

REPORT OF THE AREA STUDY COMMITTEE
Oxford Study Area 4

January 15, 2008

<p>VOTING MEMBERS</p> <p>Betteanne Cadman, Township of Norwich Ross Gerrie, Woodstock Councillor Tom Leitch, NDHS Citizen Rep Cindy Mendler, Glendale School Council Rep Steve Molnar, Town of Tillsonburg Heather Pelland, Annandale School Council Rep Laura Vannatter, Annandale/Glendale Citizen Rep Brent VanParys, NDHS School Council Rep Meg Wallace, CASS School Council Rep</p> <p>REGRETS</p> <p>Jane Esseltine, Business Rep</p>	<p>ADMINISTRATION AND OTHERS</p> <p>James Stewart, Trustee Jim Empringham, Superintendent</p> <p>Principals: Chris Friesen, Principal, Annandale School Tom McLeod, Principal, Norwich District H.S. Mary Ellen Smith, Principal, Glendale H.S. Judy Thorner, Principal, College Ave S.S.</p>
--	---

1. **WELCOME**
Trustee J. Stewart welcomed everyone to the meeting.
2. **ADDITIONS & APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
There were no additions to the agenda. The agenda was approved.
3. **CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS**
4. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING – DECEMBER 17, 2008**
The minutes were approved as printed.
5. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 17, 2007**
 - 5.1 Proposed Scenario
J. Empringham reviewed a portion of the ARC's procedures and guidelines related to the involvement of schools not included in the original ARC structure. J. Empringham relayed how the Middlesex Study Area #2 committee was directed that if a motion was made, that involved the ARC membership and/or involvement of other schools, and supported by the ARC's committee members, it would be considered by senior administration. Keeping this in mind when reviewing the pending proposal may assist the committee on what path to follow.
 - B. VanParys moved that the Accommodation Review Committee submit the Alternative Accommodation Report to Thames Valley District School Board Administration for a comparative analysis as outlined in the Plan.

Further, that the Accommodation Review Committee be provided at least three weeks to review the results of the analysis prior to the ARC meeting at which Administration will table the analysis.

Further, that individuals within the Thames Valley District School Board Administration attend future ARC meetings at the request of the ARC to explain and answer questions about the results of the analysis.

Discussion followed. S. Molnar asked for clarification that if the proposal is not from the committee as a whole, could it be considered and discussed.

B. VanParys responded that he felt this presentation did not need to comply with ARC procedures as it is a presentation not a recommendation and could be presented for discussion.

B. VanParys reviewed the presentation (Appendix A) with the committee confirming that the requests are for factual comparisons and an analysis of an alternate plan so that comparisons can be made with the senior administration's recommendations.

ARC members were asked to support this request for an analysis – which could then lead to the committee's alternate recommendation or to a minority report. Further discussion followed by committee members.

B. VanParys was asked if another evaluation template for the alternate proposal would be requested as this could be time consuming. B. VanParys responded that another template is not being requested at this time but a side by side comparison of involved schools' revenue, costs and expenditures of all the schools involved and the economic comparisons of WCI and NDHS. If, after a costs analysis is completed and it dictates that other schools become part of the ARC, then additional templates would be expected to be completed.

B. Cadman asked if this costing information could be obtained for WCI and IDCI. J. Empringham indicated that this request could be considered as long as requested by the committee as a whole. We would need to ensure that all communities being considered are not left out of the process due to the pending impact to their schools and communities.

J. Stewart ensured committee members that all considerations should be looked at by trustees before any final decisions are made and if there are other considerations then they should be examined. J. Stewart reminded the committee that the original CPAC recommendations for the first round of ARCs to be created, were altered by senior administration and again revised by trustees before the final ARC structure was created.

M. Wallace asked for clarification as to why the committee is considering involvement of IDCI and WCI when the committee had already voted to keep the ARC membership as it exists. J. Stewart reiterated that the request will only be considered if the committee as a whole makes the request.

