

EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

March 11, 2008

TO: Board of Trustees

FROM: E. Schmidt, Superintendent of Schools

SUBJECT: Responses to Trustee Requests for Information

ORIGINATOR: D. Barrett, Assistant Superintendent
J. Bidulock, Assistant Superintendent
T. Parker, Assistant Superintendent
B. Tams, Assistant Superintendent

RESOURCE

STAFF: Gloria Chalmers, Will Deys, John Edey, Michael Ediger, Mike Falk, Kerry Kope, Bob Morter, Anne Mulgrew, Jamie Pallett, Lorne Parker

This matter relates to confidential information regarding:

- Responses to trustee requests arising from a previous conference committee meeting.

INFORMATION

TRUSTEE REQUEST #9: NOVEMBER 13, 2007 (TRUSTEE ESSLINGER) RE: REQUEST #326, EXTEND THE SURVEY TO MOUNT PLEASANT FAMILIES AND GATHER INFORMATION REGARDING THE NUMBER OF FAMILIES THAT HAVE TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF THE FREE STUDENT TRANSPORTATION THAT HAS BEEN PROVIDED TO STUDENTS FROM CLOSED SCHOOLS. Nine schools, including Mount Pleasant School, have all been included in the district survey of parents, staff and principals involved in the Sustainability Review Process in 2006-2007 school year.

There are currently 14 students accessing the yellow bus transportation from Mount Pleasant neighborhood to Lendrum School. Three additional riders from the Allendale neighborhood also access this service as a result of the re-designation of the Allendale neighborhood to Mount Pleasant School, which occurred prior to the cessation of the regular program at Mount Pleasant School. (W. Deys)

TRUSTEE REQUEST #58: FEBRUARY 19, 2008 (TRUSTEE RICE): PROVIDE ADVICE ON HOW THE BOARD CAN ACKNOWLEDGE STAFF MEMBERS OR THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS WHO ARE DEPLOYING TO AFGHANISTAN IN SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY: The district recently received notice that the Alberta Chamber of Commerce is recommending that the Government of Alberta “amend labour legislation in Alberta to provide members of the Canadian Armed Forces serving as Reservists with appropriate return to work guarantees and benefits consistent with other jurisdictions, while maintaining necessary balance and appropriate notice protection for

employers.” Edmonton Public Schools has already established practices that surpass this recommendation.

In December, 2003, the Board of Trustees unanimously approved a recommendation that we support the Reserve Force in principle and that we agree to have our organization’s name and city published in a list of employers who support the Reserve Force. An official statement of support was submitted to the Canadian Forces Liaison Council, National Defence Headquarters. This statement of support has continued since that time.

A tangible way in which the district demonstrates this commitment of support is through our process of granting military service leave, according to the following guidelines:

1. That military service leave be defined as leave that an employee of Edmonton Public Schools is granted so that the employee may fulfill commitments with the Canadian Military.
2. That military service leave of 10 or few days in duration be considered as community service leave, and that the guidelines for community service leave would apply in such a case.
3. That one day of military service earned during a leave from the District be considered equivalent to one day of work with Edmonton Public Schools for salary increment purposes.

In November, 2006, Lieutenant-Colonel Alan F. Markewicz, Commanding Officer, Canadian Forces Base – Local 426 – Edmonton Garrison, addressed our leadership staff during a Superintendent’s Educational Leadership Team meeting. He indicated that over 4,000 families in the Edmonton area are directly involved with the military, and he shared his insights into the impact of this involvement on the community, the students, and their families. This presentation increased the awareness and sensitivity of our leadership staff surrounding the support required to individuals and their families who are making this commitment of service to their country. (J. Edey)

TRUSTEE REQUEST #60, FEBRUARY 26, 2008 (TRUSTEE COLBURN) PROVIDE INFORMATION REGARDING WHAT IS THE LARGEST AND SMALLEST HIGH SOCIO-ECONOMIC NEEDS ALLOCATION.

TRUSTEE REQUEST #61, FEBRUARY 26, 2008 (TRUSTEE RIPLEY) PROVIDE THE LIST OF HIGH NEEDS SCHOOLS IN RANK ORDER.

