy/Program Memorandum 150 (PPM 150) \(^2\) which applied to all schools in the province of Ontario. At this time the WCDSB nutrition policy was revised to reflect the language in the Ministry’s policy but maintained the parts of the policy which exceeded those mandated by PPM 150. It is important to note that PPM 150 does not include foods that are offered at school or foods that are used as a fundraiser off school property.

Developing a school nutrition policy is a public health strategy that may positively affect students’ eating habits \(^3,4,5\). Schools have been identified as a key setting for public health strategies that aim to lower or prevent the prevalence of chronic disease. In Ontario, public health units are mandated by the Ontario Public Health Standards to work with school boards to influence the development of healthy policies and the creation or enhancement of supportive environments to address healthy eating \(^6\). Overall, it is unlikely that chronic disease trends can be reversed without strong school based policies and programs to support healthy eating \(^7\).

Given the importance of comprehensive school nutrition policies and given that there are no other Ontario\(^3\) examples to learn from, the WCDSB and ROWPH thought it was important to document and evaluate the nutrition policy implementation process. Documentation and evaluation are necessary to help learn what has gone well and what can be improved. Information from this study will help ROWPH staff know how to better support the continued implementation of the nutrition policy and may also be useful to share with other school boards who may be considering adopting and implementing

---

1 WCDSB schools are located in the Waterloo Region of Southwestern Ontario.
2 Foods that are sold include lunches or snacks offered by the school and food in vending machines. Foods that are offered include food brought in by parents or teachers for classroom celebrations or food given to students as rewards.
3 At the point of writing there were only two known studies of school nutrition policies in Canada \(^8,9\),
similar policies. This information may also be useful to other public health units interested in pursuing policy initiatives with the school boards with which they work.

**Methodology**

This evaluation explored perceptions of parents, principals, teachers, and students regarding the nutrition policy implementation process. It did not attempt to determine if the nutrition policy has improved overall student health. Data was gathered through a parent survey, principal interviews, teacher interviews, and student focus groups. Key informant interviews were also held with the ROWPH nutritionist and WCDSB staff person responsible for developing and supporting the implementation of the nutrition policy.

The ROWPH nutritionist was involved in implementing the nutrition policy and therefore was not involved in collecting data or writing the report to ensure objectivity. The Public Health Nutritionist was involved in planning the study, helping with question design, and doing some analysis. The Public Health Planner had no connection to the nutrition policy and was unknown to staff and students at the schools. Therefore, the planner was given responsibility for data collection, some analysis, and final report writing.

Elementary schools were chosen as the focus of the documentation and evaluation study since this is where students begin their formal school experience. The goal was to have six to eight elementary schools participate in the evaluation. Schools were chosen to represent the variety of the WCDSB in terms of geographical location, socio-demographic makeup, and participation in nutrition policy workshops. The University of Waterloo (UW) was conducting a study involving schools at the same time and so to avoid burdening the same schools with research requests, the study selected a sample from the list of schools that were not part of the UW study.

Based on the desire to gather a diverse sample, ten schools were short-listed to be included in the study. School administrators were called and follow up emails were sent to invite them to participate in the study. When a school declined, another school with similar characteristics was invited to participate. In the end, five schools agreed to participate in all parts of the study and one school agreed to participate in the principal interview and parent survey.

This report begins by describing the development and implementation of the nutrition policy as well as the supports provided to schools during the implementation process. This information comes from the interviews with the ROWPH nutritionist and WCDSB’s “Active, Healthy Living” consultant as well as a review of policy implementation work plans. The text boxes contain perceptions and opinions heard during these interviews.
Policy Development

The idea of a WCDSB school nutrition policy started when a physical education teacher at a secondary school noticed that, after teaching students about healthy eating, students would leave the gym and go to the vending machines to find only unhealthy food. The teacher worked with the Healthy Choices Committee to look at other school nutrition policies and design something that would be suitable for the WCDSB. Senior management approved the WCDSB Food and Nutrition Policy for Secondary Schools in 2007.

The next step was to consider elementary schools as well. In 2008, a representative from the WCDSB, the new Healthy, Active Living consultant, approached ROWPH about creating a policy for elementary schools. ROWPH agreed. Policy standards were developed in part from the 2006 “Call for Action” document put forward by the Ontario Society for Nutrition Professionals in Public Health. This document laid out nine essential elements for a healthy school nutrition environment. The draft nutrition policy was presented to senior WCDSB administrators who suggested that the language be strengthened by changing phrases from “should consider” to “will”. The policy was revised and then approved in the spring of 2009 with the intention of implementation beginning in the new school year.

Table 1 gives an overview of the nutrition standards in the nutrition policy that are discussed in this report. Prior to the implementation of the nutrition policy in 2009, schools were not required to follow any of these standards. The policy also contains the following components:

- Purpose, goals and scope of the policy
- Definitions of terms (e.g. Maximum Nutritional Value and Not Permitted foods)
- Procedures for enforcement
- Monitoring and review procedures

The full policy is available at: http://www.wcdsb.ca/ap_memos/PDF/APH021.pdf

The conditions were right for policy development...

- Childhood obesity and physical inactivity concerns were in the news
- Ministry of Education was starting to develop its Healthy Schools Branch
- supportive School Board Superintendent and Director
- ROWPH recognized the importance of policy work
- strong partnership between the School Board and Public Health

“Certainly we seemed to be right in the wave with this one.” WCDSB Healthy, Active Living Consultant
Table 1: Examples of Nutrition Standards from the WCDSB Food and Nutrition Policy for Elementary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision or sale of foods and beverages</th>
<th>Food and beverages with Maximum Nutritional Value* are to be available and no food or beverages from the “Not Permitted”** category are to be offered or sold. The school principal may designate up to ten days (or fewer, as determined by the school) during the school year as special event days. The intent of the special event days is to have one special food celebration per chosen day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom and school celebrations (e.g., class gatherings, play days, dances, BBQs)</td>
<td>No food or beverages from the Not Permitted category are to be offered or sold for celebrations. When food or beverages are included as part of a celebration, those with Maximum Nutritional Value are to be emphasized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catered lunches</td>
<td>Catered lunches will offer at least three of the four food groups, emphasize food or beverages with Maximum Nutritional Value and contain no food or beverages from the “Not Permitted” category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza lunches</td>
<td>All pizza will be made with a whole grain crust, part-skim milk cheese (20% MF or less), lean meat (e.g. grilled chicken) and/or vegetable toppings and low sodium pizza sauce (360 mg or less).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of food as reward</td>
<td>Use of non-food rewards should be encouraged. If food is used as a reward, only food or beverages of Maximum Nutritional Value* are to be offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>Only non-food items or food and beverages with Maximum Nutritional Value will be used to raise funds via special fundraising events and ongoing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff as positive role models</td>
<td>Staff are encouraged to refrain from consuming food and beverages from the Not Permitted category when students are present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water accessibility</td>
<td>Drinking water is to be freely available and accessible throughout the school day. Students are encouraged to provide a safe, reusable water bottle for this purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Nutrition Program</td>
<td>A regular student nutrition program is encouraged for all students (i.e., free or reduced-price meals, coordinated with class and bus transportation schedules so that all students can participate). Food or beverages of Maximum Nutritional Value will be emphasized and no food or beverages from the Not Permitted category will be offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Classroom Snacks</td>
<td>Students will have opportunities to eat healthy snacks during appropriate instructional time throughout the school day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Nutrition Team</td>
<td>All schools are encouraged to form a school nutrition team. The team will help the school community promote and support healthy nutrition and lifestyle practices in the classroom, throughout the school and in the home. The WCDSB will provide resources and opportunities to support the school nutrition teams (e.g. networking sessions and workshops).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition Education for Students</td>
<td>Nutrition education begins in Kindergarten and continues through all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
grades. All classroom education is to reflect the key messages from *Eating Well with Canada’s Food Guide* and meet grade-appropriate curriculum expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrition Education for Teachers</th>
<th>The WCDSB will provide resources and opportunities for professional development and encourage staff to have adequate nutrition knowledge (e.g. articles, workshops, reputable websites).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*A food of Maximum Nutritional Value is high in nutrients needed for optimal growth and development, high in fibre, low in unhealthy fats (i.e., saturated and trans fats) and contains little or no added salt and sugars.*

** A food in the Not Permitted category contains few or no essential nutrients, high amounts of fat, sugar, and salt, and is usually lower in fibre.
Policy Implementation and Support
Soon after the policy was adopted, the ROWPH nutritionist and the WCDSB Healthy, Active Living Consultant met with principals. The purpose of the meeting was to inform them of the policy and to ask what supports they would need to successfully implement the policy in their schools. They asked for information to provide to parents, students, vendors, and for themselves so that they would feel confident in implementing the nutrition policy, especially given the certainty of parental concerns. During the seven month period between the adoption of the nutrition policy and the date when implementation was to begin, the ROWPH nutritionist and WCDSB Healthy, Active Living Consultant prepared:

- Letters to send to local vendors to inform them of the nutrition policy (May 2009)
- Compliance letters for the vendors to sign and submit to the school indicating that their menus were in compliance with the nutrition policy (The ROWPH nutritionist was available to assess menus if vendors requested this.)
- An insert for the school newsletter (distributed to parents) (May 2009 and Sept 2009)
- An advertisement placed in the student agenda to inform students of the nutrition policy
- A CD of resources for school administrators at each school, which included a URL link to a narrated PowerPoint presentation for teachers, a copy of the nutrition policy, templates, and vendor letters (May 2009)
- A list of possible fundraising alternatives to selling chocolate bars
- A press release for the community-at-large (Sept 2009)

The support continued beyond this initial seven month period and continues today. Some of the current activities include:

- organizing and running full day workshops for a group of five students, two teachers, and some parents to learn about the nutrition policy. (The expectation is that those who attend take the information back to their schools.)

What would you do differently?

WCDSB Healthy, Active Living Consultant
“I would do a lot of the same things. I think we had a really good plan.”

- involve a parent in the policy development stage

ROWPH nutritionist
“The whole process of policy development and implementation is new. We did what we thought was right at the time”

- collect baseline data about behaviours and what was going on in the school before the policy so that affects of the policy could be measured
meeting with school councils and principal groups to answer questions

submitting regular correspondence for the school newsletters (branded as the “Fit Bit”) which highlight parts of the nutrition policy, suggest a recipe, provide ideas for healthy classroom snacks, etc.

meeting with Nutrition for Learning\(^4\) staff and volunteers to inform them of the nutrition policy and how to ensure that their program meets the nutrition policy standards

working with student nutrition teams at each school to help them promote and teach the nutrition policy to their peers

conducting phone consultations with staff or vendors to determine if certain foods comply with the nutrition policy

answering any questions about the policy that arise at any time

educating new staff who are not familiar with the nutrition policy

supporting the WCDSB in revising their elementary and secondary nutrition policies to have consistent language with PPM150 while maintaining existing policy standards

---

**What supports have been effective?**

- “Workshops are expensive but they are great”
- “The “Fit Bit” – seems like a good way to get information out”
- “Having a dedicated, paid staff person from WCDSB – her coordination with the school and visibility and voice in the school are important”
- “Partnership with Public Health”

**What supports have been less effective?**

- “Tried to do nutrition networking session with teachers in different schools but attendance was an issue”

**What supports should be continued or added?**

- Education/communication that enables educators to see the nutrition policy as part of a bigger picture
- Staff time dedicated to supporting the implementation
- Grants for student activities related to “Ministry of Education - Foundations of a Healthy School”\(^5\)

---

\(^4\) Nutrition for Learning is a registered charitable organization which supports community based breakfast and snack programs for children and youth in Waterloo Region.

\(^5\) Foundations for a Healthy School is a Ministry of Education initiative to integrate all aspects of a healthy school

http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/healthyschools/foundations.html
Results and Discussion
Through the survey, parents were asked about their awareness of the nutrition policy, changes they had seen as a result of the policy, their reactions to the policy, a number of questions about communication of the policy, and whether the policy has affected eating patterns at home.

In the interviews, principals and teachers were asked about reactions to the nutrition policy from the school community, challenges and enablers for the thirteen policy standards listed in Table 1, and about support from ROWPH.

During focus groups, students were asked to describe what their school does to encourage healthy eating. They were also asked if they knew that their school had a nutrition policy. They were encouraged to talk about any differences they had noticed since the policy was implemented - prompted about various aspects of the nutrition policy, such as rewards, catered lunches, and classroom celebrations. Students were asked what they liked and what they did not like about the changes.

The detailed results, including participant quotations, for each method of data collection are presented in the appendices. Appendix 1 contains parent survey results; Appendix 2 the principals and teacher interview results; and Appendix 3 the student focus group results. The following section summarizes the results into key enablers and barriers of policy implementation under a number of different themes.

Enablers and Barriers

Taste, quality, and cost of food
The taste and quality of food affect how students will respond to a nutrition policy. Parents and students gave mixed reviews about the taste and quality of the pizza and the other hot lunch options offered at various schools. There were, however, many positive comments about the smoothies and fruit and vegetable snacks sold at one school as well as the pita lunches sold at a different school. It appears that taste is the key factor in students’ enjoyment of lunches and not whether or not the food is considered healthy. The consistent praise for the smoothies and fruit and vegetable snacks highlight the fact that healthy food and snacks can be popular.

Some parents (and some teachers as well) indicated that the cost of the healthy catered lunches is too high. There is concern that cost is prohibiting some children from being able to have hot lunches.

Research consistently shows that the lack of affordable and appealing healthy food at school is a major barrier to healthy eating and to policy acceptance. Providing tasty, affordable, and healthy food to students is a policy facilitating factor.
Awareness and Communication of Policy

Clear and consistent communication about policy is an enabler of policy implementation while miscommunication can lead to confusion and resistance to the policy. The parent survey results indicate that the majority of parents are aware of the school nutrition policy and the policy standards as well. Many parents indicate that the policy standards have been well communicated, especially by means of the school and classroom newsletters. Several parents indicate that teachers and administrators educate parents and students about the policy. Furthermore, parents suggest that many students are taught about the nutrition policy in class and bring these messages home.

Despite comprehensive communication of policy messages, a few parents were still unaware that the nutrition policy standards only pertain to foods that are sold and offered at school. The policy does not concern foods that are sent from home for lunches and snacks for their child’s own consumption. This highlights the need for continued communication between members of the school community.

Through the student focus groups it became clear that many students clearly understand what the nutrition policy involves. They knew that there were certain days when the school was allowed to be exempt from the nutrition policy (e.g. Halloween). They were aware that the school could not sell chocolate bars as fundraisers. Many students also spoke about the prevalence of healthy eating messages reaching them from different sources such as student nutrition teams, newsletters and teachers. Not only did children understand what the nutrition policy involved, but also some of them agreed with the changes. Students offered reasons why it is important to have the nutrition policy. However, there were also some standards of the nutrition policy around which there seemed to be confusion for some students.

These results are consistent with another study which indicates that most students support policy options for the promotion of healthy eating and active living. In that study, the vast majority of students reported caring about health and healthy eating and understood the causes and health consequences of unhealthy eating habits.

Strong communication between members of the school community (e.g. parents, teachers, students and administrators) is a policy enabling factor and has been shown to be essential to the success of school nutrition policy implementation. Moreover, communication with students about the school nutrition policy is crucial as children are looking to their parents and teachers to encourage, support and enable them to be involved in more healthful behaviours.

Parental support and involvement

Generally, parents appear to be supportive of the healthy changes to the school nutrition environment and the role of the school in implementing the nutrition policy. Many parents recognized the benefits of having a nutrition policy in place and believe it makes a difference to their child’s health. The strong
parent support suggested in the present study is similar to that of existing studies which show parents to overwhelmingly support school policies that promote healthy eating\textsuperscript{(14,15)}. Those parents who are not supportive of the nutrition policy state that the school should not be able to decide what foods can be sold or offered in the school.

Parents appear to be supportive of providing healthy options for classroom celebrations, snacks, and lunches but are less willing to be involved with school nutrition committees, helping with healthy eating programs at school, or making recommendations for healthier fundraising activities. Research shows that schools cite a lack of time and human resources as barriers to nutrition policy implementation\textsuperscript{(11)}. Parents can play an important role in leading school nutrition initiatives. Without their support, school personnel may struggle to implement the policy due to competing priorities in the schools\textsuperscript{(11)}. Moreover, increased community support and more parent volunteers are important factors for the success of school nutrition policies\textsuperscript{(11)}.

Parent responses indicate that in some cases the school nutrition policy has changed the way families eat at home. When family members promote healthy eating and reinforce nutrition education in the home their actions may help support implementation of school nutrition policy\textsuperscript{(1)}.

**Access to Healthy Food at School**
Overall, responses suggest that a variety of healthy foods are being offered and sold at school. The majority of parents listed several examples of healthy food choices that are provided for classroom celebrations, school events, catered lunches and fundraisers. These examples indicate that there is more variety and better quality of nutritious foods available at school.

Feedback from a few parents indicates that instead of providing healthier food alternatives that meet the policy standards, some schools have cancelled school events/celebrations altogether. Schools are provided with many suggestions and examples of healthy foods that can be used for events and in classrooms, as well as ways to celebrate without the use of food. Despite this, it appears that some schools choose to forego the event or celebration altogether. This practice is a concern, and may lead to frustration and reduced support for the school nutrition policy.

Having healthy food choices available helps support WCDSB nutrition policy standards such as student nutrition education, healthy rewards and school celebrations. When food options that are high in unhealthy fats, sugar and sodium are not provided at school, students are more likely to eat foods of maximum nutritional value which comply with the school nutrition policy standards\textsuperscript{(13)}.

**Importance of Teachers in Influencing Students**
A number of comments were made which illustrate that teachers may be a key influence on student eating behaviours and learning. Comments were made about teachers who model healthy eating and
also about situations where teacher’s eating behaviours impede positive nutrition learning and nutrition policy support. Students were aware of “Fat Fridays”; when teachers bring in baked goods, pizza, pie, chips, or pop to share in the staff room at the end of the week. Teaching staff can be key enablers of the nutrition policy and this perception is supported in the literature \(^{10}\).

**Students sharing what they know**

Students themselves can be enablers to policy implementation \(^{8}\). Particularly in the school where there was an active student nutrition team, students acted as ambassadors of the nutrition policy to other students. They helped to educate the students about the nutrition policy and also held events and announcements to encourage healthy eating. Peer to peer learning was evident in some of the focus groups when students would correct each other around perceptions of the nutrition policy or about whether a food is healthy or not. Literature highlights the importance of peer to peer learning and it is assumed that the influence of peers may play a significant role in food acceptability and selection \(^{8,9,11}\).

Students may also share what they know at home. They bring messages and information home to parents about eating well and may have an influence on the quality of food eaten at home.

**Strong Leadership and Support**

One of the key enablers for the implementation of this nutrition policy from the perspective of educators was strong support at the Board level, the school level, and from ROWPH. Principals commented on the supports provided by the Board when the nutrition policy was first introduced. Principals also spoke about the importance of ROWPH’s investment in the implementation of the nutrition policy. However, some educators feel that the support for the nutrition policy seems to be wavering. They know that education, communication, and policy supports need to continue to be in place if the longer term benefits of this nutrition policy are to be realized. Educators mentioned itinerant teachers and resources for nutrition education as important school level supports. Board level supports mentioned were the Active, Healthy Living Consultant, standard communication for parents, and a commitment to monitoring the implementation and affects of the nutrition policy.

The next section discusses three themes from the educator interviews related to the implementation of the nutrition policy.

**Challenging at First but Easier Now**

Most educators commented on the difficulty of implementing the nutrition policy when it was first introduced and agreed that it is much easier now, three years into implementation. Initially there were many fears - the school would not be able to raise money, there would be no pizza vendors for hot lunches, the school would lose its feeling of being a community, and staff would not be able to meaningfully reward students. Educators also found it difficult to deal with some
of the negative reactions of some parents to some of the nutrition policy standards. In hindsight, educators were able to look back and see that their original fears were not realized.

**Different Strategies for Different Schools**
Each school exists in a different context and has factors that make it unique. This came through in many of the comments about implementing the nutrition policy. For some schools implementing the “healthy snack on the desk” standard needed to be done in a way that minimized singling out students from families where healthy snacks were not always affordable. For that particular school, asking parents to refrain from bringing in “not-permitted” foods for birthday celebrations was welcomed because it helped to eliminate the pressure to bring something on birthdays. Some schools could offer healthy snacks for sale three days a week because it was something families could afford and there was a parent volunteer willing to make it happen. For another school, fundraisers which require a larger financial commitment (e.g. coupon books) were not possible in their community. Rural schools had fewer pizza vendors from which to choose. Each nutrition policy standard was met using different strategies at different schools – and some were still searching for the strategy that would work best for them. Educators mentioned the need to be creative in solving the issues that pertained to their particular school.

**Different Stages of Acceptance**
It is clear that most educators have a good understanding of the nutrition policy standards. They indicated that for them, there is little need for more education. However, while most educators agree that the overall nutrition policy is in the best interest of students, there are different stages of acceptance amongst educators for some of the specific nutrition policy standards.

**Limitations**
It was the intention to include six to eight schools in this study. Unfortunately it was not possible to engage that many schools in the research. A few more schools would have allowed all geographic areas of Waterloo Region to be covered as no rural schools participated. Each data collection technique had its limitations which will now be mentioned.

**Parent Survey**
As with all voluntary surveys, self selection bias may have existed. Those who chose to complete the survey may have had more knowledge about school food and the nutrition policy. As well, the influence of social desirability bias in this study is unknown. To reduce the impact of this bias, the survey was completely voluntary, self administered and anonymous.

