

EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

January 15, 2008

TO: Board of Trustees

FROM: E. Schmidt, Superintendent of Schools

SUBJECT: Responses to Trustee Requests for Information

ORIGINATOR: J. Bidulock, Assistant Superintendent
T. Parker, Assistant Superintendent

RESOURCE
STAFF: Meredith Colgan, John Edey, Michael Ediger, Leanne Fedor, Roland Labbe, Anne Mulgrew, Lorne Parker, Cindy Skolski

INFORMATION

TRUSTEE REQUEST #21: NOVEMBER 27, 2007 (TRUSTEE GIBSON) PROVIDE A REPORT ON THE PROCESSES AND THE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION SINCE JUNE 2004 THAT ILLUMINATE THE VALUES, THE DISCUSSION WITH THE COMMUNITY AND THE OUTCOMES OF ALL OF THE WORK AROUND THE USE OF DISTRICT SPACE. ALSO INCLUDE A DISCUSSION AROUND THE UNDERLYING VALUES AND BELIEFS OF THE DISTRICT REGARDING STUDENT ACCOMMODATION IN DISTRICT SCHOOLS. ALSO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON THE COST OF OPERATING SCHOOLS AT DIFFERENT ENROLMENT LEVELS; E.G., INFORMATION FROM THE ASBA REGARDING THE COST DIFFERENTIAL OF OPERATING SCHOOLS WITH LESS THAN 100 STUDENTS.

Costs Associated with Educating Students

Costs associated with educating students in small, medium, and large district elementary schools have been analyzed for three consecutive years (2006-2007, 2005-2006 and 2004-2005) in sample schools from two categories of schools (Attachment I). The first category (1a, 1b, 1c) includes schools where the student population received mostly regular programming, and the second category (2a, 2b, 2c) included schools that offer regular programming as well as Special Needs programming. In each category, the sample included three schools in three different size ranges: small schools (a) with less than 140 students, medium-sized schools (b) with approximately 250 students, and large schools (c) with more than 350 students. The data shows that the average cost of educating a student increases as a school gets smaller for both categories of schools. The average cost per student is consistently around 40 per cent higher in small schools in comparison to than large schools that offer only regular programming. For schools that offer regular programming and Special Needs programming, the average cost per student in a small school ranges from 56 per cent to 73.5 per cent higher than a large school.

Student Accommodation and District Schools

Over the years, underlying values have been influenced by economic and political factors, both within and beyond the district, in the management of student learning space. Use of space in schools has been a key indicator of how well the district manages its physical capital assets and the resources available to operate them. Space has been monitored by the Government of Alberta which has determined the amount of funding provided to the district for operation and maintenance, and used as a benchmark for provincial approvals regarding district requests for capital support to renovate or build new space.

As a district, we recognize that there is a cost associated with operating and maintaining each square meter of district space, whether it is used or not. In this regard, the district continues to focus on providing the best educational learning environment for students while rationalizing the manner in which we use space in schools.

Provided in the appendices is a summary of:

- Current Status of District Learning Space
- District Initiatives in the Management of District Learning Space
- Provincial Influence on the Management of District Learning Space
- Challenges in the Management of District Learning Space

The district's overall strategy is to build new schools in growth areas, renew existing schools that are sustainable and transform the way we manage our school space so that all students can access a quality facility close to where they live.

The district is currently working on a number of initiatives to better rationalize and manage student learning space in the district. These initiatives include:

- Implementation of 2007-08 Sustainability and Continuation Reviews.
- Pursue and develop a framework for a planning decision unit Student Space Management System to optimize the district's ability to manage the quantity, quality and location of student learning spaces in the neighbourhood, sector, and district levels.
- Review administration regulation JCB.AR Utilization of Surplus Space in Schools to reflect changes in the district and changes resulting from the Joint Use Agreement Review 2006-07. (L. Parker)

TRUSTEE REQUEST #26: DECEMBER 11, 2007 (TRUSTEE HUFF) PROVIDE INFORMATION REGARDING THE RESULTS OF THE STUDENTS WHO WROTE THE PROVINCIAL ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FROM THE OTHER THREE LARGE URBAN BOARDS. The following table provides information on the percentages of students who wrote achievement tests and met the acceptable standard and the standard of excellence for the four large urban school jurisdictions.

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING STANDARDS ON PROVINCIAL ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR THE FOUR LARGE URBAN BOARDS: 2007 BASED ON STUDENTS WHO WROTE THE TESTS

Test	Edmonton Public	Edmonton Catholic	Calgary Public	Calgary Catholic
	% Meeting Standard	% Meeting Standard	% Meeting Standard	% Meeting Standard
Gr. 3 Lang. Arts				
Acceptable Standard	88.5	91.6	88.1	92.4
Standard of Excellence	18.3	22.0	20.4	23.5
Gr. 3 Mathematics				
Acceptable Standard	88.4	89.9	87.1	90.0
Standard of Excellence	28.8	25.6	25.8	29.1
Gr. 6 Language Arts				
Acceptable Standard	89.9	91.1	90.5	93.6
Standard of Excellence	24.0	24.2	22.8	26.7
Gr. 6 Fr. Lang. Arts				
Acceptable Standard	89.3	87.9	93.2	87.6
Standard of Excellence	13.9	8.2	16.1	10.6
Gr. 6 Mathematics				
Acceptable Standard	84.0	83.8	83.3	87.4
Standard of Excellence	18.8	18.3	18.4	19.7
Gr. 6 Science				
Acceptable Standard	88.2	83.8	84.5	88.9
Standard of Excellence	35.0	29.9	31.8	33.8
Gr. 6 Social Studies				
Acceptable Standard	89.9	87.4	87.0	92.2
Standard of Excellence	28.9	25.8	26.3	32.9
Gr. 9 Language Arts				
Acceptable Standard	89.0	93.2	86.9	92.2
Standard of Excellence	21.1	19.1	16.7	19.2
Gr. 9 Fr. Lang. Arts				
Acceptable Standard	88.4	92.5	88.6	81.6
Standard of Excellence	19.9	18.5	12.0	15.3
Gr. 9 Mathematics				
Acceptable Standard	78.5	81.9	75.8	81.5
Standard of Excellence	25.9	23.4	24.2	23.2
Gr. 9 Science				
Acceptable Standard	82.3	83.8	78.1	82.1
Standard of Excellence	23.7	17.8	18.0	17.9
Gr. 9 Social Studies				
Acceptable Standard	85.1	87.3	80.2	83.6
Standard of Excellence	28.3	24.5	21.6	21.8

For acceptable standard and standard of excellence at grades 3 and 9, the district position relative to the other urban boards stays essentially the same as it was with cohort reporting. The district position at grade 6 relative to the other urban boards appears to improve when students who are absent or excused from writing are factored out of the data. The data shows that, across the province, students who write the achievement tests are doing well. When students who were absent or excused are factored out of the data, differences among the four urban boards are minimal.

