



WEST WATERLOO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS BOUNDARY STUDY

Minutes of Working Group Meeting #2

Thursday, February 19, 2015

4:30 – 6:00 PM

Mary Johnston Public School, Library

The second Working Group meeting of the West Waterloo Elementary Schools Boundary Study, involving Abraham Erb, Cedarbrae, Centennial, Edna Staebler, Laurelwood, and Mary Johnston Public Schools and the new West Waterloo (Vista Hills) elementary school, was held at Abraham Erb Public School on Thursday, February 19, 2015.

Attendees:

H. Tinnes, Principal, Mary Johnston PS, Liz Arbuckle, Principal, Laurelwood PS, Don Oberle, Principal, New West Waterloo School, Betti Adams, Principal, Centennial PS, Brad Hughes, Vice Principal, Abraham Erb PS and Centennial PS, Shelly Reed, Parent Representative, Edna Staebler PS, Marny St. Pierre, Parent Representative, Edna Staebler PS, Tracey Nairn, Parent Representative, Centennial PS, Vivian F., Parent Representative, Centennial PS, C. Lovegrove, Parent Representative, Laurelwood PS, G. Sikiladha, Alternating Parent Representative, Abraham Erb PS, Deb Bergey, Parent Representative, Abraham Erb PS, Elaine Ranney, Superintendent of Education, Nathan Hercanuck, Senior Planner, Andrea Kean, Recording Secretary and Lauren Agar, Senior Planner.

Regrets:

Jeff Parliament, Principal, Edna Staebler PS, T. Stroud, Principal, Abraham Erb PS, Mark McMath, Principal, Cedarbrae PS, Ryan Barnett-Cowan, Parent Representative, Laurelwood PS, Mairaj Naveed, Alternating Parent Representative, Cedarbrae PS, Dennis Cuomo, Manager of Planning.

1. Welcome/Introductions

Lauren Agar, Senior Planner, welcomed members of the Working Group, Board staff and Mr. Adam Lauder, City of Waterloo Growth Management Policy Planner at 4:35 PM.

Mrs. Agar led the group through the presentation, available online at

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/west-waterloo-elementary-schools-boundary-study/>

2. Draft Minutes Review/Approval

Mrs. Agar asked if there are any errors or omissions in the [Minutes from Working Group Meeting #1](#) (January 22, 2015); Mrs. Agar noted a revision to top of page 6 of the minutes under *Projected Enrolment* heading, should read **current** enrolment slide is missing; the same change was also made to page 10 to the corresponding *Action Item*; the slide will be included in the online presentation. The Minutes were approved with noted changes.

Mrs. Agar advised that the minutes will be posted on the Board's website at:

<http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/west-waterloo-elementary-schools-boundary-study/>

Action Items from the Minutes:

- Principal Parliament forwarded a list of issues facing Edna Staebler PS to be included in the draft issues and will be discussed later in the meeting.
- Vista Hills subdivision current enrolment numbers are included on slide 20 of this evening's presentation (Areas E and L):
 - 16 Grade JK-6 students and 5 Grade 7-8 students

- Mrs. Agar noted that the Board's Principal Planner advised that the site for the new west Waterloo school was chosen was primarily an access based decision; in order to reduce the amount of traffic driving through the subdivision, the school was located on the primary transportation corridor access to and from the subdivision and the majority of the network subdivision roads are within the current Board Transportation policy (1.6 km) walking distance. She noted that when the school was being planned, the walking distance was higher, 2 km for grades 1-6 and 3.2 km for grades 7-8.
- The following Boundary Study Button has been placed the each of the study area school's websites and links to <http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/west-waterloo-elementary-schools-boundary-study/>:



3. Presentation from the City of Waterloo (Adam Lauder, Urban Planner, Growth Management)

The City of Waterloo Presentation is available <http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/west-waterloo-elementary-schools-boundary-study/>

Mr. Lauder provided the following overview on west side Waterloo development:

Areas of Change (residential uses):

- **Vista Hills Subdivision:**
 - Received Plan of Subdivision approval in 2012, which allows the developer to apply for building permits for individual lots in Phase 1 of the development (max. 486 units);
 - The subdivision will build out in phases; currently in phase 1 of a multi-phase development (approx.. 7 stages in community plan that may build out in fewer phases);
 - Vista Hills subdivision is *Market Dependent* and can build out as quickly as the housing market demands;
 - There are 1200 units expected at full build out across all phases; however, engineering capacity could allow for as many as 1500 units (est. 4000-5000 people);
 - There are currently 200+ units that have been built in the first phase of development;
 - Historically, Waterloo developments have sold at a faster pace than the Vista Hills development.
- **Beaver Creek Meadows:**
 - Currently in a District Plan Process with an anticipated finalization (Council approval) in 2015; which would allow the developer to move through their zone-change and plan of subdivision approval;
 - Infrastructure constraints that will not allow building permits to be processed prior to 2017;
 - Could be further delays to the approvals process should an [Ontario Municipal Board](#) appeal be filed;
 - Anticipated 2100 units or 6000 – 7000 people at full build out;

Referring to the map on slide 4 of the City of Waterloo presentation, Mr. Lauder noted that the red boundary lines for Beaver Creek Meadows is a crude boundary and that he could provide the exact boundary map if required ([available here](#)).

