

King George Elementary Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

Education Centre Board Room

November 9, 2011

Minutes Working Meeting # 4

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members

Chair –Pat Rocco

Voting Members –Agnes Clarke, Jennifer Drahusz, Dianna Gillespie, Felicia Guarascia, Anna Macky, Brenda Reid, Crystal Provo, Brian Seamans

Non-Voting Members – Karen Bikinas, John Bradley, Lori Helt, Tim Simmons, Janet VanDuzen, Irma Belanger.

Not Present:

Voting Members – Lisa Cameron,

Non-Voting Members – John Bradley, Michelle Pickett, Susan Neville, Linda Wilson, Bernie Morelli.

Resource Staff

Ellen Warling, Daniel Del Bianco, Todd Salerno

Recording Secretary

Claire Vander Beek

1. Welcome and Introductions – Superintendent Pat Rocco
Mr. Rocco welcomed the member of the committee to the final meeting noting the ARC process began in March and involved four working and four public meeting. Members have a deeper understanding of the process and the communities in order to best serve our students. Tonight we are bringing forward the final report for approval that will be then sent to the Trustee. He noted there were no members of the public in attendance tonight. The goal of the night is to review previous meeting minutes and finalize the ARC report.
2. Agenda
 - 2.1 Additions/deletions – amended – change Item 8: to show as minutes of November 9, 2011, not November 2, 2011
 - 2.2 Approval of agenda – **Consensus**
 - 2.3 Business Arising from Minutes - None
3. Minutes of Working Group Meeting #3 (October 20, 2011)
 - 3.1 Errors or omissions – None
 - 3.2 Approval of minutes – **Consensus**
 - 3.3 Business Arising from Minutes - None

4. Minutes of Working Group Meeting #3 (November 2, 2011)

4.1 Errors or omissions – Page 4, second paragraph – Revise sentence to read: **This would take pressure off Prince of Wales and Memorial (City) Schools and help balance enrolment between the schools.**

4.2 Approval of minutes as amended – Consensus

4.3 Business Arising from Minutes - None

4.3.1 Debriefing on Public Meeting #4 – Mr. Rocco asked if any members had received further feedback from the members of the public at the previous meeting. There was no response. He noted there had been no opposition to the ARC proposal being brought forward. Thanks were extended to Karen Bikinas and Linda Wilson for their comments at the meeting on behalf of the committee.

5. Review of final ARC Recommendation

5.1 – Mr. DelBianco advised that the Transportation Department is quite rigid on their walking distances to schools. If the walking distance of 1.6k ends in the middle of the street, they adhere to that distance for equity across the system. Our proposal includes a request to the trustees to consider this pocket of families for transportation.

Q – Is there any proviso for courtesy transportation, so students can access the bus?

A: Mandated or courtesy – We make the request to trustees, Transportation department would analyze the block and give us a recommendation about proceeding with transportation. Can't do that until the boundary review is fixed. There are 60 days in which consultation takes place. The Queen Mary review would start in April and May and leaves short timelines to establish bus routes. The easiest proposal would be courtesy until we evaluate the whole lower city, expect to hear that from Kent Orr. Mr. DelBianco – After sitting through all the meetings, have we heard any feedback from the two people at the last public meeting

A: No

5.2 Final ARC Report to HWDSB Director of Education

The draft report encompasses the ARC's work over the last nine months: outlines the process, final recommendation and this will be what is submitted by the ARC to the Director.

Members were given time to review the report before providing feedback, changes or amendments.

Mr. Rocco walked the committee through a quick overview of the pages to allow input on pages

On page 6 & 7 – Mr. Rocco commented on the lower attendance turnout and will identify in his presentation how the ARC tried to encourage the public to attend.

Page 9 – He drew members' attention to the recommendation at the bottom of the page.

Page 10 – Summarizes the utilization rates as result of the recommendation

Page 15 – Additional considerations – outlines the boundary review process and the transportation recommendation. Mr. Rocco suggested that courtesy transportation would be the way to go until boundaries were sorted.

