



## Thornhill Elementary Schools - Accommodation Review Committee

### Minutes of ARC Public Meeting #3 held April 30, 2009, 7:00 p.m. at St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School 141 Kirk Drive, Thornhill

#### In attendance:

**ARC Chair:** Patricia Preston, Assistant 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
Trixie Santiago-Sorrell	Parent	St. Michael Catholic Academy
Dayna Fitzpatrick	Teaching	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
Lisa Falconi	Teaching	St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School
Gord Lovgren	Principal	St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School
Father William Burns	Parish	St. Luke Parish, Thornhill
Lisa Thalassinis	Parish	Good Shepherd Parish, Thornhill
Carol Cotton	School Trustee	Markham, Area 1, Wards 1,2,3,6

**ARC Facilitator:** Dan Del Bianco, Watson & Associates

#### ARC Resource Staff:

Bryce Eldridge	York Catholic - Superintendent of Plant
Dan McCowell	York Catholic – Senior Manager, Administrative Services
Tom Pechkovsky	York Catholic – Manager of Planning Services
Christine Hyde	York Catholic – Planner

#### Recording Secretary:

Silvana Greco  
Wendy Cosentino

#### Public Observers Signed In:

There were 93 participants signed in. Refer to Appendix A attached.

#### Absent with Reason:

Paul Wilkie	Parent, St. René Goupil-St. Luke Catholic Elementary School
Joe McLoughlin	York Catholic – Manager of Maintenance Services

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

The meeting was held in the St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School Gymnasium and was called to order by the ARC Chair at 7:00 p.m. A community information package was distributed to familiarize the community on the proposed ARC Accommodation Options and ARC process.

2. PRAYER

The ARC Non-Teaching Rep for St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School led the community in a prayer before the meeting.

3. WELCOME

Ms. Preston, ARC Chair, welcomed the community to the third Public Meeting of the Markham Thornhill Accommodation Review Committee (ARC). Members of the community were reminded to sign-in and note school affiliation. Minutes of Public Meeting #3 will be posted to the ARC website at [www.ycdsb.ca](http://www.ycdsb.ca).

A community information package was distributed to help familiarize the community on the proposed ARC Accommodation Options.

4. INTRODUCTIONS

At this point in time, the ARC Secretary and Superintendent of Education – School Leadership, Andy Di Sebastiano, was introduced along with the 21 voting members of the ARC as mandated under Board Policy 713. The ARC voting members represent Catholic School Councils Chairs, parents, teaching and non-teaching staff from each of the 3 schools under review, along with, representation from the 2 community parishes – St. Luke and Good Shepherd, and, school trustee for Markham, Area 1, Wards 1,2,3,6. Members of the ARC Resource Team were also introduced as well as the ARC facilitator to the Board in attendance from Watson & Associates.

The ARC Chair indicated that the accommodation review process is expected to take at least one year to complete. It is anticipated that any accommodation changes would begin to be implemented in the 2010-2011 school year to allow time to complete the process, including extensive consultation and any transitional planning that may be required.

The purpose of Public Meeting #3, the third of four public meetings to be held as required under *Board Policy 713, Section 2.4, Meetings of the ARC*, provided an opportunity for the ARC to receive community feedback on the proposed accommodation options presented and a review of the process followed. Those in attendance were encouraged to give their input by using the Public Meeting #3 Feedback Sheet. All submissions must be submitted to the ARC no later than Monday, May 4, 2009, 4:00 p.m.

6. PRESENTATION – THORNHILL ACCOMMODATION REVIEW

The ARC Chair welcomed 3 Committee members to present on the work of the ARC to date.

Thornhill Accommodation Process:

A representative of the ARC presented an overview on the process and considerations in the Thornhill accommodation process, reporting on:

- the final completion of the customized School Valuation Framework after review of community feedback from Public Meeting #2

- Brainstorming sessions designed to capture all possible options and solutions for consideration, including tools available and how they were used by the ARC (School Valuation Framework ARC Binder, first hand knowledge of each school site, resource staff); and
- Board and ARC considerations developed for review of proposed accommodation options; a copy of the list of Board/ARC considerations was included in the community information package for review and posted at the kiosks set up for public display of proposed options.