Mr. Lauder noted that the newer development areas have higher densities than earlier subdivisions (i.e., Laurelwood) and those developed in the 1980s and 1990s.

Areas of Stability (areas that will not change much; or at all)

Referring to the yellow circled areas on the map on slide 4; Mr. Lauder noted the following Areas of Stability:

- Laurel Creek Conservation Area
- Environmentally Sensitive Landscape (ESL)
- Low Density Residential Fabric

Information about Vista Hills and Walkability:

- Possible reasons for slower build out of the Vista Hills subdivision:
 - Neighbourhood is located on the outer edge of the City.
 - Somewhat disconnected by a substantial woodlot.
 - Columbia Street is the only access into the subdivision.
 - General market timing coincided with Blackberry down-sizing.
 - The lack of a school may be an impediment to sales.
- The new school is expected to have a positive effect on future sales by attracting families.
- Builders are planning the next phases of the subdivision despite the slow roll out of Phase 1.
- Roads in new subdivisions are built by the developers and are built to accommodate the phase of development (construction of roads coincides with each phase of development).
- Walkability:
Mrs. Agar provided a [map of the walking distances](#) from the new west Waterloo (Vista Hills) Public School.

Mr. Lauder noted that when considering the school boundaries for the new school, it will be very important to keep in mind that the wood lot will be an impediment for students being able to walk to school. He noted that there is only one access through the wood lot which follows the stream and leads to some storm ponds which may be a safety issue.

Q: A parent representative, referring to the walking distance map, asked if the 1.6 km walking distance includes walking all the way up Columbia Street and all the way into the neighbourhood and up to the school.

R: That is correct. Mrs. Agar advised that the distance would also include any roadways and pathways that would be considered a route that a child could take.

Mr. Lauder asked if there were any other questions. No other questions were put forward.

Mrs. Agar thanked Mr. Lauder for providing his information to the process.

Mrs. Agar led the group through the remainder of the presentation, available online at <http://www.wrdsb.ca/planning/boundary-studies/west-waterloo-elementary-schools-boundary-study/>

West Waterloo Working Group Mission/Vision: (slide 3 of the online presentation)

Mission

The purpose of the Working Group is to conduct a boundary study of the West Waterloo Study Area elementary schools to develop and confirm the recommendations that will be presented to the Board of Trustees who will make the final decision about the future of student accommodation in the West Waterloo community.

Vision

To strengthen the quality of learning experience for students.

4. Draft Goals/Objectives

Ms. Agar advised that the Working Group will need to narrow down the Goals/Objectives for the Study. She noted that the Goals/Objectives will be developed out of the Issues List and that she has developed the following as a starting point for the Working Group to discuss and modify as needed:

Identified Issues (slide 4)

- Boundary required for new West Waterloo (Vista Hills) elementary school.
 - Vista Hills subdivision/development area is being “held” at Cedarbrae and Centennial Public Schools.
- Enrolment exceeds permanent capacity at Edna Staebler and Laurelwood Public Schools (and at Centennial PS).
- Functional issues with sites and facilities (e.g., traffic congestion, parking, active play space, lack of internal spaces, etc.)

C: Mr. Hercanuck noted that the new west Waterloo (Vista Hills) school has yet to be named and still has to go through the Board’s naming process.

Edna Staebler Public School Identified Issues/Concerns (slide 5)

- Overcrowding issues:
 - Scheduling gym time (e.g. kindergartens using a nutrition break and more classes in the gym at a time due to the number of classes)
 - Washroom facilities can become overtaxed at certain times of the day
 - Limited storage space (e.g. equipment in the gym area)
 - Limited space in the staff room which then encourages staff to find other locations for breaks and limits staff cohesion
 - Crowding at the back doors at transition times which can lead to injuries
 - Limited space to park busses and staff/volunteer parking
- Traffic congestion in parking lot/streets during drop-off and pick-up times. *(Mrs. Agar noted that this issue is not unique to Edna Staebler PS)*
- Lack of outdoor play space (especially during nutrition break times and for track and field - students need to be bused to another facility) issue increases as more portables added; and the parkland, which had been part of the original plan for the school, is still undeveloped and unusable.