Q – Concern about equalizing the playing field between Prince of Wales and Memorial Schools such as getting more Smartboards, resurfacing the basketball court and playground or a new floor for the library.

Mr. Rocco are you making a recommendation for some facility renewal?

A: Looking at the difference between the schools.

Mr. Rocco – Are you looking for Board to allocate funds for facility renewal at Memorial (City)?

Mr. DelBianco – This would fall under Additional Considerations – do you want to be specific or ask staff Memorial (City) for specifics?

Mr. Salerno referenced RECAP and suggested working with principal and Area Supervisor to come up with list to include in the Capital Plan.

Trustee Simmons – Also work through the trustees. For the report – couch it from an equitable perspective.

Ms. VanDuzen – I think that kind of request is better facilitated through discussions with trustee and principal. If calling it equity, there are lots of other balances that are not equitable. If you want an updated court at Memorial (City), from Prince of Wales' perspective, we don't have grass or a playground. Is it equitable or something both sites need to look at independently?

Mr. Seamans – Do under Fine Facilities - upgrades to the schools.

Mr. Rocco – There are limited funds in Fine Facilities. It would not cover it all.

C – The Memorial basketball court is all grass not pavement. Your children can play basketball, we have green space. The playground is unsafe, injuries occur often. There are fights that involve pieces of playground being thrown around. Patches are only a bandaid situation – it is a concern from a safety perspective.

Q – Wondering if this should be in the ARC report? There are lots of schools that have inequities – this is because we are adding students - focus on the impact of those students. Why get preferential treatment? Only agree if schools not large enough.

A – We will have more students needing the resources. Prince of Wales is new, Memorial (City) School needs upgrades – limited resources and more students. Can we use savings from closing King George School to spend on Memorial (City) – make the resources better.

C – I would agree with needing a safer playground. Don't agree about Smartboards in a class – unless the board makes that a priority.

Mr. DelBianco – We can suggest board staff work with reps from Memorial (City) School to ensure it can accommodate additional students from King George School .

It was determined that Bullet #3, on page 15 would be added to the report as follows: **That the Facilities Department in conjunction with school Principals analyze existing facilities and suggest any recommendation for capital improvements to accommodate the influx of new students.**

Mr. Rocco noted that it is within our mandate to do this as outlined on page 3 –clause (b).

Mr. DelBianco – The final ARC report also includes a listing of appendices – that is everything given to the committee throughout the meetings - presentations, minutes, Terms of Reference, Policy, etc.

ARC members had no additional items for inclusion in the draft report .

Mr. Rocco asked for consensus on the Report with the additional recommendation – **Consensus**

6. Correspondence – None

7. Other business

7.1 Post ARC timelines

Trustees will receive the report at Committee of the Whole meeting on Monday, November 14, 2011. There will be a presentation by the Chair Rocco on the ARC Report, along with the staff recommendation - which is similar. Once ratified at the November Board on November 21, 2011, the earliest trustees can make a decision is 60 days from the November Board, excluding the Christmas break. Midway through the 60 days, trustees are to hold a public meeting to receive input on both of

the staff and ARC's recommendation – which could include delegations, comments or feedback. Once the 60 days expires, trustees would make their decision.

Mr. DelBianco confirmed that all the Board meetings are open to the public and that ARC members will be made aware of dates, times, etc. for meetings and public consultation. Both reports will be posted on the website, along with timelines. He re-iterated that the ARC reports will be going to the Monday Committee of the Whole as “monitoring” report and there would be no discussion at that time.

8. Minutes of Working Group Meeting #4 (November 2, 2011)

Members were provided with and reviewed a draft set of minutes on the understanding that Claire would be trusted to clean up the minutes. The additional recommendation to be bolded.

8.1 Errors and omissions - none

8.2 Approval of minutes - Consensus

9. Adjournment

Mr. Rocco extended appreciation to the members of the ARC for their time and work on the committee.

Adjournment took place at 7:28 p.m.