

Greater Essex County District School Board
2015 PROGRAM AND ACCOMMODATION REVIEW
Report of a Committee Meeting held on
Monday, March 23, 2015 at 5:30 p.m.
In the library of Harrow Public School



At the December 9, 2014, regular meeting of the Board, Trustees approved the following recommendation regarding General Amherst HS, Harrow DHS, Harrow PS, Kingsville DHS and Western SS,
THAT THE SUPERINTENDENT RESPONSIBLE FOR ACCOMMODATIONS FACILITATES AN ACCOMMODATION REVIEW OF GENERAL AMHERST HIGH SCHOOL, KINGSVILLE DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL, WESTERN SECONDARY SCHOOL, HARROW DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL AND HARROW PUBLIC SCHOOL, TO ADDRESS CAPACITY ISSUES.

Present:

General Amherst HS: Hazel Keefner, Principal, Amy Soucie, Staff Rep, Mary Lippert and Kim Laframboise, parents

Harrow DHS: Mary Edwards, Principal, John Konopaski, Staff Rep, Bill Parr and Sheri Dzudovich, parents

Harrow PS: Michelle Sprague- Keane, Principal, Teri Gorick, Staff Rep, Rebecca Robinson, parent

Kingsville DHS: Dina Salinitri, Principal, Chris Clements, Staff Rep, Michelle Hedge and Bill Orawski, parents

Western SS: Melissa McIntyre, Principal, Alison Oldfield, Staff Rep, Valerie Cormier, parent

Community Reps.: Barry Mannell, Pat Catton

Regrets: Mary MacLauchlan, Elaine Mailloux, Robin Trepanier, Trudy Richards

Facilitator: Superintendent, Todd Awender

Recorder: Lynne Hornby

There were four observers in the audience.

1. Call to Order, Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Chairperson Orawski thanking everyone for their attendance and Principal Sprague-Keane for hosting the meeting. Everyone was seated in school groups. Superintendent Awender introduced Lynn McLaughlin, Superintendent and Vicki Houston, Principal, Special Education Programs and Services.

The Chair noted that his personal opinions and thoughts are not brought up when he is acting as chair, only when he is in the working group setting.

He noted that he has received several calls from members stating that they have felt uncomfortable and under pressure in some of the working groups. He noted that this is unacceptable. As a committee we need to move on and work together.

2. Review of notes of committee meeting of March 9

As requested at the last committee meeting, the notes of the March 9 meeting have been circulated to the committee. It was also requested that notes be posted only after they are reviewed by the committee at their next meeting. A committee member had forwarded some changes via email. Changes will be made as appropriate and the notes will now be posted to the website.

3. Superintendent of Special Education Programs and Services, Lynn McLaughlin and Principal, Special Education Programs and Services, Vicki Houston

The Superintendent and Principal gave an overview of the Special Education Department and services as provided.

Powerpoint attached

There were no questions from the floor.

4. Community Input to date and Information Responses

A committee member spoke to information announced by the premier regarding community hubs. She stated that community hubs are to be supported by creative partnerships. Part of this mandate was to improve partnerships between school boards and municipalities.

He added that the PARC needs to help with utilization rates; we don't need to close schools. They are a vital part of any community.

In reply to a question, Superintendent Awender clarified that MoE has been talking about this for some time but he was unaware that a committee had been struck. Joint use of space is not something new.

Input received via the parc email box was distributed. It was clarified that this person's request is beyond the scope of the PARC committee and has been referred accordingly.

5. Discussion: review of 2015 Annual Accommodation and Capital Planning Report as it refers to these schools

The Chair noted that when reviewing the Annual Accommodation Plan and looking at the schools in question, it is necessary to make sure that we look carefully at the data in the document. This is part of the basis of what we are doing here. What makes the best sense – not necessarily what we want.

We want the best programming for our students but if we don't have the student populations we can't program effectively.

The Superintendent proved some additional information.

Number of walkers currently:

GAHS 314

HDHS 86

KDHS 277

WSS 0

WSS has 6 small buses and 13 full size units

In order to transport all students to a super school equidistant from all the communities, 14 extra buses in addition to those currently on the road.

The cost associated with putting a bus on the road is \$44,000 whether there are 2 riders or 72 riders.

6. Discussion: Ranking of recommendations and Advantages/Disadvantages

Review of current recommendations

The difference between voting and ranking was discussed. All committee members are ranking the ideas prior to voting. Ranking was defined as offering opinions only. It was clarified that any voting will be by non-board employees only.

A committee member spoke to an additional proposal that she submitted after the meeting. It was determined that it was not new but further defined an existing proposal.

The committee broke into groups to further clarify the suggestions. When the committee regrouped, the the guiding considerations were reviewed before further discussions took place.

