

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Final Report
Of the
**PROGRAM AND ACCOMMODATION
COMMITTEE**
For Ward 3
PE14
Southeast Oakville

March 6, 2008

Table of Contents

- Executive Summary
- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Context for the PARC
 - 2.1 The Study Area
 - 2.2 School Sites in the Study Area
 - 2.3 School Site Profiles
 - 2.4 Program and Accommodation Factors
 - 2.5 Other Factors
 - 2.5.1 Declining Enrolment
 - 2.5.2 Primary Class Size Cap
 - 2.5.3 Full Day Kindergarten
 - 2.5.4 Past History of Accommodation Uncertainty
 - 2.5.5 The Clearview Area
 - 2.5.6 Transportation Considerations
 - 2.5.7 Mid-Town Core
- 3.0 Process of the PARC
 - 3.1 Establishment of PARC
 - 3.2 Visits to Other School Sites
 - 3.3 Valuation Tool
 - 3.3.1 Generic Tool
 - 3.3.2 Weighting of Items
 - 3.3.3 Application of the Tool to Each School
 - 3.4 Presentation on the Attributes of an Effective School
 - 3.5 Brainstorming to Generate Scenarios
 - 3.6 Development of Core Values
 - 3.7 Review of Grade Structures and Programs
 - 3.8 Re-Development of Scenarios
 - 3.9 Refinement of Structures
 - 3.10 Final Meetings
 - 3.11 The Vote on Options
 - 3.12 Remaining Scenarios
- 4.0 Reporting Requirements from the PARC Policy
 - 4.1 Section 2.6
 - 4.2 Section 2.8
- 5.0 Recommendations
 - 5.1 Recommendations

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Appendices

- A. Appendices attached to this Report
1. CD Howe Institute EQAO Summaries
 2. List of 71 Scenarios Generated
 3. 71 Scenarios Grouped by Similar Grade Structure and Location
 4. Public Feedback Comments from Public Meeting #3 Grouped by Proposed Grade Structure
 5. Scenarios with Cost Implications Presented at January 29, 2008 Public Meeting
- B. Appendices found on the HDSB website

Item	Description	Location
Initial Information Supplied to PARC PE14 Members	Capital Plan Boundary Maps for all programs Current Enrolment Information for each school Approved Capital Plan Transportation Policy Floor plans for each school Site Plans for each school Administration Costs for each school Renewal Needs summary for each school	All information was supplied in the PARC Binder and is also posted on the Board website in the Background Information section
Additional Information	Organization and Programming Information for each school Operational Policy for Clerical Staff Cover Letter re Sept 2007 Organizations Enrolment and Capacity Information for each school (Sept 2007 numbers) Area Breakdowns Projected Enrolments Transportation Policy	Board website – Background Information
Agendas and Minutes	For each Committee and Public Meeting	Board website – Meeting Minutes and Documents

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

B. Appendices found on the Board Website continued

Item	Description	Location
Information Requests	Questions asked with responses shown Public Feedback from January 29, 2008 Public Meeting	Board website – Information Requests
Meeting Documents	Various documents supplied by the board, committee members and other supporting documentation including scenarios, completed valuation tools, etc	Board website – Meeting Minutes and Documents

Executive Summary

Creation of a Program and Accommodation Review Committee (PARC) for Southeast Oakville was approved by the Halton District School Board Trustees in March, 2007. The PARC was to review the programs for and accommodation of public school students in the area known as Ward 3 (and PE14). Declining enrolment and the distribution of students in the area had resulted in some schools being over-capacity and some under-capacity.

Unique to this PARC process was the fact that while there is sufficient capacity in the existing school sites to accommodate the number of students, the Board also owns property in the study area that has not been developed. A parcel of land approximately 4.92 acres (1.99 ha) located in the north east portion of the study area (the Clearview area) was acquired by the Board when the area was developed for housing in the 1980's.

Following the provincial and Board policies, the PARC met over the period from May 2007 until March 2008. Public meetings were held as required and input from the public was obtained and considered. In total, 22 meetings took place.

As part of the PARC process, the committee reviewed current enrolment information, projected enrolments, physical size and arrangement of the existing schools, and also heard presentations from Board research and program staff, study area school administrators and Town of Oakville planning staff. The Board's consultant, Watson and Associates, also supported the committee's work.

The committee has proposed two school organizations which result in a more efficient use of the existing facilities. The impact of the proposed organizations will be to enhance the curriculum delivery for the JK-grade 6 students and to utilize the middle school site for grades 7-8 at a capacity suited to the building and lot size.

The recommendations of this committee are:

1. That Committee Scenario 10 be thoroughly investigated by the Board's Facilities, Finance and Planning departments:

3 JK-6 regular track (English) schools at either New Central or Brantwood, plus Maple Grove and Chisholm
1 grades 1-6 single track French Immersion school at Linbrook
1 grades 7-8 dual track middle school at EJ James
1 grades 9-12 dual track secondary school at OTHS

That the Board consults with the community of the downtown core of Oakville in determining which of New Central or Brantwood is best suited to the long-term accommodation for the JK-6 English students of that area. As an example, the

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

consultation process could be a community information evening involving public input. This community information evening should take place within thirty days, before the Administrative Council submits its report to the trustees.

2. Reflecting the weighting received in the ranking vote, that Public Meeting Scenario 4 also be thoroughly investigated by the Board's Facilities, Finance and Planning departments:

3 JK-6 regular track (English) schools at New Central, Linbrook and Chisholm

1 grades 1-6 single track French Immersion school at Maple Grove

1 grades 7-8 dual track middle school at EJ James

1 grades 9-12 dual track secondary school at OTHS

3. That the funding available for primary class size alterations be prioritized in terms of renovations required at each affected school and that these renovations be undertaken as quickly as possible
4. That proceeds from the sale of any school site be used to make the appropriate renovations and improvements to provide for the long term accommodation for all Southeast Oakville students.
5. That a Boundary Review process and Transition Plan be developed and communicated as per Board policy.

Committee representatives of the Clearview area request that the concept of JK-6 regular track (English) students from the Clearview area being accommodated in one of the existing schools be further explored through the Boundary Review and Transition Plan procedures.

We would like to acknowledge members of the PARC who worked steadfastly through this process that at times was both frustrating and arduous. The final recommendations included in this report were not reached by consensus. Secret ballot voting that had to exceed a 60% threshold was used to determine how to narrow down the options to pursue. Conflicting interests could not be resolved by the PARC process, however members did look at what is best for student programming in the future for the area under study.

Section 1

Introduction

1.0 Reasons for the PARC

Prior to the establishment of the PARC for Southeast Oakville, a number of studies had been initiated in Southeast Oakville.

During the 2003-2004 school year, the Southeast Oakville Viability Study Committee was formed at the request of the School Council from New Central. In a letter addressed to the superintendent and director, School Council asked that staff investigate and make recommendations regarding program viability. Members included representatives from each school council, the principal of each school, the then Ward 3 Trustee Mary Chapin, and the then Superintendent of Education for the area, Keith Johnson. Representatives from the Clearview Oakville Community Association (COCA) were also members of the Committee. One of the recommendations of the Viability Study was:

Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board undertake a closure/accommodation study for the Southeast Oakville catchment area in order to provide JK-12 pupil accommodation for September 2005.

In September 2004, the options were presented to the Southeast Oakville community and an Open House was held to review these options. Comments from the community were solicited by the Board and due back in early October. In February 2005, the community was invited to present delegations to Board staff members with regard to the options under consideration.

Following the Viability Study, the Provincial Government allowed school boards to extend the final decision on any September 2005 closure from December 31, 2004 to April 30, 2005. At a Special Meeting of the Halton District School Board on January 12, 2005 the following motion was passed:

Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board undertake a closure/accommodation study for the southeast Oakville catchment area (including PE17) in order to provide JK-12 pupil accommodation for September 2005.

The School Closure/Accommodation committee conducted a process according to Board policy, procedures and past practice to account for community input, appropriate meeting dates and requests for information from Board staff.

The School Closure/Accommodation Committee was mandated to review enrolment figures and projections for each school and to present options to accommodate students over the long term. A school in the Clearview area was to be included as an option. The

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Committee was also given information on the rated student capacity for each school and was invited to tour each school. The Committee was not to look at boundary changes, and costs for each option were not considered.

Concurrently, in early 2005 the Ministry of Education released the Good Places to Learn position paper which impacted the process in the following ways: it required Boards to come up with a Consolidation/Closure Policy that allowed for a one year time span from the decision to close a school to the actual closing; it limited the class size in the primary grades to 20 students; and it stated that the province valued small schools. No information on funding for these initiatives was outlined.

In June 2005, staff presented a report to the Trustees with the options winnowed down somewhat. No cost implications were included for the remaining options. The Trustees voted to accept the report, but as it made no recommendations, no further action was taken.

The fall of 2005 and early 2006 were taken up with the preparation of the Capital Strategic Plan (CSP). The final version of the CSP, as approved by the Trustees on June 15, 2006, showed the construction of a school in the Clearview area as “possible, provided the HDSB is able to enter into a partnership with the Town of Oakville and funding from the province is made available”. No school closures were indicated for the Southeast Oakville area in the CSP.

In June 2006, Trustees discussed keeping Southeast Oakville on its ‘Hot Spots’ list, in response to letters from parents about resolving the accommodation issues in the area. In consultation with the community of Southeast Oakville, the decision was made to keep New Central open and to establish a Program and Accommodation Review Committee (PARC) for PE 14 (Southeast Oakville).

Creation of the PARC was approved by the Halton District School Board on March 21, 2007. This PARC was required to review the program and accommodation issues at all schools in the area.

The first committee meetings took place in May and June 2007 and then continued from September 2007 until March 2008. All the public meetings were held as required by the PARC policy, though the December 17, 2007 meeting was deferred until January 15, 2008. The agendas and minutes of the committee meetings and the public meetings are located on the Halton District School Board website at www.hdsb.ca under the link to the PARC for Southeast Oakville.

Section 2

Context of the PARC

2.1 The Study Area

Southeast Oakville is the area bounded by the Queen Elizabeth Way to the north, the shoreline of Lake Ontario to the south, the Sixteen Mile Creek to the west and Winston Churchill Blvd to the east. The historic downtown core of Oakville is located in the study area, as well as a large portion of the mid-town core. The balance of the area comprises some commercial, industrial and retail development, but the majority of the area is residential development of varying density.

The area developed outwards from the downtown core (first settled over 180 years ago). Farms gradually gave way to estate development along the lakeshore and to housing development in the 1950's, 60's and 70's, from the west side of the area to the east, culminating in the development of the area known as Clearview (in the north east portion of the study area) in the 1980's. With the exception of the mid-town core and the hospital site (see note below), no further housing development is expected to take place. Some re-development of the 1950's and 60's housing stock is taking place with bungalows being replaced by large two storey houses.

During the study period the Town of Oakville announced that the mid-town core (the area adjacent to the Queen Elizabeth Way and Trafalgar Road) would be re-developed to help meet the provincial targets for intensification and growth. While the Town predicts 20,000 new residents to be located in this area, it is not known what impact this will have on enrolment at schools in the area.

The Oakville Trafalgar Memorial Hospital, located at Reynolds Street and MacDonald Road, will be re-located to north Oakville. Construction is scheduled to begin in 2012. Due to restrictive covenants on the existing hospital site (which is adjacent to the former location of Oakville Trafalgar High School, also subject to the same covenants), the potential for housing re-development is unknown, though planners from the Town of Oakville have indicated that any re-development would have to be in keeping with the existing neighbourhood.

2.2 School Sites in the Study Area

As shown in the Halton District School Board's most recent Capital Strategic Plan, Southeast Oakville is covered by three school planning areas: PE 14, PE 17 (elementary school areas) and part of PS 03 (secondary). The schools in PE 14 are Brantwood, Maple Grove and Chisholm (JK-5 regular track), Linbrook (JK-5 French Immersion), New Central (6-8 regular track) and EJ James (6-8 dual track). The Board owns property in PE 17 (the area known as Clearview) that has not been developed. The secondary school serving Southeast Oakville is Oakville Trafalgar High School.

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

No outside cohorts merge into the elementary schools. Southeast Oakville students who attend the grades 5-8 Gifted Program at W. H. Morden Public School (to the west of the study area) return to Oakville Trafalgar High School for enriched level courses in grades 9-12.

Maps showing the location of the existing school sites are contained in the appendix B of this report.

A profile of each school site in the study area is contained in the next sub-section of the report.

