

Report to the Minister on Durham  
District School Board Scugog  
Township Secondary School  
Accommodation Review

July 16, 2013

The Honourable Liz Sandals

Minister of Education  
900 Bay Street  
22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Toronto, M7A 1L2

**Re: Independent Facilitator's Report on the Durham District School Board  
Scugog Township Secondary School Accommodation Review**

Dear Minister,

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with my findings as the Independent Facilitator of the administrative review of the accommodation review process undertaken by the Durham District School Board (DDSB) regarding the secondary schools in Scugog Township. The secondary schools included in the accommodation review were the following:

Cartwright High School (CHS)  
Port Perry High School (PPHS)

The request for an administrative review was filed by Theresa Eccleston. The request was accompanied by signatures representing 33% of eligible families. Board staff has also validated the list of petitioners regarding their eligibility in terms of each person's school affiliation, parent or student status, and record of participation in the accommodation review process. I was appointed by your Ministry on May 24, 2013 to conduct this administrative review.

I was present in Whitby and Scugog Township from May 27<sup>th</sup> to May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2013. During that time, I spoke with the members of the Accommodation Review Committee (ARC), the petitioners, the Board of Trustees, the Director of Education, senior school board officials, the principals of the two schools involved and some staff members and students of the affected schools. A public meeting was held on Wednesday May 29, 2013. It was attended by approximately 70 members of the public. At this meeting, I heard presentations from several individuals, followed by comments from members of the audience. During the course of my review, I also received and reviewed written submissions from several members of the ARC and other community members and staff members from the two schools affected by the Scugog Township Accommodation Review. In addition to the written submissions that I received during my week in the DDSB, I invited interested parties to forward further commentary via email following my time in DDSB with the understanding that I would be writing the report to the Minister during the month of June. Several written submissions were received from members of the ARC who wrote to express views after attending the ARC members' meeting with

me. They wrote because they felt their perspective was underrepresented in that dialogue as, in that context, most of the discussion centred on the concerns of two members of the ARC whose views were closely aligned to that of the petitioners. Clearly, the members of the ARC held polarized views with respect to both the process and their experiences as ARC members.

I was privileged to visit each of the schools under review and discussed program offerings and school objectives at some length with both principals. I also visited Cartwright Central Public School which provides some space for programming for CHS students.

My meetings with the community and stakeholders were ably facilitated by Royal Piche and Mary Fairhead of the Barrie Regional Office of the Ministry of Education. The parents, trustees, board officials, board staff, students and community members with whom I met were very engaged. There were very passionate statements made that demonstrated the depth of the convictions of the presenters. At times, individuals had to be reminded to refrain from hostile allegations about individuals and their participation in the process. On several occasions in the meetings I held with the petitioners and in the public meeting I conducted as well as in some of the written material I received, individuals ascribed motivations to actions by the ARC or the school board officials without any substantiating commentary or documentation. For example, statements like “this information seems to have been deliberately withheld” were made.

Need-less-to say, this contributed to a charged and tense environment during some of the ARC deliberations and certainly in the four public meetings which were widely described as confrontational and highly emotional.

I think it is fair to say that a few people came to the discussion very unhappy about the mandate for the review of the process and believed that the Independent Facilitator should have the responsibility to pass judgement on the legitimacy of the Board's school closure decision rather than assess the alignment of the process to DDSB's policy. I pointed out at each meeting held during the time I spent during this review that my role was very specific and involved an analysis of process. At the public meeting, several individuals including a local counsellor, expressed extreme frustration with the review process and the limits of my role and indicated that the “Minister could undo this decision if she wanted to “ and that if I was unwilling or unable to recommend this course of action , I too was “part of what is wrong”. I explained the fact that elected school boards in Ontario are responsible for providing schools and facilities for their students and for operating and maintaining their schools as effectively and efficiently as possible to support student achievement. However, some of the presenters at the public meeting and at the meeting with the petitioners were unpersuaded by this explanation and continue to assert that the government should reverse the Feb 19, 2013 DDSB decision to close Cartwright High School.

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The following terms of reference were established by your Ministry for my work as the Independent Facilitator conducting this administrative review.

## **PRINCIPLES**

- School boards, parents, communities and the government recognize that school boards have the legal right to close schools after following a board-approved pupil accommodation review process.
- The Ministry of Education released the revised Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline (2009:B7) on June 26, 2009. The Guideline provides direction to school boards regarding pupil accommodation reviews undertaken to determine the future of a school or a group of schools.
- School boards are responsible for establishing and following their own accommodation review policies. School boards' accommodation review policies are to reflect the requirements of the Ministry's Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline.
- Under the Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline, schools are required to make school valuation the centre of board and community decision-making. School valuation requires school boards to consider the value of a school or schools, based on community consultation.

## **SCOPE OF THE REVIEW**

The independent facilitator shall be responsible for:

- Determining whether the KPRDSB followed its board-approved pupil accommodation review process in conducting the accommodation review;
- Reviewing formal documentation, interviewing relevant participants including Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) members, petitioners and board staff;
- Submitting a written report to the Minister of Education upon completion of the review.

## **REPORTING TO THE MINISTER**

The report should be in the form of a letter to the Minister, indicating whether the accommodation review process followed the board's pupil accommodation review policy.

The Minister is responsible and will make the facilitator’s findings available to the board and the public in a timely fashion

## **PROFILE OF THE DURHAM DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD (2011)**

- Jurisdiction Includes: Pickering, Ajax, Whitby, Oshawa, Scugog, Uxbridge, Brock
- Elementary Students: 46,215
- Secondary Students: 23,974
- Total Students: 70,189
- Elementary Schools: 109
- Secondary Schools and Learning Centres: 26
- Total Schools: 135
- Schools by Municipality:

<b>Area</b>	<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
Pickering	17	2
Ajax	20	3
Whitby	24	4
Oshawa	33	6
Scugog	6	2
Uxbridge	5	1
Brock	4	1
Learning Centres		7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>26</b>

- Elementary Teachers: 2,771
- Secondary Teachers: 1,613
- Elementary Administrators: 205
- Secondary Administrators: 72
- Total: 4,661

## **PROFILE OF THE SCHOOLS:**

### **Cartwright High School**

Cartwright High School (CHS) has been an integral part of the Blackstock community dating back to 1925. A core curriculum in the Academic and Applied levels is offered, but due to the small size of the school the number of senior course offerings is limited, and locally developed courses are not offered. A total of 53 courses are available across all grades. In June of 2013, there were 89 students enrolled at CHS. Until recently (two years ago) only Academic courses were offered in grades 9 and 10. While there is no Special Education program, one Student Success period in each semester is offered to assist students who are identified as having special needs. This program is flexible, but it is limited in terms of the number of students it can support. Regular (monthly) review meetings for Identified Students are supported by various members of the regional Special Education Team and there is regular use of additional resource support through Social Work and Psychological Services.

Pathways programs are not offered but Cartwright HS did offer a Dual Credit course with Durham College last year (Business Marketing – grade 11). Currently, there is no link to OYAP or other apprenticeship programs. Due to the school's location in a very small town (with few employers) there is a limited Cooperative Education program, and most of CHS students are placed as teacher assistants at Cartwright Central P.S. Some placements in Port Perry, Peterborough and locally depend on whether students can arrange their own transportation to and from their Co-op placements. Co-op is offered to all students regardless of special needs or other challenges.

In the 2011/12 school year, Cartwright High School had 84% of its grade 9 students at, or above, the Provincial Standard on the EQAO Math test.

In 2012, 86% of Math students studying at the Applied level were at, or above the EQAO provincial standard, while 74% of students studying at Academic level met, or exceeded this standard. There were 18 students taking Academic and 6 students taking Applied grade 9 Math in the 2011/12 school year.

92.6% of the grade 10 Cartwright High School students who wrote their Ontario Secondary School Literacy test met, or exceeded, the Provincial OSSLT Standard. 100% of eligible students participated.

Cartwright High School has a small but active extra-curricular program and there are a variety of student leadership opportunities including the Cartwright Leadership Team (Student Council), STAR Camp, "Free to Be" Club, Equity Club and Athletic Council. Music was not offered as a course at CHS in the 2012/13 school year, but there is an "ad-hoc" choir that performs at Remembrance Day and Commencement ceremonies.

Students from CHS are very successful as literacy coaches to students attending Cartwright Central Public School.

## **Port Perry High School**

Port Perry High School (PPHS) has a rich history in this community dating back to the late 1800's. Currently, it is regarded as a composite high school. It offers a full range of options and pathways for students. Special Education programs include Gifted, Multiple Exceptionality, Modified, Practical Learning, Associated and Developmental. As well, several students who are identified as having special needs are in the mainstream and receive indirect support through Academic Resource. The Student Success program is diverse and flexible. Every semester, the teachers involved with Student Success and the Administration meet to review the needs. Then programs are established to address those specific needs. For example, last semester, a group ran for female students ages 16-18 called "Higher Ground". Additional resource support through Social Work and Psychological Services was added to enrich the discussion and long term results of the program.

Pathways have been a major focus for the past few years. The school has four dual credit programs with the colleges: Environmental Education and Culinary Arts are partnered with Fleming; Health Care and Marketing are partnered with Durham. There are currently four Specialist High Skills Major programs: Environmental Education, Culinary Arts, Transportation and Health Care. The staff has worked hard to make the Workplace pathway a viable destination for students. Links with OYAP and other apprenticeship opportunities continue to be a focus. A changing teacher mindset to encourage all destinations - apprenticeship, work, college and university - has been ongoing so that no pathway is perceived as better than another. Diverse options through Cooperative Education further extend opportunities to students to explore different destinations. Co-op is offered to all students regardless of special needs or other challenges.

Extra-curricular thrives at PPHS. Student Leadership opportunities are broad: Student Council, GSA, Me to We, Ambassadors, Leadership Camp Committee, Geeks Unlimited (tech support) and Best Buddies. Opportunities to be part of the Music performance group are numerous with over 11 different bands, choirs and ensembles. Sports are inclusive of both genders and involve a range of students.

### **EQAO 2012 results:**

OSSLT - 98% of students who were eligible participated including those students identified with special needs 78% were at, or above, the EQAO provincial standard, Numeracy - Grade 9 Academic Math - 92% were at, or above the EQAO provincial standard; Grade 9 Applied Math- 70% were at, or above, the EQAO provincial standard

### **Pathways at all levels:**

- Math Grade 9 + 10 offers Essential, Applied, Academic, Gifted/Talent; Grade 10.
- English Grade 11 + 12 offers Workplace, Mixed level, College, University and Gifted/ Talent.
- Technology courses offered at Open level for grades 9 + 10; College and Workplace level grades 11 + 12
- Business courses offered at Open level grades 9+10; College and Workplace level grades 11 + 12
- Science courses offered at Essential, Applied, Academic + Gifted/Talent grades 9 + 10; College, University grades 11 + 12
- Canadian and World Studies - same as Science
- Social Science - grades 11 + 12 Mixed, College, University
- Physical Education - open level grades 9-12. University level grade 12
- Arts - Drama 9-12; Vocal Music 9-12; Instrumental 9-12; Guitar 9-12; Visual
- Arts 9-12; Photography 11+ 12
- Languages - Core French - grade 9 Applied + Academic; Grade 10 Academic; Grade 11-12 University; Spanish - open level

### **MEMBERSHIP, SCHEDULE AND ACTIVITIES OF THE ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE (ARC)**

The Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) Scugog Township Secondary (STS) was comprised of a number of school and community members representing two school communities – Cartwright HS (CHS) and Port Perry HS (PPHS).

*The invited membership was as outlined below:*

- *The principal from each of the two schools.*
- *One teacher delegate from each of the two schools.*
- *One non-teacher delegate (i.e., custodian, secretary, educational assistant) from each of the two schools.*



- *Up to two parent representatives (i.e., School Community Council Members) as selected by the principal for each of the two schools.*
- *Up to two additional members of the community.*
- *Durham District School Board Trustees for the affected administrative area of the Board (non-voting).*
- *Durham District School Board Officials (non-voting).*

*The Committee began with a full complement of 16 members. The membership of 16 resulted in 12 voting members.*

The accommodation review process consisted of ARC Working Meetings where the ARC prepared materials for presentation at the four Public Meetings. At the Public Meetings, the ARC sought public/stakeholders input into the process. The process that the Committee undertook was lengthy and explored a variety of topics and options which involved dealing with a wide range of information. All information supplied to the ARC was posted on the DDSB's website, under the Accommodation Review Committees link. The ARC was entrusted with reviewing and making recommendations as well as gathering input from the community for the schools under review. The names and positions of 16 ARC members are outlined in Appendix B.

The ARC met for a total of 13 Working Meetings between February 7, 2012 and October 30, 2012. The ARC recommended 3 scenarios: the original Board Proposed Scenario and two scenarios (Scenario #14 and Scenario #15) developed by the ARC. The Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) Report –Scugog Township Secondary (STS), November 19, 2012 and the Durham District School Board Staff Recommendation Report, November 19, 2012 were presented to the Board of Trustees on November 19, 2012 for review and consideration.

During this ARC process there were 13 ARC Working Meetings, including 1 tour of schools (ARC schools -- Cartwright HS and Port Perry HS), 4 Public Meetings, public/stakeholders input through attendance at the 4 Public Meetings, comment sheets, emails, voicemail messages and conversations with ARC Members and numerous hours reviewing possible solutions to best meet the needs of students in the Scugog Township Secondary area. In total, 22 scenarios were considered. Based upon the reference criteria and mandate contained in the ARC's Terms of Reference, a component of the DDSB's School Consolidation and Closure Procedure #7113, the ARC assessed the various scenarios and finalized its recommendation for consideration by the Durham District School Board Trustees for a long-term accommodation solution addressing the needs of the secondary students in Scugog Township.

## **ARC-STS MEETINGS**

The ARC held 13 Working Meetings between February 7, 2012 and October 30, 2012 and 4 Public Meetings during Phase One of the ARC process. It should be noted that the original ARC meeting schedule had 12 Working Meetings. It was at the request of the Committee to add an additional Working Meeting on September 25, 2012 in preparation for the 4th Public Meeting. The dates of the Working Meetings are outlined in Appendix C.

### **1st Public Meeting (April 10, 2012)**

In preparation for the 1st Public Meeting, the ARC had four Working Meetings:

The 1st Public Meeting was held at Port Perry HS. The stated purpose of this meeting was:

- Overview of the ARC mandate and process.
- Provide Draft School Information Profiles (SIPs) for community input.
- Seek input from the community regarding the SIPs.

### **2nd Public Meeting (May 15, 2012)**

In preparation for this 2nd Public Meeting, the ARC had two Working Meetings.

The 2nd Public Meeting was held at Cartwright Central PS. The stated purpose of this meeting was:

- To seek public/stakeholders input on the ARC's proposed alternative accommodation scenarios for the two ARC STS schools under review.
- To receive input from public/stakeholders on the alternative accommodation scenarios.

### **3rd Public Meeting (June 19, 2012)**

In preparation for this 3rd Public Meeting, the ARC had two Working Meetings

The 3rd Public Meeting was held at Port Perry HS. The stated purpose of this meeting was:

- A presentation of the ARC's proposed alternative accommodation scenarios that reflected the best interest of the students at the two schools under review.

- The receipt of input from the public/stakeholders on the ARC proposed accommodation scenarios.

#### **4th and Final Public Meeting (October 9, 2012)**

In preparation for the 4th Public Meeting, the ARC had three Working Meetings.

The 4th Public Meeting in the ARC process was held at Cartwright Central PS.

The stated purpose for this Public Meeting was:

- To present the ARC's Draft Report including Scenario #14 & #15 as the proposed recommendations to the public/stakeholders for their input.

#### **STAKEHOLDERS' OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE INPUT TO THE ACCOMMODATION REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The ARC afforded the public/stakeholders with multiple opportunities for input as well as questions. The options were as follows:

- a) The public/stakeholders were invited to attend the four Public Meetings to receive information and provide feedback. Ads were placed in local newspapers announcing these meetings.
- b) Copies of all four Public Meeting minutes including a list of present public/stakeholders were posted on the website
  - 1st Public Meeting – 116 Participants
  - 2nd Public Meeting – 158 Participants
  - 3rd Public Meeting – 81 Participants
  - 4th Public Meeting – 77 Participants
- c) All public/stakeholders were permitted to attend the 13 ARC Working Meetings as observers and some individuals did so. At breaks during these meetings, as well as through the ARC, email and voicemail, the public/stakeholders had the opportunity to provide input and receive information.
- d) The minutes of the Working Meetings were posted on the DDSB website
- e) The public/stakeholders feedback (emails, voicemails and comment sheets) was received and reviewed at some working meetings. The ARC provided input and approval for all correspondence sent in response.