A total of 14 potential accommodation options were initially developed; through discussion, deliberation and a 2/3 voting mechanism, the ARC is now working on 6 proposed accommodation options.

#### Proposed Accommodation Accommodations:

A second representative of the ARC presented a slide presentation providing an overview on the:

- common themes found in the 6 selected options and of particular note that:
  - all remaining options include the Arts Program
  - all options include some form of boundary change
- development of options based on high level observations and key assumptions using draft concepts
- the specific criteria with accompanying maps and projected enrolments for Option #4 (2<sup>nd</sup> Revision), Option #5 (Revised), Option #7 (Revised), Option #10, Option #13 (Revised), Option #14 (Ministry Submission)

A summary of all 6 options with descriptors (Thornhill ARC *Alternative Accommodation Options – Revised Based on April 23, 2009, ARC Working Meeting*) was included in the public information package) and posted at all kiosks.

All accommodation options will require further review. The options will be refined or new options developed after consideration of community input received at Public Meeting #3.

#### Proposed Accommodation Accommodations:

A third representative of the ARC discussed next steps for the Accommodation Review Committee, indicating that:

- the next round of working meetings (Working Meeting #11, #12) will focus on further deliberation of the 6 proposed accommodation options - community feedback received from Public Meeting #3 will be presented and considered by the ARC at Working Meeting #11 scheduled for May 14, 2009
- The ARC will also begin creating its Draft School Valuation Report and Recommendations to the Director of Education for submission in June
- the Draft School Valuation Report will be presented to the communities for feedback at the fourth Public Meeting on May 28, 2009, 7:00 p.m., at St. Michael Catholic Academy.

The community was encouraged to visit all the kiosks for additional information on proposed options and on the accommodation review process. An invitation was also extended to attend the upcoming ARC working meetings for observation of this continuing process. A full calendar of events and all information that has been made available to the ARC, can be found posted on the Board website through the ARC link. A copy of the Thornhill ARC Flowchart of process and timelines was included for reference in the community information package.

7. COMMUNITY QUESTION & ANSWER PERIOD

A question and answer period followed, moderated by the ARC Chair. Community members were invited to ask questions in the open mike session and/or by completing and submitting the Q&A card provided in the information package distributed. The community was notified that all questions and answers would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. Those questions that may require additional research would be responded to at a later date.

- |         |           |   |
|---------|-----------|---|
| 1. ARTS | Question: | “Why is moving Arts out of Thornhill area not an option, if moving PACE out is?”  |
|         | Response: | <b><i>The ARC is looking at all the different options.</i></b>  |
| 2. ARTS | Question: | “How is the Arts program different from the regular track program?”   |
|         | Response: | <b><i>The Arts program dedicates more time to instruction in the Arts. Academic/ core subjects (i.e. Science, Geography, etc.) are shortened by 5-10 minutes to allow additional focus on the art curriculum.</i></b>   |
| 3. ARTS | Question: | “Can students join the Arts program in any grade? What qualifications to students need to attend the ARTS program?”   |
|         | Response: | <b><i>Any student can be registered at St. Michael Catholic Academy for any grade if class enrolment numbers permit.</i></b>  |
| 4. ARTS | Question: | If students are not in the Arts program now, how would they do with the curriculum? How would they do in comparison to the students who are currently in the Arts Program?  |
|         | Response: | <b><i>The teacher differentiates for new students to give them an opportunity to catch up with the program. The teacher would partner students up and spend extra time with them during recess periods. Students might receive extra lessons and practice work. Students new to the program would not be expected to try out for the school bands/choirs in order to dedicate their time to catching up with the program.</i></b> |