A list of the 2007-2008 school rankings and the actual high needs allocations are listed below. The largest allocation is to Eastglen High School (\$105,971) and the lowest is to Grovener School (\$6,865).

Rank	School	Allocation
1	JOHN A. MCDUGALL	70,618
2	PARKDALE	50,813
3	EASTWOOD	40,244
4	RUNDLE	58,494
5	MCCAULEY	40,245
6	NORWOOD	37,139

7	ABBOTT	49,229
8	SPRUCE AVENUE	53,507
9	DELTON	54,375
10	PRINCE CHARLES	72,418
11	SIFTON	49,629
12	LAWTON/R.J.SCOTT	54,248
13	BRIGHTVIEW	25,499
14	GLENDALE	26,859
15	BELVEDERE	37,065
16	SHERWOOD	16,915
17	BRITANNIA	34,122
18	EVANSDALE	60,236
19	HOMESTEADER	35,775
20	YOUNGSTOWN	50,947
21	HORSE HILL	16,942
22	ATHLONE	34,631
23	INGLEWOOD	22,318
24	BALWIN	54,313
25	BELMEAD	32,936
26	MONTROSE	21,844
27	MEE-YAH-NOH	25,401
28	GRACE MARTIN	28,030
29	JOHN BARNETT	26,014
30	NORTHMOUNT	42,541
31	WESTMOUNT	35,088
32	MCKEE	24,177
33	OVERLANDERS	30,758
34	THORNCLIFFE	20,884
35	CALDER	24,296
36	BELMONT	43,020
37	BANNERMAN	36,634
38	CALLINGWOOD	28,002
39	HIGHLANDS	23,503
40	WOODCROFT	9,684
41	RITCHIE/MILL CREEK	25,736
42	STEELE HEIGHTS	60,570
43	JAMES GIBBONS	10,555
44	TIPASKAN	18,633
45	KIRKNESS	30,593
46	JOHN D. BRACCO	44,335
47	MOUNT ROYAL	11,697
48	MAYFIELD	16,908
49	KILLARNEY	31,062
50	CAERNARVON	35,122
51	MCARTHUR	17,542
52	DICKINSFIELD	35,293
53	WESTGLEN	21,149

54	PRINCETON	20,356
55	LEE RIDGE	20,255
56	SCOTT ROBERTSON	14,154
57	DUNLUCE	46,729
58	MEYOKUMIN	43,808
59	LAUDERDALE	14,188
60	OLIVER	26,317
61	DOVERCOURT	23,900
62	LAPERLE	29,506
63	BEACON HEIGHTS	8,423
64	WESTLAWN	19,966
65	GARNEAU	26,962
66	QUEEN ALEXANDRA	16,868
67	QUEEN ELIZABETH	84,436
68	SWEET GRASS	22,033
69	YORK	35,800
70	ALLENDALE	28,478
71	EASTGLEN	105,971
72	MCLEOD	41,848
73	HILLVIEW	13,003
74	ROSSLYN	58,117
75	GROVENOR	6,865
	Total	2,566,571

(J. Pallett)

TRUSTEE REQUEST #62: FEBRUARY 26, 2008 (TRUSTEE HUFF) PROVIDE THE WRITERS' ONLY DATA REFERRED TO IN TABLE 2 OF THE RESPONSE TO TT#57: The information in Table 1 (percentage of students meeting the acceptable standard and the standard of excellence for grades 3 and 6 based on students that wrote) shows that the percentage of students meeting standards is lower for small schools than for large schools at both grade 3 and 6 for all courses tested and at both the acceptable standard and the standard of excellence with the exception of acceptable standard for grade 3 language arts. The differences for standard of excellence are quite substantial for grade 6 mathematics, science and social studies.

