

SW Milton #9 ps Boundary Review Committee (BRC) Meeting #3
Minutes
Thursday, December 11, 7-9 pm
Craig Kielburger SS

Present:

David Euale (Director), Rob Eatough (Superintendent), Gord Truffen (Superintendent), Donna Danielli (Trustee), Kim Graves (Trustee), April Bond (Chris Hadfield Parent Rep), Jane Chin (Tiger Jeet Singh Parent Rep), Colleen Golightly (Tiger Jeet Singh VP), Shalene Werynski (PL Robertson VP), Dorothy MacRae (PL Robertson Parent Rep), Erin Kijewski (JM Denyes Parent Rep), Jennifer Wood (Brookville Parent Rep), Blair Fleming (EW Foster Parent Rep), Dom Renzella (Manager of Planning), Michelle D'Aguiar (Senior Planner)

Senior Staff welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the tight timeline for the remainder of the review.

A communication went out after the last meeting. The response to the syner-email was not overwhelming but it is hoped that some of the families who assumed they would not be impacted are now paying attention to the review communications.

Senior Staff provided the agenda asking that the BRC reps start by sharing some of the feedback from their respective communities.

Senior Staff explained that new scenarios (12a and 12b) would be presented and that the committee now needs to start to dig into the remaining scenarios. Questions like 'what is the value of these scenarios' and 'how do they measure up against the criteria' need to be considered. Is the committee comfortable enough with what's been reviewed and analyzed to be bringing some scenarios to the public in January?

Prior meeting minutes have been circulated for reviewed. Requested changes can be directed to Planning Staff.

Senior Staff advised that the goal for tonight's meeting is to identify the scenarios to be shared with the public at the January 6 public consultation meeting.

Senior Staff spoke to the idea of achieving consensus. The goal is not to come up with one single scenario to recommend to the public as this can put BRC reps in a tough position within their school communities. Ultimately, a couple of supported scenarios are needed to put to the steering committee, which will pass the recommendation along to the director.

Thinking about the feedback received to date, BRC reps were asked to share what they are hearing through school councils.

Reps from Anne J MacArthur PS stated there was a school council meeting after BRC's second meeting. A powerpoint presentation was provided. Everyone was really positive and understanding, happy that the Escarpment View PS catchment was not being touched. Parents seemed to understand scenario 12a more than 12 as there is a perception of less impact. Scenario 4, 10, 12 and 12a were all presented. So far reps are not hearing from many people who feel they are negatively impacted.

There is an understanding that with 18 portables, school resources are quite stretched. Parents are happy that the newer development area is what is being impacted. If Leiterman Drive/Road? is the defining street, is it both sides of the street or down the middle. Reps from Chris Hadfield Ps stated the school community is not overly impacted.

The Tiger Jeet Singh PS reps have heard from people requesting not to be redirected. People are supportive of new development area being redirected. The concern expressed was that some existing families have experienced a number of transitions.

Planning Staff stated there is a need to find balance here; might not result in a scenario with clean line boundaries. The Joshua Creek PS hole in the donut boundary example was shared, where a small undeveloped area within the school's catchment area was redirected to another school due to accommodation pressures.

PL Robertson PS reps have not had a school council meeting since the last BRC however there is a supplementary meeting in January. In conversation with community members, the same response is coming up repeatedly. Reps had difficulty defending the jagged "claw" or "puzzle piece" boundary. Everyone understands that Anne J. MacArthur PS has pressures. There are still concerns about the suggested revisions to the Tiger Jeet Singh PS catchment.

JM Denyes PS reps had no concerns as they are not impacted. The community is more interested in what is happening with Martin Street.

Senior Staff looked to School Administrators to offer any feedback they have received thus far. The PL Robertson PS VP felt the key is that the school is not losing families in any scenarios. By and large the school is happy to welcome families in and do not want to lose any.

The Tiger Jeet Singh PS VP indicated that the community is quite used to boundary changes and understand the school is stretched.

The Trustee pointed to the fact that schools are being well run as a contributing factor as to why families are reluctant to leave existing crowded schools.

The EW Foster PS community has not heard much.

The Trustee stated that a lot of what is being heard refers to number of historical moves.

Senior Staff summarized the feedback received at the board level (copied from powerpoint here)

- o Concerns about crossing Louis St. Laurent Blvd..
- o Grandfathering options for those students being moved out of current catchments?
- o Will new school be dual track?
- o Seemingly arbitrary nature of boundaries and impact on Tiger Jeet Singh PS (e.g., neighbour will attend different school).
- o Child care implications (e.g., located beside Tiger Jeet Singh PS)
- o Concerns with Anne J. MacArthur PS moving to single-track FI and the implications of doing so.

Senior Staff summarized the feedback from the prior meeting's dot-mocracy activity. Scenario 12 had the most support. Scenario 10 did receive a lot of support but people seemed to be wavering on their support of the scenario after follow up discussion on the implications of the scenario. The BRC liked the clear boundaries but it was just too many kids and there are site/facility constraints in terms of accommodating this many portables at Tiger Jeet Singh PS.

