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Initial Staff Report to the Board of Trustees
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1. Introduction and Purpose

This “Initial Staff Report” is provided as required by the Upper Canada District School Board of Trustees and in accordance with UCDSB School Closure Policy 413. The purpose is to provide draft recommendations for school closures and consolidations that can then be used to solicit feedback from parents, students and the public to assist the decision-making responsibilities of the Board of Trustees.

This report presents considerations for potentially 16 school closures to be completed at the end of the 2016-2017 school year. An additional 13 school closures are proposed beyond that period, subject to the Upper Canada School Board securing provincial funding for building new schools or for renovating existing school facilities.

2. Background and Context

The Upper Canada District School Board is a Board of small and vibrant schools with welcoming environments that support learning. There are many wonderful things happening in all of our schools, spanning numerous communities across Eastern Ontario, and reflecting the Board’s mission We Prepare All Students for a Successful Life.

However, there is a challenge currently facing the board that needs to be addressed. We have too much surplus classroom space in our schools. This is a challenge because the funding school boards receive from the Ontario Ministry of Education to operate and maintain schools is increasingly based upon the amount of physical school space required given student enrolments.

Enrolment decline due to an aging population of “echo boom” (children of the baby boom) students is a reality across Ontario. In Upper Canada, this demographic reality has had a profound impact on school enrolments. For example, in the past 10 years (2005 to 2015), elementary enrolments have declined by about 3500 students representing almost 17% of elementary enrolments as a whole.

Similarly, secondary school enrolments over the past 10 years have declined by about 4000 students, or 30% of secondary enrolments as a whole. While the good news is that elementary enrolments have now stabilized, and that there are only several more years of secondary enrolment decline to come, the Upper Canada District School Board has significantly more small enrolment schools and more surplus space in schools overall than ten years ago.

The amount of space needed by school boards is chiefly determined by enrolment compared to the physical space available in schools. Whereas the Ministry of Education used to provide additional financial support to school boards to account for the operation, maintenance and renewal of surplus space in schools, this is no longer the case. What this
means is that, in the absence of reducing surplus school space, the Upper Canada District School Board will be challenged to operate and maintain its aging inventory of school buildings. Consider for a moment the number of baby boom parents that are now facing the reality of living on fixed retirement incomes with no children at home. Many of these retirees will opt to relocate to smaller homes because they no longer need, nor can afford, to maintain the same amount of space in their homes that was necessary when they had resident children.

The Upper Canada District School Board is in a similar situation. The Ministry of Education determines the financial resources that are available to the Board which, for the most part, are based upon the number of students in our schools. As enrolment declines, so does the revenue received from the provincial government to operate our school facilities.

For example, Ministry funding specific to school operations (e.g. heating, hydro etc.) are based on enrolment compared to school capacity formulas. Similarly, school upgrades can only be accomplished through annual “Renewal” and “School Condition Improvement (SCI)” capital funding which are also derived from enrolment vs. space availability benchmarks. As suggested earlier, the Ministry of Education is no longer providing school boards with “top-up” funding to mitigate the impact of surplus instructional space in schools.

From time to time, schools also require wholesale replacement, additions or major renovations; however, these projects cannot not be funded from Renewal or SCI funding. They must be “proposed” to the Ministry of Education through a capital priorities application process.

The current capital priorities list of the Upper Canada District School Board was formed under former “Prohibitive to Repair” (PTR) criteria that emphasized school condition only. Under new Ministry capital upgrade criteria, the business case for capital upgrade projects virtually disappears when excess pupil places are available in neighbouring schools. As a result, it is very unlikely that the UCDSB will be able to replace facilities or build additions unless surplus school space is consolidated.

