

INFORMATION ITEMS

Week Ending July 13, 2018

REPORTS

1. None

INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONSULTATIONS

1. None

CORRESPONDENCE

1. Crime Stoppers Guelph Wellington re: 30th Anniversary Event
2. Upper Grand District School Board re: Board Approval of Long Term Accommodation Plan
3. Township of Centre Wellington Resolution re: Moratorium on Commercial Water Bottling

BOARDS & COMMITTEES

1. Heritage Guelph Meeting Agenda – July 23, 2018

ITEMS AVAILABLE IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE

1. None

CSGW Is Celebrating!

Join us
Friday August 3

10:30 a.m.

Flag Raising at
Mount Forest Museum &
Archives, Main Street


11 a.m.- 1 p.m.

FREE BBQ, Cake & FUN at
Murphy's Park, Mount Forest

CRIME STOPPERS 
GUELPH WELLINGTON
1-800-222-TIPS (8477)



Everyone welcome!





UPPER GRAND DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

Jennifer Passy BES, MCIP, RPP

Manager of Planning

Board Office: 500 Victoria Road N. Guelph, ON N1E 6K2

Email: jennifer.passy@ugdsb.on.ca

Tel: 519-822-4420 ext. 820 or Toll Free: 1-800-321-4025

June 28, 2018

PLN: 18-56

File Code: B01

Sent by: mail & email

RECEIVED
JUL 10 2018
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Stephen O'Brien
City of Guelph
1 CARDEN ST
GUELPH, ON N1H 3A1

Re: Board Approval of Long Term Accommodation Plan

We are writing to advise that on June 27, 2018, the Board of Trustees approved the Upper Grand District School Board's Long Term Accommodation Plan Final Report (LTAP). The Final Report is being sent to you for your information.


The Final Report was informed by community engagement on the Background Report released in January, as well as feedback received on the draft version throughout the month of May.

The LTAP does not include specific changes to school programs or boundaries. Instead, the LTAP outlines a list of proposed short (1-5 yrs.) and long-term (6-10 yrs.) accommodation priorities requiring other processes to be undertaken.

Additional information about the review process is available at www.ugdsb.on.ca/ltap. We invite you to share this information with other members of your organization who may be interested in the Board's long term accommodation planning.

Sincerely,

Upper Grand District School Board


Jennifer Passy, BES, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Planning

Upper Grand District School Board

• Linda Busuttil; Chair
• Marty Fairbairn; Vice-Chair

• Mark Bailey
• Susan Moziar

• Kathryn Cooper
• Bruce Schieck

• Barbara Lustgarten Evoy
• Lynn Topping

• Martha MacNeil
• Barbara White

Planning Department Memo

Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) Final Report



To: Martha Rogers, Director of Education
From: Glen Regier, Superintendent of Finance
Jennifer Passy, Manager of Planning
Heather Imm, Senior Planner

Date: June 12, 2018

Report Type: DECISION

Background

The Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) is a strategic review of the Upper Grand District School Board's facilities, population projections, and enrolment forecasts. The LTAP is an important step in ensuring alignment of school facilities with the needs of the Board and the communities it serves.

The plan identifies short-term (1-5 year) and long-term (6-10 year) priorities. Priorities address school additions, new school construction, boundary reviews, accommodation reviews, and other processes.

The plan does not make specific recommendations that immediately impose changes to any schools or programs. Trustees and school communities will be involved in future decisions in accordance with Board policies.

Public engagement was an integral component of the LTAP development process and Staff conducted two separate phases of public engagement since January 2018. The first phase of engagement was to promote a shared understanding of local school issues.

The purpose of the second phase of engagement was to share the draft report and receive public input to inform the Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) Final Report. A summary of the public feedback received since the release of the draft report on April 10, 2018 is included in Appendix A of Memo PLN: 18-10.

Issue

To present the Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) Final Report including the public input received during the second phase of public engagement conducted throughout May 2018.

Recommendations

1. That memo PLN: 18-10 “Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) Final Report” dated June 12, 2018 be received.
2. That the Board approves, in principle, the short-term and long-term work plan priorities as described in Figures 4 and 5 of the Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) Final Report with the understanding that work plan priorities may be changed as a result of future annual and 5-year LTAP review cycles.
3. That staff be directed to undertake a district-wide Secondary Program Review that includes informing the boundary review and capital building program for the new South Guelph secondary school, and the French Immersion/International Baccalaureate Impact Study for Orangeville/Dufferin and Erin secondary schools, and that a report be presented to Trustees in November 2018.
4. That staff be directed to present an Initial Boundary Review Report in accordance with School Boundary Review - Policy 320, for the new South Guelph secondary school in the 2018/19 school year following the conclusion of the district-wide Secondary Program Review.
5. That staff be directed to initiate a French Immersion /International Baccalaureate Impact Study of secondary schools in Orangeville/Dufferin and Erin in the 2018/19 school year following the district-wide Secondary Program Review.
6. That an annual review of the LTAP be conducted in accordance with the process outlined in Section 1 of the Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) Final Report.
7. That a comprehensive 5-year review of the LTAP be conducted in accordance with the process outlined in Section 1 of the Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) Final Report.
8. That the UGDSB Planning Department’s Accommodation and Planning webpage be updated to include a feedback link for any school community member or stakeholder to provide input on accommodation-related matters and sign up to

receive updates from the Planning Department on future accommodation-related processes.

9. That the UGDSB send hard copies of the Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) Final Report to Mayors of local municipalities, Wardens of the Counties of Wellington and Dufferin, to the co-terminus English-language and French-language school boards, accompanied by a letter signed by the Director of Education and Board Chair.
10. That staff be directed to send letters about the release of the LTAP Final Report to the Ministry of Education and all other entities outlined in the notification list in accordance with the Board's Community Planning and Partnerships Policy 319 and Procedures Manual 319-A.

Rationale

Since the release of the Background Report in January 2018, staff conducted regional engagement workshops, met with the Board's advisory committees, and provided notice to stakeholders of the availability of the Background Report and workshops. Communication was sent to schools, posted online and regularly shared in social media.

In March 2018, a summary of input received throughout the first phase of engagement was shared with Trustees and considered in the development of the draft report.

Following the presentation of the draft report, the second phase of public engagement was conducted from April 11 to May 29, 2018. Feedback was collected through this work to inform the development of the final report.

Throughout the second phase of public engagement, staff conducted five regional public meetings and met with the Board's advisory committees, the Elementary Leadership and Secondary Leadership Groups, and provided school newsletter updates, website postings, direct mail to stakeholders and regular updates to subscribed community members. Input received at the public meetings, through the online feedback tool and directly by email is included in Appendix A.

A summary of the Questions and Answers (Q&A) from the Erin, Orangeville and Guelph meetings is attached in Appendix B. There were no Q&A from the Centre Wellington or North Wellington regional meetings due to the low attendance at these meetings.

Since the release of the draft report, staff has expanded and provided additional detail with respect to the following short term work plan priorities.

Secondary Program Review

The draft report included a Guelph Secondary Program Review in 2018/19. This review was identified to be undertaken prior to a Boundary Review process for the new Guelph Secondary School and was to include all Guelph secondary schools.

Staff has determined that this review should be expanded to consider secondary programming throughout the jurisdiction. This review will provide the Board with the opportunity to take a holistic look at the secondary panel in order to create a vision, and build upon successes and identify where there may be gaps. In part, the outcome of this work will inform both the future program and design process for the new Guelph Secondary School.

Orangeville/Dufferin Secondary French Immersion Program

Consistent comments from the first phase of engagement were received regarding the lack of a secondary French Immersion (FI) program in Orangeville/Dufferin. Similarly, there continued to be concerns expressed about the impact on Erin DHS if a new secondary FI program started in Orangeville/Dufferin.

Previous Board motions have directed staff to investigate establishing an International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma Program in Dufferin County (December 29, 2016) and conduct an impact study on FI enrolment at Erin DHS to determine viability of introducing a secondary FI program in Orangeville (June 27, 2017). As a result, a FI/IB Impact Study is identified in the short-term work plan for 2018/19 so that the two programs can be explored comprehensively given the potential effect on enrolments, facilities and school boundaries.

Staff outlined a possible timeframe describing the number of processes required to be completed before any secondary FI or IB program changes could be implemented in Orangeville/Dufferin.

Figure 1 indicates that the earliest that a new secondary FI or IB program could start in Orangeville/Dufferin is September 2021.

Figure 1 – Possible Orangeville/Dufferin and Erin DHS Secondary FI Process Flow



Following the Secondary Program Review, and in accordance with previous Board motions outlined in Section 3 of the LTAP Final Report, staff is to conduct an FI/IB Impact Study for Orangeville/Dufferin and Erin secondary schools. If the conclusion of the impact study is that a new or relocated Orangeville/Dufferin secondary FI program is recommended, then staff will need to undertake either a Boundary Review or a Pupil Accommodation Review process in accordance with Board policy.

A boundary review would be conducted if the impact study determined that there should be a new secondary FI program in Orangeville/Dufferin in addition to an FI program at Erin DHS. As a result, the current Erin DHS 9-12 FI boundary would need to be reconfigured.

An accommodation review process would be required if the impact study recommended that the secondary FI program should be moved from Erin DHS to a secondary school in Orangeville/Dufferin.

Hiring and course selection would follow either decision, which could not be completed until March 2021. As a result, a potential new program(s) start date is September 2021, at the earliest.

LTAP Annual Review Process

The annual LTAP review will replace the current Elementary and Secondary Identified (ID) Schools Report. As part of the LTAP review, enrolment and development information for the current year and the 5 and 10-year forecast period will be updated. In comparison, the Identified Schools Report has historically only provided a next year's

Principal projection based on work of the District Staffing Committee and a 5-year school utilization projection.

As previously directed by the Board, French Immersion enrolment trends such as growth and participation rates by review area, retention rates and dual track enrolments will be included in the annual review.

An evaluation of schools with potential facility partnership space will also be included in the annual review in accordance with Community Planning and Facility Partnerships – Policy 319.

It is proposed that the annual LTAP update will be broadly communicated to the Board's Advisory Committees, school communities and stakeholders to ensure public awareness. In a situation where changes may impact a school community, such as a change to the work plan priorities, staff will schedule a public information meeting with affected school communities.

5-Year Comprehensive LTAP Review

With any long term planning process, it is necessary to periodically undertake a comprehensive review of the plan. It is recommended that a 5-year comprehensive review of the LTAP be conducted and involve a more extensive public engagement process than the annual review process.

Public engagement for the LTAP review would be conducted at a scale similar to what has been undertaken in the development of this LTAP. There would be a comprehensive communication plan to ensure that school communities are informed and aware of future enrolment trends and work plan priorities. The process will also include an extensive review of any information pertaining to accommodation such as Board facilities, population projections and enrolment projections.

Communication Plan for LTAP Final Report

Following the public release of the LTAP Final Report, several communication actions will be undertaken including:

- Update the LTAP web page on the Board website to include a copy of the LTAP Final Report
- Post a message about the LTAP Final Report on the Board's main webpage and on twitter

- Distribute an email update to all stakeholders who registered with the LTAP webpage.
- Update school websites and/or newsletters with details about release of the LTAP Final Report
 - Schools may also utilize any of the following methods to communicate about the release of the LTAP Final Report with their school communities:
 - Facebook
 - Email
 - Twitter
 - Automated phone messages
- Prepare a media release(s) to inform the public about the release of the LTAP Final Report
- Send letters to the Ministry of Education and all entities outlined in the notification list in the Community Planning and Partnerships Procedures Manual 319-A to notify them of the release of the LTAP Final Report.
- Hard copies of the LTAP Final Report will be sent to Mayors of local municipalities, Wardens of the Counties of Wellington and Dufferin and to the co-terminus English-language and French-language school boards and will be accompanied by a letter signed by the Director of Education and Board Chair.

APPENDIX A

PUBLIC INPUT

In order to protect the identity of all individuals who have submitted correspondence with regards to the Long Term Accommodation Plan and in keeping with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, all personal information and/or identifiers have been severed from all recorded communication (i.e. e-mails and letters) prior to distribution. The intent or message has not been changed.

COMMENTS AND INPUT

The following comments were received between March 2, 2018 and May 29, 2018. Comments were received via email, online feedback form posted on the LTAP webpage, and blue comment sheets submitted at the Public Engagement Workshops.

Erin DHS and Brisbane PS have been long time supporters of French immersion. The schools are have a strong supportive parent base which has been beneficial to all of the school programs. We need to keep supporting these schools in order to encourage growth of the community, at the very least keep people to stay in town.

Please keep the strong and respected French immersion program in Erin High School running.

The decision to cut all summer school programs in Orangeville and go via e-learning is a mistake. This is a time for good local programs. We have the schools. We need the teachers. Asking a child to study 6 hours a day (assuming there are no glitches, and we know with technology there always are!) is ridiculous. It also takes a higher degree of motivation to finish an online course. Can you imagine trying to do Grade 10 quadratics course or studying World War 1 with its' profound issues via e-learning? At a time when the dialogue is about community hubs and fostering local programs, this decision seems contradictory. There is also the issue of interval timing. A teacher in a classroom can respond immediately to a question or engage in discussion. Waiting 24 hours for a reply or perhaps longer is not a good educational methodology. Please do not leave our schools empty during the summer. Use them, that's what they're there for. Help foster success, not failure. If anything, expand the program. The local summer program gave many a chance to really focus on a subject without distractions. Please reconsider this decision. We have to aim higher than coffee and donut jobs for the students.

Westside is a terrific environment for learning. The summer school program should not have been replaced or cut. Some of us will have to commute. Why was Dufferin targeted especially in a town with a high youth population that is projected to grow?

At a time when we must compete globally, we have to do our very best to ensure success for students. Please restore good quality local education for our students in Orangeville. Thank-you.

Looking at the usage for Eramosa, Rockwood and Harris Mill, I'm wondering why Eramosa remains open. Why doesn't the board make RCPS the English stream school for K-8 and Harris Mill the FI school for K-8? Bussing and operational costs of Eramosa would be saved and some of that money can go to bussing to RCPS and HM. Why are students uprooted from their schools in grade 6 and 7 to come to RCPS and then have to deal with that social and emotional transition at a tough age. Additionally, the plan to bring in a grade 6 FI class in two years time to RCPS seems like poor planning. Wouldn't those students be better served at a school with an existing FI program? They will be so set apart as the only FI class. Bringing the English stream to Rockwood would prevent the under utilization of the school and balance out the primary grades as well. I think offering before and after school care at RCPS would help as well as there are parents choosing FI at HM simply because they need child care.

I currently have one child [REDACTED] at Mono amaranth for FI and 3 others at centennial Hylands for FI. I know that the Erin high school is where they are to go to high school as of now. I see that Erin high school won't be over crowded over the next 10 years. Does that mean that there is no chance of FI being brought to one of the high schools in Orangeville or even Shelburne?

Please provide more of a physical outlet for the students. Consider revision of the Grade 9 physical education curriculum. Fighting can be curbed by channeling into sports. Orangeville has access to some fabulous athletes. Consider bringing some of these people in to coach and motivate the students. They are cooped up too much and are allowed to congregate too much in front of the school. Please be proactive and hopefully, leadership will adopt a "can do" positive attitude. Thank you.

