

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 57 (PRINCE GEORGE)

PROPOSED SCHOOL CLOSURES 2010

**FAQ 4**

(Responses provided by the District Sustainability Committee)

- 1. Can you forward the home catchments of all French Immersion elementary students in our district?**

See attached document.

- 2. At one of the consultation meetings a speaker indicated the Board was involved in a “dog and pony show” with no interest in listening to parents because they had already made up their minds. Others have suggested that the District Sustainability Committee control the Board and tell them what to do. What am I to believe?**

The Board commissioned and received the report of the District Sustainability Committee at the January 19, 2010 Public Board Meeting. They did not “accept” the report. This means that the Board has not made any decisions related to any of the recommendations of the District Sustainability Committee.

The District Sustainability Committee is a group of staff who work for the Board of Education. The committee has a background in business and education and understand our role and responsibilities clearly. The report and its recommendations originate with the DSC only. The DSC made these recommendations after considerable debate within the context of financial and educational sustainability. While we believe that our professional analysis led us to the best financial and educational sustainability recommendations possible, we realize and accept that this is only one piece of input the Board needs to consider. The DSC recognizes that each recommendation would need public input prior to any Board of Education decision.

DSC members attend each public consultation and request for information with positive enthusiasm. As mentioned in a previous FAQ question, we debrief after each meeting and explore suggestions made to the Board of Education so we can respond to their many questions or as chairperson Hall refers to them “The What Ifs.”

While we recognize the process is stressful for many, we are supporters of the democratic process and are confident the Board of Education will consider all the relevant facts and make decisions that best serve students our communities.

The Board of Education takes their responsibilities very seriously. They have an open mind, listen attentively, and weigh all options and opinions shared. The Board of Education is the ultimate authority within School District No. 57.

**3. I am interested in some additional information regarding the closure of the schools specifically the following:**

**a. Were the recommendations made with transfers to the aboriginal school considered?**

No, although it remains hopeful that the Aboriginal school attracts students from all points in the city, there was no anticipation that this would occur in September 2010. Indeed, the numbers presented to the Board re: the Aboriginal Choice School considered only those students who currently attend Carney Hill.

**b. What percent of students are projected to transfer from their current schools to the recommended ones? Such as CFG to Harwin etc.**

Harwin has the capacity to accept a high percentage of students from Central Fort George. There is anticipation, however, that there will be a percentage of students that choose not to attend Harwin, just as they chose to attend the Traditional Program at CFG, and they would exercise the proposed option to return to their catchment schools. Of course, at this point, what the exact percentage is in either of these situations would be a rough guess.

**4. As I'm sure you know, School District No. 73 has also made a variety of recommendations regarding school closures. They have used their website well to communicate with parents. These list the inquiries received by the school district, and then give the answers as well. Terrific communication, and I'm sure it saves time over receiving the same inquiry over and over again, as well as increasing public confidence in the school district.**

**a. Can you please consider doing the same for SD57?**

Unfortunately we do not have staff available at the central administration office to put together and maintain such a process. Additionally, because Kamloops had a more lengthy time span they were able to establish a process that allowed for input to be collected and responded to online.

That said, we have heard the concern and have undertaken a process to collect frequently asked questions and place the responses on line. In addition we have posted each consultation meeting's agenda package and Superintendent's report.

**a. Lastly, is it possible to get a Kamloops-style report for all the elementary schools in the Hart area, including Nukko, Shady Valley, and Salmon Valley?**

Yes, we can do this – see the attachment

**5. I have two safety concerns. I also have a concern regarding what I have heard related to students who would be moving from the Starlane area into College Heights Elementary and students who would be forced to move from College Heights Elementary French Immersion into John McInnis. There was mention of a possible bus from Starlane to College Heights and no mention of a bus for French Immersion students. What about student safety?**

No decisions have been made by the Board of Education related to catchment changes or program re-location at the time of writing.

Yes, the district does think about student safety. District staff will consider a bussing option regarding regular track students attending their neighbourhood school when that enrolment area is bisected by a four-lane roadway. There is precedent for this in the Hart region where the Heather Park Middle School catchment is bisected by a four-lane Hwy 97. Students who live on the east side of the highway are transported to Heather Park via bus.

French Immersion is a choice program. Parents are responsible for arranging transportation to and from school for children enrolled in French Immersion and other choice programs.

It is interesting to note that 204 of the 283 students who attend the College Heights Elementary French Immersion program are transported to the school from out of catchment at present with some traveling across Hwy 16 each day.

The school district does have a staff person who works closely with the City of Prince George staff in matters related to traffic safety. Your concerns will be brought forward.

**6. I am writing to enquire with you as to the consideration for John McInnis being a Neighbourhood Learning Centre?**

**Our local MLAs have stated that, "all new schools will be constructed as Neighbourhood Learning Centres". As you know from the proposal I recently submitted, along with your own discussions with our provincial representatives, Neighbourhood Learning Centres are the province's goal for educational facilities. As John McInnis is proposed to be substantially re-fit to make it suitable for elementary school children, I am wondering what discussions has the District had with the province to ensure that they adhere to this promise? How will John McInnis become a Neighbourhood Learning Centre, and what funding will be associated with this task?**

Specific to your question – no we have not considered a neighbourhood of learning at this point because no decision has been made to either close John McInnis Junior Secondary or re-open it as a French Immersion Elementary School.

