



SUDBURY CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

165A D'YOUVILLE STREET, SUDBURY, ONTARIO P3C 5E7 tel. (705) 673-5620 fax (705) 673-6670
<http://www.scdsb.edu.on.ca>

MINUTES of the 10th **WORKING SESSION** of the Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) for the East Planning Area, of the Sudbury Catholic District School Board (SCDSB), held in the gymnasium of Pius XII Elementary School, 44 Third Avenue, in Sudbury, on January 20, 2010, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:17 p.m.

Committee Members in Attendance:

Board Representation:

Chairperson Roland Muzzatti, Academic Superintendent
Facilitator Denis Faucher, Manager of Facility Services
Secretary Steve Rinaldi, Project Coordinator

School Representation:

Pius XII

Louisa Bianchin, Principal
Shelley Sloan, School Council Chair
Cathy Manuel, Community
Leonard Foucault, School Staff

St. Charles College

Patty Mardero, Principal
Catherine Ross-Gonko, School Council Chair
Sandra Gobbo, Community
Claire Morrison, School Staff

St. Albert Adult Learning Centre (ALC)

Cassandra MacGregor, Vice-Principal
Ann Brisebois, School Staff

St. John

Tricia Dowdall-Cirelli, Principal
Amanda Gagne, School Council Chair
Tina Madore, Community
Tara Large, School Staff

St. Andrew

Melody Henry, Principal
Mary Smith, School Council Chair
Lucille Szalai, Community

St. Mark

Sharon Oliver, Principal
Donna Kotanko, School Council Chair
Carole Remillard, School Staff
Stacey Kennedy, Community

St. Bernadette

Nicole Snow, Principal
Dan Bronicheski, School Council Chair
Mike McKeever, Community
Colette Perrin, School Staff

St. Paul

Sharon Oliver, Principal
Anne-Marie Savage, School Council Chair
Jennifer Rocca, Community

St. Raphael

Vickie McGuire, Principal
Phil Farmer, School Council Chair
Ted Keehn, School Staff
Jen Bailey, Community

Community Representation:

Fr. Remi Hebert, Diocesan Representative

Committee Members Regrets:

Dennis Bazinet, SCDSB
Katrina Chevrier, St. Albert ALC
Francine Dubreuil, St. Albert ALC
Dyan Pyott, St. Andrew

Natasha Folino, St. Paul
Mark Simeoni, Greater City of Sudbury
Clara Steele, Regional Parent Involvement Committee

2/12/2010

General Public in Attendance:

Nora Gauthier, Pius XII
Megan Murphy, Pius XII

Allison Dufour, St. Albert ALC
Denise Filipovic, St. Paul

Call to Order:

Chair Muzzatti called the meeting to order @ **6:05** p.m.

OPENING PRAYER

The Chair led the group in an opening prayer for guiding presence.

WELCOME

Mr. Muzzatti welcomed the group to ARC Working Meeting #10 and thanked everyone for attending. He also thanked Mrs. Louisa Bianchin, principal of Pius XII Elementary School, and her team for hosting the meeting and providing the food and refreshments.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOVED BY M. Smith and **Seconded by** L. Foucault

“**THAT** the agenda for today’s January 20, 2010 Working Meeting #10 be approved as presented.”

CARRIED

ARC BINDERS

The Chair reviewed the updates to the ARC binders as including the minutes from Working Meeting #8, minutes from Working Meeting #9, minutes from Public Meeting #3, and this evening’s presentation package. Mr. Muzzatti also informed the group copies of the presentation package from Public Meeting #3 were available for those interested.

APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

MOVED BY T. Keehn and **Seconded by** L. Szalai

“**THAT** the minutes for January 5, 2010 Working Meeting #8 be approved as presented.”

CARRIED

MOVED BY S. Sloan and **Seconded by** C. Perrin

“**THAT** the minutes for January 6, 2010 Working Meeting #9 be amended to reflect Stacey Kennedy, Community representative for St. Mark Elementary, and Allison Dufour as General Public in Attendance, as being present, and approved.”

CARRIED

The following question was posed by a committee member and responded by the Chair:

Q: At Public Meeting #3, Mr. Bazinet said that if option #3 or #4 were implemented, there may be a boundary change for the French Immersion students. We defeated all mention of this requirement at our previous Working Meetings, so I’m not sure how this returned to the discussion.

A: In all likelihood, one of the consequences of implementing any option may require examination of the current boundaries. The group will have an opportunity to decide the supporting rationale and implementation challenges of the Report to the Director.

MOVED BY A. Gagne and Seconded by A. Brisebois

“**THAT** the minutes for January 13, 2010 Public Meeting #3 be amended by deleting Laura O’Reilly as ARC Member absent, and approved.”

