



Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) Meeting

Working Meeting #4

November 7, 2017

6:00pm

St. Joseph Catholic Elementary School
919 D'Arcy Street North

Attendance:

ARC Committee Members:

St. Joseph - Christine Brodie, Principal; Tonya Ferguson, Parent; Lori Kendrick, Teacher; Jacqueline Maynard-MacInnes, Non-teaching Staff.

St. Michael - Guy Charette, Principal; Dawn Campbell, Parent; Karyne Roy, Teacher; Georg Wieczorek, Non-teaching Staff.

Notre Dame – Steve Egan, Principal; Sherri Slade-Brady, Teacher; Kim Bennett, Non-teaching Staff; Janet Reid, Parent.

Catholic Education Centre - Tim Moloney, Superintendent of Education.

Broader School Community - Lesley Patterson, Northumberland County.

Regrets: Diocese - Fr. Peter Seabrooke

Chair, Tim Robins.

Resource:

Isabel Grace, Superintendent, Business & Finance.

Marian Irwin – Recorder.

1. Welcome and Opening Prayer.

Christine Brodie led the group in prayer.

2. Chair – Opening Comments.

The Chair, Tim Robins welcomed Steve Egan to the ARC and thanked Carrie Graham for her work on the committee.

Tim stated that the goal for Working Meeting #4 is to complete the analysis of the Pros and Cons of all accommodation options presented in the Initial Staff Report and the addition accommodation options requested by the ARC. He shared with the committee that tonight board staff will be seeking committee members' opinion on the recommended option(s) that "best" meets the Accommodation Review priorities & goals. He added that the ARC will also be receiving a presentation on the Board's Community Transition Template and an overview of PM#2 Format.

Tim also stated that ARC members will be requested to give "silent" individual thought, based on all information received over the past months relating to the accommodation review. Through group work, the committee members will be requested to focus on key information relating to the review including the ISR, the Committee's Terms of Reference, SIP's, Pros and Cons of each option and community input. The Chair will be calling on all members this evening to provide their opinion on the final recommended option(s) that staff will consider.

Tim reminded the ARC members of the Committee Meeting Norms and that the meeting is open to the public to observe the meetings and process the ARC follows.

Tim also thanked the ARC members for extending the committee meeting by thirty minutes as the meeting agenda is anticipated to require the additional time.

The committee took time to update their ARC Binders.

3. Approval of Minutes.

The minutes from WM#3 on October 11, 2017 were approved by the ARC Committee with no changes.

4. Additional Options – Staff Presentation.

Isabel Grace, Superintendent of Business and Finance presented Option 5 and 6 (as requested by ARC). She reviewed the following options, enrollment projections and utilization charts.

Option #5 – This option proposes the construction of an addition at St. Joseph CES and the closure of St. Michael CES.

- Transfer of the French Immersion (FI) Program to an expanded St. Joseph site, which will become a dual-track FI/RT site.

Option #6 – This option proposes the construction of an addition at St. Joseph CES and the closure of St. Michael CES.

- Transfer (RT) Notre Dame School students to an expanded St. Joseph site which will house a K-8 regular (RT) school program and Transfer of the FI program to the former Notre Dame CES creating a single-track (FI) K-8 French Immersion school.

5. The Chair asked the ARC to analyze the pros and cons for Accommodation Options 1-6. (Group work), continuation of work from last meeting.

The Committee broke into their 4 groups. They were instructed to answer the following question within their designated groups and present findings.

1. What are the pros and cons of Option 1-6 referencing advantages and disadvantages from options in the ISR and additional options presentation? Analysis of Options 1 and 2 were completed at Working Meeting #3.

The following charts were presented as their findings:

Pros and Cons as per ARC Committee			
Group	Option	Pros	Cons
1	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All English students are together ▪ New build at Notre Dame ▪ All F.I. are together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Difficulty supporting learners with challenging learning needs in families ▪ Split families where children are in two streams ▪ Transportation for some families with no cars ▪ May lose families to C.R. Gummow or Terry Fox Public Schools ▪ Different bell times
2	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brand new school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Students currently at St. Joseph will be forced to leave their school ▪ Transportation costs will rise
3	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improved learning environment (air flow, lighting, removal of temp walls) ▪ Inclusion of natural lighting ▪ No port-a-pack ▪ All English students together ▪ Less split grades ▪ F.I. students get own school ▪ Rotary in class ▪ Professional development ▪ Stronger Immersion environment ▪ Better amenities ▪ Attractive to families ▪ Potential for future growth at St. Joseph ▪ Change bus and parking configurations ▪ Space for inclusion of community partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disruption at Notre Dame during construction (careful planning) ▪ Siblings could be split ▪ Traffic problems ▪ Parish link is weakened (due to school no longer being attached to Church) ▪ Limited expansion with Notre Dame in future

Pros and Cons as per ARC Committee			
Group	Option	Pros	Cons
4	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No boundary issues ▪ Builds a sense of “French Community” ▪ Multiple grades – greater collaboration between staff/divisions ▪ New facility ▪ Room for growth for F.I. ▪ More balanced green space per pupil ▪ St. Joseph remains intact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Students would need to switch schools ▪ Possible split families ▪ Does not align with Board’s preference ▪ Inequity potential

