



CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD OF EASTERN ONTARIO

Box 2222, 2755 Highway 43 - Kemptville, Ontario - K0G 1J0
Phone: 613-258-7757 Toll-Free: 1-800-443-4562 Fax: 613-258-7134
www.cdsbeo.on.ca



PUPIL ACCOMMODATION REVIEW – CORNWALL AREA ARC WORKING MEETING # 1 MINUTES Wednesday, November 9th, 2016, 6:30pm St. Joseph CSS, Cornwall, Library

Chair:

John Cameron, Superintendent of School Effectiveness

ARC Members:

Frances Derochie, Bishop Macdonell	Kim Megenhardt, St. Anne
Kim Summers, Bishop Macdonell	Mary Miller, St. Anne
Rachel Cousineau-Labelle, Bishop Macdonell	Brittnee Starblanket, St. Anne
Tracey Masterson, Bishop Macdonell	Dan Curtis, St. Columban
Renee Rozon, Holy Trinity CSS	Ashley Bergeron, St. Columban
Cheryl Tourangeau, Holy Trinity CSS	Meghan Henry, St. Columban
Alanna Pollard, Holy Trinity CSS	Louise Tait, St. Columban
Cathy Leslie, Holy Trinity CSS	Liz McCormick, St. Joseph CSS
MacLean Poulin, Holy Trinity CSS	Rob Dupuis, St. Joseph CSS
Beverly Bellefeuille, Immaculate Conception	Michael Whelan, St. Joseph CSS
Ellie Fuller, Immaculate Conception	Stephanie Montpetit, St. Matthew CSS
Patrick McLeod, Immaculate Conception	Kelly McDermid, St. Matthew CSS
Janice Flood, Immaculate Conception	Rob Lauzon, St. Matthew CSS
Shannon McDougald, Sacred Heart	Caleb Montpetit, St. Matthew CSS
Crystal Oakes, Sacred Heart	Joy Martel, St. Matthew CSS
John van Loenen, Sacred Heart	Patricia Dennison, St. Peter
Micheline Baker, Sacred Heart	Dawn Wheeler, St. Peter

Resource Staff:

Bonnie Norton, Superintendent of Business, CDSBEO

Members of the Public:

Greg Peerenboom, Standard-Freeholder
Dale Fobert, OECTA

Regrets:

Michelle Brasseur-Robillard, St. Anne Danny Conway, St. Joseph CSS

Absent:

Heather Stang, St. Joseph CSS Sarah Lawrence, St. Joseph CSS
Teegan Walsh, St. Peter Stacey Laframboise, St. Peter

Recorder:

Karen O'Shaughnessy, Administrative Assistant to Superintendent John Cameron

Call to Order:

John Cameron, Chair of the Pupil Accommodation Review – Cornwall Area ARC Committee, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

1. Prayer
Superintendent Cameron began the meeting with a prayer.
2. Approval of November 9th, 2016 Agenda for ARC Working Meeting # 1
Moved by: Joy Martel
Seconded by: Cathy Leslie
Carried
3. Approval of October 26th, 2016 Meeting Minutes from ARC Orientation Meeting
Moved by: Rob Lauzon
Seconded by: Alanna Pollard
Carried
4. ARC Working Group Activity # 1 – Data Analysis and Ranking

Superintendent Cameron and Superintendent Norton showed a slide on the presentation that explained the activity, detailing the process of completion. This activity will give the group an understanding of the *Appendix 1, Initial Staff Report – Report 1, Cornwall Review Area, October 2016* specifically the School Information Reports. By completing this activity the group will be able to delve into the data and rank the schools thus giving a clearer understanding of what the document is about. The presentation along with the activity templates are ([HERE](#)). The committee worked on their own or in a group to complete the activity. After 10 minutes, Superintendent Cameron showed the next slide and asked the group if they reached the same outcome. The committee was asked if there were any surprises based on the exercise. Discussion took place on the results, the goal of the exercise was to show the committee the reasoning of the recommendations.

