

Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB)

South Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

Education Centre Board Room

December 7, 2011

Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members

Chair -Scott Sincerbox

Voting Members - Bill Barrett, Beverly Bressette, Jackie Brown, Alexandra Butty, Ken Durkacz, Margaret Eagle, Alexandra Ewing, Anne Pollard, Cheryl Poot, Susan Pretula,

Non-Voting Members - Wanda Bielak, Donna Clappison, Patrick Elliott, Angela Ferguson, Randy Gallant, Brian Greig, Wes Hicks, Deb Jukes, Joanna Maull, John Miholics, Laura Peddle, Kevin Robinson

Regrets

Voting Members - Kim General, Derek Hambly, Al Pierce, John Whitwell

Non-Voting Members - Gary Deveau, Scott Duvall, Manny Figueiredo, Mag Gardner, Tom Jackson, Peter Joshua, Renee Majic, Lillian Orban, 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 fourteenth working group meeting.

2.0 Agenda - <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/South-ARC-Agenda-December-7th.pdf>

2.1 Additions/Deletions – There were none noted.

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

3.0 Presentation from the City of Hamilton Planning Department – Postponed at this time. The City Planning Department is not available.

4.0 Minutes of the meeting of November 29, 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 – None were noted.

Joanna Maull stated that the information requested from Superintendent Peter Joshua was not on the Agenda. The Chair shared that Superintendent Joshua was not available this evening.

4.3.1. Property – Sites south of the Linc

<http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Working-Group-14-Maps.pdf>

Mr. Del Bianco shared the maps and followed up on previous discussions regarding available land. Mr. Del Bianco showed the Broughton site and the blue area on the map is owned by the pipeline and nothing within 150 feet can be built within the area due to the release valve for the pipe line. There is nothing available at this time; however, if the Board of Trustees approval goes through then they would look to acquire land in that area.

Q. Why would this property not be sold then if it is not buildable?

A. You can flip it for land that could potentially be available. It could also be available to build on depending on the size of the building.

All three pink areas are in the draft approval stage and until we receive direction to pursue some land everything stays status quo.

Q. Is the green land owned by the city? Is it farmland?

A. Yes it is. There is potential to explore land in the green area.

Q. Other than the Jerome site is there nothing available south east of the Linc.

A. These are the current areas that we could look at.

Q. Is there any way to change the elementary site and switch it to the secondary school and have the elementary school build on the Broughton site?

A. Yes but it would not be viable from a cost perspective.

4.3.2 Other

Joanna Maull stated that there was a request for MID research information. She assumed that there is not research otherwise he would have sent it. The Chair stated that he felt that would not be a fair assumption. We will check with Superintendent Joshua to see if this can be provided at the next meeting.

Q. What are we going to derive from the City Planning presentation? Do you have a sense of what will be provided?

A. Mr. Fex stated that based on the information that you requested they will speak to intensification of the geography of the areas. Mr. Del Bianco shared that the ARC already has this as part of the enrolment information that was provided earlier in the year.

Q. Could they share potential land sites that could be available?

A. Mr. Del Bianco stated that they will be reluctant to share that information; however, they might say that they could support us in obtaining a site in the area.

There was consensus to move off of item 4.0

5.0 Accommodation Options

5.1 Review of Decisions and Options

The Chair reiterated the options that were approved at the previous meetings:

The first recommended the closure of Sherwood and MacNab. The self-paced program would move to Hill Park and 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-east of the LINC.

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

Mr. Wibberley noted at the last meeting these motions conflict with each other.

5.2 Full Committee Discussion and Decisions

The floor was opened for discussion.

Anne Pollard stated her feeling about the options that were approved at the previous meetings. She did not feel that it was a problem to have two options that are not similar.

Mr. Wibberley shared that he felt it was important to go to the public meeting with the options prioritized so the community understands the committee's intent.

Joanna Maull asked the Committee what the ideal vision for the Mountain students would be and if that decision could be made then that would support them in moving forward.

Mr. Wibberley shared how the North ARC dealt with a similar situation. The Parkview facility will be closed and the students will be moving to the new facility. They also struggled with this situation. They did not like the term "wing" or "annex" and they have chosen to have a sub Committee post ARC to support the students with the transition and the implementation of the program. The fact that it is a brand new facility provides the opportunity to ensure the needs and requirements of the students are being met and that the building be built with programming in mind.

Joanna Maull stated that the Committee has not made the decision to put the students into an annex in the new school although she appreciated the information.

The Committee discussed the options further and shared their thoughts on the Mountain as a stand alone facility versus in the new building.

