

Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB)

South Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

Education Centre Board Room

September 6, 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, Cheryl Poot, 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, Wes Hicks, Peter Joshua, Deb Jukes, Ted Kocznur, Renee Majic, Joanna Maull, John Miholics, Laura Peddle, Kevin Robinson

Regrets

Voting Members - Donna Dixon, Derek Hambly

Non-Voting Members - Scott Duvall, Tom Jackson, Lillian Orban, Terry Whitehead, Paul Vukosa

Resource Staff

Daniel Del Bianco, Steve Stirling, Jim Wibberley

Recording Secretary

Tracy McKillop

1. Call to Order

Superintendent Scott Sincerbox welcomed everyone back after the summer break to the seventh working group meeting. He informed the Committee that there was a package of information for the night's meeting.

2. Agenda

2.1 Additions/Deletions – There were no additions or deletions.

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

3.0 Minutes of the meeting of June 7, 2011

3.1 Errors or Omissions – there were changes made to the minutes.

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

3.3. Business Arising from the Minutes – There was some confusion around a second printing of the minutes once the amendments have been completed. It was not the practice in the past to reprint the amended minutes; however, going forward the Committee would like to adopt this practice.

3.3.1 School Tours - Some Committee members asked if it was necessary to attend the second South ARC School Tour since they participated in the first school tour. Mr. Del Bianco shared that this was outside of the ARC and not mandatory. The tour would be lead by Mr. Steve Stirling and it would consist of the same schools with the addition of Westmount. Westmount was scheduled first on the tour for those who wished to visit Westmount yet did not want to dedicate the entire day to the tour as they had attended the previous one.

3.3.2. ARC Timelines - Mr. Wibberley spoke of ARC Timelines. He stated that the ARC Committee must have its recommendations ready to present to the public prior to the last public meeting. If the Committee changes any of the recommendations after presenting to the public then they must hold another public meeting to share the final version. The last public meeting is scheduled for November 29, 2011. The report is due to the Board of Trustees on January 5, 2011. Mr. Del Bianco shared that at the third public meeting the concept options are typically presented to the public. The Committee voted to change the next public meeting to October 18, 2011 and have September 27, 2011 as another working group meeting. This would provide them with three working meetings prior to the next public meeting. The change was approved by consensus.

There was some concern around the January 3, 2011 date which may need to be changed due to the school schedule and holiday season. This lead to discussion around the final report due date of January 5, 2011, and a question of “How soon would a request to the Board of Trustees” need to be presented in order to change the report due date?” Mr. Del Bianco shared that he was optimistic that the report would be ready prior to the holiday break. Margaret Eagle stated that she was very concerned that she had not received information that she requested earlier in the process. Mr. Wibberley agreed to meet with Margaret to review the data that she felt was missing and Trustee Peddle asked to be kept informed of the result.

3.3.3. Facility Partnerships Update - Mr. Del Bianco spoke of Facility Partnerships and shared that they had received a total of 18 expressions of interest for space within HWDSB. Of those 18, five could potentially meet the screening criteria according to the interim Facility Partnership policy which was passed by the Board in June. Some of the criteria include:

- The health and safety of students must be protected.
- Partnerships must be appropriate for a school setting.
- Partnerships must not compromise the student achievement strategy.
- No entities that provide competing education services such as private schools/colleges or credit offering entities are eligible.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that the Board reached out to the community through a number of mediums. There was an advertisement in the Hamilton Spectator. There was also outreach through social media channels such as Twitter and Facebook. The Board’s website featured the application prominently on its homepage. There was an article in the Hamilton Community News as well as the Hamilton Spectator

indicating that space was available. The Board also reached out to its current partners, not-for-profits and organizations outlined in the Regulation 444. This is the Regulation governing the disposition of property. In total, 440 letters were distributed to the community. The Facilities department is in the process of contacting those organizations that meet the screening criteria to get a better understanding of the facility requirements. Mr. Del Bianco shared that Boards are not expected to take on additional costs to support Facility Partnerships. They must be cost neutral.

Questions:

Q. How do you process the application when going through a review with the Board?

A. The job of the Board is to educate their students. The focus is on what is best for the students and then Community Partnerships come into play.

