# Halton District School Board 

Report Number:<br>16132<br>Date: $\quad$ September 29, 2016<br>FOR DECISION

TO: $\quad$ The Chair and Members of the Halton District School Board
FROM: S. Miller, Director of Education
RE: Director's Preliminary Report on the Undertaking of a Program and Accommodation Review for Burlington Secondary Schools

## Warrant

The Ministry of Education released the "Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline" in March 2015. The purpose of the Guideline is to provide a framework of minimum standards for school boards to undertake pupil accommodation reviews to determine the future of a school or group of schools. The Halton District School Board revised its Program and Accommodation Review (PAR) Policies to reflect the new guidelines. As outlined in the Board PAR policies, the Director must prepare a Preliminary Report which identifies a school or group of schools that may be considered for a Program and Accommodation Review. In order for a PAR to be initiated, one of five conditions must be met, which has been addressed in this report. As per Board PAR policies there must be a recommended option if more than one option is presented, which is also identified in this report.

## RECOMMENDATION

Be it resolved that the Halton District School Board undertake a Program and Accommodation Review for all secondary schools located in the City of Burlington:

- Aldershot High School,
- Burlington Central High School,
- Dr. Frank J. Hayden Secondary School,
- Lester B. Pearson High School,
- Nelson High School,
- M.M. Robinson High School and
- Robert Bateman High School

FURTHERMORE, a Program and Accommodation Review Committee (PARC) be formed, in accordance with the Board's Policy; and,
THAT, the staff recommended Option 19 be provided to the Program and Accommodation Review Committee for further review and to develop any other options, in accordance with the Board's Policy; and,

THAT the parents/guardians, staff and school council members of the affected schools be informed of the decision to form a Program and Accommodation Review Committee within five (5) business days of the approval of a PAR; and,
THAT within five (5) business days of the approval of a PAR, a written notice is to be provided to the Ministry of Education, City of Burlington, Region of Halton, Halton Catholic District School Board, Conseil Scolaire Viamonde, Conseil Scolaire de District Catholique Centre-Sud, Ministry of Education and community partners; and,
THAT, Trustees authorize the Director of Education to tender for a third-party consultant to facilitate the Program and Accommodation Review Process, in terms of the Program and Accommodation Review Committee and all public meetings.
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## Background

## Policies

In 2015, the Ministry of Education, as part of their School Board Efficiencies and Modernization Strategy, released two major documents: The Community Planning and Partnership Guidelines and Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines (appendix 1). The Community Planning and Partnership Guidelines directs Boards to identify potential partnership opportunities and to share such opportunities with government agencies and parties that expressed interest for such opportunities. In response, the Halton District School Board adopted the new Community Planning and Partnership Policy on October 21, 2015. The first annual Community Planning and Partnership meeting was held on June 22, 2016, in Burlington. Approximately eight organizations had representatives at this meeting. There have been three follow up meetings and preliminary inquiries with interested partners since June 2016. At this time, there has been expressed interest in potential partnerships, but no specific details related to a partnership within a Burlington secondary school(s).
The Ministry of Education released the revised Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines in March 2015. This guideline provides school boards with an efficient tool to address a Board's need to close or consolidate facilities. Community participation is a requirement in the updated guideline. The Halton District School Board continues its commitment to an open and participatory procedure through its development and adoption of a Program and Accommodation Review (PAR) Policy (Appendix 2). For a PAR to occur, a committee of school representatives is required. This policy was adopted on February 17, 2016 and this PAR will adhere to the policy.

## Conditions Required for A Program and Accommodation Review (PAR)

As outlined in the Board PAR policies, the Director must prepare a Preliminary Report which identifies a school or group of schools that may be considered for a Program and Accommodation Review. In order for a PAR to be initiated, one of five conditions must be met. The conditions are as follows:

1. The school or a group of schools has/have experienced or will experience declining enrolment where On-The-Ground Capacity (OTG) utilization rate is below 65\%;
2. Reorganization involving the school or group of schools could enhance program delivery and learning opportunities;
3. Under normal staffing allocation practices, it would be necessary to assign three or more grades to one class in one or more schools;
4. The current physical condition of the schools negatively impacts the optimum operation of the building(s) and program delivery;
5. In respect of one or more of the schools under consideration there are safety, accessibility and/or environmental concerns associated with the building of the school site or its locality.

## Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP)

On an annual basis, the Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) is published and adopted by the Board of Trustees. This document provides enrolment projections for the upcoming ten years for all schools in Halton. The plan identifies review areas and schools where enrolment issues are projected to occur within the immediate future and the need to undertake associated

## Halton District School Board

boundary studies. The 2015/2016 LTAP and Board report states that a consideration should be given to undertaking a PAR for all secondary schools in Burlington.

Under-enrolment for multiple Burlington secondary schools has been a concern for the last four plus years, and has been stated since the 2012/2013 LTAP Board Report. Projections do indicate that future growth will not significantly impact secondary enrolments.
Burlington Secondary Enrolments, Utilization and Available Pupil Places 2015-2025

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Enrolments | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |
| On The Ground <br> Capacity* (OTG) | 7275 | 7275 | 7275 | 7275 | 7275 | 7275 | 7275 | 7275 | 7275 | 7275 | 7275 |
| Utilization (UTZ) | $74 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $74 \%$ |
| Available Pupil <br> Places | 1893 | 1819 | 1748 | 1653 | 1631 | 1598 | 1568 | 1683 | 1731 | 1796 | 1919 |

It is also recognized Dr. Frank J. Hayden Secondary School will exceed total building and portable capacity within the immediate future. A redistribution of students will increase utilization for schools in Burlington. Schools south of the QEW will continue to be under enrolled.
Burlington High Schools Under Study (Appendix 3)

## Aldershot HS

Located within the Aldershot community in southwest Burlington, the Aldershot facility houses elementary (Grades 7-8) and secondary classes (Grades 9-12). It is the only Grade 7-12 school available west of QEW/407 ETR. This school offers English and French Immersion programming. Enrolments are projected to decline beyond 2020. In 2015, there were 327 available pupil places in the facility. Growth from infill developments and North Aldershot Planning Area developments are included in the projections. The high school's utilization is currently $78 \%$ and is expected to increase to $83 \%$, by 2019. It is projected there will be close to 100 English secondary students per grade (excluding Grade 12).

| Aldershot High School | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| OTG | 558 | 558 |
| Enrolment | 436 | 461 |
| Utilization | $78 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| Available Pupil Places | 122 | 97 |

*Note: The elementary OTG of the Aldershot facility for the Grade 7 and 8 program is 460 pupil places. TOTAL OTG of the Aldershot facility is 1018 pupil places.

## Burlington Central HS

The Burlington Central facility houses elementary and secondary school classes (Grades 7-12) and is located within the downtown core. Combined with adjacent Central PS (K - Grade 6), this facility forms a part of a K-12 campus. This school offers English and French Immersion programming. Enrolments are projected to be stable. Growth from infill developments are

## Halton District School Board

included. The high school's utilization is expected to remain stable at $68 \%$ capacity. In 2015, there were 376 available pupil places in the facility. Burlington Central is the only facility without an elevator/stairlift. The sports field lands are not owned by the Halton District School Board.

| Burlington High School | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| OTG | 870 | 870 |
| Enrolment | 595 | 593 |
| Utilization | $68 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Available Pupil Places | 275 | 277 |

*Note: The elementary OTG of the Burlington Central facility for the Grade 7 and 8 program is 391 pupil places. TOTAL OTG of the Burlington Central facility is 1271 pupil places.

## Nelson High School

Nelson High School, Grades 9-12, is located south of the QEW between Walker's Line and Appleby Line. This school offers English, French Immersion, and Secondary Gifted Placement. Enrolments are expected to increase over the next ten years. Growth from infill developments are included in the projections. Nelson HS utilization rates are expected to remain above $80 \%$. Nelson HS has the second highest high school utilization in Burlington. There is an excess of 343 available places at this school in 2015. There is support for a Nelson Stadium Revitalization project between the community, Board and Burlington staff.

| Nelson High School | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| OTG | 1341 | 1341 |
| Enrolment | 998 | 1111 |
| Utilization | $74 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| Available Pupil Places | 343 | 230 |

## Robert Bateman HS

Robert Bateman High School, Grades 9-12, is located south of the QEW between Appleby Line and Burloak Drive. A small area known as Samuel Curtis Estate in Oakville is directed to this school. The school offers English programming, International Baccalaureate programming (IB) and a variety of Self Contained-Special Education (SC-SPED) programs. Robert Bateman High School is the only school in Burlington to offer the IB program. This program attracts students from senior elementary schools in the Burlington area. This high school is one of two schools to offer SC-SPED classes and as such, this school has specialized facilities to accommodate the programs. Growth from infill development is included in the projections. Utilization is below 65\% and is expected to decline. There currently is an excess of 500 spaces in the facility. The combined English program and IB program is expected to be under 100 students per grade (excluding Grade 12), by 2022.

| Robert Bateman High School | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| OTG | 1323 | 1323 |
| Enrolment | 799 | 726 |
| Utilization | $60 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Available Pupil Places | 524 | 597 |

## Halton District School Board

## M.M. Robinson HS

M.M. Robinson High School, Grades 9-12 is located north of the QEW between Guelph Line and 407 ETR. The school offers English, French Immersion and SC-SPED programming. It is one of two schools to offer SC-SPED programming in Burlington. The SC-SPED program was added to the school in 2013. Growth from infill developments are included in the projections. The utilization is below $55 \%$ and is expected to decline. There is currently an excess of 617 spaces in this facility.

| MM Robinson High School | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| OTG | 1347 | 1347 |
| Enrolment | 730 | 633 |
| Utilization | $54 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| Available Pupil Places | 617 | 714 |

## Lester B. Pearson High School

Lester B. Pearson High School, Grades 9-12, is located north of the QEW between Guelph Line and Walker's Line. This school offers English and Late French Immersion programming. It is the only school in Halton to have Late French Immersion. Late French Immersion begins in Grade 7 at Sir E. MacMillan Public School. Growth from infill developments are included in projections. The utilization is $65 \%$ and it is expected to decline. There currently is an excess of 220 spaces in the facility. Enrolments in Grades 9-11 English are expected to be less than100 students per grade.

| Lester B. Pearson High School | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| OTG | 642 | 642 |
| Enrolment | 416 | 353 |
| Utilization | $65 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Available Pupil Places | 226 | 289 |

## Dr. Frank J. Hayden Secondary School

Dr. Frank J. Hayden Secondary School, Grades 9-12, is Burlington's newest high school located in Alton Village, north of Dundas St. It opened in 2013 and offers English and French Immersion programming. Enrolments are expected to increase. It is the only high school in Burlington that is currently above total capacity (2016) and is expected to continue to grow until 2021. Growth from new development west of Guelph Line and north of Dundas Street, and infill development is included in the projections. Current utilization is $118 \%$.

| Dr. Frank J. Hayden Secondary School | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| OTG | 1194 | 1194 |
| Enrolment | 1408 | 1799 |
| Utilization | $118 \%$ | $151 \%$ |
| Available Pupil Places | -214 | -605 |
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## Not Assigned Development

A major development application has been submitted after projections have been created for the 2015-2016 LTAP in the Evergreen Community, located north of Dundas St., and west of Tremaine Line. This area has not been assigned to a specific school. The development consists of 907 residential units. The City of Burlington is in the midst of creating a secondary plan. It is anticipated that there will be approximately 50 secondary students from this area. The closest high school to this development is Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS.

## Condition 1 - By reviewing the above enrolments two schools will be under 65\% utilization; Robert Bateman HS, M.M. Robinson HS. One school is approaching this threshold; Lester B. Pearson HS.

## Small Secondary Schools, Large Secondary Data Trends

In a presentation to the Program and Accommodation Committee (Appendix 4), dated January 14, 2015, with an updated version presented to the Committee of the Whole on September 28, 2016 (Appendix 8). Senior Administrative Staff outlined the benefits and challenges associated with small and large high schools. This presentation recognized that low enrolments e.g. under 600 students, can have positive effects for students such as:

- Staff tend to know each student better and may be more able to proactively intervene to support a student who is in need of assistance;
- Extra-Curricular Participation - while the number of types of activities available to students may be fewer in a smaller school, students are more likely to make a team/activity because there are fewer students interested in participating in each team/activity;
- Higher ratio of service area staff to students - to maintain core functions in the area of Special Education, Guidance and Library, smaller schools have a significantly richer staffing ratio than larger schools. This however comes with increased costs to the Board;
- Less pressure on the physical space in the building e.g. less scheduling challenges on gym space.

There are also positive effects associated with high enrolment, e.g. greater than 1000 students.

- More course options available to students to support different learners, interests and pathways.
- Fewer scheduling and timetable conflicts - In the 2014/2015 school year, 39\% of students at smaller schools had timetable conflicts while at larger schools 19\% of students had timetable conflicts. Timetable conflicts often result in students not being able to take a course they had selected because two or more of their selected courses are running in only one semester at the same time.
- Fewer "shared" students - a shared student is a student that is registered in more than one school. These students register for a course they require/want that is not available in their home school. In 2014/2015 12\% of students (234 students) were considered a shared student in small homes schools. 4\% of students in a large home school were considered shared students (169 students).
- Fewer Early Leavers in larger schools - An Early Leaver is a student that leaves school prior to graduating. In 2014/2015 the percentage of early leaver prior to graduation was $1 \%$ at large schools and $3 \%$ at smaller schools. This in turn affects the graduation rates at high schools.
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- More teacher subject specialization - more classes mean more teachers, therefore it is more likely to get specialized teachers while smaller schools with limited classes have less diversity in staff. For instance in larger schools there may be 4-5 science teachers, a biology specialist, physics specialist, a chemistry specialist and two science generalist, while at a small school there may be only 2 science teachers to teachers to teach all science curriculum areas.
- More opportunities for Extra-Curricular participation - in larger schools there are more staff and thus more opportunity for greater special interests and skills and thus a greater offering of extracurricular activities.
- More funding for students, less spent on maintaining empty spaces.

While small schools offer a more close-knit community and a high ratio of support staff, large schools offer choices to students, by way of courses, activities and teaching staff.

## Condition 2 - By reorganizing the school and creating larger grade sizes and enrolments, the Halton District School Board can enhance program delivery by offering more courses and a variety of courses using funding that would otherwise be spent on maintaining empty spaces.

In accordance with Board Policy, at least one of five conditions is required to be fulfilled in order to initiate a PAR. Since there are two Burlington secondary schools that have met the 65\% threshold, this condition is satisfied. By re-organizing the secondary schools and creating larger grade sizes, HDSB can improve program delivery and learning opportunities for all secondary students in Burlington. HDSB has met two of the conditions needed to initiate a PAR.

## Program and Accommodation Review Committee (PARC)

The PARC is an advisory group that acts as an official conduit for information shared between the Board of Trustees and their communities. The PARC will meet, review information, provide feedback from the community, and suggest options. The PARC does not make the final decision. A recommendation(s) by the Director of Education will be presented to the Board of Trustees for decision. The Board of Trustees will ultimately make the final decision.

The PARC consists of

- A Trustee and Superintendent from an area outside of Burlington.
- From each affected school
o Principal or designate
o Two parents/guardians
Once the PARC is formed, a municipal councillor or delegate will be invited. The appropriate staff resources will be available at PAR meetings, which can include but not limited to representatives from specific Halton District School Board departments; School Programs, Special Education, Human Resources, and Planning.
There will be a minimum of four (4) working meetings following an orientation session. In the orientation session staff will present options for review. All information presented to the PARC will be posted on the website (www.hdsb.ca) including meeting minutes.
Members of the public can attend PARC working meeting strictly as spectators. Additional opportunities will be available for members of the public to provide input throughout this process.

It is intended that a third party consultant will be utilized to facilitate at all the Program and Accommodation Review Committee meetings, as well as all public meetings.

## Halton District School Board

## Staff Recommended Option

The Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines (March 2015) requires the Halton District School Board to present a preferred/recommended option in the initial staff report (Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines, VI. p6).
At this time one option is recommended. It is the intent this recommendation not to be presented as a final option but as a starting point for review and discussions by the PARC. Each school is unique and is valuable to the community they serve, and each school has its own unique benefits and challenges. Therefore it is necessary to solicit community feedback during this process.
Several options (Appendix 5) were developed that showed the impact of each Burlington secondary school closing, with the exception of Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS. However many options did include the opportunity to redirect a program and/or areas in order to provide accommodation relief to Dr. Frank J.Hayden SS. The review of options started with the the impact of closing one school. As identified in the 2015-2106 LTAP, there are 7275 secondary spaces in secondary school facilities with a utilization rate of $78 \%$ and 1893 empty pupil places.

List of Options Reviewed By Staff

| Scenario | School to Close | \# of students <br> in 2018 | \# of availablel <br> shortage of pupil <br> places in 2018 | Utilization <br> in 2018 (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current | All school are opened | 5622 | 1653 | $77 \%$ |
| Option 1 | Aldershot HS | 5622 | 1095 | $84 \%$ |
| Option 2 | Burlington Central HS | 5622 | 783 | $88 \%$ |
| Option 3 | Nelson High School | 5622 | 312 | $95 \%$ |
| Option 4 | Robert Bateman HS | 5622 | 330 | $94 \%$ |
| Option 5 | M.M. Robinson HS | 5622 | 306 | $95 \%$ |
| Option 6 | Lester B. Pearson HS | 5622 | 1011 | $85 \%$ |
| Option 7 | No closures - Capping <br> Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | 1653 | $85 \%$ |
| Option 8 | Lester B. Pearson HS <br> Boundary Change - <br> Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | 5611 | $106 \%$ |
| Option 9 | Robert Bateman HS, <br> Lester B. Pearson HS <br> Program Change - <br> Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | -312 | $106 \%$ |
| Option 10 | Robert Bateman HS, <br> Lester B. Pearson HS <br> Boundary Change - <br> Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | -2 |  |
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| Scenario | School to Close | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# of students } \\ & \text { in } 2018 \end{aligned}$ | \# of availablel shortage of pupil places in 2018 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Utilization } \\ & \text { in } 2018 \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Option 11 | Robert Bateman HS, Lester B. Pearson HS Program Change Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | -312 | 106\% |
| Option 12 | Nelson HS, M.M. Robinson High School Program Change Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | -1035 | 123\% |
| Option 13 | Robert Bateman HS, Lester B. Pearson HS Boundary Change Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | -312 | 106\% |
| Option 14 | Burlington Central HS, Lester B. Pearson HS Boundary/Program Change - Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | 141 | 98\% |
| Option 15 | Burlington Central HS, Lester B. Pearson HS Boundary Change - <br> Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | 141 | 98\% |
| Option 16 | Aldershot HS, Lester B. Pearson HS Boundary/Program Change - Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | 453 | 93\% |
| Option 17 | Aldershot HS, Lester B. Pearson HS Boundary/Program Change - Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | 453 | 93\% |
| Option 18 | Aldershot HS, Lester B. Pearson HS Boundary/Program Change - Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | 453 | 98\% |
| Option 19 | Burlington Central HS, Lester B. Pearson HS Boundary / Program Change - Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS | 5622 | 141 | 98\% |
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*A negative number indicates a shortage of pupil places.
From these 19 options, a preferred Option 19 (Appendix 6) was selected in which staff recommends to close Lester B. Pearson HS and Burlington Central HS, as well as redefine Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS program and boundaries.
Option 19 is staff recommended in order to address:

- Low enrolments at Lester B. Pearson HS and low-utilization at M.M. Robinson HS by closing Lester B. Pearson HS;
- Low enrolments at Aldershot HS, under-utilization at Burlington Central HS by closing Burlington Central HS and redistributing students to Nelson HS and Aldershot HS;
- High enrolments at Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS by redistribution of students to Robert Bateman HS and the removal of the FI program and redirecting FI students to M.M. Robinson HS;
- Low enrolments and low-utilization at Robert Bateman HS by adding a FI program and by redistribution of students from Nelson HS and Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS.


## Lester B. Pearson HS

The preferred staff option (Option 19) is to close Lester B. Pearson HS effective the end of June 2018. All students currently at Lester B. Pearson HS (including students enrolled in Late FI) can be accommodated at M.M. Robinson HS. The distance between the two schools is 1.6 km .

Closing Lester B. Pearson HS does not impact the issue of under enrolments at schools south of the QEW. The Halton DSB still has 956 available pupil places, this includes the overcapacity of Dr. Frank J. Hayden HS. Taking into account only the schools located south of the QEW, there is an availability of 1200 pupil places.

## Burlington Central HS

Also, it is staff's preferred option that Burlington Central HS be closed effective the end of June 2018. All secondary students, west of Brant St., will be redirected to Aldershot HS and secondary students east of Brant St to be redirected to Nelson HS. This recommendation does not include the redirection of Grade 7 and 8 students from the Burlington Central Elementary PS. In the event that the decision is made to close this high school, there is a potential that a Program and Accommodation Review may be required for the elementary schools that currently feed into Burlington Central PS for Grades 7 and 8.

## Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS

Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS has exceeded total capacity. Current trends indicate growth will continue until 2021. Staff recommends changing its catchment and removing the Fl program. English and FI students south of Upper Middle Rd. will be redirected to Robert Bateman HS. French Immersion students residing north of Upper Middle Rd.will be redirected to M.M. Robinson HS. As a result of this recommendation Dr. Frank Hayden SS enrolments are expected to be close to OTG capacity.

## Aldershot HS

The Aldershot HS catchment will be expanded east to Brant St, as a result of closing Burlington Central HS. Enrolments indicate total capacity will exceed the secondary allotment of the OTG by 2018. The Aldershot facility size is 1018 pupil places. Ten portables can be placed on the site. Should this recommendation be approved, a PAR maybe required for the elementary schools in the Aldershot community.
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## MM Robinson HS

In the staff recommendation, M.M. Robinson HS English catchment is expanded to include the current Lester B. Pearson HS catchment. The Late French Immersion program currently at Lester B. Pearson HS will be redirected to M.M. Robinson HS. Staff recommends to expand the FI catchment to include the current Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS area north of Upper Middle Rd. M.M. Robinson HS utilization is projected to increase to $100 \%$ in 2018. SC-SPED programs will remain at M.M. Robinson HS.

## Nelson HS

Under Option 19, Nelson HS English catchment expands west to Brant St. The FI program at Nelson HS will be divided along Appleby Line. Students that reside west of Appleby Line will remain at Nelson HS and students that reside east of Appleby Line to be redirected to Robert Bateman HS. There is no proposed changes to the Secondary Gifted Placement. Utilization should immediately increase to close to $85 \%$ then slowly decline and stabilize at $80 \%$ capacity.

## Robert Bateman HS

It is staff recommended to establish a new FI program at Robert Bateman HS. The recommended boundary will expand Robert Bateman HS catchment English and French Immersion to north of the QEW, south of Upper Middle Rd and east of Appleby Line. The International Baccalaureate program and SC-SPED program will remain as status quo. Utilization is projected to increase to 73\% in 2018.

This staff recommendation is based on a programming decision to create a more opportunities in education and extra-circular activities for the students the Burlington communities.

Impact of Recommended Option High Schools, September 2018

| School | Boundary Changes | Program Changes | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Community } \\ \text { Partnership }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldershot HS | Expands |  | None | \(\left.\begin{array}{l}Interest has been <br>

expressed for a <br>
partnership within a <br>
Burlington high school <br>
or TA Blakelock by <br>
Habitat For Humanity. <br>
A specific school had <br>
not been identified.\end{array}\right\}\)
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## Impacts to Transportation

Transportation is provided in accordance with Board Policy and provided by Halton Student Transportation Services. To be eligible for transportation, students must reside greater than 3.2 km away from the school. Students on optional attendance, and non-resident students are not eligible for transportation services but can apply for courtesy seating through Halton Student Transportation Services.

Staff recommended Option 19 will increase the number of students eligible for transportation as follows:

| School | Students Eligible for <br> Transportation <br> Current Boundaries | Students Eligible <br> for Transportation -- <br> Staff Recommended <br> Option | Increase/Decrease <br> of Eligible Students |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldershot High School | 162 | 419 | +257 |
| Burlington Central HS | 5 | 0 | -5 |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden <br> Secondary School | 472 | 369 | -103 |
| Lester B. Pearson HS | 5 | 0 | -5 |
| M.M. Robinson HS | 67 | 244 | +177 |
| Nelson HS | 95 | 287 | +192 |
| Robert Bateman HS | 194 | 1000 | 1579 |
| Total |  |  | +579 |

## Impacts to Capital Investment

The average age of HDSB's high schools in Burlington is 51 years. Investments in our high schools is continual. By eliminating the excess pupil places, the Halton District School Board will have the opportunity to apply for funding to rebuild and upgrade older facilities. Projects arising from this PAR will be presented to the Board of Trustees at a later date and follow normal Ministry of Education funding procedures and timelines.

