



**Grand River South/Sunnyside Elementary Schools Pupil
Accommodation Review
Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee Meeting # 8
June 8, 2010 - 4:30 pm**

The eighth meeting of the Grand River South/Sunnyside Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) was held at Sunnyside P.S., on June 8th, 2010.

Committee Members Present:

Julie Lobsinger, Principal of Wilson Avenue P.S., Dayle Buller-Power, Principal of Lackner Woods P.S., Maria Lotimer, Principal of Howard Robertson P.S., Darren Batt, Vice Principal of Franklin P.S., Heather Preddie, Principal of Rockway P.S., Jeff Lovell, Principal of Sunnyside P.S., Rebecca Jutzi, Vice Principal of Sunnyside P.S., Jane McVeigh, Principal of Sheppard P.S., Stuart Gallacher, parent – Lackner Woods P.S., Naz Ritchie, parent – Lackner Woods P.S., Christine Lassel, parent – Rockway P.S., Jennifer Childs, parent – Sheppard P.S., Bonnie Heimbecker, parent – Wilson Avenue P.S., Kelly Kempel, parent – Sunnyside P.S., Charlene Rushmere, parent – Howard Robertson P.S., Diane Kewley, parent – Sheppard P.S., Richard Briston, parent – Franklin P.S., Robert Dean, parent – Wilson Avenue P.S., Mary Hingley, recording secretary, Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner, Lauren Manske, Planner and Chris Smith, Manager of Planning, for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

Regrets:

Gregg Bereznick, Area Superintendent, Al Watt, Vice Principal of Wilson Avenue P.S., Andrea Michelutti, Vice Principal of Howard Robertson P.S., Ron Dallan, Manager of Capital Projects – Facility Services, Katie Anderl, Municipal Rep – City of Kitchener, Jonathan Blake, parent – Rockway P.S., Edda Kerr, parent – Sunnyside P.S.

1. Welcome/Introductions

Chris Smith, Manager of Planning welcomed members of the ARC and opened the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

2. ARC Meeting # 7 – Draft Minutes Approval

- Mr. Smith asked the group if there were any corrections/concerns with the minutes from the May 18th ARC meeting.
 - No concerns or corrections were raised.
 - Minutes from the May 18th meeting were approved.
 - Mover: Stuart Gallacher
 - Seconded: Jennifer Childs

Mr. Smith noted that we will jump to # 5 on the agenda for a Public Meeting recap first, and then discuss the Draft Review Objectives and School Information Profiles.

3. Public Meeting – Recap – Feedback – Scenarios

Mr. Smith asked the ARC for any comments/thoughts from the Public Meeting that they have heard whether or not they attended.

- An ARC member's husband presented a neighbourhood petition at the Public Meeting stating their opposition to Area X1/X3 being moved to Howard Robertson P.S. from Lackner Woods P.S. in both Scenarios 4 and 5. They felt that they are the area most affected by the proposed changes and felt the petition was necessary to express their feelings.
- Concern from another ARC member's husband that had attended the meeting; the Sheppard P.S. boundary is split at Ottawa Street, with some 7/8's going to Courtland P.S. and some going to Sunnyside P.S.
- The display boards were good, easy to read and helped to show where we go from here.
- ARC member advised that some Lackner Woods P.S. parents had contacted her assuming decisions had already been made. They were advised that it's still too early in the process for that, and info was given about the Public Meeting date/time and location.
- Disappointed with the low turnout.
- There were approximately 28 members of the public present that night.

Mr. Smith noted that the Public Meeting minutes will be posted on the Board's website next week, and for any other information regarding the Grand River South/Sunnyside Accommodation Review, to visit the following link:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/about-us/planning/accommodation-reviews/grand-river-south/sunnyside-elementary-schools-accommodation>

Tonight's ARC presentation can be viewed on the link above as well.

Ms. Manske provided the ARC with a handout detailing all of the scenarios created to date in text/chart form. A few typos were noted and the ARC was asked to adjust their copies.