Using an electronic survey only proved to be a limitation. One school did not request paper copies of the survey and only sent out the online version to families. Unfortunately, very few completed surveys
were received from this school. Schools who received both formats (e.g. paper and link to online survey) completed more paper copies compared to online entries. In the future, using both online and paper copies for each school would be the best method.

**Educator interviews**

This study is based on the opinions of a small number of educators. As such, it should not be used to generalize to the opinions of all educators in the WCDSB. However, given the resources available at the time, it does give an accurate picture of the challenges and enablers of nutrition policy implementation in six diverse schools.

Although confidentiality was assured and the researcher conducting the interviews had no previous connection to implementing the nutrition policy, teachers and principals may have felt the need to speak positively about the nutrition policy.

**Student Focus Groups**

It was also the intention to choose students randomly from those who returned consent forms. So few returned consent forms that all those who did were included in the study. Those who returned consent forms may have been biased to those who had some awareness of the nutrition policy and were interested in providing feedback.

Lastly, while students were encouraged to share their honest opinions, they may have felt the need to please the interviewer and thus their answers may have reflected this.

**Recommendations**

Principals and teachers in the WCDSB have been involved in implementing one of the most comprehensive school nutrition policies in Ontario. They have been at the forefront in creating healthier school food environments – something which is controversial and about which people have strong and mixed feelings. Students in Grade 7 and their parents have seen their school go through a major shift in how it sells and offers food school. Most students and parents were well aware of these changes. Many spoke very positively about the changes – while some did not. Policy implementation is not a linear process and so while the nutrition policy has been in place for three years, the following are some recommendations for how nutrition policy implementation can continue to be supported.

WCDSB and ROWPH should continue to provide strong support and leadership with respect to the nutrition policy. Two key components of this support should be education and communication. Education for new staff and students and parents needs to be maintained. Communication needs to be ongoing to correct any misconceptions and continually draw attention to the nutrition policy. Furthermore, it is essential to continue to explain and communicate the importance of the nutrition
policy to the school community. This will ensure a higher degree of buy in and acceptance. Tailoring the education and communication strategies to the needs of busy staff and parents will be important. Ensuring that there is dedicated support and resources for personnel and nutrition policy monitoring is also crucial.

ROWPH’s interventions related to healthy eating, physical activity, and mental health need to be combined. Educators are looking for a comprehensive school health approach as it is more effective and efficient. Opportunely, a recent reorganization within ROWPH will see the creation of a team dedicated to a comprehensive school health approach. Engaging students meaningfully in the creation of this team will increase the likelihood that they accept and understand the nutrition policy and other school policies pertaining to health. Additional support and resources dedicated towards the initiation and implementation of comprehensive school health teams in schools are warranted.

Two policy advocacy possibilities were suggested for exploration by ROWPH and WCDSB. One involves increasing support for student nutrition programs. These programs are seen as highly necessary and yet seriously underfunded. Recently, Ontario’s Healthy Kids Panel recommended the establishment of a universal student nutrition program for all publicly funded elementary and secondary schools. The second is the return of curriculum that teaches children food preparation skills. Literature suggests that food skills are an important precursor to eating well.

ROWPH and WCDSB should continue working with schools to ensure that tasty, nutritious, and reasonably priced food choices are available. They can also provide suggestions for healthy food alternatives to help support policy implementation. Given that the taste of the food is so important to students, schools can involve students (and parents) to determine the most favourable food items that meet policy standards. If students like the food, they are more likely to order it, which will mean more revenue for the school.

As a process evaluation, this research has only looked at issues pertaining to the implementation of the nutrition policy. In order to determine if the implementation of the nutrition policy results in positive outcomes on student health, a much more in-depth outcome evaluation would be required after the nutrition policy has been in place for a significant length of time.
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Appendix 1: Detailed Results of the Parent Survey

A survey was designed to assess parents’ knowledge and perceptions of the WCDSB school nutrition policy implementation process. An electronic survey was designed in iSurvey. Surveys were provided to six elementary schools in electronic format and to five of the six schools in paper format as well. An electronic link to the survey was inserted in the school newsletter and paper copies were distributed to each family (except in one school which did not request them). Parents were asked to complete either the paper or electronic version of the survey. In total, two hundred and twenty eight parents completed the survey (n=228) from six elementary schools. Paper copy results were entered into iSurvey and all survey results (electronic and paper) were then compiled using iSurvey. Major themes and relationships in the data were noted and recorded.

Results

Sixty three percent (63%) of parents who responded indicated that their children attended the school before September 2009. Sixty eight percent (68%) of parents noticed changes to the foods offered and sold at school since they first started sending their children there (Figure 1).

Changes to the Foods Sold and Offered In School

Most parents indicated that they noticed changes to foods offered and sold for catered lunches (93%), followed by school events and celebrations (45%), school fundraisers (37%) and classroom rewards (32%) (Figure 2).
Parents noted the following changes to foods that are offered and sold in the school since the WCDSB Food and Nutrition Policy was adopted in 2009:

**Fundraisers** (50 total responses): no chocolate bars; better quality items; turkey hot dogs; fruit; healthy snack options to purchase; more nutritious choices; non food related items; no flavoured popcorn being sold; health promoting activities like Fit-a-Thons; cookie dough sales discontinued; fewer fundraisers with food; no more candies.

**Classroom rewards** (48 total responses): elimination of most candy; no more cupcakes, cookies; pencils, stickers, erasers are given; no treats for celebrations; usually non food items; healthy snacks are encouraged; more recognition of good deeds; no junk food; non food rewards are offered instead of food rewards for positive behaviour; healthier; healthy prizes; at times cookies/candy were given, now stopped; no candy or treats unless it is a special day; there is a greater incentive to choose healthier alternatives.

**School Events and Celebrations** (55 total respondents): better quality food; turkey hot dogs and water to drink; water instead of pop; apples instead of chips; adding some healthy options such as apples to the end of year BBQ; no longer allowed to bring cake or treats to school on child’s birthday; more nutritious choices; we are asked to send in more nutritious foods; water more readily available; healthy choices; healthier snacks; no longer treats for Valentine’s Day or Halloween; healthy food and beverages are offered; healthier treats; only healthy food is requested by school; variety of meat and veggie products and whole wheat buns; more fruit available; when school council runs programs they must follow guidelines; ham and green beans instead of hot dogs; includes salads and vegetables; food selection limit or no celebrations; fewer school events due to the Nutrition Policy.

**Catered Lunches** (136 total respondents): Now have whole wheat cheese pizza instead of pepperoni on a white crust; greater focus on healthy choices; catered lunch vendor needs to meet nutritional guidelines; healthier options from school catering like whole wheat pizza, whole wheat noodles, salads and wraps; variety and healthy choices; dropped the milk program, unfortunate; based on Canada’s Food Guide; healthier choices(e.g. salads, whole wheat, lower fat, fun food such as smoothies, fruit kebabs); pizza is more nutritious; more variety; nutrition days with fruit for purchase; pitas now offered; the meals are more nutritious; more vegetable options; ham instead of pepperoni; better choices; less hotdogs; grilled chicken and whole wheat buns; no fries or hamburgers; more choices that include fruit, veggies, protein are included; has been communicated that now are lower sodium, etc., per new guidelines; hot lunches are more nutritious; no pop; now have cheese and ham pizza; healthy burger
choices with fruit and veggies; pizza lunches aren’t as tasty; my kids have been happy with the catered lunches; pizza has changed to a healthier choice but is very poor quality; the hot lunch offered monthly has good choices, but it is very expensive; less to no options.

Other (15 total respondents): Now have Nutrition for Learning program which offers cereal, fruit, yogurt and milk; school offering fruit and cereal every morning; greater focus on healthy choices; parents avoid sending in doughnuts, cupcakes and instead choose a healthier alternative.

The majority of parents indicated that they are “pleased” (54%) or “somewhat pleased” (31%) about the changes made to the foods available at school. Eight percent (8%) of those who responded indicated they were “not pleased” and 7% responded that the changes “do not matter” to them (Figure 3).

Ninety-two percent (92%) of parents indicated that they received communication from the school about the changes made to foods offered and sold at school (Figure 4).
In terms of how the changes were communicated, most parents indicated the school newsletter (70%), followed by student (36%), school flyer (32%), school personnel (23%), parent council (13%) and school website (6%) (Figure 5).

**Figure 5: How were changes communicated?**

Awareness and Communication of the WCDSB School Nutrition Policy

Seventy-eight per cent (78%) of parents reported that they were aware of the WCDSB Elementary Food and Nutrition Policy (Figure 6). Of those 78%, 31% had joined the school after the policy had been implemented. The other 69% had been at that school while the policy was being implemented. Of the 22% of parents who were not aware of the policy, 90% had joined the school after 2009.

**Figure 6: Have you heard about the WCDSB Food and Nutrition Policy?**

The majority of parents learned about the policy through the school newsletter (61%). Other methods included school personnel (21%), school flyer (20%), student (19%), parent council (15%), school website (4%), and other (e.g. ROWPH and the media) (8%) (Figure 7). Of those who were unaware of the policy (22%) indicated that the best way to let them know about this policy change would be through the school newsletter, a school flyer, and educating the students about the change.
Eighty percent (80%) of parents responded that learning about the nutrition policy has not changed the way they eat at home (Figure 8). It is important to note that many parents indicated they already eat healthfully at home and therefore, the nutrition policy has not changed the way they eat.

Parents who indicated the policy has changed the way they eat at home (20%) gave examples of how it has transformed their eating behaviours:

Pack snacks and recess food based on healthier choices; try to make healthy snacks; kids understand healthy food vs. sometimes foods; we always eat healthy and this is only helping us; we pack healthier lunches for school; we definitely make better choices and our child automatically prefers healthier choices; we try to offer healthier choices to our children, more veggies, limit the amount of cookies they eat; we always tried to eat healthy at home but found with the program and nutrition policy the children are more aware and choose to eat healthier things for snacks and talk about food and what it can do to our bodies; my children are able to choose healthier snacks; we, as a family, are more conscious of food choices; the children remind us of sometime foods; trying to eat healthier snacks and meals; limited snacks, must be healthy and only one or two treat nights; the kids talk about healthy
eating more; now we are reading more food labels; my son asks “mommy is this healthy?”; son will request healthy food instead of junk food; we try to reinforce the connection between home and school; eating better now according to food groups; healthier variety of choices; we are more aware of what to eat and what we shouldn’t eat; shop for more healthier snacks/foods; more conscious of food choices; I buy healthier foods instead of junk foods; I avoid purchasing sugary cookies and canned foods; the kids are involved with healthy food; changing what I bought before for lunch to better and healthier products.

Sixty-five percent of parents responded that they have discussed the nutrition policy at home with their children (Figure 9).

Most parents (70%) indicated that the school regularly encourages parents to prepare healthy foods for classroom celebrations (Figure 10).

Parents provided the following examples of how the school regularly encourages parents to prepare healthy foods for classroom celebrations (117 total responses):
Unhealthy choices cannot be eaten at school and are sent home; request that healthy snacks are sent in for classroom celebrations and not candy; guidelines such as what is and what is not a healthy choice i.e. fruit and veggies as opposed to cupcakes and cookies; we are asked to bring foods meeting the policy; unhealthy food is not allowed and/or taken away; they send flyers with suggestions of what to send and what not to; the school newsletter is great for suggesting alternatives to junk food; reminds us that on their birthdays we are not permitted to bring in cake or sugary treats, those are only allowed for designated treat days like Halloween or Valentine’s Day; teachers have asked parents not to bring sweets to celebrations so I have brought fruit trays and veggie trays for the kids to snack on throughout the day, it is well received by the school staff and students... it always gets eaten; recipe in every newsletter; newsletter provides recipes for healthy snacks; teachers asks us to limit the junk we send and prefer healthy snacks; through my daughter’s (i.e. the student’s)understanding; via classroom discussion; when informed of the celebration asking to send healthy snacks is part of the notification; ask for only healthy foods that support the policy; students relay messages to parents that they should try to bring healthy choices; via word of mouth (teachers and parents); for her birthday I asked what I could bring to share and the teacher suggested fruit instead of cake; teachers expectations are passed onto children; through my student, they ask is there a healthy treat I can take to school?; at a meeting before school started.

As well, most parents (81%) indicated that the school regularly encourages parents to send healthy snacks for their child to eat at school (Figure 11).

![Figure 11: Does you school regularly encourage healthy snacks for your child(ren) to eat during class time?](image)

Parents provided the following examples of how the school regularly encourages parents to send healthy snacks to school (138 total responses):

Teacher allows kids to snack at their desks as long as they are healthy snacks; allowing water at desks; in monthly calendar; constant reminders in the newsletters about snack ideas and recipes and nutritional information of common snacks; newsletter reminds us about the nutrition policy; it has reminders posted on the front doors of the school and on the table where parents drop off their kids’ lunches and snacks and on the bulletin boards around the school; newsletter always has a section with
creative healthy choices; the staff encourage kids to make better choices and ask mom or dad to pack healthier snacks; the staff also encourage kids to read the packaging to know exactly what they are eating; they send home literature representing the basic food groups and give examples of types of snacks to send in; through the students; I received information when my son started school; they let me know if something isn’t allowed and I won’t let my child eat it; teachers pointing out healthy foods for kids; encouraging kids to eat better so that they are healthier; educating the children on healthy choices; encouraged at the beginning of the school year; discussion in class about healthy eating; stats/info sent home on how healthy foods affect/improve their learning ability; kindergarten orientation; teachers ask to send in water; learned from the school to send the lunch with fresh fruit, veggies, salads, good juice, not candy and sugar product.

In order to improve foods that are available at school, parents indicated they are willing to provide healthier foods for classroom and school celebrations (72%) and pack healthy school lunches and snacks for their child (96%). Parents were less willing to find out if the school has a healthy eating committee (13%), help with healthy eating programs already under way (16%), or make recommendations for healthier fundraising activities (15%).
Appendix 2: Detailed Results of Principal and Teacher Interviews

Six principals were interviewed during April and May of 2012. Six teachers were interviewed during October and November of 2012. Interviews lasted between 30 and 45 minutes. Principals and teachers were asked about reactions to the nutrition policy from the school community, challenges and enablers for each of the 13 nutrition policy standards, and about support from ROWPH. Since principals and teachers were both asked the same questions, their results are described together. Interview results were analysed for themes and are presented in the following section.

Results

In this results section, when comments were specific to one group, they are recorded as reflecting the comments of either “principals” or “teachers” respectively. When similar comments came from both groups, they have been recorded as reflecting the comments of “educators”.

The first question was about general reactions to the nutrition policy at the time it was introduced in 2007 – reactions from staff or parents or their own reactions. With respect to parent reactions, educators said that some parents felt the nutrition policy was long overdue as they had concerns about the food that was sold and available at schools. Some principals mentioned the positive reaction of parents who were already health conscious and who supported the move to improving the health of the food found at schools. Educators mentioned that some parents reacted negatively; these parents were concerned about the role schools were taking in making decisions about the food that their children were eating and were fearful of what else the school might try to control. Principals also mentioned that some parents were angry and sad over the loss of some school specific traditions that involved “not permitted” food (e.g. cake raffles) as these traditions had helped to build a sense of school community.

In terms of staff reactions, one principal said there was some initial “scrambling” to figure out what exactly the nutrition policy entailed, followed by the correction of misinterpretations of the nutrition policy standards. Some educators reacted with enthusiasm to their role in implementing the nutrition policy and others immediately sensed the difficulty and work involved in trying to create behaviour change. Others suggested that the nutrition policy was a natural extension of the focus over the last decade on anaphylaxis prevention (particularly as it relates to the consumption or exposure to nuts) and the accompanying efforts to sensitize parents about appropriate foods for their children to bring to school to support these prevention efforts. Educators were concerned over the potential loss of funds that the implementation of the nutrition policy might cause. One principal also lamented the loss of food as a way to build school community while another felt school community could be built in other ways. Most educators agreed that the nutrition policy was in the best interest of students.

“Overall it makes sense. You want to instill lifelong habits that are good.”

“It is important that the school is a healthy place.”
“[The changes are] very important – nutrition has a direct relationship to health and learning.”

“The mind-body-environment connection is manifest – and we are well aware of that. Our job is easier when kid’s nutritional needs are met.”

“Staff do really want what is best for the children.”

Educators reported a variety of student reactions. Some students welcomed the changes as they made school food more like the food they received at home. Others wondered what was wrong with the food that used to be available and still others were not even aware of the changes that had been made.

Educators were then asked how easy or difficult it was to implement the following 13 nutrition policy standards. This next section lists each nutrition policy standard followed by the comments made by the principals and teachers.

**Provision or sale of foods and beverages**

Food and beverages with Maximum Nutritional Value are to be available and no food or beverages from the Not Permitted category are to be offered or sold. The school principal may designate up to ten days (or fewer, as determined by the school) during the school year as special event days. The intent of the special event days is to have one special food celebration per chosen day. Schools are encouraged to follow this practice. School administrators will communicate the dates of special event days to the school community.

Most of the discussion of this standard focused on the ten special event days. Some educators felt that the special event days were helpful in implementing the nutrition policy as a whole.

“Because we have the ten [special event] days of “wiggle room” – we can model for most of the time how things should be – but are not boxed in and can still have some non-compliant days.”

“Having the ten [special event] days makes this much easier. There hasn’t been much of an impact because the class/school celebration days were matched with the ten [special event] days so these events have continued with food items.”

Some principals discussed how they decided along with their staff which ten days would be designated as special event days. However in some schools there was some initial confusion about whether the principal would chose the special event days or if each teacher would chose them for their own classroom. Some educators thought ten days was generous and that their schools sometimes did not designate ten special event days.

One challenge is the communication with parents about the special event days in a way that does not create confusion. Another challenge for some schools is to make sure that each class of children has access to the same number of special event days since some celebrations (like graduation) are grade
specific. One teacher specified that if their class was not able to participate in all of the ten special event days, the teacher would do what they felt was necessary to ensure fairness – even if this was not allowed by the nutrition policy.

**Classroom and school celebrations (e.g., class gatherings, play days, dances, BBQs)**

No food or beverages from the “Not Permitted” category are to be offered or sold for celebrations. When food or beverages are included as part of a celebration, those with Maximum Nutritional Value are to be emphasized.

Educators said that many parents of students (particularly in the younger grades) like to bring in “not permitted” foods such as cupcakes or candy for the class on their child’s birthdays. Teachers also commented that they like to acknowledge birthdays. Educators said that initially, some parents were not pleased with this standard of the nutrition policy.

In order to implement this standard, some principals asked their staff to not serve any “not permitted” foods that parents brought in and to send them back home. Confronting parents when they brought in “not permitted” foods was seen as a way to tell them that the school needed their support to implement the nutrition policy. Some schools also took the opportunity to provide suggestions of foods or non-food items parents could bring in instead. Some felt that it was also easier to help parents understand this due to policies around anaphylaxis and severe allergies. Teachers need to send “not permitted” foods back home now much less often than when the nutrition policy was first introduced.

“Parents pretty much know now – but occasionally some do bring in treats and we have to send a note home.”

Other principals implemented this standard by insisting that staff only bring healthy food for a classroom celebration. These principals asked teachers to encourage parents to bring in healthier food but not to return food that was brought in. One principal was reluctant to police what goes on in the classroom regarding whether or not “not permitted” foods were returned home.

Some principals felt that this standard was well received because it prevents singling out kids whose parent’s cannot afford to bring in food for the whole class. They also felt it avoided the pressure that many parents feel to bring in a snack that all children will enjoy. Educators mentioned that it satisfies parents who are very concerned about what their children are given to eat at school – either because of allergies or because of wanting to limit the amount of unhealthy food their children consume. Although some principals initially felt that this standard would limit the ways their school could use food to celebrate and build school culture, most now felt that there was enough latitude within the ten special event days to celebrate special times.

In terms of school-wide celebrations, some teachers found that students adapted to the changes quite well.
“There are a lot of celebrations in the school and they always involve food. Now when food is included in a celebration they serve veggies, crackers, and cheese, etc. The students don’t seem to notice or care about the move away from cakes and other treats at celebrations. They are just happy there is food.”

Catered and Pizza Lunches

Catered lunches will offer at least three of the four food groups, emphasize food or beverages with Maximum Nutritional Value and contain no food or beverages from the Not Permitted category.

All pizza will be made with a whole grain crust, part-skim milk cheese (20% MF or less), lean meat (e.g. grilled chicken) and/or vegetable toppings and low sodium pizza sauce (360 mg or less).

All educators said that initially this was a challenging standard to implement because there were no food vendors who complied with this nutrition policy standard. They were concerned that their school would lose revenue because children would not want to order healthy food. To help with implementation, the School Board sent a letter to school food vendors telling them about the standards. Since food vendors were interested in continuing to provide food for the school, they changed their menus to comply with the standards. Within a short period of time it became much easier to find school lunches for sale that complied with the nutrition policy. Although some principals remembered some initial complaints about the taste of the pizza, they noted that sales continue to be made.

“No pizza company went out of business even though they said they would. In fact now there are more companies than before with an amazing quality of food. Kids like the new pizza and it has had a ripple effect to the community. They know they can eat this type of pizza at home.”

Principals mentioned that some students now realize that they can have this kind of pizza at home. Therefore, this may be changing eating habits beyond the class room.

One principal expressed some concern about whether this standard was being maintained by the vendors. This principal followed up with one vendor to determine whether it was in compliance with the nutrition standards.

Use of food as reward

Use of non-food rewards should be encouraged. If food is used as a reward, only food or beverages of Maximum Nutritional Value are to be offered.

