



**East Kitchener-Waterloo Elementary Schools Pupil
Accommodation Review
Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee Meeting # 4
November 24th, 2009 - 4:30 pm**

The fourth meeting of the East Kitchener-Waterloo Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) was held at Margaret Avenue P.S., on November 24th, 2009.

Committee Members Present:

Ian Gaudet, Controller, Facility Services, Elke Whitmore, Principal of Bridgeport P.S., Kelly Wilkinson, Principal of Elizabeth Ziegler P.S., Janet Hale, Principal of King Edward, Frank Ewald, Principal of Lexington P.S., Brian Ward, Principal of Margaret Avenue P.S., Leisa Kuntz, Principal of Prueter P.S., Darlene Stubbs, Principal of Suddaby P.S. Elizabeth Brown, Development & Technical Services Dept., City of Kitchener, Tara Bridger, parent – Bridgeport P.S., D.L. Brown, parent – Suddaby P.S., Cindy Shirley, parent – Elizabeth Ziegler P.S., Carrie Dawson-Thomas, parent – Margaret Avenue P.S., Amy Stewart, parent – Margaret Avenue P.S., Don Snider, parent – Prueter P.S., Chris Smith, Manager of Planning, and Lauren Manske, Planner for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

Regrets:

Mark Schinkel, Area Superintendent, Gregg Bereznick, Area Superintendent, Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner, Susie Fowler, parent – Suddaby P.S., D. Welsman, parent – King Edward P.S., Laura Dick, parent – Prueter P.S., Kelly Miller, parent – Elizabeth Ziegler P.S., Joanne Davis, parent – Suddaby P.S., Michael Reinhardt, parent – Bridgeport P.S., T. Gilhuly, parent – Lexington P.S., Peter Brown, parent – Lexington P.S., Carolyn Laurie, parent – King Edward P.S., Mary Hingley, recording secretary

1. Welcome/Introductions

Chris Smith, Manager of Planning opened the meeting at 4:35 pm and welcomed members of the ARC. Introductions were made around the table.

- Mr. Smith advised the committee that Trudy Beaulne has had to resign and that we will be seeking another community representative to take her place on the ARC. If anyone has a suggestion, please let Planning staff know.
- Ms. Manske provided the group with handouts of information pieces that had been requested with respect to washroom fixture counts, accessibility summary, French Immersion waiting lists, and school capacities

Q – Are Elizabeth Ziegler and Suddaby the only schools offering French Immersion in the area?

R – Currently, yes. Elizabeth Ziegler is only up to grade 3 this year, and Suddaby is grades 1-6.

2. Meeting # 3 – Draft minutes approval

- Mr. Smith asked the group if there were any corrections/concerns with the minutes from the October 27th ARC meeting.
 - No concerns or corrections were raised.

- Minutes from the October 27th meeting were approved. Mover: Cindy Shirley and seconded by: Lynn Brown.

3. Public Meeting # 1 – Follow-up and Comments

- Mr. Smith observed that there was a good turn out for the first meeting.
- Mr. Smith asked if any one in the group had attended the meeting, and asked those who were in attendance to comment on how they thought it went.

C – The meeting was good, it was well run, and there were some good questions

Q – What kinds of questions?

R – We will be posting the minutes from the meeting on the Board's website if you wish to see a full record of the questions asked.

C – The meeting was mostly a time for information sharing on the ARC process.

4. Ongoing: Draft Review Objectives, School Valuations – School Information Profiles

Draft Objectives

- Mr. Smith noted that we requested comments on the Review Objectives at the Public Meeting, and did receive some feedback.
- There was a critique about the number of objectives, there are too many, and we need to focus them more.
- Mr. Smith showed the ARC an example of how the objectives could be refocused by grouping together 'like' pieces under a single bullet.
- The ARC was shown the following changes to the draft objectives:
 - **To determine long-term boundaries for schools in the Review area, which include:**
 - a permanent solution for Lexington P.S.
 - determine need to keep/utilize the 410 Falconridge Drive, Kitchener property
 - **To determine viability of a JK-8 school in the Review area.**
 - **To have regard for community schools:**
 - which recognize the relationship/identity of community to local elementary school
 - which minimize transportation costs in the long-term
 - **To support optimal use of facilities, capital and operating costs**
 - **To have regard for policies, directions or statements of the Ministry of Education and the WRDSB:**
 - the Good Schools Standing Committee guidelines on school size and ensure well balanced student population
 - distribution and accessibility of Special Education and English as a Second Language programs
 - the Provincial and Board priorities for physical accessibility of facilities

