

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Monday, November 5, 2007

Trustees Present: Jessica Brennan (Chair), Robert Barlow, Shirley Glauser, Wes Hicks, Ray Mulholland, Lillian Orban, Laura Peddle, Tim Simmons, Karen Turkstra and Judith Bishop (Chair of the Board). Lauren Millar (Student trustee).

In Attendance: Dr. Chris Spence (Director of Education and Secretary), Chuck Reid (Associate Director), Ken Bain (Superintendent of Operations), Damian Borrelli (Executive Officer, Human Resources), Marguerite Botting (Acting Superintendent of Education, Student Services), Vicki Corcoran (Superintendent of Education, Student Services), Krys Croxall (Superintendent of Program and Assessment), John Forbeck (Superintendent of Education), Pam Reinholdt (Superintendent of Education), Scott Sincerbox (Superintendent of Education), Sharon Stephanian (Superintendent of Education), and Dennis Webb (Acting Superintendent of Business and Treasurer).

Regrets: Ronald English, Trustee, Sharon Stephanian, (Superintendent of Education) Don Grant (Superintendent of Business and Treasurer)

I. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

It was moved by W. Hicks, seconded by K. Turkstra: That the agenda be approved as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. The student trustee voted in favour.

3. Declaration of Conflict of Interest

Nil.

4. Approval of the Minutes – October 15, 2007

It was moved by S. Glauser, seconded by J. Bishop: That the minutes of the October 15, 2007 Meeting be approved as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Chair expressed the trustees' appreciation for the minutes as presented and requested that the names of the speakers be attributed to questions and comments in future.

II. ACTION ITEMS

5. Education Centre Pathway

Dr. Spence introduced the presentation of Concept Four regarding the future of the education centre, other administrative facilities and the funding options associated with the options presented to date.

It was moved by R. Barlow, seconded by T. Simmons:

- 1) **That the Communication Strategy project as outlined in Appendix D be implemented on November 7, 2007.**
- 2) **That Administration be directed to prepare a recommendation regarding the Board's administrative needs for consideration by the Board of Trustees at its December 10, 2007 Committee of the Whole Meeting.**

Presentation highlights:

R. Francki reviewed the concepts presented to the October 15 Meeting of the Committee of the Whole -- Option 1 (One Building Concept), Option 2 (Two Building Concept), and Option 3 (Renovation of the Existing Buildings Concept).

Trustees Present: Jessica Brennan (Chair), Robert Barlow, Shirley Glauser, Wes Hicks, Ray Mulholland, Lillian Orban, Laura Peddle, Tim Simmons, Karen Turkstra and Judith Bishop (Chair of the Board). Lauren Millar (Student trustee).

In Attendance: Dr. Chris Spence (Director of Education and Secretary), Chuck Reid (Associate Director), Ken Bain (Superintendent of Operations), Damian Borrelli (Executive Officer, Human Resources), Marguerite Botting (Acting Superintendent of Education, Student Services), Vicki Corcoran (Superintendent of Education, Student Services), Krys Croxall (Superintendent of Program and Assessment), John Forbeck (Superintendent of Education), Pam Reinholdt (Superintendent of Education), Scott Sincerbox (Superintendent of Education), Sharon Stephanian (Superintendent of Education), and Dennis Webb (Acting Superintendent of Business and Treasurer).

Regrets: Ronald English, Trustee, Sharon Stephanian, (Superintendent of Education) Don Grant (Superintendent of Business and Treasurer)

1. Call to Order The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

It was moved by W. Hicks, seconded by K. Turkstra: That the agenda be approved as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. The student trustee voted in favour.

3. Declaration of Conflict of Interest Nil.

4. Approval of the Minutes - October 15, 2007

It was moved by S. Glauser, seconded by J. Bishop: That the minutes of the October 15, 2007 Meeting be approved as presented. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Chair expressed the trustees' appreciation for the minutes as presented and requested that the names of the speakers be attributed to questions and comments in future.

II. ACTION ITEMS

5. Education Centre Pathway

Dr. Spence introduced the presentation of Concept Four regarding the future of the education centre, other administrative facilities and the funding options associated with the options presented to date.

It was moved by R. Barlow, seconded by T. Simmons: 1) That the Communication Strategy project as outlined in Appendix D be

implemented on November 7, 2007. 2) That Administration be directed to prepare a recommendation regarding the Board's administrative needs for consideration by the Board of Trustees at its December 10, 2007 Committee of the Whole Meeting.

Presentation highlights: R. Francki reviewed the concepts presented to the October 15 Meeting of the Committee of the Whole -

Option 1 (One Building Concept), Option 2 (Two Building Concept), and Option 3 (Renovation of

the Existing Buildings Concept).

