

PART Meeting Minutes
Sunday, April 14, 2013
4:00 pm

1. Welcome

Lori Miller welcomed the parents and thanked them for attending on such short notice. There has been new information presented to the PART committee since the March 27th meeting. The committee felt it necessary to share the important information that they have learned since March 27th.

Lori introduced Heather Stark, a parent representative for Allenby in the PART process. She also introduced Lisa Speigel, the other parent representative for Allenby in the PART process.

Lori explained that the PART process so far has been very challenging as there is a rapid influx of data daily. The need for analysis of such data also proves challenging. Furthermore, there is constant change as to what ideas remain on or are taken off the table seems to change on a regular basis. Therefore, the PART process has been extremely challenging for all involved. She requested that everyone in attendance respect the information presented by the messengers.

Lori also explained that Trustee Howard Goodman was taken out of the PART process at the beginning owing to concerns about 'conflict of interest'. This removal of Goodman from the process has left Allenby without a 'middleman' to assist in negotiating with the TDSB.

Lori introduced Melanie Dickenson who is acting as an observer for the community. Lori explained that she has signed a letter to requesting that Goodman be back into the process There will be a petition posted on the Allenby Parents Association website that is requesting that Goodman be invited back to the table to participate in the PART process. This will be live tomorrow and Lori invited the participants to visit the website to read and sign the petition.

Lori explained that this meeting is open to the community; however, non-Allenby parents were requested to act as observers today and to abstain from voting. She explained that there is a public meeting being held on April 16th. She explained that today's meeting is to solicit feedback from Allenby parents around the various PART options. She welcomed the Allenby parents to participate and to vote on issues. She reiterated that today's meeting was called to allow PART committee to share information that was recently learned.

Heather Stark explained the following with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation:

Purpose of today's meeting:

- To review new information that has been forthcoming since the March 27th meeting. The purpose is to begin only where we left off.
- To rank the options that will be presented on April 16th so that the Allenby PART representatives can advise the TDSB of the options preferred by the Allenby community.

Heather provided a recap of the March 27th meeting as follows:

- 169 *individuals* signed in. Some households may have signed in as one person.
- Attendees were asked to ensure there was 1 'vote' per household as to the preferred options presented by the committee.
- A presentation was given by the committee on data analysis to date.
- Options were presented at end of meeting. Each household was requested to 'vote' for their preferred options. Each household were requested to vote only once per household.

Heather provided the Results of the 'Vote' as follows:

DECISION 1: What is the preferred option to obtain 4 Classrooms for FDK & Increased Enrolment?

- Option 1: Build two classrooms and repurpose two rooms for classrooms: **117 votes**
- Option 2: Boundary Changes & repurpose space: **11 votes**
- Option 3: Boundary Changes as a stand alone option: 20 votes

- Option 4: Repurpose space as a stand alone option: 5 votes
The total number of votes for Decision 1 was 153.

DECISION 2: If repurposing space is part of the preferred solution, what space do you prefer be repurposed to find 2 Classrooms within Allenby?

- Option 1: 1/2 music room & Room 006 (shared space with daycare) **48 votes**
- Option 2: Room 006 (shared space with daycare) & Room 1 or 2 (as shared space with daycare). **101 votes**

The total number of votes for Decision 2 was 149.

These results were sent out in an email blast to the Allenby parental community.

Heather explained that since March 27th that additional information has come forward and that this information seems to be changing daily. She explained the process to date and upcoming opportunities to voice opinions:

Public Meeting #2 – April 16th: Options will be reviewed and participants will be surveyed at the end of the evening as “consultation”. An online survey will also occur after this meeting.

PART Meeting - April 30th: Final recommendations will be discussed by the PART. To be written up and discussed at the final Public Meeting May 15th.

Final Public Meeting #3 - May 15th: The PART committee will present its findings, in preparation for the report that will go to the Board of Trustees. There will be time for questions and comments from the audience.

Heather then provided what is known and what can be ruled out at this time. She explained that some ideas have remained constant throughout this entire process.

- Allenby will remain a dual track school (French and English).
- There is capital funding available ONLY for FDK spending. The preferred building site is Allenby.

