



**West Galt Elementary Schools
Pupil Accommodation Review
Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee Meeting #10
April 10, 2012, 5:30-7:30 PM
St. Andrew's Public School Library**

The tenth meeting of the West Galt Elementary Schools Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) was held at St. Andrew's Public School on Tuesday, April 10, 2012.

Committee Members Present:

Karen Tomlin, Principal, St. Andrew's P.S., Wendy Bowker, Principal Highland P.S., Jodie Meyer, Principal, Blair Road P.S., Michelle Schmid, Vice Principal, St. Andrew's P.S., Roy Roethel, Parent Rep., St. Andrew's P.S., Paula Ouellet, Parent Rep., Highland P.S., Hayley Orman, Parent Rep., Highland P.S., Barry Frame, Principal Dickson P.S., Karen Destun, Parent Rep., Tait Street P.S., Kelly Deml, Parent Rep., Blair Road P.S., Bev Fox, Parent Rep., St. Andrew's P.S., Lynn Robb, Parent Rep., Blair Road P.S., Al Potma, Parent Rep., Dickson P.S., Dianne Ray, Parent Rep., Dickson P.S., Trevor McWilliams, City of Cambridge Representative, Dennis Cuomo, Manager of Planning, Andrea Kean, Recording Secretary, and Lauren Manske Senior Planner, for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

Other WRDSB Staff Present:

None

Regrets:

Marcia Lubert, Principal Tait Street P.S., Nick Chiarelli, Vice Principal, Highland P.S., Maura Fuller, Parent Rep., Tait Street P.S., Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner, Ron Dallan, Manager Capital Projects and Lila Read, Superintendent of Education for the Waterloo Region District School Board.

1. Welcome/Introductions

Ms. Manske, Senior Planner opened the meeting at 5:30 pm and welcomed the ARC members.

2. ARC Meeting #9 – Draft Minutes Approval

Ms. Manske asked the ARC if there were any corrections/concerns with the minutes from the March 20, 2012 ARC meeting. No corrections or concerns were noted.

Minutes from ARC Meeting #9 approved without changes.

Moved by: Wendy Bowker

Seconded by: Barry Frame

Ms. Manske noted that hardcopies of the minutes will be sent out to the schools for the school binder and the minutes will also be posted on the Board website at:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/accommodation-reviews/west-galt-elementary-schools>

Ms. Manske led the ARC through the [presentation](#), available on-line at:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/accommodation-reviews/west-galt-elementary-schools>

3. Public Meeting #3:

- **Comments/Feedback** (slide 3 of online presentation)

Ms. Manske noted that approximately 66 members of the community (including children) were in attendance.

Feedback received from comment sheets and boundaryfeedback@wrdsb.on.ca included the following subjects:

Dickson Public School

- Do not close Dickson P.S.
- Concern expressed over splitting up the Dickson students between 4 schools
- Close knit school that needs to stay that way

Proposed Beechwood Road School

- Concern over size of the school
- Concern about possible increase in traffic around site

Highland Public School

- Support for Scenario [16](#) and/or [20](#) to include the Grade 6 program at Highland P.S.

St. Andrew Public School

- Landmark school
- All schools should start at St. Andrew's at same grade (Grade 7)

General

- Hard to hear during Question and Answer session because of unsupervised children.
- Support for [Scenario 14](#) and hopes changes will happen sooner rather than later.
- How will these changes benefit the students?

Ms. Manske noted that she has received a number of letters supporting the addition of the Grade 6 program to Highland P.S. and has put together Scenario 21 to address this request.

Scenario 21 (see slides 5-7 of the online presentation)

- On the ground (OTG) capacity would be under-utilized at St. Andrew's P.S.
- Capacity is somewhat better at Highland P.S. but does not solve all issues.

Q: Wendy Bowker asked how Highland P.S. could accommodate the Grade 6 program given that one of the issues the ARC is dealing with is the over enrolment which the school is currently facing.

R: By doing a boundary change, some of the population at Highland could be reduced; however, because of French Immersion, the addition of Grade 6 would almost certainly require the continued use of portables on site.

Q: Kelly Deml asked if the Highland parents requesting the program change are aware that the school is over enrolled.

