



---

## Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) Meeting

### Working Meeting #3

October 11, 2017

6:00pm

Notre Dame Catholic Elementary School  
760 Burnham Street, Cobourg, ON

---

#### 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 - Caroline Graham, 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.

Diocese - Fr. Peter Seabrooke.

Chair, Tim Robins.

#### Resource:

Isabel Grace, Superintendent, Business & Finance.

Marian Irwin – Recorder.

---

#### 1. Welcome and Opening Prayer.

Carrie Graham led the group in prayer.

#### 2. Discuss Public Meeting #1.

Committee members participated in a round table discussion and shared their observations relating to Public Meeting #1. All were in agreement that although they were disappointed with the turnout they felt that the feedback they received was positive. All agreed that there should be increased interest over the next few months and for the next Public Meeting.

### 3. Chair – Opening Comments.

The Chair, Tim Robins welcomed back the committee to the ARC process and thanked the members for their dedication and commitment to the accommodation review process. He stated that we are half-way through the five month process and the work completed by the committee has been consistent with the mandate as defined under the committee's Terms of Reference.

Tim highlighted the ARC work completed prior to the summer break:

- May 15th - The ARC held WM#1 (at St. Michael CES) and undertook an orientation to the Accommodation Review Process (meeting norms, ARC schedule, binders, PARG, Policy & AP 109 and reviewed the Initial Staff Report (ISR) and School Information Profiles).
- May 31st - The ARC held WM#2 (at St. Joseph CES) where the committee received a detailed presentation on the ISR and accommodation options and completed group work to analyze each of the proposed accommodation options.
- June 5, 2017 - PM#1 (at Notre Dame CES) where the public was invited to learn about the Cobourg Catholic Elementary Schools Accommodation Review, Ministry of Education Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline, Board Policy, School Information Profiles, Initial Staff Report and Accommodation Options and provide input on the process through the published ARC public survey.

Tim stated ARC goals for Working Meeting #3 are to:

- Review the public feedback relating to the Initial Staff Report from both Public Meeting #1 and emails received to date and the public survey results.
- Examine in detail the accommodation options presented in the Initial Staff Report and determine if there are any additional alternative options that board staff should consider.
- Focus on group work.
- The Chair will be introducing individual work on the proposed accommodation option priority – this is highlighted in the presentation, but will not occur until our next working meeting.

The committee took time to update their ARC Binders.

### 4. Approval of Minutes.

The minutes from WM#2 were approved by the ARC Committee on June 16, 2017 and posted on the Board's ARC webpage.

5. The Chair asked the ARC members to review data from the public survey results collected in June 2017 and September – October 2017. (Group work).

The Committee broke into their 4 groups. They were instructed to answer the following questions within their designated groups:

1. What are the survey results showing?
2. Discuss public priorities, what are they?

The following charts were presented as their findings:

Review of Survey Results				
Group 1	Preferred		Not Preferred	
Option	Public	Student	Public	Student
1	6	6	12	14
2	2	2	10	12
3	14	9	5	2
4	11	8	4	1
Common Themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yard, space</li> <li>• Infrastructure</li> <li>• New facility</li> <li>• Grass</li> <li>• Less split classes</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of jobs</li> <li>• Boundary changes</li> <li>• Buses</li> <li>• Effect of change/emotions of kids</li> <li>• Old building</li> <li>• Construction</li> </ul>	

Review of Survey Results				
Group 2	Preferred		Not Preferred	
Option	Public	Student	Public	Student
1	6	6	14	10
2	2	8	11	12
3	14	10	6	2
4	11	8	5	1
Common Themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Playground space including grass</li> <li>• New facility attractive to some</li> <li>• Less split classes</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boundary concerns</li> <li>• Construction – where will kids go?</li> </ul>	

