



Dalewood

Elementary Accommodation Review

Dalewood – Prince Philip – G.R. Allan

DRAFT COPY

Report To: Director of Education
Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board

Report From: Dalewood Accommodation Review Committee

Submitted On: December 2, 2011

Table of Contents

- 1.0 Executive Summary**
- 2.0 Accommodation Review Process**
 - 2.1 Purpose of the Accommodation Review Committee**
 - 2.2 Composition of the Accommodation Review Committee**
 - 2.3 Meetings of the Accommodation Review Committee**
 - 2.4 Resources Available to the Accommodation Review Committee**
 - 2.4.1 School Information Profiles**
 - 2.4.2 Staff Recommendation**
 - 2.4.3 School Tours**
 - 2.4.4 Resource Staff and Meeting Minutes**
 - 2.5 Communication Strategy**
 - 2.6 Community Input**
- 3.0 Recommendation**
 - Map #1: ARC Recommended Option (Status Quo)**
- 4.0 Additional Considerations**
- 5.0 Summary**
- 6.0 List of Appendices**

1.0 Executive Summary

At the January 24, 2011 Board meeting, Trustees approved a recommendation to initiate the Dalewood Accommodation Review which included Dalewood, Prince Philip and G.R. Allan elementary schools. The mandate of the ARC was to produce a report to the Board which addressed a number of different criteria including accommodation, facility condition, program, transportation, funding and implementation. An Accommodation Review Committee (ARC), comprised of parents, students, community representatives, principals, teachers, trustees and non-teaching staff began its work on April 6, 2011.

This report outlines the recommendation of the Dalewood Accommodation Review Committee and details the work completed by the ARC throughout the entire process.

2.0 Accommodation Review Process

In June 2009, the Ministry of Education revised its “Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline” which outlines the necessary steps to follow when school closures are being considered. In accordance with the guideline, the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board revised its Pupil Accommodation Review Policy (No. 12.0, **Appendix ##**), in December 2009.

The Pupil Accommodation Review Policy states that the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board is committed to providing viable learning programs in quality facilities in a fiscally responsible manner. Various factors may result in the need to consolidate, close or relocate one or more schools in order to align pupil accommodation with resident enrolment. These factors include: changes in demographics and/or student enrolment, mobility rates and/or migration patterns, government policies or initiatives, curriculum or program demands, operating costs, and the physical limitations of buildings.

2.1 Purpose of the Accommodation Review

School Boards in Ontario are responsible for providing schools and facilities for their students and for operating and maintaining their schools as effectively and efficiently as possible to support student achievement. The purpose of the Pupil Accommodation Review Policy is to provide direction regarding public accommodation reviews undertaken to determine the future of a school or group of schools.

The Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) serves as an advisory body to the Board of Trustees of the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board. The mandate of the Dalewood ARC, as outlined in the Terms of Reference (**Appendix ##**), is to produce a report to the Board that encompasses the following:

(a) Accommodation: Develop recommendations to maximize the utilization (enrolment as a percentage of Ministry “on-the-ground capacity”) of Board facilities in the review area with a target of 100% utilization for a future ten-year period achieved through accommodation changes including, but not limited to, school closures, new school construction, permanent additions, (i.e., bricks and mortar structures), non-permanent additions (i.e., portables or portapaks), and partial decommissions (i.e., the demolition or shut-down of part of a building).

(b) Facility Condition: Develop recommendations for capital improvements (i.e., repairs, renovations or major capital projects such as new construction) into existing facilities and sites along with a funding strategy to pay for those improvements.

(c) Program: Develop recommendations around the strategic locations of Elementary School programs, including, but not limited to, regular programs, programs of choice, French immersion, special education, care treatment and correctional programs and alternative education.

(d) Transportation: Develop recommendations that address the implications of other recommendations on pupil transportation.

(e) Funding: Develop a funding strategy to address any capital works that are contemplated in the recommendations above.

(f) Implementation: Develop recommendations for implementation timeframes for any of the above recommended changes.

(g) Scope: The ARC’s work (i.e., discussion and recommendations) applies only to the following schools: Dalewood, Prince Philip and G.R. Allan.

(h) Timeline: The ARC will complete its work and submit its report to the Director of Education by Friday, October 28, 2011. Please note that the Dalewood ARC requested and was granted an extension by the Board of Trustees to extend its report deadline until Friday, December 2, 2011.