- To reduce the number of students coming to Allenby going forward the TDSB has closed optional attendance for French Immersion beginning in 2013. The TDSB may shrink the number of French Immersion (FI) SK students from 60 to 56. The TDSB is looking into the exemption possibilities for primary FI classes – e.g. increasing the SK class size cap from 20 to 23.
- The TDSB may shrink the FI catchment for “Allenby” only (with grandfathering). She explained that most students in the FI are from within the Allenby district.

New information that has been brought forward by the TDSB in the last few days include:

- TDSB has re-opened the discussion about using Bannockburn. The TDSB has requested that we look at this option. This information is different from the last meeting where we were informed that this option was taken off the table.
- TDSB has advised the PART Committee that it supports the recently received Daycare Business model which states it requires continued exclusive use of Daycare Rooms 1 and 2. For a copy of the business model, visit the APA website.
- TDSB has released 3 options for a build at Allenby. The TDSB appears to feel positive about this option; however, the Ministry will decide on this option as the Ministry has final say in capital spending. The TDSB staff appear to be of the view that the build could be approved by the Ministry of Education.
- The lunchroom is off the table as a room available for repurposing.

There are three options going forward that will be explored further and voted on:

1. build repurpose and limit incoming number of FI students
2. reopen Bannockburn
3. boundary changes

The build is an option; however, this is dependent on the Ministry’s decision. The TDSB has requested that we come up with a ‘best workable’ second choice. Therefore, there will be an opportunity for the Allenby parents to rank the options today.

Option - Build 2 Classrooms on St. Clements

At the last meeting the option of building on the Castlefield side was presented. Since then, an assessment of the costs associated with this was done by the TDSB. There are two options regarding a build: 1. To build on Castlefield side into the hill (as proposed at the last meeting); 2. to build on the St. Clements side. The concerns about the build basically come down to cost. The cost to build on the St. Clements side is less expensive. Therefore, the only real option to build requires that the build be on the St. Clements side of the school.

All options to build require that the parking lot be expanded due to the by-laws. A variance to the existing by-law can be sought to allow for increased parking. The parking lot cannot be built towards Avenue Road. Please note that nothing is absolute at this point in time. If the parking lot is expanded, it will therefore encroach upon the field and specifically encroaching upon the track by at least a few feet.

Build Option Requires Re-purposing of Space for 2 classrooms

To date, TDSB has estimated 4 rooms are required to accommodate FDK and increased enrollment at Allenby. The build is for 2 FDK rooms. If 4 rooms in total are required, an additional 2 rooms must be found on the existing footprint. 006 is available for shared space (1 of 2 additional rooms).

TDSB Planning is currently investigating the possibility of NOT needing a 2nd room. Based on historic FI data, an enrollment bulge from 2004 that is no longer in the school, and a future change in the FI catchment, updated projections might show a 2nd room is not needed. The committee hopes to have clarity on this issue by Tuesday's public meeting.

The idea of repurposing the Music room is currently being re-evaluated as it may not be feasible to cut it in half.

The use of Rooms 1 & 2, which are currently used by daycare as "exclusive space", has been taken off the table.

The pros and cons of building on site were presented as follows:

Building on Site: Positive Considerations

- The combination of (1) building 2 classrooms on site and (2) repurposing space and limiting FI students to find 2 additional classrooms could remove the need for boundary changes.
- Building FDK classrooms could include building new bathrooms for those classrooms.

Building on Site: Negative Considerations

- Increased strain will occur on **ALL** space (facilities/green space) and may impact on students feeling of well being during the day
- Building will not address strain on all other components of school life
- Increased traffic in and around the school will lead to unsafe congestion of cars, further the need for several more parent volunteers and other actions to improve traffic safety. As it stands now pick up drop off poses safety concerns. Parents would need to fundamentally change their approach to Pick-up and Drop-off
- Issues regarding where children gather, line up and enter must be resolved
- The current kindergarten playground is not large enough to hold the number of incoming students in the morning and teachers must work out a play schedule
- The teachers would need to work out a schedule for all classes to play in the small yard during alternate times of the day

Options – Boundary Changes

There are two potential boundary changes that could potentially reduce the number of students attending Allenby:

- Boundary change to the WEST (with students being redirected to North Prep)
- Boundary change to the NORT (with students being redirected to John Ross Robertson)
- This option includes moving a minimum of 100 students currently in the English Stream. Students presently registered in the English stream within potential boundary changes would not be grandfathered.