I have two [REDACTED] currently enrolled in the FI program at Brisbane. I myself went to Ross R. MacKay and Erin District High School. Taking away the FI program will drastically impact not only my family our schools but the entire community. Please do not remove the FI program from EDHS!! Let us build up our town and community before you make this decision!!

My [REDACTED] is currently a student in grade 10 French Immersion at Erin District HS and a graduate of Brisbane PS and Erin PS. [REDACTED] LOVES EDHS and one of the things [REDACTED] has enjoyed and benefited from most is meeting and coming together with students from Orangeville. High school is a time of expanding horizons for many kids like my [REDACTED], including making friends and feeling a sense of belonging within a larger community (compared to elementary school) as well as exploring a range of interests through specialized and elective courses. When I told my [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] friends there is a possible threat of losing the Orangeville students from EDHS in the future, they were completely dismayed. They immediately grasped the detrimental effects this would have for both the Erin and Orangeville students in terms of limiting their academic, elective, extra curricular and social experiences.

As a parent of a [REDACTED] who is currently in grade 7 FI at Erin PS, I am deeply concerned about the possible splitting of Erin and Orangeville students in the future. My [REDACTED] very much needs the same kind of expansive experiences that my [REDACTED] has had when [REDACTED] gets to high school.

Rather than pulling in opposite directions, let's work together to make EDHS the best school it can be for students from both Orangeville and Erin.

I believe because ODSS is so under utilized, it is the perfect location for an Secondary FI location. The majority of the children will be travelling from Orangeville to Erin to High School. Why spend all that money on bussing when you could simply add FI to ODSS

Not sure if this is the comment area for the DRAFT but after I attended the May 2nd meeting at EPS I feel as though I need to make my concerns known. Any changes to EDHS will have an impact on every student and teacher. English kids will be impacted by changes to the FI program as well. Why are we not looking at specific boundary reviews between Dufferin schools and Wellington schools? If we are all amalgamated under UGDSB why can't the overcrowding of kids from East Garafraxa come down to Ross R McKay or Erin Public school? Why can't the kids in the south end of Orangeville continue to come down to EDHS for FI courses and the north end of Orangeville have their own FI high school program? Why are we not looking at transportation ideas like late buses that would allow kids from out of town the option to participate in some extra curricular activities outside of the school day? Lots of questions... not many answers... YET. I am hopeful that the trustees and board members and parents can work toward a positive result for all.

The Dufferin elementary catholic school board has 3 feeder schools in Orangeville. All these schools go to Caledon at Robert F Hall for their high school..we are talking about aprox. 100+ kids each year that start grade 9..not to mention all the grade 10s to 12s, and they take a bus from 20 mins to an hour to another town outside of Orangeville to attend high school...very similar distance from Orangeville to Caledon and Orangeville to Erin.

Why can the catholic school board parents from Orangeville be fine with busing their kids to Caledon..with such a big cohort, but not the public school board parents busing in total approx. 150 kids to Erin? This sounds more like a want than a need and unnecessary spending.

Thank you for your time.

■■■■

We are one community that **DEPENDS** on a well attended high school ensuring that the spirit of events, clubs, and organizations for youth are in existence for students to actively engage in at school rather than private clubs, etc.

Moving the French Immersion program would limit the options for students that are currently signed on to the FI program at Brisbane knowing that our family strategically chose to move to this location to have this option. Orangeville families have signed on to the French program knowing that it is currently offered in Erin. We live very close to EDHS, a community hub of a library, senior centre, nursery school, arena, theatre, tennis clubs, baseball diamond, the local tobogganning hill, and OPP office. This is the centre of my community and my ■■■■ wants to attend EDHS. This French program does not have to end in Erin because other parents have not had foresight to consider their location and their children's schooling options. We are starting the process of growing our community and welcome folks to our charming village, but we plead the UGDSB to not remove a vital part of our school community out to Orangeville which will also take our small town students that contribute a great deal to our community with them.

Our school population would see a dramatic decrease if the French students were pulled not only from the Immersion courses but from English courses as well, thus affecting the number of teachers and the course selection for English students at the school.

Other than the distance which can be accommodated by Wi-Fi on buses, Orangeville parents that want the program changed to closer have nothing to currently lose at their

well populated schools but everything to gain, whereas, we will LOSE a great deal. A bridge program could be started such a small program in Orangeville to grow or share staff resources between schools as Erin's population increases over the next few years.

Please retain the FI program at Erin District High School and consider other options and solutions.

Hopefully, there will be an opportunity to discuss the potential of integrating programs among Montgomery, Westside and the Recreation Center to optimally use these facilities-i.e. more swimming, skating, how to research using the libraries, e.t.c. However, another opportunity is the prospect of allowing an indoor/outdoor garden at Westside. This could offer a quiet place for people to retreat. In these hectic times, a natural refuge should be available for everyone-all students, teachers and administrators. It should be available inside the school with possibilities for expansion outside. It could be incorporated into the curriculum with "sustainability," science, or perhaps cooking, volunteer hours, physical education or if someone needs to go "chill" and find some peace-and possibly a place of creativity and beauty. There is a vision of something indoors with natural seating where everyone and anyone within the school is invited and welcome(a fountain-sound of water) . Again, it would be a beautiful, indoor nature setting-a beautiful green space-a place of calm and quiet. I would also like to see this more incorporated with many more nature walks and educational trips especially in Orangeville, Mono provincial park, the Bruce trail and Monora park (or even cross-country skiing) This could be coordinated with Dufferin County museum or maybe even the CVC to educate students about wild food, flora and fauna. Have guest speakers from these local places. Have disappointedly seen little action in providing school trips and "real" physical activity in nature which is so necessary to provide an outlet and release for students and staff. The few opportunities for trips that do exist seem to be very targeted and select which might result in low enrolments and low enthusiasm. The possibilities of this can overlap into many areas and could be incredibly innovative. Thank you again for this opportunity to express ideas and for your invitation to share.

After looking around several different towns in Upper Grand, we chose to move to the small, quaint town of Hillsburgh specifically because it offered a French Immersion program for elementary AND high school. I come from a French background so the FI program was a top priority on our list of moving and we moved just a few months before our first child started JK. Another reason that education was high on our list is that our [REDACTED] is diagnosed with anxiety so we wanted [REDACTED] to feel comfortable with [REDACTED] schooling by being brought up in a small town that offered the program across the grades. Orangeville was one of the places we looked into moving to, however, when we

found out they traveled to Erin for the FI secondary program, we had made our minds up and decided to move here to Hillsburgh. That being said, parents from Orangeville CHOSE to move to Orangeville and have their children in the FI program knowing full well that for the secondary program, they would be traveling to Erin. We moved to Hillsburgh knowing that, and they moved to Orangeville knowing that. To pull that program out from our community shows a great disrespect for our children and our community just because a ""bigger"" town wants it there for them.

If our FI students are forced to travel to Orangeville then not only will many students end up dropping out of the program, but Erin's school population would also be drastically affected. This dramatic decrease in population would affect the amount of courses, programs, sports and after school activities left for the remaining students. We are extremely lucky to have a school that is the main hub of our town to bring everyone together with a public library, tennis club, arena, baseball diamond, skate park, nursery school and seniors program. We do not have all the luxuries that a larger town like Orangeville offers so to pull out our FI children from our community would affect everyone in the town. We are a community that **DEPENDS** on a fully populated student body so that these programs can still take place and be enjoyed by everyone of **ALL AGES**.

We may be a smaller community but our voices are loud in pleading with you **NOT** to remove our French Immersion from our high school. We not only **DEPEND** on it as a community, but our children depend on it for a consistent transition from school to school. Research shows that anxiety levels in children are at an all time high, so please, do the right thing and leave things alone the way they are for the student's sake as well. Please keep our program alive and look into other options or solutions. It is our town of Erin/Hillsburgh that loses a great deal whereas the Orangeville parents already have an abundance of populated schools and programs. Their loss is **NOTHING** in comparison to ours.

By moving the FI secondary program to Orangeville, I feel that extracurricular activities in the Hillsburgh-Erin community will be severely affected. As a figure skating coach in Erin, I know the extra travel time will discourage older students from skating here in the community.

Please do not pull the FI program from EDHS! If Erin-Hillsburgh FI students are forced to travel to Orangeville then not only will many students end up dropping out of the program, but Erin's school population would also be drastically affected. This dramatic decrease in population would affect the amount of courses, programs, sports and after

school activities left for the remaining students. We are extremely lucky to have a school that is the main hub of our town to bring everyone together with a public library, tennis club, arena, baseball diamond, skate park, nursery school and seniors program. We do not have all the luxuries that a larger town like Orangeville offers so to pull out our FI children from our community would affect everyone in the town. We are a community that **DEPENDS** on a fully populated student body so that these programs can still take place and be enjoyed by everyone of **ALL AGES**.

We may be a smaller community but our voices are loud in pleading with you **NOT** to remove our French Immersion from our high school. We not only **DEPEND** on it as a community, but our children depend on it for a consistent transition from school to school. Research shows that anxiety levels in children are at an all time high, so please, do the right thing and leave things alone the way they are for the student's sake as well. Please keep our program alive and look into other options or solutions. It is our town of Erin/Hillsburgh that loses a great deal whereas the Orangeville parents already have an abundance of populated schools and programs. Their loss is **NOTHING** in comparison to ours.

If our FI students are forced to travel to Orangeville then not only will many students end up dropping of the program, but Erin's school population would also be drastically affected. This dramatic decrease in population would affect the amount of courses, programs, sports and after school activities. FI children from our community would affect everyone in the town. We are a community that **DEPENDS** on a fully populated student body so that these programs can still take place and be enjoyed by everyone of **ALL AGES**.

We may be a smaller community but our voices are loud in pleading with you **NOT** to remove our French Immersion from our high school. We not only **DEPEND** on it as a community, but our children depend on it for a consistent transition from school to school. Research shows that anxiety levels in children are at an all time high, so please, do the right thing and leave things alone the way they are for the student's sake as well. Please keep our program alive and look into other options or solutions. It is our town of Erin/Hillsburgh that loses a great deal whereas the Orangeville parents already have an abundance of populated schools and programs. Their loss is **NOTHING** in comparison to ours.

Link:

I purchased vacant land on the actual border of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], but on the [REDACTED] side of the border. I invested nearly [REDACTED] to build an [REDACTED] directly beside [REDACTED], which provides

business services and jobs to students and local residents. We have been in touch with the community to be part of your [REDACTED]. My children attend FI school in Brisbane. I chose this property because there was a FI school and high school in Erin. My previous property was in [REDACTED] which I sold in order to make a bigger facility to offer job opportunities and a better future for my children. Having them bused to Orangeville for high school is not in their best interest and takes away from the only currency in my and their lives that matters... time. Time to spend with them after a long day of school. Time to relax, unwind and play sports and games. To talk and be a family. By shunting them 1.5 hours per day, 5 days a week from our home, you are taking away the most precious thing we have. Time. I do not support any decision to have my childrens' FI schooling moved to Orangeville. I pay a significant amount of taxes to your community due to the value of my [REDACTED] that was only vacant land 7 years ago. I want to maximize my time with my children, not be robbed of it by the UGDSB.

Our community depends on the FI program staying here. The lose of high school students would devastate the school so while I respect the Orangeville Parents pushing for this the board has to have the whole pictures at EDHS part of the decision .

Four years ago we moved our family to Erin, ON. We invested a lot of money to build a home and make this town a permanent residence for our family. One of the main reasons we chose Erin is so that our children could continue in the French immersion program, in which they are thriving. Our oldest child will be going to Erin High School in a few years and to have the FI program taken away is wrong. We would have chosen a different community to put down permanent roots in had this been a factor at that time. Our children would have to spend 10 hours a week on a school bus each week. Would you do that to your own children??????

I think kids benefit from learning 2 languages at a young age. It's important to have those schools close. I would not want my kids riding a bus to Orangeville. It would be a 45 minute ride and that's not fair. Brisbane has been an excellent school for both my kids. We can't loose good schools where kids learn. French is benefit for them to learn it and can be used across Canada

We moved to our small town of Erin excited to have access to an excellent FI program at our doorstep! It would tear our community apart if kids had to start bussing to Oville in order to continue their education....not to mention most kids would likely leave the FI program altogether in order to stay in town and not have to spend countless hours

commuting.

Erin & Hillsburgh have a thriving FI community. We need to ensure it stays viable, thriving AND in Erin. To pull all the Orangeville students would decimate the program as they would undoubtedly lose funding a teachers or if the entire program was moved a large majority of students would most likely decline to continue. Erin students have to do without a lot that other schools have such as a proper sports field etc. Don't take this amazing program from them

French immersion is important to keep in our community. At both the elementary and high school level. Part of the reason we moved to Erin wa that it offers French immersion programming.

We need to keep the French program at Erin District High School! We moved to our small town as I wanted my children to be part of the French program and go to school their entire time within our town.

I surely hope that for the sake of my children and the many more that are studying full french immersion, that these programs will continue to be offered in Erin highschool. Displacing students in other districts and towns is a terrible plan. Disconnecting students from their town at such crucial ages does not bode well at creating a sense of community and home. The excessive travel time spent on buses will also negatively impact on their well being, health and studies. There is always a bottom line, and it is such a pity and shame that our childrens future is being toyed with in order to save a few bucks. A few bucks where I might add I pay my property taxes that goes towards funding my childrens education in MY home town Erin and NOT Orangeville. As a rate payer and engaged voter I sincerely hope that this ill thought out plan never sees the light of day.

Many secondary schools across the province are in declining enrollment. Knowing this, if you move the FI program, it will all but cripple EDHS, the school that has served as a hub for this community for almost 2 decades. Why should this matter? As educators, it is your responsibility to offer the students of the Erin community an opportunity to engage in 21st Century Learning. How will this be possible if many of their courses are cancelled because the numbers don't support the sections allocated? Collaboration, innovation, leadership happens when groups come together with purposeful facilitation - and our students will miss out on that opportunity if our FI program is dismantled and

relocated. We need to focus on empowering modern learning - instead of starting over, we should be further building on what is already great! Our kids deserve to experience a program that is already rich in leadership and content. The best opportunities for rich learning experiences come from experienced and established programs that are extending beyond an already established foundation.

As I know my peers have written to you and mentioned - the residents of Orangeville are not losing anything by sending their children to EDHS for FI. They have made the decision to enroll in that program, knowing what would be expected. It is a very different story to ask families who specifically purchased homes in a demographic area so that their children would not need to spend the extra time on a school bus each day, to travel to their chosen program. To backtrack on your offering of that program to a community is ethically wrong, if you have an option - which you do! Our community is small, which makes it a wonderful place for your FI program. This program can thrive here, as it is established in the community, already. Please respect the decisions that our community members made years ago, when deciding to come to this area, in many cases because of the location of this program. It is the right thing to do, to honour families and to offer the best 21st century education possible for their children. We all want the best for our children, let's take this opportunity to keep them in something great and give them the chance to explore outside of their own boxes. Please keep the FI program thriving and alive, at Erin District High School.

