

South Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

Education Centre Board Room

May 17, 2011

Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members

Chair -Scott Sincerbox

Voting Members - Bill Barrett, Beverly Bressette, Jackie Brown, Alexandra Butty, Ken Durkacz, Margaret Eagle, Kim General, Al Pierce, Anne Pollard, Susan Pretula, Julia Shen, John Whitwell

Non-Voting Members - Wanda Bielak, Donna Clappison, Gary Deveau, Angela Ferguson, Manny Figueiredo, Randy Gallant, Mag Gardner, Brian Greig, Peter Joshua, Renee Majic, Joanna Maull, John Miholics, Lillian Orban, Laura Peddle, Paul Vukosa

Regrets

Voting Members - Donna Dixon, Derek Hambly

Non-Voting Members - Scott Duvall, Wes Hicks, Tom Jackson, Deb Jukes, Ted Kocznur, Kevin Robinson, Terry Whitehead

Resource Staff

Daniel Del Bianco, Steve Stirling, Jim Wibberley, Peter Joshua

Recording Secretary

Tracy McKillop

1. Call to Order 6:02 p.m.

Superintendent Scott Sincerbox welcomed everyone to the fifth working group meeting. He informed the Committee that there was a package of information for the night's meeting and that Trustee Wes Hick's sent his regrets. He is out of the country on a vacation that was planned many months ago.

2. Chair's Update – Discussion of Westmount and Saltfleet

Superintendent Sincerbox stated that the matter of Westmount and Saltfleet has been of concern since early days of this ARC. He thought that it was fair to say that this matter has resulted in the work of this

Committee being paused. He believes that there is now a resolution that will allow the Committee to move forward. He summarized...

The Terms of Reference for this ARC remain as approved however, Westmount and Saltfleet may be discussed and information provided so as to inform this ARC's consultations and recommendations to the Board. This will allow the Committee to discuss these two schools with the understanding that the ARC's recommendations will address the five schools set out in the terms of reference.

Questions:

Al Pierce spoke about a minority report and went on to ask if the Committee could question the people from the other Committees if they were in the Gallery. The Chair shared that he would take that back to the Steering Committee.

3. Agenda

3.1 Additions/Deletions - Al Pierce stated that he was looking forward to hearing Superintendent Joshua's presentation but wanted to know if the Committee could forego breaking into smaller groups because he felt that the Committee was not ready for that yet. He asked if the Committee could remain in the large group and deal with programming down the road.

Mr. Wibberley stated that the intention of the small group discussion was not to go as deep as Mr. Pierce was anticipating. It is framed around a few questions.

Superintendent Joshua went on to say that the small groups are merely discussions around a set of question. He felt that it was beneficial to get the Committee's insights and shared that there were maps which showed where the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board felt that the programs could be placed. Superintendent Joshua indicated that this is an initial discussion.

The Committee members went on to discuss their points of view around the possibility of breaking into smaller groups versus remaining in a large group. Susan Pretula asked if the Committee needs to stick to the final date for filing their report under the Terms of Reference. Mr. Del Bianco stated that the Committee does need to stick to the final date so there would need to be some report made even if it is to ask to have the time extended. It would mean changing the Terms of Reference.

There was a motion that was brought forward requesting that the Committee remain in a large group but it failed.

Bill Barrett then put forth a motion to have the presentation with 20 minutes in the large group followed by 40 minutes in the small group and there was consensus.

There was another request for an addition to the Agenda and that was to have small group discussions around the Board recommendation as well.

Consensus was given to make that #5 on the Agenda

Joanna Maull asked about discussing the correspondence in small groups as well. Mr. Wibberley shared that the correspondence was there for the Committee's information and it depended on if the Committee would like to address these.

Susan Pretula asked if it was prudent to respond to them if the people had taken the time to write them. Mr. Wibberley shared that the authors of the questions/comments are thanked and notified that all correspondence that comes into the ARC information email is shared with the Committee members. The committee may or may not find the correspondence to be of value.

Joanna Maull requested to discuss the OSSTF letter in the small group discussions and consensus was given to add this to Item #4 on the Agenda.