Review of Survey Results				
Group 3	Preferred		Not Preferred	
Option	Public	Student	Public	Student
1	6	6	14	10
2	2	1	11	12
3	14	10	6	2
4	11	8	4	1
Common Themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New facility (updated building)</li> <li>• Larger facility, green space, play area</li> <li>• Quite a few in favour of a French Immersion Centre</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boundary issues can be a challenge</li> <li>• Construction</li> </ul>	

Review of Survey Results				
Group 4	Preferred		Not Preferred	
Option	Public	Student	Public	Student
1	6	6	Not provided	Not provided
2	2	1	Not provided	Not provided
3	14	10	Not provided	Not provided
4	11	8	Not provided	Not provided
Common Themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fresh new facility</li> <li>• Upgrades</li> <li>• Favour F.I. Centre</li> <li>• No boundary issues (Option 3)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boundary issues possible</li> <li>• Construction</li> <li>• 2-Tiered system (dual track)</li> </ul>	

6. The Chair asked the ARC to analyze the pros and cons of the ISR for Accommodation Options 1-4. (Group work).

The Committee broke into their 4 groups. They were instructed to answer the following questions within their designated groups and present findings at WM#4:

1. What are the pros and cons of Option 1, 2, 3 and 4 referencing advantages and disadvantages from options in the ISR?

The following charts were presented as their findings:

Pro's and Con's as per ARC Committee			
Group	Option	Pros	Cons
1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No issue with boundaries</li> <li>• Families could have children in both streams</li> <li>• Extra-curricular access for all</li> <li>• Access to daycare for all (separate facility within)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting the needs of a large group of kids</li> <li>• Families have only one option (large school) (RC vs, Public)</li> <li>• Access to school by families with no transportation</li> <li>• Difficulties for kids to make teams</li> </ul>
1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Least expensive option</li> <li>• Safer and more efficient infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Movement of kids to new school (some vs. all)</li> <li>• Unhappy parents with location</li> <li>• Construction issues</li> </ul>

Pro's and Con's as per ARC Committee			
Group	Option	Pros	Cons
2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extracurricular/more opportunities</li> <li>• On-site child care/family centre</li> <li>• Air conditioning</li> <li>• More straight classes = more team teaching</li> <li>• Energy efficient</li> <li>• Higher enrollment</li> <li>• More resources/larger budget</li> <li>• Social worker – more direct service delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less intimate with more children</li> <li>• More difficult to manage student behaviour</li> <li>• Longer commutes/more congestion due to busses</li> <li>• Less attention during unstructured time</li> <li>• Special needs transitioning</li> </ul>
2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility</li> <li>• Child care?</li> <li>• Smaller school environment</li> <li>• Closer student connections</li> <li>• More walkers = less transportation cost</li> <li>• Dual track options available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction</li> <li>• Costly</li> <li>• Boundary changes</li> </ul>

Pro's and Con's as per ARC Committee			
Group	Option	Pros	Cons
3	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New facility, modern with lots of greenspace</li> <li>• Eliminates boundary issues</li> <li>• Easier for Priest with all students in one school</li> <li>• Cost savings – one building (operating costs)</li> <li>• Modernized learning facility</li> <li>• Fundraising (e.g. purchasing iPads for school)</li> <li>• Less split grades</li> <li>• More divisional team planning</li> <li>• Diverse population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased transportation (bus) costs</li> <li>• Dual track system</li> <li>• Only one Catholic school (elementary) in Cobourg</li> <li>• Too many kids on the school yard (need to do split lunches/recess)</li> <li>• Might not be built for future enrollment (possible need of portables)</li> <li>• Traffic in parking lot for drop off/pick up</li> <li>• Community (large can be overwhelming)</li> <li>• Difficult on the neighbourhood having 600 plus students</li> </ul>
3	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St. Michael's students get more greenspace</li> <li>• Less displacement</li> <li>• Closing St. Michael will generate an operating cost savings</li> <li>• Less impact than closing two schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closure of St. Michael's (attached to Church)</li> <li>• Retrofitting an aging facility</li> <li>• Notre Dame affected significantly during the addition (renovation)</li> <li>• Boundary changes</li> <li>• Not cost effective</li> </ul>

