



# 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 # 2 MINUTES Wednesday, December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016, 6:30pm St. Joseph CSS, Cornwall, Library

### Chair:

John Cameron, Superintendent of School Effectiveness

### ARC Members:

Frances Derochie, Bishop Macdonell	Mary Miller, St. Anne
Rachel Cousineau-Labelle, Bishop Macdonell	Brittnee Starblanket, St. Anne
Renee Rozon, Holy Trinity CSS	Dan Curtis, St. Columban
Alanna Pollard, Holy Trinity CSS	Ashley Bergeron, St. Columban
Cathy Leslie, Holy Trinity CSS	Meghan Henry, St. Columban
MacLean Poulin, Holy Trinity CSS	Liz McCormick, St. Joseph CSS
Beverley Bellefeuille, Immaculate Conception	Rob Dupuis, St. Joseph CSS
Ellie Fuller, Immaculate Conception	Michael Whelan, St. Joseph CSS
Patrick McLeod, Immaculate Conception	Danny Conway, St. Joseph CSS
Shannon McDougald, Sacred Heart	Stephanie Montpetit, St. Matthew CSS
Crystal Oakes, Sacred Heart	Kelly McDermid, St. Matthew CSS
John van Loenen, Sacred Heart	Rob Lauzon, St. Matthew CSS
Micheline Baker, Sacred Heart	Caleb Montpetit, St. Matthew CSS
Michelle Brasseur-Robillard, St. Anne	Joy Martel, St. Matthew CSS
Kim Megenhardt, St. Anne	Kennedy MacDonald, St. Peter

### Resource Staff:

Bonnie Norton, Superintendent of Business, CDSBEO  
Jack Ammendolia, C.N. Watson and Associates

### Members of the Public:

Lois Ann Baker, Standard-Freeholder

### Regrets:

Cheryl Tourangeau, Holy Trinity CSS

### Absent:

Kim Summers, Bishop Macdonell	Heather Stang, St. Joseph CSS
Tracey Masterson, Bishop Macdonell	Teegan Walsh, St. Peter
Louise Tait, St. Columban	Dawn Wheeler, St. Peter
Janice Flood, Immaculate Conception	Stacey Laframboise, St. Peter
Sarah Lawrence, St. Joseph CSS	

### 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 December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016 Agenda for ARC Working Meeting # 2  
Moved by: Micheline Baker  
Seconded by: Joy Martel  
Carried

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee asked if the projected staffing reductions for OECTA and CUPE requested on November 9, 2016 are available.

**Response:** Senior Administration acknowledged that this is being reviewed and that the data is not available yet.

3. Approval of November 9, 2016 Meeting Minutes from ARC Working Meeting #1  
Moved by: Cathy Leslie  
Seconded by: Rob Dupuis  
Carried
4. Minutes, PowerPoint and Input received from the City of Cornwall Meeting – November 21, 2016

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee asked what the difference is between Brownfield and Greenfield sites?

**Response:** Greenfield sites are sites that are ready to be developed whereas Brownfield sites are contaminated or has some sort of environmental cleanup associated with it and not so easy to develop.

Mr. Jack Ammendolia reviewed the presentation and minutes of the meeting with the representatives of the City of Cornwall. This meeting is mandated by the Ministry as part of the Pupil Accommodation Review process and the purpose was to identify what is going on with the Pupil Accommodation Review and why the board is going forward with this ARC review. It was a fruitful meeting and the City of Cornwall representatives provided the board with realistic feedback. The setup was similar to our ARC Orientation meeting when we sat down and described the ARC process, purpose of the ARC committee and why the board is doing a Pupil Accommodation Review. The board projections are consistent with the City of Cornwall Planning projections. The City provided us with possible employment opportunities coming in the next few years and how that may impact projections. The Board spoke of the possibility of a potential new construction for Sacred Heart School and if that recommendation were to go through, that it may be built on the same site or an alternative nearby site. The Board asked if there are sites available in that neighbourhood or in close proximity that would be near where the existing students live. The City provided some feedback and would assist the board if the recommendation goes forward and an alternate site was required.

Superintendent Norton added that the presentation and minutes of the meeting will be posted on the Board website. The goal of Mr. Ammendolia's presentation was to provide the information to the members of the ARC Committee and to answer any of the ARC Committee's questions. ARC members were also reminded that all of the information concerning the Cornwall ARC is posted at [www.cdsbeo.on.ca](http://www.cdsbeo.on.ca).

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee asked about distance in terms of an alternative site possibly for Sacred Heart or maybe St. Joseph CSS, is there any restriction to radius or distance of where that site could be?

**Response:** There is not an official restriction, however, when you are looking for a new site, a board would want to maximise the number of walkers and be as close as possible to the largest concentration of students. As we have mentioned in the past, it is important for the board to maintain a presence in the East, West, South and North areas of Cornwall. The Board would be looking for something in the north end of the City of Cornwall if an alternate site was required.