In all, the following key aspects to this dilemma need to be recognized:

- The Board has significantly more instructional space than it receives funding to operate and to maintain our schools,
- The Board has significantly more space than it can generally use to demonstrate business cases to the Ministry for capital upgrades to schools,
- The Board’s excess inventory of school building continues to age which, in turn, is expanding its need for capital upgrades, and
- The provincial funding we receive for all aspects of school operations favours the consolidation of schools to demonstrate optimal levels of enrolment and efficient use of school space,

We can also recognize that, with great things already happening in all of our schools, additional learning opportunities can be created when we bring more students together. For
example, bringing students together can reduce the need for split grades in one classroom, improve access to a greater number of staff to serve students by co-locating these resources within fewer sites, and provide greater opportunities for extracurricular activities and socialization.

3. How We Got to Here

In this era when public finances are being directed to address a wide variety of needs in our communities, it is understandable that the Ministry of Education asks school boards to operate an inventory of school buildings that is aligned with the number of students it serves. Accordingly, the Upper Canada began, last year, to undertake the prerequisite background work to understand both the extent and scope of surplus space that is being maintained across the Board and the program needs and expectations of our students, parents and communities.

More specifically, information was received by the Board of Trustees by virtue of the April 27, 2016 report re: Long Term Accommodation Projections and the May 15, 2016 report re: the findings of the spring 2016 UCDSB Program Review. As demonstrated below, both of these information sources followed approval by the Board of its School Closure Policy 413 and Facility Collaboration Policy 4002 to align with the Ministry’s Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines and Community Planning and Partnership Guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Closure Policy 413</td>
<td>Approved by the Board on Nov. 15, 2015</td>
<td>Updated in accordance with Ministry Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline, 2015</td>
<td>Specifies Board process and timelines for Pupil Accommodation (i.e. school closure) Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Collaboration Policy 4002</td>
<td>Approved by the Board on Nov. 15, 2015</td>
<td>Created in accordance with Ministry Community Planning and Partnerships Guideline, 2015</td>
<td>Specifies Board requirements for information sharing re: surplus space with Municipalities and Community organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Accommodation Projections</td>
<td>Received by the Board on April 27, 2016</td>
<td>In keeping with Policy 413 and PARG</td>
<td>Provides the Board with Long Term Planning (i.e. enrolments, space utilization, facility condition) information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review</td>
<td>Received by the Board on May 25, 2016</td>
<td>Not a Policy or Guideline requirement</td>
<td>Provides the Board with information related to the programming needs and expectations of our community schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting with Municipal Partners</td>
<td>June 6 and June 9, 2016</td>
<td>In keeping with Policy 4002 and CPPG</td>
<td>Provides an opportunity for board staff to share information with municipalities and community organizations re: potential daytime space available in schools for lease on a cost recovery basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together, these information sources have been foundational for the Board to consider the big question “Given the resources available to our school district, do we have the right
number of schools in the right places to support our vision for educational programming?” Seeking an answer to this big question, to assist the decision making responsibilities of the Board, has led to the development of this Initial Staff Report.

4. Highlights from Long Term Accommodation Projections Report

Information provided in the Long Term Accommodation Projection Report to the Board on April 27, 2016 addresses the first part of the big question by focusing on:

- current and projected enrolments for schools over a 2015 to 2030 time period,
- the availability of school space over that same time period, and
- an indication of each school physical condition related to on-going maintenance and repair.

The following table, assembled from information provided in the April report, demonstrates the extent to which the Board is currently maintaining surplus classroom space in schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Elementary and Secondary Pupil Places Currently Maintained</th>
<th>Total Elementary and Secondary Enrolment</th>
<th>Surplus Pupil Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36084</td>
<td>26250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that 9834 surplus pupil places were maintained by the Board in 2015-16 and that, accounting for future enrolments, this same general level of underutilization will remain in place for the next 14 years unless efforts are undertaken to reduce space.

