

Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB)

West Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

Education Centre Board Room

October 11, 2011

Working Meeting #8

Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members

Chair –Superintendent Sharon Stephanian

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

Non-Voting Members –Paul Barwinski, Judith Bishop, Jessica Brennan, Krys Croxall, Michelle DesRochers, Rick Hart, Alex Johnstone, Judy Langsner, John Laverty, Brian Lenart, Maria Rikic-McCarthy, Virginia McCulloch, Laurie Swackhammer, Dan Thomson, Anne Waldie

Regrets

Voting Members - Deborah Knoll,

Non-Voting Members – Gudrun Anderson, Lloyd Ferguson, Brian McHattie, Russ Powers

Resource Staff

Daniel Del Bianco, Don Hall, Jim Wibberley

Recording Secretary

Tracy McKillop

1.0 Call to Order

Superintendent Stephanian welcomed everyone to the eighth working group meeting and welcomed Em Del Sordo back to the Committee now sitting as the Principal Representative and a voting member. She spoke of the follow-up information from the previous meetings that had been included in the handouts and reminded the Committee that microphones were available for their use so that everyone could be clearly heard.

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

2.1 Additions and Deletions – There were no additions to the Agenda.

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

3.0 Data and Option Updates – Daniel Del Bianco

There are updates distributed to the Committee and the replacement page #8 replaces page 8 from the enrolment presentation which took place on March 29th which is located under the presentation Tab.

Daniel Del Bianco reviewed the hand outs which are for information only. The other ARCs requested this information and the staff felt that the Committee may also find it interesting.

There were no questions asked.

4.0 Accommodation Options – Daniel Del Bianco

http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/WestARC_SummaryOptions_WGMeeting8_revisedOct12_2011.pdf

Mr. Del Bianco shared the summary of the accommodation options with the Committee.

Q. Where do the boundaries come from?

A. The staff presented the possible options to the Planning department over the summer and they looked at these and made up the proposed boundaries. These are simply proposed and can be fine tuned by the Committee. Daniel presented the ARC options again and what was reviewed by Mr. Fex at the previous meeting. Mr. Del Bianco reviewed the options that were remaining as well as two new options. He then went on to explain the boundary proposals. Dan reviewed the enrolment projections for the current situation as well as the proposed options.

4.1 Full Committee discussion on the Accommodation Options

The floor was opened up for discussion and some questions and comment were as follows:

Questions:

Q. What is the capacity of Waterdown?

A. 1701

Q. I understood that the Staff Recommendation would take the students from Parkside and distribute them over the remaining schools. How fluid and precise is the staff recommendation?

A. Originally that was the recommendation; however, when they had all of the numbers they were able to make boundary changes and change the distribution. The Staff have learned a lot over time and they can make changes to have a different final option.

Westdale projections based on the current programming and the school has a stable enrolment.

Q. How did you come up with 950 for Ancaster?

A. We removed one wing and once that is taken into account we used the remaining classrooms. We took the two wings off which would be the logical step since they were additions and have existing outside walls.

We have not done a complete assessment to see if the program would fit into the 950 capacity. We are looking at that now; however, we were unable to do that in the time allotment.

There are two components on funding based on the enrolment within the Board. The closer you get to 100% then you are maximizing the funding. You have individual school top up funding as well.

Q. How do we integrate our ARC option with another ARC option?

A. We have to work with the schools within our Terms of Reference; however, we can propose alternate decisions with schools that are outside of the ARC. We are only able to make a side recommendation not your final recommendation.

Q. Is it possible to collaborate with other ARCs?

A. The South ARC is a couple of steps behind you and the North ARC is close to approving their final recommendation.

Q. What % capacity would be 1701 and how full is Waterdown? Is there room at Waterdown?

A. Yes

Q. Is there talk of a Catholic Secondary in Waterdown and if so what would that do to Waterdown?

A. We are not able to answer that question.

Q. Do you have the financial figure to add the library, cafeteria, etc?

A. We are taking the East side off so it is only classrooms not the gym, auditorium or the cafeteria being removed.

Q. Can we make a suggestion that would involve the other three ARCs or can we make a suggestion for Waterdown?

A. We can make a suggestion for a boundary study in Waterdown. The Board of Trustees don't have to do that; however, if they approve that then that would open up another process. You can make boundary recommendations.