A map of the current English catchment area was presented. Lori reviewed the various streets on the map and explained the present Allenby English catchment area.

Option – Boundary Change N/E

This option would require some present Allenby students in the English stream to be redirected to John Ross Robertson (JRR). The TDSB objective would be to move 100 children out of Allenby to be redirected to JRR. Note that the FI students in the same catchment area will not be moved as JRR does not provide a FI program.

Lori explained that the following streets would be affected by this option:

- Hillhurst to Lytton/Proudfoot to Rosewell. This option would result in 54 students currently at Allenby being redirected to JRR.
- Eglinton to Briar Hill/Avenue to Yonge – This option would result in 61 students currently at Allenby being redirected to JRR; however, it is important to note that students located in the far SE corner may be over the 1.6 km to JRR. Therefore, this option may not be viable owing to the TDSB policy of students being within the 1.6 km walking distance.
- Roselawn to Briar Hill/Rosewell to Yonge – This option would result in 32 students currently at Allenby being redirected to JRR

Since building will only take place at one of the five Ward 8 public schools involved in this PART, if there is going to be a boundary change this could only occur at one of the two potential schools, i.e. North Prep or JRR. The receiving school will have to take 100 students and thus there will be building at one of these two sites.

A parent expressed concern about the potential influx of students from the building of condos at Yonge/Eglinton. It was explained that the TDSB has advised the purchasers of these condos that they are not guaranteed access to closest school. Parents were requested to hold questions until question period at the end of the presentation.

Option – Boundary Change West

This option would require some present Allenby students in the English stream to be redirected to North Prep (NP). The TDSB objective would be to move 100 children out of Allenby to be redirected to NP. Note that the FI students in the same catchment area will not be moved as NP does not provide a FI program.

Lori explained that the following streets would be affected by this option:

- Latimer to Hedington/Eglinton to Roselawn. This option would result in 53 students currently at Allenby being redirected to NP.
- Castlewood/Eglinton to Roselawn. This option would result in 20 students currently at Allenby being redirected to NP.
- Heddinton/Eglinton to Roselawn. This option would result in 8 students currently at Allenby being redirected to NP.
- Lamtimer/Eglinton to Roselawn. This option would result in 20 students currently at Allenby being redirected to NP.

Lori explained that the numbers do not appear to align. She explained that these were the numbers provided by the TDSB; however, a quick count suggests that the Latimer to Castlewood/Eglinton to Roselawn would potentially result in 42 students being redirected to NP.

Lori stressed that none of these number add to 100 students. Therefore, the boundary changes would have to be more than one or wider. Please note that the streets listed in the boundary changes are only some of the streets that may be affected. If the TDSB objective is to redirect 100 students then there are potentially more streets that would need to be incorporated into a boundary change.

Lori reviewed map again. She reiterated that this is plan B. Boundary changes are only in option if a build at Allenby does not occur.

Lisa Spiegel presented the following information;

Boundary Changes – Positive Considerations

- Decreasing overall number of students will immediately decrease strain on Allenby's common facilities including:
 - "Green" space - playground
 - Cafeteria
 - Gym
 - Pool
 - Bathrooms
 - Hallways/Stairways
- Decrease traffic congestion at drop off/pick up
- Possibly contribute to smaller classrooms and more room for children to work in small groups (however, it was later pointed out that this is probably not going to occur).

- Allow for continuation of enrichment/music room/daycare and other programming with fewer a la carte programs than might occur with no boundary change

Boundary Changes – Negative Considerations

- Social impact on children will be enormous when children are moved to a new school both for students who remain and who move. Best friends can be affected. Grandfathering will not be an option.
- Junior high/high school pathway could be impacted
- Would likely cover large area to achieve intended reduction of population.
- ‘Community Uproar’ if new school is not considered equal caliber
- Since neighbouring schools are unlikely able to absorb additional students, such schools may require a build. There will simply not be a build on two sites.
- Some concern over property values decreasing; however, the PART committee did not want to speculate on this.

Bannockburn – Allenby North

Bannockburn is currently owned by the TDSB and leased to a Montessori school. When this was an option, the PART committee was willing to consider this option; however, this option had been removed from the table a few weeks back. Since then the TDSB has put this back on the table. Please note that the possibility of using Bannockburn is an option open only to Allenby students.

