

KAWARTHA PINE RIDGE DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

**ARMOUR HEIGHTS PUBLIC SCHOOL AND KING GEORGE PUBLIC SCHOOL  
ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE  
WORKING MEETING**

Tuesday, December 15, 2015 at 6:30 pm  
King George Public School – Library  
220 Hunter Street East, Peterborough, Ontario

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Superintendent Peter Mangold (Co-Chairperson), Superintendent Joe Tompkins (Co-Chairperson), Trustee Wayne Bonner, Trustee Rose Kitney, Marguerite Masterson (Principal, Armour Heights Public School), Jodi Whetung (Principal, King George Public School), Jaime Muldoon (Teacher, Armour Heights Public School), Nicola Jennings (Teacher, King George Public School), Chantelle Clarke (School Council, Armour Heights Public School), Geoff Barnes (School Council, King George Public School), Ziyah Von Bieberstein (School Council, King George Public School), Mary-Ann Meagher (Community Member), Gary Baldwin (Ashburnham Ward Councillor, City of Peterborough) and Keith Riel (Ashburnham Ward Councillor, City of Peterborough), Dean MacDonald (Senior Manager, Planning and Pupil Accommodation), and Pat Bjorndahl (Administrative Assistant)

**REGRETS:** Trustee Sarah Bobka

**1. Welcome**

Co-chairperson Peter Mangold called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm and welcomed everyone to the second working meeting. Videoconferencing is provided in the Gymnasium for any members of the public wishing to hear discussions and view the presentations.

**2. Overview and Adoption of Agenda**

An overview of the agenda for tonight's working meeting was provided by Peter Mangold. There were no additional agenda items. Discussion and questions are encouraged from the committee members throughout this working meeting.

**3. Adoption of Minutes – Tuesday, November 24, 2015**

The minutes from the Armour Heights Public School and King George Public School Accommodation Review Committee's working meeting held on November 24, 2015 were approved with no revisions or additions.

The Accommodation Review Committee's mandate was reviewed. The committee's role is to ensure that the Board of Trustees is provided with all of the appropriate and necessary information to make a decision in the best interest of students regarding staff accommodation recommendations. The information will inform the final staff report and the subsequent decision by the Board of Trustees

The Ministry of Education's *2015-2016 Education Funding: A Guide to the Grants for Student Needs* information was discussed at the last working meeting. This funding guide has been added to the KPR website for the accommodation review.

#### **4. Optimum Learning Environment – Value to Students and Board**

Co-chairperson Joe Tompkins provided an overview of the criteria for creating an Optimal Learning Environment. This criteria will assist in the discussion of the pros and cons for each of the options.

The recommended option to provide the optimal learning environment for the students attending Armour Heights Public School and King George Public School is to consolidate students from both schools at the King George site.

Research from Dr. Tracy Vaillancourt, Professor and Canada Research Chair in Children's Mental Health and Violence Prevention, University of Ottawa, is referenced to provide indicators for developing a positive school climate.

Criteria, value to students, and value to the Board were discussed under the following categories:

- Environment and Physical Structure
- Safety
- Teaching and Learning
- Relationships

The acronym STEAM is Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics.

Increased academic achievement with a focus on student well-being, student development, and character development would result in creating an optimum learning environment.

Some of the functional components discussed for a possible new school building include safe storage, Science and Technology curriculum, visibility of the office upon entering the school, separate kitchen from the staff room for breakfast programme, accessibility, wider hallways, environment and physical activity, ecology with lots of trees, and esthetically pleasing. Parents may provide input on functional components of a new school to the two Principals.

Dean MacDonald, Senior Manager, Planning and Pupil Accommodation reviewed the process which entails the Accommodation Review Committee's recommendations and the final report, approval by the Board of Trustees, Ministry of Education approval, followed by

the early pre-design stage with the architect, Administration, Principals, Facilities Department staff based on priorities within budget. Deadlines must be met to request funding from the Ministry of Education and funding is contingent upon an accommodation review. Major renovations must meet accessibility codes.

The next submission date for Ministry funding is in the Spring. This accommodation review will be finished by the end of March. If approval is given for building a new school, possible timelines for construction in July 2017 to August 31, 2018. The opening of a new school would take place in September 2018.

A video was viewed on KPR’s newest school, C.R. Gummow Public School in Cobourg. There were two original campuses with portables. A new school was built while students attended the original buildings. C.R. Gummow Public School has an enrolment of 700 + pupils.

Possible options of relocating students during construction were discussed with Principals Jodi Whetung and Marguerite Masterson with few viable options being available.

**5. Pro and Cons of Options**

The committee members worked in groups for forty minutes recording pros and cons for the following options. The following are summaries of six options that were discussed at great length with the whole committee.

<b>Option 1 – Construct new school and repurpose the existing school</b>	
<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Repurpose building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green space will be lost</li> <li>- Students need to relocate</li> <li>- Building compromised as it is not used as intended</li> <li>- Two sets of traffic for school and repurposed building</li> <li>- More costly</li> <li>- Over time, need to bring it up to code (by 2024)</li> <li>- Not accessible</li> <li>- Won’t get funding as we aren’t closing a building to consolidate</li> <li>- The board isn’t in the leasing business or real estate</li> <li>- What would it be repurposed for?</li> </ul>
<b>Points to consider</b>	
Nil.	