D. Sage delivered a PowerPoint presentation of Concept 4 (Remodeling the Education Centre and Constructing an Addition).

Design Concept Four has as its central theme, the retention of the current education centre at 100 Main Street West. In this concept, the Education Centre would be either renewed (Concept 4A) per the ReCapp and consultant's reports, or remodeled (Concept 4B) in order to increase its internal capacity for administrative staff. An addition, generally conceived to house the training and maintenance components of the Board would be constructed.

D. Sage noted that the funding strategy will change based on the concept the Board chooses.

Board administration is controlled by the Ministry through various regulations e.g. Regulation 444 controls the disposition of property—how it will be done and who the preferred agencies are. A second regulation, 446 controls how the Board is able to utilize funds realized from the disposition of property. Of the seven administrative properties the Board owns, if disposed of, the proceeds from five would have to go into the capital reserve fund for the purchase of new school sites or construction of new schools. That money cannot be used for administrative purposes. The other two could be used for administrative purposes, i.e. the Education Centre and the Memorial Building in Ancaster.

If the proceeds from the sale of those two sites are insufficient to cover the cost of the concept chosen, the next available money would be from the sale of vacant land.

The Board owns 137 acres of land of various sizes and parcels. Of those properties, 90 acres have been identified as not being required by the Board for future potential schools. If the proceeds from the sale of these lands are insufficient, the Board would need to look at long-term financing with Ministry approval. At this time, the Ministry does not fund administrative buildings.

J. Penman, Public Relations Officer, outlined the proposed communications plan. It involves:

- Creating a webpage with information on the Education Centre Property Disposition Process;
- Videotaping presentations at the Board meetings concerning the Education Centre Property Disposition Process and making them available for the public to download;
- Developing a questionnaire to allow community stakeholders to provide feedback on the various concepts being considered by the Board;
- Taking out ads in both the Hamilton Community News and the Hamilton Spectator to invite stakeholders to participate in the questionnaire; and
- Providing copies of the questionnaire to schools and school councils.

Comments and Questions:

W. Hicks asked if it is known what income would likely be realized from the disposition of the Education Centre and the Memorial Building.

D. Sage responded in the affirmative.

J. Bishop expressed the concern that the sale of 90 acres of land might be completed without knowing the full implications in the context of new school requirements in the future. J. Bishop commented that it is not clear how new schools will be financed. She noted that there are only 90 acres of land, and once sold, they cannot be retrieved. She asked if information could be brought back.

Centre and Constructing an Addition).

Design Concept Four has as its central theme, the retention of the current education centre at 100 Main Street West. In this concept, the Education Centre would be either renewed (Concept 4A) per the ReCapp and consultant's reports, or remodeled (Concept 4B) in order to increase its internal capacity for administrative staff. An addition, generally conceived to house the training and maintenance components of the Board would be constructed.

D. Sage noted that the funding strategy will change based on the concept the Board chooses.

Board administration is controlled by the Ministry through various regulations e.g. Regulation 444 controls the disposition of property—how it will be done and who the preferred agencies are. A second regulation, 446 controls how the Board is able to utilize funds realized from the disposition of property. Of the seven administrative properties the Board owns, if disposed of, the proceeds from five would have to go into the capital reserve fund for the purchase of new school sites or construction of new schools. That money cannot be used for administrative purposes. The other two could be used for administrative purposes, i.e. the Education Centre and the Memorial Building in Ancaster.

If the proceeds from the sale of those two sites are insufficient to cover the cost of the concept chosen, the next available money would be from the sale of vacant land.

The Board owns 137 acres of land of various sizes and parcels. Of those properties, 90 acres have been identified as not being required by the Board for future potential schools. If the proceeds from the sale of these lands are insufficient, the Board would need to look at long-term financing with Ministry approval. At this time, the Ministry does not fund administrative buildings.

j. Penman, Public Relations Officer, outlined the proposed communications plan. It involves:

I Creating a webpage with information on the Education Centre Property Disposition Process; I Videotaping presentations at the Board meetings concerning the Education Centre Property Disposition

Process and making them available for the public to download; I Developing a questionnaire to allow community stakeholders to provide feedback on the various concepts being considered by the Board;

I Taking out ads in both the Hamilton Community News and the Hamilton Spectator to invite stakeholders to participate in the questionnaire; and

I Providing copies of the questionnaire to schools and school councils.

Comments and Questions: W. Hicks asked if it is known what income would likely be realized from the disposition of the Education Centre and the Memorial Building.

D. Sage responded in the affirmative.

j. Bishop expressed the concern that the sale of 90 acres of land might be completed without

knowing the full implications in the context of new school requirements in the future. j. Bishop commented that it is not clear how new schools will be financed. She noted that there are only 90 acres of land, and once sold, they cannot be retrieved. She asked if information could be brought back.

D. Sage indicated that, based on the recommended actions, a specific plan for a financial strategy would be brought back including what would be realized from the sale of vacant lands. He added that the value of specific land would be an in-camera item.

R. Barlow asked if the sale of land could, in fact, be used for schools and administrative buildings.

D. Sage agreed to bring back specific confirmation of that.

R. Barlow noted that eventually the Board would run out of assets to sell and he would prefer that the proceeds from those sales be used to build new schools.

