



**Southeast Galt Elementary Schools Pupil Accommodation
Review
Minutes of Public Meeting # 3
April 21, 2009
Stewart Avenue Public School 7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.**

The third Public Meeting of the Southeast Galt Elementary Schools Pupil Accommodation Review was held at Stewart Avenue Public School on April 21, 2009.

Welcome/Introductions

- Chris Smith, Manager of Planning welcomed members of the public, school communities, ARC members, Trustees, and Board staff present for the evening, and made the following introductions:

Trustee Cindy Watson, Trustee Colin Harrington, Marilyn Marklevitz, Executive Superintendent of Business and Financial Services and Treasurer, Margaret Coleman, Manager of Communications, Sue Thorne-McCaffrey, Principal of Alison Park P.S., Allan MacKay, Principal of Manchester P.S., Brian Beney, Vice Principal of Lincoln Avenue P.S., Cindy Benedetti, Principal of Chalmers Street P.S., Jennifer Crits, Principal of Central P.S., Cathy Dowling, Principal of Elgin Street P.S., Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner, Lauren Manske, Planner, Mary Hingley, Recording Secretary.

Thank you to Leslie Tinning, Principal of Stewart Avenue P.S., and Vice Principal Wendy Daley, our hosts here this evening.

Approximately 54 members of the public were also in attendance.

Why are we here?

- The southeast area of the Galt community of Cambridge was an area the Board had identified for an accommodation study in our Capital Plan, but as you are aware, the fire and subsequent demolition of Alison Park P.S. brought a certain urgency to the need for decisions about facilities in this community.
- Most obvious was the need for a long term solution for the Alison Park community.
- Replacing it as it was would have resulted in new space to replace the old school, but would not have addressed the small school organization there, nor the declining enrolment in the older neighbourhoods, while we have growth in the newer residential subdivisions.
- It was recognized that some of the facilities we do have in this part of the City could use some attention.
- The Board decided that it would make more sense to take the time to do an Accommodation Review of the schools in the area rather than rush to a short term

solution for Alison Park which would involve rebuilding Alison Park to its size before the fire.

- The Accommodation Review Process is a formal one required by the Ontario Ministry of Education which has the Board establish a community based Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) to review and develop recommendations for the Board to consider.
- Tonight we have 2 scenarios to present to you as we work towards that final set of recommendations, and our purpose is to hear from you, as well as any questions or comments that you may wish to share with us.
- I also want to let you know two key items:
 1. We are looking at possible boundary changes, but no changes will be made for this September, the earliest would likely be September 2011.
 2. We are looking at school closures in both scenarios.

Reasons for an Accommodation Review

- Mr. Smith referred the group to the meeting presentation slides. The presentation is available on the Board's website at: www.wrdsb.on.ca/accommodation-segalt.php.
- The Board may determine by resolution to undertake an Accommodation Review for a number of reasons. Although the accidental loss of a facility as in the case of Alison Park isn't specifically listed, even deciding simply not to rebuild that school and accommodate students elsewhere is defined by the Ministry as a *school closure*. This requires the formal Pupil Accommodation Review Process.
- The Board did request permission to amend the timing to expedite the process, but the Ministry of Education denied the request.

How does the WRDSB Accommodation Review Process Work?

- Once the Board has formally established the review, Planning asks the Principals at each of the schools involved to seek out up to 2 community representatives to sit on the Accommodation Review Committee (ARC), along with the Principals or Vice Principals as determined, the Area Superintendent of Instruction, one or more at large community representatives, Municipal Planning staff and the Board Planning staff.
- The ARC helps us to represent the larger community and:
 - Develop objectives for the review (these are important because we go back to them to determine the "fit" of each scenario).
 - Review the School Valuation Templates for each of the schools in the review (the templates are available online or in hard copy at each of the schools).
 - Assist us with developing possible solutions or scenarios.
- The ARC has had 11 meetings to get to this stage, as well as our last Public Meeting, where we had those of you who attended help us with considering the initial scenarios.
 - Tonight you will see that we are down to 2 scenarios which have been fine tuned based on the feedback we've received.
 - We have put more detail into assessing these from the point of view of costs, transportation, special needs programming, etc.
- The key here is to get your collective feedback from tonight with our comment sheets; online feedback, phone calls, etc. back to the ARC and evaluate the scenarios again.