Thank you,

■■■■

Concerned Parent

I am disappointed that the board report and parents at the LTAP meetings did not raise the issue of equity in terms of consistency and stability for FI students in the Dufferin area. Parents were poorly informed, initially, about the consultations and perhaps did not attend for that reason. (I was on the email notification list and did not receive ONE notification by email. I attended the Erin meeting as I had missed the Orangeville one, and this in itself is an example of one of the major issues for FI parents in this region-- we are a part of many school communities and have far more 'work' to be involved and aware of school activities than a RT parent. Even this feedback form asks which school community we belong to and I can only list one, though I have 3 children attending 3 FI schools.

The equity issue is paramount and unaddressed in the LTAP draft. FI students represent a large portion of the board community yet consistently these students are the

kids in portables in a school: at PEPS my kids were in portables; at MAPS my kids only had one year NOT in a portable; and in Erin, some kids aren't even able to have their class schedule fit in required courses because there may be only one class available and FI students, though they have many more 'required' courses to complete, don't get the necessary access to these classes and often have to add an additional term or year to their high school studies. FI kids just have to accept what is offered to them as in all school they are treated like accessories, not as the MAIN population, but rather as those that have been imposed on a school community. This is not equity and our kids feel it.

All three of my children have had to attend 3 different elementary schools between JK and Gr 8, sometimes only attending a school for one year before being bounced to another. This is not the case for most students in the RT. And having three kids in different schools though all in elementary? Imagine trying to be on the school council in all three, participate in fundraising and evening activities in all three, and even attend parent/teacher interviews in all three. Parents scramble between schools and even towns on parent/teacher nights. School trips conflict so you can't volunteer for each child's outings, school evening activities OFTEN conflict and we have to let down one kid. This is not equitable.

A solution to this would be to offer fairness to FI students--when looking at your numbers and buildings, look also at the fundamental structure of your FI programs and change them so children in FI are a part of a school from JK to Gr 8. Let them be an integral part of ONE school for their elementary studies so they can grow to become confident leaders of a school, feeling safe and included, respected as a citizen and even active in creating its environment. Let parents put all their energies into supporting ONE school, and not fragmenting them. If you look at the 'numbers', you may see that doing so will also benefit the stability for all the school populations, and longterm planning will be easier to manage. But if not, maybe thinking of these kids and their families as something other than 'numbers' to juggle, and offering them the same ONE school as RT students may be a more satisfying approach for the planners, and one more likely to fulfill your board's goal of safe inclusive communities of learning with the child at the centre of all of our attention.

My suggestion that I made during the parent council meeting at Central PS was the board should consider adopting guidelines that would define how much outdoor green play space children / students should have access to.

This guideline should be based on ensuring sufficient room for physical education needs, active play at recess, and connection to nature (i.e. ensuring the outdoor space

includes greenery and not only concrete / asphalt). Adjacency to public parks should be supported in principle - as City Planning documents identify this as parks beside schools as a good fit.

I would also encourage the board to consider whether guidelines for elementary / middle / high schools could be different.

Hope this helps to clarify. Please let me know if I can provide additional clarity around this suggestion for the LTAP.



EDHS was ranked #1 in Fraser Ins. Report. We know O'ville wants a new school but they need to think of our community too!

We are #1, O'ville parents should be happy their kids attend an excellent school.

Please don't destroy the program, school, community here – the birthplace of FI in Upper Grand District Board!

At the end of the day, O'ville FI students account for 140 students. Not much for O'ville community but a large # for Erin community. Does O'ville really need an FI program for only 140 students? Do they need it or do they just want it? We have space here now, when that becomes an issue, then O'ville should get their FI program.

In the Catholic School Board, students from Mt. Forest get a bus that takes them to St. James in Guelph. Students from Erin to to St. James and they get a late bus so they can attend after school activities. Maybe these recommendations would be better for short term accommodation plans – until Erin can get their numbers up – so that it wouldn't decimate our programs both in English + French, and O'ville students still have an opportunity to attend an excellent school.

Good afternoon

I attended the secondary school meeting at ODSS a couple of weeks ago.

My take away was that the goal is to have the FI program start at ODSS when the current grade 5's hit grade nine.

We have three children in the FI program.

One in grade 6, one grade 5 and one grade 3. Our younger two were affected when the Shelburne divide happened. They moved to CHES. Our daughter stayed at MAPS.

We would love to have our kids reunited at the High school level and be able to attend the same school. How can I help make this happen. Who do I direct my hopes to?

I know of others who feel the same about the current grade 6 kids.



SHAPING GREAT COMMUNITIES

May 29, 2018

File No: 15017.900

Upper Grand District School Board
500 Victoria Road North
Guelph, ON
N1E 6K2

Attn: Ms. Jennifer Passy, Manager of Planning

Re: **Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP)**
Town of Shelburne Comments

Dear Ms. Passy,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) Draft Final Report that has been recently prepared by the Upper Grand District School Board (UGDSB) and for our meeting on May 28th. We are submitting comments on behalf of the Town of Shelburne as the municipality's planning consultants.

We support the UGDSB's initiative to undertake long term planning for school facilities in the Town of Shelburne to address the needs of continued population growth and recognizing Shelburne's central location in Dufferin County. Rapid growth is expected to continue and will require planning for and building additional capacity of educational and community facilities and this is consistent with the local planning objectives and policies for complete community development set out in the Town's Official Plan.

We understand through the LTAP that the UGDSB is forecasting that Glenbrook Elementary School and Hyland Heights Elementary School will become overcrowded within the next five years as rapid population growth continues in the Town of Shelburne. We would agree with the prioritization of funding applications to construct a 4-classroom addition to both Glenbrook ES and Hyland Heights ES as a near-term strategy for expanding capacity at existing schools prior to or in conjunction with pursuing additional school facility development.

The Draft Final Report also identifies a capital priority request to plan for the development of a new Shelburne elementary school in the the 2024/2025 timeframe, with a boundary review being anticipated for 2026/2027. As the UGDSB advances further planning initiatives based on the directions of the LTAP, we would be pleased to assist the Town and UGDSB to undertake a coordinated review of potential school site locations and alternatives, and to ensure appropriate land use designations, policies and zoning are put in place at the appropriate time to facilitate a new elementary school development. As discussed at our meeting, land opportunities are increasingly constrained as all of the vacant remaining residential lands within the urban area are committed in draft approved plans and/or are subject to active planning applications that are in process or proposed developments. Further, under the 2017 Growth Plan urban expansion is confined to an upper-tier Municipal Comprehensive Review process.

PLANNING | URBAN DESIGN | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

72 Victoria Street South, Suite 201, Kitchener, ON N2G 4Y9 519 569 8883
162 Locke Street South, Suite 200, Hamilton, ON L8P 4A9 905 572 7477
gspgroup.ca

The Shelburne West Secondary Plan has been prepared for the remaining lands within Shelburne's municipal boundary and servicing studies are underway in support of the planned urban expansion; however, a future school site has not been identified within the Secondary Plan. Location options for new school facilities are very limited. We would encourage the UGDSB to initiate further planning initiatives and processes for any new school facilities and capacity needs as soon as possible. This is also an opportunity to ensure a coordinated approach aligned and integrated with the growth management planning that the County of Dufferin and local municipalities are embarking on through the Municipal Comprehensive Review.

Currently, most of the new residential development in Shelburne is occurring in areas that are designated by the Board as Development Areas which leaves some uncertainty about where students will be accommodated for people considering the purchase of a new home and for those who are just moving in. We believe it would be of mutual benefit for the Town, UGDSB and home buyers to have a plan for future school accommodations that reduces this uncertainty while we also recognize that these decisions involve additional planning processes undertaken by the UGDSB involving boundary reviews and other studies that may not be completed at the time of development approvals for new housing in some areas.

At our meeting on May 28, 2018 we discussed some concerns that have been raised in the community about the capacity of the Centre Dufferin District High School as it relates to current and growing enrolment. The LTAP Draft Report identifies that the high school is expected to become overcrowded in the next five years. We understand that a boundary review is being forecasted for the Orangeville, Dufferin and Erin area in 2019/2020 to determine if students can be directed to under-utilized schools within the district.

The LTAP background report forecasts Shelburne to have a population of approximately 10,000 people in 2036 which is consistent with the population forecasts currently established in the County and Town Official Plans. We would like to take this opportunity to highlight some residential developments that are planned or proposed that might not have been considered at the time of the LTAP Background Report preparation that should be considered by the UGDSB:

- Fiddle Park has been recently declared surplus lands by the Town with the intent to sell the land for residential development having a total area of 31 acres. As of the date of this letter, the agreement to sell the land has not yet been finalized/approved. More details can be provided as this matter is considered further by the Town.
- The Fieldgate draft plan application for approximately 320 residential units has been circulated to the UGDSB and comments have been provided.
- 600 Main Street East was recently draft plan approved for 57 residential townhomes and semi-detached units.
- Hyland Village (Tribute Communities) draft plan is moving towards final approval and registration for approximately 248 residential units.
- Stone Ridge Holdings Inc. has revised their draft plan of subdivision/condominium to increase the original plan from 38 townhouse units and 2 semi-detached units (40 units total) to 66 units including 33 townhouse units and 33 apartment units.
- West Side Expansion Area is being planned for by the Town and County to ensure additional lands will be provided to accommodate future population growth.

Based on the above, we anticipate that Shelburne will surpass the 2036 population forecast of 10,000 within the next five years. This may affect the timelines associated with the strategies and initiatives identified in the LTAP Draft Final Report.

Further, in conjunction with the planned west side urban expansion, the Town has initiated servicing studies to plan for a total population in the range of 13,000 to 15,000. We expect that these forecasts will be reviewed and considered further in the context of local and County-wide forecasts and land needs through the Municipal Comprehensive Review process for the Dufferin County Official Plan.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments regarding the LTAP and we would be pleased discuss our comments further. On behalf of the Town of Shelburne we look forward to continuing to work with the UGDSB to ensure the school facility needs of the community are met in a timely and strategic manner.

Yours truly,
GSP Group Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steve Wever', is positioned above the printed name.

Steve Wever, MCIP RPP
Associate – Senior Planner

cc. Ms. Denyse Morrissey, CAO, Town of Shelburne
Ms. Jennifer Willoughby, Clerk, Town of Shelburne
Valerie Schmidt, GSP Group Inc.

APPENDIX B
PUBLIC MEETING Q&A

**Long Term Accommodation Plan
Q & A and Comments**

**Public Meeting – Phase 2
Erin PS – Old Gym
7 to 9 pm - May 2, 2018**

Q: Has there been progress in FI staffing? Is there still a shortage in elementary? Will there be secondary staffing issues if the Board adds a secondary FI program in Orangeville/Dufferin?

A: The Board has made headway in responding to the French Review recommendations. We now have dedicated staff for FI teacher recruitment (Hiring Managers). We have been attending many career fairs to increase interest in UGDSB. We are still battling with other Boards for a limited supply of FI teachers. There are challenges with both elementary and secondary panels. The rosters aren't full. It is an ongoing issue and part of the considerations for FI caps.

C: I am a parent of four and a town councillor. We are a small town with no real growth yet, but growth will happen no matter what. We want the Board to understand that growth will happen and Board decisions impact many aspects of Erin community. I have a passion for this town. Erin DHS is a success story as it was rated #1 by the Frasier Institute. We must get the message out and understand the challenges. There are lots of Catholic families at Brisbane, but they may change boards if disrupted. Creative solutions are required to solve problems. The Town wants to work with the Board.

Q: FI was part of our decision to move to Erin, and it is the same for many families. Does the Board look at how communities age and how this impacts growth? This can bring in kids as the population ages and turns over. It is short sighted to drop programs that are doing so well.

A: There has been no decision other than to conduct an Impact Study. There are no recommendations at this point. Any potential changes must be accompanied by a study that will evaluate all considerations.

Q: I am concerned about the English students as well as the FI students. If Erin DHS loses that many FI students, it will hurt both FI and English programs. What about other course options?

A: Yes, any changes to programming will have to consider all possible outcomes to both the FI and English tracks.

Q: I am from East Garafraxa and have a daughter in FI at Mono Amaranth PS and next year she will be at Erin DHS. She is excited to go to Erin DHS because it is a smaller school community. Why don't Orangeville kids want to come to Erin DHS?

A: Each family has a different perspective for and against the travel distance to Erin. The jurisdiction extends north of Shelburne and some of the Dufferin FI students are travelling a very long distance and committing to significant travel time. This limits some students' ability to participate in extra-curricular activities.

C: Catholic students in Mount Forest travel all the way to Guelph for High School. They have a special late bus that runs for those who have extracurricular activities and Wi-Fi on the bus for students to do homework. There are other options for student travel that would benefit both communities.

C: The student base is growing at Brisbane. Orangeville families knew what they were getting into, but I understand that Orangeville FI students will be a large majority of Erin's program. What about other creative solutions? What about sharing French teachers across schools? What about non-semester courses? We should look for ways for both communities to win.

Q: I am a Hillsburgh resident, but originally from Toronto. I'm not a parent but I have been here for 7 years and am learning about the community. What has been done to keep enrolment up? Why don't kids stay? How has the community been involved? The community and the Board should get together more often instead of waiting for problems to arise. I would suggest a follow up session in 5 years.

A: The enrolment decline is not as a result of issues with the schools, but rather that rural populations are aging and there are fewer students. We anticipate growth when there are servicing plans in place to facilitate growth. Until a decision is made about servicing, it is not possible for the board to make assumptions about future growth potential. Erin is a smaller community with a high FI participation rate which affects RT enrolment. The Board monitors and reports on enrolments each year, but it is good practice to do a more comprehensive review every 5 years.

Long Term Accommodation Plan

Q & A and Comments

Public Meeting – Phase 2 Centennial CVI – Cafeteria 7 to 9 pm - May 3, 2018

Q: Will the new Guelph high school be French Immersion?

A: Some members of the community are expressing that they want the new secondary school to have FI while others have expressed that they are opposed to this. At this time, program has yet to be determined. Several factors will need to be considered when determining the program and boundary of the new secondary school – the program needs of current and future secondary students, enrolment projections, etc.

Q: When and how are decisions made regarding new high school programming?

A: In 2018/19, a secondary program review will occur and it will look at all of the Board's secondary schools to review what is currently being offered and how this aligns with the needs of our secondary students. Following this, once we know what programs the new secondary school is going to offer, a boundary review will need to be conducted. Boundary reviews follow Board policy which is a prescribed process; however, program reviews do not. It is likely that public engagement will be a part of the program review process.

Q: What are the timelines for the new high school project?

A: It is likely a 3-4 year process for program decisions and for the design and school construction to occur.

Q: Why does the school only have 900 pupil places? This does not seem like enough.

A: The Ministry has approved funding for a 900 pupil place school. Staff is cognizant of designing a building that will accommodate future growth/additions to the structure and will plan/strategize for this during the building process.

Q: Could the International Baccalaureate (IB) program be offered at the new secondary school?

A: IB, as a program, is only offered within the City of Guelph at Guelph CVI at this time. When the program is next reviewed and evaluated, the Board will look at the possibility of expanding the program beyond Guelph. This is the only commitment that the Board has made at this time.

Q: Will we see an increase to mental health and guidance supports in the future?

A: The Ministry has committed additional funds to this; however, we are currently reviewing this to determine what this will bring beyond the scope of services and staff that we are currently offering.

Q: How does the Board determine the need for Before and After School Programs?