R. Barlow suggested that the questionnaire ask the community how important it is for the Board to remain downtown. It is important that the costs associated with remaining downtown be shown.

L. Orban stated that it is very important to look at a downtown facility and requested permission to make a motion for a fifth option at an appropriate time.

R. Mulholland asked if the Board still has access to the hundred million dollar line of credit at the CIBC that they had in the past.

D. Webb was not aware of the details of this arrangement with the CIBC but promised to investigate.

T. Simmons inquired about new lands that may open up as a result of declining enrolment over the next 20 years.

D. Sage responded that as the Board moves forward on a capital plan, there may be more schools, subject to a pupil accommodation review; and the proceeds from the sale of those schools may be invested in new schools.

L. Peddle asked if there is a concept that simply speaks to revamping the Education Centre as it sits, almost the same as the two-building concept, but without the underground parking.

R. Francki responded that, at the will of the Board, that concept could be presented.

L. Peddle asked if empty facilities downtown had been taken into consideration. She too wanted to know from the public how important the Board presence is to the downtown.

K. Turkstra agreed with L. Peddle that consideration should be given to remodeling the Education Centre and having the training and maintenance centre elsewhere. Parking should be above ground because it is a lot less expensive than underground.

The Chair asked if these ideas could be made as suggestions to staff or should be presented as motions.

C. Spence requested that motions be made to provide direction to staff.

L. Peddle asked for clarification of what was on the floor. If staff is expected to come back to the Board with one recommendation, she would like all proposed models on the floor tonight. Conversely, she would like to see staff come back with their first recommendation plus others in descending order.

W. Hicks asked how officials would handle the revenue discussion, given that the value of property is an in-camera discussion.

D. Sage indicated that, based on the recommended actions, a specific plan for a financial strategy would be brought back including what would be realized from the sale of vacant lands. He added that the value of specific land would be an in-camera item.

R. Barlow asked if the sale of land could, in fact, be used for schools and administrative buildings.

D. Sage agreed to bring back specific confirmation of that.

R. Barlow noted that eventually the Board would run out of assets to sell and he would prefer that the proceeds from those sales be used to build new schools.

R. Barlow suggested that the questionnaire ask the community how important it is for the Board to remain downtown. It is important that the costs associated with remaining downtown be shown.

L. Orban stated that it is very important to look at a downtown facility and requested permission to make a motion for a fifth option at an appropriate time.

R. Mulholland asked if the Board still has access to the hundred million dollar line of credit at the CIBC that they had in the past.

D. Webb was not aware of the details of this arrangement with the CIBC but promised to investigate.

T. Simmons inquired about new lands that may open up as a result of declining enrolment over the next 20 years.

D. Sage responded that as the Board moves forward on a capital plan, there may be more schools, subject to a pupil accommodation review; and the proceeds from the sale of those schools may be invested in new schools.

L. Peddle asked if there is a concept that simply speaks to revamping the Education Centre as it sits, almost the same as the two-building concept, but without the underground parking.

R. Francki responded that, at the will of the Board, that concept could be presented.

L. Peddle asked if empty facilities downtown had been taken into consideration. She too wanted to know from the public how important the Board presence is to the downtown.

K. Turkstra agreed with L. Peddle that consideration should be given to remodeling the Education Centre and having the training and maintenance centre elsewhere. Parking should be above ground because it is a lot less expensive than underground.

The Chair asked if these ideas could be made as suggestions to staff or should be presented as motions.

C. Spence requested that motions be made to provide direction to staff.

L. Peddle asked for clarification of what was on the floor. If staff is expected to come back to the Board with one recommendation, she would like all proposed models on the floor tonight.

Conversely, she would like to

see staff come back with their first recommendation plus others in descending order.

W. Hicks asked how officials would handle the revenue discussion, given that the value of property is an incamera discussion.

D. Sage suggested that one way would be to give an aggregate total for the sale of the land. The specific property values would have to be discussed in-camera.

W. Hicks noted that it should be very clear when information is given the public that a very important consideration in the decision has to be in-camera.

To the motion, **CARRIED, TWO OPPOSED**. The student trustee voted in favour.

It was moved by L. Orban, seconded by R. Mulholland: That the Education Centre at 100 Main Street West be retained using a maintenance schedule to complete deferred maintenance in a reasonable length of time, along with the annexed building on site and housing the maintenance services at the Crestwood Site at a cost not exceeding \$40 million.

L. Orban urged the Board to take into consideration the on-going renovations to the Education Centre since 1998—the Paikin Library, now the Assessment Centre; the renovation to the boiler and heating system in conjunction with Sir John A. MacDonald and the City of Hamilton; part of the roof has been replaced. The Education Centre is already a viable meeting place having the Upper and Lower Auditoriums as well as various other meeting rooms. The maintenance of the Crestwood building would not cost anything additional. The sale of 90 acres of land needed to finance a new administrative building could be used for students, and the Board would remain a presence downtown.