Each proposal was ranked and the guiding considerations were reviewed:

1. Each community maintains a JK-12 school – all new buildings

WSS closes and students return to home schools

WSS AB programs implemented at two locations

Possible boundary changes

Ranking 6, 3,5,3,5 – 22

Does it meet the Guiding considerations?	
Consolidations (Ministry favours for new builds)	yes
Must improve Utilization Rates / Empty Spaces	yes
Community School	yes
Renewal Needs / Aging Infrastructure	yes
Try to minimize the # of student changes	no
Student Programs	no
Secondary Size Schools (800-1200)	no
Transportation	yes
Coterminous Board – Strategic places	yes

2. Close all 3 high schools; build a mega school equidistant from each community.

Transition all students to the new mega school.

Ranking: 6,4,6,4,7 – 27

Does it meet the Guiding considerations?	
Consolidations (Ministry favours for new builds)	yes
Must improve Utilization Rates / Empty Spaces	yes
Community School	no
Renewal Needs / Aging Infrastructure	yes
Try to minimize the # of student changes	no
Student Programs	yes
Secondary Size Schools (800-1200)	yes
Transportation	no
Coterminous Board – Strategic places	no

3. JK-12 in each community

Leave WSS as is; expand the programming – ASD

Ranking: 1,4,5,4,4 – 18

Does it meet the Guiding considerations?	
Consolidations (Ministry favours for new builds)	yes
Must improve Utilization Rates / Empty Spaces	yes
Community School	yes
Renewal Needs / Aging Infrastructure	yes
Try to minimize the # of student changes	no
Student Programs	yes/no
Secondary Size Schools (800-1200)	no
Transportation	no
Coterminous Board – Strategic places	yes

It was determined by consensus that this is not a realistic proposal

4. Consolidation of HDHS and KDHS - close Harrow; KDHS new JK-12 school
 Consolidation of WSS and GAHS - both schools close with a new facility; status quo until new facility built

Ranking: 2,5,1,7,2 – 17

Does it meet the Guiding considerations?	
Consolidations (Ministry favours for new builds)	yes
Must improve Utilization Rates / Empty Spaces	yes
Community School	no
Renewal Needs / Aging Infrastructure	yes
Try to minimize the # of student changes	no
Student Programs	yes
Secondary Size Schools (800-1200)	yes
Transportation	no
Coterminous Board – Strategic places	yes

5. Incorporate WSS into KDHS; keep special programming
 KDHS as JK-12 **with a new school**
 Harrow JK-12 right size school at either location
 GAHS adds 7 and 8s from over population in Amherstburg family
 Amherst adds 7 and 8s from Anderdon; add FI
 GNPS or MCB as FI

Ranking: 5,2,2,3,3 -15

Does it meet the Guiding considerations?	
Consolidations (Ministry favours for new builds)	yes
Must improve Utilization Rates / Empty Spaces	yes
Community School	yes
Renewal Needs / Aging Infrastructure	no
Try to minimize the # of student changes	no
Student Programs	no
Secondary Size Schools (800-1200)	no
Transportation	no benefit
Coterminous Board – Strategic places	yes

6. Change boundary – close Malden they go to Amherst and Harrow
 Close CNPS they go to Essex and Harrow
 Amherst becomes a 7-12 school – until a new school can be built
 Harrow is JK-12 at Harrow site
 Kingsville is JK-12
 WSS closes and transitions to BRDHS and/or KDHS

Ranking: 5,1,4,1,5= 16

Does it meet the Guiding considerations?	
Consolidations (Ministry favours for new builds)	yes
Must improve Utilization Rates / Empty Spaces	yes
Community School	yes
Renewal Needs / Aging Infrastructure	yes
Try to minimize the # of student changes	no
Student Programs	no
Secondary Size Schools (800-1200)	no
Transportation	no
Coterminous Board – Strategic places	yes

7. Kingsville as JK-12

Close Harrow and adjust boundary between KDHS and GAHS

Western closes; AB split between GAHS and KDHS or maybe BRDHS

LDC to home schools

Ranking: 6,7,2,6,2 = 23

Does it meet the Guiding considerations?	
Consolidations (Ministry favours for new builds)	yes
Must improve Utilization Rates / Empty Spaces	yes
Community School	no
Renewal Needs / Aging Infrastructure	no
Try to minimize the # of student changes	no
Student Programs	yes
Secondary Size Schools (800-1200)	yes
Transportation	yes
Coterminous Board – Strategic places	yes

Change board policy not to have a school involved in a PARC in less than 5 yrs

Lengthy discussion took place as to whether each proposal met the Guiding considerations.

It was determined by consensus to attempt to eliminate two options, by way of secret ballot. Choices were to eliminate two options; numbers 2, 3 or 7.

The votes were tallied and options 3 and 7 were eliminated.

7. Questions

Questions were answered in general discussion throughout the meeting.

8. Additional committee meeting dates

April 20 at Harrow DHS

April 30 at Western SS

9. Adjournment at 9:40 p.m.