The province provides schools and jurisdictions with results based on both students who wrote as well as for the cohort population. It is the cohort data that is used for public reporting purposes (e.g. Accountability Pillar Reporting). The reasons provided by the province for using cohort data are to:

- provide a truer picture of provincial and jurisdiction student achievement that accounts for all students enrolled in grades 3, 6 and 9;
- encourage jurisdictions and schools to be as inclusive as possible in providing students the opportunity to demonstrate their learning;
- create a “level playing field” across the province so that comparisons across jurisdictions or from year-to-year within jurisdictions are derived from a common population base; and
- act as a deterrent to jurisdictions and schools from being selective as to which students would be given the opportunity to write achievement tests. (A. Mulgrew)

JB:TP:cg

Appendix I	Current Status of District Learning Space
Appendix II	District Initiatives in the Management of District Learning Space
Appendix III	Provincial Influences on Management of District Learning Space
Appendix IV	Challenges in the Management of District Learning Space
Appendix V	2007-08 Operational and Non-operational Schools
Appendix VI	School Closure Policy
Attachment I	Cost Associated with Educating Students in Small, Medium and Large Elementary Schools

Current Status of District Learning Space

The district provides programs in 197 operational schools and in a number of leased premises, (Appendix V). The district also provides programming in institutional settings where district teaching staff provide education services through service contract agreements (e.g. Glenrose, Yellowhead Youth Detention Centre, Eric Cormack). In these sites, the district does not assume responsibility for maintaining the space used.

Over the past 12 years the district has experienced a period of fiscal constraint and flat enrolment. During this time, the district closed 13 schools including: Alex Taylor, Bellevue, High Park, Idylwyld, Newton, North Edmonton, Prince Rupert, Queen Mary Park, Sherbrooke, Strathearn, Terrace Heights, Wellington, and Westview Village schools. The district sold seven schools that had been closed in the past (Argyll, Beverly Heights, Canora, Cromdale, H.A. Gray, McQueen, and Strathearn schools). As well, a parcel of surplus land (St. Albert Trail site) and three surplus administration properties (Assumption College, Old Administration Building and Annex Building was sold). Edmonton Christian School purchased McQueen School and Millwoods Christian School purchased Westview Village School. The latter two sites are still counted in the operational district capacity yet the district does not assume capital responsibility for the sites. Additionally, the district has entered into a long-term lease for Alex Taylor School with the City Centre Church Corporation until 2020.

During this time the district has also significantly added to its operational inventory by:

- reopening four closed schools to accommodate new learning programs (The Academy at King Edward (elementary facility), Argyll Centre at Terrace Heights Campus, Rites of Passage at Prince Rupert School, Terra at Braemar School);
- leasing 12 buildings for new or current learning programs (Alberta School for the Deaf, Amiskwaciy Academy, Centre High, Talmud Torah, Edmonton Christian (3), Meadowlark Christian, Major General Griesbach, Millwoods Christian and Woodside schools).
- absorbing new programs and leasing their facilities (Alberta School for the Deaf/Tevie Miller Heritage School, Edmonton Christian Schools, Millwoods Christian Schools and Meadowlark Christian Schools);
- opening outreach programs (Learning Stores) at Blue Quill, Circle Square, Londonderry Mall, Whyte Avenue and West Edmonton Mall; and
- relocating decentralized administration from a leased location (R. H. David) to a closed school (Queen Mary Park)

In 2006-07, Metro Continuing Education shifted programs out of leased space and into L'Académie Vimy Ridge Academy and Idylwyld; facility and operational costs relating to the operation of Metro are designed to be cost recovery.

District Initiatives in the Management of District Learning Space

As alluded to earlier, the issue of managing excess learning space and operating schools with low enrolments has been a challenge in the district since at least 1979. Moving to school site based decision-making, and the transparency of the allocation system, highlighted the reality that small schools tend to be inefficient due to the higher proportion of resources allocated to them.

Faced with the realities of severely restricted funding, and the district's desire for local schools, Edmonton Public Schools undertook a number of initiatives in the management of student learning space. Some of the initiatives were:

- Semi-Permanent Classroom Pods and Portables (1975-2007)
- Twinning/Multi-Campuses Schools (1975 – 2007)
- City Centre Education Project (2001)
- Concept Development Studies (2001)
- Leasing and Partnerships (1982 – 2007)
- Inventory of Student Space (1983 - 2004)
- Cluster Studies (2004-05)
- Ten-Year Facilities Plan (2005 to 2007)
- Annual Implementation Plan (2006)
- Sustainability Reviews (2006-07, 2007-08)
- School Closures

Semi-Permanent Classroom Pods and Portables (1975-2007)

In the mid 1970's the district implemented a core-expandable model of school construction which involved building smaller core facilities with the ability to support the construction of semi-permanent additions (pods) in order to accommodate peak enrolments in schools. These pods were designed so they could be easily removed from schools, as required, when neighbourhoods got older and enrolment levels dropped.

In 2003, a review of the district's pod inventory was completed as part of the ongoing effort to reduce excess student learning space. Fifty-seven "core" schools with one or more pod attached additions were identified in the district. At that time, there were 95 pods with between two and six classrooms in the district, representing a total capacity of 9,815 student learning spaces. While pods are still required, there are and continue to be opportunities to reduce surplus student learning spaces through the disposition of pods that are no longer required.