ARC updates were provided at the ongoing School Community Council (SCC) meetings of the two high schools under review.

## **DATA AND INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE ARC BY BOARD STAFF:**

At the first ARC Working Meeting, ARC Members were provided with a binder of information.

The information provided to the ARC for consideration, and updated accordingly throughout the process included the following:

- The timelines for the thirteen ARC Working Meetings and the four Public Meetings.
- DDSB Profile.
- Ministry of Education, Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline, June 2009.
- DDSB Policy and Procedure #7113 - Pupil Accommodation Review.
- Staffing Guidelines.
- DDSB Policy and Regulation #3313 – School Boundaries.
- DDSB Procedure #3379 – Indoor Environmental Quality.
- DDSB Policy and Regulation #3545 – Transportation.
- DDSB Procedure #5080 – Permission to Enrol a Resident Internal Student.
- Ontario Regulation 444/98 -- Disposition of Surplus Real Property.
- DDSB January 23, 2012 Board Report - “Proposed Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) Establishment – Scugog Township Secondary (STS)”.
- Information for each of the two ARC STS schools by the ARC Scugog Township Secondary review process as identified below:
  - School Information Profiles (SIPs) which included an overview of the schools, but not limited to: Building/Property Information, Program Information, Facility Utilization Percentages, Facility Condition Index, Operational Costs and Revenues, Community Use, Transportation, Parking and Accessibility.
  - Assessment Data and EQAO Reports.

- Program Challenges and Extra-curricular activities.
- Boundary Maps and Site Plans.
- Major Projects.
- Operating Costs.
- Originating Home School Data and School Class Summary Data.
- Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food & Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) Literature

Further, during the ARC process, the following Supplemental Information memos were prepared by Board Staff to provide the ARC with additional information in response to requests or for clarification:

1. May 29, 2012- Cartwright HS- FCI Information
2. June 6, 2012- Community Comments
3. September 11, 2012- Five questions presented at June 18, 2012 Board Meeting
4. September 11, 2012- Community handout at 3rd Public Meeting (June 19, 2012)
5. September 11, 2012 -Community member question from 3rd Public meeting
6. October 10, 2012 -Stantec Audit
7. September 25, 2012- Community member question from September 17, 2012 Board Meeting
8. October 18, 2012 -E-Learning; Good Places to Learn (GPL); and ARC Operational costing per student
9. October 18, 2012- Community member email (September 24, 2012)
10. October 18, 2012- Community member email (September 28, 2012)re: Auditor General
11. October 18, 2012 -Community member comment at Board Standing Committee Meeting October 1, 2012
12. October 18, 2012 -Handout at 4th Public Meeting
13. October 30, 2012- Community member email to Minister L. Broten (October 23, 2012)

# **FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ARC AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF ADMINISTRATION LEADING TO THE BOARD'S DECISIONS ON FEB.19, 2013**

## **ARC Recommended Scenarios:**

From the 22 scenarios which the ARC contemplated, the committee recommended three scenarios for consideration by DDSB Trustees:

### **Scenario #1:**

Close Cartwright High School, June 2013. Consolidate Cartwright High School into Port Perry HS, September 2013.

### **Scenario #14:**

Create a K-12 school at Cartwright Central PS, Port Perry HS operates current programming; provide transportation for students from Cartwright HS to Port Perry HS and provide transportation for students from Port Perry HS to Cartwright HS.

### **Scenario #15:**

Continue to operate Cartwright HS status quo; continue to operate Port Perry HS status quo; provide dual zone transportation from Port Perry HS to Cartwright HS, therefore, making it easier for Port Perry HS students to attend Cartwright HS, and from Cartwright HS to Port Perry HS.

## **SENIOR STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

In a report to the DDSB, dated November 19, 2012, Board Senior Administration recommended that:

1. The Durham District School Board of Trustees receives the reports entitled:
  - a) Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) Report Scugog Township Secondary (STS).
  - b) Staff Recommendation Report for information.
2. The Durham District School Board of Trustees defers the decision of the following motions until the Board Meeting on February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2013. The deferred motions are:
  - a) That the Durham District School Board Trustees authorize staff to close Cartwright HS effective June 2013.

- b) That the Durham District School Board Trustees authorize staff to consolidate the Port Perry HS and Cartwright HS attendance area, effective September 2013

In support of their recommendations, the senior staff report outlined the reasons they believe this to be the best scenario to consider. In summary, this scenario:

- effectively addresses program issues
- provides a variety of options for students(including French Immersion and Gifted)
- does not require additional teachers to be allocated (from other DDSB Secondary Schools) to Cartwright HS due to timetabling issues
- eliminates dual-zone transportation thereby supporting equity in the application of the Board's Transportation Regulation #3545 across the Board (57% to 65% of the Cartwright HS catchment area already choose to attend Port Perry HS)
- addresses the extensive potential repairs, renewal and upgrade costs to Cartwright HS
- does not require additional capital investment
- facility is accessible to students with special needs.

## **ANALYSIS OF ISSUES**

Several of the issues raised in the meetings I had during this administrative review and in the written submissions I have reviewed fell outside the scope of the mandate for this review of the process. While these issues were raised with passion and commitment, they relate to the Board's decision itself or to some perceived deficiencies that, once analyzed, are not borne out as legitimate deviations from Board and Provincial policy.

I made this point repeatedly during all the discussions with various groups but it was a challenge for some people to remain focused on the process when they were so adamantly opposed to the decision itself. As mentioned earlier, several of the petitioners expressed frustration that my role did not allow me to contemplate recommending reconsideration of the Board's decision through an intervention by the provincial government.

There are a few specific areas of concern expressed by some ARC members, the petitioners and presenters at the public meeting which I held that are not directly addressed in the provisions of the Procedure #7113 and therefore, cannot constitute violations of DDSB policy. That said, there may well be ways in which the policy and

process could be changed to enhance community satisfaction and the capacity for engagement. Suggestions will be included in this report to address three of these issues with respect to voting procedures during the ARC's deliberations, rules of engagement for the public meetings and the involvement of feeder schools in secondary school accommodation review processes.

The petitioners, in their written justification for a review of the process by an independent facilitator, outlined 42 alleged violations of the DDSB Procedure #7113. Many of the 42 points raised are repetitive as there is significant overlap among them. Some of the 42 points, while of concern and interest to the petitioners, are not relevant to the mandate of this review and speak more to the petitioners' disagreement with any consideration of closing a small school which they believe serves students well.

Those alleged violations which, after careful examination, appear to be pertinent to the mandate of this review, will be clustered under five issue categories for purposes of analysis and comment. I will deal with these clusters of alleged issues by first summarizing the perspectives of the petitioners and like-minded community members. I will then outline the Board's responses to the identified issues. Finally, I will provide my analysis of each cluster of issues and make a determination about each in terms of whether or not it constituted a deviation from the process.

The DDSB's Consolidation and Closure Procedure # 7113 is attached for reference in Appendix A.

## **ISSUE #1: Board Decisions Prior to Establishment of the ARC and Justification for the Accommodation Review**

### **A) Fair and objective consideration of options in the ARC process**

#### **Petitioners' and Some Community Members' Perspective:**

The petitioners assert that the DDSB prejudiced the deliberations of the ARC by providing one of the two schools, Port Perry HS, with an unfair advantage through the awarding of a contract for the addition of new science labs during the ARC process. The petitioners claim that "this unfairly made the January 23, 2012 staff recommended option appear to be much more economical than it was" and consequently, would contribute to the argument "to keep the newly renovated school open and close another school."

#### **Board's Response:**

The Board argues that the request for funding approval for an addition at Port Perry predated the Board's decision to establish an accommodation review for the area. The



approval by the Ministry of Education for a renovation to create 4 science rooms and 2 classrooms at PPHS was sought by the Board in January, 2011, a full year ahead of the establishment of the ARC. The January 23, 2012 staff report recommending the ARC STS documented that this project was part of a long term DDSB initiative to upgrade science rooms across the Board to current standards for which resources have been allocated under the Ministry of Education capital wrap-up initiative in which funds are to be used for new construction only. The Board maintains that the decision to proceed with the addition at PPHS did not impact on the decision to establish an accommodation review for the secondary schools in the Township of Scugog.

Rather, the PPHS addition's primary focus is to provide updated specialized program space (science labs) for students. Port Perry High School was identified for science lab upgrades with a scheduled completion for September 2013. It was more cost effective, based on a feasibility study, to construct a 6-classroom addition resulting in the science labs being grouped together rather than converting existing classrooms to science labs scattered throughout the facility. In the ARC-approved Minutes of Working Meeting #8, the ARC Secretary noted that the funding for the Port Perry High School addition is part of a Ministry of Education capital wrap-up initiative in which funds are to be used for new construction only.

It was indicated to the ARC in Phase 1 of the ARC consultation and in the October 18, 2012 supplemental information provided to the ARC that approximately \$0.9 M to \$1M in Renewal Funding would be allocated to meet future building repair needs at CHS if this option were recommended by the ARC and if the Board of Trustees decided that the school should remain open. This identification of funding to support an ARC option is a requirement of Policy #7113.

### **Facilitator's Perspective:**

There is ample evidence to indicate that the decision to request approval to proceed with an addition of 4 science labs and 2 classrooms to PPHS was made well in advance of the commencement of this ARC in order to provide updated specialized program space and would have unfolded as part of the DDSB overall planning whether or not the secondary school ARC for Scugog Township was convened. It is also clear that renewal funds would have been made available to CHS should the decision have been made for this school to remain open. I agree with the Board's view that the decision to proceed with the addition at PPHS did not impact on the decision to establish an accommodation review for the secondary schools in the Township of Scugog and that this ARC would have been established whether or not this addition had taken place in order to address the needs of the students of the township.

## **B) Justification for the ARC**

### **Petitioners' and Some Community Members' Perspective:**

The Petitioners argue that “enrolment projections in justification for the ARC documentation did not show an enrolment decline. Staff has suggested that because Cartwright High School is small that its current enrolment met the criteria. This would mean that small schools would constantly be subject to ARCs, which is not the intent of the policy. This is further clarified in the School Information Profiles that refer to enrolment "trends" not current enrolment.” The petitioners’ assert that the enrolment numbers used in the establishment of the ARC showed CHS at above capacity enrolment rather than in decline. They argue that that disqualifies the CHS from inclusion under DDSB Procedure #7113, section 2.1.1 as the enrolment numbers do not show a decline. They further argue that “enrolment projections, in justification for the ARC, documentation does not show an underutilization of the buildings through 2020.”

They also argue that the database was not being properly maintained as the repairs to the boilers were not included nor were the repairs to the stairs. Because of these omissions, the petitioners assert that the Trustees were not fully aware of the total dollar value of repairs and therefore, would not have been able to determine if the repairs required were greater than or approached the replacement cost of the building. It is their position that, since the database was not being completely maintained, it should not have been used to justify an ARC.

### **Board's Response:**

Regarding the petitioners’ concerns about enrolment information, the Board asserts that the ARC and the Board of Trustees received the full and accurate information on enrolment throughout the ARC process including both projections and actuals as they became available. While the projected enrolment data cited in the January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012 report recommending the establishment of the STS ARC did not show a decline in enrolment, there is no doubt that there were severe programming challenges at CHS at the time of the initiation of the ARC and these challenges stemmed from a small staff complement and a small student population with increasing differentiated needs. The Board maintains that its ability to offer a full secondary school program at CHS is a challenge due to the fact that in recent years there has been a demand for applied level courses for CHS students when previously, the school program was primarily offered at the academic level. Currently, the grade 9 cohort at CHS has only two electives as a result of time-tabling issues resulting from smaller class sizes. These circumstances would comply with Section 2.1.1 of the DDSB Procedure #7113.

In compliance with Section 2.1.3 of the DDSB Procedure #7113, building condition was a factor in Cartwright High School being included in the ARC. The January 23, 2012

DDSB Board Report requesting Trustees' approval for the establishment of the ARC STS indicated that CHS had current repair needs of \$1.6M compared to the Ministry-calculated replacement value of the school of \$1.9M. This information was in the ARC binder. Throughout the ARC process, the community maintained that the information on building condition provided by the Board *was inaccurate* and that repair costs were inflated. The information provided in the January 23, 2012 Board Report was extracted from the Board's ReCapp/TCPS database.

To satisfy the community's concerns, during the summer months, while the ARC was on hiatus as per the Ministry's Guideline and the Board's Policy and Procedure #7113 requirement, the DDSB staff commissioned a condition assessment inspection of CHS through Stantec Consulting Ltd. The Stantec findings, once finalized, dated October 10, 2012 were provided to the ARC as Supplemental Information at Meeting #12 on October 18, 2012. Stantec's overall assessment finds that the Board's repair needs information provided to the ARC at the beginning of the ARC process is understated. The Stantec Audit found that repair costs were \$2.05M, approximately \$0.47M higher than what was stated in the Board's January 23, 2012 report. This amount does not recognize accessibility needs also disclosed to the ARC in Supplemental Information in the amount of \$425,000 to \$500,000 for an elevator and accessible washrooms.

The Stantec Audit outlined the replacement of the two boilers at Cartwright HS occurring in 2007 and 2011. The ReCapp data originally provided to the ARC Committee had *incorrectly included* the requirement for the boiler replacements. During Phase 2 of the process community members, on January 7, 2013 and January 15, 2013 questioned the validity of the need for the boilers' replacement. Board Staff indicated that both boiler repairs were of an emergency nature and as a result were completed and paid for from a repair account rather than a capital account. Therefore, the replacement was not captured as a completed item and indicated as such in the ReCapp data. Adjustments were included in the Stantec Report to recognize the replacement by the Board of the boilers in 2010. Despite this, the DDSB repair costs for CHS remain understated compared to those contained in the 80-page Stantec Report.

In 2003, the Provincial inspection of Cartwright HS (CHS) indicated the need to repair the existing fire escape stairs. This work was completed in 2004 and 2005. During the repairs it was noted that the stair's life expectancy was coming to an end, so the replacement cost was entered into the data base at a value of \$75,000. The ReCapp program adds provincially determined inflation factors to the original costs resulting in the Replacement Cost for the fire escape stairs at \$81,240. The Stantec Audit in 2012 revealed the need for a further \$15,000 in repairs, which were completed immediately. The fire escape stairs continue to be in need of replacement consideration. As a result of Ontario Building Code changes in 2006, any replacement of this type of structure must include a new, enclosed stairwell. Costs are estimated at \$200,000 to \$250,000. There was no error in the information provided re the costs of repairs to the stairs.

## Facilitator's Perspective:

There are three criteria set out in DDSB Procedure #7113, sections 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3, to trigger an ARC. In its opening section, the policy states that "One or a combination of these factors may trigger the need to develop alternative solutions to student accommodation including the closure of a school or schools and/or the consolidation of two or more schools."

Criteria to start an ARC are as follows:

- Schools where current and/or projected enrolment declines would compromise program offering and extra-curricular or co-curricular offerings;( 2.1.1)
- Schools with enrolment declines leading to sustained underutilization of the buildings; (2.1.2)
- Schools where required repair, renewal or upgrading costs are greater than or approaching the replacement cost of the building. (2.1.3)

It is clearly stated in Sections 1 and 2 of DDSB Procedure #7113 that **any or all** of the three criteria may result in a recommendation for the establishment of an ARC to assess options for improved learning experiences for students. Section 2.1.1 of the DDSB Procedure #7113 seems to clearly apply here as there is no doubt that the DDSB was unable to provide a fully optioned secondary school program at CHS due to staffing and facility limitations. This challenge has been compounded by the recent increase in need and demand for applied level courses for CHS students when previously, the school program was solely offered at the academic level. Currently, the grade 9 cohort at CHS has only two electives as a result of time-tabling issues resulting from smaller class sizes.

