

UPPER GRAND DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

BUSINESS OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

MINUTES

January 17, 2012

The Business Operations Committee of Upper Grand District School Board met on Tuesday, January 17, 2012, in the Board Room at 500 Victoria Road North, Guelph, Ontario commencing at 7:00 p.m.

Trustee Fairbairn, Chair, presided and the following Trustees were present: Bailey, Borden, Busuttil, Cooper, Gohn, Moziar, Schieck, Topping and Waterston, along with Student Trustees MacDougall and Sampson.

Present from the Administration were Director of Education, Dr. M. Rogers, Superintendents Benallick, Kelly, Boswell, Fyfe, Morrell, and Wright; M. McFadzen, Communications Officer; M. Weidmark, Administrative Officer, Communications; J.L. Rose, Executive Officer of Human Resources; H. Imm, Senior Planner; J. Passy, Manager of Planning; J. Veit, Manager of Operations; and, P. Scinocca, Manager of Capital and Renewal Projects.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Trustee Busuttil moved that the agenda be approved as printed.

The motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Trustee Waterston moved that the minutes of the previous meeting, held December 13, 2011 be approved as printed.

The motion carried.

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

OPEN SESSION

DELEGATIONS

Edward Johnson Boundary Review

1. Mr. Vincent Brisbin and Ms. Janine Hodgins

Mr. Vincent Brisbin addressed Trustees and expressed his view that it is imperative that the issue be given more time for discussion. He felt that following a conversation with the Ministry of Education, the review should be conducted as an accommodation review as report #3 indicates that 51-60% of the students enrolled in the school will be impacted. In addition, the UGDSB guidelines indicate a boundary review timeline would be 120 days and the Edward Johnson review will be conducted in 63 days. Mr. Brisbin also cited inconsistency in the numbers used between the reports and challenged the accuracy of the Planning Department's claim that these students cannot be accommodated in Guelph.

Ms. Janine Hodgins addressed the Trustees as a parent of children in the French Immersion program in Guelph who are not directly impacted by this particular review. Ms. Hodgins lives outside the City of Guelph limits and considers her family to be part of the French immersion community in Guelph. She addressed her concerns regarding the procedural fairness of the review based on historical precedent, constructive closure of the program, the sudden onset of this review and the abbreviated timeline which it has followed.

Ms. Hodgins noted that there is no actual entity called "East Wellington" as referred to in the report. She went on to say that she felt the proposed changes result in a constructive closure of the program as the historical central location of the French Immersion program being offered for the families that live east of Jones Baseline is being changed to Erin when for approximately the past 30 years it has been centered in Guelph for these residents. Ms. Hodgins expressed concern that it will result in the closure of the realistic opportunity to enrol the students in French immersion as distance, family and community factors could outweigh the feasibility for some families to continue to have their students participate. Ms. Hodgins also felt that the process did not allow enough time for community feedback. She asked that Trustees consider deferring the vote on the issue to allow more time and input or voting against the scenarios and sending the issue back to Planning to ensure more fulsome input has been received and to allow other viable scenarios to be developed and considered.

It was clarified for Trustees that a boundary review can be conducted if less than 50% of enrolled students (FTE) will be affected. The numbers used in the report are full-time equivalents.

2. Ms. Joanne Oliver

Ms. Joanne Oliver, who lives in downtown Guelph and is a parent of children in the Tytler PS catchment area, addressed Trustees. She indicated the neighbourhood is

dynamic, diverse and foot-friendly. She participated in the ARC process over the past few years that resulted in the approval of a scenario in October 2010 that reassigned 24 students from Tytler PS, 2/3 of which now attend Edward Johnson PS which is not within walking distance. The change supported the aims of the group who worked to meet the needs of the middle schools in north Guelph and called for all grade 7/8 FI students to move to John McCrae until an FI Centre could be developed north of the river. This reassignment of 24 students included the remainder of the students in the Tytler area. She noted the concern that arose when the families read the current boundary review report and learned that the board is considering moving the children to a dual track school with a grade 8 FI program as well as an English program which is precisely what the October 2010 decision hoped to eliminate. Ms. Oliver noted that feedback from the neighbourhood was provided early in the process and is referenced in Report #3. The request is to consider providing some stability to the students by allowing them to continue to be enrolled at Edward Johnson PS until 2014 when they are moved to the new King George School as planned. This would avoid moving the children to two schools within two years. It is also requested that should there be a decision to move the students, that accommodation at John McCrae be pursued as it is within a safe walking distance and is accessible by public transit.

