



**ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
NORTH SIDE
ORIENTATION MEETING
VICTORIA PARK TRAINING CENTRE
Monday, April 4, 2016 6:30 pm – 9:00 pm**

Chair: Colleen Kappel, Superintendent of Education
Moderator: 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: Wayne McElhone, Russell Aegard, Charlene Padovese, Kim Code, Elaine Oades, Denis Bourdages, Vince Tropea, Paula Haapanen, Anne Marie McMahon-Dupuis, Shanlee Linton, Marina Brescia, Lee Ann Luby, Charles Bishop, Alex Kraft-Wilson, Dawna Watts, Paul Fayrick, Allison Jones, Michelle Probizanski, Kristine Hilden, Judy Korppi, Susan Reppard, Casey Hudyma, Angela Hill, Board Chair Deborah Massaro

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Welcome and Introductions	<p>Colleen Kappel, Superintendent of Education and Chair of ARC- North called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and on behalf of Lakehead District School Board welcomed everyone.</p> <p>The moderator and members of the committee introduced themselves. A sign in sheet was distributed and housekeeping items were discussed.</p>	
Meeting Norms	All members received a binder of information that will be referred to through the meeting. The primary role of the committee is to be a conduit to gather information. The chair explained the goal of the working meetings is to organize and prioritize information that has been	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>gathered into categories/themes for submission to the Trustees of the Board as part of the final staff report.</p> <p>The Chair addressed the meeting norms.</p> <p>The committee agreed to the norms that are part of the Board’s policy (based on the Ministry of Education’s revised Pupil Accommodation Guidelines).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Committee members are not required to reach consensus on options or information that will be presented to the Board. 2. Discussions are focussed on the potential for enhancing the learning environment and providing the best education opportunities for students when considering recommended options. 3. There are no alternates for absent members throughout the process in order to ensure continuity, except for AEAC and SEAC members. 4. Colleen Kappel, Chair of the North Side ARC will facilitate the meetings. Minutes of meetings will be posted on board website. <p>In addition to the above norms, the following additional norms will be adhered to at all meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyone has the opportunity to speak and has an equal and valued voice at the table, and that opinions and ideas of each committee member will be valued and thoughtfully considered; • Meetings will begin and end on time – but with the consensus of group, we may extend the end time to finish the discussion of a particular item; and • All members will sign in at each meeting. <p>As these are public meetings, they will be voice recorded and the minutes of each meeting will be posted on the Lakehead Public Schools website. To ensure accuracy and transparency, names will be attached to each question and comment throughout the meetings.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Terms of Reference and Role of Committee</p>	<p>The Chair reviewed the Mandate of the committee emphasizing that LDSB is committed to the success and well-being of every student. She explained the focus of this committee's role on the potential for enhancing the learning environment and providing the best possible educational opportunities for students as the recommended options are considered.</p> <p>The Chair thoroughly reviewed the Terms of Reference (from Board Policy 9010) that all members received and which will be adhered to during all ARC working and public meetings. The first public meeting will take place on April 11, 2016 at Superior CVI. Sheelagh Hendrick will moderate the public meetings.</p> <p>Questions?</p> <p>Q - Wayne McElhone inquired about 3.2.3 in the Terms of Reference, that the ARC will hold at least two public meetings in the school(s) under review, but we are only holding one in each school.</p> <p>A - The Chair responded that there are two public meetings in total for the schools under review.</p> <p>Q- Wayne McElhone asked if CD Howe, St James and Vance Chapman are under review.</p> <p>A - Heather Harris responded that the high schools were chosen to hold the public meetings as they have more space. The Chair indicated that because there are five schools involved and two public meetings are to be held, the two secondary schools were chosen as locations to hold the public meetings.</p> <p>Q - Kim Code asked if there was any way that we can let the public know that the elementary schools are welcome to attend these meetings? The conversations that she has had, people think the meetings are only for the two affected high schools.</p> <p>A - The Chair responded that committee members can assist with</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>getting the message out that the meetings are for elementary parents as well and that administration will do their best to get the message out.</p> <p>Q - Kim Code indicated that the plan will affect kids not yet in the school system and that the message should get out to the public in general that they are welcome to attend the public meetings.</p> <p>A - Bruce Nugent responded that an ad ran in The Chronicle Journal for the south side public meeting and a synervice went out for all those affected on the south side. The same will be done for the north side.</p> <p>Q - Paul Fayrick commented that as parents in the process, without the terms of reference, they would expect that this vast body of people (North Side ARC) would be doing something other than just listening.