

Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB)

West Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

Education Centre Board Room

December 13, 2011

Working Meeting #11

**Minutes**

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Committee Members**

*Chair –Superintendent Sharon Stephanian*

*Voting Members –Christopher Austin, Deborah Beedie, Phyllis Chasty, Em Del Sordo, Allyssa Horning, Bea Howell, Lori King, Deborah Knoll, Heather MacDonald, Sharon Ricci, Judy Shen, Boris Williams*

*Non-Voting Members – Gudrun Anderson, Paul Barwinski, Judith Bishop, Jessica Brennan, Kryz Croxall, Rick Hart, Alex Johnstone, John Laverty, Maria Rikic-McCarthy, Virginia McCulloch, Laurie Swackhammer, Anne Waldie*

**Regrets**

*Voting Members - Rosemary Bellefeuille*

*Non-Voting Members – Michelle DesRochers, Lloyd Ferguson, Judy Langsner, Brian Lenart, Brian McHattie, Russ Powers, Dan Thomson*

**Resource Staff**

*Daniel Del Bianco, Don Hall, Jim Wibberley, Robert Fex*

**Recording Secretary**

*Tracy McKillop*

**1.0 Call to Order**

Superintendent Stephanian welcomed everyone to the eleventh working group meeting.

**2.0 Agenda** <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/West-ARC-Agenda-December-13th.pdf>

**2.1 Additions and Deletions** – There were no changes.

**2.2 Approval of the Agenda** – The agenda was approved by consensus.

### **3.0 ARC Updates**

There was nothing to report because there have been no meetings since last Thursday. The presentation from the West ARC last week has been distributed to the South ARC as correspondence.

### **4.0 Minutes of the Meeting of December 8, 2011**

**4.1 Errors or Omissions** – There were no changes made to the minutes.

**4.2 Approval of the Minutes** – The minutes were approved by consensus.

### **4.3. Business Arising from the Minutes**

#### **4.3.1. Ancaster HS, rightsizing and new school information**

Mr. Hall and Mr. Del Bianco put together a presentation for the three requests that came forward at last week's meeting.

To view the presentation please click on the following link: [http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/WestARC\\_WG11\\_Dec\\_13\\_2011.pdf](http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/WestARC_WG11_Dec_13_2011.pdf)

### **Ancaster West Wing Review – Revisit Capital Planning Implications**

#### **Assumption/ Clarification**

- Assumes that the Auditorium structure allows for retention after demolition of the remaining building structure.
- Assumes that the existing Shop / Tech Rooms (x2) structure allows for retention after demolition of the remaining building structure.
- After demolition the facility will require the construction of the following elements:
  - New Gymnasium
  - New Lobby / Entrance to school, Gymnasium and Auditorium
  - New Building Plant services (Boiler, A/C) to service both new and existing structures as well as the existing Recreation Centre.

#### **Questions:**

C. We would lose all of those classroom spaces and there is no money in here for the East Wing.

Q. How would they be joined to the rest of the school?

A. The tunnel that connects the east and west wing would remain and we would integrate this in the construction.

### **Ancaster High – New School on the Existing Site**

Planning Related Information:

#### Area Calculations:

Proposed Square Footage = 135,737 sq. ft. (utilizing MOE Planning template for 1000 student pupil population)

#### Site Constraints:

- The plan attached indicates a severance in which 20 acres of the existing site would be retained for a new school. This could be potentially less, should the existing recreation centre be relocated.
- The plan attached indicates a severance in which the remaining 23 acres of the existing site would be surplus and could be sold to fund the proposed new school
- The City of Hamilton existing Recreation Centre could potentially remain on the site, but would require new plant infrastructure for heating and electrical provision.

#### Questions:

Q. The recreation centre would be a stand alone facility?

A. We were simply looking at what would be the most effective way to build on the site. It could be built and tied into the existing Recreation Centre.

Q. If the West Wing was demolished could we build it that way?

A. Yes we would have to move students and accommodate them and it could increase the costs.

Q. Why would it increase costs?

A. If we were integrating the new school with the Recreation Centre it would be costly because of electrical and mechanical adjustments. It will be more expensive but it may not be a great deal more expensive and the Recreation Centre would still need to remain open and working.

Q. What are the benefits of having a new school versus a renovated school? We could make the new school state of the art designed to work with the new programming. It would be the right size school, complement the programming and be state of the art.

A. A member stated that if the current east wing were to be retained the science labs are inadequate and are dismal. They are not what we would like to see for future programming.

Q. Under the pool is that our land or City land.

A. I can't answer that right now because that would be speculating. In some cases the Board owns the land and in other cases the City owns the land. I would have to check into that.

