

Boundary Review, May 8, 2019

7:05 start

headcount 37

(At peak, Tamara counted 55)

7:19 -q Why do you make the proposal when Central is already crammed full

-a If you live within 5 minutes of a school, we think it makes sense for someone to try to go there.

7:21 -q on the size of this year's Margaret Jenkins grade 5 class

7:24 -q can we talk a little about Richmond grade 6

-q can we talk about split cohorts

-q why isn't George Jay going to Lansdowne

-q should we split into groups, would it be best to work as a large group

-a diversity of opinions in MJ

-q is this a place to voice concerns about small part of Oak Bay being 'hived off' to another Middle School

-a yes

7:33 table breaks

7:41

-q South oak bay parents, kids would go to Lansdowne – Monterey Dual track solution – Have Learning studios been considered to make it Dual track.

-a Mark Walsh, Land Use expert – Monterey should be about 400, could be 430, accommodating Dual track would take it to 525 – could be done, would not be quick nor easy and would a number of costs. Consultation did not want additional

-questions askers note disagreement

-a continued -Central and Lansdowne have additional spaces, gyms, art rooms – to accommodate explanatories etc, still hard to work over 500. Monterey does not have those extra spaces. Would be difficult to make work

-q What number of students would come from Bank street

-a 15 or so per year

-q Monterey seems to be only school not bursting at seams. Could Willows kids go to Lansdowne. Many MJ kids live closer

-a board will decide, limit of infrastructure at Monterey will be part of decision

-q Want our kids to be able to go to Monterey in French. If English Enrollment is going down, could French at Monterey actually be a smaller impact?

-q Hope you will follow through with French at Monterey for option, think it could work. (Might include some cohort splitting)

-a some cohort may be splits, but the feedback was clear that majority of parents do not want cohort splitting

-q small areas being (English) “hived off” – we liked the situation up to January better. Why the change

-a can get precise numbers, probably around 15 students in one packet – we are trying to balance competing priorities. Lots of MJ parents want catchment at Central

-q We appreciate consultations so far, no perfect solutions, we are looking for more options.

Would much rather have kids go to school in community. Transportation – how are kids supposed to go to school – walking to school is great opportunity. Would like to see more options.

-a we have looked at travel routes. It would take about 30 minutes is appropriate for district program – better than provincial averages. CRD assures us they can respond with sufficient lead time (6-9 months)

-q could bus routes be put up on website, what board had mind

-a we have one almost ready to go and have a couple more coming – we will out them up

-q no safe bike routes to Lansdowne. From a transportation perspective, makes sense for kids from here to go to Central or Monterey

-q This plan is a mess, Richmond is a mess. I am a child psychologist. We have an ad hoc solution at Richmond that harms the children of MJ to help other children. Adolescence is a difficult time for students. If the plan goes ahead I will pull my child from the French program. My preference is that the plan reverse course . It seems only sensible. Other option would be a French program at Monterey.

a- regardless of where MJ students stream, we will have a capacity problem in the area for middle school

-q If Lansdowne is the choice, we will have to take our child out of French – it comes down to safety.

-q Safety of kids – climate change – sustainable transportation is biggest issue, we should have access to

-q Richmond is not so far away – opportunity to work with city. Wide bridge over bowker creek could lead to safe transport. Richmond is good for grade 6. There are some good advantages to Richmond – it is immediate, would not be crowded

-q program opportunities at Richmond – eg, shop etc

-a -had home ec and art room as middle school, had shop tools

-q is there a chance to grandfather families already in Central?

-a enrollment priorities – once student is in, they stay in . Non catchment siblings are higher in priority over non catchment non siblings. Transfer process can help this work. This will be a question on the table for us to work on.

-q would district introduce a sibling tier above other priorities

-a an important thing for us to work with

-q how many families would be affected by sibling priorities down the road

-a we do not have disaggregated data that predicts for possibilities

-q climate change is important , kids encouraged to walk and bike – not safe to send kids to Lansdowne that way. I will have to adjust my work or send student by bus. Will be hard for students how go one year (grade 6) to Richmond, get used to all the expectations and structures and then change.

-a French Immersion district program is program of choice, is not possible to offer dual track system across entire geography (18 of 47 schools) – greatest accessibility in province, proximity in SD to French immersion compares well to rest of province

-a2 if grade 6 French is opened at Lansdowne – staff will work on structures – including a VP who would move with them

One last question

-q BC transit tried to take bus service away from our area – will be 10 to 20 minute walk to bus stop. Busses might be full at peak times, especially #7. Could be a great deal of waiting times at bus. Having to wait near hospital in the dark will not work well. This plan only meets 2 of 11 proposals – this plan does not support the majority of families in our neighborhood

-Please write any further questions on paper provided. Can also e-mail.



April 12, 2019

Ref: 209332

All Boards of Education

All:

I am pleased to bring your attention to the Ministry of Education's new approach to long-term capital planning for boards of education. The Ministry's guidelines for the development of Long-Range Facilities Plans (LRFP) for school districts have undergone a significant revision from the initial version that was produced in March 2017 under the previous administration.

Government is focused on building and expanding schools; with record levels of operating and capital funding. In contrast, the previous government used the LRFP to overemphasize "capacity utilization" as a means to force mass school closures. We are changing the guidelines for drafting LRFPs to speed up the planning process, so we can focus on investing in students and schools. We have already removed the old government's 95% utilization requirement, and now I'm pleased to announce we are making even more changes to give school boards more flexibility and autonomy.

