

**Boundary Review Committee
March 31 Meeting – Minutes
West Oak Trails P.S.**

**Meeting started at 7:00 p.m.
Chairs Superintendent Stuart Miller and Trustee Kelly Amos**

1. Minutes

The Chairs thanked the BRC participants for the incredible amount of time and effort that they have committed to this review. It was emphasized that the process is not complete. The BRC is Part 2 – getting focused on the public meeting on April 7. After input from the public, the BRC will meet again to review that input.

Action: Last week’s meetings minutes were electronically distributed. Hard copies available as required. Minutes reviewed by members. **Correction:** Under point 5 Scenario 4 – delete no FI program viability

Chair noted that many questions and concerns being brought to the table are from elementary parents. At the high school level, chair reminded BRC that the high school student is an active participant in the decision-making process for program involvement. It is important that the community understand this reality. *Example Concern: My child is in Grade 4 and is looking forward to attending a particular school because the school offers a business high school certificate program. (In fact, by the time student attends high school, there could be completely different interests.)*

A BRC member shared results of polling Grade 9 & 10 F. Immersion students. This group of students agreed with b (program viability) and g (stable long-term boundaries) criteria. However, the other two important criteria for students were that they wanted to be with their cohorts (siblings were not a priority) and their dislike of portables. Programming was more important to students than the ability to walk to school.

Another parent noted that when FI and English students are in same high school, the students often remain in original “program-related” groups.

2. Review of Norms and Process

The norms were reviewed with a reminder to respect participants’ viewpoints. BRC participants were reminded that a consensus approach to BRC was key. It is important to compromise and understand other points of view. At the April 7 meeting, opportunities for the public to provide input through questions/suggestions will be available through the website up to April 18. A follow-up meeting later in April for BRC will be arranged to share feedback.

2. Review of Questions

A hard copy of two questions submitted to website was distributed with detailed answers to the questions for BRC participants to review. These answers will be posted on the website.

A correction regarding Scenario #10 was also brought to BRC attention. The chart is correct stating that FI Grade 9 starts at the new high school in September 2016 not the descriptive wording stating 2012. Question from BRC - Why not start in 2012? This would result in further splitting of cohorts even though cohorts are already splitting themselves with 12% attending WOSS.

A BRC member asked the Planning Department why the 2008 LTAP numbers show 380 more students at Abbey Park than the BRC Scenario 1 (same boundaries). The Planning Department will look into this discrepancy.

A BRC member indicated that the Abbey Park HS administrator said the school could not handle an enrolment of 1386.

4. Scenarios 15 Presented

A detailed map with data was distributed to BRC members with an opportunity to review this Scenario and provide feedback. The consensus was that this scenario still overcrowds the new school. Consensus to DELETE this scenario.

5. Programs

Superintendent of School Programs reminded BRC members that when reviewing scenarios for program (FI in particular), it is a best practice that a high school should open with at least two sections for program viability. Over utilization and under utilization are very important issues for high school programming. Over utilization leads to portables and puts pressure on curriculum, resources and extra curricular opportunities.

6. Process and Concerns

Chairs asked for participants to share questions and basic opinions that their school communities are struggling with and to review priorities.

Top concerns were as follows:

- balanced enrollment in all schools
- program viability
- stable long-term boundaries
- concern that FI program remain strong
- concern with decreasing numbers in English programs
- community walk-to schools a priority
- transparency and honesty in process, continue to work in good faith
- parents don't want kids to be moved around
- transparency and honesty in process

General question from BRC - *How accurate are numbers?* Because the Planning Dept. has the base numbers from elementary schools, high school numbers are more definitive. For example, the actual discrepancy this year for high schools was about 1.5% (a couple hundred students over whole Board population) In elementary numbers are more difficult to project. Such things as community growth, proximity of Catholic school in area, new program offered – can lead to discrepancies in elementary projections. In more stable communities, numbers are more accurate. Zero optional attendance is used in projections...why? It is a general option made when a new scenario created. Numbers are very importance to school administrators as numbers affect staffing – secondary numbers have been accurate. For elementary schools it depends on stability of community.

7. Objectives of Meeting

Chairs reiterated that the objective of tonight's meeting was to decide on three viable scenarios that would be presented at the public meeting on April 7. Staff and BRC want feedback from the public on scenarios presented. A reminder that change is part of the process – there may be necessary “tweaking” involved for any scenario.

8. Scenario Review and Prioritization by Participants

1, 5, and 10 were the top scenarios with Scenario 6 and 9 also being mentioned

Process of elimination

Scenario 13

Since no school chose Scenario 13, consensus to DELETE Scenario 13.

