

**South Accommodation Review Committee Meeting**

**Education Centre Board Room**

**January 25, 2011**

**Minutes**

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Committee Members**

***Chair –Superintendent Scott Sincerbox***

***Voting Members - Bill Barrett, Beverly Bressette, Jackie Brown, Alexandra Butty, Donna Dixon, Margaret Eagle, Kim General, Angela Koklis, Al Pierce, Anne Pollard, Susan Pretula, Teresa Robson, John Whitwell***

***Non-Voting Members - Lisa Anderson, Wanda Bielak, Donna Clappison, Gary Deveau, Scott Duvall, Angela Ferguson, Manny Figueiredo, Randy Gallant, Mag Gardner, Brian Greig, Wes Hicks, Tom Jackson, Peter Joshua, Deb Jukes, Ted Kocznur, Joanna Maul, John Miholics, Laura Peddle, Kevin Robinson, Paul Vukosa, and Terry Whitehead.***

**Regrets**

***Voting Members - Derek Hambly, Julia Shen***

***Non-Voting Members - Lillian Orban***

**Resource Staff**

***Daniel Del Bianco, Steve Stirling, Jim Wibberley, Michael Slee, Don Hall, Kevin Morton***

**Recording Secretary**

***Tracy McKillop***

1. **Call to Order** – Superintendent Scott Sincerbox called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m. Superintendent Sincerbox commenced the meeting with introductions and reviewed the house rules. Mr. Sincerbox also indicated that the media would like to have access to the committee member's contact information and if any committee member was open to sharing this information then they were to inform Tracy McKillop of this.

2. **Agenda**

**2.1 Addition and Deletions** – There were no additions or deletions to the Agenda.

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

**3. Minutes of the Meeting of January 4, 2011**

**3.1. Errors or Omissions** - Trustee Laura Peddle noted some revisions.

**3.2 Approval of the Minutes** -The minutes were approved as amended.

**3.3 Business Arising from the Minutes**

**3.3.1 Binder Updates** – Mr. Del Bianco spoke about the updated School Information Profiles (SIP) which was distributed to the Committee and now includes sections two and three. The committee also received the “Non ARC” SIP for Saltfleet District High, Waterdown District High and Westmount School. School overviews for each of the schools – Barton, Hill Park, Mountain Secondary, Sherwood and Sir Allan MacNab Secondary were added. It was noted that the school overviews should be filed behind the yellow tabs located under the school profile tab.

**3.3.2 Clarifications** – Superintendent Sincerbox spoke with the committee regarding the start time. The start time is currently 6 p.m. and the committee would be required to vote to make a change to the starting time of the meeting. There was consensus to leave the start time at 6 p.m. There was consensus to move off of number three.

**4. Information Items and Follow-Up**

**4.1 Timelines and Benchmarks** – A flow chart outlining the meeting dates and objectives was included in the handout package. Mr. Del Bianco shared that the timelines chart can be adjusted if necessary as this is just a guideline.

**4.2 Public Meetings and Organization** – Mr. Del Bianco informed the committee that the public meeting provides an opportunity to present an update to the public regarding what has taken place at both working meeting one and meeting two. The intent is to provide a brief overview of the ARC process, the SIPs and the program strategy as well as the recommendations from the Senior Administration team. This meeting will allow the committee an opportunity to listen to the questions and comments of the community. The meeting is scheduled for Hill Park at 6:00 p.m. The public meeting will be advertised in the media.

Questions - there were no questions asked at this time.

**4.3 School Tours** – Mr. Del Bianco indicated that the school tours will provide the members of the committee a better understanding of the SIPs and the opportunity for them to see the properties first hand. March 26, 2011 was the proposed date and a tentative agenda was included in the handout package.

