



Finance and Facilities Committee

Wednesday, February 8, 2017

Room 340-D

Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board
20 Education Court, P.O. Box 2558
Hamilton, ON L8N 3L1

AGENDA: 2:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Resolution Into Committee of the Whole (Private Session) as per the Education Act, Section 207.2 (b) the disclosure of intimate, personal or financial information in respect of a member of the board or committee
4. Beverly Central/Dr. Seaton Consultation
5. Elementary Program Strategy Benchmarks
6. Capital Projects Update Report
7. Adjournment



EXECUTIVE REPORT TO FINANCE & FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Date: February 8, 2017

To: Finance & Facilities Committee

From: Manny Figueiredo, Director of Education

Prepared by: Stacey Zucker, Executive Superintendent of Board Operations & Treasurer
Bill Torrens, Superintendent of Student Achievement
Robert Fex, Senior Planner

RE: Beverly Central & Dr. Seaton School Temporary Accommodation Proposal Consultation

Action X

Monitoring ☐

Recommended Action:

It is recommended that students from Beverly Central and Dr. J. Seaton elementary schools remain in their respective locations until the opening of the new elementary school on the Beverly Community Centre site.

Rationale/Benefits:

The recommended action addresses questions and concerns raised by the community through the community consultation process. The parents who engaged in this process overwhelmingly did not support the proposed temporary accommodation plan.

An analysis of the school community's input indicated the following major themes:

- Parents who participated in the consultation identified more disadvantages to the proposed temporary accommodation plan than advantages;
- Many parents worried that this transition would negatively impact their child's learning and well-being;
- Many parents had concerns about the proposal's health and safety implications;
- Many parents felt that the plan was financially driven;
- Many parents felt that the plan did not respect the recommendations arising from the West Flamborough Accommodation Review Committee work that concluded in 2014.

A considerable amount of correspondence was received regarding the temporary accommodation plan as well. It reflected the themes arising from the consultation. The consultation data captured through the December 13th, 2016 Community Consultation event and the on-line survey are available as Appendix A.

As well, there are no compelling financial or physical plant reasons for supporting the temporary accommodation plan. An analysis of the financial impact of the temporary plan indicated that there would be no significant cost savings (please see the chart below for a breakdown of potential costs). An

curiosity • creativity • possibility

analysis of the physical plants at both schools indicated that both schools can be operated safely, without major capital outlay, until the opening of the new school. Please see Appendix B *Consultation Response Frequently Asked Questions*.

<i>Annual Operating Savings Related to Closing Beverly</i>			
School Administration	\$	190,000	
School Operations		180,000	
		370,000	
Less:			
Lost Grant Revenue Related to School Administration	-	115,000	
Total Annual Operating Savings Related to Closing Beverly	\$	255,000	
<i>One-Time Costs Required to Move to Dr. John Seaton</i>			
Portables	\$	100,000	
Moving Costs		30,000	
Minor Renovations at Dr. John Seaton		50,000	
Total One-Time Costs Required to Move to Dr. John Seaton	\$	180,000	
<i>Total Savings for 2017-18 if Beverly is Closed and Students Move to Dr. John Seaton</i>	\$	75,000	

Background:

On October 24th 2016, HWDSB Trustees “On the motion of Todd White the Finance and Facilities Committee **RECOMMENDS** that staff engage in consultation with the Beverly Central and Dr. J. Seaton communities regarding a temporary accommodation proposal which moves students from Beverly Central to Dr. J. Seaton until the new elementary school is constructed.”

Staff engaged in a community consultation event at Dr. John Seaton Elementary School on December 13th, 2016. The consultation asked community members to share their voice on the proposed temporary accommodation proposal through focus groups that asked three questions:

1. What questions are raised by the proposal to temporarily accommodate Beverly Central students at Dr. Seaton?
2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the staff’s recommendation to temporarily accommodate Beverly Central students at Dr. Seaton?
3. What additional factors could be considered by staff regarding the proposal?

A second community event was held on February 1st, 2017 to share the themes arising from the consultation. The session consisted of a short presentation, distribution of *Consultation Response Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)* and an opportunity for community members to ask HWDSB and City of Hamilton staff questions regarding the responses in the FAQ.

The new elementary school on the Beverly Community Centre site is currently at the approval process stage with the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change and Ministry of Transportation. It is expected that provincial and municipal approvals will be in place in the spring of 2017 and projected that construction will be completed by September, 2018

Appendix A

BEVERLY/SEATON CONSULTATION MEETING #1

Tuesday, December 13th, 2016

7:00 pm – 9:00 pm

Dr. John Seaton Elementary School
1279 Seaton Road, Sheffield, Ontario L0R 1Z0

MINUTES

1. Focus Group Sessions Process

Small working group sessions shared their questions and comments with facilitator. The facilitator asked their table groups these (3) questions:

- ***What questions are raised by the proposal to temporarily accommodate Beverly Central students at Dr. Seaton?***
- ***What are the advantages and disadvantages of the staff's recommendation to temporarily accommodate Beverly Central students at Dr. Seaton?***
- ***What additional factors could be considered by staff regarding the proposal?***

- Facilitator recorded questions and comments on chart paper
- Groups came to a consensus on the 2-3 *most important questions or comments*
- Facilitator recorded on-line
- Parents had the option to submit their comments or questions confidentially by writing on a piece of paper and putting it into an envelope provided at each table; or use their own personal device via this link:
<http://bit.ly/BCDSConsult>
- Questions will be taken back to the Board and Trustees in order to investigate and provide answers at the January 17th meeting

2. Large Group Debrief

Facilitators shared each of their Focus Groups (3) questions to the large group for debriefing. A summary of the results from the discussion will be shared with the community at a later date.

3. Final Questions

Community members were encouraged to voice questions that may have not been captured within their Focus Group Session, with the understanding that answers would be explored and responded to at the next meeting. These questions will be collated and included with the results of the table discussions.

ANONYMOUS COMMENTS

- Health and Safety, in terms of washroom space; source water quality; consumption; sanitation; and septic?
- What is the immediate plan if the boiler suddenly stops working at Beverly Seaton, during the decision making process?
- Why can't Beverly Central students stay one more year? How much money is being saved? What are the additional costs required at Dr. Seaton if Beverly students come there? Is this being financially responsible for a temporary solution?
- How will students achieve their academic or curricular achievements if the schools are joined?
- What support systems are in place to help with the transition in regards to behaviour and students already at risk?
- What is happening at the new site to accommodate Queens Rangers?
- Why is the Board not following the recommendations of the original ARC? Are there proper permits?
- Does the community have input on the new school design?

Appendix A

TABLE DISCUSSIONS ORGANIZED BY THEMES

MOVING 2X:

- What is the impact of moving twice in two years?
- Why move if this is only for one year?
- Why not start fresh with both Beverly Central & Dr. Seaton students starting at a new school?
- What if Spencer Valley project is delayed?
- How do you reconcile this transition with the Board strategy/vision statement?

ARC

- Why is this being raised again when we understand this would be raised after the ARC?
- Other than cost savings, what are the other advantages to merge now?
- Why were recommendations of ARC ignored or dismissed?
- Original ARC did not include an additional transition.
- Why is the board breaking our commitment to keeping both schools open until the new school is built?

WATER /SEPTIC

- Is the water and septic safe at Seaton?
- Can the Dr. Seaton manage additional volume in their washrooms?
- Was there a Risk Assessment done prior to the proposal in regards to health and safety?
- Will Seaton septic system handle the increased staff and students?
- Portables and water supply?
- Septic infrastructure/capacity? Condition? Ministry approval? Records? Loss of upgrading? Codes? Byelaw for the number of toilets.
- Why were Public Health issues about the water ignored? Potable water supply; there has been sanitation issues for two years?
- Drinking water?
- Seaton meet washroom basic requirements and building code?

NEW SCHOOL

- What would the new school start times and both times be?
- Will this move have a negative impact on the opening date for the new school?
- Why is the new school not attached to the Community Centre?
- September 2018 start are they going to commit to a penalty attached to the tender process liquid state of damages?
- Appropriate permits Ministry of Ed and City obtained?
- What is happening at the new site to accommodate the projected numbers especially with Queens Rangers?
- Shouldn't the design of the new school be discussed with the community/parents for our input?
- How can you be positive the new school will be ready September 2018 when permits haven't been approved?
- Why is there no playground? How asphalt is being considered a play area?
- Why is there a spot for a portable? And an extension?
- Why is the new school the size it is?
- Why is it not being built to connect to the community center? What is the timeline for the building?
- Why isn't this proposal a first step in the new school naming process? Can we do this by September?
- Who determines the plans?

Appendix A

COST SAVING?

- What will be the total cost savings if the building is not repaired?
- If the move takes place, what will the process and show me the savings?
- What are the relative costs of moving versus staying?
- What is the cost of portables, septic versus the cost of keeping Beverly open?
- Total of all costs to Seaton for both groups?
- How much money saved by moving to Seaton?
- Comparisons to cost of fixing septic/water at Seaton, to cost of roof/heating boiler at Beverly Central?
- More upfront information before this meeting, not just financial look at "to be determined later".
- Available resources are they the same in Bev/Seaton?
- Are both Bev/Seaton in the average condition index value for the next five years?
- The condition of the facilities: what is the rationale for adding additional strain to out Dr. Seaton?
- Was there a detailed cost analysis completed on keeping both schools open as baseline versus merging? If so is that information available? Which is most an economical?
- How many extra student spaces are available at Queens Rangers?
- Could some of the students to be accommodated there at Queens Rangers to ease the crowding at Seaton?

