

**Central Mountain Accommodation Review Committee  
Working Group Meeting # 5  
Tuesday, November 26, 2013  
6:00 p.m.**

**Queensdale Elementary School  
67 Queensdale Avenue, Hamilton, ON**

**Minutes**

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Committee Members**

**Chair** - Michael Prendergast

**Voting Members** - Diana Asrani, Amber Bourque, Candice Campbell, Marney Campbell, Jenn Clarke, Philip Erwood, Leanne Friesen, Dianna Gamble, Adam Hinks, Marj Howden, Barbara Jalsevac, Jennifer Lockhart, Kathy Long, Denise McCafferty, Jamie McLean, Sharon Miller, Patricia Mousseau, Robert Nixon, Candice Romaker, Janeen Schaeffer, Margaret Toth, Lourie Vanderzyden, Laurie Walowina

**Non-Voting Members** - Linda Astle, Julie Beattie, Maria Carbone, , Colin Hazell, Jennifer Robertson-Heath, Nanci-Jane Simpson, Doug Trimble

**Regrets**

**Voting Members** - Nil

**Non-Voting Members** - Biljana Arsovic Filice, Lillian Orban,

**Resource Staff**

Ian Hopkins, Ellen Warling

**Recording Secretary**

Kathy Forde

**Public** - 18 public attendees present - George L. Armstrong (2); Linden Park (1); Queensdale (14); No School Affiliation (1)

**1. Call to Order**

Michael Prendergast welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. With respect to recent concern regarding displays of support at Queensdale, it was noted that any perceptions of bringing Queensdale students into the ARC process were misunderstood. It is recognized that the Queensdale community is passionate about their school as is common with other schools. There is no intent to silence student voice

or parent voice. Administration is responsible for ensuring students are focused on their studies. The role of non-voting committee members is to stay neutral throughout the process.

## 2. Agenda

### 2.1 Additions/Deletions

Item 5 will follow Item 6 as discussion from Item 6 may provide insight for Item 5.

### 2.2 Approval of Agenda

Approved by consensus by a show of hands.

## 3. Minutes from Working Group # 4

### 3.1 Clarification

In response to a question raised on Item 6.2, second paragraph, regarding availability of the Jerome site, Ellen Warling clarified the site has been declared surplus so is not available and cannot be reconsidered. Once a property has been declared surplus the status cannot change without a board motion.

### 3.2 Approval of Minutes

Approved by consensus by a show of hands.

## 4. Minutes from Public Meeting # 2

### 4.1 Clarification

Nil

### 4.2 Approval of Minutes

Approved by consensus by a show of hands.

## 5. Accommodation Options

### 5.1 Overview of Current Accommodation Options

Fifteen options have been prepared for review based on public feedback and on input from committee members. Duplicate ideas have been merged.

### 5.2 Discussion and Development

Ideas on how to proceed on the development of accommodation options were shared. To generate discussion, the following questions were raised. Comments are noted below.

#### **Question: How many options should be presented at the Public Meeting on December 10?**

- The number of options to be considered ranged from three to seven.
- It may be important to stay as close as possible to the guidelines suggested by the Board (i.e. JK-8 model) so that options presented to Trustees are considered in a more favourable way.
- Reference criteria needs to be considered.

- Timelines for the options developed should be stipulated.
- FDK will not impact options being developed as implementation will be at all schools by September 2014.
- New proposals if submitted can still be reviewed if received before the next Working Group meeting.
- If schools are closed and consolidated school capacity is at 95% there is no guarantee that the Ministry will fund a new school so alternative options will be needed to fall back on.
- In terms of construction timelines, Ellen Warling noted that if a decision is made in May 2014, a capital priorities submission can go forward by the end of October 2014 assuming the Ministry has a Capital Priorities submission in fall 2014. The Ministry then makes a decision around February or March 2015. If permission is granted to go ahead with construction, design and permits take time so actual construction would be targeted for an opening date of September 2017. If there are any site limitations, these will be identified as options are developed.
- Concerning life cycle, repairs were previously prohibitive when costs to replace with new outweighed the cost of renovating. In the mid-2000s, money was available to schools deemed prohibitive to repair but that term and that funding no longer exists.
- Regarding the Hill Park site as an option, Ellen Warling advised that the Hill Park site will officially close in June 2014 as a Secondary School, but phase one of the property disposition protocol has not yet started. The Hill Park site can be included within the elementary options because it stills belongs to HWDSB and has not been sold. However, using only a portion of the building or site would need to be investigated. No formal decision has been made on the sale of Hill Park. Proceeds from the sale of Hill Park will be used to support secondary transitions. Members should not assume Linden Park is impacted by Hill Park. Linden Park is on approximately five acres of land. Hill Park is on approximately eight acres. Separately, the City owns the recreation centre and the parkland.

**Question: What will our work look like over the next two weeks?**

Members formed breakout groups to review and discuss the 15 options developed with the intent to narrow down the options from 15 options to 10. One ballot was provided for each voting member to select up to 10 preferred options for further review. Ballots were collected and tallied by two voting members (Adam Hinks and Sharon Miller) as follows:

Option 1:	12 votes	Option 2:	14 votes
Option 3:	10 votes	Option 4:	4 votes
Option 5:	4 votes	Option 6:	13 votes
Option 7:	14 votes	Option 8:	13 votes
Option 9:	10 votes	Option 10:	5 votes
Option 11:	9 votes	Option 12:	5 votes
Option 13:	5 votes	Option 14:	4 votes
Option 15:	0 votes		

As a group, it was determined that options with 9 plus votes would be selected to move forward. As such, eight options (Options 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11) will move forward for further consideration. The eight options selected will remain with their original numbers. Should any new options be added, numbers will be assigned consecutively as option 16, 17, etc. Members reiterated that if funding for a new school is not available, an alternative backup plan or two will be needed. Members concurred on the eight options moving forward by consensus by a show of hands.

