

# Pupil Accommodation Review (PAR) Public Meeting #4

# Present Draft School Valuation Report & Recommendations Receive Community Input

**April 27, 2009** 



Rooted in Faith, Hope and Love



## HANDOUT INFORMATION

- ✓ AGENDA / PRAYER
- ✓ PRESENTATION
- ✓ RECOMMENDATIONS
- ✓ COMMENT SHEETS
- ✓ GLOSSARY OF TERMS





# 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 to be transparent and consultative.
- Each school in an accommodation review area will be assessed using the School Valuation Framework (SVF).

SIMCOE MUSKOKA CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

The PAC makes recommendations to the Board; however, the final accommodation decisions will be made by the Board.



# **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 determine facility needs.
- On November 5, 2008, the Board approved the formation of a Pupil Accommodation Committee for the Orillia Area Catholic Elementary Schools.
- Schools included are:
  - Foley Catholic
  - Guardian Angels
  - Monsignor Lee
  - Notre Dame Catholic
  - St. Bernard's

SIMCOE MUSKOKA CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD



## PAC MANDATE & RESPONSIBILITY

- With School Valuation as its focus, the PAC will study, report & make recommendations on accommodation options respecting the Orillia Area group of schools under review.
- The PAC will be responsible for;

SIMCOE MUSKOKA CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

- Customizing the School Valuation Framework;
- Representing the interests of the school and providing input;
   both as individual members & as a Committee;
- Attending Working Group & Public Meetings;
- Receiving & analyzing public input from community consultation;
- Providing a final School Valuation Report with Recommendations to the Board.
- The work of the PAC will end once the Committee submits the PAC School Valuation Report to the Board.



1<sup>st</sup> Public Meeting = February 9, 2009 @ Monsignor Lee

- Describe Mandate & Process for the PAR
- Provide Public with preliminary data & issues to be addressed
- Explain the School Valuation Framework

2<sup>nd</sup> Public Meeting = February 24, 2009 @ Notre Dame

- Presentation of draft school-specific valuation reports
- Receive community input

3<sup>rd</sup> Public Meeting = March 26, 2009 @ Guardian Angels

- Presentation of Accommodation Options to be considered
- Receive community input

4<sup>th</sup> Public Meeting = April 27, 2009 @ St. Bernard's

 Presentation of draft School Valuation Report & Recommendations

Receive community input



# TECHNICAL INFORMATION PROVIDED TO PAC & AT PUBLIC MEETINGS

✓ SCHOOL BUILDING & SITE FACTS

**✓ MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT** 

**✓ENROLMENT & CAPACITY** 



**✓ FINANCIAL INFORMATION** 



# IMPACTS FROM SCHOOL VALUATION FRAMEWORK (SVF)

**✓IMPACT TO LEARNING** 

**✓IMPACT TO FACILITY & OPERATION** 

**✓IMPACT ON ENROLMENT & CAPACITY** 

**✓IMPACT ON SAFETY** 

DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD



# **IMPACTS TO LEARNING**

## **Considerations:**

- Split grades
- Specialty programs (ie. music)
- Computers
- Playing fields
- Green space
- Air conditioning
- Mechanical ventilation
- Extra curricular programming
- EQAO





# **IMPACTS TO LEARNING-EQAO**

	EQAO Test Results compared to Board Average						
Schools	Gr.3 Reading	Gr.3 Writing	Gr.3 Math	Gr.6 Reading	Gr.6 Writing	Gr.6 Math	
GAN	-8	-7	-15	n/a	n/a	n/a	
MLE	-9	-9	-8	3	-1	1	
SBE	9	-13	-5	0	2	-16	
FOL	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
NOD	1	7	6	-7	-8	3	
Board Avg.	61%	65%	68%	68%	69%	60%	



# **IMPACTS TO FACILITY & OPERATION**

## Considerations:

- School Site Size
- Barrier Free
- Special Needs
- Elevator
- Furniture & Equipment
- General Purpose Room / Stage
- Retrofit Costs
- Replacement Costs
- Facility Condition Index (FCI)





