

**Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB)**

**North Accommodation Review Committee Meeting**

**Board Room – Education Centre**

**November 15, 2011**

**Working Meeting #9**

**Minutes**

**Attendance:**

**Committee Members**

***Chair – Vicki Corcoran***

***Voting Members – Sandra Binns, Anna Busse, Michele Cameron, Lisa Deys, Laura Gill, Jane Henry, Marie Jackson, Rick Kunc, Mohamud Mohamed, Joyce Schneider, Dawn Spencer, Grant Thomas, Barb Wachner***

***Non-Voting Members – Robert Barlow, Scott Barr, Marco Barzetti, Danielle Bawden, Paul Beattie, Judith Bishop, Marilyn Bratkovich, Lawrie Cook, Glenn Cooke, Geoff Coombs, Mark Currie, Jim Holubeshen, Peter Joshua, Nancy Leach, Ray Mulholland, Maria Pearson, Don Pente, Bob Pratt, Pam Reinholdt, Pat Rocco, Michael Root, Tim Simmons, Carol Town, Todd White***

**Regrets**

***Voting Members – Michael Chalupka, Annie Fu, Prema Rao, Jane Withers***

***Non-Voting Members – Chad Collins, Jason Farr, Bernie Morelli, Sam Merulla***

**Resource Staff**

***Daniel Del Bianco, Jim Wibberley, Kevin Morton***

**Recording Secretary**

***Tracy McKillop***

**1.0 Call to Order**

Superintendent Vicki Corcoran welcomed everyone to the ninth working group meeting. She drew the committee attention to the follow-up information from the previous meetings that had been included in the handouts and reminded the Committee that microphones were available for their use so that everyone could be clearly heard. The Chair also made note that at this working group meeting the Committee will finalize the North ARC's recommendation. The next meeting is a Public Meeting at

which time the Committee will share these recommendations with the Community. The final working group meeting in January will be to fine tune and approve the Committee's report.

**2.0 Agenda** <http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/North-ARC-Agenda-November-15th.pdf>

### **2.1 Additions and Deletions –**

Correspondence was moved up as part of #3 on the Agenda. There was consensus on this and it became 3.1 on the Agenda

The Agenda was approved with the flexibility of being allowed to move around the items in number 4.

Michael Root shared that in light of the public meeting they would like to reconsider the closure of Parkview.

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

### **3.0 Debrief of the Public Meeting**

Superintendent Peter Joshua wanted to comment on what the Committee heard clearly from the public at the last meeting. He shared that we need to acknowledge the voices of our students, parents and our community at Parkview.

- We have heard concerns about potential bullying and the need to absolutely ensure the SAFETY of our students.
- We must pay attention to student well-being and their sense of belonging.
- Students need to feel valued through participation in clubs; activities, events and we need to be sure that they don't feel lost in their surroundings.

Superintendent Joshua noted that moving forward we need to give this focused attention by striking a subcommittee following the ARC process that will engage the community, parents, school council members, staff and students to ensure that we have the right program, the right supports, the right learning environment and attention to successful transitions for our Parkview students. He urged the committee to make this concept of a subcommittee a recommendation in the final report you put forward to the Trustees.

Trustee Bishop spoke about the need for a sense of belonging and attention to the problem of bullying.

Q. Could we have the average of the daily percentage of attendance and the graduation rates for the Parkview students? I would like to see the full context when considering this. We need an objective view when we are considering the needs of our students. Can we have this for all of our schools?

Danielle Bawden felt that the information would be helpful but not in terms of bullying.

Michael Root shared that Parkview functions differently from other schools and there are other factors involved with regard to the attendance of these students.

The Chair shared the need to be careful with regard to suspension and the expulsion rates as the rules are very much the same as with any other school.

### **3.1 Correspondence**

Carol Town read Anne Pollard's letter. Carol feels that maybe the Mountain school could join the Parkview students in a stand alone school. She feels that this should be reconsidered.

Barb Wachner shared that at the public meeting the recommendation was not well received and it was very emotional. Clearly there is enough evidence to say that this won't work and people at them public meeting did not support it. In a small setting these kids will flourish.

