

Pupil Accommodation Committee (PAC) Working Group Meeting #7

 Preparing the Draft School Valuation Report with Recommendations

April 23, 2009



Rooted in Faith, Hope and Love



TECHNICAL INFORMATION Reminders

✓SCHOOL FACTS

SIMCOE MUSKOKA CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

✓ MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT

✓ENROLMENT & CAPACITY

✓ FINANCIAL INFORMATION



CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING ACCOMMODATION PLANS

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





- **✓IMPACT TO LEARNING**
- **✓IMPACT TO FACILITY & OPERATION**
- **✓IMPACT ON ENROLMENT & CAPACITY**
- **✓IMPACT ON SAFETY**





ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATION PLANS

•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

DISTRICT SCHOOL BONNOTE: CONSIDERATION OF BOUNDARY CHANGES IN ALL OPTIONS

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 ML	E, GAN, & SBE ON EXISTING SITES
------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------

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 - will require 2 full summers to complete construction)					
FOL:	Winter 2010 Boundary Review	2010	September institute new boundary					
NOD:	Winter 2010 Boundary Review	2010	September institute new boundary					
	Purchasing new school site in west ridge	TBD	Unknown at this time					



OPTION 1:

BENEFITS

- Improving buildings
- Access for funding more immediate (asking for less \$)
- Already have sites
- Buildings safer, up to code
- Less impact on students
- Less expensive in the short-term

LIMITATIONS

- Access to building is limited
- Potential relocation (temporary)
- Upheaval to students
- Unknown costs
- Safety risks (Health Dust)
- Band aid solution
- Less cost effective, still do not maximize school & 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 & 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 / REBUILD SBE ON EXISTING SITE	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

	STATUS QUO FOR FOL & NOD SCHOOL BUILDINGS						
GAN:	June	2011	Closure				
MLE:	September	2011	Occupancy (design & construction to take 2 years)				
SBE:*	September - December	2010	Occupancy (design currently underway - will require 2 full summers to complete construction)				
FOL:	Winter 2010 Boundary Review	2010	September institute new boundary				
NOD:	Winter 2010 Boundary Review	2010	September institute new boundary				
	Purchasing new school site in west ridge	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

SIMCOE MUSKOKA CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

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

	ACADEMIC	SCHOOL	ENROLMENT	NEW SCHOOL		
SCHOOL	PROGRAM	CAPACITY	(Bodies)	CAPACITY	OPTION EXAMPLES	OPTION SUGGESTIONS
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 -

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

GAN: June 2012 Closure MLE: June 2012 Closure Purchase / Aquire alternate site property (funding unknowns & financial NEW: TBD **TBD** impacts) Occupancy of GAN/MLE consolidated new school on new site (design & NEW: September 2012 build to take 2+ years) Occupancy (design currently underway - will require 2 full summers to 2010 complete construction) SBE:* September - December FOL: Winter 2010 Boundary Review 2010 September institute new boundary NOD: Winter 2010 Boundary Review 2010 September institute new boundary Unknown at this time Purchasing new school site in wes TBD





OPTION 3:

BENEFITS

- New school buildings
- Better facilities to meet needs
- Long term energy savings
- Green fit
- Long term stability
- Public image
- Up to code
- Meet safety standards
- Potential increased student enrolment
- 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
- Competition for funding between schools (internal)
- Ministry extensively involved
- Potential for a large 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



WHAT HAVE WE HEARD?

•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



OTHER OPTIONS FROM PUBLIC MEETINGS

•OPTION A: PROGRAM ADJUSTMENT FOR GAN / MLE

What does this option look like?

MAINTAIN MLE FACILITY –Program Adjustment Grade 4–8 students MAINTAIN GAN FACILITY –Program Adjustment JK-3 students only REBUILD SBE ON EXISTING SITE STATUS QUO FOR FOL & NOD SCHOOL BUILDINGS

What are the impacts of this option?

PROVIDES BETTER UTILIZATION OF MLE & GAN BUILDINGS DOES NOT PROVIDE BETTER FACILITY FOR BOTH SCHOOLS Is it realistic to have more capacity on these school sites?