- R: Ms. Manske responded that the parents may not have a clear understanding that to be able to implement the Grade 6 program at Highland would require that we shrink the school's boundary; possibly resulting in some of these families being outside the school's catchment area.
- Q: Karen Tomlin asked if it is possible to determine whether the requests are coming from the French Immersion parents or the home school boundary parents.
- R: Ms. Manske noted that should the ARC support adding the Grade 6 program to Highland P.S. it can be discussed further; but the issue remains that there isn't enough room in area schools to take the number of students who would need to be taken out of Highland P.S. to be able to accommodate the JK-6 program there without portables
- Q: Dianne Ray asked if some of these students could be moved to Dickson P.S.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that would be dependent on whether Dickson would be able to revise its room usage plan and whether the ARC would be recommending a long-term solution which would involve having to move these students again in 5 years should Dickson close. Ms. Manske suggested considering this only if the ARC chooses not to close Dickson P.S.
- Q: Lynn Robb asked how many of Highland's students could be added to the Dickson boundary that would be within walking distance to Dickson P.S.
- C: Paula Ouellet commented that moving students to Dickson P.S. would result in taking students from a school with a gym and playground to a school that does not have comparable amenities.
- R: Dianne Ray responded that it is not just about a gym; the Dickson P.S. students do not miss having a gym and get as much gym time as students from other schools; plus they spend more time outside.
- C: Barry Frame commented that he had a student transfer from another school (with a double gym) to Dickson P.S. who when asked, did not miss anything from his previous school and expressed the opinion that Dickson is a great school.
- R: Kelly Deml responded that all school students get to spend time outside; it's the Dickson P.S. school facility itself that is very different in what it has to offer students. She noted that even a small boundary change would still have an impact on those students affected and noted that perhaps the ARC should focus on the big picture, long-term solution. There will be implications no matter what the ARC decides.
- Ms. Manske asked the ARC if we can come back to consider moving students to Dickson P.S. should it decide on a one-phase solution. The ARC agreed.
- Q: Barry Frame asked why the Highland P.S. parents are asking for the Grade 6 program.
- R: Wendy Bowker responded that the Highland P.S. students have to go through 2 years of integration at St. Andrew's P.S. because Blair Road P.S. and Tait Street P.S. students don't start there until Grade 7. Parents would like students to start at St. Andrew P.S. at Grade 7 to reduce the number of transitions they have to go through.

- Q: Ms. Manske asked if the Dickson P.S. community has a similar view considering that the Dickson P.S. students also attend St. Andrew's P.S. for Grade 6.
- R: Al Potma responded that Dickson P.S. parents would also like to stay on at Dickson P.S. for the Grade 6 program.
- C: Haley Orman commented that Highland P.S. will still have portables even with the amount of enrolment pressure that is reduced with either of the scenarios.
- C: Karen Tomlin commented that the ARC needs to decide if we will go with a short-term and long-term plan. We will want to keep change as limited as possible for the short-term. If going ahead with just a short-term solution perhaps then we can look at the best scenario which might include significant boundary and program changes to have all senior elementary students enter St. Andrew's P.S. at Grade 7.
- C: Ms. Manske noted that Hayley Orman had asked about the possibility of reverting back to the 1995 boundary between Tait Street and Highland Public Schools (see shaded area on the map on slide 4 of the online presentation). Ms. Manske advised that the shaded area was moved from Tait Street P.S. to Highland P.S. and moving this area back to Tait Street P.S. would shift the over enrollment issue from Highland to Tait Street P.S. and not solve any other issues in the review area. Some of the scenarios have looked at dividing up the pieces to attend area schools.

Ms. Manske advised that if the ARC is to go ahead with Public Meeting #4 on May 1st we will need to reach a decision tonight on what we will be looking at for a recommendation and whether it will be a 1 phase solution for 2014 or a 2 phase solution for 2017. She noted that if the ARC will be moving forward with a dual phase solution we will need to determine implementation dates for each phase. The draft right now lists 2013 as the earliest implementation date for phase 1 (earliest date we could make any boundary changes) and September 2017 as the earliest implementation date for phase 2. Ms. Manske asked the ARC for comments on the draft dates.

- C: Trevor McWilliams commented that depending how fast things proceed, there could be action in the Cambridge West development area by 2017.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that for the Report, the ARC can indicate that once the developer starts registering plans for this area, the Board will want to consider carving it off as a development area and decide on which schools have the capacity to accommodate that population.
- Q: Ms. Manske asked the ARC if 2017 is too far out for a solution.
- R: Al Potma responded that in his opinion the ARC does not have enough information to make its decision.
- C: Jodie Meyer commented that at the last ARC meeting we went over the Board's process of how long it takes to get funding and it looks like it would likely take 5 years before anything could be built and operational.

- R: Ms. Manske responded that it would not be unreasonable to consider that it could take to 2017, to get everything going.
- C: Dianne Ray commented that at the last Public Meeting it was stated that the very earliest date for a new school could be 2015.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the 2015 date would be possible provided the Board receives funding from the Ministry of Education right away and everything were to move forward without any delays. Given the number of current Board priorities which would likely take precedence over this project, 2015 would be unlikely.
- C: Barry Frame commented that the Provincial Budget recommends closing small schools.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that while the Province is recommending closing small schools it does not give a definition of what is considered a small school and/or the process for closing small schools; we are still awaiting more information/direction on this.
- Q: Al Potma asked why the Board would close a small school that is in good shape and why not build another small school that is expandable in the future to relieve part of Highland P.S.'s issue.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that for organization reasons and economies of scale for building; the Board has decided to not build schools any less than 350 pupil places. We do not have enough students in this area to build another 350 pupil place school and keep all remaining schools open.
- C: Ms. Manske commented that a one-time 'grandparenting' option could be considered to address the Dickson P.S.'s concern to be able to keep that small school community together at another review area school rather than splitting them between 4 different schools. Once a school has been chosen it will be the school you attend and you do not get to choose again. This may also alleviate the concerns of Dickson parents who do not wish their children to attend the larger 650 pupil place new school, allowing them to choose a smaller review area school instead. There would be a form to sign. The ARC does not have to include this option but the Board has offered these kinds of options to alleviate transitions in the past.
- Q: Paula Ouellet asked if a school could run without taking any new Junior Kindergarten students until all grades finished out (phase out the grades).
- R: Barry Frame commented that this might work for larger schools but would be very expensive to run for Dickson P.S. with its low enrolment.
- Q: Michelle Schmidt asked how the Board is able to manage its enrolment numbers when it allows the grandfathering option to multiple grades.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that potentially we could have everyone wanting to attend the same school and we could be overloaded there, but we could minimize that by only allowing the option to the older grades (3, 4 and 5). You risk the possibility of having siblings attending different schools but that could happened the other way as well with any sibling attending St. Andrew's P.S. Alternatively, would we consider a boundary that would have Dickson P.S. students all attend the same school?