In response to questions from Trustees, it was clarified that the neighbourhood would prefer to have a home school. Previously they had that with John McCrae PS, which had the advantage of being within walking distance. If it is to be Edward Johnson, then they would like to see the students from the Tytler area remain there until grade 6 and then move at that time as a group.

TRUSTEES' RESPONSE TO DELEGATIONS

The delegations were thanked for their presentations. It was noted that the Edward Johnson FI Boundary Review - Report #3 would be discussed as the next agenda item.

EDWARD JOHNSON FI BOUNDARY REVIEW – REPORT #3

Ms. Janice Wright, Superintendent of Finance, introduced and reviewed the report entitled “Edward Johnson JK-6 FI Boundary Review – Report #3,” dated January 17, 2012. She highlighted the background, including the Goals, Objectives and Constraints pertaining to the review. It was noted that a public information session was held on December 15, 2011 and that additional feedback has subsequently been received via the Board’s website and that delegations have appeared before Trustees responding to Staff’s preferred scenario, and have presented an alternative scenario for consideration. Report #3 was then reviewed in detail including comparison of projected Guelph FI Enrolment to Capacity in FDK Capital Plan, assumptions and facts considered by the staff committee, a summary of comments received from the public, the East Wellington Parent Scenario, the Edward Johnson JK-6 FI Boundary Scenario, the Implementation Plan and the Communication Plan. It was explained that Scenario A included in the report is the staff’s preferred scenario as presented in Report #2. A

Scenario A Modified has also been included. This second scenario was developed subsequent to the December 15, 2011 Public Information Session and includes an adjustment to realign the boundary for Edward Johnson PS slightly to decrease the projected enrolment to within the planned capacity. The recommendation is that either Scenario A or Scenario A Modified be considered as both scenarios create a sustainable JK-6 FI boundary for Edward Johnson PS; alleviate the enrolment pressure at Edward Johnson PS, and given that a boundary is approved on January 24, 2012, will establish an attendance area/program boundary in time to inform parents of the changes prior to kindergarten registration and allow for sufficient time to staff for the 2012/2013 school year.

Recommendation #1

Trustee Moziar moved

THAT:

1. the report attached to memo PLN:12-03 "Edward Johnson JK-6 FI Boundary Review – Report #3," be received.
2. the Board approve Scenario A Modified as described in Section 3.2 of PLN:12-03 "Edward Johnson JK-6 FI Boundary Review – Report #3" and the boundaries as presented on Maps 3 and 4 contained in Appendix 4, with the exception that East Wellington FI Students east of Jones Baseline, be allowed to remain at King George PS until September 2014 with transportation provided.

Trustee Moziar explained that motion 2 is Motion 2b) from the report with additional wording to address provision of transportation as she felt that provision of transportation to these students would be a fair and equitable thing to do.

The possibility of offering Edward Johnson as an optional school was raised as it might allow for the provision of transportation to either King George or Edward Johnson.