A: The Board maintains interest lists at schools. If there is expressed interest to fill 30 spaces, the Board examines community need, child ages, and interest from third-party providers to offer service in the location required. Staffing, based on the ages of children filling the spaces, can be a challenge for some providers which is a challenge to establishing a new program. Through JK registration, the Board also solicits schools with no existing Before and After School Programs to gauge the interest level of new families.

Q: Is Brock Road the only continuing education site in the Board?

A: While Brock Road is the principal site, satellite classes and continuing education opportunities are available throughout the Board at various sites.

Q: What is FCI?

A: FCI stands for Facility Condition Index. The Facility Condition Index is a ratio used by the Ministry to measure the relative condition of each school facility. FCI is calculated by dividing the cost of repairs for a building by the replacement value of the building. Information on the condition of Ontario schools is gathered in five-year cycles, the first of which took place from 2011 to 2015. The program is currently in year two of its second cycle (2016 to 2020). A school with a low FCI rating needs less repair and renewal work than a school with a higher FCI rating.

Q: From an equity perspective, schools with active councils earn funds to build great outdoor play spaces. Schools with less active councils cannot secure the funds to do so. Does the Board fund outdoor space improvements or only building improvements?

A: The Board is primarily funded for facility improvements. All schools are treated equally, regardless of what their student councils choose to initiate. The Board does assist all schools with inspection and maintenance of outdoor spaces/play structures once they are installed/established.

Q: Is this standard across all Boards?

A: Due to limited funding and resources, the need for improved outdoor play and learning spaces is a common concern province-wide. Our Environmental Education Management Team considers funding and how to support schools in this capacity so that all students have access to outdoor learning space in varying capacities. Although the look and type of space may vary, we work to find solutions to make outdoor learning equally accessible to all.

C: We appreciate the Board taking the time to host public meetings and to engage the community in this process. Learning how these processes work and the many areas of operation within the Board is helpful to parents, as it increases understanding in relation to the education system.

Q: Will the new high school offer enough program options at opening, especially if it combines FI and Regular Track programs?

A: When completing a French Diploma in secondary, only 10 of the required credits must be in French. This allows for a varied program and integration of the two tracks. That having been said, a program review must occur and at this time, the program for the new school has yet to be determined.

Long Term Accommodation Plan

Q & A and Comments

Public Meeting – Phase 2 Orangeville DSS – Cafetorium 7 to 9 pm - May 10, 2018

C: I am a Westside parent. I see that recreation centres and community hubs are underutilized by the schools. I think that a better job can be done integrating them, especially with summer programming. The schools should take advantage of the closeness of facilities. Also, students need better mastery of subjects. E-learning is not practical for many students. I have concerns with the expectation of doing 6 hours of math/day online and limited access to teachers. The response time to questions online is too long. We should be using the empty schools during the summer instead. Why no reach-ahead programs in Grade 8? What about the integration of programs? The principals are not proactive enough. Activities in the margins of schools are key. Activities like recreation, extra-curricular, etc.

A: We have shared your previous comments regarding e-learning with the Board. The district-wide secondary program review will be the opportunity to address these kinds of issues directly.

C: The only e-learning in person for math is in Guelph. If parents don't know about that program, it could impact its popularity/attendance.

Q: We live in Orangeville and since there is no secondary FI here, kids from the French Language school go to Mississauga for French secondary. There are approximately 200 students at the French language school now, with 10-15 graduating from Grade 8. Secondary FI in Orangeville will benefit the students. Do I understand correctly that a secondary FI program wouldn't open until 2021?

A: 2021 is just a projection. No decision has been made. Board processes need to be followed. Several factors will need to be considered in the Impact Study.

C: I would like to see a review of Community Hubs. What are the Principals doing with them? I would like to see data regarding lack of extra-curricular activities and field trips. Montgomery Village students should be using the facilities at Westside. There are not enough marginal activities. The use of the recreation centres needs to be leveraged and expanded.

A: When we make reference to community hubs as it relates to schools, we are talking about a different circumstance. We are referring to the use of either surplus space in

schools or the co-location/building with other public services for the benefit of students. However, your point about making use of community assets is an important consideration.

C: Barrie is also taking some of the Orangeville kids for secondary FI.

Q: For secondary FI, what could we do to get a program in Orangeville sooner? Students have been moved around a lot during elementary and would like some stability through secondary. What are our next steps? We want some stability instead of travelling so much and losing extra-curricular activities.

A: We have heard this from other parents and you aren't alone in that desire. When the Board undertakes the district-wide secondary program review and Impact Study, this is when more focused discussion can happen.

Q: Would there be grandfathering opportunities for kids who might be moved to the new Orangeville secondary FI?

A: A comprehensive district-wide secondary program review must take place first. Then we would need to conduct an FI/IB Impact Study for Orangeville/Dufferin and Erin DHS. Depending upon the outcome of the Impact Study we may need to conduct an accommodation and/or boundary review. Following this would be course selection and staffing. The earliest start for a possible secondary FI program in Orangeville/Dufferin is 2021/22. Grandfathering would need to be considered as part of a future accommodation or boundary review process.

C: It must be difficult to project or to know future enrolment.

A: We do have access to enrolment lists and projected trends to assist in projections.

Q: What is the mindset for International Baccalaureate (IB) in Orangeville? Does it have parent support?

A: In 2012 the Board completed an evaluation of interest in IB. The study found support for IB in Guelph and future opportunities in Dufferin and Wellington. IB will be part of the secondary program review.

C: I want to state again that I am concerned about the question and response time with e-learning courses.

Upper Grand
District School Board

LONG TERM ACCOMMODATION PLAN FINAL REPORT

As Approved June 27, 2018



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION.....	2
Board Overview.....	2
Purpose Of A Long Term Accommodation Plan.....	2
Guiding Principles	3
Vision.....	3
Focus.....	3
LTAP Annual Review	4
LTAP 5-Year Review.....	4
Board Enrolment Projections 2017-2027.....	5
Elementary Enrolment Projection	5
Secondary Enrolment Projection	5
Enrolment Overview By Review Area.....	6
SECTION 2: REVIEW AREA ACCOMMODATION PRIORITIES.....	7
5-Year Work Plan Priorities	8
Existing Board Motions.....	8
Capital Priorities.....	9
Program Reviews	9
District-Wide Secondary Program Review	9
10-Year Work Plan Priorities.....	9
Erin Review Area	10
Program, Resource and Facility Considerations	16
Elementary and Secondary	16
Elementary	16
Secondary	17
SECTION 3: ACCOMMODATION CONSIDERATIONS.....	18
Current Board Motions and Ministry Directives	18
Current Board Motions.....	18
École Harris Mill PS Boundary Review (January 28, 2014):	18

James McQueen PS Boundary Review (January 28, 2014):	18
École Guelph Lake PS Boundary Review (June 23, 2015):	18
UGDSB Elementary French Review (May 25, 2016):	18
Expansion of the International Baccalaureate Program in the Upper Grand DSB (December 20, 2016):	19
Report of the Secondary French Review Committee (June 27, 2017):	19
Ministry Directives.....	19
Board Motions for Secondary French Immersion.....	20
Secondary FI Enrolment	20
Accommodation of Secondary FI.....	21
Impact Study	21
SECTION 4: BOARD-WIDE INITIATIVES.....	22
Community Hubs/Facility Partnerships.....	22
Childcare and Before and After School Programs.....	23
Adult and Continuing Education Programs.....	23
Glossary	24
Appendix A.....	26
Enrolment and Utilization Forecasts	26
Appendix B.....	40
Review Area Maps.....	40
Appendix C.....	41
Existing Before & After School Program and Child Care Availability	41

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) Final Report was developed by Board staff in consultation with stakeholders. Public engagement was important to the LTAP process and determination of future priorities considered the input received.

The establishment of LTAP Guiding Principles at the outset of this process ensured that the LTAP was aligned with the Board's Strategic Plan and consistent with the Board's overall Guiding Principles and Vision.

The LTAP Final Report identifies short and long-term priorities to address student accommodation needs. Each of the priorities requires other processes to be undertaken prior to a final decision by trustees.

The list of priorities includes annual processes such as the LTAP review, consideration of Community Planning and Partnership opportunities, and the review of *Development Area* school assignments. The short and long-term priorities include Ministry Capital Priorities Requests to resolve current and projected enrolment pressure, as well as proposed *Program/Grade Level Reviews*, Boundary Reviews and *Pupil Accommodation Reviews (PARs)*.

The report also includes the need to consider Board-wide programming, resource and *facility* matters. It highlights possible servicing gaps and opportunities to improve the delivery of equitable and effective programs across the jurisdiction.

The report is organized as follows:

- Section 1 Provides an overview of the UGDSB, the purpose of the LTAP, the LTAP Guiding Principles, the annual and 5-year LTAP review processes and the 10-year enrolment projections for the elementary and secondary panels.
- Section 2 Includes the *review area* short and long-term accommodation priorities, an explanation about the timing and necessity of priorities and a summary of Board-wide program, resource, and facility considerations.
- Section 3 Highlights other considerations including current Board motions and Ministry directives impacting accommodation and specifically Board motions regarding secondary French Immersion (FI).
- Section 4 Includes information about other Board-wide initiatives including Community Hubs and Facility Partnerships, Child Care and Before and After School Programs and Adult and Continuing Education Programs.

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

Figure 1 - Map of UGDSB



BOARD OVERVIEW

The Upper Grand District School Board (UGDSB) currently has 65 elementary *schools* (JK-8) and 11 secondary schools (Grades 9-12), and serves nearly 35,000 students.

By 2027 it is projected that the Board will have an enrolment of over 39,000 students. A review of the Board's accommodation is necessary to respond to enrolment changes and to ensure the needs of students are met.

PURPOSE OF A LONG TERM ACCOMMODATION PLAN

The Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) is a strategic review of the Upper Grand District School Board's facilities, population projections, and enrolment forecasts.

The LTAP is an important step in ensuring alignment of school facilities with the needs of the Board and the communities it serves.

The LTAP includes a list of priorities for the Board to focus on in the short-term (1-5 years) and long-term (6-10 years).

The LTAP does not provide recommendations about changes to school programs or boundaries. Any future accommodation solutions must be considered through an open and transparent process, in accordance with Board policy. Final decisions regarding future changes to school boundaries and programs are made by the Board of Trustees.

Accommodation planning is not static. There are several factors that can influence enrolment projections and school *utilization* such as changes in the pace of new residential development construction, demographic shifts, and changes to Ministry initiatives. For this reason, the LTAP is a living document that will be reviewed and updated on an annual basis.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Board established guiding principles to reinforce what is important to consider when developing the LTAP. The Guiding Principles are divided into two categories, Vision and Focus.

Vision reflects Board and Ministry policies and initiatives to ensure that the LTAP is consistent with the overall Board vision and plan.

Focus addresses values that relate to the methodology of the LTAP. The principles are aligned with the Board's focus on ensuring that schools can respond to changes in curriculum and program, are safe and in good condition, and the operation of schools is in line with Board resources.

VISION

- The plan should be a component of the Board's Strategic Plan and be consistent with the Board's overall Guiding Principles and Vision Statement.
- The plan's primary purpose is to support the efficient use of the Board's facilities while integrating student and program needs in a holistic jurisdiction-wide approach.
- The plan will identify regular processes that:
 - Monitor Board and/or Provincial policies and initiatives;
 - Identify the impact of Board and/or Provincial policies and initiatives on the Board's accommodation strategy;
 - Implement actions that maintain alignment of the Board's accommodation strategy with the Board's Strategic Plan.

Focus

- The plan should identify alternatives that support a range of accommodation models and opportunities in elementary, secondary and continuing education where demand, space and viability exist.
- The plan should identify and reflect accommodation processes that allow the Board to be responsive to changes in curriculum, program and policy.
- The plan should promote the continued renewal and maintenance of facilities to ensure high quality, environmentally responsible and safe learning environments.
- The plan should promote schools with viable concentrations of school-aged populations, while accounting for unique program or geographic circumstances, where necessary.

- The plan should align with the Board's financial resources.
- The plan should take "into account opportunities for partnerships with other school boards (if viable) and appropriate public organizations that are financially sustainable, safe for students and support the Board's Vision, Guiding Principles and Strategic Plan priorities." (UGDSB Policy 319)
- The plan should promote communication and establish a strategy for receiving input from school communities.

LTAP ANNUAL REVIEW

The LTAP will be reviewed annually and include; updated data, information about changes to Provincial policy or programs affecting the LTAP, changes to accommodation priorities and any relevant information pertaining to Board-wide priorities and initiatives and will ensure that identified capital priorities reflect the accommodation and program needs of our schools.

The annual update will be communicated to school communities and stakeholders to ensure public awareness. The Board's advisory committees will also be provided with an update on the outcomes of the LTAP review and an opportunity to provide input.

Dependent upon the changes contemplated, staff may schedule a public information meeting with affected school communities to provide additional information about the changes.

LTAP 5-YEAR REVIEW

A comprehensive review will be conducted every five years. The process undertaken will include an extensive review of the Board's facilities, population projections and enrolment forecasts as well as any other information pertaining to accommodation.


In comparison to the annual review process, the public engagement process for the 5-year review would be expanded to promote a shared understanding of local issues between the Board, staff, partners and school communities.

BOARD ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS 2017-2027

ELEMENTARY ENROLMENT PROJECTION

As shown in Figure 2, total elementary enrolment is projected to increase to just over 27,000 students by 2027, an increase of approximately 16% from 2017.


Figure 2 - Board -Wide Elementary Enrolment Projection



SECONDARY ENROLMENT PROJECTION

In Figure 3, the secondary enrolment projection indicates growth of approximately 11% to a total of 12,300 students by 2027. The breakdown of secondary enrolment between Dufferin and Wellington County and the City of Guelph is similar to the elementary panel.

Figure 3 - Board-Wide Secondary Enrolment Projection



ENROLMENT OVERVIEW BY REVIEW AREA

Based on total available *capacity* in the Board's elementary schools and secondary schools, projected growth will result in a shortfall of approximately 1,000 pupil places in each panel by 2027.

However, this shortfall does not mean that every school is fully utilized. Many of those schools which are fully utilized today are the same schools that are projected to be *overcrowded* in the 5 and 10-year projections. This trend is more apparent in the individual review area enrolment projections in Appendix A.

Appendix A includes the enrolment projections by elementary and secondary review area and identifies schools that are projected to be overcrowded, *underutilized* or well utilized over the 10-year forecast period.

SECTION 2: REVIEW AREA ACCOMMODATION PRIORITIES

Annual priorities are identified starting in 2018/19, and in each year of the 10-year planning period. These priorities align with the vision and focus of the LTAP Guiding Principles. The annual LTAP review process will ensure that the priorities continue to support these principles.

Any accommodation action requires approval from the Board. Staff will prepare reports in accordance with Board policy or procedures for consideration by the Board.

Annual capital priorities requests, such as new schools or additions require funding approval by the Ministry of Education. As such, timing associated with these priorities or subsequent actions are subject to Ministry approval.

Consideration of school conversions or additions to address Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) classroom needs will also be examined through accommodation or boundary review processes or as part of a capital priorities needs assessment. Staff will bring forward capital priorities for Board approval.