In addition to the seven public schools in the study area, there also two JK-8 Catholic schools: St Luke's on Kingsway Drive in the Clearview area; and St Vincent's on Braeside Drive, just south of EJ James. Many private schools are also located in the area including:

- Clanmore Montessori School (18 months – grade 6)
- Dearcroft Montessori School (preschool – grade 8)
- St Mildred's Lightbourn School (girls JK-grade 12)
- MacLachlan Academy (JK-grade 12)
- John Knox Christian School (JK-8)
- Wildwood Academy (grades 2-6)
- Chisholm Academy (grades 9-12).

Just outside of the study area are two more private schools; Appleby College (grades 7-12), Fern Hill School (pre-school - 8) and Glenburnie School (preschool - 8). Several nursery schools and private daycare centres also operate in the study area.

2.3 School Site Profiles

The following notes apply to all school profiles:

- All information is taken from material supplied to the committee during the PARC process, with additional information on timelines of original construction and additions supplied by school principals and school council members.
- Capacity is based on the OTG (On the Ground), a provincial formula that determines the number of students that can be accommodated at a given school. OTG capacity does not include any porta-paks or portables. All OTG capacities reflect the cap on primary class size regardless of whether a school has primary students.
- Current enrolments are shown as Head Count and Full Time Equivalent (FTE) and are based on September 17, 2007 enrolment figures supplied to the committee
- Future enrolments are shown as Head Count and are taken from the Capital Strategic Plan and information supplied to the committee by the Board's planning consultant Watson and Associates. Included in the projected enrolments are students designated as 'others', that is students who would be attending other

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

programs or schools outside the study area (these students are not included in the current enrolment figures).

- Projected enrolment figures assume the same boundaries are in place.
- Clearview area students are shown at the schools they attend currently for the JK-8 regular track program.
- An assessment of how each school meets the building code requirements for barrier-free accessibility has not been undertaken; statements on accessibility are based on a visual review of the school sites.

BRANTWOOD PUBLIC SCHOOL

Address:	221 Allan Street, Oakville						
Current Grade Configuration:	JK-5 regular track						
Year Built:	1921						
Additions:	mid 1970's Gymnasium						
	2005 and 2007 New Playground Structure						
	2006 Windows replaced						
Site Size:	2.2 acres (.89 ha)						
Capacity (based on OTG):	227						
Utilization:	54% (Head Count)			45% (FTE)			
Current Class Structure:	2 JK/SK classes, 1 class each of grades 1-5						
Current Enrolment (Sept 07):	122 (Head Count)			102.5 (FTE)			
Grade:	JK	SK	Gr01	Gr02	Gr03	Gr04	Gr05
Regular Track	16	23	14	13	16	19	21
Projected Enrolment (2015):	120 (Head Count)						
Grade:	JK	SK	Gr01	Gr02	Gr03	Gr04	Gr05
Regular Track	17	17	17	17	17	17	18
Specialty Classrooms:	2 (JK/SK)						
Regular Classrooms:	6 plus 2 in basement						
Other Spaces:	1 computer lab						
Portables:	0						

Notes:

Bus Drop Off: No

Accessibility: Gymnasium is accessible and a ramp provides access to the first floor; basement and second floor are accessed by stairs

Brief History: Built as 1-8 school for the downtown core, was a K- grade 4 school for many years; a Heritage district that includes Brantwood was created by the Town of Oakville in 1994

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

MAPLE GROVE PUBLIC SCHOOL

Address:	288 Maple Grove Drive, Oakville						
Current Grade Configuration:	JK-5 regular track						
Year Built:	1872						
Additions:	1935	Classroom and basement					
	1953, 1957	Classrooms and library					
	1986	Gymnasium					
	2005	Playground structure					
Site Size:	5.89 acres (2.39 ha)						
Capacity (based on OTG):	302						
Utilization:	109% (Head Count) 93% (FTE)						
Current Class Structure:	5 JK/SK classes, 3 grade 1's, 1 grade 2, 1 grade 2/3, 2 grade 3's, 2 grade 4's, 2 grade 5's						
Current Enrolment (Sept 07):	329 (Head Count)		280.5 (FTE)				
Grade:	JK	SK	Gr01	Gr02	Gr03	Gr04	Gr05
Regular Track	38	33	42	27	29	39	30
Clearview	12	14	18	8	12	11	16
Projected Enrolment (2015):	309 (Head Count)						
Grade:	JK	SK	Gr01	Gr02	Gr03	Gr04	Gr05
Regular Track	29	37	28	28	28	28	29
Clearview	14	18	14	14	14	14	14
Specialty Classrooms:	3 (JK/SK)						
Regular Classrooms:	10 plus 1 in basement						
Other Spaces:	1 special education room						
Portables:	1						

Notes:

Bus Drop Off: Through parking lot

Accessibility: Most of the school is on one floor with the exception of one kindergarten classrooms which is accessed by stairs

Brief History: Originally built as a one room schoolhouse for grades 1-8; is located adjacent to Oakville Trafalgar High School though they front on to different streets; The one room schoolhouse portion received a Heritage designation from the Town of Oakville in 1993. Children's Choice, a private daycare, operates a before and after school program in co-operation with the school, using school facilities for the after-school portion

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

CHISHOLM PUBLIC SCHOOL							
Address:	165 Charnwood Drive, Oakville						
Current Grade Configuration:	JK-5 regular track						
Year Built:	1974						
Additions:	2001 Playground						
	2004 Library upgrade and computer lab renovation						
	2007 New floor in gymnasium						
Site Size:	3.8 acres (1.55 ha)						
Capacity (based on OTG):	230						
Utilization:	124% (Head Count) 108% (FTE)						
Current Class Structure:	4 JK/SK classes, 2 grade 1's, 2 grade 2's, 2 grade 3's, 1 grade 3/4, 1 grade 4, 2 grade 5's						
Current Enrolment (Sept 07):	285 (Head Count)		249 (FTE)				
Grade:	JK	SK	Gr01	Gr02	Gr03	Gr04	Gr05
Regular Track	16	22	18	22	21	21	20
Clearview	16	18	20	18	24	20	29
Projected Enrolment (2015):	245 (Head Count)						
Grade:	JK	SK	Gr01	Gr02	Gr03	Gr04	Gr05
Regular Track	20	22	20	20	20	20	21
Clearview	14	16	14	14	14	14	15
Specialty Classrooms:	3 (JK/SK)						
Regular Classrooms:	8						
Other Space:	1 special education room, 1 computer lab						
Portables:	1						
Notes:							
Bus Drop Off: At front entrance on school property							
Accessibility: Designated special needs school for Southeast Oakville (grades JK-5); school is fully accessible							
Brief History: Originally built as an open concept school; the YMCA operates a before and after school program in the school							

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

ÉCOLE LINBROOK PUBLIC SCHOOL

Address:	1079 Linbrook Road, Oakville						
Current Grade Configuration:	JK-SK regular track, 1-5 single track French Immersion						
Year Built:	1932						
Additions:	1949	Classrooms and washrooms					
	1954	Classrooms					
	1955	Classrooms and Gymnasium					
	2007	Library renovations					
Site Size:	5.3 acres (2.13 ha)						
Capacity (based on OTG):	236						
Utilization:	155% (Head Count) 147% (FTE)						
Current Class Structure:	1 JK and 1 SK class, 3 grade 1's, 4 grade 2's, 3 grade 3's, 1 grade 3/4, 2 grade 4's, 1 grade 4/5, 2 grade 5's						
Current Enrolment (Sept 07):	365 (Head Count) 346.5 (FTE)						
Grade:	JK	SK	Gr01	Gr02	Gr03	Gr04	Gr05
Regular Track (Catchment)	6	7					
Optional Attendance (PE14)	10	9					
Optional Attdnce Clearview	3	2					
French Immersion			61	72	68	64	63
Projected Enrolment (2015):	FI only 342 (Head Count), 43 JK/SK (Head Count)						
Grade:	JK	SK	Gr01	Gr02	Gr03	Gr04	Gr05
Regular Track *	20	23					
French Immersion			68	68	68	68	71
Specialty Classrooms:	1 (JK/SK)						
Regular Classrooms:	11						
Other Spaces:	1 Special Education room; 1 computer lab						
Portables:	6						

Notes:

Bus Drop Off: Designated bus lane at front of school, separate from parking lot
 Accessibility: Most of the school is on one floor, except the original one room schoolhouse portion which now contains the office, library and music/staff room which are accessed by stairs
 Brief History: Originally built as a one room school house for grades 1-8; became the grade 1-5 French Immersion centre for Southeast Oakville in 1982; has a small boundary for kindergarten with optional attendance for younger siblings of students in French Immersion currently permitted
 * Note: Breakdown of JK/SK students by catchment and optional attendance is not shown in projected enrolments

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

NEW CENTRAL PUBLIC SCHOOL

Address: 133 Balsam Drive, Oakville
Current Grade Configuration: 6-8 regular track
Year Built: 1958
Additions: none
Site Size: 4.6 acres (1.88 ha)
Capacity (based on OTG): 161
Utilization: 60% (Head Count) 60% (FTE)
Current Class Structure: 1 grade 6, 1 grade 6/7, 1 grade 7/8, 1 grade 8
Current Enrolment (Sept 07): 96 (Head Count) 96(FTE)
Grade: Gr06 Gr07 Gr08
Regular track 35 31 30
Projected Enrolment (2015): 57 (Head Count)
Grade: Gr06 Gr07 Gr08
Regular Track 19 19 19
Specialty Classrooms: 3 (music, science, art)
Regular Classrooms: 6
Portables: 0

Notes:

Bus Drop Off: Through school site

Accessibility: School is on one floor

Brief History: Built to replace the original Central School; was a grade 5-8 school for many years; has housed the Late Immersion program and later, the Gifted program

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

ÉCOLE EJ JAMES PUBLIC SCHOOL

Address: 338 Cairncroft Road, Oakville
 Current Grade Configuration: 6-8 regular track and French Immersion
 Year Built: 1957
 Additions: 1961 – library and classrooms
 1968 - classrooms
 1982 – gymnasium, change rooms and locker area
 2002 – library renovation
 2006 – gymnasium floor replaced
 Site Size: 5.0 acres (2.01 ha)
 Capacity (based on OTG): 377
 Utilization: 133% (Head Count) 133% (FTE)
 Current Class Structure: regular track: 4 grade 6's, 4 grade 7's, 5 grade 8's
 French Imm: 2 grade 6's, 1 grade 7, 1 grade 7/8, 1 grade 8
 Current Enrolment (Sept 07): 501 (Head Count) 501(FTE)
 Grade: Gr06 Gr07 Gr08
 Regular track 73 70 80
 Clearview 41 40 59
 French Immersion 47 45 46
 Projected Enrolment (2015): 465 (Head Count)
 Grade: Gr06 Gr07 Gr08
 Regular Track 54 54 54
 Clearview 31 31 31
 French Immersion 71 71 68
 Specialty Classrooms: 6 (2 science, 1 music, 1 art, 1 technical/design, 1 computer lab)
 Regular Classrooms: 13
 Other Spaces: 2 special education rooms
 Portables: 2

Notes:

Bus Drop Off: Bus circle at rear of property
 Accessibility: Designated special needs school for Southeast Oakville (grades 6-8)
 Brief History: Built as a K-8 school; changed to a middle school in the mid 80's and a dual stream middle school by the late 80's

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

OAKVILLE TRAFLAGAR HIGH SCHOOL

Address: 1460 Devon Road, Oakville
Current Grade Configuration: 9-12 regular track and French Immersion
Year Built: 1991
Additions: approx 2002 – porta-pak added
Site Size: 13.47 acres (5.45 ha)
Capacity (based on OTG): 1158
Utilization: 111% (Head Count) 111% (FTE)
Current Class Structure: regular track: grades 9-12
French Immersion: grades 9-12
Current Enrolment (Sept 07): 1287 (Head Count) 1287 (FTE)
Regular track 1081
French Immersion 206
Projected Enrolment (2015): 950 (Head Count)
Regular Track 688
French Immersion 262

Notes:

Bus Drop Off: Dedicated bus lane at front of school, separate from parking lot
Accessibility: Designated special needs school for Southeast Oakville (grades 9-12)
Brief History: Built to replace the original OTHS (circa 1908); the YMCA operates a day care facility in the school

CLEARVIEW SITE

Address: Kingsway Drive, 0.5 km west of Winston Churchill Blvd
Site Size: approx 4.92 acres (approx 1.99 ha), abuts municipal parkland

For current and projected JK-8 regular track enrolments, please see the preceding school site profiles.

