

Dalewood Elementary Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

Education Centre Board Room

September 27, 2011

Minutes (Working Meeting #6)

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members

Chair –Krys Croxall

Voting Members – Suzanne Brown, Maria Carbone, Nadia Coakley, Pamela Irving, Anita McGowan, Kim Newcombe, Michael Reid, Kristen West.

Non-Voting Members –Heidi Harper, Silvana Galli Lamarche, Joanne Hall, Margaret Jobson, Debra Lewis, Peter Martindale, Denise Minardi, Michelle Rodney-Bartalos, Judith Bishop.

Regrets

Voting Members – Emily Reid

Non-Voting Members – Colleen Morgan, Brian McHattie

Resource Staff

Ellen Warling, Ron Gowland

Recording Secretary

Claire Vander Beek

1. Call to Order – Superintendent Krys Croxall, Chair

Superintendent Krys Croxall welcomed everyone, noting today is a working meeting and public are welcome to observe.

2. Agenda

2.1 Additions/ deletions – There were no additions to the agenda.

2.2 Approval of agenda – The agenda was approved by consensus.

3. Minutes of Working Group Meeting #4 (September 7, 2011)

3.1 Errors and omissions – It was noted Judith Bishop was in attendance although arriving at approximately 9pm after the Special Board meeting.

3.2 Approval of minutes – **Revised minutes approved by consensus.**

3.3 Business arising from minutes – None identified.

There was a concern raised about Option 13 not being captured in the September 7, 2011 minutes. After several minutes of discussion, Ms. Croxall clarified that the discussion re Option #13 took place on September 14th, not the 7th. Option 13 would be captured in September 14, 2011 summary.

4. Review of Data Requested by the Committee

4.1 Questions from the committee

Q: An explanation was sought about functional capacity numbers.

A: As the scenarios have been examined, our intention is to determine the number of rooms needed to make the scenarios work as opposed to the number of pupil placements.

Q. Are you basing your calculation on On the Ground (OTG) capacity? I understood that most schools don't run at 100% but closer to 85%. How far off are we from optimum utilization?

A. Kindergarten (K) rooms load at 20, grades 1-8 rooms load at 23. Classes are organized at 20 in Primary and 25 in Junior/Intermediate.

Q. What is the number each of the schools function at?

A. As an example, at my school, each teacher has a classroom now. If numbers increase it could result in French teacher losing a room, i.e., rooms are used every period of every day, and the French teacher moves between rooms using a cart.

Q. We are missing a benchmark, I have heard 85% as a measure.

A. It varies significantly as it depends on the layout of the school and how the school is organized. Some boards won't offer portables at the secondary level until they have reached 115% capacity.

A. There is not an ideal number. You provide programming as best you can until the space runs out, then get a portable(s) to have school population function.

Q. I recall a reference in a technical paper to 85%; if at 85% then Ministry would fund you the shortfall?

A. That 85% has nothing to do with capacity, but to do with top-up grants for operations, which is not related to functional capacity of a building. The percentage was 80%, then went to 85%, and they may continue to raise it. The Ministry changes it based on their own funding.

Q. You made a comment that you are looking for 85-90% and that once you get above 90%, a school would get portables.

A. Yes, with dual programming you will run into that, as you have smaller classes.

Q. Does 100% equal every seat full?

A. The Ministry's capacity = 23 per class, K = 20, but Primary or Jr/Int is 23 but could be loaded higher.

Q. Dalewood is at 72% capacity. What is 100%? Is every classroom full?

A. 100% assumes if OTG capacity is 400 you have 400 students

Q. Does OTG = 25 students in class?

A. No, 23 - with the exclusion of resource rooms, special classes, etc. If you have 10 regular classes, no resource/spec ed, you would be full with 230 students.

