



Review the criteria for School Capital Planning Priorities

Activity 2

Identify the challenges & strengths of the current capital process –

Challenges:

- A lot of mobility in the ranking system year by year by using current data, not looking at projections. Capital plan rankings change every year - if no approvals, should list stay the same next year?
- Larger communities – no consistency from the City developing perspective – need planning to be evolving. Inner City planning not being addressed.
- Defining a community – geographic or are there different definitions of a community?
- Too many communities going to one school – is there a way or something CBE can do with the Province if the feeder school isn't announced – can we increase the capacity of the approved schools (after they have been announced)?
- Pitting community against community – can the population sustain a school – other school division calls it an ELA (elementary review area (Milton S.D)
- Alternative programs – capital plan doesn't address this. Ex. Science school – treat them as secondary programs. Community based choice for alternative programs.
- Long term accommodation plan and capital planning not tied together. 10 year strategy for each school not tied together with current plan.
- Grade configuration – logistically causes problems (feeder school & times)
- Timing of the population statistics being used. How do you project community growth?
- Can there be a global ranking criteria for all schools (including high schools)?
- Having accurate numbers of enrolment of each grade at each school. Numbers change during the year.
- -need a way to determine for schools in new communities the numbers of residents enrolled in school, not just CBE. Missing children from charter, alternative programs etc. which impacts rankings
- Politically active communities can sway the process to the disadvantage of less vocal/politically active communities.
- Limited by traditional words like community. Which communities need the school first – there are ways to look at it more broadly, where can you locate a school that would serve the largest population. One community may not have the population to warrant a school today but over the years the populations will shift and an area school may serve the evolving needs better.
- Forecasting of numbers and making sure the space can manage the enrolment
- Schools on finite plots of land
- CBE owns the criteria and the process and the proposal making and the province owns the purse strings. Creates too much opportunity for finger pointing. It would be nice for the CBE to own more of the process. Receive \$ to apply to their plan as they see fit. Gives CBE more accountability for applying their criteria. Lobby province for block funding.
- Building new schools beside old building in need of modernizations, stark contrast

- How much does it address diversity?

Strengths:

- Fair and transparent process for assigning points
- points based system – maintains equity
- -collecting the data the best ways possible
- -innovative and flexible with the created space to deal with fluctuations in enrolment
- Modularity and modernizations and new schools are packaged into one process, even if rankings are done singularly, recognizes the needs of new and existing communities.
- Good that Point system is written up by community so each can see where they rank currently

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

- Lack of school in neighbourhood – parents look outside of CBE – so the numbers of population for the age groups are skewed. Look at total population of community (CBE, private, separate)
- Prevent domino effect - Does one school solve the problem of accommodation?
- The need of the age population should dictate the grade configuration of the requested school. Do you have to have a K-4 school before a middle school.
- Criteria for looking at resources within the community (public space & partnerships)
- Not enough focus on projected future growth. 3-10 yrs.
- Re-evaluate the points ranges.
- Re-evaluation of the timing of the build out of a community (over 10 years) – what does that change for the demographics?
- Targeting areas that rank low on child readiness. (ie Early Years Evaluation)
- Plan by geographical area, not community based - A school that can support more than one area (makes it a flexible space)
- Extend the community growth profile – how many years do you look at? 3 – 5, 10 years down the road? By the time a school is built it is full. (Milton, Ontario Model: 10 year history; 10 year forecast; 5 year comparative age related history)
- -look at areas that are lacking schools, regardless of their growth rate (every community should have a school)
- Boundaries should change – every community should get a school and many boundaries overlap.
- New schools to serve two or more communities?
- Look at configurations other than a k-4 school as the first school, or bundle with the Gr. 5 – 9 middle school
- Consider busing – median, vs. avg., vs. distance travel time
- Currently Public school supporters only, use all city preschool census.

What criteria do you think should be eliminated as a method to rank the need for new schools?

- Current enrolment not a relevant factor, should look at projections.
- Eliminate the (5) points assigned for an existing k-4
- Eliminate ranges when assigning points – award one point per criteria , don't do the range

What is the most important:

- Focus on future population projections – 3 – 10 yrs out

Activity 4

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

- Role of the school in the community should be considered. (programs it offers)
- Evaluation of other accommodation options in that area if you pull transportation into the equation within adjacent communities.
- Disconnect with the programming in the school. (CTS -high school science labs) Should be higher ranked for the career options.
- What is the potential for re-purposing the space for educational and community supports
- Looking at community partnerships (financial & educational programs)
- Combine schools that could meet the programming needs - may need to do only 1 modernization
- Redistribute the weighting %
- Utilization should be broken out by elem, middle & high for that community it serves, not combined for the area.
- Use of school building
- Technology upgrading
- Use of facility to support other community needs (after hours)
- Fate of older schools once population moves to new school
- Cost of modernization vs. cost of tear down and re build (replacement school)
- Site features, location, and current condition need to be higher ranking than school use (we can put anything in a school going forward).

What criteria should be eliminated for ranking Major Modernizations:

- Take out the cosmetic (facility condition) changes – focus more on educational programming
- Don't role it together with the new construction list. Keep modernizations & new schools on separate lists.

What is most important:

- Take out the cosmetic (facility condition) changes – focus more on educational programs that the facility can deliver

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

- Definition of capacity – redefine realistic classroom space (CBE vs Province)
- Does it keep kids in the community and does it solve the problem within the 3-5 yr window.*
- Define near - transportation wise
- Take some of the modernization factors into consideration for modular classrooms
- How do you support grade continuity – capping enrolment vs extra space.
- Timeline of a modular before it changes into a new build or modernization. (fiscally responsible)
- Add a “Crisis” category
- What is the impact and how do you quantify educational programming lost by not getting the modular (quality of education)
- Aggregate community problems to solve space problem
- Enrolment figures – principals don’t get the accurate numbers in spring, usually received in fall when it’s too late
- If 20 mod’s = a school and if it’s a temporary fix we really need a new school not modulars
- What is the core’s capacity to support a modular?
- How many non-classroom spaces are currently being used for fulltime teaching space (music room, staff room)
- Site constraints
- Is the 3 – 5 years solution window appropriate? 2 years better?
- Whether or not they’re on another list (– ie modernizations, new school build) and where they’re on that other list
- Use same point system that we use for ranking new schools and modernizations
- Principal input
- Busing times
- If schools can partially fund the modernization
- Programing at the school – proximity of similar programing for moving/designating students

What is most important:

- Degree of overcrowding – occupancy rate