

Accommodation Review and
Establishment of Accommodation
Review Committee - Central Whitby

1 of 11

David Visser, Superintendent of Education/Facilities
Services
Martyn Beckett, Director of Education

1. Purpose

To provide the Board, for Trustee approval, a report reviewing school accommodation and the establishment of an Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) providing an integrated accommodation solution in central Whitby, in accordance with the Board's approved Policy and Procedure #7113 - Pupil Accommodation Review, attached as Appendix A.

2. Background

2.1 The Ministry of Education's Capital Funding Model has evolved over the past 10 plus years. The following outlines Ministry funding from the past, as identified in the Capital Funding Models report submitted for information at the October 15, 2007 Board meeting. This information helps with the explanation of the need for a school accommodation review in central Whitby and the establishment of an Accommodation Review Committee.

2.2 Prior to 1998, school boards were required to submit to the Ministry of Education, Capital Expenditure Forecasts (CEF) which outlined the need for new schools and additions. The Ministry would review the needs of Boards on a province-wide basis, and approve individual Board capital projects based on the provincial budget available.

2.3 In 1998, a new student-focussed funding model was introduced. With this model, all schools across the Province were assessed by the Ministry of Education to determine the recognized permanent capacity (the number of student spaces in a school) for each school. Boards were given annual New Pupil Place Grants based on the difference between pupil enrolment and the permanent capacity. The avenues for Boards to increase funding were to have an increase in enrolment, or to have a decrease in capacity from 1998-99 to 2004-05. With this funding model communities did not necessarily directly benefit from a new school in their community. Boards

2. Background (Continued)

2.3 continued

could close a school in one community, and use the funding anywhere within their jurisdiction to construct a new school.

2.4 Since 2004, the Ministry's funding announcements related to Capital Plans have been segmented and have also evolved over time. Three avenues of compartmentalized funding are currently available to finance only portions of Board Capital Plans related to new construction (new schools or additions). They are described as follows:

- (i) New Schools Funding - A grant for new schools and additions where an Education Development Charge (EDC) by-law is in place, and where boards' New Pupil Place funds are insufficient to finance the project. The average enrolment for any proposed school boundary for the first ten-year period, after the first year of operation of the new school, must be at least 80% of the new school's capacity. Boards are required to submit Business Cases to outline how each proposed school or addition qualifies for the funding. The financing is available pending Ministry approval for projects to be completed in 2007/08, 2008/09 or 2009/10. Recently, the DDSB received New Schools funding for five Business Cases that were before the Ministry for approval.

The new schools receiving 2008/09 and 2009/10 Ministry Funding approval are as follows:

- Unnamed Tormina Woodlands PS (Brooklin) *[capacity 511.5]*
- Unnamed Olde Winchester PS (Brooklin) *[capacity 535]*
Unamed Hamlet PS (Ajax) *[capacity 556]*
- Unnamed Meadows of Ajax PS (Ajax) *[capacity 535]*
- Unnamed Whitby Shores (Whitby) *[capacity 443]*

Further information regarding the announcements can be found on the Board's Website.

2. Background (Continued)

2.4 continued

(ii) Primary Class Size (PCS) Funding - Granted to Boards to accommodate the Ministry's requirement for smaller pupil-teacher ratios in the primary grades. The funding must be used to address capital costs related to PCS accommodation. The funding is specific to each Board's need based on capacity and enrolment in primary grades. This is a 'one-time' funding from which the Board has already approved the construction of 17 additions to various schools within the system. As of the end of April, 2008, sketch plan approval has been received for 14 of the projects. The remaining 3 projects will be brought forward for approval in the near future. A complete list of PCS additions can be found on the Board's Website.

(iii) Prohibitive to Repair (PTR) Funding - Related to schools with costly renewal needs. The following factors were considered in determining a PTR school:

- The amount of renewal needs identified in the Ministry's RECAPP analysis of 2002/2003. RECAPP is defined as data consisting of renewal needs, priorities, and the cost of repairs for every school.
- Updated facility information since 2003.
- Alternatives for accommodation of the students currently attending the school.

The needs of all boards are being considered province-wide, by the Ministry of Education.

2.5 In 2005, the Ministry announced that the closure of a school and the subsequent offer of the closed school, at no cost to the co-terminous boards and the Province, would no longer result in a decrease in the permanent capacity. As a result, boards were no longer able to increase Grants for New Pupil Places by closing schools or manage decreasing funding resulting from enrolment declines. The Board was invited to submit plans for all capital needs to the Ministry. Durham District School Board (DDSB) staff has worked with Watson & Associates

2. Background (Continued)

2.5 continued

(economists) since 2006 to develop a Capital Plan which included new schools, closures, consolidations, rebuilds, etc. This accommodation plan is evolving as details in the funding models and processes are received by School Boards. Although Business Cases have been submitted, a multiple year accommodation plan is being compiled. This plan will be available during 2008.

2.6 RECAPP data was reviewed for every school in the system (and province-wide). All schools assessed were assigned a Facility Condition Index (FCI). This is the dollar value of repair work needed in each school, as calculated within the RECAPP system, divided by the replacement value for the school. The replacement value is calculated by two separate methods, the first using the capacity or number of student spaces in a school and the second using the gross floor area of a school.

