



**Breslau/Stanley Park Elementary Schools Pupil Accommodation
Review
Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee Meeting # 15
February 9th, 2011 – 6:00 pm**

The fifteenth meeting of the Breslau/Stanley Park Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) was held at Mackenzie King P.S. on February 9th, 2011.

Committee Members Present:

Gregg Bereznick, Area Superintendent, Pauline Shiry, Principal of Mackenzie King P.S., Darv Easton, Acting Principal – Breslau P.S., Jodi Albrecht, Vice Principal of Stanley Park P.S., Libby Martz, Vice Principal of Lackner Woods P.S., Crysta Fernandez, parent – Stanley Park P.S., Doug Hudson, parent – Breslau P.S., Troy Starr, parent – Smithson P.S., Tracy Jasmins, parent – Mackenzie King P.S., Mark Richardson, parent – Stanley Park P.S., Nancy Allan Catton, parent – Breslau P.S., Janice Scherer, parent – Franklin P.S., Laurie Tremble, parent – Lackner Woods P.S., Anessa Selcage, parent – Franklin P.S., Kathy Waybrant, Community Representative, Mary Hingley, recording secretary, Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner, Lauren Manske, Senior Planner and Chris Smith, Manager of Planning for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

Regrets:

Rob MacQueen, Principal of Stanley Park P.S., Carolyn Griffiths, Principal of Crestview P.S., Jane Pritchard, Principal of Franklin P.S., Ron Dallan, Facility Services, William Grobe, Principal of Breslau P.S., Carolyn Graham, Principal of Smithson P.S., John Scarfone, Township of Woolwich, Brian Bateman, City of Kitchener, Tania Hunter, parent – Crestview P.S., Sean Mahoney, parent – Mackenzie King P.S., Aimie LeRuez, parent – Smithson P.S., Lesley Kraehling, parent – Crestview P.S., T. Ritchie, parent – Lackner Woods P.S.

1. Welcome

Chris Smith, Manager of Planning welcomed members of the ARC and opened the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

2. ARC Meeting # 14 – Draft Minutes Approval

- Mr. Smith asked the group if there were any corrections/concerns with the minutes from the January 12th ARC meeting.
 - No concerns or corrections were raised.
 - Minutes from the January 12th meeting were approved.
 - Mover: Doug Hudson
 - Seconded: Mark Richardson

Tonight's ARC presentation can be viewed on the following link:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/accommodation-reviews/breslau-stanley-park-elementary-schools-accommodation-review>

3. Additional Requested Information

Mr. Hercanuck noted that at a past ARC meeting, a request was made for some costing considerations between Scenarios 1 and 2.

The difference in capital costs between the 2 scenarios has been estimated at \$9.37M. However, also applied to Scenario 2 was an additional \$5.1 M representing anticipated revenue from the sale of the Stanley Park P.S. property, and deferred maintenance that would not have to be completed at Stanley Park P.S. and Mackenzie King P.S. The deferred maintenance included in the \$5.1M represented all the high to urgent priority maintenance items out to 2015 listed in each schools ReCapp report. The ReCapp report identifies the anticipated maintenance needs of the facilities out to 2030.

In addition to the property sale revenue, and deferred maintenance (to 2015), there are other cost considerations that would narrow the gap between the two scenarios.

- Mr. Hercanuck provided handouts for the ARC that detailed Renewal Events by Year and Priority (ReCapp report) for both schools.
- When amortized over the next 25 years the anticipated energy savings are significant. Mr. Hercanuck provided the energy usage and costs for Mackenzie King P.S. and Stanley Park P.S. Also provided was the energy usage and cost for one of the Boards newer JK-8 facilities (W.T. Townshend). It was noted that on a per sq. m basis the energy usage of the newer facility is almost half that of the older Stanley Park P.S. and Mackenzie King P.S.
- Also anticipated are the salary and benefits savings realized from one less facility in the system. It is estimated that the WRDSB would require one less principal, head secretary and custodian.
- Mr. Smith noted that these savings would be reflected in the operating costs, capital costs are a separate area.

4. Senior 7/8 program information – panel discussion

Mr. Smith introduced and welcomed guests to the ARC meeting to talk about and give their perspectives on the senior elementary program delivery in JK-8 and 7/8 schools.

- Brenda Cox-Sangster, Assistant Superintendent of Learning Services – Program, Hannah Kyowski and Claire Waters, grade 8 students from Stanley Park P.S. and Jessa Braun and Thuy Nuygen, grade 8 students from Breslau P.S., and Gregg Bereznick, Area Superintendent was also in attendance.
- Introductions were made around the table.

Mr. Smith advised that this would be an information sharing, informal discussion. The ARC was emailed some research on the topic prior to the meeting for their review.

Brenda Cox-Sangster began the discussion by giving some background on both school models, and advised that she has had personal experience in both, having been a principal of a 7/8 school and a parent of students in a JK-8 school.