Notes:

Brief History: See section 2.5.5

2.4 Program and Accommodation Factors

In the study area the following programs are currently offered:

- Regular track (English) programs at three JK-5 schools
- Single track French Immersion at one JK-5 school
- Regular track (English) program at one grade 6-8 school
- Dual track (English and French Immersion) at one grade 6-8 school
- Dual track (English and French Immersion) at one grade 9-12 high school

The following programs are offered outside the study area, but within Oakville:

- English as a second language
- Gifted program for grades 5-8
- International Baccalaureate program

The following programs are not offered in Oakville:

- Late French Immersion

The programs currently offered at the elementary and high schools in Southeast Oakville are excellent. The EQAO scores are consistently high. The CD Howe Institute data attached in Appendix A shows that a Southeast Oakville school has ranked number 1 in the Halton District School Board every year since EQAO testing began in 1998. All schools in the community also benefit from a high level of parent volunteer activity, including successful All-Star Reading programs and active school councils.

The concern that is being studied under this PARC is the viability of programming as it is affected by enrolment.

2.5 Other Factors

2.5.1 Declining Enrolment

Southeast Oakville is defined, in planning terms, as a mature neighbourhood. Other than the possibility of further housing development in the midtown core and at the hospital site, no growth in the number of houses in the neighbourhood is anticipated. Since the 1970's, Canada has experienced a declining national birth rate. Student enrolment in Southeast Oakville is projected to decline until approximately 2011, at which point enrolment should stabilize (see Appendix B for Projected Enrolments in 2015 and the Capital Strategic Plan for projections broken out by year).

The declining enrolment has led to some schools being below capacity, and given that the capacities of the schools were small to start with, viability of the programs may be affected. Declining enrolment is also a factor that has impacted on administrators' ability to hire and retain staff.

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

2.5.2 Primary Class Size Cap

The cap on the primary class size has resulted in portables at all of the JK-5 schools except Brantwood. Administrators have creatively continued to offer music programming by using part of a staff room, the stage or a music cart.

Due to the uncertainty of the accommodation issues in this area, \$1.1 million of the Primary Class Size funding earmarked for Southeast Oakville remains unspent.

2.5.3 Full Day Every Day Kindergarten

During the study period, the provincial government announced plans to offer full day every day Junior and Senior Kindergarten programs. The impact of doubling the accommodation requirements for this program have been taken into account in this PARC by showing the utilization on both a Head Count and FTE basis. As well, Head Count enrolment figures are shown as the projected enrolments for 2015.

2.5.4 Past History of Accommodation Uncertainty

For at least the last 17 years, the Southeast Oakville area has seen schools marked for closure. The moratorium on school closures was a temporary relief, but the threat of closure is one factor that has impacted on the ability of administrators to hire and retain staff. It may also have impacted on parents' decisions regarding enrolment of their children in the public school system.

2.5.5 The Clearview Area

An important factor in the PARC study was the fact that the Board owned property in the Clearview area that was never developed and thus resulted in students from that area being bused to holding schools in PE14.

The Halton District School Board acquired the 4.92 acre (1.99 ha) parcel of land on Kingsway Drive in the Clearview area when the area was being developed for housing in the 1980's. An elementary school has not been constructed due to a number of factors, including:

- Declining enrolment projections
- Changes in provincial government leadership, resulting in changes in educational policies and funding formulas
- Moratoriums on school closures.

2.5.6 Transportation Considerations

Two areas in Southeast Oakville are affected by the main east-west rail corridor and high traffic intersections. These areas are the northwest corner of the study area and the northeast corner of the study area (the Clearview area). Students from these two areas, similar to other areas in Halton with such safety considerations, are bused regardless of the distance to the school they attend.

Any changes to school configurations would have to take busing of students into account.

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

2.5.7 Mid-Town Core

Mid-town Core development proposed by the Town of Oakville has cast some uncertainty on the total number of projected students coming to PE14.

Section 3

Process of the PARC

This section outlines the process followed by the PARC for Southeast Oakville. It is not a strict timeline as some items were taking place concurrently. The required public meetings were held and feedback received was included in the deliberations of the committee.

3.1 Establishment of the PARC

Following the approval of the PARC for Southeast Oakville by the Trustees, committee members were sought. Each school was to invite representation of four to six members including:

- One principal or vice-principal
- One member of the teaching staff
- One member of the non-teaching staff
- A maximum of three parent representatives

Where Clearview students attend a school in the area, it was suggested that one parent representative be from the Clearview area. One French Immersion parent representative was also suggested from schools that offered the program. A total of 41 members made up this PARC committee.

At the first committee meeting in May 2007, representatives received a binder of information (see Appendix B for the list of materials the committee received). The process of the PARC was laid out and the timetable reviewed. At this meeting, three members of the Clearview Oakville Community Association (COCA) were introduced as representatives of the school site in the Clearview area. Town Councillor Mary Chapin was also named as the representative of the Town of Oakville.

In October 2007 the first public meeting was held to review the PARC process and to outline how the public could contribute to the PARC process in Southeast Oakville.

3.2 Visits to Other School Sites

In June and September 2007, committee members were given the opportunity to visit other schools in Halton, outside of Southeast Oakville. These three schools were École Pinegrove Public School, a newly renovated grades 1-8 single track French Immersion school in South West Oakville; Maplehurst, a renovated school in Burlington; and École Alexander's Public School, a newly built dual track JK-8 school in Burlington. Costs of the renovations and construction were given to committee members subsequent to the school visits.

3.3 Valuation Tool

3.3.1 Generic Tool

The generic Valuation Tool that had been developed as a template was presented to the committee. The template could be modified by adding specific items relevant to the study area, but no items could be taken away from the tool.

3.3.2 Weighting of Items

To determine the relative importance of items on the generic tool, all members of the committee placed stickers beside the items they deemed important. Committee members had made additions to the generic tool before the weighting stickers were added.

The results of the weightings were reviewed and then the committee split into two groups, each taking a different half of the tool, to determine how the weightings would be used to develop the final version of the valuation tool. One group combined like items together and assigned points to each line item based on the number of stickers received, with the total being the number of points available for that section. The other group combined items and interpreted others to arrive at new line items and points were assigned to the line items that totaled the number of points available for each section.

The Valuation Tool was the agenda item for the November 2007 public meeting. The tool was presented and then the public was invited to comment on the tool and make suggestions.

It was not until the next committee meeting that the discrepancy in weighting methods was discussed. Much discussion also took place on the way the valuation tool would be used. The decision was made to carry on with the process of completing the tool.

The valuation tool's use in this process was questionable; however, it was completed as per provincial regulations.

3.3.3 Application of the Tool to Each School

Another meeting involved rating each school according to the valuation tool. The ratings for each school were done by the members of the committee for that school. The results were tabulated and distributed at the next meeting. Committee members were cautioned not to regard the total number of points as a 'report card' for each school.

Following that meeting, some inconsistencies were noted in the points assigned by each school to certain items. A group discussion resulted in some points being revised so that there was a consistent interpretation of each item. The final Valuation Tools for each school are contained in the Appendix B of this report.

3.4 Presentation on the Attributes of an Effective School

HDSB staff members Susan Orchard (School Programs) and Heather Gatevackas (Research) gave a presentation on the attributes that contribute to an effective school.

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

From this presentation, committee members learned that a successful school depends most importantly on good teachers and administrators. The size and grade structure of the school was shown to be less important. A copy of the presentation is contained in Appendix B of this report.

3.5 Brainstorming to Generate Scenarios

The committee met to generate scenarios. No restrictions were imposed on the scenarios. Each committee member could generate up to three scenarios. These were then presented to the committee by someone other than the person who generated the scenario. A total of 71 scenarios were presented.

There was some overlap of ideas generated, so subsequent to the meeting the scenarios were grouped by location and grade structures and duplicates were noted. This still resulted in 17 different sub-groupings of location and grade structures. The original list of scenarios and the grouped list of scenarios are contained in appendix A of this report.

3.6 Development of Value Statements

The committee deemed it appropriate to develop a set of value statements that could be used to guide the process. Members split into three groups to generate ideas and statements of values. The list of the value statements developed by the committee includes:

- Maintain great academics
- Stability to attract and maintain top staff
- Specialists for appropriate grade levels
- Minimize splits
- Walk-to Schools
- Appropriate school structure
- Long-term stability
- Minimal disruption
- Before and after school programs
- Balance fairness for all in Ward 3
- Sustainable size (teacher teaming within the school)
- Facilities that support programs
- Appropriate numbers for additional support (eg SERT, librarian, vice-principals, secretaries)
- Safe schools
- School serves community.

These statements were not prioritized, weighted or defined.

3.7 Review of Grade Structures and Programs

The committee was given a presentation on grade structures and programs that was developed by the principals and vice principals at the schools in the study area. The wide

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

range of experience of the administrators contributed to the effectiveness of the presentation as it outlined the pros and cons of each type of grade structure and program, including single track and dual track French Immersion.

Subsequently, a principal of a dual stream French Immersion was invited to give a presentation on the dual stream program. Copies of both presentations are contained in Appendix B of this report.

3.8 Re-Development of Scenarios

Rather than try to narrow down the original list of 71 scenarios, the committee chose to re-develop a list of scenarios to be presented to the public that would build on the learning that had taken place. Each school group came up with up to three scenarios and a framework for presenting the scenarios was developed. This process generated 18 options, although there were some duplicates.

The framework for the scenarios produced for the public meeting showed the current and future enrolment for each scenario. Also shown was the capacity for each school based on the suggested boundaries developed by the committee. The boundaries came from an exercise undertaken by the Board's Planning department, at the request of the committee. The current and projected enrolments for Southeast Oakville were broken out into nine geographical areas and sub-divided by program (ie regular track and French Immersion).

Both the list of scenarios as presented to the public and the enrolment breakdowns are contained in the Appendix B of this report. The corrected projected enrolments are posted on the Board website.

3.9 Refinement of Structures

Feedback from the public meeting on the scenarios presented was used in discussions to further refine the scenarios. A table grouping the feedback comments was developed and is contained in Appendix A of this report. To summarize the results briefly, a significant number of positive comments were received for the scenarios that involved three JK-6 regular track schools and a significant number of negative comments were received for scenarios that involved two JK-8 schools.

At this point, the committee determined that the Board staff could have a significant impact on the further refinement of scenarios. The committee did not want to pursue any scenarios that would not be viable in the eyes of the Facilities, Finance and Planning staff.

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Rather than focus on specific sites, the committee opted to put certain grade structures and programs forward to the Board staff for their input. The grades structures and programs put forward were:

- JK-6 English schools in either two or three locations
- a single track grade 1-6 French Immersion school
- a dual track 7-8 school
- and the dual track 9-12 high school at OTHS left unchanged.

Due to the time constraints of the schedule of public meetings, the Board staff was only able to put this information together in a very short period of time. The committee did not have a meeting to review and revise the Board's suggestions on the locations of the programs before the public meeting took place.

The four scenarios that the Board staff presented, based on the direction given to them by the committee, are listed below. The presentation for the public meeting, which included financial information and outlines of the changes required at each school, are contained in the Appendix A of this report.

Scenario 1: 2 JK-6 English schools (Clearview and Linbrook)
 1 1-6 French Immersion school (Maple Grove)
 1 7-8 Dual Track school (EJ James)

This would result in closing Brantwood, New Central and Chisholm.

Scenario 2: 2 JK-6 English schools (Clearview and Chisholm)
 1 1-6 French Immersion school (Maple Grove)
 1 7-8 Dual Track school (EJ James)

This would result in closing Brantwood, New Central and Linbrook.

Scenario 3: 2 JK-6 English schools (Linbrook and Chisholm)
 1 1-6 French Immersion school (Maple Grove)
 1 7-8 Dual Track school (EJ James)

This would result in closing Brantwood and New Central.

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Scenario 4: 3 JK-6 English schools (Linbrook, Chisholm and New Central)
 1 1-6 French Immersion school (Maple Grove)
 1 7-8 Dual Track school (EJ James)

This would result in closing Brantwood.

At the public meeting, significant input was received from the community. Following the public meeting, the public could comment on a special section of the HDSB website which was open for 48 hours. 435 comments and letters were received and may be found in Appendix B.

The major trends in the public comments included the following:

- Concern regarding the lack of a school in the downtown core in the three scenarios that were based on the two JK-6 regular track model
- That a school be built on the Clearview site
- That the French Immersion single-track program be retained at Linbrook Public School
- Transportation (busing) was an area of concern
- Walk-to schools, community based schools and minimal busing
- Minimal disruption.

3.10 Final Meetings

At the committee meeting following the public meeting, the committee spent significant time discussing how to move forward. The Board staff presented revised financial figures for the public meeting scenarios and presented a table showing their own interpretation of the value statements as applied to the four scenarios (see Appendix B of this report).