The following tables from the report provide an alternative view of the surplus space in its elementary and secondary schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As At 2015/16</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>As At 2029/30</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 60%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Under 60%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% - 100%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61% - 100%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 100%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Over 100%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (7-12/9-12) Utilization</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary (7-12/9-12) Utilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 60%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Under 60%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% - 100%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61% - 100%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Over 100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (JK-6/JK-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary (JK-6/JK-8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 75 pupils</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Under 75 pupils</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 - 200 pupils</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76 - 200 pupils</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 200 pupils</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Over 200 pupils</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (7-12/9-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary (7-12/9-12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200 pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Under 200 pupils</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 - 500 pupils</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>201 - 500 pupils</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 500 pupils</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Over 500 pupils</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For the purposes of these charts, Rothwell Osnabruck (K-12 School) has been divided into the JK-8 and 9-12 categories.
It can be seen that, based upon 2015-16 enrolments, there are 23 elementary schools and 5 secondary schools with a space utilization of less than 60%. Additionally, there are 5 elementary schools with less than 75 students and 24 elementary schools with enrolments between 76 and 200 students. There are 6 secondary schools with a utilization of less than 60%, with 1 secondary school having fewer than 200 students and 10 secondary schools with enrolments between 200 and 500 students.

From a facility condition perspective, the report also observed that the Board will be challenged under current conditions to meet the repair/retrofit/renewal needs of its inventory of underused schools. Consequently, the report also concluded that “recommendations could be developed that consider more effective utilization of existing facilities”.

5. Highlights from the 2016 Program Review

The second part of the big question relates to our vision for educational programming. Information to assist the Board in this respect was presented in May 2016 and based upon the feedback received in conjunction with the spring 2016 Program Review. This district-wide dialogue with parents, students and communities was undertaken to help the Board understand the educational programming that our students need and deserve to prepare them for secondary school and life after secondary school.

From the Review, the Board has learned that our communities value and appreciate:

- caring and safe learning environments for students,
- flexible program offerings that meet individual student needs,
- skilled and knowledgeable teachers,
- positive and nurturing relationships,
- leadership opportunities for students,
- access to effective (French) language instruction that promotes bilingualism / conversation as a key outcome, and
- alignment and connection with the larger school community.

With these findings, a connection can be made between the opportunities to address the program needs of students with the operational need to close schools and consolidate physical space.

6. Implications for this Report

As emphasized earlier, the Ministry of Education is requiring school boards to reduce and consolidate school space as a means to aligning funding with the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrading of schools.

While it can be appreciated that effective student learning is dependent on much more than simply bricks and mortar, it is also true that access to up-to-date facilities with appropriate kindergarten spaces, playground and gymnasium, and technological platforms can create optimal conditions through which innovative learning can occur. The Upper Canada District School Board is compelled to address the realities of maintaining its aging
inventory of school buildings, and that it has a surplus of almost 10,000 student spaces that will place a drain on future financial resources. Additionally, school consolidations can bring more students together and improve their access to educational programming experiences that are optimal.

Accordingly, this Initial Staff Report is an opportunity for the Board to consider a significant realignment of its school facilities. In doing so, the necessary conditions can be put in place to implement a progressive and comprehensive capital plan that will take advantage of the funding mechanisms provided by the Ministry for capital upgrades, maintenance and long term sustainability. That is why this Initial Staff Report is suggesting Building for the Future as a title for the proposed Pupil Accommodation Review.

