

West Kitchener Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

A meeting of the Accommodation Review Committee was held on November 27, 2008 at 6:00 p.m. at Monsignor Gleason Catholic Elementary School.

Present: **Committee Members:**

Lois Peterson (Principal - Monsignor Gleason), Pam Garbutt (Principal - St. John), Pat Runstedler (Vice Principal - St. Dominic Savio), Brian Goodyear (Principal - St Paul), Gerry Clifford (Superintendent – Chair), Marion Thomson Howell (Trustee), Dave Bennett (Senior Manager of Capital Planning), Paul Laurie (Parent - Monsignor Gleason), Marie Bishop (Parent - St. Dominic), Michelle Bedic (Parent – St. Mark), Katherine Flitton (Parent – St. Mark), Marilyn Hughes (Parent - St. Paul), Teresa Rafferty-Parker (Parent – St. John), Cynthia Ehrlich (Parent - St. John).

Staff Support:

Lindsay Reinhardt (Planner)
Shuyu Zhou (Planner & recording secretary)

Regrets: John Shewchuk (Senior Manager of Public Affairs), Manuel da Silva (Trustee), Kendra Duench (Principal - St. Mark), Principal of St Dominic Susan Hunt is represented by Pat Runstedler.

Next Meeting: December 3, 2008 at St. Paul Elementary School

1. Welcome, Introductions and Opening Prayer:

The meeting opened at 6:15 p.m. with a prayer led by Lois Peterson. Gerry Clifford thanked Lois Peterson & Monsignor Gleason for hosting the meeting.

2. Scoring the Valuation Framework

This meeting is the continuation of the November 19 ARC meeting for scoring the Valuation Framework. Lindsay explained the process the ARC was using to assign scores for each school since some ARC members were not present at the last meeting. The ARC continued to assign scores to each school for each sub-category.

Value to Student (Scores from the November 19 ARC meeting are grey)

Sub-category	Weight	Monsignor Gleason	St Dominic	St John	St Mark	St Paul	Rationale
Supports	5	3	3	3	3	3	Schools scored equally since the number of staff is relative to enrolment.
Range of Course/Program Offerings	3	4	4	3	5	5	Difficult to attract any new volunteers over past 4 years at St John.
Proximity to External Teaching Resources	2	3	3	5	3	3	St John is within walking distance of a lot of resources since it is located near the downtown.

Student Academic Outcomes	3	3	3	3	3	3	Based on EQAO only. There are many different factors that affect test scores and scores are not a reflection of the quality of education at the school.
Quality of the Learning Environment	4	2	5	1	4	3	Students have to move from the top floors at St. John to the basement when it's hot. There are many noise distractions at the school. Monsignor Gleason has no natural light in many classrooms and also has some noise distractions.
Adequacy of Internal Physical Space to Support Learning & Development	4	3	5	3	4	1	St Paul's gym is too small. St. John's gym is not in good condition. Monsignor Gleason has open concept classrooms.
Accessibility	5	2	4	1	3	3	St Dominic is outstanding however their playground is sloped. St John is not accessible in any way. At Monsignor Gleason, as person in a wheelchair has to travel through the gym to get to the second floor.
Adequacy of External Physical Space to Support Learning & Development	3	4	4	2	4	5	St Paul has huge yard with a park adjacent to the school. St John's outdoor space is less than board average. If the school was full it would be problematic.
Extracurricular Activities	3	3	3	4	3	3	All five schools have similar extracurricular activities except St John also has the Virtual YMCA.
Safety	5	2	3	2	3	4	Sight lines at St. John are obstructed by the building, causing supervision issues. Monsignor Gleason & St. John have potentially 'hazardous' land uses adjacent – these have not been a problem during school hours.
Proximity to Students	4	1	3	5	4	2	St John has no bussing. St. Dominic & Monsignor Gleason have students that are bussed due to the railway tracks. St. Paul has a separate bussed area.
Interaction between the School and Parish	5	3	3	4	3	3	St John school is beside the parish. All schools have similar interaction with the parish.
Total		33	43	36	42	38	
Weighted Score		24.4	33	26.4	31.8	28.6	

Principals interpreted the extra-curricular activity section differently when completing the information. Some principals listed the activities the students participated in to raise money and some principals listed the charities for which they raised money. The ARC suggested that clarification be provided to the principals for how to complete the extracurricular activity section.