Q: Mrs. Agar asked if there are any other issues/concerns at Edna Staebler PS that are not listed.

C: An Edna Staebler PS parent representative commented that there are students from two different school areas that were transferred to Edna Staebler PS within the last ten years.

R: Mrs. Agar responded that when Edna Staebler PS opened there had been students that would have to change schools three times (Elizabeth Ziegler PS to Abraham Erb PS to Edna Staebler PS) within a very short timeframe and to reduce the number of transition for those families, a grandfathering option was put in place to allow those affected families to remain at Abraham Erb PS. Mrs. Agar noted that while she has not researched the total number of students who transferred from other schools to Edna Staebler PS that are still at Edna Staebler, but she did look at the grandfathered area and based on the list of students who would have qualified for the grandfathering option. Based on the 2016 opening date for the new West Waterloo school, there are likely only three students remaining on the list of students who were grandfathered. She noted that while a lot of those that opted to stay at Abraham Erb PS stayed for a year or two then ended up transferring to Edna Staebler PS. Also, Abraham Erb PS is a JK-6 school so a lot of those students would have moved on to Laurelwood PS or Edna Staebler PS for Grade 7-8. She also noted that while she doesn’t have the number of students that did move to Edna Staebler PS she could research that for the Working Group if they wanted those numbers.

C: An Edna Staebler PS parent representative noted that the another subsection that moved over to Edna Staebler PS, came from Mary Johnston PS from the area located between Ira Needles Blvd. and Old Erbsville Rd. She noted that one of the issues there is that those students are crossing

near the roundabout at Ira Needles Blvd. at 8:00 am; and while they are not supposed to be crossing at the roundabout, some are. While there is a crossing guard located further down at Erbsville Rd. and Chablis Dr., there is a lot of traffic and it is especially busy in the morning with people rushing to get to work. There are safety concerns for those students.

Q: Mrs. Agar asked if there are issues/concerns at the other study area schools to be included.

Laurelwood PS Issues/Concerns/Opportunities:

R: Principal Arbuckle noted that Laurelwood PS's parking lot is congested, as well as the washrooms.

Q: Mrs. Agar asked if gym time is an issue at Laurelwood PS.

R: Principal Arbuckle responded that gym time is manageable because there are ten periods per day.

C: A parent representative, referring to the feedback that was received from a Laurelwood PS parent that refers to students attending Laurelwood PS for Grades 7-8 and are attending from out of boundary; asked Mrs. Agar if she could confirm the number of out of boundary students?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that she suspects that the out of boundary students being referred to are those students discussed earlier (on page 4) that were grandfathered to Abraham Erb PS that then attended Laurelwood PS for Grades 7-8, or all of the Abraham Erb PS students who feed Laurelwood PS for Grades 7-8 (actually in boundary).

C: Principal Arbuckle responded that the out of boundary students being referred to might also be the French Immersion (FI) students. She noted that if a student is in the FI program and there isn't a FI school in their neighbourhood they can attend the program at another school.

Q: A parent representative asked if the FI program school would be dictated by geography or if there would be a choice of FI schools?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that typically the [FI program](#) is dictated by geography but the Board does not have boundaries for the FI program. The school can be a choice for those who do not have FI offered at their home school; a parent can opt to have their child attend the FI program at a school near their workplace (for convenience, as the Board does not provide transportation for FI) if there is room in the FI program at that school.

Q: What would be the senior elementary school choices for the FI program in Waterloo?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that:

- MacGregor PS and Centennial PS both offer the 7-8 FI program.
- Laurelwood PS offers FI for Grades 1-8.
- Edna Staebler PS does not offer 7-8 FI yet; but will once the program progresses through the grades to that level. Currently offers Grade 1-6 FI.

C: Principal Arbuckle noted that most of Laurelwood PS's 7-8 FI students have been in the program and at the school since Grade 1.

Abraham Erb PS Issues/Concerns/Opportunities:

C: An Abraham Erb PS parent representative commented that their school does share some similar issues/concerns as noted at the other study area schools but does not necessarily have the same capacity challenges. In terms of boundary issues, there are some students that have to cross Erbsville Road but can cross at a traffic light. She noted that, while not exactly an issue, that there is much interest in exploring the possibility of adding Grades 7 and 8 to Abraham Erb PS.

