

# Boundary Review Committee

## Minutes

Tuesday, March 27, 2012

7-9 p.m.

M.M. Robinson Library

**Staff Present:** David Euale, Jeff Blackwell, Dane Tutton, Rob Eatough, Dom Renzella, Michelle D'Aguiar, Sarah Galliher (minutes)

**Trustees:** Amy Collard, Jennifer Hlusko, Don Vrooman

**Absent:** Dianna Bower (BRC Co-chair), Kristen Lochhead

### **BRC Parent Members:**

---

Dane Tutton chaired the meeting

#### 1. Introductions, Agenda and Materials

D. Tutton welcomed everyone to the meeting indicating that the meeting will start on time and end on time.

He then introduced board staff and trustees noting that the BRC co-chair Dianna Bower was absent.

D. Tutton indicated that BRC meetings are open and the public may attend as observers but may not participate.

The BRC parent representatives introduced themselves.

#### 2. Goals

- Ensuring process is fair and transparent
- Voices are heard
- Best for all students
- There is consensus

#### 3. Procedure

Roles

Trustees are listening, observing and answering questions, vote on final recommendations

Planning staff provide projection details and other data

School staff play less of a role at this table, will respond to inquiries

BRC Co-chairs will keep meetings moving, put a process in place where we can look at recommendations.

The Boundary Review *Steering* Committee reviews enrolments, generates initial options for consideration by the larger BRC, eventually makes a recommendation to Admin Council and the Director.

The Boundary Review Committee examines initial options generated by the BRC, gives feedback, utilizes criteria, offers suggestions, revisions or new options. Committee is made up of parents from all schools that may be affected.

#### 4. Norms – working together as a group

Hard copies were distributed around the room.

D. Tutton reviewed norms.

The BRC was asked to review and provide input.

After ten minutes D. Tutton offered an opportunity to comment on the norms.

The BRC indicated they were comfortable with the norms as presented and had no concerns.

D. Tutton indicated that these norms can be revised in time if changes are identified by the committee. He then stated that it is important to establish agreed upon norms.

#### 5. Timelines

D. Tutton reviewed the timelines noting that they would be distributed electronically. He advised that some dates will change (April 12 will not be the public consultation).

Four BRC meetings are listed, if the committee feels it can be done in three that is acceptable. Not rushing the process, will use the amount of time that's right for the decision that needs to be made. BRC meetings will be Tuesday nights.

#### 6. Criteria

D. Tutton provided a brief explanation of the significance of the criteria and the role they play in guiding discussion. Narrowing the criteria may occur at the next meeting.

D. Tutton then reviewed each of the criteria and invited the BRC to make note of any questions they may have (*see handout*).

D. Tutton took the opportunity to address the rumour about Lester B. Pearson HS closing. Closures are not a part of this boundary review and there have been no discussions on any school closures. School closures happen under an entirely different policy and process.

D. Tutton did note that the outcome of this review may lead us to review the projected enrolments of other schools. Halton DSB is fortunate to be growing, the elementary bubble has not moved into the secondary panel yet.

This process is about identifying the kids who will attend the new school.

An explanation of the capacity implications of secondary schools was provided e.g. some students take three periods instead of four. The functional rated capacity means even with an OTG (on the ground capacity) of 1200, 1300 or more students could be accommodated without portables.

Questions

**a) Who established these criteria?**

They are from the school boundary review admin procedure.

This list is not exhaustive.

**7. Scenarios**

D. Renzella distributed hard copies of the current scenario along with Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. He then walked the committee through the current boundaries, explaining how to interpret the data.

R. Eatough asked for clarification regarding secondary OTGs and whether the number accounts for additional capacity through efficient timetabling.

D. Renzella indicated that there is 15-20% flexibility through timetabling.

M. D'Aguiar reviewed the assumptions hand out.

Question

**a) Assumption 7, the new school will offer grades 9 and 10 for the first year?**

Grade 11 added in subsequent year, then year after that grade 12 would be available.

R. Eatough explained that this assumption was discussed at the BRSC table. The main concern related to the program implications for grade 11 and 12s facing a move.

D. Renzella then reviewed the two scenarios.

*Scenario 1* – English boundary includes the Orchard neighbourhood, Florence Meares PS, Charles R. Beaudoin PS and the Alton community.

*Scenario 2* – the only difference between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 is that Scenario 2 includes the English students from rural Burlington at the new high school rather than Lester B. Pearson HS.

## Questions

**a) How are the numbers projected out to 2021?**

D. Renzella responded, explaining that software called SPS is utilized. The elementary projections provide the base and are migrated through into secondary. The software uses the assumptions as outlined and also accounts for things like share between boards/private schools, grade by grade changes based on historical trends etc...New residential development is a factor in the projections. The area labelled TBD the City of Burlington is reviewing at the secondary plan level.

**b) Looking at the white space on the map, west of the 407, students attend M.M. Robinson HS or Aldershot HS. Why are they not shown on the map?**

The maps show the review area, however students from that white space are included within the projections. They are not being considered for a move in this review.

**c) What percent utilization does the board like to see?**

Full schools are obviously ideal. Schools will be looked at for program viability when they get below 50% utilization. The trigger point may change as the Board review's its PARC policy moving forward.

An opportunity was provided to discuss the scenarios.

## Questions

**a) Looking at the scenarios can you clarify the difference between the two? It appears to be a small number. There must be a third or fourth scenario in here. The pocket currently at Nelson, west of Walker's Line and south of Dundas Street, that cohort doesn't stay together, or does it?**

The difference between the two scenarios is only the rural Burlington English. D. Tutton advised about the recent boundary changes resulting from the Alton elementaryschools boundary review.

**b) Are the FI students from Walker's Heights being redirected to Clarksdale for FI?**

Yes. This was the result of the Alton elementary schools boundary review. (Walker's heights also referred to as North Headon Forest the area south of Dundas St, Between 407 ETR and Walker's Line)

**c) And the FI attend Nelson HS?**

Yes. (Clarification for minutes - If the students are graduating from CRB they are directed o Nelson, if students are graduating from Rolling Meadows they are directed to MMR)

**d) Why is there no option for rural Burlington FI to attend the new school?**

This was discussed at the BRSC table. It is a small number of kids at Rolling Meadows PS and they would be separated from their cohort. There are only 8 or 9 rural Burlington FI students in total in grades 1 to 8.

**e) Optimal number of students for a program?**

D. Tutton stated that it is usually 22 based on funding.

**f) Given the low attendance at the school in opening years what is the impact programming, sports and other extracurricular activities?**

The Grade 9 and 10 students should be in good shape for course availability. As for extra-curricular activities it could be a positive situation for students in terms of their participation opportunities.

**g) Can we have the projections broken down by grade?**

**8. Wrap Up**

D. Tutton asked the committee to review the handouts from tonight before next week so that they could begin to digest the scenarios and review the criteria.

D. Tutton asked what if anything needs to be communicated after the first BRC meeting?

R. Eatough responded that nothing was sent out after the BRC meeting for the Alton elementary schools boundary review, but the BRC kept the schools informed, in some cases through council chairs. Principals have purposely been removed from this process. The link to the webpage will be shared, a 'how to' for reading the scenarios document will be added.

BRC reps may submit scenario requests and information requests through email.

Meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

**Next meeting:**

Tuesday, April 3<sup>rd</sup> in the Board Room at the JW Singleton Centre (2050 Guelph Line)