

Dalewood Elementary Accommodation Review Committee Meeting

Education Centre Board Room

June 8, 2011

Minutes (Working Meeting #2)

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members

Chair –Krys Croxall

Voting Members – Suzanne Brown, Maria Carbone, Nadia Coakley, Anita McGowan, Kim Newcombe, Emily Reid, Michael Reid, Kristen West

Non-Voting Members –Judith Bishop, Heidi Harper, Silvana Galli Lamarche, Joanne Hall, Margaret Jobson, Debra Lewis, Peter Martindale, Brian McHattie, Denise Minardi, Colleen Morgan, Michelle Rodney-Bartalos

Regrets

Voting Members – Pamela Irving, Juanita Parent

Non-Voting Members –

Resource Staff

Ellen Warling, Daniel Del Bianco, Ron Gowland.

Recording Secretary

Tracy McKillop

1. Call to Order – Superintendent Krys Croxall, Chair

Superintendent Krys Croxall welcomed everyone to the second working group meeting of the Dalewood ARC. She shared that this is the second to last meeting on this school year, with the next working group meeting scheduled for Wednesday, June 22nd.

The Chair welcomed all members of the public in attendance. She stated that the working group meetings of the ARC differ slightly from the “town hall” style public meetings in that any one that was not a member of the ARC was there in an observing capacity only.

2.0 Agenda - http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/DalewoodARC_WorkingGroupMeeting2_Agenda-2.pdf

2.1 Additions/Deletions – 8.3 Community Partnerships was added to the Agenda.

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

3.0 Review of the School Information Profiles (SIP) – to view the SIPs please click on the following link: <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arcelementary/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Dalewood-Area-SIP-2.pdf>

3.1 Overview of each section of the SIP (Small group discussions)

The Committee members worked in three groups for two hours reviewing the SIPs. Consensus was given to go through the first 10 items of the SIPs.

3.2 Questions from the Committee

Comments from the three groups included:

Mr. Ron Gowland's Group – Prince Philip

- The question came up about the use of a classroom that is currently shown as a staff room.
- The replacement cost of the building came up for discussion and the question on having an appraisal value of the land only was also raised.
- Updates were made to the extracurricular activities.
- It was stated that only 8% of the Prince Philip students require bussing and the others just go along for the ride.
- #17 – clarification of the government initiatives came up – what level of government agencies would be considered.
- #22 – Home and school was added.

Ms. Ellen Warling's Group – GR Allan

- Last fall the Ministry came out with data on enrolment. There are a number of enrolment data reports that will be coming out.
- #4 – Does that include upgrades like elevators?
- How would we fund accessibility – That would be looked after under the renewal Grant and perhaps the Ministry will provide access Grants in the future.
- Is there a way to break down urgent need versus something that can wait to be addressed? Mr. Gowland stated that items that will close a school down are a priority. The Committee will get that information from the Facilities Management presentation.
- #11 - # of students out of catchment – how is that determined?
- City owned pool under Dalewood is not owned by the Board.
- #16.2 – looks at the range of programs offered – all three schools are exactly the same – is that true or an error?
- #17 – Is “Me to We” a government initiative?
- #18.5 All schools say zero however the schools have access to some of those professionals.
- Does each school have a Home and School Association?
- #5.4 - Outdoor portable – is that a Board portable? Yes
- #5.4 – The total on the side does not add up.
- #5.8 - Quality of classroom – it is a subjected number – It is not the size of the room but the quality of air, etc.

Daniel Del Bianco's Group – Dalewood

- #1 – There was discussion around enrolment projections and a number of requests came from that. What is the functional capacity-not the utilization capacity?
- How much surplus space does the Board currently have and how does that rank against other schools in the Province?
- #2 – Explore the agreement between the Board and the City.
- Breaking down that summary – the cost of school operations per student and per school space
- #4 The FCI is the same as the other groups – replacement value as well.
- #5 Quality of learning environment – the student surveys discussion – are surveys done at different times?
- Mr. Del Bianco encouraged that the groups do this student survey as a whole under the umbrella of the ARC.
- Questions regarding gymnasiums – Dalewood can operate two classes out of the gym – can it be identified as a double gym?
- Is the group in agreement to this or does it need to meet the Ministry standard to be classed as such? This will be looked into.
- If not can it be classed as a gym and a general purpose room?
- Dan will clarify the computer studies in the three schools. There were questions about the computer studies program because the elementary schools do not offer computer study programs. There was some discussion around not having an art program; however, there is an Art Room at Dalewood – the Committee members would like to capture that some of the schools have a dedicated space for curriculum delivery.
- Does the school have a stage or an auditorium? How often are the stage and auditorium used because some of the space is used in very creative ways? Can we revise these forms for the elementary instead of the secondary?
- At GR Allan we were told to fill in the form showing that we have a computer lab instead of a classroom. There was a recommendation put forth to go over this section again with the Principals.
- Do the elementary schools offer co-op – can we make them all N/A?
- Student and community engagement – there was discussion about whether that had a place in an ARC. Some students were not able to participate in extra curricular for e.g. drums because there was a cap on it. There is a difference in the number of teachers at each school so the more teachers there are the more opportunity there is for extra curricular activities to be offered. Some felt that if it is reflective of the reality that is something that we should be considered – should it be discounted because of school size?
- The Chair stated that this would be a difficult task because not all programs run year round. Can the Committee use the percentage of their school population? She stated that it would be difficult to get an accurate reading due to the levels of grades at each school –e.g. K-5 versus the middle school. Superintendent Croxall asked the Committee if they could go with a sense instead of an accurate number. She stated that if the ARC uses the number on the SIPS it could be over represented when adding the numbers up.
- Are all athletics board sanctioned – Krys – would have to have staff willing to run the programs but they are board sanctioned.

- Joanne Hall went through the list to identify them as Board sanctioned or school based programs.
- Would a K-8 have a school council? – Yes.

It was stated that “this ARC is an onerous task because we have 3 excellent schools with communities that are very involved. When looking at the 3 schools we can’t just go by numbers because each of the schools has something unique and wonderful to offer”.

Approval was given to the Chair to move on to Other Business.

7.0 Other Business

A draft report of Antonio Paez’s presentation was distributed to the Committee. The Committee members discussed the possibility of having the presentation on June 22, 2011 and consensus was reached. The 30 minute presentation will be heard on June 22, 2011

June 23rd or September 8th was given to the Committee as possible school tour dates. The tour would be from 6:00-9:00 p.m. and is considered outside of the ARC process. Mr. Del Bianco shared that there will be an agenda for the tours and that is was voluntary since it did not fall within the guidelines of the Terms of Reference. The tours would be guided by the Principals along with the Custodial Staff. Trustee Bishop shared how enlightening the secondary tours were and encouraged the Committee members to participate if they were able to do so.

Consensus was given to hold the school tours prior to the next working meeting on June 22, 2011. The tour would commence at Prince Philip at 5:30 and end at Dalewood where the working group meeting would be held from 7:30-9:00 p.m. It was decided to hear Mr. Paez’s presentation at a later date.

Due to time constraints consensus was given to approve the minutes in principle and they will be formally approved at the next meeting.

9.0 Adjournment – 9:27 p.m.