# **IMPACTS TO FACILITY & OPERATION**

## **Cost Considerations:**

- Operation Costs
- Administration Costs
- Transportation Costs





# **IMPACTS TO FACILITY & OPERATION**

	Gran	ts Less Expenses PER PU	PIL COSTS
Schools	Operation	Administration	Transportation
GAN	\$ -159	\$ -148	\$ -89
MLE	\$ -79	\$ 38	\$ -23
SBE	\$ 169	\$ 5	\$ -196
FOL	\$ 287	\$ -145	\$ -676
NOD	\$ 53	\$ -10	\$ -370
BOARD AVERAGE	\$ 45	\$ -9	\$ -7





## **IMPACTS ON ENROLMENT & CAPACITY**

## Considerations:

- Current Enrolment
- Projected Enrolment
- Capacity of each school
- Utilization Rate (% capacity of school)





# **IMPACTS ON SAFETY**

## **Considerations:**

- Safety Issues to Facility or Site
- Safe Route for Pedestrian & Vehicular Traffic on or off site
- Vandalism & Record of Incidences





### **FOLEY - HIGHLIGHTED KEY FINDINGS**

- 1. Exposed to Catholic Values
- 2. Close proximity to Church (St. Andrew's Parish)
- 3. Outstanding Leadership Role Opportunities
- 4. State of the Art Gym

SIMCOE MUSKOKA CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

- 5. Smaller School means everyone can participate on sports teams
- 6. Strong Community presence and historical significance
- 7. Everyone participates in 'Spirit Teams', including staff and students
- 8. Special Needs opportunities, therefore, no one is excluded
- 9. Community and Family Oriented
- 10. Split Grades (staff must ensure good communication in order to accommodate)
- 11. Only Catholic School in the area



### **GUARDIAN ANGELS - HIGHLIGHTED KEY FINDINGS**

- 1. Only opportunity for primary education within our School Board
- 2. Close proximity to Church (Guardian Angels Parish-Key Strength)
- 3. Strong Sense of Leadership Opportunities for Younger Students
- 4. Under Capacity/Utilized
- 5. Leased School

SIMCOE MUSKOKA CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

- 6. Strong Significance with School and City
- 7. Little People, Little Problems
- 8. Location Very Central where everything is walkable and great exposure for the Board on West Street and adjacent to the Parish
- 9. Fenced Yard for the students safety
- 10. Smaller staff means fewer issues &/or easier to be addressed
- 11. Prohibitive to Repair School
- 12. Only real issue is needing more students



### **MONSIGNOR LEE - HIGHLIGHTED KEY FINDINGS**

- 1. Rich History of Catholic Education in the Community
- 2. Safety Issues
- 3. On-site facilities programming space/washrooms
- 4. Extremely active school with many co-curricular offerings to students
- 5. Location is excellent
- 6. Parking concerns
- 7. EQAO
- 8. Partnerships
- 9. Partial Prohibitive to Repair School





### **NOTRE DAME - HIGHLIGHTED KEY FINDINGS**

- 1. EQAO scores are very positive
- 2. Newest school of all others in this review area
- 3. Very Large Site Size
- 4. Daycare Facility to Support Community and current JK/SK students on off days. Before/After program within 2 classrooms to Support Students
- 5. Drama Productions, including grades 1-8
- 6. Currently Large # bussed City sidewalks are planned for 2010
- 7. Large use of school and play field for students and community
- 8. Biggest need is for a Kiss-N-Ride
- 9. School is Reading Recovery Training Centre for all schools north of Barrie with specialized training room in library
- 10. Kindergarten play area is fenced & gated





# DRAFT SCHOOL-SPECIFIC VALUATION FRAMEWORK (SVF) ST. BERNARD's - HIGHLIGHTED KEY FINDINGS

- 1. Rich Intergenerational History (52years)
- 2. Rising EQAO scores
- 3. Wonderful relationship with Guardian Angels & St. Columbkille's Parishes allowing student involvement in music ministry and the life of both Parishes
- 4. Oxford Street property is ideal location for servicing this community, and provides lots of space for a new facility
- 5. School provides community with many valuable opportunities (ie. Triple PPP Parenting Course)
- 6. Significant Security / Safety Issues to be addressed (increased police presence)
- 7. Kindergarten Play area is adjacent Oxford Street which is a safety concern
- 8. Facility is completely inadequate, although school is working well because of students and staff Prohibitive to Repair



# ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLAN STRATEGIES

- •Section 2.7 of our Pupil Accommodation Review Policy LE-14 identifies the requirement to provide Alternate Accommodation Plans to the PAC prior to the first PAR Public Meeting
- The Alternate Accommodation Plans should include;
  - Suggestions as to where the students could be accommodated
  - What changes to existing facilities might be required
  - What programs could be available to the students
  - Any associated transportation requirements





# CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING ACCOMMODATION PLANS

SIMCOE MUSKOKA CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

- ✓ CONSIDER ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL BOARD REPORT
- ✓ CONSIDER DRAFT SCHOOL-SPECIFIC VALUATION FRAMEWORK REPORTS
- ✓ CONSIDER KEY IMPACTS TO SCHOOLS RELATED TO THE VALUATION REPORTS
- ✓ CONSIDER ACCOMMODATION OPTIONS THAT COULD ADDRESS THESE IMPACTS



### **ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS**

As part of the Pupil Accommodation Review Process, Alternate Accommodation Plans were provided for review with the PAC Committee and presented to the Public on the following dates;

# ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS PRESENTED AT:

- ► PAC Working Group #3 January 21, 2009
- ► PAR Public Meeting #1 February 9, 2009
- ► PAR Public Meeting #6 March 10, 2009
- ► PAR Public Meeting #3 March 26, 2009
- ► PAC Working Group #7 April 23, 2009



### PAC DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

• PAR Public Meeting #4 - April 27, 2009



# ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS PRESENTED AT:

PAC Working Group #3 - January 21, 2009 PAR Public Meeting #1 - February 9, 2009

**•OPTION 1: STATUS QUO** 

OPTION 2: REPLACEMENT/REBUILD

OPTION 3: RETROFIT

•OPTION 4: CONSOLIDATE, CLOSE & REPLACE

OPTION 5: BOUNDARY OPTIMIZATION



(Added as a result of input at February 9, 2009 meeting)



# upil ccommodation eview Orillia

# ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS PRESENTED AT:

PAC Working Group #6 – March 10, 2009 PAR Public Meeting #3 – March 26, 2009

•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 &

**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 & CONSOLIDATE MLE & GAN SCHOOL COMMUNITIES
- STATUS QUO FOR FOL & NOD SCHOOL BUILDINGS



## **ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS**

OPTION 1: REPLACE / REBUILD MLE, GAN, & SBE ON EXISTING SITES STATUS QUO FOR FOL & NOD SCHOOL BUILDINGS

SCHOOL	ACADEMIC PROGRAM	SCHOOL CAPACITY	ENROLMENT (Bodies)	NEW SCHOOL CAPACITY		OPTION SUGGESTIONS
MLE	JK - Gr.8	187	295	187	Replace MLE (187 pp) at existing site	students accommodated in replacement facility; no
GAN	JK - Gr.4	178	81	178	Replace GAN (178 pp) at existing site	change in academic programming; no change in
SBE	JK - Gr.8	213	279	213	Replace SBE (213 pp) at existing site	transportation requirements
NOD	JK - Gr.8	389	480	389	may be impacted by boundary review considerations	status quo for school building
FOL	JK - Gr.8	112	58	112	Considerations	

# ACCOMMODATION OPTION – Timing -

OPTION 1:	REPLACE / REBUILD MLE, GAN, & SBE ON EXISTING SITE	S
	, , ,	

STATUS QUO FOR FOL & NOD SCHOOL BUILDINGS

	(dependent on funding availability to replace each of GAN, MLE, SBE)								
GAN:	September (issues related to leased facility)	TBD	Occupancy (design & construction to take 2 years)						
MLE:	September	TBD	Occupancy (design & construction to take 2 years)						
SBE:*	September - December	2010	Occupancy (design currently underway)						
FOL:	Winter 2010 Boundary Review	2010	September implementation of new boundary, based on review						
NOD:	Winter 2010 Boundary Review	2010	September implementation of new boundary, based on review						
	Purchasing new school site in west ridge	TBD	Unknown at this time						



## **OPTION 1:**

# **BENEFITS**

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

### **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 & site potential with # of pupil places constructed
- Legal issues due to leased site at GAN