Planning Staff provided an review of Scenario 12 wherein SW Milton #9 ps is a single track English school.

Planning Staff introduced Scenario 12a which was proposed at the last BRC meeting. The difference in the English boundary is the area between Bronte Street and the train tracks (at SW Milton #9) and the area south of Leiterman Drive/Road? (at Anne J MacArthur PS).

BRC members asked for clarification on the estimated portable counts for Anne J. MacArthur PS in this scenario. Planning Staff estimate 12 portables but the number could increase beyond that in 2020.

Planning Staff explained that these numbers are not absolute. School enrolment numbers can be below total capacity and still result in a need for portables due to program needs (SPED offerings) and class orgs and class caps.

A BRC member reiterated the impact of SPED program offerings on class utilization in the school

The Trustee pointed to the Martin Street Rebuild as potentially offering relief to Anne J. MacArthur in this scenario. Planning Staff agreed there would be relief from the rebuild, subject to the final boundary being approved.

A BRC member asked about how Anne J. MacArthur PS was modified to accommodate 18 portables. Planning staff explained that Anne J. MacArthur had the hydrant included in part of the construction, but Tiger Jeet Singh does not have this. Installation can cost up to \$160,000. Intent is for this to be included in future new schools.

Planning Staff reviewed Scenario 12b which is the same as 12a except that PL Robertson PS's FI catchment is not extended south.

Senior Staff looking at the numbers stated it appears to be make a difference of only 20 students. A BRC member asked how many kids in that area are in the English track. Planning staff explained that this area is in various stages of development, so it is the hardest FI uptake to project (no existing community to reaffirm trends).

Senior Staff asked BRC members to reflect on the scenarios and identify any preferences that may exist. Members were asked to think about the 3 versions of scenario 12, are there common strengths and issues? Is there one of the scenario 12s that is least preferred?

A BRC member asked if there was a scenario where the new SW Milton #9 ps is a dual track school.

Senior Staff replied that the BRC's thinking had been that Anne J. MacArthur PS, Tiger Jeet Singh PS and PL Robertson PS were already dual track and all relatively near one another. Additionally, some members had been forward thinking about the possibility of SW Milton #10 ps going dual track.

Senior Staff commented that if SW Milton #10 ps were to open as a dual track school that would also provide relief to Anne J. MacArthur PS. Does this add support for scenario 12a or 12b?

BRC members prefer not to move people south of Leiterman Drive/Road that might be moved again to the new school....which one 9 or 10.

Senior Staff asked if Scenario 12 can be taken off the table.

BRC members suggested that the Tiger Jeet Singh PS “puzzle piece” or “claw” attend at the same school for FI and regular track rather than being divided. School staff noticed each scenario has that tiny pocket being split up and divided among a number of schools. Could they at least be assigned to a dual track school so they are less divided?

Planning Staff pointed out that the numbers are high at Anne J. MacArthur PS and the school cannot handle the FI and English from this pocket of development.

Senior Staff pointed out that we are not seeking perfection for the next 20 years here i.e. Leiterman Road/Drive?area could be repatriated at some point to clean up the boundary lines but at this point the need is in achieving balance of enrolments. Need to be cognizant of what SW Milton #9 ps opens as.

BRC members reiterated their concerns about carving up the Tiger Jeet Singh PS catchment area.

A BRC member pointed to a similar division of FI and regular track catchments at Escarpment View PS.

Senior Staff again asked if there was support for taking scenario 12 off of the table at this point.

A BRC member asked about the strip between the railtracks and Bronte St and wondered if these kids had already made a move. Staff responded that students were at PL Robertson for kindergarten but only because the holding school (EC Drury Campus) did not have Kindergarten offered on site.

Pocket West of Bronte St, that total was 149 English, 31 French versus the Leiterman Drive/Road area which had a really similar number of kids and would mean less bouncing back and forth.

Senior Staff moved the focus to Scenario 12a and 12b as there was no objection to taking Scenario 12 off the table.

Similarly, Scenario 10 was also taken off the table as it was problematic for Tiger Jeet Singh PS.

Senior Staff thought it was worth discussing and keeping Scenario 4 on the table because it is the only dual track scenario being considered for SW Milton #9 ps . Based on prior reviews, it is better not to bring 3 similar scenarios. It is more helpful to bring some scenarios that are different, even if the scenario is not the most preferred option since this helps the public to

understand that these various scenarios have been contemplated and make assessments of the projected enrolments themselves.

The Trustee reiterated that the consultation dialogue will be overcome with people thinking things were not considered if we do not include a variety of options.

A BRC member felt that Scenario 10 should stay on the table for exactly that reason, to show Tiger Jeet Singh PS families that the tidier boundary was considered; helps them realize that that scenario just is not viable.

Senior Staff summarized that so far we are looking at scenario 4, 10, 12a and 12b. Everyone was asked to have a final look at scenarios 3 and 5.

BRC members felt that there is a clean lined boundary in scenario 5 but it does not work. WHY?