- R: Al Potma responded that moving all of Dickson P.S.'s population together to another school might make some parents happier, but is still not ideal.
- C: Dennis Cuomo commented that a boundary that would take Dickson P.S.'s population to the same school (depending on the school) may not be a good long-term boundary for the Board going forward.
- Q: Dianne Ray commented that financially, she does not see why the ARC is considering building a new school right now in light of possible new developments and with 5 viable schools in the review area. She questioned the maintenance costs for Dickson P.S. and whether it would be more economical to build additional classrooms onto current schools rather than closing two schools to build one new school.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the ARC had previously gone over the facility maintenance costs for the review area schools and noted that the costs are based on all the components that are in the building, the site and the building itself and their theoretical useful lifecycle (it does not mean we would have to spend that amount of money in 5 years at the school). We had also looked at the possibility of putting additions onto the remaining schools and were informed that there are a lot of constraints at each of the facilities for various reasons.
- C: Kelly Deml commented that when she joined the ARC she had personally hoped to see Blair Road P.S. become a JK-8 school but quickly realized that would not be the best solution for this area of town. She noted that as an ARC member she is committed to developing the best solution for all students in the review area and noted anyone wishing to have their personal opinions heard should attend the public meetings and lobby their [Board Trustees](#).
- C: Al Potma commented that the ARC is looking at a picture which has not developed yet.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that is why she believes the ARC is considering a long-term solution.
- C: Wendy Bowker commented that ultimately, long-term (after 2025) Dickson P.S. will not be able to accommodate students because it is not accessible.
- C: Dianne Ray responded that Dickson P.S. is not accessible now but there are things that can be done to make it accessible for the future.
- C: Lynn Robb responded that the cost of making Dickson P.S. accessible is not something the Board should do; to take that amount of money and put it into a building that does not have the specialized spaces and serves such a small population.
- C: Bev Fox commented that in light of the recent Provincial Budget, it might be wise to plan on a closure rather than being forced to close by the Province at a later date without a plan for where the population will be redirected.
- C: Paula Ouellet commented that during the school tour Barry (Frame) really pointed out the positives of Dickson P.S. and really sold his school, but the fact remains that there are certain physical aspects of the school which cannot be overlooked going forward.

- C: Bev Fox commented that at Highland P.S. the students that have been spending their entire school experience in a portable instead of being inside a school building and the one hundred plus students that are in the main school building do not have to walk through the snow/rain to go to the washroom. She noted that her daughter had broken her leg and had to be carried back and forth to a portable because she was unable to walk; students housed in portables also become an accessibility issue. The ARC has to do what is right for all the students in the entire review area community.
- C: Wendy Bowker commented that the situation at Highland P.S. has resulted in students having to spend three years in a portable; all of the juniors are in portables because there is no room for them inside the school. The school can only house the JK – Grade 2s. We have the Grade 3s in portables knowing that they will have to stay in the portables for 3 years; that is not fair to the students and the teachers.
- Q: Jodie Meyer asked if the ARC could go back to the question that Ms. Manske had asked the ARC earlier; if we are in agreement as a committee that we are looking at a 2 phase solution for a recommendation.
- R: Ms. Manske asked the ARC if they would like to vote or go around the table for consensus. Noting that consensus is the ideal.
- C: Al Potma commented that the question should be if we agree on the phase 2; and noted that he considers it too early to make that decision.
- R: Karen Destun noted that we are recommending that there be a change that will better accommodate the students and to take into consideration the 2025 accessibility requirement.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that it will ultimately come back to the objectives the ARC set out. By doing a simple boundary change in phase 1 only achieves about half of the objectives.