Accommodation priorities identified in the next 10-years include:

- impact studies,
- boundary reviews,
- pupil accommodation reviews (PARs),
- program/grade level reviews, and
- requests for capital funding to support new schools or additions.

As required by the Board's Community Planning and Partnership Policy and consistent with the LTAP Guiding Principles, the annual Partnership Report will identify potential partnership space and co-build opportunities.

Consideration of new, modified, or deleted Development Areas requires the presentation of an annual report and approval by Trustees.

Figure 4 illustrates the Board's short-term (5-year) work plan and these priorities are summarized by review area in Table 1. Long-term work plan priorities are illustrated in Figure 5 and Table 2. Long-term priorities are matters to be addressed by the Board in the 10-year planning horizon.

5-YEAR WORK PLAN PRIORITIES

Priorities in the 5-year work plan are meant to address the most immediate accommodation issues. There are processes identified to address existing Board motions, review of Board policies for compliance with Ministry guidelines, school utilization and program issues.

EXISTING BOARD MOTIONS

There are a number of Board motions which pre-date the initiation of the LTAP. These motions need to be addressed in the short term work plan.

One of these motions about investigating the expansion of the International Baccalaureate (*IB*) program to include a Primary Years or Middle Years Program in the City of Guelph, has been initiated by a committee of Board staff and is ongoing.

Staff is required to bring a report to Trustees prior to February 2019, recommending whether École Guelph Lake PS should accommodate the senior grades starting with Grade 7 in September 2019 and then Grade 8 in September 2020. The alternative is to delay the start of the intermediate grades at École Guelph Lake PS, with students continuing to feed to École King George PS for Grades 7&8 until the size of these cohorts have increased.

Consistent with the Guiding Principles of the LTAP, a review of Board policies is identified in the 5-year work plan. It is necessary for Board Policy 305 and Procedure 305-A to be aligned with the Ministry's revised Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline (PARG). Further, Board Policy 319 and Procedure 319-A will need to be revised once the Ministry releases a revision to the Community Planning and Partnerships Guideline (CPPG).

There are Board motions directing staff to explore the expansion of IB outside of Guelph as well as the possibility of secondary FI programming in Orangeville/Dufferin. Staff has included an FI/IB Impact Study for Orangeville/Dufferin secondary and Erin DHS in 2018/19. If the impact study concludes that a new FI secondary program should be offered in Orangeville/Dufferin, a subsequent boundary review or PAR process would need to be conducted. This is included as a priority in 2019/20.

A PAR for Centre Wellington elementary is identified in 2019/20 in response to previous Board motions. Board decisions on a PAR process are necessary prior to the Board submitting a capital priorities request for funding for a new elementary school in Centre Wellington.

CAPITAL PRIORITIES

Capital priorities are identified to support the efficient use of Board facilities while integrating student and program needs. Submission of capital priorities requests to the Ministry, as described on page 7 are intended to resolve the most immediate overcrowding issues. Processes are also included to address underutilization or enrolment imbalance issues.

PROGRAM REVIEWS

A program review for JK-8 FI in West Guelph in the short-term is identified in response to feedback about the lack of a consolidated JK-8 FI program. The timing of this priority presents an opportunity to consider the feasibility of a consolidated program in advance of the first year that the new West Guelph FI program expands from Gateway Drive PS to Willow Road PS for Grades 4-8 FI.

DISTRICT-WIDE SECONDARY PROGRAM REVIEW

A district-wide secondary program review will evaluate the high school programming currently offered throughout the UGDSB. It will identify the programming needs of secondary students throughout the jurisdiction to ensure that the Board is providing a range of quality programs and learning opportunities at the secondary level to maximize student engagement, achievement and well-being.

As part of this review, the 7-12 school model will be discussed and will consider the pros/cons, and implementation issues associated with this type of school organization. This aligns with the Guiding Principle that the LTAP identify alternatives that support a range of accommodation models, where demand, space and viability exist.

The Secondary Program Review is to be initiated immediately, and a final report presented to Trustees in November 2018. This review will inform future short-term priorities including the FI/IB Impact Study for Orangeville/Dufferin secondary and Erin DHS as well as the new South Guelph secondary school boundary review.

10-YEAR WORK PLAN PRIORITIES

Priorities indicated in the 10-year work plan are intended to address accommodation matters that are less immediate. Identified actions address projected underutilization and enrolment imbalances as well as capital priorities requests and associated processes to resolve overcrowding concerns.

The 10-year priorities may change as the LTAP is reviewed to ensure the work plan is responsive to changes in enrolment, curriculum, program and policy.

ERIN REVIEW AREA

The Erin Secondary Review Area is included as part of the FI/IB Impact Study and associated boundary review/PAR. However, aside from this, there are no other short or long-term accommodation priorities identified for the Erin Elementary Review Area.

The Town of Erin is undertaking a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) to determine the preferred design alternative for wastewater servicing of the existing urban areas of the Village of Erin and Hillsburgh, and to accommodate future growth.

There remains uncertainty around the timing and scope of wastewater servicing, and as such, it is not appropriate to identify elementary accommodation priorities for the Erin Elementary Review Area at this time.

Two enrolment scenarios are provided in Appendix A. One scenario shows enrolment if development begins within 5 years and the status quo scenario shows enrolment if development does not proceed within the projection period.

The Board will review LTAP projections and priorities annually and will reflect future decisions of the Town of Erin.

Figure 4 – 5-Year Work Plan




Figure 5 – 10-Year Work Plan




Table 1 - Summary of Proposed Short-Term Accommodation Actions by Review Area

Review Area	Recommended Action	Detail
All Review Areas	Capital Priorities Request	FDK Classroom Conversions/Additions
	Program/Grade Level Review	District-wide Secondary School Program Review
	LTAP Review	Annual review of LTAP enrolment information and priorities
	Community Planning and Partnerships	Annual consideration of partnership opportunities
	Development Areas	Annual review of DAs and school assignments
Wellington County	Program/Grade Level Review	IB in County of Wellington (Feasibility Study)
Orangeville DPE01 DPS01	Program/Grade Level Review	FI and IB in Orangeville/Dufferin and Erin (Impact Study)
	Program/Boundary Review	Orangeville/Dufferin/Erin Secondary Review
	Capital Priorities Request	Island Lake PS Addition
Dufferin DPE02 DPS01	Program/Grade Level Review	FI and IB in Orangeville/Dufferin and Erin (Impact Study)
	Program/Boundary Review	Orangeville/Dufferin/Erin Secondary Review
	Capital Priorities Request	Hyland Heights ES Addition
	Capital Priorities Request	Glenbrook ES Addition
East Guelph WPE01 WPS01	Program/Grade Level Review	École Guelph Lake PS Grade 7&8 Implementation Plan
	Program/Boundary Review	New Guelph Secondary School
	Capital Priorities Request	Edward Johnson PS Addition
West Guelph WPE02 WPS01	Program/Boundary Review	New Guelph Secondary School
	Program/Grade Level Review	JK-8 FI program consolidation (Feasibility Study/Boundary Review)
South Guelph WPE03 WPS01	Program/Boundary Review	New Guelph Secondary School
	Capital Priorities Request	New Clair-Maltby Elementary School #1

Italicized words are found in the Glossary starting on page 24.

Review Area	Recommended Action	Detail
	Boundary Review	South Guelph Regular Track Elementary Review
Guelph/Eramosa WPE04 WPS01	Program/Boundary Review	New Guelph Secondary School
Wellington North WPE05 WPS02	No Short-Term Accommodation Actions Proposed	
Minto WPE06 WPS02	No Short-Term Accommodation Actions Proposed	
Mapleton WPE07 WPS02	PAR	Centre Wellington Elementary (incl. Alma) Review
Centre Wellington WPE08 WPS02	PAR	Centre Wellington Elementary (incl. Alma) Review
	Capital Priorities Request	Northwest Fergus Elementary School
Erin WPE09 WPS03	Program/Grade Level Review	FI and IB in Orangeville/Dufferin and Erin (Impact Study)

Table 2 - Summary of Proposed Long-Term Accommodation Actions by Review Area

Review Area	Recommended Action	Detail
All Review Areas	5 Year LTAP Review	Comprehensive review of LTAP
	Capital Priorities Request	FDK Classroom Conversions/Additions
	LTAP Review	Annual review of LTAP enrolment information and priorities
	Community Planning and Partnerships	Annual consideration of partnership opportunities
	Development Areas	Annual review of DAs and school assignments
Orangeville DPE01 DPS01	Capital Priorities Request	Credit Meadows ES Addition
Dufferin DPE02 DPS01	Capital Priorities Request	New Shelburne Elementary School
	Capital Priorities Request	New Grand Valley Elementary School

Review Area	Recommended Action	Detail
	Boundary Review	Shelburne Elementary ¹
	Boundary Review	Grand Valley Elementary ¹
East Guelph WPE01 WPS01	No Long-Term Accommodation Actions Proposed	
West Guelph WPE02 WPS01	No Long-Term Accommodation Actions Proposed	
South Guelph WPE03 WPS01	Boundary Review	New Clair-Maltby Elementary School #1 ¹
	Capital Priorities Request	New Clair-Maltby Elementary School #2
Guelph/Eramosa WPE04 WPS01	PAR	Guelph/Eramosa Elementary
Wellington North WPE05 WPS02	PAR	Wellington North Elementary
Minto WPE06 WPS02	No Long-Term Accommodation Actions Proposed	
Mapleton WPE07 WPS02	No Long-Term Accommodation Actions Proposed	
Centre Wellington WPE08 WPS02	No Long-Term Accommodation Actions Proposed	
Erin WPE09 WPS03	No Long-Term Accommodation Actions Proposed	

¹ Contingent on other actions (i.e. Capital Priorities Approvals and Ministry Funding)

PROGRAM, RESOURCE AND FACILITY CONSIDERATIONS

The purpose of the first phase of public engagement was for staff to share the [Long Term Accommodation Plan Background Report](#) and gather input from school communities to inform the writing of the LTAP.

The feedback received highlighted the consistency of issues, regardless of the school community or region. Given that stakeholders had the opportunity to discuss any school related matters, feedback received reflected a number of non-accommodation matters, including:

- a school's culture/community such as inclusivity and the value of a supportive and cohesive school community,
- desire for programming opportunities/access and the resources necessary to support successful students,
- school environments and facilities/grounds such as school size, parking, playgrounds and school yard greening.

Feedback reinforced a need to reflect on other Board-wide programming strategies, resource and facility matters, separate from traditional school board accommodation planning.

Senior administration will need to consider the following issues in the context of how each aligns with the Board's overall Vision, Guiding Principles and strategic plan priorities as well as current Board initiatives.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY

- Ensure equitable and accessible technology at the school-level including Wi-Fi speed
- Review Special Education accommodation
- Ensure equitable distribution of FSL resources throughout the jurisdiction
- Assess play structure and school yard greening procedures, and funding options
- Support active transportation

ELEMENTARY

- Ensure transition planning practices and resources support staff and students when transitions are proposed
- Continue to encourage best practices in school communication to parents/guardians

- Consider opportunities for grade structure continuity (i.e. JK-6, JK-8) in accommodation and boundary reviews

SECONDARY

- Review mental health and educational supports for students (i.e. guidance staff)
- Review availability of program options (i.e. AP courses, FI courses, college level science and math and e-learning courses), and school-level promotion of course options
- Inventory small group discussion spaces in secondary schools and investigate opportunities to increase access to such spaces
- Promote secondary school activities aimed at integrating students of various grades and programs to create more connected school communities

SECTION 3: ACCOMMODATION CONSIDERATIONS

CURRENT BOARD MOTIONS AND MINISTRY DIRECTIVES

There are a number of existing Board motions and Ministry directives that have an impact on the proposed LTAP accommodation priorities.

CURRENT BOARD MOTIONS

ÉCOLE HARRIS MILL PS BOUNDARY REVIEW (JANUARY 28, 2014):

4. Effective June 2022 when the first class of FI students graduates to Grade 9, students in the Rockwood FI program will attend John F. Ross CVI. This secondary school assignment is subject to change by any Board process that occurs prior to this date which may alter secondary school *attendance areas*.”

JAMES MCQUEEN PS BOUNDARY REVIEW (JANUARY 28, 2014):

8. Planning staff consider an accommodation review for Centre Wellington elementary students, both RT and FI in the upcoming long term accommodation plan.

The Board direct staff to include the *consolidation* of the FI program in Centre Wellington in one school as one consideration in the revision of the long term accommodation plan and in any resulting accommodation review objectives.”

ÉCOLE GUELPH LAKE PS BOUNDARY REVIEW (JUNE 23, 2015):

3. That prior to February 2019, the Planning Department provide a report to the Board with recommendations about the start of Grades 7 and 8 at the Couling Crescent school supported by updated enrolment projections and information on intermediate class sizes.

UGDSB ELEMENTARY FRENCH REVIEW (MAY 25, 2016):

18. That future elementary and secondary French immersion accommodation needs and locations be considered during the development of the Board's long term capital and accommodation plan.

EXPANSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM IN THE UPPER GRAND DSB
(DECEMBER 20, 2016):

2. Staff be directed to investigate the expansion of the International Baccalaureate program to include a Primary Years Program and/or Middle Years Program, in the City of Guelph.
3. Staff be directed to investigate establishing an International Baccalaureate Diploma Program in Dufferin County and/or the County of Wellington.

REPORT OF THE SECONDARY FRENCH REVIEW COMMITTEE (JUNE 27, 2017):

- 2i. Identify accommodation options for the placement of French Immersion programs in UGDSB secondary schools as part of the Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) process.
- xii. Through the Long Term Accommodation Planning (LTAP) process, determine if the forecasted doubling of the FI enrolment by 2026 requires the addition of FI secondary sites or whether students can be accommodated at existing sites.
- xiv. Planning Department conduct an impact study on FI enrolment at Erin DHS to determine the viability of introducing either Extended French or FI programs at an Orangeville secondary school.

MINISTRY DIRECTIVES

In June of 2017, the Ministry notified school boards of its intention to revise both the Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline (PARG) and Community Planning and Partnerships Guideline (CPPG).

The Ministry released its final revised version of the PARG on April 27, 2018. Templates to be used by Boards when conducting a PAR are expected to be made available by the Ministry in the fall of 2018.

The timing for a revised CPPG is undetermined. The Board's PAR [Policy 305 and Procedure 305-A](#) and Community Planning and Partnerships [Policy 319 and Procedure 319-A](#) will need to be amended to align with the revised guidelines.

Until the PARG templates and CPPG have been released by the Ministry, and both Board policies updated, no new PARs can be undertaken.


BOARD MOTIONS FOR SECONDARY FRENCH IMMERSION

As required by the Secondary French Review motions, the LTAP must identify secondary FI accommodation options, and advise whether the doubling of secondary FI enrolment requires additional sites.

SECONDARY FI ENROLMENT

As shown in Figure 6, French Immersion secondary enrolment growth is projected to increase significantly over the 10-year forecast period.

Figure 6 - Secondary FI Enrolment Projection



The secondary FI forecast by school is outlined in Table 3.

Table 3 - Secondary FI Enrolment Projection by School

School	OTG	Enrolment		
		2017	5 Yr	10 Yr
John F Ross CVI	1,755	510	696	1,000
Centre Wellington DHS	1,467	93	102	122
Norwell DSS	975	62	34	52
Erin DHS	558	137	241	295
Total	4,755	802	1,073	1,469

As a percentage of the total secondary enrolment, FI is projected to increase from 7% in 2017 to 12% by 2027.