- |     |         |           |  |
|-----|---------|-----------|--|
| 5.  | ARTS    | Question: | TCH 19 that is volume based is not fair to a portion of our student population (please respond).   |
|     |         | Response: | <b><i>TCH 19 registrations are allowed when there is space in the school and parents provide transportation.</i></b>   |
| 6.  | ARTS    | Question: | Was it considered to move ARTS to a more central area such as what is being recommended for PACE? Aren't most of the Arts coming from all over not just within our area?   |
|     |         | Response: | <b><i>Moving the Arts program out of Thornhill was considered by the ARC; however, a good portion of the Arts enrolment comes from within the review area (i.e. SML - 190 students, SRG/SG - 50 students, SAY -11 students.)</i></b>   |
| 7.  | ARTS    | Question: | If it's an ARTS only school, why is there a boundary?  |
|     |         | Response: | <b><i>Boundaries are established to manage school enrolment and facilitate transportation services.</i></b>  |
| 8.  | ARTS    | Question: | If St. Michael will be combined with other students from other schools into one school, would all students be guaranteed into the Arts?  |
|     |         | Response: | <b><i>Anyone within the new school boundary will be in that program.</i></b>   |
| 9.  | SCIENCE | Question: | Was there any consideration to the addition of a Science program like the Arts program as part of any of the options? Can you add a different track and/or do enhancement to regular track (i.e. few hours every day)? There needs to be a balance between Science & Arts programs.  |
|     |         | Response: | <b><i>The ARC did have some dialogue regarding adding programs but this is beyond the scope of the ARC. As an ARC, it is possible to make recommendations as an addendum to the ARC final School Valuation Report to the Director but is not within the mandate to assign a program. Please feel free to include this recommendation on the feedback sheet available and submit to the ARC.</i></b>  |
| 10. | PACE    | Question: | "If PACE program is removed, what happens to PACE students?  |
|     |         | Response: | <b><i>PACE is a regional program that can take place anywhere. The Board is in the process of reviewing all PACE programs to determine what areas students are traveling from. Some PACE centres have been in the same location for 10+ years but student population has changed. There may be recommendations for change at the Board level in order to eliminate what are now, in some cases, very lengthy bus rides for students.</i></b> |

- |     |                                  |           |   |
|-----|----------------------------------|-----------|---|
| 11. | PACE                             | Question: | Out of the 6 proposed options, why is the PACE program in only 2? Is it necessary to take the PACE Program out of options?  |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>PACE is a regional program that can take place anywhere. Statistics available on the PACE program show, that of the total number of students attending PACE at St. Anthony, only 6 are from the Thornhill area (3 from St. Anthony). Accommodation options are developed to meet the best interests for all the students in the review area based on future considerations and growth. The ARC can amend any of the 6 options at anytime. If there is a clear message from the communities to reinstate PACE, this can be done. It will be important for the community to provide their feedback on proposed options.</i></b> |
|     |                                  |           |   |
| 12. | PACE                             | Question: | If PACE is removed from Thornhill, where will it go – Richmond Hill?  |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>The relocation of the PACE program would be contingent upon where the majority of the students presently live. The Board would make a decision in consultation with the PACE families.</i></b>  |
|     |                                  |           |   |
| 13. | PACE                             | Question: | “Would removing the PACE program effect available funding?”   |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>No, it would not affect funding.</i></b>  |
|     |                                  |           |   |
| 14. | PACE                             | Question: | “If PACE program is removed (Option 10), what would be the resulting school capacity?”  |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>The PACE centre at St. Anthony consists of 4 classes. This would decrease capacity by 92 pupil places.</i></b>  |
|     |                                  |           |   |
| 15. | PACE                             | Question: | “If PACE moves – would it affect high school?”  |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>This would be a totally separate process. The decision to move the PACE program would be made only after study and consultation with PACE families. The PACE program can also be part of a high school feeder group.</i></b>  |
|     |                                  |           |   |
| 16. | TRANSPORT<br>TRAFFIC<br>BOUNDARY | Question: | “Has the committee taken into consideration the traffic southbound, travel time, pollution, etc?”   |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>This will be considered.</i></b>  |

