

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

Wednesday, December 3, 2008  
3:00 – 5:00 p.m. Education Centre - Room 1017

### *In Attendance:*

Chair: Joe Hircock

Secretary: David Visser

### Members (alpha by school):

Monique deVillers (Principal, Capt. M. VandenBos)  
Debra Hayes (Non-teaching Rep, 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)  
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)  
Angie Weiss (Parent Rep, Palmerston)  
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  
Anne Dobos, Senior Planner  
Janet Edwards, Administrative Officer – Whitby/Oshawa  
Danielle Pépin, Administrative Assistant

Regrets: Joe Hamilton (Non-teaching Rep, Pringle Creek)

Absent: Lynda Darling (Teacher Rep, Leslie McFarlane)  
Tim Ralph (Principal, Palmerston)

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. He directed the group's attention to the package of handout materials to be referred to during the meeting. He also stated that at some point later in the evening, a decision would need to be made by the group as to who from the membership will be making the ARC's presentation at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Public Meeting.

A member requested guidance as to how to deal with the issue of surveyors present at Leslie McFarlane PS and indicated that the poor timing of this survey gave a wrong message to the students and community.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, explained that the Leslie McFarlane site was being surveyed for a number of reasons. The ARC had considered 12 scenarios that reflected alternative accommodation options for the students in Central Whitby. Each of the scenarios developed by the ARC included a rebuild of a new school on the existing Leslie McFarlane site. ARC members expressed concerns regarding the traffic flow and the possibility of installing traffic lights. The last time the board conducted a land survey of the Leslie McFarlane site was 28 years ago. To ensure that a proper topographical survey was completed, the Board decided to have it done now when there's no snow on the ground. If the Board had to do the survey later on, it would have to wait until late in the spring after the snow had melted. David Visser further indicated that since the original survey had been conducted, CP Rail had made revisions to the existing traffic flow which resulted in a change to the grading of the site. He further indicated that the topography had certainly changed over that time period and used the maturing of the trees on the lot as an example. He apologized on behalf of the Board for the miscommunication.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, suggested that the ARC communicate with their School Community Councils and take the clarification forward to their staff and students.

Motion to accept the December 3rd, 2008 Agenda:

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

Seconded: Sue Lunn (Principal, Pringle Creek)

Carried

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair requested the ARC members to review the ARC minutes of November 19, 2008 to ensure its accuracy.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, offered a clarification to a question asked at the previous ARC working meeting regarding bus transportation and revenue which had been reflected in the November 19, 2008 minutes. He stated that the Ministry funds transportation on a per pupil basis recognizing elementary and secondary needs. The available funding for transportation would remain unchanged as long as the number of students overall within the Board remained unchanged. Therefore, as the number of students bussed increases, so would the cost. Revenue would not change if the overall number of students within the Board remained unchanged. This change will be reflected as an amendment in the minutes of November 19, 2008.

An ARC member indicated that a question and response from the ARC Chair was not included in the November 19, 2008 minutes and it should have been.

***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, December 3, 2008 pg 3***

The question was in regard to the timing of any proposed moves, specifically that of the closure of Leslie McFarlane PS with the students then being moved to Pringle Creek. The member wanted clarification as to whether or not this move would occur for the September 2009. The Chair indicated that at the time the question was posed, he had said that this was certainly possible if the ARC's recommendation was to close Leslie McFarlane PS and move the students to Pringle Creek and if, the Trustees adopted the recommendation as a resolution of the Board.

Motion to accept the Minutes of November 19, 2008 with amendments.

Moved: Sue Lunn (Principal, Pringle Creek)

Seconded: Judy Whiteman (Non-teaching Rep, Leslie McFarlane)

Carried

Carey Trombino, ARC Research Staff, spoke of agenda item #4 - emails, messages & responses. No questions resulted from the review of these documents.