ACCOMMODATION OF SECONDARY FI

Access to secondary FI is dispersed throughout the District, and high schools offering FI are located in communities where original elementary programs were established.

However, smaller secondary programs do face challenges when there is only one feeder school, resulting in small cohorts of students each year in secondary FI. Despite this, it is important to maintain these locations to provide continuity between elementary and secondary FI.

Accordingly, and because there are no accommodation related matters which would necessitate reconsideration of program locations, no reviews related to FI at Centre Wellington DHS or Norwell DSS are suggested.

At John F. Ross CVI, FI enrolment is projected to increase to 1,000 students by 2027. Together with *Regular Track (RT)* growth, this will place significant pressure on the school. FI enrolment alone equates to 60% utilization of the school.

The Ministry's funding approval of a new 900-pupil place high school in South Guelph will require the review of program and boundaries for the new school, and other Guelph high schools.

At Erin DHS, FI enrolment is forecasted to increase from approximately 140 students in 2017 to almost 300 students in 2027. This growth is largely due to increased FI enrolment from Orangeville/Dufferin.

Orangeville/Dufferin FI enrolment is projected to increase by 90% from nearly 70 students in 2017 to approximately 200 students in 2027. By 2027, Orangeville/Dufferin FI enrolment will represent approximately 70% of Erin DHS FI enrolment.

IMPACT STUDY

The Board approved secondary program-related motions direct staff to explore the expansion of the International Baccalaureate program and possible secondary FI programming in Orangeville/Dufferin.

The impact of either of these programs needs to be assessed comprehensively in order to consider the effect on enrolment at existing schools, how existing program enrolment may change, whether existing facilities can accommodate new programs, and whether existing school boundaries need to be adjusted in response to possible new programs. A comprehensive evaluation is suggested to include Orangeville/Dufferin high schools and Erin DHS.

SECTION 4: BOARD-WIDE INITIATIVES

COMMUNITY HUBS/FACILITY PARTNERSHIPS

The UGDSB has a variety of facility partnerships throughout the jurisdiction. These partnerships include standalone childcare facilities on Board property, childcare space in converted school space, purpose built community rooms and a jointly constructed facility.

The UGDSB recognizes that facility partnerships can:

- reduce facility operating costs for school boards and governments;
- improve services and supports available to students;
- strengthen relationships between school boards, community partners and the public;
- maximize the use of public infrastructure through increased flexibility and utilization; and
- provide a foundation for improved service delivery for communities.

Partnership opportunities may exist in surplus school space or in planned new schools in accordance with the provisions of the Board's Community Planning and Facility Partnership Policy 319 and Procedure 319-A.

The [2017 Facility Partnerships Report](#) identified that it would be appropriate to consider co-build opportunities at the new South Guelph secondary school. It also identified that it would be appropriate to approach the partnership list about interest in a co-build on the Northwest Fergus elementary school site, prior to making a future application to the Ministry for capital priorities funding.

In accordance with Board policy, the Board will continue to evaluate opportunities to utilize unused space in schools for facility partnerships.

In June 2017, the Ministry of Education announced it would revise the Community Planning and Partnerships Guideline (CPPG). The timeframe for a revised guideline is uncertain. However, once a revised guideline is released, the Board's policy will be revised to conform to the new guideline.

The UGDSB will continue to share planning information and consult annually with potential partners about co-location or co-building opportunities.

CHILDCARE AND BEFORE AND AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Responses to the Board's online survey in the first phase of engagement indicated that there is a demand for childcare in some schools across the jurisdiction.

In particular, respondents indicated interest in childcare in Wellington County schools and specifically in the Guelph/Eramosa (Rockwood) area.

Input received reinforces the need for the Board to continue the annual survey of school communities to determine whether there is sufficient demand to open viable Before and After School Programs.

Further, the Board will continue to work with Consolidated Municipal Service Managers (CMSMs) and other stakeholders to confirm the demand and viability of new and existing programs.

A table showing 2017/18 Before and After School Programs and a map showing current licensed school based, institutional and home child care locations across the jurisdiction are included in Appendix C.

ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Adult and continuing education programs are distributed across the jurisdiction. However, there was support from survey respondents to expand access to this service.

In areas where long-term surplus school space is projected, it is appropriate to consider if there is opportunity to expand adult and continuing education programming.

GLOSSARY

Attendance Area is a Board defined geographical area that designates which school a student attends based on program and primary residential address of the student.

Capacity refers to the number of students a facility can accommodate.

Consolidation refers to the merging of two or more schools or programs into one facility to create a new or enlarged school or program.

Development Area (DA) is a geographically distinct area designated by the Board, which is not part of a school attendance area. Students from these areas are assigned temporary accommodation at holding schools that have spaces available.

Dual Track is a school that offers both Regular Track (English) and French Immersion instruction.

Facility is the physical components of a school.

IB stands for the International Baccalaureate program. There are a total of four [IB programmes](#) that focus on teaching students to think critically and independently, and how to inquire with care and logic. The IB Diploma Program is offered in the UGDSB for students aged 16-19.

On The Ground (OTG) Capacity is the student loading of a school as reported to the Ministry of Education for grant purposes and reflects all permanent teaching space available for instructional purposes. OTG capacity does not include capacity in temporary facilities (i.e. portables or portapaks).

Pupil Accommodation Review (PAR) is a Ministry-mandated process to determine the future of a school or group of schools.

Program/Grade Level Review is a review of programs and grades in a school or schools which may include an impact study or feasibility study.

Portable is a single, temporary structure providing additional classroom space. Portables are built with wood frame construction, fully heated and without plumbing. Portables are considered temporary accommodation and are not included in a school's OTG capacity.

Portapak is a cluster of portable classrooms joined together by a common hallway and attached to the permanent facility. Portapaks are built with a wood frame, fully heated but without plumbing, and is considered temporary accommodation and are not included in a school's OTG capacity.

Regular Track (RT) refers to English programming.

Review Area may include the attendance area of an individual school or group of

schools, family of schools, Municipal, or any other geographic area.

School is a facility that accommodates a body of elementary students or secondary students organized as a unit for educational purposes under the jurisdiction of the Board.

Utilization measures the extent to which a school is operating at full capacity. The Board uses two points of reference to compare school utilization; Underutilized and Overcrowded.

Overcrowded is a standard whereby Full Time Equivalent (FTE) enrolment exceeds a school's On the Ground (OTG) capacity resulting in a utilization rate of 110% or higher

Underutilized is a standard whereby Full Time Equivalent (FTE) enrolment falls below a school's On the Ground (OTG) capacity resulting in a utilization rate of 80% or lower.

Appendix A

ENROLMENT AND UTILIZATION FORECASTS

ORANGEVILLE/DUFFERIN REVIEW AREAS - ELEMENTARY (DPE01, DPE02) & SECONDARY (DPS01)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK FROM WORKSHOPS AND SUBMISSIONS RE: ACCOMMODATION

- Secondary FI program location in Orangeville/Dufferin
- Consolidated JK-8 FI programs in Orangeville

OVERVIEW OF ACCOMMODATION ISSUES

Orangeville Elementary Review Area (DPE01)

- Credit Meadows ES projected to be well utilized in 10-year forecast, without Development Area currently assigned to Laurelwoods ES
 - Area designated as North Hansen and Edgewood Development Area (DA) and assigned to Laurelwoods ES
- Island Lake PS projected to be overcrowded in the 10-year forecast period
- Princess Margaret PS projected to be underutilized in the 10-year forecast period

Dufferin Elementary (DPE02)

- Enrolment pressure forecasted at Laurelwoods ES and Grand Valley & District PS
 - Enrolment growth pressure at Laurelwoods ES due to assignment of North Hansen and Edgewood Valley DAs
 - Enrolment growth pressure at Grand Valley & District PS due to proposed new development in Grand Valley
- Current and projected enrolment pressure at Hyland Heights ES and Glenbrook ES
 - Reliance on temporary capacity at both schools to accommodate current and projected growth
- Significant short and long-term residential growth planned in Shelburne
 - Sustained enrolment pressure in all Shelburne schools with insufficient capacity to accommodate projected growth

Orangeville/Dufferin Secondary (DPS01)

- Orangeville/Dufferin secondary FI students attend Erin DHS
- Enrolment decline projected at Orangeville DSS in next 5 years
- Enrolment growth projected at Centre Dufferin DHS in next 5 years

REVIEW AREA ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS

Table 1 – Orangeville Elementary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Credit Meadows ES	JK-8 RT	426	410	447	402	96%	105%	94%	13%
Island Lake PS	JK-8 RT	490	519	560	553	106%	114%	113%	1%
Montgomery Village ES	JK-8 RT	481	502	481	443	104%	100%	92%	2%
Parkinson Centennial PS	JK-8 RT	521	309	264	229	61%	95%	88%	22%
	JK-3 FI		10	230	230				
	Sum		319	494	459				
Princess Elizabeth PS	JK-8 RT	636	240	243	317	97%	89%	101%	16%
	JK-5 FI		374	324	326				
	Sum		614	567	643				
Princess Margaret PS	JK-8 RT	443	314	318	317	71%	72%	72%	2%
Spencer Avenue ES	JK-8 RT	423	269	309	312	71%	110%	126%	0%
	4-8 GI		33	50	50				
	4-8 FI		0	105	173				
	Sum		302	464	535				
Review Area		3,420	2,980	3,331	3,352	87%	97%	98%	8%

Table 2 – Dufferin Elementary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Centennial Hylands ES	JK-8 RT	541	296	340	364	74%	100%	113%	16%
	JK-8 FI		103	203	245				
	Sum		399	543	609				
East Garafraxa PS	JK-8 RT	167	175	175	208	105%	105%	125%	13%
Glenbrook ES	JK-8 RT	449	520	561	554	116%	125%	123%	0%

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Grand Valley & District PS	JK-8 RT	458	249	395	597	54%	86%	130%	21%
Hyland Heights ES	JK-8 RT	418	475	633	657	114%	151%	157%	18%
Laurelwoods ES	JK-8 RT	375	285	341	489	76%	91%	130%	6%
Mono Amaranth PS	JK-8 RT	328	178	158	155	120%	85%	82%	15%
	6-8 FI		215	120	113				
	Sum		393	278	268				
Primrose ES	JK-8 RT	377	468	437	401	124%	116%	106%	3%
Review Area		3,113	2,964	3,363	3,783	95%	108%	122%	12%

Table 3 – Dufferin Secondary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Centre Dufferin DHS	9-12	798	795	1,018	1,059	100%	128%	133%	28%
Orangeville DSS	9-12	1,332	1,171	1,019	987	88%	77%	74%	25%
Westside SS	9-12	777	868	842	852	112%	108%	110%	5%
Review Area		2,907	2,834	2,879	2,898	97%	99%	100%	19%

ACCOMMODATION PRIORITIES

Table 4 - Short and Long-Term Priorities for Orangeville/Dufferin Review Areas

Tools	Short Term	Long Term
LTAP Review	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities
Community Hubs/Facility Partnerships	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space
Development Areas	Annual review of DA school assignments	Annual review of DA school assignments

Tools	Short Term	Long Term
Capital Priorities Request	Resubmit Ministry capital priorities request for addition at Glenbrook ES	Submit Ministry capital priorities request for addition at Credit Meadows ES
	Resubmit Ministry capital priorities request for addition at Hyland Heights ES	Submit Ministry capital priorities request for new Shelburne Elementary School
	Submit Ministry capital priorities request for addition at Island Lake PS	Submit Ministry capital priorities request for new Grand Valley Elementary School
Program/Grade Level Reviews	Impact study to examine FI and IB program opportunities in Orangeville/Dufferin and impact on enrolment at Erin DHS	None proposed at this time
Boundary Reviews	Orangeville/Dufferin/Erin Secondary Review	New Shelburne Elementary School Review ¹
		New Grand Valley Elementary School Review ¹
Accommodation Reviews	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time

¹ Contingent on capital priorities funding approval from the Ministry of Education

GUELPH AND PUSLINCH REVIEW AREAS – ELEMENTARY (WPE01, WPE02, WPE03) AND SECONDARY (WPS01)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK FROM WORKSHOPS AND SUBMISSIONS RE: ACCOMMODATION

- Consolidated JK-8 FI program in West Guelph
- Overcrowded elementary and secondary schools

OVERVIEW OF ACCOMMODATION ISSUES

East Guelph Elementary (WPE01)

- Enrolment growth pressure projected at Brant Avenue PS
 - Morningcrest DA is holding at Brant Ave PS
- Long-term enrolment growth pressure at École King George PS and Edward Johnson PS
 - Growth in 5-year horizon at École King George PS due in part to feed of Grade 7&8 from École Guelph Lake PS
 - Reliance on temporary capacity at Edward Johnson PS to accommodate enrolment pressure
- Ottawa Cres PS projected to remain underutilized during the 10-year forecast period

West Guelph Elementary (WPE02)

- No consolidated JK-8 FI program in West Guelph
- June Avenue PS projected to be underutilized during the 10-year forecast period
- Limited residential development projected in review area
 - Enrolment growth projected at Gateway Drive PS in the 5-year projection is due to new JK-3 FI program
 - Enrolment growth projected at Willow Road PS in the 10-year projection due to addition of Grades 4-8 FI

South Guelph/Puslinch Elementary (WPE03)

- Significant long-term residential development projected for Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan lands and Guelph Innovation District lands
 - Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan DA holding at Aberfoyle PS
 - Guelph Innovation District DA holding at Priory Park PS (JK-6) and Jean Little PS (7-8)
- New elementary school sites in the Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan lands required to accommodate projected growth
- Projected enrolment imbalances in RT programs in South Guelph

Guelph Secondary (WPS01)

- New 900 pupil-place secondary school in South Guelph is not included in Guelph Secondary projection table
 - New secondary school programming and boundary to be determined
 - New school may impact existing Guelph secondary schools boundaries and programs

REVIEW AREA ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS

Table 5 - East Guelph Elementary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Brant Ave PS	JK-6 RT	259	255	289	276	98%	112%	107%	29%
École Guelph Lake PS	JK-8 FI	541	349	445	434	65%	82%	80%	0%
École King George PS	JK-8 FI	481	474	646	645	99%	134%	134%	0%
Edward Johnson PS	JK-6 FI	285	369	352	338	129%	124%	119%	15%
John Galt PS	JK-8 RT	380	348	412	409	92%	108%	108%	0%
Ken Danby PS	JK-8 RT	576	487	521	464	85%	90%	81%	0%
Ottawa Crescent PS	JK-6 RT	357	217	218	213	61%	61%	60%	25%
Waverley Dr PS	JK-8 RT	593	371	401	423	83%	88%	92%	22%
	4-8 GI		123	123	123				
	Sum		494	524	546				
William C. Winegard PS	JK-8 RT	510	409	545	602	80%	107%	118%	0%
Review Area		3,982	3,402	3,952	3,927	85%	99%	99%	10%