Phase 1: (boundary change only)

Objectives	Meets	
	Yes	No
To reorganize the JK-5, 6-8 school organizations in favour of JK-6, JK-8 or 7-8.		X
To reduce the number of students currently attending Highland P.S. to better match the enrolment to the school's built capacity.	X	
To reduce the potential for combined grades at schools by moving towards the following criteria (from Board Policy 3002): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JK-6 facilities between 350-400 students (approx. 2 classes/grade) • JK-8 facilities between 500-650 students (approx. 2 classes/grade JK-6, 2+ classes/grade 7-8) 		X
To increase the number of students within walking distances to their assigned school.	X	
To reduce the reliance on portable classrooms for long-term student accommodation.		X
To reduce unused (surplus) capacity by organizing schools and boundaries to achieve utilization rates (enrolment/capacity) that exceed 80% over the long-term (approx. 10 years)		X
To maintain those school buildings that can provide appropriate, purpose- built facilities (Kindergarten rooms, gyms, libraries etc.)		X
To reduce the cost to achieve legislated accessibility requirements by 2025.		X

Phase 2: (new school construction and school closures)

Objectives	Meets	
	Yes	No
To reorganize the JK-5, 6-8 school organizations in favour of JK-6, JK-8 or 7-8.	X	
To reduce the number of students currently attending Highland P.S. to better match the enrolment to the school's built capacity.	X	
To reduce the potential for combined grades at schools by moving towards the following criteria (from Board Policy 3002): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JK-6 facilities between 350-400 students (approx. 2 classes/grade) JK-8 facilities between 500-650 students (approx. 2 classes/grade JK-6, 2+ classes/grade 7-8) 		X
To increase the number of students within walking distances to their assigned school.	X	
To reduce the reliance on portable classrooms for long-term student accommodation.	X	
To reduce unused (surplus) capacity by organizing schools and boundaries to achieve utilization rates (enrolment/capacity) that exceed 80% over the long-term (approx. 10 years)	X	
To maintain those school buildings that can provide appropriate, purpose- built facilities (Kindergarten rooms, gyms, libraries etc.)	X	
To reduce the cost to achieve legislated accessibility requirements by 2025.	X	

Ms. Manske noted that the one objective not met (shaded above) meets the JK-8 portion for the new school but the JK-6 portion is not met at the remaining Blair Road, Highland or Tait Street Public Schools. The enrolment numbers achieved for each of the three remaining schools, while not ideal, they are workable and may result in instances of 1.5 classes per grade at some levels.

Q: Kelly Deml asked, beyond consensus; how the ARC voting process works.

R: Ms. Manske responded that beyond consensus then majority vote would apply.

Q: Hayley Orman asked how often an area can go through an accommodation review process.

R: Ms. Manske responded that the Ministry of Education's guideline suggests that an area not be reviewed again within five years of the completion of an accommodation review; they do have a caveat that suggests that special circumstances could necessitate another review. She noted that current and future priorities and workload for Planning Department staff would not likely allow another review in this area in the next 5-7 years.

Q: Al Potma asked what rules apply when there are extenuating circumstances; can we make a recommendation to come back in 3-5 years because we will have more information at that point.

R: Ms. Manske responded that we could but she is not sure what that would accomplish and asked what other information Al feels is needed.

R: Al Potma responded that the development information, including the aging population who are not selling their homes to make way for younger family buyers.

C: Kelly Deml commented that those types of demographic factors are taken into account in Ms. Manske's enrollment projections and we trust that information and that is why Trevor McWilliams is here as well. If in 5 years the West Galt population explodes in the new

development area, the Board will just build a new school without the need for an accommodation review.

- R: Ms. Manske responded that the area that we are really unsure of, with regard to development, is within Blair Road P.S.'s boundary and we decided that this area could be set apart from the remainder of the schools so Blair Road P.S. could deal with that area itself and it would not affect the other review area schools. She noted that we would be looking at approximately 50 less students if we were to take the Blair Road P.S. Grade 7 & 8 students out of the projections for the area.
- C: Mr. Cuomo responded that these are the issues that Planners must deal with. There is this myth that you will always be able to make a recommendation with perfect knowledge but decisions are made based on what we know at the time, where the development is going, which schools are experiencing pressure. As long as people are having children and moving, the system will always be in a state of change and we will not be able to have a decision that will be perfect forever.
- R: Trevor McWilliams voiced his agreement with Mr. Cuomo's response and noted that the Board does have the benefit of being able to take land in the new development area if it determines the need for a new school to be located there.
- C: Ms. Manske responded that with respect to the remainder of the area south of Blair Road, the City is very limited in terms of what has any potential for any further development and would likely be looking only at intensification projects into the future.
- C: Trevor McWilliams commented that the Municipal Boundary is the limit to Cambridge's development potential.
- Q: How many voting members are in attendance tonight?
- R: Ms. Manske responded that Planning Staff and Principals do not vote. Therefore, 10 out of a possible 11 voting members are present tonight. Ms. Manske noted that the rules state that should the ARC decide that decisions will be made by majority vote instead of consensus; a majority will consist of 50 percent plus 1 of all voting members present at the meeting the day the vote is held. A quorum consists of 50 percent of the voting members of the ARC. A reconsideration vote requires a two-thirds majority of the voting members. We have a quorum tonight.
- C: Trevor McWilliams noted that he will respectfully abstain from voting.

ARC Vote:

Ms. Manske asked the ARC for a show of hands for all in favour of a 2 phase solution.

- **7 out of the 9 voting members were in favour of a 2 phase solution.**
- **Both Dickson P.S. parent representatives were not in favour.**

Result of majority vote the ARC to move forward with a recommendation of a 2 phase solution.

