



**Forest Hill / Trillium Elementary Schools Boundary Study**  
**Minutes of Working Group Meeting #6**  
**November 8, 2011**  
**Forest Hill Public School - 5:00-6:00 p.m.**

The sixth Working Group Meeting of the Forest Hill / Trillium Elementary Schools Boundary Study was held at Forest Hill Public School on Tuesday, November 8, 2011.

**Attendees:**

B. Brown, Principal of Trillium P.S., Steve Zack, Principal of Forest Hill P.S, and our host for the evening, Carol Fuller, Parent Representative Forest Hill P.S., Jennifer Kroeker, Parent Representative Forest Hill P.S., Jennifer Passy, Parent Representative Trillium P.S., Shane Hall, Parent Representative, Trillium P.S., Lauren Manske, Senior Planner and Andrea Kean, Recording Secretary.

**Regrets:**

Gregg Bereznick, Superintendent of Education, Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner

**1. Welcome/Approval of minutes – November 2, 2011 Meeting.**

Ms. Manske welcomed members of the Working Group at 5:00 p.m. and asked if there were any changes to the draft minutes of the previous meeting. None were brought forward and minutes were passed. Minutes from the fifth meeting are now available on the website: <http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/forest-hill-trillium-elementary-schools-boundary-study>

Ms. Manske led the group through the presentation (available online at: <http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/forest-hill-trillium-elementary-schools-boundary-study> )

**2. Forest Hill Public School Capacity**

The Working Group discussed the capacities (Ministry rated and Functional) for both schools in the review (Please see slides 3-10 of the online presentation).

**Forest Hill PS 2011-2012 Capacity**

Ministry Capacity - 483

Functional Capacity - 455

**Forest Hill PS with Phase 2 of construction** (new Gymnasium)

Ministry Capacity - 506

Functional Capacity - 478

**Forest Hill PS with Phase 3 future construction** (new Library and Office)

Ministry Capacity - 529

Functional Capacity - 501

It was noted that Phase 3, which was scheduled to be completed after Phase 2, is very uncertain at this point.

Ms. Manske informed the group that the capacities that the Working Group have been using to this point are incorrect due to the fact that the Board's data had not been updated to reflect this year's changes to the facility. She noted Forest Hill's 2011-2012 Ministry Capacity is 480 and Functional Capacity is 455 when you factor in the ABLE Class and other room uses.

Trillium PS 2011-2012 Capacity

Ministry Capacity - 236

Functional Capacity - 224

Trillium PS with Full-Day Kindergarten (FDK) (no money for an addition but will have conversion of 2 classrooms for FDK)

Ministry Capacity - 230

Functional Capacity - 239

3. Scenario 11

The Working Group liked the enrolment numbers with respect to how they worked with the facility capacities for both schools under Scenario 11.

Ms. Manske noted that Scenario 11 does not bump the numbers up much per grade as they are spread out over the grade structure. Does it go far enough for balance?

It was noted that it might prevent the placement of an additional portable at Forest Hill PS.

Ms. Manske noted that Scenario 11 does not take a very large chunk out of Forest Hill PS and there could be more growth here. Forest Hill PS currently has 6 portables and could end up with another one – or do we bring these kids to Trillium PS and place a portable there where the site can accommodate it?

Q: Steve Zack inquired if the numbers take into account the Habitat for Humanity homes that are going in?

R: The additional units were accounted for; however, it may be worth adjusting the standard yield/unit # that was applied here because these units are all likely going to have children.

Q: What's the rule for Habitat for Humanity qualification; do you have to have at least 2 children to qualify?

R: Jennifer Passy responded that as far as she knows the qualifications are dependent on an assessment of need on an individual case basis.

C: Steve Zack commented that Forest Hill PS had 11 students register yesterday.

Q: Would Area P require bussing to Trillium PS which is a non-bussed school?

C: Shane Hall noted that in Area P there is no housing in the area beyond the cul-de-sac (Woodfern Court) therefore there are no students living on Chandler that would be any greater distance from Trillium PS than those already attending Trillium on Woodfern Court.

The Working Group further discussed the scenarios resulting in:

**Scenario 6**

Same as Scenarios 10 – too many students being moved - will not discuss further.