The Principal of CHS made it very clear at my meeting with the ARC and in his participation in the ARC's discussions, that, while the school has rich history, there is a serious and escalating problem at Cartwright HS with timetabling and that it is extremely difficult to meet the needs of the students. He expressed great concern about the "dwindling numbers in grades" and commented that it would be very difficult to program successfully for students given the number of compromises that have to be made. For September 2012, the pre-ARC anticipated grade 9 enrolment was 16 students for Cartwright HS; however, it was reduced to 15 actual grade 9 students who attended. From a programming perspective, the Principal credited the flexibility of staff as the main factor that he relies on in a context where only two electives can be offered at the academic level and students who want something other than Art and Business such as Music cannot be accommodated. This would become more problematic in grade 11 and 12 when the number of elective classes should increase. An increased student base is

necessary to increase available courses within the parameters of the negotiated collective agreement.

Facility conditions as addressed in DDSB Procedure #7113, Section 2.1.3 also seem to be pertinent in this situation, notwithstanding the petitioners' concerns about the maintenance of the database. Even with the acknowledgement that the repairs to the boilers were overlooked and not properly noted in the initial information provided to the ARC (although corrected after the STANTEC report), these costs are not major in light of the clearly established needs for repairs at CHS which were documented at about \$ 1.6M in the January 23, 2012 report to the DDSB requesting the establishment of an ARC STS. This figure was found to be somewhat understated in light of the Stantec Audit which was conducted in the summer of 2012 and estimated the repair costs at about \$2.05M approximately a half million higher than the Board's estimate without taking accessibility issues into account. It is also interesting to note that Stantec Consulting Ltd. was engaged by the DDSB in order to provide substantiation and third party reassurance to the community about the estimates of repair and renewal costs for CHS because the community had expressed concern about the costs being inflated.

There was considerable anger expressed by the petitioners about "erroneous and inconsistent data" and I will deal with this under Issue #2. That said, for the purposes of addressing the concern about proper justification for the establishment of this ARC, there is ample indication of both program and facility conditions challenges/problems to allow for the establishment of the ARC under DDSB Procedure # 7113, sections 2:1:1 and 2:1:3 without considering the enrolment numbers which were documented as only 15 students for grade nine when the actuals in September, 2012 were available. Therefore, there is no violation of the policy with respect to the criteria outlined in Procedure #7113 regarding the establishment of an ARC

## **ISSUE #2: SCHOOL INFORMATION PROFILES AND ACCURACY OF DATA PROVIDED TO THE ARC**

### **Petitioners' and Some Community Members' Perspective:**

As mentioned earlier, there is a great deal of overlap in the petitioners list of 42 alleged violations of the DDSB Procedure #7113. 10 of the 42 issues raised deal with the preparation, accuracy and completeness of the School Information Profiles.

The petitioners express concerns in the following five areas:

### **A) Inaccuracies in the calculations for operating costs based on teachers' salaries**

The DDSB Terms of Reference indicate the information to be included in a School Information Profile should include current per pupil costs to operate the school. This was not accurate since the boiler replacement cost, a capital expenditure, was included in operating costs. The petitioners go so far as to state that "no values in the financial section of the SIP were accurate for CHS."

### **B) Incorrect information on the number of students transported**

The petitioners state that the total provided for the number of CHS students who were transported is approximately 10% more students than attend Cartwright High School. Therefore, this value is inaccurate. They also claim that the 5 Year Projected Transportation Cost is also inaccurate because the projected enrolment figures were inaccurate.

### **C) Inaccurate replacement value of the school and repair costs for the school based on inaccurate estimates and documentation of repair history**

The petitioners argue that the database was not being properly maintained as the completed repairs to the boilers were not included nor were the repairs to the stairs. Because of these omissions, the petitioners assert that the Trustees were not fully aware of the total dollar value of repairs and therefore, would not have been able to determine if the repairs required were greater than or approached the replacement cost of the building

### **D) Requests for the operating costs of the previous five years were denied**

The petitioners state that an ARC member requested the operating costs for the previous 5 years in order to validate the operating costs that had been presented. The DDSB refused to provide that information. It was later determined that capital improvements [the boiler replacements] had been made using operating funds. It is the petitioners' view that if the DDSB had provided the information as requested it could be reasonably assumed that the overstated operating costs would have been realized by the ARC.

### **E) Failure to put value to student as a priority over other considerations and insufficient reference to the excellent student outcomes at Cartwright High School**

There was concern about how the value of the CHS to the students was considered. Any reference to the excellent student outcomes at Cartwright High School was dismissed by the false statement that 4.5 additional teachers were provided from the staffing of other schools to Cartwright High School. This statement was repeated many

times in the ARC deliberations. The petitioners contend that, with a student population of 122 students Cartwright High School was only subsidized with 1 additional teacher.

It was also included in the final ARC reports even though community members by that time had informed the DDSB of their error by the petitioners.

In addition, the ARC committee defeated a motion to direct staff to provide graduation rates from the two schools. One petitioner asserted that “If value to the student had been actually listened to and adhered to, the school would never close. Cartwright has always had a far reaching reputation for being “a small school with a big heart. “The cultural, social and academic benefits of attending a school where you know everyone are tremendous and are documented in the literature. Cartwright’s academic history stands for itself. And yet, ironically, these advantages and positives were overlooked during this process.”

#### **F) Inaccuracy in Enrolment Information**

The ARC reviewed the enrolment data provided and found it to be unrealistic as it required 80% of Cartwright Central Public School to attend Cartwright High School while historically the rate had been approximately half that number. Revised enrolment with reduced projections as much as 30% were released by the board in June but the ARC was never informed nor were the SIP's ever updated. When questioned in May by community members, the DDSB maintained its projections were accurate. In their final report, DDSB staff mentioned the community members' concern but never provided the ARC with realistic enrolment projections that could be used as the basis of a review.

#### **G) Failure to designate Cartwright High School as a "rural" school**

CHS is designated by the Province as a "rural" school; Port Perry High School is not. The Province recognizes the significance of schools in rural and small communities. The Durham District School Board refused to recognize this distinction. When the Community raised the issue of this rural designation in a handout at the third public meeting the Board's response dealt only with the financial issues and ignored the larger issue of the affect on the students and the community.

The Board’s explanation is, because Cartwright is not a supported school, it is not a "rural" school. The petitioners assert that the ‘supported’ categorization of a school is different from "rural" designation.

It is the petitioners’ contention that by refusing to recognize Cartwright High School as "rural" the DDSB limited opportunities for discussing factors that could reflect local circumstances and consider the important role schools play in strengthening rural communities as described in the Ministry Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline.

## **Board's Response:**

The School Information Profiles for both PPHS and CHS, in accordance with the Ministry's Guideline and the DDSB's Procedure #7113 were initially completed by DDSB staff as a starting point for discussion with the ARC Members. The ARC members had the opportunity to review and modify the profiles where appropriate based on their local knowledge and input from the community. The ARC Members provided several revisions to the SIPs prior to the presentation of the documents at the ARC's Public Meeting #1 and they unanimously approved the SIPs as final in a motion adopted at Working Meeting #6 on May 1, 2012. At any time during the ARC process, the ARC Members could revisit final ARC-approved documents and through motion, revise what the members had already finalized if there was majority voting member support. The ARC STS did not do this.

With respect to each of the five areas articulated above in the petitioners' perspective, the following is the Board's response:

### **A) Inaccuracies in the calculations for operating costs based on teachers' salaries**

Operating cost per student was recognized as an inconsistency between the SIP and the financial info in the binder. The difference was the costing of teacher salaries: one figure was based on **average** teacher salaries and the final information was based on **actual** teacher salaries for both schools. When ARC members recognized this inconsistency, it was corrected for the following Working Committee Meeting #6.

### **B) Incorrect information on the number of students transported**

The information provided was not inaccurate. However, the format in which it was presented made it difficult for some to connect this information to the information provided in the SIP. This concern was raised at the June 4, 2012 Standing Committee and as a result, staff clarified the format for the 8<sup>th</sup> Working Committee of the ARC (June 12, 2012) and thus, transportation costs were addressed in the Supplemental Information provided to the ARC. Staff re-formatted the data contained within the ARC binder so that it was easily understood. While reformatted information was provided in the interests of clarity, this did not change the figures originally provided and they remained consistent with those set out in the SIPs. After the provision of the reformatted information, the ARC did not request any further information on student transportation.

### **C) Replacement Value**

The Board acknowledges that the database did not include the repairs to the boilers because they were paid for out of operating funds as emergency repairs. With this amount accounted for through the Stantec estimates which were provided to the ARC at



Working Committee #12, the ARC had the most up-to-date cost estimates which were still in excess of the Board's original repair estimates even when the cost of the boiler repairs were removed. The Board of Trustees also had the correct estimates in the Staff report of November 19, 2012.

The Board's response to the concern over the documenting and estimates on repair of the stairs is as described in the Board's response under Issue #1 (B) above. Essentially, the Board asserts that the repairs the community felt had been completed were maintenance repairs only and further cost estimates were included for full replacement of the stairs.

**D) Requests for the operating costs of the previous five years were denied.**

The Board reports that operational costs for the base year 2010 were provided in the ARC. Binder to the committee and these figures have not changed throughout the process. Five year projected costs to operate the school on a per pupil basis were also provided to the ARC. The ARC did not request information on the operating costs for the preceding five years. Had this request been made by the ARC, staff would have undertaken the compilation of this data which did not exist in the format requested through the Freedom of Information request. The DDSB responded to the Freedom of Information request indicating that given requested information does not exist in the format requested, it would have to be compiled at a cost to the requester. However, in relation to the ARC process, the ARC never requested this type of information, so it was not provided. Similar to other ARC requests, had there been a request made for this information by a member or members of the ARC and had the ARC voted to ask staff to compile this information, it would have been provided to the ARC.

**E) Failure to put value to student as a priority over other considerations and insufficient reference to the excellent student outcomes at Cartwright High School**

The School Information Profiles (SIPs) for both PPHS and CHS, in accordance with the Ministry's Guideline and the DDSB's Procedure #7113 were initially completed by DDSB staff as a starting point for discussion with the ARC members. Each SIP considered the Value of the School to the Student, the Board, the Community and the Local Economy. The ARC members had the opportunity to review and modify the profiles where appropriate based on their local knowledge and input from the community. The ARC Members provided several revisions to the SIPs prior to the presentation of the documents at the ARC's Public Meeting #1 and they unanimously approved the SIPs as final in a motion adopted at Working Meeting #6 on May 1, 2012.

The petitioners raise the issue of student outcomes (graduation rates) not being shared with the ARC. At Working Meeting #7 on May 29, 2012, a request made by an ARC member for graduation rates for each school was discussed. As a result of the

complexities surrounding multiple program offerings at Port Perry HS, as well as a lack of a prescribed provincial reporting format, the request to compile this information was defeated by the ARC with 8 of the 12 voting ARC members in attendance opposed to the compilation of the information. As a result, ARC Resource Staff, who are not members of the ARC, but are considered ARC support, did not proceed to provide this information.

EQAO provides a provincially prepared and assessed mechanism to evaluate Grade 9 mathematics performance at both the academic and applied levels for both schools, as well as the Grade 10 literacy test. The staff report dated November 19, 2012, provides a summary of the data from 2007 to 2011, illustrating fine achievement at both schools. This information was also available in the ARC binder and was included in the November staff report to the Board along with further academic results data for 2012.

With respect to the number of staff provided to CHS that was not generated by the staffing formula, the Board states that, from February 7, 2012 and for the duration of the ARC's consultation process, there was consistent indication to the ARC and to community members through ARC-approved e-mail responses, that CHS requires 4.5 teaching staff reallocated from other secondary schools to deliver program in addition to the number of teaching staff the Ministry of Education's funding model generates for the actual 2010 enrolment of 122 students. Indeed, the actual enrolments of 108 in 2011 and 89 in 2012 generated even fewer teachers but the allocation remained based on the 2010 enrolment numbers. Therefore, the Board did not alter the staff allocation based on lower enrolments. At the ARC Working Meeting #8 on June 12, 2012, Senior Staff from the Operations Office for the DDSB explained the staffing allocation model to the ARC indicating that the average secondary class size for the DDSB is 21.36 students and that the collective agreement recognizes 22 students. It was also indicated that the 2010-2011 average class size for CHS was 12 students.

## **F) Inaccuracy in Enrolment Information**

Regarding the petitioners' concerns about enrolment information, the Board asserts that the ARC received full and accurate information on enrolment throughout the ARC process including both projections and actuals when they were available.

Enrolment information was provided to the ARC and posted on the ARC link of the Board's website. The information reflected 5-year historical data, 5-year and 10-year projections which were based on 2010 actual enrolments and 2010 official enrolment projections. In February of 2012, at the beginning of the ARC's deliberations, updated 2011 actual enrolments were provided to the ARC. Further, a comparison of enrolment projections versus actual enrolments from 2007 -2011 was provided for CHS, PPHS and the system as a whole. This was done to illustrate the accuracy of the enrolment projection process. Therefore, the ARC had the 2011 actuals and the projections for

2012 – 2016 based on the 2011 actuals. The last working meeting of the ARC was October 30, 2012. The process of preparing reports on 2012 actuals did not commence until after the ARC had completed its work. In June of 2013, the Board is still finalizing the 2012 actuals and projections for 2013. That said, in the DDSB staff report dated November 19, 2012, September 2012 student headcounts for CHS and CCPS were provided in order to ensure the Board of Trustees had the most current information available. The Board stands by its projection methodology that has been used historically and continues to be used by the Board for planning purposes. This methodology has had a 99.75% accuracy rate from 2007 to 2011.

The catchment area for Cartwright HS is unique as it is a dual zone student attendance area with transportation provided to either school which does not exist at any other DDSB school. As a result, in any grade, students in the Cartwright HS catchment area have been able to move between Cartwright HS and Port Perry HS which could result in enrolment fluctuations. The Board took a conservative approach giving the possibility of enrolment influx the benefit of the doubt and did not reduce the enrolment projections to a point where they created a self-fulfilling prophecy. This was intended to be respectful of the programs offered to Cartwright HS students and to create a higher level of student base upon which possible scenarios could be built by the ARC.

At the January 7, 2013 Standing Committee Meeting, a Scugog community member provided a presentation intended to outline concerns with the ARC process, including a concern about enrolment projections. This individual pointed out that the enrolment projections provided by the Board did not indicate a decline at CHS when compared to his calculation which did predict a decline and this was a concern to community. These comments were captured in a report to Board's Standing Committee on February 4, 2013. Trustees and ARC members were provided with all relevant enrolment information.

### **G) Failure to designate Cartwright High School as a "rural" school**

DDSB recognized during the ARC deliberations that CHS is located in a rural setting and, based on the second digit of the postal code being "0" is defined by the Ministry as a rural school. However, the school is not under-utilized and therefore, does not generate any additional School Operations and School Renewal top-up funding. Further, while the postal code for the school indicates it is "rural", the school does not meet the Ministry criteria for being a Supported School (being 45 kilometres away from the next secondary school of the board) and therefore, the school does not qualify for any of the subsidiary grants for Supported Schools. This was explained to the ARC and documented in supplemental information presented at Working Committee #9.

## **Facilitator's Perspective:**

### **A) Inaccuracies in the calculations for operating costs based on teachers' salaries**

It is clear that there were two ways to present this data and there was a temporary inconsistency between the two sources of this data that the ARC was dealing with. While this was perhaps initially confusing, once the discrepancy was pointed out, it was corrected prior to SIPs being finalized by the ARC.

### **B) Incorrect information on the number of students transported**

Again, this appears to be a question of how the information was formatted. Having looked at the data provided, I am satisfied that there was no material difference and that the reformatting was genuinely offered for clarity purposes following a presentation on this issue by a concerned community member at the June 4, 2012 Standing Committee of the Board. DDSB staff prepared the reformatted information in time to present it to the next working committee of the ARC in order to assist the ARC members in understanding the transportation data.

### **C) Replacement value**

The issue of the documenting of the cost of the repairs to the boiler and the estimates on the cost of the stairs was a cause of great consternation to the petitioners. During Phase 2 of the process, community members, on January 7, 2013 and January 15, 2013, questioned the validity of the need for the boiler replacement. The Board indicated that the boilers had been replaced and that the costs of repair to the boilers were not included in the information that was provided to the ARC at the outset as it had not been captured in the ReCapp data. This was because the repairs of both boilers were of an emergency nature and as a result, were completed and paid for from a repair account rather than a capital account budget. Board Staff indicated adjustments were included in the Stantec Report to recognize the replacement by the Board of the boilers in 2010.