The best information regarding Neighbourhoods of Learning is available on the Ministry of Education website, specifically:  
<http://www.neighbourhoods-of-learning.gov.bc.ca/create/>

Attached to this document the summary of a stakeholder forum held in January 2010 related to creation of Neighbourhoods of Learning. As you will see, it is a systematic and involved process of partnership between school districts and community partners who share a common vision and bring funding to the planning table to make the project a reality.

School District No. 57 knows the process well and is listed on the Ministry website as a district that was a “forerunner” in this process. Valemount Secondary was a partnership between the province, our district and the Valemount community who raised \$250,000. to provide up to 120 square metres of additional space and enhancements to the replacement school.

The extra space helps to make the building a local centre for arts and recreation and a gathering place for the community.

People in our area often speak of the community hub in Pouce Coupe. The province and school district (Peace River South) partnered with the community who agreed to contribute \$1 million towards the project that created a community centre included in the school.

- 7. I don't get all this talk about bathrooms for kindergarten classes. Our school kindergarten does not have bathrooms. My friend's child goes to a school without a kindergarten bathroom. Please explain.**

You are correct. Many of our kindergarten rooms do not have bathrooms contained within the room. There is no requirement to put a bathroom in a Kindergarten class.

- 8. I am a parent of children currently enrolled in Mackenzie Elementary and was at the meeting tonight, Mar. 4/10.**

**I also want to express my concern re: the cold temperatures, the darkness and the wildlife concerns in our area.**

**The most likely route walked to get to Morfee is not a well lit area (path across from high school).**

**Frostbite is a very real possibility at such a distance and with a spouse working away at present, many will not be able to walk their children or drive them. The father may have the only vehicle.**

**Finally, a friend has had a wolf in her backyard not a block from Mackenzie school. She is not on the greenbelt.**

**It sounded positive that Mackenzie Elementary would be maintained but I am wondering for how long, while we wait for the turnaround to reach an enrolment level of 294 Mackenzie Elementary students?**

While you did not ask a question in relation to the concern about safe walk routes, crossing of a four-lane highway, cold winter temperatures and the presence of wolves within the community, we are making an assumption that you are asking if the Board of Education would consider providing bus transportation for students living in the Mackenzie Elementary catchment. Please see the answer to question 5 above.

Any prediction about enrolment turnaround at this point in time would be sheer speculation.

9. **Is there a possibility of using the stage and gym if it closes? The gym at Morfee is quite small and parents there say that concert etc is overcrowded as it is. There is no stage.**

It would be unlikely the facility could be used on an occasional basis as that would involve increased costs as opposed to minimal maintenance.

10. **It is written that the children will benefit with more staff and resources. Where has this happened? Will it be a guaranteed and by which board?**

Our schools have site based decision making so the staffing decisions for each year rest with the principal of the school. Full buildings generate more dollars for the students within them versus half empty buildings. As an example, in some school settings 58 students could be housed in two classes. Typically these 58 students would be of two or three age levels. In other school settings, three classes are required. In this situation the students could span the ages 5-12 years. Economies of scale are what contribute to increased staff, resources, program choice, and learning support. There is a cost reduction of approximately \$86 000 for the two class scenario. These dollars can then be used to fund library, learning assistant or computer support for children in the school.

11. **The school principal has mentioned the possibility of making a "pod" of older elementary students going to the high school. For various social reasons I am very opposed to this idea. My kids do not need to be exposed to high school environment in any way. They need to belong to the elementary environment and the younger kids do benefit by their leadership and participation. I say this knowing that there are great kids in high school.**

The DSC report did not list a recommendation of this type related to Mackenzie Elementary and Mackenzie Secondary.

Thank you for sharing this opinion. It will be posted in the folder we have established so the Board of Education can read of your concern.

**12. Will the district allow a ministry standard, community-funded structural assessment of the building that is Dunster Fine Arts School in order to address any major faults within the structure itself that would reinforce the presented position of closure?**

In order to answer your question it is important that we share what a facility audit is supposed to do and what the rating means.

The numerical rating is for capital planning purposes (not a condemning of a building). It provides a context in which informed and optimal program and investment management decisions can be made for an asset.

It is a screening for buildings with problems in order to identify facilities that will require more detailed evaluation to determine the appropriate program and investment strategy.

It is the first step in identifying potential remedies of building and functional deficiencies and, where appropriate, the nature, cost and timing of remedial actions that may be required to address physical deficiencies.

The rating score is a comparative against a new school and its functions, examples may be special education space, multi-purpose space, electrical properties and potential, heating and ventilating properties, grounds and amenities, classroom and office space.

