

Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB)

South Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

Education Centre Board Room

December 14, 2011

Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members

Chair - Scott Sincerbox

Voting Members - Bill Barrett, Beverly Bressette, Jackie Brown, Alexandra Butty, Ken Durkacz, Margaret Eagle, Alexandra Ewing, Kim General, Al Pierce, Anne Pollard, Cheryl Poot, John Whitwell

Non-Voting Members - Wanda Bielak, Gary Deveau, Patrick Elliott, Angela Ferguson, Manny Figueiredo, Randy Gallant, Mag Gardner, Brian Greig, Wes Hicks, Peter Joshua, Deb Jukes, Renee Majic, Joanna Maull, John Miholics, Lillian Orban,

Regrets

Voting Members - Derek Hambly, Susan Pretula

Non-Voting Members - Donna Clappison, Scott Duvall, Tom Jackson, Laura Peddle, Kevin Robinson, Paul Vukosa, Terry Whitehead

Resource Staff

Daniel Del Bianco, Jim Wibberley, Ian Hopkins, Robert Fex

Recording Secretary

Tracy McKillop

1.0 Call to Order – Scott Sincerbox

Superintendent Scott Sincerbox welcomed everyone to the fifteenth working group meeting.

2.0 Agenda - <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/South-ARC-Agenda-December-14th.pdf>

2.1 Additions/Deletions –

John Miholics asked if it was necessary to have the presentation from the City and made a motion to remove #3 from the Agenda.

There was not consensus to eliminate the presentation. Bill Barrett seconded the motion. A vote took place and it was unanimous to keep the presentation on the Agenda so the motion failed.

Joanna Maull wanted correspondence moved up to 5.2.A. and there was consensus to make this change.

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

3.0 Presentation from the City of Hamilton Planning Department

Mr. Robert Fex stated that there was a request to have a presentation from the City Planning Department in to update the Committee on future development in the South ARC neighbourhoods and the Community. Alissa Mahood, Planner, Community Planning and Design and two senior Planners Chris Bell and Joe Muto from Development Planning joined the Committee to speak to any updates in the area and answer any questions that the Committee might have.

Questions:

Q. At a public meeting a comment was made from one of your co-workers who spoke of going higher than wider. How would this affect the numbers in the area?

A. Going higher you can get more intensification.

Q. Can you explain draft approved versus pending?

A. Draft approved has already been through the process and gone through Council as well as public meetings.

Q. Can it be stopped?

A. A developer could decide not to follow through with it.

A. Pending occurs when an application has been submitted but nothing has been approved.

Alfrida is a possible long term expansion area. This report was done in 2008 so it is no longer on the map. This is not city owned property. These are geographic areas not necessarily owned by the City. Robert Fex noted that that is outside of the boundary.

Q. Is there going to be development south of Rymal Road?

A. It is quite possible at some point in the future that the Province may let us develop outside of the current urban boundary. Development in the green belt area is highly unlikely at this time and there are strong mandates about this. The City has been told to put a firm boundary on its growth and stick to it.

There was discussion on the urban boundary areas.

The Chair thanked the presenters.

4.0 Minutes of the meeting of December 7, 2011

4.1 Errors or Omissions – There were minor changes made to the minutes.

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

4.3. Business Arising from the Minutes

4.3.1. Research – MID students and integration

Superintendent Corcoran and Superintendent Joshua compiled a number of items that were distributed to the Committee as part of the handouts.

Superintendent Corcoran looks after the special Ed portfolio for the Board. She spoke to the information that had been distributed to the Committee.

Questions:

A motion was put on the floor by Al Pierce who wondered if this could be tabled until a future meeting. There was not consensus on this motion and this was seconded by Beverly Bressette.

A vote took place - 5 in favour and 6 opposed - motion failed.

Joanna Maull felt that it was unfair that they received this information late. She inquired as to the source of this additional literature. Superintendent Corcoran shared the source information.

Q. Are MID students part of the study of response to Intervention?

A. It can be students with learning disabilities, MID and many other exceptionalities.

Anne Pollard spoke of the fact that MID students vary. Anne shared a number of questions that she felt needed to be addressed.

Superintendent Corcoran shared that the studies would have different parameters. For Example: one of the studies is from Australia and incorporated studies from a number of countries.

A Committee member felt that the Learning Four All pamphlet was inspired for people with physical disabilities; however, it does not speak of other disabilities.

Superintendent Corcoran spoke of the how the document dealt with a range of disabilities.