## Timeline

If the Program and Accommodation Review proceeds as scheduled the following is a proposed timeline for the implementation staff recommended Option 19. Should an alternate scenario be recommended to the Board of Trustees, this timeline may be adjusted to reflect the final decision of the PAR.

Completion of a PAR with Final Decision 8-9 months
Capital Priorities Application and Funding
3-6 months
1 year
Pre-Construction and Construction (project dependent)
School Closing
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## Community Planning and Partnerships

A list of eligible schools for Community Planning and Partnerships was presented to the public on June 22, 2016. Following this meeting, interest has been expressed by Habitat for Humanity for a partnership at one of the Burlington secondary schools. At the time of this report, a school has yet to be determined. In addition, inquiries have taken place regarding the shared use of Burlington secondary school facilities, preferably in the downtown core by a post-secondary institution. All potential partnerships are in its preliminary stages of planning, and no endorsements have been made by any approving authority at this time.

## School Information Profiles (SIP)

School Information Profiles (SIP) will be provided for each secondary school in Burlington. These documents have been designed to assist the PARC and community by the rationale of why these school are involved in the PAR. Information provided in the SIP are consider the values of the school to the students and to the Board. SIPs will be posted on the website (www.hdsb.ca).

## Consultation Plan

The PAR will follow timing as described in the policy commencing with the approval of the Director's Preliminary Report. An independent third party firm will conduct two public meetings, a minimum of four working PARC meetings. A delegation night will be available to the public after the release of the PAR recommendation. This process will result in a final report including public feedback to be presented to the Board of Trustees in 2017. The Consultation Plan (Appendix 7) outlines key consultation dates and meetings; times and locations to be established and posted on the website www.hdsb.ca.

## Communication Plan

Communication to all stakeholders is essential for the Halton District School Board. Notice of public meetings will be provided 20 days in advance through;

- School-based communication (newsletter/principal blog),
- Email messages via the home notification system,
- Social Media / Twitter,
- HDSB website (www.hdsb.ca)
- Media release,
- Letters to the school community,
- Advertisements in the Burlington Post.

A Planning email will be available for members of the public to submit comments and questions to Board staff and PARC. Throughout the PAR process, a frequently asked questions and answers section will be maintained on the Board's website.

## Conclusion

Since the 2012 LTAP, the Halton District School Board has identified that there was and would continue to be a significant amount of empty secondary school pupil places in Burlington and the potential existed to undertake a Program and Accommodation Review.
The Ministry of Education released its revised Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline on March 26, 2015. As a result, the Board was required to revise it existing policy to reflect these new guidelines. The new policy was adopted by the Board in February 2016.

## Halton District School Board

The revised PAR policies reflect the conditions for the Director to present a Preliminary Report to the Board of Trustees that identifies a school or group of schools that may be considered for a Program and Accommodation Review. The report will also identify the accommodation and programming/issues and opportunities that the schools are experiencing and provide one or more options to address such issues.
The Board staff recommended option is not to be construed as the Board of Trustees preferred or approved option. The intent of the staff recommended option is to provide the Program and Accommodation Review Committee with an option to initiate the review process, and to develop and consider any other options, in accordance with the Board Policy.
As result the Board Staff recommended option is as follows:

- to close Lester B. Pearson HS
- And to redirect student from Lester B Pearson HS to M.M. Robinson HS
- to close Burlington Central HS
- And to redirect students from Burlington Central HS to Aldershot HS and Nelson HS
- to change Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS program and boundary
- And to redirect the French Immersion program at Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS to M.M. Robinson HS and Robert Bateman HS
- And to redirect a portion of English program students to Robert Bateman HS
- to add French Immersion program to Robert Bateman HS
- to redirect a portion French Immersion students from Nelson HS to Robert Bateman HS

It is understood these schools have meaning and value for their communities. The Halton District School Board values and encourages community participation in this process. We are therefore requesting the formation of a Program and Accommodation Review Committee to participate in an advisory role, to be a conduit of information, and to provide meaningful input and feedback in the proposed solutions.
This review and resulting recommendations are focused on continuing to provide exceptional opportunities for our students, while ensuring fiscal responsibility in our use of facilities. Provisions will be made to ensure our students receive superior learning opportunities and program delivery.

Respectfully submitted,

## Stuart Miller

Director of Education

## Appendices

Appendix 1 - Ministry of Education - Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines
Appendix 2 -- Halton District School Board Program and Accommodation Review Policy
Appendix 3 -- Burlington High Schools Location Map
Appendix 4 - Small School, Large School Data Trends Presentation
Appendix 5 - Options Reviewed By Staff
Appendix 6 - Staff Recommended Option
Appendix 7 -- Program and Accommodation Review Consultation Plan
Appendix 8 - Committee of the Whole presentation, September 28, 2016 "Small/Large Schools"
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## PREAMBLE

School boards are responsible for managing their school capital assets in an effective manner. They must respond to changing demographics and program needs while ensuring continued student achievement and well-being, and the financial viability/sustainability of the school board.

One aspect of a school board's capital and accommodation planning is reviewing schools that have underutilized space. These are schools where the student capacity of the school is greater than the number of students enrolled. When a school board identifies a school that is projected to have long-term excess space, a school board would typically look at a number of options such as:

- moving attendance boundaries and programs to balance enrolment between over and underutilized schools;
- offering to lease underutilized space within a school to a coterminous school board;
- finding community partners who can pay the full cost of operating the underutilized space; and/or
- decommissioning or demolishing a section of the school that is not required for student use to reduce operating costs.

If none of these options are deemed viable by a school board, the board may determine that a pupil accommodation review process take place which could lead to possible school consolidations and closures. These decisions are made within the context of supporting the school board's student achievement and wellbeing strategy and to make the most effective use of its school buildings and funding.

The Ministry of Education expects school boards to work with their community partners when undertaking capital planning, including when a school board is beginning to develop options to address underutilized space in schools. The Ministry of Education's Community Planning and Partnerships Guideline (CPPG) outlines requirements for school boards to reach out to their local municipalities and other community partners to share planning related information and to explore potential partnership opportunities. This version of the Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline (the "Guideline") builds upon the CPPG by providing requirements for school boards to share information with and seek feedback from their local municipalities and other community partners related to any pupil accommodation reviews a school board initiates.

If a pupil accommodation review results in a school closure decision, a school board will then need to decide whether to declare that school as surplus, potentially leading to the future sale of the property. These sales are governed by provincial regulation. Alternately, a school board may decide to use a closed school for other school board purposes, or hold the property as a strategic longterm asset of the school board due to a projected need for the facility in the
future. Each school board decides when it is appropriate to review its strategic property holdings to determine if these properties are still required to be held or should be considered surplus to the school board's needs and considered for a future sale.

This document provides direction to school boards on one component of their capital planning - the pupil accommodation review process. It provides the minimum standards the province requires school boards to follow when undertaking a pupil accommodation review. It is important to note that school boards have flexibility to modify their pupil accommodation review policies to meet their local needs, and can develop policies that exceed the provincial minimum standards outlined in this document.

## I. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Guideline is to provide a framework of minimum standards for school boards to undertake pupil accommodation reviews to determine the future of a school or group of schools. This Guideline ensures that where a decision is taken by a school board regarding the future of a school, that decision is made with the involvement of an informed local community and is based on a broad range of criteria regarding the quality of the learning experience for students.

This Guideline is effective upon release and replaces the previous Guideline of June 2009.

## II. INTRODUCTION

Ontario's school boards are responsible for deciding the most appropriate pupil accommodation arrangements for the delivery of their elementary and secondary programs. These decisions are made by school board trustees in the context of carrying out their primary responsibilities of fostering student achievement and well-being, and ensuring effective stewardship of school board resources. In some cases, to address changing student populations, this requires school boards to consider undertaking pupil accommodation reviews that may lead to school consolidations and closures.

Under paragraph 26, subsection 8 (1) of the Education Act, the Minister of Education may issue guidelines with respect to school boards' school closure policies.

## III. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Guideline has been established to align with the Ministry of Education's vision and as such, focuses on student well-being; academic achievement; and school board financial viability/sustainability.

All school board pupil accommodation review policies should be designed to align with these guiding principles.

## IV. SCHOOL BOARD ACCOMMODATION REVIEW POLICIES

School boards are responsible for creating and implementing a policy to address pupil accommodation reviews to serve their local needs. The Ministry of Education expects school boards to consult with local communities prior to adopting or subsequently amending their pupil accommodation review policies.

All pupil accommodation review policies must be clear in stipulating that the final decision regarding the future of a school or group of schools rests solely with the Board of Trustees. If the Board of Trustees votes to close a school or schools in accordance with their policy, the school board must provide clear timelines regarding the closure(s) and ensure that a transition plan is communicated to all affected school communities within the school board.

It is important to note that this Guideline is intended as a minimum requirement for school boards in developing their policies. School boards are responsible for establishing and complying with their pupil accommodation review policies to serve their local needs.

A copy of the school board's pupil accommodation review policy, the government's Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline and the Administrative Review of Accommodation Review Process documents are to be made available to the public as determined in the school board's policy, and posted on the school board's website.

The Guideline recognizes that pupil accommodation reviews include a school or group of schools to facilitate the development of viable solutions for pupil accommodation that support the guiding principles.

School board pupil accommodation review policies will include statements that encourage the sharing of relevant information as well as providing the opportunity for the public and affected school communities to be heard.

The Ministry of Education recommends that, wherever possible, schools should only be subject to a pupil accommodation review once in a five-year period, unless there are circumstances determined by the school board, such as a significant change in enrolment.

## V. SCHOOL BOARD PLANNING PRIOR TO AN ACCOMMODATION REVIEW

As described in the Community Planning and Partnerships Guideline, school boards must undertake long-term capital and accommodation planning, informed
by any relevant information obtained from local municipal governments and other community partners, which takes into consideration long-term enrolment projections and planning opportunities for the effective use of excess space in all area schools.

School boards must document their efforts to obtain information from local municipal governments as well as other community partners that expressed an interest prior to the pupil accommodation review; and provide any relevant information from municipalities and other community partners as part of the initial staff report (see Section VI).

## VI. ESTABLISHING AN ACCOMMODATION REVIEW

School boards may proceed to establish a pupil accommodation review only after undertaking the necessary assessment of long-term capital and accommodation planning options for the school(s).

## Initial Staff Report

Prior to establishing a pupil accommodation review, the initial staff report to the Board of Trustees must contain one or more options to address the accommodation issue(s). Each option must have a supporting rationale. There must be a recommended option if more than one option is presented. The initial staff report must also include information on actions taken by school board staff prior to establishing a pupil accommodation review process and supporting rationale as to any actions taken or not taken.

The option(s) included in the initial staff report must address the following:

- summary of accommodation issue(s) for the school(s) under review;
- where students would be accommodated;
- if proposed changes to existing facility or facilities are required as a result of the pupil accommodation review;
- identify any program changes as a result of the proposed option;
- how student transportation would be affected if changes take place;
- if new capital investment is required as a result of the pupil accommodation review, how the school board intends to fund this, as well as a proposal on how students would be accommodated if funding does not become available; and
- any relevant information obtained from municipalities and other community partners prior to the commencement of the pupil accommodation review, including any confirmed interest in using the underutilized space.

Each recommended option must also include a timeline for implementation.
The initial staff report and School Information Profiles (SIPs) (see Section VIII) will be made available to the public, as determined in the school board's policy,
and posted on the school board's website following the decision to proceed with a pupil accommodation review by the Board of Trustees.

School boards must ensure that individuals from the school(s) under review and the broader community are invited to participate in the pupil accommodation review consultation. At a minimum, the pupil accommodation review process must consist of the following methods of consultation:

- Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) (see Section VII);
- consultation with municipal governments local to the affected school(s) (see Section IX);
- public meetings (see Section X); and
- public delegations (see Section XI).


## VII. THE ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

## Role

School boards must establish an ARC that represents the school(s) under review and acts as the official conduit for information shared between the school board and the school communities. The ARC may comment on the initial staff report and may, throughout the pupil accommodation review process, seek clarification of the initial staff report. The ARC may provide other accommodation options than those in the initial staff report; however, it must include supporting rationale for any such option.

The ARC members do not need to achieve consensus regarding the information provided to the Board of Trustees.

The school board's staff resources assigned to the ARC are required to compile feedback from the ARC as well as the broader community in the Community Consultation section of the final staff report (see Section XI) to be presented to the Board of Trustees.

## Membership

The membership of the ARC should include, at a minimum, parent/guardian representatives from each of the schools under review, chosen by their respective school communities.

Where established by a school board's pupil accommodation review policy, there may also be the option to include students and representation from the broader community. For example, a school board's policy may include a requirement for specific representation from the First Nations, Metis, and Inuit communities. In addition, school board trustees may be ad hoc ARC members to monitor the ARC progress.

## Formation

The ARC should be formed following the Board of Trustees' consideration of the initial staff report but prior to the first public meeting. The school board will invite ARC members from the school(s) under review to an orientation session that will describe the mandate, roles and responsibilities, and procedures of the ARC.

## Terms of Reference

School boards will provide the ARC with Terms of Reference that describe the ARC's mandate. The mandate will refer to the school board's education and accommodation objectives in undertaking the ARC and reflect the school board's strategy for supporting student achievement and well-being.

The Terms of Reference will also clearly outline the school board's expectations of the roles and responsibilities of the ARC; and describe the procedures of the ARC. At a minimum, the ARC will provide feedback on the initial staff report option(s).

The Terms of Reference will outline the minimum number of working meetings of the ARC.

## Meetings of the Accommodation Review Committee

The ARC will meet to review materials presented by school board staff. It is recommended that the ARC hold as many working meetings as is deemed necessary within the timelines established in their school board's pupil accommodation review policy.

## VIII. SCHOOL INFORMATION PROFILE

School board staff are required to develop School Information Profiles (SIPs) as orientation documents to help the ARC and the community understand the context surrounding the decision to include the specific school(s) in a pupil accommodation review. The SIP provides an understanding of and familiarity with the facilities under review.

The SIP is expected to include data for each of the following two considerations about the school(s) under review:

- value to the student; and
- value to the school board.

A SIP will be completed by school board staff for each of the schools under review. The following are the minimum data requirements and factors that are to be included in the SIP:

- Facility Profile:
o School name and address.
o Site plan and floor plan(s) (or space template) of the school with the date of school construction and any subsequent additions.
o School attendance area (boundary) map.
o Context map (or air photo) of the school indicating the existing land uses surrounding the school.
o Planning map of the school with zoning, Official Plan or secondary plan land use designations.
o Size of the school site (acres or hectares).
o Building area (square feet or square metres).
o Number of portable classrooms.
o Number and type of instructional rooms as well as specialized classroom teaching spaces (e.g., science lab, tech shop, gymnasium, etc.).
o Area of hard surfaced outdoor play area and/or green space, the number of play fields, and the presence of outdoor facilities (e.g., tracks, courts for basketball, tennis, etc.).
o Ten-year history of major facility improvements (item and cost).
o Projected five-year facility renewal needs of school (item and cost).
o Current Facility Condition Index (FCI) with a definition of what the index represents.
o A measure of proximity of the students to their existing school, and the average distance to the school for students.
o Percentage of students that are and are not eligible for transportation under the school board policy, and the length of bus ride to the school (longest, shortest, and average length of bus ride times).
o School utility costs (totals, per square foot, and per student).
o Number of parking spaces on site at the school, an assessment of the adequacy of parking, and bus/car access and egress.
o Measures that the school board has identified and/or addressed for accessibility of the school for students, staff, and the public with disabilities (i.e., barrier-free).
o On-the-ground (OTG) capacity, and surplus/shortage of pupil places.
- Instructional Profile:
o Describe the number and type of teaching staff, non-teaching staff, support staff, itinerant staff, and administrative staff at the school.
o Describe the course and program offerings at the school.
o Describe the specialized service offerings at the school (e.g., cooperative placements, guidance counseling, etc.).
o Current grade configuration of the school (e.g., junior kindergarten to Grade 6, junior kindergarten to Grade 12, etc.).
o Current grade organization of the school (e.g., number of combined grades, etc.).
o Number of out of area students.
o Utilization factor/classroom usage.
o Summary of five previous years' enrolment and 10-year enrolment projection by grade and program.
o Current extracurricular activities.
- Other School Use Profile:
o Current non-school programs or services resident at or co-located with the school as well as any revenue from these non-school programs or services and whether or not it is at full cost recovery.
o Current facility partnerships as well as any revenue from the facility partnerships and whether or not it is at full cost recovery.
o Community use of the school as well as any revenue from the community use of the school and whether or not it is at full cost recovery.
o Availability of before and after school programs or services (e.g., child care) as well as any revenue from the before and after school programs and whether or not it is at full cost recovery.
o Lease terms at the school as well as any revenue from the lease and whether or not it is at full cost recovery.
o Description of the school's suitability for facility partnerships.
School boards may introduce additional items that could be used to reflect local circumstances and priorities which may help to further understand the school(s) under review.

Each school under review will have a SIP completed at the same point-in-time for comparison purposes. The Ministry of Education expects school boards to prepare SIPs that are complete and accurate, to the best of the school board's ability, prior to the commencement of a pupil accommodation review.

While the ARC may request clarification about information provided in the SIP, it is not the role of the ARC to approve the SIP.

## IX. CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS

Following the Board of Trustees' approval to undertake a pupil accommodation review, school boards must invite affected single and upper-tier municipalities as well as other community partners that expressed an interest prior to the pupil accommodation review to discuss and comment on the recommended option(s) in the school board's initial staff report.

The invitation for this meeting will be provided through a written notice, and will be directed through the Clerks Department (or equivalent) for the affected single and upper-tier municipalities.

The affected single and upper-tier municipalities, as well as other community partners that expressed an interest prior to the pupil accommodation review, must provide their response on the recommended option(s) in the school board's initial staff report before the final public meeting. School boards must provide
them with advance notice of when the final public meeting is scheduled to take place.

School boards must document their efforts to meet with the affected single and upper-tier municipalities, as well as other community partners that expressed an interest prior to the pupil accommodation review; and provide any relevant information from this meeting as part of the final staff report to the Board of Trustees (see Section XI).

## X. PUBLIC MEETINGS

Once a school board has received an initial staff report and has approved the initiation of a pupil accommodation review, the school board must arrange to hold a minimum of two public meetings for broader community consultation on the initial staff report. School board staff are expected to facilitate the public meetings to solicit broader community feedback on the recommended option(s) contained in the initial staff report.

The public meetings are to be announced and advertised publicly by the school board through an appropriate range of media as determined by the school board.

At a minimum, the first public meeting must include the following:

- an overview of the ARC orientation session;
- the initial staff report with recommended option(s); and
- a presentation of the SIPs.


## XI. COMPLETING THE ACCOMMODATION REVIEW

## Final Staff Report

At the conclusion of the pupil accommodation review process, school board staff will submit a final staff report to the Board of Trustees which must be available to the public as determined in the school board's policy, and posted on the school board's website.

The final staff report must include a Community Consultation section that contains feedback from the ARC and any public consultations as well as any relevant information obtained from municipalities and other community partners prior to and during the pupil accommodation review.

School board staff may choose to amend their proposed option(s) included in the initial staff report. The recommended option(s) must also include a proposed accommodation plan, prepared for the decision of the Board of Trustees, which contains a timeline for implementation.

## Delegations to the Board of Trustees Meeting

Once school board staff submits the final staff report to the Board of Trustees, the school board must allow an opportunity for members of the public to provide feedback on the final staff report through public delegations to the Board of Trustees. Notice of the public delegation opportunities will be provided based on school board policy.

After the public delegations, school board staff will compile feedback from the public delegations which will be presented to the Board of Trustees with the final staff report.

## Decision of the Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees will be provided with the final staff report, including the compiled feedback from the public delegations, when making its final decision regarding the pupil accommodation review.

The Board of Trustees has the discretion to approve the recommendation(s) of the final staff report as presented, modify the recommendation(s) of the final staff report, or to approve a different outcome.

The Ministry encourages school boards not to make final pupil accommodation review decisions during the summer holiday period (typically from July 1 to the day after Labour Day).

## XII. TRANSITION PLANNING

The transition of students should be carried out in consultation with parents/guardians and staff. Following the decision to consolidate and/or close a school, the school board is expected to establish a separate committee to address the transition for students and staff.

## XIII. TIMELINES FOR THE ACCOMMODATION REVIEW PROCESS

The pupil accommodation review process must comply with the following minimum timelines:

- Following the date of the Board of Trustees' approval to conduct a pupil accommodation review, the school board will provide written notice of the Board of Trustees' decision within 5 business days to each of the affected single and upper-tier municipalities through the Clerks Department (or equivalent), other community partners that expressed an interest prior to the pupil accommodation review; and include an invitation for a meeting to discuss and comment on the recommended option(s) in the school board's
initial staff report. School boards must also notify the Director(s) of Education of their coterminous school boards and the Ministry of Education through the office of the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Financial Policy and Business Division.
- The affected single and upper-tier municipalities, as well as other community partners that expressed an interest prior to the pupil accommodation review, must provide their response on the recommended option(s) in the school board's initial staff report before the final public meeting.
- Beginning with the date of the Board of Trustees' approval to conduct a pupil accommodation review, there must be no fewer than 30 business days before the first public meeting is held.
- There must be a minimum period of 40 business days between the first and final public meetings.
- The final staff report must be publicly posted no fewer than 10 business days after the final public meeting.
- From the posting of the final staff report, there must be no fewer than 10 business days before the public delegations.
- There must be no fewer than 10 business days between public delegations and the final decision of the Board of Trustees.


## XIV. MODIFIED ACCOMMODATION REVIEW PROCESS

In certain circumstances, where the potential pupil accommodation options available are deemed by the school board to be less complex, school boards may find it appropriate to undertake a modified pupil accommodation review process. The Guideline permits a school board to include an optional modified pupil accommodation review process in its pupil accommodation review policy.

A school board's pupil accommodation review policy must clearly outline the conditions where a modified pupil accommodation review process could be initiated by explicitly defining the factors that would allow the school board the option to conduct a modified pupil accommodation review process. The conditions for conducting a modified pupil accommodation review process need to be based on two or more of the following factors:

- distance to the nearest available accommodation;
- utilization rate of the facility;
- number of students enrolled at the school; or
- when a school board is planning the relocation (in any school year or over a number of school years) of a program, in which the enrolment constitutes more than or equal to $50 \%$ of the school's enrolment (this
calculation is based on the enrolment at the time of the relocation, or the first phase of a relocation carried over a number of school years).

School boards may consider additional factors that are defined in their pupil accommodation review policy to qualify for the modified pupil accommodation review process. Multiple factors may be developed by the school board to appropriately reflect varying conditions across the board (e.g., urban, rural, elementary panel, secondary panel, etc.). The Board of Trustees must approve these explicitly defined factors, after community consultation, in order to adopt a modified pupil accommodation review process as part of their school board's pupil accommodation review policy.

The guiding principles of this Guideline apply to the modified pupil accommodation review process.

Even when the criteria for a modified pupil accommodation review are met, a school board may choose to use the standard pupil accommodation review process.

## Implementing the Modified Accommodation Review Process

The initial staff report will explain the rationale for exempting the school(s) from the standard pupil accommodation review process, in accordance with the school board's pupil accommodation review policy.

The initial staff report and SIPs must be made available to the public, as determined in the school board's policy, and posted on the school board's website.

A public meeting will be announced and advertised through an appropriate range of media as determined by the school board.

Following the public meeting, school board staff will submit a final staff report to the Board of Trustees which must be available to the public as determined in the school board's policy, and posted on the school board's website. The final staff report must include a Community Consultation section that contains feedback from any public consultations as well as any relevant information obtained from municipalities and other community partners prior to and during the modified pupil accommodation review.