There was a variety of reactions to implementing this standard. Some principals and teachers found it very difficult to discontinue the habit of rewarding students with candy or other unhealthy food. Others said that there was evidence and education about the negative effects of the use of food as a reward and they were already moving away from this before the nutrition policy was implemented. Each principal stated their opposition to the use of food as a reward. Some teachers indicated that implementation of this standard takes time – as some teachers relied on food as a reward more than others.
“All teachers may not yet be on board with not giving out food as a reward. It takes time to change the mentality and break habits.”

School wide programs rewarding good behaviour without food helped implement this standard. For example, rewards consisted of a longer recess or an extra gym class for everyone. Another strategy was the use of dollar store items or stickers as individual rewards. Some principals are still searching for appropriate ways to reward older children; dollar store items are not as meaningful for older children and other options, such as gift cards, are too expensive. Some teachers mentioned this problem as well as their solution to it.

“It is easier to reward younger kids with little toys and pencils; doesn’t always work as well for older students, they respond better to computer time or more gym time as rewards.”

Teachers indicated that students have adapted to this change quite well.

“...find that the students are just as or maybe more appreciative/responsive to healthy food rewards.”

**Fundraising**

*Only non-food items or food and beverages with Maximum Nutritional Value are used to raise funds*

Reactions towards using only non-food rewards or foods with Maximum Nutritional Value were mixed. Some principals indicated that their schools had already begun to move away from chocolate bar sales and were combining fundraising with physical activity and literacy activities before the nutrition policy was implemented. This strategy proved successful even though they had initially been concerned that they would not be able to raise as many funds.

“We initially wondered if it would be possible – but it is completely possible.”

Some teachers said that it was difficult and took some work when the nutrition policy first came out. For some schools, chocolate bar sales had been their most effective fundraiser and an effective alternative for their school community had not been found. Some schools have managed by incorporating food fundraising into the ten special event days.

“It took discussion, education, and some time figuring out what they can and can’t do to change the fundraising for the school.”

“Had to be creative to create other fundraising ideas – the reality is that workplaces change and you always need to be able to adapt.”

One principal commented, “I still miss it [chocolate bar sales] – but so what?” This indicates awareness that in spite of a personal preference, it was better for the children and their families. Another principal talked very proudly about combining fundraising with activities that are actually good for student’s health such as physical activity and reading.
There are still some other challenges to be faced. One principal mentioned that it was now harder for student council to raise funds. They traditionally had relied on “smaller amount” fundraisers (i.e. candy grams) which students found affordable but are no longer permitted. Another challenge is that other school boards within Waterloo Region still allow for chocolate bar fundraisers which results in an unfair fundraising advantage. Lastly, one principal mentioned that catalogue purchases or coupon books are alternative methods of fundraising but they indirectly allow or encourage people to purchase chocolate or other unhealthy food.

**School staff as positive role models**

Staff are encouraged to refrain from consuming food and beverages from the Not Permitted category when students are present.

Some principals commented on how this was a difficult standard to implement. The principals themselves tried to be good role models in order to encourage staff to do the same. However, confronting staff about their eating behaviour was considered a challenge. Other principals indicated that even before the nutrition policy their schools had established a culture in which staff do not walk about with coffee mugs and eat in front of students and that if unhealthy food is to be eaten at all – it is to be eaten in the staff room.

“If going to indulge – do it in the staff room is our practice.”

Most teachers felt that it was not a challenge to be a positive role model when it came to healthy eating. They do not eat in front of the students and only eat unhealthy food in the staff room.

Some educators had comments on the food available in the staff room – even though this is not covered by the nutrition policy. In some schools “Fat Friday” was changed to “Treat Friday” and some staff brought in healthier options. Teachers in particular spoke about the unhealthy food brought into the staff room on Fridays as a challenge and “bothersome” to those who were trying to maintain a healthy diet. At one school a teacher was trying to convince others to only have “Fat Friday” once per month but has not yet been successful.

“If still have Fat Fridays at this school. A few people will bring in fruits and vegetables, but most bring in baked goods and junk.”

Modeling healthy eating is still an area towards which schools are working. As mentioned, it is difficult to confront individuals about their personal food choices.

---

5 “Fat Friday” is when teachers bring in baked goods, pizza, pie, chips, or pop to share in the staff room at the end of the week.
**Water accessibility**

*Drinking water is to be freely available and accessible throughout the school day. Students are encouraged to bring a safe, reusable water bottle for this purpose.*

Most educators remarked that this standard was not at all difficult to implement. In fact, schools made this change before the nutrition policy was adopted. Some teachers were concerned about this standard because of the possibility of students being distracted by continuous access to water. Other educators have found that having water readily available actually decreases the distraction that used to occur when students needed to stand up and leave the classroom each time they needed water.

Water is not freely available in portables. Students in portables need to go back into the school to fill up their bottles which takes much longer and therefore poses a challenge.

Two schools are connecting this standard to eco school initiatives by stopping the sale of bottled water and planning to install “water bottle filling” water fountains.

*“We would like to see a special water fountain for filling up water bottles – which promotes the safety of our local water and moves away from corporate waste.”*

**Student breakfast/snack program**

*A regular student nutrition program is encouraged for all students (i.e., free or reduced-price meals, coordinated with class and bus transportation schedules so that all students can participate).*

Not all schools interviewed had student breakfast or snack programs. For those that did, some educators mentioned that trying to have the food served at the program comply with the nutrition policy was difficult given the limited budget of the program. Others, however, thought that their breakfast/snack programs complied with the nutrition policy before it even came into place.

Teachers especially appreciated that all students were well fed. They also felt that the breakfast and snack program in classrooms gave students exposure to healthy food – which was better than telling students to bring healthy food to school. In their school children often do not bring healthy food.

One principal felt that the benefits of a student nutrition program were so great that they should be universal and fully funded. The challenge with current student nutrition programs is that they are poorly funded and rely on parent and staff volunteers.

---

6 Nutrition for Learning is a registered charitable organization which supports community based breakfast and snack programs for children and youth in Waterloo Region.
Healthy snacks

Students will have opportunities to eat healthy snacks during appropriate instructional time throughout the school day.

Some principals mentioned the existence of this practice prior to the implementation of the nutrition policy. The benefits of allowing students to eat when they are hungry were seen to outweigh concerns about distraction and mess:

“Teachers have had legitimate concerns – mess, hygiene, but they now listen to best practice – which is that it is better for kids. Now they have water bottles and snacks on demand – which is a good thing.”

From the teachers’ perspective, allowing students to eat during instructional time depends on the teacher and the age group of students. Some teachers felt that students work better when their hunger is satisfied and others felt that consistent access to food was not healthy.

“One school delayed implementing this standard because their school serves a large number of families that they felt would not be able to afford a healthy snack. When they implemented it in the next year they decided to allow students to have opportunities to eat any snack they had in their lunch in an attempt to avoid singling out those who do not get healthy snacks. It is important to note, however, that it is not only children from families with low incomes who bring unhealthy snacks.

School Nutrition Team

All schools are encouraged to form a School Nutrition Team. The team will help the school community promote and support healthy nutrition and lifestyle practices in the classroom, throughout the school and in the home.

Each of the schools interviewed had a different experience with School Nutrition Teams. One school had such a team and it was still active. Another school had had a team but when the support ended, the team stopped meeting. Others did not have one because of competing priorities and some schools were not aware of the purpose of these teams.

The one school with the active team found that the students and teachers involved would take the information that they learned at workshops and bring it back to the whole school. They created DVDs and presentations to do this. In this way the nutrition team acted as a conduit of accurate information while also continually drawing attention to the nutrition policy.
Nutrition education for all students

Nutrition education begins in Kindergarten and continues through all grades. All classroom education is to reflect the key messages from *Eating Well with Canada’s Food Guide* and meet grade-appropriate curriculum expectations.

All educators mentioned that healthy eating is covered in the health and physical education curriculum and that teachers are accountable to meet the nutrition criteria in that curriculum. One principal highlighted that this curriculum had recently been reviewed and was very well written.

Some teachers mentioned supports and resources that were in place to help them meet curriculum requirements. For grades K-3 there are itinerant staff who teach the health curriculum. Some teachers used information received at the workshop put on by ROWPH and WCDSB to teach label reading and the nutritional value of food.

Nutrition education for teachers

The WCDSB will provide resources and opportunities for professional development and encourage staff to have adequate nutrition knowledge (e.g. articles, workshops, and reputable websites).

Many educators commented that the Healthy, Active Living Consultant, employed by WCDSB, is a helpful resource for staff when it comes to gaining adequate nutrition knowledge. Two examples of how the consultant works with ROWPH to support the nutrition policy are providing full-day workshops for staff and students and the monthly nutrition article in the school newsletter (the “Fit Bit”).

Teachers indicated that they are provided with many opportunities for nutrition education as well as information about the nutrition policy.

“When policy came into place there was some grumbling about another thing to learn, but there was lots of support and options for teachers to learn about the policy if they were interested in learning it.”

Teachers specifically mentioned that they face a lot of demands on their time which often does not leave much time to attend full day workshops.

In the last part of the interview, educators were asked what enabled the implementation of the nutrition policy, and about any benefits associated with its implementation, and what ROWPH could do to support its continued implementation. In addition to these questions, teachers were also asked if they felt the need for more education about the nutrition policy.
Four Key Enablers of the Nutrition Policy
The first enabler of the nutrition policy was its deadline for implementation. There were no exceptions. All Catholic elementary schools in the WCDSB had to implement it by a certain date. 

“It is easy when everyone has to do it!”

Support from the board was the second enabler of the implementation process. Principals reported that the Director and other senior staff spoke of the nutrition policy with pride. Moreover, they stated that the Board level communication helped to ensure consistent messages within the school community. Some educators provided examples of the extensive work done by the Healthy, Active Living Consultant (a position paid for by the Board) to help schools implement the nutrition policy. Teachers also appreciated the support provided through the itinerant health teachers.

One principal spoke of a relationship of trust and mutual understanding developed over time with their staff as an enabler of nutrition policy implementation.

“You can’t always have the benefit of that length of relationship when trying to implement something new because new things come out all the time – but things are always easier to implement when there is mutual understanding and trust.”

Lastly, public discourse was another factor which enabled the implementation of the nutrition policy.

“I think that there is a broad movement in the public discourse around what constitutes health, what makes kids learn or ready to learn, what we know about behaviour and nutrition – and educators are aware of this discourse. It makes it easier to implement these changes when the issues are being broadly discussed.”

Benefits of Nutrition Policy Implementation
Principals were quick to say that they have no hard proof of the benefits associated with the implementation of the nutrition policy. However, they were willing to speak of their observations which they considered to be anecdotal evidence. Any benefits they noted that were specific to one nutrition policy standard are mentioned earlier. In terms of overall benefits, educators say they observe that children are more aware of nutrition, the importance of eating healthy food, and how to make a healthy choice. Several educators suggested that the nutritional content of children’s lunches is improving even though lunches are not covered by the nutrition policy. Some teachers mentioned noticing better focus in students.

One teacher spoke of the longer term benefits to society of having this nutrition policy.

“If it [nutrition/healthy eating] becomes part of the environment and every day lifestyle it is worth every penny and effort put into it”
“Overall benefits for society – it is beneficial if it can reduce strain on the healthcare system and all of our frustrations would be rewarded.”

What support from ROWPH would be helpful?

One principal recalled the support that ROWPH had provided to schools around bullying and how effective that had been. This principal suggested that perhaps similar support could also be sustained for the nutrition policy to ensure similar effectiveness.

In order to address the issue of competing priorities, some principals suggested that ROWPH could support the use of a comprehensive school approach, in which all health related issues could be dealt with together. They suggested combining issues like active and safe routes to school, anti-bullying, mental wellness, and nutrition and having one school committee to promote them. They also wondered if working with groups of schools around these issues might be more effective than working with each individual school.

Other educators spoke about the importance of the workshops and other educational activities which help to keep the nutrition policy in the forefront. This is especially important for new staff and families in the school community. Some educators spoke about the need for more education for staff, students, and the parent community about the nutrition policy; others felt that these groups already knew it well. All agreed that education is still needed for new teachers, parents and students.

Educators also asked that ROWPH provide new and creative ideas and resources for teachers to use in the classroom, access to guest speakers, and a listing of the resources available.

Lastly, some teachers requested that ROWPH advocate for the return of home economics courses in the schools.

“It is important to give students some exposure to cooking and to types of foods they may not see at home.”
Appendix 3: Detailed Results of Student Focus Groups

Focus groups were held with grade seven students at four different schools (total of 24 students) and one focus group was held with students from a Grade 3 class (5 students). They were held in October and November of 2012.

All teachers of students in grade three are provided with an itinerant teacher for health. For this reason the Healthy, Active Living Consultant at WCDSB was interested in knowing grade three student’s perceptions and experiences as they have been attending school since the nutrition policy was implemented and have been taught nutrition lessons with an itinerant teacher since grade one.

In order to obtain consent to speak with the students, each child was given an information and consent form to take home and be signed by their parents. Before beginning the focus groups, consent information was explained to the students. The initial plan was to randomly select six students who had returned their consent forms from each class for the focus group to ensure that a variety of opinions were heard. In reality, most classes only had about six children who returned their consent forms – so anyone who returned the form became part of a focus group. In the initial focus group, boys and girls were placed in the same group. For subsequent focus groups, when numbers allowed, girls and boys were placed in separate groups.

Students were asked to describe in general what their school does to encourage kids to eat healthier. They were also asked if they knew if their school had a food and nutrition policy. They were encouraged to remember what school was like four years ago – before the nutrition policy was in place – in terms of the food that was available to them and sold to them. They were encouraged to talk about the differences between then and now – and were prompted about the various aspects of the nutrition policy – such as snacking during class time, rewards, catered lunches, nutrition education, communication of messages, fundraisers, and classroom celebrations. The students were asked if there was anything else they thought their school could do to encourage healthy eating. Lastly they were asked what they liked about the changes and what they did not like about the changes. The questions were slightly different for the grade 3 focus group since these students have only ever attended school in the current environment of having the nutrition policy in place.

Results
This section gives a summary of the students’ responses to each of the questions they were asked.

What does your school do to help encourage you to eat healthier?
When asked generally what the school does to encourage health eating, students mentioned teacher and principal encouragement about the policy:
“They promote it a lot. They are always telling you to bring healthy stuff – the teachers and the principal.”

“Non-stop advertising, 24-7, it kind of gets annoying after awhile.”

Students from the school that has an active nutrition committee spoke about the role of that committee in encouraging students to bring in healthy foods. They sponsor healthy eating competitions which they felt encouraged their fellow students.

Nutrition for Learning programs as well as having the opportunity to eat healthy snacks in class during instructional time were also commonly mentioned.

**How many of you know that your school has a nutrition policy?**
Generally students in grade seven knew what a policy was and were also aware that their schools have a nutrition policy. Some students who were new to Waterloo Region were not aware of the nutrition policy and some thought that it had always existed. The Grade 3 students were not able to articulate what a policy was and were not aware that their school had “rules” about healthy eating.

**Do you remember what school was like before there was a nutrition policy?**
Many grade seven students have noticed changes in their school since the nutrition policy was implemented. They noticed that there were fewer or no bake sales, hot lunch menus had changed, and classroom celebrations had changed. Students also mentioned that the school is promoting and encouraging health eating more often. Lastly, they mentioned changes that are not prescribed by the nutrition policy but are encouraged, such as students bringing more healthy foods in lunches.

*Before the policy, baked goods could be brought in for birthdays. “If you had 20 or more kids per class that is 20 or more days with junk food, which is more that we are allowed now. It is good that they can’t have all those cake days now.”*

*One student pointed out “We could bring junk food to Christmas parties and now we can’t really bring a lot of junk food.”*

Students were then prompted with some of the nutrition policy standards (refer to Table 1) to see what changes, if any, they noticed. Their responses are summarized below.

**Healthy Classroom Snacks**
There was agreement among all students that whether or not healthy snacks could be eaten during instructional time depended on the teacher. Some teachers allowed it while some limited snacking to

---

7 Nutrition for Learning is a registered charitable organization which supports community based breakfast and snack programs for children and youth in Waterloo Region.
times immediately before or after recess. Some teachers permitted only healthy snacks to be eaten during class while others made no distinction.

“…. not really allowed to eat during class, but it depends on the teacher.”

“In past years the teachers say that you have to eat healthy for the first snack because they don’t want you to be tired or anything.”

**Use of Food as a Reward**

Overall, students gave many examples of non-food rewards in schools and it appears that the use of “not permitted” food rewards is less common, although not entirely eliminated. Some students mentioned that they like non-food related rewards such as pencils and other school supplies. Some students no longer remember a time when they received candy as a reward.

“Better to have rewards that aren’t food related. It helps keep people healthy.”

“On Halloween kids get too much candy anyway, so it’s good that they don’t get much more at school.”

“For prizes, they don’t give away anything unhealthy, except for on treat days.”

“On days like Halloween, the teachers don’t really like to give out candy, so they’ll give out a Halloween-themed pencil or eraser, etc.”

Candy is still used as a reward in some cases on special event days. When it comes to food given as a reward, there appeared to be a miscommunication about special event days in some cases. Some students eluded to the idea that special event days are a “free for all” for the entire school community for that day. In reality, the school principal may designate up to ten days (or fewer, as determined by the school) during the school year as special event days. The intent of the special event days is to have one special food celebration per chosen day.

“Because they have only a certain amount of treat days, the teachers give away things like pencils or other school supplies. On treat days, they may distribute a treat for a reward though.”

Students at most schools indicated that their school had a school-wide reward system to encourage and reward good behaviour. For example, at one school good behaviour is rewarded with a pompom – which gets put into the class bucket. Each class empties its bucket into the pom-o-meter each week. Once the pom-o-meter gets filled to a certain level, the whole school gets a reward such as extra recess time. Some school had moved to this type of reward system even before the nutrition policy was implemented.
Catered Lunches

There were mixed reviews about the taste and quality of catered lunches. Some students like the taste of the pizza and pitas while others did not. Hot catered lunches do not seem as popular or well liked as many students indicated that they are not happy with the taste or quality. Some students mentioned that they bring their lunches from home instead of ordering the available hot lunch options because they do not like the taste of the hot lunch options. Some expressed that they think kids just don’t like the taste of the food, but not necessarily because it is healthier. Others say that fewer kids are ordering now than they did before the implementation of the nutrition policy because they do not like the taste of the healthy options.

“I like the pizza with the whole grain crust, but don’t like that the grease runs off the plate.”

In order to improve the food, one student said “Actually cook it, cook it on the day of instead of ahead of time, not packaged, offer fresh, made by hand food, no chemicals on it.”

“Pizza isn’t the best. Its just whole grain. I’ve heard it tastes like cardboard.”

“Whole grain pizza with turkey pepperoni is good.”

“The pizza tastes different than before. It was better before.”

“The good thing is that there is more variety of what you can order now.”

Some students expressed a desire for more choice. For example, they want other toppings on the pizza such as vegetables or meat, and some would like the option of thin crust pizza. They mentioned that they used to be able to choose their own toppings and liked this.

“We should get like veggies on it [the pizza].”

At one school, a parent makes fresh fruit smoothies and offered cut up vegetables and fruit as healthy snacks. These items are offered for sale three days of the week. This was popular with students. In fact one student said that they preferred the food before the nutrition policy was implemented – but that they would like to keep the smoothies and veggie snacks sales that were started in response to the nutrition policy.

“Kids can order various snacks (e.g., yogurt parfaits with strawberries, blueberries, or bananas on top, veggies & dip, smoothies). They are really popular with the kids, especially after seeing it advertised in the newsletter (kids tend to go home and bug their parents to order them).”

“Kids prefer the healthier snacks – like the smoothies and the fruit and vegetables, over the hot lunches.”
Nutrition Education for Students

Students were able to give many examples of healthy eating and nutrition messages that they learned in class. They said that when the nutrition policy came out there was quite a bit of related education about the nutrition policy and healthy eating.

“In health, healthy eating is the thing we learn about the most, out of all the things we learn and the thing we like to learn about the most.”

“In Health, we are studying motivational ways to help encourage kids to eat healthier (e.g., growing a garden; instead of having 3 treats a day, they could have 1; following Canada’s Food Guide; talking to parents about buying healthier food; and finding healthy recipes online.).”

 “[The teacher] teaches us that if we eat something that is healthy that is good. But you can’t eat unhealthy things a lot of times, it is a sometimes food.”

“When they changed the rules...they really started to focus on teaching more about healthy eating and stuff.”

In some instances, students mention bringing home nutrition messages learned in class to their families. One student mentioned that she went home and told her mom about what they were learning in class, and the mom was so encouraged she bought a recipe book on healthier recipes.

“when we learn about it in school it encourages a lot of people to go home and learn about it... and talk to their parents about it and about what is a better choice and what’s not and then their parents realize it and they will start doing a lot more healthy stuff to encourage it too.”

“my mom got so annoyed though cause I kept going home and saying what [healthy foods] we needed to buy. So she had me write down a list and then we could buy it.”

Lessons in the classroom appear to make some students reflect on their own food choices. Other student indicated that they do not think the communication of health messages affects what they eat.

“For a lot of people it disappoints them (learning about the nutrition of food) because if they really like something and then they see how much sugar is in it, but it also encourages them to stop eating that, and not to have so much.”

“I think it’s made everyone think more, like ‘Maybe I should pack a healthier lunch’.”

“Kids are coming to school remarking on how yummy healthy snacks such as veggies & dip look; they make funny designs on their plates with the veggies.”

Fundraising

Overall, many students gave examples of fundraisers that are non-food related (e.g., dance-a-thons, read-a-thons, Jump Rope for Heart) and/or use healthy foods. They also gave examples of fundraisers...
they remembered that used foods of minimum nutritional value which the school now no longer uses to raise funds.