At a subsequent meeting, the committee decided to add to the four original scenarios presented at the January 29, 2008 public meeting. In addition, the issue of single track versus dual track French Immersion was revisited. A formal vote took place and the committee voted in favour of retaining the single track French Immersion program.

More scenarios were put forward to add to those developed for the January 29 public meeting. A combination of 14 new options was sent to the Board staff for development into the same format containing the same information as the ones presented to the public.

The only significant variable between all the proposed scenarios was the delivery of the regular track program for grades JK-6 at either three sites or two. Therefore, the committee decided to vote as a first step: **EITHER** three JK-6 English schools plus one grade 1-6 French Immersion school **OR** two JK-6 English schools plus one grade 1-6

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

French Immersion school. Both options included one dual track grades 7-8 middle school and the grades 9-12 dual track program remaining at OTHS.

The committee also decided that a vote of this importance should be required to meet a higher threshold than a simple majority. A 60% vote in favour of one of the options above would be required to consider only that option going forward. The option that received less than 40% would be dropped from any further considerations. In the event that neither option received 60% or more of the votes, scenarios representing each option would be further developed into recommendations for the final report.

3.11 The Vote on Options

The committee decided that the vote would be a secret ballot vote. Proxy votes were allowed, if notice had been given in advance to the chair of the committee. Trustees Ockenden and Ellis and the Board staff who had been involved in the committee did not vote, nor did Town Councillor Mary Chapin. Abstentions, if any, would not count in determining the 60% threshold.

The results of the vote on options were:	Votes	%
3 JK-6 schools plus 1 grade 1-6 French Immersion school:	27	68
2 JK-6 schools plus 1 grade 1-6 French Immersion school:	13	32
Abstentions:	0	
Members absent with no proxy	1	

Therefore, the three JK-6 English schools plus 1 grade 1-6 French Immersion school option carried.

3.12 Remaining Scenarios

The result of the vote left four scenarios to be considered. The four scenarios and their financial implications are shown below. In each scenario the following assumptions and notes were stated by HDSB staff:

- All scenarios may also require portables in the short term
- Renewal savings from closed schools will be used to support schools that remain open
- Property Sales based on \$850,000/acre (Board Net Proceeds are 50%); Sale subject to Ontario Regulation #44498
- Savings from Operations amortized over 25 years
- Information is subject to change.

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Additionally, it should be noted that the committee had many differing enrolment figures to work with. The current number of JK-6 regular track (English) students is 886 (Head Count). The projected enrolment for 2015 for the same group is 818, however, this figure includes the 'other' students that live in Southeast Oakville but attend schools outside the study area. The 'other' students number approximately 60 currently, and thus are projected to include approximately 50 students in 2015.

The committee decided to use a long term capacity of 300 (OTG) at each of the three proposed JK-6 regular track schools on the assumption that the actual number would be determined during the Boundary Review process. Redistribution of the Linbrook kindergarten students is not shown in the projected enrolments; this will have to be addressed. Thus all proposed modifications are subject to change.

Public Meeting Scenario 4 Financial Implications		
Description: 3 JK-6 regular track (English) schools, 1 grades 1-6 French Immersion school, 1 grades 7-8 dual track school, 1 grades 9-12 dual track high school		
Sites	Program and approx OTG Capacity	Proposed Modifications
Linbrook	JK-6 English (300)	Add 4 classrooms
Chisholm	JK-6 English (300)	Add 4 classrooms
New Central	JK-6 English (300)	Add 4 classrooms and gym
Maple Grove	1-6 French Immersion (400)	Add 4 classrooms
EJ James	7-8 dual track (377)	None
OTHS	9-12 dual track (1158)	None
Revenue		
Close and sell Brantwood		\$1,000,000
Sell Clearview site		2,500,000
Savings from Operations		316,000
Available PCS Funds		<u>1,100,093</u>
Subtotal		\$4,916,093
Expenses		
Linbrook modifications		\$ 800,000
Chisholm modifications		800,000
New Central modifications		2,300,000
Maple Grove modifications		<u>800,000</u>
Subtotal		\$ 4,700,000
Net cash implication		<u>\$ 216,093</u>

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Committee Scenario 10 Financial Implications

Description: 3 JK-6 regular track (English) schools, 1 grades 1-6 French Immersion school, 1 grades 7-8 dual track school, 1 grades 9-12 dual track high school

Sites (Option A)	Program and approx OTG Capacity	Proposed Modifications
New Central	JK-6 English (300)	Add 4 classrooms and gym
Maple Grove	JK-6 English (300)	None
Chisholm	JK-6 English (300)	Add 4 classrooms
Linbrook	1-6 French Immersion (400)	Add 8 classrooms and gym
EJ James	7-8 dual track (377)	None
OTHS	9-12 dual track (1158)	None

Sites (Option B)	Program and approx OTG Capacity	Proposed Modifications
Brantwood	JK-6 English (300)	Add 4 classrooms and site work
Maple Grove	JK-6 English (300)	None
Chisholm	JK-6 English (300)	Add 4 classrooms
Linbrook	1-6 French Immersion (400)	Add 8 classrooms and gym
EJ James	7-8 dual track (377)	None
OTHS	9-12 dual track (1158)	None

OPTION A	Revenue	
	Close and sell Brantwood	\$1,000,000
	Sell Clearview site	2,500,000
	Savings from Operations	316,000
	Available PCS Funds	<u>1,100,093</u>
	Subtotal	\$4,916,093
	Expenses	
	New Central modifications	\$ 2,300,000
	Chisholm modifications	800,000
	Linbrook modifications	<u>4,100,000</u>
	Subtotal	\$ 7,200,000
	Net cash implication	<u>\$ (2,283,907)</u>

OPTION B	Revenue	
	Close and sell New Central	\$1,955,000
	Sell Clearview site	2,500,000
	Savings from Operations	316,000
	Available PCS Funds	<u>1,100,093</u>
	Subtotal	\$5,871,093
	Expenses	
	Brantwood modifications	\$ 1,200,000
	Chisholm modifications	800,000
	Linbrook modifications	<u>4,100,000</u>
	Subtotal	\$ 6,100,000
	Net cash implication	<u>\$ (228,907)</u>

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Committee Scenario 12a Financial Implications

**Description: 3 JK-6 regular track (English) schools, 1 grades 1-6 French Immersion school,
1 grades 7-8 dual track school, 1 grades 9-12 dual track high school**

Sites	Program and approx OTG Capacity	Proposed Modifications
New Central	JK-6 English (300)	Add 4 classrooms and gym
Maple Grove	JK-6 English (300)	None
Clearview	JK-6 English (300)	Build 300 pupil space school
Linbrook	1-6 French Immersion (400)	Add 8 classrooms and gym
EJ James	7-8 dual track (377)	None
OTHS	9-12 dual track (1158)	None

Revenue

Close and sell Brantwood	\$1,000,000
Close and sell Chisholm	1,615,000
Savings from Operations	632,000
Available PCS Funds	<u>1,100,093</u>
Subtotal	\$4,347,093

Expenses

New Central modifications	\$ 2,300,000
Build Clearview school	6,371,690
Linbrook modifications	<u>4,100,000</u>
Subtotal	\$ 12,771,690

Net cash implication **\$ (8,424,597)**

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Committee Scenario 12b Financial Implications

Description: 3 JK-6 regular track (English) schools, 1 grades 1-6 French Immersion school, 1 grades 7-8 dual track school, 1 grades 9-12 dual track high school

Sites	Program and approx OTG Capacity	Proposed Modifications
New Central	JK-6 English (300)	Add 4 classrooms and gym
Chisholm	JK-6 English (300)	Add 4 classrooms
Clearview	JK-6 English (300)	Build 300 pupil space school
Linbrook	1-6 French Immersion (400)	Add 8 classrooms and gym
EJ James	7-8 dual track (377)	None
OTHS	9-12 dual track (1158)	None

Revenue

Close and sell Brantwood	\$1,000,000
Close and sell Maple Grove	2,503,250
Savings from Operations	632,000
Available PCS Funds	<u>1,100,093</u>
Subtotal	<u>\$5,235,343</u>

Expenses

New Central modifications	\$ 2,300,000
Chisholm modifications	800,000
Build Clearview school	6,371,690
Linbrook modifications	<u>4,100,000</u>
Subtotal	<u>\$ 13,571,690</u>

Net cash implication **\$ (8,336,347)**

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

To provide further clarification, the committee decided to do a weighted ranking of the remaining four scenarios to assist in determining the next steps. Each scenario would be listed in order of preference in descending order. A first place ranking would receive four points, a second place ranking three points and so on.

Results of the Rankings					
Scenario	Number of First Place Rankings (4 pts)	Number of Second Place Rankings (3 pts)	Number of Third Place Rankings (2 pts)	Number of Fourth Place Rankings (1 pt)	Total Points
Committee Scenario 10	22	11	4	3	132
Public Meeting Scenario 4	10	21	4	5	116
Committee Scenario 12a	6	3	17	14	81
Committee Scenario 12b	2	5	15	18	71

Given the clear indication of the rankings, the committee opted to vote on whether the two highest ranked scenarios should be the only ones going forward in the final report. The majority voted in favour of only the top two scenarios being included as recommendations in the final report.

The committee briefly discussed what impact these remaining scenarios would have on students from the Clearview area. Consensus was not reached on whether it was appropriate to request that they all be in one JK-6 regular track (English) school or whether this would cause undue disruption.

Section 4

Reporting Requirements

The PARC policy approved by the Trustees sets out lists of questions that the PARC committee must answer. These questions are contained in section 2.6 and section 2.8 of the PARC policy.

4.1 Section 2.6

1. *Does the school or group of schools currently provide the range of mandatory programs required to meet the Ministry of Education policies and ensure program quality for all the students of the Halton District School Board who reside in the catchment area?*

All schools (Oakville Trafalgar High School, Brantwood, Chisholm, E.J. James, Linbrook, Maple Grove and New Central) currently provide the range of mandatory programs that meet the Ministry of Education policies and ensure program quality for all students from the Halton District School Board who reside within the study area.

2. *Does the school or group of schools currently provide the range of optional programs required to ensure an appropriate education and program quality for all students? What optional programs cannot be offered currently that are available in other Halton District School Board schools?*

All schools (Oakville Trafalgar High School, Brantwood, Chisholm, E.J. James, Linbrook, Maple Grove and New Central) currently provide the range of optional programs that meet the Ministry of Education policies and ensure program quality for all students from the Halton District School Board who reside within the study area. We are not aware at this time of any optional program (other than Late French Immersion starting in grade 7 and essential programs and some technical programs in the secondary panel) that is not offered in this area.

3. *Is the operation of the schools or size of schools supported by the funding guidelines of the Students-Focused Funding Model or are there other sustainable sources of revenue to support the operation?*

Operation is funded entirely by existing grants; no other revenue sources are in place.

4. *Do enrolment projections and development plans indicate that the enrolments will be high enough for the next five years to keep the organization viable?*

Enrolment projections show a decline for another three years, at which point they should stabilize. The projected enrolments may result in some of the existing small schools being in a position where they would no longer be adequately supported by the existing funding models.

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

5. *Is there a proposed organization of all or some of the existing schools that could result in remaining school being able to provide the range of mandatory programs required to meet the Ministry of Education policies and ensure program quality for the Board's students who reside in the existing or proposed catchment area?*

The proposed organization contained in the recommendations of the PARC allow for the continued offering of the range of mandatory programs required to meet the Ministry of Education policies and ensure program quality for the Board's students who reside within the study area. See section 5 of the report.

6. *Is there a proposed organization of all or some of the existing schools that could result in each remaining school being able to provide the range of optional programs required to ensure an appropriate education and equity for all the students? What optional programs could be offered in the in the proposed organization that are available in other Halton District School Board schools?*

The proposed organization contained in the recommendations from the PARC allow for the continued offering of the range of optional programs required to meet the Ministry of Education policies and ensure program quality for the Board's students who reside within the study area. With few exceptions, (see #2 above), optional program offerings match what is offered in other areas within the Halton District School Board.

7. *Can the proposed school organization result in an equivalent or improved environment for the students from a health and safety perspective?*

Health and safety issues are currently addressed at the existing schools; however, enhanced traffic controls would be incorporated into the newly consolidated sites.

8. *What busing would be required under the proposed organization? If there are increased busing costs, can these be offset by reduced operating and administrative resource costs?*

The impact on busing and its associated costs will depend on the results of the Boundary Review. The importance of maintaining walk-to schools was a value statement developed by the committee.