Once school board staff submit the final staff report to the Board of Trustees, the school board must allow an opportunity for members of the public to provide feedback through public delegations to the Board of Trustees. Notice of the public delegation opportunities will be provided based on school board policy.

After the public delegations, school board staff will compile feedback from the public delegations which will be presented to the Board of Trustees with the final staff report.

The Board of Trustees has the discretion to approve the recommendation(s) of the final staff report as presented, modify the recommendation(s) of the final staff report, or to approve a different outcome.

The Ministry encourages school boards not to make final pupil accommodation review decisions during the summer holiday period (typically from July 1 to the day after Labour Day).

A transition plan will be put in place following the decision to consolidate and/or close a school.

## Timelines for the Modified Accommodation Review Process

The modified pupil accommodation review process must comply with the following minimum timelines:

- Following the date of the Board of Trustees' approval to conduct a modified pupil accommodation review, the school board will provide written notice of the Board of Trustees' decision within 5 business days to each of the affected single and upper-tier municipalities through the Clerks Department (or equivalent), other community partners that expressed an interest prior to the modified pupil accommodation review; and include an invitation for a meeting to discuss and comment on the recommended option(s) in the school board's initial staff report. School boards must also notify the Director(s) of Education of their coterminous school boards and the Ministry of Education through the office of the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Financial Policy and Business Division.
- The affected single and upper-tier municipalities, as well as other community partners that expressed an interest prior to the modified pupil accommodation review, must provide their response on the recommended option(s) in the school board's initial staff report before the final public meeting.
- The school board must hold at least one public meeting. Beginning with the date of the Board of Trustees' approval to conduct a modified pupil accommodation review, there must be no fewer than 30 business days before this public meeting is held.
- The final staff report must be publicly posted no fewer than 10 business days after the final public meeting.
- From the posting of the final staff report, there must be no fewer than 10 business days before the public delegations.
- There must be no fewer than 10 business days between public delegations and the final decision of the Board of Trustees.


## XV. EXEMPTIONS

This Guideline applies to schools offering elementary or secondary programs. However, there are specific circumstances where school boards are not obligated to undertake a pupil accommodation review. These include:

- where a replacement school is to be built by the school board on the existing site, or built or acquired within the existing school attendance boundary, as identified through the school board's policy;
- where a replacement school is to be built by the school board on the existing site, or built or acquired within the existing school attendance boundary and the school community must be temporarily relocated to ensure the safety of students and staff during the reconstruction, as identified through the school board's policy;
- when a lease for the school is terminated;
- when a school board is planning the relocation (in any school year or over a number of school years) of grades or programs, in which the enrolment constitutes less than $50 \%$ of the school's enrolment (this calculation is based on the enrolment at the time of the relocation, or the first phase of a relocation carried over a number of school years);
- when a school board is repairing or renovating a school, and the school community must be temporarily relocated to ensure the safety of students during the renovations;
- where a facility has been serving as a holding school for a school community whose permanent school is over-capacity and/or is under construction or repair; or
- where there are no students enrolled at the school at any time throughout the school year.

In the above circumstances, a school board is expected to inform school communities about proposed accommodation plans for students before a decision is made by the Board of Trustees. The school board will also provide written notice to each of the affected single and upper-tier municipalities through the Clerks Department (or equivalent), as well as other community partners that expressed an interest prior to the exemption, and their coterminous school boards in the areas of the affected school(s) through the Director of Education, and to the Ministry of Education through the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Financial Policy and Business Division no fewer than 5 business days after the decision to proceed with an exemption.

A transition plan will be put in place following the Board of Trustees' decision to consolidate, close or move a school or students in accordance with this section.

## XVI. DEFINITIONS

Accommodation review: A process, as defined in a school board pupil accommodation review policy, undertaken by a school board to determine the future of a school or group of schools.

Accommodation Review Committee (ARC): A committee, established by a school board that represents the affected school(s) of a pupil accommodation review, which acts as the official conduit for information shared between the school board and the affected school communities.

ARC working meeting: A meeting of ARC members to discuss a pupil accommodation review, and includes a meeting held by the ARC to solicit feedback from the affected school communities of a pupil accommodation review.

Business day: A calendar day that is not a weekend or statutory holiday. It also does not include calendar days that fall within school boards' Christmas, spring, and summer break. For schools with a year-round calendar, any break that is five calendar days or longer is not a business day.

Consultation: The sharing of relevant information as well as providing the opportunity for municipalities and other community partners, the public and affected school communities to be heard.

Facility Condition Index (FCI): A building condition as determined by the Ministry of Education by calculating the ratio between the five-year renewal needs and the replacement value for each facility.

On-the-ground (OTG) capacity: The capacity of the school as determined by the Ministry of Education by loading all instructional spaces within the facility to current Ministry standards for class size requirements and room areas.

Public delegation: A regular meeting of the Board of Trustees where presentations by groups or individuals can have their concerns heard directly by the school board trustees.

Public meeting: An open meeting held by the school board to solicit broader community feedback on a pupil accommodation review.

School Information Profile (SIP): An orientation document with point-in-time data for each of the schools under a pupil accommodation review to help the ARC and the community understand the context surrounding the decision to include the specific school(s) in a pupil accommodation review.

Space template: A Ministry of Education template used by a school board to determine the number and type of instructional areas to be included within a new school, and the size of the required operational and circulation areas within that school.

## PROGRAM AND ACCOMMODATION REVIEW

## 1. OBJECTIVE

The Halton District School Board (HDSB) is committed to providing the best educational opportunities and learning environments within the financial resources available for its students.
The Halton District School Board is committed to the following principles:

- Program and accommodation decisions that might require school closures, consolidation, construction, boundary changes or program relocation will endeavor to take into account the needs of all students in all schools in the affected community and the Board as a whole.
- Communities affected by program and accommodation reviews will have an understanding of the process and the level of consultation that will take place.
- Processes for decision-making including those related to program, accommodation, school boundary reviews, school closures/consolidations will be timely, inclusive, transparent and open.
- In the students', community's or system's best interests, school closures/consolidations ,construction, boundary changes, or program relocation may occur as a result of financial constraints, changes in curriculum, program demands, student enrolment, or other unforeseen factors.
Section 171(1), paragraph 7 of the Education Act authorizes the Board of Trustees to close schools in accordance with policies established by the Board from guidelines issued by the Minister of Education.
This Policy aligns with the revised Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline released by the Ministry of Education on March 26, 2015 (2015:B9). A copy of the Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines, and the Ministry document entitled "Administrative Review of the Accommodation Review Process" along with this Policy will be posted on the Halton District School Board (HDSB) website.
Context:
The Board of Trustees is responsible for deciding the most appropriate pupil accommodation arrangements for the delivery of its elementary and secondary programs. Decisions that are made by the Board of Trustees are in the context of carrying out its primary responsibilities of fostering student achievement and well-being, and ensuring effective stewardship of school board resources. The Board of Trustees may consider undertaking pupil accommodation reviews that may lead to school consolidations and closures in order to address declining and shifting student enrolment.
The final decision regarding the future of a school or a group of schools rests solely with the Board of Trustees. Where the Board of Trustees vote to close a school or a group of schools, in accordance with this policy, Board staff will provide clear timelines and rationale regarding the closure(s) and communicate a transition plan to all affected school communities.

Any decisions under this policy will take into account the HDSB's Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP). School boards are required to develop and maintain multi-year capital plans as a condition of funding for accommodation needs. Each year, the HDSB will develop an LTAP. The LTAP identifies and monitors the implementation of new school capital projects. The plan outlines the impact of these new capital projects on existing school communities, and the need to undertake school boundary studies.

The LTAP also identifies review areas and schools where enrolment and/or program pressures will likely occur within the immediate future (i.e. 4 years), and the need to undertake associated boundary studies. The LTAP is designed to assist in identifying opportunities for the effective use of excess space in all schools.
The HDSB is committed to sharing relevant information with the public and affording affected school communities and stakeholders the opportunity for input. The HDSB will invite parents, students and staff from the school(s) under review and the broader community to participate in the pupil accommodation review process.
The Program and Accommodation review process will comprise the following steps:

- Director's Preliminary Report to the Board of Trustees;
- Preparation of the School Information Profile(s);
- Board of Trustee's approval to undertake a Program and Accommodation review process;
- Communication with all stakeholders about the process, opportunities for involvement, and identifying outcomes;
- Establishing the Program and Accommodation Review Committee;
- Consultation with Local Municipal Governments/Community Partners;
- Public Meetings;
- Final Staff Report, including a Community Consultation section;
- Public Delegations to the Board of Trustees;
- Decision by the Board of Trustees; and,
- Implementation and Transition Planning.


## PROCEDURES

## 1. The Director's Preliminary Report to the Board

Prior to establishing a pupil accommodation review, the Director will present to the Board of Trustees a preliminary report that identifies a school or group of schools that may be considered for a Program and Accommodation Review (PAR) if one or more of the following conditions apply:

- The school or group of schools has experienced or will experience declining enrolment where the On the Ground (OTG) utilization rate is below $65 \%$;
- Reorganization involving the school or group of schools could enhance program delivery and learning opportunities for students;
- Under normal staffing allocation practices, it would be necessary to assign three or more grades to one class in one or more of the schools;
- The current physical condition of the school(s) negatively impacts the optimum operation of the building(s) and program delivery;
- In respect of one or more of the schools under consideration there are safety, accessibility and/or environmental concerns associated with the building, the school site or its locality.

The Director's Preliminary Report will identify the accommodation and programming issues/opportunities that the schools under review are experiencing and provide one or more options to address such issues. Each option addressed in the report must have a supporting rationale. There must be a recommended option if more than one option is presented. The report must also include information on actions taken by school board staff prior to establishing a pupil accommodation review process and supporting rationale as to any actions taken or not taken. The option(s) included in the report must consider the following:

- summary of accommodation issue(s) for the school(s) under review;
- where students would be accommodated;
- identify any program changes as a result of the proposed option;
- identify how student transportation would be affected if changes take place;
- if new capital investment is required as a result of the pupil accommodation review, how the school board intends to fund this, as well as a proposal on how students would be accommodated if funding does not become available; and
- any relevant information obtained from municipalities and other community partners prior to the commencement of the pupil accommodation review, including any confirmed interest in using the underutilized space.

Each recommended option presented in the report must also include an estimated timeline for implementation. The report will also include a brief, draft consultation and communications plan so the community will know what to expect.
The Director's Preliminary Report and School Information Profiles will be made available to the public and posted on the Board's website following the Board of Trustees' decision to proceed with a PAR.

## School Information Profiles

School board staff will develop School Information Profile(s) as background documents that are designed to assist the Program and Accommodation Review Committee (PARC) and the community to understand the rationale for including the specific school(s) in a pupil accommodation review.

The School Information Profile(s) will record information having regard for two principle considerations relating to the school(s) under review:

- value to the student; and
- value to the Board.

Board staff will complete a School Information Profile for each of the schools under review. The School Information Profile will be completed at the same point-in-time to facilitate a meaningful comparison.

The minimum information and details to be included in the School Information Profile(s) are detailed in Schedule "A" to this policy.

The completed School Information Profile(s) will be posted on the Board's website following the decision to undertake a PAR.

The School Information Profile(s) will be provided to the PARC prior to its first meeting together with the Director's Preliminary Report. The PARC will review the completed School Information Profile(s) and have the opportunity to discuss and consult thereon. Board staff will respond to reasonable requests from the PARC and the public for additional information concerning the School Information Profile(s). While the PARC may request clarification about information provided in the School Information Profile(s), it is not the role of the Committee to approve the School Information Profile(s).
2. Establishing a Program and Accommodation Review Committee

After reviewing the Director's Preliminary Report, the Board of Trustees may approve the undertaking of a PAR and direct the formation of a Program and Accommodation Review Committee (PARC) for a group of schools or for a single school. The PARC will represent the school(s) under review.
The PARC will be formed before the first public meeting is held by the Board.

### 2.1 Composition of the PARC

A PARC will be formed following the consideration by the Board of Trustees of the Director's Preliminary Report. The PARC will consist of the following persons:
o A Trustee as an ad hoc member, and Superintendent, both from an area not under study;
o From each affected school:

- the school Principal or designate (resource only)
- two parents/guardians from each school, one of whom will be nominated by the School Council Chair; the other will be selected by the Superintendent(s) through the submission by parents of an expression of interest. The Superintendent will review all parent representation and endeavor to ensure that all affected geographic areas and programs are represented.

All Trustees are invited to attend PARC working meetings to observe the proceedings.
Once the PARC is constituted, it will invite a municipal councillor or delegate to join the Committee. The Committee will be deemed to be properly constituted whether or not all of the listed members are willing and able to participate.

The Board will invite PARC members from the school(s) under review to an orientation session that will describe the mandate, roles and responsibilities, and procedures of the PARC.

## 3. Terms of Reference and Role of the PARC

Board staff shall provide the PARC with a copy of the Program and Accommodation Review policy, which incorporates the terms of reference, and describes the mandate of the PARC. Board staff shall also provide the PARC with the Director's Preliminary Report. For greater certainty, the Program and Accommodation Review policy together with the Director's Preliminary Report will constitute the terms of reference and guide the PARC.

The PARC will assume an advisory role only. The PARC acts as the official conduit for information shared between the Board of Trustees and school communities. The PARC does not make any decisions as that responsibility lies with the Board of Trustees. The PARC will provide feedback to the Board of Trustees and the community on the options considered in the Director's Preliminary Report and may, throughout the PAR process, seek clarification of the Director's Preliminary Report. The PARC may provide accommodation options other than those in the Report; however, it must include supporting rationale for any such option.

### 3.1 Operation of the PARC

The Director will appoint a Superintendent who does not represent the area under study as Chair of the PARC. The Chair will convene and chair meetings, and will provide direction to the PARC to carry out its obligations under this Policy.

The Superintendent will also function as secretary and resource person.
Other Board staff can be called on to provide information and resources to the PARC including, but not limited to, the Superintendent of Business Services, Superintendent of Facilities, Senior Manager of Planning, Superintendent of Program, and the Superintendent of Student Services.
Board staff assigned to the PARC will compile feedback from the PARC as well as the broader community and present such information in the Community Consultation section of the final staff report to be presented to the Board of Trustees.
The PARC does not need to achieve consensus regarding the information provided to the Board of Trustees and the Director

The PARC will operate within the timelines in the Program and Accommodation Review Policy.
The PARC will meet to review materials provided by Board staff including the Director's Preliminary Report and the School Information Profile(s). A minimum of four (4) working meetings will be held by the PARC, which will be open to the public. A quorum is not required to properly constitute a working meeting of the PARC.
Members of the PARC will solicit input from the community they represent. The format and process of the input will be discussed once the PARC is formed.
It is important to inform all stakeholders in the affected communities of the PARC meetings. The community includes stakeholders who will be directly affected (e.g. families with children in affected schools) as well as the Special Education Advisory Committee, which represents students with special education needs. The community also includes stakeholders who are not directly affected but may be interested (e.g. neighbours, day-care providers and families, local businesses).

Any information requested or additional options generated by the PARC will be shared through a combination of methods including community meetings, letters to the community, website postings, school newsletters, and media releases. Board staff will maintain a question and answer record related to the PAR on the Board's web site.

The secretary of the PARC will be responsible for preparing detailed minutes of all meetings. Once approved by the PARC, the minutes will be posted on the Board's website.

### 3.2 The Work of the PARC

The HDSB is committed to providing the best educational opportunities and learning environment within the financial resources available for its students. Curriculum and programming decisions that might require school consolidation, closure or program relocation will endeavour to take into account the needs of all of the students in all of the schools in a particular group, recognizing that the schools may form a community of interest and shared values. The Board of Trustees encourages PARCs to be clear about the challenges and opportunities being addressed and work actively to identify and promote shared values and interests.

Attention will first be paid to the current educational situation in the school or group of schools. Attention will then be paid to the potential for enhancing the learning environment for students. The questions set out below are intended to help the PARC to focus on common issues in order to reach a constructive and positive outcome; however, a focus and assessment of individual schools may also be required.

## PARC Framework

In respect of the school or group of schools being studied, the PARC will consider, but not be limited to the following:

1. Range of mandatory programs;
2. Range of optional programs;
3. Viability of Program - number of students required to offer and maintain program in an educationally sound and fiscally responsible way;
4. Physical and environmental state of existing schools;
5. Proximity to other schools (non-bus distances, natural boundaries, walking routes);
6. Accommodation of students in permanent school facilities and minimal use of portable classrooms;
7. Balance of overall enrolment in each school in the area to maximize student access to programs, resources, and extra-curricular opportunities and avoid over and underutilization of buildings;
8. Expansion and placement of new ministry or board programs;
9. Stable, long-term boundaries to avoid frequent boundary changes;
10. Cost effectiveness of transportation;
11. Fiscal responsibilities;
12. Existing and potential community uses and facility partnerships;
13. Goals and focus of the current multi-year plan.

Consultation with Local Municipal Governments and Community Partners
Within five (5) business days following the Board of Trustees approval to form a PARC, written notice will be provided to the local municipality where the PAR is to occur, the Region of Halton, as well as other community partners that expressed an interest prior to the pupil accommodation review. The notice will also include an invitation to the aforementioned parties to discuss and comment on the recommended option(s) in the Director's Preliminary Report. The invitation for this meeting will be provided through a written notice from Board staff, and will be directed through the Clerk's Department (or equivalent) for the local municipality and the Region of Halton. Board staff will also provide written invitation to the other community partners to allow them to provide comments.

Board staff will notify the Director(s) of Education of its coterminous school boards and the Ministry of Education through the Office of the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Financial Policy and Business Division, that a PARC has been established.

The affected local municipality, the Region of Halton, as well as other community partners that expressed an interest prior to the pupil accommodation review will be encouraged to provide their responses on the recommended option(s) in the Director's Preliminary Report before the final
public meeting. The HDSB will provide ten (10) business days advance notice of when the final public meeting is scheduled to take place.
Board staff will document its efforts to meet with and obtain information from the affected local municipality and the Region of Halton, as well as other community partners that expressed an interest in the pupil accommodation review; and will provide any relevant information from these meetings as part of the final report to the Board of Trustees.

## Public Meetings and Input

Board staff will hold two public meetings within the affected municipality to secure broader community consultation on the recommended option(s) contained in the Director's Preliminary Report. If considered appropriate, Board staff may hold additional public meetings.Board staff will organize and facilitate the public meetings. The public meetings will not be meetings of the Board of Trustees.

Members of the PARC may attend the public meetings held by Board staff in accordance with this policy. If the members of the PARC do not attend such public meetings, the meetings will proceed nonetheless.

Notice of the public meetings will be provided through school newsletters, letters to the school community, the home notification system, the HDSBs website, media releases and advertisements in local community newspapers, and will include date, time, location, purpose, contact information.

Notice of the first public meeting will be provided no less than twenty (20) business days in advance of the meeting. Excluded from the calculation will be school holidays such as summer vacation, winter break and spring break, including adjacent weekends.

The first public meeting will be held no fewer than thirty (30) business days after the Board of Trustees decides to conduct a PAR.

At a minimum, the first public meeting will address the following:

- an overview of the PARC orientation session;
- the Director's Preliminary Report with recommended option(s); and
- a presentation of the School Information Profile(s)

The final public meeting will be held at least forty (40) business days after the date of the first public meeting. Notice of the final public meeting will be provided no less than twenty (20) business days in advance of the meeting. Excluded from the calculation will be school holidays such as summer vacation, winter break and spring break, including adjacent weekends.

Information presented at the public information meetings will be posted on the HDSB website. The public will be have the opportunity to provide input on the information provided at the public meetings. At a minimum, public input will be obtained through the HDSB website. As well, a question and answer section will also be established to respond to queries and input received.

## 4. Final Director's Report (including Community Consultation)

At the conclusion of the pupil accommodation review process, a Director's Final Report will be submitted to the Board of Trustees. The public will be advised of the availability of the Report by means of community meetings, letters to the community, web site postings, school newsletters, and media releases.

The Director's Final Report will include a community consultation section that contains feedback from the PARC and any public consultations, as well as any relevant information obtained from municipalities and other community partners prior to and during the pupil accommodation review, and for transparency, identifies key considerations in formulating the final recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

The recommendation(s) accompanying the Director's Final Report may be one or more of the following:
o To maintain the schools and to continue to monitor them (status quo);
o To reorganize the schools, their programs and/or their grade structures;
0 To change the boundaries of the schools;
o To consolidate and/or close one or more of the schools;
0 To locate or relocate special education placements and programs.
The Director will consider all input received in developing recommendations. The recommended option(s) must also include a proposed accommodation plan, prepared for the decision of the Board of Trustees, which details a timeline and process for implementation.
The Director's Final Report will be publicly posted on the Board's website no fewer than ten (10) business days after the final public meeting.
5. Public Delegations to the Board of Trustees

Members of the public will be given the opportunity to provide feedback on the Director's Final Report through public delegations to the Board of Trustees at a properly constituted Board meeting.
Notice of the opportunities for public delegations will be provided in accordance with the Board's procedure for public delegations.
Feedback from the public delegations will be compiled and included as information to the Board of Trustees together with the Director's Final Report.

From the posting of the Director's Final Report, there must be no fewer than ten (10) business days before the public delegations.

The Director will present the Final Report, including the compiled feedback from the public delegations, to the Board of Trustees. The Trustees will make the final decision regarding the PAR.

The Board of Trustees has the discretion to approve the recommendation(s) of the Director's Final Report as presented, modify the recommendation(s) of the Director's Final Report, or to approve a different outcome or solution.

There must be no fewer than ten (10) business days between the date of the public delegations and the final decision of the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees will not make its final decision during school holidays such as summer vacation, winter break and spring break, as outlined in the HDSB school year calendar.

If the Board of Trustees decision is consolidation, closure or program relocation, the following school year will be used to plan for and implement the Board of Trustees decision, except where the Board of Trustees and the affected community believe that earlier action is required.
6. Modified Accommodation Review Process

In certain circumstances, the Board of Trustees may find it appropriate to undertake a modified pupil accommodation review process.
A modified pupil accommodation review process may be initiated where two (2) or more of the following factors are present:

- distance to the nearest available accommodation; five (5) kilometers or less; or
- utilization rate of the facility; equal to or below $50 \%$ utilization; or
- number of students enrolled at the school; 126 or fewer for elementary schools; or
- when the Board is planning the relocation (in any school year or over a number of school years) of a program, in which the enrolment constitutes more than or equal to $50 \%$ of the school's enrolment (this calculation is based on the enrolment at the time of the relocation, or the first phase of a relocation carried over a number of school years); or,
- there are no more than three (3) schools subject to the pupil accommodation review process; or
- the entire student population of a school, that is subject to a pupil accommodation review process, can be accommodated in another school without a boundary change.

Even though two of these factors are present, the Board of Trustees may, in their discretion, decide to use the standard pupil accommodation review process detailed above.

### 6.1 Implementing the Modified Accommodation Review Process

(i) Initial Staff Report and School Information Profiles

The Director will prepare a Preliminary Report. The Director's Preliminary Report will explain the rationale for exempting the school(s) from the standard pupil accommodation review process and will specify the factors that are present, based on the list above. The Director's Preliminary Report will be presented to the Board of Trustees.
A School Information Profile will be prepared for each of the schools that may be subject to the modified pupil accommodation review. The School Information Profile(s) will be provided to the Board of Trustees. The School Information Profile(s) must meet the criteria set out in this policy under the standard pupil accommodation review process.
The Board of Trustees will decide whether a modified pupil accommodation review will proceed.
A PARC will not be established if the Board of Trustees decide that a modified pupil accommodation review is warranted.

## (ii) Notice Requirements

Following the decision of the Board of Trustees to proceed with a modified pupil accommodation review, the Director's Preliminary Report and School Information Profile(s) will be made available to the public and posted on the Board's website.

Within five (5) business days of the decision of the Board of Trustees, the Director will provide written notice of the decision and include an invitation for a meeting to discuss and comment on the option(s) in the Director's Preliminary Report to the following:

- affected single and upper-tier municipalities through the Clerks' Departments (or equivalent); and
- community partners that expressed an interest prior to the modified pupil accommodation review.

Within five (5) business days of the decision of the Board of Trustees, the Director will provide written notice of the decision to:

- the Director(s) of Education of the coterminous school boards; and
- the Ministry of Education through the office of the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Financial Policy and Business Division.