Table 6 - West Guelph Elementary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Central PS	JK-6 RT	274	218	238	243	80%	87%	89%	25%
Gateway Drive PS	JK-8 RT	369	254	241	249	69%	107%	104%	9%
	JK-3 FI		0	154	135				
	Sum		254	395	384				
June Avenue PS	JK-6 RT	257	183	182	187	71%	71%	73%	3%
Mitchell Woods PS	JK-8 RT	495	578	552	514	117%	112%	104%	5%
Paisley Road PS	JK-6 RT	510	214	267	298	93%	100%	99%	16%
	JK-6 FI		259	244	206				
	Sum		473	511	504				
Taylor Evans PS	JK-8 RT	454	391	431	465	86%	95%	102%	14%
Victory PS	JK-6 RT	308	83	100	96	87%	82%	81%	20%
	JK-4 FI		184	152	153				
	Sum		267	252	249				
Westwood PS	JK-8 RT	458	373	384	405	81%	84%	88%	14%
Willow Road PS	JK-8 RT	607	346	375	446	59%	62%	91%	15%
	4-8 FI		13(JK)	0	108				
	Sum		359	375	554				
Review Area		3,732	3,096	3,320	3,505	83%	89%	94%	13%

Table 7 - South Guelph/Puslinch Elementary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Aberfoyle PS	JK-8 RT	423	379	404	515	90%	96%	122%	31%
École Arbour Vista PS	JK-8 FI	449	493	504	435	110%	112%	97%	0%
Fred A. Hamilton PS	JK-6 FI	308	295	277	265	96%	90%	86%	20%

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Jean Little PS	JK-8 RT	343	367	393	424	107%	115%	124%	27%
John McCrae PS	JK-8 FI	484	635	624	573	131%	129%	118%	1%
Kortright Hills PS	JK-8 RT	426	473	484	522	111%	114%	123%	6%
Priory Park PS	JK-6 RT	289	205	262	374	71%	91%	129%	34%
Rickson Ridge PS	JK-8 RT	490	447	568	592	91%	116%	121%	0%
Sir Isaac Brock PS	JK-8 RT	527	555	472	420	105%	90%	80%	1%
Westminster Woods PS	JK-8 RT	588	664	575	538	113%	98%	91%	0%
Review Area		4,327	4,513	4,563	4,658	104%	105%	108%	12%

Table 8 - Guelph Secondary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Centennial CVI	9-12	1,167	1,506	1,639	1,564	129%	140%	134%	26%
College Heights SS	9-12	516	413	557	518	80%	108%	100%	30%
Guelph CVI	9-12	1,269	1,264	1,117	1,115	122%	123%	124%	30%
	9-12 IB		281	447	460				
	Sum		1,545	1,564	1,575				
JF Ross CVI	9-12	1,755	1,501	1,658	1,549	115%	134%	145%	20%
	9-12 FI		510	696	1,000				
	Sum		2,011	2,354	2,549				
Review Area		4,707	5,475	6,114	6,206	116%	130%	132%	27%

ACCOMMODATION PRIORITIES

Table 9 - Short and Long-Term Priorities for Guelph/Puslinch Review Areas

Tools	Short Term	Long Term
LTAP Review	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities
Community Hubs/Facility Partnerships	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space
Development Areas	Annual review of DA school assignments	Annual review of DA school assignments
Capital Priorities Request	<p>Submit Ministry capital priorities request for addition at Edward Johnson PS</p> <p>Submit Ministry capital priorities request for addition at New Clair-Maltby Elementary School #1</p>	Submit Ministry capital priorities request for addition at New Clair-Maltby Elementary School #2
Program/Grade Level Reviews	<p>Grade level review involving École Guelph Lake PS and École King George PS to determine start of intermediate division at École Guelph Lake PS</p> <p>Feasibility study to determine potential to consolidate JK-8 FI program in West Guelph</p>	Investigate potential to create JK-8 FI program(s) in West Guelph
Boundary Reviews	<p>Guelph secondary boundary review to include all Guelph high schools and establish boundary and program(s) for new south-end high school</p> <p>South Guelph Regular Track Boundary Review</p>	New Clair-Maltby Elementary School #1 Boundary Review ¹
PARs	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time

¹ Contingent on capital priorities funding approval from the Ministry of Education

GUELPH/ERAMOSA REVIEW AREA – ELEMENTARY (WPE04) AND SECONDARY (WPS01)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK FROM WORKSHOPS AND SUBMISSIONS RE: ACCOMMODATION

- Keep schools open

OVERVIEW OF ACCOMMODATION ISSUES

Guelph/Eramosa Elementary (WPE04)

- Residential development in north Rockwood projected to increase enrolment at Rockwood Centennial PS
- Enrolment decline projected at Eramosa PS in the next 5 years
 - Eramosa PS projected to remain underutilized for the 10-year forecast period

Guelph Secondary (WPS01)

- Guelph/Eramosa RT and FI students attend JF Ross CVI
 - Guelph secondary boundary review process to include Guelph/Eramosa secondary students

REVIEW AREA ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS

Table 10 –Guelph/Eramosa Elementary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
École Harris Mill PS	JK-5 RT	320	159	119	127	93%	94%	98%	0%
	JK-5 FI		140	183	185				
	Sum		299	302	312				
Eramosa PS	JK-6 RT	164	118	80	73	72%	49%	45%	34%
Rockwood Centennial PS	JK-8 RT	469	360	323	372	77%	79%	92%	16%
	6-8 FI		0	47	61				
	Sum		360	370	433				
Review Area		953	777	752	818	82%	79%	86%	17%

Table 11 - Guelph Secondary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Centennial CVI	9-12	1,167	1,506	1,639	1,564	129%	140%	134%	26%
College Heights SS	9-12	516	413	557	518	80%	108%	100%	30%
Guelph CVI	9-12	1,269	1,264	1,117	1,115	122%	123%	124%	30%
	9-12 IB		281	447	460				
	Sum		1,545	1,564	1,575				
JF Ross CVI	9-12	1,755	1,501	1,658	1,549	115%	134%	145%	20%
	9-12 FI		510	696	1,000				
	Sum		2,011	2,354	2,549				
Review Area		4,707	5,475	6,114	6,206	116%	130%	132%	27%

ACCOMMODATION PRIORITIES

Table 12 - Short and Long-Term Priorities for Guelph/Eramosa Review Area

Tools	Short Term	Long Term
LTAP Review	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities
Community Hubs/Facility Partnerships	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space
Development Areas	Annual review of DA school assignments	Annual review of DA school assignments
Capital Priorities	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time
Program/Grade Level Reviews	Feasibility study to investigate potential to expand IB program into Wellington County	None proposed at this time
Boundary Reviews	Guelph secondary boundary review to include all Guelph high schools and establish boundary and program(s) for new south-end high school	None proposed at this time
Pupil Accommodation Reviews	None proposed at this time	Review of Guelph/Eramosa Elementary Schools

WELLINGTON NORTH ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (WPE05) AND SECONDARY (WPS02)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK FROM WORKSHOPS AND SUBMISSIONS RE: ACCOMMODATION

- Continue to support rural schools

OVERVIEW OF ACCOMMODATION ISSUES

Wellington North Elementary (WPE05)

- Enrolment growth projected at Victoria Cross PS in the next 5 years
 - Victoria Cross PS is holding school for South Mount Forest DA
- Arthur PS and Kenilworth PS projected to remain underutilized in 10-year forecast period

Wellington Secondary (WPS02)

- Wellington Heights SS projected to remain underutilized in the 10-year forecast period

REVIEW AREA ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS

Table 13 - Wellington North Elementary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Arthur PS	JK-8 RT	446	328	349	358	74%	78%	80%	22%
Kenilworth PS	JK-6 RT	118	74	68	71	63%	58%	60%	38%
Victoria Cross PS	JK-8 RT	409	384	425	473	94%	104%	116%	16%
Review Area		973	786	842	902	81%	87%	93%	25%

Table 14 - Wellington Secondary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Centre Wellington DHS	9-12	1,467	1,130	1,167	1,306	83%	87%	97%	3%
	9-12 FI		93	102	122				
	Sum		1,223	1,269	1,428				
Norwell DSS	9-12	975	588	635	668	67%	69%	74%	30%
	9-12 FI		62	34	52				
	Sum		650	669	720				

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Wellington Heights DHS	9-12	651	474	444	474	73%	68%	73%	2%
Review Area		3,093	2,347	2,382	2,622	76%	77%	85%	12%

ACCOMMODATION PRIORITIES

Table 15 - Short and Long-Term Priorities for Wellington North Review Area

Tools	Short Term	Long Term
LTAP Review	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities
Community Hubs/Facility Partnerships	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space
Development Areas	Annual review of DA school assignments	Annual review of DA school assignments
Capital Priorities	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time
Program/Grade Level Reviews	Feasibility study to investigate potential to expand IB program into Wellington County	None proposed at this time
Boundary Reviews	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time
Pupil Accommodation Reviews	None proposed at this time	Review of Arthur PS, Kenilworth PS and Victoria Cross PS

MINTO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (WPE06) AND SECONDARY (WPS02)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK FROM WORKSHOPS AND SUBMISSIONS RE: ACCOMMODATION

- Continue to support rural schools

OVERVIEW OF ACCOMMODATION ISSUES

Minto Elementary (WPE06)

- Enrolment growth pressure projected at Palmerston PS in the next 10 years

Wellington Secondary (WPS02)

- Norwell DSS projected to remain underutilized in the 10-year forecast period

REVIEW AREA ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS

Table 16 - Minto Elementary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Minto Clifford PS	JK-8 RT	500	436	475	500	87%	95%	100%	15%
Palmerston PS	JK-8 RT	426	212	223	260	97%	111%	123%	10%
	JK-8 FI		202	249	262				
	Sum		414	472	522				
Review Area		926	850	947	1,022	92%	102%	110%	13%

Table 17 - Wellington Secondary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Centre Wellington DHS	9-12	1,467	1,130	1,167	1,306	83%	87%	97%	3%
	9-12 FI		93	102	122				
	Sum		1,223	1,269	1,428				
Norwell DSS	9-12	975	588	635	668	67%	69%	74%	30%
	9-12 FI		62	34	52				
	Sum		650	669	720				
Wellington Heights DHS	9-12	651	474	444	474	73%	68%	73%	2%
Review Area		3,093	2,347	2,382	2,622	76%	77%	85%	12%

ACCOMMODATION PRIORITIES

Table 18- Short and Long-Term Priorities for Minto Review Area

Tools	Short Term	Long Term
LTAP Review	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities
Community Hubs/Facility Partnerships	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space
Development Areas	Annual review of DA school assignments	Annual review of DA school assignments
Capital Priorities	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time
Program/Grade Level Reviews	Feasibility study to investigate potential to expand IB program into Wellington County	None proposed at this time
Boundary Reviews	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time
Pupil Accommodation Reviews	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time

MAPLETON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (WPE07) AND SECONDARY (WPS02)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK FROM WORKSHOPS AND SUBMISSIONS RE: ACCOMMODATION

- Continue to support rural schools

OVERVIEW OF ACCOMMODATION ISSUES

Mapleton Elementary (WPE07)

- Enrolment growth pressure projected at Drayton Heights PS and Maryborough PS for next 10 years
- Alma PS projected to remain underutilized in the 10-year forecast period

Wellington Secondary (WPS02)

- Norwell DSS projected to remain underutilized in the 10-year forecast period

REVIEW AREA ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS

Table19 - Mapleton Elementary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Alma PS	JK-6 RT	190	130	102	103	68%	54%	54%	18%
Centre Peel PS	JK-6 RT	282	227	213	231	80%	76%	82%	8%
Drayton Heights PS	JK-8 RT	351	349	412	441	99%	117%	126%	14%
Maryborough PS	JK-6 RT	179	188	224	232	105%	125%	130%	2%
Review Area		1,002	894	951	1,007	89%	95%	100%	11%

Table 20 - Wellington Secondary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Centre Wellington DHS	9-12	1,467	1,130	1,167	1,306	83%	87%	97%	3%
	9-12 FI		93	102	122				
	Sum		1,223	1,269	1,428				
Norwell DSS	9-12	975	588	635	668	67%	69%	74%	30%

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
	9-12 FI		62	34	52				
	Sum		650	669	720				
Wellington Heights DHS	9-12	651	474	444	474	73%	68%	73%	2%
Review Area		3,093	2,347	2,382	2,622	76%	77%	85%	12%

ACCOMMODATION PRIORITIES

Table 21 - Short and Long-Term Priorities for Mapleton Review Area

Tools	Short Term	Long Term
LTAP Review	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities
Community Hubs/Facility Partnerships	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space
Development Areas	Annual review of DA school assignments	Annual review of DA school assignments
Capital Priorities	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time
Program/Grade Level Reviews	Feasibility study to investigate potential to expand IB program into Wellington County	None proposed at this time
Boundary Reviews	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time
Pupil Accommodation Reviews	Centre Wellington Elementary Accommodation Review (includes Alma PS)	None proposed at this time

CENTRE WELLINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (WPE08) AND SECONDARY (WPS02)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK FROM WORKSHOPS AND SUBMISSIONS RE: ACCOMMODATION

- Consolidated JK-8 FI in Centre Wellington
- Address overcrowded schools

OVERVIEW OF ACCOMMODATION ISSUES

Centre Wellington Elementary (WPE08)

- Significant residential development planned in Centre Wellington over projection period
- Enrolment growth pressure projected at Salem PS in next 5 years
 - Salem PS is holding school for Northwest Fergus DA
- Elementary school site reserved in Northwest Fergus DA
 - Salem PS cannot accommodate all of projected enrolment from Northwest Fergus DA
 - No schools in Centre Wellington have surplus capacity to accommodate all the enrolment projected from this DA
 - Ministry capital priorities funding approval required to construct new elementary school
- John Black PS projected to be overcrowded in 5 & 10-year forecast period
- James McQueen PS projected to be underutilized in the 5 & 10-year forecast period
- Motion to consider consolidation of JK-8 FI program in Centre Wellington

Wellington Secondary (WPS02)

- Centre Wellington DHS projected to be well utilized in the 10-year forecast period

REVIEW AREA ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS

Table 22 - Centre Wellington Elementary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Elora PS	JK-8 RT	487	432	480	588	89%	99%	121%	18%
J. Douglas Hogarth PS	JK-8 RT	573	382	323	380	104%	104%	113%	15%
	3-8 FI		215	272	270				
	Sum		597	595	650				

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
James McQueen PS	JK-3 RT	380	102	92	92	83%	76%	78%	14%
	JK-2 FI		215	198	203				
	Sum		317	290	295				
John Black PS	JK-8 RT	328	353	379	387	108%	116%	118%	22%
Ponsonby PS	JK-6 RT	190	181	203	205	95%	107%	108%	6%
Salem PS	JK-6 RT	213	213	441	630	100%	207%	296%	6%
Victoria Terrace PS	JK-6 RT	222	196	270	266	88%	122%	120%	25%
Review Area		2,393	2,289	2,658	3,021	96%	111%	126%	15%

Table 23 - Wellington Secondary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Centre Wellington DHS	9-12	1,467	1,130	1,167	1,306	83%	87%	97%	3%
	9-12 FI		93	102	122				
	Sum		1,223	1,269	1,428				
Norwell DSS	9-12	975	588	635	668	67%	69%	74%	30%
	9-12 FI		62	34	52				
	Sum		650	669	720				
Wellington Heights DHS	9-12	651	474	444	474	73%	68%	73%	2%
Review Area		3,093	2,347	2,382	2,622	76%	77%	85%	12%