</p> <p>A - The Chair responded that as committee members, our role is to listen, highlight, categorize and hear the main themes and to share the ideas and themes with the Board. Heather Harris also responded that at the public meeting, information will be shared with the public what the role of the ARC is. The committee can ask questions of clarification through the Chair. David Wright responded that much of what is being covered this evening will also be highlighted at the public meeting.</p> <p>Q - Kristine Hilden sought clarification if, in 2.8 of the Terms of Reference, Pupil Accommodation Committee and Accommodation Review Committee are the same thing, and if in number 5 of the Terms of Reference, regarding the report, will the ARC members be provided the report before it is provided to Trustees?</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that the staff report will be written by board staff and provided to Trustees directly based on the information that has been gathered at the ARC working</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>meetings and the public meetings. There will be two reports. One in June will include administration's option for the north side. The final final staff report will go to Trustees at the beginning of October after Trustees have had the opportunity to hear the public delegations.</p> <p>Q - Charlie Bishop inquired about the statement that the ARC will receive community input on the options, what does that look like?</p> <p>A - Heather Harris responded that there will be microphones set up and members of the public will be able to come up and ask questions.</p> <p>Q Charlie followed up by asking if individuals or groups could come up and ask questions.</p> <p>A - Heather Harris responded that either individuals or groups could come up and ask questions. Groups will be provided an opportunity to provide a delegation to the Board at a future date.</p>	
Pupil Accommodation Review Process	<p>The Chair reviewed Policy 9010, Pupil Accommodation Review which was revised on October 27, 2015 due to the release of revised Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines from the Ministry of Education. The Chair provided a detailed explanation of each section of the policy, sharing the dates of all milestones to date. A timeline of the North Side ARC with all meeting dates and times was also addressed. Particular attention was provided on the process of transition planning.</p> <p>Questions?</p> <p>Q - Michelle Probizanski inquired about section 12.3 in the procedures, <i>School board staff will compile feedback from the public delegations which will be presented to the Board with the final staff report</i>, if there is an additional staff report from the one in June?</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>A – Heather Harris responded that there are two reports. A staff report in June and then a final staff report in early October.</p>	
Initial Staff Report	<p>Colleen Kappel, reviewed the initial staff report, <i>School Renewal Plan Report No. 029-16</i>.</p> <p>David Wright shared the background on grant funding to the Board from the Ministry of Education and that the Ministry of Education is now changing their focus and that they are no longer supporting artificial top up funding to keep schools open, so there is a financial component to consolidate schools.</p> <p>Q - Kristine Hilden indicated that a lot of the staff are asking why we are moving so quickly, is it solely based on the reduction in funding?</p> <p>A - David Wright responded it is not solely based on the reduction in funding. The Ministry has undergone consultation over the last number of years with the School Board Modernization Efficiency consultation on where to focus their resources. The Board has undergone transformation over the last two decades and has not closed any schools since 2009. There is a three year timeline to complete the process.</p> <p>Q - Paul Fayrick inquired how the enrolment decline at Lakehead Public Schools compares to the separate school board as the community of Thunder Bay itself has declined.</p> <p>A - The Chair responded that all boards in the region are declining in enrolment. David Wright shared that Lakehead is the largest board in the region, dramatically changing over the last number of years, educating 28,000 students 25 years ago. Therefore large elementary schools were built to accommodate up to 400 students. The catholic board built smaller schools. They have updated their policy but there has not been an announcement to date as they are not on the same timelines.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Q - Paul Fayrick suggested that the Ministry of Education mandate is for publicly funded education and they don't really care who provides it. They are just looking at efficiencies.</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that there are special considerations for French language school boards. The French Catholic school board has a competitive interest in enrolment and there is also a French public school board that has expressed interest in opening a school in Thunder Bay.</p> <p>Q - Kim Code inquired why there are two options on the North Side.</p> <p>A - The Chair responded that there are two viable options on the North Side. David Wright shared that because there are two viable options on the North Side, receiving community input to the facilities is important. It is best to explore both options.