Municipalities and community partners who were provided with notice must provide their responses, if any, to the recommended options before the public meeting (or, if more than one public meeting is convened, prior to the final public meeting).
(iii) Public Meeting

Board staff will convene and facilitate a public meeting within the affected municipality. Board staff, at their discretion, may convene more than one public meeting.

The public meeting is not a meeting of the Board of Trustees.
The public meeting shall be convened no fewer than thirty (30) business days after the date on which the Board of Trustees decides to conduct a modified pupil accommodation review.

Notice of the public meeting will be provided through school newsletters, letters to the school community, the home notification system, the Board's website, media releases and
advertisements in local community newspapers, and will include date, time, location, purpose, and contact information.
Board staff will record feedback and comments received from the community at the public meeting.
(iv) Director's Final Report and Public Delegations

The Director's Final Report will be posted on the Board's website for the public to view no fewer than ten (10) business days after the final public meeting (if more than one).
The Director's Final Report must include a community consultation section that contains feedback from any public consultations as well as any relevant information obtained from municipalities and other community partners prior to and during the modified pupil accommodation review.
Members of the public will be given the opportunity to provide feedback on the Director's Final Report by way of public delegations to the Board of Trustees.
Public delegations will be scheduled no fewer than ten (10) days after the Director's Final Report is publicly posted.
Notice of the opportunity for public delegation will be given in accordance with the Board's policy on public delegations. Public delegations to the Board of Trustees must comply with the Board's policy on such delegations.
Board staff will compile feedback from the public delegations.
(v) Board of Trustees' Decision

The Director will present the Final Report, including the compiled feedback from the public delegations, to the Board of Trustees.
There must be no fewer than ten (10) business days between the public delegations and the final decision of the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees will make the final decision regarding the modified pupil accommodation review.

A transition plan will be developed and implemented following the decision to consolidate and/or close a school.
7. The School Integration Process

It is important the integration of students and staff into their new school(s) is achieved in a way that is positive and supportive for the students and parents of the respective school communities and neighbourhoods. This process of integration will be carried out in consultation with parents and staff. The Director will establish an Integration Committee immediately following the final decision to close or open a school.

## Mandate of the Integration Committee

The Integration Committee will plan for and implement the positive integration of students and staff affected by consolidation, closure or program relocation into their new school environment(s).

### 7.1 Composition of the Integration Committee

The Integration Committee will consist of the following persons:

- From each affected school:
- the Superintendent of the school
- the school Principal
- the Trustee for the school
- the School council Chair or designate

The Committee has the authority to invite additional members.

### 7.2 Operation of the Integration Committee

The affected school Superintendent of Education will act as the Chair of the Integration Committee.
Other resource personnel can be called to assist the Integration Committee.
7.3 Meetings of the Integration Committee

The Integration Committee will operate within the timelines in this policy and will meet as often as required.

### 7.4 School Closing Ceremony \& Funding

The Integration Committee will determine whether a school closing ceremony is appropriate. If a closing ceremony is recommended, the Committee will design the format and program.

The Principal will contact the Superintendent of Business Services to make the necessary financial arrangements and obtain a budget allocation. The Board will provide funds up to $\$ 500$.

### 7.5 Timelines

The Integration Committee will report to the Director and through the Director to the Board of Trustees no later than February of the final year of a school(s) on the progress of integration planning, and again no later than six (6) months after the implementation of the consolidation decision.

## 8. Exemptions

The Board is not obligated to undertake a pupil accommodation review in any of the following circumstances:

- where a replacement school is to be built by the Board on the existing site, or built or acquired within the existing school attendance boundary, as identified through the Board's policy;
- where a replacement school is to be built by the Board on the existing site, or built or acquired within the existing school attendance boundary and the school community must be temporarily relocated to ensure the safety of students and staff during the reconstruction, as identified through the Board's policy;
- when a lease for the school is terminated;
- when the Board is planning the relocation (in any school year or over a number of school years) of grades or programs, in which the enrolment constitutes less than $50 \%$ of the school's enrolment (this calculation is based on the enrolment at the time of the relocation, or the first phase of a relocation carried over a number of school years);
- when the Board is repairing or renovating a school, and the school community must be temporarily relocated to ensure the safety of students during the renovations;
- where a facility has been serving as a holding school for a school community whose permanent school is over-capacity and/or is under construction or repair;
- where there are no students enrolled at the school at any time throughout the school year.

In the above circumstances, Board staff will inform school communities about proposed accommodation plans for students before a decision is made by the Board of Trustees to consolidate, close or move a school or students pursuant to an exemption to the pupil accommodation review process. The communities will be informed through a combination of methods including community meetings, letters to the community, web site postings, school newsletters, and media releases.
Board staff will prepare a report to the Board of Trustees which details the circumstances that give rise to an exemption in regard to the school(s) under consideration.

Board staff will, no fewer than five (5) business days after the Board of Trustees decision to proceed with an exemption, provide written notice to the following:

- each of the affected single and upper-tier municipalities through the Clerks' Departments;
- other community partners that expressed an interest prior to the exemption;
- the coterminous school boards in the areas of the affected school(s) through the Directors of Education; and
- the Ministry of Education through the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Financial Policy and Business Division.

Board staff will implement a transition plan following the Board of Trustees' decision to consolidate, close or move a school or students in accordance with an exemption to the standard pupil accommodation review process.

## Legal References:

Ministry of Education Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline
Ministry of Education Community Planning and Partnerships Guideline Ontario Regulation 444/98

Board References:
Community Partnership and Planning Policies

## SCHEDULE "A" <br> (INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED IN THE SCHOOL INFORMATION PROFILES)

## Facility Profile:

- School name and address.
- Site plan and floor plan(s) (or space template) of the school with the date of school construction and any subsequent additions.
- School attendance area (boundary) map.
- Context map (or air photo) of the school indicating the existing land uses surrounding the school.
- Planning map of the school with zoning, Official Plan or secondary plan land use designations.
- Size of the school site (acres or hectares).
- Building area (square feet or square metres).
- Number of portable classrooms.
- Number and type of instructional rooms as well as specialized classroom teaching spaces (e.g. science lab, tech shop, gymnasium, etc.).
- Area of hard surfaced outdoor play area and/or green space, the number of play fields, and the presence of outdoor facilities (e.g., tracks, courts for basketball, tennis, etc.).
- Ten-year history of major facility improvements (item and cost).
- Projected five-year facility renewal needs of school (item and cost).
- Current Facility Condition Index (FCI) with a definition of what the index represents.
- A measure of proximity of the students to their existing school, and the average distance to the school for students.
- Percentage of students that are and are not eligible for transportation under the school board policy, and the length of bus ride to the school (longest, shortest, and average length of bus ride times).
- School utility costs (totals, per square foot, and per student).
- Number of parking spaces on site at the school, an assessment of the adequacy of parking, and bus/car access and egress.
- Measures that the school board has identified and/or addressed for accessibility of the school for students, staff, and the public with disabilities (i.e. barrier-free).
- On-the-ground (OTG) capacity, and surplus/shortage of pupil places.


## Instructional Profile:

- Describe the number and type of teaching staff, non-teaching staff, support staff, itinerant staff, and administrative staff at the school.
- Describe the course and program offerings at the school.
- Describe specialized service offerings at the school (e.g. cooperative placements, guidance counseling, SHSMs, etc.).
- Current grade configuration of the school (e.g. junior kindergarten to Grade 6, JK to Grade 12, etc.).
- Current grade organization of the school (e.g. number of combined grades, etc.).
- Number of out of area students.
- Utilization factor/classroom usage.
- Summary of five previous years' enrolment and 10 -year enrolment projection by grade and program.
- Current extracurricular activities.


## Other School Use Profile

- Current non-school programs or services resident at or co-located with the school as well as any revenue from these non-school programs or services and whether or not it is at full cost recovery.
- Current facility partnerships as well as any revenue from facility partnerships and whether or not it is at full cost recovery.
- Community use of the school as well as any revenue from the community use of the school and whether or not it is at full cost recovery.
- Availability of before and after school programs or services (e.g., child care) as well as any revenue from the before and after school programs and whether or not it is at full cost recovery.
- Lease terms at the school as well as any revenue from the lease and whether or not it is at full cost recovery.
- Description of the school's suitability for facility partnerships.

School board staff may introduce additional items that could be used to reflect local circumstances and priorities which may help to further understand the school(s) under review.


## SCHEDULE "B"

Program and Accommodation Review Timeline -Modified Review Process



## SMALL SCHOOL LARGE SCHOOL

 DATA TRENDSJan 14, 2015

## Introduction

- Comparison of a number of factors that might impact programming in small vs large Secondary Schools the Halton context
- For the purposes of this analysis, small schools are considered to be schools with enrolments in the range of $450-600$ students and large schools are considered to be schools with enrolments of 1000-1200 students
- Schools with regional Essential program and large vocational programs were not considered in this study because of the uniqueness of each setting


## Introduction

- The following schools were used as example "small" schools and "large" schools
- Small schools - LBPHS, ALDHS, BCHS, ADHS
- Large schools - APHS, IRHS, TABHS, NELHS
- Data from these 8 schools was considered in the following areas:

| Course Variety | Service Areas |
| :--- | :--- |
| Scheduling/Conflicts | Early Leavers |
| Shared Students | Graduation Rates |
| E-learning | Other Factors |

## Course Variety

- Typically the grade 9 program does not vary substantially across all schools within our system.
- Increases in the number of different course types offered (ie: the variety of options) occurs in grades 10-12
- Variety in course types/pathways support different learner profiles, interests and post secondary pathways
- Larger schools are generally able to offer a larger variety of courses

| Number of | School | Projected Enrolment (2014 2015) | \# of Courses Offered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LBP | 482 | 117 |
|  | ALD | 459 | 98 |
|  | ACT | 508 | 125 |
| Offered for | BCHS | 590 | 121 |
| School Year | AVERAGE |  | 115.25 |
| 2014-2015 |  |  |  |
|  | TAB | 1139 | 137 |
|  | NEL | 1132 | 130 |
|  | APHS | 1006 | 130 |
|  | IRHS | 1253 | 141 |
|  | AVERAGE |  | 134.5 |

## Scheduling and Timetable Conflicts

## Building The School Timetable

1. Based on enrolment, staffing is assigned to schools (equates to total number of classes)
2. Students select courses (both required and optional courses)
3. The Principal (Leadership Team) determines the number of classes of each course that will run
4. A draft timetable is built. Trillium considers all course selections for all students and places courses in semesters and periods to accommodate the largest number of student requests ie: minimize conflicts
5. A typical high school schedules has 10 "slots" to place courses. Some schools have a common lunch and therefore have 8 "slots" to place courses

## Scheduling and Timetable Conflicts

Example Timetable

| Per | Semester 1 | Semester 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | English | Geography |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Science | Auto |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Lunch | Math |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Phys Ed | Lunch |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | Art | Business |

## Scheduling and Timetable Conflicts

- A timetable conflict occurs when a student's schedule is built and they are unable to get all of the courses they requested
- This occurs when two courses a student requests are only available in the same semester and period
- This occurs often where a student selects two courses that each have only one class assigned (single section courses) and both are scheduled in the same period same semester


## Scheduling and Timetable Conflicts

- Example:

Small school, common lunch, grade 10 cohort of 100 students, 4 classes of 25 students run in each period. For compulsory courses there are likely only 1 Applied course for each of science, history, English and math. All students take Civics/Careers. Assume about 8 optional area courses to choose from (art, music, drama, auto, construction, business, phys ed, French)

## Scheduling and Timetable Conflicts

| Per | Semester 1 | Semester 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Applied English | Applied History |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Applied Science | Applied Math |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Lunch | Lunch |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | X | Civics/Careers |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | X | X |

- After the compulsory courses (Applied English, Science, History and Math) have been scheduled, only 4 periods available to schedule the 8 optional area courses and Civics/Careers $\longrightarrow$ "Conflicts"


## Scheduling and Timetable Conflicts

- For a larger school with a grade 10 cohort of about 200, there might be 2 applied classes in each compulsory area and there would be many more multi section courses in the optional areas
- This provides flexibility and options for course placement to schedule students into their courses of choice
- The number of single section courses increases in grade 11 and 12
- This becomes a concern for students if they are unable to get the courses they require for their pathway and for post secondary requirements


## Scheduling and Timetable Conflicts

- Generally, the data shows that students in a small school experience twice as many timetable conflicts

| School | Projected <br> Enrolment <br> $(\mathbf{2 0 1 4 ~ 2 0 1 5 ) ~}$ | \# of Courses <br> Offerred | \# timetable <br> Conflicts | \% of students with <br> one or more <br> conflcits |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LBP | 482 | 117 | 212 | 44.0 |
| ALD | 459 | 98 | 157 | 34.2 |
| ACT | 508 | 125 | 227 | 44.7 |
| BCHS | 590 | 121 | 190 | 32.2 |
| AVERAGE |  | 115.25 |  | 38.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| TAB | 1139 | 137 | 180 | 15.8 |
| NEL | 1132 | 130 | 200 | 17.7 |
| APHS | 1006 | 130 | 226 | 22.5 |
| IRHS | 1253 | 141 | 250 | 20.0 |
| AVERAGE |  | 134.5 |  | 18.9 |

## Scheduling and Timetable Conflicts

- Efficiencies in the timetable also increase as number of students in a given course increase. This allows staffing to be used for other courses in the school where students numbers may not normally be sufficient to run a class.

Eg: Consider a course selected by:

- 33 students - probably 2 classes of 16.5 students
- 66 students - probably 3 classes of 22 students
- 99 students - probably 4 classes of 24.75 students


## "Shared" Students

- A student is a shared student when they are registered in more than one school ie: they are shared between two schools
- Students will register for courses at another school when a course they require/want is not available in their home school
- Students in small schools are three times as likely to be a "shared" student than students in large schools


## Students Attending More Than One School

| School | Oct 31, 2014 Enrolment | Shared Schools |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# of students shared to another HDSB school | \% of students in school taking course(s) outside of home school |
| Acton | 491 | 46.0 | 9\% |
| Aldershot | 461 | 78.0 | 17\% |
| Bur Central | 597 | 63.0 | 11\% |
| Pearson | 467 | 47.0 | 10\% |
| Total Small School | 2016 | 234.0 | 12\% |
| Abbey Park | 972 | 74.0 | 8\% |
| Nelson | 1139 | 54.0 | 5\% |
| Blakelock | 1120 | 26.0 | 2\% |
| Iroquois | 1283 | 15.0 | 1\% |
| Total Big School | 4514 | 169.0 | 4\% |

## Elearning (On-line Courses)

- Elearning is a valuable alternative to face to face learning that is available in all schools
- Many students choose on-line courses because it suits their learning style and interests
- Students sometimes choose on-line courses because the course they are choosing is not available in their home school
- Students in small schools are almost twice as likely to take an on-line course as in a large school

| School | Enrolment <br> $(2013$ <br> $2014)$ | Online <br> Course <br> Requests <br> (2014/15 <br> as of Mar <br> 2014) | \# of <br> Requests/ <br> students | AMDEC <br> Course <br> Enrolments <br> $(13 / 14)$ | \# <br> AMDEC <br> Courses/ <br> 100 <br> students |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Acton | 503 | 59 | 11.7 | 20 | 4.0 |
| Aldershot | 518 | 62 | 12.0 | 70 | 13.5 |
| Bur Central | 672 | 84 | 12.5 | 11 | 1.6 |
| Pearson | 555 | 52 | 9.4 | 12 | 2.2 |
| Total |  |  | 11.4 |  | 5.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abbey Park | 1067 | 130 | 12.2 | 83 | 7.8 |
| Nelson | 1208 | 91 | 7.5 | 25 | 2.1 |
| Blackelock | 1119 | 38 | 3.4 | 20 | 1.8 |
| Iroquois | 1265 | 30 | 2.4 | 4 | 0.3 |
| Total |  |  | 6.2 |  | 2.8 |

## Service Areas

- Service areas are staffed by teachers but are not generally considered classroom areas eg: Guidance, Special Education and Library
- Staffing is provided to schools to ensure that these areas are kept "open" and available to students over several periods a day
- Most schools will have their Special Eduction Resource Room, The Guidance Office and the Library open and available to students all periods of the day.


## Service Areas

On a per pupil basis,

- Special Education Staffing in small schools is 1.4 times richer than in larger schools
- Guidance staffing in smaller schools is 1.4 times richer than in larger schools
- Library staffing in smaller schools is 2.3 times richer than in larger schools


## Service Areas

| School | Projected <br> Enrolment <br> (2014 <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 )}$ | Guidance <br> Allocation | Students <br> per <br> Guidance <br> section | Library <br> Allocation | Students <br> per <br> Library <br> Section | Sped <br> Allocation | Students Per <br> Sped Section |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACT | 508 | 9.0 | 56.4 | 6 | 84.7 | 11 | 46.2 |
| ADHS | 459 | 9.0 | 51.0 | 6.0 | 76.5 | 11 | 41.7 |
| BCHS | 590 | 9.0 | 65.6 | 6.0 | 98.3 | 14 | 42.1 |
| LBPHS | 482 | 9.0 | 53.6 | 6.0 | 80.3 | 11 | 43.8 |
| Average |  |  | 57 |  | 85.0 |  | 43.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| APHS | 1006 | 12.0 | 83.8 | 6.0 | 167.7 | 19 | 52.9 |
| NELHS | 1132 | 15.0 | 75.5 | 6.0 | 188.7 | 20 | 56.6 |
| TABHS | 1138 | 15.0 | 75.9 | 6.0 | 189.7 | 20 | 56.9 |
| IRHS | 1253 | 15.0 | 83.5 | 6.0 | 208.8 | 20 | 62.7 |
| Average |  |  | 79 |  | 188.7 |  | 57.3 |

## Early Leavers

- A student in considered an early leaver when they leave a school prior to graduation and do not register in another school (inside or outside our Board)
- The numbers of Early Leaver across the board is gradually declining each year
- Last year, there were three times the number of early leavers in our small schools compared to our large schools


## Early Leavers

|  |  | Early Leavers |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School | Oct 31, 2014 Enrolment | \# of students left school prior to graduation (this school year)* | \% Left school prior to graduation (this school year)* |
| Acton | 491 | 14 | 3\% |
| Aldershot | 461 | 15 | 3\% |
| Bur Central | 597 | 15 | 3\% |
| Pearson | 467 | 8 | 2\% |
| Total Small School | 2016 | 52 | 3\% |
| Abbey Park | 972 | 8 | 1\% |
| Nelson | 1139 | 15 | 1\% |
| Blakelock | 1120 | 12 | 1\% |
| Iroquois | 1283 | 10 | 1\% |
| Total Big School | 4514 | 45 | 1\% |

## Graduation Rates

- Larger percentage of early leavers in small schools will contribute to decreased graduation rates
- Also, more students on a per capita basis stay for a $5^{\text {th }}$ year in smaller schools
- This may be attributed to not being able to "fit" their desired courses in their first 4 years of school
- Results in a significantly lower graduation rate after 4 years and a slightly lower graduation rate after 5 years in smaller schools compared to larger schools


## Graduation Rates

| School | Number of Graduation Candidates** | Graduated in 2012-13 | Percentage Graduating in 4 yrs. | Graduated in <br> $2013-14$ | Percentage Graduating in 5 yrs. | Total Number Graduating | Total <br> Percentage Graduating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACT | 129 | 111 | 86.0\% | 10 | 7.8\% | 121 | 93.8\% |
| ALD | 117 | 103 | 88.0\% | 8 | 6.8\% | 111 | 94.9\% |
| BCH | 168 | 131 | 78.0\% | 17 | 10.1\% | 148 | 88.1\% |
| LBP | 176 | 142 | 80.7\% | 14 | 8.0\% | 156 | 88.6\% |
|  |  |  | 82.5\% |  | 8.3\% |  | 90.8\% |
| School | Number of <br> Graduation <br> Candidates** | $\begin{gathered} \text { Graduated in } \\ 2012-13 \end{gathered}$ | Percentage Graduating in 4 yrs. | Graduated in <br> $2013-14$ | Percentage Graduating in 5 yrs. | Total Number Graduating | Total Percentage Graduating |
| APH | 289 | 255 | 88.2\% | 22 | 7.6\% | 277 | 95.8\% |
| NEL | 332 | 286 | 86.1\% | 21 | 6.3\% | 307 | 92.5\% |
| TAB | 269 | 222 | 82.5\% | 14 | 5.2\% | 236 | 87.7\% |
| IRHS | 308 | 280 | 90.9\% | 18 | 5.8\% | 298 | 96.8\% |
|  |  |  | 87.1\% |  | 6.3\% |  | 93.4\% |

## Other factors

- Teacher Subject Specialization
- greater specialization in larger schools for senior courses eg: 4 or 5 science teachers - a biology specialist, a physics specialist, a chemistry specialist, 2 science generalists
- In a smaller school with only 2 science teachers, you may not have all specialization areas covered to the same extent.


## Other factors

- Extra Curricular Participation
- Larger schools offer greater number and more variety of activities because they have enough staff with the interest and skill - more opportunities for students
- Smaller schools have fewer extra-curricular activities, but students are more likely to be able to make school teams because of the smaller student numbers


## Other factors

- Monitoring and support
- Larger schools have more flexibility in the way they use Guidance, Special Education and Student Success staffing to support students
- In smaller schools, staff tend to know each student better and might be more able to proactively intervene to support a student who is in need of assistance

sTATUS:
Current Boundary and Enrolments for Burlington Secondary Schools
By 2020 there will be approximately 1598 ( 1200 south of the QEW and 398 north of QEW) available spaces at Burlington high schools. overall utilization is near $78 \%$.
There will be an inequality for enrollments between schools north and south of the QEW.
notes:
Aldershot ts: By 2020 utilization will be at $83 \%$, with 97 available spaces. Enrolments are expected to continue to decline. Development is included in
these numbers.
Aldershot HS: Aldershot Elementary PS (Grade $7 \& 8$ ) is associated with the facility (not included in projections or OTG). Additional OTG capacity available, 205 pupil places (2015).

Burlington Central HS: Enrolments are expected to increase, an excess of 277 pupil places is projected by 2020 .
Burlington Central HS: Shares a campus with Central PS. The sports field is not owned by HDSB.
Burlington Central HS: Shares a campus with Central PS. The sports field is not owned by HDSB. (
Burlington Central HS: Burlington Central (lementary PS (Grade $7 \& 8$ ) is associated with the facility (not included in projections or OTG). Additional
OTG capacity available, 101 pupil places (2015).
Nelson HS: Enrolments are expected to increase to approximately $83 \%$ utilization by 2020 . There will be approximately 229 available pupil places
Nelson HS: The .

|  | Program | OTG | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 202 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldershot HS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 558 | 0 | 558 | 344 | 344 | 370 | 361 | 369 | 357 | 331 | 326 | 315 | 311 | 307 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 92 | 100 | 106 | 105 | 105 | 104 | 107 | 107 | 111 | 109 | 105 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 436 | 444 | 476 | 466 | 474 | 461 | 438 | 433 | 426 | 420 | 412 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 122 | 114 | 82 | 92 | 84 | 97 | 120 | 125 | 132 | 138 | 146 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 78\% | 80\% | 85\% | 84\% | 85\% | 83\% | 78\% | 78\% | 76\% | 75\% | 74\% |
| Burlington Central <br> HS <br> Grades 9-12 | ENG | 870 | 6 | 996 | 538 | 512 | 507 | 512 | 499 | 490 | 470 | 460 | 468 | 483 | 472 |
|  | Fl |  |  |  | 57 | 55 | 63 | 78 | 86 | 103 | 127 | 131 | 132 | 134 | 124 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 595 | 567 | 570 | 590 | 585 | 593 | 597 | 591 | 600 | 617 | 596 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 275 | 303 | 300 | 280 | 285 | 277 | 273 | 279 | 270 | 253 | 274 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 68\% | 65\% | 66\% | 68\% | 67\% | 68\% | 69\% | 68\% | 69\% | 719 | 69\% |
| Nelson HS <br> Grades $9-12$, secondary Gifted Placement | ENG | 1341 | 12 | 1593 | 869 | 851 | 869 | 875 | 860 | 838 | 814 | 760 | 755 | 726 | 730 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 129 | 141 | 179 | 202 | 225 | 274 | 296 | 328 | 358 | 347 | 327 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 998 | 992 | 1048 | 1077 | 1085 | 1112 | 1110 | 1088 | 1113 | 1073 | 1057 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 343 | 349 | 293 | 264 | 256 | 229 | 231 | 253 | 228 | 268 | 284 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 74\% | 74\% | 78\% | 80\% | 81\% | 83\% | 83\% | $81 \%$ | 83\% | 80\% | 79\% |
| Robert Bateman <br> HS <br> Grades 9-12, <br> International <br> Baccalaureate Program | ENG | 1323 | 3 | 1386 | 567 | 538 | 498 | 475 | 467 | 453 | 432 | 413 | 403 | 378 | 394 |
|  | sc-sped |  |  |  | 232 | 263 | 266 | 266 | 273 | 273 | 272 | 270 | 270 | 269 | 272 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 799 | 801 | 764 | 741 | 740 | 726 | 704 | 683 | 673 | 647 | 666 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 524 | 522 | 559 | 582 | 583 | 597 | 619 | 640 | 650 | 676 | 657 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 60\% | 61\% | 58\% | 56\% | 56\% | 55\% | 53\% | 52\% | 51\% | 49\% | 50\% |



NOTES CON'T
Nelson HS: Typically attracts students.
Robert Bateman HS: By 2020 utilization is expected to decrease to $55 \%$, with approximately 597 available spaces.
Robert Bateman HS: Contains several specialized classes; Essential. SC-SPED a Secondary Centre and the Internation
Robert Bateman HS: Contains several specialized classes; Essential, SC-SPED, a Secondary Centre and the International Baccalaureate Program. These
programs attract students from other catchments.
M.M. Robinson HS: By 2020 , utilization is expected to be under $50 \%$ and there will be approximately 714 available pupil places.

