

REPORT OF THE ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
Middlesex Study Area 1

2007 October 24
6:45 p.m. - 11:00 pm.

VOTING MEMBERS	ADMINISTRATION AND OTHERS
M. Bedford S. Clark J. Gough R. Langford L. Lutowicz F. MacKellar Deller	S. Doub (Chair) S. Bandeen K. Dalton B. Desjardins L. Fleet P. Jones C. Knight-Smith P. Tufts R. Van Belois 50 community members
REGRETS K. Albrechtas J. McDougall M. Veale	

The Committee convened the meeting on 2007 October 24 at 6:45 p.m. at Metcalfe Central Public School beginning with a tour of the school.

- 1. WELCOME**
Chair S. Doub welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked the host school for the tour of the school.
- 2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
Agenda was approved by a motion by S. Clark, seconded by J. Gough.
- 3. CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS**
S. Doub provided an overview of a document provided in response to a Committee member's request for specific information. It was explained that any requests for information be held for an ARC meeting and such requests as deemed appropriate by the Committee will then be forwarded to the TVDSB Capital Planning Coordinating Committee for response. Questions surrounding the template were held until the template was reviewed line by line. It was noted that if Committee members are unable to download information, that Principals will provide a copy upon request.
- 4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**
Minutes of the meeting held 2007 September 12 were approved by motion by J. Milligan, seconded by C. McFadden.
- 5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**
None.
- 6. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**
Municipal Leader(s)
Nothing at this time.

Citizen Representatives

R. McDougall suggested that receiving template information with more advance notice would be helpful as the information is not easy to understand. S. Doub advised that tonight's meeting is intended to review the template line by line in order that all Committee members understand where the information has come from. A resource binder is now available to each ARC. Table of contents for the binder was distributed. Copies of specific information to assist with template review may be made available.

R. Langford advised that Principals have indicated the school is slated to be closed. K. Dalton advised that each ARC has been informed of the Administration's Recommendation and that this information is public knowledge. The ARC's job is to respond to the Administrative Recommendation. The ARC has three choices when drafting their report to Board: accept; reject; or propose an alternative to the Administrative recommendation. Administration will respond to the recommendation of the ARC, and both the ARC's recommendation and the Administrative response will be forwarded to the Board.

School Council Representatives

J. Gough queried the public input process.

Concern was expressed from the public gallery that individuals do not have a say. K. Dalton provided a review of the public input process including the following:

- a) a minimum of 4 meetings are open for public input;
- b) the public must forward a Public Input form to C. Bear 8 days in advance of the meeting;
- c) a presentation package is not required (just the completed form);
- d) there will be time allotted for public input on each agenda;
- e) written information may be submitted if the individual does not wish to speak;
- f) public input requests received between this meeting and 8 days prior to next meeting will be scheduled within the hour of allotted time at the next meeting;
- g) presenters' names will be printed on the agenda;
- h) if time does not permit all requested input to be received at that meeting, the input will carry forward to the next meeting;
- i) if necessary, a 5th public input meeting will be scheduled;
- j) an individual may speak once;
- k) a group may be represented once;
- l) following public input meetings, the Committee will draft a recommendation to the Board which will be posted to the Board's website for 30 days following which a public input meeting to respond to the Committee's recommendation will be held; and
- m) 8 day advance notice of request to provide public input is required. The Committee reviews and amends (if desired) their recommendation(s) following this public input and submits their final recommendation(s). Administration then reviews the ARC's recommendation(s) and submits a response to the Board.
- n) McKellar-Deller stated that she would be willing to add public input to the agenda if the Committee agrees. S. Doub recognized frustration with the process, however, advised we would be stepping out of procedure if we were to allow that to occur. S. Clark asked if there was any thought to putting notice in taxpayers' tax notices or in the Age Dispatch to advise of the process? K. Dalton advised that, due to the variance among communities, the ARC website and the school communication system was determined to be the method of communication most consistent for all ARCs. Principals can have input forms available for members of the public.
- o) Nicol suggested that means to secure public input to date had failed. Discussion resulted in an agreement to have all 5 schools issue an information newsletter outlining the information that is on the website.

- p) Milligan wished to open the agenda to allow public input this evening to hear concerns. S. Doub advised that Board procedure must be followed and we cannot allow public input without 8 days' prior notice.
- q) Doub encouraged schools to issue a school newsletter outlining the process and timelines for public input as well as providing the Public Input Request form. K. Dalton agreed to develop a consistent message from the schools to each community.
- r) S. Paisley moved that K. Dalton work with the Principals to develop a letter that would explain the timelines and process. Seconded by M. Bedford. Motion carried.

