



Elementary

ACCOMMODATION Review Committee



East Hamilton City 1 Accommodation Review Committee
Working Group Meeting # 3
Tuesday, October 29, 2013
6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Viscount Montgomery Elementary School
1525 Lucerne Avenue, Hamilton, Ontario

Minutes

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members

Chair - Peter Joshua

Voting Members - Norma Rockwood, Abbie Boyko, Sandra Lindsay, Shannon Weston, Carla Shewell, Casey Eaton, Samantha Prosser, Tracie Wilson, Susan Pretula, Chris Weston, Barbara Mitchell, Laurie Hazelton, Megan MacDonald, Brian McPhee, Brandy Paul, Brianna Okerstrom, Jennifer Voth

Non-Voting Members - Ray Mulholland, Peter Sovran, Sandra Constable, Tiz Penny, Dan Ivankovic, Lisa Barzetti, John Gris

Regrets

Voting Members - Susan Fischer

Non-Voting Members - Todd White, Elaine Pilgrim-Susi, Joanna Crapsi-Casicoli

Resource Staff

Bob Fex, Peter Sovran

Recording Secretary

Colleen Pyke

Public - 11 public attendees were present - Rosedale (11)

1. Call to Order

Superintendent Peter Joshua called the meeting to order. Public attendees were welcomed.

2. Agenda

2.1 Additions/Deletions

The agenda package was reviewed and the meeting outline was discussed. It was noted that the main focus will be preparation for the next Public Meeting on November 7th. An open discussion on the recommendation from the Committee was added as item 8.2 of the agenda.

2.2 Approval of Agenda

Agenda approved by consensus.

3. Review of Quorum and Voting Procedures

Peter Joshua reviewed quorum and voting procedures.

4. School Tours

4.1 Discussion

There was concern from the Committee that 10 minute tours are insufficient to gather the appropriate information needed to formulate a recommendation. Some discussion revolved around a dedicated tour day in which all 7 schools would be visited, outside of scheduled ARC meeting dates. Peter Joshua recommended that for now, we aim for an 8:30 p.m. end time at working group meetings in order to facilitate a more in-depth 20-30 minute tour. He reminded the group that the ARC recommendation is to be presented at the December 5th Public Meeting therefore there aren't many dates available to add a tour day outside of the current schedule. The Committee agreed by consensus that this format will be sufficient at this point.

DECISION: Tour format acceptable

5. Minutes from Public Meeting #1

5.1 Clarification

No clarification needed.

5.2 Approval of Minutes

Minutes approved by consensus.

6. Minutes from Working Group Meeting #2

6.1 Clarification

No clarification needed.

6.2 Approval of Minutes

Minutes approved by consensus.

7. School Information Profiles

7.1 Additions

Bob Fex explained that the amendments that were requested by the Committee including the addition of current enrolment (as of September 30, 2013) have now been updated in the SIP. The Committee was asked to take a few minutes to review the amended SIP as it requires approval at this meeting, in order to be presented at the Public Meeting on November 7th. For clarification 'current enrolment' listed on the SIP is from October 2012. Committee requested that October 2012 be noted here to avoid confusion. Bob noted that the definitions for administrative costs and operating costs are to be corrected. There was a question regarding the inclusion of EQAO results in the SIP. Peter Joshua noted that it has been requested in other Accommodation Reviews and is a common question asked of the Planning Department. If it were not included the likelihood of it being requested is high. There was some discussion surrounding the list of extracurricular activities offered at each school. The Committee ultimately agreed by consensus that this list is sufficient to provide a sense of what each school offers. Peter Joshua pointed out that when the

Committee presents the SIP to the public, any questions or concerns that are raised can be assessed by the Committee and included in the ARC recommendation.

7.2 Approval

All in favour of approving the SIP as amended.

DECISION: SIP approved

8. Public Meeting #1 - Continuing Discussion

8.1 Key Themes Handout

Peter Joshua thanked the Committee for the work they did at the last meeting to put together key themes from the Public Meeting. This information will be presented to the public by the Committee at the next Public Meeting. Members broke into groups to consolidate 3 or 4 main points from each question.

Question 1: How does the staff recommendation follow the reference criteria?

Transportation, Boundaries, Partnership opportunities

Question 2: What additional reference criteria do you think are important for the ARC to consider when developing recommendations?

Accessibility, Operations; what will the day schedule look like/Timelines (2014)/Staffing

Question 3: Using the additional reference criteria, how well does the staff recommendation meet the new criteria? Please explain.

Transportation, Building conditions, what will happen to closed schools, Effectiveness of JK-8 vs. JK-5 (special needs, specialty classes)

Question 4: What else do you feel is important for the ARC to consider as they begin developing options?

Class sizes, School size (bigger not necessarily better), Community (property value, partnerships, 'community feel')

8.2 Open Discussion Regarding ARC Recommendation

The Committee requested more information regarding JK-8 model versus JK-5/6. Bob Fex will look into this and bring his findings to the next Working Group meeting.

