

# King George Elementary Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

## Memorial (City) School

June 1, 2011

### Minutes (Working Meeting # 2)

#### **ATTENDANCE:**

##### **Committee Members**

***Chair –Pat Rocco***

***Voting Members –Lisa Cameron, Agnes Clarke, Jennifer Drahusz, Dianna Gillespie, Felicia Guarascia, Anna Macky, Brenda Reid, Crystal Provo, Brian Seamans***

***Non-Voting Members – Karen Bikinas, John Bradley, Lori Helt, Susan Neville, Tim Simmons, Janet VanDuzen, Irma Belanger, Michelle Pickett, Linda Wilson***

##### **Not Present:**

***Voting Members –***

***Non-Voting Members – Bernie Morelli***

##### **Resource Staff**

***Ellen Warling, Daniel Del Bianco, Michael Slee, Todd Salerno***

##### **Recording Secretary**

***Claire Vander Beek***

1. Welcome and Introductions – Superintendent Pat Rocco

Chair Rocco welcomed everyone to the second King George working meeting, noting the next meeting will be a public session in September. He emphasized the busy agenda for the evening and that as boundary options had been requested, they will be presented for consideration of the members.

2. Agenda [http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/June-1-KingGeorgeARC\\_WorkingGroupMeeting2\\_Agenda.pdf](http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/June-1-KingGeorgeARC_WorkingGroupMeeting2_Agenda.pdf)

2.1 Additions/deletions - no issues

2.2 Approval of agenda - Consensus was received.

3. Review of School Information Profiles (SIP) [http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/KingGeorge\\_Apr20\\_2011.pdf](http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/KingGeorge_Apr20_2011.pdf)

3.1 Overview of each section

3.2 Additions / deletions

3.3 Questions from the committee

Mr. Del Bianco presented the sections of the SIP information in relation to each of the three schools, noting much of the information contained in the SIP is formula driven.

- 1. Enrolment versus Available Space – compares enrolment projections, current and projected classrooms required, capacity and utilization rates. Principal Van Duzen noted the current enrolment at Prince of Wales School is 541. No changes made
- 2. Cost of School Operations – includes current costs and grant information. No changes made.
- 3. Cost of School Administration – current and projected costs. No changes made
- 4. Condition of School – renewal needs current and projected. It was noted the FCI index for King George is at 80% and how that relates to its overall replacement value. The total projected Board revenue to support all school renewal projects for next 10 years is \$76,673.280. No changes made.
- 5. Quality of the Learning Environment at the School– Members were asked to review and ensure the current information for schools is correct. Mr. Del Bianco also encouraged members to forward any questions to him if they arise subsequent to tonight’s meeting.
  - #31 Changed to: Yes under King George and Prince of Wales.
- 6. Range of Program Offerings – members reviewed the data listed.
  - # 2 While the intent is “child care services on site”, a footnote is to be added to reflect the Y across the street from King George.
- 7. Range of Extracurricular Activities – No changes made.
- 8. Adequacy of the School’s Grounds for Healthy Physical Activity & Extra-curricular Activity
  - #1 – Change Prince of Wales to Yes – basketball court
  - #1 – Change Memorial (City) to Yes – basketball court and play structure
  - #7 – Change Prince of Wales to reflect *informal* rather than *formal* use of Scott Park, Scott Park arena and TiCat stadium for track & field & football
- 9. Accessibility of the School for Students with Disabilities – No changes made.
- 10. Safety of the School – No changes made.
- 11. Location of School (relative to where students live) - this information is derived from Transportation Department data.
- 12. Student Outcomes at the School – EQAO testing numbers are percentages (at or above the provincial levels 3 & 4). Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) testing numbers reflect the average score per grade.
  - Mr. Slee to update DRA content to reflect percentage of students reaching benchmarks.
- 13. Location of School (within community) – No changes made
- 14. Facility for Community Use – No changes made.
- 15. School Grounds as Green Space – No change made.
- 16. Range of Program Offerings at the School
  - Add Family Literacy program under Prince of Wales.
  - Under Memorial, change No to Yes and add Family Literacy program.
- 17. School as Partner in Other Gov’t Initiatives – No changes made.
- 18. School as Local Employer – figures are actuals from 2009/2010.
- 19. Availability of Cooperative Education – No changes made.
- 20. Availability of Training Opportunities – No changes made.
- 21. Attracts or Retains Families in the Community
  - Under King George, add: Staff/program attracts community not facility.