Going forward, the Ministry will no longer need to approve a school district's LRFP. We will no longer expect LRFPs to be evidentiary documents that are needed to justify individual project funding requests. The new guidelines no longer use terms like "requirements" or "mandatory". Instead, we encourage you to use the LRFP as a broad visioning document, much like a Local Area Plan or Official Community Plan (OCP). The purpose of an LRFP is to help guide local decisions and I encourage you to have a much broader focus than a typical capital submission. I appreciate there are several districts with draft LRFPs well underway. While I certainly don't expect those districts to begin the process anew, I would encourage those districts to consider the guidelines for future LRFP drafts.

The changes to the LRFP guidelines are meant to give boards the flexibility and space to lay out a wide-ranging vision for their districts, rather than a rigid and prescriptive process. To help you manage your existing facilities and allow school facilities to play a larger role in the community, LRFPs should have a much broader focus than just enrolment and capacity utilization. LRFPs should emphasize potential changes to programming to support the natural movement of students, analyzing changing demographics to neighbourhoods, and account for other important facility uses such as childcare, before-and-after school care, and community uses of school buildings. Local boards can create their own LRFPs and use those plans to guide their submissions to the Ministry.

Like an OCP, LRFPs are developed by local officials to guide medium and long-term planning. Locally elected boards of education are in the best position to consider needs of the current population, and how their communities may grow and change in the years ahead. Like an OCP, an LRFP should serve as a

It really seems Margaret Jenkins
kids are losing out at the
expense of other kids on
a number of fronts : 1) losing
Central; 2) Losing middle school model
3) Losing option of Monterey

Proposals

- Overload temporarily
until SJ Willis becomes
available
- Can students go to
Monterey temporarily -
no ideal solutions
- What about
transportation - safety
- city bus?
- etc - sustainability

- 1) logic of adding students to
already crammed Central
does not make sense.
- 2) ~~per~~ school catchment is a
major factor in buying a
house.
- 3) our children have gone through
several grades, developing
friendships which are now
being jeopardized by this.

① Is Richmond seismically upgraded?

② If Landsdowne is the new F.I. location for EHS, there is a major possibility that many F.I. students will transfer to English, just so they can attend Monterey. What would you do with the influx of English track kids @ Monterey?

I want to strongly suggest that children with siblings currently enrolled in their French catchment, that are affected by the revised boundaries, gain priority access to their siblings' current school.

Distance and safety and
neighbourhood schools must
be more of a priority

Focus needs to ~~also~~ also be on
impact on kids + families, not
just on the numbers. I can
appreciate it is very hard to
make the numbers work. But
you haven't found the solution yet.

~~For~~

Provided a lot of suggestions
that were outlined carefully in
the report. The response was
to reject all suggestions
proposed. Please look at Monterey.

The Northwest & Southwest (Stonard, ^{Earle} ^{PL})
areas that were now cut-out of
their original catchments (MJES, Monterreys
Oak Bay)
strongly disagree with the new proposal.

Why? 1) Logic does not make sense.
Middle school is crammed and you want
to add our kids to a crammed school.
2) Trauma of splitting our kids from their
friends. They grown up with.
3) We bought our house with these original
catchment in mind.

Solution : don't change
our boundary.

or grandfather these families
into the new boundaries.

Can we get
French maps
online?

Willows → S. end of catchment
should be going to
Landsdowne.

Emergency Reunification: Will not
know any closeby people to
pick up my kids (within walking
distance). You are supposed to list
4-6 families

Monterey → yes! with plans to
expand if necessary
(portables, ^{building} additions.)

Cohort → do not need whole cohort
to stay together! ❗

Richmond → too big (10+ Grade 6's)
without mix of grades (+ too
far to electives)

① Richard - will have the
opportunity for the
middle school experience
in Jr 6.

Currently there is a grade
school playground.

② Is Monterey School or the
district prepared for
the potential increase in
English at Monterey due to
the proposed changes? (Leave
French)

Please seriously consider
Monterey dual track. Look at
how this could work with data
points so the full cost / possibility
is understood. I think the opportunity
is greater than you can see right now.

The opportunity at Monterey for dual track is better than you can see right now. Look at this option more seriously. It solves more than one issue.

- ✓ spreads capacity
- ✓ provides safe distance
- ✓ provides fosters community

1) If the families at Margaret Jenkins affected by the boundary review move to Monterey (switching out of French) will there be space to accommodate them?

Please allow a sibling priority consideration for families with two children in French, one already at Central ^{-in Grade 6} and one who would otherwise be at Richmond/Landsdowne in 2020. Otherwise these families will be logistically challenged, I think unfairly.

You only met
2/11 of the
survey goals.
please Try again!

If you tried to keep walking
distances for English smaller,
why didn't you look at
North Oak Bay → Landsdowne
EMJS → Monterey

282 English
Catchment

150 French Immersion

432 @ Martrey,

This can work!

How do we feel
like you are listening
when you only addressed

2/16 survey requests?

Feedback: Consider
Climate Impact

My top concern for my children's future is climate change. I feel every decision-maker needs to prioritize ways to rapidly reduce emissions and would hope the school board would look for ways to support sustainable transportation options for students.

My opposition to the proposal to move French Immersion EMJS to Lansdowne is that it makes the commute by foot or bike twice what it would be too...

to Central or Monterey.
I feel students should
be able to walk or bike
to school.

I am asking for
serious consideration
of dual-track at
Monterey for EMJS
French students and
would like to see a
response from the
Board or why this
is not possible.