Portable classrooms were built over two separate periods of time: 1956 to 1967 and 1988 to 1994. According to the most recent inventory (2007–08 school year), the district maintains 94 portable classroom units. Of the district's 94 portable classrooms, six are deemed to be surplus. Planning continues to work with schools to relocate students into core buildings further identifying surplus portables.

Rather than adding portables to schools, the district has vigorously pursued initiatives to reconfigure existing core of school space to create additional classrooms. Examples of this are at Brookside, Delwood, George P. Nicholson, Greenfield, Holyrood, and York schools.

Twinning/Multi-Campuses (1975 to 2007)

The intent of Twinning/Multi-Campuses was to combine student populations at low enrolment schools resulting in a cost savings related to educational administration, staffing, resources and extra curricular services. Today, Twinning/Multi-Campuses are administered by a single principal or two principals. Twinning/Multi-Campuses do not address the rising costs for maintenance and infrastructure needs of the facilities as the facilities remain open. The following is a chronological history of schools that were twinned/multi-campuses:

- In the mid-seventies, six schools were twinned: Cromdale/Virginia Park, Beverly Heights/Bellevue, and Queen Mary Park/Prince Rupert.
- In September 1998 Prince Charles and Sherbrooke schools were twinned. The AWASIS program was extended from grades seven to nine at Sherbrooke School under the administration of Prince Charles School. Students in grades five and six at Prince Charles School were then relocated to Sherbrooke School.
- For the 2007 – 2008 school year, seven multi-campus schools exist: The Academy at King Edward/King Edward, Avalon/Lendrum, Coronation/Westminster, Ellerslie Campus Ellerslie North/Ellerslie South, Mill Creek Elementary/Ritchie, Mount Royal/Virginia Park, and R. J. Scott/Lawton.

City Centre Education Project (2001)

In 2001, the City Centre Education Project (CCEP) was initiated to provide a comprehensive effort to strengthen the delivery of educational programming and experiences for city centre students. The CCEP involved eight city centre schools: Alex Taylor, Eastwood, John A. McDougall, McCauley, Norwood, Parkdale, Queen Mary Park and Spruce Avenue. At that time, schools in the city centre faced challenges that included low achievement results, declining enrolments, limited programming opportunities, deteriorating buildings, and the challenge of serving a population that had a high percentage of disadvantaged students and families. Existing budgets were unable to support needs and demands, and the challenge to provide students with all the high-quality learning opportunities and enrichment required change. As a result, junior high programs at Eastwood and John A. McDougall schools were closed and consolidated with the junior high programs at Parkdale, McCauley and Spruce Avenue schools. Alex Taylor and Queen Mary Park schools also were closed during this period.

Concept Development Studies (2001)

In 2001, provincial support in the amount of \$140,000 was received to complete Concept Development Studies. The Concept Development Studies were intended to generate ideas to improve learning opportunities and address space utilization in schools. For each group of schools, cluster teams were formed consisting of parents, community members, school representatives, principals of the schools, community recreation contacts, architects, and staff from Planning. The four study groups were:

- Centre East: Bellevue, Highlands, Montrose, Mount Royal, Newton
- Centre West: Inglewood, Westmount, Woodcroft
- North West: Athlone, McArthur, Wellington
- North East: Balwin, North Edmonton, Princeton

At the request of the Board, these studies were discontinued in April 2002. As of 2007, of the 14 schools reviewed through Concept Development Studies;

- Ten schools have been reviewed a second time through Cluster Studies (2004-05) or Sustainability or Program Fit Reviews (2006-07);
- Four schools have been closed;
- Three schools will be directly impacted when the six new elementary/junior high schools open in 2010. The schools are Athlone, McArthur and Princeton.

Leasing and Partnerships (1982 – 2005)

In 1982 the board established set minimum leasing rates for specific users. These rates were meant to ensure schools were not subsidizing leases from educational and operational funds. In 2003, the administration completed a lease rate review which included examining other school district approaches and rates pertaining to leases, consultation with district principals, input from current tenants and consultation with those agencies involved with the district in educational and co-curricular provision of services. The lease rates were then set to ensure full recovery of operating and capital investment costs for the district. At the same time the administration acknowledged the need to provide subsidized space for interagency provision of early education and intervention programming that, while outside the district's immediate K-12 mandate, is integral to the success of district students.

Edmonton Public Schools has been successful at implementing partnerships to acquire new facilities and make better use of existing facilities. The district has been successful in a number of partnerships with existing facilities such as Conseil Scolaire Centre-Nord, Edmonton Ballet, Edmonton City Centre Church Corporation, Capital Health, Terra Association, and a number of Head Start Societies (ABC, Ben Calf Robe, Bent Arrow, and Oliver Child Care Centre). Another example of this is the George P. Nicholson School partnership with Capital Health and the YMCA. Our district continues to seek appropriate partnerships and leases to occupy our excess student learning space.

In 2006-07 the district leased a total of 25,202 square meters of operational school space to outside parties; 19,215 square meters of this number is exempted space under the definition of the provincial government. This represents three per cent of the district's total operational school space.

Closed schools are exempted from utilization when they are closed. This is not dependent on whether or not they are leased out. However, leases in closed schools are an essential means of recovering the buildings' operational costs so far as to not divert scarce resources from the four per cent administrative cap. Currently, approximately 3,911 square meters of vacant space in closed buildings is available for lease while 22,850 square meters is already leased.

Inventory of Student Space (1983-2004)

During the period 1983 to 1995, the Planning and Student Accommodation Branch annually collected information from principals on the use of space in each school as identified in Administration Regulation (JGB.AR) titled Utilization of Surplus Space in Schools. This inventory was conducted for the purpose of encouraging increased community use of space. After this time, the process of identifying and inventorying use of space was considered onerous for principals and was discontinued. Administration Regulation (JGB.AR) titled

Utilization of Surplus Space in Schools is scheduled to be reviewed in 2008 to reflect this and changes resulting from the 2006-07 Joint Use Agreement Review.

