

**Central Mountain Accommodation Review Committee
Working Group Meeting # 4
Tuesday, November 12, 2013
6:00 p.m.**

**Franklin Road Elementary School
500 Franklin Road, Hamilton, ON**

Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members

Chair - Michael Prendergast

Voting Members - Diana Asrani, Amber Bourque, Candice Campbell, Marney Campbell, Marj Howden, Barbara Jalsevac, Jennifer Lockhart, Kathy Long, Denise McCafferty, Jamie McLean, Sharon Miller, Robert Nixon, Candice Romaker, Janeen Schaeffer, Margaret Toth, Lourie Vanderzyden, Laurie Walowina

Non-Voting Members - Linda Astle, Julie Beattie, Maria Carbone, Biljana Arsovic Filice, Colin Hazell, Lillian Orban, Jennifer Robertson-Heath, Nanci-Jane Simpson, Doug Trimble

Regrets

Voting Members - Jenn Clarke, Philip Erwood, Leanne Friesen, Adam Hinks, Patricia Mousseau

Non-Voting Members - Nil

Resource Staff

Ian Hopkins, Ellen Warling

Recording Secretary

Kathy Forde

Public - 6 public attendees present - Linden Park (1), Queensdale (4), Ridgemount (1),

1. Call to Order

Michael Prendergast called the meeting to order.

2. Agenda

2.1 Additions/Deletions

Additions:

- Item 3.3. Dates of ARC Process
- Item 3.4 Timelines of Recommendations

2.2 Approval of Agenda

With two items added as noted above, approved by consensus by a show of hands.

3. Minutes from Working Group Meeting # 3

3.1 Clarification

Nil

3.2 Approval of Minutes

Approved by consensus by a show of hands.

3.3 Dates of ARC Process

Members were concerned that the committee might not be prepared for presenting options at Public Meeting #3 so wanted to review dates. Ian Hopkins reviewed the calendar of key dates. From October 08, 2013, the date of the first Public Meeting, there is a window of 90 to 120 days to complete and deliver the report so January 21, 2014 is the earliest date and February 20, 2014 is the latest date, which provides some flexibility. Delivery date of the final report is currently projected for January 31, 2014. If the report is delivered January 31, 2014, staff then has 30 days to create a report. There is then a 60-day window to present both staff and the committee's option and an opportunity for public delegations. Holiday dates are not included in the count as per Ministry guidelines. After the 60 days, Trustees move forward on making a decision.

3.4 Timelines of Recommendations

Ian Hopkins noted that a Working Group meeting could be added or switched with a Public Meeting to accommodate the needs and comfort level of the committee moving forward. Members agreed unanimously by a show of hands to switch December 03 from Public Meeting # 3 to Working Group Meeting # 6 and December 10 from Working Group Meeting # 6 to Public Meeting # 3. This change in schedule will provide committee members with an extra meeting prior to presenting option(s) at Public Meeting # 3 as required. Locations will need to be confirmed and schedule updated. New dates will be posted to the website and provided to Corporate Communications.

DECISION: Switch December 03 and December 10 meeting dates

ACTION: Confirm meeting locations / update schedule

Michael Prendergast added that in the recommendation(s) developed, the committee can create timelines that are considered most effective for implementation. Trustees however may merge various parts of recommendations and will decide on whether the timelines are appropriate. Information is provided for Trustees to make an informed decision.

4. Data Requests

4.1 Past Accommodation Reviews

Ian Hopkins provided an outline of past accommodation reviews to show how initial staff options evolved through the review process to Trustee decisions. The key takeaway is that the staff option does change and can change with community input. The process includes public voice.

Ellen Warling noted that other ARCS have started to formulate some questions and answers to provide clarification on common concerns. Working Groups will then review to determine what gets posted to the website. Members were invited to send in any questions relevant to the review process for Central Mountain.

5. Public Meeting # 2

5.1 Public Feedback

Michael Prendergast indicated that the raw data provided from Public Meeting # 2 was intended for review prior to the meeting. The feedback sheets focused on two questions: Question 1: Do the presented key themes make sense to the group? What is not there that is important for us to know? Question 2: In creating an ideal elementary learning facility, what considerations do you feel are most important? Members felt acquainted with the feedback and expressed no concerns so agreed to move forward to the next agenda item.