Phase 1 Scenario Discussion:

Ms. Manske asked the ARC which of the scenarios 16 – 21 they would like to recommend for the first phase.

Ms. Manske noted that the ARC had previously decided that Scenarios 16 and 20 were preferred; and did a quick summary of each of the short-term scenarios still being considered as follows:

Scenario 15:

- Best matched projected enrolment to school capacity for each school.
- Moves townhouse complex at Beechwood Road/St. Andrew's Street students from Highland P.S. to Dickson P.S. and moves some of Dickson P.S.'s current students out to Blair Road P.S. and Tait Street P.S. to make room for the townhouse complex students.

Scenario 16:

- Moves same Beechwood Road/St. Andrew's Street townhouse complex students from Highland P.S. and bussed to Tait Street P.S.
- Blair Road P.S. boundary change (taking a portion from the south-end of the boundary to Tait Street P.S.). Affects approximately 21 students.
- Minimal impact to matching projected enrolment to built capacity.
- Small change to Dickson P.S.'s boundary area with no affect to any students. (optional clean-up piece moving to Tait Street P.S.'s boundary)
- Highland P.S. enrolment is not reduced as much as Scenario 20.

C: Karen Destun commented that if the ARC chooses either 16 or 20 which would mean another bus load of students for Tait Street P.S; we will need to address the transportation issues at Tait.

R: Ms. Manske suggested that the Report could make a strong recommendation for the Board to come up with a plan to deal with the transportation issues at Tait Street P.S. given that it is a long-term issue for that school; and that the ARC has identified it as an issue.

C: Ms. Manske noted that in Scenario 20 there would be a large portion of students that would have to move from Highland P.S. to Blair Road P.S. and asked the ARC if any parents had expressed concern that they do not identify with that school community.

R: Jodie Meyer responded that Scenario 16 would seem to have the gentlest impact on students.

R: Ms. Manske responded that if we decide on a short-term solution, we have to consider where we will be moving students short-term and then how they would be affected long-term with 2017 being the next transition; there could be some students who would be caught having to change more than twice (if they go to St. Andrew's P.S. in between). She noted that Scenario 16 would impact the lesser amount of students. The population on the other side of St. Andrew's Street would be included in the boundary for the new school in the long-term; whereas Scenario 20 would be moving all of that population twice.

Scenario 20:

- Blair Road P.S. boundary change (taking a portion from the south-end of the boundary to Tait Street P.S.)
- Boundary change between Highland P.S. and Blair Road P.S. (westerly portion taken to Blair Road P.S. and half of the proposed Grand Ridges Estate population to Blair Road P.S.)
- Transportation implications for the short-term. (students north of Cedar Street would not be eligible for bussing; anyone south of Cedar Street would get bussing)
- Portion of Highland P.S.'s boundary going to Tait Street P.S.
- Brings Highland's projected enrolment below built capacity but still JK-5 facility.

C: Wendy Bowker noted that Highland P.S. has just been given an additional French Immersion (FI) Grade 1 class that will be staying for 5 years. Has this Third FI class been added to the enrolment projections? Any out-of-boundary FI students will likely bring their siblings as well. Highland P.S.'s enrolment projection for September 2012 is 555 students and that does not include late registrations. Scenario 16 only takes away 21 out of Highland and that will not be enough.

R: Ms. Manske noted that she will have to discuss the additional FI Grade 1 class with Learning Services to find out the extent of the numbers coming to Highland P.S. for September. Since she was unaware of this late addition, the projections do not include these out-of-boundary students. Ms. Manske will modify the projections for the next meeting.

Action Items:

- **Ms. Manske to discuss the additional FI class at Highland P.S. with Learning Services**
- **Ms. Manske to modify the projection to include the new FI class at Highland P.S.**

C: Dianne Ray commented that Scenarios 16 and 20 still has Highland and Tait Street P.S. over capacity and Dickson P.S. is underutilized; would we be able to do a boundary change that would better utilize all the schools.

C: Al Potma asked if Dickson P.S. could be able to take on some of surplus enrolment from either Highland or Tait Street. He noted that there are a couple of logical streets that could be moved from Tait Street's boundary, but that would not help Highland P.S.

R: Ms. Manske noted that this would bring the discussion back to the multiple transitions for students. She noted if the objective in the short-term is to get as many students inside the building as possible she would be happy to develop a scenario that tries to accomplish that.

Q: Wendy Bowker asked how Dickson P.S. would accommodate any significant extra enrolment (of 50 students); Dickson only has 1 classroom available and a portable cannot fit on the site.

R: Dianne Ray noted that there would not be a full class coming; but a different range of grades that could be integrated into current classes.

R: Al Potma suggested that Dickson P.S.'s site could hold a portable if it could get approval from the City of Cambridge to locate it on the site's parking lot and relocate the staff parking to Cant Avenue.

