



PART – PUBLIC MEETING

PLEASANT VIEW JHS

October 26, 2015

7:00-9:00 p.m.

Pleasant View JHS

Central Membership:	Ken Lister (Trustee), Beth Veale (Superintendent), Karen Buzzelli (Recorder), David Paltser (Planning), Peter Naperstkow (Planning), John Tancredi (French), Lori Moore (Special Education), Ian Allison (Special Education)
School Administrators:	Linda Nardea (Pleasant View), Linda-Sue Thomas (Ernest), Phyl Jackson (Cherokee), Paul Farrell (Brian), Rick Tarasuk (Sir John A Macdonald), Huw Chinnery (L'Amoreaux), Pat Chater (Muirhead)
Attendees:	Records indicate that 132 individuals signed in

<i>Item / Presenter</i>	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Attachments / Actions / Results</i>
Objective of Meeting:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community to hear what we are proposing in the way of changes taking into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Space accommodation issues in the area ○ Board motion from 2000 regarding JHS ○ Secondary gifted program pathway 	
Questions/Concerns/Comments:	<p>During the course of the evening the following were raised, in some instances by more than one individual:</p> <p>Safety Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern with Gr. 6 (age 10/11) students travelling on major arterial roads to get to Pleasant View. If parents don't drive it is too far to walk and would then have to pay \$150 per month for a metro pass. Children are too young to be walking the distance or taking the TTC alone. • Comment made about children being given consent to leave school grounds at lunch? Logistically how will this be implemented in a Gr. 6-8 school? <p>Before/After School Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before & after school programs for Gr. 6 students – what are the timelines on a decision regarding this? Will this have an impact on this decision? Can we put this as a condition of this plan being approved? <i>Looking into and will put forward that</i> 	

Item / Presenter	Discussion	Attachments / Actions / Results
	<p><i>this is a concern from the parents.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ernest & Cherokee for French would like before and after school care. Lots of parents want Brian because of the daycare availability. <p>FI Pathway (York Mills):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a plan to address York Mills and no room for Gr. 9? <i>Nothing on capital priority list which we have to submit to province. Not to say that this is not something trustees will not push for. Trustee Lister committed to working towards this. Typically capital priorities process takes a number of years.</i> Don't like the extra Windfields transition. Not given a choice other than to send child to Don Valley when wants Windfields for Gr. 7-9 like older sibling. Standards are not the same at Don Valley as at Windfields...schools are not equal. Feel there will be no choice if these changes are made. Keep Brian FI students at Brian until Gr. 6 and then move them to Don Valley for Gr. 7-8. They would be 1 year older and wiser...safety trumps French choice. <p>Phased-In Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why do we not do a phased approach? New parents coming in would have no choice, but allow us to follow through with our previous choice. Children enrolled at Pleasant View should be allowed to graduate from Gr. 9 at Pleasant View. Children entering Gr. 6 at Pleasant View should be told will be a Gr. 6-8 school only once current students have graduated. Academics at Pleasant View for grade 9 are excellent...it works. JHS model allows for children to slowly step into higher grades. Fundamentally this model works so why change it? 1000 students in secondary school vs. 200 in JHS is good for some students. Guidance teacher commented that she gave out Gr. 9 choices to Gr. 8 students today. What does she tell the Gr. 8 students now about their decision making process? <i>If this was to go through there would be altered timelines and processes for students to go through.</i> Understand the problem with under and over utilized schools; this issue has been on the table for over a year since Ken Lister became Trustee. He has consistently brought up at council meetings. As we are saying this is not good for us, we would like it to be phased in. Have confidence Supt. Veale and Trustee Lister will listen 	

<i>Item / Presenter</i>	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Attachments / Actions / Results</i>
	<p>and take this concern to the board.</p> <p>Grades:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why only this area being changed to K-5 schools? It's not fair to change only certain schools. Change the Gr. 7-9 schools to Gr. 7-8 and phase the change in. Keep the schools K-6. • People are already fighting to get their child into Sir John A. Macdonald. It's not fair to the schools to have more students. It's hard for parents. Feels that the TDSB should keep K-6 or K-8 model across the board. Understands the need to phase out to Gr. 9 <p>Transportation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other schools have had buses that took kids from overcrowded schools to another school. Why can this not be done here? • Are there not guidelines about distance students should travel? <p>Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the grade 6 program look in a Gr. 6-8 school (i.e. rotary)? Some gr. 6 will not be mature enough for kind of program that is core/rotary. • Muirhead is concerned about reduced enrolment. Not convinced that the area south of Sheppard has a lot of children coming in. Concerned about special needs children – what will happen to them, specifically in the intervening time if enrolment is low? <i>No plans to change special needs programs at Muirhead. Special Ed placement is done separately from this program.</i> <p>Optional Attendance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wants to be allowed to continue to go to grade 6 at Brian. Is there any other choices? <i>Would be grandfathered with siblings.</i> • If an Optional Attendance student graduates from Brian would they be allowed to go on to Pleasant View or be forced back to their home school? <i>They would have to apply through Optional Attendance to Pleasant View.</i> <p>Lack of Parent Feedback/Short Timelines/No Choice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't feel like entire process has asked for parent feedback, no communication with teachers and principals due to WTR. Letter did not explain the scenario. Talk 	

<i>Item / Presenter</i>	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Attachments / Actions / Results</i>
	<p>on street is that this is already a done deal. Telling students now that this is your last year in this school and you are going to a new school in September 2016. Phase this in slower instead of all by September 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels like it has already been decided that we are doing this and it's a done deal. • Doesn't seem to be a choice about the preferred scenario; were not given any options. Can we look at other options? • Stats are for 2024 when wanting to implement for 2016. <i>Reason for no major changes in enrolment initially is that students are being grandfathered in so numbers will change slowly.</i> • Have had no preparation for the elementary school change to JK-5. Don't feel there is enough time for thorough consultation. • If you really want our input you should give us all the options, not just one. Then have select preferred alternative from that. • What is going to be done with this feedback? What will happen with this? What will you do with preferred option so this is not rammed down our throats? Beth: This will be taken back to the team/board, will look into what can we do with this. Will you come back to parents before this is implemented? • Before coming to a decision there should be another community meeting. • Feel that this community was not taken seriously; just a flyer in the mail that really didn't say anything concrete. • Communicate timelines about this proposal are too short. Community should be advised step-by-step as changes are made, well in advance. 	
Next Steps:	PART members will meet to discuss feedback	
Next Meeting:	November 3, 2015	
Adjournment:	Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.	

A02 (2015-10-26 Pleasant View PART Public.docx)kb.4158