9. *What are the financial benefits of the proposed organization that would enable the Board to maintain or improve the student learning environment? Would the operation of the proposed school organization be supported by the funding guidelines of the Student-Focused Funding Model or are there other sustainable sources of revenue to support the operation of this organization?*

The sale of any properties deemed surplus will result in funds to improve the remaining schools. Additionally, the resulting long-term nature of the proposed school organization will allow the Board to spend the Primary Class Size funding to make renovations to

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

reduce the impact of the cap on the primary class size. The proposed school organization will be supported by the Student-Focused Funding Model.

10. *What are the capital requirements of the proposed organization in terms of renewal, additions, new schools, or program enhancements? Would they be supported by the funding guidelines of the Student –Focused Funding Model or are there other sustainable sources of revenue to support the capital requirements, such as the shared use of a building or site?*

The capital requirements for the proposed modifications are shown in section 3.12 of this report. The actual modifications that will be required are dependent on the outcome of the Boundary Review process. The proposed school organization utilizes the existing facilities in a capital efficient way.

11. *Do alternative organizations of all or some of the schools offer better long term opportunities to provide quality educational services and accommodation for students within current fiscal realities?*

The proposed organization results in long-term larger enrolments which will qualify for higher support levels from existing funding sources. The proposed organization meets some of the values developed by the committee, addresses the re-distribution of students and offers quality long-term educational outcomes for the Board’s students in Southeast Oakville given the current fiscal realities.

12. *What effects would the proposed organization have on community activities of social, educational, cultural or recreational nature?*

The Reciprocal Agreement with the Town of Oakville Recreation and Culture department would lose one location to program community use; however, if the enhanced gymnasiums at two sites are completed, improved facilities for the school and community rental groups could result. Committee representatives from the Clearview area note that these new facilities would be distant from that area.

13. *What are the possible alternative uses for any building recommended for consolidation or closure?*

Possible uses for any school site deemed surplus in this area could include:

- maintenance of green space and parklands
- partial redevelopment in accordance with the provincial “Good Places to Grow” policy statement
- an administrative center (proximity to existing hospital)
- residential complex for seniors or others
- municipal facility
- and other options to be further explored

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

4.2 Section 2.8

Issues to be Addressed:

Implication for the program for students both in the school under consideration for consolidation, closure or program relocation and in the school(s) where programs may be affected

All JK-8 programs and school locations are being affected by the proposed school organization. The goal of the PARC has been to provide effective programs with viable enrolments. The impact of keeping the grade 6's with the JK-5 students will be to enhance the curriculum delivery. The impact of making the middle school for grades 7-8 only will allow the facility that can best deliver a middle school program (E J James) to be used to its capacity without over-enrolment challenges.

The effects of consolidation, closure or program relocation on the following:

The attendance area defined for the schools

Attendance at other schools

The need and extent of busing

The Boundary Review process will determine the final impact of the changes proposed, however, Board staff have confirmed that the proposed organization is possible.

The financial effect of consolidating or not consolidating the school, including any capital implications

See section 3.12 of this report.

Savings expected to be achieved as a result of the consolidation, closure or program relocation

See Section 3.12 of this report.

Additional expenditures, if any, at schools which will accommodate the students displaced as a result of a consolidation, closure or relocation decision taken by the Board

School operations (heating, lighting, cleaning, routine maintenance)

School administration

School renewal

Transportation

See Section 3.12 of this report.

Net savings/costs associated with:

Teaching staff

Paraprofessionals

Student transportation

Savings or costs will depend on the outcome of the Boundary Review process.

The possible alternative use or disposition of an empty building:

See section 4 of this report.

Section 5

Recommendations

5.1 Recommendations

The PARC for Southeast Oakville submits the following recommendations:

1. That Committee Scenario 10 be thoroughly investigated by the Board's Facilities, Finance and Planning departments:

3 JK-6 regular track (English) schools at either New Central or Brantwood, plus Maple Grove and Chisholm
1 grades 1-6 single track French Immersion school at Linbrook
1 grades 7-8 dual track middle school at EJ James
1 grades 9-12 dual track secondary school at OTHS

That the Board consults with the community of the downtown core of Oakville in determining which of New Central or Brantwood is best suited to the long-term accommodation for the JK-6 English students of that area. As an example, the consultation process could be a community information evening involving public input. This community information evening should take place within thirty days, before the Administrative Council submits its report to the trustees.

2. Reflecting the weighting received in the ranking vote, that Public Meeting Scenario 4 also be thoroughly investigated by the Board's Facilities, Finance and Planning departments:

3 JK-6 regular track (English) schools at New Central, Linbrook and Chisholm
1 grades 1-6 single track French Immersion school at Maple Grove
1 grades 7-8 dual track middle school at EJ James
1 grades 9-12 dual track secondary school at OTHS

3. That the funding available for primary class size alterations be prioritized in terms of renovations required at each affected school and that these renovations be undertaken as quickly as possible.
4. That proceeds from the sale of any school site be used to make the appropriate renovations and improvements to provide for the long term accommodation for all Southeast Oakville students.
5. That a Boundary Review process and Transition Plan be developed and communicated as per Board policy.

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Committee representatives of the Clearview area request that the concept of JK-6 regular track (English) students from the Clearview area being accommodated in one of the existing schools be further explored through the Boundary Review and Transition Plan procedures.

This report is respectfully submitted by the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for Southeast Oakville.

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Appendix A

1. CD Howe Institute EQAO Summaries
2. List of 71 Scenarios Generated
3. 71 Scenarios Grouped by Similar Grade Structure and Location
4. Public Feedback Comments from Public Meeting #3 Grouped by Proposed Grade Structure
5. Scenarios with Cost Implications Presented at January 29, 2008 Public Meeting

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

**Appendix A.1: Further results compiled by C.D. Howe may be found on their website
EQAO Grade 3 and 6 School Results, 2006-07: Halton DSB (*Revised)**

Percentage of All Students Achieving At or Above the Provincial Standard in Reading, Writing and Mathematics, 2006-07 N/D =no data, grade not represented at school site						
Site	Grade 3 Reading	Grade 3 Writing	Grade 3 Math	Grade 6 Reading	Grade 6 Writing	Grade 6 Math
Province	62	64	69	64	61	59
HDSB	69	71	73	68	64	62
School	Grade 3 Reading	Grade 3 Writing	Grade 3 Math	Grade 6 Reading	Grade 6 Writing	Grade 6 Math
Abbey Lane	69	81	83	57	64	55
Alexander's	69	74	82	77	67	77
Brant Hills	65	65	85	52	55	61
Brantwood	65	60	70	N/D	N/D	N/D
Brookdale	65	55	68	66	66	80
Brookville	66	68	81	60	56	58
Bruce Trail	57	67	65	59	53	37
B.T. Lindley	50	46	56	75	70	59
Capt. R. Wilson	61	61	55	71	81	71
Chisholm	90	92	95	N/D	N/D	N/D
C.H. Norton	65	68	70	77	69	57
Chris Hadfield	69	71	71	61	46	61
C.R. Beaudoin	67	70	67	81	74	74
Centennial	N/D	N/D	N/D	69	63	64
Central	71	65	88	72	62	70
Clarksdale	69	71	70	66	65	47
Dr. C. Best	61	68	68	N/D	N/D	N/D
E.J. James	N/D	N/D	N/D	76	72	66
Eastview	73	89	84	76	57	56
E.W. Foster	63	64	66	N/D	N/D	N/D
Falgarwood	77	77	85	70	72	85
Florence Meares	56	72	75	51	56	63
Frontenac	58	61	58	77	62	72
School	Grade 3 Reading	Grade 3 Writing	Grade 3 Math	Grade 6 Reading	Grade 6 Writing	Grade 6 Math
Geo. Kennedy	75	67	83	N/D	N/D	N/D
Gladys Speers	56	59	56	79	70	67
Glenview	65	61	84	71	69	60
Glen Williams	76	76	76	N/D	N/D	N/D
Harrison	65	65	68	N/D	N/D	N/D
Hawthorne Vil.	63	70	75	68	57	63
Heritage Glen	77	83	83	77	79	71
J.M. Denyes	60	67	60	N/D	N/D	N/D
J.T. Tuck	79	78	88	71	60	55
Jos. Gibbons	80	80	80	N/D	N/D	N/D
Joshua Creek	73	77	79	74	76	76
Kilbride	65	65	88	88	74	71
King's Road	55	57	39	75	53	58
Lakeshore	81	73	62	63	63	48
Limehouse	77	77	87	N/D	N/D	N/D
Linbrook	84	79	90	N/D	N/D	N/D
Lorne Skuce	62	58	79	79	88	83
Maple Grove	81	67	88	N/D	N/D	N/D
Maplehurst	69	72	56	78	76	61
Martin Street	41	48	52	N/D	N/D	N/D
MacKenzie S-B	64	67	81	33	31	18
Mohawk Grdns.	67	73	66	62	69	55
Munn's	42	42	58	73	73	57
New Central	N/D	N/D	N/D	75	68	71
Oakwood	48	63	59	N/D	N/D	N/D
Orchard Park	73	84	73	61	47	53
Park	77	65	84	N/D	N/D	N/D
Pauline Johnson	80	87	100	86	77	69

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

School	Grade 3 Reading	Grade 3 Writing	Grade 3 Math	Grade 6 Reading	Grade 6 Writing	Grade 6 Math
P.A. Fisher	47	60	70	56	63	46
Pilgrim Wood	74	67	83	70	61	60
Pine Grove	87	91	82	81	76	78
Pineland	72	74	75	82	79	70
Pineview	63	65	67	N/D	N/D	N/D
Post's Corners	58	66	66	68	67	77
River Oaks	86	83	86	79	75	68
Robert Baldwin	82	82	84	N/D	N/D	N/D
Robert Little	69	69	69	N/D	N/D	N/D
Rolling Meadows	63	61	71	54	50	52
Ryerson	67	50	58	56	33	67
Sam Sherratt	43	53	57	49	44	47
Silver Creek	77	75	80	61	61	55
Sheridan	64	56	58	N/D	N/D	N/D
Sr.E. MacMillan	63	80	77	76	77	82
Stewarttown	N/D	N/D	N/D	66	63	70
Sunningdale	73	83	70	79	82	66
Tecumseh	52	52	55	70	61	55
Tom Thomson	74	63	76	66	66	60
W.H. Morden	82	59	76	72	62	64
W.I. Dick	N/D	N/D	N/D	54	46	46
West Oak	59	67	63	58	69	60

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Appendix A.2: List of 71 Scenarios Generated

These scenarios are clearly at the DRAFT stage. No values, judgments or rankings were applied to them. These were generated by the PARC at this stage simply to identify some possibilities as a starting point for more thorough investigation.

<p>1 Move FI to EJ James for JK or 1-8 Reno New Central to accommodate all 6-8 English Close Brantwood, move JK-5 English to Linbrook</p>	<p>2 Portapak on EJ James to accommodate all 6-8 FI & English Close New Central or Brantwood and move JK-5 to New Central</p>	<p>3 Create new special program school on Clearview site (ie sports/art/IB, etc.)</p>
<p>4 Refurbish EJ James to make it FI 1-8 Refurbish New Central to make it JK-8 English One of MapleGrove & Chisholm becomes JK-5, the other becomes 6-8. Re-draft boundaries to balance JK-5 populations. Results in closing Linbrook & Brantwood</p>	<p>5 Status quo, except Clearview 6-8 students (English) are bussed to New Central</p>	<p>6 Build Clearview as a FI for Clearview only and north of Upper Middle Rd. Move FI 1-8 all to EJ James and refurbish Move JK-8 to New Central & refurbish Make either Chisholm or MapleGrove JK-8 & refurbish Review boundaries to balance populations Results in closing Linbrook, Brantwood & either Chisholm or MapleGrove</p>
<p>7 Close Linbrook EJ James FI 1-8 Close Brantwood New Central-refurbish JK-8 MapleGrove – 6-8 Chisholm leave as is</p>	<p>8 Clearview FI single track JK-8 (Clearview + North of Upper Middle) Close Linbrook Close Brantwood New Central refurbish JK-8 MapleGrove refurbish JK-8 + Clearview English Close Chisholm (boundary changes)</p>	
<p>9 Renovate EJ James K-8 Close Brantwood & New Central</p>	<p>10 Renovate MapleGrove/Chisholm K-5 either at MapleGrove or Chisholm</p>	<p>11 Clearview new school K-8 dual track Closing Linbrook</p>
<p>12 Clearview K-8 school Move the FI program MapleGrove K-8 school, boundary change required EJ James or New Central K-8 school Boundary adjustment necessary</p>	<p>13 Clearview K-8 school Chisholm K-8 school, requires boundary change EJ James or New Central K-8 school, requires boundary change</p>	