Motion to accept the prepared responses:

Moved: Sue Lunn (Principal, Pringle Creek)

Seconded: Trudy Collins (Principal, Jack Miner)

Carried:

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, then referred the group to the Tab 14 documents contained in the package of handouts.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, requested that the ARC members review the ARC's mandate as a status update. He indicated that based on the ARC Mandate which is for the ARC to:

*“value each school, develop options to improve the education opportunities for the students in Central Whitby as well as to examine options already developed by the Board and make recommendations on the accommodation of the students in the schools under review to the Director of Education.”*

The ARC has already valued the schools and with the options under discussion tonight, the ARC is at the part of the process where it would be bringing forward these options for Community feedback.

After the third public meeting, the ARC would be considering the community's feedback as it prepared its recommendations on the accommodation of the students in the schools under review.

David Visser, ARC chair, then went on to introduce the two scenarios that the Captain Michael VandenBos and the Palmerston Avenue Public Schools had requested be developed at the November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2008, ARC Working Meeting.

He then indicated that the Captain Michael VandenBos PS scenario had been re-submitted for consideration since the original submission, as presented by the ARC Resource Staff, did not accurately reflect the group's accommodation scenario.

***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, December 3, 2008 pg 4***

Scenario 9b (ARC binder tab 14.9.2)

David Visser, ARC Secretary walked through the scenario found on Page 14.9.2, also known as 9b. He pointed out that the scenario developed was very similar to that of Scenario 4a which had already been approved by the ARC for further consideration.

The difference between the two scenarios was the size of a proposed addition at Captain Michael VandenBos. Scenario 9b – the one currently under consideration – contemplates a 6-classroom addition while Scenario 4a – the one approved for further consideration – contemplates a 4-classroom addition.

Scenario 9b would eliminate the need for portables at Captain Michael VandenBos while Scenario 4a would require 2 portables by the end of the 10-year timeframe.

The ARC Chair asked the Captain Michael VandenBos PS group to consider whether it made sense, in light of the ARC criteria, to accept Scenario 4a instead of Scenario 9b.

The group explained that they considered a 6-classroom addition as a means of “squaring off” the building. Originally, when constructed, the school was designed to accommodate two additional classrooms; however, this did not materialize. The recommendation would see the addition of the two missing classrooms as well as an additional 4 classrooms to address the accommodation pressures. Having explained their approach, a motion was made to accept a friendly amendment to their proposal and replace Scenario 9b with Scenario 4a.

A motion was made to remove Scenario 9b from further consideration and to adopt Scenario 4a which suggests a 4-classroom addition rather than Scenario 9b’s 6-classroom addition.

Moved: Monique deVillers (Principal, Capt. M. VandenBos)

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

Carried

David Visser then reviewed with the group, the analysis done by the ARC Research Staff on the friendly amendment previously put forward by the Palmerston Avenue PS group. This amendment was labelled 5a and proposed the construction of two new schools – the proposed replacement school on the Leslie McFarlane site and a replacement school for the existing Palmerston Avenue PS.

David Visser briefly addressed the issue of the question posed by an ARC member regarding whether or not the board’s enrolment projections considered new development on the southeast corner of Rossland and Brock and the development at the southwest corner of Rossland and Brock. He indicated that the enrolment projections did consider these developments. A more complete response could be found in the response to question 40 on page 4J of the ARC binder.

In the discussion that ensued regarding Scenario 5a, the ARC’s attention was drawn to the fact that the proposed scenario would see utilization of the 5 schools (2 new schools and 3 existing schools) average 100% over the 10-year timeframe; however, the three existing schools would be operating at less than 100% utilization while the two new schools would be operating at greater than 100% utilization.

***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, December 3, 2008 pg 5***

David Visser also indicated that depending on the distribution of students per grade at the schools, there would be a potential for split grades over the 10-year timeframe.