4. Review of Alternate Accommodation Options <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/KingGeorgeAltOptionsPresentation-2.pdf>

4.1 Presentation of alternate boundary scenarios – Michael Slee

Mr. Slee provided the following overview for his presentation:

**The original board recommendation**

- The original Board option to close King George in June of 2012 and relocate students to Prince of Wales and Memorial (City) that September , was presented to the King George ARC at working group meeting #1, and to the public at public meeting #2. As outlined in the Terms of Reference, the Board is to develop its own option to present to the ARC. The King George ARC may accept, reject or modify the Board option.

**Why we are looking at alternative boundary options?**

- When the Board option was presented to the ARC, it became apparent that there was interest in exploring other boundary options. By presenting alternative boundary options, the ARC will be able to make a well-informed decision as to which option is the best fit. Presenting three options will allow the ARC to make comparisons of the options to better inform their decision on the recommended boundaries.

**Some points to consider when creating new boundaries**

- We are looking for an even distribution of students, with a target utilization of around 85% for each school.
- There is an attempt to minimize the distance between the students and the school so the students can walk safely to their community school.
- The walking distances for JK/SK is 1km and for grades 1-8 is 1.6km.
- It is also important to ensure that the option works today as well as in the next 10 years.

**Alternative boundary scenarios summary**

- Three options will be presented. Each has a Phase 1 and Phase 2 element.
- Phase 1 - Each of the options will show different boundaries for Prince of Wales and Memorial (City) Schools, that will determine where the King George students will go, and what the new enrolments for the receiving schools will be. Phase 1 will only involve the ARC schools [King George, Memorial (City) and Prince of Wales].
- Phase 2 – Each of the options will also have a Phase 2 presented, which involves a Queen Mary boundary review proposal. This will have students from the King George ARC going to and coming from Queen Mary School . This can only be a recommendation as a potential boundary review because Queen Mary is not a part of this ARC.

**Alternative boundary scenarios**

Mr. Slee first reviewed the current situation of the three schools in the ARC. He identified the utilization rates as: King George approximately 57% - Memorial (City) approximately 70% - Prince of Wales approximately 70%, dropping to 60% in 9 years. (Queen Mary approximately 86%)  
With an average total utilization for all four schools being around 70%

**Option A – Phase 1** - is the original Board and proposes the closure of King George, with the King George students going to Memorial (City) and Prince of Wales.

Utilization: Memorial (City) approximately 78% - Prince of Wales approximately 96% dropping to 88% -with an average between the two schools at around 83%

- Prince of Wales and Memorial enrolments increase

Mr. Bradley noted that Memorial School also draws south of Queen Mary zone for grades 6-7-8.

### **Option A - Phase 2**

Current boundaries are outlined on the map in black. Proposed boundaries are shaded in colour. Phase 2, which is based on the original Board option, has Queen Mary taking in students North of its current boundary. In this scenario Memorial (City) would be taking in the West segment of the current Queen Mary boundary. This scenario is looking to achieve North-to-South boundaries for the schools.

**Utilization:** Memorial (City) increased from the original option to approximately 90% - Prince of Wales dropped slightly to approximately 83% due to some of the students in the North boundary going to Queen Mary in this scenario - Queen Mary approximately 83%, dropping slightly from the current situation of 86%. This is because there are more students living in the West Segment of the Queen Mary boundary (around 85 students), compared to the North-of-Queen-Mary area (around 57 students).

### **Option B - Phase 1**

This option is similar to the original Board option, except it uses the current East boundary of Prince of Wales, instead of Gage Ave N.

**Utilization:** The enrolment projections and utilizations are similar to the Board option.

Memorial (City) approximately 80%, up slightly from the original Board option.

Prince of Wales approximately 86%, down slightly from the original Board option.

This difference is from the Gage Ave N to Balsam Ave N area.

### **Option B – Phase 2**

Current boundaries are outlined in black on the map and the proposed boundaries are shaded in colour.