While there was an omission in the ReCapp data regarding the replacement of the boilers, this was clarified and the Board had reliable estimates for the repair costs for CHS prior to consideration of the ARC report and the Staff Report and making the final decision regarding these recommendations. Even with the removal of the amount for the repair of the boilers that was included in the original estimates, the DDSB repair costs for CHS remain understated compared to those contained in the Stantec Report which estimated repair costs at 2.05M without taking into account accessibility needs which would be at least \$425,000 in addition. Clearly, the failure to capture the boiler replacements in the ReCapp data did not substantially affect the overall cost issues involved in the repair requirements for CHS. This omission of data was an

understandable oversight which, when discovered, was explained and fully disclosed. This concern does not constitute a violation of DDSB Procedure #7113.

The DDSB database indicated that the stairs needed to be replaced for approximately \$80,000. The Petitioners have asserted that the stairs were actually repaired prior to 2005 but the database was not updated to reflect the repair. This seems to be an argument about “apples and oranges” as the approximately \$80,000 needed was not for the repair work that was completed in 2004 and 2005 but rather the 2005 estimate for the replacement of the stairs which were coming to the end of their “life expectancy”. This figure predated the 2006 Ontario Building Code requirements which stipulate that any replacement of this type of structure must now include a new, enclosed stairwell. Costs are now estimated at \$200,000 to \$250,000.

Petitioners also indicated that pictures in the engineering report show both the old and new stairs and believed that this indicated the stairs had been repaired and needed no further work and that Stantec was using outdated photographs upon which to base their estimates. This was not the case. Including pictures that show the history of the building’s repair needs and work done is standard practice for such reports and constitutes a record rather than misinformation. Indeed, some repairs to the stairs were done and ultimately, replacement will be required. There was no error in the information provided re the costs of repairs to the stairs. Rather, there seems to have been a misunderstanding regarding what remained to be done with the petitioners disagreeing with the professional estimates for the full replacement of these stairs.

#### **D) Requests for the operating costs of the previous five years were denied**

Operating costs were provided for the 2010 as well as a projection of operating costs for the next five years. The request for a compilation of the operating costs for the past five years came from some community members through a Freedom of Information request. This request did not come through the ARC and I am confident that if the ARC had made such a request staff would have made the effort to compile the data that was not readily available in a prepared format. That said, given the interest expressed by some community members in this data who believed it to be relevant to their concerns regarding the ARC, it would have been preferable if the Freedom of Information request had been granted without assigning costs. It is important to note however, that the operating costs in previous years were not cited by the Board as reasons for the staff recommendation to close CHS. The staff’s reasons for this recommendation were program and renewal cost related. Although the response to the Freedom of Information request seemed arbitrary to the community members who brought it forward, because this request did not come through the ARC process, there is no violation of the DDSB Procedure #7113.

### **E) Failure to put value to student as a priority over other considerations and insufficient reference to the excellent student outcomes at Cartwright High School**

Clearly, there were strong views held by those who opposed the consideration of closing CHS that the value of the school to the student was undermined by the Board's strongly expressed position that there were serious programming limitations. I believe that there was considerable discussion of the value of both schools to their students at both the working meetings and the public meetings. There is no question that the small and intimate nature of the school community at CHS has strong appeal to the petitioners and that CHS students were academically successful.

The petitioners were frustrated by the repeated reference to the need to augment the staffing at CHS by 4.5 teachers from the system-wide allocation in order to deliver the current program offerings. They viewed this discussion as a detractor from the perception of the excellence of the school's program. In fact, the DDSB staffing allocation explanation was correct. It was made clear to the ARC by staff that should the Board of Trustees decide to keep CHS open, staffing would continue to be made available from the system-wide allocation in order to augment the funded staffing numbers for CHS sufficiently to ensure the continued provision of the current programming. Staffing calculations were provided for the options that were included in the ARC's final report.

EQAO results for both schools were provided to the ARC and the minutes of both the ARC working meetings and the minutes of the public meetings indicate that there was discussion of the academic successes of the students at both schools. The November 19<sup>th</sup> staff report on the Accommodation Review to the Trustees included a table that illustrated the EQAO student achievement results for both schools. These results speak to impressive student achievement in both schools.

The issue here seems to be not that the value of the schools to their students was not discussed; rather, it seems to be that the value of CHS to its students did not eliminate programming concerns for future students and for those currently needing differentiated instruction and electives.

### **F) Inaccuracy in Enrolment Information**

Full and accurate information regarding the enrolment at the two secondary schools under review was made available to the ARC. The petitioners assert that misleading numbers that showed the school was not experiencing declining enrolment were used at the outset of the ARC and new numbers showing a decline were introduced "at the last minute" at the end of the process to justify a recommendation to close CHS. In fact, the numbers differed at the beginning and end of the process because they reflected the difference between projected numbers and the actual student numbers that were

available once the school year had begun and numbers were final. The initial enrolment information provided to the ARC was 2010 actual student numbers. In March of 2012, the ARC requested updated figures for 2011 and 2012 which were provided.

It is perplexing why a decreased enrolment projection which would diminish the future viability of the school would be an argument which the petitioners would wish to make. The Board deliberately took a conservative approach to projecting in order to account for the possible enrolment fluctuations which the dual zone transportation made possible and this approach rendered projections that were somewhat higher than the number of students who actually were attending in the fall of 2012.

### **G) Failure to designate Cartwright High School as a "rural" school**

While there is no doubt that CHS is situated in what most would call a rural community, the school is not under-utilized and therefore, does not generate any additional School Operations and School Renewal top-up funding typically provided to rural schools. In addition, the school does not meet the conditions for additional funding provided to Supported Schools (i.e., the school is not more than 45 kilometres away from the next closest secondary school of the board). These facts, unfortunately, mean the school does not have the flexibility afforded by that kind of funding to consider enhancements to the school's programming and human and physical resources. It is not within the Board's purview to designate a school as 'rural' or 'supported'. This is determined by Ministry criteria.

## **ISSUE # 3 Voting, Membership, and Public Participation in the ARC**

### **Petitioners' and Some Community Members' Perspective:**

#### **A) Voting/Membership**

The petitioners assert that the ARC meetings were not conducted in "an open, transparent and professional manner." To support this assertion, they indicated their belief that the ARC was dominated by DDSB staff and that the ARC had too many Board employees serving on it. It was suggested that voting members of the ARC who are Board employees were directed how to vote by superiors on the ARC who were non-voting members. It was alleged that individual staff members on the ARC and other DDSB staff felt constrained about disagreeing with Board positions or their superordinates' views both in the working meetings of the ARC and in the public meetings.

## **B) The process of the public meetings: negative commentary and constraints on expression of viewpoints:**

The petitioners assert that some individual DDSB staff were encouraging community members to make negative comments about CHS at the public meetings and that individuals, some of whom provided services to DDSB, were fearful that if they spoke out in support of CHS, they would jeopardize their business relationship with the Board. The petitioners state that this fear prevented these individuals from sharing their views openly.

The petitioners expressed concern that one DDSB staff ARC member had their student stage a "meeting takeover" at one of the public meetings by taking over the microphone for an inordinate amount of time, speaking on behalf of the Board proposal not on the subject of the meeting. The meeting was chaired by DDSB staff that made no attempt to control the time that the speaker took. The length of the comments made by this speaker was of great concern to the ARC members who voted at the next working meeting to limit individual speakers for the sake of other speakers.

## **C) Re-introduction of the Board recommended option**

The petitioners also objected to the "reintroduction of Scenario 1 (the Board recommended option) by Board staff members of the ARC at the final working meeting." They indicated that they believed such a reintroduction required a two thirds majority as had been the case in previous DDSB ARCs rather than a majority plus one.

## **Board's Response:**

### **A) Voting/Membership**

The membership of the ARC was as stipulated in DDSB Procedure # 7113 in the terms of reference, Section 4. The ARCSTS members reflect representation as suggested in the Ministry of Education Guideline to ensure the expertise and interests of stakeholders in the schools under review are represented so that decisions could be made through informed discussion and through consensus or a vote if required.

The Chair of the ARC stated that, from her perspective, "there were no pre-conceived notions about how the ARC's deliberations would go" and that it was her belief that "members of the Committee came to the table with integrity and understood their job was to bring forward recommendations in the best interests of students."

The petitioners reference voting information from the East Oshawa ARC. This is not relevant to the ARC STS. The East Oshawa ARC was conducted under the DDSB Policy and Procedure #7113 as it read on May 22, 2007. The ARC STS was conducted under the amended Policy and Procedure #7113 as of March 22, 2010. These



amendments reflect the requirements of the Ministry's Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline as revised June 2009. As part of the amendments, the DDSB addressed the voting structure under Section 6 of the Procedure #7113.

### **B) The process of the public meetings: negative commentary and constraints on expression of viewpoints**

Each of the 4 Public Meetings included a scheduled time period for questions, comments and responses. Within the DDSB, there has been no ARC to date where members of the Public were limited by staff to only providing opinions on the main consultation point of the meetings. All opinions on the process may be expressed so that the ARC members can hear, first hand, the concerns or opinions. At Working Meeting #1, the ARC was requested to review an e-mail that had been submitted by a member of the public and for which a draft response to the e-mail had been prepared by ARC Resource staff for the ARC's consideration. An ARC member suggested revisions to the E-mail response to read "All public, including teachers are welcomed and encouraged to attend the ARC meetings". This revision was unanimously adopted by motion by the ARC voting members in attendance.

The Board staff made every effort to encourage participation and refrained from redirecting public input even when it appeared unfairly expressed or offensive in the interests of ensuring people felt free to express their opinions.

### **C) Re-introduction of the Board recommended option**

At Working Meeting #12, an ARC member motioned that, prior to any decisions being made on the ARC-recommended options, that the ARC members review all of the ARC binder information and make decisions at Working Meeting #13. This motion was unanimously approved. At Working Meeting #13, following the decision to review all information available to them, an ARC member motioned that the DDSB Staff scenario to close CHS and consolidate with PPHS be considered. After much discussion centering on whether the two existing proposed recommendations addressed all students' needs, the conclusion was reached by the majority of the ARC members that the third recommendation was needed to address all of the best options for the Board to consider. The motion was approved.

## **Facilitator's Perspective:**

### **A) Voting/Membership**

The membership of the ARC STS was as laid out in Board policy and reflects a reasonable inclusion of community members, parents, educators, and board officials. Trustees who were members of the ARC were non-voting members. While the

petitioners felt that there were too many DDSB staff on the ARC, it is hard to imagine how the two schools could have been represented differently and still have sufficient expertise and interests reflected in the deliberations.

Several community members and staff members serving on the ARC stated, in written correspondence and in discussions with me in my role as the Independent Facilitator, they felt no constraints in expressing their views nor did they feel any threat of reprisals. These individuals, who represented the majority of the ARC, indicated that they expressed their views without interference or influence. Certainly, during the meeting I held with the ARC as part of this review, the members of the ARC representing CHS, including the staff, were very forthcoming with their views with no apparent sense of constraint. Indeed, during the meeting I held with the members of the ARC, one staff member who had been a member of the CHS staff suggested quite directly that she lacked faith in the knowledge base of the Principal of CHS in preparing the SIP as he was relatively new to the school. She was assured that the Principal had consulted widely to ensure he had the necessary information. This exchange, initiated by the staff member, certainly did not indicate concern or anxiety about expressing opinions that might differ from those of superiors.

Some members of the ARC suggested to me that, given there were passionate feelings expressed both in the working meetings and certainly at the public meetings and that there was tension among individuals with opposing views, that an opportunity for a secret ballot when the ARC members were required to vote might have been helpful. The DDSB Procedure #7113, Section 6 lays out the voting members and the process for voting. The policy was followed during the conducting of this ARC. That said, in future, given the views expressed by some that an option for a secret ballot might have made participation in the ARC easier for some members, the board might wish to consider including a provision for this option in its policy.

It is interesting to note that the final recommendations of the ARC to the Board of Trustees included three approaches to the accommodation problems ranging from status quo, through consolidation with the elementary school, to closure. This does not suggest that there was a feeling of coercion to support only the initial staff recommendation.

## **B) The process of the public meetings: negative commentary and constraints on expression of viewpoints**

As previously mentioned in this review, I did receive several reports from staff and community members that the public meetings were often fraught with conflict and sometimes involved belligerent behaviour aimed at some speakers who made observations about PPHS's program breadth. There is no doubt that the public meetings were highly charged and ironically, in light of the petitioners concerns in this

regard, during my time speaking with individuals and groups in the district, I heard some very direct negative commentary by members of the CHS community about Port Perry High School. Some individuals in the public meeting I held went so far as to suggest that children would not be emotionally safe at PPHS.

I understand from several members of the ARC who communicated with me regarding their experience during this process that a number of individuals at public meetings unfairly characterized Port Perry HS as having serious and ongoing problems with bullying, drug use and other worrying issues, suggesting that these issues never arose at CHS. One member of the ARC communicated to me in a written submission that he was disturbed by the behaviour of some opponents to the closing of CHS at the public meetings. He asked and I quote "When has it become acceptable to allow a member or members of the audience at a Durham District School Board function to engage in heckling at a public gathering? It is a bullying tactic (is this not something the Board wants to rid from schools?) that seeks to intimidate, interrupt or at worst silence the speaker of the moment."

Similarly, there was concern voiced by the petitioners at the meeting that I held with them that at least one speaker who spoke in support of PPHS suggested that the supporters of CHS were naïve if they thought that their school had no problems and that they would be wise to consider the advantages attendance at PPHS could provide to CHS students.

This concern was also expressed at the public meeting I held by an individual who felt a PPHS staff member had made disrespectful comments about the CHS community at one of the public meetings. I have seen the speaking notes for these remarks and they seem to be aimed at stressing the full program strengths of PPHS. It is understandable that these observations may have been taken as casting CHS in a negative light by comparison. While this may or may not have been the intention, there is no doubt that these remarks were not well received by some individuals. It is interesting to note that the petitioners' concerns about controlling the commentary arose with respect to the meeting where they felt unfair observations had been made about CHS rather than with respect to earlier meetings where negative and confrontational commentary was delivered by CHS supporters.

It is not unusual for emotions to run high during discussions that are focussed on a possible school closing or consolidation. Clearly, there were exchanges that left much to be desired in terms of civility and respect in a public dialogue. In the interests of allowing all viewpoints to be expressed and the range of observations to be heard, it is understandable that some unwelcome commentary would ensue. No doubt, had the Chair of the meeting objected to all commentary with the potential to offend, the Board would have been accused of stifling the dialogue and inhibiting the provision of public input. I do not believe the DDSB could control all commentary by individuals on either

side of the debate who chose to speak publicly in unfortunate ways. That said, however, it appears that some individuals behaved inappropriately from their seats in the audience by interrupting recognized speakers, including students, by speaking out of turn with disdainful observations. The DDSB may wish to consider including a clause in their policy which specifies actions that will be taken by the Chair of the public meetings when this type of interaction occurs.

### **C) Re-introduction of the Board recommended option**

The ARC was initiated as a result of a staff report which recommended the consideration of the closing of CHS in order to meet student needs. Given the significant opposition to the closing of CHS by some in the CHS community, it is understandable that the ARC attempted to identify other options that might lead to viable recommendations. However, as one community member said in a written communication to me “It is misleading to tell an audience such as the one that was present at the public meeting that the closure of Cartwright High School is not an option being considered by the ARC at the present time... in fact, the process would not have been triggered were it not one of the options that the Durham District School Board was considering.”

I think it is clear that it was always understood from the beginning of the ARC process that this option could be considered. It was reintroduced in the last working committee meeting because the majority of the ARC members did not believe they were providing recommendations that fully addressed all the learning needs of all the secondary school students of Scugog Township. The option was reintroduced under the voting rules of the revised DDSB Procedure # 7113, Section 6.4, which requires a vote of a majority of the members plus one to pass a motion. The reintroduction of this scenario resulted from an ARC committee motion that the ARC members review all of the ARC binder information and make final decisions regarding recommendations to the Board at Working Meeting #13. While the reintroduction of the original DDSB staff recommendation was disappointing to its opponents, it was not a violation of the DDSB Procedure #7113 and did represent a legitimate conviction by the majority of the ARC membership that this option would provide an opportunity to better meet student needs. The vote of the ARC in favour of its inclusion in the final ARC report reflected this conviction.