**TABLE 1
2007 PROVINCIAL ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS
BASED ON STUDENTS WHO WROTE**

Achievement Test	SMALL <140 # OF SCHOOLS = 21	LARGE >400 # OF SCHOOLS = 15
	% of Students Meeting Standards	% of Students Meeting Standards
Grade 3 Language Arts		
Acceptable Standard	89.4	88.9
Standard of Excellence	19.4	22.6
Grade 3 Mathematics		
Acceptable Standard	87.9	88.3
Standard of Excellence	27.6	33.4

Grade 6 Language Arts		
Acceptable Standard	85.2	93.2
Standard of Excellence	24.4	29.7
Grade 6 Mathematics		
Acceptable Standard	78.9	85.6
Standard of Excellence	17.1	24.4
Grade 6 Science		
Acceptable Standard	83.8	90.5
Standard of Excellence	33.3	44.7
Grade 6 Social Studies		
Acceptable Standard	88.3	92.0
Standard of Excellence	21.7	37.9

(A.Mulgrew)

TRUSTEE REQUEST #63: FEBRUARY 26, 2008 (TRUSTEE COLBURN) PROVIDE A BREAKDOWN OF THE ARRAY OF PROGRAMS OFFERED IN THE SMALL AND LARGE SCHOOLS LISTED IN TABLE 5 IN RESPONSE TO TT#57. DID THE PROGRAMS OR STUDENTS COME FIRST IN THE LARGER SCHOOLS? In response to the first request, attached are tables (Appendix I) listing the alternative and special education programs offered at the schools identified as having fewer than 140 students (small) or more than 400 students (large) enrolled in kindergarten to grade 6. With regard to the second request, the table listing the larger schools provides information about the enrolment at the time the first program was introduced and the current enrolment. (G.Chalmers, M.Falk, K.Kope).

TRUSTEE REQUEST #64, FEBRUARY 26, 2008 (TRUSTEE FLEMING) PROVIDE INFORMATION REGARDING WHETHER STUDENTS ACHIEVE AT A HIGHER STANDARD IN SMALLER SCHOOLS OR LARGER SCHOOLS. While this issue has been widely debated, mostly in the United States, empirical research has not established any clear relationship between school size and achievement. Because achievement may vary with numerous characteristics of students, families, teachers, schools and curricula, the isolation of any single factor, such as school size, is logically problematic.

None of the published research is based on controlled trials, with students randomly assigned to schools that are similar in all respects but size. And few studies have attempted, statistically, to hold constant, or control for, other factors such as family incomes -- which are known to correlate with achievement.

A recent literature review by Kenneth R. Stevenson found that “while much of the featured research in school size during the past decade has touted smaller schools, the issue has not been resolved, at least from a research perspective. Several studies concluded in the 1990s have not confirmed that school size is a significant factor in school performance.” In theoretical discussions, larger* schools have been attributed greater efficiencies of scale, especially in capital and building-operation costs, while smaller schools have been credited with more personalized and supportive environments. But both claims have drawn a counter-argument that potential effects of size can be mitigated by administrative and instructional

practices; the inflexibility of larger schools may negate their efficiency -- or student-centred practices may enhance their personalized support.

In summary, the difficulty of inferring causality among schools with non-randomized student populations, the many contingencies that may intervene between size and achievement, and the paucity of research comparing achievement among small and medium-small schools (which predominate in Edmonton Public Schools) preclude any simple or definitive answer to the question relating school size to achievement.

*(Note: Most Edmonton Public Schools “larger” schools would be categorized as “smaller” U.S. schools.) (G. Chalmers)

TRUSTEE REQUEST #65: FEBRUARY 26, 2008 (TRUSTEE SHIPKA) PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION REGARDING RITCHIE SCHOOL:

1) **WHERE WOULD THE MONEY COME FROM TO UPGRADE RITCHIE SCHOOL?** Money to upgrade Ritchie School would come from the province under the school facilities funding envelope. There are two options available under this envelope. A specific capital funding request to upgrade Ritchie School can be made via the *Three-Year Capital Submission*. The request would identify the scope of the upgrading to be included in the project. Also available under the school facilities funding envelope are Infrastructure Maintenance and Renewal (IMR) funds. As stated in Part 7 of the *2007-2008 Funding Manual for School Authorities*, IMR funds are intended “to upgrade and/or replace building components that have failed or pose problems, in order to meet health and safety requirements; to extend the useful life of a school facility; and to maintain the quality of the school environment.” Under the first option, the Board determines which funding requests are presented to Alberta Education. The capital requests have always been greater than the funding received from the government. The second option, using IMR funds, provides flexibility in assigning funds to projects, however limits to the size and scope of the work apply. The demand for these funds also extends beyond funding available. The manual can be viewed in its entirety at the following web address:
<http://education.gov.ab.ca/funding/FundingManual/pdf/CompleteD.pdf>