</p> <p>Q - Kim Code shared that she was involved with the last round of consolidations at CD Howe, and that the competition between schools created bad feelings. Kim suggested to visit social media to see the level of involvement and from her perspective it is getting intense. Kim suggested that if there was only one option to choose from, it would have been better. Her experience from the last consolidations was that it got pretty ugly.</p> <p>A - David Wright acknowledged that people are passionate about their school communities. The process was changed in an effort to reduce the controversy. It wasn't anticipated that two school communities would be combatting through the process. The focus will be on what is best for students. The Chair acknowledged that Kim raised a good point. ARC members need to keep a focus on all students not just one student or some students. Keeping that at the forefront and thinking of the best educational and learning opportunities for all students is suggested.</p> <p>Q - Casey Hudyma indicated that even on the south side there is</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>competition and a lot of people are trying to campaign to keep Churchill open.</p> <p>A - The Chair acknowledged that people are committed and passionate about their school communities. David Wright indicated that there are two options on the south side and three on the north side. The additional options would be for Trustees not to close schools. Trustees will make the final decision.</p> <p>Q - Kristen Hilden inquired about the statement in 2.3 of the Terms of Reference: <i>The ARC may provide other accommodation options than those in the initial staff report.....</i> is it possible that the ARC could come up with a fourth option or other options, (closing, not closing)?</p> <p>A - The Chair responded that yes, another option could be determined, but it would have to be supported with a rationale. We would have to look at the benefit to students and consider the finances and if resources are used in the best way possible for schools.</p> <p>Q - Kristine Hilden inquired if the idea has been brought up about rebranding. Should the ARC be looking at that now to create a more united front?</p> <p>A - The Chair thanked Kristine for her comments.</p> <p>A - David Wright clarified that Trustees have approved proceeding with an accommodation review, and that the ARC cannot put another school on the table for closure as Trustees have not approved that.</p> <p>Q - Paula Happanen inquired why all schools weren't profiled and why ARC members weren't provided with the data for all schools. Paula inquired why there are only three schools on the table.</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that administration has made public</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>the school profiles under review.</p> <p>Q - Paula Happanen inquired why the school profiles for all of the schools on the south and north were not provided. Paula suggested that the ARC members have been provided with a limited amount of information, not all the information and that she would have been interested in the information for the other schools on the north side.</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that the information has been collected, but the school profiles that were provided to Trustees with the initial staff report were provided to ARC members for the North Side affected schools.</p> <p>Q - Paul Fayrick requested clarification that if the ARC wanted to come up with another option it would have to be with the schools that have already been approved for review.</p> <p>A - David Wright clarified what Trustees have approved for review. Five schools on the North Side, and four schools on the South Side. To close another school is not in the mandate of the committee. Trustees have not approved accommodation reviews of other schools.</p> <p>Q - Paul Fayrick suggested that without having the resources of all the staff, the ARC is limited to options 1 and 2.</p> <p>A - Heather Harris shared that the new process from the Ministry has indicated that the focus of the ARC is on the recommendations contained in the initial staff report. That is a change from previous ARCs. David Wright shared that the previous accommodation review process provided the ARC to put other options on the table. The guidelines state that if an ARC is going to provide another option, there has to be program and financial rationale on the table, so the process is different.</p> <p>Q - Paula Happanen inquired about rationale, and that her</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>assumption is the majority of people on the committee are not equipped to come up with another option. Paula inquired if board staff are available to provide committee members with the information to come up with rationale to provide another option?</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that Heather Harris will run through a detailed school information profile and if a committee member has a reasonable request of the board we will do our best to accommodate the request. It really depends on what you are looking for.</p> <p>Q - Paula Happanen indicated it would most likely be financial information that she would be looking for as it is beyond her/committee members expertise.</p> <p>Q - Wayne McElhone inquired about the option to add on to Superior. What is the preferred addition, adding a third floor?</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that there are several options on the table and that the board has engaged an architect to get an idea of design.</p> <p>Q - Vince Tropea inquired if that information will be available at the public meeting, as parents will want to know about the field, parking, etc.</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that some of that information is available now, but it will depend on what the final option will be.