- |     |                                  |           |   |
|-----|----------------------------------|-----------|---|
| 17. | TRANSPORT<br>TRAFFIC<br>BOUNDARY | Question: | When considering accommodation options, is there any consideration when looking at sites for access to highways?  |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>Size of site, site characteristics and locations are all things to consider.</i></b>  |
|     |                                  |           |   |
| 18. | TRANSPORT<br>TRAFFIC<br>BOUNDARY | Question: | “If developing a new school with lots of travel, consider traffic flow in and out for drop-off and pick-up. This should be included in planning when looking at options.”   |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>In terms of design, we have made improvements and new school construction provides for this.</i></b>  |
|     |                                  |           |   |
| 19. | TRANSPORT<br>TRAFFIC<br>BOUNDARY | Question: | “Will families be able to remain in their current school even though the boundary is changed?”  |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>It is difficult to be specific right now. Setting boundaries is part of the accommodation review process and are important to have in place. This is something the ARC is considering.</i></b>  |
|     |                                  |           |   |
| 20. | TRANSPORT<br>TRAFFIC<br>BOUNDARY | Question: | “What will happen to students who currently live out of area? We have attended SML for over 10 years now and have 4 more to go.”  |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>Students already enrolled will continue at the Arts school. Current practice on TCH 19 registration is that once accepted in to a school, the student will be allowed to remain to complete their elementary career at that school.</i></b>   |
|     |                                  |           |   |
| 21. | TRANSPORT<br>TRAFFIC<br>BOUNDARY | Question: | “If a 120 students additional students enrolled in school, how would that work? Depending on how options roll out, can we send students to another school? Would registration not be guaranteed?”   |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>Parents can apply on a TCH 19 to go to another school. However, registrations can be accepted only if there is space in the school. A school cannot accept extra students in from out of area that would cause school/class reorganization (i.e. if there is sufficient space to allow addition without causing number of students to exceed class size). Accepting a student in to a school on a TCH 19 cannot result in extra staffing that school does not have. However, in this case (i.e. review accommodation), the Board would try to give special consideration.</i></b> |

- |     |                                  |           |  |
|-----|----------------------------------|-----------|--|
| 22. | TRANSPORT<br>TRAFFIC<br>BOUNDARY | Question: | “What consideration has been given to a new, central location; and, if it has been addressed and dismissed, is it financial?”  |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>Yes, this was discussed under the original Option #14. However, the Board does not have another site available. The Board only owns these 3 properties (SAY, SML, SRG/SL). There was an inquiry made about another location (through the Town of Markham / Public Board), but there is nothing available.</i></b>  |
|     |                                  |           |  |
| 23. | TRANSPORT<br>TRAFFIC<br>BOUNDARY | Question: | “What is the plan for dealing with vacant property?”   |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>This is out of the scope of the ARC’s mandate to recommend a solution on surplus property. This is an issue for the Board. Decisions on use of any vacant property would be dependent on the Board’s needs. Any action on dispensation would be regulated under guidelines set out by the Ministry of Education.</i></b>   |
|     |                                  |           |  |
| 24. | BUILDING/<br>FINANCE             | Question: | “Taking into consideration all the options, which one is considered to be financially advantageous?”   |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>Option #14 – since it is based on a submission to the Ministry of Education the funding matches the option precisely.</i></b>  |
|     |                                  |           |  |
| 25. | BUILDING/<br>FINANCE             | Question: | What sort of weight if any was given for proposed development around Langstaff? Knowing Langstaff will have lots of new housing, are new schools funded with that?   |
|     |                                  | Response: | <b><i>All new development is calculated in enrolment projections.</i></b>  |
|     |                                  |           |  |
| 26. | BUILDING/<br>FINANCE             | Question: | “Why would the board reserve land in the Langstaff development when they already have the site at St. Anthony and any students coming out of the Langstaff development could attend St. Anthony school?”   |
|     |                                  | Response: | “If the Board has already reserved a school lot in the Langstaff area – doesn’t that show that numbers will go up for St. Anthony?”<br><br><b><i>Research shows that high density development does not generally result in large numbers for student enrolment. The School Board follows a process along side the municipality. The Board is seeking a site in the Langstaff area as a safety net for future planning.</i></b> |