2) **WHAT WOULD THE NET SAVINGS BE TO THE DISTRICT IF RITCHIE SCHOOL WERE CLOSED?** Monies accruing from closure of Ritchie School would be fully redeployed to support teaching and learning in the District. From this perspective, the funds are not saved but reallocated or redeployed to other schools. These funds would include: Plant Operations and Maintenance Allocation, 1st Program Allocation, Community Use Allocation, Dual Plant Allocation, and High Needs School Allocation. The total amount of these additional funds to redeploy would be \$288,396.

There is also a potential for reduced overall expenditures on staffing. Closure of Ritchie School could result in a District-wide reduction of 1.0 FTE Head Custodian position, 1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant position and a 0.5 FTE Principal position. The unit cost value of these staff positions is \$157,732. The realization of this expenditure reduction would depend upon the independent staffing decisions made by the administrators receiving the redeployed funds. The unexpended funds would be used by schools for other instructional purposes.

- 3) **WHERE WOULD THE MONEY SAVED BE USED; E.G. COULD IT BE USED FOR FREE TRANSPORTATION TO DESIGNATED SCHOOLS?** Funds not allocated to Ritchie School would be allocated to other District schools in accordance with the basis for allocation. For example, Ritchie's High Needs School allocation would be available to other High Needs Schools. Closure of Ritchie School would enable one more school to benefit from this targeted resource which goes to the 75 District schools qualifying for High Needs funding.

The province requires that transportation funding must be used solely for that purpose. Provision of free transportation services would be funded from within the overall transportation budget, thus marginally reducing the resources available to support the rest of the student transportation system.

(M. Ediger, J. Pallett)

TRUSTEE REQUEST #66: FEBRUARY 25, 2008 (TRUSTEE COLBURN) PROVIDE A REPORT COMPARING CORONATION, GROVENOR AND WOODCROFT SCHOOLS AND INCLUDE AN EXPLANATION AS TO WHY WOODCROFT IS BEING RECOMMENDED FOR CLOSURE WHILE THE OTHER TWO SCHOOLS ARE NOT: Coronation, Grovenor and Woodcroft Schools all have similar viability profiles and are experiencing the same challenges of:

- Low total school student enrolment;
- Low program student enrolment;
- Low student enrolment at entry level;
- Low Edmonton Public School population numbers;
- Low student space and cost averages; and
- In addition, they are all located in the same geographic area of the City, and are all part of the West 1 Sector. Coronation and Grovenor schools are in the Westminster junior high attendance area. Woodcroft School is in the Westmount junior high attendance area.

All three schools were reviewed independently and had independent outcomes. Although we agree that the three schools are alike, the rationale on how to address the programming and operational challenges is different.

Coronation School

Prior to the review last year, Coronation School was, and still is, an accredited site for the International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme. The outcome of the review was to extend the existing program to the Primary Years and to further strengthen the partnership with Westminster School's International Baccalaureate Programme.

- The effectiveness of the program extension and partnership will be reviewed in September 2010, should the viability benchmarks not be met.

Grovenor School

Grovenor School is located in a neighbourhood adjacent to a major development that will create 270 new housing units. During the review last year, the City of Edmonton was active in consultation with the community and developers to determine the extent and type of housing that will be added to the area. The City of Edmonton approved the new

development in January of this year. At the same time, Grovenor and Glenora schools are developing a partnership.

- The effectiveness of the new housing development in terms of increasing student enrolment and the partnership with Glenora School will be reviewed in September 2010 should the viability benchmarks not be met.

Woodcroft School

The School Closure Process has been initiated at Woodcroft School because the Board has concerns regarding the long-term viability of the school. Woodcroft School is located in a neighbourhood with an abundance of green space and recreational facilities in addition to a major shopping centre. Although these are considered positive neighbourhood features, the design of the neighbourhood limits the typical number of homes, for residential neighbourhoods of this size in the city. There are no opportunities for new development that would significantly increase housing units and ultimately increase enrolment at the school.