Option 1 – move JK/SK children from both streams to Bannockburn. Bussing of students to Bannockburn would be an option. The students would be picked up at Allenby and delivered by bus to Bannockburn.

Option 2 – move grade 5 & 6 from both streams to Bannockburn. Again, bussing of students to this location would be an option.

It was reiterated that these options affect both French and English streams.

Bannockburn – Positive Considerations

- No boundary changes – grades stays together and all students of grades JK/6 would have the same pathway for junior and secondary schools

- Relief on the facilities would occur with potential for space for rotary subjects at both sites
- Less pressure on field
- No construction upheaval
- For JK/SK a dedicated early learning environment
- School would not be running to full capacity. Only some of the school would be opened. Therefore, if demographics persist there could potentially be the possibility of adding rooms to the school in the future.

Bannockburn – Negative Considerations

- Bussing kids. There are different implications for both age groups. JK/SK – being bussed at the ages of 3 to 4 years. Grade 5/6 students may lose independence.
- Could potentially split families
- There isn't a pool at Bannockburn. This may be more of an issue for older kids – such as swim teams.
- Fundraising and parent volunteering complications. There will no longer be one physical property. The sharing of electronic devices that have been already provided to Allenby by the APA would need to be worked out.
- Extracurricular complications for older grades – 8:00 am practise for various teams may become complicated. Before and after care for JK/SK moves to Bannockburn. Driving students to Bannockburn in the mornings or picking up after school may be more problematic for families.
- Multiple transitions for children as they attend Allenby, Bannockburn and Glenview
- Negative impact of well being /health by not walking

Ranking of Options

The following five options were presented for ranking by the Allenby parents:

- A. Build, Repurpose, Space a Close FI
- B. Boundary Changes to the West
- C. Boundary changes to the North/East mtha would Feed JRR
- D. Bannockburn early years academi (Jk/SK)
- E. Bannockburn grade 5 & 6

The parents were requested to be prepared to rank the options after the question period even if these option appear to be unsavory. Rank 1 as best option, with 5 as worst option.

Question Period:

Question 1: A parent requested a point of clarification around boundary changes. Why would boundary changes affect class sizes? The committee responded as reduction in number of students might result in additional space, but may not.

It was further commented that 100 students will need to move to Bannockburn/JRR/NP under the boundary change option. The goal of moving 100 students seems to makes sense to the TDSB. Bannockburn removes students in a more precise manner over the other two boundary change options.

Question 2: A parent pointed out that there may need to be a political strategy taken on the PART. According to this parent, the options, except for A, are all catastrophic with negative outcomes. He enquired whether Allenby parents should focus on sending a strong political message to the board. Since the only option that is acceptable is option A, it would be important to send a clear message to the board. He reiterated that the pedagogical outcomes are negative for students.

Lisa explained that the build, repurpose space and closing FI optional attendance remained on the table. The committee only received that the cost and impact for this new information recently.

The parent explained that these are not palatable options. The PART committee explained that there is a need to have alternative options so that they can gage parents and the will of the community.

A parent then expressed concern about the ranking system. It was explained that ranking may not get a good sense of how many people are strongly opposed to options B through E. He suggested adding an additional option of F.

Lori explained that to Lisa's point that the committee is attempting to collect data to gage where Allenby parents are on multiple options.

Lori explained that there needs to be a political push in this process, but that without the data the committee cannot begin a political push.

Question 3: A parent made an enquiry about Glenrush – a TDSB school – that may have been sold recently. She wanted to know why such a school could have been sold when there is a need for space within the TDSB. The committee could not comment on this and requested that the parent redirect this question to the public meeting on Tuesday.

Question 4: A parent enquired why the daycare option and repurposing this space has been taken off the table? It was explained that the Daycare Business model was placed on the APA website and is available for all to read. It was recently at the end of a two-hour meeting and the PART committee was informed that this option had been removed from the table without any public consultation. Lori explained that the committee was unaware of why this occurred. Melanie Dickenson explained that this can be brought back to the table on Tuesday night. The Allenby PART representatives can bring this forward. The parent reiterated the question of why the daycare option has been taken off the table. Lisa explained that this is a process. The committee could not comment any further on this and she requested that the parent redirect this question to the public meeting on Tuesday.