DAYCARE

- Will there be an extended pick up times for after a before school care
- Extended hours and capacity for childcare?
- Child care spaces where would they be housed?
- Losing childcare spaces due to the boundaries

CLASSES

- Creating new kindergarten classes?
- Class sizes and will how will they be split in the building?
- How can 3 kindergarten classes be accommodated?
- EQAO and academic unrest
- What happens to IT moves to Seaton, and then to the new school, including Smart boards etc.?
- Larger class sizes
- How is it fair that all of Beverly's tech that has been provided by Beverly Central's school council be split?
- By using Beverly Seaton's technology, while Seaton has very little tech available - will there be enough to go around?
- Loss of art room and Spec Ed class
- Isn't it against ministry provisions for FDK portables?
- Is there still a choice as to which high school they go to?
- No money to upkeep classroom sizes
- Functional use of gym for so many students - how is this going to benefit kids?
- Which grades in the portables?
- What support systems will be available to at assist children's transitions?
- Ratio to students to teacher?
- Difference and split classes?
- Will students have equal or same opportunity to access lockers, gym, etc.?
- Will there be split classes if combined?
- What specialized classrooms will be lost as a result of the combined schools?
- What will the number of students per classroom be at Seaton versus the new school?

Appendix A

TRANSPORATION

- How will this affect bus routes times?

WELL-BEING

- Have they considered the impact of teacher changes specifically JK?
- The well-being of students: changing school 3x times, mental health, academic progress and effect of performance for all students
- I would appreciate more transparency and communication in the process.
- How does the temporary joint accommodation help students achieve their curriculum targets?
- Emotional well-being of students, is a crucial – is the motivation behind this temporary transition for money or well-being?
- There is already a sense of community due to parents having children at both Schools and through outside sports and community etc.
- How can we ensure that Seaton and the Beverly community grows to become inclusive safe and welcoming?
- Building community, a challenge
- Board keeps talking about transparency, however superintendent skirts around all of the parent questions and didn't give us a straight answer to a single one question.
- How is cramming all of our children into Seaton and calling them all Seaton students creating a sense of community? You're just making us into Seaton not maintaining the identities of two schools?
- Mental health for all families and staff? Is there a Transition plan on both and support staff for anxiety etc.
- What is the mental health impact and learning impact of multiple transitions for primary grade learners?

STAFF

- Will teacher recruitment be done on the basis of the new school question?
- Staffing at the combined temporary school site versus staffing at the new school: how will the process differ?
- Loss of good teachers,

CURRENT BUILDING CONDITION

- Facilities upkeep?
- Quality using computer lab size of gym
- Cost for upgrades at Beverly?
- What has changed and have Bylaws been considered?
- Why has no one been out to Beverly Central to actually assess our roof issues, if there are any?
- Seaton has a huge cleanliness issue
- Will the merge to Seaton safely accommodate the fire code?
- What assessment has been conducted to indicate need for a move?
- What is the Structure in regards to the Building Code? Heating, electrical, utility service if so does the public have access to that information?
- What is the strategy plan to cost if we have to stay longer at Seaton in an aging building?
- Value of Beverly Central – what was the lead/first factor into the calculations for costing of repairs to Beverly Central?
- Do you expect further problems and heating costs for heating system at Beverly?
- Could portables be added as Beverly to address heating problem?
- Library at Seaton as it stands looks deplorable - where are all the books and desks? It looks horrid
- No leaks have been found the last few rains at Beverly - where is the roof issue? Has anyone been on site to see this? Has anyone from the board actually physically been to both schools to see the issues including septic, water and roof?
- Currently, what's the plan? Queens Rangers? Where does the third school fit into this transition?

Appendix A

ADVANTAGES

- Families have students at both schools which will make lives easier
- More students seem great; will it save money?
- More extracurricular, after school care
- Building school culture, bringing students together more opportunities for students

DISADVANTAGES

- Increased bus times for students for at Beverly Central
- Washrooms at Seaton are they adequate in terms of volume and quality?
- Unnecessary multiple transitions for younger students?
- Gym is too small currently for concerts and community events
- Water is not safe
- Computer lab size
- Students who expected to graduate from Beverly are upset?
- Temporary move in regards to emotional well-being?
- If we do this move the board will say we don't need to build a new school or prolong its construction?
- Longer bus times?
- Loss of public confidence in process
- Overcrowded portables
- Contradiction of 2014 ARC decision puts Beverly Central student at a disadvantage in regards to ownership and building
- Pay attention to what the community wants
- Multiple transitions
- Over-populated school
- Water issues at Seaton and septic issues,
- Not enough can a green space
- Timeline is too short to do it properly
- Washroom accommodations can't support larger number of children
- Addition of portables
- If Daycare is staying and if there are more students, what is the child to staff ratio?
- Does the board consider Seaton a safe and useable school as opposed to Beverly?
- There is a negative atmosphere at Seaton between staff and parents - but a really positive one at Beverly how will this impact our kids emotionally and educationally?
- Emotional impact on the children and the effects of the 2 moves over the years?
- Negative impact on education/learning for students could be due to stress etc. studies show this can be a result

Appendix A

Parent Voice Captured by On-Line Survey

What questions are raised by the proposal to temporarily accommodate Beverly Central students at Dr. Seaton?

- What is the state of the septic at Seaton School? Will it accommodate more students?
- Will something be done to make drinkable water available to the students?
- What are the financial differences in keeping both schools open as opposed to combining the schools at Seaton?
- Is it worth our children's well being of having to move twice?
- How will this move positively affect the kids in both schools? It would seem to me to just be putting extra stress on the Beverly students as they will now have to go through two moves instead of one.
- Why is this early merger necessary? Is it a child welfare issue or a money issue? We were assured during the ARC that children would remain in their current schools until a new school is available. At the consultation meeting the superintendent mentioned merging the 2 schools now was originally a plan B when asked why it's now become the plan he never gave a straight answer. Neither school is capable of housing both sets of students.

My concerns about this proposal are threefold:

1. Current research indicates Academic Performance decreases with multiple school moves before Grade 3.

A University of McMaster study (2014) indicated that "Children who switch schools between kindergarten and Grade 3 don't do as well on Ontario's standardized tests, the province's own data shows." The data used for this study was the EQAO's data on 45,000 Ontario children evaluated in kindergarten and then Grade 3. "Moving between schools lowers math achievement by over 10 percent, 9 percent for reading and 6 percent for writing". The authors go on to say that they were surprised the difference was not trivial but significant and is consistent with other findings that school moves seem to worsen school performance.

The American Psychological Association (2015) published research from Chicago indicating "low-income students who change schools frequently are at risk for lower math scores and have a harder time managing their behavior and attention in the classroom than similar students who stay in the same school." They went on to explain that these students scored, on average, 10 points lower which equates to being 8 months behind. The authors concluded that there is a "need for policies to prevent school changes and to support students, families and teachers when children do change schools".

University of Notre Dame research (2009) indicated that "student mobility is creating academic problems for the students who move, but it's also a problem for those who remain" and that "students who change schools, especially frequent movers, can suffer psychologically, socially and academically, another important finding is that academic achievement of the "stable core" - the students who stay in one school - is also negatively affected by the school's mobility rate". The authors concluded the study by saying "We need to tell people how detrimental it is to switch schools. We want to let people know how much they may be hurting their children. It puts kids behind, and they may never catch up".

Simply stated, frequently changing schools is a major risk-factor for early academic success.

NOTE: Under the Pupil Accommodation Review Policy No. 3.8 of the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board, which was approved in November 2015, it states "decisions are made by HWDSB Trustees in the context of carrying out their primary responsibilities of fostering student achievement and well-being, and ensuring effective stewardship of school board resources." This clearly lays out the PRIMARY responsibilities of the Trustees is student achievement and well-being on an equal footing to the effective stewardship of resources. Therefore, fact-based decision making cannot discount all current research such a school move would have on two of the three primary responsibilities of the Trustees.

Furthermore, under the Finance and Administration Pillar Policy No. 3.0, approved in May 2014, it states that the purpose is to "conduct efficient and effective financial management practices that ensure appropriate and effective stewardship of all Board resources and through the provision of effective service to schools, help attain the Board's vision of all students achieving their full potential". It goes on to further state that the Board is to "ensure financial operations align with HWDSB approved goals and priorities for student achievement".

Appendix A

Question: How is the Board going to mitigate the effects of two school moves within 2 or 3 years on the academic performance of the students?

2. Current research indicates that multiple school moves can harm children's mental health.

A study (2015) by the Warwick Medical School in the UK, which looked at only grades 1 through 8, indicated that "Changing schools can be very stressful for students and may increase the risk of psychotic symptoms – independent of other factors".

There are many stressors for children, who all have varying abilities to handle change. My daughter, a SK student, has no mental health issues which I am aware of at this time. However, she did have a hard time transitioning from Preschool into JK. There were clearly some anxiety issues for the first few months of her transition. The teachers handled it in quite an amazing fashion, but she is just one student and was on the minor end of the spectrum. I have spoken to parents who are very concerned about their children's ability to cope with change. For one parent, just getting a new school bus driver sent her child into a tail spin of mental health issues. As Trustees, you now have to be mindful of the mental health of students at both Dr. Seaton and Beverly Central. School transitions are not easy, and major changes often trigger issues that would not have normally presented themselves.

According to the Mental Health Commission of Canada (CMCC), between 15% and 25% of children and youth suffer at least one mental health problem or illness, including depression and anxiety. Mental health awareness is on the rise in Canada. On September 30, 2016, the Canadian Teacher's Federation released a discussion booklet for Grades 5-12 to help teachers open up classroom discussions on mental health stigma as stigma and discrimination are by far the biggest barriers hindering dialogue and support.

The World Health Organization (WHO) constitution states: "Health is a state of complete physical, mental or social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity".

Therefore, as a Board of Trustees making decisions on the behalf of students, one of your primary responsibilities you must take into account is student well-being, which includes any impact on their mental health. We are not talking about just moving adult staff, for which change can also be a stressor, but children as young as 4 or 5 years old. To add to the stress of attending school in a new building, some of these children may be with new teachers and may not be in classes with their same friends. This is just a recipe for stress and anxiety, which as a parent is heartbreaking to see in children so young.

Question: What is going to be done to minimize and/or mitigate the effects of two school moves on the mental health of children, especially those diagnosed with mental health issues?