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

	MapleGrove-FI program	
14 New Central JK-8, boundary change Chisholm JK-8 English, boundary change Clearview JK-8 English, boundary change MapleGrove FI 1-8 Oakville Trafalgar 9-12 Close Brantwood, Linbrook, EJ James	15 Brantwood/MapleGrove/Chisholm English JK-6 Linbrook 1-6 EJ James 7-8 Dual track Oakville Trafalgar 9-12 Close New Central	
16 Clearview K-8 dual track 2 community schools either Chisholm or Linbrook//New Central/EJ James/MapleGrove combined Bussing only for FI students		
17 Oakville Trafalgar status quo Chisholm status quo Clearview JK-8 Linbrook moves to MapleGrove EJ James JK-8 Brantwood moves with New Central as JK-8	18 Oakville Trafalgar status quo Clearview New FI at EJ James New single track at MapleGrove site New single track at New Central site Eliminate/sell Linbrook, Brantwood & Chisholm	
19 K-6 New Central/Brantwood/Chisholm – sell 1 site MapleGrove no renovation except basic maintenance 1-6 French only Linbrook, advocate for middle school 7-8 Middle school FI at EJ James	20 MapleGrove FI 1-8 Chisholm K-5 Linbrook K-5 New Central K-5 EJ James 7-8 Single track Close Brantwood No renovations	
21 K-6 Brantwood or New Central (one closing) takes JK-K from Linbrook K-6 Chisholm K-6 MapleGrove Linbrook 1-6 French only EJ James takes 7-8 Dual track No renovations except to upgrade scenarios Does not address Clearview	22 MapleGrove 1-8 FI New Central middle school to EJ James Brantwood closes New Central K-5 Linbrook K-5 Chisholm K-5 EJ James stays middle school English 6-8	
23		

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

<p>Close Linbrook & sell the property to SML Make EJ James single track French 1-8 Make New Central 6-8 English & renovate Feeder schools JK-5 (Brantwood, MapleGrove & Chisholm) No Clearview school</p>		
<p>24 Close Brantwood Build large school at New Central site New Central JK-8 (E) Add (E) from EJ James While school is built: New Central kids go to Brantwood Linbrook (F) 6-8 EJ James (F) JK-5 Boundaries: MapleGrove, change boundaries (some kids to new New Central-living close to Lakeshore Chisholm-all from Clearview at Chisholm, some go to MapleGrove to make room at Chisholm Renovations needed at Linbrook, EJ James, MapleGrove, Chisholm</p>		
<p>25 Linbrook FI 1-6 (PE 14 only) Clearview JK-6 Dual track Boundary change in NE FI to Clearview Maybe holding school for English as your area expands Brantwood to MapleGrove JK-6 New Central & EJ James together 7-8 dual, incl. Clearview 7-8 Chisholm JK-6</p>	<p>26 Clearview JK-8 dual incl. All FI (14 & 17) Brantwood to Linbrook Eng. JK-5 New Central & EJ James Eng only 6-8 Close MapleGrove Chisholm JK-5 incl. MapleGrove kids</p>	
<p>27 Close Brantwood Construct new school at New Central Dual track at Clearview</p>		
<p>28 Amalgamate New Central & Brantwood to create an English JK-8 (where?) New Central site? Keep Linbrook FI JK-5</p>	<p>29 Close New Central-move English 6-8 to EJ James using funds from sale of New Central to renovate EJ James.</p>	

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

MapleGrove English JK-5 Chisholm JK-5 EJ James dual 6-8, renovate to expand or change catchment borders for EJ James and New Central to provide balance	Dual track large enough to accommodate kids. Spread remainder of proceeds to remaining schools for renovations	
30 Close Linbrook and EJ James Enlarge New Central to accommodate Linbrook FI 1-6 Or MapleGrove 7-8 dual track Brantwood continues – takes Linbrook’s K MapleGrove & Chisholm combine in renovated building K-6 New school in Clearview K-6		
31 Status quo	32 Close New Central, Brantwood & Linbrook and combine all in new school at New Central property dual track FI Redo boundaries to take pressure of EJ James Keep OT the same	33 Close Brantwood, renovate New Central K-8
34 Close EJ James & Linbrook Renovate MapleGrove & Chisholm K-6 New Clearview school K-6 MapleGrove 7 & 8 Brantwood (167) New Central & Linbrook K-6 FI		
35 Build a school in Clearview Dual track K-8	36 Build new school on MapleGrove property K-8	37 Leave Oakville Trafalgar Close Linbrook, Chisholm, Brantwood & New Central
38 Clearview dual track	39 New South school on MapleGrove site	
40 Dual track Clearview K-6 (new) Renovate MapleGrove K-6 Close Chisholm, Brantwood EJ James 7-8 dual track Close New Central		

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

<p>3 schools: 2 x K-6 1 x 7-8 Close Linbrook, New Central, Chisholm & Brantwood</p>		
<p>41 Close Brantwood & move students to New Central Make New Central JK-8 & retrofit New Central Look at all PE14 boundaries to redistribute more equitably student population Essentially status quo for remainder of schools looking at future upgrades to keep up with curriculum demands to EJ James & Linbrook, possibly portapaks instead of portables depending on long term enrolment/forecasts</p>		
<p>42 Build Clearview school JK-8 dual track housing Linbrook, MapleGrove Clearview, Chisholm Clearview and EJ James Clearview & FI MapleGrove/Linbrook/New Central closes EJ James becomes English only intermediate (houses New Central students) Chisholm brings in MapleGrove students (non Clearview) Brantwood status quo</p>		
<p>43 Expand Oakville Trafalgar to 7-12 (excluding FI 7-8) Include MapleGrove adjoining facilities & land since properties are adjoining Add on if required Make EJ James French only K-8 Make all JK-5 schools JK-6 schools except Brantwood Close Linbrook & Brantwood & sell properties Move JK-6 from Brantwood to New Central as property is more suitable</p>		
<p>44 New Central & Brantwood aligned for JK-8 in one facility (New Central property) Linbrook remains 1-5 Immersion and all</p>	<p>45 Make EJ James 1-8 Immersion New Central to accommodate 6-8 English</p>	<p>46 MapleGrove/Chisholm/Brantwood K-5 New Central 6-8 French Linbrook 1-5 French; remove K</p>

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

<p>JK/SK go to appropriate home school JK-5 (Chisholm/MapleGrove/Brantwood) Renovate EJ James to accommodate Immersion middle school students</p>	<p>Brantwood JK-5 to Linbrook MapleGrove/Chisholm JK-5 Close Brantwood</p>	<p>EJ James English intermediate 6-8 Build new school on New Central K-6 Close Brantwood MapleGrove & Chisholm K-6 EJ James 7-8 intermediate only dual track Linbrook 1-6 remove K</p>
<p>47 Clearview dual track K-8 Linbrook closes MapleGrove closes Chisholm English only JK-5 EJ James 6-8 English New Central closes Brantwood JK-5</p>	<p>48 Expand Oakville Trafalgar 7-12 (excluding Imm 7-8) MapleGrove adjoined to accommodate EJ James 1-8 French Immersion Centre Close Linbrook Chisholm JK-6 Brantwood closes and moves to New Central</p>	<p>49 Re-balance 6-8 English between EJ James and New Central (new boundaries) Retrofit as required Linbrook – remove K MapleGrove/Chisholm/Brantwood redistribute</p>
<p>50 Move Brantwood to New Central</p>		
<p>51 MapleGrove/Chisholm/Brantwood K-5 EJ James Eng. 6-8 New Central 6-8 French Linbrook 1-5 French, remove K</p>	<p>52 Build new school on New Central K-6 Close Brantwood MapleGrove & Chisholm K-6 EJ James dual track 7-8 intermediate only Linbrook 1-6 FI remove K</p>	
<p>53 K-8 building new & Brantwood on New Central property as K-8 & aligned with New Central English from 6-8 Chisholm/MapleGrove Renovate EJ James to accommodate 6-8 French</p>	<p>54 EJ James 1-8 Immersion New Central to accommodate 6-8 English</p>	<p>55 Brantwood JK-5 to Linbrook Close Brantwood (assuming Linbrook is bigger) MapleGrove & Chisholm – JK-5 status quo</p>
<p>56 Build one new school on Clearview site Close Linbrook & dual track New Central and MapleGrove EJ James English only 6-8</p>	<p>57 Oakville Trafalgar & MapleGrove intermediate & senior, not 7 & 8 immersion EJ James 1-8 French Chisholm K-6 New Central K-6 Brantwood & Linbrook close</p>	

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

<p>58 <u>6-8 Curriculum</u> Re-allocate the student population between New Central & EJ James. This could be to move FI or English depending on the most equitable split to ensure the programs are properly accommodated. Retrofit both buildings as required</p> <p><i>JK-5 Curriculum</i> Linbrook – FI only K-5 no English, K, SK programs MapleGrove/Chisholm – redraw the boundaries to accommodate Brantwood students and look to renovate both MapleGrove & Chisholm to accommodate the increased numbers and ensure that curriculum is properly delivered</p>		
<p>59 New Central FI 6-8 EJ James English only 6-8 Close Linbrook & Brantwood New Central becomes JK-8 & new school or renovate</p>		
<p>60 New Central becomes FI 6-8 EJ James becomes English only 6-8</p>	<p>61 New Central becomes JK-8 with the closing of Brantwood & Linbrook. Either renovate or rebuild</p>	<p>62 Status quo Build new school in Clearview</p>
<p>63 Close New Central & move the 6-7 to EJ James Make Oakville Trafalgar an 8-12 school</p>	<p>64 Sell Linbrook to St. Mildred's Sell Brantwood to town as heritage building Rebuild a New Central to combine Linbrook & Brantwood and New Central together</p>	
<p>65 New Central – FI centre for south of QEW 1-8 FI, required renovations and additions Bussing necessary for more EJ James students</p>	<p>66 Linbrook English only K-8 serving downtown Oakville including present New Central population Would require additional bussing?</p>	<p>67 Keep things the way they are and build a school K-8 in Clearview as well</p>

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

<p>68 Close New Central, move it to EJ James, possibly renovate 2 more portables up to 600 students “new” New Central</p>	<p>69 Close Brantwood & Chisholm JK-8 move to New Central, renovate</p>	<p>70 “New” New Central, empty EJ James More population to New Central 6-8 Tear down New Central rebuild 6-8 on New Central site (most valuable real estate)</p>
<p>71 Build dual track K-8 school in Clearview Renovate Chisholm to hold English students Rebuild either Linbrook or New Central for English</p>		

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Appendix A.4: 71 Scenarios Grouped by Grade Structure and Location

BUILD CLEARVIEW GROUP OF SCENARIOS		
Status Quo	62, 67	
62 Status quo Build new school in Clearview (grades?)	67 Keep things the way they are and build a school K-8 in Clearview as well	
Build Special School in Clearview	3	
3 Create new special program school on Clearview site (ie sports/art/IB, etc.) Chose best option for New Central (either move 6-8 to EJ James or make New Central JK-8 and close Brantwood)		
Build Clearview as a Single Track FI	6, 8	
6 Build Clearview as a FI for Clearview only and north of Upper Middle Rd. Move FI 1-8 all to EJ James and refurbish Move JK-8 to New Central & refurbish Make either Chisholm or MapleGrove JK-8 & refurbish (<i>incl Clearview Eng</i>) Review boundaries to balance populations Results in closing Linbrook, Brantwood & either Chisholm or MapleGrove	8 Clearview FI single track JK-8 (Clearview + North of Upper Middle) Close Linbrook Close Brantwood New Central refurbish JK-8 MapleGrove refurbish JK-8 + Clearview English Close Chisholm (boundary changes)	
Build Clearview as a Dual Track School JK-6	25, 40, 38/39	
25 Linbrook FI 1-6 (PE 14 only) Clearview JK-6 Dual track Boundary change in NE (<i>outside ward</i> 3?) FI to Clearview Maybe holding school for English as your area expands (<i>which area?</i>) Brantwood to MapleGrove JK-6 New Central & EJ James together 7-8 dual, incl. Clearview 7-8 Chisholm JK-6	40 Dual track Clearview K-6 (new) Renovate MapleGrove K-6 Close Chisholm, Brantwood EJ James 7-8 dual track Close New Central 3 schools: 2 x K-6 1 x 7-8 Close Linbrook, New Central, Chisholm & Brantwood	38/39 Clearview dual track JK-6 EJ James JK-6 english Maplegrove dual track 7-8 <i>Infers closing Brantwood, New Central, Linbrook and Chisholm</i>