To fulfill this mandate a number of key criteria was considered by the ARC. These *Reference Criteria* include the following:

(a) Facility Utilization: Facility Utilization is defined as enrolment as a percentage of “on-the-ground” capacity. The goal is to maximize the use of Board-owned facilities over the long term.

(b) Permanent and Non-permanent Accommodation: Permanent accommodation refers to “bricks and mortar” while non-permanent construction includes structures such as portables and portapaks. The goal is to minimize the use of non-permanent accommodation as a long-term strategy while recognizing that it may be a good short-term solution.

(c) Program Offerings: The ARC must consider program offerings, each with their own specific requirements, at each location. Program offerings include, but are not limited to: regular programs, programs of choice, French immersion, special education, care treatment and correctional programs and alternative education, etc.

(d) Quality Teaching and Learning Environments: The ARC should consider the program environments and how they are conducive to learning. This includes spaces such as Science Labs, gymnasias, other specialty rooms, etc.

(e) Transportation: The ARC should consider the Board’s existing Transportation Policy and how it may be impacted by or limit proposed Accommodation Scenarios.

(f) Partnerships: As a requirement of the HWDSB Policy and Ministry of Education guidelines, the ARC should also consider opportunities for partnerships.

(g) Equity: The ARC should consider the Board’s Equity Policy, specifically as it relates to accessibility, both in terms of the physical school access as well as transportation and program environments.

2.2 Composition of the Accommodation Review Committee (ARC)

The Board’s policy stipulates that ARC membership will consist of the following persons:

- **Chair - One Member of Executive Council** *(to be appointed by the Office of the Director) who will not have any “Voting” status;*

Voting Members Include the Following:

- **One Principal** that is not directly associated with any of the schools in the Review Area *(to be chosen by the respective Principals’ Association);*
- **One Teacher** that is not directly associated with any of the schools in the Review Area *(to be chosen by the respective Teacher Union Executive);*
- **Two Student Leaders** from outside the review area *(to be chosen by Executive Council in the case of an Elementary ARC);*
- **Two “Public School Supporter” Community Leaders** *(Community Leaders must not be directly associated with any of the schools in the Review Area. Community Leaders are to be appointed by the Parent Involvement Committee);*
- **Two Parent Representatives** from each of the schools directly affected by the accommodation review *(to be appointed by School Council);*

Non-voting Members include the Following:

- **Any Superintendent of Education** whose direct responsibilities include a school in the Review Area;
- **The Trustee(s)** whose ward includes a school in the Review Area;
- **The Ward Councilor(s)** whose ward includes a school in the Review Area;
- **One Principal** from each of the schools directly affected by the accommodation review;
- **One Teacher** from each of the schools directly affected by the accommodation review *(to be chosen by teaching peers);*
- **One Non-Teaching Staff Representative** from each of the schools directly affected by the accommodation review *(to be chosen by non-teaching staff members at each of the schools).*

In accordance with the above composition guidelines the table below represents the Dalewood Accommodation Review Committee membership list:

Position	School Affiliation	Name
Chair & Superintendent of Student Achievement		Krys Croxall
Voting Members		
One Principal Representative		Maria Carbone
One Teacher Representative		
Two Student Leader Representatives		Emily Reid
Two Public School Community Leader Representatives		Pamela Irving
Two Parent Representatives	Prince Philip	Nadia Coakley Michael Reid
Two Parent Representatives	G.R. Allan	Suzanne Brown Kristen West
Two Parent Representatives	Dalewood	Kim Newcombe Anita McGowan
Non-Voting Representatives		
Area Trustee		Judith Bishop
Area Ward Councillor		Brian McHattie
Principal	Prince Philip	Denise Minardi
Principal	G.R. Allan	Michelle Rodney-Bartalos
Principal	Dalewood	Joanne Hall
Teacher	Prince Philip	Colleen Morgan
Teacher	G.R. Allan	Silvana Galli Lamarche
Teacher	Dalewood	Peter Martindale
Non-Teaching Staff Representative	Prince Philip	Debra Lewis
Non-Teaching Staff Representative	G.R. Allan	Heidi Harper
Non-Teaching Staff Representative	Dalewood	Margaret Jobson

2.3 Meetings of the Accommodation Review Committee

In preparation for the four public meetings, the ARC was also involved in eight (8) working group meetings. The Terms of Reference for the Dalewood ARC originally identified only four (4) working group meetings; however the Committee felt that they required additional time to properly review the data, develop options and feel comfortable with their final recommendation and as a result held four additional (4) meetings. Although working group meetings were centred on ARC members' discussion, the public was invited to attend as observers.

