



Thornhill Elementary Schools - Accommodation Review Committee

Minutes of ARC Working Meeting #4 held February 19, 2009, 7:00 p.m., at St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School, 135 Green Lane, Thornhill

In attendance:

ARC Chair: Patricia Preston, Associate Director
ARC Secretary: Andy Di Sebastiano, Superintendent of Education: School Leadership

Members:

Norbert Koehl	CSC Chair	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
Sam Cuda	Parent	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
Maureen Hurley	Parent	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
Amanda Butters	Teacher	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
Tony Patriarca	Non-Teaching	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
June Buick	Principal	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
Joe Wigglesworth	CSC Chair	St. Michael Catholic Academy
Louie Gavros	Parent	St. Michael Catholic Academy
Dayna Fitzpatrick	Teacher	St. Michael Catholic Academy
Melodie Curran	Non-Teaching	St. Michael Catholic Academy
Luisa Busato	Principal	St. Michael Catholic Academy
Tracey O'Connor-Lauzon	CSC Chair	St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School
Diane Scaini	Parent	St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School
Paul Wilkie	Parent	St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School
Lisa Falconi	Teaching	St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School
Gordon Lovgren	Principal	St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School
Father William Burns	Parish	St. Luke Parish, Thornhill
Lisa Thalassinou	Parish	Good Shepherd Parish, Thornhill

ARC Facilitators:

Dan Del Bianco, Watson & Associates

ARC Resource Staff:

Dan McCowell, York Catholic - Senior Manager, Administrative Services
Tom Pechkovsky, York Catholic - Manager of Planning Services
Christine Hyde, York Catholic – Planner
Joe McLoughlin, York Catholic – Manager of Maintenance Services

Recording Secretary:

Wendy Cosentino

Public Observers Signed In:

Connie Mason CSC Co-Chair St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School

Absent with Reason:

Bryce Eldridge, York Catholic – Superintendent of Plant
Trixie Santiago-Sorrell, Parent, St. Michael Catholic Academy
Angie Della Rovere, Non-Teaching, St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School
Carol Cotton, Trustee (Accompanying Student Trustee Conference, Ottawa)

1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTION

The meeting was held in the St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School Gymnasium and was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Patricia Preston, ARC Chair, welcomed everyone to Working Meeting #4.

2. PRAYER

Ms. Preston led the group in prayer.

3. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 19, 2009, ARC AGENDA

The agenda of the Thornhill Elementary Schools Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) meeting of February 19, 2009, was approved as distributed.

4. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 22, 2009, ARC MINUTES, WORKING MEETING #3

The Minutes of the ARC Working Meeting #3 held January 22, 2009, were approved.

5. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 5, 2009, ARC MINUTES, PUBLIC MEETING #1

The Minutes of the ARC Public Meeting #1 held February 5, 2009, were approved. Questions and Answers received at Public Meeting #1 specific to the accommodation review process were addressed under **ARC Agenda Item, 8, Questions & Answers: Questions Received from the Community at Public Meeting #1.**

5. UPDATES TO ARC BINDER

ARC members were provided with **A Summary of Supporting Documentation Distributed with Revised Table of Contents for Working Meeting #4.** The list of materials and documents for file in the ARC binder, were reviewed by the ARC Secretary and Board resource staff, with particular note to:

(a) **Thornhill ARC School and Parish Boundaries Map**

A replacement copy of the Thornhill ARC School and Parish Boundaries Map, with corrected legend symbols, was distributed for file in the ARC Binder, Section 16, Appendix C.

(b) **Request from ARC: School Profile, Our Lady Help of Christians CES**

On motion made and approved by the ARC, it was agreed that the ARC Resource Team will provide the Committee with a copy of the School Profile for Our Lady Help of Christians CES, which was visited as part of the ARC school tour on January 12, 2009. The purpose will be to provide the ARC with a point of reference for comparison when the committee begins to look at accommodations solutions.

(c) **ReCapp Reports**

A Conditions Assessment for St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School, St. Michael Catholic Academy and St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School will be available to the ARC. An Executive Summary of the 2003 ReCapp Report for each school will be forwarded to Committee members in advance of the next working meeting. A copy of the full Conditions Assessment Report by Anderson Building Services will be available at Working Meeting #5 on March 5, 2009.