Q. How do boards decide you have to have 115%?

A. My comment re the 115% is connected to secondary loading from another board.

Q. So you can't go above 100% in an elementary school, i.e., more than 23 students per class?

A. It would be 100% with 230 students, that's not the reality.

A. When developing scenarios, those 230 students in primary require 12 classes at 20. (short 2 rooms). But at Jr/Int they only require 9 rooms. Functional capacity is how many classes are needed for the program. The Ministry loads at 23 OTG, but if in Primary then only have 20 students. That is why OTG never matches the functional capacity. We organize classes based on enrolments, by determining K, Pr, Jr/Int classes and whether there is a need for more purpose-built classrooms. This creates functional capacity as opposed to OTG capacity.

Q. When have we fulfilled the requirement of having right size for number of students? What is well utilized? If school has 12 classrooms, we need to make sure they are well utilized, and classes reasonably full?

Q. How are Programs of Choice (POC) calculated by Ministry, i.e., the Mandarin program is well below 23 students? How does it factor in the functional capacity or is it left out?

A. We will encounter this as we address Full Day Kindergarten (FDK). The Ministry adds all the students and divides by 26. By having a variety of programs it may not break out evenly into the four classrooms the Ministry will give you. POCs eat into functional capacity versus OTG.

A. POCs are not really recognized by the Ministry. The Board had to get special Ministry approval to have the Mandarin program as it is not taught in English or French.

A. Rotary doesn't affect functional capacity, but is a different delivery and classes are used for different reasons.

Q. Kindergarten - 26 or 20?

A. Half day K classes average at 20, FDK at 26 plus 1 Early Childhood Educator. The catch is the Ministry is looking at up to 30 students in the class. If I have 27 students in K, you will not have the Ministry fund for two classes, only one.

Q. And the Ministry Business "B" memos?

A. These were brought by Mr. Del Bianco to the last meeting but I don't believe distributed.

However, they are in electronic format and will be sent out through Tracy. [Distributed] Three deal with PTR. The Board received PTR funds for Dr. Davey, Queen Victoria, and Cathy Wever schools. All funds were expended.

Q. When we got the board report, the FCIs were above 100 in 10 years. What is the difference between the two reports?

A. The original RECAPP information was incorrect.

Q. What about the transportation data to come back?

A. I thought you were wondering about the number of students that would be bused. HWSTS has not given us this data, and I will follow up. We had many scenarios - it is a lot of numbers to run. If we can narrow down options, it would be preferable to ask about three or four options as opposed to six to eight options.

C. Quite a long time ago there was a chart provided on transportation that showed the walking distance that could be used as a reference.

5. Review of Concept Options proposed by the ARC

5.1 Overview of remaining options

The following financial documents were laid down

- Additional Option Summary & Financials <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Dalewood-ARC-Option-Summary-and-Financial-Presentation-Sept.pdf> (Posted document incorporates revised page 8 below)
- Revised Slide 8
- A ledger-size Financials summary was distributed to members. (It summarizes all the Financials pages into one page for easier reading by members)

Overview of revisions to Slide 8: Original numbers included a new gym at Dalewood. \$1.5M was removed as it is not part of our decision; it is tied to the City's decision re Rec Centre.

Earlier we had a lengthy discussion about boilers, controls and terminal units. The boilers were not an issue in the RECAPP and we have taken them out across all options as the Board would address these needs through regular maintenance. Items that do not need changing as part of ARC, we have removed. We are talking about new FDK classes, new classes needed as opposed to "nice to have". We carefully went through FDK numbers – how many classes we need versus funded for.

Slide 2

The six options in slide 2 match the ledger size Financial Summary's options. Based on our earlier discussion, I believe Option 13 needs modification to reflect K-8 classes at G. R. Allan and Prince Philip Schools. Our analysis was based on Prince Philip and Dalewood.

The six options were reviewed:

- Status quo (Option 11) was to leave all three schools – or Option #11 with additional renovations. All schools remain the same. As we implement FDK we require two additional classes at G. R. Allan
- Staff recommendation – no change to Dalewood School, close Prince Philip School, G. R. Allan School JK-5
- Option 4 - Dalewood single tracks, close Prince Philip
- Option 9 - closing all 3 and building new school on Dalewood site
- Option 12 – Dalewood Eng & Fr I K-8, close G. R. Allan, Prince Philip no change.
- Option 13 – data needs to be revised to reflect K-8 classes at G. R. Allan and Prince Philip Schools as our analysis was based on Prince Philip and Dalewood with G. R. Allan closure.