## **ISSUE #4 Exclusion of Cartwright Central Public School from the Scugog Accommodation Review**

### **Petitioners’ and Some Community Members’ Perspective:**

DDSB Pupil Accommodation Review Procedure section 2.3: "Wherever possible, the accommodation review process being proposed should focus on a group of schools within a planning area, rather than a single school, in an effort to develop feasible and

practical solutions for the accommodation of students within the planning area." DDSB Pupil Accommodation Review Procedure section 2.3.1: "A planning area is a previously defined sub-area of the Board's jurisdiction in which the location of the schools are close enough to each other to impact the accommodation needs of students and to impact the ability of the Board to support program needs."

Students at Cartwright High School currently use the gymnasium at Cartwright Central Public School (CCPS) because of its close proximity. The Ministry requires school boards to utilize existing available space when reviewing accommodation requirements. At the time of the ARC, there were 4 empty classrooms at Cartwright Central Public School. Cartwright High School students are a valuable resource within the literacy program at Cartwright Central Public School. Cartwright Central Public School should have been included in the Review process with membership on the Accommodation Review Committee and a School Information Profile prepared.

### **Board's Response:**

The Board has complied with the procedure outlined in Section 2.3 of Procedure #7113 which indicates that an ARC should focus on a group of schools within a planning area. It further defines a planning area as "a previously defined sub-area of the Board's jurisdiction in which the location of the schools are close enough to each other to impact the accommodation needs of students and to impact the ability of the Board to support program needs" (Section 2.3.1).

It should be noted that Section 2.2 indicates that an Accommodation Review is established to determine educational opportunities for either elementary or secondary students of the Board because the Board considers its elementary accommodation needs and its secondary accommodation needs separately. In the case of this ARC, the focus was on resolving the accommodation needs for secondary students in the Township of Scugog and, as such, the local elementary school, Cartwright Central Public School, was not included in the ARC as a school to be reviewed nor identified as part of the ARC in the Board-approved resolution establishing the ARC STS.

The Board Report did identify the establishment of an ARC for the two secondary schools in the Scugog Township area – Cartwright High School and Port Perry High School and only addressed issues regarding these schools. However, as part of the alternative accommodation options to address the secondary school accommodation issues in Scugog Township and required as part of the DDSB Procedure #7113, Section 9, the ARC developed 21 scenarios, excluding the Board staff-developed scenario. Included in the development of the 21 scenarios was the scenario for a K-12 school combining CHS and Cartwright Central PS. This was first considered at Working Meeting #6 on May 1, 2012. At Public Meeting #4 on October 9, 2012, a community member polled the audience regarding support for the K-12 school (Scenario #14). No

support was forthcoming. Despite this, the ARC included this scenario as one of the three recommended accommodation options in the ARC Report for the DDSB Trustees to consider when making their final decision. The potential use of the elementary school was an option being considered by the ARC but Cartwright Central Public School was never considered to be a school under review through this process.

### **Facilitator's Perspective:**

The purpose of this ARC was to consider the needs of secondary school students in Scugog Township. As such, the Board's decision to consider the two secondary schools in the area in an accommodation review makes sense as the overall purpose of the ARC was to address the programming needs of secondary school students in the most effective and efficient way. The DDSB complied with its Procedure #7113 in identifying two schools "close enough to each other to impact the accommodation needs of students and to impact the ability of the Board to support program needs".

It has been suggested by the petitioners and by some staff from the secondary schools under review that it might have been helpful if there had been some representation on the ARC of the staff and community from the feeder school, Cartwright Central Public School. This representation might have allowed parents of the students who would be attending secondary school in future a more direct role in the determination of secondary school programming options. It appears that there was no formal discussion of the ARC's mandate or deliberations at the School Council meetings of CCPS and in fact, a request by two members of the ARC to present at a School Council Meeting was not approved.

That said, Cartwright Central PS included all of the ARC meeting notices in the hard copy newsletter which goes to the family courier (the parents indicate which sibling is to receive the newsletter). The newsletters including the notices of ARC meetings were also posted on the CCPS website. As well, extra copies of the invitations to the meetings were always available at CCPS' secretary's desk.

The ARC members passed the following motion:

"All public, including teachers are welcomed and encouraged to attend the ARC meetings".

It is clear that the staff, parents and community members affiliated with Cartwright Central Public School were free to attend any of the meetings of the ARC as observers at the working meetings and participants at the public meetings.

It is interesting to note that **Scenario #14** developed by the ARC proposed to create a K-12 school at Cartwright Central PS. This proposal was included as one of the ARC's three recommendations to the Board for consideration in the final ARC report even

though it did not receive any support from the community when the idea was raised at the fourth public meeting. During the ARC's deliberations there was discussion of the use of the CCPS gymnasium by CHS students and the role of the CHS students in providing literacy coaching to CCPS students was also raised. The inclusion of the K-12 recommendation in the ARC report makes it apparent that the deliberations of the ARC considered the resources that CCPS might be able to contribute to an accommodation solution.

While the exclusion of CCPS in the ARC does not violate DDSB Procedure # 7113, and it is clear that the school's resources were considered when the ARC was reflecting on options, it might be advisable for the Board to consider ways of including representatives of elementary feeder schools in the process of the secondary school ARCs as consistent contributors to the information base that supports the ARC's decision-making. Including all feeder schools as voting members of an ARC considering the future of secondary schools could be unwieldy if there are several feeder schools involved. In this case, given there was only one, it might have been a possibility. At the very least, formal opportunities for the ARC's proceedings to be discussed at the School Community Council meetings of CCPS would have been helpful in gathering and incorporating the viewpoints of these particular parents and students. In addition, information on the ARC's proceedings and deliberations could have been included on the agendas of the feeder schools of PPHS.

## **ISSUE #5 Communication Concerns**

### **A) Failure to Record Requests or Information regarding the ARC on the Board Website.**

#### **Petitioners' and Some Community Members' Perspective:**

The petitioners refer to DDSB Pupil Accommodation Review Procedure 6.1: "All information or requests provided to the ARC or developed by the ARC will be posted on the Board's Website and made available to the general public in printed form" and assert that not all information was properly posted on the Board's website. They specifically refer to the OMAFRA report concerning the value of small, rural schools which was provided to and accepted by the ARC. A motion was made and passed to include this report in the official ARC binder; however, it is not found in the binder nor was it made available in printed form to the general public.

The petitioners state that because the ARC dominated by DDSB staff refused to supply relevant information, community members resorted to filing Freedom of Information requests to obtain information controlled by some Staff members of the ARC. They state that these ARC related requests and information were never shared with the other

ARC members, or posted on the Board's website, or made available to the general public in printed form. The petitioners assert that one such request, dealing with the application for funding for the addition at Port Perry High School, was brought to an ARC working meeting, taken away by the Secretary of the ARC but never shared with the other ARC members or the public.

**Board's Response:**

All information provided in the ARC Binders to enable the members to undertake the work required to complete their mandate was posted on the Board's Website. Clarification/ information documents in the form of supplemental information memoranda are found in the ARC binder. The Petitioners' reference to material being shared but not left with the Committee relates to a legal opinion regarding establishing an academy school at CHS which was shown to the ARC but the original legal opinion was taken back as it referred to a particular school. A synopsis of this opinion was left with the ARC. While supplemental information memoranda did not require ARC approval, these memoranda were in response to the DDSB Procedure #7113, Section 10.9 of the Terms of Reference document which requires the Chair of the ARC to disseminate information to all ARC Members in the event that community input is provided to individual ARC Members. In many instances, the ARC Chair and/or the ARC Secretary reported back to the ARC regarding community presentations or questions posed at DDSB Board of Trustees' meetings. All work undertaken by the ARC was posted to the DDSB website based on ARC approval.

At Working Meeting #8, the ARC Chair reported to the ARC regarding the presentation of the OMAFRA document at the Board's Standing Committee and indicated that the document was available for ARC member review pending a motion to accept the document for ARC consideration. Upon consensus, the commitment was made to provide the document by e-mail to the ARC Members so they would have an opportunity to review the document prior to it being included as part of the ARC binder at Working Meeting #9. On June 13, 2012, the ARC Administrative Assistant sent the link to the document to the ARC Members so they could review the document. The document was then provided in hard copy at Working Meeting #9 in September, after the summer hiatus of the ARC and a motion was tabled and carried, to include the document as part of the ARC binder. An electronic version was subsequently shared by email with the ARC. It was posted on the website subsequently after Working Meeting #9.

All ARC-approved requests for information from ARC Resource staff were responded to in a timely manner as referenced throughout the ARC-approved minutes in ARC Binder as well as ARC requests for information listed on the "Request for Information Tracking Sheet. As set out in the ARC-approved minutes of Working Meeting #4, the ARC was reminded that any questions, concerns or revisions to ARC documents requested by



ARC members would be brought to the ARC for the members' consideration as a group during scheduled working meetings.

In the ARC-approved minutes of Working Meeting #8, Staff noted that the funding for the Port Perry High School addition is part of a Ministry of Education capital wrap-up initiative in which funds are to be used for new construction only. In Supplemental Information – Twelve – Handout distributed at the 4<sup>th</sup> Public Meeting, clarification was provided that indicated that the addition at Port Perry High School was a more cost-effective approach to providing specialized spaces at the school. These documents are in the ARC binder along with a comparison business case for the addition at Port Perry High School and a renovation of existing classrooms. In addition, the ARC received a public Board report about the tender for the renovations at PPHS. Finally, once approved by the ARC, all minutes of the ARC meetings were posted on the website.

### **Facilitator's Perspective:**

The OMAFRA report and detailed information dealing with the application for funding for the addition at Port Perry High School were both included in the materials in the ARC binder and were made available to the members of the ARC. In addition, both sets of material were discussed at the ARC with staff explanations provided as required and this is reflected in the minutes of the meeting which were posted on the website. It is puzzling that the petitioners would make these assertions about lack of provision of these materials to the Committee and on the website when there is clear evidence to the contrary.

With the exception of the request for graduation rates which was defeated by a vote of the ARC, all other requested material was provided as it came available. There is an onus of responsibility on ARC members to request the materials they need notwithstanding the capacity to go to other sources for the information they require whether it be the Provincial Government or through Freedom of Information requests. I am satisfied that when requests for information were made directly of Staff through the ARC, they were dealt with appropriately and the relevant information was provided.

### **B) Failure to provide information in plain language**

#### **Petitioners' and Some Community Members' Perspective:**

The petitioners assert that some information that was requested by the ARC was presented in vague, confusing or inaccessible documents or was not provided at all. For example, one ARC member (who holds a MBA) asked for the details regarding the \$1.5M in repair costs. She asserted that she was informed by Staff that it was too complicated for her to understand and Staff refused to provide her with the information and this information was never provided to the ARC.

Other examples of concern re the provision of information in plain language include:

- Replacing a 13 item list of major projects for CHS repairs with a 10 item list that was less detailed and more vague
- An unclear explanation of the funding formula for the generation of teacher numbers
- The DDSB ARC STS website is not organized or labelled in a manner to make it useable. For example, the engineering report is not filed under engineering report but rather under "Supplemental Information #6" which contains over 100 pages of data without an index. There are 13 supplemental information sections. Due to the volume of the data, community members would need to read through thousands of pages of information in order to find a relevant document.
- There are 167 pages of e-mails from community members concerning the ARC STS with no index or topic headings for these e-mails. This made it difficult for community members to reference background information on new scenarios and other discussions of options for Cartwright High School

### **Board's Response:**

All information requested by the ARC was presented in a format easily understood by the ARC members. Where the members suggested a different presentation approach to help them more easily understand the data, the ARC Resource Staff complied with the requests. As an example, transportation costs were addressed in the Supplemental Information in the ARC binder. Staff, at the request of the ARC Members, re-formatted the data contained within the ARC binder and presented the reformatted information to the ARC.

All ARC-approved requests for information from ARC Resource Staff were provided in a timely manner as referenced throughout the ARC-approved minutes in ARC binder as well as ARC requests for information listed on the "Request for Information Tracking Sheet" also in the ARC binder. As set out in the ARC-approved minutes of Working Meeting #4, the ARC was reminded that any questions, concerns or revisions to ARC documents requested by ARC members would be brought to the ARC for the Committee's consideration as a group during scheduled working meetings. These requests were tracked through ARC binder.

Clarification/information documents in the form of supplemental information memoranda are found in ARC binder which provides supplemental information to support ARC-related discussions. Contrary to the suggestion that members of the ARC were refused information on the basis that they wouldn't understand it, staff provided non-technical explanations and the original technical documents. For example, the supplemental

information memoranda included the memorandum dated October 10, 2012 which provided the entire 80-page Stantec Audit Report regarding CHS as well as the 12-page event cost by component summary. This information was explained in non-technical terms in the memorandum and included in the ARC binder. While supplemental information memoranda did not require ARC approval, these memoranda were in response to the DDSB Procedure #7113, Section 10.9 of the Terms of Reference document which requires the Chair of the ARC to disseminate information to all ARC members in the event that community input is provided to individual ARC members. In many instances, the ARC Chair and/or the ARC Secretary reported back to the ARC regarding community presentations or questions posed at DDSB Board of Trustees' meetings. All work undertaken by the ARC was posted to the DDSB website based on ARC approval.

The 13 items in the original list of repairs required was provided to the ARC in broad categories. When some members asked for more detail a more specific list of "repair events" as summarized by the ReCapp system was provided.

The DDSB provided staffing information in the original ARC binder and in working committee #8 brought the Board's Operation's Officer for staffing to the ARC to provide clarification as required by the ARC. After that discussion, there were no further inquiries raised by the ARC members on this topic nor were there any tracked inquiries by ARC members.

The DDSB ARC STS Website is organized to follow the ARC binder and is in chronological order based on the table of contents and the type of meetings (working meetings or public meetings). This has been a practice employed in all previous DDSB ARCs. The Board's Policy and Procedure #7113 is silent on the structure for online web posting. That said, the Board continues to work on enhancing the clarity of the voluminous information on the website and recognizes that the breadth and depth is formidable in this kind of process.

### **Facilitator's Perspective:**

There is no doubt that there was a great deal of information provided during this process both in the original ARC binder and in the many pages of supplemental information that was included in response to specific questions from ARC members or members of the public who raised questions or concerns during the ARC public meetings or as a result of being observers at the ARC working meetings. It would be almost impossible to provide all this material in a format that would not require some explanation to individuals unfamiliar with the data or the information. After examining the material provided to the ARC and captured on the website and in the ARC binder, I am satisfied that efforts were made to provide both the technical information that the ARC needed and requested and clarifications regarding the meaning of these materials when

ARC members indicated a need for different formats or explanations to make the information more accessible.

The examples cited by the petitioners regarding lack of clarity in repair costs information and in staffing funding were addressed by the DDSB staff both in writing and in staff presentations to the ARC. There is also significant indication through the supplemental materials documents that inquiries were received and responded to throughout the process of the ARC's deliberations. There are some instances where material requested by some members of the ARC that required significant staff time to compile was not provided when the request was not supported by the majority of the ARC members. The "Requests for Information Tracking Sheet" provides an opportunity for the ARC to review outstanding questions and responses. At the completion of the ARC, there were no outstanding requests or unanswered questions on record.

The DDSB recognizes the complexity of the information posted on the ARC website and is working to continuously improve the organization and presentation of this material in ways that ensure thoroughness and still aim at clarity. There are, no doubt, areas where there can be improvements in the way written records are posted and/or provided. That said, there are no violations of DDSB Procedure #7113 in this regard.

### **C) Failure to allow the community an opportunity to present their views and comments to the Board in regard to the Accommodation Review.**

#### **Petitioners' and Some Community Members' Perspective:**

The petitioners assert that the community was not provided access to either the ARC Report or the Staff Report prior to the publicized November 19th Board meeting. It was indicated that the Scugog ARC would be discussed. Any questions to be asked at the meeting had to be provided to the Board prior to the meeting. Presentations must be submitted 8 business days prior to Standing Committee meetings. The public did not know what would be in the ARC report as the approved scenarios had changed at the last working committee meeting and the minutes of that meeting were never made available to the public on the Board's website. The petitioners believe that the public was not afforded an opportunity to present their views and comments at this publicized meeting. Subsequently, individuals of the community were allowed to speak to the Trustees but the public was not notified of these meetings through media etc.

