

**West Glanbrook Accommodation Review Committee**

**Working Group Meeting # 4**  
**Wednesday, November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2013**  
**6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.**

**Bell-Stone Elementary School**  
**6025 White Church Road and Nebo Road, Mount Hope, ON**

**Minutes**

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Committee Members**

**Chair** – Sue Dunlop

**Voting Members** – Amie Vandevrie, Theresa Weylie, Steve Paul, Janet Lewis, Alyson Brave, Karen Stewart

**Non-Voting Members** – Alex Johnstone, Rob Maudsley

**Regrets**

**Voting Members** – Melanie Holjak, Trisha Woehrle

**Non-Voting Members** - Nil

**Resource Staff**

Ian Hopkins

**Recording Secretary**

Colleen Pyke

**Public** - 0 public attendees present

**1. Call to Order – Chair**

Superintendent Sue Dunlop called the meeting to order and welcomed all Committee members

**2. Agenda**

**2.1 Additions/Deletions**

None

**2.2 Approval of Agenda**

Approved by consensus

**3. Minutes from Public Meeting #2**

**3.1 Clarification**

None

**3.2 Approval of minutes**

Approved by consensus

#### 4. Minutes from Working Group Meeting #3

##### 4.1 Clarification

Facilitator notes from Public Meeting #2 will be presented to the group in a handout

##### 4.2 Approval of minutes

Approved by consensus

#### 5. Tour of Bell-Stone

Principal Rob Maudsley provided a tour of the school

#### 6. Data requested by the committee

##### 6.1 Past Accommodation Reviews

Sue Dunlop explained the handout on past Accommodation Reviews. The handout shows initial staff recommendation, the final staff recommendation, the Accommodation Review Committee's recommendation and the final Trustee decision. Each Accommodation Review in the handout was reviewed.

- The Dalewood ARC recommendation was not accepted by the Trustees
- In the King George Accommodation Review- the staff recommendation, ARC recommendation and final Trustee decision all aligned
- Trustee Johnstone talked to the North Secondary Accommodation Review. She explained that the Trustees landed on the Scott Park/King George site because of its proximity to the largest number of secondary students over the next 20 years. She also explained that part of the Trustees' decision listed on the chart has ultimately changed as issues arose
- Ian Hopkins explained the South Secondary Accommodation Review and the multiple options recommended by the ARC. He also discussed the West Secondary Accommodation Review, explaining that Parkside and Highland will combine into Highland (renamed Dundas Valley Secondary School).

There was a question regarding whether or not there are Ministry guidelines for optimal school size. Ian Hopkins noted that there are not Ministry guidelines; however as per the Long Term Facility Master Plan, HWDSB has outlined optimal size as 1000-1250 for secondary schools and 500-600 for elementary.

In summary, Sue Dunlop explained that there have been ARC recommendations that Trustees did not accept, recommendations that they did and some situations where there were multiple recommendations presented. She noted that the best bet for the ARC is to make a viable recommendation.

##### 6.2 Capital Renovations Information

Ian Hopkins discussed the capital renovations information that was requested by the Committee. He explained that Facilities Management staff did an audit of Mount Hope and this is a breakdown of costs, including what the Committee requested as well as high and urgent needs. He also noted that Mount Hope is scheduled for accessibility upgrades in 2016/17 in the Long Term Accessibility report. This will include ramps, proper hardware for doors, etc. He pointed out that there are a number of immediate specific

Next Working Group Meeting – December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013 at Mount Hope

\*\*\*All Accommodation Review Committee Meetings are open to the public\*\*\*

requests/needs that come in from schools and this could slow down the process. Ian explained that each item within the school is entered into a database and each item has a lifecycle; this is how they determine high and urgent needs. One of the major costs in the 5-10 year high/urgent is the roof. He noted that an FDK addition is roughly \$500,000 and a renovation of existing space is around \$250,000. He also explained that at a certain enrolment, the Ministry recommends that the gym be larger; it would cost about \$300,000 for that. The remaining money would be bringing the spaces up to the Ministry benchmark. He explained that although this is all listed, does not necessarily mean it will all occur. There was a recommendation that the Accommodation Review Committee rank their requests in their recommendation. Rob Maudsley pointed out that he toured the school with the Facilities Management staff and noted that some of the 1-5 year high and urgent needs are doors and windows, washrooms, lighting, exterior paint, and interior paint. It was also noted that high and urgent means timing and not necessarily critical. Trustee Johnstone explained that Trustees rank the priorities every year; critical needs are at the top, then they look at things like technology (ex. adding electrical outlets and upgrading to wireless). Items change from year to year as things arise at schools. There was a question from the Committee regarding whether or not there is a specific dollar amount the Trustees have in mind for this review, once a decision has been finalized. Trustee Johnstone explained that there isn't a specific dollar amount "assigned" to each school at this point. For example, Ancaster High needs 14 million dollars for capital renovations, but the Board needs to apply to the Ministry for funding. The reality is there are a lot of things that need to be done across the system, but the funds are limited. Ian Hopkins explained that there is no guarantee that all these things will get down right away. If the ARC decides to recommend holding off the closure of Bell-Stone for a year, that doesn't necessarily mean that all the renovations are going to be complete by then either.

There was a question from the Committee regarding what happens to the contents of the school that closes. Sue Dunlop explained that the furniture belongs to the Board and will likely be redistributed where necessary. The items that the Parent Council purchased would be their decision. Until they make a decision as to what they want to do with the building, there would likely be no decision made. That will be part of the transition plan. Once the Trustees decision is made, there will be a Transition Committee formed. However, typically the "equipment" follows the students.