Ms. Warling suggested proceeding with the enrolments as they are valid numbers.

Option #13 – Ms. Warling reviewed the stats on slide 4. <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Dalewood-ARC-Option-Summary-and-Financial-Presentation-Sept.pdf>

Prince Philip - 204 = 20 students per class in primary, then split grades over grade 4-8 = less than 1 class per grade at each level. The financial piece is incorrect, however, as an enrolment option would you consider this?

A short discussion ensued about split classes and individual experiences.

- Split grades are what parents are most opposed to.
- Teachers are working with two different levels of students.
- Probably have fewer specialist teachers, i.e., music/Phys Ed. as you don't have a population large enough in the 6-8 grades. It won't match the current program offered at Dalewood.
- Increased numbers may result in more split classes. It was noted that with the primary cap, the reality is there will be splits in all grades.
- Should we not be providing the public with three closure options, a scenario with each school closed? Option #13 was Dalewood closure.
- Which would parents consider to be worse: a split class at local school or a straight grade at a distant school involving transportation? From a programming perspective this member felt parents prefer a local school with split classes.
- As a parent, I would prefer straight grades & busing as an ideal scenario. The teacher's ability is critical in split grades and dual curriculums. My children have done well in both, I still prefer straight grade.
- Parents will have two different views. When asked why the difference in the two programs, what explanation is there for more gym/ science in one school, and the other school not having the choices? From an equity perspective, that would be a difficult scenario.

It was re-iterated that Option #13 on slide 4 should reflect the closure of Dalewood not G. R. Allan School, i.e., JK-8 model in Prince Philip School and G. R. Allan Schools and Dalewood closed with FI to G. R. Allan School and Mandarin stays at Prince Philip.

Ms. Warling: As our next meeting is a public meeting, we should review the options after considering the financial summary. Are we taking all of the options forward or taking some off the table?

Ms. Croxall: Since Option #13 needs to change, we should look at the financials because program may be biased, maybe the financials will give us a better picture.

A five-minute break was taken to determine if data was immediately available to pull and update the revised Option #13. Ms. Croxall announced that Ms. Warling and Mr. Gowland did not have the data on hand to put accurate figures to Option #13; however, the committee opted to go forward with reviewing the financials for the other options.

Referring to the ledger size financial summary, Mr. Gowland identified the four sections into which each option has been summarized. Data in A & B are critical numbers, Section C can be considered as legacy items (things we would strive to do as funding became available) and Section D contains potential Ministry funding.

Mr. Gowland proceeded to review the six options:

- i) Status Quo – no changes other than Full Day Kindergarten
- ii) Staff Recommendation – 4 FDK – 3 classrooms and expanding gym and washrooms, book room etc. Costs included a potential parkland dedication fee, which may be eliminated with a by-law change.

Ms. Croxall – As Ministry funding does not cover this cost, it has to be included.

Mr. Gowland – The Board will retain consultants for final numbers, but these concept numbers can be used to reduce our options.

- iii) Option 4 - Close Prince Philip, Dalewood becomes single track, 2 FDK renos at Dalewood, 3 FDK at G. R. Allan, gym reno and additions

Q. Can someone comment on whether putting all FI students together would result in more specialists?

A. You need to remember that in grades 6-8 only 50% of the classes would be taught in French.

C. I suggest eliminating Option #4 based on transportation issue, i.e. busing every Prince Philip School student over and losing grades 6-8.

Consensus – to eliminate Option #4

iv) Option 9 – new school constructed on Dalewood site, close G. R. Allan School and PP. There would be a demolition cost to remove Dalewood.