A concern regarding timeline (June 2014 closure) was mentioned. Peter Joshua noted that the staff option does not have to be your recommendation. Timeline may be something the ARC will want to address in their recommendation. He suggested including a rationale.

Consideration of a new facility was addressed by Committee members. It was suggested that the ARC look at the cost effectiveness of investing in aging facility versus a new build. It was also mentioned that a request for brick and mortar over portables be included in the recommendation. In addition, the Committee requested a cost breakdown for high and urgent repairs/upgrades (particularly air conditioning

and asbestos) in each school be provided. Bob Fex will request a list of differed maintenance costs from Facilities Management and will address findings at the next Working Group meeting.

ACTION: Cost breakdown to be provided

The Committee brought forth the idea of creating a transition plan for younger students (JK-5) amalgamating with older students (6-8), including the possibility of staggering the transition. Peter Joshua suggested that the ARC include this plan in their recommendation.

A Committee member suggested perhaps the ARC could create a working recommendation to present to the public on November 7th to give themselves and the public more time to assess the options before the final presentation on December 5th. The Committee agreed by consensus that there is not enough information at this point to formulate a working recommendation at this point.

Transportation costs were discussed. Bob Fex will provide the Committee with the number of busses currently used for each school and the number of busses that will be required as per the staff option. He noted that cost is not necessarily viable until the actual year of implementation. Peter Joshua noted that the Transportation Policy will apply to any outcome. If a student lives further than 1.6 km from their home school, they will be provided transportation. In addition, he pointed out that transportation costs are separate from maintenance and facility costs associated with school closures. HWDSB honors the distance noted in our policy regardless of the cost.

ACTION: Bus information to be provided

As requested by the Committee, Peter Sovran listed the walking distances from school to school, according to Google Maps Rosedale to Viscount Montgomery 1.7 km, Parkdale to W.H. Ballard 1.3 km, Woodward to Hillcrest 1.1 km and Roxborough Park to Hillcrest 1.4 km.

There was a suggestion from a Committee member that the group conduct a more informal discussion to get a better sense of what everyone wants to see. All Committee members were in favour of a more informal discussion. Peter Joshua allotted 20-30 minutes to conduct discussions.

The Committee questioned whether or not a new school would be feasible, or if this should not be something they include in their recommendation. Bob Fex noted that there is nothing preventing the ARC from recommending it. Peter Joshua added that if it is something the ARC would like to recommend, there will have to be a rationale to support it. He also suggested that the ARC create a backup plan in addition.

9. Public Meeting #2 - Thursday November 7th

9.1 Presentation of the School Information Profiles

9.2 Presentations of the key themes from Public Meeting 1

Peter Joshua outlined the concept for the Public Meeting. He noted that 3 individuals from the ARC will serve as presenters for the meeting. It was decided that Chris Weston will conduct the introductions and explain the process up to this point, Susan Pretula will present the main themes that arose from the first Public Meeting and Laurie Hazelton will present a summary from the SIP. Sandra Lindsay will serve as a

backup presenter, if needed. Bob Fex will create a PowerPoint presentation with this information and will send it out to the Committee by Monday. It is necessary to respond with any suggestions and/or approval by Tuesday in order to be prepared for the Public Meeting on Thursday November 7th. It was suggested that a large portion of the Public Meeting be designated to a question and answer period. Bob Fex noted that we will have a break out session similar to the first public meeting, with facilitators. The format was discussed including changing the seating concept, the option of a microphone for question/answer period versus round table discussions. Peter Joshua noted that from past experience, this format gives everyone a chance to have their comments and concerns heard, whereas a microphone format does not.

A list of questions was provided to support staff regarding various boundary concerns. These questions will be addressed at the next meeting. Bob Fex outlined that it is necessary for the Committee to devise protocol for data requests. Any data must be supplied for all the schools involved. It was noted that schools that are not included in this ARC may not be included in the ARC recommendation.

ACTION: Boundary information to be provided

The Committee requested a student distribution map inclusive of the entire Accommodation Review area in order to better formulate boundary recommendations.

ACTION: Student distribution map to be provided

10. Correspondence

Peter Joshua noted that there is one piece of correspondence in the agenda package for the Committee to review.

11. Next Steps

- Presentation for the Public Meeting will be provided to the Committee on Monday November 4th. Please review and forward any questions or concerns to Bob Fex by Tuesday November 5th
- **Next Public Meeting #2 - Thursday November 07, 2013 at Parkdale**
- **Next Working Group Meeting #4 - Thursday November 14, 2013 at W.H. Ballard**

12. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Handouts

- Agenda
- Presentation
- Draft Minutes Public Meeting #1 - Thursday October 10, 2013
- Draft Minutes Working Group Meeting #2 - Thursday October 17, 2013
- School Information Profiles (SIPs)
- Committee membership list
- Schedule Calendar
- Walking distance Map
- Correspondence