3.2 Approval of the Agenda – Consensus was given to approve the Agenda as amended.

4.0 Program Plan

4.1 Presentation – Superintendent Peter Joshua

Superintendent Sincerbox referred to Item #4 on the Agenda which was the presentation of the Program Plan. He shared that the Committee had received information about the Board's vision of education in the future and that tonight they wanted to present more detailed information on how this vision translates an on the ground plan in our schools. Superintendent Sincerbox asked the Committee to please note one thing – this plan will be adapted to reflect the final decisions of the Board regarding student accommodation. The plan will reflect the recommendations of senior administration because this is the example that was presented to the Committee. The final version of the plan must reflect the ultimate decisions of the Board of Trustees. In addition, this ARC may make program recommendation that may be adopted by the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Peter Joshua spoke of "Why a Program Strategy". He shared that this is about "Learning for All" and it is about rethinking the way that programs are offered so that Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board best meets the needs of each of the students. They want students to have choice, support and directions as they benefit from the knowledge and skills they acquire from their educational program. Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board is restructuring what they offer, where they offer it and how they can support all students to achieve their full potential in their schools. Everything they do, from the placement of programs, supports and facilities, will make strategic sense and ensure students feel safe, welcome, energized and included as they work to achieve their goals.

"What is Changing?" – This represents a shift in thinking and touches many themes including:

- All Students Learning - This is about equal learning for every student
- Personalized Learning - Students choosing how they learn
- All Pathways in All Schools – wanting every school to meet every major student destination (apprenticeship, college, community, university, work)
- Schools with Specializations – where you live should not determine what you can study.

- Board, Cluster and Community Supports – adjusting the type and intensity of our supports to fit the needs of each student.

“What is Vocational Education?” Vocational education consists of programs that:

- Focus on workplace preparation with a strong emphasis on the development of literacy, numeracy, personal life management and employment skills.
- Experiential learning through job shadowing, work experience and co-operative education.
- Deliver safe, nurturing and inclusive environments.
- Student achievement improves when students learn alongside peers of mixed abilities.

Superintendent Joshua stated that an important piece is that Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board is delivering this program in a safe, nurturing and inclusive environment in a local school.

Superintendent Joshua shared that Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board already has many of these programs throughout the Board, in the Specialist High Skills Majors and the Ontario Youth Apprenticeship Programs. Through the vocational programs, the students will have the same choices, variety and flexibility in their course options, while Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board will continue to offer support in the areas that are needed.

Tier 1 – School and class-wide learning

This tier has four pathways which all students in the system will choose a pathway to follow.

One such pathway is apprenticeship. College is another pathway that students may choose. The third option is a University pathway and the last pathway is work. The key to this approach is to have the student’s achievement at the centre. They must feel good about being in school and reaching their goals.

Tier 2 – Selected Interventions

Support for Tier 2 - include programming for at-risk students. A student in Tier 2 could receive support while also being in a Special High Skills Major program.

Tier 3 – Targeted Interventions

In Tier 3 programming is delivered for identified students. These students could have support with math, reading and writing for the morning and then they could take classes in the afternoon like cooking, music, drama, arts, etc. Programming like this is about making sure that that staff are on hand if the student needs help understanding his/her work, while also helping them to become more independent.

What are the benefits?

Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board will respond to the unique needs of each student with a mix of programs and supports.

Other benefits include:

- Continuity – giving the students a smooth transition from elementary to secondary schools.
- Direction – giving students option so they can focus on programs that fit their interests.
- Engagement – using a Board-wide view to place specialized programs throughout the system.

- Equity – locating programs so all students can access them.
- Inclusion – educating students with higher needs with peers, with supports at every school.

Fundamental beliefs

- Serve each student
- Engage each student with programs to improve achievement
- Provide access to programs that meet each student’s needs.

To View the presentation please click on the following link: <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/HWDSBProgramStrategy.pdf>

4.2 Discussion and review in small groups

4.3 Feedback, questions and comments from the small groups

Questions (Q) Answer (A) Comment(C)

Q. Special High Schools Major – there is no catchment area is that correct.

A. That is our intent. Access to the program will not be an issue and Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board is working toward having equal capacity in all of the clusters.

Q. What is the percentage of student in Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3? If 90% of our students are in Tier 1 then we may want to spend 90% of our time working on Tier 1.

A. We would need to look into that and bring that information back to the committee.

Q. How many pupils leave the catchment to go to other schools for programs for example Special High Skills Major (SHSM)? Students are not happy to go to schools outside of their own home school so what makes you think that this will work? Is there a transportation component to this?

A. Now more than ever Universities and Colleges are recognizing programs such as SHSM and we can not address the transportation component until we have a final decision.

C. I find it hard to believe that the Board has no idea what transportation costs are. You are talking about integrating students – how many students have been integrated now?

A. The fall model will have approximately 15-17 students in the class. This is pertaining to math and reading however the Board does have other students in the specialized programs.

C. Mountain and Parkview have approximately 480 students who will need to be integrated.

A. We would need to integrate about 200 Mountain students – this is what we would like you to take back to the small groups. This is why it is important to have models.

Q. What evidence do we have to show that the Colleges and Universities are looking at the SHSM students?

A. This is noted on the application form for the Colleges/Universities and the Board has had connections with Mohawk College.

