

# King George Elementary Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

## Memorial (City) School Auditorium

November 2, 2011

### Minutes (Public Meeting # 4)

#### **ATTENDANCE:**

##### **Committee Members**

**Chair –Pat Rocco**

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

**Non-Voting Members – Karen Bikinis, John Bradley, Lori Helt, Janet VanDuzen, Linda Wilson, Irma Belanger.**

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

**Voting Members – Anna Macky (regrets)**

**Non-Voting Members – Michelle Pickett, Tim Simmons, Susan Neville, Bernie Morelli**

**Resource Staff - Todd Salerno, Daniel Del Bianco**

##### **Recording Secretary**

**Claire Vander Beek**

**1. Welcome and Introductions** – Superintendent of Student Achievement Pat Rocco  
Chair Pat Rocco welcomed the members of the public to the ARC meeting. Everyone was encouraged to sign in and advised that questions will be entertained at the end of the meeting. ARC members were introduced. Regrets were received from Anna Macky and Michelle Pickett; Trustee Simmons was expected to arrive late following another commitment.

**2. Purpose of the Meeting** [http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/KingGeorgeARC\\_PublicMeeting4-Agenda-Nov-2.pdf](http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/KingGeorgeARC_PublicMeeting4-Agenda-Nov-2.pdf)

It was explained that the purpose of tonight's meeting was to provide the final ARC recommendation to the public and take final input from the public so the Committee can finalize the recommendation at their last working group meeting scheduled for Wednesday, November 9, 2011.

**3. Presentations** [http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/KingGeorge\\_PublicMeeting4\\_Presentation.pdf](http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/KingGeorge_PublicMeeting4_Presentation.pdf)

**a. Brief Overview of the Accommodation Review Process**

Mr. Del Bianco explained he would give a brief overview of the process and there would be an opportunity to ask questions of the process or the recommendation. Relative to the process, he stated the ARC follows Ministry of Education guidelines, Board Policy and the Terms of Reference. Both working group meetings and public meetings were held –all open to the public. The ARC's mandate is to develop an accommodation solution to address the long-term requirement of the community. The ARC is in the process of finalizing their recommendation to send to the Board of Trustees. He explained that the Trustees of the Board make the final decision on the ARC. The ARC will hold its fourth and final working group meeting after we have gathered public input

tonight. Next Friday the King George ARC report goes to the Director and along with the staff recommendation, then to trustees at the Committee of the Whole meeting on November 14, 2011. No decision is made at that time, as there is a 60-day cooling-off period after receiving the report. In the 60 days the trustees of the board will host an open house to receive public input on both recommendations.

Mr. Del Bianco reviewed the dates of public meetings that have been held.

**b. Work Completed by the King George ARC**

Referring to slide 7, Mr. Del Bianco advised that the ARC has considered various information:

- i) School Information Profiles – contains 181 items that provide an overview of each school in such areas as: core programs, infrastructure, quality of learning environments, community use, after school programs to help to identify challenges and perks of each school. These profiles consider the value of schools to the student, the community, the Board and the local economy.
- ii) Senior Administration recommendation – Board staff provided a recommendation as a starting point. The two recommendations are similar.
- iii) Additional information – any requests for additional information or costs have been provided to the ARC.
- iv) Final ARC Report

The final report will be reviewed by the ARC at Working Group Meeting #4. As outlined in the board policy, the reference criteria include eight areas: accommodation, facility condition, program, transportation, funding, implementation, three school scope and timelines. (Slide 8 contains a brief summary of each criteria)

At this point, ARC members Karen Bikinas and Linda Wilson stepped to the podium to present their update on behalf of the ARC, as follows:

*The decisions of the ARC have not been made in haste. This process takes a lot of time to ensure that all the angles are considered and everyone gets to have their say. Having all of the information makes for good decision-making. This is what we've done so far –*

Working Group Meeting:

*Working Group meeting # 1 – April 20, 2011*

- **Overview of the ARC process** – guidelines are set by the Ministry of Education. HWDSB determines the purpose and who is involved in the ARC.
- **Setting the Committee operating procedures and meeting norms** – We decided how the meetings would run, how we would vote (by show of hands/consensus) and when voting members would need to make decisions.
- **Review of Staff recommendation** – which was to close King George School and change boundaries so that approximately two-thirds of the students go to Prince of Wales School and one-third to Memorial (City) School.