### **Ancaster High – New School on the Meadowlands Site**

#### **Planning Related Information:**

#### Area Calculations:

Proposed Square Footage = 135,737 sq. ft. (utilizing MOE Planning template for 1000 student pupil population)

#### Site Constraints:

- The plan attached indicates a general site location within the Meadowlands area that would be required to be purchased.
- The existing 43 acre Ancaster High site could be sold in order to finance the purchase of the new site

- Discussions with the City of Hamilton would need to be undertaken to discuss the need to:

- i) Retain the existing recreation centre on the existing Ancaster High site, or
- ii) Build a new recreation centre on the new school site.

#### Questions:

There were no questions.

#### **4.3.2. Absentee Voting**

Mr. Wibberley shared that there is nothing in the Terms of Reference that permits absentee voting. He feels that it would be inappropriate and from a practical point of view the members would not know what the motion on the floor is.

A member shared that under the Policy section (4.4.) it supports what Mr. Wibberley said when a vote is required only the voting members present are permitted to cast a vote.

**4.3.3. Other** – There were no other questions.

### **5.0 Accommodation Options**

#### **5.1 Review of Decisions and Options**

The Chair shared that at the last meeting the Committee decided to finalize other recommendations regarding the Dundas area and then work towards a recommendation for Ancaster.

We finished with a decision to recommend to the Board of Trustees the closure of both Parkside and Highland and the construction of a new school on the Highland site.

#### **5.2 Full Committee Discussion and Decisions**

##### **5.2.1. Dundas Plan B**

The Chair shared that the Committee could determine as a group if they support a plan B and if yes then what will a plan B look like.

Trustee Brennan wondered if Plan “B” means Diana Kenel’s Plan “B” that came through as correspondence or does it just mean that we consider a plan “B” not necessarily Diana’s proposal. The group felt that plan “B” does not mean Diana Kenel’s Plan “B”.

The floor was opened for discussion and the Committee shared their opinions on having a Plan “B”. Some members felt that they need a strong Plan “A” and if rejected they would like to know why it was rejected. Others felt that the Trustees have heard a lot of what has been said at the meetings as well as at the Public meetings. There was good group discussion and sharing of ideas from the members of the ARC. There were a few members who were in favour of having a Plan “B.”

If the Ministry does not support the business case then it will come back to the Board of Trustees and we would seek rationale as to why or what concessions are required and staff could be directed to have another run at it.

A member felt that it was not necessarily to have a plan "B"; however, they could make recommendations that they would like to see if Plan "A" does not go forward.

Q. Is this a possibility?

A. Yes you could put it as a footnote and it would provide some direction to the Board of Trustees. It might be a challenge to present this at a Community meeting though...having a Plan "A" with a footnote.

Q. What are the other ARC's doing?

A. The North ARC is just going forward with one option and the South ARC is still working through their options.

Mr. Del Bianco stated that an alternate option would be required if the Board's first choice not going to get funded. The Board of Trustees have an appetite for change and we know this because we have an ARC in place to deal with the under utilization.

***A motion was put forward by Sharon Ricci to not have a plan B. There was not consensus. A vote was taken to not have a plan "B" - 8 in favour and 4 against – MOTION CARRIED.***

Q. If the Ministry says that there is no funding for a new school (if the Board of Trustees adopts the ARC decision) does that mean that the Board of Trustees would accept the staff recommendation?

A. Mr. Wibberley shared that it is not as simple as that. They would need to consider other options to meet the needs of the Community and that may or may not be the staff recommendation.

Q. So is it better if we have a clear Plan "A" and if Staff has an enlightened Plan "B" could we go with that. Has Staff changed their recommendation?

A. Mr. Del Bianco shared that Staff recommendation did not involve the building of a new school and with the closure of just two schools he was not sure that the Committee would receive funding for a new school. He stated that to his knowledge he has not heard of any changes to the original recommendation.

Ministry Policy states that unless there are extraordinary circumstances that there is a five year waiting period before considering another ARC. The ARC Report and a Staff Report will be presented to the Board of Trustees on the same evening. Members of the public will have an opportunity to make the presentation to the Board of Trustees and then there is a minimum of 60 days before any decision is made. The Trustees receive the reports as well as all of the appendices that the ARC received (all handouts in the binders).

Rick Hart shared how he has heard this discussion and he felt that if a Plan "A" is not accepted that the Trustees are well read with all of the information and can make a Plan "B" option.

This spurred on further discussion with the group.

