

**ORILLIA PUPIL ACCOMMODATION REVIEW
COMMITTEE (PAC)
2008/2009**

School Valuation Report

And

Recommendations to the Director of Education

May 20, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Topic	Page
Executive Summary	3
Process Framework for PAC Performance.....	3
Lessons Learned.....	4
Conclusion.....	4
 1. Introduction	 6
Purpose.....	6
 2. Process	 7
Ministry of Education Policy Background.....	8
SMCDSB Policy Highlights.....	8
 3. PAC Membership	 9
Pupil Accommodation Review Committee.....	10
Mandate of the Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (PAC).....	11
 4. School Valuation Framework	 12
 5. Alternate Accommodation Options	 13
i) Options Considered by the PAC.....	13
ii) Options Presented at Public Meeting #3 on March 26, 2009.....	14
iii) Benefits and Limitations.....	15
 6. PAC Recommendation	 18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 5, 2008, the Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board approved the formation of a Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (PAC) for the following Orillia Area Elementary Schools: Monsignor Lee Catholic School (MLE), Guardian Angels School (GAN), Foley Catholic School (FOL), Notre Dame Catholic School (NOD) and St. Bernard's School (SBE).

The committee was responsible for completing a customized School Valuation Framework Report (SVF), as outlined by the Ministry of Education guidelines for each of the elementary schools under review. Throughout the pupil accommodation review process, the PAC reviewed a variety of information, including boundary maps, reports showing current and future enrolment and financial impacts of each of the scenarios presented. The Facility Condition Reports were presented and copies of these reports were available for review. The PAC studied and analyzed the data within these reports with respect to the Orillia Area group of schools, emphasizing the value to the student.

The PAC had the opportunity to visit all the school sites involved in the review to enhance their understanding of each of the school communities (especially the three facilities identified as Prohibitive to Repair [PTR], MLE, SBE, and GAN). Four public meetings were held in four different schools to present information and gather input from the community. This community feedback was taken into consideration when the committee formed the draft recommendations.

Process Framework for PAC Performance

- PAC members understood their mandate to be a strong advocate for their school community while considering the long term impacts for Catholic education for all students in the Orillia area.
- PAC members had to think about and describe their school communities as they are now (SVF) and what needs to happen to continue offering Catholic education to students in the Pupil Accommodation review.
- It was agreed that the PAC would operate on a consensus decision-making model. If consensus could not be reached on a final recommendation, the committee would identify the options recommended and the level of support for each.
- Timelines were established and meeting lengths were clearly identified. Every effort was made to adhere to this structure in order to respect the time commitment of PAC members.

Rooted in Faith, Hope and Love

- The PAC recognized that any recommendations provided, were contingent on adequate funding and that final decisions were made by the Board.
- The School Valuation Framework for each school community was completed by the individual school team and then presented to the larger committee for review. This process allowed for efficient use of time as well as active engagement by the PAC.

Lessons Learned

- It is important to ensure that communication for all stakeholders, especially for parents, is in common language without the use of education jargon. In particular, it is important to be clear in what could be the possible outcomes of a Pupil Accommodation Review. It is also important to be clear that a boundary review (as a possible recommendation) is outside of the Pupil Accommodation Review and, if recommended by the PAC, would involve an additional consultative process.
- While we provided optional site tours for the committee and had our public meetings at a different school each time, it was felt that it might have been beneficial for the committee to tour a brand new facility for comparison.
- There was a short timeframe between the last committee meeting and the fourth public meeting. It is recommended that more time be allowed in the event that a PAC has difficulty in determining its final recommendation to the board.
- At each location, there was a greater turnout of local parents (i.e. more parents from NOD turned out when the meeting was at NOD). Having public meetings at the different schools allowed for the local community to provide input and raise concerns and issues relevant to that particular school.

Conclusion

The PAC was pleased to reach consensus in making its final recommendation as outlined further on in this report. The PAC also recognizes that changes may represent difficulties for students, staff and parents, and that all members of a school community are strongly attached to their school. We believe that our recommendation takes into account the long term needs of students in the Orillia area without compromising the high expectations parents have for Catholic education in this community.