- It will be the challenging task of the ARC to come up with a recommended scenario which we will bring back to the community for a final look before delivering it to the Board.

Timing

- We are at the third of at least four mandatory Public Meetings that are part of the Accommodation Review process. We are aiming to get the ARC's recommendation to the Board's senior administration by this June.
- Under the Ministry's timelines, the Board cannot formally consider the recommendations until 60 days later (not counting the summer break). We are anticipating the Board decision and vote being October 2009 at the earliest.
- Since both scenarios require planning for new construction, we anticipate the changes taking place for September 2011, and we may want to consider phasing in any senior elementary changes over two years

Study Objectives – Presented by Nathan Hercanuck

- One of the things that is common to all of our boundary studies and which we carried over to the Accommodation Review process are the Study Objectives.
- The Study Objectives are what we want to accomplish when we implement the solution. We develop these at the beginning of the process to help resolve the issues in the particular study area.
- As we work through the solutions (i.e. scenarios or options) we look at how well they do at accomplishing the objectives and modify them or set them aside if it's clear that they don't accomplish the objectives.
- For this Accommodation Review, the ARC developed the following Study Objectives:

To determine a permanent option for Alison Park (not portables), and where possible, keep Alison Park students together.

To find a solution that is long-term, considers permanent construction, and has regard for future demographic changes and development patterns.

- One of our goals in facilitating boundary studies and Accommodation Reviews is always that the solution be long-term, and that we do our best to plan for future development and demographic shifts, so that we are not back here in a few years disrupting families with boundary changes. When we refer to long-term we mean one generation through a JK-8 school, or about ten years.

To address enrolment impact on programs at all schools by maintaining/developing equitable facilities that are financially feasible.

- The ARC also felt it important that we try to provide equitable programming opportunities at all the schools in the study area. Enrolment drives a lot of what we do at the school level, if the enrolment at a school is too low it becomes more difficult to deliver the program, having in some cases to run combined/spilt classes.

Where possible, reduce busing to reduce environmental and transportation costs in the long-term.

- It was also felt that if we had the potential to shift some boundaries in this area that we should have an eye to reducing transportation, which has both an environmental and financial benefit.

To address physical accessibility of facilities in the study area.

- The ARC felt it was important that there perhaps existed an opportunity to look at the physical accessibility of facilities in the study area.

Where possible, to provide access to specialized programs more broadly across schools in the study area.

- Also identified as an opportunity is to look at where we deliver specialized programming (such as ESL and special needs classes) and see if these could be more equitably distributed.

To support optimal use of facilities (school and site), capital and operating resources.

- The ARC felt that we should have as an objective that we try to use our existing facilities as best we can and be financially responsible, which also assists in program delivery.

To have regard for secondary school boundaries.

- Regard for secondary school boundaries is an objective that has been included in many boundary studies. Where possible we like to have consistent feeds to the high schools, so that most 7/8 students at a particular school or senior elementary program feed to the same high school. This isn't the case currently; right now the grade 8 students at Lincoln Avenue go on to two different high schools: Galt Collegiate and Glenview Park.

To address student transitions where changes are proposed.

- Student transitions are always a very important piece, once we have a solution how we are going to get there. This may involve grand parenting, where some students finish out at whatever school they are at. For example, as part of a boundary change we often have the grade 8's finish out their senior year where they are at rather than change schools for grade 8, then change again for the move to high school.