</p> <p>Q - Vince Tropea inquired if there are timelines for the construction?</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that if the K to 8 school is Superior, it is intended to open 2018. If the addition is on Superior, it will be open 2017.</p> <p>Q - Russ Aegard inquired if the costs for construction are available</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>or are the costs in the report.</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that the costs were not in the report. Preliminary costs are estimated at 5.5 million at Superior CVI; Vance Chapman 3.2 million; and renovation costs at Superior and Hammarskjold if going with option 2 is 3.5 million each.</p> <p>Q - Vince Tropea inquired if tenders are going out now or if they are in progress.</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that tenders have not been issued and cannot be issued until after the Board makes the final decision in October 2016.</p> <p>Q - Vince Tropea highlighted that with tendering and inflation, prices go up.</p> <p>Q - Paul Fayrick inquired with Option 2, and the renovations to Superior, if it's considered an internal conversion?</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that it is an internal conversion.</p> <p>Q - Charlene Padovese inquired when Superior was built it was state of the art, eco, super green, energy efficient, if the decision is Hammarskjold, will there be a pay off?</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that two different questions have been asked: utilities and the eco aspect of the schools. Hammarskjold runs on predominantly natural gas. Superior runs on a combination of electricity and natural gas. It costs more to keep the lights on at Superior. Because of nature of utilities and the way they are consumed, the eco footprint is about half of what it is at Hammarskjold. Hammarskjold is less expensive to run than Superior. It's not significant either way.</p> <p>Q - Vince Tropea inquired about the timelines and the tenders. Whoever wins the tenders, what if they can't meet the timeline? Can the Board kick back the opening of the school if</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>construction is delayed?</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that if the Board could not make a construction timeline, space will be available to accommodate students. David provided the timeline from tendering, to construction, and opening, conceding they are aggressive timelines, but not impossible, and with the understanding that construction seasons vary in Thunder Bay.</p> <p>Q - Vince Tropea inquired if the tenders will be awarded to local contractors.</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that there is a public procurement process in place which the Board must adhere to, so the tender would be awarded based on the procurement directives.</p> <p>Q - Denis Bourdage inquired about the paragraph above 4.1 of the report that indicates <i>Administration has selected Option 1 as the preferred option for the North Side Renewal Plan, but welcomes and will give consideration to feedback received throughout the pupil accommodation review process on both options.</i></p> <p>A - The Chair responded that as a requirement of the Ministry, administration must select one preferred option. David Wright indicated that if we were able to, we wouldn't provide a preferred option. Superior is a purpose built secondary school. They are two viable options. That was the preferred option for administration.</p> <p>Q - Susan Reppard inquired if not viable, the Board would not have provided the option of a third floor on Superior.</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that with a third floor on Superior the top of the third story would be under the 14 meter city zoning requirement and therefore is a viable option for Superior.</p> <p>Q - Susan Reppard – so all the rumours and myths can be extinguished.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>A - David Wright responded they are rumours and myths.</p> <p>Q - Allison Jones inquired how will these renovations affect education and the learning process?</p> <p>A - Colleen Kappel responded that with 1200 students in a secondary school, the Board would be able to offer the breadth of programming and the courses that students need.</p> <p>Q - Paula Happanen inquired about the elementary schools.</p> <p>A - The Chair responded that it is similar for elementary students as well. With the larger school single grades could be offered. Heather Harris responded that the larger elementary school would also be able to offer rotary for students in the older grades. An explanation of rotary classes was provided to ARC members.</p>	
<p>School Information Profiles</p>	<p>Heather Harris explained the section of the binder entitled “School Profiles” and went through the school information profile of Vance Chapman Public School.</p> <p>Questions?</p> <p>Q - Russ Aegard inquired about the utilization percentage of the school, is the daycare included in that percentage?</p> <p>Q - Heather Harris responded that a daycare would not be counted. The current capacity is based on the current configuration.</p> <p>Q - Liz Tod inquired if there is more information on the accessibility of the secondary schools – Hammarskjold and Superior.</p> <p>A - Heather Harris responded that both schools are completely accessible. The Board has some information on accessibility.</p> <p>Q - Dawna Watts indicated that the secretarial information for</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	Vance Chapman is incorrect, presently there are 1.25 secretaries at Vance Chapman.	