3. This is completely contrary to what was in the Accommodation Review Committee report to the Director of Education, submitted Feb 7, 2014

Under section 3.2 Accommodation Review Committee Rationale, it was outlined that the Committee's preferred option was to close both Seaton and Beverly and combine, with the caveats that, for both options presented, the "new schools will be complete before student's transition into them – no transitional spaces or waiting in transition and the Transportation ride times were identified as important considerations".

To be quite blunt, the Board used the support of the ARC as part of the justification to the Province to get the funding for the new school. I find that it is very misguided for the Board to use this community support when it suits the Board's end goals of getting funding, and then completely ignore the caveats and the community's wishes when it again suits the Board, closing one school to save money, but is against ALL current research indicating that moving children multiple times is harmful.

I was at the meeting Dec. 13, where it was effectively stated by Mr. Todd White that the ARC recommendations were taken into consideration by the Board but there was never a guarantee they would be adhered to. While I understand this may be the case, and I do not expect the Board's actions to be dictated by the community, the Board's Engagement Pillar, Policy No. 2.0 states the Board believes in high levels of student, parent, community and staff participation, involvement and engagement contributing to student achievement and well-being. I understand the Board has to weigh many factors, but you can be assured that community members also weighing these factors. We are parents concerned about the well-being of our children, but we are also tax payers and do want our dollars to be

Appendix A

handled by competent stewards. If our concerns are dismissed on the belief that the Board is looking at financial implications and the community is not, this is false. Many parents have brought up concerns regarding the infrastructure of Dr. Seaton and the cost it would take to upgrade this building to ensure the safety of all children.

Furthermore, it was stated at the Dec. 13 meeting by Mr. Torrens that he was not aware of any school for which bottled water is the primary source of drinking water. The Board may want to clarify this with Principal Eddie Gratton, as the flyer sent home September 7, 2016 indicated that the sodium level is 6 times the level needed to be reported to the local Medical Officer of Health and therefore Public Health Services has instructed HWDSB to provide an alternate source of drinking water for all users of Dr. Seaton School. The fact that the superintendent was not aware of this was quite a shock to everyone at my table discussion group.

Question: How are you going to ensure that the infrastructure of Dr. Seaton is up to bylaws and standards regarding drinking water standards, number of toilets for the school population, septic capacity and condition?

- Capacity / attention per student

- Is it really temporary?
- Why moved 2 times?
- How much will class sizes increase?
- Will my children have farther bus ride?
- What is the cost or cost savings?
- How many teachers will leave or be surplus?
- What is the benefit?
- How will my anxious child react? Why?

- Efforts should be focused on building the new school, not jamming the kids into Seaton that has poor water issues. Merging these schools now is illogical and a waste of energy. More resources and energy should be directed the true goal

- What will happen to the before and after school program and summer camp program at Beverly?
- What is the plan to provide students with safe drinking water?
- Can the septic system at Dr. Seaton accommodate Beverly Students?
- Will hours for after school program be extended to accommodate Beverly parents who have to drive further to pick up their children?
- Will class sizes for Full Day Kindergarten be increased with more EAs and fewer teachers?
- Will there be enough toilets and hand washing stations at Dr. Seaton school?
- Why is school board gathering community input when it was previously decided that neither Beverly nor Dr. Seaton school would be closed prior to the new school opening?

- Capacity, what number of students and staff, therefore sewer and its limits, problems with Seaton's current salt levels in the water and busing small children to the far end of the catchment; such a long ride for the younger students. Seaton is not equipped for a designated Special Needs room as is Beverly.

- how is a school that already has problems with the septic system and hasn't had potable drinking water for the students they currently have for the last 2 years going to incorporate another 130 students?
- The overall cost for transporting all the kids to Dr. Seaton would be better spent repairing Beverly to get them through the interim period.

- How will the current infrastructure handle it?
- What are the specific concerns at Beverly?
- What is the cost to fix the Beverly concerns and keep both schools open as planned?
- What about the childcare options?
- What about the bus ride length?
- Times are very long for Beverly kids now so what will happen?
- What happens with the teaching staff? How is it decided who stays - there are strong teachers and ones not as strong?
- Will class sizes be greater? How will you handle the kindergarten specific needs?

- How will Dr. Seaton accommodate Beverly students with septic/water situation?
- Why move children twice? We are already a tight-knit community. Is there a cost benefit to the move?

Appendix A

- Beverly Central School is in better shape than Seaton, each of the rooms are equipped with smart boards for the benefit of the students and the teachers. Water and septic is working. Why would you move them to a school where the roof leaks, the septic is overburdened, and the water is bagged due to unsafe conditions?
- As a parent of two children in Seaton my concern is with the upkeep and cleanliness of Seaton once the merge takes place. Seaton school is already in very rough shape and we have seen no improvements in YEARS! The school is very dirty at times, especially washrooms. How will these be maintained with more students as it's already a problem that is never addressed correctly. Will the custodian staff be increased to help in the cleaning of the school?
- How will an old school hold another 180 students? I think the septic system won't last.
- the water system and plumbing i don't think it can handle more bodies
- Mr. Torrens stated at the community meeting that "staff" came up with the idea to close Beverly as a back up plan. He stated that Beverly would only be closed if the boards hand was forced. He went on to say that in case Beverly's roof or heating boilers were to fail then they would have to close Beverly and temporarily move the students to Dr. Seaton school.
- So my question is, how can the board make a decision on this proposal in February when Mr. Torrens stated that it is only a back up plan? That doesn't make any sense!!
- Would the board not have to asses Beverly School at the end of the year to see what repairs need to be done on the roof/heating boilers?
- Wouldn't the board have to wait until the school year is over to make this decision?
- Why are they wasting all this money on this proposal when it could go towards the repairs at both schools to get them through another year?
- What if it were your children who were being forced to move twice in two years?
- Research suggests that frequently changing schools during childhood may cause mental health issues in later years. (<http://www.todaysparent.com/blogs/run-at-home-mom/effects-of-moving-kids-mental-health/>)
- the list of concerns/questions is lengthy
- concerns about length of time on bus, Seaton's capacity to house all these students, the priority being placed in money (by the HWDSB, even though they spent 32 million on their education centre and then sent all the principals to a 2-day conference and spend 72000\$....its a bit concerning). My concerns go on and on. This merger should not even be on the table. The HWDSB should stay true to their word as they had originally promised that Beverly students would stay at their school until the new school is built.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of the staff's recommendation to temporarily accommodate Beverly Central students at Dr. Seaton?

Disadvantage:

- Two transitions
- No Drinkable water
- Septic not able to accommodate more kids (not working well for the kids in the school currently)
- Longer bus rides for more kids
- Loss of library and music rooms
- Portables
- Not enough toilets for the kids
- Sharing the gym with more classes

Advantage:

- Ideal as a back up plan should something happen and Beverly students HAVE to move due to structure issues at the school.
- Don't see any positives to this move.
- Disadvantages no working septic system at Seaton, no water from well only bottled water, kids have to go through two moves, kids will now be in a school not designed for the number of students, portables, longer bus rides for students, potentially loosing before and after school care program.
- As far as I can see other than making after school care available to Seaton parents there are no advantages to merging the 2 schools before the new school is built. The board argues creating a sense of community but how can that be accomplished when the principal of Seaton already segregates former Beverly students by labelling them as such and never calling them Seaton students even after they have been at the school for 2 years. There are plenty of disadvantages over crowding, longer bus rides for the younger students, multiple transitions, Seaton has no drinkable water and septic problems this is a major issue!!', Seaton is very poorly kept its filthy, staffing changes that will possibly change again with the new school, realistically this temporary merging and cramming of everyone in to Seaton will be for longer than one year. There is no way the new

Appendix A

school will be ready to open Sept. 2018 permits haven't even been obtained and no builder had even been hired.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• no advantages except for the school board
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tough on students and staff. Seaton school in disrepair. Larger population.• Disrupts learning of anxious child. School start times change.• Not sure about advantage other than money savings?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There appears to be only disadvantages in temporarily accommodating BC students at Seaton.• The solution is to increase efforts to building the new school. What is delaying breaking ground?
Disadvantages: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unnecessary and extra transition for Beverly students.• longer bus rides for many Beverly students• I cannot think of any advantages to the students.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are no logical advantages to moving the kids to Dr. Seaton. The points raised in the first question are enough to logically keep them at Beverly and perform the necessary temporary repairs to the school.
Advantage <ul style="list-style-type: none">• cost savings to the board which can be used to increase the size of the new school so it accommodates the actual numbers which are almost 50 over. Board staff projections are wrong and do not reflect the shift in ritual communities which result in younger families.
Disadvantage <ul style="list-style-type: none">• additional changes for the kids,• no guarantee of when the new school will open (nothing started yet),• longer and more crowded bus rides,• Seaton has several problems (water, septic, aged building) which may not handle the student numbers,• inability to accommodate JK/SK numbers which will result in impacting senior students,• threat of losing strong teachers,• unknown childcare impact, childcare impacted as the school is after west which will need to be open different times to accommodate parent travel times, schools vary - holiday musical nights not at both, tt
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Other than having all my children on the same bus schedule, I can not think of any advantages.• The culture at Beverly is fantastic. I would hate to see my younger children crammed into Seaton which has safety issues of its own.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Seaton school has been left to rack and ruin. I went to that school over 30 years ago and I am certain there have been no upgrades since it originally opened. My youngest daughter is in grade six and I am appalled to hear of the conditions roof leaks, the septic is overburdened, and the water is bagged due to unsafe conditions. It would be a big mistake to overburden a school that is already unsafe in many different capacities. Portables are not a solution when the kids are already at a perfectly acceptable school. Stay the course and start breaking ground asap.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Size, is Seaton large enough to accommodate more students.• Will there be enough drinking water supplied, enough lockers, and more importantly will there be more resources for students with special needs and learning disabilities?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The new school will take years to build.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• this was not in the initial proposal. this is why the public does not trust politicians and others in an authoritative position.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simple, there are none advantages!
Disadvantages: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Longer bus rides for the students of Beverly Central students (especially JK and SK students)• Changing schools twice in two years• No potable water at Dr. Seaton??? Are you kidding me...that is horrible that students can't even drink out of a water fountain at school because that water is not safe. Now staff want to add more children to a school that doesn't even have potable water....• Putting Dr. Seaton over student capacity???
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• concerns about Seaton school's capability to deal with influx of Beverly students (space, water, septic etc. etc.), concerns about the young Beverly students transitioning twice for various reasons (two transitions, the transition being longer than the proposed timeline, the mental health concerns of students etc.).
What additional factors could be considered by staff regarding the proposal?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The heating issue has been addressed at Beverly and no visible leaks have been noticed during the last couple significant rainfalls.• We are already a close community who know each other through community events and sports.