- C: Vice Principal Hughes commented that Abraham Erb PS is currently at capacity and noted that any additional capacity would have to be accommodated with portable classrooms. The FI program (Gr. 1-4) is offered at the school and can lead to additional capacity needs as that program grows out to the Grade 6 level. Traffic congestion is a concern (particularly in cold weather) and the school is working with its parent community to address. The entry and exit off of Laurelwood Dr. is a challenge due to it being divided by a median, with some sightlines (which are not addressable) are concerning when coming and going. He noted that additional infrastructural work may need to be put in place to meet future needs that might result in increased capacity at the school.
- C: Mr. Hercanuck advised that should any addition be required at Abraham Erb PS to accommodate increases in enrolment, the addition would be subject to site plan control by the City of Waterloo and would likely include items such as parking and traffic flow and circulation.

Mary Johnston PS Issues/Concerns/Opportunities:

- C: Principal Tinnes noted that there are parking concerns. There are two portables in use at the school. The school is operating with 2/3 FI with approximately 30 students attending the program from out of boundary and is anticipating some growth next year which could result in another portable classroom. He noted that should the boundaries be changed to include the students crossing Ira Needles Blvd., it could result in Mary Johnston PS's requiring additional capacity. The school only has a single gym. He noted that Mary Johnston PS's site is approximately 11 acres if you include the City Park. The Board owned site is 8.18 acres.
- R: Mrs. Agar noted that the boundary study process is also an opportunity to consider the opportunities as well.

Referring to slide 6 of the online presentation Mrs. Agar discussed the following sample goals used in past boundary studies:

Sample Goals

What is this boundary study trying to achieve? (Longer term, may not be strictly measurable or tangible)

- To establish grade configurations that provide the best learning opportunities for students and staff while giving consideration to:
 - existing facilities, community connections and distance;
 - student learning opportunities;
 - community growth patterns;
 - capital funding, including partnership opportunities
(i.e., *adding a 7-8 program at Abraham Erb PS would require specialized 7-8 classrooms and would require an addition and/or conversion of classrooms; what funding opportunities exist to make that happen? are there partnership opportunities with the City or Region? - Or, does the City need more gym/recreational space in the area – would they be interested in partnering on a new gym at Mary Johnston PS?*)
- To consider facilities and infrastructure (including sites, offices, gyms, specialized classrooms, etc.) necessary to deliver curriculum and support student achievement where changes are proposed.
- To establish boundaries that consider:
 - efficiency of transportation (*students within walking distance, bus routes*)
 - permanent capacity of schools and/or future construction requirements (*e.g., site, program spaces, safety*)
 - current and future population density and demographics (*i.e., how long is growth expected to last and does it make sense to over build on capacity if not required in the longer term*)
 - impact on feeder and surrounding schools (*i.e., consistent boundaries for Gr. 6 students moving to Gr. 7, and Gr. 8 students moving to secondary school*)

Mrs. Agar noted that while the Board tries to keep consistent boundaries for secondary schools, it is not always possible because of the large distances between secondary schools.

- the distribution and accessibility of Special Education and French Immersion programs
All of the study area schools, except for Cedarbrae PS have the FI program - Impacts us only in how many students are attending the program from out of boundary.
- to minimize the impact on students where changes are proposed (e.g., consideration for grandfathering, phasing, etc.).
Gives consideration to Board required school changes, not changes due to a change in home address.

Mrs. Agar advised that the sample Goals will be sent out to the Working Group via email for their consideration prior to our next meeting.

C: Principal Arbuckle noted that Laurelwood PS's 7-8 program currently has 9 classes of 7-8 students which would be negatively impacted should Abraham Erb PS add their own 7-8 program. Having a larger 7-8 cohort means that students are benefiting from specialized 7-8 teachers and rotary classes for Math, Art, Science and Phys. Ed. She noted her concern that losing Abraham Erb PS as a feeder school could result in the loss of specialized teachers and that would not be best for students.

R: Mrs. Agar responded that would be considered as an *impact on feeder and surrounding schools* to be considered. She noted that the following *Sample Objectives* also give consideration to Board Policy 3002 - Elementary School Size and Configuration, which states the Board's preference to have a minimum of 2 classes per grade in JK-6 and more than two classes per grade in Grades 7-8, for the reasons that Principal Arbuckle just mentioned. When you have more classes at the 7-8 level it can provide the opportunity to run a more specialized program like the one offered at a Board's Senior Elementary schools, pure 7-8 school.

She also noted that while the JK-8 school model would meet the requirement to reduce the number of transitions on students, the drawback might be that the number of students needed to run the 7-8 program often requires the need to have feeder schools to supplement at the grade 7-8 level. Having a variety of school models allows the Board to offer more wide-ranging learning opportunities for students.

