



**West Galt Elementary Schools
Pupil Accommodation Review
Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee Meeting #11
May 2, 2012, 5:30-7:30 PM
St. Andrew's Public School Library**

The eleventh meeting of the West Galt Elementary Schools Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) was held at St. Andrew's Public School on Wednesday, May 2, 2012.

Committee Members Present:

Karen Tomlin, Principal, St. Andrew's P.S., Jodie Meyer, Principal, Blair Road P.S., Michelle Schmid, Vice Principal, St. Andrew's P.S., Marcia Lubert, Principal, Tait Street P.S., Nick Chiarelli, Vice Principal, Highland 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., 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:

Wendy Bowker, Principal Highland P.S., Bev Fox, Parent Rep., St. Andrew's 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 5:40 pm and welcomed the ARC members.

2. ARC Meeting #10 – Draft Minutes Approval

Ms. Manske noted that Karen Destun had emailed corrections to pages 3 and 7 (typos) and pointed out an incomplete response on page 10 which Ms. Manske revised. Ms. Manske asked the ARC if there were any other corrections/concerns with the minutes from the April 10th ARC meeting. No other corrections or concerns were noted.

Minutes from ARC Meeting #10 - approved with changes noted above.

Moved by: Karen Destun

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. Beechwood Road Site (slide 3 of the online presentation)

Ms. Manske advised that she had discussed the proposed new school on the Beechwood Road site with the City of Cambridge (led by Trevor McWilliams) and the Board's Facility Services staff to determine whether the Beechwood Road site at 4.7 acres (and not the previously report 4.9 acres) would be appropriate for building a 650 pupil place school.

The following site issues and options to alleviate those issues were noted as a result of the consultations:

- Southwood Secondary would lose the use of the site as an additional practice field which they use on a regular basis and is included in their gym time. (*Southwood SS currently has 3 playing fields for use – two fields is the norm for a secondary school*)
- The project will require cooperation between the Region of Waterloo, the City of Cambridge and the Board to work – (*because of neighbouring properties/uses*)
- Would be a lot of wear and tear on the site with 650 students using the small site. (*the use of artificial turf may help alleviate this concern*)
- Would require creative design to deal with the traffic flow concerns with the approximate 200 foot frontage. (*Possible to build the school 3 stories to reduce building footprint on site and/or look at joint parking with the City of Cambridge or child care operator*)

Result:

The Beechwood Road site, while it would be challenging, would not be impossible to hold a 650 pupil place school; site would be ideally better suited for a smaller school. The site is zoned for Institutional and Residential (N1R5 zoning) and will not require an amendment to City Bylaw for construction of a school on the site.

- C: Jodie Meyer noted that if we are looking at less than 650 pupil places for a JK-8 facility the optimal school size (as outlined in [Board Policy 3002](#)) may be difficult to achieve.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that we may have to consider building the school as a JK-6 and asked the ARC if we should look at maintaining St. Andrew's P.S. for the 7-8 program; or look at Southwood Secondary as another alternative for the 7-8 program.
- C: Kelly Deml suggested keeping St. Andrew's P.S. as a 7-8 facility to alleviate bussing the students from that area to the new school as it appears that most of the bussing to the new school would come from the 7-8 students who could attend St. Andrew's P.S.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that she has put together an additional scenario - Scenario 23, which includes the option of keeping St. Andrew's P.S. open to offer the 7-8 program.
- Q: Paula Ouellet asked if there is another location available to build the new school on that would be better suited.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that there isn't another location that would be in an ideal location to serve the community that requires a school. The Board could consider new planned subdivisions but the location would not be ideal for the West Galt community.