**DECISION: Eight options moving forward for further discussion**

Options moving forward were further discussed:

**Option 1**

- Numbers, boundaries and capacity to be considered if diverting children
- Not stating any criteria stipulated by the Board stipulates
- Grades are not changing
- No timelines
- No backup plan if funding does not exist
- Moving students to a new K-8 school is a big transition
- Reference to Hill Park site but Board's intention for Hill Park site unknown
- Need back up plan (all options)

**Option 2**

- Timelines need to be adjusted
- More clarity needed
- If a pre-existing structure is in place then why add additions
- Great but funding could be an issue due to extent of renovations identified
- Seem to be building a new school considering the many renovations identified
- Need back up plan (all options)

**Option 3**

- Does not require a new build
- Similar to board option except Armstrong splits
- School boundary should be done on a four-lane road - less likely to split friends who are probably split by a two-way road only
- Grades 6, 7, 8 students to go to Franklin Road (yes)
- Five schools are under 90% capacity
- Need back up plan (all options)

**Option 6**

- Very similar to staff option - only difference is not building a new school - seems like a backup plan to the staff option
- Pupil numbers might change due to grade configuration
- Staff option intends to use Pauline Johnson as a transition school
- Need back up plan (all options)

#### Option 7

- Does not split up Eastmount
- Cardinal Heights and Armstrong at low capacity
- Splits Linden boundaries
- No new school
- Same boundaries for Ridgemount
- Need back up plan (all options)

#### Option 8

- Closing two schools that are at capacity
- Four areas affected with boundary changes
- Two schools under capacity
- Additions to three schools
- Pauline Johnson would have portables only temporarily
- The idea of using Hill Park as the transition school would need to be submitted as a new option
- Need back up plan (all options)

#### Option 9

- Increased enrolment numbers and space for Queensdale to be verified if accommodating FDK, resource classrooms and additional grades 6, 7, 8 students. Ian will verify numbers.
- Some students will need to transition twice
- Grade organization will allow for multiple classes
- Need back up plan (all options)

#### Option 11

- Timeline to be determined
- Feasibility for building a new school on existing Armstrong site while current school is occupied by students is in question - not sure if this is practical
- The number of transitions that students need to make before arriving at their final destination to be considered
- Must also consider the impact of any changes on future students
- For information, Ministry guidelines indicate kindergarten classroom may contain up to 30 students - once numbers reach 16 a teacher and ECE are assigned to the classroom - if numbers exceed 30 students another class is required. The standard space for FDK classrooms is 950 sq



ft, which is bigger than the average classroom. Maximum space is encouraged where possible. For example, Pauline Johnson is using two regular school classes with partitions to accommodate 30 FDK students in one class. The setup is creative and works well.

- Need back up plan (all options)

Discussions also focused on the potential for an extension on the timeline for any changes and/or implementation to occur September 2015 at the earliest on all options. A September 2015 date would alleviate concerns. Changes starting June 2014 would not allow enough time to consider staffing and staff impacts. Schools amalgamation should be in a healthy manner with reasonable timelines. However, it was also noted that changes earlier than September 2015 may save money and that timelines should not be prolonged. Timelines will need to be determined for each option so that timelines do not change twice. Timelines will need to be specified for each option presented to the public. The public can provide feedback on the timelines. Members agreed by consensus by a show of hands to specify timelines in the options that are presented to the public in order to get feedback on each option.

**DECISION: Timeline will be identified for each option presented to the public**

Any additional options can be submitted to Ian Hopkins by November 29<sup>th</sup> - 12:00 noon.

## 6. Public Meeting # 3 Discussion - December 10<sup>th</sup>

### 6.1 Location

Potential locations central to the ARC and with sufficient space were discussed. Ideas varied between Queensdale, Ridgemount, George L. Armstrong, Mountain, Sir Allan MacNab, Westmount and Hill Park. Some gyms require indoor footwear only. Members considered Hill Park to be the most suitable location. Bus tickets are available upon request if needed. Members agreed to Hill Park as the meeting location by consensus by a show of hands.

**DECISION: Public Meeting # 3 will take place at Hill Park**

### 6.2 Format of Meeting

Twenty-one responses were received concerning meeting format. Ideas were shared on how the meeting should run. As committee representatives, members recognized they have an obligation to the community. The meeting needs to be purposeful and comfortable. Since the last public meeting was abruptly interrupted, guidelines on meeting norms will need to be shared. It will be important to ensure the public can express themselves and feel they have been heard in an organized manner. However, to avoid potential conflict, security should perhaps be considered. The meeting will start in the auditorium with opening remarks and presentation of options, move into the cafeteria for a carousal where attendees can view options and provide comments then return to the auditorium for a brief question and answer session. A carousal session will provide an opportunity to gather feedback on the pros and cons of the options presented. Question sheets can also be used for

members to collect feedback during this time. Members agreed to the meeting format by consensus by a show of hands.

**DECISION: Meeting format confirmed**

**7. Correspondence**

Correspondence provided for information and consideration.

**8. Next Steps**

- Continue development of options
- **Next Working Group Meeting # 6 - December 03, 2013 at Ridgemount Elementary School**
- **Next Public Meeting # 3 - December 10, 2013 6:00-9:00 pm @ Hill Park Secondary School**

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

**Handouts**

- Agenda
- Presentation
- Draft Minutes - Working Group Meeting # 4
- Draft Minutes - Public Meeting # 2
- Accommodation Options
- Correspondence
- Membership Update (Binder - Tab C)