T. Simmons supported the motion. He suggested it would help narrow the scope for the staff. He noted that in 20 years, with a declining enrolment, the Board will be much smaller. This would allow the Board to remain in the lower city and not have to sell vacant lands.

R. Mulholland expressed support for the motion on the floor. He stated that Crestwood seemed to be the logical choice for maintenance. There is lots of land; the building is in good shape; 20 trucks park there now; it would avoid driving downtown or on Upper James Street. There would not really be increased costs to keep Crestwood. There are meeting rooms and shops there as well as a plumbing training centre. The location is excellent with quick access to the Lincoln Alexander Expressway and the Red Hill Valley Parkway. The presence of Crestwood does not interfere with neighbours. He expressed support for retaining the Education Centre and building an annex connected by a walkway. He noted that hundreds of thousands of dollars could be saved by this plan. Building on the Jerome neighbourhood land would be a waste of prime land and possibly four or five million dollars.

R. Mulholland added to his comments that the Education Centre roof is 50% completed, renovations have been done to the reception area, the Communications Department; even new drapes in the Board Room. He suggested an architectural competition to complement the Education Centre.

L. Peddle asked for an investigation of the cost. She stated that the motion is narrowly directing the staff which is undesirable.

W. Hicks asked for clarification of the use of the word "maintenance" in the motion. There is a difference between the cost of renovation and having a maintenance schedule.

L. Orban clarified that the intention is to look at the entire building—what is done and what needs to be done to make it a viable building.

S. Glauser asked if Concept 5 would mean that the other administrative buildings, except maintenance, would become empty.

D. Sage suggested that one way would be to give an aggregate total for the sale of the land. The specific property values would have to be discussed in-camera.

W. Hicks noted that it should be very clear when information is given the public that a very important consideration in the decision has to be in-camera.

To the motion, CARRIED, TWO OPPOSED. The student trustee voted in favour.

It was moved by L. Orban, seconded by R. Mulholland: That the Education Centre at 100 Main Street West be retained using a maintenance schedule to complete deferred maintenance in a reasonable length of time, along with the annexed building on site and housing the maintenance services at the Crestwood Site at a cost not exceeding \$40 million.

L. Orban urged the Board to take into consideration the on-going renovations to the Education Centre since 1998—the Paikin Library, now the Assessment Centre; the renovation to the boiler and heating system in conjunction with Sir John A. MacDonald and the City of Hamilton; part of the roof has been replaced. The Education Centre is already a viable meeting place having the Upper and Lower Auditoriums as well as various other meeting rooms. The maintenance of the Crestwood building would not cost anything additional. The sale of 90 acres of land needed to finance a new administrative building could be used for students, and the Board would remain a presence downtown.

T. Simmons supported the motion. He suggested it would help narrow the scope for the staff. He noted that in 20 years, with a declining enrolment, the Board will be much smaller. This would allow the Board to remain in the lower city and not have to sell vacant lands.

R. Mulholland expressed support for the motion on the floor. He stated that Crestwood seemed to be the logical choice for maintenance. There is lots of land; the building is in good shape; 20 trucks park there now; it would avoid driving downtown or on Upper James Street. There would not really be increased costs to keep Crestwood. There are meeting rooms and shops there as well as a plumbing training centre. The location is excellent with quick access to the Lincoln Alexander Expressway and the Red Hill Valley Parkway. The presence of Crestwood does not interfere with neighbours. He expressed support for retaining the Education Centre and building an annex connected by a walkway. He noted that hundreds of thousands of dollars could be saved by this plan. Building on the Jerome neighbourhood land would be a waste of prime land and possibly four or five million dollars.

R. Mulholland added to his comments that the Education Centre roof is 50% completed, renovations have been done to the reception area, the Communications Department; even new drapes in the Board Room. He suggested an architectural competition to complement the Education Centre.

L. Peddle asked for an investigation of the cost. She stated that the motion is narrowly directing the staff which is undesirable.

W. Hicks asked for clarification of the use of the word “maintenance” in the motion. There is a difference between the cost of renovation and having a maintenance schedule.

L. Orban clarified that the intention is to look at the entire building—what is done and what needs to be done to make it a viable building.

S. Glauser asked if Concept 5 would mean that the other administrative buildings, except maintenance, would become empty.

L. Orban responded that the intent would be to sell those buildings and have all administration in the Education Centre.

L. Peddle asked if any of the concepts put all administration in one place.

J. Francki indicated that Concept 1 brings all administration together on a different site. Concept 4 remodels the Education Centre and constructs an annex on the site in order to bring all administrative staff together.

L. Peddle noted that the motion on the floor specifies Crestwood and caps the amount of money, which does not allow the staff the flexibility to tell the Board what the best concepts are.

