



# Keele Street PS/Mountview Alt. JPS, General Mercer JPS & Runnymede C.I.

Program Area Review Team

April 24, 2018

6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

<b>Present:</b>	<p>Sandra Tondat (SOE-LN27), Manon Gardner (Executive Superintendent), Trustee Pilkey, Trustee Stiles, Rod Zimmerman (Principal – Keele Street PS), Lisa Patsiopoulos (Parent Council – Keele Street PS), Sean Hertel (Parent Council – Keele Street), Chris Hosiak (Vice Principal – Mountview Alt. School), Sylvia Walker (Parent Council Mountview Alt. School), Pam Miehlis (Parent Council Mountview Atl. School), Heather Wheeler (Principal – General Mercer JPS), Matt Walton (Parent Council General Mercer), Lusa Azevedo (Parent Council General Mercer), Paul Edwards (Principal – Runnymede C.I.), Harpreet Gulri (Parent Council – Runnymede C.I.), Mages Palany (Parent Council – Runnymede C.I.), Richard Villivencio (Parent Council – Runnymede C.I.), Viktor Kuslikis (Design Services – Architectural), Reema Khanna (Educational Planning Officer) and Bill Wallace (Educational Planning Co-ordinator)</p> <p>Regrets: Tracy Hayhurst (SOE – LN22), Liz Hoang (Manager – Child Care), Fatima Bhabha (Education Planning Officer), Lachlan Gray (Student – Runnymede C.I.), Shahan Mahmood (Student – Runnymede C.I.), Jennifer Newby (Special Education), Liz Hoang (Child Care)</p>
-----------------	--

<i>Item / Presenter</i>	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Attachments / Actions / Results</i>
Review of objective of Meeting	Based on the recommendation of the Local Feasibility Team (LFT) that a Program Area Review Team (PART) be established to consider relocating Mountview Alternative JS from Keele Street PS. Keele Street continues to experience enrolment pressures. In 2012 they were included in the Runnymede JPS PART to address their enrolment pressures. Even after a 12 room addition was built projections are suggesting that the school’s capacity will be exceeded by September 2018.	
Review of Options Considered by LFT	<p>There were four options considered by the Local Feasibility Team:</p> <p>Accommodating Portables on site: staff conducted a portable review on the playfield and in the parking lot. There is artificial turf scheduled for Spring 2018. Locating portables on the parking lot would impact exiting, delivery and waste removal. In an accommodation emergency one portable could possibly be located south of the school. However, the LFT determined that the installation of portable was not a sustainable solution.</p> <p>Staff also considered boundary changes to mitigate accommodation growth at Keele Street PS. As mentioned at the last meeting changes were explored with Annette St. PS, Fern Avenue JR/SR PS, Howard JPS and Indian Road Crescent JPS. These schools are operating at or near their respective capacities and will remain fully enrolled. To redirect students would create an accommodation pressure at another school.</p>	

<i>Item / Presenter</i>	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Attachments / Actions / Results</i>
	<p>They considered that when a large residential development is proposed to be constructed in an area that is served by overcrowding that those students would be assigned to a school outside the area that has available space. This would occur before the development is occupied.</p> <p>The Team also considered existing programs that can be moved between schools (e.g. DD Programs, French, Adult and Alternative) to reduce overcrowding and to utilize surplus space.</p>	
<p>Review of Options from PART and/or Community Members</p>	<p>There were five options from the PART and/or community members</p> <p>Expansion of site: staff doesn't believe that a further expansion on site is possible due to the small site without impacting the play area and green space</p> <p>Reclaiming space from Child Care: TDSB has Procedure to review the use of exclusive school space by child care operators but not engaged until other options for accommodating students have been explored. The City of Toronto has provided funding to the TDSB for the construction of a child care room during the 12 room addition at Keele St. PS.</p> <p>Reclaiming space from Community Centre: The Keele Street Community Centre is providing a service to children residing within the community and is a valued partner. They are also using the general purpose room and office space. These spaces are not available for instructional purposes.</p> <p>Relocating program into Condo: these developments are rental buildings and there is no mechanism that would allow TDSB to secure space.</p> <p>Changing Grade ranges at Keele St. PS: Keele Street expanded their grades to K-8 in September 2014. It would go against the accommodation drivers to go back to a K-6.</p>	
<p>Review of Options from Meeting #1</p>	<p>Option 1 – Keele Street – redirecting new development, reclaim 5 classrooms, model assumes that Mountview students living within Keele St. attendance area will return to Keele Street. Long term may be short 1 or 2 classrooms.</p> <p>General Mercer JPS – Redirect to Mountview Alt. JS in its entirety by September 2019. Projected enrolment remains the same, Mountview would occupy 5 classrooms in the long term there would be classrooms available. Capacity</p>	