We thank the Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board for the opportunity to participate in a meaningful process of consultation that will provide input into the Board's decisions regarding the future accommodation of students in Orillia and Brechin. We also thank all those parents, students and community members who provided valuable input throughout this process.

TO: Michael O'Keefe, Director of Education

FROM: Pupil Accommodation Committee (PAC)

SUBJECT: Orillia Pupil Accommodation Review
School Valuation Report with Recommendations

REVIEW AREA: Foley Catholic School
Guardian Angels School
Monsignor Lee Catholic School
Notre Dame Catholic School
St. Bernard's School

DATE: May 20, 2009

1. INTRODUCTION

Purpose

A Pupil Accommodation Review is a formal consultative process, guided by the Ministry of Education that is used to evaluate and review how our schools accommodate students and determine facility needs. On November 5, 2008 the Board approved the formation of a Pupil Accommodation Committee (PAC) for the Orillia Area Catholic Elementary Schools. The following schools included are: Foley Catholic School, Guardian Angels School, Monsignor Lee Catholic School, Notre Dame Catholic School, and St. Bernard's School.

This report results from the review process as well as the incorporation of public input and information received from the four Public consultation meetings.

This finalized school valuation report with recommendations incorporates all public comments received during our four Public meetings. All information relating to the process is posted to our Board website at www.smcdsb.on.ca and distributed to attendees of the (PAC) public meetings.

2. PROCESS

A Pupil Accommodation Review is a formal consultative process, guided by the Ministry of Education that is used to evaluate and review how our schools accommodate students and assists in determining facility needs.

There are several reasons why an elementary school accommodation review may be initiated:

- Reorganization of the schools could enhance program and learning opportunities for students
- Retrofitting learning spaces may be cost prohibitive
- Significant costs in building maintenance or buildings in need of major capital improvements
- Safety concerns within the schools in the review area
- Consolidation is in the best interest of the overall school system
- Changing enrolment within the review area

Notices for Public Meetings and the process included advertisements in the Orillia Packet and Times. Letters were placed in school newsletters and sent home to parents/guardians with students in the review area. The process was open and transparent and guided by the PAC to meet the policy and procedures of the Board. Public questions and comments are attached as Appendix Q.

Ministry of Education Policy Background

- The Ministry's Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines were released on October 31, 2006.
- Guidelines were developed in consultation with the Ministry's Good Places to Learn.
- School Valuation, and in particular the value to the student, is the centre of the community consultation process and Board decision making.
- Boards are to consider their Capital Plan Priorities in identifying the need to establish a Pupil Accommodation Review (PAR).

SMCDSB Policy Highlights

- The Board adopted Policy LE-14: Pupil Accommodation Review on June 13, 2007.
- This Policy is in keeping with the Ministry of Education Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines issued October 31, 2006.
- The pupil accommodation review is transparent and consultative.
- Each school in an accommodation review area will be assessed using the School Valuation Framework (SVF).
- The PAC makes recommendations to the Director of Education however, the final accommodation decisions will be made by the Board

3. PAC MEMBERSHIP

Membership of the PAC is set out in section 2.2 of the Board's Pupil Accommodation Review Policy LE-14.

The Pupil accommodation review committee consists of the following representation:

- Appropriate Board staff
- One or more Trustees
- Representative from local parish
- Municipal Councilor representative
- Business community representative
- From each affected school:
 - The school principal or designate
 - 1 teacher
 - 1 non-teaching staff member
 - 3 parents

All stakeholders were invited to send a representative. Unfortunately, not all areas were represented.