- |     |                      |           |   |
|-----|----------------------|-----------|---|
| 27. | BUILDING/<br>FINANCE | Question: | “Regarding population and accommodation at proposed super school – has the proposed new development around the corner at Don Mills & Steeles been considered?”  |
|     |                      | Response: | <b><i>All new development has been considered. As with Langstaff, new development planned at Don Mills &amp; Steeles, and, Yonge &amp; Steeles, have been considered.</i></b>   |
| 28. | BUILDING/<br>FINANCE | Question: | “Do all options meet the available funding? Have costs for each option been considered in the overall evaluation process?”  |
|     |                      | Response: | <b><i>Development of options have been based on high level observations and key assumptions using draft concepts. The cost of an option is more or less the last item reviewed. At this point in the process, looking at what is in the best interest of the students is most important. Capital costs (and transportation) are considerations that require further analysis.</i></b> |
| 29. | BUILDING/<br>FINANCE | Question: | “In the event that you build a new school, what is the plan to handle the children during this transition and construction period?”   |
|     |                      | Response: | <b><i>A Transition Committee will be struck to plan for and implement the positive transition of students and staff affected by consolidation and/or relocation into a new school.</i></b>  |
| 30. | BUILDING/<br>FINANCE | Question: | “How will the single building option, be weighted against the two building options?”  |
|     |                      | Response: | <b><i>There is no special weighting for any options. The ARC must consider all input as part of the process.</i></b>  |
| 31. | BUILDING/<br>FINANCE | Question: | “PTR costs are for St. Anthony and St. Michael. How much time and money would be spent to rebuild St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke? If having SAY in northwest and SML in southeast, we could keep Arts Program at SML – was it one of the options and if so, why was it rejected?”   |
|     |                      | Response: | <b><i>The ARC did discuss this with the ARC Resource team (Planning, Plant, Maintenance) and it was determined that it would be more expensive to retrofit a school due to outdated electrical, ventilation system, etc. Age of systems within a school can differ considerably. It would be much more cost effective.</i></b>  |
| 32. | BUILDING/<br>FINANCE | Question: | “What about expansions? Are there costs available?”   |
|     |                      | Response: | <b><i>Capital costs used are rough dollar amounts per square foot. To retrofit an existing school, the Board would be required to make existing facilities meet current building codes. Until we get closer to establishing exactly what options are, costs are estimates only.</i></b>   |