Q. What happens to the ¼ acre owned by the rec centre?

A. There is not space to accommodate the rec centre.

C. Earlier we explained line D. If you look at option #9 wherein the recommendation is to close three schools and a build new school. You lose all costs in Section C in RECAPP costs. To pay for the new school would involve asking the Ministry for \$16.5M – capital dollars. There are no capital dollars today. The Ministry reviews capital funding against Board capital projects. As a board we have to look at capital priorities and whether we would recommend it as a top priority for the Ministry to consider. Then would the Ministry consider it a viable option on their list? What is the FCI of these buildings? Do we have schools that have a higher FCI? As staff, we have to believe the recommendation we put forth is a #1 priority. Reports have to reflect if we get funding, or if we don't. All of Line D is a BIG *if*. FDK funding is the only funding we know we will get.

Q. If we put a super size school on the small lot, could we vote it off?

A. The other issue is how big a school do you want? The school will start off at over 900 students. A super school may never get funded. Do we want a school that big?

Q. Are there numbers for comparison?

Discussion ensued about recommending the elimination of Option #9 for a super school.

C. As there is no adjacent board-owned land, the option is to build vertically.

Q. Is there any chance the City would sell Lincoln Alexander Park? Prince Philip School is too far away from the majority of students. Is there any way of getting land around G. R. Allan School?

A. I don't see land becoming available in that area.

Q. With the super school, is the likelihood of split classes reduced?

A. The super school would be dual stream, plus the Mandarin program. It would probably reduce split grades but not eliminate them. In effect, you are running three schools within a school.

Consensus to eliminate Option #9

v) Option 11 – status quo with upgrades

2 FDK at G. R. Allan, renos for staff room, washroom, book room, and basement classes coming out eventually. No work at Dalewood or Prince Philip.

Q. Why do the sub-totals for this and status quo option work out the same?

A. This is a result of certain options that get funded or not. Ministry funding for FDK at G. R. Allan School is slated for year 4 and Prince Philip School in year 5. The Ministry will not announce anything related to FDK until the ARC decision is finalized. If the ARC decides status quo, we get funding for 2 FDK rooms at G. R. Allan. The staff recommendation states we need four rooms for FDK and the Ministry is looking at the number rooms. Costs: \$215,000 / renovated room or \$430,000 / new class.

C. I recalled discussing the elimination of basement classes.

A. By 2020, you will eliminate basement classrooms without renovations due to reduced enrolment.

Ms. Croxall - \$1,810,000 does not include renovations to Dalewood, just G. R. Allan. Does not include accessibility.

Ms. Warling – In the staff recommendation, we took any renovations away from Dalewood School. The costs include architects. \$860,000 is for the FDK rooms, structural work, some elevator costs. Again, these are concept numbers.

Q. Are you including costs to get classrooms out of the basement?

A. Not needed.

Q. If we try to keep all three schools open, how do we choose which schools to renovate or do we renovate them all?

Q. Option 11 is status quo and just adds necessary washrooms and elevator - this is your \$1M? It leaves out the other two classrooms?

A. The washrooms are the biggest issue, Dalewood has washrooms on every floor; Prince Philip School is a one floor plan. G. R. Allan School has three floors and washrooms on the first floor. The cost for the elevator is Ministry funded, but Mr. Gowland has included costs for the renovated rooms impacted by the elevator to make better use of the rooms.

Q. Option 11 - the only school in 2020 that drops is G. R. Allan and that eliminates the need the basement rooms. What about accessibility funding – would that cover the total cost for an elevator? Wouldn't you need an elevator at Dalewood – is this the difference from Ministry?

A. The elevator would not necessarily be funded by the Ministry.

A. To make every floor accessible, you would wipe out your capital budget for the next 20 years. That is why the Ministry has extended the deadline for accessibility out to 2035.

A. \$650K – makes two schools accessible but only brings them to current standards, not 2035.

Q. One reason I supported the status quo option was to see if enrolment drops as projected. Do we have to deal with asbestos removal or can put it on hold? Is it OK if not touched?