Referring to slide 7 of the online presentation, Mrs. Agar outlined the following Sample Objectives:

Sample Objectives:

What is this boundary study intended to accomplish? Used to measure the success of a scenario (objectives should support the attainment of the goals)

- To establish a boundary for the new West Waterloo (Vista Hills) elementary school
- To increase the number of students housed in permanent accommodation (*reduce the need for portable classrooms where possible*)
- To provide equitable learning opportunities for students and staff by moving towards the following criteria (from Board Policy 3002 - Elementary School Size and Configuration):
 - *A minimum of 2 classes per grade in JK-6*
 - *More than 2 classes per grade in Grades 7-8*
 - *Minimize the number of schools with enrolments over 700 students wherever possible*
 - *Minimize the transition of elementary students between schools where practical*
- To increase the number of students within walking distance to their assigned school (<1.6km)

Q: Mrs. Agar asked the Working Group if they would like to add and additional objectives.

- C: Principal Tinnes noted that Objective - the *minimum of 2 classes per grade* can be quite challenging on the Regular Track program when a school offers the FI program. He noted that he has 1.5 classes of regular track (English) at each grade level and the rest are French. The 1.5 regular track classes per grade poses a challenge, especially in allowing for opportunities to minimize contact of conflicting personalities.
- R: Mrs. Agar responded that the FI program can often times take over and result in a school having very few students left in the Regular Track program. She noted that some Boards have moved away from the dual track system for that reason and instead offer single track and FI programs at separate school locations.
- C: Vice Principal Hansen noted that there can be advantages such as “creating community” when there is only one class per grade. He noted that in Denmark, they keep the same group of students together from Grade 1 through to Grade 10, to create a sense of community.

Resources (slide 8)

Links to the following Board guidelines were included because they have an impact on the Boundary Study:

- [Board Policy 3002 - Elementary School Size and Configuration](#) (Revised January 2015)
A link to the revised policy will be posted on the Boundary Study Website.
- Board Policy 4009 - Student Transportation (under review)
- Maps showing approx. distances (via walking routes) from schools;
 - [Abraham Erb Public School Walking Distances](#) (slide 9 of the online presentation)
 - [Edna Staebler Public School Walking Distances](#) (slide 10 of the online presentation)
 - [Laurelwood Public School Walking Distances](#) (slide 11 of the online presentation)
 - [Mary Johnston Public School Walking Distances](#) (slide 12 of the online presentation)
 - [New West Waterloo \(Vista Hills\) Walking Distances](#) (slide 13 of the online presentation)

Mrs. Agar noted that both Cedarbrae and Centennial PS's walking routes are not included.

Referring to the walking distances maps above and available on slides 9-13 of the online presentation, Mrs. Agar noted the following:

- The maps show all areas within the study area (may include areas located in another schools boundary) that are within walking distance to the noted school
- The pink area is approximately <800 metres from the school and walkable for grades JK-8
- The rust area is approximately between 801-1600 metres from the school and walkable for grades 1-8; JK-SK may qualify for transportation (bussing).
- >1600 metres may qualify for transportation
- Maps show the following:
 - Walkways:
 - Winter maintained
 - Unmaintained walkways (Winter)
 - Sidewalks
 - Forest
 - Parks/Open Space
- Abraham Erb PS's boundary (slide 9) the majority of its boundary is within walking distance of the school.
- Edna Staebler PS's map (slide 10) does not capture the northern portion, located beyond Munich Crossing; students living there would qualify for transportation to Edna Staebler PS. Edna Staebler PS's boundary also cuts into Mary Johnston PS's boundary; the pocket that was discussed earlier ([page 4 and 5](#)) referred to as the “Erbsville Triangle” in the last boundary study, was likely included in Edna Staebler PS's boundary because of how close it is to Edna Staebler PS.

- C: A parent representative commented that it totally makes sense on a map but not quite as much in practice.
- R: Mrs. Agar noted that the “Erbsville Triangle” pocket would not necessarily have to be bussed to Mary Johnston PS should a boundary change be implemented that would direct this area back to Mary Johnston PS.
- Laurelwood PS’s map (slide 11) the vast majority of the JK-6 population is within walking distance. The 7-8 student’s coming from Abraham Erb PS’s boundary would be bussed in.
- C: A parent representative asked if the top left portion of the Laurelwood PS’s map is part of Abraham Erb PS’s boundary currently.
- R: Yes.
- Mary Johnston PS’s map (slide 12) is an ideal boundary as it is entirely within walking distance to the school.
 - Vista Hills Subdivision (new school) map (slide 13) which was discussed earlier (page 3). Mrs. Agar noted that the existing roads are included, as well as the roads and walkways that are planned for the future (see map legend for details). All but the northern portion will be within walking distance (Gr. 1-8) of the new school once the subdivision is fully developed.