Pro's and Con's as per ARC Committee			
Group	Option	Pros	Cons
4	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No boundary issues</li> <li>• Attractive to gain funding approval</li> <li>• New facility/getting rid of tired building</li> <li>• State of the art – accessibility for all</li> <li>• Balanced streams</li> <li>• Creates a unified community (families not separated)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss for the Parish (plus name)</li> <li>• Mega-school may be too big for Cobourg community (perspective)</li> <li>• Crowded</li> <li>• Loss of family feel</li> <li>• Bus time for kids</li> <li>• Too big</li> <li>• What would happen to St. Joseph's School (empty)</li> </ul>
4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St. Joseph's community may not have to move</li> <li>• St. Michael's kids get a newer location</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expensive</li> <li>• Architectural nightmare</li> <li>• Less popular</li> <li>• Too far from Church</li> <li>• Priest is concerned about the parish</li> <li>• End result – people not happy – not new!</li> <li>• Addition is not cost effective</li> <li>• Very disruptive for students/community</li> </ul>

The Chair advised that Group work on the Pros and Cons from the ISR Accommodation Options would continue at WM#4.

7. Ministry of Education Initiatives – PARG Review and Capital Submissions.

Isabel Grace shared information on this.

In June 2017 the Ministry of Education issued a memorandum to School Boards advising Directors of Education on the Plan to Strengthen Rural and Northern Education.

Within the memorandum, the Ministry had advised that in the fall the Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline (PARG) will be updated. School boards have been advised not to initiate new PAR until the revised PARG is complete. For PARs that are already underway a board may either continue with the PAR process under its existing PAR policy or wait until the Ministry releases the revised PARG to continue.

Upon consulting with the Director of Education, Senior Administration and advising the Board of Trustees, it was decided that the Cobourg Catholic Elementary Schools ARC will continue under the current PAR policy.

8. Additional Options from ARC.

As outlined in the PARG and ARC Terms of Reference, the ARC may provide other accommodation options than those in the ISR; however, it must include supporting rationale for any such option. The Committee broke into their 4 groups. They were instructed to consider other options and rationale by reviewing terms of reference and present their findings.

The groups reported back to the ARC on the following additional options:

<b>NEW OPTION 5</b>
<b>CONSOLIDATE 3 SCHOOLS INTO 2 SCHOOLS</b>
This option proposes the closure of St. Michael CES and the construction of an addition at St. Joseph CES.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Make expanded St. Joseph a dual track school; and</li><li>2) Update infrastructure at Notre Dame.</li></ol>
Advantages:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Yard Enhancements (paving, playground)</li><li>• An addition would allow the possibility of a Child and family centre with separate security.</li><li>• Sellable features</li></ul>

<b>NEW OPTION 6</b>
<b>CONSOLIDATE 3 SCHOOLS INTO 2 SCHOOLS</b>
This option proposes the closure of St. Michael CES and the construction of an addition at St. Joseph CES.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Make expanded St Joseph a single track English;</li><li>2) Make Notre Dame single track French Immersion; and</li><li>3) Update infrastructure at Notre Dame.</li></ol>
Advantages:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An addition would allow the possibility of a Child and family centre with separate security.</li></ul>

The Chair stated that staff will complete an Accommodation Option analysis, following the ISR format, for the two additional accommodation options and that these analysis would be presented by staff at WM#4.

9. Next Steps.

- Focus for WM#4 is to conclude accommodation options Pro's and Con's review and consider all accommodation options (ISR and ARC additional options).
- ARC members to provide individual input on final recommended accommodation option.
- Staff to present the board's Transition Plan Framework.
- Review of Public Meeting #2 format.
- Working Meeting #4, Tuesday November 7, 2017 at St. Joseph CES, 6-8 pm.

10. Closing Prayer and Adjournment.

Carrie Graham led the group in closing prayer and the meeting concluded with a tour of Notre Dame. The meeting was adjourned at 8:15pm.