A. Asbestos is managed, inspected and encapsulated. It is not only asbestos but other critical costs that could close a building and then it becomes asbestos AND whatever work that may entail removing asbestos.

Q. Section C – if we close G. R. Allan School the only changes in the other schools would be “build as required”. RECAPP would not be done.

A. We would be looking at funding from Ministry, costs, disposition and what you do with your proceeds of disposition.

Q. Status quo and Option 11 – I am trying to understand the benefit of Option 11 over status quo if doing FDK.

Mr. Gowland – Option 11 We may have to do some accessibility upgrades, subject to the final design of the FDK additions and building department requirements at this time.

Q: Kristen we are putting 4 new rooms in G. R. Allan. Suzanne's point is extremely valid.

A. Then Option 11 becomes status quo.

C. Do we understand there is no such thing as status quo? **Keep option #11.**

v) Option 12

Close G. R. Allan, Dalewood becomes K-8 for Eng & Fr students from G. R. Allan K-5 boundary, and Prince Philip School stays the same with Mandarin, no FI and its 6-8 students to Dalewood.

Nothing at G. R. Allan School as closing, 11 room addition at Dalewood and 4 rooms renovated for FDK.

Q. Explanation of FDK funding for option 12?

A: Renovations of 4 rooms at \$215,000 per room or if doing 4 rooms new at \$430,000 per room.

C. At Dalewood the rooms are large enough that every two rooms could be made into three rooms.

A. Yes – they will become the four FDK rooms as rooms are 1200 square feet. We are taking the opportunity to use those rooms for FDK, and also, it would become a wing.

Q. Can we renovate any other classrooms and then need less new rooms?

A. Once we determine an option, we will retain consultants who will look at the scenario.

C. This is our best guess.

Q. Option 12 - have we maintained the speciality rooms in this option, i.e., art, science etc?

A. Yes.

Q. Option 12 – if loading all students from G. R. Allan School into Dalewood, you have to go to a balanced day schedule; it will also impact playground space. Where will 11 classes be built?

A. Either where rec centre is or vertically.

C. If rec centre goes, it would deprive students of the swim program and result in fewer programming options. With 400 students at Dalewood, there is room for more. But if adding 400 more, that would have significant impact on space and increase primary/junior social issues. My concern is there is not enough space. I recommend eliminating Option 12. We have talked about pros and cons of JK-8 model, and fewer transitions being good. Programming issues outweigh transition and perhaps transportation issues. Recommend taking both JK-8 options off the table. A JK-5 school has been renovated to JK-8 in the past.

C. It was a difficult renovation and cost more than expected.

Q. Agree there are too many students for either site (Dalewood or G. R. Allan as a K-8). Like to better understand an earlier comment that adding students would eliminate programs, as you have the same number of students. Why eliminate programs?

A. Mostly related to the gym - more students for same gym space, becomes overcrowded.

C. My kids in G. R. Allan School would be bused to Dalewood, not only be bused but lose JK-5 and 6-8 model. Puts us in double loss situation.

Q. I'd like to ask about playground issues. When looking at the staff recommendation, adding students to G. R. Allan School site, it will be K-5 but increased numbers. Are you concerned about JK-5 & 6-8 or space per child?

A. A balanced day schedule is two nutrition breaks of approximately 40 minutes per break. In a JK-5 you can manage them better. In a JK-8 environment there is more potential of social issues during transition periods.

Q. If you look at busing, large number of grade 6-8 students would be bused. With a balanced day in the proposal, would lunchtime programs be eliminated?

A. My kids are in a balanced day school; you can run intramurals.

Q. Are you not then asking parents to come in twice a day? We have knitting, sports games, and 20 minutes does not seem very long.

A. Balanced day scheduling doubles gym opportunity. Students frequently take their lunch to go to music or arts. We run an activity every break.

C. I worked at a balanced day school and the first break is 40 minutes in length, the second is 50 minutes. The second break is used for those that walk home and back for their lunch. The first one was for light snack (15 minutes) so then activities can still be run.

