# EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS 

January 13, 2004
TO: Board of Trustees
FROM: A. McBeath, Superintendent of Schools
SUBJECT: Trustee Electoral Ward Boundary Review
ORIGINATOR: A. Habinski, Executive Director School and District Services
RESOURCE
STAFF: Jenise Bidulock, Michael Ediger, Anne Sherwood, Cindy Skolski

## INFORMATION

On November 12, 2003 a motion was brought to the board seeking an amendment to the current electoral ward criteria. At that board meeting the board requested information regarding the possible implications of the approval of the motion on ward electoral boundaries. This report provides information on two scenarios: one indicating implications should the motion not be approved and one indicating the implications for ward changes should the motion be approved.

The November 12, 2003 motion was placed on today's agenda following this report. If the motion is approved a recommendation for change to ward boundaries and a subsequent change of bylaw would be taken to the next board meeting on January 27, 2004. If the motion is not approved then this information report indicates no change to ward boundaries and no further action would be required by the board.

The next general municipal election will be held on Monday, October 18, 2004. The City of Edmonton has indicated there will be no changes to the municipal ward boundaries. However, any changes for ward boundaries for trustee elections could be accommodated provided that the board decision is communicated and approved by the Minister no later than March 1, 2004.

## History of Trustee Wards

Prior to 1989, all public and separate school trustees were elected at large. In 1989 the Minister of Education required trustees to be elected by wards. Nine public and seven separate school trustees were elected under the City of Edmonton’s six ward system.

In 1995, nine public school trustee electoral wards were implemented which were distinct from municipal wards. Boundary alignments were chosen in order to distribute future urban growth and to ensure that the ward populations would remain within a $+/-10$ per cent of average public school supporting population for at least three elections. Wards were designed on the basis of achieving a balance of total public school supporting population among wards as a priority over seeking to achieve a balance in the number of schools or
students within a ward. The potential for population growth or decline within each ward was also considered.

## Current Criteria

The current Edmonton Public Schools nine ward trustee electoral ward boundaries were approved by the board on December 13, 1994 to be implemented in the 1995 General Municipal Election. The ward design criteria were as follows:

The wards must:

1. have a resident population of public school supporters that is within $+/-10$ per cent of the average for all wards (one ninth of the total district-wide public-school supporting population);
2. reflect the potential for population growth or decline with the goal that school ward populations remain within +/- 10 per cent of the average through three municipal general elections;
3. encompass entire school attendance areas where possible;
4. be regular in shape, and be delineated by easily identifiable boundaries such as major roadways, railways, ravines, rivers, etcetera; and
5. ensure where possible that communities of common interests or characteristics are kept within the same ward.

It should be noted that in order for the City of Edmonton Elections Office to provide computerized compilation of electoral results, the public school board ward boundaries must conform to existing voting subdivision boundaries.

The data used to complete the 2003-04 review was provided by the City of Edmonton from the 2002 Federal Census and the 1999 Civic Census counts. This is the same data source the City of Edmonton used for the 2002 City Municipal Ward Review.

## Scenario 1 - Current Ward Boundaries

Trustee electoral wards have met the 1995 criteria for the past three elections, and the criteria would be met through the next election in 2004. With the current ward boundaries, the resident population of public supporters would deviate from +7 to -9 percent from the average public supporting population. This is within the current $+/-10$ per cent criteria (Appendix II). Criteria 2 through 5 would also be met. A list of the schools located in each existing ward is provided in Appendix III. The numbers of operational schools within the current ward boundaries are as follows:

| Ward | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# Schools | 23 | 23 | 30 | 22 | 16 | 21 | 28 | 17 | 26 |

## Scenario 2 - Proposed Ward Realignment

The administration has prepared a scenario that seeks a better balance of public supporting residents among wards and addresses the implications of the board's approval of the board motion served on November 12, 2003. The motion sought an amendment to the board
approved electoral ward criteria to include: "ensure that each ward includes within its boundaries at least one elementary, junior high and senior high school."

Minor ward boundary amendments, as follows, would accommodate this and enhance the balance of public supporters among wards as illustrated in Appendix I.

1. Moving voting subdivision \#115 West Meadowlark Park and \#116 Meadowlark Park from Ward C to Ward E would result in an increase of 4,674 public school supporters in Ward E. Three schools would be moved from Ward C to Ward E, Afton, Meadowlark, and Jasper Place.
2. Moving voting subdivision \#409 and \#410 Westmount/Oliver from Ward F to Ward C would result in a decrease of 4,243 public school supporters in Ward F. There are no schools in voting subdivision \#409 and \#410 that would require movement.
The combination of movement between Wards C, E, and F would result in a net decrease of 431 public school supporters to Ward C (Appendix II).