R. Mulholland suggested that a sixth concept could be put on the floor. The maintenance people could stay at Crestwood. The Education Centre would have an annex, not an addition and the other five buildings could be shut down. The annex would include the archives, currently located at Vincent Massey School.

To the motion, **LOST, 4 IN FAVOUR, 7 OPPOSED**. The student trustee abstained from voting.

It was moved by L. Peddle, seconded by R. Mulholland that staff investigate a further model that would take into consideration the total remodel of the Education Centre and that a training and maintenance centre be located at another site to be determined. This is not to include underground parking but on or above ground parking.

K. Turkstra supported the motion but would add above ground parking.

L. Peddle indicated the intent is to look at the cost of upgrading the Education Centre.

W. Hicks asked if that would include bringing other people to one site.

L. Peddle responded that would be a concept.

W. Hicks stated that would not be a feasible concept because of the numbers.

L. Peddle noted that there is already a concept that talks about administration but not training and maintenance. There is no assumption that all staff will be included.

J. Brennan indicated that staff may come back to the Board and say that it is not possible to include all staff.

To the motion, **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**. The student trustee abstained from voting.

It was moved by R. Mulholland, seconded by T. Simmons: That staff investigates retaining/remodelling the Education Centre with an annex building connected by a walkway to house all of the administrative staff.

R. Mulholland noted that the Education Centre would have to be brought up to code.

R. Francki responded that the Education Centre could not be as efficient as a new building.

L. Peddle asked if the maintenance staff would be housed at the Education Centre.

administration in the Education Centre.

L. Peddle asked if any of the concepts put all administration in one place.

j. Francki indicated that Concept I brings all administration together on a different site. Concept 4 remodels the Education Centre and constructs an annex on the site in order to bring all administrative staff together.

L. Peddle noted that the motion on the floor specifies Crestwood and caps the amount of money, which does not allow the staff the flexibility to tell the Board what the best concepts are.

R. Mulholland suggested that a sixth concept could be put on the floor. The maintenance people could stay at Crestwood. The Education Centre would have an annex, not an addition and the other five buildings could be shut down. The annex would include the archives, currently located at Vincent Massey School.

To the motion, LOST, 4 IN FAVOUR, 7 OPPOSED. The student trustee abstained from voting.

It was moved by L. Peddle, seconded by R. Mulholland that staff investigate a further model that would take into consideration the total remodel of the Education Centre and that a training and maintenance centre be located at another site to be determined. This is not to include underground parking but on or above ground parking.

K. Turkstra supported the motion but would add above ground parking.

L. Peddle indicated the intent is to look at the cost of upgrading the Education Centre.

W. Hicks asked if that would include bringing other people to one site.

L. Peddle responded that would be a concept.

W. Hicks stated that would not be a feasible concept because of the numbers.

L. Peddle noted that there is already a concept that talks about administration but not training and maintenance. There is no assumption that all staff will be included.

j. Brennan indicated that staff may come back to the Board and say that it is not possible to include all staff.

To the motion, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. The student trustee abstained from voting.

It was moved by R. Mulholland, seconded by T. Simmons: That staff investigates retaining/remodelling the Education Centre with an annex building connected by a walkway to house all of the administrative staff.

R. Mulholland noted that the Education Centre would have to be brought up to code.

R. Francki responded that the Education Centre could not be as efficient as a new building.

L. Peddle asked if the maintenance staff would be housed at the Education Centre.

R. Mulholland responded that maintenance and plumbing training would remain at Crestwood. The administrative staff at Maple Lane, the Memorial Building, Vincent Massey, Seneca and Red Hill would be at the Education Centre.

R. Francki noted that some limited training is done at Crestwood, principally for maintenance. Other training facilities are not at Crestwood. Some study would have to be done to determine which training element would come to the new Education Centre. Another feature to be determined would be how to provide a facility large enough to accommodate the large system-wide meetings that take place. A training centre would bring lots of people to one spot and require significant parking.

R. Mulholland suggested that bringing back underground parking would address that issue. Further, he added that parking could also be built above that other people could pay to use.

K. Turkstra noted that the difference between the two motions is that the new motion does not have a cap of 40 million dollars.

L. Peddle asked what the difference is between Concept 4 and what has already been done.

R. Francki indicated that his understanding of the difference is that the maintenance centre would be at Crestwood and not constructed downtown. The estimated cost of the training and maintenance centre is \$23 million.

R. Mulholland noted that two or three million dollars would be lost by selling the land.

J. Bishop asked which is the preferred concept—bringing the Education Centre up to code or remodeling?

L. Orban suggested a friendly amendment to the motion by adding "investigate".

L. Peddle asked that the friendly amendment include "remodeled".

CARRIED, 6 IN FAVOUR, 5 OPPOSED. The student trustee abstained from voting.

6. Terms of Reference – Human Resources Advisory Committee

W. Hicks thanked the committee who spent many hours working on the terms of reference for the Human Resources Sub-Committee—R. Barlow, T. Simmons, J. Bishop, and L. Peddle.