2.7 The RECAPP analysis identified these DDSB central Whitby schools in need of significant repair:

	<u>FCI Previous</u>	<u>FCI Current</u>	<u>FCI Future*</u>
Florence M. Heard Public School	73.96%	88.48%	91.47%
Leslie McFarlane Public School	75.77%	86.53%	113.52%
Palmerston Avenue Public School	65.65%	77.13%	99.82%

*Future identified as the year 2013.

2.8 The DDSB has prepared a Business Case with the goal to provide the Staff and Students with the possibility to improve the educational opportunity currently located at the three schools identified above. It is proposed that this opportunity for improvement is provided through a combination of new construction (new school and an addition) as well as the transfer of students located at the older buildings previously identified, to more recently constructed buildings. Through the RECAPP data, significant repairs were identified in these facilities. These schools also lack accessibility, and specialized classroom space such as science, art and music rooms.

2. Background (Continued)

2.9 In order for boards across the Province to consider a closure/consolidation, an Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) process, as outlined in the Board's Policy and Procedure #7113 - Pupil Accommodation Review, which is attached as Appendix A, must be initiated. This policy and procedure was created in accordance with the Ministry's Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines for any closures.

2.10 In order for the Board to maximize the accommodations best suited to benefit the greatest number of students in central Whitby, three additional schools were included in the Central Whitby Business Case. Along with the three PTR candidate schools for review, the following schools are included within the Accommodation Review for consideration as enrolment and program moves:

- Captain Michael VandenBos Public School
- Jack Miner Public School
- Pringle Creek Public School

More details regarding the program and boundary changes proposed in the Business Case, as submitted to the Ministry, are attached as Appendix B.

2.11 Consistent with Ministry Guidelines, a Standard School Valuation Framework (SSVF) was created by a Committee of parents, educators, Board officials and municipal and business leaders, and was approved at the March 17, 2008 Board meeting. The framework uses the four principles set out in the Board's Policy and Procedure #7113 and identifies the percentage points assigned to each principle. These principles will be used in the analysis of the six Whitby schools as identified in the PTR Business Case, as noted below, along with their assigned scores:

Value to the student	- 50 points
Value to the community	- 10 points
Value to the school board	- 30 points
Value to the local economy	- 10 points

3. Analysis

- 3.1 The first step in the Board's proposed Business Case is the initiation of an Accommodation Review Process, as outlined in the Board's Policy and Procedure #7113. This process, in accordance with Ministry Guidelines, has not been put into practice by many boards. At this time, several boards have begun or are about to begin Accommodation Reviews. Two boards have completed the actual Accommodation Review process and are now examining the Accommodation Review Committees' recommendations - these boards are Halton District School Board and Durham Catholic District School Board.
- 3.2 Consistent with the Board's Policy and Procedure #7113, an Accommodation Review process requires an Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) to analyze the six central Whitby schools identified in the Board's Business Case.
- 3.3 As part of its mandate, the ARC is to customize the Board's Standard School Valuation Framework (SSVF), as noted in Section 2.11 of this report. In the Board's Policy and Procedure #7113, Section 3.7 - the ARC shall customize the Board's SSVF in order to ensure that it is relevant to the schools under review and has regard to local issues and concerns. Each member of the ARC will then complete a school valuation report for each school reviewed using the customized SSVF.
- 3.4 The Accommodation Review process will consist of ARC Working Meetings in which the ARC will prepare materials to be presented to the local community in a series of four public meetings. The process that the Committee will undertake is a lengthy, consultative and detailed process. Information supplied to the ARC will be posted on the DDSB's Website, under the Student Accommodation Updates link found on the main page. This information will also be made available to the general public in printed form. Information provided to the ARC will include, but not be limited to the following, and will be updated on a continuous basis:
- DDSB Policy on School Closures
 - DDSB Procedures, Pupil Accommodation Review
 - Ministry Guidelines, Pupil Accommodation School Review
 - Standard School Valuation Framework

3. Analysis (Continued)

3.4 continued

- Core and Enhanced Programs (each school)
- Transportation (each school)
- Maintenance (each school)
- Capital Improvements (each school)
- Accommodation Options (existing Business Case and other options)
- Site information

This is a collaborative process with the ARC members having the opportunity to review data, make suggestions, as well as request additional information. Through their analysis, other alternative accommodations may be proposed by the ARC for the six schools under review.

3.5 As outlined in the Board's Policy and Procedure #7113, a timeline has been established to provide a reasonable amount of time for the review of information for the ARC process. The following outlines the proposed meeting schedule format with specific dates listed in Appendix C, as attached:

- Tour of all six schools
- Four Public Meetings
- Fourteen ARC Working Committee Meetings

3.6 The ARC will afford the public/stakeholders with multiple avenues for input as well as asking questions. The avenues are as follows:

- All public will be permitted to attend the 4 public meetings to receive and provide feedback.
- All public/stakeholders will be permitted to attend the 14 ARC working meetings as observers. At breaks during these meetings, as well as through the ARC email and voice mail, the public/stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide and receive information.
- At the 4 public meetings as well as the 14 ARC working group meetings, minutes will be taken and posted on the Board's Website.

