

On Jan 21, 2016, at 8:52 AM, Karen Rodricks <[karen.andy@rogers.com](mailto:karen.andy@rogers.com)> wrote:

My son attends Our Lady of Sorrows School and we live in the area south of Bloor Street and bounded by Mimico Creek and Islington Avenue.

I am writing to you as unfortunately I am unable to attend tonight's meeting. This letter speaks for a large part of my area of the OLS community.

The Board's decision to put forward scenario 3 is welcome news to us. We trust that you and the Board's team noted our concerns and the parents in our area, given that we are less than 1 km from the school and walkability and maintaining a significant part of Our Lady of Sorrows community were critical determining factors in your decision. There are a significant number of parents and community members in our area that were upset with the SARC and school's direction.

Over this past year we have watched the SARC process and provided our input on a number of occasions. The SARC process has caused a rift in our community and has been an emotional roller-coaster ride for all in my part of the community.

We recognize that a great deal of thought and work has gone into the SARC process. Whilst there were a number of scenarios put forward, OLS committee finally put forward 3b or scenario 9. We were against this scenario for a number of reasons:

1. Walkability: We were given to understand that walkability was the main guiding principle. However, this was not taken into account when they proposed 3b. I live less than 1 km to the school. Most parents in the OLS school boundary live significantly further north or east, and their kids have to be bussed or driven to the school. My son walks to school daily except on very cold days. Sunnylea area (south of Bloor between Royal York and Prince Edward is further away from the school...yet this area was included as there were parents that were on the SARC and Capacity committee, and unfortunately we believe they did not act in the best interests of all in the OLS community. They didn't want their community to be directed to St Marks school which in fact is under-capacity!
2. Inclusivity and diversity: By choosing 3b or scenario 9, the SARC and Capacity committee would create an EXCLUSIVE and "PRIVATE" school by reducing the utilization numbers for OLS. The school has been over capacity for many years and has functioned perfectly well producing fine students from all of its community, not just the more affluent families.

We also understand that there are parents from OLS school that are angry with the staff recommendation of scenario 3. Even though the school's SARC committee recommended to accept Scenario 3 they are doing everything in their power (including meeting privately with Angela Gauthier) to change your decision back to 3b. Whilst their voice was being heard (prior to the scheduled board meeting today) in no way do they represent the school's entire community.

Whilst we are happy with the staff recommendation of Scenario 3, we also feel that the Admission Policy should be revised so that oversubscribed schools could redirect any families that subsequently move outside of the catchment to their new home school. This is not new and has been suggested on many occasions. The Board agreed that change was needed during the All Saints boundary review. Rather than leave this in the hands of the school administration, as suggested by the SARC, we strongly urge that board clearly define and limit accessibility for out of catchment students.

I thank you for listening to my concerns and the parents in my community, and feel that Scenario 3 is the best possible solution and that the majority of us are in agreement.

Thanks

Sincerely

Karen