Appendix A

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrap the idea and stick with the original plan of one move for Beverly students
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The timeline this won't be a 1-year situation we will absolutely not be in the new school by Sept 2018 it never happens that quickly look at Highland-Parkside that merger took forever and the children were in chaos for a couple years with negative impacts on their education and college plans. If these were your kids what would you want? Forget about asking us to list pros and cons and ask questions how about you just ask us straight out who's for and against the merger the resounding answer will be against. You are just trying to find a way to talk is into it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased HWDSB Legal Liability with increased enrollment at Dr J Seaton increasing the chances of some student body membership getting sick and dying after (accidentally) drinking the unhealthy Dr J Seaton water...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board's 3 guiding principles are fostering student achievement and well-being, and ensuring effective stewardship of school board resources. Factors to consider: the science and studies regarding the damaging effects of school moves on student academic performance (achievement) and how to mitigate it; the science and studies of the damaging effects of school moves on students' mental health (well-being) and how to mitigate it; and how to best spend taxpayers' money (effective stewardship of board resources). At the January meeting, I would expect to see the cost to repair the roof at Beverly for one or two more years vs. upgrading the plumbing, incorporating a water treatment system or continue supplying bottled water, and the cost to upgrade the septic system at Seaton. Side note: I still cannot believe the Board is satisfied supplying bottled water to an entire school as the solution to a drinking water issue, especially in Southern Ontario.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does Seaton school fit the planned merger? Additional stress created on students. Time required to build new school could cause longer term relocation instead of temporary move could it be premature.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus routes wait times and changes. Poor water at Seaton. Seaton's capacity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moving our 3 children from Beverly to Seaton poses huge problems for our family as my husband and I both work full time and we both have long commutes to and from work. Even if there is before and after school care at Seaton, it's not going to be possible to pick our kids up by 6 pm given that Seaton is much further than Beverly from our places of work. Moving Beverly students doesn't just impact students, it also has the potential to have tremendous negative impacts on a family like mine. Additionally, we live in a rural area will no other before and after school care options and we do not have family support. Again, this proposal will adversely affect our family and may force us to consider moving.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus ride, lack of classrooms, lack of gym time and overall disorder the move would cause
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New school size - staff need to reconsider their estimates for enrolment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is ridiculous and unnecessary to move children twice. My children love it at Beverly. I think the staff should take the children into consideration when considering this proposal.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leave the students at BC at BC until the school is built. Focus your energies on getting it done in a timely fashion and quit stalling.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I pay a lot of taxes out here in the country with very little service. I am tired of my children going to school that doesn't even have potable water. I don't want my children crammed in an outdated facility. Focus on getting the new school built, not on making this change.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> bus time for children, lack of smooth transition caused by constant change.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put the CHILDREN FIRST!! Think about the students at Beverly Central and Dr. Seaton. If they were your children would you want them to be crammed into a school that doesn't even have potable water all to save a few dollars? Fix Dr. Seaton's was regardless if it is closing down in the next couple of years!! The water issue would have been fixed immediately if it was a school located in Ancaster! These children are our children, and we as a community DO NOT WANT THIS TO HAPPEN!! These children are our future, please don't risk jeopardizing their futures because it would save a few dollars now. Think about it long term and how this could affect them years down the road. Its just not worth it!! Thank You
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> concerns about not breaking ground on the new site with a promise that the timeline states 12-16 months, e.g. Ancaster meadowlands new build was a disaster....it was post-poned and students are just going to be moving in Jan 2017. It is hard to believe the proposed timeline for the new school in Flamborough when permits have not been obtained yet. Not very realistic/transparent.

Beverly Central/Dr. Seaton Consultation Frequently Asked Questions

Consultation on a proposed temporary accommodation plan for Beverly Central and Dr. Seaton took place in December 2016. The questions below were raised during a community meeting on December 13 and through the online survey.

CONSULTATION

Why is HWDSB considering a temporary accommodation plan for Beverly Central and Dr. Seaton?

HWDSB is consulting the community regarding a potential temporary accommodation plan for the following reasons to:

- Begin to build a combined school community in advance of moving into the new school
- Explore the financial implications of moving to a combined site
- Develop a strategy in the event of significant plant issues at Beverly Central

No decisions have been made.

What triggered the consultation and when will a final decision be made?

A report was presented at the Finance & Facilities committee on [October 12, 2016](#). The Finance & Facilities committee directed staff to consult with the community on the temporary accommodation proposal of Beverly Central and Dr. Seaton. A recommendation will be presented to the Finance & Facilities committee on February 8. The final decision will come forward at the February 27 Board meeting.

Why is the recommendation of the previous Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) not being followed?

We respect the recommendations that came forward from the West Flamborough Accommodation Review Committee. A consultation has been taking place about the potential of bringing the two school communities together. No decisions have been made.

Why not start fresh with both Beverly Central and Dr. Seaton students starting at a new school?

No decisions have been made. The consultation will reflect the communities' voice on the potential merger between the new schools. A final decision will be made by Trustees on February 27.

FACILITIES

Is Dr. Seaton able to accommodate all of the students from Beverly Central?

The building can accommodate students from both schools and be in compliance with the Ontario Building Code and Fire Code.

Is Beverly Central a safe building?

Beverly Central is a safe building. As with all HWDSB buildings, any items that relate to the health and safety of staff and students will be addressed immediately.

Are there enough washrooms to accommodate the increase in the number of students?

Yes. Based on 380 students, there is a requirement to have toilets for every eight females and seven for males for a total of 15. Dr. Seaton has 22 toilets. The septic system is based on fixtures and was built to manage the 22 toilets.

Are there issues with the septic system at Dr. Seaton?

No. There is no indication there are any issues with the Dr. Seaton septic system.

Can you provide construction details, records on maintenance work and capacity testing since installing the septic at Dr. Seaton?

The size of the septic tank is 5050 imperial gallons. The additional load on the system is not anticipated to have a negative effect. The system is designed to accept 18,000 litres of waste per day and can accommodate over 600 individuals. Maintenance records show items such as the sewage pumps and float arm have been addressed since 2013.

Has Hamilton's Planning Department and the Ministry of Environment been engaged to obtain proper permits and approvals to support the increased load on the septic system?

There is no increased load on the septic system. The system was constructed to accommodate waste from 22 toilets and can accommodate 600 individuals.

Will portables be required to accommodate the additional students at Dr. Seaton?

Yes. We estimate that two portables will be needed at Dr. Seaton to accommodate additional students.

What are the health and safety implications of the merger at Dr. Seaton?

There are no health and safety implications due to the merger of the two schools. As with all schools, any health and safety issue is addressed right away.

Is the water safe at Dr. Seaton?

HWDSB is required to test sodium levels in the drinking water at public schools in rural Hamilton that use a well for their source of drinking water. When sodium levels in drinking water are higher than 20 milligrams per litre of water (mg/L), it must be reported to the local Medical Officer of Health. Recent testing of Dr. Seaton Public Elementary School's water supply from June to Aug 2016 found sodium concentrations in the drinking water to range between 120 and 150 mg/L.

The Health and Safety department continues to monitor the sodium level in the drinking water and report to Public Health accordingly. The levels of sodium found in the Dr. Seaton Elementary School water supply does not pose a health risk to the general user. However, the sodium concentrations detected in the water supply are considered too salty to taste to be considered drinkable for hydration purposes.

Therefore, Public Health Services has instructed HWDSB to provide an alternate source of drinking water for all users of Dr. Seaton School. Students at the school are provided with bottled water.

When was the well at Dr. Seaton constructed? How often has the well been serviced?

The well is original to the school. We have 136 work orders that have been processed in the past four years.

What is the immediate plan if the boiler suddenly stops working at Beverly Seaton during the decision making process?

As with all schools, any health and safety issue is addressed right away.

What are the advantages of merging the two schools now?

We can begin to build a combined school community in advance of moving into the new school.

What is the financial difference between moving to one school and the status quo?

It is estimated that joining the schools would be cost neutral. Any savings in closing Beverly Central would be offset by the costs of moving and adding portables.

Do the padlocked doors at the back of the Dr. Seaton gym meet fire code regulations?

The back door was padlocked in error. The lock has been removed and a work order has been placed to install a window in the door.

The data presented is out of date. What are the current number of students in each school?

Dr. Seaton

Year	JK	SK	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2013	18	11	10	14	11	20	16	41	47	40	228
2014	10	18	11	12	14	13	15	47	41	46	227
2015	10	8	17	10	11	15	12	43	47	41	214
2016	12	16	9	18	11	13	13	35	41	47	215
2017	12	14	16	9	19	12	12	31	35	40	200

Beverly Central

Year	JK	SK	1	2	3	4	5	SP-E	Total
2013	17	15	28	19	26	28	32	7	172
2014	17	21	16	26	21	26	28	4	159
2015	32	21	22	18	28	20	24	8	173
2016	24	32	21	24	20	25	18	7	171
2017	23	26	34	22	26	19	24	8	182

TRANSITION

What is the impact on children of moving or transitioning them to multiple schools?

Overall, research studies indicate that transience (moving schools) can have a negative effect on student achievement. One long-term study stated that adjustment issues, including attempting to make new friends, are typical for students who move schools, but making one friend in the first month is key to a successful transition to a new school. Hattie (2009)

What support systems are in place to help with the transition in regards to behaviour and students already at risk?

If the decision was made to move forward with the merger, a Transition Committee would be made up of principals, parents, teachers and students. The Transition Committee would identify what is needed to support students during the process.