Mr. Hercanuck summarized the scenario feedback from the Public Meeting:

Scenario 4

- Additional JK-8 accommodation constructed in the southern portion of the review area on a site to be determined. The new school receives Areas Y and Z2 from Sheppard P.S. and Areas Q2, X2, and X4 from Lackner Woods P.S.
- Lackner Woods P.S. receives Areas Z3 and Z4 from Sheppard P.S.
- Howard Robertson receives Area X3 from Lackner Woods P.S.
- The new JK-8 facility provides the senior 7/8 program for its own catchment as well as Lackner Woods P.S.
- Sunnyside P.S. remains open but gives up Areas T, Q1, Q2, X2, X4, Y, Z2, Z3 and Z4 to the new school for its 7/8 program.

Opportunities:

- K-8 model
- Schools better matched with capacity

- Senior schools would go to the same high school (with the exception of Area P that is in Sunnyside P.S.'s boundary, they would go to Grand River C.I.)

Issues:

- Traffic concerns/arterial roads around the new school
- Petition received from some Area X residents opposing move to Howard Robertson P.S.
- Some did not like transition with the K-6 feed to K-8 for senior program

Scenario 5

- Additional JK-8 accommodation constructed in the Morrison Road area. Receives Area Y and Area Z2 from Sheppard P.S., and Area AB from Franklin P.S.
- Lackner Woods P.S. receives Area Z1 from Sheppard P.S.
- Howard Robertson P.S. receives Area X1 from Lackner Woods P.S.
- The new JK-8 provides the senior 7/8 program for its own catchment as well as Howard Robertson P.S.
- Sunnyside P.S. continues to provide the senior 7/8 program for Wilson Avenue, Franklin, Lackner Woods and portions of Rockway and Sheppard public schools. Receives Areas P and T from Stanley Park P.S. eliminating the split feeds from Franklin and Lackner Woods public schools.

Opportunities:

- K-8 model

Issues:

- Lackner Woods P.S. still over capacity
- Some did not like transition with the K-6 feed to K-8 for the senior program
- Loss of transportation to French Immersion program for Area AB
- Both senior schools would have split feed to high school

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the Break Out sessions yielded more general questions than specific discussion of the two scenarios. School sizes, policies/procedures, transportation, programming questions, i.e. French Immersion were among them.

Mr. Smith made the observation that based on the opportunities/issues summary, Scenario 4 fared better.

Q – With the concerns raised about transitioning from a JK-6 school to a JK-8 school, can we look at having Howard Robertson P.S. feed to Sunnyside P.S. for 7/8 instead of the new JK-8 school in Scenario 5?

R – That might make Sunnyside P.S. too big, and leave the new school with a small 7/8 population.

Q – The 7/8 numbers at the new school would be around 210-230, and out of a total school population of 530 that is a pretty healthy balance. Sunnyside wouldn't be too big, the enrolment could be handled.

R – We will look at that modification and bring it to the next meeting.

Q – What about Stanley Park P.S.'s numbers and the transition concern? Can we divert some students there to keep their numbers healthy?

R – One of the scenarios from the other review (Breslau/St Stanley Park) has Stanley Park P.S. closing and building a new JK-8 with JK-6 feeds. We are looking at the JK-8 model in both reviews.

Mr. Smith added that the Board has been working with a JK-8 school model with JK-6 feeds to maintain strong senior 7/8 programs. For example, the new Millen Woods P.S. that opens September 2011 will be JK-6, feeding back to Lester B. Pearson for the 7/8 program. There are very few JK-8 schools with their own catchments (Edna Staebler P.S. being one of them).

C – At least you transition with your peers when you go from a JK-6 to a JK-8.

Q – What about the population at Breslau P.S.?

R – They are heavy in the JK-6 population right now, but those students will move up. Their 7/8 program is small currently and does present a challenge.

Q – Will the Misty Court area of Kitchener (that is currently attending Breslau P.S.) be moving back into a Kitchener school?

R – There are scenarios being proposed that bring them back – but not to the already overcrowded Lackner Woods P.S.

C – Looking at the summary, there are more issues with Scenario 5 than opportunities.