In Scenario 2, the number of operational schools proposed in each ward boundary (Appendix III) would be as follows:

| Ward | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# Schools | 23 | 23 | 27 | 22 | 19 | 21 | 28 | 17 | 26 |

If the board approves the motion to add to the current criteria the board would then be asked to approve Scenario 2. This would result in the distribution of public supporting population among wards improving to +7 to -7 percent and continue to meet the current $+/-10$ per cent criteria. It is anticipated that this criteria would be met through the 2004 and 2007 General Municipal Elections with potential growth or decline within each ward through urban intensification and new development.

## Ministerial Approval

If the board approved the motion, in accordance with Section 262 of the School Act Regulations boards are required to pass a bylaw to establish wards for trustee elections prior to March $1^{\text {st }}$ of an election year and seek Ministerial approval. At the January $27^{\text {th }}$ board meeting a recommendation to change the ward boundary criteria and bylaw would be brought to board for approval and submission to the Minister of Learning.
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## APPENDIX II

## PUBLIC POPULATION DEVIATION COMPARISON

## Scenario 1 - Current Ward Boundaries

| Current <br> Ward <br> Boundaries | Total City <br> Population | Public <br> Supporting <br> Population | Difference from <br> Optimum Public <br> Population <br> $+/-10 \%$ | Public <br> Population <br> Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ward A | 87,045 | 56,646 | 1,292 | $2 \%$ |
| Ward B | 77,807 | 52,931 | $(2,424)$ | $-4 \%$ |
| Ward C | 71,525 | 53,673 | $(1,681)$ | $-3 \%$ |
| Ward D | 77,138 | 56,804 | 1,449 | $3 \%$ |
| Ward E | 74,397 | 50,481 | $(4,873)$ | $-9 \%$ |
| Ward F | 62,307 | 55,534 | 180 | $0 \%$ |
| Ward G | 73,357 | 56,371 | 1,017 | $2 \%$ |
| Ward H | 74,211 | 56,680 | 1,326 | $2 \%$ |
| Ward I | 76,726 | 59,069 | 3,714 | $7 \%$ |
| Total City <br> Population | $\mathbf{6 7 4 , 5 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 8 , 1 8 8}$ |  |  |
| Ward Average | $\mathbf{7 4 , 9 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 , 3 5 4}$ |  |  |

Scenario 2 - Proposed Ward Realignment

| Senior High <br> School in Each <br> Ward | Total City <br> Population | Public <br> Supporting <br> Population | Difference from <br> Optimum Public <br> Population <br> $+/-10 \%$ | Public <br> Population <br> Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ward A | 87,045 | 56,646 | 1,292 | $2 \%$ |
| Ward B | 77,807 | 52,931 | $(2,424)$ | $-4 \%$ |
| Ward C | 71,525 | 53,242 | $(2,112)$ | $-4 \%$ |
| Ward D | 77,138 | 56,804 | 1,449 | $3 \%$ |
| Ward E | 74,397 | 55,155 | $(199)$ | $0 \%$ |
| Ward F | 62,307 | 51,291 | $(4,063)$ | $-7 \%$ |
| Ward G | 73,357 | 56,371 | 1,017 | $2 \%$ |
| Ward H | 74,211 | 56,680 | 1,326 | $2 \%$ |
| Ward I | 76,726 | 59,069 | 3,714 | $7 \%$ |
| Total City <br> Population | $\mathbf{6 7 4 , 5 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 8 , 1 8 8}$ |  |  |
| Ward Average | $\mathbf{7 4 , 9 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 , 3 5 4}$ |  |  |

Scenario 1 - Current Ward Boundaries

Scenario 2 - Proposed Ward Realignment

| WARD A <br> B. BONKO | WARD B R. DEAN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WARD C } \\ & \text { L. ODYNSKI } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WARD D } \\ & \text { R. MARTIN } \end{aligned}$ | WARDE J. WOODROW | WARD F <br> D. FLEMING | WARD G S. HANSEN | WARD H <br> G. NICHOLSON | WARD I <br> G. GIBEAULT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unchanged | Unchanged | Afton <br> Remove <br> Jasper Place <br> Meadowlark | Unchanged | $\quad$ Add Afton Jasper Place Meadowlark | Unchanged | Unchanged | Unchanged | Unchanged |