Ken Durkacz proposed another option which would be a slight change to concept B. Everything stays that same except close Barton and leave Sherwood open and the Westmount program would not move into Sir Allan MacNab. The location is better, Sherwood is on many bus lines and it is accessible, we need to hear the public outcry, the FCI – there is not a strong enough case to close Sherwood, and the enrolment is in good standing.

The floor was open to discuss Ken's proposal.

Mr. Del Bianco asked the Committee if they would like them to take this away to gather information. Members of the ARC shared their opinions on this option.

Susan asked if they could have a friendly amendment to receive the information from resource staff.

A motion was put on the floor to consider a revised option B – closure of Barton, maintains keeping Sherwood open and a friendly amendment to have resource staff take away this option and present the data to the Committee at the next meeting.

Consensus was not given to receive the data for the new option "D". Kevin Robinson seconded this motion.

A vote took place resulting in 7 in favour and 3 opposed - the motion carried – option A removed.

Margaret Eagle wants to take concept A off of the table because she would like it to be an ideal option. Does the Committee want Mountain as a stand alone school?

A motion was put on the floor to remove concept A off of the table. There was not consensus. Kevin Robinson seconded the motion.

There was discussion for removal of concept A.

Concept A allows an option for the Trustees to build a school for Sir Allan MacNab and Ancaster.

A vote was taken resulting in 8 in favour and one opposed so the motion carried.

Integration came up for discussion.

Q. Does the North ARC have a second option if they do not receive funding for a new school?

Mr. Wibberley shared that they wanted to have only one option.

Q. Is there someone at the Board who could answer if they want to have the students integrated?

A. Superintendent Sharon Stephanian shared that the Board is very aware of the ARCs work and they have not made a final recommendation. Their work is being informed by all of the ARCs and there is nothing definitive right now.

Anne Pollard shared that the job of the ARC is to consider the needs of the people that they are representing even if their recommendation is not adopted. She believes in options and felt that it is difficult to say that integration works well for everyone. Anne Pollard shared that a new school would be second to a stand alone school and there is a need to continue to get input from the parents. She felt that integrations does not work for everyone and the students need options – integration for some and specialization for others. Anne shared that the Parkview people were in favour of a stand alone building; however the majority vote ruled. She is proud of their ARC because they have maintained options.

Susan Pretula feels that it is important to have a sub Committee post ARC and asked who would comprise this Committee.

Mr. Del Bianco stated that it would be staff from Parkview, students, parents, and community people.

The Chair asked if the Committee would like to make a decision about the Mountain program and opened the floor for discussion.

Superintendent Stephanian referenced the program strategy – page 14. The student support program will exist in every secondary school. This is similar to what we have in schools right now in terms of resource. There are profiles in the back as well that will give you examples. The second program will be the alternative student support program – social/emotional supports for example anxiety. This would be in place for students in every secondary school. The hope would be that the students would be taking classes where they feel comfortable and they could decide if they want to be in the regular classes for two classes per day. The comprehensive support program is a targeted support program. They may be in an art class and a Music class in the morning. In the afternoon they could have comprehensive classes with support – like Math and English. This will available in all secondary schools. There are other programs that will be available in every cluster of schools.

The floor was opened once again for discussion and the Committee shared their perspective on the Mountain school and programming.

How long will the transition take? Jackie Brown shared her concerns about implementation and transitioning not only the students from the schools that have closed as well as the Mountain students.

Superintendent Stephanian shared that this group can recommend timelines and implementation procedures.

Joanna Maull brought everyone's attention to page 22 which identifies the student's profiles and examples of these. She felt strongly that this is not a good example of transition rather a special school.

Joann Maull made a motion to have mountain as a stand alone school.

Superintendent Stephanian stated that if we covered the entire scope then the book would be larger. We want to provide a number of different options, supports and meet the needs of the students. There are a number of areas in the document where you can find other examples.

Margaret Eagle would like to separate the Mountain into two separate items – bricks and mortar and then the program. She would like all of the options to show that the mountain building closes. Sherwood could accommodate the Mountain students or in the new school. Take this to the public and use the word inclusion in place of integration.

How are we going to fund the implementation of the new program strategy?

A. It would be the same as any priority and the allocation of resources would be provided through the allocation of funds in the budget.

Q. Can these students have increased funding?

Superintendent Stephanian said that she does not feel that she can answer that right now. They currently have mental health supports and the Ministry of Education is using this Board currently as a pilot project.

Deb Jukes found two documents in Superintendent Corcoran's office one of which was the "Education for All" document written in 2005. Deb read some quotes from the document on special education.

Bill Barrett shared his frustration and he felt that the Committee had already decided to close the facility and keep the program together.