5. PUBLIC MEETING

a) Observations & Questions

The ARC participated in a round table discussion of observations made at Public Meeting #1.

b) Communications Update

A Communications Strategy update was distributed for review and consideration; the strategies are being proposed to help simplify and clarify the ARC process for school staff and community:

- **ARC Website:** the ARC website is updated on a regular basis. Meeting agenda, minutes and supporting documentation, including Questions & Answers are posted to the site. Q & A have been posted in 2 areas: (1) as part of meeting minutes and (2) in their own dedicated space in *Section 22, Questions & Proposed Responses*.
- **School Newsletter Insert:** a draft one-page summary to update school communities on the ARC process was distributed for review. The intent would be to have the newsletter proposed included in the 3 Thornhill Markham March school newsletters for distribution home to families. The ARC requested that the insert be amended to further clarify on:
 - The purpose of the ARC - *to meet the needs of students and to provide the best learning environment; the ARC represents all 3 schools, and all students therein*
 - The process of the ARC – *this is the first time the Board is working through an accommodation review process newly mandated by the Ministry of Education*

The Committee also requested that the newsletter provide additional information on the purpose behind the School Valuation Framework as *a tool used to gather information* in the accommodation review process.

The ARC Secretary along with the Communications Department will make revisions and forward to the ARC Committee for final approval.

- **School Bulletin Boards:** A bulletin board in each of St. Anthony, St. Michael and St. René Goupil-St. Luke schools will be dedicated to the ARC. The School Principal will be asked to post all ARC updates on the bulletin boards. A laminated poster of the ARC Flowchart of process and timelines was given to each Principal for posting. It was agreed that a copy of the laminated poster will also be provided to St. Luke and Good Shepherd, for posting at the parish.
- **Presentation to School Staffs:** Based on the positive response received from the ARC survey on this proposal, the ARC Secretary will proceed with arrangements to present to School staffs of St. Anthony, St. Michael and St. René Goupil-St. Luke on the ARC process. A copy of the information package from Public Meeting #1 will be given to staff as part of the presentation.

6. SCHOOL VALUATION FRAMEWORK

a) Summary of Feedback for Public Meeting #1

All Feedback Sheets submitted and comments scribed at the 4 value kiosks at Public Meeting #1 were reviewed by the ARC Resource team. In accordance with *Board Policy 713, Pupil Accommodation Review, 2.4 - Meetings of the ARC*, feedback specific to the School Valuation Framework was identified and included in the draft framework presented to the ARC for final consideration. Feedback/questions not specific to the Framework but identified as specific to the accommodation review process, have been addressed under Questions Received from the Community at Public Meeting #1, February 5, 2009, & Proposed Responses Prepared for Review at Working Meeting #4.

On motion passed by Committee vote, it was agreed that the ARC will not receive feedback after the February 9 due date that had been established for the process and as indicated on the Public Meeting #1 Feedback Sheet. It was further agreed that the ARC Secretary send a response by email to any and/or all submissions received past the February 9 deadline to advise that feedback cannot be considered based on this decision.

b) Draft School Valuation Framework with Questions from Community

The draft School Valuation Framework with Questions from the Community was presented to the ARC. A total of 14 questions were received in public feedback to the School Valuation Framework presented at Public Meeting #1 and were identified in the Framework as item 1.12.2, 1.15.1, 1.15.2, 1.27.4, 1.27.5, 1.27.6, 1.27.7, 1.27.8, 1.27.9, 1.36.1, 1.36.2, 4.13.12, 4.13.13 and 4.13.14.

1.12.2. *“Is there a segregated playground for kindergarten children?”*

Category - Value to Student

Recommendation 1.12.2 – Approved - Add to School Valuation Framework, motion passed.

1.15.1 *“What percentage of the school’s students come from out of area?”*

Category: Value to Student

Recommendation 1.15.1 – Approved - Add to School Valuation Framework, motion passed.

1.15.2 *“How many km does the average student travel?”*

Comments: There was concern expressed that students living outside the school’s catchment area but attending on a TCH 19, would skew results and affect the average.

Recommendation: Not approved - delete, motion passed.

1.27.4 *“Does the School have a dedicated space for education in a specialized programme such as music/band room, art room, drama facility?”*

1.27.5 *“Does the school have a music room, drama/dance room, visual arts room computer lab?”*

1.27.7 *“Does the school have a computer lab?”*

Category: Value to Student

Comments: Questions 1.27.4, 1.27.5, 1.27.7 are similar in nature and can be amalgamated. In doing so, list all programs and space specifically used for specialized programs including music, art, dance, drama and drama facility, and computer and computer lab, ESL, FSL, and Special Education.