Mrs. Agar advised that the maps will be posted online and are for use in Scenario development.

- [Administrative Procedure 1000 - Partial French Immersion](#)
- 2014/15 School Attendance Areas:
 - [Abraham Erb Public School Attendance Area](#)
 - [Cedarbrae Public School Attendance Area](#)
 - [Centennial Public School Attendance Area](#)
 - [Edna Staebler Public School Attendance Area](#)
 - [Laurelwood Public School Attendance Area](#)
 - [Mary Johnston Public School Attendance Area](#)

Historic Enrolment (slides 14 – 17 of the online presentation)

The historic enrolment charts demonstrate the growth experienced in the study area since 2004. Mrs. Agar noted the following:

- Area has experienced steady growth
- Abraham Erb PS opened in 2005
- Edna Staebler PS opened in 2008
- Laurelwood PS has still maintained high enrolment despite the opening of 2 new schools

Historic Enrolment by School

Mrs. Agar noted that slides 15 – 17 illustrate the historic enrolment by school; showing how enrolment has changed over time. She noted the following:

- **Abraham Erb PS** (slide 15)
 - 3 percent increase in enrolment 2008-2014
- **Cedarbrae PS** (slide 15)
 - Has a lot of unused capacity.
 - 10 percent increase in enrolment 2008-2014

Mrs. Agar noted that in the future, the Board may undertake an Accommodation Review of the schools in the vicinity of Cedarbrae PS because of the amount of surplus capacity in that area, to determine if consolidation is required and if a school needs to be closed.

- **Centennial PS** (slide 16)
 - Orange area on the chart shows the use of temporary capacity (portapak and portable classrooms) to accommodate students.
 - 18 percent decrease in enrolment 2008-2014

C: Principal Adams advised that Centennial PS still has the portapak; however, the portables have been removed.

- **Edna Staebler PS** (slide 16)
 - Orange area on chart represents portables on site.
 - 45 percent increase in enrolment 2008-2014

Mrs. Agar noted that the reason why permanent capacity (green area on the chart) of the schools has changed over time is because permanent or *on-the-ground* capacity is dictated by the Ministry of Education and how the Ministry is loading the classrooms (the number of students in a classroom). She noted that the current loading is:

- 23 students per classroom
- 23 Students per computer lab (*not considered a homeroom classroom and could warrant the need for a portable classroom*)
- 26 Students per Kindergarten classroom – up from 20 in previous years
Depending on how the classes work out, we could have a school at 100 percent capacity but requiring portables.

- **Laurelwood PS** (slide 17)
 - Orange area on chart represents portapak
 - 11 percent decrease in enrolment 2008-2014
In retrospect, could have benefited from a larger build initially

- **Mary Johnston PS** (slide 17)
 - 11 percent decrease in enrolment 2008-2014
 - *Spike in temporary capacity (orange area) due to temporarily accommodating students in portables while an addition was being built for the Ministry's Primary Class Size (PCS) initiative.*

2014/15 School Information (slide 18)

Missing slide from last meeting's presentation

Mrs. Agar noted that slide 18 provides the current year's enrolment and capacity for each of the study area schools. She pointed out that the newer schools have smaller site sizes, in part, because land values have increased and because the Ministry of Education has set criteria as to how much land can be requested based on the size of a school (i.e., 400 student school = 4 acres; or, 1 acre per 100 students)

5. Scenario Discussion (slides 19 – 20)

Mrs. Agar provided a brief overview of how Scenarios are developed using the projection area map on slide 19 and corresponding enrolment information on slide 20, noting the following:

- Each colour on the *projection area map* represents the current boundaries of study area schools and are broken down into smaller *projection areas* with a letter assigned to each as follows:
 - Abraham Erb PS – (blue) *areas* A, B, C and D
 - Cedarbrae PS:
 - Vista Hills Subdivision portion only – (yellow) *areas* E and L
 - Remainder - (salmon) *area* J
 - Centennial PS – (grey) *area* K (also Gr. 7-8s from *areas* E, L, O, R, U and V)

- Edna Staebler PS – (purple) *areas* F, M, N Q, P, S and T
- Laurelwood PS – (green) *areas* G, H and I (also Gr. 7-8s from *areas* A, B, C and D)
- Mary Johnston PS – (cream) *areas* O, R, U and V
- Some school boundaries are broken down into more *projection areas* than others.
- Each *projection area* will have corresponding student enrolment numbers - see slide 20.
- *Projection areas* are used as building blocks for developing Scenarios. (i.e., if we wanted to add or remove a *projection area* to Laurelwood PS, we can see how that would affect the enrolment numbers there).
- *Projection areas* can be subdivided further (best to make those revisions earlier in the process).
- Enrolment numbers includes all regular track and French Immersion students attending the school in the boundary they reside; does not include students living in the projection area that may be attending another school.