Q. Will the Trustees still be in their position in their term?

A. Mr. Wibberley shared that they are only in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the 4 year term.

Trustee Brennan shared that there will be discussion amongst the Board of Trustees on the decisions to be made. We do receive the information from the ARC and we will receive correspondence and phone calls as well as hear delegations which will educate all of the Trustees.

A member of the Committee questioned the other members who voted again a plan “B” and asked if they are happy to not have a footnote in the recommendation.

Q. Can there be dialogue between the ARC and the Board of Trustees if the new school is turned down. Is this in the Terms of Reference?

A. Mr. Wibberley shared that there are not provisions for post-ARC discussions with the committee.

There was concern that this is not in the Terms of Reference.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that the Terms of Reference does not make provision for post ARC or outside of the ARC if the original recommendation does not realize.

A member shared that we could express our concerns, guiding principles and values within the report and this would inform the Board of Trustees of our position.

Mr. Wibberley informed the committee that the Terms of Reference requires that the report to the Board include the wishes of the ARC; however, there is nothing for post ARC.

***A motion was put forward that the final report to Trustees will include the components of what a school in Dundas should have.***

The Committee members continued to share their perspectives.

***There was not consensus and the vote resulted with 11 in favour and one abstention so the motion carried.***

### **5.2.2 Ancaster High School Option**

Heather MacDonald shared that she is not comfortable with the demolishing of the west wing and if you read the correspondence you will understand why. <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Ramifications-of-East-Wing-Demolition-2.pdf>

<http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/West-ARC-Letter-from-the-Ancaster-High-Staff.pdf>

She is in favour of building on the existing site. The current location with its many amenities (which she listed) is a great asset to the current school. In the Meadowlands you will not have all of those facilities and the school would only be surrounded by homes. The Community will not be happy losing that site as well as the land. If they could give up part of that land and get a new school it would be a win all around for the community, school and students.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that questions will arise as to what will happen to the other half of that site.

The Committee discussed the Ancaster options. The only concern is that the current site is geographically challenging and the area is not very accessible by public transit. Some felt that the Meadowlands are more easily accessible and it could draw from the mountain area as well.

Heather MacDonald shared that the public transit is considering extending bussing to the current area and school bussing will be the same whether it is on the current site or in the Meadowlands.

There was concern about putting forth a proposal for two new schools with the closure of two schools.

The Committee continued to discuss the Ancaster options.

Sharon Ricci shared that HWDSB could potentially be closing nine schools and building four new schools. She believes that to be a pretty strong recommendation.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that once decisions have been made a complete package will go forward to the Ministry as a system wide presentation.

Trustee Johnstone stated that she understood the land in the Meadowlands would be near Redeemer College and there is HSR bussing in that area.

Rick Hart shared his perceptions of what the ARC is asking for. We are asking for four new schools which is close to half of what the Province has available for funding new schools province wide. Are we being reasonable in our request? He asked the Committee to consider this when they are considering their options.

***Heather MacDonald put a motion forward as a second recommendation that a new school of an appropriate size be built on the existing Ancaster High School site.***

***There was not consensus. A vote took place resulting in 5 in favour, 4 opposed and 3 abstentions so the motion carried.***

Mr. Del Bianco reminded the Committee that the first level is the Board of Trustees. They will ultimately be making the final recommendation to the Ministry.

### **5.3 Program Placement Options**

There was discussion around program placement. The Committee shared some changes that were required.

Trustee Bishop wondered why some of the programs were not added to Westdale since it is a very accessible school. Only Tier 2 had been added and since this is such an accessible school should it not house more programs.

Superintendent Croxall shared that it is extremely full at the moment and given the capacity of the building it may not be wise to add more programming. This could change if French Immersion is housed in another school as well as Westdale. It does not preclude having future programs at Westdale; however, at the moment there is not a lot of room for expansion.

Westdale Principal Virginia McCulloch shared that they have applied to have a horticulture SHSM at Westdale. Media and digital arts programs are very vibrant at Westdale and they are looking at how to shift this into a SHSM.

Superintendent Lavery shared that there is a Tier 3 in the cluster; however, they do not have the enrolment to have more than one Tier 3 program in another school. This would be readdressed if more students required Tier 3 programming.

Strive West is a system alternative program and is currently being discussed for placement by the Staff.

Sharon Ricci felt that a great continuation would be to move Quest to Westdale so that it is accessible. Upper and lower city kids don't have access to Dundas to participate in the Quest program. Paul Barwinski shared that a natural flow would be to go from Ryerson to Westdale. There was not enough enrolment at Parkside so the program did not go forward.

It was noted that it would make sense to see the Quest program move to Westdale.

Virginia McCulloch spoke of the Decca program and the fact that it is more club based at Westdale. She spoke of the Horticulture program and the space limits that Westdale is encountering.