- Q: Barry Frame noted that Highland P.S.'s over enrolment seems to be the focal point of this review and asked if the ARC could look at building a 2nd storey addition at Highland P.S.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that the construction work has already begun on the Full Day Kindergarten addition at Highland P.S. and there was not any money allocated by the Province to build the infrastructure for a 2nd storey.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that for Highland P.S. to be able to accommodate its enrolment with an addition would also require a bigger gymnasium and additional parking. There are other implications to this review besides Highland's issues and an addition at Highland P.S. would still leave a more densely populated area under serviced (they will never have a walk-in school). Building a new school on the Beechwood Road site would allow a greater number of students to be able to walk to school.
- Q: Paula Ouellet asked how many parents are allowing their children to walk to school, noting that personally she drives her children.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that parents should be given the option to allow their children to walk.
- Q: Hayley Orman asked what the benefit would be to have another JK-6 school in West Galt.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that a new JK-6 school would better align the schools to the population in the community so that all areas would be serviced by a school.
- C: Barry Frame commented that building another JK-6 school will result in every review area school being underutilized.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the enrolment projections will have to be looked at; and noted that the utilization numbers can be misleading; In Scenario 22, Dickson P.S. is listed at 88 percent utilized but is in fact using every one of its 4 classrooms. It can be argued that Dickson is in fact being 100 percent utilized.
- Q: Barry Frame asked if the Board would build a JK-8 at 450 pupil places.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that it would not likely meet the criteria in Board Policy 3002. She has developed Scenario 23 because of this. St. Andrew's P.S. is below capacity in Scenario 23 and noted that there are other options for using this surplus space and perhaps it can be used to house the components needed to achieve the accessibility option.
- C: Jodie Meyer commented that the Board can use surplus space for other options including congregated Spec. Ed. classes.
- Q: Trevor McWilliams asked if the Ministry of Education provides a discount to school boards for using existing space.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that all funding is based on a per pupil basis, i.e., how many students the Board has enrolled at its facilities, so no discount or dollars based on utilization, only operational efficiencies.

- C: Al Potma commented that in his opinion it would not make financial sense for the Board to build a school smaller than 650 pupil places.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that when doing construction projects the Board receives more funding dollars per square foot for renovations versus for a new building.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that there will be a tradeoff to building a 350 pupil place building versus a building of 650 pupil places in regards to specialized spaces but noted that he does not consider it to be prohibitive financially. (Funding formula is the same for both a 350 and a 650 pupil place school)
- Q: Hayley Orman asked if all other schools have two gymnasiums and how often does the Board review schools to determine if the gym situation is adequate.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that when we are constructing schools, enrolments over 400 pupils would be considered as candidates for a double gym (for programming needs), but it is not mandatory and does not mean that the school will get a double gym as there are other factors to be considered as well. As for existing facilities, there is a list of schools that have been brought forward for consideration. Highland P.S. has been identified because its capacity will be over 400; however, it is likely that a better solution would be to adequately reduce enrolment to negate the need.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that although Highland P.S. is on the list, there are other schools that have a higher priority. While Highland P.S. is on the list because its need was recognized; it does not mean it will be approved. The Board is allocated approximately \$8 million per year to be used for various program driven construction projects and given the other program priorities, may only be able to complete one or two gymnasium projects every few years.
- C: Ms. Manske advised that the cost of a new Beechwood Road site school at JK-6 with 340 pupil place capacity would be in the area of \$6.3 million; approximately half the cost of a JK-8 / 650 pupil place capacity facility.
- Q: Dianne Ray asked if the \$6.3 million would be the total cost and if the Board would have to find any extra money needed elsewhere.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the funding for new school construction comes from the Ministry of Education which determines where all the tax dollars earmarked for education funding are allocated. Operational funding to school boards is based on the number of students enrolled within a board on a per pupil basis (with regional factorization). The Waterloo Region District School Board's enrolment has been increasing over that past number of years and therefore our budget allocation has been increasing. This is the budget you hear about in the paper, the one that Trustees help to set. The funding for school capital (new construction) is a totally separate process which is in the process of being reconfigured. For the interim, until the Ministry finalizes a new Funding Model, the Board will have to submit a business case to justify its needs on a project-by-project basis to the Ministry which is the case for all capital construction project requests. The Ministry has their list of criteria that they consider and share out the funding to boards based on the projects that meet their somewhat undisclosed criteria. The most recent funding received from the Ministry in June 2011 seemed to be in response to the Board's growth related needs.

- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that if the Board goes over the amount allocated from the Ministry for the new school then the Board would have to pay out of its own resources. (Which would likely be Proceeds of Disposition – money collected from the disposition of properties.)
- C: Al Potma commented that the new school will still have to have a library and a gym and questioned the accuracy of the cost.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the cost for these specialized spaces is incorporated in the benchmark cost for the new school. A smaller school will have a single gym but may cost more proportionally for such items as architect fees, whereas the larger school will have a double gym but cost proportionally less for fees. Ultimately, it equals out and it will cost the same per square foot to build for 340 or 650 therefore the funded cost for the smaller school would be half of the larger school.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that the Ministry's benchmark formula works better at the 650 size and tender prices tend to come in lower than that amount on larger projects. There are many boards in the province that build schools from 340-400 pupil places within that benchmark, including this Board. (Examples: Grand View P.S. and Ryerson P.S.)
- C: Trevor McWilliams commented that the Board does build new schools and this proposed school on Beechwood Road would not be a first.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the Board is currently building 2 new schools at 650 pupil places funded for \$12 million each.
- C: Mr. Cuomo responded that the Board has approved a new JK-6, 325 pupil place school for Falconridge Drive in Kitchener. This new school would have the potential to add the 7-8 program if enrolment should warrant at a later date. The other size criteria is directed at the programming that determine the number of classes per grade that is optimal which can also be achieved in a 350 pupil place JK-6 school.
- Q: Jodie Meyer asked what the solution for the West Galt area would be for the interim if the ARC choses to precede with Scenario 23 and a 2017 implementation date.

4. Scenarios:

- [Scenario 23](#) – Yea or Nay?

- R: Ms. Manske responded that we should first decide if the ARC is in favour of further consideration of Scenario 23.
- R: Dianne Ray responded that she is not in favour of Scenario 23. She would like the ARC to consider how many of the approximate 108 students out of the 245 Highland P.S. French Immersion (FI) students are attending from out-of-boundary that can be grouped (to their home school) to see if numbers would warrant setting up a new FI program at the home school with the possibility of moving these out-of-boundary students out of Highland P.S. to alleviate the over enrolment pressures. The 108 out-of-boundary FI students are almost a quarter of the population of the entire school. She noted that in her opinion some of the FI program issues could be solved if there were better education of parents on the FI registration process on how to campaign for the program at their home schools by selecting the home school as the first choice.

R: Ms. Manske responded that she had discussed the French Immersion Program requirements, and the possibility of starting a new program at Blair Road, Tait Street or Dickson P.S. with the Board's Learning Services staff. Learning Services staff indicated that there is no interest in starting a new FI program at any of the other review area schools on the basis that:

- West Galt area school's Kindergarten enrolments (currently sitting at 1-2 classes/grade) would only be able to support the FI program at the detriment of the regular stream (English) program (enrolment would not be able to support both programs i.e., 18 home school boundary students are needed for the FI program to be considered; which may leave less than ideal number of students in the English program).
- FI program enrolment tends to decline as the program progresses through the grades; therefore the minimum of 18 students is not ideal. (i.e., a Grade 1 class may start with 20 students and graduates in Grade 6 with only 14)
- There is no surplus space at any of the West Galt schools. Any new school considered for implementation of the FI program would need to have the space to provide it.

Approximately 30 of the current out-of-boundary students that have been admitted to Highland P.S. for the FI program are coming from the home school boundaries on the east side of the Grand River. There are not enough students coming from each school to afford starting a FI program at those schools. Since, there is no FI program being offered on the east side of the river, the priority for Learning Services would be to offer a program on that side of Cambridge. Learning Services indicated that they would do their utmost to cap the Highland P.S.'s FI program combined with a freeze on any out-of-boundary registrants may be considered to address Highland P.S.'s over-enrolment issues going forward.

Ms. Manske noted that while the policy states 18 students are needed for the FI program, there are more requirements that have to be met for the program to be implemented to achieve a good balance of programs (French and English) at the school.

Q: Paula Ouellet asked if the new Moffat Creek P.S. being built on Myers Road will be considered for the FI program.

R: Ms. Manske responded that Learning Services suggested that Moffat Creek P.S. might be a better alternative to host the FI program and may likely have the space available to be able to accommodate out-of-boundary requests.

- **Scenario 22 – Yea or Nay? (Slides 4-6 of the online presentation)**

- Ms. Manske noted that Scenario 22 would bring some of Highland P.S. boundary to Dickson P.S. and Tait Street P.S.
- Blair Road P.S. would retain the Shep's (Riverview Settlement area) subdivision students for the interim.
- While this scenario does get the enrolment numbers down, Highland P.S. would still remain a JK-5 in terms of enrolment distribution to classroom use. There would still be portables required.
- This scenario would also require portables to be added to every other review area school as well to accommodate the growth from boundary changes.
- There is the potential to have to move the affected area students multiple times when they move into the long-term solution. Moving from Highland to Dickson/Tait Street and in 2017 moving back to Highland and with a possible additional to St. Andrew's for the 7-8 program under Scenario 23. A further complication is that Tait Street P.S. is the last to implement the

Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) program; with 2014 as the implementation date, we could be moving JK students from the FDK program (Highland P.S.) to a school without (Tait Street P.S.). Would that be fair to those students? What are the implications? If we do a phased-in implementation, it can result in siblings split between schools.