It was noted that part of the problem with the presentation was that the annex concept did not come across as the committee had discussed it. It took a while to get that information out and people were upset by that time.

There was a concern about putting forth a recommendation for two schools.

It was noted that the money that would be used to build the annex could be used to update Parkview and it could be filled with the Mountain students. I feel that we need to reconsider so can we revisit this.

Mark Currie shared that at no time did he hear that we need to keep the Parkview building open. We as a Committee decided that we would keep the program and students together but not keep the building. If we are only closing two schools we may not get the funding for a new school.

Michele Cameron shared that she heard at the public meeting that the students would be full of anxiety if moved and transportation would be an issue. The annex would cost a great deal of money so why can we not reinvest in a building for the Parkview and Mountain students.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that it would be difficult to receive the funding if we do not have a strong business case. We would be the same as all of the other Boards who are closing two schools and we would be challenged in receiving the funding.

Dawn Spencer agreed with Mr. Del Bianco and she shared that we did not hear from the other schools that would be closing. She feels that this is not a viable option and that if we don't close three schools we will not receive the funding.

Michael Root shared that this is a unique opportunity to have a special needs school. He was dismayed that we only have one recommendation and he feels that the Trustees would like to have several options to choose from.

Nancy Leach shared that there was a lot of talk about programming. The issue is the students getting to class and if they are in a composite school they have to go through the smoking area, the bullies prior to reaching the safety of their annex. The Board's job is to provide programming. We are talking about five ARCs and some of that money could be shared amongst all of the schools. We need to listen to the public and keep Parkview open as a stand alone.

Mr. Wibberley noted two things that he heard at the public meeting with regard to the Parkview students: a sense of place for these students and a feeling of safety and well being. What he did not hear was concern about the model of programming that is being offered to the Parkview students in an annex.

Mr. Wibberley shared that when you look at the mandate of the Committee you have to consider the viability of the option that is being put forth by the Committee from a financial perspective also. If you look at the option to keep Parkview open you have to consider the funding and how that will affect the remainder of the schools.

Scott Barr liked what he heard from Superintendent Joshua and would like to hear more. If we could get the students to the annex safely would the program work well?

Superintendent Joshua shared that he does not have a master plan at this point in time; however, recognizing that in the time period that we have the Board can look at the real issues and have a sub committee.

We need to ensure the safety of all students. It is our job to modify and accommodate these students with IEP's in all schools and have the feelings of safety.

Mr. Del Bianco shared that this would take place in September 2015 so the implementation timelines are in two plus years which provides a window of opportunity to explore options and transition plans.

The Chair shared that the date has been moved to 2015 because we are talking about the construction of a new school.

Parkview would not close prior to the new school being completed and this could be a recommendation of this Committee.

There is no plan "B" and what if we do not receive the funding we need to have other options for the Trustees to consider.

Rick Kunc stated that at the public meeting we heard the desire for the safe environment. This is the message and no one is disputing that. Everyone wants a safe place for the students; however, we have 5000 other students that we need to consider as well.

If we can propose something that works well then programming can be addressed. If there is a sub Committee to support these students then we have done our job well.

Michael Root asked the Trustees to speak to this.

Trustee Bishop shared that the Committee can present as many options as they would like.

Carol Town feels that it is important to have a plan "A" and a plan "B".

Trustee White shared that the Committee can have as many options as possible. If you have more than one option then the Trustees would be looking for something that is clear.

#### **4.0 School Closures and Program Placement**

#### **4.2 Program Location Chart**

Superintendent Joshua reviewed the presentation with the Committee. To view the presentation please click on the following link:

<http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Program-Placement-Proposal-for-ARC-North-Nov-13.pdf>

Superintendent Joshua reviewed the possibilities of program placement as displayed in the chart.

<http://www.hwdsb.on.ca/arc/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Tiered-Intervention-and-Deflnitions-Sept-262.pdf>

Superintendent Corcoran stepped out of the role of the Chair to share the information about the Tier 1 programming. The Tier 1 programming supports students who may or may not receive a graduation certificate. Tier 2 is a specialized programming. The Tier 3 programming supports students who possess higher needs and more support. She shared information on the specialized programming and as you move up the Tiers the students require more support.