<i>Item / Presenter</i>	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Attachments / Actions / Results</i>
	<p>decreases, which increases utilization.</p> <p>Option 2 – Keele Street – 50% of students from Mountview are from Keele St attendance area assuming students living in catchment return to Keele. Long term Keele St may be short 1 or 2 classrooms.</p> <p>Runnymede C.I. – projected enrolment remains the same, Mountview would occupy 5 classrooms. In both the short term and long term RCI would have classrooms available. Capacity decreases, which increases utilization.</p> <p>Mountview Alt – the program will remain viable and be backfilled. Program will remain JK-6 and will occupy 5 classrooms.</p>	
<p>Comments/Questions:</p>	<p>Q: When you conduct a boundary change do you look at all schools?  A: We start with what we consider the problem and look at quantifying the number of students and what happens to the other schools. Mountview Alt. school is a program that doesn't have a boundary (catchment) area.</p> <p>Q: Why can't we go as far back to the houses to build?  A: The Province will want to know what we've done to solve this accommodation problem. We have space in other schools to solve our problem here. It also takes 4-5 years to get an expansion that is also a problem for the TDSB. The Province doesn't fund for the future. You need to have "students in seats".</p> <p>Staff spent time on these considerations. The bulk of the apartments will be opening in 2023; these students will go to other schools.</p> <p>Q: How many times do the Trustees turn down these types of considerations?  A: The Trustees do debate these recommendations. We want to see the facts with the recommendation. There have been times that we have turned them down.</p> <p>It was mentioned that some of the group feels that the TDSB is doing what they want.</p> <p>It was mentioned again that the TDSB is not closing this alternative school but relocating it.</p>	

<i>Item / Presenter</i>	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Attachments / Actions / Results</i>
	<p>Runnymede C.I. SAC meet and they spoke to the concerns that were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is an extremely large amount of money</li> <li>• Moving an elementary school into a secondary school is not grade appropriate</li> <li>• Construction will bring too much disruption for RCI students especially in grade 12</li> <li>• What will their school look like in 3-5 years? They want different options and feel they will have less space</li> <li>• General Mercer is a closer school to get to</li> </ul> <p>Response to those concerns were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are a number of grade 7-12 (or 7-10) schools in the province. We currently have elementary alternative schools in secondary schools that are successful.</li> <li>• The TDSB will approve the cost of the retrofits. This also adds value to the school. Doesn't believe construction will be an impediment to the grade 12 students.</li> <li>• The proposed plan is for one confined area. There could be curriculum/program connections between both schools.</li> </ul> <p>Runnymede Parent Reps still feel that RCI should be the last option.</p> <p>The bulk of the construction would be done over the summer months.</p> <p>General Mercer's SAC also met and the Principal shared some of their ideas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They spoke about space accommodation with Mountview as well as still hoping to add grades 7 &amp; 8</li> <li>• They are concerned about an alternative school coming because they are a small inter-city model school with limited resources</li> <li>• The parking drop off is a concern</li> <li>• They would rather see them go to a larger school but will open their arms and welcome them should General Mercer be the school decided upon</li> </ul> <p>Staff spoke about sharing resources. It was indicated that staffing is based on enrolment and that the staffing will there. Gyms, Library, etc. will be shared at General Mercer however at Runnymede a separate library will be built.</p>	

<i>Item / Presenter</i>	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Attachments / Actions / Results</i>
	<p>Parent representatives from Mountview indicated that they have a problem with moving. It doesn't make sense to them. They feel that the SAC representatives from Keele Street shouldn't have a say on where they go.</p> <p>The Keele Street parent representatives indicated that they have been largely silent through this process and one member indicated that he/she won't be voting in this process. At what point do we say that a decision has been made? We need to create some sort of happy place for our children.</p> <p>Planning reiterated again that the PART makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees. And the Board of Trustees makes the final decision. Parents will have their voice at the public meeting.</p> <p>The idea of Mountview Alternative and General Mercer co-existing in a grade change of K-8 was discussed. The PART can make this recommendation for Mountview Alternative; however it would then also make the same recommendation for General Mercer. It was further discussed that students would be able to enter Mountview in grade 7 because it doesn't have a natural flow.</p> <p>Q: Are we still committed to the timelines?  A: Yes, but we would need to have another working meeting should we decide that we want to explore a K-8 option.</p> <p>Q: What happens if Runnymede C.I. says no to Mountview coming, as does General Mercer and we don't want to go.  A: The Report would read that the PART doesn't see a solution to the accommodation going forward. However, the report will also indicate that it is the recommendation of staff involved that we move forward with Option 1 or Option 2.</p>	
Next Steps:	<p>Planners will explore a K-8 grade change for Mountview Alternative moving to General Mercer with General Mercer also receiving a grade change of K-8. Explore Mountview Alternative moving to a grade change of K-8 moving to Runnymede C.I.</p> <p>Site visits can still be arranged.</p>	If you are interested in visiting the sites please connect with Sandra Tondat and she will arrange.
Next Working Meeting Public Meeting	<p>May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2018, 6:00-8:00pm at Keele St./Mountview Alt. PS (Staffroom)</p> <p>May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018, 7:00-9:00pm at Western Technical School (Aud)</p>	

<b><i>Item / Presenter</i></b>	<b><i>Discussion</i></b>	<b><i>Attachments / Actions / Results</i></b>
Work Meeting #4	May 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2018 , 6:00-8:00pm at Keele St./Mountview Alt. PS (Staffroom)	
Adjournment:	8:00pm	