\* Benefits & Limitations developed through comments from PAC & community input

### OPTION 2: REPLACE / REBUILD SBE ON EXISTING SITE

**CLOSE GAN** 

REPLACE / REBUILD ON EXISTING MLE SITE & CONSOLIDATE GAN & MLE COMMUNITIES

STATUS QUO FOR FOL & NOD SCHOOL BUILDINGS

SCHOOL	ACADEMIC PROGRAM	SCHOOL CAPACITY	ENROLMENT (Bodies)	NEW SCHOOL CAPACITY	OPTION EXAMPLES	OPTION SUGGESTIONS
MLE	JK - Gr.8	187	295	350	Replace M LE-PTR portion (350 pp) at existing site	students accommodated in MLE consolidated facility; consistency in JK-8
GAN	JK - Gr.4	178	81	0	Close School & Consolidate school community with MLE	programming within Orillia Catholic schools; no change in transportation
SBE	JK - Gr.8	213	279	350	Replace SBE (350 pp) at existing site	students accommodated in replacement facility; no change in academic programming; no change in transportation
NOD	JK - Gr.8	389	480	389	may be impacted by boundary review considerations	pursue acquisition of West Ridge site for future accommodation needs sooner than projected
FOL	JK - Gr.8	112	58	112		status quo for school building

# ACCOMMODATION OPTION – Timing -

OPTION 2: REPLACE / RE	BUILD SBE ON	<b>EXISTING SITE</b>
------------------------	--------------	----------------------

**CLOSE GAN** 

REPLACE / REBUILD ON EXISTING MLE SITE & CONSOLIDATE GAN & MLE COMMUNITIES

STATUS QUO FOR FOL & NOD SCHOOL BUILDINGS

	OTATOO GOOT OTITOE & NOD CONCOL DOLLDINGO								
GAN:	June	2011	Closure						
MLE:	September	2011	Occupancy (design & construction to take 2 years)						
SBE:*	September - December	2010	Occupancy (design currently underway)						
FOL:	Winter 2010 Boundary Review	2010	September implementation of new boundary, based on review						
NOD:	Winter 2010 Boundary Review	2010	September implementation of new boundary, based on review						
	Purchasing new school site in west ridge	TBD	Unknown at this time						
	<u> </u>	TBD	Unknown at this time						



# **OPTION 2:**

## **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

SIMCOE MUSKOKA CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

- 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?

<sup>\*</sup> Benefits & Limitations developed through comments from PAC & community input

OPTION 3: REPLACE / REBUILD SBE ON EXISTING SITE

**CLOSE GAN** 

**CLOSE MLE** 

BUILD NEW SCHOOL ON ALTERNATE SITE & CONSOLIDATE GAN & MLE SCHOOL COMMUNITIES STATUS QUO FOR FOL & NOD SCHOOL BUILDINGS

	ACADEMIC	SCHOOL	ENROLMENT	NEW SCHOOL		
<b>SCHOOL</b>	PROGRAM	CAPACITY	(Bodies)	CAPACITY	OPTION EXAMPLES	<b>OPTION SUGGESTIONS</b>
MLE	JK - Gr.8	187	295	350	Replace MLE-PTR portion (350 pp) on alternate site	MLE & GAN students accommodated at new consolidated facility; consistency in JK-8
GAN	JK - Gr.4	178	81	0	Close School & Consolidate school community with MLE	programming within Orillia Catholic schools; no change in transportation
SBE	JK - Gr.8	213	279	350	Replace SBE (350 pp) at existing site	students accommodated in replacement facility; no change in academic programming; no change in transportation
NOD	JK - Gr.8	389	480	389	may be impacted by boundary review considerations	pursue acquisition of West Ridge site for future accommodation needs sooner than projected
FOL	JK - Gr.8	112	58	112		status quo for school building

# ACCOMMODATION OPTION – Timing -

OPTION3: PEPLACE/ PEBULD SECONEXISTING STE CLOSE GAN CLOSE M.E BUILD NEWSCHOOL ON ALTERNATE STE & CONSOLIDATE GAN & M.E.SCHOOL COMMUNTIES STATUS QLOFOR FOL & NOD SCHOOL BUILDINGS							
GAN	June	2012	Closure				
	June	2012	Closure				
NEW!	TBD	TBD	Purchase / Aquire alternate site property (funding unknowns & financial impacts)				
NEW!	September	2012	Occupancy of GAN/MLE consolidated newschool on newsite (design & build to take 2+years)				
SEE*	September - December	2010	Occupancy (design currently underway)				
FQL:	Winter 2010 Boundary Peview	2010	September implementation of newboundary, based on review				
	Winter 2010 Boundary Review	2010	September implementation of newboundary, based on review				
	TBD September September - December Winter 2010 Boundary Peview	TBD 2012 2010 2010	Purchase / Aquire alternate site property (funding unknowns & financial impacts)  Occupancy of GAN/MLE consolidated newschool on newsite (design & build to take 2+years)  Occupancy (design currently underway)  September implementation of newboundary, based on review				