As outlined in the Terms of Reference, the ARC held four public meetings in order to receive input from the community as follows:

a) **Public Meeting #1 (April 6, 2011, Dalewood)**

Members of the Public in Attendance: 73

At the first public meeting, the ARC described its mandate, provided an overview of the accommodation review process, and reviewed the data contained within the School Information Profiles (SIP). After the presentations by resource staff, the ARC Chair facilitated a question/answer session with members of the public.

b) **Public Meeting #2 (May 19, 2011, Dalewood)**

Members of the Public in Attendance: 103

At the second public meeting, resource staff provided an overview of the accommodation review process and presented the accommodation option created by Board staff. After the presentations by resource staff, the ARC Chair facilitated a question/answer session with members of the public. In preparation for Public Meeting #2, the ARC held the following working group meetings:

- Working Group Meeting #1 (April 28, 2011)

c) **Public Meeting #3 (October 5, 2011, Dalewood)**

Members of the Public in Attendance: 76

At the third public meeting, resource staff provided an overview of the accommodation review process and members of the ARC reviewed the work that they had completed to date, presented the three proposed accommodation options and discussed the next steps of the committee. After the presentations, the ARC Chair facilitated a question/answer session with members of the public. In preparation for Public Meeting #3, the ARC held the following working group meetings:

- Working Group Meeting #2 (June 8, 2011)
- Working Group Meeting #3 (June 22, 2011)
- Working Group Meeting #4 (September 7, 2011)
- Working Group Meeting #5 (September 14, 2011)
- Working Group Meeting #6 (September 27, 2011)

d) **Public Meeting #4 (October 19, 2011, Dalewood)**

Members of the Public in Attendance: 57

At the fourth public meeting, resource staff provided an overview of the accommodation review process while ARC members presented their final recommendation. The presentation provided an outline of the ARC report that will be presented to the Director of Education December 2, 2011. After the presentations, the ARC Chair facilitated a question/answer session with members of the public. In preparation for Public Meeting #4, the ARC held the following working group meetings:

- Working Group Meeting #7 (October 12, 2011)

One final Working Group Meeting (#8) was held on November 10, 2011 to review community input from Public Meeting #4 prior to finalizing the ARC option and report. Detailed minutes of all of the public meetings and working group meetings were recorded, made available to the public via the Board's website and are attached as appendices to this report.

2.4 Resources Available to the Accommodation Review Committee

Throughout the entire process ARC members relied on a number of resources and data to assist them in developing and assessing potential accommodation options. These resources include the School Information Profiles (**Appendix ##**), the ARC resource binder and the knowledge of resource staff. All of the information contained within the resource binder (including the School Information Profiles) was made available to the public via the ARC website and has been included in the appendices of this report.

2.4.1 School Information Profiles (SIP)

Prior to the commencement of the ARC, the Board in accordance with the Ministry of Education Guideline developed and approved a School Information Profile. The SIP is a "tool" available to the ARC designed to provide an overview of each of the schools based on the following considerations:

- *Value to the student*
- *Value to the community*
- *Value to the school board*
- *Value to the local economy*

The SIP document provided a starting point and the ARC then customized each school profile to address unique local factors which should be considered during the ARC process. Review of the SIP allowed the ARC members to gain a better understanding of all the schools involved in the process.