Trustee Schieck acknowledged the amount of time and effort put into this project by the East Wellington parents. He requested information be provided to Trustees regarding the cost of providing transportation to these students until 2014 including a comparison of bussing costs to Erin versus bussing costs to Guelph. He also suggested that the parents in Rockwood and East Wellington should consider coming together to determine what kind of FI program they would like to see in that area should an additional school be built in that area in future

Trustee Bailey thanked the delegations and acknowledged that they raised some good points this evening. He noted that the implementation of FDK has resulted in capacity issues and the need to make difficult decisions that impact school communities. He expressed concern that the provision of transportation to out of area students in this case will set a difficult precedent in light of the number of upcoming boundary reviews and would be unfair to those who have been denied in the past

In response to questions by Trustee Cooper it was clarified that a Boundary Review can be conducted when less than 50% of the enrolment is affected. This percentage is based on the projected enrolment at the time the change is implemented which means that this review is in line with the Ministry of Education guidelines. It was also explained that the term "East Wellington" is identified in Report #2 as the term being used for the purpose of the report and current review and that it is not commonly used elsewhere. In addition, the changes do not fall into the definition of a program closure. A breakdown of FI projections for 2016 and 2020 by school was also provided and include the progression factor based on historical data. It was further explained that Scenario A Modified does not identify additional capacity at King George School, but merely provides a better balance between Edward Johnson and King George School over time. It was acknowledged that it cannot be predicted if there will be any potential shift of students from the FI program to attend the new school being built in East Guelph.

Trustee Waterston requested separation and placed an amendment to motion 2 made by Trustee Moziar to remove the wording pertaining to transportation and suggested that transportation should be considered under motion 3 as contained in Report #3 which addresses implementation of the plan and has not yet been placed:

1. the report attached to memo PLN:12-03 "Edward Johnson JK-6 FI Boundary Review – Report #3," be received.

The motion carried.

The amendment to motion 2 taking precedence was considered first.

Trustee Waterston moved that the wording "with the exception that East Wellington FI Students East of Jones Baseline be allowed to remain at King George PS until September 2014 with transportation provided" be removed from the proposed motion 2b.

Trustee Moziar requested a recorded vote which was as follows:

Yeah: Trustees Bailey, Borden, Cooper, Fairbairn, Topping and Waterston,
Nay: Trustees Busuttill, Gohn, Moziar and Schieck

The motion carried.

The motion as amended was considered as follows:

2. Scenario A Modified as described in Section 3.2 of PLN:12-03 "Edward Johnson JK-6 FI Boundary Review – Report #3" and the boundaries as presented on Maps 3 and 4 contained in Appendix 4.

The motion carried.

Trustee Borden moved

THAT:

3. the Board approve the Implementation Plan as articulated in Section 3.3 of PLN:12-03 "Edward Johnson JK-6 FI Boundary Review – Report #3," which is further illustrated by the flow diagrams contained in Appendix 5.
4. additional resources be made available to assist with the implementation and transition

It was noted that motion 3 deals with implementation but does not currently address the provision of transportation to Guelph for the East Wellington students. Information was requested from staff regarding costs and any potential impact on our E and E rating and full funding. Superintendent Wright explained that the E and E process for the UGDSB and the Transportation Consortium has been completed and that there is no known intent for the Ministry to revisit the issue. There is also no indication that any amendment to our funding level is planned. Ms. Wright also explained the three components of the transportation costs (fixed, kilometres and time) and reported that the annual cost for provision of an additional bus is approximately \$45,000-\$50,000. It was noted that courtesy bussing is not normally provided to out of area students.

Trustee Schieck requested separation and placed an amendment to motion 3 made by Trustee Borden to add wording pertaining to the provision of transportation until 2014.

The amendment taking precedence was considered first.

That the wording "and that transportation be supplied to East Wellington FI students east of Jones Baseline to come to Guelph until 2014" be included in the motion.

Trustee Schieck requested a recorded vote which was as follows:

Yeah: Trustees Borden, Busuttil, Cooper, Fairbairn, Gohn, Moziar, and Schieck

Nay: Trustees Bailey, Topping and Waterston

The motion carried.

The motion as amended was considered as follows:

3. the Board approve the Implementation Plan as articulated in Section 3.3 of PLN 12-03 "Edward Johnson JK-6 FI Boundary Review – Report #3" which is further illustrated by the flow diagrams contained in Appendix 5 and that transportation be supplied to East Wellington FI students east of Jones Baseline to come to Guelph until 2014.

The motion carried.