C – The main concern with Scenario 5 is that it does not address the enrolment pressure at Lackner Woods P.S. The numbers are still too high and doesn't solve the problem. Simply put:

- Scenario 4 puts the new school where the kids are
- Scenario 5 puts the new school where the kids used to be

C – Could you make the school at Morrison Road bigger and move the boundaries around?

R – Enlarging and moving the boundaries impacts transportation and you lose the community school feel (one of our objectives).

Q – Is Scenario 4 viable? Is there a possibility of purchasing the property?

R – The property is currently available on the open market; we are waiting for Board approval to proceed further.

C – If we kept Lackner Woods P.S. feeding to Sunnyside for 7/8, the new school could probably support its own catchment.

R – We will modify Scenario 4 to reflect that request.

C – Scenario 4 does do a good job with the numbers, good balance.

4. Draft Review Objectives

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the review objectives will be used as a decision screen for the scenarios once the ARC has narrowed them down and costing details, etc, have been completed. In order to evaluate the scenarios fairly, we will put them up against each objective and gauge them as a meet or doesn't meet. Planning staff have come up with some proposed modifications to the wording in order to ease that process. He added that in avoiding words like consider and review, it will be easier to evaluate the scenarios success.

- Mr. Hercanuck asked the ARC to consider the modifications, and to provide their thoughts/comments.

Current:

- Provide current and future students in the review area with equitable program opportunities to ensure their success by:
 - Having regard for the Good Schools Standing Committee guiding principles on school size
 - Reviewing elementary school organizations (i.e. JK-6, 7-8, JK-8)
 - Recognizing the distribution of Special Education, French Immersion and English as a Second Language programs

Proposed:

- Provide current and future students in the review area with equitable program opportunities to ensure their success by:
 - Having regard for the Good Schools Standing Committee guiding principles on school size
 - Reviewing elementary school organizations (i.e. JK-6, 7-8, JK-8) *Delete line*
 - Recognizing the distribution of Special Education, French Immersion and English as a Second Language programs, *and ensuring they are accommodated with any proposed changes.*

Discussion:

C – It was noted that bullet 2 states *reviewing elementary school organizations* and is in the Terms of Reference for the Accommodation Review process, so may be redundant.

C – We have talked a great deal about the JK-8 and 7/8 school models, and feel the objective is important to keep on the list. The public needs to know that we have had regard for it throughout the whole process.

- ARC agreed by consensus to keep the objective in the list.

C – Adding the word accommodated to bullet 3 may be misleading. The public may think we are referring to transportation for the French Immersion (FI) program. This is a choice program and no transportation is provided for those students. (Current exception: the students in Area AB that are directed to Franklin P.S. which also happens to have FI). If Area AB is directed to another school, and there is a FI student that wishes to stay at Franklin P.S., they would have to provide their own transportation.

C – Change wording to: and *ensuring these programs are accommodated with any proposed changes.*

- ARC agreed by consensus to adjust the wording as above.

Current:

- Support the optimal use of facilities, capital and operating resources through the consideration of:
 - School location
 - Recognize the relationship/identity of community to local elementary school
 - Minimize transportation costs in the long-term by maximizing the number of students within walking distance of a school
 - Facility amenities and condition

- Priorities for physical accessibility of facilities by the Accessibility Committee
- Site
- Safety and security

Proposed:

- *Make the best use of Capital and Operating resources by:*
 - *Maximizing the number of students within walking distance to school*
 - *Maximizing the number of students in permanent accommodation*
 - *Where practical eliminate underutilized space and introduce new facility*
 - *Improve retained facilities (i.e. site, layout, security, access, facility)*

Discussion:

Q – What is meant by: where practical eliminate underutilized space?

R – There may be an opportunity for consolidation, or removing a portapack that is no longer needed.

- ARC agreed by consensus to change the wording as proposed.

Current:

- Develop a solution that is long-term (approximately 10 years) by taking into consideration:
 - Consistency of feeds to senior elementary and secondary school programs
 - Future development plans and demographic shifts
- Consider student transitions

Proposed:

- Develop a solution that is long-term (approximately 10 years) by *taking into consideration (delete highlighted words)*
 - *Creating more consistent feeds between the secondary and senior elementary program*
 - *Addressing future development plans and demographic shifts*
 - *Minimizing the number of student transitions where changes are proposed*

Note that the final objective was rolled up into this proposed version.