Mr. Del Bianco then reviewed the financial summary with the Committee members.

http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/WestARC_Financial_Summary_revised_Oct12_2011.pdf

The cost of a new school differs slightly due to the size of the school. The subtotal represents the minimum amount required to get things up and running.

Q. Why does it cost more to demolish the Parkside building alone then it does to demolish Parkside and part of Ancaster.

A. It is not the demolition of Parkside but of Highland.

Q. I see that any renovation is very expensive and costly to the Board and the Ministry of Education. It seems much more economical to have a new build. Is this true?

A. If you were to close three schools you would eliminate a lot of money required for renewal needs. You would have a very strong business case that could be presented to the Ministry of Education. If you are closing three schools compared to one school then three schools is a much stronger business case.

Q. I don't see anything about partnerships.

A. Mr. Del Bianco shared the facility partnerships information "once we have worked through everything we are down to three facility partners and only one is looking to partner with a brand new build and two are just looking for space in an existing facility. The renewal needs that we are tasked with are shared with the partner as well. Community partnerships don't always work as easily because they have to meet the guidelines. Our first goal is the education of the students."

Q. Is it fair to say that we are tasked with making a recommendation that has to meet many needs?

A. The Committee is tasked with:

- the needs of the students and future programming.
- utilizing the space.
- addressing the renewal need.

Q. Does partnership include donations and can people make donations?

A. Superintendent Lavery shared that there is a donation process that can be made through the foundation. The possibility does exist; however, it is clearly outlined on how they can do that.

The funding for the construction of a new facility has to come from the Ministry of Education. We do have the power over the proceeds of disposition. Mr. Del Bianco shared that the final number needs to be updated as it is not correct on the sheet.

Mr. Del Bianco shared a list of costs associated with upgrading Highland (5.3 million) that the ARC members requested at the previous meeting if they were to endorse the Staff Recommendation with upgrades.

Q. Under the Staff Recommendation there is about 40 million in renewal costs. It is a lot of renewal costs and more than a new school. What is included in that?

A. Mr. Hall indicated that these are the numbers that were received under the RECAPP data for Ancaster, Westdale and Highland. This would be above and beyond the 5.3 million which would be required to upgrade Highland to the ARCs specifications. The Staff recommendation does not currently include these 5.3 million dollars.

Mr. Hart commented on RECAPP data. They are not the type of items that would bring life to the schools but is required maintenance. The 5.3 million would be required to bring life to the school and he feels that this is prohibitive and not a wise decision.

Q. Does the Board have the money to support some of these options? Should we not just eliminate some of these options?

A. Mr. Hall shared that there is a subtotal here which is the minimum amount required to get these options up and running. He feels that Mr. Hart has some wise insight into these options. Over time money will have to be spent on renewal needs of the facilities and that money could be spent on a newer facility.

Q. We brought up the right sizing of Ancaster and the addition of a new wing. Now in option 4 we are left with fewer classrooms and the building chopped. It won't be able to compete with a new Highland and a new Bishop Tonnos. How did we end up with this drastic change and drop in capacity?

A. We came away with right sizing the school. We may have missed cosmetically improving the school. A 1000 pupil place school is actually the right size for Ancaster in this particular option.

Trustee Jessica Brennan asked who is going to see this paper and can we get the correct numbers? Money has to be spent to build a new school and there are costs to maintain the facilities. There is short term money and money required over many years. Can we remove option #2 and #3 and can we renumber them?

A. The financial numbers will be corrected before going on the web site. For the time being and continuity sake we have kept the numbers the same in case we have to go back to look at numbers two and three. Sections A and B on the financial summary are the minimum amount of money required to get these options up and running. We do need to see the long term needs (renewal needs or legacy costs).

Q. Are we tasked with coming up with an option tonight? I am not comfortable voting on anything tonight. I liked option 4 until I saw that no other additions would be made to Ancaster High.

A. Ultimately it will be added to this sheet and if you would like this added for the public meeting we can work toward making that happen.

Q. If the Staff has a list, like we did with Highland we will work toward having that for the public meeting.

Trustee Johnstone shared that there are needs necessary for Ancaster High so can we put together a list.

The Chair indicated that this would be addressed after we hear from the other speakers.

Q. I don't like the idea of cutting off a piece of Ancaster and then leave it. It is like cutting off a limb. I do not feel that this is how HWDSB has indicated that it wants to move into the future. Is there are perfect scenario of a school and school size?