“At dances, instead of selling candy, they now sell whole-wheat pizza with water.”

“They had a tuck shop [store] with freezies, etc that you could buy. But since the nutritional policy they aren’t allowed to do the store.”

“We don’t sell candy or have bake sales.”

Some schools use special event days for fundraisers. Special events days refer to days on which a special food celebration can be held. Schools may designate up to ten such days per year.

“For other fundraisers, it’s considered more of a treat day. Kids are encouraged to bring healthy snacks regardless of it being a treat day though. Mission Day at the end of the year is a fundraiser where they sell hot dogs and other things, as well as bake sales, which raise money to go to charity, but those are considered treat days, and they only have a couple over the year.”

Students spoke of the challenges to using healthy or non-food items as fundraisers. For example, they were aware that public schools do not have the same nutrition policy and that chocolate bars are still sold in their neighbourhoods. Some felt that the nutrition policy should not affect people who are not part of the school.

“The people we would be selling them [chocolate bars] to aren’t at this school so they aren’t with the food policy so they should be able to buy them… and it’s not during school hours.”

“I know we are supposed to be healthy but like we’re selling stuff after school and no one really buys what we sell.”

“No one buys what we sell. Coupon books are $35 and no one wants to spend that much.”

**Classroom and School Celebrations**

Most students were aware that they were not to bring in “not permitted” foods for the entire class to share on a special occasion such as their birthday. They also mentioned other things that were done to celebrate special events.

“We aren’t really allowed to bring treats for birthdays or Halloween parties.”

“In kindergarten, they had little parties with a birthday dance. They had a party for all the summer birthdays.”

“At the end of the month, everyone who had a birthday in that month would get a ‘prize’ from the teacher like a soccer ball, dodge ball, or road hockey stick.”
After discussing the above nutrition policy standards, we asked students about how nutrition messages are communicated, what else they thought their school could do to encourage healthy eating, what they liked about the nutrition policy, and what they would change.

**How Nutrition Messages are Communicated**

Students cited newsletters and agendas as sources of information about the nutrition policy—even though these ways might not reach all parents. It was also acknowledged that some children go home and talk to their parents about it.

“Information about healthy eating is in every newsletter.”

“Some students don’t bring the newsletter home, or they forget it and parents don’t see it.”

“There are kids that go home and talk to their parents about it.”

Newsletters are sent home with healthy recipes/tips for packing healthier lunches. “I know my mom reads the letters and then she packs me healthier stuff, like apples and oranges, or veggies & dip, kind of stuff.”

There is information in the agenda about the policy. “But it is not at the front like other important information; it is at the back, mixed with other things that aren’t relevant.”

“when we learn about it in school it encourages a lot of people to go home and learn about it... and talk to their parents about it and about what is a better choice and what’s not and then their parents realize it and they will start doing a lot more healthy stuff to encourage it too.”

“My mom got so annoyed though ‘cause I kept going home and saying what [healthy foods] we needed to buy. So she had me write down a list and then we could buy it.”

There were also some examples of improper communication of the nutrition policy. As mentioned in the background to this report, the nutrition policy does not cover what children bring in their own lunches. It does cover what students bring in to share with everyone in the class. Also, special event days are meant to be for one special food celebration per chosen day—and not a day in which all nutrition policy standards are suspended.

“But it’s like, sometimes when you have an [unhealthy] snack and they [teachers] say you can’t eat it its like oh darn.”

“A lot of the time we’re supposed to have lunches that only have a certain amount of junk food.”

“There is still unhealthy stuff brought in by kids (in their lunches) and it isn’t taken away. The principal sets the rule but he doesn’t enforce them.”

“Teachers aren’t allowed to give us stuff, but if we bring in stuff from home, say like its my birthday and I brought cupcakes, we’d be allowed to like give it out, but our teacher is not allowed to like bring her own stuff in and give it out.”
Because they have only a certain amount of treat days, the teachers give away things like pencils or other school supplies. On treat days, they may distribute a treat for a reward though.

Students cited a number of examples of both positive and negative role modeling.

“Teachers are very supportive on eating healthy and nutrition.”

“They do not eat healthy in there [referring to staff room]. We’re not supposed to know about this. But we know!”

“[The teacher] tells us about healthy foods when she eats not healthy foods. [The teacher] is like on a diet they tell us – a diet of chocolate, a diet of good chocolaty chocolate.”

What else can your school do to encourage healthy eating?
To encourage healthy eating, suggestions from students included: create a fruit program for students, have less frequent pizza days, have a student nutrition team at school, improve hot lunches, connect with church and community centres to have healthy eating programs for students, and have positive role models.

Provide fruit once a week for students so that “at least once a week we would be eating more fruit than junk food.”

Only have pizza day every-other week instead of every week because “that’s a lot of grease”.

“Programs for learning about how to do more healthy things at the community centre or something like that. Because we are kind of connected to the community centre and the church. If there were nutrition programs there that would be helpful too.”

“If they say we should stick to the health policy they should too [teachers], because like we’re all supposed to work together.”

“You have to be a good role model.”

“One year when a previous teacher was here there was a student nutrition team and we went on a trip to a nutritious learning thing [school nutrition workshop] and we learned some games. It was near the end of the year so we were going to come back the next year and do a bunch of the stuff but we never got the chance. But it was really fun.”

What do you like about the Nutrition Policy?
Students mentioned the following as examples of what they like about the nutrition policy: learning healthy eating skills (like how to read labels), having the Nutrition for Learning breakfast/snack program, fewer days where “not permitted” foods are available, having the opportunity to be involved
in nutrition teams\textsuperscript{8} at school, the availability of healthy treats (smoothies, fruit), and the role of the school in the promotion of healthy eating.

“What I like about it is that sometimes we get healthy foods and I really like eating healthy.”

“The food that we get as snacks is really good – everyone loves it (the smoothies, and the fruit). I like the healthy treats.”

“I like how the school is so motivated to get us to eat healthy stuff.”

“I was on the Nutrition Team last year, and I thought it was really fun. We were encouraging it so much that we made a music video and a PowerPoint – it was educational, but at the end we got to do something fun. We got the tune of one song and made up our own lyrics about eating healthy. I think next year, more people are going to join the Nutrition Team because of all the fun we had.”

“I like that they cut back. Not having as many junk food days. And if you want to have something like cake at home, you don’t want to have it all the time. With a big class there are always junk food days with people bringing in junk food and baked goods.”

“I like the fact that they are helping us to learn to eat more fruits and veggies because it keeps you healthy and in shape and energized.”

What do you wish was different about the Nutrition Policy?
There were mixed responses about what students would change. Responses ranged from wanting the nutrition policy to go away to wanting more enforcement of it.

“Change the hot lunches back to the way they were before – before they were delicious and if they changed them back I would order them again”. [They felt the previous caterer was still serving healthy lunches, but since the change to another caterer, it was just not as good].

“Just go back to the way things were. In general they have taken away a lot of the things that make you say “Yes, it’s hot dog day!” or “Yes, it’s pizza day!” Now it’s just “Ah its smoothie day, have to go throw this out now.””

“I think that like they could enforce the thing [policy] a little better because if you’re eating junky stuff at school and then you’re eating junky stuff at home too than you don’t really have a balanced diet.”

“Wish we could have a couple more days of junk food. It is a nice treat.”

“I think it’s [healthy eating at school] good.”

“I don’t really mind it [school promoting healthy eating].”

\textsuperscript{8} One of the policy standards (see Table 1) encourages schools to form a student nutrition team. The team will help the school community promote and support healthy nutrition and lifestyle practices in the classroom, throughout the school and in the home. The WCDSB will provide resources and opportunities to support the school nutrition teams (e.g. networking sessions and workshops).
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2011-2012 Community Labour Market Analysis
Employment and Income Support, Social Services annually asks the Workforce Planning Board of Waterloo Wellington Dufferin (WPB) to produce a profile of the local labour market. The Community Labour Market Analysis is used along with other information reports such as the 2012 Ontario Works Caseload Profile to develop the Ontario Works Service Plan and to plan programs which address the employment needs of Ontario Works participants.

The Community Labour Market Analysis examines labour market statistics and trends, provides an overview of employment by sector and occupation, and outlines barriers to employment for certain groups for the Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo Census Metropolitan Area (Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo CMA). The Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo CMA includes the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo and the Townships of North Dumfries and Woolwich.

Key Findings
The Community Labour Market Analysis illustrates that recovery from the economic downturn is taking place in the Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo CMA. While the unemployment rate for the Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo CMA did not drop back to pre-recession levels (5.7% in 2008), it dropped by 0.8% in the last year and 1.4% in the last two years (from 7.4% in 2010 to 6.8% in 2011 to 6.0% in October 2012).

The number of employers (excluding owner operators) in the Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo CMA increased slightly (0.4%) from 2011 to 2012, with 99.5% of all businesses having less than 200 employees. Since the loss at Research in Motion (RIM) of approximately 900 jobs locally in July 2011, two Action Centres (Maple Leaf and RIM/Communitech) remain in the CMA to support laid off workers. In 2012, a number of Zellers stores closed and while some will be replaced by new Target stores many long tenured Zellers employees will face unemployment.
The Community Labour Market Analysis demonstrates that the CMA’s population continued to increase with growth of 1.2% from October 2011 to October 2012. This increase resulted in only slight growth of 0.07% in the labour force. Growing employment and decreasing unemployment would suggest a strong local labour force and potential opportunities for those wishing to find employment in the Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo CMA. Labour force participation rates remain higher than the Ontario average (66% compared to 62% in October 2012), peaking earlier than typical reaching almost 74% from February to May 2012. While the number of people in Ontario who were unemployed for 27 weeks or more decreased from 132,000 in October 2011 to 123,000 (-6.8%) in October 2012, 19,000 (0% change since 2011) individuals aged 15-24 were unemployed for over 27 weeks compared to just 8,000 in 2008. This would seem to indicate that youth are experiencing disproportionately high employment barriers.

Employment in the Goods Producing Sector, which is made up of industries that are primarily associated with the production of goods (e.g., growing of crops, generation of electricity, the manufacturing of computers) increased by 13.8% from October 2011 to October 2012 after a decline of -13.3% from 2010 to 2011. Employment in the Manufacturing Sector has increased 14.6% since 2011, accounting for 20% of employment in the Waterloo Region in 2012. For the first time since 2008, manufacturing employment is back above pre-recession levels. Revenue has grown yearly by 8% on average since the beginning of 2010 and it appears that Ontario's manufacturers are recovering from the previous displacement.

Employment in the Service Sector which provides such services as education, health, and transportation decreased overall by -4.8% from October 2011 to October 2012, influenced by decreases to Information, Culture and Recreation (-38%); and Health Care and Social Assistance (-19.4%) services. Healthy gains to Transportation and Warehousing; Finance, Insurance Real Estate and Leasing; and Business, Building, and other support services assisted in mediating some losses experienced by other services.

Priorities
In terms of local employment services, the Community Labour Market Analysis highlighted several gaps or priorities for the Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo CMA.

- Employment in the Professional, Scientific and Technical Services sector continues to be an economic development priority for most of the region. While this sector experienced a decrease from 2011 to October 2012 it is still well above 2010 figures.
- Immigrants, youth and women continue to experience higher than average unemployment rates. The Workforce Planning Board has identified a need for more flexibility in youth employment program criteria for all youth to more easily access employment assistance services.
- There appears to be a mismatch between the skills needed for new employees in some manufacturing businesses and the pool of available labour. The Community Labour Market Analysis recommends longer-term supports to help potential employees recognize the areas where growth is occurring and gain access to these opportunities.

This work supports the Region’s Corporate Strategic Focus Area Two: Growth Management and Prosperity; Strategic Objective Three: Support a diverse, innovative and globally competitive economy.

The full report is attached separately. A copy of the report will be placed in the Councillors’ library. For further information please contact Tamara Kerr, Social Planning Associate at 519 883-2040 or tkerr@regionofwaterloo.ca; or David Dirks, Director, Employment & Income Support at 519-883-2179 or ddirks@regionofwaterloo.ca.
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Labour Market Analysis 2011-2012

Introduction

This labour market analysis identifies changes in the labour market in the Waterloo Region by examining variances between 2011 and 2012 data. The report makes yearly comparisons as it relates to other metropolitan areas in South Western Ontario.

Much of the data in this report is derived from Statistics Canada’s monthly Labour Force Survey however other data is also considered, including Canadian Business Pattern and Taxfiler data and information from provincial and federal labour market reports. In all cases, numbers are seasonally adjusted unless otherwise indicated. ¹

1.0 Labour Market Statistics, Trends and Analysis

1.1 Labour Force Characteristics

Table 1 - Labour Force Characteristics – Kitchener Census Metropolitan Area (KCMA)²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population over 15 years of age</td>
<td>409,500³</td>
<td>414,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Force ⁴</td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>291,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>271,100</td>
<td>273,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>17,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From October 2011 to October 2012 there has been a slight slowing from the previous period with population growth returning to normal levels (normally approximately 5,000 – 6,000 people each year). The labour force has not kept up with population growth and has remained static. This could indicate a decrease in opportunities in the labour force for those entering or re-entering the labour force. Employment continues to grow while unemployment is declining throughout 2012; however there remains a lack of labour market growth in certain industries and occupations.

¹ Seasonal Adjustment – A statistical technique used to remove the effect of normal seasonal fluctuations in data so underlying trends become more evident. Economic statistics, which are subject to seasonal influence, are sometimes presented with the seasonal influence removed. The calculated effect of the seasons has been eliminated from the data.

² CMA – A Census Metropolitan Area is a geographical unit used by Statistics Canada to describe significant urban areas. Kitchener CMA includes the cities of Kitchener, Cambridge, Waterloo and the townships of Woolwich and North Dumfries.

³ All numbers in the report have been rounded to the nearest 100.

⁴ Labour Force - Refers to the labour market activity of the population 15 years of age and over, excluding institutional residents, prior to the survey week. Respondents are classified as either employed or unemployed.
Waterloo Region is still closest to London in population size. While the Waterloo Region labour market has remained steady at 291,000 from October 2011 to October 2012, London has experienced growth to the labour market of 5,000 people, compared to growth in the Waterloo Region of about 2,000 people over the same period.

1.2 Trends and Comparisons

Chart 2 – Participation Rate Trends
The monthly participation rate is calculated as the percentage of the total population aged 15 and over who are employed or actively seeking employment. The patterns of participation rates differ slightly from those recorded over the past couple of years. Normally we would expect to see increases from May to August due to summer student employment however, 2012 had its peak participation rates of almost 74% from February to May, with a steady tapering off from May to September. This indicates that the increases in those looking for work in those peak months did not come from the student population but from the non-student population e.g. newcomers to the region. Participation rates are still much higher than those of Ontario as a whole, which remain static at just under 62%.

**Chart 3 – Employment Rate Trends**

![Chart 3 – Employment Rate Trends](image)

Unlike last year, employment rates declined in 2012 from May to September. In 2010-2011 the employment rate remained above 68% from March until August, while 2012 experienced peak growth much earlier from February until June.

**Full-Time vs. Part Time**

Full-time employment increased substantially from 2010 to 2011, while part-time employment fell and returned to pre-recession levels.

**Table 2 – Full-Time vs. Part-Time (presented in 000s).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labour force characteristics KCMA</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>253.5</td>
<td>259.9</td>
<td>255.4</td>
<td>263.7</td>
<td>276.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employment</td>
<td>201.9</td>
<td>208.9</td>
<td>197.5</td>
<td>210.3</td>
<td>224.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employment</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Unemployment Statistics

Table 3 – Unemployment Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMA</th>
<th>Annual Unemployment Rate (%)</th>
<th>Seasonally Adjusted (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catharines – Niagara</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantford</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unemployment rate in the Waterloo Region in October 2012 was 6%, coming second to Guelph (5.8%). This suggests that many newcomers to the Waterloo Region are finding employment, when compared to other areas in the province.

As of October 2012, the unadjusted average duration of unemployment in Ontario continues to sit at 22 weeks, consistent with last year at this time. The number of people who were unemployed for 27 weeks or more is 123,000; a reduction of over 9,000 from 132,000 in October 2011. Approximately 19,000 persons aged 15-24 years were unemployed for more than 27 weeks, the same as last year; however the average number of weeks unemployed for this age group has gone up from 12 weeks to 13 weeks.

Chart 4 – Unemployment Rate Trends
1.4 Other Significant Information for the KCMA

- The total number of businesses has decreased by -0.48% from June 2011 to June 2012, in line with Ontario at -0.49%.
- The number of owner operated businesses experienced a -1.23% reduction, declining by 219.
- Small and medium sized business with 1-50 employees saw a net increase of 28 businesses between June 2011 and June 2012, compared to a decrease of 37 businesses recorded between June 2010 and June 2011.
- In businesses with more than 100 employees, there was a net increase of 26 businesses, compared to a decline in 2011 by 24 businesses.
- The number of large businesses having more than 500+ employees remained steady at 39.
- 99.5% of all Waterloo Region businesses have less than 200 employees.

2.0 Employment by Sector and Occupation

Table 4 - Employment by Sector Comparison – KCMA (Seasonally unadjusted)
Presented in 000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Oct-10</th>
<th>Oct-11</th>
<th>Oct-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total employment all industries</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Goods Producing Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Oil &amp; Gas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Service Sector</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance and Real Estate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Building and other Support Services</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, Culture and Recreation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey

Manufacturing sector employment has grown throughout 2012, peaking at 60,000 in September 2012. The average number of people employed in the Manufacturing industry in 2011 was approximately 51,000 and is expected to average above 56,000 in 2012. The industry is growing with employment vacancies in all categories. There has been a dramatic decline in the number of workers in unskilled general labour type positions from 2006 to 2012 while the total number
of positions remains the same. This is reflective of industry employment trends shifting from unskilled to semi-skilled and skilled workers. In 2012, 76% of all manufacturing businesses had less than 20 employees.

From June 2011 to June 2012, there was a net increase of 26 employers with 100 or more employees in the Waterloo Region. There are now 370 employers in Waterloo Region with more than 100 employees, this is up from 344 last year. The total number of employers has increased from 15,116 to 15,177 (excluding owner operators).

**Table 5 - Employment by Occupation – KCMA (seasonally unadjusted)**

*Presented in 000s*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Oct-10</th>
<th>Oct-11</th>
<th>Oct-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All occupations</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management occupations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, finance and administrative</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural &amp; applied sciences &amp; related</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health occupations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations in social science, education, government service and religion</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations in art, culture, recreation and sport</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and service occupations</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations unique to primary industry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations unique to processing, manufacturing and utilities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey

The majority of occupations had slight decreases to employment, while employment in Trade and Transport increased 14% since 2011 representing a large proportion of overall employment in the region.

**2.1 Changes in Employment by Sector**

Chart 5 highlights the changes in employment from October 2011 to October 2012. The largest increases in employment were in Manufacturing and Health Care and Social Assistance sectors; both experiencing growth since 2011.

---

5 Information taken from Ontario Labour Market Report, LMI & Research, MTCU – November 2011
2.2 Employment and Economic Forecasts

Scotiabank’s Global Auto Report released October 4, 2012 points to an increase of 8% in automotive sales globally in July and August and an increase of 6% for the same time period in Canada. This growth is reflected locally by Toyota Canada adding 400 employees at both their Woodstock and Cambridge manufacturing facilities generating direct opportunities and significant spin-off job creation in the automotive parts manufacturing industry.

In Ontario, the unemployment rate is forecasted to remain high and decline slowly during 2013 and 2014, averaging to about 7.5% and 7.0%, compared to 7.8% in 2012. By 2017, the unemployment rate is forecast to decline to 5.6%; the lowest since 1989.

According to the Workforce Planning Board’s monthly labour market snapshot for Waterloo Wellington and Dufferin, there were 67 new jobs created within the 33 participating employers in November 2012. 46 of those positions were in the manufacturing sector and 72% are temporary positions.

In July, manufacturers’ sales in Ontario were $22.3 billion, 32% above their recession low. Revenue has grown yearly by 8% on average since the beginning of 2010. From these figures, it...
appears that Ontario’s manufacturers are recovering from the previous displacement brought upon by the recession of 2008-2009.10

2.3 Goods Producing Sector

The Goods Producing Sector is made up of industries that are primarily associated with the production of goods (e.g., growing of crops, generation of electricity, the manufacturing of computers). However, these sectors may also produce some services (e.g., pest control services, plumbing services, land subdivision, house-painting, and support services for mining operations).

2.3.1 Manufacturing and Construction

Chart 6 – Employment Trends for Manufacturing and Construction (Kitchener CMA 2007-2012)

Manufacturing increased from 2011 to October 2012 after declining from 2010 to 2011. For the first time since 2008, manufacturing employment is back above the pre-recession low. The overall Goods Producing Sector employment numbers are also stabilizing back to pre-2008 levels. In the past several years, the Construction Sector has remained fairly constant with minor fluctuations in employment levels.

10 EYE on ICI Newsletter, Ontario Construction Secretariat, October 2012
Manufacturing employment overall increased monthly with a slight downturn in September and October of 2012. The expected average employment for 2012 is likely to be around 56,000, putting Manufacturing employment once again at approximately 20% of all employment within the region.

Construction employment overall remained steady throughout 2012 with only a slight decline in the number of construction businesses in Waterloo Region dropping from 3,849 in June 2011 to 3,801 in June 2012 (inclusive of owner operators).

2.4 Service Sector

The Service Sector provides services key to supporting the local population and industry such as education, health and transportation services.