### **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 & site
- Better technology available
- Healthier to staff and students
- Location is important

### **LIMITATIONS**

- Contingent on funding
- Short term inconvenience
- More expensive (short term & long term)
- Impact of relocation
- Ministry extensively involved
- Potential for a larger school
- 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



<sup>\*</sup> Benefits & Limitations developed through comments from PAC & community input



# WHAT HAVE WE HEARD FROM COMMUNITY CONSULTATION SO FAR?

•SBE: REPLACE WITH BRAND NEW FACILITY ON EXISTING SITE

•NOD: STATUS QUO FOR SCHOOL BUILDING - POSSIBLE BOUNDARY REVIEW TO CONSIDER ADJUSTMENTS

•FOL: STATUS QUO FOR SCHOOL BUILDING – POSSIBLE BOUNDARY REVIEW TO CONSIDER ADJUSTMENTS

•MLE: REPLACE OLD WING WITH NEW FACILITY OF BUILD NEW SCHOOL ON ALTERNATE SITE & CONSOLIDATE MLE & GAN



•GAN: STATUS QUO
Or CLOSE SCHOOL CONSOLIDATE MLE & GAN ON
EXISTING MLE SITE Or ALTERNATE SITE



# PAC DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS PAR Public Meeting #4 - April 27, 2009

**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





# PAC DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS PAR Public Meeting - April 27, 2009 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.



# PAC DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS PAR Public Meeting - April 27, 2009

## ST. BERNARD'S

DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

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



# PAC DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS PAR Public Meeting - April 27, 2009

## **MONSIGNOR LEE & GUARDIAN ANGELS**

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

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

**OPTION A:** (PREFERRED OPTION):

Replacement school located on alternative site OPTION B:

Replacement school located on MLE existing site





# **REPORT OUTLINE – Timing -**



DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

Monday April 27, 2009: PAR Public Meeting #4

- Presenting the PAC Draft School Valuation Report with Recommendation

Monday May 4, 2009: PAC Working Group Meeting #8

- Finalizing the PAC School Valuation Report with Recommendations

Wednesday May 20, 2009: Delivering the finalized PAC School Valuation Report with Recommendations to the Director of Education

Wednesday May 27, 2009: Submitting PAC Report to the Board for info only

Wednesday June 24, 2009: Submitting Staff's Report with Recommendations to the Board for review and consideration

(PAC Report to be included as Appendix to Staff Report)



### **WEB-SITE**

- PLEASE VISIT OUR WEB-SITE:
- www.smcdsb.on.ca
- Under the 'COMMUNITY' Section



#### PUPIL ACCOMMODATION

Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board » Community » Pupil Accommodation

### Community

Pupil Accommodation

Orillia Area

Ministry of Education Information

**Board Policy** 



#### What is a Pupil Accommodation Review?

A Pupil Accommodation Review is a formal process, following Ministry of Education guidelines, which helps us evaluate and review how we accommodate students in our schools. This process assists us with planning so that we can best meet the needs of our students and parents now and in the future.

Involvement from members of the community is a critical part of the review process. We encourage those who are interested in this process to visit this section of our website often to get the latest updates and to find out about opportunities for public consultation.

#### Orillia Area Elementary School Accommodation Review

Currently we are conducting an accommodation review for the Orillia area. Schools in this area include Notre Dame, Monsignor Lee, Guardian Angels, St. Bernard's and Foley Catholic.



© 2004-2009 Intrafinity Corporation | Privacy Statement | Disclaimers | Download Acrobat Reader | Download FirstClass | FirstClass Login



## **NEXT STEPS**



i) PAC Sub-Group will finalize School Valuation Report & <u>MAY</u>

Recommendation

ii) Submit finalized School Valuation Report to the Director MAY of Education

iii) Submit finalized Staff's Report to the Board

iv) Board meeting to receive Public Input

v) Submit Staff's follow-up report on Accommodation to the <u>OCTOBER</u> Board

vi) Board meeting to decide on Accommodation Option(s) NOVEMBER





**JUNE** 

**SEPTEMBER**