J. Empringham relayed details of the Board's Capital Plan and why NDHS's closure was determined as one of senior administration's considerations. Student learning and declining enrolment are the Board's focal points and NDHS is, and will continue to be, one of the Board's priorities to ensure they can offer students' the educational learning options they deserve. R. Gerrie commented that part of the ARC's mandate is what is best for the students – and sometimes financial concerns are not the main question.

J. Empringham confirmed that there is second round of ARCs being prepared. There are no secondary schools in the next round but if the board were to use the CN Watson report as a guideline, WCI could be considered by 2012. B. Cadman asked why an ARC with all Oxford County secondary schools was not being considered to address declining enrolment.

H. Pelland commented that the committee needs to be aware of the time and expense that goes into an analysis preparation and that the committee needs to be certain that the proposal is viable before asking for a considerable amount of work to be completed by board personnel. H. Pelland also asked about the issue of holding the Grade 10-12's to any revised boundaries and how can we be certain that those students will move to the specific schools we determine or possibly choose physical closeness of a school or programming options. She was also concerned about the affects to Glendale HS with the proposed boundary changes in that the lower enrolment might affect the tentative program enhancements.

T. Leitch supported B. VanParys proposal indicating that this analysis is to assist in finding another alternative and that if it takes the committee and board's time and expense that this is the time to do it.

S. Molnar asked about the number of students in the Norwich township area and how many students attend other boards and private schools. Would changing programming or creating equitable programming attract students to NDHS?

B. VanParys spoke to the motion indicating that he is looking for facts and economic realities. If the analysis determines that other schools should be involved then that recommendation should be made, otherwise a minority report will be submitted on actual facts.

J. Stewart called for a vote to the motion.
All in favour -3; Opposed – 5
The motion was not passed.

5.2 Additional Transportation Questions - none

6. **COMMENTS FROM THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS RE FEELINGS OF THEIR INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL COMMUNITIES**

7. **PUBLIC INPUT**

8. **NEW BUSINESS**

8.1 PMI Exercise – J. Empringham distributed a copy of this summary chart that could be used is an option or method for committee members in order to examine issues and find the positive, minus and interesting points. This is a tool that could be used to help with discussions and pull together considerations to assist when creating the final report.

8.2 Template for Final Report – J. Empringham gave copies of the report format the committee is asked to follow when writing their recommendations and responses to take to the board.

9. **QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS**

Discussion occurred on what the next steps are and the needs of the committee for the next meeting. J. Empringham indicated that he (or Mary Ellen Smith) would write a draft report from the information given by the committee. G. Hart clarified that once the draft recommendation is completed, it is posted on the website for 30 days. After 30 days, another Public Input meeting is held for additional public input and then the report goes to senior administration for comments and to the board for consideration.

Agenda item for the next meeting: Drafting the final report.

10. **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

February 11, 2008 @ 7:00 p.m. @ Glendale High School, Tillsburg
S. Molnar suggested that the final Public Input meeting be held at Norwich District High School.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

James Stewart
Study Committee Chairperson

ALTERNATIVE ACCOMMODATION PLAN

**Submitted by: Oxford Area 4 Accommodation Review Committee
January 15, 2008**

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Observations and Assumptions.....	3
Alternative Accommodation Plan.....	4
<i>Boundary Adjustments and Closures</i>	4
<i>Facilities Upgrades and Expansions</i>	5
<i>Programming</i>	5
Analysis Required.....	6
Conclusion	7

Introduction

Since the spring of 2007 the Oxford Area 4 Accommodation Review Committee has been engaged in the examination of information pertaining to the accommodation of students at its member schools. To date we have been presented with one alternative to the existing accommodation, that being the closure of Norwich District High School. Its students would then be transferred either to Glendale District Secondary School or College Avenue Secondary School.

The following is an excerpt from the Thames Valley District School Board Independent procedure 9049 Pupil Accommodation and Facility Organization

2.2.2 Aims of Accommodation Review Committee

(a) An Accommodation Review Committee is established to review information affecting the future of the Accommodation Review Area and to identify needs related to the specific school unit(s) and the students. The Accommodation Review Committee shall consider appropriate alternatives on such matters as realignment of boundaries, program changes, repairs to the educational facility, additions to facilities, use as a holding school(s), and the closure of a school(s) where appropriate.

