

Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB)

South Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

Education Centre Board Room

November 8, 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, Susan Pretula, John Whitwell*

*Non-Voting Members - Wanda Bielak, Donna Clappison, Gary Deveau, Angela Ferguson, Manny Figueiredo, Randy Gallant, Mag Gardner, Wes Hicks, Peter Joshua, Deb Jukes, Gail Cipriani, Renee Majic, Joanna Maull, Lillian Orban, Laura Peddle, Kevin Robinson,*

**Regrets**

*Voting Members - Derek Hambly,*

*Non-Voting Members - Scott Duvall, Brian Greig, Tom Jackson, John Miholics, Paul Vukosa, Terry Whitehead*

**Resource Staff**

*Daniel Del Bianco, Steve Stirling, Jim Wibberley, Robert Fex, Ian Hopkins*

**Recording Secretary**

*Tracy McKillop*

**1.0 Call to Order** – Scott Sincerbox

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

**2.0 Agenda** - <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/South-ARC-Agenda-November-8th1.pdf>

**2.1 Additions/Deletions** – There we no changes.

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

### **3.0 Minutes of the meeting of October 18, 2011**

**3.1 Errors or Omissions** – there were no changes made to the minutes.

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

**3.3. Business Arising from the Minutes** - A Committee member raised the fact that Derek Hambly has missed a number of meetings and questioned if he was still a member. Ms. McKillop shared that she has emailed Derek and not had a response. This matter is in the hands of Judy Shen, the Student Trustee, and to date there has been no response. Gail Cipriani, the Vice Principal of Sir Allan MacNab was sitting in for Ted Kocznur.

There was consensus to move off of item number three.

### **4.0 Minutes of the meeting of October 27, 2011**

**4.1 Errors or Omissions** – there were no changes made to the minutes.

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

**4.3. Business Arising from the Minutes**

Cheryl Poot asked Steve Stirling to clarify the location of the properties that were shared at the public meeting. Mr. Stirling shared the following data:

Sheldon Site –29 acres, Southeast of Stonechurch and Garth behind city reservoir.

Jerome Site 26.6 acres between the Linc and Stonechurch and Upper James and Upper Wellington.

Broughton site 9.5 acres – south of 53, between Nebo and Miles Rd – in Ward 6.

Mr. Del Bianco indicated that in tonight’s presentation these sites will be plotted and it will include sites that are suitable for building.

A Committee member questioned Superintendent Gardiner’s comment on the bottom of Page 8 and asked “is the type of program that is at Westmount going to be shared at other sites?” Superintendent Gardiner shared that the intent was to enable students to learn in a self paced self learning way in accordance with the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning. The Westmount site will not be moved out of the Westmount School.

Anne Pollard put forth a motion to receive a list of properties that could be sold to generate income and asked if the Committee could have this information for the next meeting?

**Consensus was given to receive this information.**

At the South ARC public meeting Councillor Tom Jackson asked the Committee to consider the demographics. Can we have someone from City Planning or Tom Jackson come and speak to us about the demographics?

Mr. Del Bianco indicated that he will ask someone from the City Planning Department to make a presentation; however, he stated that there is a planning department with professional planners at the Board and they are well versed in enrolment projections. He shared that it is easy to stand at the

microphone and question the data; however, he cautioned the Committee about spending too much time on this when there are a lot of indicators showing that enrolment is declining.

Does the Board ever liaise with the city planning department?

Mr. Del Bianco stated that prior to the study of projected enrolment data the Board planning department met with the City Planning Department to review new construction and changes within the area. Mr. Fex stated that Board Planning Department is on a circulation list that indicates when subdivisions are approved and when there are changes in development. They are in contact with the City on a regular basis. Al Pierce stated that he is in agreement to have the presentation.

Mr. Del Bianco indicated that the Board Planning Department are kept abreast of changes and past history has shown that when high rise units are built in the area they have very few students and are mostly comprised of adult residency.

A committee member would like to invite someone from the City of Hamilton Planning Department to have a brief presentation on enrolment trends. Bill Barrett felt that it is a bit redundant since the Board has that information.

Mr. Fex shared that he is in agreement with Mr. Del Bianco that high rise buildings have few students. Next year they will analyze the enrolment projections again and this is done annually. Susan Pretula felt that the Councillor requested the Committee to look at demographics and should follow up and have the presentation.