Recommendation: 1.27.4, 1.27.5 and 1.27.7 be amalgamated and revised with proposed suggestions. Approved – add to School Valuation Framework. 1.27.4 amended, 1.27.5 deleted, 1.27.7 deleted – motion passed.

1.27.6 *“Is the school close to a public school – so as to enhance the opportunity for integration/socialization with other cultures?”*

Recommendation: Not approved - delete, motion passed.

1.27.8 *“How extensive is the library?”*

Comments: Question is too subjective and refers to too many aspects (i.e. program, size of library, number of books, etc.)

Recommendation: 1.27.8 – Not approved – delete, motion passed.

- 1.27.9** *Is there an instrumental music, drama, dance, visual arts, computer program, lab program?"*
 Category: Value to the Student
Comments: Question addressed in 1.23 (specialized program)
Recommendation 1.27.9 – Not approved – delete, motion passed.
- 1.36.1** *"Does the school have lockers?"*
 Category: Value to Student
Comments: Lockers provide a safe and secure space for valuables, can be included under Sub-Category - Safe of School and Site.
Recommendation 1.36.1 – Approved - Add to School Valuation Framework, motion passed.
- 1.36.2** *"Does a fenced boundary exist around the school/school yard?"*
 Category: Value to Student
Comments: Schools have fences where they back on to residential lots and/or wood lots; there are no fences usually between school and park space.
Recommendation: 1.3.6.2 – Approved – Add to School Valuation Framework, motion passed.
- 4.13.12** *"Does the school have a Before & After program for students from JK-8? Or what grades does B&A?"*
 Category: Value to Community
Comments: 4.13.12 is similar in nature to item 4.13.1. It was recommended that the questions be combined and amended to name grades covered by B&A program.
Recommendation: 4.13.1. and 4.13.2 be combined as stated. Approved – Add to School Valuation Framework, motion passed.
- 4.13.13** *"Is the school close to planned residential growth?"*
 Category: Value to Community
Comment: Planned residential growth can be considered based on timeline of completion (how close to being developed). Board would include new development and determine number of students generated in projections. There may be growth in other areas beyond school boundaries because of programming. Capacity in each school will determine number of students enrolled. It was suggested that the question be amended to include reference to the school's "attendance area"
Recommendation: 4.13.13 be amended as – "Is there planned residential growth within the school's attendance area?" Approved- add to School Valuation Framework, motion passed.
- 4.13.14** *"Is the school close to public transportation (this could also be filed under "student" as there may be benefits to parents/caretakers being able to get to the school via public transit?"*
 Category: Value to Community
Comments: Question will better serve purpose if determining how close public transportation is to school (distance from school to closest transit stop and/or existing stop).
Recommendation: 4.13.14 be amended as: "What is measured distance from the school to the closest transit stop"? Approved – add to School Valuation Framework, motion passed.

c) ARC Approval of Customized Framework

On motion made and passed on vote by the ARC, the School Valuation Framework was deemed customized with additions and amendments as approved.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

A summary of Questions & Proposed Responses were prepared for Binder Section 22 and distributed with the February 19 meeting agenda as follows:

- a) **Questions Received from the Community & Proposed Responses Prepared for Review at Working Meeting #4**
Following review and discussion, proposed responses to Questions from the Community #1 - #10 were approved as amended. For the purpose of Q&A, the York Catholic District School Board will be referred to as *YCDSB* in all responses. The approved responses processed through the ARC will be posted to the ARC website.
- b) **Questions Received from the ARC & Proposed Responses Prepared for Review at Working Meeting #4**
Following review and discussion, proposed responses to Questions from the ARC, #1 – #8, were approved. The approved responses processed through the ARC will be posted to the ARC website.
- c) **Questions Received from the Community at Public Meeting #1, February 5, 2009, & Proposed Responses, Prepared for Review at Working Meeting #4**
Following review and discussion, proposed responses to Questions from the Community at Public Meeting held February 5, 2009, #1 – #27, were approved as amended. On motion made and carried it was agreed that the request made by the community to have ARC meetings advertised on School Boulevard signs be considered as part of the Communications Strategy and included in the Communications Update as Item #5. The approved responses processed through the ARC will be posted to the ARC website.

10. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the ARC (Working Meeting #5) will be held at St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School on Thursday, March 5, 2009. The meeting will begin at 7:00 p.m.

The focus of Working Meeting #5 will be for school teams to complete the school specific valuation reports using the Customized School Valuation Framework. Conditions Assessment Reports will be forwarded to ARC members electronically as soon as possible for review in preparation for Working Meeting #5.

11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.