7. Key Factors Applied for the Draft Recommendations

Following the Long Term Accommodation Projections and Program Review of last spring, an additional tool was developed in preparation of the need for an Initial Staff Report. More specifically, Trustees were informed of four key factors that would be used by staff to develop the draft recommendations in accordance with the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Factor</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Application for Initial Staff Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment, Space Utilization and Facility Renewal</td>
<td>Optimize the use of school space with a long term view of enrolments and facility renewal needs</td>
<td>Recommendations for school consolidations to be developed from a feeder school perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Language Instruction</td>
<td>Meet Ministry defined outcomes for French as a Second Language while achieving equitable enrolment balances between schools</td>
<td>Recommendations for school consolidations to promote local (i.e. no overlapping) school program attendance boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture Rate</td>
<td>Long term sustainability of schools that can demonstrate growth in student attendance as proportion of their local school age populations</td>
<td>Recommendations for school consolidations to promote long term community interest and student attendance at UCDSB schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Collaboration</td>
<td>Provide opportunities for municipal and community partners to use available school space on a cost recovery basis per Policy 4002</td>
<td>Recommendations for school consolidations to account for the possibility of community partners sharing full costs to operate underutilized schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the assistance of the 4 key factors, the draft recommendations presented with this Initial Staff Report have been developed with a commitment to clarity and consistency of approach and rationale.
8. Format of Draft Recommendations Presented

A series of draft recommendation summaries, presented as Appendices A1 through A16 for this Initial Staff Report, are organized by feeder groups of schools; that is, the elementary schools and corresponding secondary schools that students feed into through program attendance boundaries.

Each summary of draft recommendations is formatted in a similar manner with an overview, indication of the pupil accommodation challenges to be addressed, options considered, the draft recommended option and rationale, consideration of the four key factors, other considerations, financial impact, student transportation, and timelines.

9. School Information Profiles

In keeping with UCDSB School Closure Policy 413 and the Ministry’s Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines, school information profiles have been developed to assist the Pupil Accommodation Review process. Each school profile contains information about the facility, enrolment, instruction, community use, transportation and other data and are publicly available at:
http://www.ucdsb.on.ca/programs/ourcommunities/communityplanningandpartnerships/Pages/default.aspx

Thank you in advance to the Parent Councils of each feeder group of schools who, at the launch of an Accommodation Review, will be asked to provide information that will be added to these profiles demonstrating the value that these schools offer to students, their communities and the Upper Canada District School Board as a whole.

10. French Language Instruction

In some areas of the Board, there are elementary schools with attendance boundaries for (dual track) French Immersion that “overlap” the regular English attendance boundaries of other elementary schools. In many of these situations, feeder groups of schools are being affected by an inequitable imbalance of area enrolments. This was also a common theme of discussion of the spring 2016 Program Review.

As noted earlier, four key factors have been used to guide this Initial Staff Report, with Key Factor 2 stating that recommendations for school consolidations will promote local (i.e. no overlapping) school program attendance boundaries.

Accordingly, in feeder school groups that have overlapping school attendance boundaries, the draft recommended options for this report account for a phasing-in/out of dual track French/English programs.

Where applicable and specified with the draft recommendation, projected enrolments account for a model whereby students in JK-Grade 2 would be phased-in to their local school through a singular (dual track) attendance boundary. Similarly, grades 3-6 students at the dual track school with overlapping attendance boundaries would be phased-out from
the dual track school they currently attend. This approach has been used in the past to introduce singular dual track attendance boundaries at some UCDSB area schools.

While the total number of students attending schools can be projected with a high degree of confidence, the extent to which parents and students opt for Regular French/English or Early Immersion would require an application process to confirm program viability and assist with overall school organization.

11. Other Considerations

It will be noticed that the draft recommendations offered for some feeder school groups include attendance boundary adjustments that are indirectly associated (or not associated at all) with school closures and consolidations; notably,

- Attendance boundary adjustment between Bridgewood and Central Public School (Appendix A2),
- Attendance boundary adjustment for Rothwell-Osnabruck/Tagwi/Cornwall School feeder groups (Appendices A7, A6, and A2),
- Attendance boundary adjustment for with Glengarry feeder group (Appendix A8), and
- Initiation of Grades 7-12 at Smiths Falls DHS (Appendix A15).

12. Definition of Terms

A list of definitions for the common terms used with this Initial Staff Report is provided as Appendix B.