#### **4.3 Full Committee Discussion and Decision of Program Placement**

Q. Will Glendale still have the ELL program?

Yes it will.

The existing programs that are currently housed in a school that is remaining open will continue to be offered.

There was some discussion around the program placement and suggestions were made on placement of some programs for example: Outbound currently housed at Delta, Cosmetology currently at Delta be offered at the new school, ELL at Glendale which is currently housed and remain at Glendale.)

There was information shared on the outbound program and it was suggested to have it at more than one school.

Mr. Kunc shared that we have to keep in mind that we have to be strategic about where these programs are placed because there are not enough students at every school and/or there are not enough teachers who are qualified to teach these programs.

Mr. Wibberley shared that he was in agreement with Mr. Kunc and it is challenging to schedule these programs.

Some of the moves included:

- Cosmetology is at Orchard Park and the new school
- Advanced Placement is added to Orchard Park

- ESL/ELD is the Alpha program or part of the Alpha Program
- Horticulture and landscape move to the new school
- Remove the Alpha Program out of the third column on the new school because it is already there under relocated program.
- Move manufacturing to Sir Winston Churchill.

Trustee Bishop suggested talking to the Co-Op agencies about the Health& Wellness placement so that they are able to work with Community Agencies.

Jim Holubeshen asked if the programming can serve to determine the program needs for example a theatre for the Arts Academy.

Q. Are we going to be looking at the new school as a hub?

That is certainly something that would be thought of as part of the programming. We are looking at a new school in 2015 so we would need to look at the needs of the students and the community.

Q. Will Glendale have the same amount of programming as the other schools?

Lawrie Cooke shared that they have been exploring the SHSMs and an ITC – they are on their way to developing these programs and open to more.

Mr. Kunc stated that there are a lot of further needs that will need to be addressed and discussed further down the road so can we move to the next agenda item? The Committee agreed to move to the next item on the Agenda.

#### **4.1 Confirming the Closure and Build Recommendation**

The Chair asked someone from the Committee to put forth the recommendation that was taken to the public meeting as a starting point.

Mark Currie reiterated the proposal and the floor was opened for discussion.

Carol Town wanted to discuss other options as well.

Superintendent Pam Reinholdt suggested that the Committee look at the motion on the floor and the pros and cons of this motion prior to moving onto plan “B.”

***A RECOMMENDATION TO CLOSE THREE SCHOOLS, MOUNTAIN, SIR JOHN A MACDONALD AND DELTA AND BUILD A NEW SCHOOL IN A CENTRALLY LOCATED SITE WITH THE PARKVIEW PROGRAM ACCOMMODATED WITHIN THE NEW FACILITY.***

***A VOTE WAS TAKEN WHICH RESULTED IN 10 IN FAVOUR AND ONE ABSTAINED.***

There was further discussion on the outbound program and more information was shared by Bob Pratt and he indicated that it could be difficult to narrow this down to a location. Some Committee members

felt that they were feeling unsure about placing some of the programs. Discussion on program placement continued.

***There was a recommendation as revised on this chart be put forward to the Trustees acknowledging that this is only a recommendation.***

***This was approved by Consensus.***

Trustee Bishop shared that there were two more recommendations. Do we want a plan "B" is there a recommendation with going forward for plan "B"?

The floor was opened for discussion.

***A motion was put forth to vote on if the Committee want a plan "B". Consensus was not reached. A vote was taken and the motion to have a Plan B was defeated by a vote of 10 to one and one abstention.***

## **5.0 North ARC Final Report**

### **5.1 Fulfilling the Mandate**

#### **5.1.1. Other Capital Recommendations**

The Committee was asked what renovations they would like to see.

Capital expenses that the Committee would like to see could include such things as an auditorium at the new school and this would be an additional capital expense that the Board would have to incur. Perhaps a science lab or two may need to be spruced up. The question was asked what needs to be done at the remaining facilities. Mr. Del Bianco shared that this needs to be addressed in the report as considerations by the Board of Trustees. An example would be to renovate the auditorium at Sir Winston Churchill.