This phase would recommend a Queen Mary boundary review. This option is similar to Option A Phase 2, again the difference being the Balsam Ave boundary versus. Gage.

**Utilization:** Memorial (City) up slightly to approximately 92%.

Prince of Wales down slightly to approximately 80%.

Queen Mary utilization is the same as in Phase 2 of Option A at around 83%.

### **Option C - Phase 1**

On the map the south part of the boundary is similar to the original Board option, along Gage with the boundary between Memorial (City) and Prince of Wales continuing North.

**Utilization:**

This adds more students to Memorial (City) and less to Prince of Wales compared to the other two options. Memorial (City) much higher at approximately 94% - Prince of Wales much lower at approximately 75%

### **Option C - Phase 2**

Again, Queen Mary's boundary extends North of its current boundary.

**Utilization:** Memorial (City) up even more, to approximately 98%

Prince of Wales remains the same as in Phase 1 of this option, at approximately 75%

Queen Mary utilization approximately 83%, the same as in phase 2 of the other options, which is down slightly from the current situation of around 86%.

### **The Estimated Timeline for this process**

Mr. Slee reminded members that as outlined in the Terms of Reference, the ARC committee is to bring forward a recommendation to the Board in November 2011. A decision will be made by trustees in January of 2012. A potential Queen Mary boundary review could possibly take place during the late Winter/early Spring. King George would close in June 2012 and King George students would be relocated in September 2012.

#### **4.2 Questions**

Q: Has any consideration been given to at looking at the west boundaries of Prince of Wales with Cathy Wever?

A: Mr. Rocco stated Cathy Wever is actually a school whose population is increasing. Any changes to this boundary would also impact Bennetto and Hess Street Schools. Consideration would have to be given to this population down the road.

In considering these options, Mr. Bradley commented that adding an extra 150 students to a school's capacity equates to six additional classrooms, but the number of music, gym or science rooms remain the same. Timetabling will result in fewer opportunities in such specialty rooms. Mr. Rocco added that this would be dependent on what grades are affected by the influx of students.

Q: Would moving the small area back within the Queen Mary School boundary instead of Memorial School result in Queen Mary being at 96%?

A: Mr. Rocco indicated that this can be part of a boundary review but is not part of the ARC process at this point. Moving the boundary could shift the percentages but this is not our mandate

Q: What is the ideal Board or Ministry capacity?

A: Mr. Rocco replied that there is a lot to consider such as the school structure and its Pupil Teacher Ratio (PTR). For example, Memorial School building has the capacity to have air conditioning added. The intent is to maximize capacity. The Ministry wants 90% plus.

Q: Why does Queen Mary always show staying as 70% in each of the options?

A: Mr. Rocco pointed out that Queen Mary School would have no changes until a boundary review, is done as it is not part of this ARC. We need to also consider the impact of new Catholic school in the area. Could the boundaries be changed/enlarged – yes - through a boundary review. This is “in theory” number of students.

Q: Re projected numbers. While I know Cathy Wever School is not in this ARC, what happens if inner city numbers go down?

A: Mr. Rocco – at present, Cathy Wever is maintaining its population, although it is projected to decline.

Q: But numbers may change resulting in unequal school numbers.

A: Mr. Rocco – this could be adjusted through a boundary review. We recently did a review at Dr. Davey. The Board has a process in place to address such an issue. You have to remember this is also a transient neighbourhood and jobs losses such as Siemens impact. As the population settles and students are in place, we may have to address numbers. Boundary reviews help to ascertain number of students – we may lose students to the new school.

Q: Can you house 90% capacity? Will programming be affected?

A: Mr. Rocco - In September 2012 the principals will have to identify areas to be addressed re programming.

Mr. Bradley added that if trustees approve it, there is going to be another ARC east of Queen Mary School in future.

Q: Trustee Simmons – What impact will the upcoming French Immersion programming have on this ARC?

A: Mr. Rocco – I don't know at this point. This is a trustee decision, but it is coming out in the fall from the French Immersion Advisory Committee.

Q: What is the cost of transportation as a result of these boundary changes?

A: Mr. Slee: We have current transportation costs, but have requested costs for these options. This information will be provided to the ARC members.

Q: Will this result in extra busing?

A: Mr. Rocco – boundary changes at Dr. Davey reduced the number of buses.