PAC TO FURTHER CONSIDER SCHOOL VALUATION FACTORS SUCH AS FIELD SPACE, PROGRAMMING OPPORTUNITIES, ETC.



OPTION A:

BENEFITS

- Curriculum focus (like grades together)
- Better sports teams
- Addresses capacity issues
- Specialized programming potential
- Small people small problems

LIMITATIONS

- Doesn't address facility needs & concerns
- Division of family (kids in both schools)
- Fewer opportunities to play on teams
- Duplication for families (e.g. Concerts, conference nights, etc.)
- Dependant on stable enrolment
- Duplication of bussing (overlap)
- Discipline issues in older grade schools
- Fewer leadership opportunities for gr. 8's
- Bussing longer
- Earlier pick up
- Disruption of students & families





PAC RECOMMENDATIONS





REPORT OUTLINE – Timing -



SIMCOE MUSKOKA CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

Thursday April 23, 2009: PAC Working Group Meeting #7

- Preparing the PAC Draft School Valuation Report with Recommendations

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)



PREPARING THE DRAFT SCHOOL VALUATION REPORT with RECOMMENDATIONS

- Considerations:
 - Committee's Input
 - Public Input
 - Appendix 2 of Policy LE-14
- Suggestions in Forming a Sub-Group for the Report:
 - Principal, Parent, Teacher, Non-Teaching, Community
 - one representative from each category, with each school being represented
- Report Outline:
 - Executive Summary
 - Appendices
 - Timing / Schedule
- Questions & Discussion:





PREPARING THE DRAFT SCHOOL VALUATION REPORT with RECOMMENDATIONS

- Considerations:
 - Committee's Input
 - Public Input
 - Appendix 2 of Policy LE-14





PREPARING THE DRAFT SCHOOL VALUATION REPORT with RECOMMENDATIONS

- Suggestions in forming a Sub-Group:
 - Principal, Parent, Teacher, Non-Teaching, Community
 - One representative from each category, with each school being represented





PREPARING THE DRAFT SCHOOL VALUATION REPORT with RECOMMENDATIONS

- Report Outline:
 - Executive Summary
 - Appendices
 - Timing / Schedule



APPENDIX 2 of POLICY LE-14 – QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER FOR EACH ACCOMMODATION OPTION

Range of mandatory programs

Range of optional programs

Optional programs not offered that are available in other schools in the Board

Operation of the school supported by the funding guidelines or other sustainable sources of revenue

Enrolment projections / development plans indicative of enrolments high enough for the next 5 years to keep organization educationally and financially viable

Any proposed organization options that could result in each remaining school being able to provide the range of mandatory programs

Optional programs that could be offered in the proposed organization that are available in other schools of the Board

Consideration of equivalent or improved environment for students from a Health and Safety perspective Bussing requirements

If increased bussing costs, can they be offset by reduced operating and administrative costs

Financial Benefits of proposed school organization

Would the above benefits maintain or improve the student learning environment

Would the operation be supported by the funding guidelines of the funding model

Capital requirements in terms of renewal, additions, new schools or program enhancement

Would the capital requirements be supported by the funding guidelines

Change in long term opportunities to provide quality educational services and accommodation for students within the current fiscal realities

Effects on community activities of social, educational, cultural or recreational nature

Possible alternative uses for any building recommended for consolidation or closure



REPORT OUTLINE

Introduction:

Background Process PAC Mandate

Executive Summary:

Options Considered by the PAC Options Presented to the Public PAC Recommendation(s) Rationale





REPORT OUTLINE – Appendices -

SMCDSB Policy LE-14

Agendas

Minutes

Presentations

SVF Information

Public Comments

Glossary of Terms

FCI Reports

PAC Membership

Timelines

School Profiles

Capital Funding Information

Impact Information

Summary of Key Findings

Program

Enrolment & Projections

School Facilities

School Sites

Financial Information

Pupil Distribution

Transportation

Community

Economy





NEXT STEPS

- i) Consider approach for presenting info at Public Meeting #4
- ii) Sub-Group will meet to work on Recommendation Report
- iii) Review of information sharing
- iv) Other suggestions





4th Public Meeting = April 27, 2009

St. Bernard's
 Presentation of draft School
 Valuation Report & Recommendations
 Receive community input