Lester B. Pearson HS: In 2020 , there will be 289 available pupil places. Utilization is expected to be at $55 \%$
Lester B. Pearson HS: Sir E. MacMillan PS Late FI (LII) students are directed to this school for grade 9 -12 Late FI programming.
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Expected to exceed total capacity by 2016 with a shortage of 361 spaces and continue to grow in enrolments until 2021
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Opened in 2012.

|  | Program | отG | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M.M. Robinson HS Grades 9-12 | eng | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 504 | 494 | 481 | 486 | 460 | 439 | 442 | 443 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 108 | 119 | 122 | 147 | 148 | 153 | 159 | 152 |
|  | SC-SPED |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 642 | 643 | 633 | 663 | 638 | 622 | 631 | 625 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | 705 | 704 | 714 | 684 | 709 | 725 | 716 | 722 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 48\% | 48\% | 47\% | 49\% | 47\% | 46\% | 47\% | 46\% |
| Lester B. Pearson HS <br> Grades 9-12 | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 327 | 322 | 296 | 308 | 307 | 280 | 282 | 268 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 387 | 381 | 353 | 366 | 364 | 334 | 336 | 321 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 255 | 261 | 289 | 276 | 278 | 308 | 306 | 321 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 60\% | 59\% | 55\% | 57\% | 57\% | 52\% | 52\% | 50\% |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Grades 9-12 | eng | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1391 | 1380 | 1400 | 1418 | 1374 | 1349 | 1359 | 1292 |
|  | ${ }^{\text {F1 }}$ |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 328 | 356 | 399 | 411 | 421 | 427 | 396 | 387 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1719 | 1736 | 1799 | 1829 | 1795 | 1776 | 1755 | 1679 |
|  | Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | -214 | -360 | -429 | -525 | -542 | -605 | -635 | -601 | -582 | -561 | -485 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 144\% | 145\% | 151\% | 153\% | 150\% | 149\% | 147\% | 141\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 21 | 4533 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 2874 | 2884 | 2892 | 2849 | 2795 | 2812 | 2757 | 2731 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 38 | 3981 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2748 | 2760 | 2785 | 2858 | 2797 | 2732 | 2722 | 2625 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 59 | 8514 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |

Option 1 - Aldershot HS Closes


RATIONALE:
To present the impacts of closing Aldershot HS,
issues:
Aldershot community loses its high school.
Enrolments for Robert Bateman HS, M.M. Robinson HS and Lester B. Pearson HS remain under 65\% utilization
Dr. Frank $J$. Hayden $S S$ exceeds total capacity in 2016 .
Potential Program and Accommodation Review for Aldershot elementary students.
notes:
Aldershot HS: Closes in June 2018.
Burlington Central HS: Boundary is expanded west to include Aldershot HS students.
surington Central HS: Eastern English boundary shrinks between Brant St and Guelph Lin
Burlington Central HS: Utilization is expected to increase to approximately $98 \%$ by 2020.
Nelson HS: English boundary is expanded to include an are
velson HS: Utilization will be approximately $93 \%$ by 2020 .


Option 1 - Aldershot HS Closes


NOTES CON'T:
M.M. Robinson HS: The boundary is expanded west for grades $9-12$.
M.M. Robinson HS: Utilization is approximately $52 \%$ by 2020

Aldershot Elem. PS: ENG and FI program to have a split cohort between M.M. Robinson HS and Aldershot HS,
Tecumseh PS: More students directed to Nelson HS.
Burlington Central Elem. PS: Split grade 8 cohort between Burlington Central HS and Nelson HS.

## RESULTS:

By 2020 , there will be approximately 1037 available pupil places overall, 715 available spaces south of QEW and 325 available spaces north of the QEW verall there will be a reduction of 558 spaces
verall utilization to be at $85 \%$. South of the QEW utilization will be $80 \%$ and north of the QEW utilization will be $90 \%$ by 2020 . Approximately 350 additional students eligible for transportation.

|  | Program | отє | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M.M. Robinson HS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 546 | 539 | 526 | 526 | 499 | 47 | 480 | 478 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 135 | 148 | 150 | 176 | 177 | 182 | 188 | 180 |
|  | SC-SPED |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 711 | 717 | 706 | 732 | 706 | 689 | 698 | 688 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | 636 | 630 | 641 | 615 | 641 | 658 | 649 | 659 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 53\% | 53\% | 52\% | 54\% | 52 | 51\% | 52\% | 51 |
| Lester B. Pearson HS Grade 9 -12 | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 327 | 322 | 296 | 308 | 307 | 280 | 282 | 268 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 387 | 381 | 353 | 366 | 364 | 334 | 336 | 321 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 255 | 261 | 289 | 276 | 278 | 308 | 306 | 321 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 60\% | 59\% | 55\% | 57\% | 57\% | 52\% | 52\% | 50\% |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1391 | 1380 | 1400 | 1418 | 1374 | 1349 | 1359 | 1292 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 328 | 356 | 399 | 411 | 421 | 427 | 396 | 387 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 8 | 1554 | 1623 | 1719 | 1736 | 1799 | 1829 | 1795 | 1776 | 1755 | 1679 |
|  | Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | ${ }^{-214}$ | 360 | -429 | -525 | -542 | -605 | 635 | -601 | -582 | -561 | -485 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 144\% | 145\% | 151\% | 153\% | 150\% | 199\% | 147\% | 141\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 21 | 4533 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 2805 | 2810 | 2819 | 2780 | 2727 | 2745 | 2690 | 2668 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 38 | 3981 | 2554 | 552 | 2669 | 281 | 2834 | 2858 | 2927 | 2865 | 2799 | 2789 | 2688 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 59 | 8514 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 567 | 5707 | 5592 | 554 | 5479 | 5356 |

Option 2 - Burlington Central HS Closes


Notes con't
Nelson HS: Utilization will be approximately $89 \%$ by 2020.
Robert Bateman HS: Boundary expands to include areas west of Appleby Line.
Robert Bateman HS: Utilization is expected to decline below $65 \%$ by 2022.
IMPACTS ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Tecumseh PS: More students directed to Nelson HS.
Frontenac PS: Unified grade 8 cohort directed to Robert Bateman HS.
Burlington Central Elem PS: Split grade 8 cohort between Aldershot HS and Nelson HS,
RESULTS
By 2020 , there will be approximately 728 available pupil places ( $89 \%$ utilization) overall, 329 available spaces ( $90 \%$ utilization) south of the QEW and 399 available pupil places ( $87 \%$ utilization) north of the QEW.
avaiabll pupili places s 870 utilization)
Potential PAR for Burlington Central Elementary PS and Aldershot Elementary PS students.
Approximately 450 additional students eligible for transportation.


Option 3 - Nelson HS Closes


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing Nelson HS
ISSUES:
The Secondary Gifted Placement at Nelson HS and Essential Programs at Robert Bateman HS to be relocated to M.M. Robinson HS. FI program to be added at Robert Bateman HS.
Nelson HS typically attracts students, which may not occur at Burlington Central HS or Robert Bateman HS.
Enrolments for Lester B. Pearson HS remain under $65 \%$ utilization.
Dr. Frank J Hayden SS exceeds total capacity in 2016.
notes:
urlington Central HS: Boundary expands to east to Walker's Line
Uriington Central HS: Enrolments are projected to increase to $106 \%$ utilization by 2020 .
.

Robert Bateman HS: Boundary expands west of Walker's Line.
Robert Bateman HS: FI program is implemented.
Robert Bateman HS: SC-SPED (Essential) classes to be relocated to M. M. Robinson HS.



NOTES CON’T:
Robert Bateman HS: Utilization is expected to rise to near $88 \%$ by 2020
M.M. Robinson HS: Secondary Gifted Placement currently at Nelson to be relocated to M.M. Robinson HS. M.M. Robinson HS: SC-SPED Essential Programming at Robert Bateman HS to be relocated to M.M. Robinson HS

IMPACTS ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Tecumseh PS and Frontenac PS: Unified grade 8 cohort.
John T. Tuck PS and Pineland PS FI: Split grade 8 cohort between Burlington Central HS and Robert Bateman HS.
RESULTS
By 2020, there will be approximately 257 available pupil spaces ( $96 \%$ utilization) overall, approximately 208 available pupil places ( $92 \%$ utilization)
south of The QEW and 49 available spaces ( $98 \%$ utilization) north of the QEW,
Overall a reduction of 1341 pupil places.


Option 4 - Robert Bateman HS Closes


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing Robert Bateman HS.
ISSUES:
There are approximately 185 students that attend the IB program from Burlington schools.
nrolments for Lester B. Pearson HS remain under 65\% utilization.
Dr. Frank I Hayden SS exceeds total capacity in 2016.
NOTES:
Burlington Central HS: English boundary to be expanded east of Guelph Line,
Burlington Central HS: Utilization is expected to increase to $83 \%$ by 2020 .
Nelson HS: Boundary to be expanded east to include the Robert Bateman HS catchment.
Nelson HS: No change to the FI boundary
Nelson HS: Enrolments expected to increase to $113 \%$ utilization by 2020.
Nelson HS: Typically attracts students; enrolments maybe higher with an expanded catchment.
Nelson HS: IB program to be relocated from Robert Bateman HS. This may attract more students to the IB program from other schools within
Burington. Dependent on whether program can be transfered to another site.
Robert Bateman HS: Closes in June 2018

|  | Program | от6 | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldershot HSGrades $9-12$ | ENG | 558 | 0 | 558 | 344 | 344 | 370 | 361 | 369 | 357 | 331 | 326 | 315 | 311 | 37 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 92 | 100 | 106 | 105 | 105 | 104 | 107 | 107 | 111 | 109 | 105 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 436 | 444 | 476 | 466 | 474 | 461 | 438 | 433 | 426 | 420 | 412 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 122 | 114 | 82 | 92 | 84 | 97 | 120 | 125 | 132 | 138 | 146 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 78\% | 80\% | 85\% | ${ }^{84 \%}$ | 85\% | 83\% | 78\% | 78\% | 76\% | 75\% | 74\% |
| Burlington Central HS <br> Grades 9-12 | eng | 870 | 6 | 996 | 538 | 512 | 507 | 563 | 552 | 541 | 516 | 505 | 513 | 527 | 515 |
|  | ${ }^{\mathrm{F}}$ |  |  |  | 57 | 55 | 63 | 78 | 86 | 103 | 127 | 131 | 132 | 134 | 124 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 595 | 567 | 570 | 641 | 638 | 644 | 643 | 636 | 645 | 661 | 639 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 275 | 303 | 300 | 229 | 232 | 226 | 227 | 234 | 225 | 209 | 231 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 68\% | 65\% | 66\% | 74\% | 73\% | 74\% | 74\% | 73\% | 74\% | 76\% | 73\% |
|  <br> Nelson HS <br> Srades $9-12$, <br> Sint <br> Secondary ifted <br> Pacement <br> International <br> Baccalaureate Program | ENG | 1341 | 12 | 1593 | 869 | 851 | 869 | 1299 | 1274 | 1241 | 1200 | 1128 | 1113 | 1060 | 1081 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 129 | 141 | 179 | 202 | 225 | 274 | 296 | 328 | 358 | 347 | 327 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 998 | 992 | 1048 | 1501 | 1499 | 1515 | 1496 | 1456 | 1471 | 1407 | 140 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 343 | 349 | 293 | -160 | -158 | -174 | -155 | 115 | 130 | -66 | 67 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 74\% | $74 \%$ | 78\% | 112\% | 112\% | 113\% | 112\% | 109\% | 110\% | 105\% | 105\% |
| Robert Bateman <br> HS <br> Closes 2018 | ENG | 1323 | 3 | 1386 | 567 | 538 | 498 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | SC-SPED |  |  |  | 232 | 263 | 266 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 799 | 801 | 764 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 524 | 522 | 559 | 1323 | ${ }^{1323}$ | 1323 | 1323 | 1323 | 1323 | ${ }^{1323}$ | 1323 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 60\% | ${ }^{61 \%}$ | 58\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | $0 \%$ |

Option 4 - Robert Bateman HS Closes


NOTES CON'T:
M.M. Robinson HS: SC-SPED Programs to be redirected from Robert Bateman HS.
IMPACTS ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Frontenac PS: Unified grade 8 cohort directed to Nelson HS.
results
By 2020 , there will be approximately 275 available pupil places ( $95 \%$ utilization) overall, 149 available spaces ( $95 \%$ utilization) south of the QEW and 126 availab
Overall a reduction of 1323 pupil place
Approximately 200 additional students eligible for transportation

|  | Program | отG | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 202 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M.M. Robinson HSGrades 9.12 | ENG | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 504 | 494 | 481 | 486 | 460 | 439 | 442 | 443 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 108 | 119 | 121 | 147 | 148 | 153 | 159 | 152 |
|  | SC-Sped |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 296 | 303 | 303 | 302 | 300 | 300 | 299 | 302 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 908 | 916 | 905 | 935 | 908 | 892 | 900 | 897 |
|  | vailable Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | 439 | 431 | 442 | 412 | 439 | 455 | 447 | 450 |
|  | ercent Utilization |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 67\% | 68\% | 67\% | 69\% | 67\% | 66\% | 67\% | 67\% |
| Lester B. Pearson HS <br> Grades 9-12 | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 327 | 322 | 296 | 308 | 307 | 280 | 282 | 268 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 387 | 381 | 353 | 366 | 364 | 334 | 336 | 321 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 255 | 261 | 289 | 276 | 278 | 308 | 306 | 321 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 60\% | 59\% | 55\% | 57\% | 57\% | 52\% | 52\% | 50\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dr. Frank J. } \\ & \text { Hayden SS } \\ & \text { Grades } 9-12 \end{aligned}$ | ENG | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1391 | 1380 | 1400 | 1418 | 1374 | 1349 | 135 | 129 |
|  | ${ }^{\text {FI }}$ |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 328 | 356 | 399 | 411 | 421 | 427 | 396 | 387 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1719 | 1736 | 1799 | 1829 | 1795 | 1776 | 1755 | 1679 |
|  | Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | -214 | -360 | -429 | -525 | -542 | .605 | -635 | -601 | -582 | 561 | 485 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 144\% | 145\% | 151\% | 153\% | 150\% | 149\% | 147\% | 141\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 21 | 4533 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 2608 | 2611 | 2620 | 2577 | 2525 | 2542 | 2488 | 2459 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 38 | 3981 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 3014 | 3033 | 3057 | 3130 | 3067 | 3002 | 2991 | 2897 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 59 | 8514 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |

Option 5 - M.M. Robinson HS Closes


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing M.M. Robinson HS.
Issues:
Students are transported south of the QEW, including rural FI students.
SC-SPED classes at M.M. Robinson HS are directed back to Robert Bateman HS. Schools north of the QEW will not have space for SPED students.
Rolling Meadows PS grade 8 class would attend three different schools.
Enrolments for Robert Bateman HS remain under $65 \%$ utilization.
Dr. Frank J Hayden SS exceeds total capacity in 2016.

Burlington Central HS: Catchment expands to include an area north of 407 ETR and south of Dundas St.
Burlington Central Hs: Catchment expands to incluce an area north of 402
Burlington Central H: Utilization is expected to increase to $102 \%$ by 2020
Robert Bateman HS: Utilization is expected to reach $57 \%$ utilization by 2020 .
Robert Bateman HS: To receive SC-SPED students from M.M. Robinson HS
M. M. Robinson HS: Closes in June 2018
M. M. Robinson HS: Board office located is located on the same property

|  | Program | отє | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldershot HS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 558 | 0 | 558 | 344 | 344 | 370 | 361 | 369 | 357 | 331 | 327 | 316 | 311 | 307 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 92 | 100 | 106 | 105 | 105 | 104 | 107 | 107 | 111 | 109 | 105 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 436 | 444 | 476 | 466 | 474 | 461 | 438 | 434 | 427 | 420 | 412 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 122 | 114 | 82 | 92 | 84 | 97 | 120 | 124 | 131 | 138 | 146 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 78\% | 80\% | 85\% | 84\% | 85\% | 83\% | 78\% | 78\% | 77\% | 75\% | 74\% |
| Burlington Central HS <br> Grades 9-12 | ENG | 870 | 6 | 996 | 538 | 512 | 507 | 749 | 729 | 718 | 700 | 675 | 673 | 694 | 688 |
|  | ${ }^{\mathrm{F}}$ |  |  |  | 57 | 55 | 63 | 137 | 153 | 171 | 209 | 215 | 219 | 224 | 211 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 595 | 567 | 570 | 886 | 882 | 889 | 909 | 890 | 892 | 918 | 899 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 275 | 303 | 300 | -16 | -12 | -19 | -39 | -20 | -22 | -48 | -29 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 68\% | 65\% | 66\% | 102\% | 101\% | 102\% | 104\% | 102\% | 103\% | 106\% | 103\% |
| Nelson HS <br> Grades $9-12$, Secondary Gifted Placement | ENG | 1341 | 12 | 1593 | 869 | 851 | 869 | 875 | 860 | 837 | 814 | 760 | 755 | 726 | 730 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 129 | 141 | 179 | 252 | 278 | 328 | 361 | 392 | 425 | 415 | 393 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 998 | 992 | 1048 | 1127 | 1138 | 1165 | 1175 | 1152 | 1180 | 1141 | 1123 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 343 | 349 | 293 | 214 | 203 | 176 | 166 | 189 | 161 | 200 | 218 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 74\% | 74\% | 78\% | 84\% | 85\% | 87\% | 88\% | 86\% | 88\% | 85\% | 84\% |
| Robert Bateman HS <br> Grades 9-12, International $\qquad$ | ENG | 1323 | 3 | 1386 | 567 | 538 | 498 | 475 | 467 | 453 | 432 | 413 | 403 | 378 | 394 |
|  | SC-SPED |  |  |  | 232 | 263 | 266 | 296 | 303 | ${ }^{303}$ | 302 | 300 | 299 | 299 | 302 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 799 | 801 | 764 | 771 | 770 | 756 | 734 | 713 | 702 | 677 | 696 |
|  | Robert Bateman HS Available Pupil Place |  |  |  | 524 | 522 | 559 | 552 | 553 | 567 | 589 | 610 | 621 | 646 | 627 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 60\% | 61\% | 58\% | 58\% | 58\% | 57\% | 55\% | 54\% | 53\% | 51\% | 53\% |

Option 5 - M.M. Robinson HS Closes

notes con't:
Lester B. Pearson HS: Boundary to expand to include M.M. Robinson HS catchment east of ETR 407 and Brant St (north of ETR 407)
Lester B. Pearson HS: Utilization is expected to reach $95 \%$ utilization by 2020 .
Lester B. Pearson HS: To offer two programs, i.e. English and Late French Immersion
IMPACTS TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
C.H. Norton PS: Unified cohort at Lester B. Pearson HS.

Rolling Meadows PS: FI program is grade 8 cohort will split between Burlington Central HS and Nelson HS.
Rolling Meadows PS: ENG program grade 8 cohort to attend Lester B Pearson HS.
Brant Hills PS: Grade 8 cohort to be redirected to Burlington Central HS.
RESULTS
By 2020 , there will be approximately 251 available pupil places ( $96 \%$ utilization) overall, 821 available spaces ( $80 \%$ utilization) south of the QEW and a
shortage of 570 pupil places ( $131 \%$ utilization) north of the QEW.
Overall a reduction of 1347 spaces north of the QEW.
Inequality in enrolments between north and south of QEW are exacerbated
Approximately 350 additional students eligible for transportation.

|  | Program | отє | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { M.M. Robinson HS } \\ \text { Closes } 2018 \end{array}\right\|$ | ENG | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | SC-SPED |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | 1347 | 1347 | 1347 | 1347 | 1347 | 1347 | 1347 | 1347 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Lester B. Pearson HS <br> Grades 9-12 | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 593 | 585 | 550 | 564 | 551 | 513 | 514 | 494 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 653 | 644 | 607 | 622 | 608 | 567 | 568 | 547 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 11 | -2 | 35 | 20 | 34 | 75 | 74 | 95 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 102\% | 100\% | 95\% | 97\% | 95\% | 88\% | 88\% | 85\% |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1391 | 1380 | 1400 | 1418 | 1374 | 1349 | 1359 | 1292 |
|  | ${ }^{\text {FI }}$ |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 328 | 356 | 399 | 411 | 421 | 427 | 396 | 387 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1719 | 1736 | 1799 | 1829 | 1795 | 1776 | 1755 | 1679 |
|  | Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | -214 | -360 | -429 | -525 | -542 | -605 | -635 | -601 | -582 | -561 | -485 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 144\% | 145\% | 151\% | 153\% | 150\% | 149\% | 147\% | 141\% |
| South of Q.EW Total |  | 4092 | 21 | 4533 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 3250 | 3264 | 3271 | 3256 | 3189 | 3201 | 3156 | 3130 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 38 | 3981 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2372 | 2380 | 2406 | 2451 | 2403 | 2343 | 2323 | 2226 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 59 | 8514 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |

Option 6 - Lester B Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary Change


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing Lester B. Pearson HS, and Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS English boundary change.
ISSUES:
M.M. Robinson HS to offer two Fl programs - Early Fl and Late Fl.

Redirection of Florence Meares PS grade 8 catchments.
Enrolments for Robert Bateman HS remain under $65 \%$ utilization
Enrolments for Robert Bateman HS remain under 65\%
Dr. .rank . Hayden SS exceeds total capacity in 2016.
notes:
M.M. Robinson HS: Current boundaries to be expanded to include Lester B. Pearson HS and Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS English area west of Walker's

Line and south of 407 ETR and rural areas.
M.M. Robinson HS: Utilization to increase to $89 \%$ by 2020 ,
M.M. Robinson HS: To offer Late French Immersion.