Value to the Board

ARC members questioned why projections were decreasing in older areas when they felt that as older people move out of the area they would be replaced by younger families. This is a common perception but has proved to be untrue. Older neighbourhoods have a much lower ppu (persons per unit) compared to 10 years ago for example. It has been the board's experience that young families move into the suburbs where there are many amenities and other young families. There tends to be empty nesters or families with no children moving into older areas.

Sub-category	Weight	Monsignor Gleason	St Dominic	St John	St Mark	St Paul	Rationale
Enrolment Factors	5	4	5	1	3	3	St Dominic is over capacity and has high student yields. St John's has low utilization and has low student yields. Monsignor Gleason has a high utilization.
Availability of Specialized Teaching Spaces	3	3	5	2	3	3	St Dominic has purpose-built meeting rooms and specialized spaces.
Adequacy of the Site	4	3	4	2	2	4	St Mark's topography limits possible additions or portables. It does not have a bus drop off and the parking lot is small. St John has very little frontage, no ability to accommodate portables and no bus drop off.
Cost to Operate	5	1	4	2	4	3	Monsignor Gleason has a high cost to operate on a per pupil basis. St John has no bussing or portable costs.
Long Term Capital/Renewal Costs	5	2	5	1	3	3	St Dominic is a new school with little repairs needed. St John has high renewal costs.
Total		13	23	8	15	16	
Weighted Score		11.2	20.2	6.8	13.4	14	

The Long Term Capital/Renewal Costs section contains information from ReCAPP, which is a database used by the board to manage renewal needs at all schools over the next 25 years. It is populated based on life cycles of various items and many not entirely representative of the actual needs of each school. The Facility Services department was asked to update the list of projects and their associated costs for each of the five schools. There is an engineering report being prepared for St. John as well. However, these numbers have yet to be finalized. The costs provided to the ARC for the purpose of scoring included only information listed in ReCAPP. It was felt that these numbers were reflective of the five schools in terms of how they compare to one another. Updated costs will be provided to the ARC at a later date and the ARC will then have the opportunity to revise the scoring to reflect the new information.

Value to the Community

Sub-category	Weight	Monsignor Gleason	St Dominic	St John	St Mark	St Paul	Rationale
Facility for Community Use	4	4	5	3	4	3	All schools are rented but St Dominic has high number of hours of use.

School Grounds as a Green Space and/or Available Recreation Use	4	3	3	3	3	3	All school grounds are used by the neighbourhood.
School as a Partner in other Government Initiatives	3	3	3	4	3	3	St John has the Virtual YMCA program
Range of Program Offerings that Serve both Students and Community Members	3	4	3	5	3	3	St John is used by the Polish School on weekends, which has a large student population.
Total		14	14	15	13	12	
Weighted Score		9.8	10	10.2	9.2	8.4	

Value to the Local Economy

Sub-category	Weight	Monsignor Gleason	St Dominic	St John	St Mark	St Paul	Rationale
Availability of Training Opportunities or Partnerships with Business	3	3	3	3	3	3	Elementary schools have very little economic significance.
Other Potential Impacts of a Closure	2	3	3	3	3	3	There would be no significant impact on the economy if these schools closed.
Total		6	6	6	6	6	
Weighted Score		3	3	3	3	3	

	Monsignor Gleason	St Dominic	St John	St Mark	St Paul
Total School Score (out of 100)	56.7	74.5	55.4	65.9	61.8

3. Next Steps

The meeting on December 3 2008 will be used to review the completed scoring of valuation frameworks and to discuss the next steps for valuation frameworks. The information in the valuation frameworks will be used to generate a report. This report will be reviewed at the January meeting. Meeting dates for the New Year will be determined so ARC members were asked to bring their calendars. A design charrette will be used to develop accommodation scenarios/options at the December 3rd meeting. Following the design charrette, planning staff will take the options that have been developed by the ARC had analyze them in terms of enrolment. This information will be brought back to the ARC in January.

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:30p.m.