



## Questions Received from the Community & Responses

Approved At  
ARC Working Meeting #5  
March 5, 2009

DATE RECEIVED	QUESTIONS RECEIVED: FROM THE COMMUNITY	PROPOSED RESPONSES	REFERENCE
1. 02.17.2009	<p>“Located on the York Catholic District School Board’s website re ARC, you have posted at the bottom of the first page Ministry of Education – Pupil Accommodation Review Guidelines dated October 31, 2006. By clicking on this site the guidelines for the Accommodation Review Committee are listed, and with regards to page 4 of 6 under the heading of "Community Consultation and Public Meetings", the third paragraph clearly states that "<b><u>public meetings must be well publicized, in advance, through a range of methods.</u></b>" In the same paragraph it also states that "<b><u>public meetings are to be structured to encourage an open and informed exchange of views.</u></b>"</p> <p>Attendance at the first public meeting was quite low. How did the YCDSB publicize this meeting and through what media? Since I was one of the <b><u>few people</u></b> in attendance, how was this meeting well publicized and through what methods?"</p>	<p><i>As per Board Policy 713, 2.4, Meetings of the ARC, notice of Public Meeting #1 of the ARC held February 5, 2009, at St. Michael Catholic Academy was provided to the school communities of St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School, St. Michael Catholic Academy, and St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School through the following communiqué:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>York Catholic District School Board, Notice of First Public Meeting of the Thornhill Elementary Schools Accommodation Review Committee (ARC)</b> was advertised in <i>Liberal Economist (Markham)</i> and <i>Liberal (Richmond Hill)</i> newspapers November 14-15, 2008</li> <li>• <b>ARC Letter to Thornhill School Communities with Process/Timelines, January 15, 2009;</b> distributed by St. Anthony, St. Michael and St. Rene Goupil-St. Luke schools to their school communities</li> <li>• <b>York Catholic District School Board, Notice of Public Meeting #1, February 5, 2009, Introduction to the ARC and Customization of the School Valuation Framework,</b> distributed by St. Anthony, St. Michael and St. Rene Goupil-St. Luke to their school communities the week of February 26, 2009</li> <li>• <i>Inserts regarding public meeting were included in parish bulletins and in school newsletters during Dec/Jan/Feb</i></li> </ul> <p><i>All notices include specifics on date, time, location, and purpose, along with ARC contact information (ARC email and telephone voicemail). <b>All correspondence from the ARC are also shared via the ARC website; documents can be found posted to the site under Section 10: Notices.</b></i></p>	<p>ARC Website Section 10 Notices</p> <p>ARC Website Section 10 Notices</p> <p>ARC Website Section 10 Notices</p>

DATE RECEIVED		QUESTIONS RECEIVED: FROM THE COMMUNITY	PROPOSED RESPONSES	REFERENCE
2.	02.17.2009	<p>“After your introductions and overview of what the ARC committee is supposed to do, you emphasized that no decisions had been made and that at these Public meetings you were hoping to get feed back and to show transparency. It was suggested that we go around to the different kiosks to ask our questions, which we could write down on Feedback Sheets or would be scribed for us by ARC committee members and then the committee would attempt to answer these questions and our answers would be available on your website after the ARC Working Group Meeting was completed (March 2009). How is this, <b><u>a public meeting, structured to encourage an open and informed exchange of views?</u></b>”</p>	<p><i>Experience has shown that small group discussions at kiosks provide a more conducive environment for people to ask questions, make suggestions, comment and discuss. The feedback sheets and scribing the questions which are later addressed in the Questions and Answers sheet are to ensure all voices are heard and responded to.</i></p>	
3.	02.17.2009	<p>“It was asked at this public meeting if the Arts Program at St. Michael’s was to remain intact should the school be amalgamated with St. Anthony’s. The answer was given that it would be. Where is this in writing for parents to view?”</p>	<p><i>October 17, 2008, Communication from York Catholic District School Board, <b>Notice of Establishment of Accommodation Review, states: “Please be assured that the School Board is committed to maintaining the integrity of all educational programming.”</b></i></p> <p><i>January 15, 2009, ARC Letter to School Communities of St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School, St. Michael Catholic Academy &amp; St. Rene Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School Communities, Subject: Accommodation Review for the Thornhill Elementary Schools, Dates &amp; Process, states: <b>“Please be assured that the School Board and the ARC are committed to maintaining the integrity of all educational programming for our Thornhill Elementary Students.”</b></i></p>	<p>ARC Website: Section 10: Notices</p> <p>ARC Website’ Section 10: Notices &amp; Working Meeting #3 01.22.2009 Agenda: Supporting Documentation</p>
4.	02.17.2009	<p>“Why is St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke on this list? It has been mentioned by some that when the two schools (St. Rene Goupil and St. Luke) were consolidated it was with the knowledge that the school would not be touched for 10 years (it has only been 5-6 years)?”</p>	<p><i>The review may benefit all students within Thornhill, therefore to exclude St. Rene/St. Luke would be to exclude the possibility of enhancing their learning environment.</i></p> <p><i>The ARC will take into consideration various factors such as the previous consolidation of the two schools in developing and recommending accommodation scenarios.</i></p>	

DATE RECEIVED		QUESTIONS RECEIVED: FROM THE COMMUNITY	PROPOSED RESPONSES	REFERENCE
5.	02.17.2009	<p>“Reviewing the website for the Government of Ontario – Newsroom, the article titled Ministry of Education – 100 New Schools For Ontario’s Students, last sentence on page 1 of 4 states,</p> <p>“Decisions about school buildings must now be based on a school’s value to its students and the community”. As St. Michael’s is designated an academy and is the only one in the York district, why was it listed with St. Anthony? It is obvious by the large enrollment of out of district students that it can maintain its worth to this school board. How do two completely different school programs amalgamate when one is Arts based?”</p>	<p><i>No decision has been made. To be considered by the ARC as part of the development of accommodation alternatives.</i></p> <p><i>The suggestion of combining St. Michael and St. Anthony was made by Ministry Staff as the best opportunity to receive funding.</i></p>	
6.	02.17.2009	<p>“When the Catholic School Council prepared documentation for the Ministry to have St. Michael listed as PTR (Prohibitive to repair), in the hopes of getting funding for a new school, why did the Board feel it was necessary to add St. Anthony’s school and go with the Ministry’s option of “replace several schools with one new school” instead of “replace a school on the same site or nearby”, when the board had three options as on page 3 of 4, second paragraph</p> <p>Replace a school on the same site or nearby  Replace several schools with one new school  Close the school and expand or add new facilities to an existing school</p> <p>How and why did you come to a decision that may see the two schools amalgamate?”</p>	<p><i>No decision has been made to amalgamate. The ARC process will propose accommodation solutions.</i></p> <p><i>The suggestion of combining St. Michael and St. Anthony was made by Ministry Staff as the best opportunity to receive funding.</i></p>	