John Miholics spoke to some research that he discovered which considered the idea of a big fish in little pond. He felt that the Committee needed to move off of this and he felt that the Committee does not have the expertise to decide what is best for the Mountain students. There are studies that can be pro and con integration.

Al Pierce wondered if the committee could request further information. Superintendent Corcoran shared that there are a number of web sites available on this topic. She cautioned that there is a large range in the MID students.

Q. If we close Mountain and it does not work out is there a place available for these students to go?

Superintendent Corcoran stated that in the program strategy the Board is offering has a wide range of programming. There will be students who will require a self contained program. The Board will continue to have alternative spots and programs available. The Board is not advocating that a one size fits all so we are offering a wide range of services. Superintendent Joshua shared that the Board will have a transition process in place once the students feel ready to transition.

Q. Would you provide a space for a student in the same school?

A. Not necessarily. It could mean the programming could be off-sight if necessary.

Q. Where are we going to put these students?

The Chair shared that we will come back to that when we get to the options section.

4.3.2. Tiered Intervention Implementation – Vicki Corcoran

Cheryl Poot requested information at a previous meeting about how the tiered intervention program would be implemented.

Superintendent Corcoran spoke about the tiered intervention and gave examples of what programs within each tier would look like.

Cheryl Poot asked about staffing and resources. There is a fear that students will be redeployed to their home school prior to supports being in place. The concern is that these students will fall through the cracks.

Superintendent Corcoran shared that they have had discussion on this; however, until final decisions are made by the Board of Trustees they are not able to begin implementation. They have a Committee who is looking at transition plans.

Q. Are we trying to fix something that is not broken?

Superintendent Corcoran shared that there is opportunity for students within the wider range. Is it broken...no...can we make it better...yes we can.

4.3.3. Option D Information – Ian Hopkins

<http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/added-ARC-South-WG15-Option-D.pdf>

Ian Hopkins presented the current options and reviewed the current information and concept options.

Mr. Del Bianco once again reiterated that the switching of the Westmount program would need to be a consideration post ARC.

4.3.4. Other– Mr. Del Bianco

A Committee member spoke about being disappointed in last week's work and she felt that the Committee moved back. She felt that motions that were approved in the past were undone.

Anne Pollard made a motion to be respectful of work that has been completed and motions passed as recommendations that are going forward to the Trustees. Do not reverse motions that have been passed as recommendations to go to the Trustees.

There was not consensus on this motion. It was seconded by John Miholics. A vote took place - 3 in favour and 9 opposed - Motion Failed.

The floor was opened for discussion.

Discussion took place and some members felt that they do not want their hands tied especially if they are receiving new data.

Mr. Wibberley shared that when you go to the public meeting the ARC must present its final recommendations unless you want to hold another public meeting. You can't alter your final recommendation once you have shared them with the public.

Trustee Hicks shared that once the ARC makes their recommendations the public have timelines where they can come back and give the Board of Trustees their input. The Board of Trustees is bound by the Terms of Reference to hear delegations from the south area. They can speak to the ARC recommendations as well as Sr. Staff recommendation.

5.0 Accommodation Options

5.1 Review of Decisions and Options

<http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/South-ARC-Presentation-for-WG-Meeting-15.pdf>

The Chair shared that at the end of the November 29th meeting the Committee finished with the approval of two motions.

The first recommended the closure of Sherwood and MacNab. The self-paced program would move to Hill Park and the Westmount would become a regular composite secondary school. Mountain would remain open with appropriate Alt Ed programs moved to that location. A new school would be built south of the Linc.

The second recommended the closure of Hill Park, Sherwood, Mountain and the construction of a new school south of the Linc.

5.2 Full Committee Discussion and Decisions

Concept E – a motion was put forward for Barton to remain open, Hill Park would remain open with the self paced program, Westmount would remain open as a composite school, Mountain, Sherwood and Sir Allan MacNab would close and a new school would be built south east of the Linc and include the Mountain program. Consensus to receive a presentation on this concept was given by the Committee.

<http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/added-ARC-South-WG15-Option-E.pdf>

Cheryl asked that the concept E be adopted as a concept to go forward to the Board of Trustees. There was not consensus. It was seconded by Kim.

A vote took place - 8 in favour, 3 opposed and one abstention - Motion Carried.

Q. What is a comfortable utilization rate?

Mr. Del Bianco shared that according to the Ministry it is 100-115% with proper scheduling.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that this option actually shows a good utilization rate and gets the Committee as close to 100% as is possible.

