EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

June 20, 2000	
TO:	Board of Trustees
FROM:	Trustee B. Bonko, Planning and Policy Committee Trustee C.A. Dean, Planning and Policy Committee Trustee G. Gibeault, Planning and Policy Committee
SUBJECT:	Policy and Regulation Update: IH.BP Supervision of Elementary and Junior High Students During Lunch
ORIGINATOR:	A. McBeath, Department Head
RESOURCE STAFF:	Noel Gareau, Dennis Huculak, Manfred Malzahn RECOMMENDATION
	RECOMMENDATION
1.	That IH.BP Supervision of Elementary and Junior High Students During Lunch, be approved.
2.	That IH.BP Student Welfare, be rescinded.
3.	That principals be given the option of implementing IH.BP in 2000-2001 or 2001-2002.
	* * * *

This report recommends approval of a new policy on supervision of elementary and junior high students during lunch. Appendix I contains the new board policy, as well as a proposed new administrative regulation, which is provided as supplementary information. The board is also being asked to rescind the relevant existing board policy, which is found in Appendix II. That appendix also contains the existing administrative regulation, to be rescinded by the superintendent.

The recommendation is the culmination of input from principals, central services staff, and the superintendent's council. The planning and policy committee of the board has reviewed the proposal, and supports it. The policy would take effect in some schools in 2000-2001, and others in 2001-2002, depending on each principal's preference.

Issues

The district's approach to supervision of students during the lunch break has been the source of much dissatisfaction among parents and school administrators since 1987, when the existing policy and regulation were approved. Issues that are raised most often are:

- Lack of clarity in the policy and regulation
- Perceptions of unfairness among parents, and conflict within some school communities, because some parents are expected to pay fees while others are not. Two categories of students currently receive supervision at no cost to parents:
 - Those who reside in areas where schools have been closed or where schools have not been built, and attend their designated receiving schools, and
 - Those with moderate or severe learning needs
- Difficulty in collecting fees from some parents
- Reluctance to use educational funding to subsidize lunch-time supervision
- Lack of standardization of fees and the ways in which supervision is provided

Rationale for the New Policy and Regulation

The proposed new board policy and administrative regulation are intended to address as many of the issues as possible. They would achieve the following:

- Clarity and ease of interpretation
- Confirm that principals must ensure that students are adequately supervised during the lunch break, and that parents who want the school to provide supervision are required to pay for the service unless they are specifically exempted
- Enable principals to determine school policies and fees for lunch-time supervision at the school level, within certain limitations
- Give principals the authority to withdraw student privileges or stop providing the service if fees are not paid
- Reduce dissatisfaction among parents in designated receiving schools where some children are supervised at no cost to parents, even though they may be able to go home for lunch. Examples are Kirkness/Hairsine, Clara Tyner/Braemar, Callingwood/South Callingwood, and Keheewin/Bearspaw
- Correct the perception among some parents that their fees are subsidizing service provided to others
- Require parents of students with special needs to pay a fee for supervision on the same basis as other students
- Enable principals to waive or reduce fees in exceptional circumstances
- Legitimize the use of school funds to pay for lunch-time supervision, where the principal deems it necessary

The new policy and regulation would not lead to uniformity across the district in terms of the amount of fees, and the way in which the service is delivered, which is an approach some principals favoured. The other issue it does not resolve is the use of educational funds to subsidize a non-educational service.

Several other policy approaches were considered by the administration, but were rejected. These are summarized in Appendix III.

Implementation

Students would still be encouraged to go home for lunch whenever possible. When communicating the new policy to parents, principals should stress that for most parents this is not a radical departure from current practice.

Because most schools already have plans in place for the year, they will have the option of implementing the policy immediately, or continuing their existing practices for one more year. This could include giving a one-year grace period to parents who currently are not required to pay fees, but will be required to pay under the new policy.

The \$51 per student subsidy currently provided to designated receiving schools has already been allocated for 2000-2001. After that it would be reconsidered annually as part of the basis of allocation.

MM:mm

APPENDIX	Ι-	Proposed New Board Policy IH.BP Supervision of Elementary and Junior
		High Students During Lunch, and Administrative Regulation IH.AR
		Supervision of Elementary and Junior High Students During Lunch
APPENDIX	II -	IH.BP Student Welfare; IH.AR Accommodation of Students During
		Lunch
APPENDIX	III -	Policy Approaches that were Considered and Rejected by the
		Administration