A. The majority of our schools are operating on a balanced day schedule and providing activities and intramurals within that schedule.

C. Balanced day lunch programs give parents two options. Referring back to our conversation about grades 1s and 8s together - mixing primary and intermediate students doesn't work well. Definitely have to have different washroom locations for the Pr/Jr grades, not using one bathroom.

A. In a grade 1-8 scenario, older students can be used as peer mentors and activity providers to younger students. There are some logistics to balance.

A. The solution is to have primary students eat and go out on opposite break.

C. Nutrition breaks work as time can be used for teams. For our specific area, and size of land, don't think it would work as well.

Q. Will the loss of the rec centre impact program issues in option 12?

A. Concept is fine, but on the Dalewood site we would have to build vertically to preserve playground. If you get a number of students, you could also preserve specialist teacher.

A. On the other hand you have done nothing to Prince Philip School with small classes.

C. It would continue as now.

Q. Is G. R. Allan School heritage protected?

A. No, if it were, that would add 100% to the costs.

C. If G. R. Allan School were declared for closure, the public would push to have the City declare G. R. Allan School a heritage building.

Q. The utilization rate is the driver. Dalewood has 70% utilization rate and options try to address issue. Where are we going? You are determined to address class size at Prince Philip. If JK-5, the Ministry class size calculation will result in split classes. What will we present at the public meeting to make sense of the issues and solutions? I am lost. What is your case to say there needs to be change, and what needs to change?

A. HWDSB decided some time ago to set up this ARC with these three schools, based on other numbers to address reno concerns and small schools. Prince Philip School is supported by a

Program of Choice(POC). If not there, then Prince Philip School would be a very small school. Under the logistics, despite closeness of community, the rationale from practical point of view is there are options close by, even if it involves busing (such as in the rural areas). From a number of points of view, all schools and possibility of accommodating the smallest schools elsewhere. The ARC can raise other reasonable options and present to the public.

Q. Isn't Strathcona a very small school supported by POC?

A. We have a Facility and Program strategy. We are looking at all facilities to make the best use of them. At some point Strathcona could be involved in an ARC.

A. In any school supported significantly by POC but in disrepair, the POC could be relocated. The question is does the community require that school? If the POC is moved, could the local students be placed in another nearby school, i.e., consolidate schools? There is a long-term Facilities Master Plan coming forward over this school year. Part of it is driven by the age of buildings, facility renewals, declining enrolment, and the need to consolidate schools. ARCs needed to create a better environment for all students. Prince Philip School community has 140 students that are regular K-5 students, sp ed classes for 12 students and POC for 45 students. You have three different groups of children. We assume POC is there because there is space. Sp Ed classes location may or may not change due to needs.

C. The process for consolidation and renewal has been going on for over a decade since board amalgamated. The board has closed a number of schools.

C. In fact we have closed upwards of 40 if you take into consideration those closed before amalgamation.

C. The average age of school buildings is 52 years old. We are on renewal track for a number of schools. The average lifespan of these buildings is 50 years. This has been occurring for the last decade and will continue.

C. Often smaller schools are closed. The reason Strathcona is not yet on the radar is because it was rebuilt in 1985 and the school is in good condition which is different to these three schools.

Ms. Croxall asked for consensus about the elimination of option 12? **No dissent, consensus to eliminate.**

Option 13

While we do not have financials for option 13, we do have the enrolments. We have K-8 Eng at G. R. Allan School based on G. R. Allan School junior school boundary, K-8 FI at G. R. Allan – 566 students at G. R. Allan. Prince Philip School would keep same boundary, and retain its grades 6-8 students (200 regular program students across grades) plus 45 students in the Mandarin program.

Ms. Warling: Do you want to create two K-8 schools at Prince Philip and G. R. Allan and close Dalewood? It would result in more students at G. R. Allan School across 10 grades rather than 7 grades.

C. Based on comments tonight, suggest keeping a JK-8 option for the public and have Peter speak to the concerns.

Q. Does that mean we as a committee endorse the option?

A. No, the ARC is looking for input to the options. It has been suggested we should show a K-8 option to the public because we have heard this is a recommendation from them.