The sub-committee recommends changing the terms of reference for the Human Resources Advisory Committee to include all areas of the Human Resources portfolio—not just contract negotiations. This will create a venue between the executive officer of Human Resources and the trustees.

W. Hicks drew the trustees' attention to two major areas of change:

- Item 4 – Receive reports and provide advice as required on such topical areas as grievances, staff turnover, retention rates, staff satisfaction survey, leadership applicant rates, health & safety/attendance (including accidents) rates, arbitration and grievance volumes, and professional development plans.
- Item 6 – With administration, examine, review, and revise policies related to human relations.

It was moved by W. Hicks, seconded by T. Simmons: That the Negotiations/Salary Advisory Sub-Committee recommends that the Terms of Reference be enhanced to include all areas of the Human Resources portfolio. By doing so, the Trustees will support the Director and the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board overall with achieving the strategic goal "Effective Staff".

R. Mulholland responded that maintenance and plumbing training would remain at Crestwood. The administrative staff at Maple Lane, the Memorial Building, Vincent Massey, Seneca and Red Hill would be at the Education Centre.

R. Francki noted that some limited training is done at Crestwood, principally for maintenance. Other training facilities are not at Crestwood. Some study would have to be done to determine which training element would come to the new Education Centre. Another feature to be determined would be how to provide a facility large enough to accommodate the large system-wide meetings that take place. A training centre would bring lots of people to one spot and require significant parking.

R. Mulholland suggested that bringing back underground parking would address that issue. Further, he added that parking could also be built above that other people could pay to use.

K. Turkstra noted that the difference between the two motions is that the new motion does not have a cap of 40 million dollars.

L. Peddle asked what the difference is between Concept 4 and what has already been done.

R. Francki indicated that his understanding of the difference is that the maintenance centre would be at Crestwood and not constructed downtown. The estimated cost of the training and maintenance centre is \$23 million.

R. Mulholland noted that two or three million dollars would be lost by selling the land.

j. Bishop asked which is the preferred concept—bringing the Education Centre up to code or remodeling?

L. Orban suggested a friendly amendment to the motion by adding “investigate”.

L. Peddle asked that the friendly amendment include “remodeled”.

CARRIED, 6 IN FAVOUR, 5 OPPOSED. The student trustee abstained from voting.

6. Terms of Reference - Human Resources Advisory Committee W. Hicks thanked the committee who spent many hours working on the terms of reference for the Human Resources Sub-Committee—R. Barlow, T. Simmons, j. Bishop, and L. Peddle. The sub-committee recommends changing the terms of reference for the Human Resources Advisory Committee to include all areas of the Human Resources portfolio—not just contract negotiations. This will create a venue between the executive officer of Human Resources and the trustees.

W. Hicks drew the trustees' attention to two major areas of change:

0 Item 4 — Receive reports and provide advice as required on such topical areas as grievances, staff turnover, retention rates, staff satisfaction survey, leadership applicant rates, health & safety/attendance (including accidents) rates, arbitration and grievance volumes, and professional development plans.

0 Item 6 — With administration, examine, review, and revise policies related to human relations.

It was moved by W. Hicks, seconded by T. Simmons: That the NegotiationslSalary

Advisory Sub-Committee recommends that the Terms of Reference be enhanced to include all areas of the Human Resources portfolio. By doing so, the Trustees will support the Director and the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board overall with achieving the strategic goal “Effective Staff”.



THE HAMILTON-WENTWORTH DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Monday, November 5, 2007

7:00 p.m.

A G E N D A

7:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Declaration of Conflict of Interest
4. Approval of the Minutes – October 15, 2007

J. Brennan

II. ACTION ITEMS

5. Education Centre Pathway
6. Terms of Reference - Human Resources Advisory Committee
7. Request for Scoping Document – Nutrition Policy
8. School Trips

C. Spence
W. Hicks
J. Brennan
C. Spence

III. MONITORING ITEMS

9. HWDSB's Annual Operating Plan 2007
10. Revised Board Improvement Plan as a result of 2007 results
11. Queen Elizabeth II Aiming for the Top Scholarships
12. Safe Drinking Water referred by Board motion Oct. 29, 2007
13. Compensatory Education Action Plan
14. Staffing Report – Full Time Equivalent Positions
15. 2007/2008 Monthly Financial Status Report – September 30, 2007

C. Reid
K. Croxall
K. Croxall
D. Webb
J. Forbeck
D. Borrelli
D. Webb

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

16. Finance Advisory Sub-Committee Report
17. Policy Working Sub-Committee Report
18. Governance Working Sub-Committee Report

K. Turkstra
J. Brennan
L. Peddle

19. Public Questions for Clarification
20. Adjournment

Policy Working Sub-Committee Meeting
Regular Board
Special Education Advisory Committee

Thursday, November 8, 2007
Monday, November 19, 2007
Wednesday, November 28, 2007

6:30 p.m.
6:30 p.m.
7:00 p.m.