Ms. Manske noted that in her opinion, there isn't a short-term solution that will ultimately benefit the students and the community. She asked the ARC for their comments and told them to feel free to disagree with her.

- Q: Barry Frame asked if Status Quo until 2017 would be the solution.
- C: Marcia Lubert suggested pushing up the implementation date for the new school to as soon as possible.
- Q: Al Potma asked which type of project (new school or an addition on to a school) would the Ministry responder faster to.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the Board does not know exactly what the Ministry's criteria for funding are.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that the Ministry's latest request for capital submission hinted that accommodation for new growth is the top priority. If there is an area that does not have surplus space and the request is for a new school to accommodate students where there isn't a school we may be more likely to get the Ministry's attention.
- Q: Karen Destun asked if West Galt would fit that description.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that it would depend on how well we make a business case for the new school in the area where West Galt does not have a school and there is no room at existing area schools to accommodate these students. We have to make them understand why rearranging the location of schools is needed to accommodate students that do not have a school in their neighbourhood.
- C: Kelly Deml responded that the over population at Highland P.S. would also support the case as would the new school being within walking distance to its population.
- Q: Hayley Orman suggested that the ARC put forth two recommendations and have the Trustees decide which recommendation to approve:
1. Additions/renovations to all schools that need to accommodate enrolment with status quo boundaries, (including adding Grade 6 to Dickson P.S. and Highland P.S.)
 2. New school on the Beechwood site with boundary changes.
- Q: Jodie Meyer asked if the Trustees would say that it is the ARC's job to come up with the best recommendation.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that if the ARC can come up with 2 scenarios that will equally benefit students and the community we can leave it in the hands of the Trustees to make the ultimate decision. We will have to give the pros and cons for each recommendation we can take that approach, indicating that we have consulted with the community.

Q: Hayley Orman asked if the Trustees will do what the ARC has decided.

R: Ms. Manske responded that since the new Accommodation Review Policy came into effect in 2007, staff and the Trustees have not gone against an ARC's recommendation. In our experience, this Board respects the work of an ARC and has accepted the ARC's recommendations for the past four accommodation reviews. It is important to note that the Trustees look to the ARC for guidance.

Q: Ms. Manske asked the ARC their thoughts on Hayley's suggestion of putting forth two recommendations for the Trustees to decide between; and what we might be looking at in terms of additions at the schools.

C: Dianne Ray commented that in her opinion making additions to the current schools and dealing with some of the other minor issues would be the best solution.

Ms. Manske advised going back to the objectives looking at Status Quo with the necessary accommodations (additions/retrofits) to determine how many of the objectives would be met if the boundaries were maintained and additions/retrofits were done to the facilities to accommodate adding Grade 6 to Dickson and Highland (New Scenario 24). Results on how the newly proposed **Scenario 24** meets the Review Objectives below:

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

C: Dianne Ray commented that the Dickson P.S. community has indicated to her that they would be willing to fund raise to come up with the money to pay for an elevator.

R: Ms. Manske responded that the Board would not expect the community to fund raise, nor is she sure it is allowed; therefore, the Board would have to pay for the installation of an elevator in any of its buildings.

Q: Hayley Orman asked if it would be possible to get the costing for an addition to right size Highland P.S. to its enrolment.

R: Mr. Cuomo responded that Facility Services staff will have to provide that information.