Q. This assist schools with low enrolment and high vacancy. Is it public information what the constraints are?

A. The Board policy outlines the criteria and this is public knowledge.

4.0 Data Updates – Dan Del Bianco

Mr. Del Bianco spoke to the Committee about the handouts that were distributed that evening. A request came forth that the ReCAPP Data sheet be printed in a larger font making it easier to read. Some questions arose regarding the ReCAPP data that was shared and the student plot graph.

Q. Have these high and urgent needs been approved for Westmount?

A. Mr. Stirling stated that in 2011, HWDSB has a \$5M capital improvement project consisting primarily of;

- a new window-wall system and door replacement program.

Also included in the project are;

- upgrades to the site and main entrance to the building,
- a boiler replacement and HVAC upgrade,
- structural supporting of the gym exterior wall (discovered during rec centre demolition)
- re-roofing and roof access of the technical wing,
- a number of smaller plumbing, electrical and building items.

To date HWDSB has expended approx \$3.5 M of the project, the balance of the work is continuing into 2012.

Q. Why is there a difference in price between two schools for the same item?

A. This is due to different types of equipment. The data was gathered by the Ministry such as the make and model of boilers and their costing could be different.

Q. On this data sheet the cost of paving a walkway and repairing a roof are the same. Is it a coincidence because it appears on every list?

A. The prices are determined by the Ministry engineering team. There is a base cost per square foot for a roof and a sidewalk. It is based on the equipment cost as well as square footage.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that the actual cost may be higher or lower. It is only an estimate because everything has to go out to tender so this is not an exact cost.

Some of the Committee members shared their uneasiness with closing schools using data that is based on estimates only. Mr. Del Bianco stated that there is a surplus pupil basis in the school board and this number is going to continue to grow. This is the prime focus. The ReCAPP data is not exact because it is challenging to determine what the replacements costs will be in the future; therefore, the Ministry uses as estimated life cycle and cost. There is a surplus amount of space in the schools and this is something that requires attention.

Q. Mr. Stirling mentioned that the boilers are being done yet it still appears in the ReCAPP data. The estimated numbers are applied to all schools equally so it appears that we are on a level playing field.

A. The boilers are being undertaken now instead of in two years so it needs to come off of the ReCAPP data.

Q. All of these schools are shown to need these upgrades. When was this work done?

A. If any of these items fail it could cause a school to close. It has a life cycle however sometimes things work longer than the allotted time which is fine as long as it does not compromise the safety of the students. There are no totals on any of these papers however the numbers are very similar. It is one tool to help you. It is a guide.

Q. Can you provide us with numbers showing how many students are bussed to Westmount at a cost to the Board?

Q. From day one certain schools have had a high repair bill yet looking at this they are all showing as fairly even. Can you explain this?

A. The list is consistent. The original data was the total ReCAPP costs. Now you are strictly looking at the high and urgent needs.

Q. Are high priority items the same as low priority items and are they considered not really urgent?

A. Low needs will eventually become high needs.

C. We are to consider student enrolment, programs being offered and the urgent needs of a school. It appears that the urgent needs are pretty balanced and Sherwood has the second highest enrolment next to Westmount as well as good programming then why are we closing down Sherwood?

A. There is no Board approval to close any school. The Committee has not worked through the process to come up with an option.

Q. Staff has not given the reasons why they made that particular recommendation. If we had that information it could support us in making a decision.

A. The staff looks at the ReCAPP needs that are 20 years down the road. They look at all of the needs of all of the schools.

Consensus was given to move off of #4.

5.0 Accommodation Options – To view these options on the web site please click on the following link: http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Item2-SouthARC_Preliminary_Concept_Options.pdf

5.1 Summary of Previous small group discussion - Mr. Del Bianco shared that there were 11 options in total. Some of the Committee members felt that it was important to determine a list of criteria to support them in narrowing down the options. Mr. Del Bianco agreed with the Committee members and stated that some of the other ARCs have followed the same guidelines.

Questions:

Q. The question arose as to why the Staff recommendation was made.

A. Mr. Wibberley shared that if you go back to Associate Director Ken Bain's presentation you will see that he referenced a lot of information and the reasons why.

C. I would like to look at programming however the biggest challenge is transportation. I feel that this is more important than bricks and mortar.

A. Mr. Del Bianco stated that this is something that the Committee will have to deal with. The Specialist High Skills Major (SHSM) has been identified for each cluster so we have to determine where they will be going.

C. I did not understand that at all.

A. You can move the programs around within the cluster. We looked at balancing the SHSM programs within each cluster. HWDSB's goal is to distribute all possible programs evenly to all clusters of schools.