BRC members agreed to remove Scenario 5 from the remaining mix.

BRC members felt that Scenario 3 moved families who had had many past moves. Everyone agreed that this scenario should be taken off the table.

Senior Staff stated that the preferred scenario list was now down to scenarios 4, 10, 12a and 12b.

Senior Staff directed BRC members to the T-charts spread around the room to contribute scenario strengths and considerations. (Scenarios 12a, 12b, 4, 10)

The T-charts were summarized as follows (see next page)

Scenario	Strengths	Considerations
Scenario 4	Dual Track Option SW Milton #9 numbers increase helps other schools TJS Eng/FI stays together Good option to share with the public Dual track benefit of easier FI demit	TJS students have to make another move Could we bring Leiterman boundary south to Louis Saint Laurent and remain at AJM?
Scenario 10	TJS together as a whole community Clean lines	TJS too big (2016) Too expensive Infrastructure costs/needs AJM families south of Leiterman impacted SW Milton #9 ps opens at 39% utilization Similar to current situation (status quo)
Scenario 12a	No over-capacity until 2019, 2020 Clean boundary for AJM No existing TJS families are being moved Helps balance all schools PLR helps by providing relief with respect to FI at AJM	We are dividing Bartleman and Stout and Yates In order to be successful, SW Milton #10 ps needs to be approved and purchased Chicken farm land has not been released If students are struggling with FI they may have to move schools which may keep students in FI who should not be Split families is a possibility
Scenario 12b	TJS – only new builds are affected Clean boundary for AJM No crossing Railroad Tracks Only English affected in existing builds No impact until 2019 Takes into consideration the unknown FI #s for PLR SW Milton #9 ps opens with small numbers which allows for unknown growth	Not a clean boundary at TJS Dividing a street, English and FI split up Only 323 kids (42%) in the first year (SW Milton #9 ps) PLR is doing nothing to help with the overcrowding Consider making this scenario a dual track, what would the numbers look like (Scenario 12c or 14)

BRC members asked for clarification on whether the Tiger Jeet Singh PS “claw” or “puzzle piece” is exclusively new development and if yes, is there an opportunity to look at cleaning up those streets.

BRC members proposed that east of Yates Drive stays at Tiger Jeet Singh PS, west of Yates Drive, south of Bartleman Terrace, the new development be directed to the new school.

Alternatively, the question is if there is an opportunity to clean up the lines and then grandparent the existing students but direct new residents to SW Milton #9 ps. Generally speaking Planning Staff said yes.

BRC members asked for clarification on grandparenting; would it be for anyone in the school already and anyone new goes to the new school?

The timing of new home closings was again discussed. If students move in March, where do they attend? Are they subject to grandparenting?

Senior Staff provided past examples of grandparenting being implemented in a manner that contributed to mass confusion. Trying to appease everyone is not better. Management of the new registrants can become problematic. Alternatively there is also optional attendance.

BRC members and staff discussed a scenario 12b with SW Milton #9 as a dual track school to build the numbers up at the new school to a more sustainable level.

BRC members expressed concerns with historic examples of under-projecting new school openings. There was a strong feeling that the existing projections for new school are probably too low.

BRC members also offered the counter point that it is problematic to open the new school too low.

The Escarpment View PS area needed its own dual track school.

The Trustee, thinking ahead to the Public Information Meeting, asked if any scenarios are now dropping off the table now.

Planning Staff stated that Scenario 10 is the same as the current scenario for Tiger Jeet Singh PS so the current scenario will show them the accommodation pressures.

If Scenario 4 is only being included because it is dual track would scenario 12c (or 14) cover that off.

Senior Staff were supportive of scenario 12c. Planning Staff will develop this scenario but will label it scenario 14. BRC members will have an opportunity to review the scenario prior to the public consultation.

Planning Staff stated that there is no real need for 3 scenarios, it could be 4 - 2 single track versions and 2 dual track versions e.g. Scenario 4 and 14, 12a and 12b (with grandparenting component).

Concern was expressed about the higher FI grades being light on numbers in dual track scenarios.

A BRC member asked what the likelihood is of opening a dual track school and wondered if this is a real option, do we need to revisit one of the dual track scenarios.

Senior Staff reiterated the list of existing dual track schools in south Milton (AJM, PLR and TJS).

Senior Staff proposed that the BRC meet an hour ahead of the public meeting to review what is being shared.

The Trustee reviewed the public consultation plan and clarified there is no open mic portion.

Senior Staff invited a BRC member to volunteer to speak to the Boundary Review Process at the Public Consultation.

Next Meeting: 6 pm on January 6, MDHS theatre, there will be dinner upon arrival. Advise Senior Staff of any food concerns or food allergies.

No meeting next week.

Minutes will be distributed prior to Christmas.

Syner-email drafted for December 12, need to ensure people are sufficiently notified and reminded of the public consultation since it is the second day back from the holiday break.

In particular there is a need to ensure that 3 impacted schools will be well notified.

Hard copy flyers should go home with kids at the impacted schools with the translation information attached. Translation services can be made available.