Pupil Accommodation Review Committee

On November 5, 2008, the Board approved the formation of a Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (PAC) for the following Orillia Elementary Schools: Monsignor Lee Catholic School, Guardian Angels School, Foley Catholic School, Notre Dame Catholic School and St. Bernard's School. The role of the PAC is to lead the public review and seek community input through Public consultation on options for accommodating students within this review area, and prepare a report with recommendations to the Director of Education. The PAC is comprised of the following representatives:

Monsignor Lee Catholic School

Paul Campbell, Principal
 Megan Bondy, Parent Representative
 Jeff Duggan, Parent Representative
 Sandra Downer, Parent Representative
 Rhonda Lauer, Non-teaching Representative
 Janet-Lynne Durnford, Teacher Representative

Guardian Angels School

Paul Frederick, Principal
 Michelle Tazzeo, Parent Representative
 Christine Fry, Parent Representative
 Eileen Brown, Parent Representative
 Karen Murphy, Teacher Representative
 Janice Tulipano, Non-Teaching Representative

Notre Dame Catholic School

Adrian Zulian, Principal
 Sue Peacock, Parent Representative
 Heather Stanton, Parent Representative
 Nadine Lajoie, Parent Representative
 Natalie D'Agnillo, Teacher Representative
 Dave Christie, Non-Teaching Representative

Parish Representatives

Deacon Bernard Harris, Guardian Angels Parish Representative
 Joyce Stanga, Guardian Angels Parish Representative
 Sharon Turlej, St. Andrews Parish Representative

St. Bernard's School

Rich Foshay, Principal
 Kristie Anderson, Parent Representative
 Darlene England, Parent Representative
 Robert Kennedy, Parent Representative
 Brenda Lawlor-MacDonald, Teacher Representative
 Valinda Trivett-Cockburn, Non-Teaching Representative

Foley Catholic School

Audrey Hamilton, Principal
 Sherri Black, Parent Representative
 Carol Taylor, Parent Representative
 Karen Whelan, Parent Representative
 Theresa Robertson, Teacher Representative
 Heather Shier, Non-Teaching Representative

Councilors

Paul Spears, Councilor; City of Orillia
 John O'Donnell, Councilor; Ward 2 Township of Ramara

SMCDSB

Jim Canning, School Trustee
 Darren Schmidt, Superintendent of Schools, Chair of PAC
 Glenn Clarke, Controller of Plant
 Jennifer Sharpe, Manager of Planning and Properties
 Kristin Dibble Pechkovsky, Planning Officer
 Deborah Cosworth, Administrative Support

Mandate of the Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (PAC)

To support the school valuation process, school boards are required to develop a generic School Valuation Framework that assesses each of the following four considerations about the schools being reviewed:

- ***Value to the student***
- ***Value to the community***
- ***Value to the school board***
- ***Value to the economy***

The PAC was responsible for completing a customized School Valuation Framework Report for each of the elementary schools included in the Orillia Accommodation Review. The PAC studied and analyzed the data within these reports respecting the Orillia Area group of schools under review which assisted the PAC in developing these recommendations presented to the Director of Education on accommodation options, for Board consideration.

The PAC has have conducted a total of seven working group meetings and four public meetings.

<i>January 7, 2009</i>	<i>PAC Working Group Meeting – SVF Customization</i>	<i>Monsignor Lee</i>
<i>January 15, 2009</i>	<i>PAC Working Group Meeting – SVF Customization</i>	<i>Monsignor Lee</i>
<i>January 21, 2009</i>	<i>PAC Working Group Meeting</i>	<i>Monsignor Lee</i>
<i>February 9, 2009</i>	<i>First PAR Public Meeting</i>	<i>Monsignor Lee</i>
<i>February 9, 2009</i>	<i>PAC Working Group Meeting</i>	<i>Monsignor Lee</i>
<i>February 24, 2009</i>	<i>Second PAR Public Meeting</i>	<i>Notre Dame</i>
<i>March 10, 2009</i>	<i>PAC Working Group Meeting</i>	<i>Monsignor Lee</i>
<i>March 26, 2009</i>	<i>Third PAR Public Meeting</i>	<i>Guardian Angels</i>
<i>April 23, 2009</i>	<i>PAC Working Group Meeting</i>	<i>Monsignor Lee</i>
<i>April 27, 2009</i>	<i>Fourth PAR Public Meeting</i>	<i>St. Bernard’s</i>
<i>May 4, 2009</i>	<i>PAC Working Group Meeting</i>	<i>Monsignor Lee</i>

4. SCHOOL VALUATION FRAMEWORK (SVF)

The Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board's School Valuation Framework (SVF) is the focus of the Pupil Accommodation Review process and was developed with input from stakeholders including parents, educators, Board officials and school council representatives. The School Valuation Framework was further customized by the PAC for the Orillia schools under review.