Lester B. Pearson HS: Closes in June 2018.
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: English boundaries include areas east of Walker's Line and south of ETR 407.

|  | Program | отG | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldershot HS Grades 9-12 | eng | 558 | 0 | 558 | 344 | 344 | 370 | 361 | 369 | 357 | 331 | 326 | 315 | 311 | 307 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 92 | 100 | 106 | 105 | 105 | 104 | 107 | 107 | 111 | 109 | 105 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 436 | 444 | 476 | 466 | 474 | 461 | 438 | 433 | 426 | 420 | 412 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 122 | 114 | 82 | 92 | 84 | 97 | 120 | 125 | 132 | 138 | 146 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 78\% | 80\% | 85\% | 84\% | 85\% | $83 \%$ | 78\% | 78\% | 76\% | 75\% | 74\% |
| Burlington Central HS <br> Grades 9-12 | ENG | 870 | 6 | 996 | 538 | 512 | 507 | 512 | 499 | 490 | 470 | 460 | 468 | 483 | 472 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 57 | 55 | 63 | 78 | 86 | 103 | 126 | 131 | 132 | 134 | 124 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 595 | 567 | 570 | 590 | 585 | 593 | 596 | 591 | 600 | 617 | 596 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 275 | 303 | 300 | 280 | 285 | 277 | 274 | 279 | 270 | 253 | 274 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 68\% | 65\% | 66\% | 68\% | 67\% | 68\% | 69\% | 68\% | 69\% | 71\% | 69\% |
| Nelson HS <br> Grades 9-12 Secondary Gitted Placemen | ENG | 1341 | 12 | 1593 | 869 | 851 | 869 | 875 | 860 | 838 | 814 | 760 | 755 | 726 | 730 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 129 | 141 | 179 | 202 | 225 | 274 | 296 | 328 | 358 | 347 | 327 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 998 | 992 | 1048 | 1077 | 1085 | 1112 | 111 | 108 | 1113 | 107 | 1057 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 343 | 349 | 293 | 264 | 256 | 229 | 231 | 253 | 228 | 268 | 284 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 74\% | 74\% | 8\% | 80\% | 81\% | 83\% | 83\% | 81\% | 83\% | 80\% | 79\% |
| Robert Bateman HS <br> Grades 9-12, International Baccalaureate Program | ENG | 1323 | 3 | 1386 | 567 | 538 | 498 | 475 | 467 | 453 | 432 | 413 | 403 | 378 | 394 |
|  | SC-SPED |  |  |  | 232 | 263 | 266 | 266 | 273 | 273 | 272 | 270 | 270 | 269 | 272 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 799 | 801 | 764 | 741 | 740 | 726 | 704 | 683 | 673 | 647 | 666 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 524 | 522 | 559 | 582 | 583 | 597 | 619 | 640 | 650 | 676 | 657 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 60\% | 61\% | 58\% | 56\% | 56\% | 55\% | 53\% | 52\% | 51\% | 49\% | 50\% |

Option 6 - Lester B Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary Change


NOTES CON'T
Dr. Frank $J$. Hayden SS: Utilization is expected to be $133 \%$ capacity by 2020 .
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Total capacity to be exceeded by 2016
IMPACTS TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Florence Meares PS: Spit cohort between M.M. Robinson HS and Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS (cohort was unified in 2007).
Florence Meares PS: Spit cohort between M.M. Robinson HS and D.
Kilbride PS, Sir E. MacMillan PS: Redirected to M.M. Robinson HS.
result
By 2020, there will be approximately 956 available pupil places ( $86 \%$ utilization) overall, 1200 available spaces ( $71 \%$ utilization) south of the QEW and a shortage of 244 pupil places ( $118 \%$ utilization) north of the QEW. Overall a reduction of 642 spaces north of the QEW.
Approximately 50 additional students eligible for transportation

|  | Program | отє | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M.M. Robinson HS Grades $9-12$ | ENG | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 1062 | 1040 | 993 | 1018 | 967 | 918 | 923 | 892 |
|  | Fl |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 108 | 119 | 122 | 147 | 148 | 153 | 159 | 152 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | sC-Sped |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 1260 | 1248 | 1202 | 1253 | 1202 | 1155 | 1166 | 1127 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | 87 | 99 | 145 | 94 | 145 | 192 | 181 | 220 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 94\% | 93\% | 89\% | 93\% | 89\% | 86\% | 87\% | ${ }^{84 \%}$ |
| Lester B. Pearson <br> HS <br> Closes 2018 | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1160 | 1156 | 1184 | 1195 | 1174 | 1150 | 1160 | 1111 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 328 | 356 | 399 | 411 | 421 | 427 | 396 | 387 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1488 | 1512 | 1583 | 1606 | 1595 | 1577 | 1556 | 1498 |
|  | Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 214 | 360 | -429 | 294 | 318 | 389 | -412 | 401 | 383 | 362 | 304 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 125\% | 127\% | 133\% | 135\% | 134\% | 132\% | 130\% | 125\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 2874 | 2884 | 2892 | 2848 | 2795 | 2812 | 2757 | 2731 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 1836 | 26 | 2382 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2748 | 2760 | 2785 | 2859 | 2797 | 2732 | 2722 | 2625 |
| Study Total |  | 1836 | 26 | 2382 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |

Option 7 - Dr. Frank Hayden SS - with Overflow School


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of reducing Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS enrolments without impacting current boundaries.
ISSUES:
Grade 9 entry into Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS is capped to 325
This will be the first school to be capped, precedent setting.
The process for selecting the 325 students is undetermined at this time.
Possible impacts on student entry from other boards.
Enrolments for Robert Bateman HS, and Lester B. Pearson HS remain under 65\% utilization,
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS exceeds total capacity from 2016-2020.
notes:
M. M. Robinson HS: Becomes the overflow school.
M. M. Robinson HS: Utilization is expected to reach $73 \%$ by 2020.

Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Enrolments expected to surpass Total Capacity from 2016-2020, then decrease to above OTG capacity but below total
capacity.
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Utilization expected to be at $121 \%$ by 2020
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Cohorts can be split., by a different percentage each year

|  | Program | отє | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldershot HSGrades $9-12$ | ENG | 558 | 0 | 558 | 344 | 344 | 370 | 361 | 369 | 357 | 331 | 326 | 315 | 311 | 307 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 92 | 100 | 106 | 105 | 105 | 104 | 107 | 107 | 111 | 109 | 105 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 436 | 444 | 476 | 466 | 474 | 461 | 438 | 433 | 426 | 420 | 412 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 122 | 114 | 82 | 92 | 84 | 97 | 120 | 125 | 132 | 138 | 146 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 78\% | 80\% | 85\% | ${ }^{84 \%}$ | 85\% | 83\% | 78\% | 78\% | 76\% | 75\% | 74\% |
| Burlington Central HS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 870 | 6 | 996 | 538 | 512 | 507 | 512 | 499 | 490 | 470 | 460 | 468 | 483 | 472 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 57 | 55 | 63 | 78 | 86 | 103 | 127 | 131 | 132 | 134 | 124 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 595 | 567 | 570 | 590 | 585 | 593 | 597 | 591 | 600 | 617 | 596 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 275 | 303 | 300 | 280 | 285 | 277 | 273 | 279 | 270 | 253 | 274 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 68\% | 65\% | 66\% | 68\% | 67\% | 68\% | 69\% | 68\% | 69\% | 71\% | 69\% |
| Nelson HS <br> Grades $9-12$ Secondary Gited Placement | Eng | 1341 | 12 | 1593 | 869 | 851 | 869 | 875 | 860 | 838 | 814 | 760 | 755 | 726 | 730 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 129 | 141 | 179 | 202 | 225 | 274 | 296 | 328 | 358 | 347 | 327 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 998 | 992 | 1048 | 1077 | 1085 | 1112 | 1110 | 1088 | 1113 | 1073 | 1057 |
|  | Pupil Places |  |  |  | 343 | 349 | 293 | 264 | 256 | 229 | 231 | 253 | 228 | 268 | 284 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 74\% | 74\% | 78\% | 80\% | 81\% | 83\% | 83\% | 81\% | 83\% | 80\% | 79\% |
| Robert Bateman <br> HS <br> Grades 9-12, <br> Internationa <br> Baccalaureate Program | ENG | 1323 | 3 | 1386 | 567 | 538 | 498 | 475 | 467 | 453 | 432 | 413 | 403 | 378 | 394 |
|  | SC-SPED |  |  |  | 232 | 263 | 266 | 266 | 273 | 273 | 272 | 270 | 270 | 269 | 272 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 799 | 801 | 764 | 741 | 740 | 726 | 704 | 683 | 673 | 647 | 666 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 524 | 522 | 559 | 582 | 583 | 597 | 619 | 640 | 650 | 676 | 657 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 60\% | 61\% | 58\% | 56\% | 56\% | 55\% | 53\% | 52\% | 51\% | 49\% | 50\% |

Option 7 - Dr. Frank Hayden SS - with Overflow Schoo
Rev. Sept 6, 2016


IMPACTS TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Alexander's PS, Alton Village PS, Charles R. Beaudoin PS, Florence Meares PS,
John William Boich PS and Orchard Park PS: Grade 8 cohorts could be split between Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS and M.M. Robinson HS.
RESULTS
By 2020, there will be approximately 1598 available pupil places
398 available pupil places ( $87 \%$ utilization) north of the QEW.
398 available pupil places ( $87 \%$ utilization) north of the QEW.
There is no reduction in pupil spaces; students north of the QEW are re-distributed.
There is no reduction in pupil spaces; stulents north of the QEW are re-distributed.
Expected to be an increase in students eligible for transportation. The number will vary from year to year.


Option 8 - Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS - Boundary Change


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing Lester B. Pearson HS and Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS undergoes a boundary change.
issues:
LFI to be relocated to M.M. Robinson HS.
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS will exceed total capacity between the years 2016-2017 and 2022-2024.
Robert Bateman HS to remain under 65\% capacity.
John William Boich PS community (south of Dundas St.) and Florence Meares PS community (west of Walker's Line) to have split grade 8 cohort
notes:
M. M. Robinson HS: Boundaries to expand to Burloak Dr. south of Upper Middle Rd., rural area and new development north of Dundas St.
M. M. Robinson HS: LFI program to be added.
M. M. Robinson HS: Utilization is approximately $98 \%$ by 2020.

Lester B Pearson HS: Closes in June 2018
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Enrolments are expected to reach total capacity in 2016 and again in starting in 2020, however it is manageable.
Dr. Frank J. Hayden ss: Enrolments axe expected to be above OTT capacity for the long term.
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Utilization expected to be at $122 \%$ by 2020 .

|  | Program | OTG | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldershot HSGrades $9-12$ | ENG | 558 | 0 | 558 | 344 | 344 | 370 | 361 | 369 | 357 | 331 | 326 | 315 | 311 | 307 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 92 | 100 | 106 | 105 | 105 | 104 | 107 | 107 | 111 | 109 | 105 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 436 | 444 | 476 | 466 | 474 | 461 | 438 | 433 | 426 | 420 | 412 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 122 | 114 | 82 | 92 | 84 | 97 | 120 | 125 | 132 | 138 | 146 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 78\% | 80\% | 85\% | 84\% | 85\% | $83 \%$ | 78\% | 78\% | 76\% | 75\% | 74\% |
| Burlington Central  <br> HS Grades $9-$ <br> 12  | eng | 870 | 6 | 996 | 538 | 512 | 507 | 512 | 499 | 490 | 470 | 460 | 468 | 483 | 472 |
|  | Fl |  |  |  | 57 | 55 | 63 | 78 | 86 | 103 | 127 | 131 | 132 | 134 | 124 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 595 | 567 | 570 | 590 | 585 | 593 | 597 | 591 | 600 | 617 | 596 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 275 | 303 | 300 | 280 | 285 | 277 | 273 | 279 | 270 | 253 | 274 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 68\% | 65\% | 66\% | 68\% | 67\% | 68\% | 69\% | 68\% | 69\% | 71\% | 69\% |
| Nelson HS Grades 9-12 Secondary Gifted Placement | eng | 1341 | 12 | 1593 | 869 | 851 | 869 | 874 | 860 | 838 | 814 | 760 | 755 | 726 | 730 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 129 | 141 | 179 | 202 | 225 | 274 | 296 | 328 | 358 | 347 | 327 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 998 | 992 | 1048 | 1076 | 1085 | 1112 | 111 | 1088 | 1113 | 107 | 1057 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 343 | 349 | 293 | 265 | 256 | 229 | 231 | 253 | 228 | 268 | 284 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 74\% | 74\% | 78\% | 80\% | 81\% | 83\% | 83\% | 81\% | 83\% | 80\% | 79\% |
| Robert Bateman HS <br> Grades 9-12, International Baccalaureate Program | ENG | 1323 | 3 | 1386 | 567 | 538 | 498 | 475 | 467 | 453 | 432 | 413 | 403 | 378 | 394 |
|  | sc-Sped |  |  |  | 232 | 263 | ${ }^{266}$ | 266 | 273 | 273 | 272 | 270 | 270 | 269 | 272 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 799 | 801 | 764 | 741 | 740 | 726 | 704 | 683 | 673 | 647 | 666 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 524 | 522 | 559 | 582 | 583 | 597 | 619 | 640 | 650 | 676 | 657 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 60\% | 61\% | 58\% | 56\% | 56\% | 55\% | 53\% | 52\% | 51\% | 49\% | 50\% |

Option 8 - Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS - Boundary Change


IMPACTS TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
John William Boich PS: Split grade 8 cohort, between Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS and M. M. Robinson HS.
Kilbride PS: Redirected to M. M. Robinson HS,
Florence Meares PS: Split grade 8 cohort, between Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS and M.M. Robinson HS.
Charles R. Beaudoin PS FI: Split grade 8 cohort, between Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS and M. M. Robinson HS.
C. H. Norton PS: Unified cohort, all students directed to M. M. Robinson HS.

Sir E. MacMillan PS: Redirected to M. M. Robinson HS.
RESULTS
By 2020, there will be approximately 956 available pupil places ( $86 \%$ utilization) overall, 1200 available spaces ( $71 \%$ utiliza tion) south of the QEW and a
shortage of 244 pupil places ( $110 \%$ utilization) north of the QEW.
here is a reduction of 642 pupil places. .

|  | Program | отG | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M.M. Robinson HSGrades $9-12$ | eng | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 1157 | 1144 | 1096 | 1107 | 1052 | 1004 | 1008 | 977 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 123 | 138 | 143 | 169 | 173 | 175 | 180 | 171 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | SC-Sped |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 1370 | 1371 | 1326 | 1364 | 1312 | 1263 | 1272 | 1231 |
|  | Available / Sh | Iage of $P$ | pil Plac |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | -23 | -24 | 21 | ${ }^{-17}$ | 35 | 84 | 75 | 116 |
|  | Percent Utiliza |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 102\% | 102\% | 98\% | 101\% | 97\% | 94\% | 94\% | 91\% |
| Lester B. Pearson HS <br> Closes 2018 | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupi | aces |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 |
|  | Percent Utiliza |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Dr. Frank J. <br> Hayden SS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1065 | 1054 | 1082 | 1105 | 1088 | 106 | 1077 | 1028 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 314 | 335 | 377 | 389 | 397 | 404 | 373 | 366 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1379 | 1389 | 1459 | 1494 | 1485 | 1469 | 1450 | 1394 |
|  | Sortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | -214 | 30 | -429 | -185 | -195 | 265 | 300 | -291 | 275 | -256 | 200 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 115\% | 116\% | 122\% | 125\% | 124\% | 123\% | 121\% | 117\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 21 | 4533 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 2873 | 2884 | 2892 | 2849 | 2795 | 2812 | 2757 | 2731 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 38 | 3981 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2749 | 2760 | 2785 | 2858 | 2797 | 2732 | 2722 | 2625 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 59 | 8514 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |

Option 9 - Robert Bateman HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Program Change


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing two high schools and creating 3 FI centres.
ISSUES:
FI program is removed from Nelson HS and Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS.
LFI program to be added to M. M. Robinson HS.
SC-SPED to be added at Nelson HS
notes:
Aldershot HS: IB students are redirected to Aldershot HS.
Aldershot HS: Total capacity exceeded in 2019 and 2020. Additional pupil places are available in the Aldershot facility.
Burlington Central HS: Fl boundary expands to include Nelson HS catchment.
Belson HS: English boundary is expanded to include Robert Bateman HS.
Nelson HS: FI program moved to Burlington Central HS.
Nelson HS: Utilization is expected to be at $108 \%$ by 2020 .
Nelson HS: To receive SC-SPED students from Robert Bateman HS (upon confirmation)
Robert Bateman HS: Closes in June 2018.


Option 9 - Robert Bateman HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Program Change

notes con't:
M.M. Robinson HS: Expands to include Lester B Pearson HS.
M.M. Robinson HS: Expands to include Dr. Frank Hayden SS FI.
M.M. Robinson HS: Late FI added to programming.
M.M. Robinson HS: Utilization at $103 \%$ by 2022.
Lester B. Pearson HS: Closes in June 2018 .

Lester B. Pearson SS: Closes in June 2018.
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: FI Program to be directed to M.M. Robinson HS.
Dr. Frank Hayden SS: Utilization should stabilize at $117 \%$
IMPACTS ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS:
Pineland FI PS: Directed to Burlington Central HS.
Frontenac PS: Directed to Nelson HS, unified grade 8 cohort.
Charles R. Beaudoin PS FI, Orchard Park PS FI, Alexander's PS FI, John William Boich PS FI: Directed to M. M. Robinson HS,
Chares R. Beaudoin PS FI, Orchard Park PS FI, Alexad
Sir E MacMillian PS: Directed to M.M. Robinson HS.
CH: N.
Sir E MacMillian PS: Directed to M.M. R. R
CH Norton PS: Unified grade 8 cohort.
RESULTS:
By 2020 , there will be approximately shortage of 367 pupil places overall. South of QEW will have shortage of 124 pupil places and north of the QEW will have a shortage of 244 pupil places. Overall utilization is $107 \%$ by 2020 .
Overall all a reduction of 1965 spaces.

|  | Program | отє | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { M.M. Robinson HS } \\ \text { Grades } 9-12 \end{array}\right\|$ | ENG | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 831 | 817 | 777 | 794 | 767 | 720 | 724 | 711 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 436 | 475 | 520 | 558 | 570 | 580 | 555 | 538 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | sc-sped |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 1357 | 1381 | 1384 | 1440 | 1424 | 1384 | 1363 | 1332 |
|  | Available/ Shor | ge of $P$ | pil Plac |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | -10 | -34 | 37 | -93 | -77 | -37 | -16 | 15 |
|  | Percent Utilizat |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 101\% | 103\% | 103\% | 107\% | 106\% | 103\% | 101\% | 99\% |
| Lester B. Pearson HS <br> Closes 2018 | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1391 | 1380 | 1400 | 1418 | 1374 | 1349 | 1359 | 1292 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1391 | 1380 | 1400 | 1418 | 1374 | 1349 | 1359 | 1292 |
|  | Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | -214 | -360 | -429 | -197 | -186 | -206 | -224 | $-180$ | -155 | -165 | -98 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 116\% | 116\% | 117\% | 119\% | 115\% | 113\% | 114\% | 108\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 21 | 4533 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 2874 | 2883 | 2893 | 2848 | 2794 | 2812 | 2757 | 2731 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 38 | 3981 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2748 | 2761 | 2784 | 2858 | 2798 | 2733 | 2722 | 2624 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 59 | 8514 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5706 | 5592 | 5545 | 5479 | 5355 |

Option 10 - Robert Bateman HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary Change


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing two high schools and Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS undergoes a boundary change.
ISSUES
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS reaches total capacity in 2016, 2017, 2021.
Aldershot HS exceed total capacity in 2018 (available pupil places from the elementary facility).
C-SPED to be relocated to Aldershot HS
IB program to be relocated to Burlington Central HS (program may not be transferable).
Potential PAR for Aldershot Elementary PS
notes:
Aldershot HS: SC-SPED class to be added from Robert Bateman HS.
Aldershot HS : Total capacity exceeded from 2018. Utilization is expected to be at $132 \%$ by 2020
Burlington Central HS: English $9-12$ boundary expands (includes Tecumseh PS.
Burlington Central HS: : Utilization is expected to be at 87\%\% by 2002.
Burlington Central HS: IB students to be redirected at Burlington Central HS from Robert Bateman HS.
Nelson HS: English expands to include Frontenac PS boundary.

|  | Program | от6 | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldershot HS Grades $9-12$ | ENG | 558 | 0 | 558 | 344 | 344 | 370 | 361 | 369 | 357 | 331 | 326 | 315 | 311 | 307 |
|  | Fl |  |  |  | 92 | 100 | 106 | 105 | 105 | 104 | 107 | 107 | 111 | 109 | 105 |
|  | SC-SPED |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 266 | 273 | 273 | 272 | 270 | 270 | 269 | 272 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 436 | 444 | 476 | 732 | 747 | 734 | 710 | 703 | 696 | 689 | 684 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 122 | 114 | 82 | 174 | 189 | ${ }^{176}$ | 152 | ${ }_{-145}$ | 138 | 131 | 126 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 78\% | 80\% | 85\% | 131\% | 134\% | 132\% | 127\% | 126\% | 125\% | 123\% | 123\% |
| Burlington <br> Central HS <br> Grades 9-12 <br> International <br> Baccalaureate Program | ENG | 870 | 6 | 996 | 538 | 512 | 507 | 652 | 669 | 655 | 633 | 618 | 624 | 636 | 621 |
|  | Fl |  |  |  | 57 | 55 | 63 | 78 | 86 | 103 | 127 | ${ }^{131}$ | 132 | 134 | 125 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 595 | 567 | 570 | 730 | 755 | 758 | 760 | 749 | 756 | 770 | 746 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 275 | 303 | 300 | 140 | 115 | 112 | 110 | 121 | 114 | 100 | 124 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 68\% | 65\% | 66\% | 84\% | 87\% | 87\% | 87\% | 86\% | 87\% | 89\% | 86\% |
| Nelson HS Grades $9-12$ Secondary Gifted Pracement | ENG | 1341 | 12 | 1593 | 869 | 851 | 869 | 1210 | 1158 | 1125 | 1083 | 1014 | 1002 | 951 | 974 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 129 | 141 | 179 | 202 | 225 | 274 | 296 | 328 | 358 | 347 | 327 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 998 | 992 | 1048 | 1412 | 1383 | 1399 | 1379 | 1342 | 1360 | 1298 | 1301 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 343 | 349 | 293 | 71 | -42 | 58 | 38 | -1 | 19 | 43 | 40 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 74\% | 74\% | 78\% | 105\% | 103\% | 104\% | 103\% | 100\% | 101\% | 97\% | 97\% |
| Robert Bateman HS <br> Closes 2018 | ENG | 1323 | 3 | 1386 | 567 | 538 | 498 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | SC-SPED |  |  |  | 232 | 263 | 266 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 799 | 801 | 764 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 524 | 522 | 559 | 1323 | 1323 | 1323 | 1323 | 1323 | 1323 | 1323 | 1323 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 60\% | 61\% | 58\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |

Option 10 - Robert Bateman HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary Change
rev. Sept 6, 2016
notes con't
Robert Batemans HS: Closes in June 2018.
M.M Robinson HS: English Boundary expands to include Kilbride PS (Burlington )catchment and Florence Meares PS catchment.
M.M. Robinson HS: Utilization is expected to increase to $100 \%$ in 2020 .
M.M. Robinson HS: Utilization is expected to increase to $100 \%$ in 2020 .
M.M. Robinson HS: Acquires LFI program

Lester B. Pearson HS: Closes in June 2018
Dr. Frank I. Hayden SS: English boundary is reduced in size. Utilization is expected to be near $120 \%$ in 2020
IMPACTS ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Florence Meares PS, Sir E. MacMillan PS and Kilbride PS: Redirected to M.M. Robinson HS.
pesuts
By 2020 there will be approximatly a shortage of 367 pupil places ( $107 \%$ utilization) overall. South of the QEW will have shortage of approximately 122 pupil places ( $104 \%$ utilization) and north of the QEW will have shortage of 245 pupil places ( $110 \%$ utilization).

|  | Program | отG | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M.M. Robinson HSGrades $9-12$ | ENG | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 1214 | 1183 | 1139 | 1173 | 1120 | 1067 | 1060 | 101 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 108 | 119 | 122 | 147 | 148 | 153 | 159 | 152 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 54 | 55 | 53 |
|  | SC-SPED |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 1412 | 1391 | 1348 | 1408 | 1355 | 1304 | 1304 | 1251 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | -65 | -44 | -1 | 61 | 8 | 43 | 43 | 96 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 105\% | 103\% | 100\% | 105\% | 101\% | 97\% | $97 \%$ | 93\% |
| Lester B. Pearson HS <br> Closes 2018 | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dr. Frank J. } \\ & \text { Hayden SS } \\ & \text { Grades } 9-12 \end{aligned}$ | eng | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1008 | 1012 | 1039 | 1039 | 1022 | 1001 | 1022 | 987 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 328 | 356 | 399 | 411 | 421 | 427 | 396 | 387 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1336 | 1368 | 1438 | 1450 | 1443 | 1428 | 1418 | 1374 |
|  | Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | -214 | -360 | -429 | -142 | -174 | -24 | -256 | -249 | 234 | -224 | 180 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 112\% | 115\% | 120\% | 121\% | 121\% | 120\% | 119\% | 115\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 21 | 4533 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 2874 | 2885 | 2891 | 2849 | 2794 | 2812 | 2757 | 2731 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 38 | 3981 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2748 | 2759 | 2786 | 2858 | 2798 | 2732 | 2722 | 2625 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 59 | 8514 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |

Option 11 - Robert Bateman HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Program Change


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing two high schools and creating one central French Immersion high school.
ISSUES:
The Secondary Gifted Placement at Nelson HS to be relocated to M.M. Robinson HS The IB program at Robert Bateman HS to be relocated to Alde
Late French Immersion to be relocated to M.M. Robinson HS.
Late French Immersion to be relocated to M.M. Robinson HS.
SC-SPED currently at Robert Bateman HS to be relocated to Nelson HS.
Aldershot HS exceeds Total Capacity by 2018 (pupil places are available at Aldershot Elem. PS).
Burlington Central HS exceeds Total Capacity by 2020 (pupil places are available at Aldershot Elem. PS).
notes:
Adershot HS: Boundary expands east towards Brant St
Aldershhot HS: Utilizazion is expected to be at $140 \%$ capacity. Capacity can be gained from the elementary facility.
Burlington Central HS: Boundary expands to include all FI from Burlington high schools.
Burlington Central HS: Becomes the sole early French Immersion high school in Burlington.
Burlington Central HS: Capacity can be gained from the elementary facility.