The petitioners also stated that the minutes from ARC Working Meeting #13 held on Oct 30, 2012 are missing

**Board's Response:**

The concern was raised that the community did not received the Accommodation Review Staff Report, dated November 19th, 2012 in advance of the Board Meeting on November 19th, 2012. It is DDSB practice to send Trustees the in-camera and open agendas 72 hours in advance of the meeting. It is also DDSB practice not to make Staff Reports available until the date of the meeting. In the January 23, 2012 Staff Report which commenced the start of the STS ARC, an "Accommodation Review Process - Phase Two" chart was provided which clearly outlined the opportunities for input from the community as well as the role of the Trustees. This chart recognizes that the November 19th Board Meeting date would allow Trustees to receive and review both the ARC Report and Staff Report. This chart recognizes that there are 6 subsequent meetings for community input and that these 6 meetings do not include the November 19th meeting. This timeframe complies with the expectation of the Ministry Guideline. Community members made several presentations to the Board on the Staff report and the ARC report at several meetings during the 76 days between the November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Board and the February meeting of DDSB where Trustees made their final decision.

**Facilitator's Perspective:**

There was a clear understanding of the process for Phase 2 of the ARC which involved the time after the conclusion of the ARC's deliberations for public presentations to the DDSB about the November 19, 2012 recommendations of both the ARC and the final Staff report. The information about community members' input to the Trustees on both the reports was understood and indeed, there were numerous presentations by concerned members of the community at the six meetings between November and February when the final decision of the Trustees was made. The Phase One process of the ARC which includes all deliberations of the ARC and the Phase Two process of the review which includes community input directly to the Board of Trustees was explained in detail in the Jan 23, 2012 report establishing the ARC STS and at commencement of the ARC's deliberations.

The last public meeting of the ARC process provided an opportunity for discussion of two of the three final scenarios and it is only reasonable to assume that the public was aware that the original staff recommendation in the January 23, 2012 report involving the closure of CHS could be included again in the final staff report which was presented at the November 19, 2012 meeting along with the ARC report. All throughout the process of the ARC public meetings, there was substantial public debate on the merits and the arguments against consolidating CHS with PPHS. At the thirteenth working meeting of the ARC, Scenario #1 was discussed and was included as one of the options in the ARC's final report after the majority of the members of the ARC voted to include it. The possibility of the board considering Scenario #1 either as a result of the final report of the ARC or the final report of Staff to the Board would not have been a surprise

given earlier public discussions and debates at public meetings. Any of the other 22 scenarios discussed during the deliberations of the ARC could also have been reintroduced in this 13<sup>th</sup> Working Committee meeting which was requested by the ARC in order to ensure that all options had been given thorough consideration in the interests of the students.

Any discussion and decisions emerging from this meeting were captured in the minutes of the 13<sup>th</sup> working meeting of the ARC held on October 30, 2012. These minutes were approved and posted on the Board's website and were accessed by Staff and by community members. Apparently, there was a concern raised by one ARC member that the link to these minutes was not reliable and this technical problem was corrected within a few days.

There was specific notice of the November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Board where the final ARC report and the final Staff Report on the ARC would be received to be followed by a 76 day period with opportunities for public input to the Board of Trustees at six scheduled meetings of the Board of Trustees. Notice of the November 19, 2012 meeting of the Board was both in the ARC binder and on the Board website and on the websites of CHS, PPHS and CCPS.

With respect to questions and presentations to the Board during Phase Two of this ARC, members of the public could raise a question or concern during the public question period of the Board meetings without prior notice as long as they indicated this intention prior to the commencement of the meeting. Related supplemental questions were also allowed. If community members wished to make a presentation to a Standing Committee of the Board they were required to notify the staff person working with the Trustees. All the information regarding opportunities for presentation and questions to the Board in Phase Two of the process providing for public input was outlined on page seven of the January 23, 2012 report to the Board recommending the establishment of the ARC STS and was also included in the ARC binder.

Opportunities for public presentation on the final ARC report and the Staff final report were sufficiently provided through the six meetings of the Board prior to the final decision of the Board. The DDSB Procedure #7113 was followed with respect to allowing the community ample opportunities to present their viewpoints to the Board of Trustees prior to the final decision of the Board regarding the accommodation of the secondary students of Scugog Township.

## **D) Failure to encourage forms of communication and to involve School Community Councils**

### **Petitioners' and Some Community Members' Perspective:**

The Cartwright Central Public School Council was not allowed to put the ARC STS on its agenda and two members of the ARC wishing to make a presentation on the ARC to the School Community Council of CCPS were denied the request.

The petitioners point out that, at another ARC within the DDSB, the Chair of that ARC expressed the importance of the involvement of School Community Councils.

### **Board's Response:**

As with all previous DDSB ARCs, it was strongly encouraged that the Principals of schools under review ensure continued communication with the School Community Councils. This is in addition to the 7 Newsletters which were distributed to each of the secondary school communities as well as information being available on the Board's Website. Further, in accordance with the Board's procedure, advertisements for Public Meetings were placed in local newspapers to provide an avenue for individuals to attend Public Meetings. In particular, the Newsletters relating to the 3rd and 4th Public Meetings were directly shared with Cartwright Central PS to be shared with their community. Also, for the 3rd Public Meeting, the ARC directed Staff to share the scenarios under consideration with the 2 secondary schools and Cartwright Central PS. This was done through the secondary schools newsletters and on their websites and there was a notice on the CCPS website and in their newsletter that the scenarios were available in the school office. All participants at all four public meetings received hard copy of any presentations that were to be made at the meeting by Staff.

### **Facilitator's Perspective:**

Information regarding the ARC's deliberations and process was shared directly with the School Community Councils of both CHS and PPHS. Information on the process of the ARC was available to Cartwright Central Public School through the school newsletter, on their website and in the school office but not directly in the meetings of the School Community Council of CCPS. While Cartwright Central Public School was not a named school in the ARC STS nor part of the formal process, it would have been desirable if there had been information sharing with the CCPS School Community Council built into the process in a way that would have allowed the perspectives of these parents to be gathered in a focussed way. The decision to decline a presentation about the ARC offered by two members of the ARC may have been made because this presentation was to be by individual members of the ARC who represented one side of the argument. Perhaps an outline of the process and the opportunities for input could have been highlighted at a CCPS School Community Council meeting and parents from this

community could have been encouraged to forward questions or comments to the ARC for consideration.

That said, the dates of the public meetings were sent home via the school newsletter to parents of CCPS students and the schedule of meetings was available in the school office for interested parents and on the school and DDSB website.

There is no violation of the DDSB Procedure #7113 in regard to communication with the School Community Councils of the two schools under review. However, the involvement of feeder schools in secondary school accommodation reviews is an area where the Board may wish to expand upon its current policy.

### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

I doubt that anyone involved in the discussions of this administrative review would argue with the statement that there was a sharp divide in opinion regarding the functioning of the ARC and its adherence to the letter and spirit of DDSB Procedure #7113. That divide generally followed the school affiliation of the presenter or speaker in the Administrative Review process. Broadly speaking, members of the community opposed to the closing of CHS expressed various concerns regarding the efficacy of the process. Similarly, those who indicated satisfaction with the process tended to be parents, staff, students or community members affiliated with PPHS.

There is no question that the exchanges that occurred between and among some community members, particularly during the public meetings of the ARC, have left some rifts in the fabric of Scugog Township that will need some time to heal. That said, at the meetings I held in Scugog Township, I did hear from members of the CHS community, including staff and students at the school who feel that the time has come to move on and that the students of CHS will be well served in their new school. Indeed, extensive steps have been taken this spring to help the students make a successful transition to PPHS while acknowledging and celebrating the many positive aspects of their experience as students of Cartwright High School. These activities are outlined in Appendix E.

After a careful consideration of the petitioners' submission and the alleged violations of the process which they identified and an examination of the DDSB's responses as well as lengthy and thorough discussions and correspondence with the members of the ARC, I conclude that the DDSB did not violate its Procedure #7113 in the conducting of the ARC established to consider accommodation options for the secondary students of Scugog Township.

I do, however, have three recommendations to make to the DDSB for consideration for inclusion in their policy in the future. My first two suggestions are offered in order to address some of the issues that were raised regarding the high level of antagonism that



was apparent between and among individuals and groups during some of the proceedings of the ARC STS. My third suggestion is made in order to ensure that the opinions of parents, students and staff of feeder schools to the schools under review in a secondary school accommodation review are considered in a more focused way. These three recommendations emerged from the dialogue I had with members of the ARC and with the petitioners.

### **Recommendation #1: Provision of a Procedure for a Secret Ballot in the ARC**

The inclusion of such an option in DDSB Procedure #7113 which could be implemented or not depending on the will of the members of a particular ARC, could have the effect of reducing some of the divisiveness that naturally arises in a group when strongly held perspectives are feared to be offensive or threatening to some group members. Several members of this particular ARC expressed the view that such a secret ballot might have assisted the progress of the ARC in working through its mandate of identifying and accepting or rejecting scenarios to address the accommodation challenges of the affected schools.

### **Recommendation #2: Regarding Appropriate and Respectful Participation at the Public Meetings**

As mentioned several times earlier in this review, there is no question that many individuals felt that the tone and confrontational content of some of the commentary of some participants in the public meetings of this ARC impeded useful and productive discussion and created a toxic and inhibiting atmosphere. Some staff and community members who communicated with me on this point expressed dismay that this kind of behaviour was allowed to continue to the detriment of reasoned discussion aimed at information gathering and problem solving. While the Board would certainly not wish to curtail the public's input in any precipitous or overly directive way, the DDSB may wish to consider including a clause in their policy/procedure which specifies actions that will be taken by the Chair of the public meetings when this type of interaction occurs and compromises respectful dialogue and the inclusion of a range of perspectives in the deliberations.

### **Recommendation #3: Inclusion of Options to Directly Involve the School Community Councils of the Feeder School(s) in an Accommodation Review of Secondary Schools.**

Several petitioners, members of the community and members of this ARC expressed the view that they would have liked to have heard the voices of the senior students, the staff and the parents of Cartwright Central Public School more directly in the consideration of options for the provision of secondary school accommodation and programming in Scugog Township. Clearly, during the ARC, there was information available to the CCPS community through newsletters and advertisements about the public meetings. However, while recognizing that involving all the feeder School

Community Councils in the formal membership of an ARC established to examine accommodation options for secondary schools in a specified area might be cumbersome, designated opportunities for the input of these individuals and groups from the affected elementary schools could only enlighten the deliberations. The DDSB might wish to explore ways this might be achieved and enshrined in policy.

In conclusion Minister, I appreciated the opportunity to conduct this administrative review and provide my perspective. Able and conscientious people, including trustees, parents, students, staff and community members, invested their time and energy to consider viable options to make the best use of human and physical resources available to meet the needs of the secondary school students of Scugog Township.

This ARC was marked by very strongly held views by some participants in the process and the resulting exchanges were sometimes very discouraging for all concerned. The petitioners largely believed that the value of Cartwright High School to its community was not fully appreciated and this conviction coloured all other considerations from the outset. Despite significant differences of opinion and considerable tension, the members of the ARC persevered through 13 working meetings and 4 sometimes acrimonious public meetings and delivered what they considered to be three possible solutions to the Board of Trustees for consideration.

Given my experience assessing the efficacy and integrity of accommodation review processes in other jurisdictions, I feel confident in saying that the DDSB conducted this review in good faith and with attention to the requirements of its Procedure #7113 and the needs and views of the communities affected.

I believe the DDSB will continue to work with its communities to continuously improve its processes to ensure that students have the best learning environments possible.

No process is perfect and I have made several suggestions which, if taken up, could possibly alleviate some of the tensions which characterized some aspects of this Accommodation Review.

School consolidations and the decisions regarding the wise use of public resources to provide the best possible education for all students present many difficult challenges for School Boards and for affected families and community members. After visiting both secondary schools under review and the elementary feeder school for Cartwright High School, I know that what is best for students is the central focus of the adults in those students' lives, both at home and at school. I am confident that the students in the secondary schools of the Township of Scugog will be well-served in the future in an excellent facility which will house high-quality and diverse programs meeting the wide range of needs presented by students who face a complex and demanding world.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Green  
Independent Facilitator

## **APPENDIX A**

### **THE DURHAM DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD - 7113 - Procedure - Pupil Accommodation Review**

#### **1.0 Statement:**

The Durham District School Board is committed to providing a full range of educational opportunities and to enhancing the learning environment in its schools.

The Board recognizes that various accommodation factors, including changing demographic patterns, student enrolment, changes in curriculum and facility conditions, affect its ability to deliver educational services efficiently and effectively. The Planning Department within the Facilities Services Department is continuously engaged in the short and long-term study of these accommodation factors. One or a combination of these factors may trigger the need to develop alternative solutions to student accommodation including the closure of a school or schools and/or the consolidation of two or more schools. Any of these scenarios may also result in the movement of program and boundaries for the schools under review.

This Procedure implements the requirements of the Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline issued by the Ministry of Education in June 2009. This Guideline and the Ministry of Education's Administrative Review of Accommodation Review Process are to be posted on the Board's Website and to be made available at the Board's office.

The Board supports the concept of the Ministry of Education-required Terms of Reference and the final School Information Profile(s) providing the foundation for discussion and analysis of accommodation options leading to school accommodation recommendations. These recommendations may help the Board of Trustees make accommodation-related decisions to benefit the students in the identified review area.

#### **1.1 Scope:**

This procedure applies to schools offering elementary or secondary regular day-school programs. The following outlines circumstances where the Board is not obligated to undertake an accommodation review in accordance with the Ministry of Education's Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline. As indicated in the Ministry of Education's Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline, should the Board be required to address the situations listed below, the Board will consult with the local community about its proposed options prior to making a decision.

- Where a replacement school is to be rebuilt by the Board on the existing site, or rebuilt or acquired within the existing school attendance boundary as identified through the Board's existing policies;
- When a lease has been terminated;
- When a Board is planning the relocation in any school year or over a number of school years of a grade or grades or a program, where the enrolment constitutes less than 50% of the enrolment of the school; this calculation is based on the enrolment at the time of the relocation or the first phase of a relocation carried over a number of school years;
- When a Board is repairing or renovating a school, and the school community must be temporarily relocated to ensure the safety of students during the renovations;
- Where a facility has been serving as a holding school for a school community whose permanent school is over-capacity and/or is under construction or repair.

## **1.2 Exception to Procedure**

The Accommodation Review processes for the East Oshawa Secondary Schools and the South West Whitby Elementary Schools approved by the Durham District School Board on May 19, 2009 are undertaken in accordance with Policy #7113 and Procedure #7113 as they existed on May 19, 2009.

## **2.0 Annual Review of School Accommodation:**

2.1 An annual review of the Board's elementary and secondary schools is to be undertaken by the Area Superintendents of Education with the assistance of Facilities Services to identify:

2.1.1 Schools where current and/or projected enrolment declines would compromise program offering and extra-curricular or co-curricular offerings;

2.1.2 Schools with enrolment declines leading to sustained underutilization of the buildings;

2.1.3 Schools where required repair, renewal or upgrading costs are greater than or approaching the replacement cost of the building.

2.2 Staff shall prepare a report for the Board of Trustees that analyzes student enrolments in schools and other relevant factors including those listed above, in order to determine whether there is a need to consider possible closure and/or consolidations of a school or group of schools. Any of the points above or a combination may result in a

recommendation for an Accommodation Review to determine whether school closure or consolidation would result in improved educational opportunities for elementary or secondary students of the Board.

2.3 Wherever possible, the accommodation review process being proposed should focus on a group of schools within a planning area, rather than a single school, in an effort to develop feasible and practical solutions for the accommodation of students within the planning area.

2.3.1 A planning area is a previously defined sub-area of the Board's jurisdiction in which the location of the schools are close enough to each other to impact the accommodation needs of students and to impact the ability of the Board to support program needs.

2.4 Prior to making a decision to close a school, the Board will undertake a thorough review of all relevant information and options. Such reviews will include a determination of the value of the school to the students, the community, the school system and the local economy. The Board will, through the establishment of an Accommodation Review Committee, consult with all interested stakeholders in the review process and will provide opportunities for public input with ample notice of Public Meetings being provided.

2.5 Wherever possible, a school should only be subject to an Accommodation Review once in a five-year period, unless there are extenuating circumstances as determined by the Board.