Valuation Templates – Presented by Nathan Hercanuck

- Part of the Accommodation Review guidelines handed down by the Ministry of Education requires that for each school in the study area the ARC completes a School Valuation Template. The Valuation Template looks at each school in terms of its:
 - Section 1: Value to the Student
 - Section 2: Value to the Board
 - Section 3: Value to the Community
 - Section 4: Value to the Local Economy
- These valuation templates are intended as a consistent base of information only. The individual schools are not scored or ranked against each other in any way. It is there to ensure that during the process, especially with the potential for a school closure, everyone

has all the relevant information about the schools. The templates are available on the Board website as well as at each school in the study area.

Scenarios B & F – Presented by Lauren Manske

- The ARC has been working very hard and has narrowed down the 2 options/scenarios we're presenting to you tonight:

Scenario B

Boundaries

- This is the option where we show Alison Park and Lincoln Avenue closing. Students from Alison Park would be accommodated in a new JK-8 school in the Myers Rd. and Dundas St. area. This option would also require an addition to Avenue Road, converting it from a JK-6 to a JK-8 school.
- The grade 7/8 feeds change with the closure of Lincoln Avenue. In this option, Central would feed Stewart Avenue, Manchester and Elgin Street would feed Avenue Road, and Chalmers would feed the new school.

Projections

- When we look at enrolment projections for this option, we are making good use of each of the facilities. All schools are showing long-term capacities over 80%. The new JK-8 school would be the largest school in the area, reaching approximately 682 students by 2015. Enrolment at Manchester, Central and Avenue Road is pretty stable for the long-term.
- All projections are available on our Board website for a more detailed look.

Scenario F

Boundaries

- This option will be new to most of you because we have not presented it at a public meeting yet. It was put together based on the feedback received from Public Meeting # 2. This option shows the closure of Manchester and Lincoln Avenue.
- We would be rebuilding Alison Park to house a portion of the Manchester students, making this facility approximately 400 pupil places. This option also sees the two other components from Scenario B where a new JK-8 school is built in the Myers Rd. and Dundas St. area, as well as the addition to Avenue Road, converting it to a JK-8 school. There are quite a few changes to the catchment areas in this option, especially for Manchester students.

Projections

- In terms of enrolment projections, this does make the new school slightly smaller, while the rest of the schools are pretty much at a similar number. Chalmers Street is slightly under-utilized in this scenario, as its long-term enrolment begins to decline. The difference here can be linked to the additional facility (the JK-6 school at Alison Park) added in this scenario.

Programming

- One of the study objectives is to, where possible; provide access to specialized programs more broadly across schools in the study area. Currently there are no schools offering

French Immersion in the area, so we would recommend that a French Immersion program be facilitated in one of the schools, likely the new school or one of the existing facilities, depending on where the strongest interest is put forward.

- In terms of Special Education, we would recommend that the Learning Disabilities and Integrated Orthopaedic programs stay at Stewart Avenue and the Development Education class stay at Avenue Road. The Life Skills class (a continuation of the Development Education Class) would move from Lincoln Avenue to Avenue Road for consistency.
- All schools would continue to have individual IEP and classroom ESL support as they currently do.

