

ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE NORTH SIDE WORKING MEETING VICTORIA PARK TRAINING CENTRE Tuesday, April 19, 2016 6:30 pm – 9:00 pm

Chair: Moderator:	Colleen Kappel, Superintendent of Education Sheelagh Hendrick
Resource Staff:	David Wright, Superintendent of Business Dave Covello, Manager of IT and Corporate Planning Heather Harris, Capital Planning Officer Bruce Nugent, Communications Officer
Committee Members:	Charles Bishop, Denis Bourdages, Marina Brescia, Kim Code, Serena Essex, Paul Fayrick, Paula Happanen, Kristine Hilden, Angela Hill, Casey Hudyma, Judy Korppi, Alex Kraft-Wilson, Shanlee Linton, Lee Ann Luby, Gerry Martin, Board Chair Deborah Massaro, Wayne McElhone, Anne Marie McMahon-Dupuis, Elaine Oades, Michelle Probizanski, Susan Reppard, Vince Tropea, Dawna Watts
Regrets:	Russell Aegard, Allison Jones, Charlene Padovese

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Welcome & Introductions	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and everyone introduced themselves.	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Review of the Norms	 The Chair reviewed the meeting agenda and provided an overview of the meeting norms: Committee members are not required to reach consensus on options or information that will be presented to the Board. Discussions are focused on the potential for enhancing the learning environment and providing the best educational opportunities for students when considering the recommended options. No substitutes for absent members throughout the process in order to ensure continuity. (AEAC and SEAC members may send an alternate) The Chair will facilitate meetings. Minutes of meetings will be posted on the board website. Everyone has the opportunity to speak. The opinions and ideas of each committee member are thoughfully considered. Meetings will begin and end on time. All members should sign in at each meeting. The Chair provided the upcoming meeting dates for the North Side ARC: May 31, 2016 - Working Meeting June 8, 2016 - Final Working Meeting. The Chair thanked everyone for their commitment to students and the process. ARC Orientation Meeting Minutes – April 4, 2016 North Side ARC Public Meeting Minutes – April 11, 2016 Questions/Comments from North ARC Public Meeting Report from the Activities Director Updated FAQs Template for Presenting Stakeholder Feedback 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Meeting Minutes April 4, 2016 Orientation	The Chair asked everyone to review the April 4, 2016 ARC Orientation Meeting Minutes	
	No comments or revisions were made to the minutes.	
Student Input	Heather Harris explained how the board will seek input from the students. Bruce Nugent and Heather Harris will meet with the four students on the ARCs. Bruce Nugent and Heather Harris will assist the students to develop the survey questions. Principals will assist with implementing the survey for students in Grades 7-12. The student survey will be conducted using Survey Monkey.	
	The Chair indicated that this is good information for the school communities.	
Special Education	The Chair indicated after the decision is made by the Trustees of the Board, a Transition Committee will be established. Presently there are special education programs as follows:	
	 Hammarskjold – Special Needs Class; Superior – Pre Work Placement (PWP); and Vance Chapman – Special Needs Class. 	
	The board has previous experience with transitions for special needs classes and staff work hard thinking about the location and facilities. Administration also works closely with the staff in the special education classes when implementing a transition.	
	The Chair provided an example of the Multi-Needs (MN) class move from Woodcrest to Algonquin. The Chair (as Superintendent responsible for Special Education) met with every parent/guardian from the MN program regarding the move to determine the concerns and to meet the needs of the students in the program, such as: an accessible washroom in the classroom; and a sensory room. In addition a meeting room was added to the classroom. Based on the student needs, there	
	was also a request for air conditioning in the class room. (Woodcrest MN room did not have air conditioning). The board was able to install	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	air conditioning at Algonquin. Administration worked with the school community to put in place a facility and program that met the student's needs.	
	Q: Paul Fayrick inquired what kind of special facilities does the Pre Work Placement (PWP) program require? The special needs students have profound needs.	
	A: The Chair responded that the PWP students do not have the same needs. The programming is different than a regular classroom setting.	
	A: Michelle Probizanski provided an overview of the day for PWP students. Some of the students meet the special needs criteria but prefer to be in the PWP program. Superior had a student with multi-needs who stayed in PWP until the age of 21.	
	A: Judy Korppi provided some background on the student who has cerebral palsy and was in a wheelchair. The classroom was washroom equipped, and had a bed for changing. The student remained in the PWP program for 7 years and was mobile on her own.	
	The Chair indicated that administration will look at all schools. There may be a need to install accessible washrooms, bars, etc. There can be a lot of equipment needs with special needs students. Administration will look at the needs of all the students.	
	Kristine Hilden commented that she has experience in special needs programs at a variety of schools and would not want to subject students and families to challenges beyond what they would be able to handle. Kristine believes that the board is moving to creating an ability for resilience for change for transition with students. Kristine also spoke about accessibility and that the quality of accessibility is different in each school and that needs to be looked at to build the ability for students to be independent, as independence builds	
	The Chair indicated that administration will look at the needs of the	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	students. There is a central team that support the schools regarding needs that are required (such as the Special Education Officer, and resource teachers).	
	A special education focus group has been scheduled on May 9, 2016 @ 6:30 p.m. Information will be distributed to parents/guardians through the school principals. Information gathered at the meeting will be brought to the ARC committee.	