Question 5: A parent asked whether we could add the option of repurposing the daycare space. It was pointed out that the parental community never voted on repurposing the entire day care space. Parents were informed that they can write a letter, pose the question at the public PART meeting on Tuesday.

The parent asked whether we could add another option to the ranking system to include: Repurpose School Space. Discussion ensued and this option was added to the slide.

Question 6: A parent pointed out that North Prep is either already full or at capacity. Therefore, there would need to be a build at NP to accommodate any incoming students. The question was what would happen if in 2014 the build was not completed? Where would these students go to school? The objective would be to complete any build prior to September 2014;

however, it is suspected that portables would be used to house students until the build was finished.

Question 7: Has TDSB looked at the ongoing costs for Bannockburn? The committee requested that the TDSB consider ongoing costs to run and maintain Bannockburn; however, they have not received any information on this at this time.

Question 8: A parent expressed concern about bussing 3 year olds to Bannockburn because parents have the option of placing 3 year olds in car seats on busses. The committee agreed that this is a potential concern and requested that the parent redirect this question to the public meeting on Tuesday.

Question 9: A parent commented on the analysis of the various options and did not agree with all the pros and cons that were presented. Where does this information go? Who does this information go to? The committee explained that at this point these are the ideas have been created by a cross-representational group of parents involved in the PART committee. The committee requested that all ideas regarding pros and cons be directed to committee. The committee will not your concerns and present the ideas.

Question 10: A parent expressed concern about the repurposing of the daycare space has been taken off the table. Lori explained that she will speak to Jeff about putting this on the table for Tuesday as this concern has been raised numerous time during this meeting today. The committee reiterated that the parent can redirect this question to the public meeting on Tuesday.

Question 11: A parent enquired whether French Immersion was going to be grandfathered for 2013. Are class sizes going to increase? The committee explained that this PART does not impact students for September 2013; however, grandfathering may not be an option in September 2014. A cap of 20 students per class has been the norm. The school has had issues regarding managing the number of students and class sizes. The TDSB may apply for cap exemptions for September 2014.

Question 12: A parent expressed concern about pick up and drop off. She wanted to know whether the areas around the school will be unsafe for children? Lori explained that pick up and drop off is presently bordering on unsafe and could potentially become unsafe with the introduction of more students.

Question 13: What is the possibility of the 5/6 teachers moving to Bannockburn with the classes? The committee cannot guarantee what will happen to staff. The committee requested that the parent redirect this question to the public meeting on Tuesday.

Question 14: What changing boundaries and redirecting students to JRR or NP affect the junior and secondary pathways? Presently, JRR students feed to Glenview and then to Lawrence Park or North Toronto. Presently, NP students feed to Forest Hill Junior and then to Forest Hill. However, it is important to note that feeder school boundaries are subject to change if demographics shift or change. We cannot predict what will happen in the future.

Question 15 – A suggestion was made to rank the options, but to then add a scale to the ranking to determine parental opinion on all the options. The parent was invited to propose an idea in conference with some of the committee members.

Question 16 – A parent wanted further clarification as to the exact streets that would be affected by the TDSB model of the boundary changes. The committee explained that the TDSB is still currently working on this. The committee has presented all information that they currently have.

Question 17 – A parent thanked the committee for all their work and dedication to this issue. Do we have a sense of what the build would be at NP or JRR and what our children would be facing with regard to stress? The committee explained that at this point there is a plan underway. The committee stressed that both NP and JRR are either at or near capacity. The parent wanted clarification as to whether Allenby would be creating more stress to these school boundaries? The committee confirmed that changes to Allenby's boundaries would directly impact JRR or NP. It was pointed out that both JRR and NP do not want boundary changes.

Question 18 – Why is it that the TDSB is only willing to build on one site? The committee has been told that if there is a build at all it will be at one site only. The committee requested that the parent redirect this question to the public meeting on Tuesday.

Question 19: A parent wanted clarification on repurposing of school space. Does repurposing of school space include the music room? The committee explained that the only physical spaces that were available were the daycare spaces and the music room. The committee explained that the repurposing of space was not being presented at this meeting as that option was explored and voted on at the March 27th meeting. The TDSB has said that they do not want to repurpose the daycare. The parents at the last meeting voted on the repurposing at the last meeting and this will be taken into consideration by the PART representatives.