#### Question/Comments from the Committee:

- The question was raised “will all of the ARCs have the tours” and the answer was yes.
- There was concern because some of the committee members work Saturdays and this could result in not all members of the committee being able to participate in the school tours. Mr. Del Bianco indicated that it would be difficult to meet everyone’s schedule and that they understood that not everyone would be available to attend.
- The next question asked was if there was an alternate date scheduled. Mr Del Bianco indicated that the March date precedes the committee beginning their work on the recommendations so perhaps at the March 8<sup>th</sup> meeting the committee could re-visit this and verify who would be able to attend the tour. The Chair asked the committee if they would like to revisit the tour date at the March 8<sup>th</sup> meeting and consensus was given to look at this again.
- There was a question raised of why the Non-ARC schools were not included on the Tour. The Chair reminded the committee that the work of this committee is to focus on the schools that fall within the South ARC. A further request was put forth asking if this could be left open and possibly re-visited again in the future. Mr. Del Bianco shared that if the committee as a whole would like to revisit this then it would need to be considered.
- The last question raised was if the date of the School Tour, March 26<sup>th</sup> could be discussed at the public meeting on February 15<sup>th</sup> instead of waiting until March 8, 2011. This would allow the committee more time to make changes to their schedule if required. Consensus was given on this question.

There was consensus to move off of Agenda Item number four.

#### **5. School Information Profiles – Dan Del Bianco**

**5.1 New Information** – Mr. Del Bianco had five groups set up – one for each school. Councillor Whitehead indicated that he was interested in two of the schools and would like to participate in both of these groups and wondered how he could be in two groups at one time. Mr. Del Bianco suggested that perhaps he could spend half of his time with each of the groups. Mr. Del Bianco went on further to explain that each group would be supported by one Facility Management Resource person. Having the smaller groups allows for the members to work easily with each other as well with the Facility Management Resource person.

Each group came back to the meeting after forty minutes and had one person as a spokesperson for their group.

#### **Barton**

John Whitwell represented the Barton group. He indicated that they were able to get through all 21 items. There were a number of questions and concerns:

- What is the definition of a classroom and the number of classrooms was up for question.
- Cost of Operations – what is the rationale behind the cost of the operations between the various schools?
- Mr. Del Bianco informed the committee that all of the written questions would be reviewed for clarification and answered at the next working meeting.
- Were the costs broken down into cost per pupil based on the square footage of the building?
- FCI Projections – can we get clarification on the meaning of this – did it mean that there would be no further improvements within the next ten year period?
- Quality of Learning Environment – a breakdown of the computers and an inventory of the computers in each building
- Further clarification on the bus route. Can there be more definition of the bus route and the distance of the bus route?
- Range of programs offered at the schools. Can we update that data? There were certain clubs that were not in that data.
- Mr. Del Bianco indicated that any further questions could be emailed to Tracy Skinner which will be addressed at the Steering Committee meetings.

#### **Hill Park**

All of the written questions were submitted and will be addressed at the next working committee meeting on March 8, 2011. Some of the questions that were raised were:

- Will the students that are in and out of the catchment areas be moved into Hill Park?
- What is Re-Capp?
- Does “graduation rate” mean students leaving the school?
- Section #21 – What would be the effect of removing the school. What does that do to the property values in the area?

#### **Mountain**

Some of the questions and concerns that were raised for Mountain Secondary School are:

- The criteria that were used to collect data do not apply to Mountain Secondary School due to the special needs and programs at this school.
- There is no catchment area because it deals with the entire city.

- In section #1 why is 21 used as the average # of schools to classroom because these are smaller classes due to the programming.
- What classrooms are being utilized – there are more than 10 classrooms being used.
- There are 26 classrooms available – does that include the 3 other classrooms that are used by other groups?
- Section #2 – can you clarify the formula?
- Section #3 – what number is the true reflection of the needs and where is the special education layer for the formulas.
- Are both Board and non-Board computers taken into consideration for the computer count.
- Section #11 Location – 81% of the school consists of students who are bussed and there is no catchment area – can this number be based on the home address of the students since it reflects the entire school?
- What data was used for EQAO results?
- Section 13 – this section is irrelevant due to the catchment area.
- Why wasn't Mountain Secondary School excluded from the ARC due to its special needs? Mr. Del Bianco shared that he was not privy to that information.

## **Sherwood**

Some of the questions that were brought forward for Sherwood Secondary School are:

- Did the numbers from the average daily enrolment come from 2009 or 2010?
- Section #4 – is there a list of renewal projects, undertaken in the last 10 years, used to renovate the schools?
- Are you comparing schools that have been renovated to those four that were not?
- Does the school have a pool and is it school or community owned?
- What is the definition of the breakfast program and who supports that financially?
- Section 11 – are there details available showing where students live within the boundary and where they attend school?