**There was consensus to have the presentation from the City Planning Department.**

**There was consensus to move off of #4.3.**

#### **4.3.1. Public Meeting Debrief**

C. The parents from Mountain who spoke were quite unhappy about not having a stand alone school.

A Committee member spoke of the critical needs of students getting the proper education instead of filling the space with partnerships. She felt that it was important for the public to understand that filling the space does not mean that the students will receive the programming and education that they require.

Q. Is each of the other ARCs recommending a new school?

A. Yes.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that in the North they want to close Parkview, Sir John A Macdonald and Delta and build a new school centrally located.

The West ARC is considering a couple of options that include the building of a new school.

Al pierce shared that he did not sit up front at the public meeting because he expecting phone calls and did not want to disturb the meeting.

Beverly Bressette shared that the North were shot down at the public meeting regarding the closure of Parkview. Why are they closing a 1200 pupil place school like Sir John A Macdonald and ignoring the students at the top of the triangle. She indicated that she would not be voting that way.

Anne Pollard shared that all of these recommendations are initial recommendations.

C. All of the ARCs are recommending a new school and if this Board wants to move forward into the future they need to build new schools as well. Ms. Brown recently saw three schools with a sports venue in another Board that were spectacular. She shared HWDSB needs to move into this direction as well to put Hamilton on the map.

Thanks were expressed to Jackie Brown for her great job presenting at the Public meeting.

**There was consensus to leave agenda #4.3.1.**

**5.0 Accommodation Options** – Robert Fex

**5.1 Option Boundary Maps** - [http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/ARC\\_South\\_Boundary\\_Report\\_Final.pdf](http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/ARC_South_Boundary_Report_Final.pdf)

Mr. Fex reviewed the presentation and the boundary realignments of each of the options and spent time on each option and the financial summary associated with each option.

He put in potential boundaries based on what the Committee requested and shared that most of the hard work had been completed by Ian Hopkins.

**Questions:**

Q. When you did the reconfiguring of the boundary lines and costing did you factor in additional transportation costs?

Mr. Del Bianco shared that the Board's transportation policy was not factored into this because the standard transportation policy still applies.

Will the renewal needs continue to go into the pool along with every other school? People need to know what the renewal needs are for the remaining schools.

I don't think that this line is a realistic line. Stop trying to sugar coat things and have us listen to nonsense.

Did we see that the balance to fund number on the slide? That seems to be the bottom line.

The balance to fund line may happen over the next 25 years.

That is the cost to the Board for those options?

Yes – absolutely.

Okay then let's look at the bottom line. We don't have time to look at every single number so we have to trust your numbers.

Anne Pollard indicated that she asked for more realistic numbers for Mountain and never received them.

Anne Pollard put forth a motion requesting the utilization rates for Mountain students reflecting the real usage and classrooms at Mountain in consideration of the student's special needs.

**The motion was approved by consensus.**

Trustee Peddle shared that there was not enough time to absorb the financial information since they had not received this information prior to the meeting day. She shared that the Committee received a paper earlier in the process that showed the spread was a million and a half to fix the schools. The spread is only 6-7 million dollars in any of the recommended options. She questioned who drew the boundaries and indicated that there should be 18 maps not just 6. Why are we bussing kids who live a block away from the school? This does not make any sense.

Mr. Del Bianco stated that the staff was directed by the Committee to explore six options and the freedom to attempt to draw boundaries. If the Committee would like them to explore 18 maps then they can explore 18 maps. It was the direction that we were given at the end of the last meeting.

### **5.2 Full Committee Discussion of Accommodation Options**

The Chair summarized where the Committee are in the discussion of the options:

Firstly the Committee approves of the idea of closing Mountain Secondary but keeping the program together at another South Cluster secondary school.

Secondly the Committee believes that a new secondary school south of the Linc in the South Cluster is a desirable option.

Thirdly in addition to closing Mountain Secondary, two secondary schools in the South Cluster must close to make the case of a new school.

Anne Pollard feels that the Committee should keep in touch with the North ARC and their direction. She feels that the Committee should keep a stand alone school for both the Parkview and the Mountain students. The Committee has a moral obligation and should stick to the moral high ground and what is best for the students with the best education and not just convenience.