Motion to amend the agenda in order to allow public input this evening tabled by J. Milligan. K. Dalton advised that this request is in contravention of the Board process.

Motion by J. Milligan to recess from formal meeting for 30 minutes and resume formal meeting at 8:30 pm; seconded by M. Nicol. Motion carried.

Reconvene: 8:30 p.m.

Business Representatives

S. Clark: see above; questions on template will be tabled later on the agenda. S. Doub confirmed she represents all of Middlesex County and will have a vote on the recommendation from this ARC to the Board.

7. **PUBLIC INPUT SESSION**

None

8. **NEW BUSINESS**

- a) Content of Resource Binder
K. Dalton provided an overview of the contents of the Resource Binder. Example of maps illustrating current boundary areas for schools involved in an ARC was displayed.
- b) Review of Valuation Templates
K. Dalton provided a review of each line on the template. It was clarified that:
 - i. While the schools do not meet current building codes, they do meet current fire codes.
 - ii. Transportation provided the data related to B1-5.
 - iii. With barrier-free designation, the response is "no" if response to any of the criteria is no. K. Dalton agreed to follow up regarding Metcalfe Central's designation.
 - iv. Data related to new transportation routes was developed by the Administration. K. Dalton agreed to address length of bus rides.
 - v. The time relates to the run itself rather than for each student; K. Dalton agreed to investigate transportation standards re: changes from original templates.
 - vi. EQAO results are based on Ministry standard since the Ministry standard is consistent for all schools and all schools can achieve Ministry target; all schools would not be able to achieve a Board average.
 - vii. Ministry funding for one Principal and secretary per school site is provided.
 - viii. The Caradoc South property does not meet the standards for a school due to lack of "green space."

- ix. Funding is determined by number of pupils X 104.4 sq.ft. X \$156.56 which equates to dollars / sq ft available to build. A Design Committee then works with an architect to design a specific school or addition. Administration recommends to the Board that a new schools be built for approximately 400 students or greater as this number of students generates enough funding to meet the standard required with respect to program offerings and facilities.
- x. Use of grounds is official use as documented by Community Use of Schools applications.
- xi. The template for each school simply provides data for information purposes in a consistent template for each school in every ARC.
- xii. Further information may be provided upon request.
- xiii. H5 and H6 are trying to look at the impact on the local economy and only include services provided from within the community; example of a school receiving \$10,000 of goods and services will be investigated.

Overall valuation for each school in each area, as well as an overall valuation is illustrated on page 9 of each template. K. Dalton reiterated that the template is simply a source of information to initiate discussion. The same weightings will be used in the post valuation template. It was suggested that data being challenged on the valuation template must be resolved prior to completing a post valuation template. If any Template information changes, C. Bear will advise the Committee. Copies of material requested from the Resource Binder will be provided through the school Principals. ARC members will be notified by e-mail that the information is available for pick up at the school.

9. **QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS**

- i. According to Board policy/procedure: page 13, point 2 re: school valuation framework, the ARC should be able "to reflect local circumstances." How can the ARC reflect local circumstances if the Template must remain consistent?
It was explained that each ARC template is consistent; however, the Committee may request other information, which will be provided to the Committee for consideration; e.g., 3-5 year EQAO results.
- ii. How is a request to register students at other schools (i.e., choice of schools) facilitated? Should the ARC result in a school closure is it possible to consider designating students to attend a school other than that in the Administrative Recommendation?
The process for parent to request registration in a school, not the designated school, is covered in the Board policy/procedures, entitled "Attendance Areas for Students". The ARC could also include in their recommendation that a boundary change be implemented; e.g., assign certain students to attend Adelaide-W.G. MacDonald.
- iii. How is Native students attendance determined?
Native student attendance is determined by tuition agreements.
- iv. J. Milligan suggested he can get maps locating each school along with a 15-mile radius.
- v. What does a Scattergram map show?
These maps illustrate residences of students within a school's attendance area but do not provide the number of students at each home.
- vi. When does the Committee get the opportunity to deliberate with respect to a recommendation to the Board?
Once post valuation templates are presented, the Committee is free to deliberate in any way they choose. The Committee may need other information to assist in developing an alternative recommendation(s). K. Dalton confirmed that a new template for a new proposal is not required as part of an alternative recommendation. Additional meetings may be scheduled.