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

<p>Build Clearview as a Dual Track School JK-8</p>	<p>11, 16, 26, 42, 47, 71, 35/36/37</p>	
<p>11 Clearview new school K-8 dual track Closing Linbrook <i>Assume that 6-8FI also move to Clearview</i> <i>What happens to New Central?</i></p>	<p>16 Clearview K-8 dual track 2 community schools either Chisholm or Linbrook//New Central/EJ James/MapleGrove combined (<i>both JK-8?</i>) Bussing only for FI students <i>Infers closing 4 schools</i></p>	<p>26 Clearview JK-8 dual incl. All FI (14 & 17) Brantwood to Linbrook Eng. JK-5 New Central & EJ James Eng only 6-8 (<i>both stay open?</i>) Close MapleGrove <i>and Brantwood</i> Chisholm JK-5 incl. MapleGrove kids</p>
<p>42 Build Clearview school JK-8 dual track housing Linbrook, MapleGrove Clearview, Chisholm Clearview and EJ James Clearview & FI MapleGrove/Linbrook/New Central closes EJ James becomes English only intermediate (houses New Central students) Chisholm brings in MapleGrove students (non Clearview) Brantwood status quo</p>	<p>47 Clearview dual track K-8 Linbrook closes MapleGrove closes Chisholm English only JK-5 EJ James 6-8 English New Central closes Brantwood JK-5 <i>(same as 42)</i></p>	<p>71 Build dual track K-8 school in Clearview Renovate Chisholm to hold English students (<i>which grades?</i>) Rebuild either Linbrook or New Central for English (<i>which grades?</i>) <i>Infers closing Linbrook, Maplegrove, and possibly Brantwood, Linbrook and/or New Central</i></p>
<p>35/36/37 Clearview dual track JK-8 Either Maplegrove or EJ James is JK-8 english <i>Infers closing Linbrook, Brantwood, New Central, and one of Maplegrove or EJ James</i></p>		
<p>Build Clearview as a JK-6 School (English)</p>	<p>30</p>	
<p>30 Build Clearview as JK-6 english Close Linbrook and EJ James Enlarge New Central to accommodate Linbrook FI 1-6, keeps 6-8 english MapleGrove 7-8 dual track Brantwood JK-5 – takes Linbrook’s K MapleGrove & Chisholm combine in renovated building K-6 at Chisholm site</p>		

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

<p>Build Clearview as a JK-8 School (English)</p>	<p>12, 13, 14, 17</p>	
<p>12 Clearview K-8 school Move the FI program (<i>to where?</i>) MapleGrove K-8 school, boundary change required EJ James or New Central K-8 school Boundary adjustment necessary <i>Infers closing Chisholm, perhaps Linbrook and one of EJ or New Central</i></p>	<p>13 Clearview K-8 school Chisholm K-8 school, requires boundary change (<i>to include Maplegrove catchment students</i>) EJ James or New Central K-8 school, requires boundary change MapleGrove-FI program (<i>1-8?</i>) <i>Infers closing Linbrook and Brantwood and one of EJ or NC</i></p>	<p>14 New Central JK-8, boundary change Chisholm JK-8 English, boundary change Clearview JK-8 English, boundary change (<i>clarify boundary change</i>) MapleGrove FI 1-8 Oakville Trafalgar 9-12 Close Brantwood, Linbrook, EJ James</p>
<p>17 Oakville Trafalgar status quo Chisholm status quo (<i>JK-5</i>) Clearview JK-8 (<i>English</i>) Linbrook moves to MapleGrove (<i>JK-5</i>) EJ James JK-8 (<i>Maplegrove catchment JK-5, dual stream 6-8</i>) Brantwood moves with New Central as JK-8, <i>close Brantwood</i></p>		
<p>Scenarios involving Clearview that need Clarification</p>	<p>27, 34, 56</p>	
<p>27 Close Brantwood Construct new school at New Central (<i>JK-8?</i>) Dual track at Clearview (<i>what grades?</i>) <i>Infers closing Linbrook</i> <i>What happens to Maplegrove, Chisholm?</i> <i>What happens to EJ James?</i></p>	<p>34 Close EJ James & Linbrook Renovate MapleGrove & Chisholm K-6 New Clearview school K-6 (<i>eng</i>) MapleGrove 7 & 8 (<i>and JK-6?</i>) Brantwood (167) New Central & Linbrook K-6 FI (<i>does this mean making New Central dual stream JK-6, eng 7-8 and closing Linbrook, EJ James and Brantwood?</i>)</p>	<p>56 Build one new school on Clearview site (<i>what grades, program?</i>) Close Linbrook & dual track New Central and MapleGrove (<i>Maplegrove JK-5 dual stream and New Central 6-8 dual stream?</i>) EJ James English only 6-8 <i>No change at Brantwood?</i> <i>What happens to Chisholm?</i></p>

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

DON'T BUILD CLEARVIEW GROUP OF SCENARIOS		
Status Quo (and minor variations)	5, 31, 49	
5 Status quo, except Clearview 6-8 students (English) are bussed to New Central	31 Status quo <i>(Clearview JK-8 eng and FI students stay as is)</i>	49 Re-balance 6-8 English between EJ James and New Central (new boundaries) Retrofit as required Linbrook – remove K MapleGrove/Chisholm/Brantwood redistribute <i>(Clearview JK-8 eng and FI students stay as is)</i>
Close New Central, Move Students to EJ James (and minor variations)	2, 29, 68, 9	
2 Portapak on EJ James to accommodate all 6-8 FI & English Close New Central OR close Brantwood and move JK-5 to New Central <i>(Clearview JK-8 eng and FI students stay as is)</i>	29 Close New Central-move English 6-8 to EJ James using funds from sale of New Central to renovate EJ James. Dual track large enough to accommodate kids. Spread remainder of proceeds to remaining schools for renovations <i>(Clearview JK-8 eng and FI students stay as is)</i>	68 Close New Central, move it to EJ James, possibly renovate 2 more portables up to 600 students “new” New Central <i>(need explanation of this statement)</i> <i>(Clearview JK-8 eng and FI students stay as is)</i>
9 Renovate EJ James K-8 Close Brantwood & New Central <i>(EJ becomes JK-5 for Brantwood catchment and dual stream 6-8 for all of SE Oakville) (Clearview JK-8 eng and FI students stay as is)</i>		

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

<p>Close Brantwood, Make New Central JK-8 (and minor variations)</p>	<p>28, 33, 41, 44, 50, 69, 24</p>	
<p>28 Amalgamate New Central & Brantwood to create an English JK-8 (where?) New Central site? Keep Linbrook FI JK-5 MapleGrove English JK-5 (<i>incl Clearview JK-5 eng students</i>) Chisholm JK-5 (<i>incl Clearview JK-5 eng students</i>) EJ James dual 6-8, renovate to expand or change catchment borders for EJ James and New Central to provide balance</p>	<p>33 Close Brantwood, renovate New Central K-8 <i>Clearview JK-8 eng and FI stay as is</i></p>	<p>41 Close Brantwood & move students to New Central Make New Central JK-8 & retrofit New Central Look at all PE14 boundaries to redistribute more equitably student population Essentially status quo for remainder of schools looking at future upgrades to keep up with curriculum demands to EJ James & Linbrook, possibly portapaks instead of portables depending on long term enrolment/forecasts <i>Clearview JK-8 eng and FI stay as is</i></p>
<p>44 New Central & Brantwood aligned for JK-8 in one facility (New Central property) Linbrook remains 1-5 Immersion and all JK/SK go to appropriate home school JK-5 (Chisholm/MapleGrove/Brantwood) Renovate EJ James to accommodate Immersion middle school students (<i>Clearview JK-8 eng and FI remain as is</i>)</p>	<p>50 Move Brantwood to New Central (<i>becomes JK-8</i>) <i>Clearview JK-8 eng and FI students stay as is</i></p>	<p>69 Close Brantwood & Chisholm JK-8 move to New Central, renovate <i>Clearview JK-5 at Maplegrove stay as is, Clearview JK-8 at Chisholm move to New Central</i></p>

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

<p>24 Close Brantwood Build large school at New Central site New Central JK-8 (E) Add (E) from EJ James While school is built: New Central kids go to Brantwood Linbrook (F) 6-8 EJ James (F) JK-5 Boundaries: MapleGrove, change boundaries (some kids to new New Central-living close to Lakeshore Chisholm-all from Clearview at Chisholm, some go to MapleGrove to make room at Chisholm Renovations needed at Linbrook, EJ James, MapleGrove, Chisholm</p>		
<p>Keep Grade 6's at JK-5 Schools</p>	<p>15, 19, 21, 52</p>	
<p>15 Brantwood/MapleGrove/Chisholm English JK-6 Linbrook 1-6 EJ James 7-8 Dual track Oakville Trafalgar 9-12 Close New Central</p>	<p>19 K-6 New Central/Brantwood/Chisholm – sell 1 site MapleGrove no renovation except basic maintenance (<i>becomes JK-6?</i>) 1-6 French only Linbrook, advocate for middle school (?) 7-8 Middle school FI at EJ James (<i>EJ James becomes 7-8 dual stream</i>)</p>	<p>21 K-6 Brantwood or New Central (one closing) takes JK-K from Linbrook K-6 Chisholm (<i>incl Clearview JK-6 eng students</i>) K-6 MapleGrove (<i>incl Clearview JK-6 eng students</i>) Linbrook 1-6 French only EJ James takes 7-8 Dual track No renovations except to upgrade scenarios Does not address Clearview</p>
<p>52 Build new school on New Central K-6 Close Brantwood MapleGrove & Chisholm K-6 (incl Clearview eng students as is) EJ James dual track 7-8 intermediate only Linbrook 1-6 FI remove K</p>		

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

<p>Move 6-8 FI to New Central</p> <p>51 MapleGrove/Chisholm/Brantwood K-5 EJ James Eng. 6-8 New Central 6-8 French Linbrook 1-5 French, remove K <i>Clearview JK-8 eng students stay as is</i></p>	<p>51, 60, 58</p> <p>60 New Central becomes FI 6-8 EJ James becomes English only <i>6-8 Clearview JK-8 eng students stay as is</i></p>	<p>58 (<i>Minor Variation</i>) <u>6-8 Curriculum</u> Re-allocate the student population between New Central & EJ James. This could be to move FI or English depending on the most equitable split to ensure the programs are properly accommodated. Retrofit both buildings as required</p> <p>JK-5 Curriculum Linbrook – FI only K-5 no English, K, SK programs MapleGrove/Chisholm – redraw the boundaries to accommodate Brantwood students and look to renovate both MapleGrove & Chisholm to accommodate the increased numbers and ensure that curriculum is properly delivered <i>Clearview JK-8 eng students stay as is</i></p>
<p>Move Linbrook FI to New Central</p> <p>32 Close New Central, Brantwood & Linbrook and combine all in new school at New Central property dual track FI (<i>6-8 FI still at EJ?</i>) Redo boundaries to take pressure of EJ James Keep OT the same <i>Clearview JK-8 eng students stay as is</i></p>	<p>32, 59, 61, 64</p> <p>59 New Central FI 6-8 EJ James English only 6-8 Close Linbrook & Brantwood New Central becomes JK-8 & new school or renovate <i>Clearview JK-8 eng students stay as is</i></p>	<p>61 New Central becomes JK-8 with the closing of Brantwood & Linbrook. Either renovate or rebuild <i>(6-8 FI still at EJ?)</i> <i>Clearview JK-8 eng students stay as is</i></p>
<p>64 Sell Linbrook to St. Mildred's Sell Brantwood to town as heritage building Rebuild a New Central to combine Linbrook & Brantwood and New Central together (<i>6-8 FI still at EJ?</i>) <i>Clearview JK-8 eng students stay as is</i></p>		