- R: Wendy Bowker responded that 50 new students spread throughout the school would be very tight and would likely require an extra classroom if the class-size cap is surpassed at any grade level.
- C: Kelly Deml commented that looking at the numbers and trying to meet the objectives she agrees with coming up with a boundary that better utilizes capacity at each school.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that a solution to help Tait Street P.S. would be to not move any of the Blair Road P.S. students to Tait. That would take 21 students out of Tait Street's projections
- C: Jodie Meyer commented that Scenario 16 does not address the over enrolment issue at Highland P.S and asked if Scenario 20 better addresses those issues.
- R: Wendy Bowker commented that Highland P.S. needs to lose approximately 100 students to eliminate the portables.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that Scenario 20 would leave Highland P.S. with approximately 3 portables which is better than 7 portables short-term.
- C: Kelly Deml commented that her concern with Scenario 20 is the portion of the boundary being moved to Blair Road P.S. and there not being a long-term solution for 5 years until the new school is built.
- Q: Haley Orman asked if any school other than Highland P.S. would have portables under Scenario 20.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that a portable or two might also be required for Tait Street P.S.
- C: Ms. Manske noted that she is curious to know where the new out-of-boundary French Immersion students going into Highland P.S. are coming from (that make up the additional Grade 1 FI class). If they are coming from the other review area schools they would also have an impact on those enrolment projections and would not be included in the redirected students if they are included in any boundary change area.
- R: Jodie Meyer commented that Blair Road P.S. has not been impacted by loss of students to the FI program at Highland P.S.
- R: Wendy Bowker commented that the out-of-boundary FI students are coming from all over Cambridge. Some are coming from Chalmers Street P.S.
- C: Jodie Meyer noted that in the long-term the strip along the top of Highland's boundary moving to Blair Road P.S. could go a long way towards solving Highland's over enrolment problem. She noted that there would be students impacted twice.
- Q: Kelly Deml responded that it just would not make sense to make them change twice in a five year period. She asked if the ARC agreed that it would not be the best part of this Scenario. Should we take a look at Scenario 16 with a boundary change that adds some of Highland's population to Dickson P.S. for the short-term?

Q: Jodie Meyer asked how many students would need to be taken out of Highland P.S.'s boundary to address the over enrolment to make Scenario 16 viable; would 25 more students be enough?

R: Ms. Manske responded that taking 25 more away would leave Highland with 492 for 2013 because the current projection numbers do not include the extra out-of-boundary FI class starting in September 2012.

The ARC further discussed boundary changes to relieve the enrolment pressure on Highland P.S. which included the redirection of the Woodside Avenue area in part.

Ms. Manske asked the ARC if they wanted to **consider a Scenario that would send students to Dickson P.S. from Highland P.S.'s boundary. The ARC agreed.**

C: Dennis Cuomo noted that discussion is needed with Dickson P.S. on how they can theoretically house these students to ensure the ARC does not put forward a scenario that requires a portable for Dickson P.S. (since Barry Frame had to leave the meeting early). He noted that it would be helpful (once we have a boundary determined for Scenario 22) to get an idea of how those students that would potentially be taken out of Highland's boundary, would affect class sizes and if it would mean a reduction to the overall number of classes required. The ARC should see the impact of all these minor adjustments.

C: Wendy Bowker asked that the Scenario 22 information be sent to her so she can determine the impact on Highland P.S.

Action Items:

- **Ms. Manske to develop Scenario 22 to address boundary change to take approximately 40 students out of Highland P.S. and send them to Dickson P.S. (boundary to include the bottom half of Woodside across Victoria to Woodside and below including Osborn)**
- **Planning to discuss with Barry Frame the accommodation options for additional (40 pupil) enrolment under Scenario 22 based on grade distribution.**
- **Once Scenario 22 boundary is developed send to Wendy Bowker to determine resulting class breakdown for Highland P.S.**

Phase 2 Scenario Discussion: (Long-term solution)

Ms. Manske noted the 2nd phase Scenario 14 proposes closing both St. Andrew's P.S and Dickson P.S. and asked the ARC for comments.

The ARC discussed the probability of a new school being built by 2017 is optimistic; but **decided it would be best to have a recommended date suggested.**

C: Mr. Cuomo suggested using the wording "for a planned opening for September 2017"

C: Al Potma suggested moving the date further out to reduce impacts.

R: Ms. Manske responded that families would be impacted no matter when the change occurs, so pushing the date out is not going to make a difference; however, what can be considered is a transition plan.

Q: Kelly Deml asked if the ARC would like to vote on Scenario 14 for the phase 2 solution.

