

EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

May 26, 2009

TO: Board of Trustees

FROM: E. Schmidt, Superintendent of Schools

SUBJECT: Responses to Board Requests for Information

ORIGINATOR: T. Parker, Assistant Superintendent

RESOURCE  
STAFF: Michael Ediger, Kelly Hehn, Lorne Parker, Cindy Skolski

INFORMATION

**BOARD REQUEST #192, FEBRUARY 10, 2009: PROVIDE INFORMATION FROM THE SCHOOLS THAT HAVE EXPERIENCED REPEATED LATE BUSES IN TERMS OF AN ESTIMATION OF HOW MANY INSTRUCTIONAL MINUTES HAVE BEEN LOST SINCE SEPTEMBER AND THE PLANS FROM THOSE PRINCIPALS ON HOW THESE MINUTES WILL BE RECOUPED BEFORE JUNE. ALSO, ADVISE OF ANY COSTS SCHOOLS MAY INCUR TO MAKE UP THESE MANDATED MINUTES:** Thirty-four Principals responded with the requested information on the instructional minutes lost due to late buses, and mitigation measures utilized. The information received has been difficult to interpret. What was not reported is the total number of students impacted and therefore understanding the impact on individual students is difficult to gauge. An average of 387 instructional minutes were reported lost each month by the schools surveyed. Many school principals also reported that late buses were episodic and occurred more frequently at the start of the school year when routes were being set, or during inclement weather. School principals reported a wide range of strategies to provide for students who missed instruction because of late buses. These strategies included additional one on one time with teacher or educational assistants, peer support, homework and use of recess and lunch periods.

No principals reported a cost linked to providing additional time and support. Principals who had staff provide additional time with students by teachers or educational assistants did so within current collective agreements.

Regarding mandated minutes, schools are required to provide a set number of mandated hours per year as determined by Alberta Education. A small percentage of district students have perfect attendance and therefore access all of the mandated minutes. Schools continually adjust and respond to individual student absences and lates throughout the year.

**CONFERENCE REQUEST #207, APRIL 21, 2009, PROVIDE AN UPDATE ON THE PROPOSED 12 CITY WARDS AND BACKGROUND ON THE BOARD'S OWN WARD CONFIGURATION:**

**City of Edmonton Review Status**

The City of Edmonton passed first reading to establish 12 electoral wards on February 17, 2009. The bylaw will return to City Council on July 22, 2009. The results of a public consultation process will be considered, followed by votes on the second and third readings.

The City's proposed 12 ward system does not directly impact the Board's nine ward system. However, it provides an opportunity for the Board to consider alternatives to the nine ward system. The Board's nine ward system provides a single representative for each ward. One of the concerns raised about the single representative system is that some representatives hold the view that they serve a defined, narrow "constituency" as opposed to the broad citizenry. Rather than a single representative ward system, the Board could consider a multiple representative ward system within the City ward boundaries. For example, three Trustees could be elected from within each of three "super" wards comprised of four city wards.

Edmonton Catholic Schools will have to adopt a new ward system for their seven member board. They currently have six electoral wards coterminous with the City's six ward system with one trustee being elected on the basis of the next highest number of votes from among all of the wards.

**Approval**

A Board motion is required to amend the current ward criteria, and a Board motion and Ministerial approval is required to change the ward boundaries. Changes to ward boundaries for trustee elections could be implemented if Ministerial approval is obtained by March 1, 2010 for the October 2010 General Municipal Election.

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 next general municipal election will be held on Monday, October 18, 2010.

**Background**

Prior to 1989, all public and separate school trustees were elected city-wide. In 1989 the Minister of Education required trustees to be elected by wards. Nine public and seven separate school trustees were elected from within the existing City of Edmonton's six ward system. For the Edmonton Public School Board, the highest vote recipient from each of the six wards were elected, along with the second highest vote recipients in three of the six wards.

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  $\pm 10$  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. In November 2006, a motion was passed by the Board to amend the trustee electoral ward design criteria to have a balance of ward population of  $\pm 15$  per cent.

**Current Trustee Electoral Ward Design Criteria as Passed by Board December 6, 1994; Amended November 7, 2006**

The wards must:

1. have a resident population of public school supporters that is within  $\pm 15$  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  $\pm 15$  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.

**Current Ward Boundaries**

The data used to complete this review were provided by the City of Edmonton from the 2008 Municipal Census counts. This is the same data source the City of Edmonton used for the Municipal Ward Boundary Review currently underway. Due to a change in the census reporting process not all electors declared themselves as either public or separate supporters.

Appendix I provides a map of the current electoral ward boundaries.

The data indicates the ‘balanced ward population’ criterion will not be met in 2010 in Ward H (see table below).

<b>Current Ward Boundaries</b>	<b>Total City Population</b>	<b>Public Supporting Population</b>	<b>Difference from Optimum Public Population (<math>\pm 10\%</math>)</b>	<b>Public Population Deviation</b>
A	101,249	68,706	4,383	6.81%
B	90,268	64,503	180	0.28%
C	73,980	58,110	(6,213)	-9.66%
D	72,600	58,086	(6,237)	-9.70%
E	75,742	56,036	(8,287)	-12.88%
F	71,123	61,566	(2,757)	-4.29%
G	88,087	70,869	6,546	10.18%
H	100,915	79,656	15,333	23.84%
I	78,448	61,380	(2,943)	-4.58%
<b>Total Population</b>	<b>752,412</b>	<b>578,912</b>		
<b>Ward Average</b>	<b>83,601</b>	<b>64,323</b>		

Population Deviation with the No response as 100 per cent Public Support

### Potential Realignment

To meet the current criteria, voting subdivisions 506 (Brander Gardens), 507 (Brookside) 517 (Bulyea Heights), 519 (Rhatigan Ridge) and 518 (Ramsay Heights) could be moved from Ward H to Ward F. This area is north of Rabbit Hill Road, west of Whitemud Creek and east of the Saskatchewan River. This realignment would bring all nine wards back into the  $\pm 15$  per cent range and provide flexibility for future population growth in Ward H.

<b>Current Ward Boundaries</b>	<b>Total City Population</b>	<b>Public Supporting Population</b>	<b>Difference from Optimum Public Population (+/-10%)</b>	<b>Public Population</b>
A	101,249	68,706	4,383	6.81 %
B	90,268	64,503	180	0.28 %
C	73,980	58,110	(6,213)	-9.66 %
D	72,600	58,086	(6,237)	-9.70 %
E	75,742	56,036	(8,287)	-12.88 %
F	86,077	73,320	8,997	13.99 %
G	88,087	70,869	6,546	10.18 %
H	85,961	67,902	3,579	5.56 %
I	78,448	61,380	(2,943)	-4.58 %
<b>Total Population</b>	<b>752,412</b>	<b>578,912</b>		
<b>Ward Average</b>	<b>83,601</b>	<b>64,323</b>		

Population Deviation with the No response as 100% Public Support

TP:ja

APPENDIX I – Map of Current Electoral Boundaries