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Move 1-8 FI to EJ James	1, 4, 7, 23, 45, 54	
<p>1 Move FI to EJ James for JK or 1-8 Reno New Central to accommodate all 6-8 English Close Brantwood, move JK-5 English to Linbrook <i>Clearview JK-5eng students stay as is, Clearview 6-8 to New Central</i></p>	<p>4 Refurbish EJ James to make it FI 1-8 Refurbish New Central to make it JK-8 English One of MapleGrove & Chisholm becomes JK-5, the other becomes 6-8 Re-draft boundaries to balance JK-5 populations. Results in closing Linbrook & Brantwood <i>Clearview JK-5 eng students at Maplegrove, 6-8 eng students at Chisholm</i></p>	<p>7 Close Linbrook EJ James FI 1-8 Close Brantwood New Central-refurbish JK-8 MapleGrove – 6-8 (<i>for Maplegrove, Chisholm and Clearview catchments</i>) Chisholm leave as is (<i>JK-5 for Chisholm, Maplegrove and Clearview catchments</i>)</p>
<p>23 Close Linbrook & sell the property to SML Make EJ James single track French 1-8 Make New Central 6-8 English & renovate Feeder schools JK-5 (Brantwood, MapleGrove & Chisholm) No Clearview school (<i>Clearview JK-5 eng students stay as is</i>)</p>	<p>45 Make EJ James 1-8 Immersion New Central to accommodate 6- 8 English Brantwood JK-5 to Linbrook MapleGrove/Chisholm JK-5 Close Brantwood <i>Clearview JK-5 eng students stay as is</i></p>	<p>54 EJ James 1-8 Immersion New Central to accommodate 6-8 English <i>Infers closing Linbrook Maplegrove, Chisholm, Brantwood – no change Clearview JK-5 eng students stay as is</i></p>
Move 1-8 FI to Maplegrove	20, 22	
<p>20 MapleGrove FI 1-8 Chisholm K-5 (<i>JK-6?</i>) <i>(all Clearview JK-5/6 eng students)</i> Linbrook K-5 (<i>FI moved to Maplegrove, so is this to hold Maplegrove students?</i>) New Central K-5 (<i>JK-6?</i>) EJ James 7-8 Single track (<i>6-8?</i>) Close Brantwood No renovations</p>	<p>22 MapleGrove 1-8 FI New Central middle school to EJ James Brantwood closes New Central K-5 Linbrook K-5 Chisholm K-5 (<i>all JK-5 Clearview eng students</i>) EJ James stays middle school English 6-8</p>	

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Move 1-8 FI to New Central	65	
65 New Central – FI centre for south of QEW 1-8 FI, required renovations and additions Bussing necessary for more EJ James students <i>(Clearview eng students stay as is)</i> <i>(Infers closing Linbrook, moving New Central 6-8 to EJ)</i>		
Change Configuration of OTHS	43, 48, 57, 63	
43 Expand Oakville Trafalgar to 7-12 (excluding FI 7-8) Include MapleGrove adjoining facilities & land since properties are adjoining Add on if required Make EJ James French only K-8 Make all JK-5 schools JK-6 schools except Brantwood, Chisholm takes Maplegrove students <i>(incl all Clearview JK-6 eng students)</i> Close Linbrook & Brantwood & sell properties Move JK-6 from Brantwood to New Central as property is more suitable	48 Expand Oakville Trafalgar 7-12 (excluding Imm 7-8) MapleGrove adjoined to accommodate EJ James 1-8 French Immersion Centre Close Linbrook Chisholm JK-6 <i>(incl all Clearview JK-6 eng students)</i> Brantwood closes and moves to New Central Same as 43, 57	57 Oakville Trafalgar & MapleGrove intermediate & senior, not 7 & 8 immersion EJ James 1-8 French Chisholm K-6 <i>(incl all Clearview JK-6 eng students)</i> New Central K-6 Brantwood & Linbrook close Same as 43, 48
63 Close New Central & move the 6-7 to EJ James <i>(EJ becomes dual stream 6-7)</i> Make Oakville Trafalgar an 8-12 school <i>Clearview JK-5 eng students stay as is</i>		
Single Scenarios		
55 Brantwood JK-5 to Linbrook <i>(dual stream JK-5)</i> Close Brantwood (assuming Linbrook is bigger) MapleGrove & Chisholm – JK-5 status quo <i>(incl Clearview JK-5 eng students)</i> <i>What happens to New Central?</i>		

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

<p>70 “New” New Central, empty EJ James More (<i>move?</i>) population to New Central 6-8 Tear down New Central rebuild 6-8 on New Central site (most valuable real estate) <i>No change for all JK-5 students incl Clearview</i></p>		
<p>SCENARIOS THAT REQUIRE CLARIFICATION</p>	<p>10, 18, 46, 53, 66</p>	
<p>10 Renovate MapleGrove/Chisholm K-5 either at MapleGrove or Chisholm <i>What happens to other schools and Clearview site?</i></p>	<p>18 Oakville Trafalgar status quo Clearview (<i>open or not?</i>) New FI at EJ James (<i>which grades?</i>) New single track at MapleGrove site (<i>eng? which grades?</i>) New single track at New Central site (<i>eng? which grades?</i>) Eliminate/sell Linbrook, Brantwood & Chisholm</p>	
<p>46 MapleGrove/Chisholm/Brantwood K-5 New Central 6-8 French Linbrook 1-5 French; remove K EJ James English intermediate 6-8 Build new school on New Central K-6 Close Brantwood MapleGrove & Chisholm K-6 EJ James 7-8 intermediate only dual track Linbrook 1-6 remove K <i>Is this two scenarios?</i></p>	<p>53 K-8 building new & Brantwood on New Central property as K-8 & aligned with New Central English from 6-8 Chisholm/MapleGrove (<i>at which school?</i>) Renovate EJ James to accommodate 6-8 French</p>	<p>66 Linbrook English only K-8 serving downtown Oakville including present New Central population Would require additional bussing? <i>Where do Linbrook JK-5 FI students go?</i></p>

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Appendix A.5: Public Feedback Comments from Public Meeting # 3 Grouped by
Proposed Grade Structure

Ranked by total number of positive comments								
Scenario	Comments				Percentages			Description
	Positive	Negative	Unclear	Total	%+	%-	%?	
6a	51	19	1	71	71.8%	26.8%	1.4%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI, 7-8 EJ
7	42	14	2	58	72.4%	24.1%	3.4%	1 K-8 CV, 4 K-5, 6-8 EJ
6b	31	14	1	46	67.4%	30.4%	2.2%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI, 7-8 EJ
10	21	18	5	44	47.7%	40.9%	11.4%	3 JK-8, 1-8 FI
13	16	16	1	33	48.5%	48.5%	3.0%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI, 7-8 EJ
14	14	15	0	29	48.3%	51.7%	0.0%	K-6 Dual CV, 2 K-6 RT, 7-8 EJ
1(a)	13	26	2	41	31.7%	63.4%	4.9%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI, 7-8 M
1(b)	13	26	4	43	30.2%	60.5%	9.3%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI, 7-8 M
4	12	29	0	41	29.3%	70.7%	0.0%	2 K-6 RT, 1 K-6 Dual, 7-8 M
9	10	48	2	60	16.7%	80.0%	3.3%	1 K-6 Dual CV, 1 K-6 NC, 7-8 M
3	9	39	1	49	18.4%	79.6%	2.0%	1 K-6 RT, 1 K-6 Dual, 7-8 M
2	6	39	6	51	11.8%	76.5%	11.8%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI, 7-8 M
11a	6	12	2	20	30.0%	60.0%	10.0%	2 K-6 RT, 1-8 FI, 7-8 RT M
5	5	52	3	60	8.3%	86.7%	5.0%	2 K-6 RT, 1 K-6 Dual EJ, 7-8 M
8	3	68	4	75	4.0%	90.7%	5.3%	2 K-8
11c	2	5	1	8	25.0%	62.5%	12.5%	2 K-6 RT, 1-8 FI, 7-8 RT M
11b	1	11	0	12	8.3%	91.7%	0.0%	2 K-6 RT, 1-8 FI, 7-8 RT M
12a	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI EJ, 7-8 M
12b	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI EJ, 7-8 M

Ranked by percentage of positive comments								
Scenario	Comments				Percentages			Description
	Positive	Negative	Unclear	Total	%+	%-	%?	
7	42	14	2	58	72.4%	24.1%	3.4%	1 K-8 CV, 4 K-5, 6-8 EJ
6a	51	19	1	71	71.8%	26.8%	1.4%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI, 7-8 EJ
6b	31	14	1	46	67.4%	30.4%	2.2%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI, 7-8 EJ
13	16	16	1	33	48.5%	48.5%	3.0%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI, 7-8 EJ
14	14	15	0	29	48.3%	51.7%	0.0%	K-6 Dual CV, 2 K-6 RT, 7-8 EJ
10	21	18	5	44	47.7%	40.9%	11.4%	3 JK-8, 1-8 FI
1(a)	13	26	2	41	31.7%	63.4%	4.9%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI, 7-8 M
1(b)	13	26	4	43	30.2%	60.5%	9.3%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI, 7-8 M
11a	6	12	2	20	30.0%	60.0%	10.0%	2 K-6 RT, 1-8 FI, 7-8 RT M
4	12	29	0	41	29.3%	70.7%	0.0%	2 K-6 RT, 1 K-6 Dual, 7-8 M
11c	2	5	1	8	25.0%	62.5%	12.5%	2 K-6 RT, 1-8 FI, 7-8 RT M
3	9	39	1	49	18.4%	79.6%	2.0%	1 K-6 RT, 1 K-6 Dual, 7-8 M
9	10	48	2	60	16.7%	80.0%	3.3%	1 K-6 Dual CV, 1 K-6 NC, 7-8 M

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

2	6	39	6	51	11.8%	76.5%	11.8%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI, 7-8 M
5	5	52	3	60	8.3%	86.7%	5.0%	2 K-6 RT, 1 K-6 Dual EJ, 7-8 M
11b	1	11	0	12	8.3%	91.7%	0.0%	2 K-6 RT, 1-8 FI, 7-8 RT M
8	3	68	4	75	4.0%	90.7%	5.3%	2 K-8
12a	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI EJ, 7-8 M
12b	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2 K-6 RT, 1-6 FI EJ, 7-8 M

*Report of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for PE 14
(Southeast Oakville)*

Appendix A.6: Scenarios Presented at Public Meeting #4

PARC 14 - REVISED 2/14/2008							
SCENARIO #1	Quantity	Type	School & OTG(Based On Modifications)	Revenue		Expenses	
	2	JK-6 ENG	Clearview (500)			Clearview	7,971,690
			Linbrook (400)			Linbrook	4,100,000 ** Add 8 Classrooms/Gym
	1	1-6 F.I.	Maple Grove (400)			Maple Grove	800,000 ** Add 4 Classrooms
	1	7-8 D.T.	E. J. James (377)				
			Close: Brantwood	Brantwood Sale	1,000,000		
			New Central	New Central Sale	1,955,000		
			Chisholm	Chisholm Sale	1,615,000		
				Savings From Operations	950,000		
				Available PCS Funds	1,100,093		
					\$5,620,093		\$12,671,690
SCENARIO #2	Quantity	Type	School & OTG(Based On Modifications)	Revenue		Expenses	
	2	JK-6 ENG	Clearview (500)			Clearview	7,971,690
			Chisholm (400)			Chisholm	1,630,000 ** Add 8 Classrooms/Site Adj.
	1	1-6 F.I.	Maple Grove (400)			Maple Grove	800,000 ** Add 4 Classrooms
	1	7-8 D.T.	E. J. James (377)				
			Close: Brantwood	Brantwood Sale	1,000,000		
			New Central	New Central Sale	1,955,000		
			Linbrook	Linbrook Sale	2,252,500		
				Savings From Operations	950,000		
				Available PCS Funds	1,100,093		
					7,257,593		\$10,401,690
SCENARIO #3	Quantity	Type	School & OTG(Based On Modifications)	Revenue		Expenses	
	2	JK-6 ENG	Linbrook (400)			Linbrook	\$4,100,000 ** Add 8 Classrooms/Gym
			Chisholm (400)			Chisholm	1,630,000 ** Add 8 Classrooms/Site Adj.
	1	1-6 F.I.	Maple Grove (400)			Maple Grove	\$800,000 ** Add 4 Classrooms
	1	7-8 D.T.	E. J. James (377)				
			Close: Brantwood	Brantwood Sale	1,000,000		
			New Central	New Central Sale	1,955,000		
				Clearview Sale	2,500,000		
				Savings From Operations	632,000		
				Available PCS Funds	1,100,093		
					7,187,093		6,530,000
SCENARIO #4	Quantity	Type	School & OTG(Based On Modifications)	Revenue		Expenses	
	3	JK-6 ENG	Linbrook (300)			Linbrook	\$800,000 ** Add 4 Classrooms
			Chisholm (300)			Chisholm	\$800,000 ** Add 4 Classrooms
			New Central (300)			New Central	\$2,300,000 ** Add 4 Classrooms & Gym
	1	1-6 F.I.	Maple Grove (400)			Maple Grove	800,000 ** Add 4 Classrooms
	1	7-8 D.T.	E. J. James (377)				
			Close: Brantwood	Brantwood Sale	1,000,000		
				Clearview Sale	2,500,000		
				Savings From Operations	316,000		
				Available PCS Funds	1,100,093		
					4,916,093		4,700,000