13. Draft Recommendations for School Closures/Consolidations

All of the school closure considerations presented as draft recommendations in this Initial Staff Report fall under three possible categories:

1. Category 1: School closures effective June 30, 2017 that can accommodate students for September 2017 at other feeder group schools without the need for additions or re-build. Twelve (12) school sites are recommended for consideration in this category.

2. Category 2: School closures effective June 30, 2017 that can accommodate students for September 2017 at other schools through portables and/or temporary facility adjustments at the receiving school until upgrade or rebuild is completed in accordance with the draft Capital Plan. Four (4) school sites are recommended for consideration in this category.

3. Category 3: School closures that are conditional upon Ministry approval for facility upgrades or rebuild at the receiving school in accordance with the draft Capital Plan, date to be determined. Nine (9) school sites are recommended for consideration in this category.
In some situations, schools identified for closure and consolidation are presented as Category 2 or 3. In these situations, the timing for closure would depend on the extent to which the number of portables required would be agreeable in relation to the program advantages associated with bringing students together and priority placement on the draft capital plan.

In accordance with these criteria, the following list of draft recommended closures reflects the more detailed information provided as Appendices A1 through A16.

**Category 1 closures provided for consideration:**

As noted above, these draft recommendations account for a start-up of September 2017 at other feeder group schools without the need for additions or re-build:

- Benson P.S. (accommodated at South Edwardsburg School)
- Char-Lan D.H.S. (accommodated at St. Lawrence D.H.S. and C.C.V.S.)
- Glen Tay P.S. (accommodated at Queen Elizabeth School)
- Long Sault P.S. (accommodated at Rothwell-Osnabuck School)
- North Elmsley P.S. (accommodated at Chimo and The Stewart Schools)
- Oxford-On-Rideau P.S. (accommodated at South Branch School)
- Pakenham P.S. (accommodated at R.Tait McKenzie School)
- Plagenten P.S. (accommodated at Rockland P.S.)
- Rideau Centennial P.S. (accommodated at South Crosby School)
- Rothwell-Osnabuck (grades 7-12, accommodated at Cornwall Collegiate V.S.)
- Seaway D.H.S. (accommodated at North Dundas D.H.S. and South Grenville D.H.S.)
- Wolford P.S. (accommodated at Chimo and Merrickville Schools)

**Category 2 closures provided for consideration:**

As noted above, these draft recommendations account for a start-up of September 2017, but would require portables and/or temporary facility adjustments to accommodate students at the receiving school until the upgrade or rebuild is completed in accordance with the Capital Plan.

- Iroquois / Morrisburg Schools; Iroquois and Morrisburg Schools are proposed for closure effective September 2017, with the students from both schools accommodated temporarily at Seaway D.H.S. until an addition is completed at Iroquois School in accordance with the Capital Priorities Plan. Note: Seaway D.H.S. (grades 7-12) is proposed for closure effective September 2017 with students residing north of Highway 401 to North Dundas D.H.S. and south of Highway 401 to South Grenville D.H.S..

- S.J. McLeod / Williamstown Schools; S.J. McLeod and Williamstown are proposed for closure effective September 2017, with the students from both schools accommodated temporarily at Char-Lan D.H.S. until an addition is completed at Williamstown School, in accordance with the Capital Priorities Plan. Note: Char-Lan D.H.S. (grades 7-12) is proposed for closure effective September 2017 with students attending St. Lawrence S.S. and Cornwall Collegiate V.S..
Category 3 closures provided for consideration as draft recommendations:

As noted above, these closures and consolidations would be conditional upon Ministry approval for facility upgrades or rebuild at the receiving school in accordance with the draft Capital Plan, date to be determined. This is due to the fact that there is insufficient space to accommodate students at other schools. However, the Board would need to confirm its intention to close these schools so that an appropriate business case could be developed.