Q. Are there any changes happening and when would we find those out?

A. This is a learning process. What the Staff had as an original option may change over time.

Q. I understood that the Committee would have the option to determine which programs go into which schools.

A. Superintendent Joshua shared that if the Committee does not feel that this is correct then they can make recommendations of where they would like the programs placed within the cluster. He also stated that another consideration would be the student need. If there is a high demand for a particular program then it may require additional classes.

Trustee Hicks stated that no decisions for program placement have been made. If the Committee feels that this is not correct that it is up to them to make the appropriate changes. He shared that this has not gone to the Board of Trustees. Part of the process is for the ARC to make those recommendations.

Q. A large piece is transportation. Is there a budget to transport the students to the place of programs?

A. Yes – that is currently at the table for discussion.

C. I am confused on the wiggle room on this.

A. Superintendent Figueiredo shared with the Committee that the booklet on the "Program Strategy" <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/HWDSBProgramStrategy.pdf>

shares the vision of HWDSB not the placement of the programs. The program placement that was distributed:

http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wpcontent/uploads/2011/01/ProgramStrategy_Recommendations.pdf

is based on the Staff recommendation for school closure. At this point in time the placement of the programs is only a recommendation. If the Committee does not agree with these recommendations then they are free to change it and make their own recommendations.

5.2 Discussion in small groups – the Committee broke into three groups.

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

5.3 Summary from the small group discussion

Superintendents Figueiredo and Joshua shared what their group discussed which includes:

- facility optimization
- moving grade 7 and 8 students into the secondary schools
- what the impact would be if they closed any of the schools
- the possibility of moving the offsite programs into the schools and what would the impact be
- Summarized the criteria:
 - The least amount of student interruption
 - Vulnerability of students
 - The facility needs to align to the student programming
 - Eliminate pupil spaces
 - Boundaries addressed
 - Ward 6 criteria
 - Obtain as much money for a new school.
 - The escarpment is not a challenge
 - Match the new site to the population growth

Steve Stirling's group spent time on the 11 options and arrived at the following considerations:

- **#1 Option** – "Relocate Mountain kids to Westmount and move self paced program". Did not eliminate enough surplus space, had impact on self paced program, most agreed not a viable option.
- **#2 Option** - "Close SJAM and relocate students to Westmount and (add Hill Park)". Still an option to follow-up on.
- **#3 Option** – "Relocate Mountain students to Sherwood". Did not eliminate enough surplus space, counts on the understanding of the Parkview program.
- **#4 Option** - Close Barton & Hill Park, build a new school south of Linc. Still an option to pursue.
- **#5 Option** - "Keep Sherwood open and bus Delta students". Noted that they felt the escarpment is not a barrier, this option should be explored further.

- **#6 Option** - "Close Sherwood but with a phase-in plan", this option should be explored further to mediate student disruption.
- **#7 Option** – "Relocate grades 7&8 to a secondary school". Felt that this option was creating a utilization problem in the elementary panel and did not address the secondary concern. Also not convinced these students are old enough to be in a high school setting.
- **#8 Option** - "Relocate off-site classes back into the secondary schools". Did not know how many students this was and felt it may not reduce enough surplus spaces.
- **#9 Option** – "No closures". Recognized status quo was not viable.
- **#10 Option** - "Combine Mountain and Parkview students and create school within the school at Barton". This option should be explored further.
- **#11 Option** – "Construct a replacement school on the Sherwood site", felt it did not address surplus space.

The group believes more time is needed to identify the ARC's own criteria to be used to evaluate options, some suggestions;

- should eliminate surplus spaces
- minimize disruption to students
- should consider special needs of the Mountain students

Bill Barrett's group established criteria considerations:

- Based on the Board Staff's recommendation look at the FCI – current and 10 year projection, utilization and capacity as well as future enrolment projections.
- What was the weighing factor?
- What decision will optimize student enrolment and show that this is the place to be?
- What would give us credibility with the public?
- Status quo is not an option. We can not keep going in the same direction.
- Access geography. Do the students have proximate distance (Mountain and East/West)?
- What is a critical mass for a school – what kind of numbers are we looking at?
- Is a school being built in the future contingent on funding from the Ministry?
- In the North - don't split elementary associate schools. Therefore create boundaries with equal access and north revitalization.
- Do we want to see a new school south of the Lincoln Alexander Pkwy? That is where the young kids are.
- Barton is looking good so perhaps the issue is not North/South but East/West.
- French Immersion/ International BACC/AP programs seem to be a draw. Will the programs be available in the cluster?