In October 2003, the process to inventory space in schools was initiated as a joint project between Facilities Services and Planning. The purpose of the inventory was to collect data and information regarding how space was being used in all district schools. The data collected was designed to be used to assist schools and central services to better meet the learning needs of students through more efficient and effective planning and improved access to funding from Alberta Infrastructure.

By May 2004, all schools in the district had been visited by staff from the Planning Department. During these visits, Planning staff met with principals, assistant principals and custodians to discuss space utilization, sectors, plant operations and maintenance funding, capital priorities, and other related issues and concerns identified by schools. A walk around of the school provided documented information as to how all space in the school was being used.

During the process to inventory space in schools, it became apparent that a system to manage current data and information about space use in schools was required to provide accurate and up to date information on demand. The information that was collected while used to inform decision-making, has yet to be processed in a meaningful manner and made readily accessible to schools and central services. A major initiative, identified in the 2007-08 Planning Department budget document is to pursue and develop a framework for a Student Space Management System. This will allow current information to be acquired, organized, and stored in an efficient and functional manner, while being easily accessible.

Cluster Studies (2004-05)

In December 2004, a series of three Cluster Studies were initiated to examine groups of schools in areas of the city with declining enrolment. Through input from parents, community members, and school staff, the goal was to explore ways in these areas of the city to:

- Enhance programming for students;
- Improve educational and co-curricular opportunities for students;
- Improve facilities and learning environments for students; and,
- Improve use of efficiency of how space is being used.

The three cluster study groups were:

Cluster A - Balwin, North Edmonton, and Princeton schools;

Cluster B - Athlone, McArthur, and Wellington schools; and,

Cluster C - Forest Heights, Fulton Place, Hardisty, Strathearn, and Terrace Heights schools.

Outcomes of the Cluster Studies resulted in the status quo at Athlone, Fulton Place, McArthur, and Princeton schools. North Edmonton, Strathearn, Terrace Heights, and Wellington schools were closed. Students at North Edmonton School were designated to Balwin School which was transformed into a Kindergarten to grade 9 school. Students of Terrace Heights School were designated to Forest Heights School. Elementary students of Strathearn School were dual designated to Holyrood and Rutherford schools. Junior High students of Strathearn School were designated to Kenilworth School.

Ten-Year Facilities Plan (2005 to 2007)

The provincial government requires all school district's submit a Ten-Year Facilities Plan annually. Planning Principles were developed to serve as a guide and reference point for the district's work in student accommodation, program distribution and capital planning.

In January 2006, the district engaged an external consultant to facilitate a consultation process to obtain input and feedback on the district's Ten-Year Facilities Plan, district planning principles, school viability indicators and facility outcomes. School viability indicators are those factors that define a healthy school from financial, physical, and educational program perspective.

The district's annual planning process involves three main tools

- a Ten-Year Facilities Plan, which determines how we will make facility decisions;
- a Three-Year Capital Plan, which determines what our capital priorities will be; and
- an Annual Implementation Plan, which assesses the viability of all district schools on a yearly basis and recommends strategies for managing them.

Annual Implementation Plan (2006)

Each year, district principles, strategies and goals of the Ten-Year Facilities Plan are put into action through the Annual Implementation Plan. The recommendations of the Annual Implementation Plan are intended to ensure equitable access to quality learning environments across the district. These recommendations are based on the School Profiles of all district schools. School Profiles include information about a school's viability, local conditions in the community and a recommended facility strategy. Individual School Profiles for all district schools are available at <http://www.epsb.ca/datafiles/TenYearFacilitiesPlanboard.pdf>

As a result of stakeholder input, a new component was added to the Ten-Year Facilities Plan, specifically aimed at ensuring the sustainability of schools over the long-term. The Annual Implementation Plan provides the rationale that is used to determine which schools are proposed to be reviewed and provides a detailed timeline for the process, reporting, and engagement opportunities for staff, parents, and community representatives.

Through extensive consultation, stakeholders requested three key enhancements to the district's facility planning process:

- advance notice regarding schools where long-term viability may be in question;
- a transparent process for identifying schools where viability may be in question; and
- opportunity for meaningful input with regard to strategies going forward to ensure the viability of schools.

As a result, individual School Profiles were developed to provide a transparent process for identifying schools to be reviewed. The School Profile provides a snapshot based on current information about each school. Benchmarks were identified for each component in order to measure a school's viability. Facility strategies are recommended for each school based on results of applying the benchmarks to the School Profile. After the first year of implementation specific benchmarks and the years schools proposed for review were amended as a result of stakeholder debrief.

Sustainability Reviews (2006-07, 2007-08)

In October 2006, through the Annual Implementation Plan process, Sustainability and Program Fit Reviews were initiated at Coronation, Grovenor, High Park, Lendrum, Montrose, Mount Royal, Newton, Mount Pleasant (regular program), and Mill Creek/Ritchie schools. Outcomes of the reviews resulted in the closure of Newton and High Park schools and closure of the regular programs at Mill Creek and Mount Pleasant schools. Regular program student of Mill Creek are designated to Hazeldean School and Mount Pleasant School students were designated to Lendrum School. Grovenor and Coronation schools were recommended for a Continuation Review and are multi campused with Glenora and Westminster schools respectfully. Mount Royal School was established as a multi-campus school with Virginia Park School and implemented the Arts Core Program. Students of Newton neighbourhood were designated to Montrose School and students of High Park neighbourhood were designated to Mayfield School.

A review of the 2006-07 Annual Implementation Plan process resulted in some amendments to the benchmarks used in the School Profiles. For example, the Facility Condition benchmark was deleted. The student enrolment benchmark was refined to include Student Enrolment at Entry Level in accordance with the Alberta Commission on Learning (ACOL) guidelines. The Student Space and Cost benchmark was changed to reflect the district's school capacity, based on ACOL guidelines as opposed to the provincial government's rated school capacity. Facility Strategies which identifies the period in time a school could be reviewed were amended to identify schools for review under year one, years two or three, or years four to ten.

Through approval of the Annual Implementation Plan in September 2007, Sustainability Reviews were initiated at Horse Hill and Woodcroft schools and Continuation Reviews were initiated at Coronation, Grovenor, and Ritchie schools. A Continuation Review is completed on a school that underwent a Sustainability Review in the previous year, yet did not result in a definitive outcome regarding the school's long term viability; therefore, the review process for the school was to continue.