### **3.0 Establishment of Accommodation Review Committee:**

3.1 Following consideration of the staff report, the Board may initiate an Accommodation Review process which is a dual-phased community consultation process.

3.1.1 Phase one consists of the establishment, by the Board, of an Accommodation Review Committee (ARC) that will be charged with reviewing and making recommendations on the accommodation options for the school or group of schools referred to it for study. The ARC will be required to engage in community consultation to help the ARC Members develop recommendations on the accommodation solution for the Board to consider. The ARC's recommendations will form part of the ARC's Report.

3.1.1.1 The Superintendent of Education for the school or group of schools under review will be appointed by the Board to Chair the ARC.

3.1.1.2 The Superintendent of Education/Facilities Services for the Board will be appointed by the Board as Secretary of the ARC.

3.1.1.3 Trustee(s) for the affected administrative area of the Board may be non-voting members of the ARC. Trustees will signify their intention with regard to membership at the time of the establishment of the ARC.

3.1.1.4 The membership of the ARC shall include, but not be limited to, the Members of the school community and the community at large as set out in the Terms of Reference (Appendix A).

3.1.2 Phase two consists of the Trustees receiving the ARC Report as well as the Staff Report to consider as support in arriving at final decisions. Community members will have access to both reports and will have the ability to consult with Trustees after the Reports are submitted to the Trustees and up to the Board Meeting where a final decision is made by the Trustees.

3.2 Within twenty-five days of its decision to establish an ARC, the Board shall provide written notice of this decision to the parents of the students and the staff of the affected schools and the Clerk of the area municipality. Notice of the decision shall also be posted on the Board's Website.

3.2.1 Notwithstanding the maximum time of twenty-five days' notice, the Board shall make every effort to provide written notice within five days of its decision.

#### **4.0 Terms of Reference:**

4.1 When an ARC is appointed, the Board is to provide the ARC with a Terms of Reference (TOR) document that describes the ARC's mandate. The TOR template is found in Appendix A of this document.

4.2 The Board may review and revise the TOR template prior to a decision leading to the establishment of an ARC if the situation so warrants.

4.3 The ARC is required to comply with the Terms of Reference set out in Appendix A of this Procedure.

4.4 The ARC's mandate is to refer to the Board's educational and accommodation objectives in undertaking the school accommodation review and reflect the board's strategy for supporting student achievement.

4.5 The TOR must contain reference criteria that frame the parameters of the ARC discussions. These criteria are to include the educational and accommodation criteria for examining schools under review and proposed accommodation options.

4.6 The TOR must identify the ARC membership and the role of voting and non-voting Members, including Board and school administration. Describe procedures for the ARC, including meetings; material, support and analysis to be provided by board administration; and the material to be produced by the ARC.

## **5.0 School Information Profile**

5.1 The Board is required to complete a School Information Profile (SIP) that it has developed to help the ARC and the community understand how well the school or schools under review meet the objectives of the reference criteria set out in the TOR. The same SIP must be used for each school under review.

The Board may review and revise the SIP template prior to beginning an ARC if such revisions are warranted.

The SIP template is attached as Appendix B.

5.2 The SIP is to include data for each of the following four considerations about the school(s) under review:

2.1.1 Value to the Student

2.1.2 Value to the Community

2.1.3 Value to the School Board

2.1.4 Value to the Local Economy

5.3 Each school's value to the student takes priority over other considerations about the school.

5.4 The completed SIPs are to be provided to the ARC for discussion, consultation and modification based on new or improved information. The ARC is then responsible for finalizing the SIP for each school under review.

2.3.1 The ARC is encouraged to introduce other factors that could be used to reflect the local circumstances and priorities which may help to further educate the community about the schools.

2.3.2 The Completed SIPs are to be provided to the ARC within the first two Working Meetings of the process.

5.5 The final SIP and the TOR will provide the foundation for discussion and analysis of accommodation options.



## **6.0 Communications and Timelines**

6.1 All information or requests provided to the ARC or developed by the ARC will be posted on the Board's Website and made available to the general public in printed form.

6.1.1 Information of a technical nature is to be provided in plain language.

6.2 The ARC is required to hold a minimum of four Public Meetings to consult with the community on the accommodation needs for the students in the school or schools under review.

6.3 Public meetings must be well publicized, in advance, through a range of methods and held at the school(s) under review, if possible, or in a nearby facility if physical accessibility cannot be provided at the school(s). Public meetings are to be structured to encourage an open and informed exchange of views.

6.4 Within four months of the Board's decision to establish an ARC, the ARC shall give notice that it will be convening the first of four Public Meetings in connection with the accommodation review process.

6.4.1 Notice of the first of the four Public Meetings is to be published at least thirty calendar days prior to the meeting date.

6.4.2 Notice of subsequent Public Meetings is to be published at least fourteen calendar days prior to the meeting date.

6.5 Written notice of the Public Meetings shall be provided to the parents of the students and the staff of the affected schools, the Clerk of the area municipality and all trustees. Notice of the Public Meetings shall be advertised in the local newspaper(s) and posted on the Board's Website.

6.6 Beginning with the first Public Meeting, the public consultation must be no less than 90 calendar days and no more than 120 calendar days unless otherwise approved by the Board. The consultation period shall exclude Summer vacation, Christmas break and Spring break, including adjacent weekends.

6.7 Within thirty calendar days of the final Public Meeting of the ARC, or as soon as practicable, the ARC shall submit its Report containing recommendations concerning school accommodation solutions to the Director of Education.

6.7.1 The Board shall post the ARC Report on its website and make hard copies available to the public on request.

## **7.0 Staff Analysis and Board Consideration of the ARC Report**

7.1 Board staff shall review and analyze the ARC Report. Following such a review, Board staff shall prepare a report to the Board detailing the findings and recommendations of the ARC Report.

7.1.1 The Staff report shall also provide staff's analysis and recommendations in regard to the accommodation issues considered and addressed by the ARC.

7.2 The Board shall notify the public that it will be considering the ARC Report and the Board staff report at a Public Meeting where members of the public shall be afforded an opportunity to present their views and comments to the Board in regard to the accommodation review.

7.2.1 The notice shall also advise that the Board will not be adopting recommendations at this meeting nor otherwise deciding on the outcome of the accommodation review.

7.2.2 The Chair of the ARC will present the ARC Report to the Trustees while the Director of Education will present the Board staff report related to the ARC Report to the Trustees.

7.2.3 Written notice of the Board meeting shall be sent to the parents of the students and the staff of the affected schools, the Clerk of the area municipality and all trustees. Notice of the Board meeting shall also be advertised in the local newspaper(s) and posted on the Board's Website.

7.3 Following the Board meeting where the Trustees formally receive both reports for their consideration, the Board shall provide at least sixty calendar days' notice of a second Public Meeting at which the Board shall vote on the recommendations related to the Accommodation Review. The sixty-day notice period shall exclude Summer vacation, Christmas break and Spring break, including adjacent weekends.

7.3.1 Written notice of the Board meeting shall be sent to the parents of the students and the staff of the affected schools, the Clerk of the area municipality and all trustees. Notice of the Board meeting shall also be advertised in the local newspaper(s) and posted on the Board's Website.

7.4 If the Board adopts a resolution to close a school or schools, the Board shall establish timelines that will govern the closure of the school or schools.

## **Terms of Reference – Appendix A**

1. The Terms of Reference document has been developed in accordance with the Ministry of Education’s Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline of June 2009.

### **2. Scope of this Pupil Accommodation Review**

#### **2.1 Review Area**

This accommodation review involves the following schools within the Insert Name Planning Area:

#### ***List Schools and Addresses***

### **3. ARC Mandate**

3.1 The Accommodation Review Committee is to review and make recommendations for a preferred accommodation solution (closure, consolidation, construction, etc.) for the students associated with the schools listed above. The Accommodation solution is to support the Board’s goal of improving student achievement through the provision of strong educational programming and opportunities in safe, healthy and accessible learning environments. In doing so, the ARC should evaluate as many scenarios or opportunities within the identified planning area to determine if any of these scenarios or opportunities offer long-term accommodation stability to students while effectively utilizing Board facilities.

Special Board instructions (usually contained as part of the Board resolution triggering an ARC and provides part of the mandate specifically designed for the school community under review)

### **4. ARC Membership and Support**

4.1 The ARC is to include membership drawn from the community, including, parents, educators, board officials and community members. Wherever possible representation is to include:

- Superintendent of Education for the school or group of schools under review as the Chair the ARC;
- The Superintendent of Education/Facilities Services for the Board as the Secretary of the ARC;
- Trustees for the affected administrative area of the board may serve as non-voting members of the ARC.

- The principals from the schools under review;
- One teacher representative from each of the schools under review;
- One non-teacher representative (i.e., custodian, secretary, educational assistant) from each of the schools under review;
- Up to two parent representatives (i.e., School Community Council Members) as selected by the principal for each of the schools under review;
  - Up to two additional members of the community
  - Where more than one member of the community sits on the ARC, there must be no more than one community member representing a specific interest or school community

#### 4.2 Board staff will provide resource support to the ARC:

- Administrative support for minute taking
- Dedicated resources to enable the ARC to understand the issues that exist and to provide:
  - support to ensure compliance with the Board's policy and procedure
  - information relevant to the mandate of the ARC as requested by the ARC
  - information relevant to the mandate of the ARC to support community questions or requests
- If the ARC Chair sees a need for additional expertise or if additional expertise is requested by the ARC, ARC Resource guests may be invited to attend specified meetings

## 5. ARC Procedures

5.1 The ARC will consult with the community through a minimum of four Public Meetings. Other forms of communication are encouraged and may take the form of e-mails, feedback forms, voicemail, school community council updates, newsletters, etc.

During the consultation period, the ARC must ensure that a wide range of school and community groups are consulted to seek input and community feedback on options for accommodating students who would be affected by a school closure. These groups may include the school community councils, parents, guardians, students, teachers, the local community and any other interested parties.

5.2 Once an ARC has been established, there must be a minimum of 30 calendar days public notice provided prior to the first Public Meeting. Notices for the remaining three Public Meetings are to be publicized no later than 14 calendar days in advance of each of the Public Meetings.

5.3 Consultation will take place regarding the customized School Information Profile (SIP) completed by the Board and revised as necessary by the ARC. The SIP may be further revised based on input received from the consultation and then deemed to be finalized.

The ARC will also seek input and feedback from the community about the accommodation options and the ARC's Accommodation Report to the Director of Education. Discussions will be based on the SIP and the ARC's TOR.

5.4 To prepare for the required minimum four Public Meetings, the ARC is expected to schedule Working Meetings and all meetings will be conducted in an open, transparent and professional manner.

5.5 The ARC Chair is responsible for:

- Managing the development of the process according to the ARC mandate, the Terms of Reference and the supporting School Information Profile.
- Coordination of the activities of the ARC, requesting support, resources, and information relevant to the ARCs mandate from the DDSB staff.
- Ensuring completion of the ARC Report to the Board.

Recognizing the value of the ARC's contribution to the Board's ability to provide quality educational opportunities for its students, ARC Members must be prepared to make a commitment as it is expected that they attend all of the Working Meetings and the Public Meetings.

In the event that an ARC member will be absent from more than one meeting, The Chair of the ARC has the authority to address the attendance issue and recommend a solution.

## **6. Voting Structure of the ARC**

6.1 All sitting Members of the ARC, excluding the ARC Chair and the ARC Secretary, are voting Members of the ARC. ARC Resource Staff are not Members of the ARC.

6.2 Trustees for the administrative area of the board are non-voting members of the ARC.

6.3 ARC Working Meetings may only proceed if there is a quorum of Members. Quorum will constitute 50 percent plus 1 of the voting Members of the ARC for the purposes of conducting a Working Meeting.

6.4 The ARC is encouraged to work on a consensus basis. Where a consensus cannot be reached, a simple majority of those voting Members in attendance (50 percent plus 1) will apply.

6.5 In the event that a member is unable to fulfill his/her duties on the ARC, the Principal of the affiliated school working with the Chair of the ARC may choose another representative. If a replacement cannot be found, the ARC will continue to function with quorum being recalculated.

## **7. Partnership Opportunities**

The Board is to outline its capital planning objectives for the area under review in order to provide the ARC with context for the accommodation review processes and decisions. The Board is to provide five-year enrolment projections, by grade, for each school included in the review. In addition, if requested by the ARC, longer-term enrolment projections and/or school-age population data for the subject review area will be provided in order to support effective decision-making by the ARC.

- These capital planning objectives should take into account opportunities for partnerships with other school boards and appropriate public organizations that are financially sustainable, safe for students, and protect the core values and objectives of the school board.
- The Board is to inform the ARC of such partnership opportunities, or lack thereof, at the beginning of the ARC process – (first or second Working Meeting).

## **8. Reference Criteria**

8.1 The ARC is to examine the school or group of schools under review from the perspective of the following criteria as the criteria relates to the existing situation and the projected situation – both physical and educational at the school or group of schools to better understand the rationale for the accommodation review. The ARC is to also examine the school or group of schools under review from the perspective of the following criteria as it assesses the impact of recommending accommodation options that would improve the school experience for the students in the school or group of schools under review.

- Declining school or program enrolments which currently impact or may limit a student's educational and social opportunity;

- The physical condition of a school or a group of schools which may impact the quality of the learning environment and/or limited financial resources of the Board;
- The presence of surplus instructional space within a school or a group of schools;
- The absence of sufficient instructional space within a school or a group of schools (which may impact a student's access to programming and physical resources e.g., gym, library).

## **9. Accommodation Options**

9.1 The Board must present at least one alternative staff-developed accommodation option addressing the objectives and the reference criteria of the TOR for the ARC's consideration.

9.2 Where the Board's proposed alternative staff-developed accommodation option(s) include new capital investment, the Board staff will advise the ARC on the availability of funding. Where no funding exists, Board staff will propose how students would be accommodated if funding does not become available.

9.3 The ARC may create alternative accommodation options, consistent with the objectives and Reference Criteria outlined above.

9.4 ARC Resource Staff will provide the necessary data to enable the ARC to examine the options proposed. This analysis is necessary to assist the ARC in finalizing the Accommodation Report to the Director of Education.

9.5 Where the ARC recommends accommodation options that include new capital investment, the ARC Chair will advise the ARC on the availability of funding. Where no funding exists, the ARC, will propose how students would be accommodated if funding does not become available. ARC Resource staff will provide analysis support for this process.

9.6 All accommodation options developed by the Board staff or by the ARC are to address, at a minimum, where students would be accommodated; changes that may be required to existing facilities; program availability and transportation.

9.7 Accommodation options developed by the Board staff or by the ARC may result in recommendations in the ARC Report to close a school or schools, consolidate two or more schools, move programs or adjust attendance boundaries for the schools under review.

## 10. Meetings

10.1 The Goal of the Working Meetings is to ensure that information is prepared for presentation at each of the minimum four Public Meetings. The materials prepared will support the objectives and the reference criteria of this TOR and will help the ARC in its development of its Accommodation Report.

- ARC Resource staff will prepare a timeline outlining the work to be accomplished at each ARC Working and ARC Public Meeting.

10.2 The ARC Resource staff will work with the ARC to prepare all Working Meeting and Public Meeting agendas and materials. Meeting agendas and materials are to be reviewed and approved by the ARC prior to being made publicly available. All approved materials are to be e-mailed to the ARC Members and posted on the Board's Website. Meeting agendas are to be available by e-mail to the ARC Members and posted on the Board's Website at least 24 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting.

10.3 ARC Resource staff will ensure that accurate minutes (not verbatim) are recorded. These minutes are to reflect the key points of the discussions that take place and decisions that are made at Working Meetings and at Public Meetings. ARC Meeting minutes will be posted to the Board's Website after the minutes have been approved by the ARC.

10.4 Requests for information in keeping with the ARC's mandate and in keeping with the schools under review will be provided by ARC Resource staff in a timely manner for the ARC's use and if the information is requested from an external party, for the ARC's approval.

10.5 The ARC acknowledges that it may not always be possible to obtain responses to requests for information in time for the next scheduled meeting. If this occurs, ARC Resource staff will provide an estimated availability time.

10.6 All information provided to the ARC is to be posted on the Board's Website and made available in hard copy if requested.

10.7 The ARC Report which is a mandatory outcome of the ARC's work is to be submitted to the Director of Education by the Chair of the ARC. The Report is to be drafted in plain language.