The School Valuation Framework created a profile or picture of the school by asking a series of questions in four categories:

- ***Value to the student***
- ***Value to the community***
- ***Value to the school board***
- ***Value to the local economy***

School Valuation, and in particular the value to the student, is the centre of the community consultation process and Board decision making.

5. ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION OPTIONS

i) Options Considered by the PAC:

- | | | |
|--------|-----|---|
| OPTION | 1: | Status quo |
| OPTION | 2A: | Replacement/Rebuild each of MLE, GAN, SBE |
| | 2B: | Replacement/Rebuild any combination of the three schools |
| OPTION | 3A: | Retrofit each of MLE, GAN, SBE |
| | 3B: | Retrofit any combination of the three schools |
| OPTION | 4A: | Consolidate, close and replace each of MLE & GAN |
| | 4B: | Consolidate, close and replace each of GAN & SBE |
| | 4C: | Consolidate, close and replace any combination of the three schools |
| OPTION | 5: | Boundary optimization |
| OPTION | 6: | Program adjustment (a change of grade level offerings at one or more schools. |

ii) Options Presented at Public Meeting #3 on March 26, 2009

The following options were those the PAC felt best addressed the mandate of the committee. Each of these options has a variety of benefits and limitations with regards to the major considerations discussed previously in this report and the factors as outlined in the SVF.

Option 1

- Replace/Rebuild MLE, GAN & SBE on existing sites
- Status Quo for FOL & NOD School Buildings

Option 2

- Replace/Rebuild SBE on existing site
- Close GAN
- Replace/Rebuild on existing MLE site and consolidate GAN & MLE Communities
- Status Quo for FOL & NOD School Buildings

Option 3

- Replace/Rebuild SBE on existing site
- Close GAN
- Close MLE
- Build new school on alternate site and consolidate MLE & GAN school communities
- Status Quo for FOL and NOD School Buildings

NOTE: CONSIDERATION OF BOUNDARY CHANGES IN ALL OPTIONS

iii) Benefits and Limitations

OPTION 1

- *Replace/Rebuild MLE, GAN, and SBE on existing sites*
- *Status Quo for FOL and NOD School Buildings*

Benefits

- Improving buildings
- Already have sites
- Buildings safer, up to code
- Less impact on students
- Continue Parish/School Relationship

Limitations

- Access to building is limited
- Potential relocation (temporary)
- Upheaval to students
- Unknown costs
- Safety risks (Health – Dust)
- Band aid solution in terms of the number of Pupil Places replaced
- Less cost effective, still do not maximize school and site potential with # of pupil places constructed
- Legal issues due to leased site at GAN

OPTION 2

- *Replace/Rebuild SBE on existing site*
- *Close GAN*
- *Replace/ Rebuild on existing MLE site and consolidate GAN and MLE communities*
- *Status Quo for FOL and NOD school buildings*

Benefits

- More cost effective – Operations, staff, admin costs would all be less
- More flexibility in program offerings and school organization
- Better use of funding
- More efficient to build and operate
- Public image – New schools within the community
- Safe and modern
- Energy efficient
- More variety in program offerings
- A new building with current technology
- More flexibility with classes

Limitations

- Impact on students, community, etc.
- Need to rebuild school culture
- Fewer opportunities on school teams, etc.
- One school (GAN) loses its identity
- What to do with vacant building (GAN)
- Upheaval of families and staff
- Lose proximity to church
- Longer process
- Construction transition (Where do students go during construction?)
Portables?