School Closures

In recent years, the decline in enrolment and fiscal restraints have required the district to take a more in-depth look at reducing excess students learning space. School closures result in the greatest gain with the least impact on the fewest number of students. Schools eligible for closure have low enrolments and are located in neighbourhoods with declining pre-school and school-aged populations. Typically, the buildings are older and require significant capital investment to improve the student learning environments for instruction. In this respect the district needs to remove student spaces to equal or exceed anticipated expansion of new student space. The ultimate goal being the efficient use of district student learning space.

In 2006, Board Policy FL.BP – School Closures was reviewed and revised to ensure the policy is clear and understandable, to ensure compliance with the School Act and associated regulations, and to ensure consistency with new aspects of the district's Ten-Year Facilities Plan, which addresses excess space in the district (Appendix VI). The school closure policy review web-survey was conducted in accordance with board policy review procedures and was open for input during the period May 24 to June 29, 2006. In addition to the web-

survey, a public meeting was held on September 13, 2006. Advice and input received from parents, staff, and community members was incorporated into the school closure policy. For convenience, a flow chart of the school closure process was provided.

Provincial Influence on Management of the District Learning Space

- Provincial Area, Capacity and Utilization Rate - PUR (1998)
- Facility Audit Review (1999)
- Provincial Government Reorganization (1999)
- Sector Model Implementation (2000-01)
- Operational Review (2003)
- Learning Commission - Small Class Size Initiative (2003-04)
- Funding for School Facilities (PO&M, IMR and Capital)

Provincial Area, Capacity and Utilization Rate - PUR (1998)

In January 1998, the School Facilities Task Force recommended that the province revise the method of determining student capacity in schools. It was requested that revisions recognize changes in the delivery of new education programs and the operational requirements of schools. Prior to 1998, the method of determining capacity of school buildings remained unchanged in Alberta since 1979. From 1979 to 1998, the utilization rate had been calculated by dividing a school jurisdiction's Full Time Equivalent (FTE) enrolment by its net capacity. Net capacity was determined by subtracting approved leases space and exemptions from the total capacity.

Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation considered space within a school to be fully utilized when 85 per cent of the school's total area (i.e. capacity) was used for instructional purposes. However, a school utilized beyond the 85 per cent capacity was not considered to be overcrowded. The approval of capital support for the construction of new schools within the city's areas of growth has been negatively impacted by district or sector utilization below 85 per cent.

While the province continues to track school and district utilization rates, plant operation and maintenance funding is now allocated to the district on a per-student basis only.

Facility Audit Review (1999)

July 1999, the School Facility Evaluation Project (SFEP) was initiated by the Province to assess the condition of all public school buildings in the province. This project was completed in July 2000. With the introduction of a new process, each school was assigned a condition rating number. The audit ratings were based on building condition alone and did not reflect other factors such as programming. The over all intent of the facility audits was to provide Alberta Infrastructure with a quick and consistent snapshot of the condition of facilities, along with an indication of the extent of funding needed to address the condition of facilities across the province.

In May 2004, Alberta Infrastructure began a five-year cycle re-evaluation process to update their database. A Facility Condition Index (FCI) methodology which expresses the cost of outstanding or deferred maintenance as a percentage of the building replacement cost will be used for the re-evaluations. The provincial plan is to evaluate approximately 300 schools each year (province wide). To date, 154 district schools have been re-evaluated.

Provincial Government Reorganization (1999)

In May 1999, Alberta Education was restructured and the Learning Facilities Branch was assigned to the Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation Department. The School Buildings Board role changed from being a capital project decision-making body to that of an advisory body to the Minister of Learning and Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation. A 2007 re-organization has led to the return of school funding decisions to Alberta Education, while Infrastructure and Transportation continues to oversee facility construction and operations.

Sector Model (2000-01)

In 2000-01, the Sector Model was established by the provincial Area, Capacity & Utilization Sub-Committee. In its report to the School Facilities Task Force Steering Committee, the sub-committee put forward a proposal that provincial utilization rates for smaller geographic areas within each jurisdiction be used instead of using a jurisdiction-wide rate. For ease of administration and for comparative purposes, the province requested coterminous sector boundaries between Public and Catholic school jurisdictions be established.

The following considerations were used in establishing these sectors:

- Natural geographic boundaries such as transportation arterials and the river valley needed to be recognized.
- City of Edmonton Area Structure and Neighbourhood Structure Plan boundaries.
- City of Edmonton suburban growth patterns are respected.
- The need to make the model useful as a planning tool for addressing the district's future space needs; and,
- A coterminous boundary between Edmonton Public Schools and Edmonton Catholic Schools was a requirement.

Sector-based planning was designed to help focus the district's efforts on ensuring an even distribution of viable school facilities throughout the entire district and equity of access to quality learning environments for all students. Edmonton Public Schools now consists of nine geographic sectors, with a tenth sector representing high schools in the district. Sector maps are provided in the district's Ten-Year Facilities Plan and Three-Year Capital Plan.

Operational Review (2003)

In 2003, the provincial government conducted an Operational Review of Edmonton Public Schools. Excess student spaces and ineffective use of space was identified as a major contributor to the district's operating deficit. The transferring of instructional dollars to maintaining facilities was identified and the district was instructed to stop this practice by the end of the 2005-06 schools year. The utilization of student learning space and non-operation facilities was identified as area of improvement.

Learning Commission – Average Class Size Initiative (2003-04)

Edmonton Public Schools committed to lowering average class sizes by the 2006-07 school year to the levels recommended by the Learning Commission. Assuming that no new capacity is added to the district's inventory, implementing the average class size initiative will have no impact on the district's space utilization as calculated by the provincial government because it neither increases the number of students in the district, nor decreases the amount of school space.

Funding for School Facilities

There are three provincial funding streams for school facilities provided by the province to school districts in Alberta. They are:

- Plant Operating and Maintenance (PO&M) Funding

This is an operational funding allocation provided to school districts by the student, which is used to fund custodial costs, utilities, supplies and equipment for custodial and minor maintenance of schools buildings and grounds.