10.8 The purpose of the minimum four ARC Public Meetings is to seek input and feedback from the community on:

- The Customized School Information Profile



- Presentation of the customized SIP is intended to help the community understand the current situation at the school or schools under review and the potential situation should action to improve the situation not be taken
- Community input may result in revisions to the customized SIP and its subsequent finalization
- Accommodation Options developed or supported by the ARC that address the needs of the students in the schools under review
- Community input may result in revisions to the Accommodation Options
- The ARC's Report to the Director of Education
- Report will contain the ARC's accommodation recommendations consistent with the objectives and reference criteria outlined in the TOR.
- Community input may result in revisions and/or refinements to the contents of the ARC's Report including the ARC's recommendations to the Board.

10.9 Community input on any aspect of the ARC's work is not limited to input at the minimum of four ARC Public Meetings. ARC Members may receive community information via e-mail, voicemail, School Community Councils, conversations with individual community members, etc. The ARC Members are responsible for ensuring that all input is shared with the Chair of the ARC for the Chair to disseminate to all ARC Members.

10.10 The minimum of four ARC Public Meetings are to be held in the school or schools under review or in a nearby facility if physical accessibility cannot be provided at the school(s).

10.11 ARC Members and community members attending ARC Working and/or ARC Public Meetings are required to sign in.

### **11.0 ARC Working Meeting requirements to support ARC Public Meetings**

11.1 Prior to the First Public Meeting, the ARC's Working Meetings will focus on finalizing a Draft School Information Profile for each school under review for the Community's input.

- Prior to the First Public Meeting, tours of the schools under review will be made available to the ARC Members. Specific tour dates will be scheduled by ARC Resource Staff.

11.2 Prior to the Second Public Meeting, the ARC's Working Meetings will focus on developing alternative accommodation options that reflect practical educational solutions for the schools under review for the Community's input.

11.3 Prior to the Third Public Meeting, the ARC's Working Meetings will focus on refining its preferred accommodation options based on community and ARC Members' input and the drafting of the ARC's Report for Community's input.

11.4 Prior to the Fourth Public Meeting, the ARC's Working Meetings will focus on finalizing its ARC Report containing its recommendations to the Board for the Community's input.

11.5 ARC Working Meetings after the Fourth Public Meeting will focus on completing its Mandate and submitting the ARC Report to the Director of Education.

11.6 Written notice of the Public Meetings shall be provided to the parents of the students and the staff of the affected schools, the Clerk of the area municipality and all trustees. Notice of the Public Meetings shall be advertised in the local newspaper(s) and posted on the Board's Website.

11.7 Beginning with the first Public Meeting, the public consultation must be no less than 90 calendar days and no more than 120 calendar days unless otherwise approved by the Board. The consultation period shall exclude Summer vacation, Christmas break and Spring break, including adjacent weekends.

11.8 Within thirty calendar days of the final Public Meeting of the ARC, or as soon as practicable, the ARC shall submit its Report containing recommendations concerning school accommodation solutions to the Director of Education.

### **School Information Profile (SIP)**

The Ministry of Education's Pupil Accommodation Review Guideline, June 2009, requires that the Durham District School Board develop a School Information Profile (SIP) and complete the SIP for each school under an accommodation review.

The ARC will discuss and consult about the SIP prepared by the Board for the schools under review and modify the profiles where appropriate. ARCs are encouraged to introduce other factors that could be used to reflect the local circumstances and priorities which may help to further educate the community about the schools.

This discussion is intended to familiarize the ARC Members and the community with the schools in light of the objectives and reference criteria set out in the TOR. The final SIP and the TOR will provide the foundation for discussion and analysis of accommodation options.

Planning Area: \_\_\_\_\_

School Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

### Program Offering

Program Offering	
Regular Track	.
French Immersion	.
Specialized (please provide type), i.e., Gifted	.
Other (please specify)	.

### School Information

School Information	
Year Constructed	.
Distance to the next closest DDSB school, offering a similar program?	.
Size of permanent structure in m <sup>2</sup>	.
Site Size in hectares	.
Green Space Size in hectares	.
School Ministry Rated Capacity	.
# of Portables on Site	.
# of Portables in Use on Site	.
Availability of Parking – Number of Parking Spaces	.
Designated Student drop-off and pick-up area on site (Y/N)	.
Bus-loop (Y/N)	.
Number of Classrooms (excl. Portables)	.
List Specialized Spaces (e.g., Gym, Science Room, etc.)	.
Accessibility (provide information indicating areas of accessibility, e.g., ramp, washroom, etc.)	.
List available outdoor play areas (e.g., soccer field, track, playground)	.
Partnerships with Community Groups	.
List Groups using the school or grounds	.
List Community Tenants (e.g., Child Care Centre)	.
Staffing	.

<b>School Information</b>	
Current	.
Impact over next 5 years	.
# of students bussed	.
# of students that walk	.
# of out of area students	.
List of course offering available in addition to the Core Curriculum requirements	.
What programs if any, does the school have to support student success	.
Student achievement data: Provision of EQAO report for current year and other measures Board may have in use	.
What pathways/programs (planned route leading to direct entry into e.g., independent living, work, apprenticeship, college, university) does the school offer?	.
What specialist high-skills majors does the school offer?	.
What is the expectation of expansion on the specialist high-skills major given the enrolment projections for the school?	.
List of extra-curricular activities available (volleyball, basketball, etc.)	.
List of co-curricular activities available (band, choir, etc.)	.
List of before and/or after school programs (e.g., Breakfast Club)	.

## Financial Analysis of School

<b>Financial Analysis of School</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Current Per pupil cost to operate the school (administration, operating and maintenance)	.
5-year projected per pupil cost to operate the school (administration, operating and maintenance)	.
Current transportation cost	.
5-year projected transportation cost	.
Board average per pupil cost to operate a school (administration, operating and maintenance)	.
Board average transportation cost	.
Replacement Value of the School Building	.
Current Cost of needed Repairs (ReCAPP data)	.
Current Facilities Condition Index (FCI)	.
Cost of needed Repairs over the next 5 years	.
Projected FCI at end of 5-year period	.

## 5-Year Historic Enrolment by Program, totalled to the school level

Program	Insert Yr. 1	Insert Yr. 2	Insert Yr. 3	Insert Yr. 4	Insert Yr. 5
.	.	.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.	.	.
Total Enrolment:	.	.	.	.	.
Utilization:	.	.	.	.	.

## Actual enrolment for current year and projected enrolment (5 years) by program, totalled to the school level

Program	Current Year	Insert Yr. 1	Insert Yr. 2	Insert Yr. 3	Insert Yr. 4	Insert Yr. 5
.	.	.	.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Total:	.	.	.	.	.	.
Utilization:	.	.	.	.	.	.

### Using the information provided above, consider the following:

#### 1. Value to the Student

1.1 How are programs affected by the enrolment trend at the school? – consider the past five years, the current year, and the projected 5 years.

1.2 How are extracurricular and/or co-curricular activities affected by the enrolment trend at the school? -- consider the past five years, the current year, and the projected 5 years.

1.3 What would the impact be to the students if this school were to close from the perspective of such things as transportation, program delivery, extra-curricular and co-curricular activities?

1.4 What type of classroom/school organization is possible with the eligible staffing allocation?

1.5 What safety measures are in place at the school (e.g., security cameras)?

1.6 How does the physical configuration of the building support or not support program offering (e.g., gym, library allocation)?

1.7 How does student achievement at the school compare to the Board Average, the Provincial Average?

1.8 Does the school have before and/or after school programs to address the needs of student?

1.9 What opportunities are available to the students due to the location of the school and its proximity to existing community facilities?

1.10 Are there components of the building that are in need of repair and if so, how does this hamper program delivery?

## **2. Value to the Community**

2.1 Is the school frequently used as a community resource/support? If yes, please list uses.

2.2 Are any of the supports listed above transferable to another location within the board's schools to ensure continued community supports are in place?

2.3 Is the school or the school grounds used for community use outside of the regular school day? If yes, please list groups using the school or grounds.

2.4 Does the school offer a range of programs that serve not only the students but also the community (e.g., adult ESL)? If yes, please list programs.

2.5 Is the school involved in a long-term community commitment (e.g., child care centre)? If yes, please identify the commitment and indicate if there are alternative sites to support the commitment should the school close.

2.6 Does the school have a historic designation?

## **3. Value to the Board**

3.1 Considering the condition and location of the school, what upgrades/major repairs to the building need to be addressed? Please list and provide estimated costs and timing of proposed upgrades/major repairs.

3.2 Describe the condition of the school grounds – if repairs are required, please list and provide estimated costs and timing of proposed repairs.

3.3 Is there room on the site for a permanent addition or for portables?

- 3.4 How does the cost to operate the school today compare to the board average?
- 3.5 How does the current transportation cost compare to the board average?
- 3.6 How are programs impacted by the enrolment trend at the school? – consider the past five years, the current year, and the projected 5 years.
- 3.7 What would the impact be to the board if this school were to close – assess the response based on the location of the school (e.g., only school in the community, rural school, operating and transportation costs, savings etc.)
- 3.8 How does the physical configuration of the building support or not support program offering (e.g., gym, library allocation)?
- 3.9 How does student achievement at the school compare to the Board Average, the Provincial Average?
- 3.10 Does the school have before and/or after school programs to address the needs of students?
- 3.11 How does the staffing model at the school compare to other schools of the Board?
- 3.12 Is the school in compliance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act?

#### **4. Value to the Local Economy**

- 4.1 Does the location of the school attract or retain families in the community?
- 4.2 Does the school contribute to the community vitality? If yes, please explain?
- 4.3 Is this the only school in the community? If yes, please explain the impact on the community if the school were to close.
- 4.4 Are there training opportunities or partnership opportunities involving the school and local businesses? If yes, please list.
- 4.5 How does the school support local employment (e.g., directly employs people living in the community, pizza day, etc.)?

#### **SIP Conclusion**

Board Staff to summarize the School Information Profile based on the responses to the questions above.

**Summary should address/provide:**

Impact of the school remaining open -- how would it affect the students, the community, the Board and the local economy (particular emphasis on the impact on students).

Description of the benefits if the planning area situation were improved through consolidation/closure, etc. Place specific emphasis on the benefits to the students and describe the impact on the community, the Board and the local economy.

**Document Links:**

Effective Date	Legislative References	Regulation
05/07/2007		
Amended/Reviewed		
03/22/2010		
06/20/2011		



## **APPENDIX B**

### **MEMBERSHIP LIST: 16 ARC MEMBERS (\*voting members)**

#### **NAME/ POSITION**

Cartwright HS – Steve David Principal \*

Cartwright HS – Ann Roberts Teacher Representative \*

Cartwright HS – KathyeMcCarey Non-Teaching Representative \*

Cartwright HS – Claire Marsh Parent Representative \*

Cartwright HS – Trish Thompson Parent Representative \*

Port Perry HS – Caysi Stark Principal \*

Port Perry HS – Frank Till Teacher Representative \*

Port Perry HS – Gwen Taylor Non-Teaching Representative \*

Port Perry HS – Karen Clark Parent Representative \*

Port Perry HS – Clare Suggitt Parent Representative \*

Community Member – Bill Holtby \*

Community Member – Joyce Kelly \*

Joe Allin Administrative Area Trustee

Carolyn Morton Administrative Area Trustee

LuigiaAyotte Chair

David Visser Secretary

LygiaDallip – Quadrant Advisory Group Limited Facilitator

Carey Trombino – ARC Resource Staff Senior Planner

Anne Taylor – ARC Resource Staff Administrative Officer

Danielle Pépin – ARC Resource Staff Administrative Assistant

## **APPENDIX C**

### **ARC WORKING MEETINGS DATES:**

Working Mtg #1 February 7, 2012

Working Mtg #2 February 22, 2012

Working Mtg #3 March 7, 2012

Working Mtg #4 March 28, 2012

Public Mtg #1 April 10, 2012

Working Mtg #5 April 18, 2012

Working Mtg #6 May 1, 2012

Public Mtg #2 May 15, 2012

Working Mtg #7 May 29, 2012

Working Mtg #8 June 12, 2012

Public Mtg #3 June 19, 2012

Working Mtg #9 September 11, 2012

Working Mtg #10 September 18, 2012

Working Mtg #11 September 25, 2012

Public Mtg #4 October 9, 2012

Working Mtg #12 October 18, 2012

Working Mtg #13 October 30, 2012

## APPENDIX D

### SCHEDULE FOR THE MEETINGS CONVENED BY THE INDEPENDENT FACILITATOR:

#### Independent Facilitator Review of Accommodation Review Process Durham District School Board (DDSB)

#### Scugog Township Secondary Schools Accommodation Review

**Monday, May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

Time	Meeting	Location
1:00 p.m.	DDSB Senior Administration	Room 1015 Education Centre (DDSB)
6:00 p.m.	Accommodation Review Committee	Conference Room Cartwright Central Public School 10 Alexander Street Blackstock

**Tuesday, May 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

Time	Meeting	Location
11:15 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Tour – Cartwright High School	14220 Old Scugog Road Scugog (Blackstock)
2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Tour – Port Perry High School	160 Rosa Street Scugog
6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.	Board of Trustees	Room 1019 Education Centre (DDSB)
7:45 p.m.	Petitioners	Conference Room Cartwright Central Public School 10 Alexander Street Blackstock

**Wednesday, May 29<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

Time	Meeting	Location
7:00 p.m.	Public Meeting	Gymnasium Cartwright Central Public School 10 Alexander Street Blackstock

**Thursday, May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Location</b>
8:30 a.m.	DDSB Senior Administration	Room 1015 Education Centre (DDSB)

## APPENDIX E

### TRANSITION PLANNING FOR CARTWRIGHT HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

The Principals from Cartwright High School, Cartwright Central Public School and Port Perry High School planned activities and events to support the academic, social and emotional success of the students entering Port Perry High School in the 2013-2014 school year.

Below is a summary of the transition activities and events:

1. Friday Feb. 8, 2013– Cartwright HS (CHS) option assembly for current CHS students and gr. 9 Cartwright Central Public School (CPS) students. Students completed course option sheets for both Cartwright High School and Port Perry HS.
2. Friday Feb. 22 , 2013 (following the final outcome of the Scugog ARC - all CHS students visited Port Perry HS (PPHS) to tour the school and discuss course option selection process for 2013/14 at PPHS
3. First CHS/PPHS Transition Committee meeting - March 21, 2013 - at CHS  
Committee is comprised of 24 people representing students, administration, teaching staff, and community parents/guardians from both CHS and PPHS as well as area Trustee, Superintendent and Administrative Officer
4. Monday Apr. 15, 2013 - 8 PPHS students spend the lunch period with CHS students and answer questions about PPHS.
5. Tuesday Apr. 16, 2013 - Transition Committee Meeting #2 - at PPHS
6. Monday May 6, 2013 - Return trip of gr. 9 to 11 CHS students to PPHS for the morning - PPHS provides a range of workshops for all students to attend about various aspects of PPHS life (Student Services, Academic Resource, Library, Clubs and teams ...)
7. Friday May 10, 2013 - Monday May 13, 2013 - Nine CHS students attend the four day Port Perry HS Leadership Camp on Lake Simcoe
8. Wed. May 15, 2013 - CHS students and their families are invited to PPHS Music Night - all CHS students and families are offered free admission
9. Thursday May 23, 2013 - Optional "School Shadow" day for all CHS students in grades 9, 10 and 11 ... 31 CHS students attend and spend the morning at PPHS matched with individual PPHS students with similar academic and extracurricular interests

10. Wednesday May 29, 2013 - PPHS students will visit CHS provide videos of students seeking Student Council office on the PPHS Student Council in 2013/14 ... CHS students will then vote for their favourite candidate

11. Friday May 31, 2013 - CHS students are invited to attend the PPHS "At Home" Prom (at PPHS)

### **COMMUNITY TRANSITION COMMITTEE**

To mend relationships within the community a Community Transition Committee was formed. The committee was comprised of the local Trustee, Area Superintendent, Principal of CHS, and several community members and a former student.

On Friday May 24, 2013 a Celebration Honouring Cartwright History was held at Cartwright High School from 1:30 -9:00pm. The committee had memorabilia displayed in each classroom for every decade from 1920 -2013. This was a very successful event.

There will be display cases at Port Perry High School, Cartwright Central Public School, Scugog Community Centre and The Historical Society housing the important artifacts from Cartwright High School.