What happens to the staff at both schools?

Regardless of when the two school merge, the collective agreements of each employee group outlines how the new school will be staffed.

Why isn't this proposal a first step in the new school naming process? Can we do this by September?

If the decision is made to move forward with the temporary accommodation plan, the recommendation would be to move forward with the new school naming process. This process could be completed by June 2017.

Is there still a choice as to which high school students go to?

Dr. John Seaton is an associate school to Dundas Valley Secondary School. The new school will also be an associate school to Dundas Valley Secondary School.

How can we ensure that the Dr. Seaton and Beverly communities grow to become inclusive, safe and welcoming?

The Transition Committee plays an important role in helping the two schools move to a combined school community. The committee is made up of principals, parents, teachers and students. The committee plans events and advises on activities that will ensure the communities come together to create a safe, inclusive and welcoming school.

PROGRAMMING

How will the Ontario Early Years programming be affected?

The goal would be to move the Ontario Early Years program to Dr. Seaton, under the temporary accommodation proposal.

Where would the Wesley Urban Ministries Before and After School Program be located?

It would be located at Dr. Seaton in shared classroom space, under the temporary accommodation proposal.

Will there be extended hours and capacity for before and after school childcare?

The hours would remain the same but discussions could take place with the childcare operator for an increase in enrolment if there is parent demand.

What will the child to staff ratio be?

Childcare ratios are outlined in the Childcare and Early Years Act. The ratio is 1:15.

How will physical education programming be accommodated in the school?

The use of the gym is dependent on the number of classes in the school. The school timetable is created based on the number of classes and available staff.

How will students achieve their academic or curricular achievements if the schools are joined?

HWDSB strives for all students to find success and meet their individual goals through the support and efforts of their teachers, educational assistants, early childhood educators and administrators. This is true at all HWDSB schools.

Will new kindergarten classes be added?

At this time, it appears that a third Kindergarten classroom would be required if the temporary accommodation proposal is approved.

Will the same student resources be available (e.g., technology, gym, library, specialty class rooms, art, student services)

If the temporary accommodation proposal is approved, this may change the amount of available space within the school. Resources will be in place to deliver the curriculum and ensure all students are successful.

How will classes be organized?

The school organization depends on how many students are enrolled in each grade. The staffing process for 2017-2018 begins in late February. Final decisions are not made until April.

What grades will be in portables?

This decision is not made until the school is organized during the staffing process.

TRANSPORTATION

What will happen with transportation?

HWDSB's Transportation Policy directs that bus routes are no longer than 60 minutes each way.

How will this affect bus routes times?

If students from Beverly Central are designated to attend Dr. John Seaton, bus times will increase simply due to the distance between the two schools. Bus routes would be adjusted to ensure that no routes exceeds 60 minutes.

What is the longest bus ride for current Beverly Central and Dr. Seaton students?

Dr John Seaton - longest bus ride - 56 minutes

Beverly Central - longest bus ride - 59 minutes

NEW SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

What is the current status of the new school?

The drawings are being finalized and we are working closely with the City of Hamilton on site plan approval.

Does the community have input on the new school design?

The plans for new schools are shared with communities at public meetings and on our website. What is included within schools is outlined by the Ministry of Education.

Will the school be ready for September 2018?

We project a September 2018 opening, pending approvals from the Ministry of Transportation and the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change. We expect to receive the approvals in the immediate future. Once we receive them, we can finalize site plan approval with the City of Hamilton.

Will a potential merger have a negative impact on the opening date for the new school?

No. We are projecting a September 2018 opening date.

Will the new school on the Beverly Community Centre site be able to accommodate students from Queen's Rangers?

Queen's Rangers is currently part of an accommodation review in Ancaster. Decisions from the accommodation review will be made in June 2017. As with any new school construction, there are options that allow for expansion to accommodate students.

What are the bell times for the new school?

The bell times for new schools are determined by Hamilton-Wentworth Student Transportation Services.

Why is the new school not attached to the Community Centre?

The new City of Hamilton recreation space and school are a combined build.

What is the size of the new school and how did you arrive at that number?

The new school is approximately 40,000 square feet. The school is designed to accommodate 347 students. The number is based on project funding calculations developed by the Ministry of Education.

Why is there no playground? Will there be green space available for a play area?

The new school site includes an arena, community center and recreation facilities. A playground will be located at the school.

What if Spencer Valley project is delayed?

We are projecting that both schools will open in September 2018. The projects are separate and any delays on either project will not affect the other.

Please provide a copy of the title register for Beverly Central School

Beverly Township trustees purchased the property in 1871. A further portion of land was purchased in 1959. Copies of land titles can be found at <https://www.ontario.ca/page/search-land-property-records>.



EXECUTIVE REPORT TO FINANCE AND FACILITIES COMMITTEE

TO: Finance and Facilities Committee

FROM: Manny Figueiredo, Director of Education

DATE: February 8, 2017

PREPARED BY: Stacey Zucker, Executive Superintendent of Board Operations and Treasurer
David Anderson, Senior Facilities Officer

RE: Elementary School Facility Benchmarks

Action X **Monitoring** ☐

Recommended Action:

That Board staff be directed to prepare a multi-year implementation plan to deliver the priorities related to the Elementary School Benchmark Strategy.

Background:

Annual Capital Plan

At the April 14, 2016 Finance and Facilities Committee meeting, a report was presented to Trustees that provided a 5-year strategy for capital spending. The components of the strategy were identified as:

Component	Amount
Secondary School Facility Benchmarks	\$11 million
Elementary School Facility Benchmarks	\$11 million
Secondary Program Strategy	\$ 2 million
Elementary Program Strategy	TBD
Annual School Renewal	\$8 million
Other	Varies depending on approved projects
Total	\$32 million
Annual Repairs and Maintenance	\$3.5 million funded by Operating Budget

As a result of that report, the final allocation of the \$11 million approved for elementary schools was deferred until the Elementary Program Strategy was complete. At the January 23, 2017 Board meeting, Trustees allocated \$1 million annually to Elementary Program Strategy and \$10 million annually for the Elementary School Facility Benchmark component.

Elementary Program Strategy

At the January 23, 2017 Board Meeting, the Board of Trustees discussed a revised motion, and moved that:

“That Board staff be directed to prepare a 5-year implementation plan to deliver the priorities related to the Elementary School Benchmark Strategy for all schools that have been through an accommodation review and including those school not yet scheduled by June 2017 and provide the intent for all school remaining beyond the 5-years.”

Staff Observations:

Guiding Principles of the Annual Plan

The guiding principles adopted by the Annual Capital Plan are provided below:

1. Schools identified as being in ‘Poor’ condition as defined in the Long-Term Facilities Master Plan will be given priority both in terms of schedule and budget;
2. Partnership opportunities that align with the Board’s Strategic Priorities, that have a cost savings associated with them and that are time sensitive will be given priority both in terms of schedule and budget;
3. The scope of work proposed for each school will adhere to the Board design standards;
4. The Overall Capital Plan will be reviewed and updated on an annual basis, as part of the Board’s Long-Term Facilities Master Plan update, to reflect any changes in scope, schedule or available funds.

Elementary Program Strategy

Based on the *guiding principles*, renovations of instrumental music, focused programs, and interventions/special education will be explored. The scope of these types of projects would typically involve upgrades to existing spaces and not require the construction of any new floor area. It is expected that finishes specific to the needs of each program (acoustical treatment for example) would be required.

Based on the above, staff will deliver the Elementary Program Strategy annually with \$1.0 million.

Elementary Facility Benchmark Strategy

Based on the *guiding principles*, feasibility studies may be required to focus on the renovation of gymnasiums (which will differ from school to school). The scope of these types of projects would typically involve upgrades to isolated electrical systems, HVAC systems, windows, roofs, etc.

The intent of the renovations are to provide the HWDSB school inventory with equity to the current benchmark for size and configuration of a newly constructed elementary school, as they relate to gymnasiums. The improvements associated with the remaining benchmarks will be accomplished within the existing facility footprint and will not increase gross floor areas.

Matrix:

As requested, Board staff have prepared the matrix in **Appendix A**. It identifies the priorities approved by the Board on January 23, 2017 and the estimated costs of each element of work considered for each of the elementary schools.

The matrix only identifies costs and does not consider the time, phasing or schedules associated with each of the components being considered.

The matrix also identifies the components have been completed to date in each school.

The matrix includes 21 schools that would be eligible for gym expansion based on the original criteria. The next step will be to review the schools to determine the feasibility. Board staff estimates that there will be approximately 16 schools which will be feasible based on the where the gymnasiums are situated and the space available on the properties.

Conclusion:

There are a number of factors that can impact the planning and execution of the approved strategy. Risks of implementation of note are:

- Availability of Proceeds of Disposition
- Availability and value of SCI funding
- Unforeseen Site Conditions
- Emergencies and high and urgent needs

Staff will continue to plan a feasible approach to the Elementary Facility Benchmark Strategy and update Trustees.