## **Sir Allan MacNab**

The group was able to work up to item number 11 and some of their questions included:

- What is the distance to the nearest school?
- Mr. Pierce was wondering what weight is put on whether a school is open or closed based on the fact that they have a city recreation centre. Mr. Del Bianco suggested that the question be taken back to the Steering Committee.
- How many students are turned away from schools?

There were a number of general questions that were then brought forward from the committee.

**Mr. Pierce** asked if the data had been developed around the city growth. Mr. Del Bianco stated that the secondary projections are driven by the elementary school enrolment. Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board projections are based on 3 year and 5 year projections that are consistent with what the City of Hamilton used at this time. He also shared that HWDSB continually updates their projection and for every positive there is usually a negative.

**Mr. Whitehead** indicated that his ward has the largest senior population. He felt that new families will be moving into the area as the senior population move out and wondered if this has been taken into consideration.

**Ms. Susan Petrula** stated that a lot of schools depend on fundraising and asked if this had been factored into the running of the schools.

**Mr. Bill Barrett** indicated that Westmount requires the most money to fix the school and is this something that we should consider. Mr. Del Bianco stated that this is not part of our mandate however if the committee felt that we need to consider this then they could incorporate this into their recommendation.

There was consensus to move off agenda item number 5.

Superintendent Sincerbox felt that the committee may need consensus to extend the meeting.

## **6. Program Plan – Peter Joshua and Vicki Corcoran – Superintendents**

**6.1 Presentations** – Superintendent Joshua stated that tonight's presentation provides an important high level look at the program strategy, its guiding principles and its connections to the Education in Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board report that was presented at the last meeting. He explained that the program strategy is all about a focus on how we can best support your child (student) in learning, achieving and preparing for life during and beyond secondary school. Superintendent Joshua shared the definitions of the program strategy which included:

**Personalized Learning** - this puts the learner at the centre and provides assessment and instruction tailored to a student's particular learning and motivational needs.

**Pathways** – this is a combination of courses that lead to graduation and to a post secondary destination which may include apprenticeship, college, university, community or the workplace.

**Specialization** – these are programs that allow students to explore their interests. In addition to the programming offered at neighbourhood schools there would be alternative programs which focus on such things as sports, academics, science, arts and languages.

**Equity** – all students have access to programs when and where they need them and where all students participate to the best of their abilities.

**Tiered Intervention** – a method used to meet the abilities and preferences of students where the level of support or programming is adjusted appropriately for each student.

The Program Strategy intertwines support to all schools. Superintendent Corcoran stated that the first criteria used to assist students in choosing an appropriate program pathway is their individual learning profile and level of independence. What is the goal for the student at the end of his/her secondary years and what is the best plan to achieve that? With the focus on “Learning for All” the schools need to provide inclusive and supportive environments that encourage the engagement and involvement of all students in all aspects of the secondary experience.

Superintendent Corcoran spoke of the Spectrum of Programs that would be available in all schools:

**Student Support Centres** – would provide support to students who are fully integrated into regular class and earning credits.

**Student Alternative Support Centres** – would be a new support program designed to support students in regular programs but who have anxiety-related or other mental health concerns and require targeted socio-emotional support in order to succeed in their chosen pathways.

**A Comprehensive Support Program** – is a program that would provide targeted, yet credit-bearing support in the core areas of literacy and numeracy plus inclusion into regular courses.

Superintendent Corcoran then went on to explain the Spectrum of Programs that would be available in all clusters:

**Graduated Support Program** – this program would be similar to a pilot program that is currently being offered at one site in our system. This program has two parts: The Personalized Support Part of the program is a 4 year program designed to solidify functional skills in literacy and numeracy, provide life skills training and focus on independence skills. Students would participate and be integrated appropriately into the school community. The transition part of the program would last a maximum of three years and involve a planned transition to the community, focusing on skills determined by the transition plan which

assist the student in their integration into the community through co-op or work experience placements.

**Specific Support Program** – would provide such support, plus some inclusion into the secondary school community as personally appropriate. This program would provide intensive, personalized support in various areas, such as life skills, communication and personal care.