- C: Marcia Lubert commented that Facility Services staff had attended [ARC meeting #7](#) to discuss related issues including the results of a maintenance audit and the higher costs involved when doing maintenance on heritage buildings.
- C: Jodie Meyer commented that it is her understanding, from information provided from Facility Services staff, that none of the review area schools are good candidates for additions.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the ARC had initially discussed with Facility Services what it would require to make all schools JK-8 facilities (requiring school capacities to be bumped up to 600 pupil places to accommodate the 7-8 program); Facility Services had determined that site sizes and buildings were not best suited for this solution. We can ask the questions again and also inquire about the cost involved for developing purpose-built spaces at Dickson P.S.
- C: Jodie Meyer commented that the Trustees may ask why a scenario that has not equally met the objectives is even on the table.
- C: Trevor McWilliams commented that Scenario 23 makes a recommendation for the entire West Galt area and in his opinion the ARC should support a recommendation that is most appropriate for the area as a whole.
- Q: Al Potma asked who put together the objectives for the accommodation review.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the draft objectives were developed by the ARC from the list of review area issues and Board reference criteria. The [draft objectives](#) were brought forward at the [2nd public meeting](#) (on March 1, 2012) to the community with a request for feedback. No public feedback was received on the objectives though they were discussed at the public meeting and posted online on the website. The [objectives](#) were then finalized by the ARC and are used as a check list for scenario assessment.
- Q: Al Potma asked if the ARC feels that these objectives are still appropriate given the possibility of recommending additions versus new school scenarios. The additions may cost less than building a new school.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that the ARC had discussed criteria for cost but decided that it was more important to come up with the best solution for the issues of the review area regardless of the cost. Even if we were to add a cost objective, the objectives are not weighted as one being more important than another. Ideally the best solution would meet as many of the objectives as possible.
- C: Marcia Lubert commented that the ARC's recommendation(s) will provide a list of costs which the Trustees can consider when making their decision.
- C: Al Potma commented that in his opinion, the ARC is trying to correct issues that revolve around one school and its over-crowding.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that Highland P.S.'s enrolment is an issue but it is not the only issue in the review. There are several other issues that have been identified. She shared with Al the [issues list that was developed on November 15, 2011](#).

- Q: Dianne Ray asked if the ARC is building a smaller school why can't we keep Dickson P.S. open and build a new smaller school.
- R: Jodie Meyer responded that looking at the [Status Quo](#) enrolment projections, year 2016 has Dickson P.S. with 5 classes of students and 64 percent capacity, which will likely result in multiple triple combined classes which do not benefit students.
- C: Ms. Manske responded that the ARC should discuss program size and benefits to students. Status Quo would result in Highland P.S.'s enrolment over 550 students - how does that affect students? Highland P.S.'s facility as it stands right now, does not support the accommodation of that number of students. That is a really big school for a JK-5. The disadvantages/non-benefits to small schools (which would include Dickson, Blair Road and Tait Street Public Schools) have fewer students in a grade which often results in combined classes, fewer teachers and staff for extracurricular activities and those staff tend to be overloaded; (it is important to note however, that combined grade classes are not unique to small schools, the larger schools can also have combined classes depending on how the numbers work out for each grade). The smaller school's students may be missing out on opportunities that can be offered at larger facilities. As [Board Policy 3002](#) suggests, the ideal size for a JK-6 school would be between 350-400 students, with less likelihood of having combined grades, and with more likelihood of benefitting from additional resource dollars based on a per pupil basis funding (i.e., Library resources). When it comes down to funding, it is more beneficial to have fewer facilities.
- Q: Ms. Manske asked the school principals what other benefits a smaller school may be missing out on.
- R: Karen Tomlin responded that often smaller schools do not have the number of students necessary to benefit from full-time Library Technicians, EYW, Educational Assistants and Spec Ed Resource teachers, which are often shared among the smaller schools.
- C: Al Potma commented that Dickson P.S. is doing better than the average when it comes to Special Education Resource teachers.
- R: Jodie Meyer commented that the Board looks at more the enrolment numbers when looking at Special Education Resource Teacher (SERT) support. The school demographic and historical need is considered as well; this is likely why Dickson P.S. has a good allocation of SERT support.
- Q: Hayley Orman asked about adjusting Highland P.S. boundary to move the section of Osborn Street students to either Tait Street P.S. or Dickson P.S. boundary. They would be within walking distance to Dickson P.S.
- R: Ms. Manske asked the ARC if it would be appropriate to move students multiple times. If the ARC recommends a change for 2013 school year, a student could potentially move from Highland P.S. to Tait Street P.S. then to the new school and further to St. Andrew's P.S. Other affects would likely include moving students out of a Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) program to a school that does not yet offer the program (i.e., Tait Street P.S. will not offer FDK until September 2014). The area being discussed would likely contain too many students to be accommodated at Dickson P.S. or at Tait Street P.S. and may not have the impact on Highland P.s. that the school needs.

Ms. Manske asked the ARC if they are at the point where they would like to make some decisions. **The ARC indicated that they were ready to make some decisions.**

C: Ms. Manske noted that Maura Fuller had sent in her comments on Scenario 22 via email and had indicated that she was pleased with the scenario but noted her concern with the extra bussing required for students redirected to Tait Street P.S.