The Principals spoke of the programs that are currently at the schools and informed the Committee of clubs, SHSMs and shared some of the grass roots specialized programs that some of the staff have developed within their schools e.g. Navy Seals, Eco challenge at Parkside.

There were some changes made to the programming chart from the input from the Committee members.

Trustee Johnstone asked if there was going to be a specialized soccer academy at Ancaster High.

Superintendent Lavery shared that there has been some discussion on having a specialized soccer program and they have looked at the Hillcrest Soccer program. They are considering a transitional program possibility at Ancaster High School.

Paul Barwinski spoke very highly of the Staff at Parkside and the many programs that they have initiated one of which is a Drama program.

Sharon Ricci spoke of the need to have more sports programs available at Westdale.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that these programs placements are based on the ARC recommendations. The people who have placed the programs have worked toward balancing the proposed programs as well as the existing programs. The Committee can make recommendations for changes if we don't like the placement.

Superintendent Kryz Croxall shared that we are working toward providing programs where they are needed and supported in the various clusters. Not all clusters support the same programming; however, the Board is working toward balancing the programs across the cluster. Each of the clusters is going to look different based on the needs, desires and enrolment of the students.



Heather MacDonald raised the question of a specialized programming for autistic students and spoke of the social communication classroom pilot. Superintendent Krys Croxall shared that it is under Tier 2 and they are hoping to have that for next year.

Superintendent Krys Croxall also shared that there is a possibility to have a self paced option in other areas and this is currently being discussed. It is a system program and an entity unto itself. Currently Westdale is the only secondary French Immersion program being offered.

**The Chair highlighted some of the recommended program additions that were requested by the Committee. The Chair read the changes to the group and there was approval on the program strategy by consensus.**

Heather MacDonald made a motion to extend the meeting until 9:30. This was passed by consensus.

#### **5.4 Implementation and Timelines** – Mr. Del Bianco

If a new school were to open that would happen in 2015 so implementation would be keep schools open until June 2015 and the new schools would open in September 2015. This would be the target subject to Ministry approval and weather conditions. 18 to 24 months for construction of a new school would be required.

What is Ministry timelines?

The Board of Trustees will submit the business case after the Board of Trustees approval and ideally we would like to hear back from them by the fall. There is no clear cut response time.

If we don't get a new school the timelines could change drastically depending on the extent of the renovations they could be done over one or two summers.

Trustee Johnstone shared that with Waterdown they heard back quickly but with Winona they heard back after one year. The Ministry has a new process so perhaps we would hear a response more quickly.

Mr. Hall shared that the validity of the business case can affect the timelines. He stated that the new schools/renovations are filed as capital expenses just like all business cases. Growth schools take priority at the moment. The earliest that we should target a new school would be September 2015.

***A motion was put forward that the existing schools that have been identified for closure will remain open until new schools have been built. There was consensus on this.***

#### **5.5 Other**

Transportation – the schools are being constructed on existing sites so transportation for Ancaster will remain the same. This applies to Highland as well. The Parkside students would need to be bussed to Highland. Mr. Del Bianco will identify which students, based on the proposed boundaries, will require bussing.

## **6.0 Correspondence**

Mr. Hall spoke to the letter from Diana Kenel. Mr. Hall shared that the presentation last week was taking what was proposed for the Highland site and moving that to the Parkside site. It was not as per Ms. Kenel's letter. He asked the Committee what they would like him to do. The floor was opened for discussion.

The Committee shared their opinions. Deborah Beedie asked if it changed anyone's opinion. The group did not require Mr. Hall to rework the presentation and the Committee felt that it was not necessary.

## **7.0 Other Business**

Timelines Chart - Mr. Wibberley stated that there is a decrease in interest in the December 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. The January 9<sup>th</sup> meeting has some challenges. The public meeting is on the 12<sup>th</sup>; however, no senior staff will be available on the 12<sup>th</sup> so that could be a challenge. The 17<sup>th</sup> is a scheduled meeting so that could become the public meeting. Mr. Del Bianco shared that we need to have a working group meeting prior to the public meeting. We could make the 12<sup>th</sup> meeting a working group meeting.

### **There was consensus on the revised dates:**

- Deletion of the December 20<sup>th</sup> working group meeting.
- Deletion of the January 9<sup>th</sup> working group meeting.
- January 12, 2012 is a working group meeting.
- The public meeting will be on Jan 17, 2012
- The final working group meeting will be scheduled for the January 25, 2012.

Trustee Bishop shared that the 24<sup>th</sup> of January is the presentation of the King George ARC Committee.

**8.0 Adjournment** - The meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m.