Option 11 - Robert Bateman HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Program Change rev. Oct 13, 2016

NOTES CON'T:
Nelson HS: Utilization to be at $110 \%$ capacity by 2020
Robert Batemans HS: Closes in 2018.
M.M. Robinson HS: Gains the Late FI from Lester B. Pearson HS, and Secondary Gifted Placement from Nelson HS.
M.M. Robinson HS: Expands to include
Lester B. Pearson HS: Closes in 2018 .

IMPACTS ON ELEMENTAPY SCHOOLS
Dual Track FI schools to have a split cohort.
Tecumseh PS, C.H. Norton PS and Frontenac PS: Unified grade 8 cohort.
Sir E. MacMillan PS to to be redirected to M.M. Robinson HS.
Burlington Elementary PS ENG: Split grade 8 cohort between Aldershot HS and Nelson HS. rev. Sept 6, 2016
RESULTS
By 2020 , there will be a shortage of 367 pupil spaces ( $107 \%$ utilization) overall. South of the QEW will have a shortage of approximately 487 pupil places (118\% utilization) and north of the QEW will have 120 available spaces $(95 \%$ utilization).
Overall a reduction of 1965 punil places.

|  | Program | отє | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M.M. Robinson HS Grade 9-12, SC-SPED Programs, Secondary Gifted Placement | ENG | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 950 | 960 | 934 | 939 | 888 | 829 | 819 | 804 |
|  | FI / LFI |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | sc-Sped |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 1040 | 1049 | 1021 | 1026 | 975 | 913 | 903 | 887 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | 307 | 298 | 326 | 321 | 372 | 434 | 444 | 460 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 77\% | 78\% | 76\% | 76\% | 72\% | 68\% | 67\% | 66\% |
| Lester B. Pearson HS <br> Closes 2018 | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Grade 9-12 | ENG | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1391 | 1380 | 1400 | 1418 | 1374 | 1349 | 1359 | 1292 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1391 | 1380 | 1400 | 1418 | 1374 | 1349 | 1359 | 1292 |
|  | Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | -214 | -360 | -429 | -197 | ${ }_{-186}$ | -206 | -224 | -180 | -155 | -165 | . 98 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 116\% | 116\% | 117\% | 119\% | 115\% | 113\% | 114\% | 108\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 21 | 4533 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 3191 | 3215 | 3256 | 3262 | 3243 | 3283 | 3217 | 3176 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 38 | 3981 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2431 | 2429 | 2421 | 2444 | 2349 | 2262 | 2262 | 2179 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 59 | 851 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5706 | 5592 | 5545 | 5479 | 5355 |

Option 12 - Nelson HS \& M.M. Robinson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Program Change


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing two high schools, and a program change for Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS.
ISSUES:
Aldershot HS and Burlington Central HS to exceed total capacity by 2018. Space is available from elementary facilities.
Lester B. Pearson HS exceeds total capacity by 2018 . Lester B. Pearson HS exceeds total capacity by 2018 .
Potential PAR or the Aldershot
Potertial PAR or the Aldershot Elementary PS and Burlington Central Elementary PS communities.
El program to be added to Lester B. Pearson HS.
notes:
Aldershot HS: Boundary expands north to include the area north of 407 ETR and south of Dundas St,
Aldershot HS: Approximately 200 (2015) available pupil places in the elementary facility.
.
Burlington Central HS: By 2020, utilization is expected to be at $134 \%$ (available space from the elementary facility).
Burlington Central HS: English boundary expands east to Walker's Line. FI boundary expands to Burloak Drive.
Nelson HS: Closed in June 2018.
Robert Bateman HS: Boundary expands west to Walker's Line.
Robert Bateman HS: SC-SPED student from M.M. Robinson HS

|  | Program | отє | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldershot HS Grades $9-12$ | eng | 558 | 0 | 558 | 344 | 344 | 370 | 591 | 595 | 582 | 559 | 539 | 518 | 517 | 519 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 92 | 100 | 106 | 150 | 163 | 164 | 180 | 181 | 186 | 187 | 180 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 436 | 444 | 476 | 741 | 758 | 746 | 739 | 720 | 704 | 704 | 699 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 122 | 114 | 82 | 183 | -200 | 188 | 181 | -162 | -146 | 146 | 141 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 78\% | 80\% | 85\% | 133\% | 136\% | 134\% | 132\% | 129\% | 126\% | 126\% | 125\% |
| Burlington Central HS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 870 | 6 | 996 | 538 | 512 | 507 | 823 | 814 | 790 | 766 | 747 | 762 | 774 | 763 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 57 | 55 | 63 | 280 | 311 | 377 | 423 | 458 | 490 | 481 | 451 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 595 | 567 | 570 | 1103 | 1125 | 1167 | 1189 | 1205 | 1252 | 1255 | 1214 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 275 | 303 | 300 | -233 | -255 | -297 | -319 | -335 | -382 | ${ }^{3} 85$ | -344 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 68\% | 65\% | 66\% | 127\% | $129 \%$ | 134\% | 137\% | 139\% | 144\% | 144\% | 140\% |
| Nelson HS Closes2018 | ENG | 1341 | 12 | 1593 | 869 | 851 | 869 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 129 | 141 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 998 | 992 | 1048 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 343 | 349 | 293 | 1341 | 1341 | 1341 | 1341 | 1341 | 1341 | 1341 | 1341 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 74\% | 74\% | 78\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Robert Bateman HS <br> Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1323 | 3 | 1386 | 567 | 538 | 498 | 1039 | 1012 | 991 | 949 | 886 | 865 | 813 | 833 |
|  | SC-SpeD |  |  |  | 232 | 263 | 266 | 296 | 303 | 303 | 302 | 300 | 300 | 299 | 302 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 799 | 801 | 764 | 1335 | 1315 | 1294 | 1251 | 1186 | 1165 | 1112 | 1135 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 524 | 522 | 559 | -12 | 8 | 29 | 72 | 137 | 158 | 211 | 188 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 60\% | 61\% | 58\% | 101\% | 99\% | 98\% | 95\% | 90\% | 88\% | 84\% | 86\% |

Option 12 - Nelson HS \& M.M. Robinson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Program Change

notes con't:
Robert Bateman HS: Utilization is expected to be at $98 \%$ by 2020.
M.M. Robinson HS: Closes in June 2018.

Lester B. Pearson HS: FI program to added.
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: FI program to be redirected to Lester B. Pearson HS.
IMPACTS ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
C>H. Norton PS, Tecumseh PS, Frontenac PS: Unified grade 8 cohort,
John T. Tuck PS to have a split grade 8 cohort between Burington Central HS and Robert Bateman HS.
RESULTS
RESULTS
By 2020 , there will be a shortage of approximately 1090 pupil places ( $124 \%$ utilization) overall. South of the QEW will have a shortage of 456 pupil places (117\% utilization) and north of the QEW will have a shortage of 634 pupii places ( $134 \%$ utilization)
places (117\% utilization) and north of the
Overall a reduction of 2688 pupil places.


Option 13 - Robert Bateman HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS with Overflow School


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing two high schools and reducing Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS with no changes to current boundaries (a RATIONALE: To present
variation of Option 7).

ISSUES:
SC-SPED facilities at Aldershot HS.
B program at Burlington Central HS (program may not be transferable).

Late If program to be added to M.M. Robinson HS
Potential PAR for the Aldershot Elementay PS.
notes:
Aldershot HS: Receives SC-SPED students from Robert Bateman HS.
Aldershot HS: Total capacity exceeded from 2018. Capacity from Aldershot Elementary PS is available.
Aldershot HS: Utilization to be at $132 \%$ in 2020 .
Burlington Central HS: Catchment to expand east to include the Tecumseh PS catchment.
Burlington Central HS: To receive the IB program from Robert Bateman HS.
Burlington Central HS: Utilization to increase to $87 \%$ by 2020.
Nelson HS: To expand to include the current Robert Bateman HS catchment.


Option 13 - Robert Bateman HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS with Overflow School


NOTES CON'T
Nelson HS: Utilization to increase to $104 \%$ by 2020
Nelson HS: Utilization to increase to $104 \%$ b.
Robert Bateman HS: Closes in June 2018 .
Lester B. Pearson HS: Closes in June 2018.
M.M. Robinson HS: Boundary to expand to include Lester B. Pearson HS catchment
M.M. Robinson HS: To add the LFI program.
M.M. Robinson HS: To become an overflow school for Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS.
M.M. Robinson HS: Utilization to increase to $99 \%$ by 2020 .
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Grade 9 class to be limited to 325 students starting in 2018 .

Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Grade 9 class to be limited to 325 students starting
Dr. Frank $J$. Hayden SS: Total capacity to be reached between 2016-2020.
IMPACTS TO ELEMENTARY SCHools
Tecumseh PS, Frontenac PS and C.H. Norton PS: Unified cohorts.
Tecumseh PS, Frontenac PS and C.H. Norton PS: Unified co
Sir . MacMillan PS to be redirected to M.M. Robinson HS.
results
By 2020, there will be an approximate shortage of 367 spaces ( $107 \%$ utilization) overall. South of the QEW will have a shortage of 122 pupil places $(104 \%$ utilization) and north of the QEW will have a shortage of 245 pupil places (110\% utilization).

|  | Program | OTG | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { M.M. Robinson HS } \\ \text { Grades } 9-12 \end{array}\right\|$ | ENG | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 937 | 1008 | 1047 | 1192 | 1121 | 1048 | 1063 | 985 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 124 | 164 | 204 | 254 | 265 | 275 | 251 | 234 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | sc-Sped |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 1151 | 1261 | 1338 | 1534 | 1473 | 1407 | 1398 | 1302 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | 196 | 86 | 9 | 187 | 126 | . 60 | 51 | 45 |
|  | Percent Utiliza |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 85\% | 94\% | 99\% | 114\% | 109\% | 104\% | 104\% | 97\% |
| Lester B. Pearson HS <br> Closes 2018 | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1284 | 1186 | 1131 | 1020 | 102 | 1020 | 102 | 102 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 312 | 311 | 317 | 304 | 304 | 304 | 304 | 304 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1596 | 1497 | 1448 | 1324 | 1324 | 1324 | 1324 | 1324 |
|  | Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | -214 | -360 | 429 | -402 | . 303 | -254 | -130 | -130 | -130 | -130 | -130 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 134\% | 125\% | 121\% | 111\% | 111\% | 111\% | 111\% | 111\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 18 | 3147 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 2875 | 2886 | 2891 | 2849 | 2795 | 2813 | 2757 | 2730 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 24 | 3045 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2747 | 2758 | 2786 | 2858 | 2797 | 2731 | 2722 | 2626 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 42 | 6192 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |

Option 14 - Burlington Central HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary / Program Change


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing two high schools, creating 3 FI centres and Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS undergoes a program and boundary change.
issues:
Burlington Central HS is a campus setting from JK-8 in in the core of Burlington
PAR for the Aldershot community and Burlington Central elementary schools will be required.
Nelson HS utilization drops below 65\% in 2020. Frank J. Hayden SS to exceed total capacity in 2016, 2017 and 2020-2024.
Florence Mears PS (west of Walker's Line) and John William Boich PS (south of Upper Middle Rd) to have split communities.
notes:
Aldershot HS: Catchment expands east toward Brant St
Aldershot HS : Utilization exceeds OTG capacity and by 2020 utilization is expected to be at $145 \%$ (additional space available at Aldershot Elem PS). Burlington Central HS: Closes in June 2018.
Nelson HS: Utilization drops to below $65 \%$ capacity by 2020
Robert Bateman HS: Utilization is expected to increase to $92 \%$ by 2020.

|  | Program | отG | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldershot HS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 558 | 0 | 558 | 344 | 344 | 370 | 688 | 680 | 661 | 614 | 592 | 582 | 576 | 561 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 92 | 100 | 106 | 144 | 145 | 149 | 158 | 159 | 163 | 161 | 154 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 436 | 444 | 476 | 832 | 825 | 810 | 772 | 751 | 745 | 737 | 715 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 122 | 114 | 82 | 274 | 267 | 252 | 214 | 193 | 187 | 179 | 157 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 78\% | 80\% | 85\% | 149\% | 148\% | 145\% | 138\% | ${ }^{135}$ | 134\% | \% | \% |
| Burlington Central HS Closes 2018 | ENG | 870 | 6 | 996 | 538 | 512 | 507 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Fl |  |  |  | 57 | 55 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 595 | 567 | 570 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 275 | 303 | 300 | 870 | 870 | 870 | 870 | 870 | 870 | 870 | 870 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 68\% | 65\% | 66\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Nelson HS Grades 9-12, Secondary Gifted Placement | ENG | 1341 | 12 | 1593 | 869 | 851 | 869 | 893 | 881 | 860 | 851 | 818 | 828 | 831 | 828 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 129 | 141 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 998 | 992 | 1048 | 893 | 881 | 860 | 851 | 818 | 828 | 831 | 828 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 343 | 349 | 293 | 448 | 460 | 481 | 490 | 523 | 513 | 510 | 513 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 74\% | 74\% | 78\% | 67\% | 66\% | 64\% | 63\% | 61\% | 62\% | 62\% | 62\% |
| Robert Bateman HS <br> Grades 9-12, <br> Internationa <br> Baccalaureate Program | Eng | 1323 | 3 | 1386 | 567 | 538 | 498 | 641 | 634 | 616 | 582 | 549 | 531 | 492 | 514 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 271 | 333 | 372 | 407 | 436 | 428 | 402 |
|  | sc-Sped |  |  |  | 232 | 263 | 266 | 266 | 273 | 273 | 272 | 270 | 270 | 269 | 272 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 799 | 801 | 764 | 1148 | 1178 | 1222 | 1226 | 1226 | 1237 | 1189 | 1188 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 524 | 522 | 559 | 175 | 145 | 101 | 97 | 97 | 86 | 134 | 135 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 60\% | 61\% | 58\% | 87\% | 89\% | 92\% | 93\% | 93\% | 93\% | 90\% | 90\% |

Option 14 - Burlington Central HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary / Program Change $\qquad$

notes con't
Robert Bateman HS: FI Program added to Robert Bateman HS
M.M. Robinson HS: Utilization increase reached $98 \%$ by 2020 .
M.M. Robinson HS: LFI program to be added

Lester B. Pearson HS: Closes in June 2018 .
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Reaches total capacity between 201 .
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Reaches total capacity between 2016, 2017, 2020-2024; it should be manageable
IMPACTS TO ELEMENTARY SChools
Tecumseh PS: Directed to Aldershot HS and Nelson HS.
Fontenac PS, Pineland PS: Directed to Robert Bateman HS.
C.H. Norten PS: Unified grade 8 cohort.
Florence Meares PS, John William Boich PS: Grade 8 cohort split between Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS and M.M. Robinson HS.

Sir E. MacMillan PS to be redirected to M.M. Robinson HS
RESUITS
By 2020, there will be approximately 86 available pupil places ( $99 \%$ utilization) overall. South of the QEW will have 333 avai lable spaces ( $90 \%$ utilization) and north of the QEW will have a shortage of 247 pupil places ( $110 \%$ utilization).

|  | Program | отє | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M.M. Robinson HS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 1157 | 1144 | 1096 | 1107 | 1052 | 1004 | 1008 | 977 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 123 | 138 | 143 | 169 | 173 | 175 | 180 | 171 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | SC-Sped |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 1370 | 1371 | 1326 | 1364 | 1312 | 1263 | 1272 | 1231 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | -23 | -24 | 21 | -17 | 35 | 84 | 75 | 116 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 102\% | 102\% | 98\% | 101\% | 97\% | 94\% | 94\% | 91\% |
| Lester B. Pearson Hs <br> Closes 2018 | eng | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1311 | 1350 | 1065 | 1054 | 1082 | 1105 | 1088 | 1067 | 1077 | 1028 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 200 | 243 | 273 | 314 | 335 | 377 | 389 | 397 | 404 | 373 | 366 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1379 | 1389 | 1459 | 1494 | 1485 | 1471 | 1450 | 1394 |
|  | Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 214 | 360 | 429 | -185 | -195 | -265 | -300 | -291 | 277 | -256 | 200 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 115\% | 116\% | 122\% | 125\% | 124\% | 123\% | 121\% | 117\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 15 | 3537 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 2873 | 2884 | 2892 | 2849 | 2795 | 2810 | 2757 | 2731 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 24 | 3045 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2749 | 2760 | 2785 | 2858 | 2797 | 2734 | 2722 | 2625 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 39 | 6582 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |



RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing two high schools and Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS undergoes a boundary change.
ISSUES:
SUdents moving south of the QEW - recently redirected to Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS from Robert Bateman HS.
Not all students to are expected to travel south to Robert Bateman HS.
Aldershot HS to exceed total capacity by 2018 (available space from the elementary facility).
PAR required for elementary schools in Aldershot Elementary PS and Burlington Central Elementary PS communities.
LF added to M.M. Robinson HS.
FI added to Robert Bateman HS.
Majority of the Orchard Community to be redirected south of the QEW.
notes:
Aldershot HS: The catchment expands towards Brant St .
Aldershot HS: Utilization exceeds Total Capacity by 2018. Aldershot Elementary PS has available empty spaces.
Aldershot HS: Utilization to be at $145 \%$, by 2020 .
Burlington Central HS: Closes in June 2018.
Nelson HS: Geegraphically not in the centre of the community,
Nelson HS: Utilization increase to $102 \%$, $y$ 2 2020
Nelson HS: Utilization increase to $102 \%$, by 2020 .
Robert Bateman HS: The catchment expands west b
Robert Bateman HS: The catchment expands west between
Robert Bateman HS: Utilization increases to $94 \%$, by 2020 .

|  | Program | отG | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldershot HS Grades 9-12 | eng | 558 | 0 | 558 | 344 | 344 | 370 | 688 | 680 | 661 | 613 | 592 | 582 | 576 | 562 |
|  | ${ }^{\text {FI }}$ |  |  |  | 92 | 100 | 106 | 144 | 145 | 149 | 158 | 159 | 163 | 161 | 154 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 436 | 444 | 476 | 832 | 825 | 810 | 771 | 751 | 745 | 737 | 716 |
|  | Aldershot HS Available Pupil Pla |  |  |  | 122 | 114 | 82 | -274 | -267 | -252 | -213 | -193 | ${ }^{-187}$ | -179 | -158 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 78\% | 80\% | 85\% | 149\% | 148\% | 145\% | 138\% | 135\% | 134\% | 132\% | 128\% |
| Burlington Central HS Closes 2018 | ENG | 870 | 6 | 996 | 538 | 512 | 507 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 57 | 55 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 595 | 567 | 570 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Burlington Central HS Available Pupil Pla |  |  |  | 275 | 303 | 300 | 870 | 870 | 870 | 870 | 870 | 870 | 870 | 870 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 68\% | 65\% | 66\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Nelson HS <br> Grades $9-12$, Secondary Gited Placement | ENG | 1341 | 12 | 1593 | 869 | 851 | 869 | 893 | 881 | 860 | 851 | 818 | 828 | 831 | 828 |
|  | ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  |  |  | 129 | 141 | 179 | 375 | 432 | 510 | 551 | 584 | 616 | 585 | 553 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 998 | 992 | 1048 | 1268 | 1313 | 1370 | 1402 | 1402 | 1444 | 1416 | 1381 |
|  | Nelson HS Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 343 | 349 | 293 | 73 | 28 | -29 | -61 | -61 | ${ }^{-103}$ | .75 | -40 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 74\% | 74\% | 78\% | 95\% | 98\% | 102\% | 105\% | 105\% | 108\% | 106\% | 103\% |
| Robert Bateman <br> HS <br> Grades 9-12 <br> International <br> Baccalaureate Program | ENG | 1323 | 3 | 1386 | 567 | 538 | 498 | 1003 | 1014 | 973 | 906 | 858 | 809 | 750 | 758 |
|  | sc-Sped |  |  |  | 232 | 263 | 266 | 266 | 273 | 273 | 272 | 270 | 270 | 269 | 272 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 799 | 801 | 764 | 1269 | 1287 | 1246 | 1178 | 1128 | 1079 | 1019 | 1030 |
|  | Robert Bateman HS Available Pupil Place |  |  |  | 524 | 522 | 559 | 54 | 36 | 77 | 145 | 195 | 244 | 304 | 293 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 60\% | 61\% | 58\% | 96\% | 97\% | $94 \%$ | 89\% | 85\% | 82\% | 77\% | 78\% |

Option 15 - Burlington Central HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary Change


NOTES CON'T
Robert Bateman HS: Fl program adde
M.M. Robinson HS: Boundaries expands to include Lester B. Pearson HS. Utilization increase to $73 \%$, by 2020
M.M. Robinson HS: LFI program is added to the school.

Lester B Pearson HS: Closes in June 2018.
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: catchment is reduced.
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: Utilization to $106 \%$, by 2020.
IMPACTS TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Alexander's PS, Orchard Park PS to attend Robert Bateman HS.
John William Boich PS: Split cohort between Dr. Frank J . Hayden SS and Robert Bateman HS.
C.H. Norton, PS Frontenac, PS Pineland PS: Unified cohort

Burlington Central Elementary PS to have a split grade 8 cohort between Aldershot HS and Nelson HS.
RESULTS
 utilization) and north of the QEW will have surplus of 290 pupil places ( $89 \%$ utilization).

|  | Program | отє | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M.M. Robinson HS Grades 9-12 | eng | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 831 | 817 | 777 | 794 | 767 | 719 | 725 | 711 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 108 | 119 | 122 | 147 | 148 | 152 | 159 | 152 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 58 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | SC-SPED |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 1029 | 1025 | 986 | 1029 | 1002 | 955 | 968 | 946 |
|  | MM Robinson HS Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | 318 | 322 | 361 | 318 | 345 | 392 | 379 | 401 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 76\% | 76\% | 73\% | 76\% | 74\% | 71\% | 72\% | 70\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lester B. Pearson } \\ & \text { HS } \\ & \text { Closes } 2018 \end{aligned}$ | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Lester B Pearson HS Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1030 | 1000 | 1044 | 1094 | 1065 | 1073 | 1101 | 1048 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 194 | 194 | 221 | 233 | 244 | 248 | 238 | 235 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1224 | 1194 | 1265 | 1327 | 1309 | 1321 | 1339 | 1283 |
|  | Dr Frank J Hayden HS Available Pupil Place, |  |  |  | 214 | 360 | -429 | ${ }^{-30}$ | 0 | -71 | -133 | -115 | -127 | -145 | 89 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 103\% | 100\% | 106\% | 111\% | 110\% | 111\% | 12\% | 107\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 15 | 3537 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 3369 | 3425 | 3426 | 3351 | 3281 | 3268 | 3172 | 3127 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 24 | 3045 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2253 | 2219 | 2251 | 2356 | 2311 | 2276 | 2307 | 2229 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 39 | 6582 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |

Rev. Sept 6,2016

Option 16 - Aldershot HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary/Program Change


RATIONAL
ISSUES:
To present the impacts of closing two high schools, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS undergoes a boundary and program change.
Aldershot community loses its only high school.
Velson H H utilization is expected to decline below $64 \%$ by 2024 .
PAR will be required for the Aldershot Elementary PS and a potential PAR for Burlington Central Elementary PS
LFI added to M.M. Robinson HS.
FFi is removed from Dr. Frank $J$. Hayden $S S$.
fis added to
Flis added to Robert Bateman HS.
John William Boich PS area south of Upper Middle Rd to be redirected south of the QEW.
notes:
Aldersho
loses in June 2018.
Surington Central HS: Boundary expands west to include Aldershot.
Nelison HS: F I students east of Appleby Line to be be redirieximated toly Robert ilt in 2020 .
elson HS: FI students east of Appleby Line to be redirected to Robert Bateman HS, creates two smaller programs
Nelson HS: Utilization is expected to be at $70 \%$ by 2020 .
Robert Bateman HS: To receive students from north of the QEW.
Robert Bateman HS: Historic trends indicate students from north of the QEW may not opt to attend Robert Bateman HS.
Robert Bateman HS: To have a FI program, creates two smaller programs
Robert Bateman HS: Utilization to increase to $77 \%$ by 2020 .
M.M. Robinson HS: Expands to include Lester B. Pearson HS, and west Aldershot area


## Option 16 - Aldershot HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary/Program Change



NOTES CON'T:
M.M. Robinson HS: Expands to include Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS
M.
.M. Robinson HS: Late FI program to
M.M. Robinson HS: Late fl program to be added.
M.M. Robinson HS: Utilization will be at $107 \%$ by 2020 .