Rick Kunc asked if the Committee could request to have the remaining schools brought to the standard level to meet all of the program needs for all of the schools. The costs would have to be added and it would be added to the recommendation requesting consideration.

Could we go to the schools to see what their needs are? Could we ask the Principals at these schools?

Yes we could itemize it and request the Board of Trustees to explore these items.

Delta was allocated to receive updates to the science labs; however, that was put on hold due to the ARC. Can we use that money for some of these updates?

Kevin Morton shared that the money was not put on hold; however, it could be prioritized for these updates and these could be considered.

Jim Wibberley cautioned the Committee about too much detail because the list could be endless. All of the remaining schools will need upgrades so he encouraged the Committee to consider the larger pieces

for example an auditorium in the new school, or renewing all of the science labs in the remaining schools.

Jim Holubeshen asked if there was a base line for the number of students per school. Mr. Del Bianco shared that this is mandated by the Ministry of Education. What is standard for a 1250 pupil place school is mandated. Geoff Coombs shared that windows could be on the list.

Scott Barr asked for a motion that we look at the renewal needs of the remaining schools prior to the wish list for the new school

***A motion was put on the floor that Facilities Management consult with the principals and teacher specialists to ensure that the existing facilities meet the program strategy and address the renewal needs as outlined by this ARC Committee.***

***The motion was approved by consensus.***

Rick Kunc asked for clarification of the requests that would pertain to the new school.

#### **5.1.2. Transportation Recommendation** – Mr. Del Bianco

Mr. Del Bianco shared a chart showing that transportation and the bus pass eligibility of the students would remain the same.

Trustee Bishop shared that there are discussions happening at the moment regarding transportation. It was shared by a Committee member that it might be cheaper to bus some of these students then have bus passes.

Can the Committee recommend where boundaries can be placed?

Yes they can. The adjustment was made to accommodate the Sir John A Macdonald students and the enrolment changes of the schools.

Why was the Churchill boundary expanded when it is already filled? It was updated to reflect the long term needs not the current needs.

We also have to remember that this considers the associate schools and do we want to split those students.

#### **5.1.3. Implementation Timelines**

Opening date of September 2015 for the new schools and all of the schools would remain open until the student's transition to the new school. ***A motion was made that all schools remain open until such time as the new facility is ready to open in September 2015 and the students will move on mass to the new school. The motion was approved by Consensus.***

#### **5.1.4. Other**

It is important to have a transition plan to focus not only at Parkview but to include all three schools that will be relocated.



We are looking at a Committee with Parent and student voice to help devise a transition plan. We need to ensure that we have something in place to alleviate the concern of the parents and students in particular the students that would have more difficulty moving to the new school.

***A motion was made to create a committee post ARC comprised of school council members, students, parents, staff, community members to inform direction around the transition, program, facilities, and supports necessary for the success of the Parkview students. The motion was approved by Consensus.***

#### **5.2 Review and approval of Report Format**

#### **5.3 Process for Final Report Content**

Mr. Del Bianco gave an overview of the table of contents and the template that the Committee could use. ***There was Consensus to accept this format.***

#### **6.0 Minutes of the meeting of October 4, 2011**

**6.1 Errors or Omissions** – There were none.

**6.2 Approval of the Minutes** – The minutes were approved by consensus.

**6.3 Business Arising from the Minutes** - None were noted.

#### **7.0 Minutes of the meeting of October 25, 2011**

**7.1 Errors or Omissions** – There were none.

**7.2 Approval of the Minutes** – The minutes were approved by consensus.

**7.3 Business Arising from the Minutes** - None were noted.

#### **8.0 Other Business**

#### **8.1 Planning for the Public Meeting**

Mr. Del Bianco shared some of the items that would be included in the presentation e.g. ARC Process and the work completed to date, the ARC Recommendation, the recommended program strategy.

There were two volunteers – Scott Barr and Michael Root. Grant Thomas will co-Chair again.

**10.0 Adjournment** – the meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m.