An ARC member asked about the secondary schools students would attend if the Leslie McFarlane students were amalgamated with the Palmerston Avenue students at a replacement Palmerston Avenue school. The member wondered whether the entire amalgamated Palmerston student body would attend Donald A. Wilson. The member went on to explain that Donald A. Wilson was overcrowded currently while Anderson CVI was not – Anderson CVI being the secondary school that the Leslie McFarlane students currently attend at the secondary level.

The ARC Chair acknowledged the question and the concern and indicated that should the ARC recommend Scenario 5a to the Board, the secondary school attendance boundaries would have to be examined.

Another ARC member wanted to know whether or not cost was a factor in examining options. The member felt that while Scenario 5a would be the preferable option as there are very little portables involved, its cost is considerably more at \$23.1 million compared to Scenario 4a which is estimated at \$17.1 million.

David Visser then walked the group through the other two scenarios that had been approved for further consideration by the ARC at the November 19, 2008, working meeting. Scenario 4a and Scenario 6 were reviewed.

A question was raised as to the proposed boundaries for a portion of the Jack Miner Gifted Program to attend Pringle Creek PS.

Carey Trombino, ARC Resource responded to the question outlining the home schools of gifted students that were within the area to attend Pringle Creek and are as follows: Bellwood PS, Dr. Robert Thornton PS, John Dryden PS, Pringle Creek PS, Leslie McFarlane PS, Sir Samuel Steele PS, C.E. Broughton PS, Brooklin Village PS, Meadowcrest PS, and Winchester PS.

This boundary realignment enabled the Resource Staff to develop the scenario where the ARC members proposed moving 125 Gifted students to Pringle Creek PS.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair asked the ARC Facilitator for an opinion as to whether or not the Ministry of Education would have concerns with the proposed scenarios being considered by the ARC members.

Lygia Dallip, ARC Facilitator, described her current position with Watson & Associates and her former position with the Ministry of Education.

The Chair asked Lygia Dallip, what the next step would be should the Ministry reject the Board's business case if it reflected "soft" information, not meeting ministry criteria?

***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, December 3, 2008 pg 6***

The Facilitator responded that the Ministry would not reject a board's request for funding without first working with the board staff to understand the business case and the board's thinking around why the submission should be funded. The Ministry staff would work with the board staff to ensure that all the Ministry's questions and concerns were addressed.

The Chair asked Lygia Dallip whether the Board report could differ from the ARC report or were they required to be the same?

Lygia Dallip, Facilitator, responded that the Board's report to the Trustees could certainly differ from the ARC's report to the Director of Education; however, the Board's report would have to consider each of the ARC's recommendations and provide an explanation as to why the Board supports or does not support the individual recommendations. The Board's report would have to provide justification for the recommendations to the Trustees.

The Chair asked Lygia Dallip if the report goes forward to the Trustees and they say no, what happens?

Lygia Dallip, Facilitator stated that Trustees would be required to review the recommendations of the ARC and of the Board staff; however, as part of local governance, the Trustees could make completely different decisions than the recommendations submitted for their consideration.

A member asked if the ARC was limited to presenting only one recommendation to the Trustees.

Lygia Dallip, ARC Facilitator, informed the group that the report goes to the Director of Education and not to the Trustees. It is the administration that would take the report to the Trustees. The ARC's mandate speaks to the ARC developing options and recommendations to the ARC is not necessarily limited to presenting one recommendation in its report to the Director of Education.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, stated that the ARC should consider whether or not its preferred options meet the criteria developed by the ARC and the ministry considerations. He added that the more complete the business case was, the better the chances the scenario has for Ministry funding approval.

A member inquired as to whether or not we could continue to review the numbers.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, stated that the 3<sup>rd</sup> Public Meeting is next week, December 10<sup>th</sup> and that we can expect to receive a significant amount of feedback from the community which we can use to provide further direction.

A member wanted to know if 80% was adequate utilization?

