

## MINUTES OF ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE (ARC) Central Whitby MEETING

Wednesday, January 7, 2009  
3:00 – 5:00 p.m. Education Centre - Room 1017

### *In Attendance:*

Chair: David Visser (acting Chair in absence of Joe Hircock)

### Members (alpha by school):

Monique deVillers (Principal, Capt. M. VandenBos)  
Linda Lyons (Parent Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)  
Carole McLeod (Teacher Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)  
Judy Wityszyn (Parent Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)  
Alana Browne (Teacher Rep, Florence M. Heard)  
Chris Montgomery (Parent Rep, Florence M. Heard)  
Sharon Murdoch (Parent Rep, Florence M. Heard)  
Monica Porteous (Non-teaching Rep, Florence M. Heard)  
Brigitte Sopher (Principal, Florence M. Heard)  
Carol Bell (Teacher Rep, Jack Miner)  
Trudy Collins (Principal, Jack Miner)  
Gail Dyson (Non-teaching Rep, Jack Miner)  
Cathy Wade (Parent Rep, Jack Miner)  
Jacquie Weber (Parent Rep, Jack Miner)  
Lynda Darling (Teacher Rep, Leslie McFarlane)  
Scott Irwin (Parent Rep, Leslie McFarlane)  
Jim Olson (Principal, Leslie McFarlane)  
Kirsty Sinclair (Parent Rep, Leslie McFarlane)  
Judy Whiteman (Non-teaching Rep, Leslie McFarlane)  
Marion Fulcher (Non-teaching Rep, Palmerston)  
Sylvia Land (Parent Rep, Palmerston)  
Leilah McBride (Teacher Rep, Palmerston)  
Tim Ralph (Principal, Palmerston)  
Angie Weiss (Parent Rep, Palmerston)  
Joe Hamilton (Non-teaching Rep, Pringle Creek)  
Sue Lunn (Principal, Pringle Creek)  
Jill MacCharles-Crain (Teacher Rep, Pringle Creek)  
Steven Misner (Parent Rep, Pringle Creek)

Facilitator: Lygia Dallip

Consultant: Daniel Del Bianco

ARC Resource Staff: Carey Trombino, Senior Planner  
Janet Edwards, Administrative Officer – Whitby/Oshawa  
Danielle Pépin, Administrative Assistant

Regrets: Joe Hircock, Chair  
Debra Hayes (Non-teaching Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)  
Anne Dobos, Senior Planner

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. He informed the group that Joe Hircock, the ARC Chair, would be absent from the meeting. He welcomed everyone back and wished them a good new year. David Visser then referred everyone to today's agenda for review and approval.

Motion to accept the January 7, 2009 Agenda:

Moved: Monica Porteous (Non-teaching Rep, Florence M. Heard)

Seconded: Lynda Darling (Teacher Rep, Leslie McFarlane)

Carried

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, reminded the group to sign in and to clearly identify themselves when posing questions and making comments. He then invited the members to review the minutes of the last ARC working meeting of December 3, 2008, Tab 6z of the ARC handout package.

Motion to accept the Minutes of December 3, 2008

Moved: Chris Montgomery (Parent Rep, Florence M. Heard)

Seconded: Steven Misner (Parent Rep, Pringle Creek)

Carried

The ARC then reviewed the minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Public Meeting of December 10, 2008, noted as item 6bb. There was one name spelled incorrectly to be corrected. No other comments resulted from the Minutes.

Motion to accept the Minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Public Meeting, December 10, 2008

Moved: Linda Lyons (Parent Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)

Seconded: Jill MacCharles-Crain (Teacher Rep, Pringle Creek)

Carried:

Carey Trombino, ARC resource staff, spoke on Agenda item #7, - Review and Approval of ARC email / telephone messages / responses. She stated that since our last meeting of December 3<sup>rd</sup>, the staff had received a number of emails, appearing on page 16 of ARC binder item 4h, starting with December 11, 2008. Three of the emails referred to new scenarios. In addition to the emails, there was one telephone message 4i (page 6 – December 11) with the response appearing on page 7. The group was given a few minutes to review the emails and voicemails with replies.

There were no comments resulting from responses to both email and voicemail documentation.

Motion to accept the prepared responses:

Moved: Judy Wityszyn (Parent Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)

Seconded: Sue Lunn (Principal, Pringle Creek)

Carried:

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, referred to Agenda item 7b, as referenced at ARC binder item 4L. This consisted of a cover letter and petition from Palmerston Avenue SCC which was address to the Whitby Trustees. The package also included a response from the ARC, as

### ***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, January 7, 2009 pg 3***

requested by Trustees. An ARC member clarified that the petition was addressed to Trustee Winters and Trustee Dolstra as they were the representatives for the Whitby area. She added

that there were 223 signatures in total with approximately 80% having come from parents, while the remainder are representative from the local community. David Visser thanked the member and reiterated that the ARC is cognizant that the Trustees are not involved in the process, however, continue to remain informed.