**Personalized Learning Centres** – would provide individualized programs not housed in a regular high school setting. These students would receive the supports necessary to transition back to the regular school environment or to a workplace setting as appropriate.

Superintendent Corcoran stated that there are two other programs which need to be provided as part of the spectrum of services in order to meet the needs of all of our students. These include:

**The Extensive Support Program** – which would provide targeted support to students requiring extensive and continuous support and supervision, and very personalized support programs. This program would be offered in at least one location in Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board.

**The Intensive System Support Program** – which is a program designed to support students in very unique situations where none of the existing programs will meet their unique needs, such that an individualized solution must be explored and developed collaboratively with our community partners.

The Chair asked if there was consensus to extend the meeting and it was agreed to extend the meeting. The Chair stated that the presenters would be happy to answer questions on the program strategy at the next working meeting. There was consensus to move on to the next agenda item

**7.0 Recommendations of HWDSB's Senior Administration – Ken Bain, Associate Director of Education** – Associate Director Bain informed the committee that the Ministry policy requires Senior Administration to provide their recommendation to the ARC and the public during the ARC process. There is no stipulation as to when the recommendation is to be presented however HWDSB's Senior Administration team felt that they would share it early in the process. He shared with the ARC Committee that this is a point in time recommendation and their best thinking at this time. He also said that the committee members could endorse it, set it aside, modify it or simply throw it away. Associate Director Bain stated that the Senior Administration team will be kept abreast of the questions and recommendations of the ARC and this information may change or impact the Board's final recommendation. He then went on to explain why we have an Accommodation Review. Larger Secondary School environments mean the following for students:

### **Program Benefits**

- Provide greater options for students
- Broader course selection
- Flexible student timetables
- More opportunities for all pathways

### **Financial Benefits**

- Vast majority of grants are provided on a per pupil basis – therefore spreading the funding over fewer schools allows for greater benefits
- Renewal – removing those schools with high renewal needs would allow the Board to reallocate those funds to the remaining schools.

Associate Director Bain spoke of the Reference Criteria as outlined in the Board policy:

- a) Facility Utilization
- b) Permanent and Non-Permanent Accommodation
- c) Program Offerings
- d) Quality of Teaching and Learning Environments
- e) Transportation
- f) Partnerships
- g) Equity

Associate Director Bain showed a chart which outlined the current situation, the on-the-ground capacity, enrolment utilization for 2009/10, 2015/16, 2020/21, the current FCI and the 10 year FCI. He also spoke of the schools located in the South ARC and their associated boundaries with the exception of Mountain which is a Vocational school with no defined boundary.

Associate Director Bain explained the South ARC Cluster Proposed Option – Phase 1

- Close Mountain (VOC) in June 2013
- Close Sherwood in June 2013
- Relocate the students to the existing facilities effective September 2013.

Associate Director Bain then displayed a chart showing the enrolment percentage changes that would result from the above listed closings. Phase 2 of the proposal:

- Close Barton - June 2015
- Construct a new school – funding of any capital projects or improvement will be addressed through:
  - Proceeds of disposition from the sale of the Mountain, Sherwood and Barton school sites.
  - A business case will be submitted to the Ministry of Education which will include all potential cost savings

Associate Director Bain again indicated that this recommendation is intended as a starting point for the ARC to build from. It is completely up to the ARC what they choose to do with this option. He stressed that this is the Board's best thinking at this point in time and that this may change after the ARC makes its recommendation.

Questions/Comments from the Committee:

- **Jackie Brown** stated that the overall utilization rate will go up to 96% when Sherwood and Mountain closes and is this based on an assumption of where the students will go once the schools have closed? Mr. Del Bianco stated that the assumption is to be equitable in the distribution of the students. The next question raised was if the students choose to move to an alternative school has that been taken into consideration? Mr. Del Bianco stated that it had not.
- The fact that Sherwood closes first and Barton closes prior to the new school being completed will the Sherwood students have an opportunity to change and go to the new school. Associate Director Bain indicated if a student needs to attend a particular school based on the new program strategy then that is an option.
- **Anne Pollard** indicated that Mountain Secondary School is highly utilized so it should not be based on the 21 per class criteria. Will the social needs of the students be addressed as well? Anne felt that there were three major issues which included staffing, location and the vulnerability of the students of Mountain Secondary School. Associate Director Bain stated that this is another premise of the program strategy and the Board will be able to provide a program for the students with special needs. He could not comment of the staffing question because that is something that would need to be discussed with the bargaining unit of the teachers.
- **Kevin Robinson** asked if a student of Mountain Secondary School will be travelling back to their home area and will they have a specialized program within one of the schools or off site? Mr. Robinson was informed that a program will be provided for them.