- Infrastructure Maintenance Renewal (IMR) Funding

This is a block capital fund allocated to the district annually for building component replacement or improvements to school buildings. It is the funding source for the district's Major Maintenance Plan, and is utilized to fund larger building component failure and Life, Health and Safety issues that arise at schools on an emergent basis. The allocation totals to the district have fluctuated over the past several years.

- Capital Plan Funding

Project priorities are established each year within the district's Three-Year Capital Plan. Priorities are typically required to be categorized separately for new construction, modernization/preservation, portable relocations, and leases/other projects. New construction priorities are typically developed in response to growth demands where proximate excess capacity is not available. Priorities for modernization/preservation projects are developed based on results of the Ten-Year Facilities Plan and outcomes of the Annual Implementation Plan. The Three-Year Capital Plan is a list of desired projects which are not funded. Projects are approved for funding by the province on a project by project basis without consistent regularity.

There are three general modernization projects currently under implementation, including Balwin School, Holyrood School and Victoria School. Essential modernization project funding was also recently approved by the province for Eastglen School, Forest Heights School, Strathcona School and Prince Charles School.

- Alberta Schools Alternative Procurement (ASAP) Project

In June 2007, the province announced the delivery of six new district schools to be provided through a public-private partnership process which will be administered by the province. This process is referred to as the Alberta Schools Alternative Procurement (ASAP) Project. The ASAP project will deliver six new kindergarten to grade nine schools in newly developing areas for September 2010, and each school will have capacity for up to eight hundred and fifty students.

Challenges in the Management of District Learning Space

The district is challenged to adopt a rationalization strategy that strikes a balance between “sustainable facilities” and “sustainable funding” so that it is better positioned to capitalize on our ability to proactively plan and manage for success, whatever the fiscal realities of the day may be. There is a very real fiscal need to identify and implement strategies to reduce the amount of excess student learning space in the district. In an environment of scarce capital resources, the district finds itself under increased pressure to address, more directly, efficiencies in the management of space in schools. At the same time, the district must continue to provide quality environments for teaching and learning now and in the future.

In managing student learning space, the district must address the following types of challenges:

- Changing Demographics
- Limitations of Funding
- New Construction Space
- Excess District Student Learning Space

Changing Demographics

The population in Edmonton and the surrounding region is growing significantly, but the number of preschool and school-aged residents in Edmonton is in decline. This is partly due to the overall aging of the average population, low birth rates, and the fact that families with preschool and school-aged children are congregating in newer suburban neighbourhoods. This includes bedroom municipalities outside of the city and district boundary.

Census data from the 2006 Federal Census indicates that from 1996 to 2006, Edmonton saw a decline in the number of pre-school residents of 6778, while there was an increase of 6392 preschool aged residents in the surrounding municipalities within the Edmonton Census Metropolitan Area (CMA). Edmonton saw a decline in five to eleven year old residents of 7312, while the CMA increased by 88. The declines in the total number of preschool and five to eleven year old residents in the City of Edmonton will have significant impact on the total number of students in the Edmonton Public School district. Current projections indicate that, for the next five years and perhaps beyond, declining enrolment will be a significant challenge for the district.

The City of Edmonton currently consists of 232 residential neighbourhoods. Of these, 100 neighbourhoods do not have a local school. More than 50 neighbourhoods are considered to be developing neighbourhoods, 24 are considered suburban neighbourhoods, and 20 are considered mature neighbourhoods. All of those neighbourhoods are considered viable, whether or not there is a local school.

While most of the district’s schools are located in the city’s older, more established areas, growth in the district’s student population is anticipated to occur primarily in newer suburban neighbourhoods. Twenty-nine per cent of the district’s elementary students now live in neighbourhoods without a local elementary school.

There is a significant and growing number of students living in the city's newer areas and are currently transported by bus or private vehicles to schools in more established areas of the City. There is a continuing decline in the number of students residing in the mature areas of the City, where many large and aging school buildings are located. Infill development in Edmonton, encouraged by City growth framework such as "Smart Choice", is accelerating in mature neighbourhoods. Yet, while housing unit density is increasing, in some instances significantly, higher density housing is not proving to attract families with children. In numerous areas, redevelopment or condominium conversion of affordable housing complexes is causing an accelerated loss of lower income family residents in mature neighbourhoods.

Limitations of Funding

When space within schools is fully utilized, less capital is required to operate and maintain space that is not being used for instructional purposes. Excess space is a financial burden taking funds from Plant Operations and Maintenance (PO&M), the Infrastructure Maintenance Renewal (IMR) and capital allocations without the benefit of serving students.

New Construction Space

As alluded to earlier, additional student spaces will be added in newly-developing areas of the city through the delivery of seven new schools. This includes one thousand student spaces at Lillian Osborne High School by September 2009, and six new kindergarten to grade nine schools with a capacity of up to eight hundred and fifty students by September 2010.

Excess District Student Learning Space

According to September 30, 2007 data, the district has 79,323 students. Using the Alberta Commission on Learning (ACOL) guidelines the district calculates 102,318 rated student spaces with our current facilities. This leaves an excess of 22,995 student spaces.

Over the next 30 months, with the construction of the new schools, the district will be gaining an additional 5,000 student spaces. This will result in an excess of 27,995 student spaces in 2010.

With respect to funding, there are currently 110,120 provincially rated student spaces in the district reflecting an excess of 30,797 student learning spaces in the district and a provincial utilization rate of 71 per cent. The provincial formula used to fund capital projects and school maintenance encourages the concentration of students in fewer facilities. This efficiency is rewarded with the funding necessary to provide excellent learning facilities for students.

Although the district has been innovative and successful in obtaining partnerships and leases, there are not enough qualified partnerships and leases to fill the anticipated 27,995 excess student spaces in the district.

