



**Accommodation Review – Ancaster
Working Group Meeting # 6
Ancaster Sr., 295 Nakoma Rd.
March 21, 2017
Minutes**

Attendance

Committee Members: Gint Murphy, Stephen Obermeyer, Jennifer Kershaw, Henry Kolodziej, Sarah Hopen, Elizabeth Crawford, Max Brett, Michael Bell

Committee Member Regrets:

HWDSB Resource Staff: Superintendent Bill Torrens/Chair, Ian Hopkins, Laura Subonovich, John Gris, Kelly Sweeting, Tammy McLaughlin, Jenny Seto-Vanderlip, Jackie Kurtz

Trustees: Greg Van Geffen

Public: Rousseau (1), Queens Rangers (1)

Media: Richard Leitner

Recording Secretary: Sue Phillips

Bill Torrens welcomed and thanked the group for their time and commitment on behalf of senior management and trustees noting that the committee has the opportunity to work on behalf of individual school communities as well as the wider community.

1. Standing Items – Ian Hopkins

- a. Confirmation of Working Group Meeting #5 Minutes. Approved with revisions.
- b. Confirmation of Public Meeting #2 Minutes. Approved with revisions. Ian noted that the agenda packages includes a summary of the public meeting feedback. Raw data is available as well and will be attached to the minutes when posted. It was noted that tallies were used in the collection of some feedback. If the committee wants the board to go back and add tallies we can do that. We can update the raw data sheet after reviewing.
- c. Correspondence – correspondence was reviewed. Ian noted there were two additional pieces provided at start of the meeting to include with correspondence discussion.
- Q. Regarding the letter from the Ministry – in support of rural schools. Was there any contact with our co-terminus board when the board was planning the initial option?
A. We do keep in touch with them but this is a different review area so they've done a review downtown.
- Q. If the Ministry letter had come in October rather than March would it have changed the process in any way?
A. The accommodation reviews were approved in June; this letter would not have changed the process if dated in October.

Comment. This letter reminds us of the importance of communities and the impact that school closures have on communities. We are trying to build communities. Often rural schools represent the heart of a small town.

- Q. I am not familiar with the information provided by the Rural School Advisory Committee (RSAC). Where did this come from?
A. Elizabeth Crawford reviewed the information from RSAC for the group along with addressing some support received around Option 1. We are looking to the farms, who are interested in the learning aspect. Would it be of interest to the board to introduce a SHSM on Agriculture? The letters of support show there are farms very interested in participating in this.



Mike Bell reviewed Fessenden Survey results – 42 responses were received to a six-question survey over two days. Question one asked if they were satisfied with the HWDSB Initial Option. 35% responded yes, 65% responded no. Mike thanked the group for including the results in the meeting.

Jennifer Kershaw reviewed a proposal presented as correspondence at the meeting: Proposal – Combination of Initial Option and Committee Option 2 – with concept as outlined below. Discussion took place on the proposal.

- Fessenden and Queen's Rangers close
- ASPS gets an addition and renovations. K-8, dual track school
- Rousseau gets a new building. K-8, dual track school. (Amended in meeting)
- CH Bray gets a new building

Q. What would happen to Fessenden if it closed?

A. If Fessenden were to close it could possibly be deemed surplus and then put through the process off 444 if that is what the Trustees decided.

444 is the disposition of property regulation that HWDSB follows when selling surplus property. The first step is to declare the property surplus. ASPS / Fessenden property would have to be severed. The next step is to offer the property to preferred agents (other school boards, levels of government, health networks, colleges, and universities in the area). If no one in that group wants the property it then would go up for sale on the open market.

Q. Could the community come together and approach the city via the local councillor with a petition on different uses for the land?

A. That could be brought to the councillor's attention. There are many steps that must happen before the sale of the property. Firstly, Trustees would have to approve the decision, funding approvals for all the projects and finally construction. It could potentially mean five-six years for this to happen.

2. Discussion of Public Meeting #2 Feedback

Ian asked for additional ideas and concepts for the Interim Report. The committee agreed to wait until the review of the Interim Report on the agenda to discuss additional ideas.

3. Interim Report

Ian reviewed the report that will go to trustees – as a monitoring item on April 10, 2017. Nothing will be approved from that report. It is an update piece. There will be a staff recommendation (not included here). Staff's best thinking at this time is continuing to recommend the initial option except with a re-build at Rousseau. The document we present will include links to the various pieces in our binders. Bill Torrens pointed out that the staff recommendation includes our best thinking at this point.

Ian explained the staff recommendation process. It is based on the guidelines approved by the Trustees as well as the criteria for the business case (as outlined at the public meeting).

The Interim Report was reviewed with individuals stating their preferred options. Discussion and revisions took place.

4. Next Steps

Ian will update the report and send it electronically to the committee with a deadline for responses of March 29, 2017. The committee agreed.

Correspondence – now that the committee meetings are over the correspondence will be made available through the Accommodation Review webpage so everyone can stay up to date.

Delegation night will take place on May 8 2017. Information about the delegation process will be coming out in April on how to arrange a delegation presentation.



Q. Will there be a presentation of the options on delegation night or is it assumed people have that information?

A. It is assumed people are aware of the options.

Q. Is the committee expected to be there?

A. No, basically your role at this point is complete, however, all are welcome to attend.

Ian reviewed the process regarding Board meetings and final Trustee approval which would happen in early June with the proposal to the ministry in July, 2017.

Bill Torrens thanked the principals and committee for their time and work. There are several ways to stay connected to this process. You are welcome to contact me if you have further questions or concerns you are welcome to contact me.

Greg Van Geffen – thank you for your work – which has been excellent. The delegation night is an important process. This offers trustees the opportunity to ask questions about the presentation. Thank you.

5. Working Group #6 Minutes

Minutes from this meeting will be forwarded electronically for revisions from committee if required with a deadline of March 29, 2017. Following approval they will be posted online the next day.

Adjournment: 8:30 p.m.