Joanna Maull indicated that the Committee did not agree with putting the students within another school. The Committee did agree to having the program and students stay together; however, not in another school. There was further discussion and the minutes of October 18<sup>th</sup> were reviewed. Mr. Del Bianco interpreted that this meant keeping the program and the students together; however, including them in one of the remaining schools or the new school. Mr. Wibberley shared that the placement of the students is listed on the chart included in the boundary presentation handout.

Beverly Bressette felt that these students should be kept together in a stand alone existing building.

Anne Pollard asked if they sold certain properties could this fund a stand alone school.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that the Staff need clarification. Do we need a new school for the Mountain students as well as a new composite school? Do we want a 1250 pupil place school? The Staff need to understand what the Committee would like to see. We could look at a Mountain/Parkview school using a facility that the Board currently has as well as a new school. We have to see if the North is interested in this option since we have no control over the North ARC. Staff is here to put together any scenario.

Mr. Wibberley shared that the Committee needs to understand that every time there is talk about adding a new school it adds to the capacity so it is important to determine how to offset this additional capacity. It makes it difficult to create a compelling business case. You can't add a new school without balancing it out.

Susan Pretula stated her concern. If we were to build a new school south of the Linc then what guarantee do we have that the students would attend the new schools. Would the students living south of the Linc have the first crack at attending the new school?

The Chair shared that this is good discussion; however, we need to keep moving forward.

Bill Barrett shared that the North ARC and Parkview are outside of this Committee's Terms of Reference.

Mr. Del Bianco indicated that Mr. Barrett is correct and there is no guarantee that the North ARC would be interested in participating.

Anne Pollard stressed that Mountain students can not be used to fill pupil places. If the Committee explores a stand alone school for the Mountain and Parkview students they only have to come up with half the enrolment and funding.

Margaret Eagle stated "if you look at the numbers prior to Catholic School funding HWDSB had six schools and only gave one school to the Catholic School Board. We have dragged our feet with excess capacity. North of the Linc we only need a certain number of schools and since North of the Linc is status quo we should only keep the schools that we need for those students. There are only three elementary catchment areas that cross the Linc. The remaining ones go east and west. Our patterns are going east and west not north and south so why are we trying to bring our kids north and south?"

"We need to look at north of the Linc separately. When I looked at the numbers, using grade 6 EQAO numbers which showed where the kids lived we actually only need two high schools north of the Linc. South of the Linc there are approximately 278 students in grade 6 and that is enough to build a new school for them. I recommend the Committee close Sherwood, Hill Park and Mountain and keep Barton and Westmount and open up the Broughton site. Take all the kids who are south of the Linc and move them into Sherwood until their new school is built. The problem is that Saltfleet is over capacity right now and the new school will be at capacity."

If we are to explore Margaret's option we need direction from the Committee.

Susan wanted to know how the Committee could make a recommendation if Westmount is not part of the Terms of Reference. Mr. Del Bianco shared that they can make a recommendation.

Bill does not want to waste time on Westmount if it is outside the Terms of Reference.

Margaret Eagle shared that John Malloy stated that they could not touch the program and she has not touched the program and the building is still in tact – we are just moving the program.

Bill Barrett asked for clarification?

Mr. Del Bianco stated that the Committee is not touching the program only moving it and they can make that recommendation.

Margaret made a motion for staff to explore keeping Barton and Westmount as the remaining composite schools and move the Westmount and Mountain program to Sir Allan MacNab. This would keep the kids north of the Linc in the north. The students south of the Linc would be housed in Sherwood Secondary School until the new school has been built on the Broughton site at which time they will be moved on mass to the new school. Hill Park would close and Sherwood would close once the new school has been built.

A friendly amendment was suggested which was to move to a site more central located South of the Linc.

There are not a lot of kids on the west mountain south of the Linc and things are not growing out there. Tell me where things are developing on the west mountain and we can build in that area.

**There was consensus for the staff to explore this option.**

Margaret Eagle requested that the Linc be the boundary line with no crossing the Linc line.

Can planning staff have some flexibility?

Anne Pollard would like to make a motion for staff to explore a stand alone school for the Parkview and Mountain students with the possibility of maintaining proper utilization rates.

Mr. Del Bianco stated “we are comfortable with saying build a school in the south; however, it proves to be challenging when recommending a north school. The north ARC would prefer to have the Parkview students move on mass to the new school. When we reconvene after the next North meeting I can give you a more definitive answer.”