- vii. Can the Committee hear an explanation of the Administrative Recommendation?
K. Dalton assured the committee members that they will be provided an overview of the Administrative recommendation along with the Post Valuation Templates at the next meeting. A map illustrating the resulting boundaries of the Administrative Recommendation may also be provided. The post valuation template will address the cost of renewal dollars vs estimated cost of the Administrative recommendation. It was noted that the Board's primary concerns include the ability of the Board to provide program offerings for students in all schools and the cost of maintaining the present number of facilities.
- ix. May we have an overview of program offering for schools of 400+?
K. Dalton agreed that this could be done.

10. **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled to be held 2007 November 29 at Caradoc North Public School at 7:00 p.m. (6:45 p.m. tour of school).

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 pm on a motion by L. Lutowicz.

S. Doub
Study Committee Chairperson

**REPORT FROM THE ADMINISTRATION
TO MIDDLESEX 1 AREA STUDY COMMITTEE
ANSWERS TO ARC QUESTIONS**

October 24, 2007

1. Can we send out a common newsletter to all school communities with information regarding the public input meetings including time, application process for public input, availability of information etc.
YES. Each principal will send out a common letter to their parent community.
2. Why is Metcalfe categorized as not accessible when it has a power door opener and there is no need for a handicapped shower?
The power door is now installed but there is no lift to the stage and the shower is a standard item for barrier free buildings similar to the requirement for an accessible lavatory and washroom.
3. Could we acquire EQAO data for the last 3 - 5 years for each school and the Board? YES.

School Name	Reading - Grade 3					Writing - Grade 3					Mathematics - Grade 3				
Year	03	04	05	06	07	03	04	05	06	07	03	04	05	06	07
Province	50	54	59	62	62	55	58	61	64	64	57	64	66	68	69
TVDSB	49	53	57	63	59	53	54	56	59	58	58	64	64	69	67
Caradoc Central	39	57	44	60	88	48	57	41	80	62	34	82	84	73	88
Caradoc North	50	53	82	48	87	54	53	68	44	67	62	60	82	56	80
Caradoc South	47	20	45	62	83	27	40	36	62	50	60	20	64	62	92
Ekcoe	45	48	68	76	46	50	57	66	76	49	65	61	76	74	56
Metcalfe	67	56	75	64	64	75	44	62	79	64	83	78	75	86	36

School Name	Reading - Grade 6					Writing - Grade 6					Mathematics - Grade 6				
Year	03	04	05	06	07	03	04	05	06	07	03	04	05	06	07
Province	56	58	63	64	61	54	54	59	61	61	53	57	60	61	59
TVDSB	52	54	57	61	61	50	50	53	57	55	54	55	55	59	55
Caradoc Central	66	60	49	61	76	64	71	41	54	70	60	54	35	46	81
Caradoc North	74	42	46	57	33	61	46	31	53	33	70	42	40	50	50
Caradoc South	22	27	54	67	50	28	32	54	33	44	6	18	38	33	56
Ekcoe	22	33	40	63	55	32	37	45	56	45	32	27	40	68	67
Metcalfe	47	60	69	82	58	33	40	54	64	58	53	53	54	64	25

4. What is the current minimum hectares required for an elementary land site?
8 Acres or 3.23 Hectares
5. How are transportation run time standards calculated and why have the standards changed from the first templates in June to the pre-templates posted?
The original templates that were given out at the CPAC were taken from the Ministry Consultant's in-service session to business officials and was only an example. The standards given to the committee were as established by the TVDSB Transportation Department taking into account all runs from all regions of the Board and Board policy. eg. The policy states, " Under normal circumstance, the Board will endeavour to transport students within a reasonable time not exceeding 75 minutes." With the exclusion of runs from the Counties into Beal, Ross and Thames, most of our runs are well under 60 minutes.
6. Why is the % Area Utilization 105% for all schools but Caradoc North (15%)?
All Area Utilizations should be 105% . The Caradoc North figure was an entry error.
7. What is an example of a school that purchased \$10,000 of goods and services locally?
Biddulph Public School.
8. Could we have a Scattergram Map for each of the 5 schools? and the 3 post schools?
It can be done, and is in progress, but the time line is not certain. Planning personnel, with Research and Assessment are trying to amalgamate the boundary maps and the scattergram data. This data will be information from spring of 07.
9. Could we have a Boundary Map for the post scenario?
YES in progress.
10. Could we have a Boundary Map for the 5 schools plus Delaware, Adelaide, Colborne, and Southdale?
Yes, this will be available for the next meeting.
11. Could we have a presentation on the benefits to students of a school of 400+?
YES. A presentation can be put together to communicate the program, facility, funding, and resource benefits.