Mr. Del Bianco shared what both the North ARC and the West ARC Committees have done once they have reached this stage in the process. They began to narrow down their options. Over the summer the Facilities Management team created proposed boundaries on these options and estimated what the

financial funding would look like. This will be coming to the North ARC and the West ARC over the next couple of weeks.

Trustee Peddle questioned where and how this process blends from little groups to large groups. Mr. Del Bianco stated that if we use the other two ARCs as an example – the same options seem to come up in every group and then it is opened up for a large group discussion.

C. Two of the three groups have stated that Mountain and Parkview should be left alone.

A. We are working toward providing the information that the group has requested.

Q. Each group talked about criteria. Can we, as a large group, decide on criteria ideas which would give us a framework?

Q. Mr. Del Bianco – do you have a recommendation on how to dwindle it down? Do we have two or three options?

A. The most we currently have in another ARC is five options. The questions that the Committee needs to ask are “do we have to do something or do we stay status quo?” Do we want equalization of schools across the mountain? Do we want a new school? Is it an option and how do we proceed from here? As a group if we narrow down the criteria we are one step closer to coming to an option. We need some direction that way...what is the vision of this Committee?

Consensus was given to extend the meeting to 9:30 p.m.

Consensus was given to move off of #5.

6.0 Public Meeting on September 27, 2011 – this date was changed to October 18, 2011.

7.0 Committee Operating Matter – ARC Membership – The Mountain School Council passed a motion to have Bev and Anne remain on the Committee. Trustee Peddle asked where in the Terms of Reference (TOR) it says that they have to step down. Mr. Wibberley shared that it does not say anything on the matter in the TOR – it is silent on this. In the Policy it says that the Community Rep is a parent of a student. To deal with this situation we have to put it to the Committee. Trustee Peddle indicated that she will take this back to the Board of Trustees since it is silent.

Susan Pretula shared that Donna Dixon will be stepping down from the Committee.

Consensus was given to defer this item.

8.0 Correspondence – Al Pierce shared that soon a paper would be coming forth regarding French Immersion. Superintendent Joshua stated that the information will come forth to the Board in November and then it will be public information.

Consensus was given to move off of #8

9.0 Other Business

9.1 Meeting with the North ARC on September 15, 2011 –

The question of an Agenda was raised. Mr. Wibberley asked if the South ARC had an agenda in mind that could be shared with the North ARC.

C. This is a special topic that we requested. This may require more than three hours.

C. Is this limited to Mountain and Parkview or are we talking about what would happen if Delta closed?

C. The entire meeting will be dedicated to discussion with the North ARC.

Q. Are we not going to get together as a group after to discuss what was discussed?

A. The North ARC believes that they are coming to talk about Vocational schools.

C. They may not have received the invitation correctly. Are the ARC Committee members structuring this? I see this as your meeting and you facilitate it. This is a meeting of the minds.

Q. Is that the purpose of meeting?

C. That is how I see it...they do flow into each other. I respect your ability to facilitate this – directed to the Chair.

C. People get off topic – the initial meeting was to talk about Mountain and Parkview – we don't need to have it so structured – we can talk about what comes up.

C. The invitation was a need resulting in programming concerns for both Mountain and Parkview...what the current student learner profile will be.

Q. Anne and I are sitting in limbo – are we invited...absolutely.

C. We are not limiting the conversation to Mountain and Parkview... there are other issues that need to be addressed.

C. I would like to focus on the Mountain/Parkview issue. Get a consensus from the two groups before we go on to anything else.

The Chair asked “can we focus on Mountain and Parkview and when that business has been completed then we could discuss other things?

C. I would like Scott to facilitate.

Q. Will the full complement of people/Staff be here? It is up to the Committee to decide.

Consensus was given to have Superintendent Sincerbox continue in the roll of the Chair for the North and South meeting as well as the full complement of Staff present.

Trustee Peddle has been provided with statistics that the Ministry has sent out – OSSTF, grade 9, etc. She stated that she will send it out to everyone on the Committee.

The Chair requested that the process be followed – that it be sent to Tracy McKillop first and she will follow the process and send it out to the Committee members. Trustee Peddle indicated that she has everyone's email and will send it out to everyone including Tracy.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.