Q. Program is driven by staff – for example the hockey program at Sherwood – those teachers will not be moving with the program. How are we going to have viable programs when staff does not move with the programs?

A. We will not lose sight of the importance of associate teaching staff to the programs they deliver.

A. Superintendent Sincerbox shared that important decisions need to be made and these are still in the early stages. We are mindful of the questions and the concerns and discussions will continue to occur.

C. We know that students achieve when in mixed groups – we need to question and analyze it – are we talking about a huge range when we are talking about mixed ability?

A. When we are talking about inclusive vs. integration – integration could mean that for a portion of the day the student could be in inclusive programs and the other half could be in regular classes. We would like them to gradually move into a mixed ability setting.

At this point the Chair mentioned that the time allotted for this portion of the Agenda was 20 minutes - and being cognizant of time and the fact that there are still five people on the speaker's list was the Committee okay to proceed with the five questions – the Committee was in agreement to carry on with the questions.

A) We are basing it on other Boards that have had this programming in place where it has been successful. These students are not in a separate school but are in mixed ability setting with supports.

Anne Pollard had submitted the following to the CEA-ACE Info regarding de-streaming of students with MID:

I have some questions regarding the article, “Should We Be Streaming Students?” in particular, the sentence that states “Research suggest that students in non-grouped settings, especially for those with lower achievement, have more healthy and positive attitudes towards school than students in grouped settings.”

I'd like to know more about studies that have been done on this issue, particularly those concerning students with Mild Intellectual Disability as well as Multiple Exceptionalities. How “low” is low? With what span on the spectrum? What happens in non-grouped settings with children of lower intelligence (first percentile) who have previously experienced bullying from same aged, average-intelligence peers? What about those who also have social issues or who have experienced trauma? How big were these classrooms and what kind of assistance was provided to the student and the teacher? What are the effects of stress on learning?

Could you please point me in the right direction for the answers to some of these questions?

Thanks very much, Anne Pollard, Hamilton

This was the response that Anne received:

Hi Anne,

Thanks for your email. I've asked around and unfortunately we don't know the answer to these questions – this piece was not really about de-streaming in the sense of inclusion of students with disabilities. We suspect there is not enough evidence on the specific questions asked here to know. In terms of the studies, additional resources can be found here:

The web site that Anne was referred to is as follows: <http://www.cea-ace.ca/publication/facts-education-should-we-be-streaming-students>

Q.) What if these students are not ready? They are capable of getting a diploma but still need EA assistance.

A. If you look at the model you will see that we are offering support to those students who need it. There will be gradual integrations – never losing sight of opportunities for students and if they are ready to be integrated then we will look at that.

Q. Which of the new programs are unique to draw students out of the catchment area on the right hand column of the program sheet?

A. SHSM – any or all of them could draw students into another school. You are only seeing the SHSM programs listed on the sheets – you may not see every program listed for example art programs. If there is a student population, within a school looking for a particular program – and there is a need this will be addressed.

Q. Senior Management has not looked at transportation?

A. Once the Board of Trustees makes the decision then this will be addressed.

C. The Board did not want to have a magnet school yet Westmount is one. Is it possible to have some of these programs in other schools so some students will not have to travel to Westmount?

A. Superintendent Gardiner shared that to make the commitment for an entire school is difficult as she has explained in the past.

The Chair asked if the Committee could move into smaller groups at 7:30 p.m. and consensus was given. The results of the small group meetings will be distributed at the September 6, 2011 working group meeting as well as posted on the web site.

Q. How will staff be re-directed if these recommendations go forward and are acceptable to the Board of Trustees – he feels that seniority will be circumvented.

A. The Chair stated that it was premature to discuss this as there are on-going talks with the union.

Q. How are we going to ensure SHSM and equity across the cluster when parents can't afford bussing for the children?

A. That is the type of question to be raised in the small groups.

Q. Is there extra funding for the extra support that will be required?

A. We currently receive funding for that type of programming.

Q. I read some sections out of the program strategy booklet and I have questions (note there is no answer here)

The Chair asked the Committee what their desires were regarding the agenda. He shared that #5 had been added to the Agenda however being cognizant of time that may not happen at this meeting.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that the facilities management team were going to present at the June meeting the work that has been completed to date and the work that still needs to be completed. Would the Committee like to take the time at the next meeting to hear the presentation or defer it? It is a factual presentation of why the buildings are the way that they are today. What work has been completed to date and what work is still to be done?

C. If we defer #5 to the next working group meeting then I would like it added to the Agenda – review of the Board recommendations.

Consensus was given to defer #5 to the next working group meeting.

C. There was concern about the length of time that the presentation would take because one agenda item seems to take two hours with this group.