**Scenario 9**

Bring forward to Public Meeting #2

**Scenario 10**

Too many students being moved – will not discuss further.

**Scenario 11**

Bring forward to Public Meeting #2

Q: What are the projections for Area P?

R: Next year approximately 20 students from that area. Area O is closer to 30 students.

Q: Scenario 9 could leave Trillium PS with 4 portables and Forest Hill PS with 5 portables?

R: Question to Trillium PS parents – is it better to have more kids in each cohort at your school and have portables, or do you want to avoid portables by having smaller cohorts.

B. Brown noted that the capacity for the gym at Trillium PS with more students would be comparable to Forest Hill PS with their gym/student ratio.

It was noted that both facilities are tight for resource space and storage space.

It was noted that Areas O and N are related areas and would send more kids to Trillium PS. Area P has a mix of students going to both schools. Is it worth taking a closer look at where the ‘area’ division boundaries are drawn?

The Working Group discussed the dividing line for Area P and questioned if there is a more rational dividing line that would make sense.

It was noted that Scenario 9 would move 12 students and not 15 as 3 of the kids already attend Trillium PS as out-of-boundary.

It was noted that there are 21 students along Chandler Drive in Area O; if these were to remain at Forest Hill PS it would relieve the pressure on Trillium PS.

The Working Group discussed ways to divide up Area O but on further investigation decided not to divide the area further as the area is closely related and offers no clear dividing line.

**Action Item:**

Ms. Manske to provide maps for next meeting with no dividing lines, the Working Group will draw what they consider are natural boundaries.

A concern was raised that at the last public meeting there were few families from this area that came out. The group discussed the idea of sending a note to these families informing them of the next public meeting and that the changes may impact them.

**Action Item:**

Forest Hill PS to send out a note to the parents/guardians in the affected Chandler Mowat Area.

It was noted that the difference between Scenarios 9 and 11 is a difference of approximately 10 students.

**4. Requested Information:**

- **Enrolment by Grade Summary**

Please see Slide 14 of the online presentation which outlines Status Quo Grade Profile Projections from 2011 – 2021. Ms. Manske noted that the graphs have Forest Hill PS holding steady and Trillium PS with fluctuations and take into consideration the out-of-boundary students for both schools.

- **Transiency Data (available in the online presentation)**

Please see Slide 22 for Forest Hill PS Data and Slide 23 for Trillium PS Data.

It was noted that a good portion of the students attending both schools are from recent immigration from countries outside of Canada.

It was noted that Retirements refer to when a student misses over 15 consecutive days and must be removed from the register and are required to re-register if they wish to return (can happen when a student goes on an extended vacation).

It was noted that Forest Hill PS had 100 students per year turnover rate, not including retirements. In contrast Trillium PS had 20 per year student turnover rate.

**5. Discussion of Next Steps**

The Working Group decided to hold Public Meeting #2 on November 30, 2011 at Forest Hill Public School in the gymnasium and to bring forward Scenarios 9 and 11 for comments from the public.

**6. Roundtable**

Q: Will we make a decision about Grandfathering before a decision is made?

R: We will talk about that at the next meeting. It's a numbers-based thing. We usually offer to the Grade 6s at a minimum but can look at the possibly of offering for the Grade 4 and 5s as well if there are not a lot being affected.

Q: Families will want to keep siblings together – what are the options for that?

R: One possibility is to let them know they are welcome to stay but they will have to move after the older sibling moves on. This however is difficult to keep track of and is not highly recommended.

It was noted that in order to keep the boundaries solid perhaps the Grade 6 class should be the only ones offered the option of grandfathering.

## **7. Future Meeting Dates:**

### **Public Meetings:**

- **Public Meeting #2**

Wednesday, November 30, 2011 from 7:00 – 8:30 pm  
Forest Hill P.S., Gymnasium

### **Working Group Meetings:**

- Working Group Meeting # 7 - Wednesday, November 16, 2011  
5:00 – 6:30 pm, Forest Hill P.S. Library
- Working Group Meeting # 8 - Tuesday, December 6, 2011  
5:00 – 6:30 pm, Trillium P.S. Library

Ms. Manske thanked the working group for their time and Steve Zack for hosting.  
The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.