3. Analysis (Continued)

3.6 continued

- It is anticipated that ARC updates will be provided at the ongoing school SCC meetings. This would provide a further opportunity for the ARC members to provide and receive feedback.
- During the ARC process, staff will provide Trustees with periodic updates as to the stage of the process the ARC has accomplished.

3.7 The first ARC working meeting will be scheduled for June 25, 2008. This timing will permit the Board to supply the ARC with a background information package in preparation for the Accommodation Review. The ARC members are anticipated to review this compilation of information during the summer months. Following their review, the ARC members will commence with the scheduled series of meetings from September 2008 to February 2009.

3.8 The ARC will be made up of various community members and could potentially consist of up to 34 individuals including a Chair and Co-Chair. As outlined in the Ministry Guidelines and in conjunction with the Board's Policy and Procedure #7113 the following persons will be invited to participate as a member of the ARC:

- One representative from the Town of Whitby (Mayor or delegate)
- One business representative
- The principal from each of the six schools
- One teacher delegate from each of the six schools
- One non-teacher delegate (i.e. custodian, secretary, educational assistant) from each of the six schools
- Up to two parents (i.e. School Community Council Members) selected by the principal for each of the six schools
- Durham District School Board officials

3. Analysis (Continued)

3.8 continued

Letters of invitation to potential members (with the exception of Board staff) will be sent out via courier and will require a signature upon receipt. A draft of the letter is attached as Appendix D and will require a written response indicating acceptance and the name of the representative or indicating that there is no interest in participating. A meeting schedule will be enclosed with the letter.

- 3.9 Once the ARC has reviewed and analyzed all of the data presented on the six central Whitby schools, each member of the ARC will take their acquired information and will complete a customized School Valuation Framework (SVF) for all six central Whitby schools. This customized SVF, which is based on a scoring system, will be used by the ARC to determine, among other things, proposed school accommodation and school closure options which may be consistent with the Business Case or identify other alternatives. At the end of the process, the ARC will submit to the Director of Education its final school valuation report including recommendations concerning the accommodation option and/or closures relating to the six schools.

It must be highlighted that the ARC process is an extremely collaborative and open process. Any and all readily available information will be shared with this Committee in order that it can formulate its recommendation to the Board of Trustees in February/March 2009. It must be noted that the ARC has the mandate to make recommendations that concur with the Board's Business Case in whole or in part, as well as the possibility of considering other alternatives entirely.

- 3.10 At this stage of the process, Board staff will review and analyze the ARC's final School Valuation Report, as outlined in Section 6.1 of the Board's Policy and Procedure #7113. A staff report would then be provided to the Board of Trustees detailing the findings and recommendations of the ARC's School Valuation Report. The report will include a Board staff analysis and recommendations regarding the six central Whitby schools under review. Given the timelines identified in the

3. Analysis (Continued)

3.10 continued

schedule attached as Appendix C, this report would come forward to Board in March 2009. This meeting is intended for information purposes only. Staff and parents of students at the affected schools, along with the Whitby Clerk and all trustees, will be notified of this meeting via written correspondence. The Board meeting will also be advertised in the local newspaper and listed on the Board's Website.

3.11 Once the Board has had the opportunity to evaluate the ARC's report, a second Board meeting, scheduled for May 2009, will be held. Notice of this meeting will follow the same procedure as the March 2009 Board meeting as noted in Section 3.10 of this report. At this meeting, the Board will vote on recommendations related to the Accommodation Review.

4. Recommendations

1. That, the Durham District School Board, approve the establishment of a Pupil Accommodation Review for central Whitby.
2. That, the Durham District School Board, approve the establishment of an Accommodation Review Committee for central Whitby.
3. That, the Durham District School Board, approve the mandate of the Accommodation Review Committee as requiring the Committee to review and make recommendations concerning the central Whitby school accommodation options including school closures and that the Accommodation Review Committee's report and recommendations on the accommodation options be submitted to the Director of Education.
4.
 - a) That, the Durham District School Board approve the Accommodation Review of Pringle Creek Public School
 - b) That, the Durham District School Board approve the Accommodation Review of Leslie McFarlane Public School

4. Recommendations (Continued)

4.4 continued

- c) That, the Durham District School Board approve the Accommodation Review of Florence M. Heard Public School
- d) That, the Durham District School Board approve the Accommodation Review of Captain Michael VandenBos Public School
- e) That, the Durham District School Board approve the Accommodation Review of Jack Miner Public School
- f) That, the Durham District School Board approve the Accommodation Review of Palmerston Avenue Public School

Report was reviewed and submitted by:

David Visser, Superintendent of Education/Facilities Services

Martyn Beckett, Director of Education

Appendix A - Durham District School Board's Policy and Procedure #7113

Appendix B - Central Whitby PTR Business Case Summary

Appendix C - Proposed Public Consultation/Accommodation Review Committee Meeting Schedule

Appendix D - Letter of Invitation to Potential ARC Members