- Caldwell P.S.; Caldwell School has significant facility condition challenges. However, there is insufficient space to accommodate Caldwell School at other schools. Accordingly, Caldwell School is proposed as a candidate for closure pending Ministry approval for either an addition at Arklan School or re-build of Caldwell School.
- Glengarry D.H.S.; While a majority of students from Glengarry D.H.S. could be accommodated at Tagwi S.S., some students would be closer to Vankleek Hill C.I. which is a grades 9-12 school. Vankleek Hill C.I. was approved for grades 7-12 through the 2006-07 Boundary 2020 Review, pending sufficient space at the school. Currently, there is insufficient capacity for Vankleek Hill C.I. to accommodate grades 7-8 students and the site cannot reasonably accommodate portables. Thus, the closure of Glengarry D.H.S. is proposed as contingent upon the development of a business case for a facility solution at Vankleek Hill C.I..
- Maynard P.S./South Edwardsburg P.S.; Maynard School has significant facility condition issues. However, there is insufficient space to accommodate Maynard at other schools. Accordingly, Maynard School is proposed as a candidate for closure with South Edwardsburg School, pending Ministry approval for a re-build at Wellington School. This proposal accounts for the earlier accommodation of Benson students at South Edwardsburg School.
- St. Lawrence S.S. /Cornwall Collegiate V.S. are proposed for closure and consolidation pending Ministry approval for the construction of one new Cornwall Secondary School.
- Sweet’s Corners P.S. is proposed for closure pending Ministry approval for a rebuild of South Crosby School.
- Maxville P.S. and North Stormont P.S. are proposed for closure pending Ministry approval for an addition at Roxmore P.S..

Category 2 or 3 closures provided for consideration as draft recommendations:

As noted earlier, there are some situations where schools identified for closure and consolidation are presented as Category 2 or 3. In these situations, the timing for closure would depend on the extent to which the number of portables required would be agreeable in relation to the program advantages associated with bringing students together and priority placement on the draft capital plan.

- Maple Grove P.S.; Clarification is required as to whether 3-5 portables at Drummond School would be acceptable to accommodate students from Maple Grove until plans for an addition at Drummond School could be finalized.
- Pineview P.S.: Clarification is required as to whether 2-4 portables at Meadowview School would be acceptable to accommodate students from Pineview School until plans for an addition at Meadowview School could be finalized.
- Prince of Wales / Toniata Schools; Clarification is required as to whether 6 portables at Westminster School to accommodate students from Prince of Wales and 1 portable at Commonwealth P.S. to accommodate students from Toniata School would be acceptable until plans for an upgrade at Westminster School and re-build at Commonwealth School could be finalized.

**Additional Actions to note:**

It is also proposed that, effective September 2017, students in the Smiths Falls feeder group of schools attend Smiths Falls D.H.S. for grades 7-12. Smiths Falls D.H.S. was previously approved by the Board through the 2007-08 Boundary 2020 Review, as a grades 7-12 school, pending space availability. It is anticipated that grades 7-12 students could be accommodated with as many as 4-6 portables, which would lead to an addition at the school in accordance with the Capital Priorities Plan.

**14. Multi Year Capital Priorities Plan**

A central premise to the draft recommendations provided is that taking a proactive stance to reduce surplus space through school closures will allow the Board to proceed with the implementation of a multi-year capital priorities plan by taking advantage of the Ministry’s funding mechanisms for facility operations, maintenance, renewal, and capital upgrades and rebuilds.

The opportunity from the Building for the Future Pupil Accommodation Review to consolidate space would improve the likelihood that the Board can finance a broad, board-wide refresh of our schools and confirm its capital priorities. For example, as outlined in this Initial Staff Report and associated draft Capital Plan, it is anticipated that the Board would be positioned to propose re-build of new schools at:

- Wellington (to replace Maynard, Benson, South Edwardsburg and Wellington),
- South Crosby (to replace Rideau Centennial and Sweet’s Corners),
- Cornwall High School (to replace S.L.S.S. and C.C.V.S.), and
- Perth and District Collegiate (as a replacement).
- Caldwell P.S (as rebuild)
- Commonwealth P.S. (as re-build)