Ms. Manske advised the ARC that 2 of its voting members are absent this evening (Maura Fuller and Bev Fox). She asked the ARC if they would be voting as opposed to consensus. **The ARC agreed that a vote was necessary.**

The ARC was asked “should a vote be really close, and if everyone agrees, the absent members can give their vote by telephone; if the absent member’s vote would not make a difference to the result, those members would not need to vote?” The [ARC Terms of Reference](#) states that a majority vote is 50 percent of the Quorum plus 1; therefore a tied vote is considered a lost vote. **The ARC agreed.**

Q: Ms. Manske asked the ARC if they still wanted to do a 2 phase recommendation. She asked the voting ARC members if they would like to vote on a 2 phase recommendation. (Short-term initial boundary change which may or may not have been considered yet) and (long-term solution; new school or additions).

C: Jodie Meyer asked Ms. Manske if in her personal opinion as a Planner, all boundary changes being considered for the short-term would resolve the issues of the area.

R: Ms. Manske responded that, in her opinion as a Planner, the boundary changes do not efficiently resolve the issues for West Galt.

New Scenario 24

Q: Hayley Orman commented that she had suggested bringing forward 2 scenarios as recommendations to the Trustees: the Status Quo with additions, and the new school.

Q: Kelly Deml asked why the ARC should consider the Status Quo with additions considering that we had determined earlier this evening that it does not meet 5 of our Review Objectives; why would we present that recommendation to the Trustees?

Ms. Manske advised that considering that there will not be consensus due to varying opinions she noted that it would be worth taking a vote on whether the ARC should proceed further with the development of Scenario 24.

ARC Vote on further development of Scenario 24:

Ms. Manske asked the voting members of the ARC for a show of hands of all those in favour of further exploring, as an option Scenario 24; with Status Quo for boundaries and enrolment and doing the renovations/additions required to make Highland P.S. and Dickson P.S. schools JK-6 and St. Andrew’s P.S. 7-8 and to keep all 5 review area schools open.

- **4 out of 8 voting members were in favour of further exploring Scenario 24.**

As a result of a tie vote (which is a lost vote) Ms. Manske asked the ARC members if they are in agreement with her contacting the absent voting members to request their vote. The ARC agreed

and suggested that it required a telephone conversation has opposed to an email to better explain Scenario 24 details.

Ms. Manske advised that a reconsideration vote could be held if a two-thirds majority of the voting ARC members are in agreement.

Action Items:

- **Ms. Manske to contact absent members for vote and email out results of vote to the ARC.**
- **If result is in favour of Scenario 24 development, Ms. Manske to begin development prior to next meeting.**

Final Result of vote (includes absent members): 5 in favour and 5 not in favour.

Tie Vote (Lost Vote)

- **As a result of a tie vote the ARC decided not to further consider Scenario 24.**

Q: Barry Frame asked if the ARC decides not to explore Scenario 24 further, where do we go from here?

R: Ms. Manske responded that the ARC needs to make a decision of whether to proceed with a 2 phase solution or a single phase solution.

- **Scenario 23 – Yea or Nay? (Slides 10-12 of the online presentation)**

Results on Scenario 23 meeting the Review Objectives as follows:

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	

Q: Jodie Meyer asked if the ARC would be voting on Scenario 23 this evening which retains Status Quo but expedites the construction of a new school on Beechwood Road, pushing the construction date up to as soon as possible.

R: Ms. Manske responded that the ARC can vote on Scenario 23 as another recommendation should the ARC decide to bring forward two recommendations forward.

The ARC decided to move forward with a vote to continue to look at Scenario 23.

ARC Vote on further consideration of Scenario 23:

Ms. Manske asked the voting members of the ARC for a show of hands of all those in favour of further exploring as an option Scenario 23; with Status Quo until a new school can be built on the Beechwood Road Site with a recommended date of as soon as possible for the new school construction. St. Andrew's P.S. would remain open as a 7-8 facility. Dickson P.S. would close.

- **6 out of 8 voting members were in favour of further exploring Scenario 23.**
- **Both Dickson P.S. parent representatives were not in favour.**

As a result of the vote the ARC will continue to consider Scenario 23.

Ms. Manske asked the ARC if they would like to continue to explore any of the other scenarios that had been previously discussed.