Question 20: A parent wanted to know whether the JK/SK move to Bannockburn would include bussing for the students to return home at lunch? The committee stated that logically the TDSB would require the students to stay for lunch.

Question 21: A parent asked for clarification with regard to boundary changes with no grandfathering. What does this mean? Will student outside the boundary changes be allowed to stay if they have been grandfathered in the past? Will students who are presently at Allenby, but have moved outside the present catchment areas be forced to move to their home school? Boundary changes without grandfathering means that children are our outside the catchment area will be redirected to their ‘new home school’. The committee explained that the TDSB policy is that students who are outside the catchment area will be requested to leave, but the TDSB does not police this.

Question 22: A parent asked to see the slides 4 & 5 again – i.e. the decisions from the March 27th meeting regarding the repurposing of space. Slides shown.

Question 23: A parent wanted to know whether there was any reason for more than one vote – i.e. if all options except A are unacceptable, why vote on these other options. The committee explained that it had spent time considering how to solicit information. The path to getting to an answer is

not linear. The committee needs to show that they have explored all options and present these to the TDSB. If the committee does not explore all potential options then the TDSB may just present an option without parental input.

Question 24: If boundaries redrawn in the SE, how would that impact the voting for all other options this evening? This is not relevant to this decision at this point in time. Please pose this question at the public meeting.

Question 25: How many students need to move or how many students are expected in 2014? Specific numbers will be presented on Tuesday. The TDSB looks at trends in the area and make predictions as to how many classes are required to support the incoming number of students.

Question 26: Why is it that the TDSB proposal only takes into consideration the FDK when it appears that the population of Allenby is continuing to grow? Why doesn't the TDSB just build an extension? The TDSB's capital funding is presently frozen by the Ministry. All TDSB capital spending must be authorized by the Ministry. The Ministry has stated that the TDSB can only build for FDK as FDK is mandatory throughout the province.

Question 27: Why is Bannockburn back on the table? Isn't the idea of a JK/SK program contradictory to the early years planning and daycare mandates? There is need for clarification around this. The committee requested that the parent redirect this question to the public meeting on Tuesday.

The following was presented for voting.

OPTION A: Build/repurpose space/reduce the number of incoming French Immersion students

OPTION B: Boundary Changes to the West that would feed North Prep

OPTION C: Boundary Changes to the North/East that would feed John Ross Robertson

OPTION D: Bannockburn Early Learning Years Academy (JK/SK)

OPTION E: Bannockburn Grades 5/6

OPTION F: Repurpose School Space (including daycare)

Parents were requested to vote twice. Rank the options from 1 to 6 with 1 being what you are most comfortable with and 6 being what you are least comfortable with. Once you have ranked the items, score the items using a scale of 1 through 5, with 1 being strongly agree, 2 being agree, 3 neutral, 4 disagree, and 5 being strongly disagree.

Meeting Adjourned

The results of the voting that were tabulated after the meeting were as follows:

Allenby Parents Signed In: 89. Allenby Parents Voting: 89

Non-Allenby Parents/Community Members in Attendance: 13; Non-Allenby Parents/Community Members Voting: 0

RANKINGS

Ranking	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E	Option F
1st	65	8	5	2	0	5
2nd	8	15	13	10	2	35
3rd	7	11	11	32	12	9
4th	2	15	19	19	17	9
5th	2	10	21	13	29	7
6th	0	23	13	6	22	15

SCORING

Score	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E	Option F
Strongly Agree	70	19	12	7	2	20
Agree	1	7	6	9	1	18
Neutral	3	6	13	13	8	9
Disagree	1	10	6	13	13	8
Strongly Disagree	8	39	44	39	57	26

Weighted Score	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E	Option F
Total	124	-43	-64	-68	-122	-2
	1st	3rd	4th	5th	6th	2nd

LOGIC

The weighted scoring works like this: for each option multiply the Strongly Agree votes by 2, Agree votes by 1, Neutral votes are not considered, Disagree votes by -1, Strongly Disagree votes by -2 and add them up. The higher the number is above zero, the more favourable the option is to the voters. The lower the number is below zero, the more undesirable the option is to the voters. BTW, as there were 88 valid (a few were partial data), the maximum score would be 176 and the minimum score would be -176.