The Chair shared that this was never finalized and Mr. Wibberley stated that there was not a definitive answer in the minutes. Mr. Wibberley stated the motion located on page 8 of the October 18th 2011 minutes.

Trustee Peddle shared that this is the third meeting in a row that we have discussed this motion and it was stated earlier that the Committee voted on this motion to take to the public meeting.

Mr. Wibberley agreed with Trustee Peddle and stated that there are contributing factors which have caused confusion. The Chair shared that we need a definitive answers on this.

John Miholics shared some data on the Mountain students e.g. grad rates are higher than the Boards standards, there is a student on the student council. He sees success of the Mountain school and this is why he feels challenged with this decision.

The Committee continued to share their ideas.

Mr. Wibberley explained the implications if they approve this motion because Option B is the Committee's preferred motion and it states that Mountain would be a stand alone school.

There was not consensus on Joanna Maull's motion. This was seconded by Anne Pollard.

Cheryl Poot stated that the Committee is waiting for Superintendent Joshua's information and could Superintendent Corcoran attend next Tuesday's meeting to discuss the special education.

Can the Trustees take bits and pieces from the recommendations?

A. Yes they can take one or the other or a combination of the two or have their own recommendation.

Q. Can you not build a 1000 pupil place building and a second building for the Mountain students?

Mr. Del Bianco shared that he does not understand the difference between a wing and a second building on the same site.

Mr. Del Bianco cautioned that he feels that moving the Westmount program is outside of the Terms of Reference as a primary recommendation. Contingent on getting it through to the Trustees the Board would then have schools on the East mountain and none on the West.

Trustee Hicks shared that the comment regarding the Trustees is not necessarily true. The Trustees will have an opportunity to read the minutes and discuss what has been said at the ARCs. He indicated that the Committee should not presume that the Trustees will automatically consider what the ARC has put forward.

Kevin Robinson clarified his earlier comment that the Trustees will consider what they have heard at the ARC meetings.

A vote was taken resulting in 3 in favour and 7 opposed so the motion to Mountain as a stand alone school failed.

Margaret Eagle asked if we could make a friendly amendment or create concept "E" by putting the Mountain program into Sherwood. She shared that with boundary changes they would lose some Sherwood students and the Mountain students would move into that school.

There was not consensus and Margaret Eagle withdrew the friendly amendment.

Mr. Wibberley clarified that option B is still on the table.

Further discussion of the options took place.

Margaret asked the Hill Park representatives if the distance to MacNab is reasonable for their students, if Hill Park were to close. Both Cheryl Poot and Kevin Robinson stated that the travel to the Westmount site would be feasible but travel to MacNab would be prohibitive.

Jackie Brown reiterated once again that the Committee needs to close another school. Sherwood has been chosen for closure so they need to close another school.

Option E – to be taken away by Staff. Barton and Hill Park would remain open with Mountain students located in Hill Park. The Mountain building and Sir Allan MacNab and Sherwood would close and leave the Westmount program alone and a new school would be built South of the Linc. With the students moving once the new school is built.

The floor was opened for discussion.

- There would be no school on the West mountain.

- What facilities would be available for the Mountain students?
- If there is no school on the West mountain then we should be building on the Sheldon site.
- Are they going to fix Hill Park?

Mr. Del Bianco stated that they would have to accommodate the programming needs.

The Committee continued to share their ideas and speak about the Mountain students.

Bill Barrett stated that we are now going to the public with four options.

Jackie Brown shared that she feels that they need to narrow down the options to eliminate the ability to juggle all of the options around and mix and match as she just did.

Bill proposed having option C as the primary option to give to the Trustees. He put this motion on the floor. There was not consensus. Kevin Robinson seconded the motion. The Committee proceeded to discuss this. A vote resulted in 2 in favour and 7 against so the motion failed.

Cheryl put a motion forward to realign the Barton boundaries, Hill Park building will contain a self paced program, close Sherwood, Sir Allan MacNab and Mountain and a new school would be built south east of the Linc and the new building will contain the Mountain program and the Westmount building becomes a composite school. This would become concept "E". It was clarified that this would go to the Trustees as an option.

Adopt option "E" – there was not consensus and Joanna Maull seconded it. There was not quorum so the Committee did not proceed with the vote.

There was not consensus to eliminate "B". Bill seconded it. There was discussion. No final decision was made as they no longer had quorum.

Mr. Del Bianco requested that everyone have a look at and consider the program placement at the schools.

Trustee Peddle questioned quorum for this Committee and feels that it should be "8" as previously noted in earlier minutes.

Kevin Robinson requested that if any voting members are not available for next week's meeting can they please notify the group in advance to avoid wasting people's time if they don't have quorum.

8.0 Adjournment – the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

