#### SUPERIOR-GREENSTONE DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

## **Pupil Accommodation Review**

Public Meeting: Manitouwadge

Thursday, June 28, 2012 Manitouwadge High School Theatre Auditorium 6:30 p.m.

## **MINUTES**

Working Committee Members	In Attendance	Regrets	Absent
HUNTER, Connie (Councillor, Township of Manitouwadge)	X		
RAYMOND, Dave (Community Representative)		Χ	
GASCON, Ray (Manitouwadge Public School Council)		Χ	
NEWTON, Marcia (Manitouwadge High School Council)	X		
BOURGOIN, Jocelyn (Community Representative)	X		
MOFFAT, Jim (Business Representative)	Х		

Board Support Members	In Attendance	Regrets	Absent
TSUBOUCHI, Cathy (Superintendent of Business)	X		
PETRICK, Nancy (Superintendent of Education)	X		
CHIUPKA, Wayne (Manager of Plant Services)	X		
WILLCOCKS, Barbara (Student Success Coordinator)	X		
MOONILAL, Patricia (Principal, Manitouwadge Public School)	X		
MUTCH, John (Principal, Manitouwadge High School)	X		

## 1.0 Welcome

Committee members were introduced. Acting Chairperson for the evening was Jocelyn Bourgoin.

## 2.0 Review of Minutes of May 23, 2012

Upon review of the minutes it was clarified that, the ARC Process could have encompassed the entire board, but the Board decided to do an independent study in Manitouwadge and Caramat only.

Re Page 4 - Delete: "Each ARC is independent of another"

Insert: "Each of the present ARC's is independent of ..."

Moved by C. Hunter / Second by: J. Moffit

To approve the May 23, 2012 Manitouwadage ARC Minutes

Another note of clarification was offered at this time, that being that the ARC process needs to happen in Caramat even thought there are no students presently attending the school. An ARC must be undertaken to close the school.

There was no business arising from the minutes.

## 3.0 Changes or Additions to Agenda

There were no changes or additions to the agenda.

#### 4.0 Presented Information

#### 4.1 Program information:

It was noted that the focus for the ARC Committee is to gather information regarding education in Manitouwadge only.

#### 4.1.1 PowerPoint presentation (Programming)

- 7-12 programming. It was noted that information provided would be applicable to K-12 programming as well)
- Audio clips included in the presentation were from teachers who shared their experiences addressing both the positive issues and the challenges that presented in teaching in a Grade 7-12 school.

#### Programming:

- Areas will be designated for students, with separate areas for Grade 7 and 8. There
  may be opportunities within programming for supervised integration during
  activities such as sport competitions.
- Inquiries about how to accommodate joint use of gym and science labs will have to be explored as the ARC process evolves. These specific questions and will require a plan of action. The committee would welcome a presentation by the teachers to the Accommodation Review Working Committee.

## 4.1.2 <u>PowerPoint Presentation (Financial /Structural)</u>

The implications of the options identified were presented.

## Option 1: Move Grade 7/8 Into MNHS (with No Build)

- Joint use of space such as art room, shops will require appropriate timetabling.
- At BAPS/GCHS, we are really just beginning to work on the programming piece, barriers are being broken down and communication between the teachers in both panels is occurring much more frequently.
- One Principal would have responsibility for the 7 12 school. The committee must consider the small elementary school that this option creates.

#### Option 2: Move All MNPS into MNHS (with Build)

- Ministry does have funds for capital projects but also has its list of priorities.
- Road will be blocked because of the playground for safety, accessible by the fire department.
- Timetabling can take care of start times, so less amount of time for interaction.
- Enough locker space in the upstairs to provide students with.
- Would the open area be taken away from the high school students? NO.
- Will the library be shared? Is there enough space in the library? Answer: It would need reorganization. One extra room could be given to the elementary, which would provide extra space.

#### Option 3: Move All MNPS into MNHS (without Build)

• There was general agreement that this option was not desirable.

# Option 4: Move all MNPS into MNHS (including the French Board)

- While this option requires a larger build, there would still be shared space and concerns were expressed regarding timetabling for use of spaces such as the gym.
- Capacity of MNHS is 369.
- There is uncertainty regarding access to Ministry funds for a build and there is a Ministry process.

# Option 5: Move Gr. 7/8 into MNHS (with a Reorganization of MNPS)

- MNPS could accommodate additional other services within the building.
- Could we shut down part of the building if we kept the grade 7 and 8's in the building? Room 6 7 8 9 are constructed of wood and it is this section that links the other two areas of the school. This middle section would need to be evaluated for a potential remodeling because of its wood structure. The school is rated for 316 students in total.

# **Committee Reflections**

- Is there a voice for EFTO and/or OSSSTF...perhaps to make a presentation?
- Could the ARC committee send a letter inviting groups (teachers) to make a presentation
- This could provide the process with a more informal/inviting venue
- Committee needs the information to make a recommendation, board is ultimately who makes the recommendation.
- We could take a look at student achievement data and how this impacts programming, i.e., "Is there a connection between student participation and academic achievement?"
- The process for delegation presentations to the board and committee will be posted on the website
- Committee would welcome the Board come to the Council to explain the rationale behind decision once it is made
- Financial Piece:
  - o There is a significant loss with all options—it comes down to the program.
  - With the grant structure, the combining of elementary schools may be financially sounder as opposed to combining to elementary and secondary.
  - Calculations showing the loss to the Board were shared for each option in the summary chart.
  - Comment: Cost by user groups depends on space they use, cost recovery basis.

## 5.0 New Business

Nil

# 6.0 Next Steps

- Post the process to bring delegation to a Board meeting on the website.
- Financial summary to be posted on the website
- Determine if the public/committee want the sketches as prepared by W. Chiupka posted to the website for viewing.
- Date for the next working committee meeting TBD.

# 7.0 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.