Discussion:

Q – Are bullets 1 and 3 different?

R – Yes, we may propose some grandparenting as part of our recommendation, and bullet 3 is really an implementation piece.

Q – We can't touch the secondary boundaries as part of this review.

R – That is true, however we can better align the senior elementary boundaries with the secondary boundaries.

C – For bullet 3, could consider adding: *where practical* minimizing the number of student transitions. When evaluating a scenario, one may have fewer transitions but affect more students; there really are 2 different perspectives here.

C – Could add to bullet 3: Minimizing the number of student transitions ***as a result of proposed boundary changes.***

- ARC agreed by consensus to change the wording as above.

An updated list of the Draft Review Objectives will be posted to the Grand River South/Sunnyside Accommodation Review webpage with the June 8, 2010 ARC Meeting Minutes, once approved.

5. School Information Profiles

- Mr. Hercanuck advised the ARC that the School Information Profiles are complete and have been posted on the Board's website under the Grand River South/Sunnyside Accommodation Review webpage:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/about-us/planning/accommodation-reviews/grand-river-south/sunnyside-elementary-schools-accommodation>

- He also noted that these profiles will play an important role further on in the process. For example, looking at Section 2 – Value to the Board and the Facility Condition Report (FCI). The FCI is a percentage ratio of the estimated repair and upkeep costs over Ministry replacement value. (i.e. if the FCI is 100% the school would cost as much to repair as it would to rebuild).
- The higher the FCI percentage means more work is required at that facility.
- Mr. Hercanuck added that if the ARC wishes, we can have Ron Dallan, our Facility Services representative on our committee speak to these numbers in more detail.
- Ms. Manske also noted that the full consultant's report is available in hard copy if anyone wishes to look at it in more detail.

Mr. Hercanuck displayed a map detailing the French Immersion distribution in the review area. It pinpoints where the FI students currently live.

Q – There was a review done recently of French Immersion in our Board, what were the results?

R – The decision made as a result of the review left the program delivery model essentially as is. They looked into French Immersion only schools (single track) with the help of parent surveys and also looked at the FI hours in the program. No changes were made. The program in this Board is Partial FI, the number of hours in the program do not meet the guidelines for a Full FI program.

C – There seems to be a lot of interest in the FI program in this review area looking at the map.

R – Yes, there is a higher proportion of FI in the Kitchener-Waterloo area than in Cambridge or the Townships.

C – Sheppard P.S. also has a fairly large FI population.

Mr. Hercanuck noted that the walk distance maps for the 2010/2011 school year (reflecting the new transportation distance policy) and the proposed new schools in Scenarios 4 and 5 are posted on the Grand River South/Sunnyside website.

Mr. Smith advised the ARC that Planning will fine tune the scenarios with the suggestions made at tonight's meeting, and bring them back for review at the first meeting in September.

- We will also plan to have a joint meeting with the Breslau/Stanley Park ARC in the fall to share the scenarios/options being discussed.
- The minutes from tonight's meeting will be emailed to the ARC for their review and approval, as well as the updated objectives. That information will then be added to the website.

6. Next Year – September 2010 – ARC meetings – Membership changes

- Mr. Smith noted that there will be some changes to the ARC membership effective September 2010. Jane McVeigh, Principal of Sheppard P.S. is retiring and Trish Starodub will be moving to Sheppard P.S. from Smithson P.S.
- Best wishes went out to Jane and welcome to Trish.

7. Future Meeting Dates:

- Mr. Smith proposed Tuesday, September 14, 2010 for the next ARC meeting. He also asked the ARC if the time (4:30 – 6:00 pm) and meeting location (Sunnyside P.S.) still works for everyone's schedule.
 - The ARC agreed the date/time/location all work. Mr. Lovell advised that Sunnyside P.S. would still be available for the ARC meetings going forward.
- Mr. Smith thanked all for coming and the meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Future Meeting Dates:
Tuesday September 14th @ Sunnyside P.S. – 4:30 – 6:00 pm