CARRIED

REVIEW OF INPUT FROM PUBLIC MEETING #3

Mr. Muzzatti stated that based on the feedback and comments from Public Meeting #3, the following issues (presentation package slide 6) were presented for ARC consideration:

- Supporting rationale and documentation for Grade 7 to 12 programming
- Student retention rates - elementary to secondary (Marymount, Wiarton, Hanmer High)
- Impact of introducing Grade 7 and 8 students at the existing St. Charles College
- French Immersion site for Planning Area
- Secondary enrolment projection concerns
- Options for St. Albert ALC
- Deferred capital cost implications of option #1-5

MOVED BY S. Sloan and Seconded by M. Smith

“**THAT** Board staff be requested to provide supporting rationale and documentation for Grade 7 to 12 programming at the next ARC Working Meeting.”

CARRIED

The following question was posed by a committee member and responded to by the Chair:

Q: When we receive this Grade 7 to 12 programming rationale, what is it that we are to do with it?

A: This information will be for the ARC to decide on its recommendations within the Report to the Director.
All information brought to the ARC is posted the website.

Through further group discussion, Mr. Muzzatti confirmed that the supporting rationale and documentation for Grade 7 to 12 programming will consist of information obtained by Board staff, through phone contact with other school boards that have implemented this programming. It was suggested by committee members that this information include the ratio of grade 7 and 8’s versus the entire school population, a discussion with a balanced representation of ‘northern’ school boards, identification of the placement of the grade 7 and 8’s within the school, identifying if any additional program funding was received and quantifying the enrolment impact of implementing this programming.

Mr. Muzzatti shared the some enrolment information with the group regarding retention rates for both Marymount Academy as our example of grade 7 to 12 programming, and the entire Board. Chair Muzzatti stated that as of June 2009, the Board had a grade 8 enrolment of five hundred and sixty-five (565) students, with four hundred and twenty-nine (429) of these students returning in September 2010 for grade 9, resulting in an overall retention rate of seventy-six percent (76%). Mr. Muzzatti further stated that with a total Board-wide grade 9 enrolment of five hundred and fifty-six (556), we acquired twenty-three percent (23%) of this population from the coterminus boards. Chair Muzzatti then shared some Marymount Academy information stating that with sixty-eight (68) of eighty-five (85) grade 8 students from June 2009 returning in September for grade 9, the retention rate is eighty percent (80%), although not all of seventeen (17) or twenty percent (20%) left our Board entirely, merely transferred to one of our other secondary schools.

The following questions were posed by committee members and responded to by the Chair:

Q: Are the enrolment numbers and retention rates presented consistent with historical trends for the Board?

A: Yes.

Q: The enrolment table for Option #1 does not seem to include students moving from St. David Elementary to St. Charles College. Will this be corrected?

A: This enrolment of approximately thirty (30) students will be confirmed as part of the St. Charles College enrolment projections and addressed if required.

Q: When preparing these enrolment projections for the South/Central Planning Area, did the demographers project a decline in enrolment for St. Benedict?

A: Enrolment decline throughout the Board was projected.

Q: My concern is that based on the projections for St. Charles College, if we do not recommend changes to address this, future students and parents may be faced with the closure of this secondary school.

A: It is up to this group to decide how to address that concern. In other planning areas, decisions were made to address school utilization through to the year 2022 and beyond.

Q: In regards to the options for St. Albert Adult Learning Centre, when did 'to be determined' become the option? What did this mean?

A: At our previous working group meetings, the committee discussed St. Albert's uniqueness in its students and services, and suggested that it be examined as a separate entity after the accommodation review for this planning area.

Mr. Muzzatti called upon Mr. Denis Faucher, Manager of Facility Services to discuss the deferred capital cost implications of option #1 to #5, as included in the presentation package, with the group.

The following questions were posed by committee members and responded to by Mr. Faucher and the Chair:

Q: When considering the school renewal needs both current and in five years, are these based on Ministry allocation of funds?

A: No, the renewal needs are based upon the replacement requirements for each school, meaning the windows, doors, roofs, boilers, etc. that need to be replaced due to condition and age.

Q: What was the amount of capital dollars requested to address the South/Central Planning Area last year?

A: A business case was presented to the Ministry in application for a five hundred and fifty (550) pupil place school inclusive of the consolidation of four (4) elementary schools in the amount of nineteen million dollars (\$19,000,000), of which the Ministry announced funding of thirteen million dollars (\$13,000,000).

Q: Within the financial summary of these options, I don't see a cost for the demolition and site preparation of the St. Bernadette site prior to construction. Where is this cost?

A: We will re-examine our costing and revise if required.

Q: Are we correct to expect that the Ministry will not provide all the funding requested within a business case for this planning area?

A: It's difficult to answer this question. We believe that we can prepare a good business case for these options.

Q: Within the financial summary of these options, the same renovation costs are expected for St. Charles College in all recommendations. Why?