- **Ministry plans with respect to curriculum and program changes (i.e. Early Learning Program, class sizes, etc).**
- **To address student transitions where changes are proposed.**
- Mr. Smith explained that the Review objectives are still in draft format, and these revisions are in response to feedback from the public meeting.

Questions/Comments:

C – The last 3 points are really just guiding principles, and not really objectives.

R - Mr. Smith noted that addressing transitions should not be minimized, as it is really something we NEED to do, but yes, it is not necessarily an objective.

C – I like the new formulation; it makes it easier for us to ‘knock them off.’

Mr. Smith asked the ARC to continue to review the draft objectives and to please bring any additional thoughts back to the table.

School Valuations – School Information Profiles

- Ms. Manske advised that we are still waiting on templates from 3 schools, and some additional information is still being gathered by Facilities staff. We should have completed templates to share by the next public meeting.

5. Preliminary Scenario Development

- Ms. Manske discussed the process involved in developing accommodation options/scenarios and provided the group with the following steps:
 1. Break study area into sub-areas (Areas A-Z).
 2. Determine number of students in each sub-area.
 3. Determine projected number of students in each sub-area: increasing, declining, stable.
 4. Develop options/scenarios based on enrolment numbers.
 - Include possible school closures, consolidations, program changes, boundary changes, construction, etc.
 5. Determine enrolment projections by school based on boundary option(s).
 6. Initial evaluation of option based on Review Objectives and Board’s strategic direction.
 7. Determine cost of implementation.
 8. Determine timing of implementation.
 9. Final evaluation of option based on Review Objectives and Board’s strategic direction.
- Ms. Manske explained that she had already broken the Review area down into sub-areas, and provided the group with a map of these areas. She also provided a break-down of the number of JK-6 and 7-8 students in each area.
- From now on, we will be looking at the Total number of students in each area instead of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) because of the Early Learning Program (ELP).
- Also included in the area totals are students attending a school outside of their home school boundary (OOB) for various reasons (French Immersion, Spec. Ed., ESL, etc.) and

specific numbers of students in French Immersion (FI). FI students may be counted 3 times in these numbers – total number, OOB number and FI number.

- Ms. Manske provided a draft version of projected enrolment numbers for the Greenfield development areas. So far, these are the only areas she has completed projections for, but will bring projections for all areas to the next meeting.

Q – The projected number of students for Area F seems low if there are going to be over 400 units built there.

R – These projections are draft and were calculated using the typical yield we are getting from developments (0.3 students per unit in Single Family Dwellings and 0.25 in Semi Detached and Townhouses). We will look more closely at what similar developments to this one have yielded in the recent past. Keep in mind that these are only Public Board students, and not Catholic, Francophone or Private Board students.

- Mr. Smith walked the group through a way we can look at putting together background enrolment numbers by ‘planning’ pieces – these are similar to what would be ‘assembled’ into scenarios.
- Mr. Smith and Ms. Manske asked the group if they would like to start to develop some scenarios today, or if they would like Planning staff to put together some options to bring to the next meeting, for example an option without a 7/8 facility and one keeping the 7/8.
 - The group decided that they would like Planning staff to bring some options to the next meeting, but would like more than 2 options presented.

6. Roundtable

- Mr. Smith asked if anyone had any questions or comments.

Q – When will we know what sites will be chosen for the first and second stages of the Early Learning Program (ELP)?