5. Primary & Secondary Facility Triggers for Consideration

Superintendent Norton explained that there are other facility triggers that the board reviewed to come up with the recommendations. The Facility Condition Index (FCI) is a calculation based on the 5 year renewal needs divided by the replacement cost of rebuilding a school. When the FCI is above 50%, it raises a flag. Triggers are not always visible to the naked eye, the buildings may require significant repairs, heating system, plumbing, and mechanical. Ministry of Education funding model is based on enrolment numbers, as enrolment drops, the operations funding for the school drops as well (see slide 6).

6. Ranking Activity of Option 1 and 2

Superintendent Cameron reviewed Option 1 and 2 with the committee to get a clearer understanding. Mr. Cameron asked the group for comments/questions on the different options. After the exercise, the group discussed some of the factors involved in their

thinking. Part two of the activity was for each school/group to look over each option and to indicate on the charts which option they feel is the best option in their opinion.

7. Discussion and Comments

Question: Why would the enrolment numbers at St. Joseph CSS showing an increase of only 10 students with the new grade 7-8 students?

Response: Yes, based on the projected enrolment numbers, St. Joseph CSS will be experiencing some enrolment decline over the next period of time. Based on those numbers, the existing facility will be able to accommodate the new students. The enrolment projections are included in each School Information Profile. There may be the possibility of an addition or portables if we go with the existing facility.

Question: What impact would Option 2 have on the students, would they remain on site?

Response: Most likely if Option 2 is chosen, there would be a need to look for an alternative site to maintain the existing St. Joseph CSS while construction is going on.

Question: If Option 1 is chosen, do we know where the facility would be built?

Response: At this point, we do not. We do know that we would like to maintain a presence in the north part of the city, looking for property in the proximity of the current St. Joseph CSS.

Question: If we go with Option 2, what changes/modification will take place at the current St. Joseph CSS?

Response: We would have to look at housing the 7 & 8 students, take this into account, possible renovations, no plans as of yet.

Question: If we go with Option 1, would the new school have the same facilities: auto shop, woodshop, hospitality room?

Response: The models that we have been looking at are similar to the layout of Holy Trinity CSS. They would include a cafeteria, chapel, etc. but very large specialized rooms like the woodshop, automotive and auditorium presently at St. Joseph CSS would be difficult to replace to the current state under the Ministry of Education's funding benchmarks.

Question: We don't want St. Joseph CSS to give up what they have, can we not approach the other board to buy the rest of the building? They have surplus space?

Response: It's not an option at this time.

Question: An ARC member shared that the way the province disposes of surplus buildings has changed and co-terminus boards now have to purchase surplus properties at fair market value. On the SIP profile for St. Joseph CSS, we see that the UCDSB currently pays for half of the repairs, if we purchase the property, are we solely responsible? ARC member asked if the board knows the cost of purchasing the rest of the building.

Response: Yes, we would have to upgrade and pay 100% of the cost. We do not have a cost of purchasing GVSS, we have not gone down that road. Keep in mind that the estimated shared repairs to the building within the next 5 years is currently around 15

million dollars. Right now, we are looking at the two options put forth in the recommendations, purchasing the building is not an option.

Question: An ARC member wished to advocate for the St. Matthew students. With the 7 & 8 students transitioning to St. Joseph and Holy Trinity, and if St. Matthew's stays a 9-12, those students will already be in the high school setting. With the current programs at Bishop, I'm assuming would move to St. Joseph, once those students are in the building, very concerned about the enrolment at St. Matthew.

Response: We would take that under consideration, duly noted.

Question: On that same note, the special education student requiring the highest needs are currently attending St. Joseph CSS as they have the facilities required, would a new build have the same amenities or would Holy Trinity CSS have to take on the programming?

Response: The board would have to look at the programming, ideally it would not be changing. Any new construction would have to be AODA compliant, meet code, accessibility compliant.

Question: An ARC member asked if Bishop would be able to accommodate the special education students currently at Immaculate, would the current programs suffer because of the higher numbers.