ACCOMMODATION PRIORITIES

Table 24 - Short and Long-Term Priorities in Centre Wellington Review Area

Tools	Short Term	Long Term
LTAP Review	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities
Community Hubs/Facility Partnerships	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space
Development Areas	Annual review of DA school assignments	Annual review of DA school assignments

Tools	Short Term	Long Term
Capital Priorities	Submit Ministry capital priorities request for NW Fergus Elementary School	None proposed at this time
Program/Grade Level Reviews	Feasibility study to investigate potential to expand IB program into Wellington County	None proposed at this time
Boundary Reviews	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time
Pupil Accommodation Reviews	Centre Wellington Elementary Accommodation Review (includes Alma PS)	None proposed at this time

ERIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (WPE09) AND SECONDARY (WPS03)

PUBLIC FEEDBACK FROM WORKSHOPS AND SUBMISSIONS RE: ACCOMMODATION

- Keep schools open
- Maintain secondary FI program at Erin DHS

OVERVIEW OF ACCOMMODATION ISSUES

Erin Elementary

- Erin PS projected to be underutilized in 10-year forecast period in both growth and status quo growth scenarios
- Ross R. MacKay PS is well utilized in 10-year projection if development occurs in next 5 years

Erin Secondary

- Erin DHS is well utilized in 10-year forecast period in both scenarios in both growth and no growth scenarios
 - FI enrolment growth is forecasted to offset RT enrolment decline during forecast period.
- Erin DHS accommodates FI secondary students from Erin and Orangeville/Dufferin

REVIEW AREA ELEMENTARY ENROLMENT PROJECTION

Table 25 - Erin Elementary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection Assuming Housing Development Starting in 5 Years

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Brisbane PS	JK-6 RT	446	139	130	143	90%	95%	107%	6%
	JK-6 FI		264	293	333				
	Sum		403	423	477				
Erin PS	JK-8 RT	535	295	228	352	65%	53%	79%	16%
	7-8 FI		51	56	72				
	Sum		346	284	423				
Ross R. MacKay PS	JK-6 RT	199	90	72	165	45%	36%	83%	20%
Review Area		1,180	839	779	1,065	71%	66%	90%	14%

ALTERNATIVE ERIN ELEMENTARY PROJECTION

Table 26 - Erin Elementary Review Area Status Quo Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Brisbane PS	JK-6 RT	446	139	130	143	90%	94%	101%	6%
	JK-6 FI		264	290	305				
	Sum		403	421	448				
Erin PS	JK-8 RT	535	295	216	187	65%	51%	47%	16%
	7-8 FI		51	56	67				
	Sum		346	271	254				
Ross R. MacKay PS	JK-6 RT	199	90	64	69	45%	32%	35%	20%
Review Area		1,180	839	756	771	71%	64%	65%	14%

ERIN SECONDARY SCHOOL (WPS03)

REVIEW AREA SECONDARY ENROLMENT PROJECTION

Table 27 - Erin Secondary Review Area Enrolment and Utilization Projection Assuming Housing Development Starting in 5 Years

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Erin DHS	9-12	558	320	332	307	82%	103%	108%	5%
	9-12 FI		137	241	295				
	Sum		457	573	601				
Review Area		558	457	573	601	82%	103%	108%	5%

ALTERNATIVE ERIN SECONDARY PROJECTION

Table 28 - Erin Secondary Review Area Status Quo Enrolment and Utilization Projection

School	Program	OTG	Enrolment			Utilization			5 Yr FCI
			2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	2017	5 Yr	10 Yr	
Erin DHS	9-12	558	320	319	220	82%	100%	91%	5%
	9-12 FI		137	240	290				
	Sum		457	560	510				
Review Area		558	457	560	510	82%	100%	91%	5%

ACCOMMODATION PRIORITIES

Table 29 - Short and Long-Term Priorities for Erin Review Area

Tools	Short Term	Long Term
LTAP Review	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities	Annual review of LTAP information and priorities
Community Hubs/Facility Partnerships	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space	Consider partnership opportunities where there is sufficient space
Development Areas	Annual review of DA school assignments	Annual review of DA school assignments
Capital Priorities	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time
Program/Grade Level Reviews	Impact study to examine both FI and IB program opportunities in Dufferin/Orangeville and any impact on enrolment at Erin DHS, as directed by Board resolution.	None proposed at this time
	Feasibility study to investigate potential to expand IB program into Wellington County	
Boundary Reviews	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time
Pupil Accommodation Review	None proposed at this time	None proposed at this time

There are no short or long-term accommodation priorities identified for the Erin elementary review area.

The Town of Erin is undertaking a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) to determine the preferred design alternative for wastewater servicing of the existing urban areas of the Village of Erin and Hillsburgh, and to accommodate future growth.

There is uncertainty around the timing and scope of wastewater servicing, and as such, it is not appropriate to identify elementary accommodation priorities at this time.

Two enrolment scenarios have been provided in this report. One scenario shows enrolment if development begins within 5 years and one shows enrolment if development does not proceed within the projection period. The Board will review these projections and the schedule of priorities annually. New priorities will reflect any decisions related to municipal services once that information becomes available.

Appendix B

REVIEW AREA MAPS

Orangeville Elementary Review Area (DPE01)



Dufferin Elementary Review Area (DPE02)




Orangeville/Dufferin Secondary Review Area (DPS01)




East Guelph Elementary Review Area (WPE01)




West Guelph Elementary Review Area (WPE02)




South Guelph Elementary Review Area (WPE03)



Guelph/Eramosa Elementary Review Area (WPE04)



Guelph Secondary Review Area (WPS01)



Wellington North Elementary Review Area (WPE05)




Minto Elementary Review Area (WPE06)




Mapleton Elementary Review Area (WPE07)




Centre Wellington Elementary Review Area (WPE08)




Centre & North Wellington Secondary Review Area (WPS02)



Erin Elementary Review Area (WPE09)



Erin Secondary Review Area (WPS03)



Appendix C

EXISTING BEFORE & AFTER SCHOOL
PROGRAM AND CHILD CARE AVAILABILITY

Table 1 - Existing Before and After School and Childcare Programs

School	2017/18 Before and/or After School Program (BASP)				2017/18 Full Day Care On Site	Third Party Operator
	Extended Day		School Age			
	Before School	After School	Before School	After School		
Aberfoyle PS		X		X		YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
Alma PS						
École Arbour Vista PS		X	X	X		Montessori School of Wellington
Arthur PS						
Brant Ave PS						
Brisbane PS	X	X	X	X		Appleseed Child Care Centre
Centennial Hylands ES	X	X	X	X		YMCA - Greater Toronto Area
Central PS	X	X		X		YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
Centre Peel PS						
Credit Meadows ES	X	X	X	X	X	YMCA - Greater Toronto Area
Drayton Heights PS						
East Garafraxa ES						
Edward Johnson PS		X				YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
Elora PS						
Eramosa PS						
Erin PS	X	X	X	X		Appleseed Child Care Centre
Fred A. Hamilton PS	X	X	X	X	X	YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
Gateway Drive PS						
Glenbrook PS	X	X		X		YMCA - Greater Toronto Area
Grand Valley and Dist PS		X	X	X		YMCA - Greater Toronto Area

School	2017/18 Before and/or After School Program (BASP)				2017/18 Full Day Care On Site	Third Party Operator
	Extended Day		School Age			
	Before School	After School	Before School	After School		
École Guelph Lake PS	X	X	X	X		YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
École Harris Mill PS		X	X	X		YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
Hyland Heights ES	X	X	X	X	X	Hyland Centre Child Care
Island Lake PS	X	X	X	X		Sandbox Tech Child Care
J.D. Hogarth PS	X	X	X	X	X	Community Resource Centre
James McQueen PS	X	X	X	X		Community Resource Centre
Jean Little PS	X	X	X	X	X	YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
John Black PS						
John Galt PS						
John McCrae PS		X		X		YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
June Ave PS						
Ken Danby PS	X	X	X	X		YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
Kenilworth PS						
École King George PS		X		X		YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
Kortright Hills PS						
Laurelwoods PS						
Maryborough PS						
Minto-Clifford PS						
Mitchell Woods PS		X		X		YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
Mono- Amaranth PS	X	X	X	X		YMCA - Greater Toronto Area

School	2017/18 Before and/or After School Program (BASP)				2017/18 Full Day Care On Site	Third Party Operator
	Extended Day		School Age			
	Before School	After School	Before School	After School		
Montgomery Village ES	X	X	X	X	X	Sandbox Tech Child Care
Ottawa Cres PS						
Paisley Rd PS	X	X		X		YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
Palmerston PS						
Parkinson Centennial PS	X	X	X	X		YMCA - Greater Toronto Area
Ponsonby PS						
Primrose ES	X	X	X	X		YMCA - Greater Toronto Area
Princess Elizabeth PS	X	X	X	X		YMCA - Greater Toronto Area
Princess Margaret PS		X	X	X		YMCA - Greater Toronto Area
Priory Park PS						
Rickson Ridge PS	X	X	X	X	X	YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
Rockwood Centennial PS						
Ross R Mackay PS						
Salem PS						
Sir Isaac Brock PS		X	X	X		Montessori School of Wellington
Spencer Ave ES	X	X	X	X		YMCA - Greater Toronto Area
Taylor Evans PS	X	X	X	X	X	Wellington Early Learning Centre
Victoria Cross PS					X	
Victoria Terrace PS						
Victory PS	X	X	X	X		Victory Kids Club

School	2017/18 Before and/or After School Program (BASP)				2017/18 Full Day Care On Site	Third Party Operator
	Extended Day		School Age			
	Before School	After School	Before School	After School		
Waverley Dr PS						
Westminster Woods PS		X	X	X		Montessori School of Wellington
Westwood PS						
William C Winegard PS		X		X		YMCA-YWCA of Guelph
Willow Rd PS						
Number of Schools/ Programs	23	35	26	34	9	
65	35%	54%	40%	52%	14%	

Table 2 - Approved New Full Day Child Care Centre Locations

School	Capacity	Type	Planned Opening
Centennial Hylands ES	73	Standalone	2018/19
Erin PS	49	Retrofit	2018/19
Palmerston PS	49	Standalone	2018/19
Rockwood Centennial PS	49	Standalone	TBD



Centre Wellington

June 29, 2018

City of Guelph
Blair Labelle, City Clerk
1 Carden Street
Guelph, ON N1H 3A1

Dear Mr. Labelle:

Please be advised the Council of the Township of Centre Wellington at their meeting held June 25, 2018 passed the following resolution:

"WHEREAS the Province of Ontario enacted a province-wide moratorium on Permits To Take Water for commercial water bottling until January 1, 2019.

AND WHEREAS the Township of Centre Wellington is projected to grow to a serviced population of 45,000 persons by 2041 as outlined in the Provincial Places to Grow, the County Official Plan and the Township of Centre Wellington Growth Management Strategy.

AND WHEREAS the Township of Centre Wellington supports a science-based approach to the management of water resources and is working with the Grand River Conservation Authority and Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change on a Scoped Tier 3 Water Budget under the Clean Water Act.

AND WHEREAS the Scoped Tier 3 Water Budget Quantity Risk Assessment pursuant to the Clean Water Act is not anticipated to be complete until after January 1, 2019.

AND WHEREAS the Township of Centre Wellington has initiated a Water Supply Master Plan in 2018 to determine the community's water supply needs to service planned population and employment growth;

AND WHEREAS the Township's Water Supply Master Plan pursuant to the Environmental Assessment Act is not anticipated to be complete until after January 1, 2019.

AND WHEREAS the Province of Ontario, through the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, is undergoing a Water Management Policy and Science Framework review which is considering the prioritization of municipal water supply over other uses.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

THAT the Council of the Township of Centre Wellington requests that the Province of Ontario extends the province-wide moratorium on commercial water bottling until January 1, 2023 . If the province-wide moratorium is not extended, the Council of the

Reply to: Lisa Miller
519-846-9691 x 242
lmiller@centrewellington.ca

RECEIVED
JUL 10 2018
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Township of Centre Wellington requests that the Province enact a moratorium on water bottling until January 1, 2023 within the Township of Centre Wellington municipal boundaries. The purpose of either the province-wide or Township-specific moratoriums are to allow for completion of the Township's Water Supply Master Plan; the Scoped Tier 3 Water Budget Quantity Risk Assessment and subsequent amendments to the Grand River Source Protection Plan; and, the Province's review of, and decision on, the Water Management Policy and Science Framework Review;

AND THAT the Council of the Township of Centre Wellington requests that the Province continue to fund the Scoped Tier 3 Water Budget Study beyond March 31, 2019 and establish reliable and consistent funding for the Centre Wellington Scoped Tier 3 Water Budget until the study's completion.

AND THAT the Council of the Township of Centre Wellington request that the Province continue and complete the Water Management Policy and Science Framework Review including the prioritization of municipal water supplies over other uses.

AND THAT the Council of the Township of Centre Wellington direct staff to work with the Honourable Ted Arnott, Member of Provincial Parliament for Wellington-Halton Hills, to lobby the newly elected provincial government on the importance of the completing the ongoing Scoped Tier 3 Water Budget, Water Supply Master Plan, and Water Management Policy and Science Review as well as the Township's request to extend the Province's bottled water moratorium until January 1, 2023.

AND THAT the Township Clerk be directed to distribute this resolution to the municipalities and Source Protection Authorities identified as Water Quantity and Water Bottling Study Areas, including Norfolk, Whitmans Creek, Guelph, Orangeville, Innisfil, Oro, Chapleau, and Quinte study areas."

Should you have any questions or require anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,



Lisa Miller
Supervisor of Customer Service/Deputy Clerk

cc. Peter Rider, Risk Management Official
Dave Belanger, Water Supply Program Manager
Peter Busatto, General Manager, Water Services

Meeting Agenda



City of Guelph

Heritage Guelph Committee (HG)

July 23, 2018

City Hall, Meeting Room B

From 12:00 noon to 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Chair: Mary Tivy

Items 1-4

12:00 to 12:05

Item 1 – Call to Order

Item 2 – Acknowledgements

Item 3 – Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest

Item 4 – Approval of Minutes of July 9, 2018

Matters Arising from the Minutes

Item 1

Election of interim Vice-Chair, Heritage Guelph

Item 2

Cultural Heritage Action Plan – Background Report

Consideration of revised background report document

Staff recommendation

That Heritage Guelph supports the revised draft of the Cultural Heritage Action Plan – Background Report as presented at the July 23, 2018 meeting of Heritage Guelph; and THAT any further revisions to the Cultural Heritage Action Plan – Background Report that are minor in nature may be dealt with by the Senior Heritage Planner before its presentation in an information report to Council.

Information Items

Item 3

Photos from recent site visits at 1172 York Road and 43 Arthur Street South (Metalworks)

Next Meetings of Heritage Guelph:

August 13, 2018 from 12:00 noon to 2:00 p.m. City Hall, Meeting Room C

September 10, 2018 from 12:00 noon to 2:00 p.m. City Hall, Meeting Room C