Lester B Pearson HS: Closes in June 2018.
Dr. Frank $\rfloor$. Hayden SS: English and FI students south of Upper Middle Rd to be redirected to Robert Bateman HS

IMPACTS ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Addershot Elem PS a spiti grade 8 cohort between Burlington Central HS and M.M. Robinson HS.


C.H. Norton PS to have a unfied grade 8 cohort.
Sir E. MacMillan PS to be directed to M.M.Robinson HS.

RESULTS:




rationale:
of scenario 16
ISSUES:
Aldershot community loses its only high school.
Nelson HS utilization
Nelson HS utilization is expected to decline below $64 \%$ by 2024.
Burlington Central HS exceeds total capacity in 2018.
PAR will be required for the Aldershot and Burlington
PAR will be required for the Aldershot and Burlington Central communities.
FI didded to M.M. Robinson HS.
Fl is removed from Dr. Frank J. Hayden
FI is added to Robert Bateman HS.
Jlis added to Robert Bateman HS.
notes:
Aldershot HS: Closes in June 2018.
Burlington Central HS: Boundary expands west to include Aldershot.
Burlington Central HS: Uilization is expected to be approximately $121 \%$ in 2020. Available space from the elementary facility.
Nelson HS: Fi students east of $A$ pplebeby Line to be redirected to Robert Batenan
Nelson HS. HStidents east of Applization Line to be redirected to Robert Bateman HS, creates two smaller programs.
Nelson HS: Utilization is expected to be at $70 \%$, by 2020 .
Robert Bateman HS: To receive students from north of the QEW.


notes con't:
Robert Bateman HS: To have a FI program, creates two smaller programs
Robert Bateman HS: Utilization to increase to $77 \%$, by 2020 .
M.M. Robinson HS: Expands to include Lester B. Pearson HS and portions of Dr. FrankJ. Hayden SS catchment. Utilization will be at $101 \%$, by 2020.
M.M. Robinson HS: Late FI added.
Lester B Pearson HS: Closes in June 2018.

Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: English and FI students south of Upper Middle Road to be redirected to Robert Bateman HS.
Dr. Frank J. Hayden ss: FI students north of Upper Middle Rd to be redirected to M.M. Robinson HS.
Dr. Frank $J$. Hayden SS: Utilization is expected to be at $109 \%$ capacity in 2020 .
IMPACTS ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Pineland d I PS: Split F F cohort between Nelson HS and Robert Bateman HS.

PS: split grade 8 cohort between Dr. FrankJ. Hayden Ss and M.M. Robinson HS.
C.H. Norton PS to have a unified grade 8 cohort. Sir E . MacMillan PS to be directed to M.M. Robinson HS.

RESULTS:
By 2020 , there will be approximately 398 available pupil places ( $93 \%$ utilization) overall; south of QEW to have 521 available spaces ( $85 \%$ utilization) and nort of the QEW will have a shortage of 123 spaces ( $105 \%$ utilization). Overall all a reduction of 1200 secondary spaces.

|  | Program | отG | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { M.M. Robinson HS } \\ \text { Grades } 9-12 \end{array}\right\|$ | eng | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | ${ }^{552}$ | 524 | 830 | 817 | 779 | 794 | 767 | 720 | 724 | 710 |
|  | Fl |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 422 | 454 | 498 | 536 | 546 | 557 | 533 | 517 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | SC-SPED |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 1342 | 1360 | 1364 | 1417 | 1400 | 1361 | 1341 | 1310 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | 5 | 13 | 17 | 70 | -53 | 14 | 6 | 37 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 100\% | 101\% | 101\% | 105\% | 104\% | 101\% | 100\% | 97\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lester B. Pearson } \\ & \text { HS } \\ & \text { Closes } 2018 \end{aligned}$ | eng | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Grades 9-12 | eng | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1299 | 1278 | 1300 | 1331 | 1291 | 1270 | 1279 | 1206 |
|  | ${ }^{\text {FI }}$ |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1299 | 1278 | 1300 | 1331 | 1291 | 1270 | 1279 | 1206 |
|  | Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | -214 | -360 | -429 | -105 | 84 | -106 | ${ }^{-137}$ | 97 | .76 | 85 | -12 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 109\% | 107\% | 109\% | 111\% | 108\% | 106\% | 107\% | 101\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 21 | 4533 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 2981 | 3006 | 3013 | 2959 | 2901 | 2913 | 2859 | 2840 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 38 | 3981 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2641 | 2638 | 2664 | 2748 | 2691 | 2631 | 2620 | 2516 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 59 | 8514 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |

Rev. Sept 6, 2016

Option 18 - Aldershot \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary/Program Change


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing two high schools, and creating 3 FI centres. Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS undergoes a program and
boundary change (a variation of scenario 16)
Issues:
Aldershot community losses its only high school.
Burlington Central HS exceeds total capacity in 2018 .
PAR will be required for the Aldershot community, and Burlington Central community.
PAR will be required for the Alde
LFI added to M.M. Robinson HS.
FI is removed from Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS.
John William Boich PS area south of Upper Middle Rd to be redirected south of the QEW for English.
Robert Bateman HS remain under 65\% capacity.
NOTES:
Aldershot HS: Closes in June 2018
urlington Central HS: Boundary expands west to include Aldershot HS catchment
Burlington Central HS: Uiliization is expected to be approximately $121 \%$ in 2020. Available space from the elementary facility.
Roberr Bateman HS: TT receive English students from north of the QEW.
Robert Bateman HS: Historic trends indicate students from


Option 18 - Aldershot \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary/Program Change

notes con't:
M.M. Robinson HS: Expands to include Lester B. Pearson HS
N.M.. Robinson HS: Expands to include Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS FI students.
M.M. Robinson HS: Late FI program added
M.M. Robinson HS: Utilization will be at $103 \%$ by 2020 .

Lester B Pearson HS: Closes in June 2018 .
Dr. Frank I. Hayden SS: English students south of Upper Middle Rd to be redirected to Robert Bateman HS.
Dr. Frank J . Hayden SS: FI students to be redirected to M.M. Robinson HS.
Dr. Frank J . Hayden SS U Utilization is expected to be at $109 \%$ capacity in 2020 .
IMPACTS ON ELEMTARY SCHOOLS
John William Boich PS: Grade 8 cohorts to be directed to three schools; D Frank J Hayden SS, Robert Bateman HS and M.M. Robinson HS
exal PS. Orchard Park PS, Charles Beaudoin PS: split trade 8 cohort between Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS and M.M. Robinson HS
Sir E. MacMillan PS to be directed to M.M. Robinson HS. C.H. Norton PS to have a unified grade 8 cohort
RESULTS:
By 2020 a, there will be approximately 398 available pupil places ( $93 \%$ utilization) overall; south of QEW 543 to have available spaces ( $85 \%$ utilization) and north
of the QEW will have a shortage of 145 spaces ( $106 \%$ utilization)
Overall all a reduction of 1200 secondary spaces.
Approximately 425 more students eligible for transportation.


Option 19 - Burlington Central HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary/Program Change


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing two high schools, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS undergoes a program and boundary change
ISSUES:
Aldershot HS exceeds Total Capacity by 2018. Space available from the elementary facility.
II program added to to Robert Bateman HS.
PAR will be require for the Aldershot and Burlington Central communities
John William Boich PS community south of Upper Middle Rd will be directed south of the QEW.
NOTES:
Aldershot HS: Boundary to expand east to Brant St.
Aldershot HS UStinization increases to $149 \%$ by 202



Robert Bateman HS: Utilization is expected to increase to t7\% by 2020 .
Robert Bateman HS: Tor eceive student from North of the ew.
M.M. Robinson HS: ENG boundary to expand to include Dr. Lester B. Pearson HS
( M.M. Robinson HS: FI Boundary to expand to in
M.M. Robinson HS: LIF program to be added.


Option 19 - Burlington Central HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary/Program Change


NOTES CON'T:
Lester B. Pearson HS: Closes in June 2018
Dr. Frank I. Hayden SS: Becomes an English-only school.
Dr. Frank. . Hayden SS: Bencomes an Engish-only school.
Dr.
IMPACTS ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Burlington Central Elem PS: Split trade 8 cohort between Aldershot HS and Nelson HS.
Pineland PS Fl: Split grade 8 cohort between Nelson HS and Robert Bateman HS.
John W. Boich PS: Split grade 8 cohort among Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS, M.M. Robinson HS and Robert Bateman HS.
C.H. Norton PS: Unified cohort.
Sir E. MacMillan PS to be directed to M.M. Robinson HS.
results
By 2020, there will be approximately 86 available pupil places overall; south of the QEW to have 209 available spaces and nor th of the QEW to have a
shortage of 123 pupil places.
Approximately 575 more students eligible for transportation.

|  | Program | отя | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M.M. Robinson HS Grade 9.12 | eng | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 830 | 817 | 779 | 794 | 767 | 720 | 724 | 710 |
|  | FI |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 422 | 454 | 498 | 536 | 546 | 557 | 533 | 517 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | sc-Sped |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 1342 | 1360 | 1364 | 1417 | 1400 | 1361 | 1341 | 1310 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | 5 | 13 | ${ }^{-17}$ | -70 | -53 | 14 | 6 | 37 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 100\% | 101\% | 101\% | 105\% | 104\% | 101\% | 100\% | 97\% |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Lester B. Pearson } \\ \text { HS } \\ \text { Closes 2018 } \end{array}$ | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | 344 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1299 | 1278 | 1300 | 1331 | 1291 | 1270 | 1279 | 1206 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1299 | 1278 | 1300 | 1331 | 1291 | 1270 | 1279 | 1206 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 214 | -360 | 429 | 105 | 84 | 106 | 137 | 97 | -76 | .85 | -12 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 109\% | 107\% | 109\% | 111\% | 108\% | 106\% | 107\% | 101\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 21 | 4533 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 2981 | 3006 | 3013 | 2959 | 2901 | 2913 | 2859 | 2840 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 38 | 3981 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2641 | 2638 | 2664 | 2748 | 2691 | 2631 | 2620 | 2516 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 59 | 8514 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 5622 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |

Option 19 - Burlington Central HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary/Program Change


RATIONALE: To present the impacts of closing two high schools, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS undergoes a program and boundary change.
Issues:
Aldershot HS exceeds Total Capacity by 2018. Space available from the elementary facility.
IFI program added to M.M. Robinson HS,
PAR will be require for the Aldershot and Burlington Central communities
John William Boich PS community south of Upper Middle Rd will be directed south of the QEW
nотеS:
Aldershot HS: Boundary to expand east to Brant St.
Aldershot HS: Utiization increases to $149 \%$ by 2020 .
Burlington Central HS: Closes
Nelson HS: Boundary is to be expanded west to Brant Stre

Nelson HS: Enrolments expected to decline to $87 \%$, by 2020 .
Robert
Roateman HS: FI program added. To include students east of Apleby Line and south of Upper Middle Rd.

Robert Bateman HS: To receive studdents from North of the QEW.
M.M. Robinson HS: ENG boundary to expand to include Dr. Lester B. Pearson HS.
M.M. Robinson HS: ENG boundary to expand to include Dr. Lester B. Pearson HS,
M.M. Robinson HS:
:IIboundary to expand to include Dr. Frank $J$. Hayden SS.


Option 19 - Burlington Central HS \& Lester B. Pearson HS Closes, Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Boundary/Program Change


NOTES CON'T:
Lester B. Pearson HS: Closes in June 2018
mes an English-only school.
Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS: English boundary to shift north of Upper Middle Rd. Become an English only school.
IMPACTS ON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Burlington Central Elem PS: Split grade 8 cohort between Aldershot HS and Nelson HS.
Pineland PS FI: Split grade 8 cohort between Nelson HS and Robert Bateman HS.
John W. Boich PS: Split grade 8 cohort among Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS, M.M. Robinson HS and Robert Bateman HS.
C.H. Norton PS: Unified cohort.
Sir E. MacMillan PS to be directed to M.M. Robinson HS.

Results
By 2020, there will be approximately 86 available pupil places overall; south of the QEW to have 209 available spaces and nor th of the QEW to have a
shortage of 123 pupil places.
Overall a reduction of 1512 secondary pupil places.
Approximately 575 more students eligible for transportation.

|  | Program | отG | Port | Total | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M.M. Robinson HSGrades $9-12$ | ENG | 1347 | 12 | 1599 | 593 | 552 | 524 | 830 | 817 | 779 | 794 | 767 | 720 | 724 | 710 |
|  | F1 |  |  |  | 110 | 119 | 97 | 422 | 454 | 498 | 536 | 546 | 557 | 533 | 517 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 59 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 |
|  | sc-Sped |  |  |  | 27 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 730 | 701 | 651 | 1342 | 1360 | 1364 | 1417 | 1400 | 1361 | 1341 | 1310 |
|  | Available / Shortage of Pupil Places |  |  |  | 617 | 646 | 696 | 5 | 13 | -17 | -70 | -53 | 14 | 6 | 37 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 54\% | 52\% | 48\% | 100\% | 101\% | 101\% | 105\% | 104\% | 101\% | 100\% | 97\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lester B. Pearson } \\ & \text { HS } \\ & \text { Closes } 2018 \end{aligned}$ | ENG | 642 | 14 | 936 | 357 | 345 | ${ }^{344}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | LFI |  |  |  | 59 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 416 | 397 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 226 | 245 | 247 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 65\% | 62\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Dr. Frank J. Hayden SS Grades 9-12 | ENG | 1194 | 12 | 1446 | 1208 | 1312 | 1350 | 1299 | 1278 | 1300 | 1331 | 1291 | 1270 | 1279 | 1206 |
|  | ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  |  |  | 200 | 242 | 273 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  |  |  | 1408 | 1554 | 1623 | 1299 | 1278 | 1300 | 1331 | 1291 | 1270 | 1279 | 1206 |
|  | Available Pupil Places |  |  |  | 214 | -360 | -429 | -105 | 84 | ${ }_{-106}$ | 137 | -97 | -76 | -85 | 12 |
|  | Percent Utilization |  |  |  | 118\% | 130\% | 136\% | 109\% | 107\% | 109\% | 111\% | 108\% | 106\% | 107\% | 101\% |
| South of QEW Total |  | 4092 | 21 | 4533 | 2828 | 2804 | 2858 | 2981 | 3006 | 3013 | 2959 | 2901 | 2913 | 2859 | 2840 |
| North of QEW Total |  | 3183 | 38 | 3981 | 2554 | 2652 | 2669 | 2641 | 2638 | 2664 | 2748 | 2691 | 2631 | 2620 | 2516 |
| Study Total |  | 7275 | 59 | 8514 | 5382 | 5456 | 5527 | 562 | 5644 | 5677 | 5707 | 5592 | 5544 | 5479 | 5356 |

## DRAFT

## Appendix 7 - Program and Accommodation Review Consultation Plan

| Date* | Action |
| :--- | :--- |
| October 5, 2016 | Director's Preliminary Report To Board of Trustees For Information |
| October 19, 2016 | Director's Preliminary Report to Board of Trustees For Decision |
| December 1, 2016 | PARC Establish and Orientation Session |
| December 8, 2016 | Public Meeting \#1 |
| January 26, 2017 | PARC Working Meeting \#1 |
| February 2, 2017 | PARC Working Meeting \#2 |
| February 9, 2017 | PARC Working Meeting \#3 |
| February 16 \& 23, 2017 | Additional PARC Working Meeting(s) (as required) |
| March 2, 2017 | Public Meeting \#2 |
| March 23, 2017 | PARC Working Meeting \#4 |
| March 29, 2017 | Director's Report with compiled feedback to Committee of the Whole |
| April 18, 2017 | Public Delegation Night |
| May 3, 2017 | Report to Board of Trustees for Information |
| May 17, 2017 | Report to Board of Trustees for Decision |

- Meeting times and locations to be established and posted on the website www.hdsb.ca. Dates may change based on inclement weather or extenuating circumstances.


# SMALL VERSUS LARGE SECONDARY SCHOOLS: a comparison 

## PRESENTATION TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE SEPT 28, 2016

## Introduction

- Halton secondary schools currently range in size from 390-1986 students
- factors related to size impact students and staff in both small and large schools

- Ponder: Is there such a thing as too small? Or too big?



## Introduction

- There is no Ministry or Board definition for small or large schools
- For our purposes, small = enrolment < 600
- Large schools = enrollment >1000
- Data from HDSB schools were used to consider the following areas:

| Course Variety | Early Leavers |
| :--- | :--- |
| Scheduling/Conflicts | Graduation Rates |
| Shared Students | Teacher Specialization |
| E-learning/On-line courses | Extra Curricular Participation |
| Service Areas | Other Factors |

## Lens to use:

Student
Achievement

## Average Secondary School Size in HDSB By Region

| Region | Average Secondary <br> School Size |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Halton Hills $(\mathrm{T}=2)$ | 1015 |
| Oakville $\quad(\mathrm{T}=6)$ | 1350 |
| Milton $\quad(\mathrm{T}=2)$ | 1267 |
| Burlington $\quad(\mathrm{T}=7)$ | 781 |

## Course Variety

- Students require 18 compulsory \& 12 optional credits to graduate.
- Grade 9 program does not vary substantially across all schools within our system.
- A variety of course types/pathways support different learner profiles, interests and post secondary pathways
- There is more variety of courses in grades 10-12

> PHYSICS ECONOMICS
> MUSIC HOSANUFACTURAMA NATIVE STUDIESALITY COMING TECH

## Course Variety

- Larger schools are able to offer a larger variety of courses, course types and pathways
- Small schools offer between 100 120 courses
- Larger schools typically offer 135+ courses
- Variety means more optional area courses e.g. Technology, Arts, Social Science and Humanities, SHSMs, etc...

STORY: One HDSB
school offers Drama
Performance, Drama
Production, Dance, Digital Photography,
Business Leadership, World Cultures and Communities, Geomatics,
Philosophy, Spanish, Landscape Architecture, Hair Styling, Autobody + much more

## Scheduling and Timetable Conflicts

- A timetable conflict occurs when a student's schedule is built and they are unable to get all of the courses they requested
- This occurs when two courses a student requests are only available in the same semester and period
- This occurs often where a student selects two courses that each have only one class assigned (single section courses) and both

Approx. 40\% of students in small schools experience one or more conflicts vs ${ }^{20 \%}$ in larger schools are scheduled in the same period same semester

## Scheduling and Timetable Conflicts

- Example:

Small school, common lunch, grade 10 cohort of 100 students, 4 classes of 25 students run in each period. For compulsory courses there is likely only 1 Applied course section for each of Science, History, English and Math. All grade 10 students take Civics/Careers. Assume about 8 optional area courses to choose from (Art, Music, Drama, Auto, Construction, Business, PhysEd, French)

## Scheduling and Timetable Conflicts

| Per | Semester 1 | Semester 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Applied English | Applied History |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Applied Science | Applied Math |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Lunch | Lunch |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | X | Civics/Careers |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | X | X |

STORY:
Single Section
Courses

- After the compulsory courses (Applied English, Science, History and Math) have been scheduled, only 4 periods available to schedule the 8 optional area courses and Civics/Careers " Conflicts"


## Scheduling and Timetable Conflicts

- Classes are more likely to be cancelled in small schools due to insufficient enrolment



## "Shared" Students

- A student is a shared student when they are registered in more than one school ie: they are shared between two schools

- Students will register for courses at another school when a course they require is not available in their home school
- Students in small schools are three times as likely to be a "shared" student than students in large schools ( $12 \%$ in small schools vs 4\% in large schools)


## "Shared" Students

## -Implications:

-Travel between schools and travel to/from home
-Scheduling challenges between shared schools
-E-Learning may be only option because of
flexibility but may not be a student's preference
-Can interfere with ability to participate in extra curriculars

```
STORY:
Jazmin wants to be a nurse,
she needs 2 of 3 grade 12
Sciences. She also needs
Kinesiology which conflicts with
her French. She takes a bus
every afternoon to another high
school. Because this can only
occur in the afternoon, she is
unable to play her desired sport.
```


## On-line Courses

- E-learning is a valuable alternative available in all schools
- Many students choose on-line courses because it suits their learning style and interests
- Students sometimes choose on-line courses because the course they are choosing is not available in their home school
- Students in small schools are much more likely to take an on-line course (25-30\%) as in a large school (8-12\%)


## Service Areas

- Service areas are non classroom areas e.g. Guidance, Special Education and Library
- Staffing is provided to schools to ensure that these areas are kept "open" and available to students over several periods a day
- Most schools will try to have their Special Education Resource Room, The Guidance Office and the Library open and available to students all periods of the day


## Service Areas

On a per pupil basis,

- Special Education Staffing in small schools is 1.4 times richer than in larger schools
- Guidance staffing in smaller schools is 1.4 times richer than in larger schools
- Library staffing in smaller schools is 2.3 times richer than in larger schools



## Service Areas

- There are definite efficiencies of scale in larger schools
- Staffing our 3 smallest schools at a lower ratio is requiring a minimum of 8 additional sections per school above the staffing ratio of larger schools with enrollments of 1000-1200. This comes at an average cost to the Board of $\$ 120,000$ per small school


## Early Leavers

- A student in considered an early leaver when they leave a school prior to graduation and do not register in another school (inside or outside our Board)
- The numbers of Early Leaver across the board is gradually declining each year
- In 2014/15, there were three times the number of early leavers in our small schools compared to our large schools



## Graduation Rates

- Larger percentage of early leavers in small schools will contribute to decreased graduation rates
- Also, more students on a per capita basis stay for a $5^{\text {th }}$ year in smaller schools
- This may be attributed to not being able to "fit" their desired courses in their first 4 years of school
- Results in a significantly lower graduation rate after 4 years in small schools (average $=82.5 \%$ vs $87 \%$ in larger schools)


## Teacher Subject Specialization

- greater specialization in larger schools for senior courses
- Less specialization in a smaller schools



## Extra Curricular Participation

- Larger schools may offer a greater number and more variety of activities because they have more staff with the interest and skill - more opportunities for students
- Smaller schools have fewer extra-curricular activities, but students may be more likely to be able to make school teams because of the smaller student numbers


## Extra Curricular Participation

Stories:


## Other Factors

-Teacher preps: increase substantially in small schools
-Staff collaboration opportunities: may be reduced in smaller schools
ie., Music teacher = Physics teacher
-Relationships: may be stronger in smaller schools as staff and students may know each better
-Cohort Effects - in smaller schools, students are in many classes with the same group of students