Scenario 14:

C: Jodie Meyer commented that as a non-voting member of the ARC, Scenario 14 looks less appealing now that we know that the Beechwood Road site is not best suited for building a JK-8 school.

Result:

The ARC decided not to further consider Scenario 14. (Consensus)

Scenario 22:

A short-term boundary change solution which involves moving students multiple times.

C: Jodie Meyer commented that Scenario 22 does not meet 6 of the Review objectives.

Ms. Manske asked the ARC if Scenario 22 is worthy of a vote. No vote was requested.

Result:

The ARC decided not to further consider Scenario 22. (Consensus)

5. Draft Report and Recommendations

Not formally discussed.

6. Revised Timelines

- **Public Meeting #4 – to be determined**

Ms. Manske advised that Public Meeting #4 had been postponed in order to give the Facility Services staff and the City of Cambridge staff time to determine the suitability of the Beechwood Road site before moving forward.

- **Report to the Board of Trustees**

To be discussed at ARC Meeting #12

7. Future Meeting Dates:

- ARC Meeting #12 - to be determined by doodle poll
- Public Meeting #4 - to be determined

Action Item:

Ms. Manske to send out Doodle Poll to determine ARC meeting date that suits the majority of voting ARC members noting that absent members can submit their votes (on items from ARC Meeting #12) if necessary.

8. Roundtable/Wrap Up

Ms. Manske summed up tonight's meeting results being that going forward the ARC may potentially be exploring Scenario 24 (based on result of votes from absent members) and will be exploring Scenario 23 as an immediate solution.

Ms. Manske asked the ARC if there were any other items they would like to bring forward.

Q: Dianne Ray asked if Ministry funding is always granted for a new school request. What is the end result if the funding is not granted?

R: Ms. Manske responded that there is no guarantee that the funding for a new school would be granted. We would likely have to return to the table to come up with another solution if funding was not granted.

Q: Al Potma asked if the ARC can recommend in our Report that the ARC would reconvene to develop an alternative solution should the funding for the new school be denied.

R: Ms. Manske responded that the Report could recommend reconvening the ARC if the funding is not granted.

Ms. Manske advised the ARC that if we have come up with at great solution that meets the majority of our objectives, the ARC should feel confident that it will receive funding.

R: Mr. Cuomo responded that the ARC's recommendation for the new school could have a cutoff date for funding and if funding is not received by the stated date that would be the trigger for the ARC to come back to the table.

Q: Dianne Ray asked if there are any other reasons (other than funding) that a new school would not be built.

R: Mr. Cuomo responded that if the Board adopted the resolution for all of the additions, the only thing that would prevent us from making it happen would be the funding.

Q: Al Potma asked if it would be easier to get the funding for a smaller project over a bigger project.

R: Ms. Manske responded that the last round of funding, the Ministry funded the requests for bigger projects (2 new 650 pupil place schools) even though the Board had smaller projects listed as a higher priority.

R: Mr. Cuomo responded that when submitting a small project, having surplus space available at a nearby school would hurt the chances of that funding being granted. The Board could likely solve this with a boundary change and without the need of Ministry funds.

- R: Ms. Manske responded that it would be very unlikely that the Board would receive funding for all the additions/retrofits required under Scenario 24 at the same time. We would likely be waiting for additional projects, keeping in mind at this point, that the Ministry only gives out funding once a year. The Ministry does not necessarily see the additions as a package even if the ARC recommends it as such.
- C: Mr. Cuomo commented that the Ministry does not give specific funding for elevators. The Board receives a yearly funding allocation and must figure out how to achieve the accessibility required for 2025 by trying to include accessibility projects into other construction projects to reduce costs.
- Q: Al Potma asked why the school communities would not be allowed to fundraise for an elevator. Is there a policy on that? What if we did it on our own and came up with the money.
- R: Mr. Cuomo responded that when it comes down to funding for capital projects; there is no desire by the Board to have fundraising happen, due to equity issues.
- C: Kelly Deml responded that the ARC does not want to close Dickson P.S. because it doesn't have an elevator; there are more issues than that.
- R: Ms. Manske responded that Dickson P.S. would also need a gym for equity of program.

Ms. Manske thanked the ARC for coming and Paula Ouellet for providing treats and the meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Post Meeting:

It was decided by a poll of the ARC that the majority of voting members could attend the following meeting date:

ARC Meeting #12 – Tuesday, May 22, 2012 from 7:00-8:30 pm at St. Andrew's P.S.