- |     |                        |           |   |
|-----|------------------------|-----------|---|
| 33. | BUILDING/<br>FINANCE   | Question: | “Would you have to bring everything to code to do expansion?”   |
|     |                        | Response: | <b>Yes, municipality by-laws/governance would dictate what would be required.</b>   |
| 34. | BUILDING/<br>FINANCE   | Question: | “If there is construction to expand –consider safety issues, closing off some areas to students while others are used?”   |
|     |                        | Response: | <b>When the Board does an expansion in a construction process while the school is being used, the area would be safely closed off while the expansion is occurring.</b>   |
| 35. | BUILDING/<br>FINANCE   | Question: | “All sites are prime real estate – what would happen to land if a school closed?”   |
|     |                        | Response: | <b>The Board does not have plans for the land. Alternatives would have to be considered.</b>  |
| 36. | CLOSURE/<br>TRANSITION | Question: | “What are the timelines for the options? When is the school’s closure? Is it 2010? 2011?”   |
|     |                        | Response: | <b>The ARC will make a report to the Director of Education in June, 2009. Accommodation for the next school year (2009-2010) would remain status quo. If there is new construction, 2010-2011 will be a transition year. 2011-2012 would be target year for new accommodation. A Transition Committee will be set up to determine where/how students would be housed during the interim period.</b> |
| 37. | CLOSURE/<br>TRANSITION | Question: | How will transitions be factored in the evaluation?   |
|     |                        | Response: | <b>Transition plans are not factored in the evaluation process. This is a separate process once an option has been approved by the Board.</b>   |
| 38. | CLOSURE/<br>TRANSITION | Question: | What if the Board does not accept the ARC proposal?   |
|     |                        | Response: | <b>The Board will consider the ARC proposal, however, may approve an alternative, subject to Ministry of Education approval.</b>  |
| 39. | CAPACITY/<br>ENROLMENT | Question: | “What happens with students at St. Michael that are not part of the 233 but out of district if Arts program is maintained and they are interested?”   |
|     |                        | Response: | <b>All options take into consideration students presently in the schools.</b>   |

- |     |                        |           |   |
|-----|------------------------|-----------|---|
| 40. | CAPACITY/<br>ENROLMENT | Question: | Why would we consider options where the projected enrolment exceeds the capacity?   |
|     |                        | Response: | <b><i>Accommodation solutions are designed for long term sustainable enrolment which may result in the need for temporary accommodation (i.e. portables).</i></b>   |
| 41. | CAPACITY/<br>ENROLMENT | Question: | “A school with more than 600 students is too large, too overwhelming. What is the research regarding large schools on a children’s experience? What are the other issues that such large schools would bring?”  |
|     |                        | Response: | <b><i>There is no research available on larger vs. smaller with respect to achievement. Academically, there are advantages and disadvantages to both small and large schools. Smaller schools will have more combined grades – larger schools will not. Some of our large schools are top performing and some of our smaller schools are high achieving. Small schools offer a lot of programs the same as larger schools. Extra curricular activity is contingent upon a hard working staff.</i></b> |
| 42. | CAPACITY/<br>ENROLMENT | Question: | “In an 800+ school, would there be more extra curricular activities added? Is there a certain number of extra curricular activities that only some kids can participate in? Fear would be that in an 800+ school, only the best would be included – kids may not be the best, but they want to participate.”  |
|     |                        | Response: | <b><i>All 3 schools offer a number of extra curricular programs. If a student doesn’t choose to join or isn’t a member of the school team, there are intramural sports / activities open to all students that they can be involved in.</i></b>  |
| 43. | CAPACITY/<br>ENROLMENT | Question: | “Knowing that schools are PTR and kids are coming from that area, would it make sense to keep site open on the east side of Bayview? Is there a possibility of retaining the St. Anthony and St. Michael locations and doing something with St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke?”  |
|     |                        | Response: | <b><i>Funding has been given to 2 schools designated PTR – St. Michael and St. Anthony. Funding is intended for PTR schools only. It would not be acceptable to include a school not designated PTR as part of an option that recommends new construction. An addition to St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke could be an option.</i></b>  |
| 44. | ENROLMENT              | Question: | Is there a possibility of retaining St. Anthony and St. Michael locations and doing something with St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke? This would make more sense since the population they are drawing are more from St. Michael and St. Anthony areas vs. St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke.   |
|     |                        | Response: | <b><i>The Ministry of Education controls the sale of a school property. When the Board presents a case to the Ministry, the Ministry could determine that new schools</i></b>   |

**are needed in other areas (i.e. dispense of property in one area, accommodation needed in another). The Board cannot dispense of a property without offering it to its community and municipal partners first. Accommodation option developed for a review area cannot be dependent upon funds from the disposition of surplus land.**

45. ENROLMENT

Question: "Is the Ministry open to any other size of school?"  
 Response: **We could make a case, but would have to meet the intent of funding provided by the Ministry of Education.**