The rental housing units in the area have existed for a long time. A review of the data received from the City of Edmonton revealed that the population of the Woodcroft neighbourhood, pre-school ages and school aged children 5-14 has declined significantly since 1971 (37 years). When the rental units were first occupied, the number of children per family was higher than it is today. Over the last 20 years Woodcroft School’s enrolment has not exceeded 175 students (peak in 1994).

On February 25th, a representative from Brentwood Homes appeared before the Board of Trustees to provide support for Woodcroft School. Currently there are 55 Kindergarten to Grade 6 EPSB students living in the 207 Brentwood Home units. Of the 55 elementary students; seven students attend District Centres for Special Education, six students attend alternative programs, 28 students attend the regular program at Woodcroft School, and 14 students attend a regular program at another school.

School	Kindergarten	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Total
Woodcroft	4	3	3	3	3	4	8	28
Other	3	4	4	3	3	2	8	27
Total	7	7	7	6	6	6	16	55

If the existing rental housing units in the neighbourhood contribute an additional 48 school aged children, as proposed by representatives of Brentwood Homes, and 75 per cent of these children attend Edmonton Public Schools, and the District average of 50 per cent students attending their designated school is met, the potential increase of student at Woodcroft School would be 18 students. This actual enrolment is dependent upon the choices parents make.

Currently, there are three District alternative programs within the Westmount attendance area. The Chinese Mandarin Bilingual program is offered at Dovercourt School, Awasis at Prince Charles School, and I.B. Middle Years at Westglen School.

The viability of schools in the immediate area, and the West 1 Sector are dependent on taking students from other sectors to increase enrolment. This is confirmed by the fact that 52 per

cent of the students enrolled in West 1 Sector live outside the sector, many who will have access to a local ASAP school in 2010.

A sports alternative program, that is not sport specific but integrates kinesthetic thinking within the core curriculum and a health and well being focus, has been proposed for Woodcroft School. However, the success of a program such as this would be dependent on attracting students from outside the Woodcroft neighbourhood. This is a concern for the district as the adjacent neighbourhoods are experiencing the same difficulties with low enrolments and low numbers of school aged children. (L. Parker)

TRUSTEE REQUEST #68: FEBRUARY 26, 2008, (TRUSTEE HUFF) WHAT WOULD THE NET SAVINGS BE TO THE DISTRICT IF WOODCROFT SCHOOL OR RITCHIE SCHOOL WAS CLOSED? In the event that Woodcroft School or Ritchie School is closed there will be a redistribution of existing resources rather than a net savings to the District. The allocations currently directed to these schools will be re-allocated to other District schools. While a tabular format was requested as the means to respond to this request, the table included line items from both the allocation and expenditure sides of the school budget. The responses below approach the request from the perspective of the allocations to the school and the possible re-allocation of those dollars in the event of closure.

Ritchie School

The additional funds available to redistribute if Ritchie School was to close come from the following sources:

- a) Monies accruing from closure of Ritchie School would be fully redeployed to support teaching and learning in the District. From this perspective, the funds are not saved but reallocated or redeployed to other schools. These funds would include: Plant Operations and Maintenance Allocation, 1st Program Allocation, Community Use Allocation, Dual Plant Allocation, and High Needs School Allocation. The total amount of these additional funds to redeploy would be \$288,396.
- b) There is also a potential for reduced overall expenditures on staffing. Closure of Ritchie School could result in a District-wide reduction of 1.0 FTE Head Custodian position, 1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant position and a 0.5 FTE Principal position. The unit cost value of these staff positions is \$157,732. The realization of this expenditure reduction would depend upon the independent staffing and management decisions made by the administrators receiving the redeployed funds.
- c) Additional costs that could be incurred as a result of closure include the designated Receiving school (closed school) allocation of \$100 per student. In addition, the current annual lease revenue of \$2160 would be lost until the building is otherwise leased.