The Committee wondered whether or not the name of the school would change once combined. Sue Dunlop explained that the Board has a naming/re-naming policy that will commence soon after the Trustees make their decision. There is public consultation as well as a survey sent out.

## **7. Accommodation Recommendation**

### **7.1 Development and Discussion**

The Committee reviewed the facilitator notes from Public Meeting #2. There was discussion regarding the public's concern that timelines are too quick. However, the Committee felt that there are ways to make the transition smooth for everyone. The notes showed there is also a lot of concern that the boundaries should be reviewed, including Bellmoore. Ian Hopkins explained that there are only 130 spaces available at Bell-Stone and long term that would not be enough accommodate the large number of students projected in Binbrook. Also, there are associated schools with associated high schools and therefore we would be

affecting the secondary boundary as well. A Committee member pointed out that when the new Bellmoore was being built, the overflow of students attended Mount Albion as a holding school as opposed to Bell-Stone mainly because they are in the same associated secondary cluster. Ian noted that the need in Binbrook is likely going to be a 500 pupil place school, not 150. It is similar to what has happened in Ancaster and the Board has applied for funding for a new school there. Sue Dunlop explained that the Accommodation Review Committee needs to make a strong business case. It needs to be made with the students' and community's best interests at heart, but also needs to take dollars and cents into account. She noted that the recommendation should keep in mind the reference criteria. The reality is there are still excess pupil places no matter how you shuffle the students between the 2 schools.

The Committee broke into 2 groups to discuss possible recommendations.

#### **Option 1**

Close Bell-Stone in June 2015; consolidate into Mount Hope September 2015

**Reasons:** Giving more time for construction/renovations, more transition time for the students and staff; perhaps creating social gatherings and planned events over the course of the year to get the two schools familiar with one another.

#### ***Capital requests:***

- 1) Addition of full day kindergarten room
- 2) Washrooms (completed before September 2015)
- 3) Parking lot updated to accommodate additional parents, students and buses
- 4) Playground- could resurface, perhaps as a temporary fix (fill cracks and seal it)

#### **Option 2**

Close Bell-Stone in June 2014; consolidate into Mount Hope September 2014

**Reasons:** Some students will leave anyway (already out-of-catchment) so pushing it off will just make September 2014 enrolment even lower at Bell-Stone. Creates a beneficial learning environment; 2 classes of each grade, more programs available, team teaching, professional development, more extracurricular activities available.

#### ***Capital requests:***

- 1) Washrooms
- 2) Expand gym
- 3) Addition of full day kindergarten room, rather than renovation of existing spaces

Would like to include a suggestion to review the high school boundaries for the new South Secondary and Ancaster high.

Rob Maudsley pointed out that the need for parking has changed a bit in the last few years, with the addition of FDK teachers/ECEs, half time students, etc. Also, there is a very tight lane way to come in and out.

Ian Hopkins suggested the Committee present both of their options and receive input from the public on both. From the feedback, the Committee can come to a decision and write the report from there.

**DECISION: The Committee agreed by consensus that both options would be presented to the public on December 04, 2013 at Public Meeting #3.**

**8. Public Meeting #3 Discussion – December 4<sup>th</sup>**

**8.1 Format of Meetings**

Ian Hopkins explained that the committee can take full ownership of the presentation for the upcoming Public Meeting. He will create the PowerPoint and send to committee by Friday for review. Please have any questions, changes, additions, etc. returned to him by Tuesday. The Committee will need to assign someone to presenting the introduction, process, etc. The Committee agreed that Alyson and Melanie will do this portion. There was a suggestion from the Committee that the pros and cons to both options are presented. Alyson will present Option 1 and Theresa will present Option 2.

**Option 2:**

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meets all reference criteria</li> <li>• Students benefit from larger staff/community, more programming</li> <li>• More extracurricular activities</li> <li>• Relieves anxiety in students by not waiting an extra year to close Bell-Stone</li> <li>• Transition Committee could be struck as soon as possible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transition too quick- short timeline</li> <li>• Construction/renovations wouldn't be complete</li> </ul>

**Option 1:**

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meets all reference criteria</li> <li>• Capital renovations can be completed before students move to Mount Hope</li> <li>• Allows for transition time to be longer for students/community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prolonged closing time could reduce Bell-Stone enrolment even further</li> <li>• Concerns about community morale at Bell-Stone</li> <li>• Concerns about program and extracurricular activities at Bell-Stone</li> <li>• Prolonged closing could create more anxiety in students</li> <li>• Difficulty staffing at Bell-Stone with impending closure</li> </ul>

The Committee members will not participate in facilitated discussions at this meeting, they will observe and be available for questions if needed. The Committee created two questions to ask the public in the facilitated discussions;

- 1) Additional pros and cons to these options?
- 2) A Transition Committee will be struck: what do you think would make the transition easier?

Next Working Group Meeting – December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013 at Mount Hope

\*\*\*All Accommodation Review Committee Meetings are open to the public\*\*\*

## 9. Correspondence

Letter from Tim Simmons, Chair of the Board to all Accommodation Review Committee members

## 10. Next Steps

- Next Public meeting #3- December 04, 2013 at Mount Hope
- Next Working Group Meeting #5 – December 11, 2013 at Mount Hope

## 11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

### Agenda Package and Handouts

- Agenda
- Draft Minutes – Working Group #3 – October 30, 2013
- Draft Minutes – Public Meeting #2 – November 06, 2013
- Past Accommodation Reviews Summary
- Projected costs for capital renovations at Mount Hope
- Facilitator Notes from Public Meeting #2
- Correspondence- Letter from Tim Simmons, Chair of the Board to all ARC members