OPTION 3

- *Replace/Rebuild SBE on existing site*
- *Close GAN*
- *Close MLE*
- *Build new school on alternate site and consolidate MLE and GAN school communities*

Benefits

- New school buildings
- Better facilities to meet needs
- Long term energy savings
- Green fit
- Long term stability
- Public image – new schools within the community
- Up to code
- Meet safety standards
- Potential increased student enrolment with larger facility and site
- Better technology available
- Healthier for staff and students
- Location is important

Limitations

- Contingent on funding
- Short term inconvenience
- Costs, more expensive (short term & long term)
- Impact of relocation
- Ministry extensively involved
- Potential for large schools
- Need to rebuild school culture
- Fewer opportunities on school teams, etc.
- GAN &/or MLE loses its identity
- What to do with vacant buildings
- Finding a location
- Upheaval of families and staff
- Require increased bussing

6. PAC RECOMMENDATION

The PAC reviewed various materials (referred to throughout report and in attached Appendices) during the Pupil Accommodation Review Process. As a result, the PAC considers the following recommendation to provide improved learning environments for students in the Orillia area and to have a positive effect on the administrative and operational costs for the Board by reducing the total number of facilities and by providing newer more efficient facilities.

RECOMMENDATION INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING:

- **FOLEY**

Status Quo for FOL school building.

Consideration should be given to proceed with review of school's boundary to better balance enrolment and capacity.

- **NOTRE DAME**

Status Quo for NOD school building.

Consideration should be given to proceed with review of school's boundary to better balance enrolment and capacity.

Consideration should be given to review timing of site acquisition for the future elementary site in West Ridge and possibly advance the acquisition timing.

- **ST. BERNARD'S**

Replacement of the school on existing site based on receiving funding from the Ministry of Education.

Replacement of school to be designed and constructed to accommodate more than existing pupil places. (Existing school designed for 213 pupil places; replacement school to target design for approximately 300 – 350 pupil places).

Consideration should be given to proceed with a review of the school's boundary to better balance enrolment and capacity.

St. Bernard's students to be accommodated in existing facility with additional temporary portables during construction.

- **MONSIGNOR LEE AND GUARDIAN ANGELS**

Consolidation of MLE and GAN school communities in a replacement school, based on receiving funding approval from the Ministry of Education.

Consideration should be given to proceed with review of the combined schools' boundary to better balance enrolment and capacity.

MONSIGNOR LEE AND GUARDIAN ANGELS

OPTION A: PREFERRED OPTION:

Closure of GAN school building.
Closure of MLE school building.

Replacement of school on alternate site.

Replacement school to accommodate approximately the same combined pupil places of existing MLE and GAN (300 – 350 pupil places).

Replacement school to take into consideration history, culture and identity of both school communities.

Alternate Site to take into consideration:

- 5 acre standard size
- within walking distance of either MLE or GAN
- usual site fit components for the replacement facility including:
 - parking and access
 - green space / activity area
 - efficient traffic flow
 - kiss-n-ride
 - bus loop
 - student safety / access to school

Students accommodated in existing facilities until such a time that a school is constructed to consolidate both GAN & MLE.

If Option A is not achievable, then proceed with Option B

MONSIGNOR LEE AND GUARDIAN ANGELS

OPTION B:

Closure of GAN school building.

Consolidation of GAN and MLE school communities and replacement school on MLE existing site.

Students accommodated in existing facilities until such a time that a school is constructed to consolidate both GAN & MLE.

Replacement school to accommodate approximately the same combined pupil places of existing MLE and GAN (300 – 350 pp).

Replacement school to take into consideration history, culture and identity of both school communities.

In developing the replacement school on the existing site, the following site considerations should be included:

- maximizing the existing and potential adjacent property available (dependent on funding)
- improved parking and access to be addressed
- green space / activity area
- efficient traffic flow
- kiss-n-ride
- bus loop
- student safety / access to school

Students accommodated in existing facilities until such a time that a school is constructed to consolidate both GAN & MLE.