Costing

- How much is all of this going to cost? I do have a few construction components to show you that are obviously going to be an expense, but there are also some cost-savings and revenue pieces to both of these options.
- Scenario B has two major construction components, an addition at Avenue Road, and a new JK-8 school.
- The Avenue Road addition is necessary to accommodate the grade 7/8 students we would be bringing there. The estimate of \$5.5 million would cover:
 - a 200 pupil place addition (which equates to approximately 8-10 classrooms)
 - additional washrooms
 - expansion to the parking lot to accommodate additional staff
 - modifications to the gym because senior students require a double gym
 - adding the necessary facilities for senior students such as lockers and larger classrooms for science and tech;
 - and as with all new construction, we would seek a child care operator
- The JK-8 school construction is estimated at \$11.5 million. This facility would have:
 - a double gym
 - all the necessary senior facilities (lockers, etc.) I mentioned for the Avenue Road addition
 - enough kindergarten rooms to accommodate the Ministry's proposal for full day learning, and again;
 - we would seek a child care operator
- All new construction would be fully accessible.
- Scenario F has one additional construction project, an Alison Park replacement school, which would be a JK-6 school on the Lauris Ave. site. We would build this school to approximately 400 pupil places and again seek a child care operator.
- In terms of funding for these construction projects, under either scenario, we have a JK-8 school in our capital plan for this area, so we would be able to receive some Ministry funding for new pupil places (to support students in the new development), which we would top up with funds from the Board's Proceeds of Disposition account, where any generated revenue is added from the sale of Board assets.
- There will be some funding available from the insurance claim for Alison Park, this can be used under either scenario, the money will follow the students.
- We would be looking at a September 2011 timeline for completion of any construction projects we are proposing. This means that we will need to accommodate Alison Park students in an alternative location (which could be the church) for an additional 2 years.

Estimated Transportation Costs

- Currently we are spending \$338,200.00 annually on transportation in this area. This covers the cost of 19-20 runs made daily. Since in both of the options, we are closing Lincoln Avenue, we are essentially eliminating 7/8 busing for urban areas by having more localized JK-8 schools.
- Overall, both options have reductions in transportation but Scenario B has about 2 fewer runs, or a \$35,600.00 difference from Scenario F. This is partly because of the busing that would be required for Manchester area students to get to Alison Park due to hazards.

Estimated Revenue

- Under both options, the Board will have excess properties which we would put on the market for sale. The Board has a process to follow with the sale of any property, offering first to public agencies – for instance, the Catholic Board, or the City of Cambridge. They would be required to pay fair market value for the properties. If those agencies are not interested, we would put the properties for sale on the open market. This means that there is a possibility a developer could purchase the land and decide to build on it.
- The constant in both options is the sale of the Lincoln Avenue property. This property is 4.48 acres, and the estimated market value is approximately \$600,000.00, which would include the cost of demolition of the building.
- In Scenario B, the Alison Park site would be up for sale, generating approximately \$900,000.00 for the 3.78 acres. There is no demolition included in this estimate since the damaged building has already been removed.
- Scenario F has the sale of Manchester, generating approximately \$400,000.00 for its 4.11 acres, which would include demolition.
- There may be some additional savings in terms of administrative staffing needs. In Scenario B, with one less facility, we would require one less secretary, custodian and principal. Their annual salaries could be worked into the overall savings, but we have not shown that tonight. We are not suggesting that there would be any lay-offs; we should be able to cover these through retirements, transfers, etc.

Summary

- To summarize, we are looking at a total estimated cost of \$14,175,400.00 - \$15,375,400.00 for Scenario B and \$21,611,000.00 - \$23,411,000.00 for Scenario F, a difference of \$7,435,600.00 - \$8,035,600 between the options.
- We do not own the property at Myers Rd. and Dundas St. which I have mentioned for the new JK-8 school. This property would be eligible for payment through Education Development Charges (EDC) which the Board collects from new development. There may also be an opportunity to do a land swap with the owner of this property. This land purchase cost has not been included in the numbers in this summary since we cannot say what the purchase price would be – although, it would be a constant in either scenario.

Mr. Smith addressed the group and asked if there were any questions/comments:

Q – Thanks to Stewart Avenue for hosting the Public Meeting. Why was Area S split into S1 and S2 (with S1 going to Stewart Avenue and S2 going to the new school)? Was consideration given to making the new school bigger?

R – According to the Good Schools Standing Committee Report, the guidelines state a JK-8 school should have 600 – 650 pupil places, which is what we are at in the projections. We felt that we had a better fit if we split Area S to balance the numbers at Stewart Avenue and the new school.

Q – Projections show Chalmers Street at 69%, couldn't you keep Area S going there?