*Working Group meeting #2 – June 1, 2011*

- **Review of the data collected in the School Information Profiles (SIP)** – to understand each school's value to the students, board, community in areas such as enrolment versus space, cost to operate, range of programs, quality of learning environment, etc.
- **Review of alternate accommodation options** – involved consideration of different boundary configurations. Because of discussions that occurred in Meeting 1, the ARC decided to explore other boundary options. Three options were developed, each with a Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase 1 are changes to boundaries between Memorial and Prince of Wales Schools. Phase 2 of each option includes a boundary review that includes Queen Mary

Working Group meeting #3 - October 20, 2011

- **Review of alternate accommodation options** – This is where we closely examined the three options
- **Finalize ARC recommendation** – After much discussion, we made a choice on which option we would recommend.

Information requested by the ARC:

- **Capital expenses by school (2000-2010)** – How much to run the schools
- **Outstanding renewal needs** – How much money to fix/update each school
- **Walking distances to each school** – How will each boundary option affect our students – will they need to walk far? Are they eligible for busing?

School Tours:

Prince of Wales School is beautiful, new, bright and inviting school. Memorial (City) School is a glorious, historical building. King George has needs in comparison.

Accommodation Recommendation Option

The initial slide presented outlines the current situation at the three schools. Slide 15 outlines the current boundaries, projected enrolment and capacity in a chart from 2012 to 2021. Please note that none of these schools are at capacity.

The ARC recommends the same option as the staff recommendation (Slide 16). As a second phase to this option, the ARC will recommend that the Board initiate a boundary study to review the current catchment area of Queen Mary School in order to stabilize the long-term enrolments at all three schools (Memorial Prince of Wales and Queen Mary).

Next Steps:

Working Group Meeting #4 will be held November 9, 2011 at the HWDSB Education Centre to review the community input received tonight, finalize the ARC recommendation and review the final ARC Report. All information will be available on the Board's website.

Mr. Del Bianco continued his comments:

**c. ARC Recommended Option**

Mr. Rocco – The ARC has decided to have the same recommendation as the staff option. However, they have made a recommendation for a boundary review involving with Queen Mary School. Once the board accepts the recommendation, the boundary review would follow.

**d. Next Steps**

Both recommendations attempt to balance the utilization of the school. The percentages (slide 15 & 16) reflects usage/capacity. There was a lot of discussion about how to increase utilization. Concerns were also raised about transportation and how it would impact one area of the streets. Queen Mary School is not part of this ARC mandate, but the ARC is requesting a boundary review and further consideration for transportation for one area to Prince of Wales School. The committee will review the final report next Wednesday.

Mr. Bradley asked that information about the boundary review be shared.

Mr. Del Bianco advised that the ARC considered three options – each with a second phase involving a boundary review with Queen Mary. Mr. Del Bianco provided a review of the various options and boundaries. (Please refer to website for the boundary details)

The Board staff recommendation will have everyone north of Barton and West of Gage going to Prince of Wales School.

The concern of the ARC committee has been whether students in four streets north of Barton Street (Dalhousie, Dalkeith, Craigmiller and Cluny) who are in closer proximity to Memorial (City) School would receive transportation to Prince of Wales.

A boundary review would address balanced enrolment. Queen Mary students currently west of Ottawa Street (Kensington, Rosslyn, Balmoral and Grosvenor Streets) could move into Memorial (City) School - this would "square off" the Memorial (City) boundary. North of Barton Street the boundary review would recommend students east of Ottawa Street and North of Barton attend Queen Mary instead of Prince of Wales School. This would take pressure off Prince of Wales and Memorial (City) Schools and help balance enrolment between the schools.

Phase 2 reduces walking distances for all students and simplifies boundaries.

#### **4. Questions/Comments from the Public**

Pat Rocco explained the timelines for closure.

Mr. Bradley commented that King George grade 7 & 8 students living north of Barton Street and east of Ottawa Street would have a shorter distance to walk to Queen Mary School under the boundary review proposal.

When asked about what might happen to King George School after the closure, Mr. Del Bianco explained the Board must follow a disposition of property process wherein the property must be offered to other agencies such as school boards, City, etc., before it can go to the open market and be sold for fair market value.

Understanding Prince of Wales was a new school, Mr. Nolan asked for the years Memorial (1919) and King George were built (1912).

Due to the older infrastructure at King George (i.e., electrical, etc.), students would benefit from equality of programs in newer sites.

Mr. Bradley observed that Memorial (City) has been used for filming of made-for-TV movies and the funds used on the school for upgrades.

Mr. Ruddle – While King George students may have had disadvantages in terms of plant, they are well cared for by the community through a breakfast program.

Mr. Bradley responded that Memorial (City) School has a nutrition program and walk-in closet but doesn't currently have a breakfast program. A number of parents and community members have indicated their interest in a breakfast program at Memorial (City) School.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.