Woodcroft School

The additional funds available to redistribute if Woodcroft School was to close come from the following sources:

- a) Monies accruing from closure of Woodcroft School would be fully redeployed to support teaching and learning in the District. From this perspective, the funds are not saved but reallocated or redeployed to other schools. These funds would include: Plant Operations and Maintenance Allocation, 1st Program Allocation, Community Use Allocation, and High Needs School Allocation. The total amount of these additional funds to redeploy would be \$163,525.

- b) There is also a potential for reduced overall expenditures on staffing. Closure of Woodcroft School could result in a district-wide reduction of 1.0 FTE Head Custodian position, 1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant position, 0.3 FTE Library Technician and a 1.0 FTE Principal position. The unit cost value of these staff positions is \$209,561. The realization of this expenditure reduction would depend upon the independent staffing and management decisions made by the administrators receiving the redeployed funds.
- c) Additional costs that could be incurred as a result of closure include the following: Bussing costs of \$40,110 less any bus fees collected from students, the designated receiving school (closed school) allocation of \$100 per student. In addition, the current annual lease revenue of \$10,730 would be lost until the building is otherwise leased.

Many of the allocations to Ritchie School and Woodcroft School are based on student enrolment and will follow the student. These include the Alberta Education Class Size Fund, AISI, Aboriginal Funds, and Consulting/Inservice allocations.

(W. Deys, M. Ediger, B. Morter)

REQUEST #69: FEBRUARY 26, 2008 (TRUSTEE HUFF): CONFIRM OR CORRECT THE INFORMATION REGARDING THE COST PER WEIGHTED STUDENTS IN SMALL AND LARGE SCHOOLS AND REPORT BACK TO THE BOARD: Appendix II which was associated with the response to Trustee Request #21 from Trustee Gibson has been reprinted with two additional columns. The tables now show the cost per student and cost per weighted student, as well as the average cost per student and average cost per weighted student. (J. Edey)

DB:JB:TP:BT:cg

SCHOOLS DETERMINED TO BE SMALL (FEWER THEN 140)

SCHOOL	PROGRAMS - ALTERNATIVE OR SPECIAL NEEDS/YEAR INTRODUCED
Alberta School for the Deaf (joined district in 1995)	Deaf or Hard of Hearing
Tevie Miller	Early Education (1996)
Beacon Heights	Literacy (1997) Early Education (2004)
Belgravia	None
Coronation	International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program (IBMY) in collaboration with Westminster (1995) Behaviour and Learning Assistance (1986) Behaviour and Learning Assistance/Opportunity (2004)
Gold Bar	Behaviour and Learning Assistance (1998)
Grandview Heights	none/elementary Academic Alternative Junior High (1974)
Grovenor	Behaviour and Learning Assistance (1990)
Horse Hill	None
James Gibbons	Traditional (1997)
McCauley	Behaviour and Learning Assistance (2004) Literacy (1997) Opportunity (1995)
Mill Creek	International Spanish Academy (2001)
Mount Royal	Behaviour and Learning Assistance (1990) Arts Core (2006)
Parkdale	Literacy (1998) Opportunity (pre 1984)
Parkview	none/elementary Pre-Advanced Placement - Junior High (2005) Chinese (Mandarin) - Junior High (1998) Behaviour and Learning Assistance (2006) Interactions (2004)
Queen Alexandra	Logos (1996)
R.J. Scott	None
Riverdale	None
Scott Robertson	Individual Support Program (1984) Early Education (1996)
Sherwood	Opportunity (2000)
Spruce Avenue	Literacy (2004) Community Mental Health Classrooms (2002)
Talmud Torah	Hebrew Bilingual (1975)
Woodcroft	Behaviour and Learning Assistance (1991)

SCHOOLS DETERMINED TO BE LARGE (MORE THEN 400)

