

MINUTES OF ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE (ARC) Central Whitby MEETING

Wednesday, September 10, 2008
3:00 – 5:00 pm Education Centre - Room 1017

In Attendance:

Chair: 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)
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)
Jill MacCharles-Crain (Teacher Rep, Pringle Creek)
Steve Misner (Parent Rep, Pringle Creek)

Absent: Monica Porteous (Non-teaching Rep, Florence M. Heard)
Debra Hayes (Non-teaching Rep, Capt. M. VandenBos)
Sue Lunn (Principal, Pringle Creek)

Substitute: Joe Cook VP, Pringle Creek on behalf of Sue Lunn

Regrets: David Visser (Secretary)

Facilitator: Lygia Dallip
Daniel Del Bianco (Consultant)

ARC Resource Staff: Carey Trombino
Anne Dobos
Danielle Pépin

Joe Hircock, Chair, welcomed everyone. There was one substitute member.

Joe apologized for the late night last week.

Adoption of Agenda of September 10, 2008

Moved: Judy Wityszyn, Capt. Michael VandenBos
Seconded: Marion Fulcher, Palmerston PS
CARRIED

Review of minutes

Approval of Minutes of September 3, 2008

Moved: Angie Weiss, Palmerston PS
Seconded: Judy Whiteman, Leslie McFarlane PS
CARRIED

Carey Trombino, ARC Resource, directed the ARC members to the E-mails received from members of the public and the proposed responses for the ARC to review. She directed the group to Tab 4h for all E-mails and proposed responses. She also directed the group to Tab 4i where questions received via voice mail and the proposed responses were located. The group was requested to review the proposed responses for both the E-mails and voicemails.

Carey further indicated that there were no new emails since our last meeting.

Lygia Dallip, Facilitator, indicated that responses to E-mail and voicemail questions or concerns would be provided by either the Chair or the Secretary of the ARC on behalf of the ARC members.

Joe Hircock, Chair, indicated that the Acronym/Definitions section of the ARC's information binder had been updated. He welcomed any comments regarding clarity from the group. Each new tab insertion was reviewed separately:

- 4h – Proposed Email Responses for ARC's Review
- 4i – Proposed Phone Responses for ARC's Review
- 4j – Accommodation Review Committee Questions and Responses - Joe commented that this represents the questions that were generated at the last meeting of September 3rd. Some of the questions are complex and would require more time and research before DDSB staff responses are forwarded to the ARC.
- 5d – Indoor Environmental Quality – Gary Gibson, manages the DDSB Health and Safety Department. We have a team to monitor the quality.
- 6b – Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee June 25, 2008.
- 6e – Minutes of Accommodation Review Committee for Wednesday September 3, 2008.
- 7c – School Enrolment Information as brought forward last week containing 5 year projected enrolment
- 7d – Facilities Condition Index information (FCI)
- 8g to 13g – School Facilities Inventory System data for each school as provided through the Ministry of Education's database.

There were no questions forthcoming from the handout packages.

There was one change to include the word '*and*' before *at the public meeting* (3rd answer to tab section 4h).

School tours:

Previous discussions with the ARC involved a proposed tour of the 6 schools under review. Two proposals were made by the Chair:

- 1) Tour #1 will take place next Tuesday, September 16, 2008 from 4:00 – 6:00 pm via school bus. Will tour 4 schools. Palmerston, FM Heard, Leslie McFarlane and one other school (includes 3 PTR schools).
- 2) Tour #2 will be held on Wednesday, September 17, 2008 from 3:00 – 4:00 pm at the remaining two schools.

Regular ARC working meeting will follow from 4:00 – 6:00 pm.

A third option was proposed for individuals to arrange for their own tours, prior to next Wednesday's, September 17, 2008 meeting if they were unable to join the two tours proposed.

The first Public meeting will be held at Pringle Creek P.S. on September 30, 2008. The School Valuation Framework, as customized by the ARC, must be ready for that date. The urgency is based on this meeting. The group was given a few minutes to discuss these options.

Group was surveyed for next Tuesday's, September 16, 2008 tour:

McFarlane - Yes

Pringle Creek - Yes

FM Heard - One member not available

Jack Miner - Yes

Captain Michael VandenBos - Yes

Palmerston - Two members cannot attend

Tuesday, September 16, 2008 was suitable for the majority of the members.

Wednesday, September 17, 2008 - 3:00 – 4:00 pm with meeting to follow from 4:00 – 6:00 pm.

Alternative suggestion made by group from Palmerston P.S. Have a longer meeting on Wednesday, September 17, 2008 and do them all (3:00 – 5:00 pm to do all six schools, then hold meeting from 5:00 – 7:00pm)

After some deliberation the group took a vote and established that the tour would take place as follows:

Tuesday, September 16, 2008 from 3:00 – 6:00 pm to visit all the schools and hold the regular ARC working meeting on Wednesday from 3:00 – 5:00 pm as originally scheduled.