R – We can look at this, we do try to look at long-term boundary solutions, the rush is from new development, then declines over time. There is the proposal to extend Franklin Blvd. down to South Boundary Road. Area S has been divided at Franklin Blvd.

Q – The land at Myers Rd. and Dundas has not been purchased yet, will that be a problem?

R – No, we don't think so. We won't negotiate in public though; the Board does have options.

Q – The new land will need sidewalks, there are none currently. Does the Board push the City to put them in due to the safety issue?

R – We would like full sidewalks when the school opens. Sidewalk installation would be a part of site plan approval. As well, the City collects Development Charges and some of those can be directed to external sidewalks in situations like Myers Road. Would it be completely ready at first, not likely, so transportation might have to be considered where sidewalks and/or crossing guards or signals are not in place yet. We work with Municipal Traffic staff on these things.

Q – Moffat Creek area, would that area once developed go to the new school being built, or is another school going to be built?

R – The larger Moffat Creek area would eventually be directed to a school that would be part of a joint city/school board/library site with plans to build a school. Students north of Moffat Creek are currently bused to Avenue Road, and are accommodated in these scenarios. The second contingency school site we have in their neighbourhood would be dropped.

Q – With 7/8 students being switched to Avenue Road from Lincoln Avenue, is it a safety concern for them walking? Elgin St. is busy.

R – Safety is always a concern. The Municipality places crossing guards through the City Traffic Dept. However they would not place a crossing guard solely for grade 7/8's, as it is the feeling that 7/8 students are capable of crossing safely themselves and would not cross with a guard anyway.

Q – Younger students are walking as well, what about safety for them?

R – We are not proposing to change the JK-6 boundaries, just the 7/8's, so no change to the current situation for them.

Q – Both scenarios have Lincoln Avenue closing, what are the driving factors that led to this?

R – There is a shift to the JK-8 model, away from the pure 7/8 senior schools, prompted by the provincial curriculum, and it is a model we have been building on. There has not been a pure 7/8 school built in the Board for over 22 years. The programs like shop/home economics are

no longer delivered like they used to be. With a JK-8 model there are fewer transitions, reduced busing, student mentoring, we are getting students to walk which means fewer parents having to drive them. As a system, we are falling in line with where most school boards and the Ministry are going.

Q – In a JK-8 feeder school, what is the experience with the 7's coming in? Relationship issues?

R – Ms. Tinning, Principal from Stewart Avenue addressed the question: This has been her third year with the transition here at Stewart Avenue, and admits that we can always do better; transitions are difficult and developing relationships challenging. Her school hosts events that have the grade 6's come and meet buddies who they can then communicate with through letters. They have ball games and participate in a variety of activities to help them get familiar with the new school and new peers. It does take time, but they do have the two years together before going off to high school.

Q – Regarding the proposed new school, it's a high traffic area; will the City be putting in lights? And where would the main entrance be?

R – The main entrance has not been determined yet. Myers Rd. is busy, but the new South Boundary Road will take much of the through and truck traffic away, which should help. Traffic signals and roundabouts are Municipal responsibilities. We would likely sit down with the City about crossing assistance. We will provide transportation if an area is deemed unsafe until it is resolved.

Q – Why don't all the schools go to JK-8, less transitions, wouldn't it be more cost effective?

R – As stated earlier, the provincial curriculum is going that way and so are we; trying to align with the Ministry is our goal. It can be a challenge with the smaller organizations, for example at Alison Park there is generally only one grade 6 class, therefore only one grade 7 and eventually one grade 8, meaning less opportunity for specialist teachers and intramurals, etc. They might even have a combined 6/7 or 7/8 class in one or more years. There are also 7-12 schools in other Boards, but our Trustees have not been comfortable going there.

Q – Scenario F is confusing – what happens?

R – Scenario F has Lincoln Avenue and Manchester closing. We would build a JK-6 school on the Alison Park site, and a new JK-8 school in the Myers Rd. and Dundas St. area, as well as an addition to Avenue Road, converting it to a JK-8 school. In this scenario, Manchester students get split into 3 different directions.

