



**Hastings and Prince Edward  
District School Board**

**STUDENT ENROLMENT/SCHOOL CAPACITY COMMITTEE (SE/SCC)  
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES  
September 12, 2016**

---

**Present:** M. Brant, J. Bray, J. Cobb, B. Danes, L. Kyle, D. Patterson, J. Williams  
**Regrets:** T. Biniaris, M. Hall, D. Inch  
**Resource:** C. DeMille, K. Donnell, T. FitzGibbon, K. Horrigan, K. MacQuarrie, N. Pfeiffer, C. Portt,  
M. Savery-Whiteway  
**Minutes:** C. Reid, Administrative Assistant

**Call to order**

Vice-chair Cobb called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**Approval of agenda**

Moved: B. Danes  
Seconded: D. Patterson

**That the agenda be approved.**

Carried

**Approval of minutes**

Moved: J. Williams  
Seconded: M. Brant

**The minutes of the June 23, 2016 meeting be approved.**

Carried

**Business arising from the minutes**

None

**Recommendations**

None

**Information**

**Draft Long-Term Capital and Accommodation Plan**

Director of Education, Mandy Savery-Whiteway, referred to the Report No. C-1 and commented that the Board had approved a recommendation to postpone adopting the draft Long-Term Capital and Accommodation Plan (LTCAP) to September 30, 2016, enabling staff and community to fully respond to the draft plan. She stated that all feedback that has been received to date has been summarized and presented as Appendix A to the report. The feedback was originally presented at the June Board meeting and a file containing the original versions of input has been circulated among trustees for review. Trustee Biniaris and Chair Inch still have to review the material. Although the Board continues to invite public input, there has been no further feedback received since June 28, 2016.

Director Savery-Whiteway called upon Kerry Donnell, Communications Officer to comment on the status of the public consultation process. She stated that over the summer the request for public input remained on the home page of the board's website. As of Tuesday, September 6, 2016, the information was updated to include the Ministry of Education's Facility Condition Index data for Ontario schools released on August 25, 2016. At that time, the article was moved back up to top of the home page and will remain there for month of September.

---

The following points of clarification were provided:

- Some of the comments contained in Appendix A are exactly what was submitted, while others are summaries of key messages from the original comments, depending on the length of the comments.
- It was requested that any comment that contains the original language be starred to distinguish that it has not been summarized.

The Director's Office will make the adjustment as noted above and will provide the Student Enrolment/School Capacity Committee with a final copy of the feedback at its meeting on October 11, 2016.

### **School Facility Condition Assessment Data**

Directory Savery-Whiteway referred to Report No. C-2 and stated that she wished to provide an update with respect to the recently released Ministry of Education School Facility Condition Assessment Data. From a big picture perspective, it is important to always use up-to-date data. School condition information had been included in the draft plan, however the data released by the Ministry on August 25 is based on a different set of criteria. It is important to consider all of this information together and to make the public aware of all the data available to support the decision making process.

Manager of Planning, Kim Horrigan presented information regarding the August 25<sup>th</sup> data released by the Ministry, which is posted on the Ministry's website: <http://edu.gov.on.ca/eng/parents/fci.html>. The website explains how the information was gathered, what it is and provides a link to the actual live data and technical paper at the bottom of the page.

Planner Horrigan explained that the Ministry assessed all schools within the province over a 5-year period from 2011 to 2015. All HPEDSB schools were evaluated between 2012 and 2014. As a result of the release of this new 5-year data, it will now be included in the LTCAP Executive Summary and as a new Appendix F – Renewal Needs Over 5 Years and Facility Condition Index.

For reference purposes, Planner Horrigan presented charts showing a visual comparison between the 5 and 10-year renewal needs for all schools. She noted that the data is reflective of a period of five years from the year that the school was assessed and the red line on the chart represents an FCI of 65%, which is considered by the Ministry to be critical and has been termed at "prohibitive to repair".

Trustee discussion occurred and the following points of clarification were provided:

- Originally Ministry 10-year renewal needs data was used to develop the LTCAP, but now that the 5-year data is available, school boards may use either the 10-year or the 5-year data or a combination of both. This information is being included in the Executive Summary so it is visible and open to everyone.
- In some cases, the 5-year renewal needs are more expensive than the 10-year. The rationale for this is that the data showing in the LTCAP came from the Watson study and reflects data from the Ministry two years ago projected 10 years from that date. The Ministry's data reflects renewal needs 5 years from the date schools were assessed. Therefore, there is no direct alignment of the data. In addition, ongoing work with capital and renewal funds in the schools has resulted in school renewal projects being completed, which changes the FCI. Further, all boards were recently transferred to a new Ministry assessment tool and data was cleaned up. As a result, some previous renewal expenses were deleted and some renewal costs that had been missed were added.
- Staff were given the opportunity to verify the data and make any corrections before it was published by the Ministry.
- In addition to looking at schools that are above the 65% FCI, other factors will also be taken into consideration, including programming, transportation and community input.
- How the Ministry will be releasing capital and school condition funds based on the data - in June additional school condition funding was announced from the Ministry with a caveat that schools closing within 5 years would not be targeted for funding. Capital and school consolidation funding is meant to address surplus space as a result of the school assessment studies. There is a requirement to submit a list of projects boards are working on to ensure they are not working on schools with a high FCI.

---

Communications Officer, Kerry Donnell distributed copies of draft Bulletin #6 entitled “Making sense of Facility Condition Index data”. This bulletin provides FCI information in a condensed version to the public and will be added to the website as the next bulletin in the series. As in the past, it will be widely distributed through newsletters, websites and email. Director Savery-Whiteway stated that this bulletin also serves as speaking points for trustees and it is critical to share this information and make it publicly accessible. It is also critical that all pieces of the data go into the framework for decision making.

Trustee discussion occurred and the following points of clarification were provided:

- Parents’ perception of data and whether a school can be kept open even if data says otherwise.
- The board is fundamentally responsible to ensure safe, active learning environments and would never disregard the state of repair or health and safety of students and staff. It has always been a priority to focus on work that maintains the integrity of a building. FCI numbers are predicted 5 and 10 years out and do not reflect the current state of the facility.
- Regarding the trustee role, it is critical to develop a framework as a way to make informed decisions. The real process begins once the plan is in place and Policy 15 is activated. Consideration of all data, programming, transportation, and community input is a mandated part of the process. The role of the trustee is to receive the recommendation, consider it, attend the public meetings, receive feedback and then make decisions to support the recommendation or not. Those decisions set in motion requests to the Ministry to support the recommendation. The Ministry is looking for boards to be responsible and follow the process with integrity. HPEDSB has repeatedly put forward successful business cases to the Ministry but it is important to note that the funding is not unlimited and not every situation will require Ministry capital funding.
- The allotment of school condition funds is based substantial renewal needs. This year HPEDSB will be receiving approximately \$20 Million. The Ministry has strict guidelines on where boards can spend these funds and have told boards which elements of a building they can spend money on, based on the current assessment data. These repairs directly affect the FCI and must be recorded in the Ministry database.
- Consideration will be given to adjusting boundaries in order to fill schools and alleviate transportation concerns.

#### **Correspondence**

None

The meeting adjourned at 4:08 p.m.