6. Accommodation Options

6.1 Discussion and Development

Michael Prendergast reminded members that as recommendations are developed, it will be important to refer to the Reference Criteria (binders - Tab B.5), which was reviewed. New criteria can be added if necessary based on group consensus. The recommendation developed will need details as support. Discussion focused on items considered important in the development of an option:

Student Impact

- School size and the combination of younger and older students (the J-8 model)
- Separate entrance wings should be considered for junior, primary and senior students
- Supervision is a concern so maybe a school size threshold of 350 might be better
- However, schools of 350 sometimes restricts the making of teams and school trips
- Schools with larger populations (400+ kids) may prefer a balanced day schedule with two staggered nutrition and activity breaks
- A schedule must be carefully considered to ensure younger students are separated from older students

Programming

- One middle school would contain more students from grades 6 to 8 so would perhaps provide an advantage for offering programs at this level

JK-8 Model

- The board has determined that the JK-8 model would ideally work best - teachers can work together and better programming can be offered in a larger school (more resources, staff and program availability)
- The Board believes a school with 500-600 students provides a good learning environment with approximately two to three classes per grade
- Opportunities for leadership and for developing relationships provided
- Senior students get involved in art room programs, lunch programs, announcements, etc.
- JK-5 and middle schools also allow opportunities for leadership
- Students responsible for their siblings are at the same school
- Small schools can be difficult for supervision due to union stipulations
- More teachers in larger schools means more supervision is available
- Playgrounds are divided and supervised in a very structured schedule
- Scheduling of gym time is a concern in a larger school - need to ensure there is adequate gyms and gym times available - gyms may need to be added within the options developed
- Other models can be considered with the options developed

Transportation

- Walking is better
- All students will have sufficient activity at school and can incorporate activity on weekends
- Concern about congestion and more vehicles on the road
- Appropriate signage needed for safety
- Kids will have to get to schools in different ways
- Student safety is a priority - crossing guards will be added as needed - there are no restrictions
- Lights should also be installed as needed (in consultation with the City)
- Students at a distance (kindergarten 1.0 kms / elementary 1.6 kms) are provided with yellow school bus transportation - distance is calculated using a Hamilton Wentworth Student Transportation application - some students may be transported by taxi as part of the gifted program or as required.

Greenspace

- Schools preferably on a 6-acre site but may not be possible on existing school sites - this would be a consideration for new builds - property size is included on the school profiles

Regarding process for the disposition (sale) of school property, initially the public is informed and then Ministry guidelines are followed offering the property first to certain preferred government agencies before a property can be offered for sale on the open market. It is approximately a one-year process. Since the Board would not want to maintain a building that will be up for sale and a vacant building is prone to vandalism, any recommendations developed may want to stipulate that any properties for disposition start at phase one of the board's property disposition protocol

immediately. Any proceeds from sales would go back to the board's capital account to be reinvested into infrastructure.

Members were satisfied with discussions and concurred to move forward on developing a recommendation. Consensus by a show of hands to move forward on developing a recommendation.

DECISION: Move forward on developing a recommendation

6.2 Alternate Option Discussion Handout

Sixteen alternate options sent to Ian Hopkins for consideration were reviewed as a starting point for developing a recommendation. One option was reviewed as an example. With information missing it would be difficult for members to make an informed decision. However, members could build upon a suggested option or take parts of various options to formulate a recommendation. In terms of changes, it was noted that a renovation would be completed faster than a rebuild. Costs and funding will need to be considered including money from disposition (sale of Board property) and from other sources. Timelines should also be considered for additions (approximately one year duration depending on how extensive).

Members asked if the Hill Park property, Jerome site or any other vacant Board property can be considered for an elementary school. Ellen Warling noted that the Jerome site has already been declared surplus and the process has started so cannot be considered. Hill Park property may be a consideration. No other Board properties within this ARC geography are vacant. Status of the recreation centre owned by the city and adjacent to Hill Park will be also be verified through Ellen Warling.

ACTION: Verify status of potential properties

With the seven Reference Criteria (binders - Tab B.5) in mind, committee members formed breakout groups to review the options.

Breakout Group Feedback

- Close George L. Armstrong and place students at Queensdale and Eastmount (K-5) - Franklin Road becomes a larger 6-8 school - Linden Park a K-5 school but accepting students from other schools - Ridgemount and Pauline Johnson remain the same and send students to Cardinal Heights for 6-8
- Transportation for older kids only
- Look at dividing George L. Armstrong
- Renovations

- Build new school on large Linden Park site near Hill Park then nobody has to be displaced - when new school completed, George L. Armstrong students go there too - Queensdale and Eastmount change from K-6 to K-5 schools.

Members were invited to provide any additional ideas for options to Ian Hopkins within the next week. Ian will work with some of the main ideas to create scenarios for further discussion at the next Working Group meeting.

7. Correspondence

Correspondence was provided for review. Ian Hopkins noted that only the cover page of the petition from the G.L. Armstrong community was provided as the remaining 130 pages include 2084 signatures. Full document will be posted online.

8. Next Steps

- Members should review and reflect on binder details for formulating a collective recommendation
- Any new options submitted to Ian Hopkins will be consolidated and sent back for review
- Contemplate how many options should be presented to the Board
- **Next Working Group Meeting # 5 - November 26 at Queensdale**
- **Working Group Meeting # 6 - December 03 - location to be determined**
- **Next Public Meeting # 3 - December 10 - location to be confirmed**

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

10. Tour of Linden Park

Tour of Linden Park to be rescheduled.

Handouts

- Agenda
- Presentation
- Draft Minutes - Working Group Meeting #3 - October 29, 2013
- Past Accommodation Reviews
- Public Meeting # 2 Feedback
- Alternate Options for Discussion
- Correspondence