It is also anticipated that the Board would be able to build additions at:

- Westminster (new gym, office and classrooms).
- Williamstown School (addition with significant renovation)
- Roxmore (new daycare, gym and classrooms),
- Drummond (addition with significant renovation),
- North Grenville District High School (addition), and
- Iroquois (addition with significant renovation)
Other schools would also receive significant renovations including purpose-built kindergarten classrooms, focus on outdoor play and learning spaces, accessibility and welcoming entrances that could be carried out due to a better alignment with renewal funding.

It is important to note that all of the capital priorities presented above are preliminary, based upon an early and high level business case analysis. A more detailed analysis would need to be undertaken for submission to the Ministry to confirm project scope and approval.

15. Formation of Accommodation Review (ARC)

In keeping with the Upper Canada District School Board School Closure Policy 413 and the Ministry of Education’s Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines, the Building for the Future Pupil Accommodation Review will require four (4) Accommodation Review (ARC) Committees. Each ARC will be led by a Superintendent of Schools as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARC</th>
<th>Superintendent</th>
<th>Family of Schools</th>
<th>Feeder Group</th>
<th>Orientation Meetings</th>
<th>Public Meeting #1</th>
<th>Public Meeting #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Val Allen</td>
<td>Prescott-Russell</td>
<td>Rockland</td>
<td>Oct 20/16, Tagwi SS</td>
<td>Nov 10/16, Rockland DHS</td>
<td>Jan 19/17, Rockland DHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VanKleek Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glengarry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Char-Lan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tagwi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rothwell-Osnabruck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Dundas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seaway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tim Mills</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 14/16, General Vanier</td>
<td>Jan 23/17, General Vanier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>David Coombs</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 15/16, South Grenville DHS</td>
<td>Jan 24/17, Brockville CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Susan Edwards</td>
<td>Rideau</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 16/16, Smiths Falls D.H.S.</td>
<td>Jan 30/17, Rideau DHS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation for the ARCs will be sought immediately following Board approval to proceed with the Building for the Future Pupil Accommodation Review. At a minimum, the ARCs will have parent/guardian representatives from each school under review.

An orientation session for the 2 Eastern Board ARCs will be held on October 20th, 2016 at Tagwi S.S. An orientation session for the 2 Western Board ARCs will be held on October 24th at Smiths Falls D.H.S..

These orientation sessions will familiarize the ARCs with the Building for the Future Pupil Accommodation Review process, including terms of reference, and preparations for the public meetings (2 per ARC) that will be held in accordance with the above-noted schedule.
16. Role of the Accommodation Review Committee

It is important to note that, with the Ministry’s update of its Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines (PARG) in March, 2015, the role of the ARC has changed.

In comparison to the earlier version of the PARG, the updated Guidelines (referenced as well in UCDSB School Closure Policy 413) clarify that the role of the ARC is to act as the official conduit for information shared between the board and school communities.

As the Building for the Future Pupil Accommodation Review proceeds, there will be many opportunities for parents, students and the public to share their thoughts in response to the draft recommendation presented with this Initial Staff Report. Accordingly, the ARC will have an important role to play to help ensure that the Board of Trustees receives all of the feedback from the Review in a timely and clear manner to inform their decision making responsibilities.

17. Accommodation Review Timelines

Approval by the Board of Trustees of this report will trigger the initiation of the Building for the Future Pupil Accommodation Review in keeping with UCDSB School Closure Policy 413. The timeline chart and the calendar provided as Appendices C1 and C2 provide a view of the meeting schedule for the Review leading to a final decision by the Board on March 23, 2017.

18. Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board proceed with the Building for the Future Pupil Accommodation Review, in accordance with the timelines and schedule provided as Appendix C1, to solicit feedback with respect to the draft recommendations options provided with this Initial Staff Report.