Q: A parent representative asked what impact the Beaver Creek Meadows area (discussed earlier) would have on area schools – or if the Board plans to build a school there.

R: Mrs. Agar responded that the Beaver Creek Meadows is located in *Projection Area B* on slide 19. Mrs. Agar advised that a Report titled [Development Area School Boundary Assignments](#) was brought to the Board of Trustees on January 23, 2015 and identifies Beaver Creek Meadows as a Development Area (DA) as per [Administrative Procedure 4992 – Temporary Accommodation for Development Areas](#) – which enables the Board to temporarily assign DAs to a yet-to-be determined school(s) that have sufficient capacity to accommodate the development until a long-term solution can be implemented. She advised that the Board is looking at a school site in that plan of subdivision.

Mrs. Agar advised that through this boundary study process we can set aside this area as a DA with a school to be determined in future based on where we have room to accommodate once the subdivision registers.

Q: Because the Board is planning a school for this development, it will not have a big impact on the surrounding area schools?

R: Mrs. Agar responded that it may have a temporary impact when we need to find accommodation for those students until a new school can be built. The holding school(s) for that area can be determined later and assigned to a school(s) that can best accommodate. (i.e., Vista Hills currently bussed to Cedarbrae PS).

C: Mr. Hercanuck advised that the Ministry of Education will not provide funding based on speculation. There needs to be a greater number of students in the area than there is capacity before funding to build a school will be awarded. Will involve a similar process to Vista Hills subdivision.

C: Mrs. Agar responded that while the Ministry does not award funding based on speculation, we were awarded funding for the new Vista Hills subdivision school with very few students actually showing in that neighbourhood, because of the overcrowding at all surrounding schools. Mrs. Agar noted that this subdivision is not developing like any other subdivision that we have seen in recent years, we would have expected to have filled up Cedarbrae PS excess capacity by now (building activity has been slow).

C: An Edna Staebler PS parent representative commented that the community may be better served if the Board built a second story addition at Edna Staebler PS (as was originally planned) as opposed to building a new school in the Vista Hills subdivision; which would alleviate some of the outdoor space and overcrowding issues there, and possibly save money. She expressed her fear

that we may be building a school that will take students away from other schools and noted that she, personally, would rather maintain the status quo for her children at their school rather than have them move to a new school just because.

- R: Mrs. Agar noted that moving students *just because* was not the original intention of this new school. The Board has been planning this school for many years and wanting to avoid in this subdivision what has happened at Edna Staebler PS. But, for whatever reason, the housing market is not there.
- R: Mr. Hercanuck advised that when we look at the Vista Hills development as a whole, once fully built out, will be capable of sustaining the school that we build.
- C: The Edna Staebler PS parent representative responded that she can see the need for the school but noted her concern that the school will need to be filled earlier which will mean that we will have to take students from other schools to fill it. When the development fills up, we will have to ship those kids back out.

Mrs. Agar noted that Principle Oberle's current school (Doon PS) is presently helping to alleviate enrolment pressure at J.W. Gerth PS by temporarily accommodating all Grade 5 and 6 students at Doon PS. She noted that while not an ideal situation, and not temporary for the students involved, it is a temporary solution to alleviate enrolment pressure for J.W. Gerth PS until the new Doon South elementary school opens. She advised that moving entire grade cohorts is something that could be considered here as well; we could look at moving Grades 7-8 or exploring other options.

Mrs. Agar advised that the projection area information will be sent out to the Working Group for their consideration for Scenario development.

6. Future Meeting Dates/Locations/Times

The following meeting dates/times were chosen based on the feedback received from the Working Group:

Working Group Meetings

- **Working Group #3: Tuesday, March 3, 2015 from 4:45 – 6:15 PM at Edna Staebler PS**
- **Working Group #4: Tuesday, March 24, 2015 from 4:45 – 6:15 PM at Laurelwood PS**

Public Meetings

Mrs. Agar advised that we will hold Public Meeting #1 sometime after March 24th and noted that at the first public meeting the following will be presented:

- Explain the Boundary Study Process
- And show initial Scenario concepts

She asked the Working Group if they would be okay with her bringing a few Scenario options to the Working Group that they could select from to present at the public meeting.

The Working Group agreed.

Mrs. Agar noted that she would also welcome ideas for Scenarios from the Working Group members and noted that she has already received one request from a community member sent in via boundaryfeedback@wrdsb.on.ca

Mrs. Agar asked the Working Group members if they are aware of any community or school events occurring during the weeks of March 30 or April 6 that we should avoid when scheduling Public

Meeting #1. It was noted that April 6th is the Easter weekend and the Thursday before and Tuesday after should be avoided as people may not be available.