Superintendent Croxall shared that to provide the range of programming you will need between 1000 and 1200 pupil places. It does not mean that you can not have a smaller school; however, we are looking at having more hands on classes. There are a number of ways to make this work with a smaller school using a creative time table.

Options 5 A, B, and C were costed as pupil places of 1450.

Q. How did we determine what the new school size would be?

A. We were comfortable with a school between 1400-1500 pupil places. There was no science behind it. We looked at the outside boundary area.

Q. Under Option #1 on the financial sheet it says that it was a new build on the Highland site and I remember it that it said it would be on a new site or on Highland. Should this be updated before going out to the Committee?

A. We can make that change to the document.

Q. Under 5 B it says reduced site so does that mean the site size would be reduced?

A. We would reduce the site and sell off some of the land.

C. We did not know that you would be selling off some of the land. I did not understand that right sizing meant the selling off some of the land as well.

A. The costs would go up then because the proceeds of disposition would help off set the cost of the demolition. We could make that adjustment to the financial sheet.

Mr. Wibberley asked the Committee "are you serious about option 5 because if you aren't then it helps you to move forward."

Q. If you are right sizing Option 4 as well, with the right sizing of Ancaster are you selling off half of the land as well?

No

C. If we built on a new site then there would be costs involved but the disposition of the Highland site would off set that.

Mr. Wibberley reminded the Committee of the timelines that this group is guided by and he spoke of the urgency of moving forward and making some decisions.

A motion was made to take 5 A, B and C off of the table. There was not consensus to remove these options and the floor was opened for discussion.

There were opposing views on a big school versus a smaller community school. The Committee agreed that having the best programming available was important. Transportation was also a consideration and a concern.

Boards prefer to build schools that are 1250 pupil place versus something larger because we will have enrolment issues down the road in schools that are larger.

Q. If our recommendation does not get accepted does the Staff recommendation get chosen automatically?

A. No the Trustees will make a final decision based on looking at both recommendation. They may not choose either of the recommendations or they may take a bit from each of the recommendations.

There was consensus to remove Options 5 A, B and C.

Q. If we remove the staff recommendation does that mean that it disappears?

A. No it just means that this Committee does not endorse this recommendation. The final Staff Recommendation can also change before the final report goes forward. They have the opportunity to hear and see what the ARC has come up with.

This next meeting is for the public to hear what the ARC Committee has been working on and what recommendation they are presenting. I think that we need to look at what Plan A is and then we can focus on Plan B.

Q. When will we know what the final Staff Recommendation is?

A. You will know once it has gone to the Committee of the Whole. The Board of Trustees will get two reports on the same night – the Staff Recommendation and the ARC Recommendation. The Board of Trustees will have a minimum of 60 days to make their final decision.

There was not consensus to endorse the Staff Recommendation and a vote was taken. All voting members were in favour of not endorsing the Staff Recommendation.

There was discussion on the remaining two options.

Q. In your opinion would you think that Option 1 is a viable option and one that the Ministry of Education would endorse?

I can't answer that question; however, you will need to have a strong business case for the Ministry of Education.

Q. If Option 4 is to go forward can we have a list of what the revitalization would include?

A. Yes we will look at that.

The Committee continued to discuss Options #1 and #4 as well as the Correspondence that they received from Diana Kenel.

There was not consensus to take Option #1 forward. A vote was taken and it passed with a vote of 10 to 2.

There was consensus to take Option #4 forward to the public meeting on November 1, 2011.

There was consensus to have Mr. Del Bianco work with Superintendents Lavery and Croxall to come up with some ideas of program planning.

There was consensus to have staff speak to the Ancaster staff as to the needs of Ancaster if the building is right sized.

There was consensus to extend the meeting until 9:20 p.m.

4.3 Program Placement and Planning - This was deferred to the next working group meeting.

5.0 Minutes of the meeting of September 20, 2011

5.1 Errors or Omissions – There were none.

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

5.3. Business Arising from the Minutes

5.3.1. Facility Partnership Information – This was discussed earlier in the meeting.

5.3.2. Other – There was no other business arising from the minutes.

6.0 Other Business

6.1 Planning for the public meeting – Heather Macdonald and Deborah Beedie will present at the public meeting.

6.2 Other – There was no discussion.

7.0 Correspondence – The correspondence from Diana Kenel was discussed earlier in the meeting.

8.0 Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.