Mr. Del Bianco added several comments to the previous discussion:

- Re capacity – the Ministry of Education tries to look at filling schools and would prefer overcapacity rather than having surplus space. A working capacity of a school – taking into consideration grades, classrooms to run the programs, housing special programs - is closer to 85%.
- Transportation funding – students qualify for busing based on an established walking distance. Transportation costs do not impact on school maintenance or programming funds as they come from different revenue streams.

## 5. Planning for Public Meeting #3 (September 21, 2011)

### 5.1 Information to be presented

Mr. Del Bianco asked the committee to consider what they want presented at the public session in September. Do they wish to present all of the options, none or the Board's? He stressed the Committee has to feel comfortable with the recommendation.

Q: Phase 2 of Option A puts it into perspective.

A: Mr. Del Bianco said it is his role to clarify that Queen Mary School is technically not part of this ARC. The Committee's options begin and end with the three schools in the ARC. Queen Mary School would be a "tack on" and as such would be a recommendation to have a boundary review initiated. Mr. Del Bianco suggested that the committee get public feedback/reaction on the presentation made by Mr. Slee tonight. The public may suggest moving a boundary in one of these options.

Mr. Del Bianco asked if the Committee would like to give the same presentation given by Mr. Slee at the public meeting?

When asked about the potential impact of the Program strategy or French Immersion Advisory Committee recommendations, Mr. Rocco said that if Memorial (City) School gets an influx of French Immersion students, then the committee could deal with that information in October. He would arrange for program staff to come to the working committee in October.

Consensus was reached to get input from public on the three options as presented by Mr. Slee at the September public meeting.

### 5.2 Public meeting start / end times

Mr. Del Bianco asked if a member of the committee would assist at the public meeting in September. Their role would be to speak about what has happened to this point and what has to happen between the public and the next working meeting. Felicia Guarascia from King George offered to take on this role.

Recalling a suggestion from the last meeting that a 6p to 9p timeframe is a deterrent to public attending, Mr. Rocco asked if there is a way to shorten that timeframe to appear less intimidating. Mr. Del Bianco confirmed that the ARC has the ability to change the hours. While it was initially suggested to only have a start time, consensus was reached on 6p-7p timeframe with the understanding that it may go over, and if people want to leave, they can.

6. Minutes of Working Group Meeting #2 (April 20, 2011) <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Minutes-final-April-20-11-.pdf>

6.1 Errors & omissions – None identified.

6.2 Approval of minutes – Consensus was received.

6.3 Business arising from minutes – Mr. Rocco noted the public time issue has been addressed.

7. Minutes of Public Meeting #2 (May 17, 2011) <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Minutes-final-May-17-111.pdf>

7.1 Errors & omissions – None identified.

7.2 Approval of minutes - Consensus was received.

7.3 Business arising from minutes – None identified.

7.3.1 Debriefing on Public Meeting #2

Mr. Del Bianco asked if the committee has suggestions or feedback on what did and didn't work at the public meeting or what could be done differently?

Feedback and discussion ensued regarding advertizing of public meetings as being too formal

- a letter is too much - use a simple flyer format instead

- keep it simple - less wordy - informal and easy to understand.

- Flyer to indicate pizza, tea/coffee available - include childminding and bus tickets provided.

Mr. Rocco will communicate with the Manager of Corporate Communications to arrange for such a flyer to be produced early in September to be distributed to the King George ARC communities.

7.3.2 Submissions to the ARC by members of the public

No submissions.

8. Correspondence

No correspondence.

9. Other Business

It was proposed by Ms. Wilson that the ARC committee not tour King George given the community has not fought to keep it open.

Mr. Del Bianco confirmed that touring the school is beyond the Terms of Reference. Ultimately it is up to the committee as the ones making the decision. Some members may prefer to see the school before voting. If you don't wish to attend the tour, members are not obligated to .

Mr. Del Bianco noted that following a tour of Memorial School the Committee was due to go to do a tour of King George School. As Ms. Wilson has proposed not touring King George School, he asked

members whether they wish to go on the tour and the consensus was No. However, he welcomed anyone wishing to tour King George to stay after the Memorial tour.

#### 10. Adjournment

Adjournment took place at 7:30 p.m.