SCHOOL	PROGRAMS - ALTERNATIVE OR SPECIAL NEEDS - YEAR INTRODUCED	Previous Enrolment*	2007-2008 Enrolment
Argyll	Multiple correspondence, home education & home instruction programs Caraway (2005)	1,973	2,138
Delwood	Ukrainian International bilingual (1974) French Immersion (Pre 1984) Opportunity (2000)	666 555 562	457
Dunluce	Strategies (grades 4 to 6) – (1993) French Immersion (K to Grade 3) (2005)	525 352	400
Earl Buxton	none		433
George P. Nicholson	none		503
Glengarry	Arabic Bilingual (1983)	337	495
Greenfield	French Immersion (pre 1984)	509	522
Greenview	French Immersion (1985)	329	465
Holyrood	French Immersion and Ukrainian International bilingual (pre 1984) Strategies (only for French Immersion) – (1996)	534 483	406
Kensington	Logos (1996) Literacy (1997) Behaviour and Learning Assistance (2005)	378 382 414	398
Kildare	Chinese (Mandarin) Bilingual (pre 1984)	264	540
Meyokumin	Strategies (2002) Cogito (K to Grade 5) (2006)	220 368	436
Michael A. Kostek	none		456
Richard Second	French Immersion (pre 1984) Cogito (K to Grade 4) (2006)	318 412	451
Westbrook	Challenge (1984)	299	509

*These enrolments are whole school enrolments. When data about the implementation year is available, the whole school enrolment for the year of implementation is provided. For programs implemented prior to 1984 but for which the implementation year is not known precisely, the 1984 whole school population is provided.

**COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH EDUCATING STUDENTS
IN SMALL MEDIUM AND LARGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS**

2004 – 2005 SCHOOL YEAR

Group	School	Student Enrol	Weighted St Enrol	Total School Expend	Cost Per Student	Average Cost Per Student	Cost Per Weighted Student	Average Cost Per Weighted Student
1a	A	82	79	620,589.48	7,568.16		7,855.56	
1a	B	118	114	865,618.54	7,335.75	\$ 7,362.30	7,593.15	\$ 7,648.00
1a	C	144	138	1,034,349.26	7,182.98		7,495.28	
1b	D	273	256	1,507,785.50	5,523.02		5,889.79	
1b	E	201	203	1,155,441.61	5,748.47	\$ 5,670.51	5,691.83	\$ 5,814.02
1b	F	292	286	1,676,090.56	5,740.04		5,860.46	
1c	G	365	375	1,991,437.53	5,455.99		5,310.50	
1c	H	397	379	2,063,219.33	5,197.03	\$ 5,211.62	5,443.85	\$ 5,341.33
1c	I	531	502	2,645,357.54	4,981.84		5,269.64	
2a	J	87	112	798,350.25	9,176.44		7,128.13	
2a	K	111	158	990,460.40	8,923.07	\$ 8,704.28	6,268.74	\$ 6,618.70
2a	L	133	165	1,065,774.21	8,013.34		6,459.24	
2b	M	267	327	1,792,213.39	6,712.41		5,480.77	
2b	N	293	294	1,798,971.39	6,139.83	\$ 7,182.89	6,118.95	\$ 6,302.26
2b	O	284	338	2,469,782.70	8,696.42		7,307.05	
2c	P	397	418	2,172,274.26	5,471.72		5,196.83	
2c	Q	407	416	2,292,571.87	5,632.85	\$ 5,560.72	5,510.99	\$ 5,438.78
2c	R	544	541	3,034,207.24	5,577.59		5,608.52	

Notes

- Group 1 includes a sample of elementary schools that have a weighted student enrolment less than the actual student enrolment, while group 2 includes a sample of schools that have a weighted student enrolment that is greater than the actual student enrolment.
- Groups 1 and 2 have been further categorized according to size: small (a) with fewer than 140 students, medium (b) with approximately 250 students, and large (c) with more than 350 students.

**COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH EDUCATING STUDENTS
IN SMALL MEDIUM AND LARGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS**

2005 – 2006 SCHOOL YEAR

Group	School	Student Enrol	Weighted St Enrol	Total School Expend	Cost Per Student	Average Cost Per Student	Cost Per Weighted Student	Average Cost Per Weighted Student
1a	A	85	81	615,593.92	7,242.28		7,599.92	
1a	B	84	79	774,218.21	9,216.88	\$ 7,881.36	9,800.23	\$ 8,303.19
1a	C	162	155	1,163,957.44	7,184.92		7,509.40	
1b	D	246	237	1,406,222.83	5,716.35		5,933.43	
1b	E	206	216	1,248,780.77	6,062.04	\$ 5,931.74	5,781.39	\$ 5,960.61
1b	Fulton Place	288	281	1,732,847.31	6,016.83		6,166.72	
1c	G	355	350	2,038,048.77	5,740.98		5,823.00	
1c	H	443	410	2,387,646.70	5,389.72	\$ 5,433.35	5,823.53	\$ 5,705.80
1c	I	508	480	2,626,023.04	5,169.34		5,470.88	
2a	J	86	121	803,488.00	9,342.88		6,640.40	
2a	K	91	151	953,299.71	10,475.82	\$ 9,784.31	6,313.24	\$ 6,756.87
2a	L	99	129	943,887.70	9,534.22		7,316.96	
2b	M	256	285	1,711,562.96	6,685.79		6,005.48	
2b	N	269	290	1,840,194.75	6,840.67	\$ 7,456.97	6,945.50	\$ 6,568.95
2b	O	257	309	2,272,967.46	8,844.23		7,355.88	
2c	P	386	412	2,283,461.22	5,915.70		5,542.38	
2c	Q	420	443	2,495,842.08	5,942.48	\$ 5,879.76	5,633.96	\$ 5,596.42
2c	R	534	550	3,087,107.77	5,781.10		5,612.92	

Notes

- Group 1 includes a sample of elementary schools that have a weighted student enrolment less than the actual student enrolment, while group 2 includes a sample of schools that have a weighted student enrolment that is greater than the actual student enrolment.
- Groups 1 and 2 have been further categorized according to size: small (a) with fewer than 140 students, medium (b) with approximately 250 students, and large (c) with more than 350 students.

**COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH EDUCATING STUDENTS
IN SMALL MEDIUM AND LARGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS**

2006 – 2007 SCHOOL YEAR

Group	School	Student Enrol	Weighted St Enrol	Total School Expenditures	Cost Per Student	Average Cost Per Student	Cost Per Wt Student	Average Cost Per Wt Student
1a	A	87	81	639,938.12	7,355.61		7,900.47	
1a	B	89	87	846,185.19	9,507.70	\$ 8,240.86	9,726.27	\$ 8,638.60
1a	C	135	128	1,061,000.19	7,859.26		8,289.06	
1b	D	245	236	1,509,290.88	6,160.97		6,395.90	
1b	E	249	243	1,579,320.45	6,342.65	\$ 6,294.33	6,499.26	\$ 6,569.63
1b	F	251	235	1,601,970.58	6,379.96		6,814.34	
1c	G	403	387	2,344,434.42	5,817.46		6,057.97	
1c	H	484	465	2,786,104.41	5,756.41	\$ 5,826.78	5,991.62	\$ 6,123.72
1c	I	533	498	3,148,145.48	5,906.46		6,321.58	
Group 2								
2a	J	76	115	882,027.59	11,605.63		7,669.81	
2a	K	88	139	967,601.94	10,995.48	\$ 11,045.50	6,961.17	\$ 7,226.43
2a	L	95	142	1,000,862.05	10,535.39		7,048.32	
2b	M	248	285	1,781,271.35	7,182.55		6,250.07	
2b	N	251	269	1,837,349.22	7,920.12	\$ 8,119.69	6,830.29	\$ 6,980.31
2b	O	256	321	2,523,240.64	9,856.41		7,860.56	
2c	P	387	413	2,390,741.39	6,177.63		5,788.72	
2c	Q	422	467	2,778,868.95	6,585.00	\$ 6,366.72	5,950.47	\$ 5,995.89
2c	R	491	498	3,111,737.20	6,337.55		6,248.47	

Notes

- Group 1 includes a sample of elementary schools that have a weighted student enrolment less than the actual student enrolment, while group 2 includes a sample of schools that have a weighted student enrolment that is greater than the actual student enrolment.
- Groups 1 and 2 have been further categorized according to size: small (a) with fewer than 140 students, medium (b) with approximately 250 students, and large (c) with more than 350 students.