4. additional resources be made available to assist with the implementation and transition

The motion carried.

The recommendations will go forward to the Board for consideration on January 24, 2012.

LEE STREET (STOCKFORD SITE) BOUNDARY REVIEW – REPORT #1

Ms. Jennifer Passy, Manager of Planning, introduced and reviewed the report entitled, “Lee Street (Stockford Site) Boundary Review – Report #1,” dated January 17, 2012. She reported that in September 2011, the Trustees approved in principle the Full Day Kindergarten Capital Plan that identified the need for a new elementary school in East Guelph and in October 2011 the Board approved the Boundary Reviews – Draft Schedule which established the schedule for a series of review processes. By 2013, FDK will be fully implemented in East Guelph with the result that the enrolment pressures currently evident at Ken Danby PS will intensify. A site has been acquired in East Guelph for a new elementary school and this review is necessary to establish a boundary for the planned new school. The Goals, Objectives and Constraints (Appendix A), the Proposed Timeline (Appendix B), and the Communication Plan (Appendix C) were reviewed in detail.

Recommendation #2

Trustee Waterston moved

THAT:

1. memo PLN:12-01 entitled “Lee Street (Stockford Site) Boundary Review – Report #1” be received.
2. the board approve a boundary review process for the new Lee Street elementary school.
3. Trustees adopt the schedule shown in Appendix B of report PLN:12-01, as the proposed timeline for the boundary review process necessary to establish the boundary for the Lee Street elementary school.

The motion carried.

NEW SHELBURNE PS JK-8 BOUNDARY REVIEW – REPORT #1

Ms. Jennifer Passy, Manager of Planning, introduced and reviewed the report entitled, “New Shelburne Elementary School Boundary Review – Report #1,” dated January 17, 2012. She noted that in September 2011, the Trustees approved in principle the Full Day Kindergarten Capital Plan that identified the need for a new elementary school in Shelburne and in October 2011 the Board approved the Boundary Reviews – Draft Schedule which established the schedule for a series of review

processes. The approvals related to the acquired site for a new elementary school are advancing and this review will establish a viable JK-8 boundary for the new Shelburne elementary school. The Goals, Objectives and Constraints (Appendix A), the Proposed Timeline (Appendix B), and the Communication Plan (Appendix C) were reviewed in detail.

Recommendation #3

Trustee Topping moved

THAT

1. memo PLN:12-02 entitled "New Shelburne Elementary School Boundary Review – Report #1" be received.
2. the Board approve a boundary review process for the new Shelburne elementary school.
3. Trustees adopt the schedule shown in Appendix A of report PLN:12-02, as the proposed timeline for the boundary review process necessary to establish the JK-8 boundary for the new Shelburne elementary school.

The motion carried.

RESIGNATIONS, APPOINTMENTS AND RETIREMENTS

Ms. J. L. Rose introduced and reviewed the report "Resignations and Retirements (Appendix A and B)", dated January 17, 2012, as distributed at the meeting.

Recommendation #4

Trustee Schieck acknowledged the long service employees and moved that this Committee recommend to the Board the report, "Resignations and Retirements (Appendix A and B)" dated January 17, 2012," be received.

The motion carried.

HEALTH AND SAFETY REPORT - Nil

OTHER BUSINESS

WOW Butter.

Trustee Borden raised the issue of WOW Butter, a new product that looks, smells, and tastes like peanut butter but contains no nuts, and its use in the schools. Superintendent Benallick explained it is difficult for principals, teachers and school staff to monitor its use when trying to maintain a nut free environment. She further reported that the Life Threatening Allergy policy is being reviewed and this topic will be addressed. Upon investigation, it was found that across the province, the product is not

being encouraged in schools. The Board's legal counsel was consulted and recommends that it should be a restricted item. While the Board does not ban a product, it does strive to provide a safe learning environment for students.

IN CAMERA

ADJOURNMENT

Trustee Waterston moved that this Committee adjourn at 9:30 p.m. to report to the Board.

The motion carried.