Scenario 9

Since Scenario 9 was brought back by a school, it was again reviewed by the members as a group.

-Four priority criteria – program viability, walk to school, capacity – good balance, stability

-Another view – modification of Scenario 9 – keep students at WOSS till 2015/16 to keep Abbey Park from overcrowding. Concern with cohort split – some students at WOSS would be moved to another school. Grandfathering can be part of the picture. Concern about West Oak students continuing to go to WOSS. One of goals of new high school is to relieve pressure at WOSS and Abbey Park. We are building a new school that does not come close to capacity – underutilized... i.e. 444 students in first year. Should Upper Middle be dividing line for FI? There was consensus as a group that Scenario 9 should not be brought back. DELETE

Scenario 6

The NW community wants school for FI in the NW. Numbers are not as good as numbers in 5 and 10. This is the only option that has every student living north of QEW attending school north of QEW. Not long-term viable; kids walking by schools; positive because FI students stay in north. However, TAB is under-utilized and the new high school is over-capacity. Abbey Park is okay for long-term. Knowing the problems that under-utilization and over-capacity bring, this scenario is not viable. There was strong advocacy for this scenario; however, there was not consensus to support this scenario for public meeting. Scenario 6 was not a preferred scenario. DELETE

Scenario 1

Program viability, keeps most English students within walking distance of schools but no FI students can walk to school in NW, TAB overcrowded, Abbey Park numbers go down; oldest school has most kids – overcrowded. PRESENT ON APRIL 7

Scenario 5

All schools balanced but new school at capacity. PRESENT ON APRIL 7

Scenario 10

All schools balanced but negative splits Palermo cohorts – similar to 5 but no cohort split. New schools is not at capacity as English students go to Abbey Park. PRESENT ON APRIL 7

Overview: Preamble to presentation of three scenarios was to be up front and state the fact that “there are not enough spots in NW community to have all students attend high school in the NW.” Reminder that FI is an optional program. Acknowledge that compromise is required to meet the priority criteria. BRC has reached consensus by presenting Scenario 1, 5, and 10 yet addressing the FI students in some way.

All 15 scenarios will go up on the website as soon as possible. The reasons why 12 scenarios were deleted will also be listed with the scenario presentation. The preferred scenarios will be listed with the reasons why preferred.

9. Public Meeting Process

April 7 Public Meeting at IRHS 7 pm – Newspaper Advertisement
Convey Importance of being Open and Transparent to Community
BRC – commitment acknowledged – bring on stage for acknowledgement??

Open House: 7 – 7:30 pm – Visual presentation (multiple stations at each scenario for questions)
Suggested that BRC participants take questions from audience by area (school) Nametags for BRC members.

Convene in auditorium 7:30 – 8:00 pm

- BRC commitment acknowledged – possibly on stage, at front, stand to acknowledge?
Important for audience to recognize contribution of time and effort by BRC.
- Presentation of process and criteria -Staff would prefer BRC involvement in presentation of process and criteria. Chairs asked that BRC members willing to be actively involved in presentation on April 7 to email Chairs.
- Detailed presentation of three scenarios by HDSB staff.

Questions/Feedback 8:00 – 8:30 p.m.

A BRC member proposed a Public Meeting format, including suggestions for handling questions. A BRC member suggested Survey Monkey as a method of gathering feedback from the public, to ensure that only one feedback form per computer is submitted. The Committee did not like the idea. The BRC member then suggested an online survey (such as the annual parent survey) which is accessed using student OEN, again to ensure fair submission of forms. The Chair stated that a survey

would take too long to set up and that the 'votes' per scenario would not be counted and the public would not be picking the scenario.

Concern by BRC member that parents at the Abbey Park boundary meeting really wanted some type of control in the feedback process and suggested using the OEN. The fear is that the trustees will use the forms and say something like 'Scenario 6 had the most public support so we'll put that motion forward'.

Feedback forms, survey, school communication (letter home, email, phone), make sure Boundary Review states the names of high schools involved – NEW High School not just Number SRA 103

Questions by representative (school/area) to staff through open mic suggested as a possibility.

Scenarios will be on the website as soon as possible. Schools advise community of this information through email/phone message and set a window for questions. Encourage questions to be sent in to website before April 7 meeting.. These questions could be answered by staff at April 7 meeting.

Important to get feedback from people who are not at the meeting.

Chairs to prepare Agenda for April 7 meeting and give to BRC in advance.

Meeting Adjourned: 11 pm

Next meeting: second half of April – meeting date to be decided