46. DAYCARE

Question: "What is the plan for daycare in these new options?"  
 Response: **It is not a consideration at this time. Once the final option is known, consideration will be given to day care.**

47. OPTIONS

Question: "... opening remarks indicated that one of the key goals was to create an environment that was best for the children. In Option 14, one school is designed to be 121% utilized within the timeframe of this project. Please explain how a school that is over 120% utilized is best for the children? For this reason, Option 14 should not be considered."  
 Response: **Accommodation solutions are designed for long term sustainable enrolment which may result in the need for temporary accommodation (i.e. portables).**

48. OPTIONS

Question: "Please comment on one other option ... would involve the renovation/expansion of St. Anthony and St. Michael and the closure of St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke. St. Anthony and St. Michael are the furthest apart geographically so a closure of St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke would optimize the catchment plan and bussing routes. Instead of a complete rebuild, the money could be more conservatively applied against the renovations and/or expansions. The closure of St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke targets the school with the lowest enrolment capacity. The maintenance of St. Anthony and St. Michael facilities keeps the south York Region PACE and St. Anthony Arts program in place. Considerations – St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke is the newest building of the 3 but the net benefit of one fewer building is the payoff. The higher projected enrolment for St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke may be due in part to their after-school program."  
 Response: **Funding has been given to 2 schools designated PTR – St. Michael and St. Anthony. Funding is intended for PTR schools only. It would not be acceptable to include a school not designated PTR as part of an option that recommends new construction.**

- |                         |           |  |
|-------------------------|-----------|--|
| 49. OPTIONS             | Question: | “Will there be options available that we can vote on?”   |
|                         | Response: | <b><i>The ARC Draft School Valuation Report with final proposed accommodation options will be presented for community feedback at Public Meeting #1 (May 28, 2009).</i></b>  |
|                         |           |  |
| 50. OPTIONS             | Question: | “Will a draft ARC report identify an alternative?”   |
|                         | Response: | <b><i>A preferred option will be sent to the Director.</i></b>   |
|                         |           |  |
| 51. OPTIONS             | Question: | “Of all options presented, are they all weighted the same? Is there any difference where they are? Does it matter that Option 14 is a ministry submission – does that play a role in how option is weighted?”  |
|                         | Response: | <b><i>Yes - all options are weighted the same. All options will be given equal consideration. The ARC will be reviewing community feedback on proposed accommodation options when reviewing and deliberating on proposals.</i></b>   |
|                         |           |  |
| 52. CATHOLIC VS. PUBLIC | Question: | “Has the Resource Team considered that families may choose public or alternative options in their enrolment projections?”  |
|                         | Response: | <b><i>This has been raised in discussions and it is the hope that this would not occur. Parents/guardians always have choices to consider. We have 2 schools within walking distance to parishes - we are lucky to share in this opportunity. Hopefully we can all work together for the Thornhill community students. There will be differences of opinion so it is important that the community give their opinion on pros and cons of all options being proposed.</i></b> |
|                         |           |  |
| 53. CATHOLIC VS. PUBLIC | Question: | “Has the committee considered a combination public/catholic school in one building?”   |
|                         | Response: | <b><i>No. This is not within the ARC mandate. Funding was provided to accommodate existing Catholic school students in the Markham Thornhill review area.</i></b>  |
|                         |           |  |
| 54. CATHOLIC VS. PUBLIC | Question: | St. Michael is the only school located next to a church – since the only reason for the existence of catholic school is our faith - why would you consider closing SML?  |
|                         | Response: | <b><i>The mandate of the ARC is to consider all accommodation options.</i></b>   |

The question and answer period concluded at approximately 9:15 p.m. All present were encouraged to proceed to the public kiosks at that time.