<b>Option 2 – Integrate existing school with new building (an addition to King George PS)</b>	
<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain historical structure</li> <li>- Accessible after renovations</li> <li>- May be cost effective but will need major costly repairs in the future</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This building still has to be brought up to code</li> <li>- Busing during renovations</li> <li>- Entrance and exit from two busy roads</li> <li>- Relocate students – may lose some students</li> <li>- Lots of concrete (access to playground) and less green space</li> <li>- Renovations cost more</li> <li>- Drainage issues</li> <li>- Carbon emissions</li> </ul>
<b>Points to consider</b>	
<p>Lots of discussion about the cons of the option in terms of moving students for 16 months.</p> <p>Consider keeping student on site from Junior Kindergarten to Grade 3 with Grades 4 to 8 attending Armour Heights PS.</p>	

<b>Option 3 – Remove existing school and construct new school in same location</b>	
<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New building</li> <li>- Modern and up-to-date</li> <li>- Take something from the old school to include in the new building</li> <li>- accessible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Must relocate students</li> <li>- Larger footprint</li> <li>- Lose historical building</li> <li>- More costly</li> <li>- Drainage concerns</li> <li>- Increased traffic on Armour Road</li> <li>- Carbon emissions</li> </ul>
<b>Points to consider</b>	
<p>Curb lane into Hunter Streets for buses only (less grade, less busy).</p> <p>Move younger students to Armour Heights PS and Junior/Intermediate students to another location i.e. Lakefield District SS, Kenner CVI, Thomas A. Stewart SS.</p>	

<b>Option 4 – Remove existing school and construct new school at top of site</b>	
<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compete with other systems</li> <li>- Students stay on site</li> <li>- Green space available</li> <li>- Enticing</li> <li>- Increase student enrolment</li> <li>- New and modern</li> <li>- One transition</li> <li>- One community school</li> <li>- Safe entrance and exit</li> <li>- Day care</li> <li>- Great view of the City</li> <li>- Best supervision of students</li> <li>- Most cost effective option</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Playground accessibility</li> <li>- Winter safety with hill</li> <li>- Carbon emissions</li> </ul>
<b>Points to consider</b>	
<p>Parking entrance and exit via from the Peterborough Museum and Archives?</p> <p>Potential to purchase some land from the Museum or from the City?</p> <p>Options for replication of some features of the old building into the new school.</p> <p>Option 2 and 4 are the original two options.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How can we take elements of King George PS and work into a new building?</li> <li>- Student input?</li> <li>- Innovative/creative architecture designs.</li> <li>- Might the concerns about Option 2 be addressed through creative design?</li> </ul>	

<b>Option 5 – Status Quo</b>	
<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historical building</li> <li>- Least disruptive for students</li> <li>- Cheapest short term</li> <li>- Give parents some choice of school</li> <li>- Closer proximity for people</li> <li>- Any increase in enrolment can be addressed in both schools</li> <li>- Least environmental impact</li> <li>- Distinct character of both schools honoured</li> <li>- Maximum green space for King George PS</li> <li>- View from King George PS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- State of current facilities require large investments</li> <li>- Missed opportunity for funding and to do something new and innovative</li> <li>- Accessibility</li> <li>- Parking</li> <li>- Storage</li> <li>- Transition from Grades 6 to 7</li> <li>- Delaying a tough decision</li> <li>- Opportunities for students with more staff, new spaces</li> <li>- Combined grades</li> <li>- Loss of opportunity to consolidate the schools to one community school</li> <li>- Operating costs of maintaining two buildings</li> <li>- Not attracting new students/families to the area</li> <li>- No day care</li> </ul>
<b>Points to consider</b>	
<p>Funds for school condition improvement are provided to the Board from the Ministry of Education and the amount is based on urgent needs for the whole system.</p> <p>Leverage number of volunteers to support one community school.</p>	

<b>Option 6 – Purchase land to build a new school (6 acres of flat land, zoned for education)</b>	
<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potentially cost effective – one flat building site</li> <li>- Selling two properties</li> <li>- No moving of students during the build except for moving in</li> <li>- Possibility for greater innovation (blank slate – not limited due to slope of land)</li> <li>- Can plant</li> <li>- Possibility of improved access and parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Location?</li> <li>- Cost of land?</li> <li>- More busing</li> <li>- Not located in heart of community</li> <li>- Small trees</li> <li>- Moving everyone</li> </ul>
<b>Points to consider</b>	
<p>Across from Thomas A. Stewart Secondary School?                      Lake property?                      Television Road?</p>	

Dean MacDonald will investigate more real estate options and will speak with the Ashburnham Ward City Councillors. There are strict restrictions on the purchase of property.

Options 1 and 3 were removed by the accommodation review committee since students would need to attend school off site for 16 months. There will be an opportunity for community input for Options 2 and 4 at the public meeting in January.

## **6. Developing the Final Report**

The Co-chairpersons have received lots of positive feedback from the committee members in preparation of the final report.

## **7. Preparation for Next Meeting**

A review of the working meetings will take place at the public meeting in January. The options will be described in detail for the public. Presentations, delegations, preparation for the final report, feedback, and information will be provided as part of the meeting.

## **8. Future Meeting**

Tuesday, January 26, 2016, 6:30 pm – 2<sup>nd</sup> Accommodation Review Committee Meeting at King George Public School (Gymnasium)

## **9. Adjournment – 10:10 pm**