2.4.1 Trade and Transportation

Chart 8 - Employment Trends for Trade and Transportation (Kitchener CMA 2007-2012)
Retail/Wholesale Trade employment has declined significantly with losses in all but 5 of 21 categories of businesses in this sector. Despite this, there has been significant growth in the number of Non-Store Retailers e.g. on-line sales, which are small businesses and owner operated 75% of the time.

A healthy Automotive Manufacturing sector is supporting steady employment in the Transportation and Warehousing sector; however changes in the types of manufacturing shipments and just-in-time deliveries may limit any other potential growth locally in this sector.

2.4.2 Finance, Professional and Business Services

Chart 9 - Employment Trends for Finance, Professional and Business Services (Kitchener CMA 2007-2012)

Businesses in the Finance, Insurance and Real Estate sector are expected to see many retirements over the next 1-5 years and are actively involved in recruitment and succession planning activities. Some entry level occupations being listed as in-demand include customer service representatives, clerks, payroll clerks, adjusters and sales and marketing staff. This sector bounced back by 13% from 2011 to October 2012, after experiencing a 6% decline from 2010-2011.

The Professional, Scientific and Technical Services sector continues to be an economic development priority for most of the region and the number of employees continues to grow. While this sector experienced a 7% decrease from 2011 to October 2012, it is still well above the 2010 numbers by 19%.

All three sectors remain above the pre-recession levels in October 2012.
2.4.3 Education, Health Care and Public Administration

Chart 10 - Employment Trends for Education, Health Care and Public Administration (Kitchener CMA 2007-2012)

The number of workers in Health Care and Educational Services has fluctuated over time, but remains fairly stable between 45,000-50,000 workers combined. Health Care and Social Assistance has tapered off by about 15% from 2011 to October 2012 after experiencing a significant increase from 2010 to 2011 by 23%. Educational services have seen a slight increase by 7% from 2011 to October 2012 initiating the first period of growth since the decline of these services in 2009.

Employment in Public Administration has declined yearly between 2008 and October 2012. This year is the lowest in five years falling below recorded 2007 figures to 7,100.

2.4.4 Information, Accommodation and Other Services

Chart 11 - Employment Trends for Information, Accommodation and Other Services (Kitchener CMA 2007-2012)
Although employment in Accommodation and Food Services was at 17,400 in October 2012, the anticipated annual average for 2012 is more likely to be around 16,000. Accommodation Services added 4 new businesses from June 2011 to June 2012, while Food Services and Drinking Places declined by 7 businesses during this same period.

The number of people employed in Accommodation and Food services and Other services increased between 2011 to October 2012 by 15% and 7% respectively. While Information, Culture and Recreation had a significant spike in the number of people employed from 2010 to 2011, this service declined by 36% from 2011 to October 2012.

### 2.5 Employment Growth/Change

#### 2.5.1 Local Adjustment – Downsizing/layoffs
Currently two Action Centres, Maple Leaf and RIM (Communitech) remain in the region to support laid off workers. Action Centres are usually established when 50 or more workers have been laid off at one time.

In 2012, a number of Zellers stores will close and while some will be replaced by new Target stores many long tenured Zellers employees will face unemployment for the first time in many years.

#### 2.5.2 Local Adjustment - Growth
Announcements of new jobs at Toyota in Cambridge will lead to direct and indirect spin off jobs among suppliers. Companies such as Musachi Auto Parts Canada Inc. in Arthur and TG Minto in Palmerston are already ramping up for additional production and seeking both skilled and unskilled workers who are willing to commute or relocate to Wellington County.

### 3.0 Labour Market Supply

**Who’s looking for work?**

One way to look at the labour market supply is to understand who is currently looking for work, what is the make-up and skill level of that pool of potential workers, and does it match with the types of employment in demand by industry.

A sample was taken from local Employment Ontario (EO) agencies of their clients from April-September 2012. The following are the results from those who responded:

- 54% of Clients < Grade 12
- 4% of clients < 20 years old
- 39% of clients > 44 years old
- 36% of clients > 26 weeks out of work/school

It is surprising that only 4% of clients are under age 20 when the youth unemployment rate is currently approximately 14%.
Over one third of current clients have been out of work or school for an extended period. This could indicate that either their skills are not matching existing opportunities or they have multiple issues impacting their ability to find work.

A survey of 30 EO service provider front line staff showed the following:
- 10 reported that 20-40% of their clients had less than Grade 10
- 5 reported that 60-80% of their clients had less than Grade 10
- 2 reported that 80-100% of their clients had less than Grade 10
- 20 reported that apprenticeship was relevant to only 0-20% of their clients
- 14 reported that college education was relevant to only 0-20% of their clients
- 17 reported that university education was relevant to only 0-20% of their clients

Again this reiterates the fact that more and more service provider staff are dealing with under-educated and lower skilled clients and fewer are working with high level trained or educated clients.

The same survey was conducted in 2011 and the results from both 2011 and 2012 are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sector Job Search (Region of Waterloo, EO Service Provider Survey)</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care/Social Assistance</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Service</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This pattern of employment search is troubling in some ways in that current clients are looking at employment sectors where employment demand is indeed high e.g. manufacturing, health care, etc. however the skill requirements are at much higher levels than those which seem to be available to these clients. For many, their employment searches are likely not going to be successful without the need for other interventions such as training or upgrading.

Almost 61% of front line staff indicated that skills training, accreditation and prior learning assessments was either absent or difficult for clients to access. Given the high concentration of clients with lower skill levels, this could have major implications on their ability to access employment, even when workers are in high demand and unemployment rates are low. Not having access to these types of services, for whatever reason, e.g. cost, low literacy levels, transportation, etc. will ensure that higher proportions of these unemployed and potential future workers cannot enter and/or be successful in the labour market. This will likely cause them to remain unemployed in the longer term or potentially indefinitely.
4.0 Client Groups

This section focuses on several key populations within the community who tend to be more vulnerable and who, in many cases face more barriers to employment than the general population.

4.1 Immigrants

According to Statistics Canada’s Labour Force Survey, in Ontario the unadjusted unemployment rate for landed immigrants of less than 5 years in 2011 was 11.2%, down from 12.4% last year. A number of local initiatives are being maintained through the Immigration Partnership including mentor and internship programs for Internationally Educated Professionals (IEPs). 2011 census information will not be available on the make-up of the immigrant population until May 2013.

4.2 Youth and Older Workers

Table 10 - Unemployment Rate by Age (Percentage in KCMA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24 years</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 54 years</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years and over</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unemployment rate for youth aged 15 to 24 in the Kitchener CMA remained steady at 13.8% from 2011 to 2012. For males in this age category the unemployment rate grew from 15.8% to 17.6%. In comparison, the unemployment rate for youth aged 15 to 24 in Guelph CMA grew from 11.8% to 14.8% during the same period.

Among older workers, the unemployment rate is low enough that a suspected primary factor in this age group is that individuals who are not able to find work likely require more skills relevant to employment opportunities and they may likely remain unemployed longer.

4.3 Women

In the Kitchener CMA, the unemployment rate among women 55 years and older was 7.2% in 2011. The 2012 data has been suppressed which means it has likely dropped. The unemployment rate for young women aged 15-24 has dropped from 11.1% in 2011 to 10% in 2012. While, women have kept pace with men in finding full-time employment, they are still almost twice as likely to be working part-time as men. From 2011 to 2012, the number of women working part-time increased from 33,700 to 38,800.

5.0 Summary

The Waterloo Region labour market profile is steadying with slowing rates of growth to population, a decreasing labour force, and increasing employment rates. The employment rate remained above 68% in 2012, peaking earlier than most years between February to June. It
appears that many of the people who are moving to Waterloo Region are finding employment, with a reported unemployment rate of 6%. The youth unemployment rate was 13.8% in 2012.

As of October 2012, the unadjusted average duration of unemployment in Ontario continues to sit at 22 weeks, consistent with last year at this time. The number of those unemployed for 27 weeks or more decreased by 7% from 2011. It is forecasted in Ontario that unemployment rates will remain high into 2013 and 2014, with an eventual decline to 5.6% by 2017 to lower than typical levels since 1989.

In Waterloo Region, the total number of employers increased from 15,116 to 15,177 (excluding owner operators). 99.5% of all Waterloo Region businesses have less than 200 employees and 76% of all manufacturing businesses had less than 20 employees in 2012.

The manufacturing sector employment levels have grown throughout 2012 with an anticipated growth by 10% when compared to 2011. The number of unskilled general labour positions declined dramatically since 2006, while the total number remained about the same.

Table 11 – Employment by Sector Comparison – KCMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment All Industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Wholesale Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, real estate and leasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and technical services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, building and other support services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, Culture and Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In July, manufacturers’ sales were $22.3 billion, which is 32% above their recession low. Employment in the Finance, Insurance and Real Estate sector; the Professional, Scientific and Technical Services, and Business, Building and Other services remain above pre-recession levels in October 2012.
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MEMORANDUM

To: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee

From: Sheri Phillips, Manager Child Care Subsidy  
Nancy Dickieson, Director, Children’s Services

Copies: Douglas Bartholomew-Saunders, Commissioner, Social Services

File Code: S04-01

Subject: CHILD CARE FEE SUBSIDY ONLINE APPLICATION

On February 25, 2013, Children’s Services launched the On-line Application Form (OLAF) for Child Care Subsidy. OLAF is a user-friendly on-line application for parents/guardians who wish to apply for Child Care Subsidy so that they can work, attend school or training, or find a child care placement for their child with special needs. Seventy percent of families currently receiving subsidy are employed and many have shared that accessing the Subsidy office between the hours of 8:30 – 4:30 Monday to Friday can be challenging.

The new on-line application means that a parent/guardian can apply for Child Care Subsidy from their computer, at a time that is convenient for them. Once the parent/guardian has submitted all their required supporting documents, the application and child care placement can be finalized in a phone call with the Child Care Subsidy Caseworker.

Parents/guardians can still complete their application in office if that is their preference. In addition, the Child Care Subsidy office will arrange for a language or ASL interpreter if needed. Since its launch on February 25th, 150 applications have been submitted and 37 of those have been completed and approved. Ninety-nine applications are pending, awaiting documentation. Of the 37 approved applications, 17 were parents/guardians who had applied previously and provided feedback that they found the process to be positive, highlighting the ease of accessing the application and how quickly the application was completed. OLAF provides a significant service enhancement to families in our community who need Child Care Subsidy.

For further information please contact Nancy Dickieson, Director, Children’s Services at 519-883-2177 or ndickieson@regionofwaterloo.ca.
To: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee  
From: Lynn Randall, Director, Social Planning, Policy and Program Administration  
Copies: Douglas Bartholomew-Saunders, Commissioner, Social Services  
File No.: S13-30  
Subject: 2013 SUBSIDIZED SUPPORTIVE HOUSING INFORMATION AND REFERRAL GUIDE AND 2013 EMERGENCY SHELTER INFORMATION AND REFERRAL GUIDE

The 2013 Subsidized Supportive Housing Information and Referral Guide: Programs funded through the Domiciliary Hostel Program and the 2013 Emergency Shelter Information and Referral Guide (the Guides) have been created to provide essential information to service providers throughout Waterloo Region about the subsidized supportive housing providers funded through the Domiciliary Hostel Program and the Emergency Shelter Programs. The Guides provide service providers with an overview of the areas and basic “Housing Profile” or “Shelter Profile” information about each of the programs.

With the information contained in the Guides, service providers will be able to provide higher quality information to potential tenants of subsidized supportive housing programs or to those seeking emergency shelter.

Creating and updating the Guides is a priority identified in The Action Framework for All Roads Lead to Home: The Homelessness to Housing Stability Strategy for Waterloo Region (2012), (SS 12-052). This priority is identified in:

- Focus Area #3, Support the housing stability system to end homelessness.
- Action 34, Increase access to information about resources to support system navigation

These Guides can be found on the Region’s website. Copies of the Guides have been placed in the Council Library. If you have any questions or comments or for further information, please contact Marie Morrison, Manager Social Planning at 519-883-2238 or mmorrison@regionofwaterloo.ca.
The Canada Learning Bond (CLB) can be an important step to breaking the cycle of poverty. It can amount to $2,000 from the Government of Canada for any child born on or after January 1, 2004 who is eligible for the National Child Benefit Supplement (NCBS). All Ontario Works participants with children born after this date would be eligible for these funds.

The Government of Canada will make an initial deposit of $500, with another $100 being added each year to a maximum of $2000 or until the child is 15 years old. No contribution is needed to receive the CLB, and it will not affect social assistance benefits. The CLB can only be used for the child’s education after high school and the child has up to 36 years to use the fund for part-time or full-time studies.

In a recent survey it was found that only 17% of Ontario Works participants are aware of the Canada Learning Bond and its benefits for their children. Further in the Region of Waterloo as a whole only 20% of eligible families has accessed the Canada Learning Bond for their children. That means that the Canada Learning Bond has so far failed to reach four out of five eligible children in this region. On the Ontario Works caseload only 7.4% of the 4,152 eligible children may be accessing the CLB.

The staff of Employment and Income Support has partnered with Opportunities Waterloo Region to raise the awareness of this resource. Staff are hosting two “sign up” sessions for Ontario Works and Ontario Disability Support Program participants to promote access to these funds. In addition to Regional staff, representatives from Service Canada and a financial institution will be present to enable those who attend to register for the program on the spot. A copy of a promotional flyer is attached for information.

This work supports Focus Area 4 of the Region’s 2011-2014 Strategic Plan: Healthy and Inclusive Communities; specifically, Strategic Objective 4.1 (to) work collaboratively to reduce poverty.

For further information please contact David Dirks, Director, Employment and Income Support at 519-883-2179 or ddirks@regionofwaterloo.ca
Was your child born on or after January 1, 2004?
Do you receive the National Child Benefit Supplement?
Your child is eligible for $500 - $2,000 of free money for their education!

The Canada Learning Bond is a Federal Education Grant. Bring identification for yourself and your child to sign up!

☐ Birth Certificate OR Canadian Status Document OR Drivers License AND
☐ Social Insurance Number

Your child doesn’t have a Social Insurance Number (SIN)? No problem! Sign up for a SIN on the spot with Service Canada. All you need to bring is your child’s Birth Certificate or Canadian Status Document.

Cambridge
When: Thursday May 23rd, 2013
10:30 a.m. – 3 p.m.
Where: 150 Main St., 1st floor, Boardroom

Waterloo
When: Thursday May 30th, 2013
10:30 a.m. – 3 p.m.
Where: 99 Regina St. S., 1st floor, Employment Resource Area

FREE MONEY. FOR YOUR KIDS. YES, REALLY.
And it won’t affect your Ontario Works or Ontario Disability Support Program benefits.
MEMORANDUM

To: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee

From: Gillian Woolner, Emergency Social Services
David Dirks, Director, Employment and Income Support

Copies: Douglas Bartholomew-Saunders, Commissioner, Social Services

File No.: D29-70

Subject: COMPLEX POST TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AND DEVELOPMENTAL TRAUMA CONFERENCE

Psycho-Social Advisory Committee

Formerly the Personal Services Coordination Committee, the Psycho-Social Advisory Committee is a community committee of Social Services. It is chaired and resourced by Regional staff. Members include representatives from community agencies in such areas as: crisis intervention, mental health, counseling, faith and spiritual needs, and emergency services. The Committee has played a key role in the development of the Waterloo Region Emergency Support Team (WREST) and now includes in its mandate the oversight of this emergency resource.

The Committee’s purpose is the provision of advice, direction and support during and after an emergency. Members focus on the emotional and psychological needs of the community and those affected. A key activity is an annual conference to promote professional awareness and development in the provision of personal services in an emergency.

2013 Conference

This year’s conference builds upon the topic addressed in the previous year: Complex Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and Developmental Trauma. The workshop is designed for counselors and front-line workers, addictions counselors, mental health professionals and those who provide a range of services to vulnerable populations in our community. The conference speaker is Ms Natalie Zlodre M.S.W., R.S.W. who is a trauma specialist out of the Hincks-Dellcrest Centre in Toronto.

The conference will be held over two days May 21 and 22, 2013 at St George Hall in Waterloo. Over 145 professionals are registered to attend.

A copy of the conference brochure which provides more detail on the conference topic and speaker is attached for information.
This conference and the work of the Psycho-Social Advisory Committee support Strategic Focus Area 4: Healthy and Inclusive Communities: Foster healthy, safe, inclusive and caring communities.

For further information please contact Gillian Woolner, Planning Associate, Emergency Social Services at 519-883-2087 or gwoolner@regionofwaterloo.ca or David Dirks, Director, Employment & Income Support at 519-883-2179 or ddirks@regionofwaterloo.ca

DD/kt
Please make cheque payable to:

The Region of Waterloo

Mail Registration Form and Payment to:

Jeff Wittich
Region of Waterloo

99 Regina Street South

1st Floor
Waterloo, ON N2J 4V6

Ph.: (519) 883-2185

Directions to St. George Hall

St George Hall
665 King St. N
Waterloo, ON
N2J 4G8
Phone: 519 884 0311
Fax: 519 884 7537
info@stgeorgehall.com

Directions from Toronto:
• Take the HWY-401 West
• Merge onto HWY-401
• Merge onto HWY-8 W via EXIT 278 toward Kitchener/Waterloo.
• Merge onto HWY-7 E/Conestoga Pky toward Guelph/HWY-85/Waterloo.
• Take HWY-85 N/Conestoga Pky toward Waterloo.
• Take the King Street exit.
• Merge onto King St N/RR-15 N.
• 665 KING STREET N.
(If you reach Bridge St W. you've gone about 0.2 kilometers too far)

Complex Post Traumatic Stress Disorder & Developmental Trauma

Responding Effectively to Clients

When:
Tuesday May 21 and Wednesday May 22, 2013
9:00 am to 4:30 pm
(2 day workshop)
(Registration begins at 8:30am)

Where:
St George Hall
665 King St. N
Waterloo, ON
N2J 4G8
Waterloo, Ontario
Ph: 519 884 0311
Workshop Overview

This workshop is designed for counsellors and front-line workers (nurses, clergy, social workers, addictions counsellors, mental health professionals) who provide a range of services to vulnerable populations in community based settings such as hospitals, schools, community health centres, shelters, crisis phone lines, ACT teams and mental health agencies.

We will discuss a conceptual framework for understanding and guiding your work with complex individuals. We will present an outline of key developmental pathways that are arrested by trauma. We will talk about key clinical approaches to respond effectively to CPTSD and DT.

We will also review the definitions of:

- Complex Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (CPTSD)
- Developmental Trauma (DT) and overlap with
- Borderline Personality (BP) Disorder
- An overview of key clinical approaches for responding effectively to CPTSD and DT will be presented.

We will discuss 4 key strategies for enhancing and maintaining our capacity to be conscious and resilient professionals while working with human suffering on a daily basis.

*Please be advised: this program offers explicit video images of trauma reactions and frank discussions of trauma related images.*

**PAYMENT MUST ACCOMPANY REGISTRATION**
Please find attached for your information the report *Won't You Be My Neighbour: Crime Prevention, Social Capital and Neighbourhood Cohesion in Waterloo Region*.

Through this report the Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council (WRCPC) explores local perceptions of crime, fear of crime and attitudes towards crime prevention. In 2009 the WRCPC made a commitment to regularly monitor perceptions of crime and fear of crime in Waterloo Region.

Using data from the 2012 Waterloo Region Area Survey the report provides an updated picture of fear of crime within Waterloo Region. Regional attitudes towards youth crime are also explored. The report concludes, using data from the Newpath survey and Kindergarten Parents survey, by examining neighbourhood levels of social capital, civic engagement, neighbourhood cohesion, and sense of community.

The results from this survey were received and accepted by the Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council at its regular meeting on December 14, 2012. Over the next few months the report will be shared with additional community partners.
Won’t You Be My Neighbour:
Crime Prevention, Social Capital, and Neighbourhood Cohesion in Waterloo Region

2012 Waterloo Region Area Survey
Won’t You Be My Neighbour:  
Crime Prevention, Social Capital and Neighbourhood Cohesion in Waterloo Region

Keely Phillips  
Master of Social Work Student,  
Wilfrid Laurier University

Anthony Piscitelli  
Supervisor Planning & Research,  
Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council

With Support from:

AGORE Committee The Advisory Group on Research & Evaluation of WRCPC

Thank you to the University of Waterloo Survey Research Centre for conducting the Waterloo Region Area Survey. Thank you also to the City of Kitchener, the Laurier Institute for the Study of Public Opinion and Policy (LISPOP) and Kitchener Waterloo Symphony for sharing their data with the Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council. Our gratitude also goes to the YMCA Ontario Early Years centre for sharing data for this report.

Published by the Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council.

January 2013

All rights reserved. The content of this publication may be reproduced, in whole or in part, and by any means, without further permission from the Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council, subject to the following conditions: that it be done solely for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary, and/or for non-commercial purposes; and that Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council be fully acknowledged.

Accessible formats available upon request.  
Region of Waterloo Document Number 1229101

For more information please contact:

Anthony Piscitelli,  
Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council  
apiscitelli@regionofwaterloo.ca
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**Executive Summary**

This report is a follow up to reports from 2009 and 2011 that measured fear of crime in Waterloo Region. Presented in this report are results from the 2012 Waterloo Region Area Survey examining fear of crime, social capital, and attitudes towards crime prevention. Results are compared to other measures of fear of crime and social capital in Waterloo Region and to national surveys.

The first set of questions in the survey asked about attitudes towards crime prevention:

- People associate ‘smart on crime’ with actions of individual responsibility such as being aware of crime or reporting crime;
- Residents in Waterloo Region are supportive of crime prevention programs and believe that youth who commit crime can change for the better;
- While few people followed media coverage on *The Safe Streets and Safe Communities Act*, the majority of Waterloo Region residents were supportive of this legislation.