Minutes from April 11, 2016 Public Meeting Questions left behind at public session Report from the	The Chair advised that the information gathered concerns both elementary and secondary. Many of the comments pertain to secondary. ARC members need to consider all comments. Committee members worked in groups to identify the themes from the input gathered at the public meeting as well as other input that has been provided	
Activities Director	The Chair explained that this document would be a collaborative working document that will be added to after the second public meeting. Committee members will prioritize what was heard and the information will be included in the final staff report to Trustees. Prioritizing will provide Trustees with an indication of what the ARC thinks the public is focussed on.	
	Heather Harris provided a demonstration on how to use the padlet. Groups worked independently on the padlet posting their themes from the resource documents provided for approximately 45 minutes.	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Common Themes	Heather Harris and Sheelagh Hendrick (The Moderator) used the Smart Board to organize the data as the ARC members determined the themes that were highlighted by the groups. The themes were organized in the following groups :	
	Accessibility	
	Alternative Options	
	Childcare	
	Community	
	Environmental Impact	
	Financial	
	Long-term planning	
	Opportunities on both sides of the city	
	Program	
	Property Size / Location / Characteristics	
	Public Perceptions	
	Rebranding	
	Safety	
	Students	
	Technology	
	Timelines	
	Transitions	
	Transportation	
Comments After Themes Presented	The Chair inquired if there was anything that was missing or what	
memes Presented	hadn't been thought of.	
Rebuilding Trust	Serena Essex suggested that building trust again and being clear	
	about messaging and numbers and stats is important. Even with the best foresight there is a shift in trust. It is important to consider that.	
	Paul Fayrick – indicated that when people are talking about closure, if	
	Superior transitions to an elementary school, the school isn't closing,	
	it's not a waste of money. It becomes a school against school thing and	
	that is part of the trust. It looks like infighting and it doesn't send a good	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	message to the community. The Chair acknowledged that is important and inquired with Serena Essex if her comments were regarding public trust.	
	Serena Essex indicated that yes it was about the public trust and also suggested that job losses will affect the community and the public trust.	
Daycare Space	Heather Harris clarified about the daycare piece. The plan will have space for all daycares and the board is not looking at closing any daycares. The final decision on child care licensing is made by the DSSAB.	
	Vince Tropea indicated that he thought that the three daycares were all run by different organizations and would they all be in the one large elementary school?	
	Heather Harris indicated that within all of the school board buildings, the daycares will be accommodated. They would not all be going into the same school.	
	Elaine Oades indicated that the daycare presently at St. James has a location on the south side of the city and would be looking to maintain a location on the north side of the city.	
	Dave Covello indicated that administration has a meeting with the DSSAB regarding next steps and then will meet with the daycares to address their concerns.	
	Angela Hill indicated that Schoolhouse Playcare Centre is the only childcare centre that has a site on both the north and the south side of the city.	
	Dave Covello confirmed that Schoolhouse Playcare Centre does have a location on both sides of the city.	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Environmental Footprint	Kristine Hilden suggested to combine the environmental footprint and rebuilding trust. Kristine indicated that she is thinking about the province's climate change strategy and thinking that the funding may change down the road. Kristine suggested that the board should take this into account now as the board may have to look at changing its policies change in the future.	
	After discussion, it was agreed to maintain the theme of Environmental Footprint in a separate category.	
Open Houses at Schools	Susan Reppard inquired if there were any plans to hold open houses at the schools affected.	
	The Chair indicated that there were no plans to hold open houses.	
	Michelle Probizanski inquired as a working committee, could they hold an open house at the school.	
	Susan Reppard suggested that it would be helpful for parents and students to see what is being offered at the schools and to see what the schools are all about.	
	Anne Marie McMahon suggested it is not just about the building, but the school community as a whole, which makes the school what it is. Anne Marie suggested that the spirit of the building may be lost without the kids being there.	
	Paul Fayrick suggested that if you invite people into a building they may think that they have some influence over the decision, however, the process does not really allow that kind of change.	
	Alex Kraft-Wilson suggested that older buildings would have a disadvantage and the public would not truly see what the finished options would look like.	
	Kim Code indicated it's important that the board show how elementary students would transition into Superior if that is the site chosen for the elementary school.	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Next Meeting	The Chair addressed the hand out <i>Presenting Stakeholder Feedback</i> that was provided to members.	
	Each school group, AEAC and SEAC will be allocated 10 minutes to present their stakeholder feedback at the next working meeting on May 31, 2016. Groups may choose to use the template, or not, however the document is a good reference to assist with obtaining feedback.	
	At the beginning of the next working meeting, members will be provided with 30 minutes of planning time to discuss their presentation or groups may choose to meet in advance to discuss.	
	Student data will be collected by the students when the student survey is distributed. ARC members are asked not to approach students for their feedback or input.	
	Members were informed that those who provide information should do so voluntarily.	
	Presentations should be no longer than 10 minutes. For fairness, if the presentation is longer than 10 minutes, it will be included in the staff report.	
	Should groups wish to use the Smart Board, it will be available to groups for presentations.	
	Groups are asked to provide a written copy of their presentation to assist with the minutes.	
	Also at the next meeting, input will be sought from ARC members as to what should be presented at the final public meeting.	
Adjournment	The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.	