The members of the Oxford Area 4 ARC have agreed that the Committee should examine at least one alternative to the Accommodation Plan presented by the Administration of the TVDSB. In this way we can provide a complete and transparent review of the Administration's Plan as well as another reasonable alternative to the status quo.

Observations and Assumptions

As a result of our research and the information provided by Administration we have formulated a number of observations and assumptions which have lead us to the development of our Alternative Accommodation Plan.

- (a) Based on 2007/2008 enrollment data, CASS has an under utilized capacity of 207 student spaces.
- (b) Based on 2007/2008 enrollment data, Ingersoll District Collegiate Institute has an underutilized capacity of 167 student spaces.
- (c) The CASS catchment area extends into and around the Village of Beachville. Students in this area may be closer or at least equa-distant to IDCI. A boundary adjustment here could help to fill the excess IDCI capacity.
- (d) Woodstock Collegiate Institute and IDCI have common boundaries that could potentially be adjusted to fill the remaining excess capacity at IDCI and reduce the number of students at WCI.
- (e) With the addition of the Annandale Grade 9 students Glendale would be 215 students above its On The Ground Capacity for the 2007/2008 year.

Alternative Accommodation Plan Oxford Area 4

- (f) A total of 185 students living within the boundaries of the Township of Norwich attend TVDSB secondary schools other than NDHS. This excludes the 11 students attending Oakridge, Ross and Thames schools.
- (g) The number of students within the NDHS catchment area attending St. Mary's Secondary School is estimated to be 50 to 60.
- (h) The Township of Norwich has a population of 10,000 people. Under Administration's proposal there would be no publicly funded secondary schools within its boundaries. The City of Woodstock has a population of 35,000. It currently has 4 publicly funded secondary schools within its boundaries
- (i) Woodstock Collegiate Institute is housed in one of the oldest secondary school premises in the TVDSB. The educational areas of the school appear to be in poor physical condition.
- (j) WCI is situated on property that may have a fair market value considerably more than that on which NDHS is situated.
- (k) Huron Park Secondary School has an enrollment of 52 students over its On The Ground Capacity.
- (l) The educational areas of HPSS appear to be in satisfactory physical conditions.
- (m) The majority of residential development in the City of Woodstock is taking place in the north, northeast and south sections. There is little residential development within the core area.

Alternative Accommodation Plan

Boundary Adjustments and Closures

- (a) Adjust the boundaries of CASS, WCI and IDCI in and around the Beachville area such that the following relocation of students is achieved:

Add to IDCI	167 Students
Remove from CASS	62 Students
Remove from WCI	105 Students

- (b) Adjust the NDHS boundaries to encompass the entire Township of Norwich, resulting in the following relocation of students:

Add to NHS	142 Students
Remove from CASS	110 Students
Remove from Glendale	32 Students

- (c) Move the Grade 9 students from Annandale to Glendale.
- (d) Close Woodstock Collegiate Institute and transfer its remaining 463 students to CASS

Alternative Accommodation Plan Oxford Area 4

As a result of these boundary adjustments the remaining secondary schools would have the following enrollments and OTG capacity:

	<u>Enrolment</u>	<u>OTG</u>
Woodstock		
CASS	1,055	969
Huron Park	<u>1,004</u>	<u>948</u>
	<u>2,059</u>	<u>1,917</u>
Norwich	<u>420</u>	<u>420</u>
Glendale	<u>864</u>	<u>681</u>
Ingersoll	<u>1,206</u>	<u>1,206</u>

Facilities Upgrades and Expansions

- (a) The property occupied by WCI should be sold for its fair market value to offset the capital upgrades to Glendale and CASS.
- (b) CASS should undergo program and facilities upgrades similar to those proposed under Administration's plan, except that OTG should be increased from the proposed 1039 students to between 1055 and 1100 students.
- (c) Glendale should undergo program and facilities upgrades similar to those proposed under Administration's plan, except that OTG should be decreased from the proposed 954 students to between 864 and 900 students.
- (d) NDHS should undergo program and facility upgrades to bring it to a level of accommodation and programming suitable and practical for a secondary school of 420 students