Q: How does the Board advertise a Public Meeting?

R: In the past we have sent a Public Meeting Flyer home with every student attending study area schools as well as advertised in the local newspapers. Mrs. Agar noted that we are moving away from newspaper advertisements as they are quite expensive and don't seem to be reaching the intended audience, based on feedback received in past studies. We also use social media including the Twitter (@wrdsb). The flyer will be posted on the Board's website, and study area schools will post on their websites and outdoor signs. Parent Councils can distribute via social media and word of mouth.

Mrs. Agar advised that we also rely on the Working Group members to get the word out and asked them to notify any neighbours who may not have children currently attending school.

R: Mr. Hercanuck noted that in the past we have also advertised at community hubs and recreation centres; either by posting flyers on their bulletin boards or outdoor signs.

Mr. Hercanuck asked the Working Group members to:

- provide any appropriate community locations for posting our Public Meeting Notices,
- help compile a list of contacts to be used as a check list for distributing the Public Meeting notice, and
- forward contacts and addresses to Andrea.

The Working Group discussed approaching neighbourhood associations to help publicize the public meeting.

A parent representative (and City of Waterloo staff member) suggested advertising the Public Meeting on the City's digital screens at the Recreation Complex and RIM Park and advised that if a graphic of the flyer were provided to her she could arrange to advertise on the digital signs. She also noted that the City can also send a copy of the graphic to neighbourhood associations to post on their websites.

C: The YMCA and Library on Fischer Hallman/Laurelwood would also be good areas to post the flyer.

Mrs. Agar noted that Ward Councilors will also receive the flyer and can share with their constituents if they wish.

It was noted that some schools are paperless and are communicating with their school communities electronically.

Mrs. Agar advised that each school would receive an electronic version of the Public Meeting flyer and requested that Principals forward the requested number of hardcopy flyers needed for their school to Andrea.

Mrs. Agar advised that Planning will look into a date that works for the schools involved and avoids the long weekend. She advised that Working Group members are welcome and encouraged to attend the Public Meeting; but are not required to do so.

Public Meetings

- **Public Meeting #1:** TBD (end of March, early April)
- **Public Meeting #2:** TBD

7. Roundtable

Upcoming Meetings:

Mrs. Agar noted that the second Public Information (Engagement) Night for the new Vista Hills school will be taking place on Wednesday, March 11, 2015 at Edna Staebler PS. She noted that it is an opportunity for those interested to attend an Open House (no formal presentation) to view a digital 3D model of the school and Board Staff and school Architect will be available to answer questions.

Q: Will a notice of the Engagement Night meeting be posted on the Board's website?

R: Mrs. Agar advised that she would ensure the notice is posted on the Boundary Study website once it becomes available and advised that the Board's Communications and Engagement Department will be overseeing the publication of the Engagement Night meeting.

Mrs. Agar thanked the Working Group for attending and adjourned the meeting at 6:00 PM.

Action Items:

- The sample Goals, Issues and Objectives will be sent out to the Working Group via email for their consideration.
- A link to the revised Board Policy 3002 - Elementary School Size and Configuration (Revised January 2015) will be posted on the Boundary Study Website once it becomes available.
- Beaver Creek Meadows Development Area to be set aside with a school to be determined in future.
- Mrs. Agar advised that the projection area information will be sent out to the Working Group for their consideration for Scenario development.
- Mrs. Agar to put together Scenarios options for our next meeting.
- The Working Group to provide any ideas for Scenarios to Mrs. Agar.
- The Working Group members to provide any appropriate community locations for posting of Public Meeting Notices.
- The Working Group to send any contacts to be used on a check list for distributing the Public Meeting notice and forward contacts and addresses to Andrea.
- Andrea to provide graphic of Public Meeting flyer to designed checklist and to be displayed on the City's digital screens at the Recreation Complex and RIM Park and forwarded to neighbourhood associations.
- Principals to forward the requested number of hardcopy flyers needed for their school to Andrea.
- Planning to confirm date for Public Meeting #1 that works for the schools involved and avoids the long weekend.
- Mrs. Agar to post the notice for the Second Engagement Night for the new Vista Hills school on the Boundary Study website.

Future Meetings:

Working Group Meetings:

- ~~Working Group #3: March 3, 2015 from 4:45 – 6:15 PM at Edna Staebler PS (CANCELLED)~~
- Working Group #3: March 24, 2015 from 4:45 – 6:15 PM at Laurelwood PS

Public Meetings:

- Public Meeting #1: TBD
- Public Meeting #2: TBD