Mr. Del Bianco reiterated the three concepts that have been approved to go forward to the Board of Trustees.

Ken Durkacz put a motion on the floor to have option D move forward as a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

Barton will close, a self-paced program at Hill Park, Mountain and additional programs at Mountain, realign the boundaries of Sherwood, Westmount would become a composite school and a new school would be built south east of the Linc.

There was not consensus. The motion was seconded by Al Pierce. A vote took place - 6 in favour and 6 opposed - Motion Failed.

The floor was opened for discussion.

There was discussion on land acquisition and Mr. Del Bianco shared that we can not definitively say that we have a site south-east of the Linc at this point in time.

There was a great deal of discussion on the closure of Sherwood and Barton.

Mr. Wibberley updated the ARC on the options that are going forward from the other two ARCs.

Al Pierce shared that the West ARC has extended their report deadline to February 3rd and if any of the ARCs require more time it has been pre-approved that the deadline can be February 3rd.

Cheryl Poot put a motion on the floor to take concept B off of the table. There was not consensus. This was seconded by Bill Barrett.

A vote resulted with 3 in favour and 6 opposed and 3 abstentions. The motion failed.

The floor was opened for discussion. There was concern about removing the only option that leaves Mountain as a stand alone school.

Anne Pollard shared her experience at a school council meeting where a Mountain student participates on the school council. Anne read correspondence to the Committee.

Al Pierce put a motion on the floor to go forward to the public meeting with the three options as presented at this time without being prioritized. There was not consensus. Bill Barrett seconded the motion. A vote was taken - 10 in favour and 2 abstentions - Motion Carried.

The floor was opened for discussion.

There was concern that concept E is not clearly stating that there will be a recommendation to move the Westmount program to Hill Park under program placement. The Westmount community have not had an opportunity to express any concerns about moving the program.

5.2. A. Correspondence

Joanna moved correspondence up on the Agenda because she thought that the Committee would prioritize the options. She felt that it is not relevant if you are not going to prioritize.

5.3 Implementation Timelines

Facilities Management feels that the earliest that a new school could be built would be September 2015.

Bill Barrett put a motion on the floor that all schools will remain open until the new school is ready for occupancy in September 2015.

Consensus was not reached. The motion was seconded by Beverly Bressette. A vote resulted with 8 in favour and 4 opposed so the motion carried.

The floor was open for discussion. There was discussion on whether to begin the movement of students in September 2013 rather than wait until September 2015. It was estimated that it would be a savings of approximately 2 million dollars per year and these students will be moving one time only.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that the Staff would need to take this information away to determine how moving students in advance would happen and where the students would move to.

Mr. Del Bianco shared the timelines with the Committee once the report has gone forward to the Director. The report will then be presented to the Board of Trustees. There will have a minimum of 60 days before the Board will make a decision. During that time the Board of Trustees will have an opportunity to hear from the public as well.

How long would it take to close a school?

Mr. Del Bianco shared that if a decision is made in the spring in 2012 then this could happen in a year so closure could be completed in September 2013.

Al Pierce wondered if this should be left up to the Board of Trustees because we are not sure which recommendation they will choose if any.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that the Committee needs to think about the Mountain students as well. The committee has expressed a desire for the least disruption for the students.

Mr. Del Bianco felt that the Committee is not ready to go to the public meeting without program placement.

The Chair shared that the public meeting is scheduled for January 11, 2012. Currently January 16th is a Committee of the Whole meeting and the Trustees would not be present if this date were used for the public meeting. January 19th is currently the report deadline unless we take the Board of Trustees up on the February 3rd date extension.

Bill Barrett put forth a motion to extend the report deadline until February 3, 2012. There was consensus on this motion.

The following dates were discussed and changed.

Jan 11th working group meeting – there was consensus.

Jan 18th Public meeting date – There was not consensus and a vote resulted with 5 in favour and 5 opposed a- this date change failed.

January 19th - Public Meeting date. There was not consensus and a vote resulted with 7 in favour and 2 opposed - this date was approved.

January 26th final working group meeting – There was not consensus. A vote resulted with 7 in favour and 2 opposed so it carried.

January 16th was removed from the calendar as a working group meeting.

John Miholics thanked Lexy Ewing for her insight and for speaking to the students of both Sherwood and Mountain and for bringing that to the table.

6.0 Correspondence

Mr. Wibberley shared that the West Committee asked that the Sir Allan MacNab/Ancaster presentation be shared with the South ARC.

7.0 Other Business – There was none.

8.0 Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.