Programming

- (a) NDHS should continue the development of its Agricultural High Skills Major, promoting this to students in the Oxford County and surrounding area.
- (b) The TVDSB should partner with the Oxford County Library to use the facilities of the Norwich Public Library to supplement NDHS's library resources.
- (c) All Oxford County secondary schools should develop high skills specialty programming such as agriculture, technical/industrial, arts, drama, horticulture, etc. Each of the schools should be included in an Integrated Programming Network with transportation provided between the schools.
- (d) The Video Remote Classroom program should be expanded such that larger TVDSB secondary facilities could provide program additions and reduce scheduling conflicts in smaller rural secondary schools. This program should be made available to all TVDSB schools in the future to provide efficient sharing of valuable teaching and specialized resources.

Analysis Required

The members of the ARC request that Administration provide analysis to enable a review and direct comparison of the 3 scenarios (Status Quo, Administration Plan, ARC Alternative Plan) as follows:

- (a) An Edulog analysis to adjust IDCI boundaries to provide the optimum adjustments to transfer 105 students from WCI and 62 students from CASS.
- (b) A detailed comparative transportation cost and logistic analysis for Glendale, CASS, WCI and IDCI under each of the 3 scenarios.
- (c) A detailed cost analysis for Glendale, NDHS, CASS, WCI and IDCI for School Administration, School Facilities and School Operations under each of the 3 scenarios.
- (d) A detailed Ministry of Education funding analysis for Glendale, NDHS, CASS, WCI and IDCI for School Administration, School Facilities and School Operations under each of the 3 scenarios.
- (e) A capital expenditure analysis for required additions, backlog renewal projects, 10 year additional renewal projects, program objective upgrades for Glendale, NDHS, CASS, WCI and IDCI under each of the 3 scenarios.
- (f) Disposal recovery analysis under each of the 2 Accommodation proposals (ie. the liquidation value of WCI and NDHS).

We request that the above analysis be presented in such a way that we can compare the resulting annual operations costs and revenues under each scenario, and the short, medium and long term net capital costs under each scenario.

Conclusion

It is incumbent upon the members of the ARC and certainly the Board of Trustees to examine an alternative course of action in their review of the secondary school accommodation needs of this region. To look at only one proposal would represent less than full diligence, especially when that alternative would result in the closure of a community's only publicly funded secondary school.

The model supported by Administration contends that consolidation provides economies of scale, the cost savings from which will be applied to additional programming resources. It gives little consideration to the preferences of the Board's rural constituents, who believe that the social and environmental benefits of NDHS far outweigh the benefits of additional courses and facilities.

This Alternative Accommodation Plan provides a balanced approach, reflecting the Board's regional diversity and its economic realities:

- (a) Consolidating schools in Woodstock provides economies and efficiencies of scale, but does so within the boundaries of the community. This is a critical difference between the two plans.

Alternative Accommodation Plan Oxford Area 4

- (b) The relocation of students to Ingersoll fills excess capacity, making full use of that Town's educational resources.
- (c) The relocation of all Norwich Township students to NDHS results in full utilization of that school's capacity and educates these students in a rural environment that is consistent with that in which their families have chosen to live.
- (d) Glendale, with the relocation of some of its rural students to NDHS, will be able to absorb the Grade 9 students from Annandale with less additional facilities.
- (e) Programming and facilities upgrades appropriate to the size of each of Glendale, CASS and NDHS will ensure all are meeting the needs of their students.

The members of the Accommodation Review Committee of Oxford Area 4 believe the merits of this Alternative Accommodation Plan are sufficient to warrant a complete analysis and side-by-side comparison with the Accommodation Plan that has been presented by Administration. We request that this plan be given full and complete consideration. We understand the implementation of this plan will require a change in the composition of the Oxford Area 4 ARC. A recommendation to this affect can be made by the ARC at a future time if the analysis proves it to be superior.