

East Hamilton City 1 Accommodation Review Committee
Working Group Meeting # 7
Thursday, January 16, 2014
6:00 p.m.

Woodward Elementary School
575 Woodward Ave., Hamilton, ON

Minutes

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members

Chair - Peter Joshua

Voting Members - Abbie Boyko, Casey Eaton, Susan Fischer, Laurie Hazelton, Sandra Lindsay, Megan MacDonald, Brian McPhee, Barbara Mitchell, Brianna Okerstrom, Brandy Paul, Susan Pretula, Norma Rookwood, Carla Shewell, Jennifer Voth, Chris Weston, Shannon Weston, Tracie Wilson

Non-Voting Members - Lisa Barzetti, Sandra Constable, Joanna Crapsi-Cascioli, John Gris, Dan Ivankovic, Ray Mulholland, Todd White

Regrets

Voting Members - Samantha Prosser

Non-Voting Members - Tiz Penny, Elaine Pilgrim-Susi

Resource Staff

Rob Faulkner, Bob Fex, Peter Sovran

Recording Secretary

Kathy Forde

Public - Nil

1. Call to Order

Peter Joshua welcomed everyone to the meeting. Susan Pretula was welcomed back from her absence. The intent of the meeting was to determine the final selection of option/s and to prepare for the next Public Meeting. The schedule allows for an extra meeting if needed. Criteria, key themes for decision-making and key points for consideration were reviewed. To provide context, members reflected individually on their efforts and accomplishments to date. As a collective group, voting style for decision-making by way of secret ballot versus consensus was discussed as it is recognized not all members wish to make their views of support or non-support public. By a show of hands by consensus committee members preferred to use secret ballot when voting. Voting preference can be reconsidered if needed.

2. Agenda

2.1 Additions/Deletions

Item 5 was renumbered adding Item 5.1 Financial Summary and Item 5.2 Approach to Reviewing and Consolidating Information.

2.2 Approval of Agenda

Agenda was approved with changes as discussed by consensus by a show of hands.

3. Minutes from Working Group Meeting # 6

3.1 Clarification

Nil

3.2 Approval of Minutes

Minutes approved by consensus by a show of hands.

4. Correspondence

None received for review at Working Group Meeting # 7.

5. Review of ARC Options

5.1 Financial Summary

Bob Fex reviewed draft costing and methodology. The summary captures relevant factors to provide a tool that represents the dollar value to assist in evaluating options. Numbers were based on the options discussed to date. Details include funding allocations, renovations, renewal costs, proceeds of disposition for schools closed, administrative savings and operational savings. As options are refined the dollar value for various aspects may change. Handout provided.

5.2 Approach to Reviewing and Consolidating Information

Chris Weston provided a presentation in an attempt to simplify details from the vast amount of information that has been provided to date. Details focused on enrolment versus capacity, age profiles, population projections, renewal needs, mapping, 10-year cost projections, views on a new school and boundary changes. Since interpretation of trends and projections can vary, Chris believes the future population will increase rather than decrease. He projects an increase of 35 kids over one year which could be a considerable impact over ten years.

In regards to new builds, Peter Joshua noted new construction has occurred on the same sites as closures with little disruption to students (i.e. Queen Victoria, Dr. Davey, Cathy Wever, Prince of Wales) although not conducted through an ARC process. The proportion of school aged children are shared at approximately a 65/35 split between the HWDSB and HWCDSB – HWDSB absorbing the higher portion being the larger Board. Bob Fex noted that population statistics for Hamilton does not mean school populations go up equally among all schools. He also noted that the Ministry is examining the top-up funding.

5.3 Discussion

Peter Joshua reviewed the options developed: Option #1 (D); Option #2 (F); Option #3 (Modified Staff Option). Bob Fex reviewed the utilization charts as revised based on discussions from the last meeting. Option # 3 is essentially a modified Staff Option that includes changes in boundaries. If a new school is proposed, a new build would be for 550 students on the Viscount Montgomery site. Boundary changes can be recommended through the committee. There are boundary review processes and consultation that do occur outside of the ARC process.

- Members voted on their top three preferred options by secret ballot:

Option 1 (D) - without new school (10) [5] votes

Option 1 (D) - with new school (5) [1] votes

Option 2 (F) - without new school (8) [3] votes

Option 2 (F) - with new school (4) [1] votes

Option 3 (modified staff option) - without new school (4) [2] votes

Option 3 (modified staff option) - with new school (7) [3] votes

The first number (x) indicates preference between the three options. The second number [x] indicates the number of times the options was listed as the top choice.

- To further narrow down the three preferred options identified above, each member selected their preferred option(s) three times without ranking (16 voting members x 3 selections = 48). The greatest number of votes tallied would determine the most preferred option.

Option 1 (D) - without new school (15) votes

Option 2 (F) - without new school (11) votes

Option 3 (modified staff option) - with new school (22) votes

5.4 Refine Options/s

Further discussion was required to determine the option(s) going forward to the public. It was recognized that emotions are high. It is also important to present the option(s) as a collective voice and to ensure members can settle with the decisions made.

Comments

- There are some boundary changes within all options
- How many options should be presented without being overwhelming
- Perhaps all three options should be presented
- Should options be presented in random order or with a percentage value by votes
- Public feedback will again be gathered
- What happens if the public reaction is negative - do we start again or what happens
- Public voice is intended to influence decision-making on the options going forward

- Public presence may not provide equal representation among all schools involved
- Schools not suggested for closure are not represented at the meetings
- Public Meetings have circulated to allow for adequate and fair representation of all schools
- Regarding Option 3 with a new school, Ministry funding is not guaranteed but closures contribute to funding of a new build plus funding from the Board
- The committee needs to make its recommendation based on best thinking
- The last working group meeting will provide an opportunity following the public meeting to make any tweaks and final changes to the recommendation that will go forward
- In the end, the decision needs to be supported in a collective manner

Members concurred by a show of hands to present all three options at Public Meeting # 4 and to display percentage votes and rationale.

DECISION: Three options will be presented with percentage votes and rationale

6. Draft Accommodation Review Committee Report - Review and Discussion

The draft ARC Report was provided as a framework for the report that will go forward. Recommended options will need to be included then modified based on any further input following Public Meeting # 4. The report is currently a work in progress. Further detail will be required. The public will also have another opportunity to express concerns through delegations as options are being reviewed by trustees.

7. Next Steps - Public Meeting # 4 Preparation (January 28 at W.H. Ballard)

Peter Joshua will send out an email to solicit committee volunteers to present at Public Meeting # 4. The number of facilitators and laptops needs to be determined.

- **Working Group Meeting # 8 - Thursday January 30, 2014**

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Handouts

Agenda

Presentation

Draft Minutes - Working Group # 6

Financial Summary

Presentation - Information Summary by Committee Member

Options with Utilization Charts

Draft ARC Report