Motion of acknowledgement of ARC response re petition on behalf of Trustees

Moved: Chris Montgomery (Parent Rep, Florence M. Heard)

Seconded: Kirsty Sinclair (Parent Rep, Leslie McFarlane)

Carried:

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, moved on to item 8 of the agenda, the preparation of the draft report to the Director. He invited the committee to bring forth comments or thoughts regarding Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 as presented at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Public Meeting of December 10, 2008. There were no comments brought forward.

David Visser, then reminded the group that they will soon need to decide which scenario(s) they will want to take forward to the Board.

An ARC member felt that the two scenarios were too far apart to bring both before the Board and the Ministry. She expressed the desire for the ARC to work more closely together as a team to lessen the gap between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. She was of the opinion that Scenario 2 was not a viable option to present to the Ministry for consideration.

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, then referred everyone to ARC binder Tab #22, a comparison chart comparing both scenarios to the criteria previously established by the ARC. He provided a quick overview while the group followed along.

There were four additional scenarios developed as a result of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Public Meeting. Scenario A was created from a comment made at the Public Meeting as reflected on page 6 of the Minutes of the December 10<sup>th</sup>, meeting. Scenarios B, C, and D were as a result of emails received post meeting. The ARC was provided with an opportunity to review all four new scenarios proposed by the community.

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, provided a brief description and review of enrolment trends applicable to each Scenario A through D. It was noted that the Palmerston site was 5.36 acres while the Leslie McFarlane site was 11.4 acres in size, as such, a proposed school size of 605 pupil places would be crowded on a small site.

Scenario A (ARC binder tab item 17) was at a cost of \$23.2M with a utilization average of 95%. Scenario B (ARC binder tab item 18) was at a cost of \$14.3M with a utilization average of 120%. Scenario C (ARC binder tab item 19) was at a cost of \$21.6M with a utilization average of 106%. Scenario D (ARC binder tab item 20) was at a cost of \$23.2M with a utilization average of 96%.

An ARC member sought verification that the number of gifted students at Jack Miner referred to in Scenario D was in fact 23. The number was confirmed as being accurate based on the

***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, January 7, 2009 pg 4***

community member's request to consider retaining only students within walking distance of Jack Miner and in the Gifted Program at the Jack Miner school.

Another member inquired as to where the scenario was on behalf of the SCC from Palmerston

Avenue as submitted by email on January 6, 2009.

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, replied that the email had not been received; however, if it was re-sent, a response would be available for the January 14, 2009 meeting.

An ARC member expressed the need to establish a deadline for community scenario submissions. Following discussion, the ARC agreed to post to the ARC website the deadline for community scenario submissions as being 4:30 p.m., Friday, January, 9, 2009. It was noted that one month had lapsed since the 3<sup>rd</sup> Public Meeting which had provided ample time to present community scenarios and feedback.

Motion made to announce deadline for community scenario submissions as being January 9, 2009 at 4:30 p.m.

Moved: Linda Lyons (Parent Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)

Seconded: Judy Wityszyn (Parent Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)

Carried:

A member expressed a desire to “tweak” the numbers in the scenarios.

Lygia Dallip, ARC Facilitator, addressed the issue by stating that it would be necessary to do any “tweaking” as a group collectively and would not be permissible on an individual basis, as the ARC is bound by a very rigid process and timeline. She stated that at the end of the day, the ARC had voted for two scenarios to go forward. The ARC would have to agree to the tweaks before they could be made

The member from Florence M. Heard PS indicated that her request to revisit the scenario had been sent in after the December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008 Public Meeting. The acting ARC Chair apologized and indicated that the scenario, while it had been received, had not been modeled. It would be modeled for the January 14, 2009 ARC Working meeting.

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, remarked that this issue had arisen at both the ARC working meeting of November 20<sup>th</sup> and again at the working meeting of December 3<sup>rd</sup> as indicated in Joe Hircock’s response regarding timelines. The ARC is mandated to follow the process. We can make suggestions for future ARCs to better address this issue.

Another ARC member felt the premise for the “tweaking” was to provide a little more time, as a group, to revisit numbers in order to come up with better scenarios.

Lygia Dallip, ARC Facilitator, reminded the group of one member’s comment that the two scenarios are far apart. It will be necessary for the group to find some common ground incorporating what was heard at the public meetings. It could be something completely different or, alternatively, a “tweaking” presented collectively as a group but all based on what was heard or sent in by the local community.