- R: Ms. Manske noted that the ARC can vote on Scenario 14 or can consider something different.
- Q: Dianne Ray asked if we have all the information needed to propose a 650 pupil place schools on the Beechwood Road site; is the 4.7 acres large enough? Do we need 7.7 acres? Do we have an adjacent park?
- R: Ms. Manske responded that there is still some work that will need to be done. We have been discussing with Facility Services' staff and unfortunately we did not receive anything to bring to you tonight, but they are developing a plan that would indicate if we will be able to fit 650 pupil places on that site. It is not a one hundred percent guarantee at this point.
- Q: Dianne Ray asked what happens if the Beechwood site is not suitable for the new school.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that we resort to Plan B which might mean we find another site, or we rebuild a school on one of the current sites.
- Q: Jodie Meyer asked how long it would take to get a definitive answer on whether the site is feasible for a new school.
- R: Mr. Manske responded that it may take two weeks to get an answer.
- Q: Jodie Meyer asked if the ARC could vote on Scenario 14 based on the Beechwood site being feasible and revisit the decision if it is not feasible.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the ARC could vote on it with that condition attached.
- Q: Mr. Cuomo asked Ms. Manske about the wording of the Grand River South – Sunnyside ARC that recommended a new school which the Board has received funding to build.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the Grand River South – Sunnyside ARC Report to the Board specified that the school would open September 2014 and that is what the Ministry approved and what the Board is going with.
- C: Mr. Cuomo noted that the recommendation was for a new school to be constructed on a site that had yet to be purchased by the Board and a project that had yet to be funded by the Ministry. That new school is now scheduled to be opened in September 2014 as set out by that ARC.
- C: Ms. Manske noted that the Ministry of Education is presently requesting boards to submit their list of capital priorities up-to and including 2015 school year. Having a date assigned to the project would allow the Board to submit to the Ministry for funding in the time period it should be considered for funding based on when it will be needed.
- C: Trevor McWilliams recommended having the wording read “no earlier than 2017”.
- R: Ms. Manske noted that the **“no earlier than 2017” wording could be added to the recommendation.**

- C: Al Potma asked if we could add wording that states “based on populations and where they are located at that time”.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that if the ARC is in agreement that a school at that location is appropriate; **the size may be determined at a later date based on numbers.** Funding is based on operating within 5 years of opening at 80 percent capacity.
- C: Trevor McWilliams suggested removing the number of pupil places and just leaving it as a JK-8 facility understanding that the Board has guidelines for what that should look like and sized to what the need is at the time.

4. Draft Report and Recommendations

Grandparenting Options:

Ms. Manske noted that tonight’s handout included a draft of how the ARC Report is typically worded; including standards for boundary changes that identify the effected schools, maps depicting the new boundaries, any ‘grandparenting’ options and any transportation provided for those ‘grandparenting’ options.

- Q: Paula Ouellet asked if the FI students would be offered a ‘grandparenting’ option.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the FI students would be able to stay because FI is a choice program. But if Highland P.S. is no longer the homeschool due to the boundary change transportation will no longer be provided to the FI students unless this is recommended. **Ms. Manske noted that the ARC could indicate this in the Report so that it will be clear to those affected that the French Immersion Program families would be allowed to stay for the program.**
- C: Wendy Bowker would like to clarify that the ARC is definitely not putting the option to change the program at Highland P.S. to JK-6.
- R: Ms. Manske asked the ARC if it has determined that Highland P.S. is not capable of accommodating the JK-6 program in phase 1. **The ARC agreed to not consider the JK-6 program for Highland P.S. any further for phase 1.**
- C: Jodie Meyer wanted to clarify that the ‘grandparenting’ option would only apply for the Grades 6s to finish out at their current school.
- R: Yes. For JK-6 schools the Grade 6 will be offered for those entering Grade 6 in the year of the change. For schools going to Grade 6 will be offered for those entering Grade 5 in the year of the change. For example in Scenario 16 we will have students entering Grade 5 (the year before they need to make that transition to St. Andrew’s P.S.) at Highland P.S. who would be given the option to enroll at either Tait Street P.S. for grades 5 and 6 and then on to St. Andrew’s P.S. for Grades 7-8; or, they could stay at Highland P.S. for Grade 5 and transition to St. Andrew’s P.S. for Grades 6-8. We allow the option to help address the number of transitions. Ms. Manske advised that this ‘grandparenting’ option is very typical of what the Board does to minimize the impact on the older established students that will be transitioning in a very short time period.

Ms. Manske, referring to slide 26 of the online presentation, noted that for the Dickson P.S. students the 'grandparenting' option would differ and gave the following example:

A student enrolled at Dickson P.S. for the 2016-2017 school year (year before the changes take place and the school is closed) is given the option to choose to enroll at Blair Road, Highland, Tait Street or the new school. This would be clarified as a one-time choice. All children entering the school for the first time (including families already living in the former Dickson P.S. boundary area) would have to attend the new designated home school (these new registrants do not get to choose.) A student (JK) may have to be bussed up until 2024 under this option if it were to be applicable to every Dickson P.S. student. This is the maximum amount of 'grandfathering' provision the Board would likely offer.

Q: Michelle Schmid asked how we would prevent an over population at one school, should everyone register for the same school.

R: Ms. Manske responded that the ARC could consider offering the 'grandfathering' option to the Dickson P.S.'s older (Grade 3-5) students only. Keeping in mind that the Dickson students may be split four ways. Their peer groups are small; if no choice of school is offered the result could be that very few grade peers could be sent to the same school.

C: Paula Ouellet commented that regardless of the school the Dickson P.S. students choose, they will have to attend the new school for Grades 7-8; it might be likely that parents would send the older students to the new school, rather than have them transition again at Grade 7.

C: Al Potma commented that in his opinion the Dickson students will all want to go to the same school. It is a tight community and they will want to stay together.

Q: Ms. Manske asked the ARC if they would like to give the 'grandparenting' option to Dickson P.S.