Members commented on the desire to show K-8 options as follows:

- Compare option 12 and 13 for feedback?
- K-8 at Prince Philip may result in a loss of students to the Catholic high school. At Dalewood there is a strong relationship with Westdale.
- Relative to the rec centre, the City has a number of options if Dalewood closes – to build a new rec centre on either the Dalewood site or Alexander Park near Prince Philip School or purchase part or all of the Dalewood site. They are waiting for our decision. Ms. Warling explained the process that the Board follows when a property is declared surplus.
- Suggest option 13 is better as we have eliminated option 12 due to busing. We have explored the issues.

- Another member wondered if the numbers supported two K-8 models and suggested keeping the 6-8 students together. She withdrew her suggestion that Option 12 be put on the table as the board's recommendation addresses facilities advantages.

In order to present the two K-8 schools (G. R. Allan School and Prince Phillip) in Option 13, Ms. Waring confirmed that financials would be available by Friday electronically. Financials are one component for consideration in the options.

Options to be presented at the public meeting: Option 13, option 11 and staff recommendation. Consensus was received in support of the three options above.

Q. Relative to the status quo option – I anticipate a question will arise about whether we are moving too quickly and why not wait five years and not spend \$7.5M? If none of the inspected items would trigger a closing, would it not be a significantly cheaper way to approach the status quo? \$2M?

A. I concur - this is why the focus is on A & B lines.

A. These are potential costs and may be a consideration, but it is not really factoring into the decision.

Q. What about changing enrolment in 2015 and if there was a possibility of taking a two-stage approach in status quo option to see if numbers align with projections and then do a second phase of FDK at G. R. Allan?

Ms. Croxall: G. R. Allan School is in year 4 of FDK and the renovations need to be done. The ARC has the ability to put an implementation timeline on the ARC recommendation.

Ms. Waring: The board uses 2020 numbers. If implementing the board's recommendation, the ARC may recommend FDK and addition work be completed before closing Prince Philip School, i.e., delay closure for one year to allow construction to proceed while G. R. Allan School enrolment is smaller, (without Prince Philip School students).

5.2 Financial summary

5.3 Group discussion (focus on eliminating options)

6. Review of ARC Timelines

Ms. Croxall reviewed the ARC timelines and asked whether the committee wishes to consider a request to extend these timelines.

Noting the need for more time may arise following input from the public, comments included:

- Given the options the ARC has looked at, it is unlikely the public will put forth a new option.
- There is no option for closing G. R. Allan School – so far only have rationale for closing Dalewood and Prince Philip.

Ms. Croxall – Rationale will be discussed in preparing for the public meeting. All the options considered are on the Board's website. We have also discussed programs, size of site/ location, enrolment, size of school.

Ms. Waring spoke to the process for a final decision as being similar to how options were eliminated tonight. The ARC will gather feedback on the 5th, then work on determining final option(s) on the 12th. Input can be sent by anyone to tracy.mckillop@hwdsb.on.ca by the timeline of October 11th. On the 12th, the ARC finalizes recommendation(s) and the rationale. All the other aspects of the report will be done by Mr. Del Bianco on behalf of the ARC and reviewed by Ms. Waring. It will provide an overview of the work of the committee and the options the ARC has considered.

In response to a question of determining one or more final options, Ms. Waring replied that if an option relied solely on Ministry funding, it would be wise to have an a) and b) option, i.e., an option with less/ no Ministry funding, as we want the recommendation to be viable. As the ARC has eliminated the "super school" option, it may well come down to one option.

Ms. Croxall advised that the board staff recommendation will not be available to the ARC beforehand as it will be made based upon public commentary and the ARC's recommendation. The staff recommendation may - or may not - look the same as the original.