Community members were also reminded that general comments and/or questions can be sent to the ARC at any time during the review process through e-mail at [arcthornhill@ycdsb.ca](mailto:arcthornhill@ycdsb.ca) or voice-mail at 416-221-5051, 905-713-1211, Ext. 7567. The Public Meeting #3 Information Package, minutes of meeting, and community feedback received on the proposed ARC accommodation options and/or input on the ARC process will be posted to the ARC website.

8. KIOSKS - OPEN FORMAT

Resource staff and ARC members were on hand during the open format to discuss and respond to inquiries regarding the proposed accommodation options, transportation and the Accommodation Review process. Kiosks remained open until the meeting adjourned.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

APPENDIX A

Thornhill Elementary Schools – Accommodation Review Committee  
 Public Meeting #3 – April 30, 2009  
 St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School

Community Sign-In

	Name	Affiliation (Area School)
1.	Abbass, J.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
2.	Appleton, L.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
3.	Arany, M.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
4.	Banwell, C.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
5.	Bernard, B.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
6.	Borgacci, L.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
7.	Butztholder, J.	
8.	Cecco, R.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
9.	Chan, F.	
10.	Chan, S.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
11.	Chang, L.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
12.	Chang, S.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
13.	Chisholm, M.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
14.	Cho, P.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
15.	Coges, B.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
16.	Cooper, J.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
17.	Costa, F.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
18.	Cuda, N.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
19.	Cundy, R.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
20.	D'Mello, C.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
21.	De Oliveira, J.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
22.	Dermody, B.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
23.	Dermody, T.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
24.	Di Nino, R.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
25.	Doane, J.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
26.	Du, L.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
27.	Durham, H.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
28.	Eidthon, J.	Baythorn Public School
29.	Emmanuel, M.	St. Anthony
30.	Emmanuel, N.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
31.	Feeney, M.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
32.	Fitzpatrick, R.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
33.	Fox-Zammit, M.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
34.	Fusciardi, E.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
35.	Gariaer, E.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
36.	Grg, H.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
37.	Hamam, C.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
38.	Haman, S.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
39.	Hamril, S.	
40.	Hanley, M.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
41.	Hopkins, W.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
42.	Huang, J.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
43.	Iaboni, G.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
44.	Jibey, H.	St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke Catholic Elementary School

45.	Kasebzanf, M.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
46.	Kennedy-Smith, Mary Ann	St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke Catholic Elementary School
47.	Khalil, F.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
48.	Khalil, K.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
49.	Koehl, G.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
50.	Koman, J.	
51.	Lee, E.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
52.	Levins, R.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
53.	Macego, T.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
54.	Mackenzie, M.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
55.	Maerov, L.	Upper Canada Child Care
56.	Mamba, R.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
57.	Mandarino, C.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
58.	Marure, F.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
59.	Mason, C.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
60.	Matthews, K.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
61.	Mendonca, L.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
62.	Middleton, K.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
63.	Mohen, T.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
64.	Moser, D.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
65.	Murray, J.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
66.	Naccarrato, L.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
67.	Ng, V.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
68.	Odintsova, I.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
69.	Pal, K.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
70.	Panikkar, E.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
71.	Papahadzis, A.C.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
72.	Pare, J.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
73.	Pezzack, J.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
74.	Pickering, A.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
75.	Pileci, N.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
76.	Piloci, R.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
77.	Provenzano, D.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
78.	Rolland, S.	St. Rene Goupil/St. Luke Catholic Elementary School
79.	Siriani, A.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
80.	Sirianni, E.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
81.	Slade, T.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
82.	Sumi, C.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
83.	Sun, S.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
84.	Tapley, R.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
85.	Thalassinos, N.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
86..	Tim, L.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
87.	Tonkcos, G.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
88.	Vigliotta, M.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
89.	Von Zeuben, Catherine	St. Michael Catholic Academy
90.	Vottero, B.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
91.	Vyn, A.	St. Michael Catholic Academy
92.	Wong, A.	St. Anthony Catholic Elementary School
93.	Wong, F.	St. Michael Catholic Academy