C: Karen Tomlin commented that in order to give the option of choice, the ARC needs to ensure that the schools can in fact accommodate all of the Dickson P.S. students should they all decide to attend the same school. For example, would Tait Street P.S. be able to accommodate them all. Otherwise we should determine which school they will have to attend.

C: Paula Ouellet commented the ARC may want to consider that the option should only be given to the Grades 3-5 classes, which would allow three years for them to acclimate at the chosen school before having to change schools again. Will the younger siblings be permitted to tag along?

R: Ms. Manske responded that generally, when 'grandparenting' is offered, it is only offered for those students in the specified grade(s) and does not include siblings. They would have the option to go to either school; if parents want their children to stay together, the older sibling will have to choose the school to which the younger sibling has been designated to attend.

C: Al Potma commented that would likely mean families will require two daycare providers.

R: Ms. Manske responded that would not be necessary; parents who want their children to stay together will send them both to what is now the new home school.

Q: Paula Ouellet asked if it would be possible to allow the choice to work in reverse as well or could that possibly overwhelm the chosen school?

R: Ms. Manske responded that if the ARC were to recommend that it would have to be a “one-off” situation that would have to be dealt with by a Principal-to-Principal transfer and be at the discretion of the school Principal. It becomes very difficult to regulate once the door has been opened for everyone.

R: Jodie Meyer commented that the Principals are governed by class size regulations at the lower grade levels and often cannot accommodate requests of this nature.

The ARC agreed to offer the ‘grandparenting’ option to the Grades 4 and 5 classes in the year of the change for Dickson P. S. students. Younger sibling will not be offered the choice. The transportation provision will be completed at the end of the 2018-2019 school year.

Ms. Manske noted that the ARC Report will provide all the boundary changes that go with Scenario 14. The ARC agreed.

The Report will also include the ‘grandparenting’ option for JK-6 schools the Grade 6 will be offered for those entering Grade 6 in the year of the change. For schools going to Grade 6 ‘grandparenting’ will be offered for those entering Grade 5 in the year of the change. Not to include siblings.

Early Enrolment Option

Ms. Manske advised that the only option not being considered here is an early enrolment option for a 2016-2017 school year Junior Kindergarten student who would have to spend JK at one school and attend a different school for SK if they are included in a boundary change situation. She asked the ARC if they would like to offer the option for the JK students to register to attend the new homeschool one year prior to the change. **The ARC agreed to add the early enrolment for JK student who will be affected by a boundary change and/or school closure and to include the projections and boundary detailing in the ARC Report.**

Ms. Manske asked the ARC if they would like to offer the students at St. Andrew’s P.S. (should it close) the option to finish out at the school by allowing the school to run for the final year with only the Grade 8s attending. The new school would therefore open as a JK-7 facility in the first year and operate as a JK-8 beginning September 2018. Ms. Manske noted that Lincoln Avenue P.S. has been granted this option and the new Moffat Creek P.S. will open as a JK-7 in September 2012.

Q: Kelly Deml asked if the option was received well by the Lincoln Avenue P.S. parents.

R: Ms. Manske responded that she assumes that they did; only 2 people attended the final public meeting for that accommodation review.

The ARC agreed that this would address the transitions objective for the St. Andrew’s P.S. students and agreed to include the option, to allow St. Andrew’s to remain open to allow the students to finish out, in the ARC Report.

Ms. Manske advised that she will put together all of tonight’s recommendations and the full Draft Report including all the tables and figures and maps that go with what we have been discussing.

At the next meeting the ARC will vote on whether it will go ahead with Scenario 22 as the phase 1 plan and Scenario 14 as the phase 2 plan.

The ARC requested that if the new Scenario 22 is feasible (to move 40 students to Dickson P.S. from Highland P.S.'s boundary), Ms. Manske would send the Scenario to the ARC electronically prior to the next ARC meeting

The ARC agreed to meet to review and vote on Scenario 22 and Scenario 14 and to go over the Draft Report in full prior to Public Meeting #4. Ms. Manske will indicate ahead of schedule that the ARC will be voting. For those members not able to attend the next meeting, Ms. Manske will provide the information of what the ARC will be voting on ahead of time to allow those members the opportunity to vote electronically.

C: Al Potma indicated that he is unable to attend the April 24th meeting and is not happy about having to vote electronically.

Action Items:

- **Ms. Manske to indicate to the ARC prior to when a vote will be taking place and to provide information to be voted on to the members unable to attend the meeting so they may vote electronically.**
- **Ms. Manske will send Scenario 22 to the ARC electronically if it is feasible.**

5. Public Meeting #4:

- **What is presented?** - To be determined at ARC meeting #11
- **Format** – To be determined at ARC meeting #11

6. Future Meeting Dates:

Post meeting Ms. Manske cancelled the meeting scheduled for April 24th as well as Public Meeting #4. The revised meeting schedule is as follows:

- ARC Meeting #11 - May 2, 2012
- Public Meeting #4 - to be determined
- ARC Meeting #12 - to be determined

7. Roundtable/Wrap Up

Ms. Manske thanked the ARC for coming and Paula Ouellet for providing treats and the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.