SCHOOLS AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES 2007-2008

Total # of Schools - 197 including: 128 Elementary, 20 Elementary/Junior High, 27 Junior High, 12 Senior High, 3 Junior/Senior High, 7 Elementary/Junior/Senior High

Total # of Educational Services - 14 Total # of Learning Stores - 5
Multi-Campus - 7

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS		
1. Abbott	45. Grace Martin	88. Mill Creek
2. Afton	46. Greenfield	89. Minchau
3. Aldergrove	47. Greenview	90. Montrose
4. Athlone	48. Grovenor	91. Mount Pleasant
5. Baturyn	49. Hazeldean	92. Mount Royal
6. Beacon Heights	50. Hillview	93. Northmount
7. Belgravia	51. Holyrood	94. Norwood
8. Belmead	52. Homesteader	95. Ormsby
9. Belmont	53. Horse Hill	96. Overlanders
10. Belvedere	54. Inglewood	97. Parkallen
11. Bisset	55. J.A. Fife	98. Patricia Heights
12. Brander Gardens	56. Jackson Heights	99. Pollard Meadows
13. Brightview	57. James Gibbons	100. Prince Charles
14. Brookside	58. John A. McDougall	101. Princeton
15. Caernarvon	59. John Barnett	102. Queen Alexandra
16. Calder	60. Julia Kiniski	103. Richard Secord
17. Callingwood	61. Kameyosek	104. Rideau Park
18. Capilano	62. Keheewin	105. Rio Terrace
19. Centennial	63. Kensington	106. Riverdale
20. Clara Tyner	64. Kildare	107. R.J. Scott
21. Coronation	65. King Edward	108. Rundle
22. Crawford Plains	66. Kirkness	109. Rutherford
23. Daly Grove	67. Lago Lindo	110. Sakaw
24. Delton	68. Lansdowne	111. Satoo
25. Delwood	69. LaPerle	112. Scott Robertson
26. Dovercourt	70. Lauderdale	113. Sherwood
27. Duggan	71. Lee Ridge	114. Sifton
28. Dunluce	72. Lendrum	115. Steinhauer
29. Earl Buxton	73. Lorelei	116. Sweet Grass
30. Eastwood	74. Lymburn	117. Thorncliffe
31. Ekota	75. Lynnwood	118. Tipaskan
32. Ellerslie South	76. Malcolm Tweddle	119. Velma E. Baker
33. Elmwood	77. Malmo	120. Virginia Park
34. Evansdale	78. Mayfield	121. Waverley
35. Forest Heights	79. McArthur	122. Weinlos
36. Fraser	80. McKee	123. Westbrook
37. Fulton Place	81. McLeod	124. Westglen
38. Garneau	82. Meadowlark	125. Windsor Park
39. George H. Luck	83. Mee-Yah-Noh	126. Woodcroft
40. George P. Nicholson	84. Menisa	127. York
41. Glendale	85. Meyokumin	128. Youngstown
42. Glengarry	86. Meyonohk	
43. Glenora	87. Michael A. Kostek	
44. Gold Bar		

ELEMENTARY/JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (EJ)	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (JR)	JUNIOR/SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (JS)	SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (SR)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avonmore 2. Bannerman 3. Balwin 4. Crestwood 5. Donnan 6. Ellerslie North 7. Grandview Heights 8. Hardisty 9. Laurier Heights 10. Major General Griesbach 11. McCauley 12. McKernan 13. Meadowlark Christian 14. Oliver 15. Parkdale 16. Parkview 17. Spruce Avenue 18. Stratford 19. Talmud Torah 20. Winterburn 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allendale 2. Avalon 3. Britannia 4. D.S. MacKenzie 5. Dan Knott 6. Dickinsfield 7. Edith Rogers 8. Highlands 9. Hillcrest 10. John D. Bracco 11. Kate Chegwin 12. Kenilworth 13. Killarney 14. Lawton 15. Londonderry 16. Mary Butterworth 17. Ottewell 18. Ritchie 19. Riverbend 20. Rosslyn 21. S. Bruce Smith 22. Steele Heights 23. T.D. Baker 24. Vernon Barford 25. Westlawn 26. Westminster 27. Westmount 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amiskwaciy Academy 2. L'Académie Vimy Ridge Academy 3. L.Y. Cairns 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Centre High 2. Eastglen 3. Harry Ainlay 4. J. Percy Page 5. Jasper Place 6. M.E. LaZerte 7. McNally 8. Old Scona Academic 9. Queen Elizabeth 10. Ross Sheppard 11. Strathcona 12. W.P. Wagner
		LEARNING STORES (Senior High) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Learning Store at Blue Quill 2. Learning Store at Londonderry 3. Learning Store at Circle Square 4. Learning Store at Whyte 5. Learning Store at West Edmonton Mall 	
ELEMENTARY/JUNIOR/ SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (EJS)		EDUCATIONAL SERVICES (SP)	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Academy at King Edward 2. Alberta School for the Deaf 3. Argyll Home Education Centre 4. Edmonton Christian School 5. Millwoods Christian School 6. Tevie Miller Heritage School Program 7. Victoria School of Performing & Visual Arts 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Braemar 2. Choice for Change 3. Early Education 4. Early Intervention 5. Institutional Services <p>Alberta Hospital (Highwood & Home Instruction) CASA (Day Program & House Program) Glenrose Hospital Howard House Koochee Mena McMan Youth Services U of A Hospital Woodside Central Woodside North Yellowhead Youth Centre</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Kennedale 7. Metro Continuing Education 8. New Directions 9. Partners for Youth 10. Rites of Passage 11. Rosecrest 12. Transition Support Program 13. Transitions at the Y 14. WIN House 	
MULTI-CAMPUS SCHOOLS			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Academy At King Edward/King Edward 2. Avalon/Lendrum 3. Coronation/Westminster 4. Ellerslie Campus – Ellerslie North/Ellerslie South 5. Mill Creek/Ritchie 6. Mount Royal/Virginia Park 7. R. J. Scott/Lawton 			

Edmonton Public Schools Board Policies and Regulations

CODE: FL.BP
TOPIC: School Closure

EFFECTIVE DATE: 07-11-2006
ISSUE DATE: 08-11-2006
REVIEW DATE: 11-2011

The board believes that the closure of schools is an important consideration in ensuring the responsible use of the resources placed in its trust; making efficient use of the district's school space; and safeguarding the health and safety of students, staff, and the public.