2.4.2 Staff Recommendation

As outlined in the Ministry of Education Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline (Appendix ##), the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board presented an alternative accommodation option which addressed the objectives and Reference Criteria as outlined in the Terms of Reference. The option created by Board staff proposed the closure of Prince Philip elementary school in June 2012 and the relocation of those students to G.R. Allan beginning in September 2012 (Appendix ##). The staff recommendation also proposed the following upgrades to the remaining facilities:

Dalewood	G.R. Allan
Renovations to classrooms	8 Classroom Addition 4 New ELP Classrooms (Remove all classes from basement)
Book Room	Book Room
Elevator	Elevator
Accessible Washroom	Accessible Washroom
Larger Staff and Work Room	Larger Staff and Work Room
New Gymnasium (pending decision from City of Hamilton)	2 nd General Purpose Room (Gymnasium)
	2 nd Floor Washrooms
	Additional Resource Room and Special Education Room

The total cost associated with the staff recommendation is estimated at \$5,839,591. The recommendation provided by staff would require additional funding which would partially be offset through Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) funding (\$1,720,416) and the proceeds of disposition from the sale of the Prince Philip site (\$4,164,591). An additional funding request would have to be submitted to the Ministry of Education as part of the Board's annual capital priorities submission requesting the balance of funds (\$1,675,000).

With the proposed closure of Prince Philip, the Board has the potential to eliminate approximately \$3,210,836 in future renewal needs from the long-term legacy costs associated with the staff recommendation.

School Tours

Tours of the facilities involved in the ARC process were conducted June 22, 2011. During that time, ARC members were provided with the opportunity to participate in guided tours of schools included in the accommodation review process. The 30-45 minute tours included a site walk of the outside of the facility as well as a tour of the interior (i.e., gymnasium, classrooms, library, etc.).

2.4.4 Resource Staff and Meeting Minutes

Resource staff were available at all public and working group meetings to assist the ARC members in deciphering any information in the resource binder and to address any questions regarding Board/Ministry of Education policies and guidelines. Resource staff were also available to respond to requests for additional information from the ARC, as directed by the Chair. The ARC also used the minutes of all meetings as reference documents.

2.5 Communication Strategy

Very early on in the process the Board realized the importance of developing an effective communication strategy to ensure that the community was continuously informed throughout the process. Notice of the public meetings was provided to the public through flyers sent home by the schools with the students, the Board's (ARC) website, and advertisements in local community newspapers (**Appendix ##**). All public meeting notices included the date, time, location, purpose, contact name and number.

2.6 Community Input

Community input was an integral part of the Accommodation Review process. Throughout the entire process the public was encouraged to share their ideas and comments through email, voicemail and through the question/answer period at all of the public meetings. Members of the community were also welcome to attend all working group meetings as observers of the process.

3.0 Recommendation

The Dalewood Accommodation Review Committee is recommending that all three schools identified in this ARC remain open and that their existing grade structure and program offering remain intact (Map #1). The approval of this recommendation was achieved through a consensus vote at Working Group Meeting #7 (Appendix ##). Furthermore, the committee has recommended upgrades to both Dalewood and G.R. Allan, consistent with those upgrades proposed in the staff recommendation. The desire of the Committee to retain all three schools and propose upgrades to Dalewood and G.R. Allan has been identified as Option #11 (Status Quo with upgrades).

DRAFT

In developing their final recommendation, the ARC has used the reference criteria to fulfill their mandate based on the following factors:

(a) Accommodation

- The ARC has recommended that all three schools remain open and continue to operate with the same program offerings and grade structure. Under this option, overall utilization at the three schools is projected to decline from 91% to 73% by 2020, resulting in 308 surplus pupil places. The following table summarizes the potential impact that the ARC recommendation will have on the projected enrolment for each school (by program).

Current Situation	OTG Capacity	2010/2011	% Utiliz.	2012/2013	% Utiliz.	2020/2021	% Utiliz.
Dalewood							
English (Grd. 6-8)		268		244		183	
French Immersion (Grd. 6-8)		109		115		93	
Dalewood TOTAL	392	377	96%	359	92%	276	70%
G.R. Allan							
English (Grd. JK-5)		220		178		120	
French Immersion (Grd. SK-5)		239		236		225	
G.R. Allan Total	498	459	92%	414	83%	345	69%
Prince Philip							
English (Grd. JK-5)		154		150		149	
Mandarin (Grd. JK-3)		29		44		45	
Prince Philip TOTAL	233	183	79%	194	83%	194	83%
TOTAL	1,123	1,019	91%	967	86%	815	73%

(b) Facility Condition

- The long-term renewal needs at each of the facilities will not change as the Dalewood ARC is not proposing the closure of any of the schools. These renewal needs will continue to be assessed against the needs of the other schools in the Board's inventory and dealt with based on priority. The Dalewood ARC has proposed a number of upgrades to Dalewood and G.R. Allan which they believe will enhance the facility condition. These proposed upgrades have been summarized in

Section 4.0. The cost required to address the current and projected renewal needs at the three schools has been summarized in the following table:

Estimated Renewal Needs	2010	2010 FCI	2020	2020 FCI
Dalewood	\$4,052,092	46%	\$5,604,073	63%
Prince Philip	\$2,629,624	55%	\$3,210,836	67%
G.R. Allan	\$3,355,301	46%	\$4,847,054	66%
TOTAL	\$10,037,017		\$13,661,963	

Note: Facility Condition Index (FCI) is a comparison of the renewal needs to the replacement value of the facility. A higher FCI reflects increasing renewal needs.

