

Central Mountain Accommodation Review Committee
Public Consultation Meeting # 2
Tuesday, November 05, 2013
6:00 p.m.

George L. Armstrong Elementary School
460 Concession Street, Hamilton, ON

Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members

Chair - Michael Prendergast

Voting Members - Diana Asrani, Amber Bourque, Candice Campbell, Marney Campbell, Jenn Clarke, Philip Erwood, Leanne Friesen, Dianna Gamble, Adam Hinks, Marj Howden, Barbara Jalsevac, Jennifer Lockhart, Kathy Long, Jamie McLean, Sharon Miller, Patricia Mousseau, Robert Nixon, Candice Romaker, Janeen Schaeffer, Margaret Toth, Lourie Vanderzyden, Laurie Walowina

Non-Voting Members - Linda Astle, Julie Beattie, Maria Carbone, Biljana Arsovic Filice, Colin Hazell, Lillian Orban, Jennifer Robertson-Heath, Nanci-Jane Simpson, Doug Trimble

Regrets

Voting Members - Denise McCafferty

Non-Voting Members - Nil

Resource Staff

Ian Hopkins, Jackie Penman, Ellen Warling

Recording Secretary

Kathy Forde

Public 158 public attendees present - Cardinal Heights (3), Eastmount (11), Franklin Road (4), George L. Armstrong (14), Linden Park (25), Pauline Johnson (1), Queensdale (92), Ridgemount(1), Highview (1), No School Affiliation (4), Trustees (3)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Michael Prendergast welcomed everyone to the meeting and outlined the format for the evening. While reviewing meeting norms, it was noted that HWDSB promotes character development in which caring, acceptance, integrity and respect are key aspects for student development and are applicable for mutual respect among attendees tonight.

2. Overview of Accommodation Review Process

Michael Prendergast indicated that the Accommodation Review Committee is mandated to act in an advisory role to study, report and provide recommendations on schools under review. The final decision will be made by the Board of Trustees. Membership structure was reviewed. As part of the Terms of Reference, Reference Criteria are provided as guiding principles for developing recommendations and relate to facility utilization, permanent and non-permanent accommodation, program offerings, quality teaching and learning environments, transportation, partnership opportunities and equity. Guiding principles are not limited. The review committee can add any criteria considered necessary.

Guiding principles under the Long Term Facilities Master Plan were also reviewed. This plan focuses on ensuring all school sites meet the needs of all students. Many schools are old and present challenges. Class size and school environments have changed since the schools were first built. The optimal utilization rate is in the range of 90-110 percent. Transportation will normally not exceed 60 minutes. In terms of 21st century learning, it is important for students to learn collaboration, communication and creativity skills. Accessibility, community access and flexible learning environments are also considered. Daycare programs are a priority so available space and partnerships will remain essential. Ideally, optimal elementary school capacity is 500-600 with grades Kindergarten to Grade 8, which allows for full programming. Site size of approximately six acres provides plenty of greenspace and playing fields.

In terms of progress, the process began in June 2013 with Board approval on the preliminary report. Following preparation over the summer, the community review phase that started in October will run until January 2014. During this phase, the Board option was shared as a starting point and now the working committee is tasked with reviewing data and gathering public input to develop an alternative option. In February 2014, the committee will bring options developed to the Board for review. Public delegations will have an opportunity to present any concerns through the Standing Committee. By May 2014, it is anticipated that Trustees will make a decision. The approved recommendation does not necessarily mean things will change immediately as timelines may be stipulated within the options that are put forward.

3. Work Completed by Accommodation Review Committee

At this point, the meeting was interrupted by John-Paul Danko, identified as John Galt, a father, concerned citizen and member of the public who took over the microphone. Continuing with his own agenda, John-Paul Danko indicated his intention to control the meeting and to permit expression of public concerns and opinions. Insisting the process was one-sided and that the meeting agenda did not allow for adequate public input, various public attendees and committee members voiced discontent and resentment toward the speaker for disrupting the meeting. Michael Prendergast intervened and asked committee members to stand and indicate by a show of hands how many had input to the meeting agenda. Members considered the intrusion to be a nonproductive use of time and concurred that the meeting continue as originally scheduled.

Committee members reiterated the importance of public voice. It was noted that each member is human, has a family and a job and is participating to do the best work possible. Members are here to inform the

public on how the process has evolved and to gather as much feedback as possible. **Voice is necessary to be informed.** Table discussions were considered to be a productive format for gathering feedback on the schools under review. Attendees were encouraged to provide any insights through their school committee representatives and were asked for their attention to proceed through the meeting as planned.

4. Review of School Information Profiles (SIPs)

4.1 School Information Profile Information Session

The SIPs have been reviewed in detail, amended and approved by the Working Group as part of the process. Committee members have also been invited into each school to tour individual facilities. Michael Prendergast invited attendees to view the SIPs posted in the library and small gym and share ideas with committee members who were available to record any further comments or concerns.

5. Review of Public Meeting # 1 - Key Themes

Not reviewed as attendees were interested in reviewing the SIPs.

6. Facilitated Group Discussion

Committee members joined tables to gather public feedback on two questions:

- Do the present Key themes make sense to the group? What is not there that is important for us to know?
- In creating an ideal elementary learning facility, what considerations do you feel are most important?

Feedback would be consolidated for review at the next Working Group meeting.

Before the group discussions began, appreciation was extended to facilitators for their assistance and to Trustees Orban, Hicks and Mulholland for their attendance.

7. Next Steps

- The idea of an open microphone format at the next Public Meeting will be discussed and voted on at a working group meeting prior to the next public meeting.
- **Next Working Group Meeting - November 12, 2013 6:00-9:00 pm at Franklin Road**
- **Next Public Meeting - December 10, 2013 6:00-9:00 pm at Queensdale**

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Handouts

- Agenda
- Presentation
- School Information Profiles (SIPs)