Response: Current enrolment numbers show that the space at Bishop is currently underutilized. The goal is not to increase class sizes, when more students are in the school, the programs become sustainable over time.

Question: An ARC member mentioned since the special education classes are capped at 16 and operating at capacity, does that have an impact on the ratio?

Response: Special education classrooms are not included in the ratings.

Question: An ARC member said both Option 1 and 2 mention possible reductions in staffing, does the board have any statistics on staffing losses for both options?

Response: The numbers are not available yet. Yes, there is a possibility, it is part of the process that would be considered. Schools would be staffed at the same level as any other school in the board. At this point in time, we don't know what the numbers will be. Both options will result in the same changes in staffing.

Question: An ARC member asked about the boundary of Immaculate students, those south of Second Street will be going to Bishop, some to St. Peter. The boundary for Holy Trinity does not align with the elementary boundaries, therefore, students attending Bishop could very well continue to Holy Trinity CSS when their classmates would go on to St. Joseph CSS. Are we going to be sending all of the students to St. Peter or is there a possibility of realigning the boundaries? By looking at the projected enrolment, if the students are sent to St. Peter that school will be over capacity by almost 100 in a few years.

Response: The board will take it under consideration.

Question: An ARC member asked if the potential staffing reductions in the two options could be shared with the ARC committee prior to making a decision. A motion was put forward that the projected job losses for OECTA and CUPE is provided for each option. Note: the motion was not seconded

Response: Senior Administration acknowledges that this will be addressed, and clarified that the outcome of either option would be the same, Option 1 or 2 would yield the same result, duly noted.

Superintendent Cameron indicated that boundary maps are available to the group to review, and that changes to the boundaries could take place.

Question: An ARC member asked if the board considered making changes to the grade 7 and 8 at St. Finnan, St. Andrew's and Iona Academy?

Response: Those options are not been considered for this review.

Question: An ARC member asked where the proposed new build for Sacred Heart would be located? The member expressed concerns as not all families have available transportation and should an emergency arise at school and if the new location is far away, it would put undue strain on the families, even attending a school meeting, or event. The issues of distance from school pertains to the Immaculate families as well.

Response: The current options are on the current Sacred Heart site or a location nearby. The board is aware, duly noted.

Question: An ARC member also expressed concern about transportation times and longer trips.

Response: Transportation times will not increase, more buses would be available. The impact on transportation is being investigated, the goal would be not to increase bus times, we are dealing with inner city schools, therefore it should not have an impact.

8. Public Meeting #1 – November 30th, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. St. Joseph CSS, Cafeteria

Superintendent Norton reviewed the format of the meeting with the group. All members are encouraged to attend if possible. Mr. Jack Ammendolia, C.N. Watson will be facilitating the evening as well as Superintendent Cameron and Superintendent Norton. A presentation will be followed by a “parking lot” style setup whereas members of the public will be able to go to each table display (special education, curriculum, STEO, human resources) to ask questions. A series of presentation boards will be on display, showing various graphs and the proposed school boundaries. Information slides or loop slides will be projected on an area in the room to display items of interest to the public.

9. Timelines

The ARC Working Group Meeting # 2 will take place on Wednesday, December 7th, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. at St. Joseph CSS in the library. The dates of any future meetings are listed below and additional dates will be added as required. A member of the committee asked if the April 4, 2017, Public Delegations to the Board of Trustees meeting could be moved to Cornwall to accommodate the participation of parents. Superintendent Norton

indicated that it probably would not be moved to Cornwall but talks are in place to provide transportation from key points within the city are being considered.

10. Adjournment

Moved by: Micheline Baker

Seconded by: Bev Bellefeuille

Carried

The meeting adjourned at 8:14 p.m.

Distribution:

ARC Members

Future meeting dates:

November 30, 2016 – Public Meeting #1

December 7, 2016 – ARC Working Meeting #2

December 14, 2016 – ARC Working Meeting #3 (TBD)

January 18, 2017 – ARC Working Meeting #4 (TBD)

February 15, 2017 – Public Meeting #2

February 22, 2017 – ARC Working Meeting #5 (TBD)