

**Central Mountain Accommodation Review Committee
Working Group Meeting # 3
Tuesday, October 29, 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, Jennifer Lockhart, Kathy Long, Denise McCafferty, 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 - Barbara Jalsevac

Non-Voting Members - Nil

Resource Staff

Ian Hopkins. Ellen Warling

Recording Secretary

Kathy Forde

Public - 17 public attendees present - G.L. Armstrong (4), Linden Park (2), Queensdale (10), Mountain News (1)

1. Call to Order

Michael Prendergast called the meeting to order. Public attendees were welcomed. Following recent news on the 2014 closure of Hill Park Secondary School, a brief update was provided. Trustees voted to close Hill Park in June 2014 rather than 2015 as previously scheduled due to the impact of declining enrolment on programming. Early transition of students from Hill Park to Barton will provide the stability critical for effective programming. An opportunity for comments was provided.

In an attempt to determine if perhaps any problems or inconsistencies from the final South ARC recommendation could provide insight moving forward on the elementary ARC process, the committee requested details on the progression of changes to the staff recommendation versus what actually happened. In response, Ellen Warling stated these will be provided to the committee.

Concerning interest in including Norwood Park within the review process in order to bump up enrolment numbers, it was noted that Norwood Park is considered a system program so is not included.

2. Agenda

2.1 Additions/Deletions

Nil

2.2 Approval of Agenda

No objections. Agenda approved by consensus by a show of hands.

2.3 Handout Protocol

Handouts provided as required.

3. Review of Voting Procedures

When a vote is required, quorum is defined as 50 percent plus one rounded down. With 23 voting members, quorum is calculated as $23 \div 2 = 11$ (rounded down) plus 1 = 12 so to reach quorum a minimum of 12 voting members must be present. As such, 12 voting members present divided by 2 = 6 plus 1 = 7 votes in favour needed to pass a vote.

4. School Tours

4.1 Discussion

A tour of George L. Armstrong will be available during break and a tour of Eastmount will follow when the meeting adjourns. Since it is difficult to see the exterior at night, tours will also be provided during the daytime with arrangements made in advance. Members can connect directly with principals as needed.

5. Minutes from Public Meeting # 1

5.1 Clarification

Minutes are intended to capture the essence of conversations.

5.2 Approval of Minutes

No objections. Minutes approved by consensus by a show of hands.

6. Minutes from Working Group Meeting # 2

6.1 Clarification

None required.

6.2 Approval of Minutes

No objections. Minutes approved by consensus by a show of hands.

7. School Information Profiles

7.1 Additions

Ian Hopkins noted that the SIP is a snapshot of data. Changes provided following review at the last meeting have been incorporated. Additional changes requested as follows:

- Franklin Road - has a computer lab

It was noted that transportation data applies to system busing needs opposed to special classes. Once approved, SIPs will not change. Any new requests for data would have to be dealt with separately. Approved SIPs will be presented at Public Meeting # 2. Ian will ensure the format is legible for review at the Public Meeting.

7.2 Approval

With changes discussed above, amended SIP profiles were approved by consensus by a show of hands.

DECISION: SIPs Approved

8. Public Meeting # 1 - Continuing Discussion

8.1 Question 2

At the last Working Group Meeting, only three of the four questions asked at Public Meeting # 1 were reviewed. As such, breakout groups were formed to continue the review of public feedback, specifically Question 2: What additional reference criteria do you think are important for the ARC to consider when developing recommendations? The seven reference criteria under the Terms of Reference (Section B.5, page 4) were also noted as guiding principles. Members reported back on the key themes as discussed. Feedback will be shared at Public Meeting # 2.