Lygia Dallip, ARC Facilitator, said that an average of 80% for new schools is looked at favourably by the Ministry, however, the Ministry would also be looking at the other schools in the review area of the proposed new school to ensure that the operation of the new school

***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, December 3, 2008 pg 7***

would not adversely affect that of the other schools in the area. The Ministry's analysis is to ensure that the new school is required. The Board's current business case and the ARC's current review include looking at resolutions to schools identified as Prohibitive-to-Repair (PTR). This designation was based on Ministry criteria. To put additions on schools identified as PTR would, in the longterm, not be cost effective and would not solve the issue at hand. She explained that while the ARC's solution appears favourable to the ARC members, the committee needs to be aware of the provincial perspective. There are 72 school boards across the

Province seeking capital funding from the Ministry of Education. As part of provincial fiscal responsibility, the Ministry would be concerned about whether or not a proposed solution was the best approach to addressing the issue locally and fiscally.

David Visser, ARC Secretary, added that although there are approximately 500 PTR projects in the Province there are only 200 being entertained.

An ARC member then suggested that, as Scenario 4a and Scenario 6 are very similar, that the group could probably agree that one of the two should go forward. She then sought guidance as to how to make this presentation before the public next Wednesday.

The group from Jack Miner also commented that there will always be some imbalance and that the focus needs to be placed on the two scenarios which are most similar.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, informed that ARC that the group was approximately 80% of the way through the accommodation review process. The task at hand was to decide which of the scenarios developed should go forward to the Community for feedback. He indicated that there were three scenarios under consideration based on the fact that all other scenarios developed had been rejected by the membership. He then invited the members to take a few minutes to determine which priority order they would prefer.

Following deliberation, the individual groups, as identified by school, offered their priority selections:

Jack Miner PS:	4a, 6, 5a
Pringle Creek PS:	4a, 6, 5a
Leslie McFarlane PS:	4a, 5a, 6
Captain Michael VandenBos PS:	4a, 6, no third scenario
Florence M Heard PS:	4a, 5a, 6
Palmerston Avenue PS:	5a, 4a, 6

Some members expressed the view that they felt there was not enough time provided for consideration of the scenarios.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, replied that the group was asked to meet over the past two weeks to review and digest the scenarios. Friendly amendments suggested at the last ARC meeting were incorporated resulting in more finely-tuned scenarios. Further suggestions will come from the 3<sup>rd</sup> Public Meeting which will provide opportunity for further consideration. While more time could be given to the process, it would result in an extension of the process to beyond June 2009.

***Minutes of ARC Central Whitby Meeting, December 3, 2008 pg 8***

Given the importance of the task under consideration, a member suggested that the decision on which options be presented to the Community be decided by individual vote. At the point in time a show of hands were presented to indicate which scenario would move forward for presentation at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Public Meeting, and which, if any, would be removed from further consideration.

**Scenario 4a** - Voted to move forward

**Scenario 6** - Voted to be removed from further consideration

## **Scenario 5a - Voted to move forward**

*It was agreed that Scenarios 4a and 5a will go forward to the public. Also voted upon were the two representatives who will make the presentation at the next Public Meeting; Linda Lyons and Chris Montgomery.*

David Visser, ARC Secretary, then reviewed the PowerPoint presentation for the ARC's approval. It was agreed that the Resource Staff would include the slides incorporating the two scenarios as voted by the ARC members. The ARC agreed to review the presentation electronically and provide comments to Danielle Pépin, ARC Resource Staff, by Friday noon.

Joe Hircock, ARC Chair, then thanked the group for attending. He reminded them that we must listen carefully to community input as this process has not yet been decided upon. We are bound by Ministry of Education rules and must present what falls most clearly within those guidelines.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting

Moved: Angie Weiss (Parent Rep, Palmerston)

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

Carried

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

*The next meeting of the ARC will take place on Wednesday, January 7, 2009 at 3:00 in the Boardroom (Room 1017) at the Education Centre.*

*Minutes ARC Working Meeting December 3, 2008- Approved*