THE HAMILTON-WENATCHEE DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

BOARD

Monday, November 5, 2007

AGENDA

Call to Order

Approval of Agenda

Declaration of Conflict of Interest

Approval of the Minutes — October 15, 2007

. ACTION ITEMS

II 5. 6. 7 8

III. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15.

V.

16. 17. 18.

19. 20.

Policy Working Sub-Committee Meeting Regular Board . Special Education Advisory Committee

Education Centre Pathway

Terms of Reference - Human Resources Advisory Committee Request for Scoping Document — Nutrition Policy

School Trips

MONITORING ITEMS

HWDSB's Annual Operating Plan 2007

Revised Board Improvement Plan as a result of 2007 results Queen Elizabeth II Aiming for the Top Scholarships Safe Drinking Water referred by Board motion Oct. 29, 2007 Compensatory Education Action Plan

Staffing Report — Full Time Equivalent Positions

2007/2008 Monthly Financial Status Report — September 30, 2007

Finance Advisory Sub-Committee Report Policy Working Sub-Committee Report
Governance Working Sub-Committee Report

Public Questions for Clarification Adjournment

Thursday, November 8, 2007 Monday, November 19, 2007 Wednesday, November 28, 2007

J. Brennan

C. Spence

W. Hicks J. Brennan C. Spence

C. Reid K. Croxall K. Croxall D. Webb J. Forbeck D. Borrelli D. Webb

K. Turkstra J. Brennan L. Peddle



#5
The Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board

EXECUTIVE REPORT TO BOARD

DATE: November 5, 2007

TO: Dr. Chris Spence, Director of Education and Secretary

FROM: Dennis Webb, Interim Superintendent of Business
Richard Francki, Senior Manager, Facilities Management
Jane Miceli, Manager, Purchasing Services
Daryl Sage, Manager, Accommodation and Planning
Jackie Penman, Public Relations Officer

RE: Education Centre Pathway

Action ✓ Monitoring □ Information □

Recommended Action:

1. That the Communications Strategy for the Education Centre Pathway project as outlined in Appendix D be implemented on November 7, 2007 for a 2-week period.
2. That Administration be directed to prepare a recommendation regarding the Board's administrative needs for consideration by the Board of Trustees at its December 10, 2007 Committee of the Whole meeting.

Rationale/Benefits:

The Board has undertaken a review of its administrative facilities to determine the most efficient and cost-effective method of delivering these services. Currently, administrative facilities are operating from 7 different locations across the City of Hamilton.

Background:

At the October 15, 2007 Committee of the Whole meeting trustees were presented with 3 possible options for these services. These options were the One Building Concept, the Two Building concept and the Renovation Concept.

Highlights of the One Building Concept (Option 1):

- Build Admin Centre
- Reserve land for potential Secondary site
- Dispose of any excess lands

Cost: \$33 million

Highlights of the Two Building Concept (Option 2):

- Build a Corporate Centre at 100 Main Street West
- Build a Training and Maintenance Centre at a separate site

Cost: \$55 million

Highlights of the Renovation Existing Buildings Concept (Option 3)

- \$28 M* in cumulative maintenance
- \$16 M for soft costs, environmental, accessibility, building code, disruption, and contingencies
- Continue to incur expense for overflow parking required at 100 Main St West
- Continue to incur annual expense for rental of private accommodation needed for Board-wide initiatives
- Leaves the Board with seven 50+ year-old renovated buildings
- Administrative staff remain dispersed over seven buildings

WENTWORTH DISTRICT EXECUTIVE REPORT To BOAR r

DATE: November 5, 2007

TO: Dr. Chris Spence, Director of Education and Secretary

FROM: Dennis Webb, Interim Superintendent of Business

Richard Francki, Senior Manager, Facilities Management
jane Miceli, Manager, Purchasing Services
Daryl Sage, Manager, Accommodation and Planning
jackie Penman, Public Relations Officer

RE: Education Centre Pathway

Information EI

Action Monitoring EI

Recommended Action:

I. That the Communications Strategy for the Education Centre Pathway project as outlined in Appendix D be

implemented on November7, 2007 for a 2-week period.

2. That Administration be directed to prepare a recommendation regarding the Board's administrative needs for consideration by the Board of Trustees at its December 10, 2007 Committee of the Whole meeting.

Rationale! Benefits:

The Board has undertaken a review of its administrative facilities to determine the most efficient and cost-effective method of delivering these services. Currently, administrative facilities are operating from 7 different locations across the City of Hamilton.

Background:

At the October 15, 2007 Committee of the Whole meeting trustees were presented with 3 possible options for these services. These options were the One Building Concept, the Two Building concept and the Renovation Concept.