- Curriculum for grades 1 – 8 is mandated by the Ministry. (JK/SK not included because they are optional grades). All schools will teach the same curriculum regardless of the building they are in.
- Perception that the 7/8 teachers job is to prepare students for high school, when in fact their job is to teach the curriculum and prepare them academically for high school.
- Rotary in the 7/8 senior school setting could mean that students have 10 teacher contacts over the school year, goal is to reduce teacher contacts so that more time can be spent on task/learning – a percentage per subject is mandated. Ms. Albrecht, Vice Principal at Stanley Park noted that this is already taking place at her school. Teacher contacts have been reduced. The students spend more time with their core teacher – i.e. teaching history and geography along with English, Science as well as Math, etc.
- The last 7/8 senior school was built by the Board in 1977, and it would be a hard sell to build one these days, with the focus being on continuous learning. Senior 7/8 schools also typically have very large boundaries and can dilute the sense of community.
- It was commented that at-risk students are more likely to get “lost” in a senior 7/8 school, can become disengaged and will often struggle more.
- There is a perception that 7/8 senior schools have specialized teachers. All elementary teachers have general classifications; specialization is required when teaching at the high school level. Certainly the 7/8 schools attract teachers that might love phys ed or music and have an interest and willingness to lead extra curricular activities; however, as mentioned there has been an effort to reduce teacher contacts during the day with teachers teaching more than one subject.
- There is a committee at the Board level currently looking into music delivery in K-8 schools. Not all schools have instrumental (7-8 or JK-8), and the Ministry maintains that the curriculum can all be taught through vocal. A parent survey will be going out for feedback.
- Ms. Cox-Sangster concluded that our schools = teachers, administration and the students, the configuration of the building does not/should not make a difference.

5. Roundtable

Q – The Board is still building JK-6 schools that feed into JK-8 or 7/8 schools, still a transition – not everyone will benefit.

R – It does depend on where you live and the school model in the neighbourhood. The Catholic School Board runs only JK-8 schools, however does face challenges with class sizes in grades 7/8. Mr. Bereznick noted that our 7/8 schools help to manage population distribution and provide some flexibility.

Q – How is the transition handled for the JK-6 students that feed into a JK-8, an already established turf for those students?

R – Integration meetings take place - teachers will network about the students. We do need to make this a focus to build those relationships starting in the fall, i.e. getting grade 6 classes together in advance of the move. One advantage is that it's usually a smaller group coming in and the administration and teachers can work with them, it still can be a challenge however. It

was noted that from a 7/8 school perspective that transition can be difficult there as well. Working with the grade 6 teachers (from 7 different schools) to create class lists may look good on paper, but doesn't always work out in reality. It takes time getting to know the students, and you only have them for 2 years. We need students to feel connected to their building and their peers, sometimes hard to do in 2 years. In a JK-8 setting it's helpful for that grade 7 teacher to collaborate with the grade 6 teacher down the hall.

C – Discipline issues are usually more prevalent at the 7/8 senior schools, not as much in the JK-8 environment. Parent involvement in the JK-8 schools seems more prevalent and that helps.

The Principals and Vice Principals on the ARC talked about their personal experiences and gave their perspectives on the different models, as well as handling transitions.

Mr. Smith invited the students from Stanley Park P.S. and Breslau P.S. to talk about their schools and tell the ARC how they feel about the different school models.

Hannah and Claire from Stanley Park P.S.

- Started a Facebook page and a petition to keep Stanley Park open, so that other students could experience the school that they love.
- Feeling that they can talk openly with their peers, without little ones being around.
- The teachers love what they do.
- Were tired of their JK-6 school and anxious to be around kids their age and experience rotary.
- Good extra curricular activities, team sports and clubs.

Jessa and Thuy from Breslau P.S.

- Have grown up in the school, feel safe/secure.
- Opportunity to be role models for the younger students.
- We get to know everyone; there is a family feel, no pressure.
- If you try out for a team, you make the team.

Q – The ARC wanted to know from the JK-8 students about grade 6's coming in – how is the transition, do they stick together and not mix in?

R – No, the students replied they mix right in.

Q – French Immersion students coming into Stanley Park, how is that handled since they generally come from farther away and different schools?

R – The Stanley Park students replied that in their opinion everyone is on a level playing field in that case.

6. Future Meeting Dates

Mr. Smith noted that for the next meeting, Scenarios 1 and 2 will be discussed and the ARC can begin to prepare the Report and Recommendations.

- Public Meeting # 4 has been tentatively set for March 9, 2011, and at this meeting the ARC will share with the public their Draft Report and

Recommendations. The ARC will meet once more after that to discuss any feedback and finalize the presentation to the Board of Trustees.

- Mr. Smith noted that presenting to the Board by the end of March will give the Trustees enough time (taking into account the 60 day waiting/deliberation period) to make their decision by the end of the school year.

Mr. Smith proposed the following meeting dates:

- ARC Meeting # 16 – February 23, 2011 at Stanley Park P.S.
- Public Meeting # 4 – tentative date – Wednesday, March 9, 2011 – location TBD
- Mr. Smith thanked all for coming and the meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Future Meeting Dates:

Wednesday, February 23, 2011 – 6:00 – 7:30 pm at Stanley Park P. S. – Library
Public Meeting # 4 – tentative date: Wednesday, March 9, 2011 – Location: TBD