To measure perceptions on the amount of crime people were asked how much they agree with the statement “*There is much more crime today than I remember as a child*”. Most respondents believe there is more crime today than when they were children.

The next set of questions asked about fear of crime. Respondents were asked: “*How safe do you feel from crime walking in your neighbourhood after dark?*” Most Waterloo Region residents (89%) feel safe walking alone at night and fear of crime is decreasing. Fear of crime is also mapped by neighbourhood using data from the 2010 Kindergarten Parents Survey and the Newpath survey.

Feelings of safety in downtown Kitchener at night were measured by asking “*how safe from crime people feel at night in downtown Kitchener?*” Feelings of safety in downtown Kitchener vary depending on the community of residence. Waterloo and Township residents feel less safe than Kitchener and Cambridge residents.

Social capital was measured by asking “*Generally speaking would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?*” Two-thirds of respondents believe that people can be trusted, giving Waterloo Region a higher level of social capital than Ontario and Canada.
Finally, using data from the Newpath survey and Kindergarten Parents survey measures of social capital, civic engagement, neighbourhood cohesion, and sense of community were examined by neighbourhood. Neighbourhoods with high levels of fear of crime tend to have low levels civic engagement.

The report concludes with a discussion of how these findings can be useful in identifying neighbourhoods with both the capacity and support for crime prevention initiatives.
Introduction

The Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council seeks to prevent crime by mobilizing the community to address the root causes of crime, reducing victimization, and confronting fear of crime. This report examines fear of crime, social capital and neighbourhood cohesion, and attitudes towards crime prevention in Waterloo Region. Measuring fear of crime is important as it shows if perceptions of crime in a community reflect the risk of victimization. Living in a community with a high fear of crime could lead to a decrease in social cohesion (Markowitz, Bellair, Liska & Liu, 2001). Measuring social capital and neighbourhood cohesion shows how willing the community is to contribute to resolve problems, such as crime (Coleman, 1990; Putnam, 1993). Ideally, a community will have a low fear of crime and high social capital. Finally, measuring attitudes towards crime prevention demonstrates what approach the community supports in resolving issues of crime and fear of crime.

The Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council has made the regular systematic monitoring of fear of crime in Waterloo Region a priority. In 2009 a report was published examining fear of crime. The report made four recommendations addressing fear of crime:

- Local government, Business Improvement Associations, community agencies and Waterloo Regional Police increase their focus on a multi-sector approach to address the unique needs of the local communities in Waterloo Region to reduce fear of crime.

- Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council, Waterloo Regional Police, Business Improvement Associations and Waterloo Region municipal governments employ strategies to address fear of crime that are based on evidence and are tailored to the needs of the local communities.

- Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council, Waterloo Regional Police, Business Improvement Associations and community agencies work to ensure that perceptions of crime reflect the reality of crime.

- Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council and Waterloo Regional Police collaborate on future surveys to continue to measure fear of crime in Waterloo Region.

In October 2011, “Changing Perceptions: 2011 Waterloo Region Area Survey” was published as a follow-up to the 2009 report. “Changing Perceptions” found that fear of crime in Waterloo Region decreased between 2009 and 2011; however work is needed within the community to address signs of social disorder. The report found residents prefer addressing crime through increasing social programs, increasing employment, and implementing harsher sentences. In-depth interviews with twelve individuals who participated in the survey revealed three themes:
People believe that community policing can reduce crime; many people watch their neighbourhood informally on the look-out for crime; and people are supportive of community crime prevention programs. Finally, Waterloo Region, having strong social capital is in a good position to implement further crime prevention programs such as neighbourhood watch.

This report uses data collected from the 2012 Waterloo Region Area Survey conducted by the University of Waterloo Survey Research Centre and compares it to similar surveys. The Waterloo Region Area Survey is a random survey of Waterloo Region residents. The survey is available for local governments, community agencies, and academics to purchase space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Title</th>
<th>Conducted by:</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region Area Survey</td>
<td>UW Survey Research Centre</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Canada</td>
<td>Environics Institute</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region Area Survey</td>
<td>UW Survey Research Centre</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Social Survey</td>
<td>Statistics Canada</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Social Survey</td>
<td>Statistics Canada</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Canada</td>
<td>Environics Institute</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Parents Survey</td>
<td>Waterloo Region District School Board, Waterloo Catholic District School Board, Conseil scolarie de district catholique Centre-Sud, Conseil scolarie Viamonde</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>School take home survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Canada</td>
<td>Environics Institute</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region Area Survey</td>
<td>UW Survey Research Centre</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newpath</td>
<td>UW Survey Research Centre</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region Area Survey</td>
<td>UW Survey Research Centre</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to using data from the Waterloo Region Area Survey this report has also made comparisons to the 2011 Waterloo Region Area Survey, the 2008 and 2009 General Social Survey conducted by Statistics Canada, and the 2008, 2010, and 2011 Focus Canada surveys conducted by Environics Institute. Results from the 2010 Kindergarten Parents Survey and Newpath walkability survey from 2010 are also presented to provide a full picture of fear of crime and social capital in Waterloo Region.
The focus and purpose of this report is:

a) to explore attitudes towards crime prevention in the Waterloo Region;

b) to explore the concept of ‘smart on crime’ in Waterloo Region;

c) to explore attitudes towards youth and crime;

d) to measure support for Bill C-10 and confidence in judges;

e) to track the changes in levels of fear of crime within Waterloo Region, comparing it to national and provincial data; and

f) to present measures of fear of crime and neighbourhood cohesion by neighbourhood.
Methodology

The 2012 Waterloo Region Area Survey was a telephone survey conducted between June 7 and June 29, 2012. Surveyors called 4,234 cell and landline telephones within Waterloo Region. Phone numbers were selected from data purchased from ASDE Survey Sampler which uses a process of enhanced random digit dialing to randomly generate phone numbers. Numbers were called up to eight times or until calls were answered. All survey participants were 18 years or older. When a landline was called the adult in the household with the next birthday was asked to answer the survey questions to randomize the sample. The survey contained questions on the following areas:

- Political participation and political attitudes
- Perceptions of crime in the region
- Regional perceptions of the K-W Symphony
- Regional perceptions of Kitchener as a city
- Kitchener-specific views on the new City budget (asked to Kitchener residents only)
- Demographic data

Results from the survey are compared to results from the 2011 Waterloo Region Area Survey, 2008, 2010, and 2011 Focus Canada Surveys by Environics, the 2008 and 2009 General Social Surveys by Statistics Canada.

Results from the 2010 Kindergarten Parents Survey (KPS) are used in this report (Romagnoli, 2011). The KPS was developed by the Offord Centre for Child Studies at McMaster University and is sent home from school to kindergarten parents every three years at the same time the Early Development Instrument is conducted. Among other measures, the KPS asks about fear of crime and civic engagement in the parent’s neighbourhoods.

Finally, results from the 2010 Newpath project are used. The Newpath, Neighbourhood Environments in Waterloo Region: Patterns of Transportation and Health project (Thompson et al., under review) asked among other measurements of neighbourhood walkability questions on fear of crime and neighbourhood cohesion. The survey had a sample size of 4,902 individuals in 2,228 households in Kitchener, Cambridge, and Waterloo. Participants were first recruited through a phone call and then completed the mail survey.

Results from the KPS survey and Newpath survey appear in this report on maps providing a visual illustration of fear of crime and civic engagement throughout Waterloo Region.
Results & Discussion

Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Numbers Called</th>
<th>No answer</th>
<th>Not Ineligible</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>Partial Complete</th>
<th>Fully Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,234</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The surveyors were successful in reaching a person a little more than half the time, giving the survey a 54.4% contact rate. Of the 4,234 numbers called, 1,584 numbers were either unanswered, went to voicemail, or were busy. An additional 950 of the numbers called were ineligible because they were fax modems, numbers not in service, the number was a business, there was a language problem, or the respondent was ineligible or incompetent. Finally for 1,306 phone numbers the respondent refused to participate, hung up, or was not available during the data collection period. The overall refusal rate was 31%. This refusal rate is reasonable considering the 27 minutes on average it took to answer the survey.

Demographic Data

The survey respondents are a reasonable representation of Waterloo Region’s demographics when comparing respondent demographics to the 2011 census. Women are overrepresented in the sample which is common as women are more likely than men to answer a survey (Rourke & Lakner, 1989). Women are 59% of the sample but only 51% of the local population. While 35-54 year olds are fairly represented in the sample, people over 55 are overrepresented and younger people are underrepresented despite including cell phone users in the sample to try to ensure accurate representation of younger adults.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 Census</th>
<th>2011 Census</th>
<th>Waterloo Area Survey 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Adult Population</td>
<td>% of Adult Population</td>
<td>% of Adult Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>8.87%</td>
<td>8.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>9.08%</td>
<td>9.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>9.77%</td>
<td>10.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>7.22%</td>
<td>7.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>9.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total adult</td>
<td>48.72%</td>
<td>51.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey results were weighted by age groups and gender to ensure the responses accurately represent the views of Waterloo Region residents. Using weights balances results by increasing the importance placed on an answer from someone in a low response group and by decreasing the importance of a response made by someone in a high response group. For example, males 18 to 24 years are under sampled and therefore their responses are weighted to be equivalent to approximately three responses. Weighted results can be found in Appendix B and unweighted results in Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weights</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 plus</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weights given to responses based on age and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population 2011</th>
<th>Percentage of Population</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>126,748</td>
<td>24.99%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>219,153</td>
<td>43.22%</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>98,780</td>
<td>19.48%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townships</td>
<td>62,415</td>
<td>12.31%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region</td>
<td>507,096</td>
<td></td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Home owners are over sampled in the survey with 81% of survey respondents owning their home and 18% renting, compared to Census 2006 data where 70% of Waterloo Region residents owned their homes and 30% rented. Immigrants are comparably represented with 80% of survey respondents born in Canada and 19% outside of Canada. This is very close to census 2006 numbers where 77% are born in Canada and 23% outside of Canada. The community of residence of survey respondents is very close to the actual population. Cambridge is under sampled by 3 percentage points and Kitchener over sampled by 3 percentage points.
**Waterloo Region Attitudes Related to Crime Prevention**

The 2012 Waterloo Region Area Survey asked questions to measure attitudes towards crime prevention on topics including street gangs; youth who commit crimes; support for Bill C-10; confidence in judges; perceptions of the amount of crime; and support for crime prevention generally. Many of the questions have not been asked on previous area surveys therefore there are no previous results for comparison.

**Being “Smart on Crime”**

![Figure #1: What does being ‘smart on crime’ mean?](image)

Survey participants were asked the open ended question: “*In your own words what does being ‘smart on crime’ mean?*” This question was asked to determine if the language of ‘smart on crime’ is being connected with crime prevention. Respondents provided their definition of being ‘smart on crime’. These responses were then coded into categories:

- being aware of crime or being careful of crime (74%);
- dealing with the root causes of crime or preventing crime (9%);
- reporting crimes (3%);
- being tough on crime or that the punishment should fit the crime (2%);
- unique responses that did not warrant a theme were coded as ‘other’ (12%).

As Figure 1 illustrates most people associate ‘smart on crime’ with individual responsibility and only 9% of respondents indicated that ‘smart on crime’ is about crime prevention or dealing with the root causes of crime.
Support for Crime Prevention

The next question sought to measure support for crime prevention. The question asked: “As you know governments today are limited in the amount they can spend in all areas. When it comes to crime and justice, do you think the major emphasis should be on: law enforcement which includes detecting crime and punishing law breakers; or crime prevention which includes education and programs to prevent crime and reduce risks?” Answering a preference for both approaches equally was not a response option but was allowed when indicated. Local results demonstrate:

- 59% favour crime prevention;
- 30% favour law enforcement;
- 11% responded they favour both approaches equally.

Environics has asked this same question in its Focus Canada surveys since 2008 allowing comparisons between local results to national ones with some caution. While the methods used and the question asked on the Waterloo Region Area Survey were the same as in the Environics survey it is possible that Environics surveyors were less prepared to accept a ‘both equally’ response. This could account for some of the difference in results.
Law enforcement which includes detecting crime and punishing law breakers | Environics Canada Wide Survey 2008 | 2010 | 2011 | Waterloo Region Area Survey 2012
---|---|---|---|---
35% | 36% | 31% | 30%
Crime prevention, which includes education and programs to prevent crime and reduce risks | 53% | 58% | 63% | 59%
Both equally | 11% | 4% | 4% | 11%

National support for crime prevention, as the table above shows, has been increasing by about 5% a year; however Waterloo Region appears to be less supportive of crime prevention (59%) than Canada overall (63%)\(^1\).

**Youth Who Commit Crime**

Survey respondents were then asked their beliefs about youth who commit crimes and approaches to street gangs. The question about youth who commit crimes asked: “Generally speaking would you say almost all youth who commit crimes have the potential to change for the better or there is not much you can do to change most youth who commit crimes?”

![Figure #3: Beliefs about youth who commit crimes](image)

\(^1\) The margin of error (at 95% confidence level) in comparing support for crime prevention in the Environics polls to the 2012 Area Survey are as follows: 2008, 2.30%; 2010, 2.28% (not significant); 2011, 2.57%
The result shows 89% believe youth who commit crimes have the potential to change for the better. This indicates an opportunity to engage with the community in creating interventions to decrease youth recidivism.

**Street Gangs**

![Pie chart showing responses to the question about street gangs.](image)

*Figure #4: In your opinion are street gangs better addressed in our society through the criminal justice system or community interventions?*

The next question asked about street gangs: “In your opinion are youth street gangs better addressed in our society through the criminal justice system which includes courts and police or community interventions which includes job search programs and counseling?” Although not a response option, some survey respondents indicated they preferred both approaches equally and this was accepted. Results were:

- 62% of respondents prefer community interventions to address street gangs
- 29% prefer criminal justice approaches.
- An additional 9% indicated support for both approaches equally.

Street gangs are seen as problematic due to their association with crime. Most street gang members are males under 17 (Dunbar, Waller & Gunn, 2011) making many street gang members a subpopulation of youth who commit crimes. Similar to the results that show most people believe that youth who commit crimes can change these results indicate the public sees community interventions as the better approach to youth street gangs.
Bill C-10

The next two questions asked about Bill C-10, or the Safe Streets and Communities Act, which was passed by parliament in March of 2012. This controversial omnibus crime bill included mandatory minimum sentences for some offenses, changes to the pardon system, and limiting the ability of judges to take an individualized approach when sentencing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parliament recently passed Bill C-10 the Safe Streets and Communities Act. How closely have you been following this Bill in the media?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all closely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to measure attitudes towards Bill C-10 survey respondents were asked two questions, the first measured attention to the Bill: “Parliament recently passed Bill C-10 the Safe Streets and Communities Act. How closely have you been following this Bill in the media?” Results found that 82.6% of survey respondents were either not at all following the Bill, or not following the Bill closely and only 17% were following media coverage on the Bill closely or very closely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose Bill C-10?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second question asked “Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose Bill C-10?” Responses found 56% either strongly supported or somewhat supported Bill C-10. However, 20% of respondents neither support nor oppose Bill C-10. This was not an option offered but was accepted if a respondent volunteered this answer.

Environics asked a similar question in a national poll in 2011: “The federal government is passing new laws for people convicted of a wide range of crimes. The new laws will increase the length of jail time and reduce judges discretion on sentencing.” Respondents were asked to what degree they support the bill. Results were 62% of Canadians and 60% of Ontarians either strongly supported or somewhat supported the bill. However, neither support nor oppose was not an option on this survey and only 4% of respondents indicated they did not know or it depends as their answer. Unfortunately, the differences between these two surveys make direct comparisons possibly misleading.
Confidence in Judges

Waterloo Region Area survey respondents were also asked if they had “no confidence, some confidence or a lot of confidence” in judges\(^3\). Results are that:

- 42% have a lot of confidence in judges,
- 54% have some confidence in judges,
- only 5% have no confidence in judges.

In 2008, Environics asked a similar question to Canadians “In general, would you say you have a lot of confidence, some confidence, little confidence or no confidence at all in each of the following: judges?” Results showed that 19% of Canadians had a lot of confidence in judges, 51% had some confidence, 19% had a little confidence, and 9% had no confidence. It is possible this different result is due to Environics providing four options or the difference may be because Waterloo Region is more confident in judges. Further research is needed to clarify this finding.

\(^3\) Confidence in police officers was also asked and results can be found in Appendix B.
Perceptions of the Amount of Crime

To measure perceptions of the amount of crime respondents were asked how much they agree with the statement “There is much more crime today than I remember as a child”. Results show that 61% either strongly agree or agree there is more crime today.

![Figure #6 “There is much more crime today than I remember as a child”](image)

This is interesting as it contrasts with a decline in police reported crime rates in Waterloo Region and in Canada since the 1990’s (Brennan, 2012; Statistics Canada, n.d.) A similar question was asked on the 2003, 2008, and 2011 Area Surveys: “Over the past five years do you think that crime in Waterloo Region has remained about the same, decreased, or increased?” Results from the 2011 Area Survey found 32.2% thought crime increased over the past five years. However, attitudes from the 2003 and 2008 Area Survey were the majority of respondents felt crime increased over the past five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Over the past five years do you think that crime in Waterloo Region has remained about the same, decreased, or increased?</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime has increased</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the questions from 2012 and 2003-2011 are very different questions, both do ask respondents to be retrospective in their thoughts about crime rates. The difference in question wording means direct comparisons between results are not possible but what is noteworthy is regardless of the question a sizable portion of the population does not perceive a decline in crime despite steady drops in crime rates over the past two decades.
Fear of Crime in Waterloo Region

Fear of crime is an important indicator of community vitality and well-being as it impacts on a person’s daily decisions as to where they live, shop, and how they interact with their community (Cordner, 2010). When fear of crime is high the impacts can be severe: “fear can confine people to their homes, and it undermines their trust in their neighbors…Fear is a key ‘quality of life’ issue for many people” (Skogan, 2006). To measure fear of crime survey respondents were asked: “How safe do you feel from crime walking alone in your area after dark; very safe, reasonably safe, somewhat unsafe, or very unsafe?” Results show 89% of survey participants feel either very safe or reasonably safe. This question was also asked on the 2011 Waterloo Region Area survey and then 85% of respondents felt very safe or reasonably safe. The 2009 General Social Survey asked the same question of the Kitchener Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) and found only 79% of Kitchener CMA residents felt safe walking in their area alone after dark. Over time this indicates a statistically significant increase in feelings of safety.

Figure# 7: How safe do you feel from crime walking alone in your area after dark?

In 2004 and 2009 General Social Surveys asked the same question about fear of crime. Results found that provincially and nationally fear of crime is decreasing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Safe or Reasonably Safe</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 2.85% margin of error between 2011 and 2012 polls at 95% confidence level and 4.32% % margin of error between 2012 and 2009 polls at 95% confidence level.
Fear of crime by neighbourhood

The Kindergarten Parents Survey report (Romagnoli, 2011) provides a closer look at fear of crime in individual neighbourhoods. The survey asked kindergarten parents to respond to the statement “It is safe to walk alone in my neighbourhood at night” with ‘not true’, ‘sometimes true’, or ‘true’. Overall 71.5% of parents felt safe walking alone in their neighbourhood at night. It is important to note kindergarten parents may not be a representative sample of Waterloo Region residents as parents may be more afraid of crime than the other citizens (Cordner 2010).

Responses from this survey are then mapped to neighbourhoods in Waterloo Region. Figure #8 displays levels of fear of crime in all of Waterloo Region’s neighbourhoods. There are eight neighbourhoods in the bottom quartile where only 44% to 58% of respondents felt safe walking in their neighbourhoods after dark:

- (4) Columbia / Lakeshore;
- (12) Victoria Hills / Cherry Hill / GR Hospital;
- (16) Downtown Kitchener & Area;
- (17) Alpine / Laurentian;
- (18) Southwest Kitchener;
- (20) Vanier / Rockway;
- (25) Central Preston / Preston Heights; and
- (27) North Galt / Elgin Park

The Newpath survey conducted in 2010 also asked Kitchener, Waterloo and Cambridge residents about fear of crime. Respondents were asked how strongly they agree or disagree with the statement: “the crime rate in my neighbourhood makes it unsafe to go on walks at night”. Figure #9 displays the results by neighbourhoods. Results show seven neighbourhoods in the bottom quartile where 41% to 72% percent of respondents feel unsafe walking at night because of the crime rate:

- (12) Victoria Hills / Cherry Hill / GR Hospital*;
- (16) Downtown Kitchener & Area*;
- (17) Alpine / Laurentian*;
- (18) Southwest Kitchener*;
- (19) Country Hills / Huron Area
- (25) Central Preston / Preston Heights and;
- (27) North Galt / Elgin Park*

---

5 The neighbourhoods in the list above marked with an * had a high fear of crime in the KPS survey as well.
Figure #8: Fear of crime by neighbourhood (Kindergarten Parents Survey, 2011)
Figure #9: Fear of crime by neighbourhood (Newpath)
Fear of Crime in Downtown Kitchener

Figure #10: Fear of crime in downtown Kitchener at Night

Respondents were asked about their feelings of safety in downtown Kitchener: “thinking about your feelings of safety in downtown Kitchener at night, do you feel: very safe, somewhat safe, somewhat unsafe, or very unsafe?” Results show:

- 7% of respondents felt very safe,
- 35% felt somewhat safe,
- 37% felt somewhat unsafe, and
- 21% felt very unsafe in downtown Kitchener at night.