- If Barton is to close would Barton open up under the name of Barton and would this affect the staffing and who can apply for these teaching jobs? This question would again have to be discussed with the bargaining unit.
- **Gary Deveau** asked if the location of the new school was known. Associate Director Bain informed Gary that the Board owned land at other locations on the mountain and could possibly look at a land swap however at this particular time the location of the new school was unknown. Mr. Deveau then asked if this would result in having no secondary schools in ward six. Associate Director Bain stated that he did not know at this time because they do not have any land purchased to build a new school however he would take the question back to the steering committee. Mr. Deveau then stated that the students in Sherwood and Barton may choose to go elsewhere.
- **Susan Petrula** asked if the school closures were happening only in the South Cluster or will other clusters have similar closures? Associate Director Bain stated that he is unable to provide that information until the other ARC committees have had their meeting. Ms. Petrula then stated that she felt isolated from the other ARCs and questioned whether the South ARC was more impacted than the other ARCs. The Chair then stated that this is a long process and an early recommendation at this point in time.
- **Joanna Maull** asked if the Board had considered the impact on the students. She felt that there was a lot of input on the financials and yet the Board says that the students are number one. She felt that the Mountain students, with their special needs, couldn't go to another school. Associate Director Bain assured Ms. Maull that the Board has the student's best interest in mind. The facilities will be better maintained and the grants received will be maximized. He indicated that this is a long term goal and getting from here to there is not going to be easy.
- **Al Pierce** questioned what the capacity of the new school would be. Associate Director Bain stated that the Board would need Ministry approval prior to saying that we would be building a new school. He also stated that no business strategy has been developed yet because the Board of Trustees may decide not to go ahead with phase 2.
- **Terry Whitehead** wanted to know "why the marked departure from what has been proven with the vocational schools and the special needs schools. Superintendent Joshua indicated that the program strategy will provide support for the students to move into a variety of pathways and the current level of research says that those students will have a higher level of graduation.
- **Trustee Laura Peddle** questioned why Hill Park was not considered instead of Barton since they are potentially the same size. She also asked why there are two closures. Why one area of the mountain was hit instead of the east west corridor with one school closure being in the east and one in the west? Associate Director Bain stated that Hill Park is a little larger and in better condition than Barton. He also suggested that the east/west question be taken away for further consideration.

- **Angela Koklis** was concerned about how this is going to affect the students some of which would be attending three schools in a four year period. Associate Director Bain could not speak on the effect on the students however he said that the Board will provide as many supports as is possible. Ms. Koklis asked if we are affecting the students long term by shifting them and Associate Director Bain said that he could not answer that question because it was speculative.
- **Councillor Tom Jackson** questioned how much bearing section 21 of the SIP had on the recommendation and wondered if the FCI carried a lot of weight. Associate Director Bain stated that the FCI is an important piece and that it was an influence as well as the utilization rate. Councillor Jackson asked why the facility has been allowed to decline and he felt that this is a question that the community will be asking. The Chair informed Councillor Jackson that this is something that the ARC committee will be looking at over subsequent meetings. Associate Director Bain informed the ARC that they could be distracted by the recommendation of the Senior Administration team however the Board of Trustees are looking for the ARCs recommendations.
- **Beverly Bressette** stated that the special needs children do not accept change well and questioned how the Board plans to educate these children in a regular school when it was a regular school that failed them in earlier years.

Due to the meeting having gone over the 10 p.m. end time the Chair asked the committee if the meeting should be extended. Susan Petrula made a motion to adjourn the meeting. There was a motion to delay the second time speakers and consensus was given. No other business was raised. There was consensus to adjourn the meeting.