Q – Why can't you build a JK-8 school on the Alison Park site?

R – It's not ideal due to the lot size. The property is 3.78 acres, and we would need at least 6 acres to build a JK-8 school. There would be no field space for senior programming and the other site requirements.

Q – Why close Manchester and rebuild Alison Park?

R – This scenario was developed with the option of giving the Alison Park community a new 400 pupil place school on the current property, so another school had to close. Manchester was chosen versus Central because it is an older school, more work is needed for accessibility upgrades, and it's a fairly small site surrounded by industrial uses. If you don't think this scenario is a front runner, please give us your feedback on the comment sheet.

Q – What would it cost to make Manchester fully accessible?

R – It could cost as much as one million; it would require an elevator built on the outside of the school accessible to all three floors, but there would still be access issues to the gym, front entrance, etc.

Q – Scenario F keeps Alison Park together, but Manchester gets split up 3 different ways.

R – It is one of our objectives to find a permanent home for the Alison Park students, and if possible to keep them together; but you make a good point about similar impact.

Q – Manchester is located in an industrial area.

R – Yes, they do have land use issues; there are residential pockets in the catchment area, but none large enough to support a school. Of note, Manchester has the only crossing guard in the Region that stops trains for the students!

Q – Will the new school have air conditioning and a lunchroom?

R – It would have air conditioning, but no lunchroom.

Q – Why no lunchroom?

R – There is no money in the funding formula for that; it is a space and cost issue.

Q – Area A on the 7/8 boundary map, why doesn't it show where they go?

R – That area is an industrial park, and currently there are no students there. It is in the Avenue Road boundary for JK-6 and William G. Davis boundary for 7/8. If a student was to move into the area, we would have to provide transportation for them. Often in industrial areas there can be original houses and those may be rented for many years.

Q – Regarding Area S2, would they be bused to Stewart Avenue? And couldn't they have walked to the new school?

R – The JK-6 students would be bused to Stewart from Area S2; the 7/8's would walk.

Q – Cheese Factory Road has no sidewalks, isn't this a safety issue? And why can't students get on the bus route if the bus isn't full?

R – We are getting into transportation issues now; the transportation department is a third party consortium now with stringent guidelines to be efficient and cost effective. We were able to offer "courtesy" at one time, if a bus was driving right by, to fill them up with students. With all the recent development in the Branchton/Myers Road area, the infrastructure will slowly come along, including sidewalks, etc.

Q – When a school closes, does the staff follow the students?

R – No, they don't follow the students necessarily but there is a process to follow for new school staffing or at a school which will expand (as well as new hires, retirements, redundancies, transfers). None of the scenarios change the number of teachers, and there will be no job losses, your location however may change. During the transition, Lincoln Avenue would possibly stay open an extra year.

Q – If teachers are not guaranteed to go with the students, are they dispersed?

R – Some may be; there is no guarantee that all existing staff would go with existing students. A discussion will need to take place with staff/students/parents and the Area Superintendent to answer these types of questions.

Q – Are the Alison Park students going back to the church for the 2009-2010 school year?

R – Yes, that has been confirmed. There is however no confirmation yet for the 2010-2011 school year.

Q – When will the decision for the review be made?

R – We will have the ARC report to the Board for June, then the 60 day waiting period, the earliest the Board could vote would be at a meeting in October 2009.

Q – The latest December 2009?

R – We can't give you that date as the Trustees could send it back to the ARC requesting changes, easily taking the decision into January 2010.

Q – I realize that this process started with Alison Park burning down, and that there are costs in projecting studies and future plans. A community is more important with a school. Has the ARC studied historical data, and why schools were built where they were initially? Older schools can be renovated, they have value. The costs mentioned for accessibility upgrades and demolition seem high to me (I am in the construction business), and with the process dragging on, the costs keep escalating. I have a son at Alison Park II (the church) and he complained that they don't have a playground. The students are supposed to be the number one priority, and things seem to be taking too long.