### ***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, January 7, 2009 pg 5***

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, expressed a concern about the limited amount of remaining time the ARC has to present their report to the Director.

A committee member stated he was confused about submitting scenarios. If revisions are not possible, then he would expect it would simply be a matter of voting on which of the two existing scenarios would go forward. He understood that this was not the case.

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, indicated that when looking at the scenario presented by Florence M. Heard, it mirrors Scenario A and that a closer examination of numbers could be looked at. He added that the ARC would have to make the determination as to whether or not they would consider any of the 4 new scenarios presented today; Scenario A, Scenario B, Scenario C, and, Scenario D.

David Visser, then referred the group to Agenda item 8b) - Proposed Outline to be adopted when completing the report for submission to the Director. He stated that the staff would be happy to do further work on the report if requested. The ARC was provided with a 15 minute time allotment to review the outline and provide a list of "highlights" that it would expect to see addressed in the report.

An ARC member suggested a clarification of the wording of section 4 d (page 3 of the outline). A revision will be made to reflect this as being "Additional considerations" on the draft report and will be provided at the next meeting of January 14, 2009. No additional comments on what should be included in the ARC's report were provided.

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, stated that the ARC meeting of January 21 would be used to review the presentation for the 4<sup>th</sup> public meeting. As a result, it will be necessary for the ARC to contemplate whether they will be left with one or two scenarios for consideration.

A member stated that the Ministry requires over 80% utilization. She added that the 4 new scenarios presented today did not meet the Ministry requirement. As a result, they should be eliminated from further consideration.

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, stated that the Ministry's average of 80% utilization over a 10-year projection period is for new schools beginning in the second year of operation. It was then suggested that a motion be made regarding the continuance of consideration to Scenarios A, B, C, and D.

Motion to remove community Scenarios A, B, C, and D from further consideration

Moved: Lynda Darling (Teacher Rep, Leslie McFarlane)

Seconded: Sharon Murdoch (Parent Rep, Florence M. Heard)

Carried

A committee member asked if the 110% formed part of the Ministry criteria?

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, replied that in the face of Province-wide declining enrolments, the Ministry would see 110% utilization as a "best practice" that, in the event, enrolment declines, there would be continued enrolment sustainability at schools.

### ***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, January 7, 2009 pg 6***

Another member sought clarification as to the 10 year timeframe for utilization.

David Visser responded that in order to obtain an acceptable average, a school must have a consistent utilization rate over the course of the ten years as opposed to a school having a 150% utilization in year one and a 60% utilization in year ten.

An ARC member asked if the 110% took into account specialized rooms such as science labs or, do they become home rooms?

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, stated that even at 110% utilization, it was still possible for students to be rotated through the specialized classrooms, however, it is ultimately at the discretion of the principals.

Another member revisited the issue of “tweaking” the scenarios and the urgency given the lack of remaining time.

David Visser, once again expressed that one member cannot request an adjustment. It must be done as a committee. He reminded the group that the numbers had been at their disposal since mid-November

A member indicated that the opportunity for further “tweaking” should have been provided.

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, stated, once again, that given the fact that the group already had two months to review the scenarios, and when asked earlier in the meeting if anyone had comments to present, there were none forthcoming. The ARC, at this point in time, should be in a position to bring forth their considerations.

Another member requested that a half hour time period be provided at next meeting to review and tweak.

David Visser indicated that this request will certainly be met at the next meeting as requested and will be placed as a dedicated agenda item. The staff will run any scenarios brought forward and do the background work providing the requests are made as a group collectively. He added that we must be mindful of the time constraints.

A member asked if there would be any time for “tweaking” following presentation at the final Public Meeting of January 28, 2009?

David Visser answered in the affirmative, but added that any “tweaking” at that time would solely be based on community feedback.

A member suggested that the staff was averse to being challenged.

### ***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, January 7, 2009 pg 7***

David Visser, acting ARC Chair, stated that at one point in time, the ARC had twelve scenarios to consider and that it has now been narrowed down to two scenarios. Any further “tweaking” would need to be undertaken as a group.

A member expressed concern that there could possibly be additional scenarios brought forward by the community following the next Public Meeting and, as a result, a cut off date would need to be established following that meeting. It was agreed that a cut-off date would be provided.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting.

Moved: Chris Montgomery (Parent Rep, Florence M. Heard)

Seconded: Steven Misner (Parent Rep, Pringle Creek)  
Carried

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

*The next meeting of the ARC will take place on Wednesday, January 14, 2009 at 3:00 in the Boardroom (Room 1017) at the Education Centre.*

*Minutes ARC Working Meeting January 7, 2009 - for approval*

DDSB Draft