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee asked what the term Co-Terminus Board refers to?

**Response:** The term refers to the Upper Canada District School Board. Both boards share the same geographical boundaries and the board is also going thru the ARC process at this time. The UCDSB plans are still in transition, how it will impact CDSBEO is unknown at this time.

5. Overall feedback and discussion regarding Public Meeting #1 – November 30, 2016

Mr. Ammendolia reviewed the Q and A and Comments provided at the meeting and provided a summary of the evening for those that did not attend. The meeting is mandated as part of the Pupil Accommodation Review. The evening began with introductions and then it was followed by a presentation similar to the one presented at the Orientation meeting. This presentation gave a summary, process and demographics, and spoke about the different options recommended in the Initial Staff Report. Then the group broke out into a "Parking Lot" setting where staff from the various Board departments set up tables in the perimeter of the room to answer specific questions from the public. From the "Parking Lot" setting, we received great feedback and discussions. The questions are included in your package for review.

One of the questions asked at the meeting was what the cost of a replacement school would be. At the meeting, a rough cost was given but once the Board of Trustees make a final decision, an exact figure will be available based on the recommendations and a Business Case will be submitted to the Ministry of Education for funding consideration outlining the exact cost.

Another member of the public asked about boundaries and why boards have school boundaries. From a planning and transportation perspective, if a board had open boundaries, they would not be able to plan for staffing, school size, etc. Boundaries are critical and provide boards with the tools to plan.

Another question was on transitions and timelines. The ARC process is still in the early stages. The new guidelines mandate that the plans must be shared with the community once a decision has been made. As an example, if a decision is made by the Board of Trustees in May 2017, then a Business Case would be submitted to the Ministry in the Summer of 2017 and Boards would likely not hear until the Fall of 2017 if the Business Case is approved. Construction probably would not start until spring 2018 with completion by Fall 2019. The process is probably 2 to 2 ½ years away.

Parents also asked about the benefits of a 7-12 model, all of the responses from board staff are included in your package. Our board has had a 7-12 model for a long time, and is a model that other boards across the province look at when looking at their own programming.

All of the questions and responses are available and posted.

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee asked if the projected transportation costs are available?

**Response:** At this point in time, the changes to transportation costs will be insignificant based on the proposed recommendations in the Initial Staff Report.

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee asked if “school performance” was taken into consideration when proposing the new school boundaries or school consolidation?

**Response:** It was a secondary factor, not a deciding factor. The process was geared towards the facility, the condition of the facility, student population, etc. The students are for the most part staying together, traditionally, test scores are related to the students, teachers, parents and all those other things and we are not changing those things. It’s not the building that impacts the scores, it’s the other things.

6. Are there other options or considerations that we have missed?

Mr. Ammendolia continued with the next item on the agenda. Tonight, we would like to know if there are any other options to consider, other items to bring forth.

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee wished to stress the considerations of St. Matthew CSS and the way the changes may impact programming for the students. Is there any way we could look at a site that would accommodate St. Matthew and the 7-8 students which will be leaving the programming at Bishop. The current Living and Learning and Connections class at Bishop also has students of other grades which would have to be taken into account as well. Parents of these students are also concerned about the large size of the school since these students already have high anxiety.

**Response:** Senior administration will take the recommendation under consideration and advised the ARC members that the special programming currently in place would not change and the classes would continue at a different location. Any special education classes would still be capped at 16 which is ministry guidelines. Most 7-12 model secondary schools have either a separate entrance or wing or division between the 7-8 students and the 9-12 students and there are ways to configure the setup to alleviate the stress to the students.

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee suggested to look at the boundaries to ensure students are not being divided from their peers?

**Response:** Yes, we are looking at the boundaries again.

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee asked if cross boundaries will be accepted, what if families want to go to the new school since they have to change schools anyways?

**Response:** At this time, the same rules would apply, all cross boundaries require Superintendent approval and approval is granted if space is available and reviewed on an individual and annual basis.

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee asked if the boundaries of Holy Trinity CSS will be changing as they will now only have one feeder school and will lose students to St. Joseph CSS. The member mentioned the area of Blessed Sacrament Drive and Tollgate and the high number of students from that area attending Holy Trinity but the boundary is changing to St. Joseph CSS. With only one feeder school in the city, where will their 7-8 students come from, with students from Iona Academy and St. Finnan's still attending those schools?

**Response:** We are looking at the elementary school boundaries and projections and will have that information available at the next working meeting.

Correction: students from the Blessed Sacrament/Tollgate area are attending Holy Trinity on cross boundaries, the boundary is not changing in that area.

7. Are there other comments/feedback at this time regarding the proposed recommendations based on ARC and Public Meeting Feedback?

