



## Meeting Notes

### 1. Welcome

Nathan Hercanuck detailed the agenda items and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Two observers were present.

### 2. Draft Objectives

The Working Group was asked if anyone had any thoughts or questions around the draft objectives. There were none.

### 3. Information Update

#### ***Re: Learning Resource Centres (Libraries)***

The Board's library consultant did an analysis on space requirements at the 3 schools in the study area (Preston, Parkway and Grand View). Copies of the comments were given to Working Group members, and will be posted on the boundary study web page.

A brief summary of the comments made:

#### **Grand View**

- Classroom converted to learning resource centre
- Inadequate space and collection for the number of students at the school
- If renovations are done to the school, or enrolment increases, there should be considerations for upgrading the library

#### *Comments:*

- If there was a portable on site, or combine 2 portables to make one larger one, could that become a library for Grand View?
  - Probably not, there are safety and security issues with having library materials in a portable.
  - One option might be to move the library into the lower level of the school and convert the current space back to a classroom. On the lower level, there could be one classroom used as a library and the other as a computer lab

- Could the current library be expanded by including the resource room next door?
  - Possibly. There are options that will need to be considered.
- Where does the funding for library collections come from? Is this something school council would have to fundraise for?
  - The schools enrolment somewhat determines funding for library collections

### **Parkway**

- Meets most standards

### **Preston**

- Purpose built learning resource centre
- Collection is small/inadequate for the school's population
- Space is inadequate
- If renovations are done to the school, or enrolment increases, there should be considerations for upgrading the library

### *Comments:*

- These comments are to be used as a benchmark for evaluation only. It is somewhat like accessibility; there are plenty of schools that need attention, it is just a matter of prioritizing these projects

### ***Re: Website***

It was brought to our attention that there are some discrepancies on the website with respect to projection numbers in the detailed year by year projections for scenarios 1, 2, 3 and status quo. There were different total numbers shown for 2010. This was an oversight as those scenarios had the new area coming to rebuilt Ryerson in 2011, instead of 2010 when it actually does open. The numbers posted on the website will be changed to reflect that correction. The numbers for Preston, Parkway or Grand View in these scenarios are unaffected.

### *Action Item:*

- Planning will post updated projections on the website and make note of the changes

Scenarios 3, 6 and 7 have slightly different totals in 2018 because of rounding errors created when splitting up Area A. This is only a difference of a few students, so no change will be made to these numbers.

## **4. Scenarios**

Mr. Hercanuck summarized the scenarios the Working Group has explored to date by grouping them together based on what they aim to achieve. The goal tonight is to narrow down the list of scenarios so that we can look at the top scenarios in more detail, and bring that to a Public Meeting (e.g. Costing, transitions, etc.)

1. Balancing Enrolment/Facility
  - Scenario B has been eliminated because there was not a lot of support for this scenario at the Public Meeting
  - Scenarios 1, 6, 7 and 3c are still being considered
2. Community Integrity
  - Scenario 4 was eliminated because Parkway gets too large, and it does nothing for Grand View
  - Scenario 5 was eliminated because it is not economically feasible
  - Scenario 3a is still being considered
3. Area B Options
  - Scenarios 1a, 3 and 3b are still being considered.

*Comments:*

- Re: Area B, is there a critical number of students you can move so that they still have friends? It doesn't make sense to only move 15 students, there would be a lot of single grades in this group and students would not be moving with their cohort friends. This does not make sense if ultimately it does not make much difference in the total numbers. This does not fall in line with the fragmentation objective.

**Scenario 1**

- Grand View gets Area D from Preston

*Comments:*

- Preston could probably get rid of a couple portables in the near term however could be looking a four portables (perhaps three depending on how the students are distributed through the grades) in the mid term as development peaks through, before declining again in the long term.
- Does reducing the number of portables to 4 have any affect on reducing poor sight lines?
  - It makes it more manageable – any reduction in portables is good.
- Is 2014 the highest the total number of students gets at Preston?
  - There is a peak in 2013, then it is predicted that the numbers will begin to decline
- What is the most equitable enrolment we can achieve based on the total number of students we have in the area, and the 3 facilities we have to house them?

- In this scenario, there would be 101 JK-6 students from Area D affected by a change (2010, JK-6 if not considering a transition strategy e.g. grandparenting).
- Parkway enrolment is going up, an additional class next year, not going down as once predicted. It is hard to predict what is going to happen to enrolment at Parkway for the long-term. This may be an attractive area for people struggling financially because homes here are affordable. Parkway is seeing an influx of people and it is uncertain how long this is going to last
- None of the scenarios are going to meet the Good Schools Standing Committee recommendation on class size. In the end, the numbers are balanced well in this scenario and enrolment evens out the most in the long-term.
- This scenario is financially feasible.
- The majority of people have heard from do not have a problem crossing King St (Area D) to get to Preston
- At the D and G border, there are people in D that think because they can see Grand View, that is their school
- Crossing streets leading up to Grand View (running north-south) may be an issue. There is a lot of through traffic and no stop signs.