Q. I am concerned that the ARC needs to review Mr. Del Bianco's report and make a difficult decision within these timelines. With G. R. Allan School full right now and enrolment projected to increase, it would be a bad time to add students. Is it possible to wait until we get over the demographic bubble then close Prince Philip as enrolment drops? McMaster University has more students enrolled than expected which would impact on housing available for families / university students.

Ms. Croxall confirmed a timeline extension is possible. While the committee made a lot of process tonight, she agreed that the ARC may consider implementation stages in their recommendation(s).

Ms. Warling suggested that the committee request an extension with a hard deadline. She suggested December 2nd, which would give the ARC five extra weeks' flexibility but without the intention of adding five extra meetings. She reiterated that the ARC would focus on the recommendation and rationale. All the rest of the report, such as overview, options, maps/data would be prepared by Mr. Del Bianco.

As it was 9pm, Ms. Croxall asked for, and received consensus, to extend the meeting until 9:30p.

Support for asking for the extension was expressed as it would give the ARC flexibility to book another meeting if needed and yet the ARC could still hand in a report by the end of November within current timelines.

Q. In asking for an extension, would trustees call an emergency meeting?

A. Although the ARC's intent maybe to keep to the original deadline, it was explained a request now could be approved during the regular October board meeting schedule.

Consensus was reached on asking for an extension to December 2nd.

7. Preparation for Public Meeting #3 (October 5, 2011)

Ms. Croxall asked for volunteer(s) to speak at the public meeting and outline what the ARC has done since the last public meeting (enrolment, renovations/additions/scenarios. Financial and data information would be prepared by staff for the options to be presented to the public.

Michael and Anita agreed to take on this this role jointly.

Ms. Warling noted that the financial info will be updated and she will send a PowerPoint out to the two volunteers by Friday. The slides will be similar to tonight's but contain the other options considered. The preamble to each option would include some rationale.

Ms. Warling confirmed her understanding that the presentation will focus on the ARC's discussion between the second and third public meetings: enrolment, renovations, additions in the preamble, present options and ask for feedback.

Michael to present the K-8 option, Anita the status quo.

8. Correspondence

Letter from Dr. Christine Wilson
The letter did not elicit comment.

9. Other Business

9.1 Review of Councillor McHattie's proposed recommendations to the ARC. To view Councillor McHattie's letter please click on the following link: <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Thoughts-on-Dalewood-ARC-Options-Councillor-McHattie.pdf>

Ms. Warling reviewed the 7 recommendations within the Councillor's letter:

1 - Status quo - Option #1 or #11

2 - Two K-8, Dalewood closes (option 13)

3 - Joint school with Canadian Martyrs -10 years ago HWCDSB consolidated several schools into this building with resulting large boundaries (east from Dundurn to Dundas). It is a small building, capacity of 325 and presently has 210 students. This site is not large enough to accommodate two schools in the same building.

Trustee Bishop commented that politically the Catholic board has not shown a willingness to work together as evidenced by the approximately 3% of mixed public and catholic riders who receive transportation through the joint HWSTS.

- 4 – Increased enrolment – can only be accomplished through regional programs or enlarging boundaries which will attract students from other public schools resulting in their potential closure.
- 5 – How can McMaster engage as partner? – The Board has embarked on a facility partnership process but Ms. Warling could not speak to whether a response had been received from McMaster.
- 6 – Role for retaining families and making neighbourhoods more attractive – this was determined not to be the role of the ARC.
- 7 – What is target population to keep all schools open? How do you increase your enrolment? Programs of Choice and expanded boundaries are two options.

Several comments were made:

- A neighbourhood rec centre would attract families.
- If setting a target percentage of 90, how do you specifically attract 75-100 public school students/families?
- Just moving students does not solve the overall problem.
- Ms. Croxall commented that if the Board knew what development would be like in the future, it is unlikely that these schools would be situated as they were. And similarly with secondary schools. Fewer students has resulted in schools evolving into different types of schools, i.e. 6-8 or K-5.
- There are more Catholic schools since provincial funding was provided.
- Boundary changes have been utilized in the past to more evenly distribute students.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:22 p.m.