A. The scheduled presentation will be about ½ an hour and then open to questions.

C. I would like to get to the point where we can work on the Committee's recommendation and he feels that the presentation would be advantageous.

C. Could we have the information in advance so that we have time to look at it and perhaps the discussion could be shorter?

A. We will get it out a.s.a.p.

Q. Is it another power point presentation? She feels that more work gets done in the small groups and there is more opportunity to talk and be heard.

Q. Is it in email form? Can you email it prior to the agenda package?

A. We will do that a.s.a.p.

A. The FM Report might be ready by the end of this month so perhaps it can be sent out in the beginning of June.

Q. Do you want to discuss the Board option as well as your own option?

A. The Committee indicated “yes.”

Consensus was given to extend the meeting to 9:15 p.m.

C. Trustee Peddle asked if the Committee could get to the minutes in order to have them approved and posted on the web site.

Q. Why are the minutes not approved earlier on the Agenda?

A. Sometimes we get tied up on some things and don’t get to the bulk of the work.

Q. Can we get the minutes approved and discuss the program group’s discussion at the next meeting?

5.0 Minutes of the Meeting of March 8, 2011

5.1 Errors or Omissions – none at this time –everyone did not have a copy of the minutes.

5.2 Approval of the Minutes – approval on principle only. Formal approval will be completed at the June 7, 2011 meeting – consensus was reached.

5.3 Business Arising from the Minutes – none

6. Minutes of the Meeting of April 5, 2011

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

6.2 Approval of the Minutes – approved as amended – consensus was reached.

6.3 Business Arising from the Minutes – Trustee Peddle requested information at the January 26, 2011 meeting regarding where the kids are coming from and where do they live. She would like to receive this information. Susan Pretula asked the Committee if they would like to request why the students are coming from the various areas. This would be referred to the Steering Committee.

Consensus was given to move off of #6.

7.0 Minutes of the Public Meeting of April 26, 2011

7.1 Error or Omissions - minor changes were made to the minutes.

7.2 Approval of the Minutes – approved as amended – consensus was reached.

7.3 Business Arising from the Minutes – none

Consensus was given at 9:30 p.m. to extend the meeting for 10 minutes.

8. Correspondence – Susan Pretula asked if someone on the South ARC should answer these questions. Mr. Wibberley indicated that would be a pretty significant undertaking.

Trustee Peddle submitted a petition, at a recent meeting of the Trustees, with 2200 names on it – two in fact which should be coming to the ARC.

Consensus was given to move off of item #8.

9. Other Business – Al Pierce suggested that, for those who have a passion for Mountain School, meet with like members of the North ARC. Is there a mutual agreement or arrangement that could be explored? He would like to organize a meeting for those Committee members that would like to come.

Q. Are you requesting a formal ARC meeting?

A. Mr. Wibberley shared that there should not be an informal ARC meeting. It needs to fit with the Committee structure. Is this the right timing? Al Pierce indicated that the North ARC is ahead of them so he was not sure of the timing. Mr. Wibberley was concerned that it could be premature to involve the North ARC when the South ARC has not yet developed any concept options. Mr. Del Bianco stated that it would have to be added to the North Agenda and it would need to be a group decision. The Chair stated that it would be an invitation from the South ARC to the North ARC.

Q. Could it be scheduled as an additional meeting in June?

C. Anne Pollard thanked Al Pierce for his vision on just not the 200 students of Mountain but the 480 students from both Mountain and Parkview.

Consensus was given to extend the invitation to the South ARC.

Q. Can the invitation go into the North ARC on June 14th?

The Committee agreed to the process for the invitation and that it would be delivered to the North ARC on June 7th

Q. Trustee Peddle asked if there would be another facility tour. The Chair stated that he would take it back to the Steering Committee. Trustee Peddle stated that the Committee has not toured the schools that it is making decisions about. Does the Committee wish another tour?

There were dissenting voices on this issue. It went to a vote and failed in a 6 to 4 vote.

Anne Pollard asked if the question could be rephrased because not everyone has to participate on the tour.

The Chair rephrased the question “would the Committee like another tour that is optional?” – Consensus was reached to have a facility tour.

Q. At the June 7th meeting can we bring back possible dates?

Q. Susan Pretula – can we get the minutes prior to two days before the meeting?

A. We get the information out as soon as possible. We have five ARCs and Tracy is the secretary of 4 of the ARCs. We will work toward that goal. The Terms of Reference states that the minutes need to be out a minimum of 24 hours in advance of the next meeting.

Q. Is the Hill Park parent going to be replaced at this point?

A. The invitation has been extended however no one has accepted at this point in time.

10. Adjournment – the meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.