Figure #11: Feelings of safety in downtown Kitchener at night by community of residence
When we examine fear of crime in downtown Kitchener by community of residence we find that Kitchener residents feel safer in downtown Kitchener at night (54%) than other Waterloo Region residents and Waterloo residents feel significantly less safe in downtown Kitchener at night (30%).

In 2011 the same question was asked to Kitchener residents only. Then, 55% of Kitchener respondents indicated they felt very safe or somewhat safe in downtown Kitchener at night; however this one percent decrease in safety from 2011 to 2012 is not significant.6

**Waterloo Region Social Capital and Neighbourhood Cohesion**

This section presents measures of social capital in Waterloo Region, civic engagement by neighbourhood, and neighbourhood cohesion. Social capital is the “networks, norms, and social trust” that facilitate community cooperation (Putnam, 1995). The degree of social capital in a community determines how willing a community is to work together to address and tackle issues, such as crime (Coleman, 1990 and Putnam, 1993). The Waterloo Region Area Survey measured social capital by asking: “Generally speaking would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?” A total of 65% of respondents felt that most people can be trusted. In 2008, 61% of the Kitchener CMA thought most people could be trusted however the increase between 2008 and 2012 is not significant.7 Comparing to national and provincial results from the 2008 General Social Survey, Waterloo Region has high social capital.8

---

**Figure #12: “Most people can be trusted”**

6 Margin of error in comparing the polls is 6.29% at the 95% confidence level (not significant).
7 Margin of error in comparing the polls is 5.23% at the 95% confidence level (not significant).
8 Margin of error in comparing the polls is 0.80% at the 95% confidence level.
The 2012 Area Survey found differences in social capital between age groups. Trust in others is highest between ages 25 and 64 with older adults (65+ years) having lower levels of trust. Young adults appear to be the least trusting group however these results should not be viewed as indicative of the population as they are only based upon 15 respondents. These results seem to mirror the 2008 General Social Survey which shows trust rises with age peaking amongst individuals aged 45 to 64 then declining amongst individuals above 65.

![Figure #13: “Generally speaking would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?”](image)

The Newpath survey asked about neighbourhood social capital within Waterloo Region. Survey participants were asked to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree with the statements: “I regularly stop and talk to people in my neighbourhood”. The degree to which neighbours positively interact with one another is a good measure of social capital as it illustrates informal social ties and trust. Results are divided into quartiles. Table #1 lists the neighbourhoods in the top and bottom quartiles.

Social capital alone does not lead to community action to address fear of crime. To better understand the likelihood of the community working together to address issues of crime we can measure civic engagement. Civic engagement is “how an active citizen participates in the life of a community in order to improve conditions for others or to help shape the community’s future” (Adler & Goggin, 2005). High fear of crime can lessen civic engagement but civic engagement and social capital may be essential elements in addressing fear of crime (Piscitelli, 2011). To measure civic engagement by neighbourhood the Kindergarten Parents Survey (2010) also asked parents how true the statement “if there is a problem around here, the neighbours get together and deal with it” was for their neighbourhood. Results are 44.5% of kindergarten parents agree they get together with neighbours and deal with problems. Results are mapped to Waterloo
Region’s neighbourhoods (Figure #14) and there are ten neighbourhoods in Waterloo Region with low civic engagement where only 21% to 37% of respondents felt it was true that if there is a problem the neighbours get together and deal with it. Table #1 (see page 29) also shows neighbourhoods with high fear of crime tend to have low levels of civic engagement.
Along with civic engagement and social capital measures of neighbourhood cohesion and sense of community were applied to Waterloo Region’s neighbourhoods to provide a fuller picture of neighbourhood well-being in relation to fear of crime. Neighbourhood cohesion shows the degree of support resources a neighbourhood has in order to address issues such as crime.
(Lochner, Kowachi, & Kennedy, 1999). A measure of neighbourhood cohesion from the Newpath survey asked respondents to strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree to the statement “I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve the living environment in my neighbourhood”. Table #1 (see page 24) lists the neighbourhoods in the top and bottom quartiles of neighbourhood cohesion. There are seven neighbourhoods in the bottom quartile where less than 83% somewhat or strongly agree they would be willing to work with others to improve their neighbourhood. Results show some neighbourhoods with high fear of crime also have high neighbourhood cohesion. This suggests neighbourhood capacity and readiness to deal with issues of crime (Renauer, 2007).

Finally, the Newpath survey asked about sense of community. Sense of community, shows to what degree residents feel they belong to their neighbourhood and have a shared purpose in dealing with neighbourhood issues (Forrest & Kearns, 2001). Survey respondents were asked if they strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, or strongly agree with the statement “living in my neighbourhood gives me a sense of community.” There are seven neighbourhoods in the bottom quartile where less than 70% of respondents somewhat or strongly agree their neighbourhood gives them a sense of community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 West Waterloo</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lakeshore North / Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Beechwood</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Columbia / Lakeshore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lincoln / Dearborn</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Eastbridge / Lexington</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Central Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Westvale</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Westmount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Highland West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Forest Heights / Forest Hill / Lakeside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Victoria Hills / Cherry Park / GR Hosp</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Bridgeport / Breithaupt / Mt Hope</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Grand R / Stanley Park / Chicopee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Frederick / Rosemont / Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Downtown Kitchener &amp; Area</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Alpine / Laurentian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Southwest Kitchener</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Country Hills / Huron Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Vanier / Rockway</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Doon / Pioneer Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Hidden Valley / Pioneer Tower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 North Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Hespeler</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Central Preston / Preston Heights</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Langs Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 North Galt / Elgin Park</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Shades Mills</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Southwood / Southwest Galt</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Galt City Centre</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 South East Galt</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Blair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 North Dumfries / Beverly</td>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Ayr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 New Dundee / Mannheim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Baden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 New Hamburg</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 North Wilmot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Wellesley Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Wellesley Rural South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Wellesley Rural North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Woolwich Rural North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Elmira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 St. Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Woolwich Rural East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Low fear of crime is desirable

Legend
- **Low** Neighbourhood ranks the lowest quartile
- **High** Neighbourhood ranks the highest quartile
- **No data available**
- Neighbourhood scores in the middle quartiles are not reported
Conclusions

The 2012 Waterloo Region Area survey shows attitudes towards crime prevention in Waterloo Region are generally favourable, fear of crime continues to decrease and social capital is high. The results also show some areas where more work is needed, especially around the language of ‘smart on crime’.

The Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council believes ‘smart on crime’ also refers to dealing with the root causes of crime. ‘Smart on crime’ is currently understood by most of the community to involve actions of personal responsibility such as being aware or being careful of crime. This presents an opportunity to increase public awareness on how ‘smart on crime’ refers to dealing with the root causes of crime and linking it to crime prevention.

Waterloo Region residents favour crime prevention programs over law enforcement approaches to crime. While Waterloo Region appears to be less supportive of crime prevention than Canada overall, local attitudes towards two specific areas of crime prevention are very positive: there is a strong belief in the community that youth who commit crimes can change for the better; and there is support for community interventions to address youth street gangs.

In looking at attitudes towards Bill C-10, the Safe Streets and Safe Communities Act, the survey found Waterloo Region residents were not closely following media coverage on the Bill and 56% supported the omnibus crime bill. Despite Waterloo Region residents support of a bill which limits judicial discretion, 96% of residence have some or a lot of confidence in judges.

Fear of crime in Waterloo Region continues to decrease with 89% of residents feeling safe or reasonably safe walking in their area after dark. While this is encouraging, fear of crime in downtown Kitchener remains an issue with the majority of Waterloo Region residents feeling unsafe in downtown Kitchener at night. When we look at fear of crime by neighbourhood using the KPS data and Newpath data we find neighbourhoods with a high level fear of crime tend to have low levels of social capital.

Waterloo Region has high social capital compared to Ontario and Canada. Using the KPS and Newpath survey results on social capital, fear of crime, civic engagement, neighbourhood cohesion, and sense of community illustrated neighborhoods in the high and low quartiles on these measures. Both this report and “Changing Perceptions: 2011 Waterloo Region Area Survey” identified that Waterloo Region is supportive of crime prevention initiatives. Looking at results by neighbourhood we can determine where crime prevention programs have the best capacity to be supported by local residents and how local initiatives can build in the strengths of neighbourhoods while targeting the local issues faces neighbourhoods.
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Appendix A: Selected 2012 Waterloo Region Area Survey Questions

1. First I’d like to ask you some questions about crime and the area that you live in. How safe do you feel from crime walking alone in your area after dark? Very safe, reasonably safe, somewhat unsafe, or very unsafe.

2. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?

3. In your own words, what does being "smart on crime" mean?

4. As you know governments today are limited in the amount they can spend in all areas. When it comes to crime and justice, do you think the major emphasis should be on: Law enforcement; which includes detecting crime and punishing law breakers or crime prevention; which includes education and programs to prevent crime and reduce risks?

5. In your opinion are youth street gangs better addressed in our society through: The Criminal justice system which includes the courts and police, or community interventions which includes job search programs and counselling?

6. Generally speaking would you say: Almost all youth who commit crimes have the potential to change for the better or here is not much you can do to change most youth who commit crimes?

7. Parliament recently passed Bill C-10 the Safe Streets and Communities Act. How closely have you been following this Bill in the media? Very closely, somewhat closely, not too closely, or not at all closely?

8. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose Bill C-10?

9. And now some questions about Kitchener specifically. Thinking about your feelings of safety in downtown Kitchener at night, do you feel: Very safe, somewhat safe, somewhat unsafe, or very unsafe?

10. Now I’m going to read you a list of institutions in Canadian society. Please tell me if you have no confidence, some confidence or a lot of confidence in them: Judges

11. Please tell me if you have no confidence, some confidence or a lot of confidence in them: Police officers

12. Now I’m going to read you some general statements about some things that people think pose risks in today's world. Please tell me if you think: There’s much more crime today than I remember when I was a child. Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree.
## Appendix B: 2012 Waterloo Region Area Survey Weighted Results

### How safe do you feel from crime walking ALONE in your area after dark?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably safe</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsafe</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsafe</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people can be trusted</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You cannot be too careful in dealing with people</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In your own words, what does being "smart on crime" mean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being aware/being careful of crime</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with the root causes/preventing crime</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being tough on crime/punishment should fit the crime</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting crimes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### As you know governments today are limited in the amount they can spend in all areas. When it comes to crime and justice, do you think the major emphasis should be on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement; which includes detecting crime and punishing law breakers</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime prevention; which includes education and programs to prevent crime and reduce risks</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both equally</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In your opinion are youth street gangs better addressed in our society through:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Criminal justice system which includes the courts and police</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community interventions which includes job search programs and counseling</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both equally</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally speaking would you say:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost all youth who commit crimes have the potential to change for the better</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not much you can do to change most youth who commit crimes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parliament recently passed Bill C-10 the Safe Streets and Communities Act. How closely have you been following this Bill in the media?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very closely</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat closely</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too closely</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all closely</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose Bill C-10??

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat support</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat oppose</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support not oppose</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking about your feelings of safety in downtown Kitchener at night, do you feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat safe</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsafe</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsafe</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now I'm going to read you a list of institutions in Canadian society. Please tell me if you have no confidence, some confidence or a lot of confidence in them: Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No confidence</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some confidence</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of confidence</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now I’m going to read you a list of institutions in Canadian society. Please tell me if you have no confidence, some confidence or a lot of confidence in them: Police officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No confidence</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some confidence</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of confidence</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There's much more crime today than I remember when I was a child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How safe do you feel from crime walking ALONE in your area after dark?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Reasonably safe</th>
<th>Somewhat unsafe or Very unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 plus</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 364 $\chi^2 = 14.9$ df = 10, $p = .136$

Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most people can be trusted</th>
<th>You cannot be too careful in dealing with people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 plus</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 374 $\chi^2 = 19.9$ df = 5, $p < .001$

Thinking about your feelings of safety in downtown Kitchener at night, do you feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Safe</th>
<th>Somewhat safe</th>
<th>Somewhat unsafe</th>
<th>Very unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 plus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 342 df = 15
How safe do you feel from crime walking ALONE in your area after dark?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Reasonably safe</th>
<th>Somewhat unsafe or Very unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 366 \chi^2 = 25.0 \text{ df } = 2, \ p < .001 \]

Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most people can be trusted</th>
<th>You cannot be too careful in dealing with people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 373 \chi^2 = 0.9 \text{ df } = 1, \ p = .335 \]

Thinking about your feelings of safety in downtown Kitchener at night, do you feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Safe</th>
<th>Somewhat safe</th>
<th>Somewhat unsafe</th>
<th>Very unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 342 \chi^2 = 19.4 \text{ df } = 3, \ p < .001 \]

How safe do you feel from crime walking ALONE in your area after dark?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Reasonably safe</th>
<th>Somewhat unsafe or Very unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 367 \chi^2 = 11.1 \text{ df } = 6, \ p < .1 \]

Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most people can be trusted</th>
<th>You cannot be too careful in dealing with people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 373 \chi^2 = 7.9 \text{ df } = 3, \ p < .05 \]

Thinking about your feelings of safety in downtown Kitchener at night, do you feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Safe</th>
<th>Somewhat safe</th>
<th>Somewhat unsafe</th>
<th>Very unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 342 \chi^2 = 23.2 \text{ df } = 9, \ p < .01 \]
Appendix C: 2012 Waterloo Region Area Survey Unweighted Results

### How safe do you feel from crime walking ALONE in your area after dark?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably safe</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsafe</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsafe</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people can be trusted</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You cannot be too careful in dealing with people</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In your own words, what does being "smart on crime" mean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being aware/being careful of crime</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with the root causes/preventing crime</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being tough on crime/punishment should fit the crime</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting crimes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### As you know governments today are limited in the amount they can spend in all areas. When it comes to crime and justice, do you think the major emphasis should be on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement; which includes detecting crime and punishing law breakers</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime prevention; which includes education and programs to prevent crime and reduce risks</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both equally</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In your opinion are youth street gangs better addressed in our society through:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Criminal justice system which includes the courts and police</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community interventions which includes job search programs and counseling</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both equally</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally speaking would you say:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost all youth who commit crimes have the potential to change for the better</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not much you can do to change most youth who commit crimes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parliament recently passed Bill C-10 the Safe Streets and Communities Act. How closely have you been following this Bill in the media?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very closely</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat closely</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too closely</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all closely</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose Bill C-10??

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat support</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat oppose</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support not oppose</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking about your feelings of safety in downtown Kitchener at night, do you feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat safe</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsafe</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsafe</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now I'm going to read you a list of institutions in Canadian society. Please tell me if you have no confidence, some confidence or a lot of confidence in them: Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No confidence</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some confidence</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of confidence</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now I'm going to read you a list of institutions in Canadian society. Please tell me if you have no confidence, some confidence or a lot of confidence in them: Police officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No confidence</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some confidence</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of confidence</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There's much more crime today than I remember when I was a child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In lieu of the April 11th Awards Event that was cancelled due to inclement weather, as Executive Dean, I am pleased to announce the award winners in this Communication!

As background to these announcements, the tradition of recognizing student awards and preceptors for excellence in inter-professional work in an “Partners Enhancing Practice” event began four years ago with a donation from the TD Financial Group for awards related to inter-professional practice in health care.

This year, April 2013, would have been our first year with the focus of the event, Partners Enhancing Practice, being on multi-program student, preceptor, faculty & staff, and partner awards across a broader range of programs. This will be our focus going forward as we celebrate team work, collaboration and professionalism >>>>PARTNERS ENHANCING PRACTICE!

I am sorry that you did not have the benefit of meeting Chameli Naraine, as our guest speaker. Chameli is an alumnus from Conestoga’s Business program and was the Premier’s Award Winner for Business Alumni 2012. She is President & CEO for Symcor as well as having her personal foundation.

Marlene Raasok, Executive Dean
CONGRATULATIONS TO 2013 STUDENT WINNERS OF THE
TD FINANCIAL GROUP AWARDS — EXCELLENCE IN INTER-
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE IN HEALTH CARE

This award recognizes STUDENTS IN HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS, with financial need, who display ex-
emplary inter-professional behaviors in their final year at the College. Students receive a certificate of
recognition, a cheque of $125 and have their name added to the TD Financial Group plaque that will be
displayed in the Schlegel Agora of the Cowan Health Sciences Centre

♦ BScN: Kelly Tarcza. “Kelly is a natural leader and has reflected on the role of a variety of
disciplines she encounters as a level IV in the “float pool”. She has been an active and integral
exec and member of WIHSC for years—and was terrific in ‘crisis sim’ (an intra professional
cardiac arrest event with Practical Nurses)” — from nominator, Professor Jenn Mohaupt.

♦ Practical Nursing: Jessie Caplan. “Jessie’s personal and professional accountability for
learning and enacting the RPN role in an inter-professional context allowed her to excel in her
pre-graduate placement at Homewood Health Care Centre. Jessie collaborated with nurses,
psychiatrists and physicians to ensure advocacy and best practices were incorporated into care
pathways. Her inquisition led to increased awareness of the value of support groups, behav-
ior modification groups and therapists within the inter-professional team>>all providing a
solid foundation for her desire to work in the mental health environment” — from nominator,
Professor Karyn Cox.

♦ Personal Support Worker — Doon: Scott (“Sid”) Baker. “Sid is an outgoing, enthu-
siastic PSW student who advocates for PSW’s as part of the team. Sid demonstrates behaviours
of a professional PSW, demonstrating resident-centered care in both long-term care and com-
munity placements; his residents have asked for him to return. Sid alludes to his past experi-
eince as a factory worker and how his role as a PSW brings meaning to his life and how he feels
like a valuable member of the care team” — from nominator, Professor Sarah Pottier

♦ Personal Support Worker — Riverside Glen: Stefanie Schultz. “Stefanie demonstrat-
ed a great curiosity toward the roles of members of the health care team, asking questions and
seeking advice to ensure quality of care and safe practice. Her patience and caring endeared
her to her clients and colleagues” — from nominator, Professor Jane Douglas.
CONGRATULATIONS TO 2013 STUDENT WINNERS OF THE TD FINANCIAL GROUP AWARDS — EXCELLENCE IN INTER- PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE IN HEALTH CARE, cont’d

♦ OTA/PTA: Jenny Griffith “Jenny has shown a keen interest in working collaboratively with fellow classmates, faculty, clients/residents and other health professionals. Her preceptors have consistently provided positive feedback about her clinical skills. Jenny was team leader for the OTA/PTA program at the regional inter-professional case event in November. She is also a peer tutor through Disability Services and works as a special needs home worker”—as nominated by Professor Dianna Fong Lee

♦ Dietetic Technician: Jodi Haskett. “Jodi is an absolute joy to work with—learning from very encounter, reaching out to other professionals and team members and engaging positively with the residents” in the practicum setting. Jodi is a leader within her program, contributing to her fellow classmates and has shadowed other members of the IPE team to gain a greater understanding of their roles.” —as nominated by Professor Janice Schmeltzer.

♦ Paramedic: Michelle Harrison. Michelle quietly exhibits leadership qualities both in & out of the classroom. She is the current President of WIHSC and she clearly demonstrates a passion for health care and takes the initiative to both understand other disciplines as well as promote her own professional career. “—as nominated by Professor Neil Freckleton.

♦ Respiratory Therapy: Edward Anderson. “Ed continually demonstrates the desire to understand the roles of others during his work in the clinical simulation lab and in his leadership role within the WIHSC peer mentoring sessions. Ed, along with a number of his colleagues, has demonstrated the ability to communicate the role of the RT in an effective way and understand the role of others in a number of peer mentoring sessions. Ed continues to be involved in the RT Student Federation helping to inform the college community as a whole of the role of the Respiratory Therapist.”—from nominator, Professor Lori Peppler Beechey

Congratulations!
CONGRATULATIONS TO 2013 PRECEPTOR WINNERS OF THE TD FINANCIAL GROUP AWARDS — EXCELLENCE IN INTER-PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE IN HEALTH CARE

This award recognizes two PRECEPTORS each year who display exemplary inter-professional behaviors as they support students in the practicum situation.

Preceptors receive a certificate of recognition, a cheque of $125 and have their name added to the TD Financial Group plaque that will be displayed in the Schlegel Agora of the Cowan Health Sciences Centre.

Erin Kiernan, Preceptor for Respiratory Therapy Students at Southlake Regional Health Care in Newmarket. Southlake Regional Health Centre has been a clinical partner since the inception of the Respiratory Therapy Program in 2006. The RT team of preceptors lead by Erin have continually demonstrated a passion for student clinical education each and every year. They create an inter-professional environment that is welcoming and supportive of students making Southlake a very highly rated clinical site among the students. Southlake Regional Health Care Centre has demonstrated an ongoing commitment to professional development for their RRT’s through collaborative learning with the Cowan Health Sciences Centre and its Cross Centre for Simulation Learning, contributing to quality care and ensuring a very fine learning environment for our students. Erin through her leadership and enthusiasm is key to the excellent practicum experiences of our students.

Jason Brinson, Preceptor for Paramedic Students at Brantford EMS. Jason has been an excellent preceptor and a positive addition to the Primary Care Paramedic Program. Jason was a great asset and advocate for our program during recent challenges securing placements in our first term. Jason elicited fellow professionals for assistance and went well beyond normal expectations to ensure students were receiving the appropriate experience. Jason is a role model of professional practice and exhibits positive relationships and cooperation with medical staff and other allied health professionals with respect to patient-centered practice. Jason’s personal growth, both professionally and academically, is clearly evident in this work — and he is role model for students.

WE WILL BE INVITING THESE PRECEPTORS TO A PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN THE FALL TO RECEIVE THEIR RECOGNITION.