Facility Condition Index	<p>David Wright provided an overview of the facility condition index (FCI). The facility condition index reflects the cost of the renewal. Renewal is the ongoing and capital maintenance costs of the building. Assessors come and advise what the lifespan of the items in the school are. The Board does not control the information. The Ministry of Education contracts a company to visit all schools and school boards in the province. That company looks at everything in the schools. The assessed conditions are lifespans and don't reflect reality. The only input the Board has is to highlight to the Ministry what work has been done to the facilities. When the capital plan is determined, board staff consult with principals, custodians and the maintenance department. The facility condition index does not necessarily indicate what the Board is likely to invest in the schools in the next few years. The Ministry of Education is funding additional investment in renewal. The facility condition index is what it is and a good way to compare schools against each other. With a score of 65 or greater, a school is deemed prohibitive to repair (PTR). There are a few PTR schools in our system. Some are included in the ARC process. FCI is an indicator as to the state of the building.</p> <p>Questions?</p> <p>Q - Angela Hill indicated that David Wright spoke about the challenge to change a high school into an elementary school and asked for a recap of why it would be so challenging to take Superior and turn it into an elementary school.</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that he did not recall saying that. Mr. Wright indicated that the Board has converted Ecole Gron Morgan from a secondary school to an elementary school. Ultimately the cost of 30 million to build would be the highest cost elementary school in the province. There are tech shops that are not currently used in elementary schools. There are challenges to convert the space but we have done so before and been successful.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Survey	<p>Bruce Nugent provided a handout and overview of the online survey conducted with Survey Monkey, a cloud based software. The survey was promoted to parents/guardians, students, staff and taxpayers using a variety of different avenues to promote the survey. The survey closed on March 11, 2016 and there were 1016 responses.</p> <p>Colleen Kappel, Chair of the North Side ARC, reviewed some of the common themes that were addressed in the survey and submitted in the questions and comments section.</p> <p>Questions?</p> <p>Q - Paul Fayrick inquired what is an SHSM and a ELKP?</p> <p>A - The Chair provided an explanation of the program Specialist High Skills Major (SHSM) and the Early Learning Kindergarten Program (ELKP).</p> <p>Q - Kristin Hilden inquired if the survey could be released again as the number one concern that she has heard from parents and from staff is the ability to build relationships.</p> <p>A - The Chair acknowledged that relationships are important.</p> <p>The Chair suggested that committee members review the survey comments and FAQs as homework prior to the next working meeting.</p>	
Public Meeting April 11, 2016 Superior CVI	<p>Sheelagh Hendrick, Moderator of the Public Meetings, shared information on the flow of the public meeting that will take place at Superior CVI on April 11, 2016. The role of the ARC members is to listen and bring back to the next working meeting for discussion and themes. The minutes of the public meeting will be available to all members as well as on the website. The Chair will address the policy, the initial staff report, and the school information profile. Then the moderator will take over and open the meeting to questions from the public until 9 p.m. The meeting will be recorded for note taking and the minutes will be posted on the board website. There will be two microphones. In addition, the public can write questions down on</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>cards provided at the entrance to the room and handed to staff. The moderator will read those questions. The public will also be able to write questions and leave them to be responded on the website. All responses to questions will be reviewed by the ARC members. Participants will be limited to one question at a time to provide an opportunity to as many people as possible. Should someone have a lengthy comment (more than 2 minutes) they will be asked to send their comments to renewal@lakeheadschoools.ca In the interest of privacy, participants will be asked to not take photos or record the meeting.</p> <p>Questions?</p> <p>Q - Kristine Hilden inquired as ARC members will we be called upon at the meeting?</p> <p>A - Sheelagh Hendrick responded that all information will flow through the Chair and committee members will not be called upon.</p> <p>Q - Kristine Hilden inquired as they are public meetings, are we going to prioritize community members? Will staff be able to participate?</p> <p>A - Sheila Hendrick responded that she will be unable to differentiate who is who. People can speak as individuals or on behalf of a group.</p> <p>Q - Michelle Probizanski inquired if Trustees are going to be in attendance.</p> <p>A - David Wright responded that there are Trustees as Ad Hoc members on each ARC. Those Trustees will be in attendance. Additional Trustees may attend if they are able to.</p> <p>Q - Anne Marie inquired if there will be assigned seating for ARC members?</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	A - Seating will be assigned for the ARC to sit as a group.	
FAQs and Questions	Bruce Nugent advised that he has updated the FAQs as of April 4, 2016 and provided a handout for members. Members were requested to direct anyone asking questions to send their questions to renewal@lakeheadschoools.ca	
Reminders and Additional Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next working meeting is scheduled for April 19, 2016 and the committee will look at the feedback from the public meeting. The role of the ARC member is to listen and provide feedback. • The working meeting of May 31st, members are requested to bring feedback from their school community or advisory committee. • The second public meeting will take place on June 8, 2016 at Hammarskjold High School. <p>Questions?</p> <p>Q - Paul Fayrick inquired about the FAQs and a student with special needs as students with an IEP are also included in this category. There may be some confusion until the fine print is read. Paul wondered if the issue had come up previously?</p> <p>A - Bruce Nugent responded it has not come up before but it would be something that could be addressed through the FAQs.</p> <p>Q - Paul Fayrick indicated that he has heard talk from parents from schools affected speaking about the needs of their special needs students.</p> <p>A - The Chair responded that administration will look at that.</p> <p>The Chair thanked everyone for their time and questions.</p>	
Additional Comments	David Wright indicated that a survey will be created by students for students to ensure that all students can become involved in the process.	
Adjournment	The meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.	