Elementary Facility	Original Construction Year	OTG	Accommodation Review Schedule	*FCI Rating	Meets Gymnasium Benchmark	Gymnasium Expansion Feasibility	Meets Science Room Benchmark	Meets Visual Arts Room Benchmark	Meets Learning Commons Benchmark	**Meets Playfield Benchmark
Schools That Have Undergone A Pupil Accommodation Review By June 2017										
A. M. Cunningham, Building ID 9062-1	1929	409	N/A	Fair	No	Yes	No	No	No	TBD
Adelaide Hoodless, Building ID 9063-1	1912	548	N/A	Poor	✓	N/A	No	No	No	TBD
Billy Green E S, Building ID 5409-1	1981	372	N/A	Fair	No	Yes	No	No	✓	TBD
Cootes Paradise, Building ID 9075-1	1927	678	Complete 2011/2012	Average	No	Yes	No	No	✓	TBD
Dalewood, Building ID 9108-1	1948	370	Complete 2011/2012	Average	✓	N/A	No	✓	No	TBD
Ecole Elementaire Michaelle Jean, Building ID 5405-1	1955	274	N/A	Poor	✓	N/A	No	No	No	TBD
Franklin Road, Building ID 9073-1	1954	444	Complete 2013/2014	Average	✓	N/A	No	No	No	TBD
George L. Armstrong, Building ID 9074-1	1930	577	Complete 2013/2014	Fair	✓	N/A	No	✓	✓	TBD
Glenwood, Building ID 9115-1	1976	99	N/A	Fair	No	Yes	No	No	No	TBD
Helen Detwiler, Building ID 9083-1	1991	456	N/A	Average	✓	N/A	No	No	No	TBD
Janet Lee PS, Building ID 6051-1	1986	378	N/A	Good	No	No	✓	No	No	TBD
Lake Avenue, Building ID 9093-1	1952	516	2015/2016	Fair	✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	TBD
Memorial PS (Hamilton), Building ID 9099-1	1918	668	Complete 2011/2012	Poor	No	Yes	✓	✓	No	TBD

Elementary Facility	Original Construction Year	OTG	Accommodation Review Schedule	*FCI Rating	Meets Gymnasium Benchmark	Gymnasium Expansion Feasibility	Meets Science Room Benchmark	Meets Visual Arts Room Benchmark	Meets Learning Commons Benchmark	**Meets Playfield Benchmark
Millgrove PS, Building ID 6292-1	1915	234	Complete 2013/2014	Average	No	Yes	No	No	✓	TBD
Mount Albion PS, Building ID 6311-1	1952	280	N/A	Poor	✓	N/A	No	No	No	TBD
Mount Hope PS, Building ID 6315-1	1952	363	Complete 2013/2014	Average	✓	N/A	✓	No	No	TBD
Norwood Park, Building ID 9121-1	1954	464	N/A	Fair	No	No	No	✓	✓	TBD
Parkdale, Building ID 9122-1	1946	291	Complete 2013/2014	Poor	✓	N/A	No	No	No	TBD
Pauline Johnson, Building ID 9072-2	1967	438	Complete 2013/2014	Average	✓	N/A	No	No	No	TBD
Queen Mary, Building ID 9128-1	1996	686	N/A	Good	✓	N/A	No	✓	No	TBD
Queensdale, Building ID 9130-1	1948	317	Complete 2013/2014	Fair	No	Yes	No	No	No	TBD
Ridgemount, Building ID 9134-1	1961	461	Complete 2013/2014	Fair	✓	N/A	No	No	No	TBD
Rosedale, Building ID 9136-1	1953	257	Complete 2013/2014	Fair	No	Yes	No	No	No	TBD
Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Building ID 9148-1	1990	709	2015/2016	Good	No	No	No	No	No	TBD
Tapleystown PS, Building ID 8752-1	1881	291	N/A	Fair	No	No	No	No	No	TBD
Viscount Montgomery, Building ID 9156-1	1951	444	Complete 2013/2014	Fair	No	No	No	✓	✓	TBD
W. H. Ballard, Building ID 9157-1	1922	807	Complete 2013/2014	Poor	No	Yes	✓	No	✓	TBD

Elementary Facility	Original Construction Year	OTG	Accommodation Review Schedule	*FCI Rating	Meets Gymnasium Benchmark	Gymnasium Expansion Feasibility	Meets Science Room Benchmark	Meets Visual Arts Room Benchmark	Meets Learning Commons Benchmark	**Meets Playfield Benchmark
Schools in a Pupil Accommodation Review in 2016-2017										
Ancaster Sr PS, Building ID 5343-2	1968	387	2016/2017	Poor	✓	N/A	No	No	No	TBD
Bennetto , Building ID 9103-1	1966	744	2016/2017	Average	No	Yes	No	No	No	TBD
C H Bray PS, Building ID 5479-1	1952	199	2016/2017	Poor	No		No	No	No	TBD
Central, Building ID 9104-1	1851	283	2016/2017	Average	No	Yes	No	No	No	TBD
Earl Kitchener, Building ID 9111-1	1915	548	2016/2017	Fair	No	No	No	No	No	TBD
Fessenden PS, Building ID 5343-1	1959	383	2016/2017	Fair	No	No	No	No	No	TBD
Hess Street, Building ID 9084-1	1974	450	2016/2017	Average	No		No	No	No	TBD
Queens Rangers PS, Building ID 8683-1	1958	222	2016/2017	Average	No		No	No	No	TBD
Rousseau PS, Building ID 6625-1	1958	291	2016/2017	Poor	No	No	No	No	No	TBD
Ryerson, Building ID 9139-1	1969	343	2016/2017	Average	✓	N/A	No	✓	No	TBD
Strathcona, Building ID 9151-1	1956	245	2016/2017	Fair	No	No	No	No	No	TBD
Schools Expected To Close Or Closing										
Beverly Central PS, Building ID 5418-1 (Closing)	1959	N/A	Complete 2013/2014	Average	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Elementary Facility	Original Construction Year	OTG	Accommodation Review Schedule	*FCI Rating	Meets Gymnasium Benchmark	Gymnasium Expansion Feasibility	Meets Science Room Benchmark	Meets Visual Arts Room Benchmark	Meets Learning Commons Benchmark	**Meets Playfield Benchmark
Collegiate Avenue PS, Building ID 5616-1 (Closing)	1954		2015/2016	Fair	N/A		N/A	No	No	TBD
Dr John Seaton PS, Building ID 5700-1 (Closing)	1968	349	Complete 2013/2014	Average	N/A		N/A	No	No	TBD
Eastdale PS, Building ID 5751-1 (Closing)	1965		2015/2016	Fair	N/A		N/A	No	No	TBD
Elizabeth Bagshaw, Building ID 9113-1 (Closing)	1969	511	2015/2016	Poor	✓		No	No	No	TBD
Glen Brae Md S, Building ID 9078-3 (Closing)	1967	331	2015/2016	Fair	No		No	✓	No	TBD
Glen Echo, Building ID 9078-2 (Closing)	1962	314	2015/2016	Poor	No		No	No	✓	TBD
Green Acres PS, Building ID 5924-1 (Closing)	1956	389	2015/2016	Fair	✓		No	No	✓	TBD
Greenville PS, Building ID 8596-1 (Closing)	1885		Complete 2013/2014	Average	N/A		N/A	No	No	TBD
Memorial PS (Stoney Creek), Building ID 6282-1 (Closing)	1956	358	2015/2016	Fair	No		No	No	No	TBD

Elementary Facility	Original Construction Year	OTG	Accommodation Review Schedule	*FCI Rating	Meets Gymnasium Benchmark	Gymnasium Expansion Feasibility	Meets Science Room Benchmark	Meets Visual Arts Room Benchmark	Meets Learning Commons Benchmark	**Meets Playfield Benchmark
Mountain View PS, Building ID 6317-1 (Closing)	1949	231	2015/2016	Fair	No		No	No	✓	TBD
R. L. Hyslop, Building ID 8597-1 (Closing)	1966	254	2015/2016	Fair	✓		No	No	No	TBD
Sir Isaac Brock, Building ID 9146-1 (Closing)	1969	268	2015/2016	Average	✓		No	No	✓	TBD
Spencer Valley PS, Building ID 6713-1 (Closing)	1968		Complete 2013/2014	Average	N/A		N/A	No	No	TBD
Schools Built On Or After The Year 2000										
Ancaster Meadow, Building ID 11226-1	2005	579	N/A	Good	✓		No	✓	No	TBD
Bellmoore (New), Building ID 12289-1	2012	640	N/A	Good	✓		✓	✓	✓	TBD
Cathy Weaver, Building ID 9140-2	2006	780	2016/2017	Good	✓		✓	✓	✓	TBD
Dr. J Edgar Davey (New), Building ID 9110-1	2010	816	2016/2017	Good	✓		✓	✓	No	TBD
Gatestone, Building ID 11227-1	2005	582	N/A	Good	✓		✓	✓	✓	TBD
Hillcrest, Building ID 9088-1	2006	764	Complete 2013/2014	Good	✓		No	✓	✓	TBD
Prince of Wales (New), Building ID 9126-1	2009	816	Complete 2011/2012	Good	✓		✓	✓	No	TBD
Queen Victoria (New), Building ID 9129-1	2009	764	2016/2017	Good	✓		✓	✓	No	TBD

Elementary Facility	Original Construction Year	OTG	Accommodation Review Schedule	*FCI Rating	Meets Gymnasium Benchmark	Gymnasium Expansion Feasibility	Meets Science Room Benchmark	Meets Visual Arts Room Benchmark	Meets Learning Commons Benchmark	**Meets Playfield Benchmark
Ray Lewis PS, Building ID 11225-1	2005	628	N/A	Good	✓		✓	✓	No	TBD
Tiffany Hills, Building ID	2016	537	Open 2016/2017	Good	✓		✓	✓	✓	TBD
Winona (New), Building ID 12288-1	2011	761	N/A	Good	✓		No	✓	✓	TBD
Schools That Have <u>Not</u> Undergone A Pupil Accommodation Review By June 2017										
Allan A. Greenleaf School, Building ID 8417-2	2000	548	2020/2021	Good	✓		No	No	✓	TBD
Balaclava PS, Building ID 5425-1	1989	381	2020/2021	Good	No		✓	✓	✓	TBD
Buchanan Park, Building ID 9070-1	1960	245	2017/2018	Fair	No		No	No	No	TBD
Cecil B. Stirling, Building ID 9102-1	1977	326	2019/2020	Poor	✓		✓	✓	No	TBD
Chedoke, Building ID 9105-1	1957	579	2017/2018	Average	✓		✓	✓	✓	TBD
Dundana PS, Building ID 8595-1	1953	398	2019/2020	Poor	No		No	No	No	TBD
Dundas Central S, Building ID 5722-1	1854	442	2019/2020	Poor	✓		✓	No	✓	TBD
Flamborough Centre Senior PS, Building ID 5835-1	1928	N/A	2020/2021	Average	N/A		No	No	No	TBD
Gordon Price, Building ID 9081-1	1991	442	2017/2018	Average	No		No	No	No	TBD
Guy Brown (New), Building ID 5936-2	2011	632	2020/2021	Good	✓		✓	✓	No	TBD
Highview, Building ID 9085-1	1954	511	2019/2020	Poor	No		✓	No	No	TBD