A SPECIAL THANK YOU TO TD FINANCIAL GROUP FOR MAKING THESE AWARDS POSSIBLE. WE HAVE AN ENDOWED FUND FOR ONGOING RECOGNITION OF STUDENTS AND PRECEPTORS!
CONGRATULATIONS TO 2013 STUDENT WINNERS OF THE SECURITAS AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE AND PROFESSIONALISM IN COMMUNITY SAFETY

These awards are being given for the first time for 2013 as a result of a financial contribution by Securitas Canada. Three $500 awards are available, one to a student from each of Protection, Security and Investigation, Police Foundations and PreService Fire.

Protection, Security & Investigation Award Recipient: Gabriella Klosak. Gabriella has demonstrated dedication, commitment and leadership towards the PSW Program and the College as a whole over her two years as a PSI student. She organized a volunteer network which played significant supportive roles in the new court house emergency procedure days; she organized her classmates to provide ongoing student feedback and serve as sounding board for the program, demonstrating a high degree of professionalism and collegiality; and she contributes to the learning environment in a positive manner. She has used a net-working opportunity to secure a part-time opportunity in her field and open new doors to her professionally.

Police Foundations Award Recipient: Stephanie-Lee Tschirhart. Stephanie excels in the Police Foundations Program as a role model of professionalism with strong academic performance, initiative in class discussions and exercises, team work, and leadership to other students. Her leadership was recognized with her selection to be in charge of the Crime-Scene exercise with 84 fellow students. She is a very good ambassador of the Police Foundations Program and very proud of being part of it.

Pre-Service Fire Fighter Education and Training Award Recipient: Lanny Noble. Lanny demonstrates a genuinely positive attitude towards his studies and a commitment to training quality. In this equipment intensive program, Lanny has supported his fellow students by the care and extra attention that he gives to ensuring all equipment is properly set-up and maintained. Lanny even used his welding skills to repair a piece of equipment used by the Paramedic Program. Lanny has been involved inter-professionally, with WIHSC and has delivered peer mentoring, demonstrating collaboration within and across programs. Lanny’s willingness to support student recruiting events along with his own program and other programs exemplifies the servant leadership that is key to a career in this vital community service.

A SPECIAL THANK YOU TO SECURITAS CANADA LIMITED FOR MAKING THESE AWARDS POSSIBLE!

We were pleased to have had an opportunity to present theses awards at the Awards for PSI/PF Students on April 18th.

The awards were presented by Kirsty Bradley-McMurtrie, Area Vice-President of Greater Toronto and Southern Ontario for Securitas Canada Limited. Of note, Kirsty as an alumnus of the LASA program (the former name for PSI)!
CONGRATULATIONS TO 2013 FACULTY AND STAFF WINNERS OF THE LEADERSHIP TEAM AWARDS FOR EXEMPLARY INTERPROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

Each year the Leadership Team of the School awards up to three awards to faculty and staff who demonstrate exemplary inter-professional and collaborative practice, as nominated by their peers and as selected by a sub-group of the Leadership Team and Human Resources. For 2013, we have increased this number to four due to the exemplary characteristics of the nominees.

The following recipients will receive a certificate of recognition and will have their name placed on the Leadership Team Inter-professional Awards Plaque that will be placed in the Schlegel Agora of the Cowan Health Sciences Centre.

♦ Jane Douglas: Jane, as Coordinator for the Personal Support Worker Program, has been the pivotal player in developing, launching and implementing the first Living Classroom at the Village of Riverside Glen in Guelph. The following examples demonstrate Jane’s initiative, creativity and collaborative practice: Riverside Glen staff are welcome in the PSW classroom to observe, learn or participate; residents come into class & talk about person-centered care and what they expect from PSW’s; Kinesiologists from Riverside Glen facilitate positioning and transfer skills in the labs and in the tub rooms on the floors; students learn foot care or vital signs in the labs and then take their learning to the floors with the residents; and Jane collaborates with Neighborhood Coordinators to plan inter-professional experiences for students while the students are on placement. Jane has also reached out to community agencies in Guelph to expand the practicum network and increase their awareness of the program. Finally, Jane shares her learning materials freely with all faculty at Doon and at Riverside Glen!

♦ John Richards: As Chair for Continuing Education and Certificate Programs for the School, John is constantly working with programs and individuals across the School and the College. In this role, John has become the “go to guy” to solve problems and create new initiatives, all of which he does in the most helpful (and detailed) way. John has also been instrumental in moving forward the following initiatives: growth and development of the PSW program; development of a new approach to meet the College’s international enrollment goals with the Enhanced Nursing Practice Program—Critical Care and the second option, Gerontology and Chronic Illness, with superior ability to align program requirements with academic systems; evolution of the Bridge to Practical Nursing for Foreign-educated professionals with the government granting agency MCI and then evolution of this program to a college-approved program with even more finesse; and development and sustainability of the Conestoga-Schlegel partnership, with particular leadership re innovation in the development and delivery of new continuing education offerings. John excels in placing student success first and always have an “ear” for others; there is nothing too small or unimportant for John’s help.
CONGRATULATIONS TO 2013 FACULTY AND STAFF WINNERS OF THE LEADERSHIP TEAM AWARDS FOR EXEMPLARY INTERPROFESSIONAL PRACTICE, Cont’d

♦ Lori Peppler Beechey. As Coordinator for the Respiratory Therapy Program, Lori has been instrumental in demonstrating the integration of the School’s inter-professional outcomes and supporting competencies and learning expectations throughout the RT program to ensure that graduates will demonstrate the team behaviours and attitudes expected in the workplace. As a member of various committees focused on IPE and most recently as the Scholarly Lead for IPE in the School, Lori has shared her expertise and experience in that models the collaborative team approach. Examples of her contributions include: evaluation of IPE implementation, contributions of IPE expertise to various major program reviews, and bringing an IPE perspective to the Cowan Health Sciences Centre during pre-construction planning and subsequently through operational planning activities. Lori also contributes to positioning Conestoga as a leader in IPE through collaborative work with the regional IPE committee and providing support and education for Brantford Hospital as that organization implements an IP model of care. We appreciate Lori’s enthusiasm, energy and commitment both to RT and interprofessional practice in the School.

♦ Mary Elizabeth Roth. As a Nursing Professor in the Practical Nursing Program and the School’s Leader for the IP Preceptorship Workshop, Mary Elizabeth is a leader in inter-professional education. As the Faculty Expert in the PN4 Leadership for Practical Nurses course, enables students to build leadership characteristics while supporting life-long learning strategies within the design and incorporating both best practices with realistic expectations to provide students with the reality of the RPN role and their journey. Mary Elizabeth embraces team work across the nursing programs and had been working with the School’s placement team to incorporate new partners, particularly related to seniors care. As the School’s lead for the IP Preceptorship Workshop, Mary Elizabeth is known for the quality and creative flare of these workshops, for which she has been recognized provincially and nationally. Mary Elizabeth is a pillar for the Nursing Profession and the entire inter-professional team, embracing and forging links between partners, faculty, students and client/families for person-centered practice, team work quality outcomes.

DUE TO THE CANCELLATION OF THE APRIL 11TH EVENT, WE WILL BE RECOGNIZING THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS AT THE SCHOOL’S WELCOME BACK EVENT, THURSDAY, AUGUST 29TH, 2013!
CONGRATULATIONS TO 2013 PARTNER WINNERS OF THE LEADERSHIP TEAM AWARDS FOR EXEMPLARY EDUCATION/PRACTICE COLLABORATION

Each year the Leadership Team of the School awards three awards to education partners whose demonstrate exemplary inter-professional and collaborative practice, as nominated by their peers and selected by a sub-group of the Leadership Team with Human Resources.

The following recipients will receive an engraved glass piece that illustrates the interconnectedness of education and practice as the necessary ingredient to moving forward for improved practice and service. Their name placed on the Leadership Team Inter-professional Awards Plaque that will be placed in the Schlegel Agora of the Cowan Health Sciences Centre.

♦ Cambridge Memorial Hospital Therapy Team, lead by Joan Tew, Professional Practice Lead PT and Sonya Kochanski, Professional Practice Lead OT. Each year, this therapy team offers their time and knowledge to preceptor students from the OTA/PTA program in a wide range of experiences and teaching from acute to complex care and across the disciplines of OT and PT. Students learn that inter-disciplinary team interaction is key; communication skills and strategies among team members and clients are essential skills that are emphasized. This team has also demonstrated great flexibility in creating interesting learning experiences across the hospital and being able to meet Program requests when placements are tight, continuing to offer opportunities despite tight staff and challenging times. Lastly, the members of this team have shown dedication to the College by being members of our PAC as well as becoming teaching assistants in our labs.

♦ Neighborhoods in Long-Term Care (LTC) at Schlegel Village of Riverside Glen, lead by Amy Brasil, Assistant Director of Care. Neighborhood teams in LTC add enormous value to the learning of over 60 PSW, PN, OTA/PTA and Recreation Students per year. Staff consistently show leadership in welcoming students to their environments; creating a diverse range of inter-professional activities (ie, all students shadow staff on a neighborhood); encourage learning in formal and informal ways (ie engaging students in social activities outside their normal comfort zone); and promoting high levels of expertise and professionalism (ie. Involving students in complex discussions related to resident, family or team situations). In addition, the staff at the Village of taken deliberate steps to enhance the mentor and preceptor capabilities of all team members (ie attending preceptor workshops) and having discussions with the college staff about ways to develop innovative learning experiences for students (eg the undertaking of the special ‘Recreation Therapy Week’ for students). We applaud the enormous commitment, passion and energy of the staff to act as role models for our students. Several statements from students attest to the fact that the staff on these units have absolutely changed the way students perceive LTC—with several students now setting their sites on a career path with seniors care!
Region of Waterloo Children’s Services, lead by Nancy Dickeson. The Children’s Service Department provides leadership for quality early learning and care in the Region. Through their innovative work with child care agencies, our ECE students are engaged in rich and meaningful field placement experiences and, upon graduation, in supportive and full-filling work opportunities. The last decade has been one of significant shifts in the field of early learning and child care, with the results being fiscal uncertainty, outdated practices and worries regarding ability to redevelop and retain staff. While a number of communities are struggling with these impacts, the Region of Waterloo Children’s Services is emerging as a groundbreaker in supporting the field through collaboration and innovation. The following examples with Conestoga demonstrate the far-reaching impacts that are possible through education and practice collaboration:

- establishment of the Professional Resource Center for ECE (the first at a college) which is becoming a hub for development of Child Care staff to take on new expectations;
- collaboration with the School Boards and College to develop an innovative way to roll-out the province’s new full-day learning program (strategies that are being recognized as best practice in the province);
- supporting the creation of the course, Redefining Early Learning & Care (unique in the prov);
- creating the opportunity for child care centres, such as our own, to modernize their facilities to Support new expectations for early learning and care; and
- actively participating on the PAC for ECE.

WE WILL BE INVITING OUR PRACTICE PARTNERS TO PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS IN THE FALL TO RECEIVE THEIR RECOGNITION.
TO: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee
DATE: April 30, 2013
SUBJECT: FUNERAL RATES

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a maximum funeral rate of $2,974 plus applicable taxes effective June 1, 2013;

AND THAT any funds provided by family or others for additional services be in addition to any payment made by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, as outlined in report SS-13-015, dated April 30, 2013.

SUMMARY:

Nil

REPORT:

1.0 Background

The Region of Waterloo provides funerals in the following circumstances:

1. For unclaimed bodies, as required under the Anatomy Act
2. For low income individuals eligible for Ontario Works (OW) and Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) benefits as part of the Ontario Works Discretionary Benefits (OWDB) Program, entirely at the discretion of Regional Council.
3. For persons with low income but not eligible for OW or ODSP benefits, entirely at the discretion of Regional Council.

For the last number of years, the Funeral Directors have requested a maximum rate of $5,545 for funeral services. The Region has approved the following rates:

2012 $2,830
2011 $2,775
2010 $2,700
2009 $2,400

The Region has based its rate on the median of comparable Ontario municipalities.

At its meeting of January 18, 2012, Council approved the following motion with respect to funeral rates:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a phased-in approach to increasing funeral rates, subject to Council approval of a Memorandum of Understanding with the
Region of Waterloo Funeral Directors to establish the service standards for funerals undertaken under the agreement;

AND THAT the Memorandum of Understanding reflect a phase-in of funeral rates over a three-year period as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$5,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$2,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND FURTHER THAT the phased-in funeral rates shall become effective upon completion of the Memorandum of Understanding.

Staff met with representatives of the Funeral Directors several times in 2012 to determine the contents of the Memorandum of Understanding. These discussions were paused as a result of the cap on Discretionary Benefits introduced by the Province in July 2012. Prior to this there was no cap on expenditures for funerals. Following the 2013 Budget approval for Discretionary Benefits staff restarted the discussion within the approved level of funding for discretionary benefits and was not able to reach an understanding. The two representatives felt that they were no longer able to speak on behalf of all Funeral Directors and advised that the Region identify the service expected and set an amount, recognizing the actual cost of services.

2.0 Comparator Municipalities

Staff has surveyed other municipalities for approved funeral rates. The following chart summarizes the 2012 rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>$ for Full Service (excluding HST)</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>$4,837</td>
<td>22.9% increase over 2011 rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>$3,605</td>
<td>47% increase over 2011 rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>$3,448</td>
<td>22% increase over 2011 rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>No increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>$2,440</td>
<td>6.6% increase over 2011 rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>$2,390</td>
<td>No Increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average rate of the comparators is $3,203 and the median rate is $2,974. In 2012, the Region of Waterloo’s rate was $2,830, an increase of 2% over the 2011 rate.

To move to the comparator median of $2,974 would be an increase of 5.1% over the 2012 rate. The costs related to burial and / or cremations, paid directly to the applicable cemetery, are in addition to the fees paid to Funeral Directors.
3.0 Proposed Funeral Program

As the Region is not able to reach an agreement on a memorandum of understanding with the Funeral Directors and given the approved level of funding for the Discretionary Benefits program, the phased-in rates approved in the 2012 motion have not been implemented.

If approved, the recommendations in this report would result in the following elements for the provision of funerals by Waterloo Region effective June 1, 2013:

1. The Region will pay a maximum of $2,974 plus applicable taxes for funeral services for eligible individuals.
2. Costs related to the burial and/or cremation are in addition to fees paid to Funeral Directors.
3. Any recoveries from CPP and/or other sources will continue to be assigned to the Region. In the event funding received exceeds the total cost incurred by the Region, any excess funding will be returned to the deceased estate.
4. Should the cost of the services provided by the Funeral Director exceed the funding approved by the Region, the Funeral Director will be able to contract directly with the family or other individuals for reimbursement of these costs.

The recommended program differs from the current program only in relation to the Funeral Directors being able to contract with families and others for services in excess of the funding provided by the Region (item 4 above). Currently, this is not allowed by the Region.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The provision of funerals to those with low income and social assistance recipients addresses the Region’s Corporate 2011-2014 Strategic Focus Area 4: Healthy and Inclusive Communities: (To) foster healthy, safe, inclusive and caring communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The following table summarizes the funeral program in 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ontario Works /</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unclaimed</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Funerals</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral Director Fees</td>
<td>$377,599</td>
<td>$178,489</td>
<td>$556,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial / Cremation Costs</td>
<td>101,918</td>
<td>52,098</td>
<td>154,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Recoveries</td>
<td>(139,046)</td>
<td>(76,086)</td>
<td>(215,132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cost</td>
<td>$340,471</td>
<td>$154,501</td>
<td>$494,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Subsidy *</td>
<td>216,923</td>
<td></td>
<td>216,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Regional Cost</td>
<td>$123,548</td>
<td>$154,501</td>
<td>$278,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Effective subsidy rate for OWDB program

Based on the 2012 experience, and assuming a maximum rate of $2,974 (plus applicable taxes) the fees paid to funeral providers could increase by as much as $92,000 (net of HST rebate), depending on the services provided. The cost of cremation, burial and recoveries would not be impacted by the increased fees to the funeral providers.

Cost sharing for the Ontario Works Discretionary Benefits program is capped at $10.00 per case per
month. As the Region has approved spending in excess of the Provincial cap for the OWDB program, the Region’s share for cost shared funerals would be the full $92,000. The 2013 Budget includes sufficient funding to accommodate this increase.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Finance was consulted in the preparation of this report.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

PREPARED BY: David Dirks, Director, Employment and Income Support

APPROVED BY: Douglas Bartholomew-Saunders, Commissioner, Social Services
TO: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of the Community Services Committee

DATE: April 30, 2013

FILE CODE: A02-40

SUBJECT: IMMIGRATION PARTNERSHIP – WATERLOO REGION

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve entering into an agreement with the United Way Kitchener Waterloo and Area under the Local Immigration Partnership, dated January 1, 2013, in a form satisfactory to the Commissioner of Social Services and the Regional Solicitor;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality approve an increase in staff of one temporary full time equivalent;

AND FURTHER THAT the 2013 Operating Budget for Social Planning, Policy and Program Administration be increased by $42,500 and $0 net Regional Levy, as outlined in report SS-13-016, dated April 30, 2013.

SUMMARY:

The Immigration Partnership is comprised of a broad range of stakeholders including employers, service providers, immigrants, municipal government representatives, healthcare providers, and other representative groups. The mandate of the Immigration Partnership is to help facilitate successful settlement and integration of immigrants and refugees in Waterloo Region by creating and enhancing partnerships and implementing collaborative strategies through coordination, information sharing, problem-solving and implementing strategies for change. This report seeks Council approval for the continuation of the work of the Immigration Partnership with renewed funding from existing partners, the federal government and United Way of Kitchener Waterloo and Area.

REPORT:

The Immigration Partnership vision is that Waterloo Region will be a community where immigrants and refugees can settle, work and belong. The Waterloo Region Immigration Partnership Council is accountable, through the Region, to the Federal Government for the funds contributed to the initiative, and to the Region of Waterloo as the host and signatory to those agreements. The role of the Immigration Partnership Council is to:

- Facilitate collaborative and strategic relationships among stakeholders and across the community
Set strategic priorities and monitor action-plan implementation
Provide advice or direction on key initiatives (in collaboration with action groups)
Provide strategic guidance to the Immigration Partnership Manager
Seek out and strategically allocate resources for the Immigration Partnership and initiatives
Seek input from community-at-large and educate the community about immigrant issues
Share information back to community
Identify and conduct advocacy (within the Region and potentially beyond Waterloo Region together with other Local Immigration Partnerships)

The purpose of the Immigration Partnership is to facilitate the following outcomes:

1. Improvements in accessing and coordinating services that facilitate immigrant's settlement and integration. (SETTLE)
2. Build a strong workforce in Waterloo Region through attracting and hiring job ready immigrants. (WORK)
3. Strengthen local and regional awareness and capacity to integrate immigrants. (BELONG)

A Community Plan was developed in 2011 and the Immigration Partnership Action Groups (Settle, Work and Belong) have been implementing the actions. Each year, the Community Plan is reviewed and monitored. In the Settling Pillar the focus is on working with settlement service providers to investigate development of a ‘one-stop shop’ of immigration services, as well as enhancing access to interpretation in the health care system. In the Working Pillar, the focus is on developing capacity of both the employers and immigrants, through networking opportunities and training. The Belonging Pillar focuses on the longer integration and support of immigrants. The partners are working with ethno-cultural groups to identify learning and networking opportunities, as well as working in the community with leadership develop service providers to identify how we can support immigrants to become more civically involved in their communities.

Some notable achievements to date are:

- Completion of a Settlement Systems Mapping project, which has led to an agreement among settlement service providers to develop a shared client intake form which will result in a better service experience for the immigrant.
- The Global Skills networking event provides an opportunity for immigrants to meet employers directly through an informal process. Immigrants were able to pass their resumes on to employers that are hiring, and connect to learn more about how they can better market themselves for employment in the region.
- Development of the Interim Federal Health Program chart has helped primary care service providers to better understand what is covered under this program for refugee claimants. This has led to better service for the client.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The report supports the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Area 4: Healthy and Inclusive Communities and Strategic objective 4.8 (to) Partner with the community to improve programs and services for immigrants and refugees. Action 4.8.1 indicates that the Region will continue to support the Immigration Partnership in its work to coordinate efforts to attract, welcome and integrate immigrants and refugees in our community.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Funding for the Immigration Partnership initiative is from several sources including: federal (Canadian Immigration and Citizenship), provincial (Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration), United Way of Kitchener Waterloo and Area (United Way) and Region funds. The amount from United Way is $42,500 for the period January 1, 2013 to March 31, 2013. Other funding sources have been previously reported to Regional Council (SS-11-013/CA-11-004, SS-11-037, and SS-13-010). As part of the 2013 budget process the Region approved $50,000 in 2013 and 2014. Funding from all sources supports temporary staffing up to 4.8 temporary fulltime and part time staff to maintain the Immigration Partnership and action groups as well as operating costs.

With the United Way funds, the operating budget for Social Planning, Policy and Administration will be increased by $42,500 for the period January 1, 2013 – March 31, 2014.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Legal Services has been consulted regarding the development of the legal agreements. Finance provided support in reviewing project financial reporting requirements. Human Resources provided support regarding staffing requirements.

ATTACHMENTS

NIL

PREPARED BY:  Lynn Randall, Director, Social Planning, Policy and Program Administration
Jo-Anne Gibson, Manager, Immigration Partnership

APPROVED BY:  Douglas Bartholomew-Saunders, Commissioner, Social Services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Assigned Department</th>
<th>Anticipated Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27-Nov-12</td>
<td>S. Strickland</td>
<td>That the matter of mandatory CPR and AED training for all Regional employees be referred to staff to report back with options for a Health &amp; Safety staff training policy.</td>
<td>Public Health/Human Resources</td>
<td>Jun-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>