



Review the criteria for School Capital Planning Priorities

Activity 2 Identify the challenges & strengths of the current capital process –

Challenges:

- Challenge of complexity of the document which leads to mistrust. Too much to digest.
- Information not accessible/transparent to parents which leads to mistrust.
- No criteria for reasoning of why they get portables. What determines the maximum size for the community to get a school?
- Timelines – approval process by Province and decision making by CBE.
- Disrupts balance with the “squeaky wheel” process through the media and straight to the government.
- Public doesn’t understand the process and the work that goes into ranking.
- The communities that don’t voice their frustrations – are they honoured in the plan?
- Communication and understanding of the process is very hard for parents and communities to understand. Need to continue to build their understanding.
- Principals or school council chairs need to be educated ie in Area meetings and school council chair meetings (council of school councils) to be able to talk to their staff and families about the process
- If the process results in a change, a meeting needs to be held to explain what changed and why
- Timelines implementing the decisions & contractor/A.I. /school timelines
- Interpretation of the data could be a strength or weakness.
- How do we advocate the document to the public that makes sense?
- Very emotional process for parents; objective process but doesn’t help you if you don’t get in.
- If you don’t win the lottery you become critical of the process
- Depopulation of inner city schools with build of new schools, impact on their community
- Trying to manage an infrastructure boom at the outskirts of the city which may impact the vibrancy of the inner city. Will this end up pushing more people to the outside?
- How do we prioritize building vs. modernization/upkeep of existing buildings - deficit of improvements – are schools deteriorating at a more rapid rate than the need for new schools? Maintenance does not follow the schedule of need, costs increase exponentially
- Political nature of the appointment of new schools-ranking is the best way to get around that, but the list that is submitted is not necessarily responded to by the province in the same order of priority.
- Public does not understand that the province does not have a schedule for approving new schools – CBE cannot plan for provincial ambiguity
- CBE transparency is there but transparency does not guarantee approval or consensus with the general public.
- Need to educate the public so that they understand it’s not a personal solution, it’s a system solution.

- We give the perception that CBE has control when really the government is in control.
- Challenge is the complexity of the dynamics. Historical, developmental, programs of choice expanding at the rate they didn't anticipate
- There is no aspect of ranking system for building new schools for alternative programs
- We cannot move space from one to another or build new space without the provincial consent
- K-4 set and 5-9 set of community specific criteria - High School based on regional need
- New school and modernizations are now intermingled for approval by the province – this is a challenge if one has to take priority over the other.
- Capital requests compete provincially – all that can be controlled is our own process.
- Focused on current growth, not anticipating growth in the future; is this the right way to go?
- Needs flexibility required to adapt to changes like the new Education Act.
- Take into consideration proximity to recent projects? ie Tuscany and Panorama – points are taken off for the structures they have but still ranked like the rest. Does Tuscany need two schools in 15 years?

Strengths:

- That there is a process in place & data is concrete and based on facts (enrolments/City census)
- Parents have different challenges that they don't have time to be involved in the process.
- CBE & education values are inline.
- Lots of information and graphs.
- transparent, dynamic, thoughtful
- process is objective

Activity 3 New School Construction – what criteria is important to consider as a method to rank the need for new schools?

- Median travel time – don't want their kids on a bus for a long time. How do you weigh alternative programs against regular programs as a consideration.
- How has the growth been monitored for the communities.
- How the data is gathered and where is the data from for busing/transportation times?
- Potential for future growth – viability for future use.
- Inner city areas – density changes are not captured and multi families living in 1 dwelling.
- Bus receiver factor is good.
- Developer should be involved.
- Keeping smaller kids closer to home.
- Travel time/distance for students at their designated school (median should hold, not average) Actual ride times vs scheduled ride times
- Future growth missing – where is the potential vs. the current population? How do we make the formula more responsive to the future?
- How does the data set respond to the new builds?
- Should modernizations go up in priority once the new schools open?
- Are we dealing with too small a data set in communities? i.e. Sector placements.
- Need to account for sizes of communities.
- No community should go on the list until after a certain amount of time or age.
- Some schools will be emptied out as a result of our new builds.
- Availability of space within a certain time frame – we can accommodate the students over the growth of the community. If there will be space in this community, then we won't build in that community because they can share the space.

What is the most important:

- Student enrolment & projections
- Long term viability of all schools
- Distribution around the city
- Enrolment vs. available space
- Availability of space at schools within a certain proximity to each other

Activity 4 What criteria do you think should be considered as a method to rank the need for major modernizations?

- How much money is needed to modernize it? Is it worth it? (Take out the political rallying)
- Facility Condition rating should be the single most important factor
- Enrolment & projections (Weighting % should be higher for the enrolment)
- Role of the school is not as important, but it is still interconnected with the other factors.
- Do we need to change the weighting percentage?
- Are criteria really distinct? If not, greater weight is assigned than first appears. Clarity around what each of the criterion means – how are they distinct?
- Present vs. future growth but only 3 yr roll out not 5 – 10 yr.
- Where is programming/curriculum on the list? Ability to deliver the program of studies (Role of the school?) more appropriately described as equitable provision of program of studies from school to school?
- Age of facility

What is most important:

- Enrolment utilization – don't modernize if no one is going to be there. Program (curricular) need
- Facility condition to support delivery of program of studies.

Activity 5 Developing Ranking Criteria for New & relocating Modular Classrooms:

- Enrolment projections & accommodation options (Financial feasibility)
- Site considerations
- How do you be equitable?
- Type of program (alternative programs taken into account?)
- How large do you want the school to be – how big a K-4 should it be middle.
- What type of Partnerships could be fostered?
- Should there be a preliminary exclusion of schools before ranking?
- Stress on school to accept this new capacity
- Enrolment, population growth
- Facility viability-daily phys. Ed.
- Sustainability of solution
- Number of overflow schools attached to one school
- Alternative programs?
- Anything that decreases transportation
- Better to build a bigger school?
- Auto exclusionary criteria (site constraints are so expensive, etc.) would eliminate a site for consideration

What is the most important:

- Reduce transportation
- Based on regular program enrolment not alternative program
- Cost benefit to the system