Elementary Facility	Original Construction Year	OTG	Accommodation Review Schedule	*FCI Rating	Meets Gymnasium Benchmark	Gymnasium Expansion Feasibility	Meets Science Room Benchmark	Meets Visual Arts Room Benchmark	Meets Learning Commons Benchmark	**Meets Playfield Benchmark
Holbrook, Building ID 9089-1	1962	326	2017/2018	Average	No		No	No	No	TBD
Huntington Park, Building ID 9090-1	1956	453	2019/2020	Fair	No		✓	✓	No	TBD
James Macdonald, Building ID 9091-1	1954	317	2017/2018	Fair	No		No	No	No	TBD
Lawfield Elementary School, Building ID 9094-1	2007	602	2019/2020	Good	✓		No	✓	No	TBD
Lincoln M. Alexander, Building ID 9095-1	1989	326	2019/2020	Fair	✓		No	No	No	TBD
Lisgar, Building ID 9097-1	1963	369	2019/2020	Fair	No		No	No	No	TBD
Mary Hopkins PS, Building ID 6248-1	1920	401	2020/2021	Poor	No		No	No	No	TBD
Mountview, Building ID 9120-1	1967	291	2017/2018	Fair	No		No	No	No	TBD
R A Riddell, Building ID 9131-1	1972	594	2017/2018	Fair	No		✓	✓	No	TBD
Richard Beasley, Building ID 9066-2	1968	280	2019/2020	Fair	No		No	No	No	TBD
Sir William Osler Elementary School, Building ID 12129-1	2007	602	2019/2020	Good	✓		✓	✓	No	TBD
Templemead, Building ID 11086-1	2003	513	2019/2020	Average	✓		✓	✓	No	TBD

Elementary Facility	Original Construction Year	OTG	Accommodation Review Schedule	*FCI Rating	Meets Gymnasium Benchmark	Gymnasium Expansion Feasibility	Meets Science Room Benchmark	Meets Visual Arts Room Benchmark	Meets Learning Commons Benchmark	**Meets Playfield Benchmark
Westview, Building ID 9117-3	1967	343	2017/2018	Average	No		✓	✓	No	TBD
Westwood, Building ID 9117-2	1964	395	2017/2018	Average	No		No	No	No	TBD
Yorkview S, Building ID 6954-1	1954	222	2019/2020	Poor	No		No	No	No	TBD

*FCI Rating is based upon Long Term Facilities Master Plan Condition Index (5 Year FCI) last updated May 2016.

**Playfield benchmark scope and components to be determined.



EXECUTIVE REPORT TO FINANCE AND FACILITIES COMMITTEE

TO: Finance and Facilities Committee

FROM: Manny Figueiredo, Director of Education

DATE: February 8, 2017

PREPARED BY: Stacey Zucker, Executive Superintendent of Board Operations and Treasurer
David Anderson, Senior Facilities Officer
Agnese De Fazio, Manager, Capital Projects

RE: Capital Projects Update

Action ☐

Monitoring ☒

Background:

On November 7, 2016, Trustees were presented with a construction update on capital projects currently underway. This report is a summary of on-going and approved projects for the school year 2016-17 and forms part of Facilities Management's commitment to update Trustees regarding the status of capital projects on a regular basis.

Staff Observations:

A summary of the capital projects underway, in various stages, is provided as **Appendix A**. This summary is categorized by each of the projects' funding sources and Board initiative. Project status updates are as of February 1, 2017.

Conclusion:

Staff continue to work to complete existing projects and have advanced new project initiatives including School Renewal, Secondary Program Strategy, Secondary Facility Benchmark Strategy, Elementary Facility Benchmark Strategy and Elementary Program Strategy, as well as new school construction projects.

Staff continue to monitor project risks that can negatively impact progress on a project. These risks are:

- Regulatory approvals (i.e. Site Plan Approval, Building Permit, etc.)
- Unforeseen site conditions
- Delays with material deliveries or labour disruption
- Environmental abatement

Board staff will update Trustees on a consistent basis regarding capital projects.

School	Description	Budget	Phase	Project Status
Secondary Facility Benchmark Strategy				
Dundas Valley	Sports Field Revitalization (Natural Turf)	\$ 1,250,000	DD	Targeted Completion - September 2017
Glendale	Gym floor refurbishment	\$ 40,000	DD	Targeted Completion - September 2017
Orchard Park	Science Labs, Learning Commons & Gym Floor Revitalization (includes window replacement and other renewal work)	\$ 2,540,000	DD	Tender - March 2017 Gym & Learning Commons - Targeted Completion - September 2017 Science - Targeted Completion - November 2017
Sir Winston Churchill	Sports Field Revitalization (Artificial Turf)	\$ 2,000,000	DD	Coordinating SPA process. Tender - March 2017 Targeted Completion - September 2017
Sir Winston Churchill	Gym floor refurbishment	\$ 48,000	Warranty Period	Complete
Westdale	Sports Field Revitalization (Natural Turf)	\$ 1,250,000	DD/Permit/Tender	BPA - February 2017 Tender - February 2017 Targeted Completion - September 2017
Westmount	Science Labs & Learning Commons Revitalization	\$ 3,000,000	DD	Tender - June 2017 Targeted Completion - April 2018
Subtotal:		\$ 10,128,000		
Funding Allocation:		\$ 11,000,000		
Contingency Allocation:		\$ -		
Remaining Contingency:		\$ 872,000		
Secondary Program Strategy				
Sir Winston Churchill	Aviation & Aerospace Retrofit	\$ 300,000	Warranty Period	Part of Window Replacement Project. Complete. SHSM program in operation September 2016.
Nora Frances Henderson	Transportation	\$ 50,000	Project Initiation	Project scope & requirements to be confirmed.
Sir Allan MacNab	Hospitality & Tourism	\$ 750,000	Consultant Procurement	Relocation of SHSM from Mountain SS to MacNab. Project will be done in two phases. Phase 1 (teaching kitchen) - Fall 2017 Phase 2 (servery) - Fall 2018
Subtotal:		\$ 1,100,000		
Funding Allocation:		\$ 2,000,000		
Unallocated:		\$ 900,000		

LEGEND:
SD - Schematic Design
DD - Design Development
WD - Working Drawings
BPA - Building Permit Application
SPA - Site Plan Approval

Elementary Facility Benchmark Strategy				
Cootes Paradise	Gym Floor Replacement	\$ 55,000	Close-out	Complete.
Gatestone	Playfield Revitalization (pilot project)	\$ 100,000	Warranty Period	Installation complete. Warranty and 3-year maintenance period commenced.
Guy Brown	Playfield Revitalization (pilot project)	\$ 100,000	Warranty Period	Installation complete. Warranty and 3-year maintenance period commenced.
Cathy Wever	Playfield Revitalization (pilot project)	\$ 100,000	Warranty Period	Installation complete. Warranty and 3-year maintenance period commenced.
Winona	Playfield Revitalization (pilot project)	\$ 100,000	Warranty Period	Installation complete. Warranty and 3-year maintenance period commenced.
Mount Albion	Playfield Revitalization - South/upper field at former septic bed	\$ 125,000	Construction	GC awarded Targeted Completion - September 2017
TBD	Gym Expansion	\$ 2,500,000		
TBD	Gym Expansion	\$ 2,500,000		
TBD	Gym Expansion	\$ 2,500,000		
Westview	Learning Commons	\$ 15,000	Project Initiation	Scope confirmation on-going. Targeted Completion - March 2017
Sir Wilfred Laurier	Learning Commons	\$ 100,000	Project Initiation	To be included with FDK Addition & Renovations project.
TBD	Learning Commons	\$ 100,000		
TBD	Learning Commons	\$ 100,000		
TBD	Science Rooms	\$ 50,000		
TBD	Science Rooms	\$ 50,000		
TBD	Science Rooms	\$ 50,000		
TBD	Visual Arts Room	\$ 50,000		
TBD	Visual Arts Room	\$ 50,000		
TBD	Visual Arts Room	\$ 50,000		
Subtotal:		\$ 8,695,000		
Funding Allocation:		\$ 10,000,000		
Unallocated:		\$ 1,305,000		

LEGEND:
SD - Schematic Design
DD - Design Development
WD - Working Drawings
BPA - Building Permit Application
SPA - Site Plan Approval

Elementary Program Strategy				
Mount Albion	Music Room Upgrades	\$ 60,000	Project Initiation	Targeted Completion - September 2017
Queensdale	Music Room Upgrades	\$ 60,000	Project Initiation	Targeted Completion - September 2017
Sir Wilfred Laurier	Music Room Upgrades	\$ 60,000	Project Initiation	To be included with FDK Addition & Renovations project.
TBD	Music Room Upgrades	\$ 60,000		TBD
Glenwood	Accessibility Renovations for Structured TEEACH program	\$ 50,000	Close-out	Complete.
Lisgar	Calming Room	\$ 15,000	Project Initiation	Targeted Completion - September 2017
Cathy Wever	Calming Room	\$ 15,000	Project Initiation	Targeted Completion - September 2017
Subtotal:		\$ 320,000		
Funding Allocation:		\$ 1,000,000		
Unallocated:		\$ 680,000		
Other				
Capital Priorities				
Beverly Central (New)	New School Construction (consolidation of Beverly Central & Dr. Seaton)	\$ 7,542,105	WD	80% WD complete. Anticipated Construction Start - June 2017 Anticipated School Opening - September 2018* *Dependent upon MOECC & SPA timely approvals.
Eastdale (New)	New School Construction (replacement of Eastdale)	\$ 11,557,854	SD	Design commenced. Anticipated School Opening - September 2019
Nora Frances Henderson (New South SS)	New Secondary School Construction	\$ 33,482,300	DD	Land Acquisition/OPA/Rezoning phase on-going. External Works Agreement - week of February 1, 2017 SPA submitted - City comments received, SWM design & road design on-going to satisfy Development Engineering at City. Tender - late July 2017 (dependent on timely Ministry ATP) Anticipated Construction Start - Fall 2017 Anticipated School Opening - September 2019* *Note: School Opening in Sept. 2019 at risk.