### **Scenario 6**

- Grand View gets Area A2 from Preston

#### *Comments:*

- There is a larger spread in the enrolment numbers in terms of difference in enrolment between schools
- Fragmentation of Area A an issue
- 78 students affected by move (2010 JK-6 if not considering a transition strategy)
- Is it possible to create a transportation plan that doesn't result in kids from the same neighbourhood (Area A) riding on the same bus and being dropped at two different schools?
  - Yes; however, there could be an increased cost of transportation for a few years.
- Are there examples of other bused communities that have been split?
  - Nothing comes to mind. If runs are not separate, we could risk creating unnecessary divisions between communities.

### **Scenario 7**

- Grand View gets Area A2 from Preston
- Parkway gets Area A1 from Preston

#### *Comments:*

- Preston's enrolment is significantly reduced, means a decrease in the number of portables

- Parkway is at capacity for the short-term, and goes beyond once development begins in the Mattamy subdivision
- Fragmentation of Area A
- Area A2 has the majority of unbuilt units; if you switch where Areas A1 and A2 are going, you'll see a greater peak in enrolment at Parkway
- Parkway would probably need 5 additional portables (bringing it up to 6 total), so this doesn't really meet the objective of aligning facilities.
- 149 students would be affected by move (2010 JK-6 if not considering a transition strategy)
- Parents are more supportive of getting kids out of portables, not putting them in more
- Would there be any point in moving 5 portables from Preston to Parkway?
  - In this scenario, we may need to look at facility upgrades, for example, a Port-A-Pak at Parkway instead of portables. This is because the enrolment increase is likely going to be for the long-term
- In this scenario, there would be bussing to all 3 schools, which means all schools would be using the all day, alternate day Kindergarten model. This may be a convenience issue for some. Is it worth making this an objective for programming reasons?
  - The Group decided that this should not be an objective. There are personal preferences about which Kindergarten program model is best. Given the way the Ministry of Education has indicated we are moving (All Day Every Day), this may not be a concern for the long-term anyway.

### **Scenario 3c**

- Grand View gets Area A1 and A2 (Area A) from Preston
- Preston gets Area J from Grand View

#### *Comments:*

- Two of the schools would have bussed students
- There would be a change in the Kindergarten program model for Areas A and J
- The enrolment numbers are reasonable
- This scenario may fall a little short with the number of transitions – there would be 188 students affected (2010 JK-6 if not considering a transition strategy)
- All schools are below 2 classes per grade recommendation, but they are equitable and financially feasible
- Fragmentation between G and J, this is considered to be a community, even though it was not discussed at the Public Meeting
- There was a discussion at Grand View school council about Area J moving to Preston, and the feeling that was most of Area J is content

at Grand View and would not want to move to Preston. Many are not concerned about crossing King Street because they have made arrangements to make this work.

### **Scenario 3a**

- Grand View gets Area A from Preston

#### *Comments:*

- Significant reduction in the numbers at Preston, no change for Parkway and an increase at Grand View. This scenario does a good job at making the enrolment equitable
- More students at less facility if moving Area A to Grand View.
  - We may need to look at a small addition or portapak at Grand View in this scenario
- 149 (2010 JK-6 if not considering a transition strategy) students would be transitioning, this avoids community fragmentation by moving all of Area A together
- When looking at splitting Area A, is it really considered fragmentation if most of the area isn't built yet?
  - The street patterns and development would mean boundaries would not make much sense. If you just take the unbuilt areas, you would have pockets, not one solid area.
- If you establish boundaries now, people know when they move in it is not a transition if you don't live there yet.
  - Part of what we have to do is speak for the people who are not there yet. Take the Huron Heights S.S. boundary for example. A boundary for this school was made before there was anyone living in one of the areas. It is always a balance to do what in the best interest of both current and future residents.
- This scenario still does not avoid fragmentation. There is existing fragmentation between areas D and G (Lowther area)
- Does the Group want to look at the Lowther piece (funny jog in the Preston/Grand View boundary on the S side of King)?
  - Only worth discussing if choosing a scenario where Area D doesn't move
  - Don't know if it's an assumption or a desire for this pocket to go to Grand View
  - This is not going to solve an enrolment issue – There are not a lot of people who have questioned this
  - If we are talking about establishing logical boundaries, we're already here, we should look at it
  - We need to consider every possibility, ultimately it is the Board's decision
- Will the Blair area be more connected to Parkway once the Mattamy development is completed?

- No, the nature of the physical geography in the area is such that there would be no obvious connection

*Action Items:*

- Planning will further subdivide Area D and create a new scenario where part of Area D goes to Grand View, and Area B goes to Parkway

#### **4. Round table**

- Students will adjust regardless of what decision is made. Kids have far better capacity to connect with peers than adults do. We shouldn't underestimate the resiliency of children
- Regardless of the decision, at what point does it make sense both economically and from a human perspective. Is it going to come down to whom is going to be the most inconvenienced?
- What are the timelines for the remainder of this study?
  - We do not want to dictate timelines, but we do need to think about the next public meeting. We would like to have 2 public meetings before June.

The Working Group went through the all the scenarios to decide which ones to keep and do further analysis on. It was decided that Scenarios 1, 6, and 3a were ones to keep and scenarios 3c and 7 were maybes.

#### **5. Future Meeting Dates**

***Next Working Group meeting:***

Thursday April 9, 2009 at Parkway P.S. 4:00 – 5:30 pm.

***Public Meeting # 2***

Wednesday April 29, 2009 at TBD, 7:00 – 9:00 pm