A: We will re-examine our costing and revise if required

Finalize Accommodation Options

The group further discussed the merits of options #1 to #5, including the opportunity to invest in expanded grade 7 and 8 programming, the possible impacts of St. Bernadette and St. Andrew closing, and the possibilities included in the construction of a new elementary school in New Sudbury.

The following questions were posed by committee members and responded to by the Chair:

Q: How much does the Board have left in the reserve fund to possibly utilize in the East Planning Area? How does this funding get renewed or replenished?

A: The mandate for this group is to provide recommendations to the Director of Education and the Board of Trustees that address accommodation in the best primary interest of the students.

Q: Within the financial summary of these recommendations, could the four million dollars (\$4,000,000) identified for Pius XII create a new school in Minnow Lake?

A: That estimate would not build a new school, but rather fund renovations to the existing school, maintaining the school instead of demolition and rebuild.

MOVED BY L. Foucault and **Seconded by** P. Mardero

“**THAT** this ARC Working Meeting postpone adjournment until 8:30pm.” **CARRIED**

MOVED BY D. Kotanko and **Seconded by** M. McKeever

“**THAT** the ARC delete Option #3 as a recommendation to be presented at Public Meeting #4.” **CARRIED**

MOVED BY P. Mardero and **Seconded by** C. Morrison

“**THAT** the ARC delete Option #1 as a recommendation to be presented at Public Meeting #4.” **CARRIED**

MOVED BY N. Snow and **Seconded by** D. Kotanko

“**THAT** the ARC amend Option #5 to stated Pius XII grade 7 and 8’s to remain at Pius XII, and accept as ARC Recommendation #1 to be presented at Public Meeting #4.” **CARRIED**

Amendment

“**THAT** the location of the new elementary school be stated as ‘to be determined’ ” **DEFEATED**

The following question was posed by a committee member and responded to by Mr. Faucher:

Q: Do we have enough available space at St. Raphael’s to demolish the prohibitive to repair section, and rebuild the proposed new elementary?

A: It would be difficult to accomplish this with a single level school, given the current land available. This may be possible with a multi-floor addition, with added costs for accessibility (i.e. elevator).

MOVED BY L. Foucault and **Seconded by** L. Bianchin

“**THAT** this ARC Working Meeting postpone adjournment until 9:00pm.” **CARRIED**

MOVED BY V. McGuire and **Seconded by** S. Sloan

“**THAT** Option #2 be accepted as ARC Recommendation #2 and presented at Public Meeting #4.” **DEFEATED**

MOVED BY C. Perrin and **Seconded by** N. Snow

“**THAT** Option #4 be accepted as ARC Recommendation #2 and presented at Public Meeting #4.” **CARRIED**

MOVED BY A. Savage and **Seconded by** L. Bianchin

“**THAT** the ARC reconsider Option #2 as ARC Recommendation #3 and be presented at Public Meeting #4.”

CARRIED

It was recognized by Chair Muzzatti, prior to the calling of the committee vote, that to carry the motion to reconsider Option #2 required members who previously voted against the inclusion of Option #2, to now vote in favour.

MOVED BY N. Gauthier and **Seconded by** P. Farmer

“**THAT** the ARC Recommendation #1 and #2 be identified as preferred, with Recommendation #3 to be considered only in the event that Ministry funding is not available for the construction of a new school.”

CARRIED

MOVED BY L. Foucault and **Seconded by** P. Mardero

“**THAT** this ARC Working Meeting postpone adjournment an additional fifteen (15) minutes to complete tonight’s agenda items.”

CARRIED

DRAFT ACCOMMODATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Muzzatti outlined the proposed structure of the ARC Report to the Director, based upon previous year’s submission. There were no objections from the committee for revision to the report structure as presented.

TIMELINES AND MEETING SCHEDULE

Mr. Muzzatti reviewed the timeline and meeting schedule with the group.

TASK FOR NEXT WORKING MEETING

Mr. Muzzatti reminded the group that at the next Working Meeting, the group would review and approve the agenda for Public Meeting #4 and the member’s supporting rationale and implementation challenges to be submitted by 9am, January 29, 2010 for inclusion in the Draft ARC Report to the Director.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Mr. Muzzatti reviewed two (2) email submissions received by the ARC email account, and included in tonight’s presentation package for ARC consideration.

Chair Muzzatti also identified that the response to an ARC member’s email request to provide detail regarding the sections of St. Raphael and Pius XII Elementary Schools that are prohibitive to repair, has been included in this presentation package.

NEXT MEETING DATES

Chair Muzzatti closed the meeting by thanking the committee for their hard work and reminded the group that the next meeting would be Working Meeting #11, to be held on **Wednesday, February 3, 2010 from 6:00 to 8:00p.m. at St. Albert Adult Learning Centre, 504 Raphael Street, Sudbury.**

CLOSING PRAYER

Chair Muzzatti led the group in the closing prayer.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Roland Muzzatti, Chair
Sudbury Catholic District School Board