A. SCOPE AND AUTHORITY

1. The authority of the Board is derived from the *School Act* and the Alberta Closure of Schools Regulation, which say that the Board of Trustees may:
 - a. close a school permanently or for a specified period of time, or
 - b. close entirely three or more consecutive grades in a school, or
 - c. transfer all students from one school building to one or more other school buildings on a permanent basis.

The process for closure of schools under this authority is explained in section C, Process for School Closure.

2. The board authorizes the administration, under the direction of the superintendent of schools and with consultation as determined by the Alberta Closure of Schools Regulation to:
 - a. close or permanently relocate fewer than three consecutive grades in a school, or
 - b. temporarily relocate any number of grades from one school to another.

The process for this shall be in accordance with the Alberta Closure of Schools Regulation, which says that, the board will convene an information meeting with parents of the students affected by the transfer and the alternative arrangements for continuing the education program at another school.

Discontinuance or relocation of a regular program or an alternative program or a special needs program, is not a school closure. The process for discontinuance or relocation of an alternative program is addressed in HA.BP - Student Programs.

B. CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDING SCHOOL CLOSURE

Before recommending the closure of a school to the Board of Trustees, the administration will develop viability benchmarks and school profiles through the Ten-

Year Facilities Plan and will consider all of the following criteria:

- the educational impact on students in the school;
- the enrolment of the school and programs within the school;
- the population and demographic data;
- the amount and cost of excess space in the school;
- the cost to staff and operate the educational program at the school;
- the cost to maintain the facility in operable condition or to restore the facility to operable condition;
- the location and accessibility of the school and the proximity of other schools;
- the necessity to safeguard the health and safety of students, staff, and public;
- the need to consolidate or relocate existing programs;
- the impact of closing the school on the community taking into account existing or proposed development plans.

C. PROCESS FOR SCHOOL CLOSURE

The process for closure will be in accordance with the *School Act* and Alberta Closure of Schools Regulation

A process for school closure flow chart is provided for reference. In case of conflict between this policy and the flow chart, the policy shall prevail.

Reference(s):

HA.BP - Student Programs

School Act Section 58

Alberta Closure of Schools Regulation

Ten-Year Facilities Plan 2007-2016

Process for School Closure Flow Chart

Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation - School Infrastructure Manual

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

2004 – 2005 SCHOOL YEAR

Group	School	Student Enrol	Total School Expend	Cost Per Student	Average Cost Per Student
1a	A	82	620,589.48	7,568.16	
1a	B	118	865,618.54	7,335.75	\$ 7,362.30
1a	C	144	1,034,349.26	7,182.98	
1b	D	273	1,507,785.50	5,523.02	
1b	E	201	1,155,441.61	5,748.47	\$ 5,670.51
1b	F	292	1,676,090.56	5,740.04	
1c	G	365	1,991,437.53	5,455.99	
1c	H	397	2,063,219.33	5,197.03	\$ 5,211.62
1c	I	531	2,645,357.54	4,981.84	
2a	J	87	798,350.25	9,176.44	
2a	K	111	990,460.40	8,923.07	\$ 8,704.28
2a	L	133	1,065,774.21	8,013.34	
2b	M	267	1,792,213.39	6,712.41	
2b	N	293	1,798,971.39	6,139.83	\$ 7,182.89
2b	O	284	2,469,782.70	8,696.42	
2c	P	397	2,172,274.26	5,471.72	
2c	Q	407	2,292,571.87	5,632.85	\$ 5,560.72
2c	R	544	3,034,207.24	5,577.59	

Notes

1. 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.
2. 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.

2005 – 2006 SCHOOL YEAR

Group	School	Student Enrol	Total School Expend	Cost Per Student	Average Cost Per Student
1a	A	85	615,593.92	7,242.28	
1a	B	84	774,218.21	9,216.88	\$ 7,881.36
1a	C	162	1,163,957.44	7,184.92	
1b	D	246	1,406,222.83	5,716.35	
1b	E	206	1,248,780.77	6,062.04	\$ 5,981.74
1b	F	288	1,782,847.31	6,016.83	
1c	G	355	2,038,048.77	5,740.98	
1c	H	443	2,387,646.70	5,389.72	\$ 5,433.35
1c	I	508	2,626,023.04	5,169.34	
2a	J	86	803,488.00	9,342.88	
2a	K	91	953,299.71	10,475.82	\$ 9,784.31
2a	L	99	943,887.70	9,534.22	
2b	M	256	1,711,562.96	6,685.79	
2b	N	269	1,840,194.75	6,840.87	\$ 7,456.97
2b	O	257	2,272,967.46	8,844.23	
2c	P	386	2,283,461.22	5,915.70	
2c	Q	420	2,495,842.08	5,942.48	\$ 5,879.76
2c	R	534	3,087,107.77	5,781.10	

Notes

1. 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.
2. 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.

2006 – 2007 SCHOOL YEAR

Group	School	Student Enrol	Total School Expend	Cost Per Student	Average Cost Per Student
1a	A	87	639,938.12	7,355.61	
1a	B	89	846,185.19	9,507.70	\$ 8,240.86
1a	C	135	1,061,000.19	7,859.26	
1b	D	245	1,509,290.88	6,160.37	
1b	E	249	1,579,320.45	6,342.65	\$ 6,294.33
1b	F	251	1,601,370.58	6,379.96	
1c	G	403	2,344,434.42	5,817.46	
1c	H	484	2,786,104.41	5,756.41	\$ 5,826.78
1c	I	533	3,148,145.48	5,906.46	
2a	J	76	882,027.59	11,605.63	
2a	K	88	967,601.94	10,995.48	\$ 11,045.50
2a	L	95	1,000,862.05	10,535.39	
2b	M	248	1,781,271.35	7,182.55	
2b	N	251	1,837,349.22	7,320.12	\$ 8,119.69
2b	O	256	2,523,240.64	9,856.41	
2c	P	387	2,390,741.39	6,177.63	
2c	Q	422	2,778,868.95	6,585.00	\$ 6,366.72
2c	R	491	3,111,737.20	6,337.55	

Notes

1. 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.
2. 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