

My questions from public input meeting #4 (June 16/08) as asked:

- 1) Is Princess Anne also a PTR school, and what is their FCI score?
- 2) How much does Princess Anne need in terms of PTR/overall maintenance repairs?
- 3) It seems that we have possible alternatives available to us to significantly reduce the cost of repairs to Wembley, and people who are prepared to offer their expertise and assistance. Are we prepared to accept their assistance and investigate our options further, or is this a done deal?

For the record, the answers provided to questions 1 and 2 did NOT mirror the answers provided to the same questions asked during the June 3/08 meeting between Diane Cayen-Arnold, Sandi Ackroyd, John Hamalainen and myself. At the June 3/08 meeting, we were told that Princess Anne IS a PTR school, and that it would require approximately \$2.6 million in PTR repairs above and beyond any costs to add an addition. At the June 16/08 meeting, we were told Princess Anne is NOT a PTR school, and that the speaker was unsure of the PTR repair costs. So, what is the truth?

### **General Comments**

- The guidelines for the makeup of the ARC committee need to be revised. If the Parent/School Council for a school has determined itself not to be a political body, then quite frankly it is not in a leadership position to represent the school community, and it should not be automatically allowed to have 2 seats on the ARC committee. If the Council cannot or will not be political and take a leadership role, then those two seats should be open to any parent from the school community. In the event of multiple names, the 2 seats could be elected or chosen randomly.
- Public input and public meetings are only useful if the questions that are asked are actually answered. How can the public be expected to provide input on the options if the regular response from the board is "I don't know" or "we haven't considered that option yet"? How can we have made it this far into the review process, and be expected to endorse any option, when the board itself appears not to have done the proper background investigation of the basic issues (ie. Options for dealing with each maintenance issue listed in the ministry study of Wembley).
- When exactly did the board know that the issue of PTR funding and excess spaces was no longer relevant? At the first three public meetings the public was told that funding would not be provided to Wembley for PTR repairs as there were excess pupil spaces at schools within an 8 mile radius of Wembley. At the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, we were told this criteria no longer applied to

Wembley. So, did the Ministry recently change the guidelines, or is this yet another example of the Board not providing up to date information on the status of Wembley until pushed by the public?

- How is it that in a private meeting, board officials are able to rhyme off details of maintenance and new building costs, PTR statuses, FCI scores, etc. for Princess Anne; yet, when asked the same questions at a public meeting, they cannot remember the same details?
- The flip-flop on the issues of access to background documents was an embarrassment. To suggest that the documents were always available without the need for an FOI request is an outright lie. John Hamalainen and myself specifically asked for copies of the original Ministry report at the June 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting with Diane Cayen-Arnold and Sandi Ackroyd, and we were told we could not have a copy without submitting an FOI request. If that report was actually available, then why were copies of it not provided when we WERE allowed to have copies of the Castellan report?
- The whole issue of when is building replacement cost not actually replacement cost when calculating the FCI for a school was baffling (ie the response to the question asked by John Reynolds at the June 16<sup>th</sup> public meeting). How can we be willing to accept a supposed devalued current market value of a building to determine it's FCI score (which significantly inflates the FCI score for Wembley), yet uses full replacement cost values optional solutions (ie. Expansion at Princess Anne)?
- How can we justify making a decision that could radically effect another school (Princess Anne) without including that school in the decision making process? This appears to be in direct contravention of the Ministry guidelines (Ministry of Education Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines, pg.2). Are we proposing to steamroll over the parents, staff and Parent Council of Princess Anne at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour if they do not agree with the ARC committee choices?
- I believe a recorded vote should be held at the end of the public input process to unequivocally send a message to the ARC committee of EXACTLY where the Wembley community stands on the recommended options. There should be no margin for error in a decision as critical as this one.
- Given the fact that there are no more public meetings scheduled (at the school level), how does the ARC committee plan to respond to any further questions raised by the public regarding the final decision of this process?

Overall, as a parent participating in these meetings, it has been very frustrating. The reliance on a Ministry study that appears to have been blatantly skewed in a worst case scenario (and its results seemingly not questioned by anyone at the Board level), overall lack of information being presented by the Board, the continual delay in providing answers to key questions, the flip-flopping on important details by Board officials when pressed by the public – all these and more lead me to feel that this is NOT an open and transparent process and that there is a definite agenda being pushed that is NOT in the best interests of the public.

The overall review process is severely flawed, and I sincerely hope that it will be revisited by the Board and corrections made before the next school has to undergo an accommodation review.

Based on the information I have heard at the meetings, and learned through investigation, I do not believe that Wembley needs to close. As such, I do NOT support the either of the two preferred options of the ARC committee.

Kirk Dopson