Palmerston - Agreed

Capt. Mike - Agreed

Jack Miner - Agreed

FM Heard - No for one person but would tour some on Monday independently

Pringle Creek - Agreed

Leslie McFarlane - Agreed

The majority of members will be able to participate in the tour of all six schools on Tuesday, September 16, 2008. The bus will leave at 3:00 pm and return at 6:00 pm from the Education Centre.

After having time to review the proposed responses to the E-mails and Voicemails, one member indicated the following:

4h 1st question and 4i 2nd question – should include a link to the Board's website to ensure that responses of a similar nature were provided a consistent message.

Customization of Standard School Valuation Framework

(Continuation of work from September 3, 2008 meeting)

Joe Hircock, Chair, gave each school group an opportunity to provide additions to the Standard School Valuation Framework. After each new point for inclusion was presented by the individual school group, the ARC members had an opportunity to discuss the point under consideration and a vote was taken as to whether the point was to be included as part of the ARC's Customized School Valuation Framework. The points raised and the decisions of the group are as follows:

FM Heard suggested:

Add New Section 1.10 "Does the school offer any special programming?"

Lygia Dallip, Facilitator, was requested to provide clarification as to whether or not this question could be considered a new subsection of Section 1 or whether it could be a part of subsection 1.1 which addressed enhanced programming. She responded that this point might fall under subsection 1.1 if the ARC agreed and that if the concern was in specifying certain specialized programs, that the list be examples of such so as not to limit the considerations to only those specialized programs that were included in the list.

Under Section 1 – Value to the Student

Add in brackets under 1.1 (examples: French Immersion (FI) and Gifted)

Motion carried to adopt inclusion.

1.1.1 "What percentage of student population is using the enhanced program?"

Motion carried to adopt inclusion.

To include 1.4.1 "What percentage of student population is bussed for a specialized program?"

Motion carried

Under 1.3 "Are there specific resources purchased by the school to accommodate the specialized program?"

Lygia Dallip, Facilitator, commented that the ARC needed to look at the end result of the questions being formulated. These would be presented at the Public Meetings. The ARC would need to be prepared to provide a consistent answer as to what each question meant. As a result, if the question being posed is too broad, the ARC should explore the concern that generated the question to further refine it.

The question was then reworded as follows:

1.3 “How are specific resources allocated by the school for the enhanced program?”

Motion defeated

Add to the end of this point “such as environmental studies, physical activities or board-wide events”

Motion carried

Add 1.7.1 “Does the existing school office have direct control or sight lines to visitors entering the building?”

Motion carried

Under Section 2 – Value to the Community

2.4 add sentence “would an addition to the school or an additional portable affect the community use of the property?”

Motion defeated

Lygia Dallip, Facilitator, was requested to help the group understand the points on environmental aspects contained in the Standard School Valuation Framework as developed by the SSVF Committee. She indicated that while the points on environmental aspects are very broad, the group may want to explore what it means to them and create sub-points. A member raised the issue of how specific points would be valued – as certain points could be negative or a positive depending on the school.

Lygia reminded the group that this is an evaluation of an individual school. For example, Green space may be of value to one school while a portable may be of value to another school.

Under Section 1 – Value to the Student

Add 1.9 “Would an addition to the school or additional portables affect the student use of the property?”

Motion Carried

Under Section 3 – Value to the Board

Add 3.3.1 “Currently are the specialized spaces in your school being used as intended?”

Motion carried

Add 3.5.1 “What repairs have been done to your facility since the PTR report was released in 2003?”

Motion Carried

Under Section 1 – Value to the Student

Value system – suggested adding 1.10 following 1.9

What would the economic demographic impact have on students being moved from one level to another?”

Joe Hircock, Chair, responded that the same opportunity should be available to all students. This is a public school system. He encouraged the ARC members to consider equal opportunities for all students.

Motion defeated

1.10 "What would the impact be on the students at the existing school being moved to another school accommodation?"

Motion defeated

Under Section 3 – Value to the Board

Add sub point 3.12.1 "What are the opportunities for joint use with other school groups e.g. DEA and for school board initiatives?" Motion carried

Joe stated that we now have a tool to use for the meeting for September 30, 2008. He reminded the members of the tour of schools next week and the work to be done next Wednesday, September 17, 2008 on the School Valuation Framework which would be revised by staff to incorporate the customized points agreed to by the ARC.

He reminded members to use the question templates to record queries for response. Answers would be provided as soon as possible.

Joe Hircock, Chair, called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion to adjourn: Lynda Darling, Leslie McFarlane PS

Seconded: Leilah McBride, Palmerston PS

All in favour to adjourn.

Tour of all six schools – Tuesday, September 16, 2008 from 3:00 to 6:00 pm by bus, departing from the Education Centre.

Next meeting of the ARC Central Whitby: Wednesday, September 17, 2008
3:00 – 5:00 pm - Education Centre, Room 1017