(c) Program

- The ARC has not proposed any changes to the programs currently offered at the schools.

(d) Transportation

- The current walking distances for elementary students is 1.0km for grades JK/SK and 1.6km for grades 1-8. The proposed ARC option to retain all three schools along with their existing grade structure and program offerings would have no impact on transportation.

(e) Funding

- Although no additional funding will be required to initiate the proposed ARC option, the Committee has recommended that the Board of Trustees consider a number of upgrades to the existing facilities. The cost of the proposed upgrades along with a funding strategy has been summarized in the next section of this report.

(f) Implementation

- An implementation timeline is not required under the ARC option as the Committee is recommending that all three schools remain open and continue with their existing program offerings and grade structure.

(g) Scope

- The schools identified in the Terms of Reference include: Dalewood – Prince Philip – G.R. Allan

(h) Timeline

- The final ARC report was submitted to the Director of Education on Friday, December 2, 2011.

4.0 Recommended Option Rationale and Additional Considerations

The Dalewood ARC had developed and analyzed a total of 13 possible options prior to recommending that the status quo was the best course of action for the community. The other options developed by the ARC included:

- Closing all schools and building a new “super school”
- Consolidating the three schools into two of the existing schools considering all sites, program offerings and grade models
- Consolidating with local partners to optimize building utilization

A number of factors made it possible to dismiss many of these options very early on including grade structure, the possibility of split grades due to low enrolments and the financial impact.

There are a number of additional criteria that the Dalewood ARC considered when recommending the status quo option to the Board of Trustees. These additional criteria included:

- Community Interrelationships
- Walk Ability/ Transportation Issues
- Facility Utilization
- Facility Renewal Opportunity
- Program Balance (English/FI)
- HWDSB Small School Trends

As part of their recommended option, the Dalewood Accommodation Review Committee requests that the Board of Trustees consider the following recommended upgrades to Dalewood and G.R. Allan when making their final decision.

Dalewood	G.R. Allan
Elevator	Elevator
Larger staff and work room	Larger staff and work room
Book room	Book room
Accessible washroom	Accessible washroom
	2 nd Floor washroom
	Allowance to remove 2 rooms from the basement
	2 additional Kindergarten spaces

The cost associated with these proposed upgrades is estimated at \$2,970,208, a portion of which (\$860,208) would be funded through the Ministry of Education for the construction of 2 additional kindergarten spaces as a result of its full-day kindergarten initiative. An additional funding request would have to be submitted to the Ministry of Education as part of the Board's annual capital priorities submission requesting the balance of funds (\$2,110,000).

5.0 Summary

In January 2011, Trustees of the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board initiated an Accommodation Review process which included Dalewood, Prince Philip and G.R. Allan elementary schools. The Accommodation Review was initiated by Trustees to address the long-term viability of this group of schools. Enrolment in the area has steadily declined as the surrounding community continues to mature leading to smaller schools and class sizes at Prince Philip. Also the renewal needs at all of the facilities will continue to increase over the long-term.

An Accommodation Review Committee (ARC), consisting of parents, principals, teachers, students, trustees, a community representative and non-teaching staff, began their work in April 2011 to develop an accommodation option for the three schools contained within the ARC. Over the course of eight (8) Working Group Meetings, four (4) Public Meetings, school tours, community input through email, voicemail and public meetings, as well as countless hours spent reviewing background information; the ARC developed a total of 13 possible accommodation options. Through further consultation and feedback from the community, the ARC choose to recommend Option #11, which can be described as status quo with proposed upgrades to Dalewood and G.R. Allan schools, to the Director of Education for the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board.

6.0 Appendices

Includes list of all documents in the ARC Binder