Highlights of the One Building Concept (Option 1):

I Build Admin Centre I Reserve land for potential Secondary site

I Dispose of any excess lands

Cost: \$33 million

Highlights of the Two Building Concept (Option 2):

I Build a Corporate Centre at 100 Main Street West I Build a Training and Maintenance Centre at a separate site

Cost: \$55 million

Highlights of the Renovation Existing Buildings Concept (Option 3)

\$28 in cumulative maintenance I 6 M for soft costs, environmental, accessibility, building code, disruption, and contingencies Continue to incur expense for overflow parking required at 100 Main St West

Continue to incur annual expense for rental of private accommodation needed for Board-wide initiatives
Leaves the Board with seven 50 year-old renovated buildings**

Administrative staff remain dispersed over seven buildings

Background (cont.):

Following the presentation and discussion the Board approved the following resolution:

That Administration be authorized to undertake a pre-consultation property disposition assessment of the Education Centre and lands as a part of its market value due diligence with a report provided to the Committee of the Whole on November 5th, 2007.

Administration was also directed to develop a 4th option which would result in a temporary relocation of all personnel in the Education Centre while the facility was completely remodeled and a Training and Maintenance Centre was added.

The following appendices are attached:

- Appendix A – Design Concept 4
- Appendix B – The 4 Options
- Appendix C – Funding Concept
- Appendix D – The Communication Strategy

Attach.

CTW Nov. 5, 2007

Background (cont.): Following the presentation and discussion the Board approved the following resolution:

That Administration be authorized to undertake a pre-consultation property disposition assessment of the Education Centre and lands as a part of its market value due diligence with a report provided to the Committee of the Whole on November 5", 2007.

Administration was also directed to develop a 4" option which would result in a temporary relocation of all personnel in the Education Centre while the facility was completely remodeled and a Training and Maintenance Centre was added.

The following appendices are attached:

Appendix A — Design Concept 4 Appendix B — The 4 Options Appendix C — Funding Concept
Appendix D — The Communication Strategy

Attach.

Design Concept Four

Overview

Design Concept Four has as its central theme the retention of the current education centre at 100 Main Street West. In this concept, the education centre would be either renewed (Concept 4A) per the ReCapp and consultant's reports, or remodelled (Concept 4B) in order to increase its internal capacity for administrative staff.

Furthermore, an addition generally conceived to house the training and maintenance components of the Board would be constructed.

Funding Consideration

Because this concept presumes that the property at 100 Main Street West be retained by the Board, and the construction of an addition on this property, it eliminates the funding stream that would otherwise be generated by the sale of this property.

Feature and Cost Considerations

- Option 4A
 - Remodelling of the existing building. This concept includes renewal of mechanical systems and building envelope issues, and would prolong building life expectancy by 25 years. As well, the internal organization of the facility would be gutted and remodelled according to current office standards in order to increase the efficiency of the floor area.
 - Construction of an addition to house the training and maintenance components. This construction could be in the form of a wing, or a separate facility on the current site. The size of this addition is estimated at 70,800 square feet, and is reduced from Design Concept 4A because of the remodelling and improved efficiency of the existing education centre.
 - This concept would draw hundreds of staff members to the downtown core on a regular basis to use the training facility.
 - Construction of a 500 stall parking facility. This facility could be underground or above-ground, or a mix thereof. This component has severe cost implications.
 - Accommodation of 30 maintenance vehicles, loading bays, overnight parking and circulation areas. This concept would impose significant traffic of maintenance vehicles, equipment and material manipulation on the downtown core, as well as the distribution centre for school curriculum kits supplies.

Appendix A

Design Concept Four

Overview

Design Concept Four has as its central theme the retention of the current education centre at 100 Main Street West. In this concept, the education centre would be either renewed (Concept 4A) per the ReCapp and consultant's reports, or remodelled (Concept 4B) in order to increase its internal capacity for administrative staff.

Furthermore, an addition generally conceived to house the training and maintenance components of the Board would be constructed.

Funding Consideration

Because this concept presumes that the property at 100 Main Street West be retained by the Board, and the construction of an addition on this property, it eliminates the funding stream that would otherwise be generated by the sale of this property.

Feature and Cost Considerations

Option 4A

- o Remodelling of the existing building. This concept includes renewal of mechanical systems and building envelope issues, and would prolong building life expectancy by 25 years. As well, the internal organization of the facility would be gutted and remodelled according to current standards in order to increase the efficiency of the floor area.

- o Construction of an addition to house the training and maintenance components. This construction could be in the form of a Wing, or a separate facility on the current site. The size of this addition is estimated at 70,800 square feet, and is reduced from Design Concept 4A because of the remodelling and improved efficiency of the existing education centre.

- o This concept would draw hundreds of staff members to the downtown core on a regular basis to use the training facility.

- o Construction of a 500 stall parking facility. This facility could be underground or above-ground, or a mix thereof. This component has severe cost implications.

- o Accommodation of 30 maintenance vehicles, loading bays, overnight parking and circulation areas. This concept would impose significant traffic of maintenance vehicles, equipment and material manipulation on the downtown core, as well as the distribution centre for school curriculum kits supplies.