In summary for the next working meeting, we are looking at providing feedback on the boundary adjustments and some of the factors for the elementary and secondary schools. We are also reviewing the programming and 7-8 implications at St. Matthew CSS. These are tweaks to the two options presented, if that is the case, we can move forward. Or are there any other options, questions, feedback that the ARC Committee would like to present at this time? We need to start working towards some recommendations, we are going to work within the two options as presented now. No response from the ARC Committee.

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee asked if the option of consolidating St. Peter into Immaculate. It is similar to the existing Options presented, only difference would be school location.

**Response:** The board will look at this option and provide feedback at the next meeting.

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee feels that the changes to St. Matthew are more than a tweak, if the 7-8 students are to attend, then the existing capacity will not allow for the extra students. Can St. Matthew CSS not move to one of the schools closing, is there an Option 3? If St. Matthew had room, they could grow. The school members feel that if they lose the 7-8 students to secondary now, they will lose the students and the students will struggle.

**Response:** The board will look at this option, is there somewhere else we can house those students? Before we create a 3<sup>rd</sup> Option, give the board time to look at the numbers and come back to the next meeting with additional information.

**Question:** A member of the ARC Committee asked about economies of scale, can some of the cost savings be rolled into increasing or maintaining what we currently have. For example, at Immaculate classrooms currently have A/C units that Bishop doesn't have, can we use this money to return to the schools to keep students in existing schools and not the new school which may be constructed.

**Response:** The board's goal is to free up money to use in the existing facilities to improve the environment, focus on viable schools, all part of the transition plan.

**Question:** An ARC member asked why the transportation cost are not increasing since St. Columban's students will be bussed a further distance, most of the students are walkers, and now, you will have to bus students to church. Why are the students being relocated to Sacred Heart and not Bishop which is a few blocks away?

**Response:** At the next meeting, we will give the ARC committee feedback as to the rational and provide scenarios.

## 8. Communications

### a. Updated Q & A

Superintendent Norton reviewed the updated Q & A with revisions and updates from the public meeting and over the course of all meetings. All information will be posted on the board website under the Pupil Accommodation Review page.

## 9. Questions

Superintendent Cameron asked if there were any other questions.

**Question:** An ARC member asked about 9<sup>th</sup> Street/7<sup>th</sup> Street boundaries for Bishop Macdonell and Sacred Heart as well as walking distances.

**Response:** The Board will look at this option and provide feedback at the next meeting.

**Question:** An ARC member asked if any of the committee members see an advantage of going with Option 1 specifically the new build for St. Joseph CSS. The question has come up, staff are not excited about the possibility of a new building. Would Option 2 be the better choice given the current facilities, hospitality room, automotive shop, and auditorium? New is not always better. What would it take to retain the existing building? Another member from Holy Trinity spoke and expressed the opinion that the programs/facilities currently at St. Joseph CSS are an integral part of the programming (SHSM, etc.) and must be considered. Is it worth losing the auditorium, hospitality room, automotive shop, woodshop to save a few dollars? Is it worth 7 million dollars, as teachers, we feel it isn't worth it, the programs and facilities are important. If the SHSM automotive program is lost at St. Joseph CSS, the students may also leave the board as St. Joseph CSS is the only Catholic school in the city offering the program.

**Response:** Mr. Ammendolia explained that as mentioned before, test scores stay with the students regardless of the facility, however, we do look at programs and programming and feedback from this committee. If the board cannot offer a certain program because of the facility, it is something that staff and the Board of Trustees need to be made aware of. Just to relate to cost, yes, the cost is to be considered to the Ministry and the Business Case but before it gets to that point, this exercise and the feedback is exactly what is

needed. The Board of Trustees will need to hear the willingness of the school community to retain the existing building and give the reasons why.

10. Public Meeting #2 – February 15, 2017– Format

Superintendent Cameron asked for comments, would you like to see the same format, different format?

**Question:** An ARC member asked if the same items would be reviewed, same information? **Response:** Ideally, the goal would be to have a recommendation ready to review, or a clear view of the recommendation. The “parking lot” style setup worked very well, whereas members of the public were able to go to each table display (special education, curriculum, STEO, human resources) to ask questions. Some people felt more comfortable speaking one on one rather than in front of a large group and questions were geared to specific departments for response. The Committee agreed that the same format should be used for the February 15, 2017 public meeting.

11. Future ARC Working Meeting Dates

Discussion was held and the next meeting date will be Wednesday, January 18, 2017.

12. Adjournment

Moved by: Cathy Leslie  
Seconded by: Rob Lauzon  
Carried

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

**Distribution:**  
ARC Members

**Future meeting dates:**  
~~December 14, 2016 – ARC Working Meeting #3 (TBD)~~  
January 18, 2017 – ARC Working Meeting #3  
February 15, 2017 – Public Meeting #2  
February 22, 2017 – ARC Working Meeting #4 (TBD)