R – The Ministry of Education is supposed to get back to us by the end of December for approval of the sites for the 2010/11 school year. Beyond that we are unsure.

Q – Where do the French Immersion students in this area go for 7/8?

R – Elizabeth Ziegler is not there yet, they only have up to grade 3 at this point, but they would be a feeder school for MacGregor and Suddaby students would go to Stanley Park.

C – With smaller 7/8 programs, you do increase your chance of having 7/8 split classes?

R – Probably, depending on actual numbers by grade of course. As a Board, we have looked at JK-6 as feeders to JK-8 or 7/8 schools so that we can have larger congregated programs.

Q – Is it the will of the board to get rid of 7/8 schools?

R – At this point the board has not made a definitive statement.

C – The board hasn’t built a new 7/8 school in many years, but they have converted JK-8’s to 7-8’s.....Margaret Avenue is an example of this.

Q – How does the transition work with a JK-6 feeding an established JK-8, wouldn’t there already be cliques formed at the JK-8 school?

R - There tend to be about as many students feeding the JK-8 as there are remaining, so there are approximately equal numbers of students from each school which makes the transition a little easier.

R – We can ask to get some feedback from administrators on this topic.

C – I support 7/8 schools.

C – There was a lengthy discussion about general ‘pros’ and ‘challenges’ of senior 7/8 and composite JK-8 schools with JK-6 feeders.

C – I am concerned, as well as others, that when there is a 7/8 school and not a JK-8, I will have 3 kids in 3 different schools at one time – JK-6, 7/8 and secondary school.

R – As opposed to potentially 2.

Q – Is there an environmental push from the Board to develop community schools – removing the need for transportation?

R – A lot of Board members support environmental initiatives, there is even a Board Environmental Advisory Committee. Planning and community design tends to look at creating community schools that people can walk to. There are currently a lot of community initiatives to support walking to school (e.g. Active and Safe Routes to School programs – Walking School Bus and Walking Wednesdays) and the Board supports these programs.

C – Mr. Gaudet added that the Facilities Department is looking at efficient building systems.

Q – When looking at scenarios, should we consider secondary school boundaries?

R – Yes. We can provide the group with maps of the secondary boundaries for the area; however, these boundaries are not necessarily static.

Q – Is there a scenario where you would look at 2-3 JK-8 schools in the study area?

R – Yes, we can look at that.

C – I would like to see a scenario that shows Margaret Avenue staying open as a 7/8 school along with building a JK-8 school on Falconridge Dr.

C – I would also like to have a scenario that keeps Lexington open.

Q – Can we have another representative on this committee from the Falconridge Drive area?

R – We will add this request as an agenda item for discussion at the next ARC meeting. We would need to get an agreement from the committee if we were to invite an additional person.

Q – What would be the benefit of having another representative?

R – This area has the most to lose, and Lexington has two voting members.

C – Right now, this area falls under Bridgeport P.S. and there are two representatives from Bridgeport already. It is our hope that we can reach a decision by consensus and would not have to go to a vote; this worked for us in Southeast Galt, but we do recognize this is a different area.

Q – Can we get a map of the neighbouring schools with their capacities and enrolment, as well as which ones have French Immersion?

R – Yes, we can bring that to the next meeting. If there are any other resources you would like, please contact Ms. Manske.

7. Future Meeting Dates

- The next ARC meeting is Tuesday, December 8, 2009 at 4:30 pm at Margaret Avenue P.S. in the library.
 - Planning staff will bring some preliminary accommodation options/scenarios as discussed earlier.
- Mr. Smith thanked all for coming, and asked the ARC to start thinking about options and to bring any ideas to our next meeting.
- The meeting adjourned at 6:05 pm.

Future Meeting Dates:
Tuesday Dec. 8th @ Margaret Ave. P.S. – 4:30 – 6:00 pm
Tuesday January 12th 2010 @ Margaret Ave P.S. – 4:30 – 6:00 pm
Public Meeting #2 – Tuesday January 26, 2010, TBD