Pros and Cons as per ARC Committee			
Group	Option	Pros	Cons
1	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New build at Notre Dame ▪ St. Michael families will all be together ▪ Dual track option for some families ▪ Evening of numbers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ St. Joseph boundary change
2	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No more portables ▪ New facility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Boundary change ▪ Construction will impact students ▪ Higher transportation costs for bussing
3	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New facility ▪ New and improved learning environment ▪ Less split grades ▪ Rotary at Notre Dame ▪ Better amenities ▪ Space for inclusion of community partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Huge influx of students trying to switch to newer school ▪ Not the same professional development opportunities ▪ Limited rotary at St. Joseph ▪ Limited expansion at Notre Dame
4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New facility ▪ School facilities are maximized i.e., boundary adjustments ▪ Supports board’s dual track preference ▪ Relationship building for both languages ▪ Supports students switching streams 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change of boundary – students switching school and possibly leaving friends ▪ Just disruptive! ▪ Unsuccessful in F.I. – return to home school

Pros and Cons as per ARC Committee			
Group	Option	Pros	Cons
1	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More students to St. Joseph ▪ Fewer accommodation issues for families ▪ Lower cost ▪ No displacement of St. Michael and St. Joseph students (new community in 2017) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not address condition of Notre Dame
2	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction won't displace students ▪ Shorter construction time ▪ No boundary change ▪ Dual track 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Notre Dame – no upgrades ▪ Still portables
3	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Investing in a new building ▪ More feasible (addition vs. new build) ▪ Least amount of disruption ▪ Quicker process/transition ▪ Biggest displacement only with F.I. students ▪ St. Michael's community reunited ▪ No loss of green space at Notre Dame ▪ No disruption at Notre Dame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Notre Dame remains outdated (facility-wise) ▪ Inconvenience for St. Joseph community ▪ Less marketable asset than brand new building ▪ No additional space at Notre Dame for inclusion of community partners ▪ Gym at Notre Dame remains outdated – less facilities for sports ▪ At some point Notre Dame facility will need to be assessed
4	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not disruptive to relationships ▪ Creates dual-track (board likes this) ▪ Only one addition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Notre Dame is.....

Pros and Cons as per ARC Committee			
Group	Option	Pros	Cons
1	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Addition at St. Joseph ▪ Notre Dame would not be over capacity (no port-a-pack) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ F.I. Centre – splitting families
2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shorter construction period 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not dual track ▪ No accommodations at Notre Dame ▪ Renovation will cost more than Option 5 but less than Option 2
3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rotary at St. Joseph ▪ Strong Immersion environment ▪ Many of the same facility-based pros as Option 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Families split ▪ Older Notre Dame site still requires updating
4	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Room for growth ▪ All English together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not in-line with Board ▪ Less yard space; too many students at St. Joseph ▪ No new school for Notre Dame ▪ Cost for Notre Dame and St. Joseph

6. Review of ARC data - Group Work.

Groups were asked to:

- Review and discuss Accommodation Review data including ISR, SIP's, public survey results and accommodation options Pros and Cons.
- Focus on Board-wide and Cobourg Accommodation Review Goals, ISR pg. 3&4.
- Reflect on the "best" accommodation option from the 6 options (individual thought).

7. Accommodation Option - Individual work.

Committee was asked to consider which accommodation option that "best" meets the system priorities & review goals and to record their choice on a ballot.

Round One: Options 1, 3 and 4 (New School). Each committee member was asked to mark their preferred option (one only) on a folded paper, identify by option number (no personal name or school identifier).

Result: Option 3 – 6 votes
 Option 4 – 8 votes

Round Two: Options 2, 5 and 6 (New Addition). Each committee member was asked to mark their preferred option (one only) on a folded paper, identify by option number (no personal name or school identifier).

Result: Option 2 – 9 votes
 Option 5 – 3 votes
 Option 6 – 2 votes

8. Community Transition Template – Presentation.

Tim Moloney, Superintendent of Education shared with the Committee the Board's Community Transition Template. The plan outlines how to support the school communities before, during and after the transition process.

9. Public Meeting #2 - Format and Presentations.

ARC Public Meeting #2 – will be on Monday November 20, 2017 at St. Michael Catholic Elementary School 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

Format and Agenda – Open House, 5 areas including reception, policy & procedures, recommended option, transition plan and, public input.

The Chair reminded the ARC that all members are required to attend ARC Public Meetings. The Chair will be asking the ARC members to provide their observations at the next Working Meeting. ARC members are requested to direct any questions from the public to the Chair or the two Superintendents, Isabel Grace or Tim Moloney.

10. Next Steps.

- PM#2 – Monday, November 20, 2017 at St. Michael CES, 4-7 pm.
- WM#5 – Monday, December 18, 2017 at Notre Dame CES, 6-8 pm.

11. Closing Prayer and Adjournment.

Christine Brodie led the group in closing prayer and the meeting was adjourned at 8:25pm.