Group 1

- School walkability
- Daycare provision
- Transition plans
- Student safety

Group 2

- Lack of exercise
- Loosing students to Catholic Board
- JK-8 school model not necessarily better

- Safety crossing streets
- Renovations and updates

Group 3

- Programming
- Community impact
- Safety

Group 4

- Greenspace availability
- Student safety - primary students having to be walked or bused
- Benefits of smaller versus larger schools - larger schools may not be better

Group 5

- Young students on buses and spending time with older students
- Daycare availability
- Would kids go to schools recommended or prefer to go to other schools

8.2 Key Themes Handout

Public voice is essential. Feedback tells us what the public thinks is important - it is an opinion. All viewpoints need to be considered as a recommendation is developed.

9. Data Requested by the Committee

9.1 Facility Management Presentation

Ellen Warling provided an overview. The presentation is available on line for review.

9.2 JK-8 Model Research and Information

Michael Prendergast noted that HWDSB builds right-sized schools. Optimal sized secondary schools, built for approximately 1000 to 1200 students, provides opportunities for meeting the needs of all student pathways. Our schools are not considered super-sized as referenced by the media. Larger schools allow for more classrooms per grade which provides an advantage for programming and for reading buddies, leadership and citizenship initiatives. The elementary configuration, the JK-8 model is advantageous for middle grade students because they remain in one school with less transition. Research indicates a JK-8 model provides more stability. HWDSB has as a guiding principle the optimal school capacity for an elementary school is 500-600 students. The average school capacity for surrounding Boards is similar for new builds. In response to a request for the research that support the JK-8 model, the names, titles and links of related studies will be provided.

ACTION: Provide research information

10. Public Meeting # 2 - Tuesday November 5th

Breakout groups formed to focus on planning for the upcoming Public Meeting. Key points from discussions are highlighted below. Committee members were encouraged to help lead discussions.

10.1 Presentation of the School Information Profiles

The SIPs will be presented by the schools with an opportunity for feedback. Jamie XX volunteered to lead in the presentation. Slides will be provided by Ian Hopkins. Information needs to be easily understood. Stations will be setup for the public to move around. Anything displayed will require large font for clarity. A link could perhaps be provided for the public to access ARC information. Hardcopy information will also be provided to each school for parents who might not have access to the Internet. Principals and Board staff will be available to answer any questions.

10.2 Presentation of the Key Themes from Public Meeting # 1

What feedback from the first Public Meeting do we want to share and how? Leanne Friesen volunteers to be the lead on this in the presentation.

There is way too much data to share so information needs to be filtered in a general format (i.e. transportation, boundaries, funding, how can we make it better for our kids) opposed to a school specific format.

What other things do we need to know from the public meeting to inform our decisions?

Parents will want to voice their opinions and options. Parents can provide comments to their ARC school representative or through the ARC Info contact link (with clear title) for review at the next Working Group meeting.

Questions can be sent to Michael Prendergast or Ian Hopkins for inclusion.

11. Correspondence

Ian Hopkins provided a package for review. It was noted that a community partnership letter was sent out by the Director in June and posted on the Board website inviting community partners to utilize available space in the schools but there were no responses. A copy was provided in the previous correspondence package for information.

12. Next Steps

Following Public Meeting # 2, committee members should be in a position to start formulating alternative recommendations. Options developed as a group would then be presented at Public Meeting # 3.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

14. Tour

14.1 George L. Armstrong

Tours of the school were available during the break.

14.2 Eastmount Park

A tour of the school followed the meeting.

Handouts

- Agenda
- Presentation
- Draft Minutes - Public Meeting # 1 - October 08, 2013
- Draft Minutes - Working Group Meeting #2 - October 15, 2013
- Key Themes from Public Meeting # 1
- School Information Profiles
- High and Urgent Renewal Needs
- 10 Year Capital History
- Age 0-3 Comparison Map 2006-2011
- Age 4-13 Comparison Map 2006-2011
- Facilities Management Presentation - Overview of HWDSB Facilities
- Correspondence
- Binder Updates
 - Final Minutes Working Group Meeting # 1 (Tab O)
 - Qualitative Analysis Presentation - Working Group Meeting # 2 (Tab P - Item 8.1)