Mr. Wibberley stated this is tricky because you are stepping outside of your Terms of Reference. You should make recommendations with the schools under your Terms of Reference. The North ARC considered all of the same issues and you are making a recommendation into another ARC which is outside of the Terms of Reference.

This is an unfair structure having to stay within the Terms of Reference.

What is the possibility of maintaining Mountain school with proper utilization rates?

Joanna said that Mountain students do not have a catchment area so they would like a school to house these students.

I would like the Committee to reconsider keeping the Mountain building or look at an alternate location that would encompass the population to be somewhere within the current mountain catchment area.

There was further discussion on this...

It is not to move them into a wing. You have Alt Ed programs at Crestwood with six secondary classrooms that will need to move. They would be different yet similar. Why can't we put Alt Ed in Mountain? This will support the utilization and meet everyone's needs.

Mr. Wibberley shared that when you look at this you have to look at this as a whole. It has an impact on the viability of the other options and how it impacts the other schools. It needs to be looked at as part of the whole.

Looking at other options was then discussed.

Kevin Robinson shared that the Broughton site may not accommodate a new school, parking and fields. The other sites could possibly have turf sites and be less dependent on city sites that we have to rent. Are there any options that we can throw out?

The floor was opened for discussion.

**A motion was made to eliminate phase one and two of the staff option. There was consensus to eliminate the Staff Recommendation.**

A motion was put forward to eliminate concept #1. **There was consensus to remove option #1.**

Q. Can we amend option #5 to be changed from the Jerome site to the Broughton site as the location of the new school?

This was opened for discussion. ..

Q. Does the Board feel that the Broughton site is big enough since 9.5 acres would be a tight site to build on and there are water retention requirements?

A. It would be challenging to build a secondary school on the site of this size. We would have to go vertical and adjust the field size. The Board purchases sites based on development and it could have been purchased for an elementary school.

This sparked further discussion because the Committee feels that they need to know what sites are available. They want to build a school to be proud of.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that it is difficult to say that definitively they have the perfect site. It may require trading of land, the sale of land, etc. We will put all of the sites down that are currently within the Board's inventory to show what they currently own.

A motion was made to pursue Option #5 with a more easterly site than the Jerome site. **There was consensus on the motion.**

Can we build the new Ed Centre and a new school on the same site?

The education plan has been approved for the Crestwood site.

**There was no consensus to eliminate concept #2.**

Discussion ensued:

Will the students that are out of catchment have the opportunity to go to the new school? Mr. Del Bianco shared that the Board's out of catchment policy would apply.

Could those students be grand fathered then?

That would have to be a recommendation.

**The motion was passed by a vote of 6 to 3 and Option #2 was eliminated.**

Could we recommend that Mountain school be closed but put in the recommendation to have the Mountain school as a holding school for 3 to 5 years, in case we need one down the road? Mr. Wibberley suggested closing the school with a long closing date of 3-5 years.

**There was consensus to extend the meeting until 9:15 p.m.**

Option #4 instead of on the Jerome site could we put an easterly site. **There was consensus to have this change.**

A motion was made to hold off eliminating anymore schools until the next working group meeting. **There was consensus to suspend the idea of eliminating option #6 until the next meeting.**

**There was consensus to move off of item #5.**

#### **6.0 Other Business**

##### **6.1 Additional Meeting Dates**

Mr. Del Bianco reviewed the timelines and opened the floor for discussion.

November 29<sup>th</sup> is currently scheduled. A proposal was made to add December 7<sup>th</sup> and December 14<sup>th</sup> as working group meetings and change January 3<sup>rd</sup> to January 11<sup>th</sup> (for the Public meeting) and the final working group meeting would be on January 16<sup>th</sup>. A proposal was made to also add Wednesday, November 23<sup>rd</sup> as a working group meeting. Consensus was not given. It was seconded by Al Pierce. **There was a vote of 6 to 5 in favour so the motion carried. The new dates are as written above.**

**There was consensus to move off of item #6**

**6.2 Other** – there was no other business.

#### **7.0 Correspondence**

Correspondence was distributed to the Committee. There were no questions or comments. There was consensus to move off of item #7.

**8.0 Adjournment** – There was consensus to adjourn at 9:17.