LEGEND:
SD - Schematic Design
DD - Design Development
WD - Working Drawings
BPA - Building Permit Application
SPA - Site Plan Approval

North SS	New Secondary School Construction	\$ 31,839,111	Ministry ATP/Tender	ATP request submitted to Ministry on Nov. 11, 2016. Project is over-budget due to the Ministry Benchmark Funding from 2012. Therefore, awaiting Ministry approval to proceed (ATP) to tender. Alternate source of monies to fund the difference (eg: POD's). Building Permit received January 30, 2017 Tender - February 2017* Anticipated Construction Start - March 2017 Anticipated School Opening - January/February 2019 *Dependent on timely Ministry ATP approval.
Sir Wilfred Laurier	FDK Addition and Renovations (to consolidate with Elizabeth Bagshaw)	\$ 1,087,803	Project Initiation	Targeted Completion - September 2018
Summit Park	New Summit Park Elementary School	\$ 14,388,899	DD	Anticipated Tender - June 2017 Anticipated School Opening - September 2018
Tiffany Hills	New Elementary School	\$ 12,015,873	Close-out	Construction complete. School Opening - January 9, 2017
Subtotal:		\$ 111,913,945		
School Consolidation Capital				
Franklin Road	School Consolidation - Interior Reno, New Gym and Daycare Addition	\$ 1,932,852	80% Costing/ATP	Permit comments received. 80% Cost Estimate received. ATP request to Ministry early February 2017. Tender - March 2017 (dependent on ATP) Targeted Completion - September 2017
Greensville (New)	New School Construction (consolidation of Greensville & Spencer Valley)	\$ 2,520,427	DD	Anticipated Construction Start - August 2017 Anticipated School Opening - September 3, 2018* *Dependent upon MOECC & SPA timely approvals.
Mount Hope	School Consolidation - Phase 3 - Addition/Renovations	\$ 2,911,737	Construction	Targeted Completion - March 2017
Pauline Johnson	School Consolidation - Addition/Renovations	\$ 4,343,716	Construction	Targeted Completion - February 2017 Cardinal Heights move scheduled for mid-February 2017.
Ridgemount	School Consolidation - Addition/Renovations	\$ 3,375,266	Construction	FDK Occupancy - achieved Nov. 2016 7-Room Addition - Targeted Completion - February 2017 Gym - Targeted Completion - March 2017
Subtotal:		\$ 15,083,998		
Child Care Retrofits				
Chedoke	Child Care Retrofit - EL 3/4	\$ 600,000	DD	80% DD complete, issue for BPA week of Feb. 6th. Targeted Completion - September 2017
Yorkview	Child Care Retrofit - EL 3/4	\$ 600,000	DD	Tender - February 2017 Targeted Completion - September 2017
Subtotal:		\$ 1,200,000		

LEGEND:
SD - Schematic Design
DD - Design Development
WD - Working Drawings
BPA - Building Permit Application
SPA - Site Plan Approval

Proceeds of Disposition				
Dalewood	Dalewood Renovations	\$ 12,746,500	Close-out	Construction complete.
Greenville (New)	New School Construction (consolidation of Greenville & Spencer Valley)	\$ 5,569,063	DD	Anticipated Construction Start - August 2017 Anticipated School Opening - September 3, 2018* *Dependent upon MOECC & SPA timely approvals.
Hill Park	Retrofits to accommodate various programs	\$ 5,200,000	Consultant Procurement	Tender - April 2017 Targeted Completion - September 2018
Various Schools	Binbrook Accommodation Project: - 4 Portables incl. site drainage improvements at Bellmoore. - 6 Portables incl. septic system & electrical upgrades at Michaelle Jean.	\$ 1,400,000	DD	BPA submission - February 2017 Tender - February 2017 Targeted Completion - September 2017
Subtotal:		\$ 24,915,563		
Total Other:		\$ 153,113,506		
School Renewal Strategy				
A.M. Cunningham	HVAC Upgrades	\$ 320,000	Construction	Targeted Completion - February 2017
Chedoke	Re-pave playground, oil tank removal, exterior doors & door hardware replacement	\$ 215,000	DD	Included with Child Care Retrofit scope of work. 80% DD complete, issue for BPA week of Feb. 6th. Targeted Completion - September 2017
Chedoke	Natural Learning Gardens - Feasibility Study (school fundraised funds)	\$ -	Feasibility Study	School Council is to set up a date to review final design with Consultant. Capital Project Supervisor assisting school with implementation.
Cootes Paradise	Gym window coverings - mechanically operated	\$ 21,500	Close-out	Complete
Dundas Valley	Cooling for AHU3 & AHU4	\$ 200,000	Close-out	Complete.
Earl Kitchener	Playground revitalization	\$ 49,600	Close-out	Natural playground equipment ordered and and line painting to be installed Spring 2017 (weather permitting).
Glendale	Paving & Sidewalks replacement	\$ 100,000	Project Initiation	Consultant RFP to be issued Feb. 2017 with construction to take place summer 2017.
Glendale	Auditorium Restoration	\$ 447,297	Close-out	Project complete. Deficiencies complete. Dimmer switch for auditorium house lighting requested by school - to be addressed as separate project.
Glendale	Gym Bleacher Replacement	\$ 60,000	DD	Targeted Completion - September 2017
Gordon Price	New Universal Barrier Free Washroom	\$ 200,000	Close-out	Complete
Guy Brown	Outdoor Classroom - Feasibility Study (school fundraised funds)	\$ -	Complete	Complete

LEGEND:
SD - Schematic Design
DD - Design Development
WD - Working Drawings
BPA - Building Permit Application
SPA - Site Plan Approval

Lake Avenue	Replace Rooftop Units & Washroom Renovations	\$ 1,120,000	Consultant Procurement	BPA - March 2017 Tender - April 2017 Targeted Completion - September 2017
Orchard Park	Window replacement and other renewal work	\$ 3,880,000	DD	Part of Science Labs, Learning Commons & Gym Floor Revitalization. Awaiting confirmation of scope from Stakeholders for Science. Tender - March 2017 Gym & Learning Commons -Targeted Completion - September 2017 Science - Targeted Completion - November 2017
Parkdale	Washroom renovations	\$ 400,000	Project Initiation	Project Charter issued.
Queensdale	Sound attenuation in Rooms 139 & 140	\$ 50,000	GC award	GC awarded. Work scheduled over March Break. Targeted Completion - March 2017
Rosedale	Roof Replacement, HVAC & Electrical Upgrades	\$ 2,400,000	DD	Tender - March 2017 Construction start - July 2017 Targeted Completion - September 2017
Sir Wilfred Laurier	Roof Replacement	\$ 613,600	Project Initiation	Part of FDK Addition & Renovations project
Sir Winston Churchill	Window Replacement & Aviation/Aerospace Retrofits	\$ 3,200,000	Construction	Aviation/Aerospace and Manufacturing room complete. Window Replacement - Targeted Completion - March 2017
Sir Winston Churchill	Auditorium seating replacement	\$ 460,000	WD/Tender	Targeted Completion - March 2017
Viscount Montgomery	Phase 2 Renovations - Washrooms, Corridor, Front/Rear Entrances	\$ 700,000	Close-out	Complete
Viscount Montgomery	Phase 3 Renovations - incl. classroom unit ventilators	\$ 2,300,000	DD	BPA submission - February 2017 Tender - March 2017 Targeted Completion - September 2017
Waterdown D H S	Skylight Replacement	\$ 500,000	Close-out	Complete
Westmount	Fire Alarm Upgrades and other renewal work	\$ 500,000	DD	Part of Science Labs, Learning Commons Revitalization
Various Schools	Anniversary Spruce-up	\$ 102,500	In Progress	On-going
Various Schools	Room Numbering - All Facilities	\$ 123,000	In Progress	Installation on-going.
Various Schools	Lockdown Upgrades	\$ 250,000	In Progress	Installation for 2016 phase complete. RFQ for 2017 phase to be issued March 2017. Targeted Completion - September 2017.
Various Schools	Fire Alarm Upgrades	\$ 200,000	In Progress	ULC compliance retrofits at various sites.
Various Schools	Security System Upgrades	\$ 50,000	In Progress	On-going
Various Schools	Washroom renovations	\$ 2,000,000	Project Initiation	Scope confirmation & costing.
Various Schools	Outdoor Ground Signs	\$ 800,000	In Progress	Various elementary schools - 75% of this year's new signs installed.
Various Schools	Anniversary Spruce-up	\$ 131,500	In Progress	Various school anniversary projects on-going
Various Schools	Studies, Reports, Design	\$ 150,000	In Progress	Elementary Design Manual on-going. Initial meeting with various program stakeholders held with draft notes completed.

LEGEND:
SD - Schematic Design
DD - Design Development
WD - Working Drawings
BPA - Building Permit Application
SPA - Site Plan Approval

Subtotal	\$ 21,543,997	
Unallocated	\$ 19,633,316	**

Total Capital: \$ 218,290,819 ++

**** School Renewal Amount includes:**

Amount carried forward from previous year	\$ 21,513,777
Amount allocated to School Renewal from Overall Capital Plan	\$ 8,000,000
Additional SRG/SCI Funds Allocated to 2016-17	\$ 12,875,896
	<u>\$ 42,389,673</u>

++ Total Capital is comprised of:

Overall Annual Capital Plan	\$ 32,000,000
Other Ministry Funding	\$ 126,985,583
Proceeds of Disposition Allocated to Other Projects	\$ 24,915,563
Amount of School Renewal Carry Forward from Previous Year	\$ 21,513,777
Additional SRG/SCI Funds Allocated to 2016-17	\$ 12,875,896
	<u>\$ 218,290,819</u>