R – The timelines are set by the Ministry for this process, so our hands are tied in that respect. It is a long process, but the Ministry is trying to make sure that students don't just get moved – that there is adequate community input. We try to look at the bigger picture, and then break it down, i.e. for specific community impact. Regarding the costs and estimates – we try not to highball them, but as you know demolition could have environmental issues that would increase the end cost. In the past, neighbourhood schools were great with all the students able to walk, but people had larger families back then to support them. It takes a bigger neighbourhood today to support the larger school organizations, and it is a challenge to sustain all the facilities and programs equitably.

- Mr. Smith asked that anyone who had a comment sheet to please hand them in, and invited the public to continue to follow the process online and/or with subsequent public meetings. Mr. Smith also noted that the Planning Staff would be on hand for some one on one discussion after the meeting if needed.
- The Public Meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Mr. Smith thanked all for coming, and gave the contact numbers and Board website information for the public to access with any questions or comments:

Website:

www.wrdsb.on.ca/accommodation-segalt.php

Email:

boundaryfeedback@wrdsb.on.ca

Phone:

519-570-0003 ext. 4419

Responses to questions received on comment forms submitted at Public Meeting # 3 that were not answered at the Public Meeting:

Q – Many Manchester addresses walked to Alison Park for 25 years and now you're concerned for safety and need to bus all of Manchester or is this just to inflate the cost so the Myers Rd. area school looks more favourable?

A – The proposed need for busing is based on the safety hazard areas identified by Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region in consultation with Board staff. Currently these areas are bused for grades 7 and 8 for safety reasons; therefore, we would not expect that these areas would be safe for JK-6 students to walk.

Q - What other option for Elgin student in gr. 7 rather than Avenue?

A – In either scenario, there is no other option; Elgin Street P.S. feeds Avenue Road P.S.

Q - As a father of a special needs student (autism) I'd prefer my child remain at this school (Chalmers Street) as opposed to moving to a new one – transition. What is my recourse?

A – The Waterloo Region District School Board's Administrative Procedure 1040 outlines the guidelines and expectations regarding the premises under which boundary exceptions can be made, and the process to be followed in the cases of boundary exceptions for elementary students. If a child is currently receiving support at their school through an IEP, they would continue to receive that support at their new school.

Q - If the subdivision builds up around the proposed new school on Myers, those kids will be within walking distance. I'm sure that eventually it will make more sense to stop bussing Alison Park, etc. students and they'll be "kicked out". So, instead of dealing with another situation wherein another school will be needed (for AP, etc.) later on, does it not make sense to build the 2nd school now (on Lauris)?

AND

A new Myers Rd. school would be right in the area of a new subdivision. When this housing is built, it seems likely to have those students attend the new school and reshuffle Alison Park kids down the road again. Doesn't seem like the best decision to permanently locate Alison Park and Manchester (etc) now at the 420 Lauris Ave site instead of moving them in the future?

A – All known new subdivisions in that area have been worked into the projected number of students at the new school at Myers and Dundas; therefore, all "walk in" students have been included in the projected numbers for both scenarios. The only other plan of subdivision that would bring in additional students to the area should be accommodated by the proposed second school on a joint site in the Moffat Creek area with the City of Cambridge and the Catholic school board (a school identified in the Board's Capital Plan). A new school that has Alison Park area students bused in can be a school for that community for the long-term.

Q - Could Elgin be extended upwards to accommodate gr. 7/8?

A – Yes this is a possibility; however, the Board generally tries to have a minimum of 2 classes per grade level for grades 7 and 8, the Good Schools Standing Committee guiding principals suggest that a minimum of 3 classes per grade is ideal. With Elgin Street's current numbers, it appears the numbers are not strong on their own to support the ideal number of classes.