An engineer would not be able to do this alone – it would require an architect, a mechanical engineer, a civil engineer, a structural engineer and an electrical engineer, all experienced in school building function and design.

If we were to proceed with the next steps of a replacement school we would commission this group of people to give us a report. The cost would be \$ 30-40 thousand dollars.

We are prepared to act on your request with receipt of \$40,000.

**13. I am writing this letter in support of maintaining a French immersion program in the Hart at the new Heather Park school beginning in the fall of 2010.**

**As a parent of two children, one of whom currently attends Ecole Austin Road and of another to attend Kindergarten in the fall, I was**

saddened to hear of the closure of our school. However, I believe that I have an economically viable and sustainable option to present which can keep the new Heather Park school site operating at capacity over the long-term.

Members of the CARES (Citizens for Austin Road Elementary School) have presented you a school organization for the new Heather Park school via email which assumes that all students from Austin Road (both English and French track), all Nukko Lake, and all Springwood students attend. It also assumes that none of the current Grade 6 students return to their catchment schools, but remain at Heather Park. The first year there would be a large number of Grade 7 students, making the student numbers large, but this significantly drops the following year. This scenario also leaves space for additional classroom use for other programming. This school organization clearly shows that there is room to accommodate a French immersion program at this site, even when full-day K is implemented. Under the current proposal put forth by the District Sustainability Committee the school would be filled to only 63% capacity.

Because of the large numbers of students attending this school, the \$80,000 supplement provided to dual-track schools in the past would be less likely to be needed.

According to a survey conducted by CARES, 87.6% of all Austin Road Elementary parents stated that they are in favor of Heather Park becoming a dual-track school. A second survey of French immersion parents revealed that 67% would NOT send their children to John McInnis if the French immersion were to be centralized, the main reason being "that it is not a local school" and the second being "poor air quality". Our family moved to the Hart area for better air quality. Due to health issues, sending our children to a school in the bowl is not an option, as it is not for many families. If the majority of families do this, many students will end up attending Heather Park or other schools in the area. Therefore, it seems only logical to provide them with an option to attend French immersion in the Hart.

Thank you for giving strong consideration to this sustainable and economically viable alternative as a way of maintaining French immersion in the Hart. It provides choice to those families who opt to choose French immersion and to those who may have one child in each program and want to keep their children in the same school.

**Keeping students in the Hart is crucial to the vitality of our community and to the optimal development of our children.**

Only a few members of the District Sustainability Committee have seen the report due to other commitments and responsibilities during the spring break. Those who have seen the document are very impressed with the understanding the committee has about the district's financial challenge, the research undertaken within the local community and the variety of suggestions that are presented for consideration.

BP/wd

2010.03.15

S:\ExecAssistant\School closures\2010.03.15 FAQ 4.doc

**Schol District No. 57 (Prince George)  
2009-2010 Revenue and Expenditure Analysis  
Austin Road Elementary**

<b>Revenue</b>		
Operating	1,682,162.50	
<b>Total Revenue</b>		<b>1,682,162.50</b>
<b>Staffing</b>		
Education	1,359,429.49	
Support	177,567.72	
<b>Total Staffing</b>		<b>1,536,997.21</b>
<b>Replacement</b>		
	53,823.19	
<b>Total Replacement</b>		<b>53,823.19</b>
<b>Utilities</b>		
Water/Sewer	1,402.00	
Natural Gas/Propane	18,225.00	
Hydro	11,955.00	
<b>Total Utilities</b>		<b>31,582.00</b>
<b>Services and Supplies</b>		
Telephone	1,894.58	
School Supplies and Services	33,345.98	
Photocopying	6,995.07	
Custodial Supplies	4,009.49	
<b>Total Services and Supplies</b>		<b>46,245.12</b>
<b>Total Staff and Operating Expenditures</b>		<b>1,668,647.52</b>
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>		<b>13,514.98</b>

**NOTES**

1. Revenue is based on Full Time Equivalent (FTE) student count as September 30, 2009
2. Staff is based on actual 2009-2010 salary grids and projected benefits at September 20, 2009
3. Staff does not include special education staff
4. Replacement, utilities and supplies and services are based on actual 2008-2009 operating expenses

Summary	Amount	FTE	PER FTE
Operating Grant	1,682,162.50	287.50	5,851.00
Staff and Operating Expenditures	1,668,647.52	287.50	5,803.99
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>	<b>13,514.98</b>		<b>47.01</b>

**Schol District No. 57 (Prince George)  
2009-2010 Revenue and Expenditure Analysis  
Glenview Elementary**

<b>Revenue</b>		
Operating	696,269.00	
<b>Total Revenue</b>		<b>696,269.00</b>
<b>Staffing</b>		
Education	577,109.71	
Support	116,834.01	
<b>Total Staffing</b>		<b>693,943.72</b>
<b>Replacement</b>		
	23,908.60	
<b>Total Replacement</b>		<b>23,908.60</b>
<b>Utilities</b>		
Water/Sewer	542.00	
Natural Gas/Propane	25,380.00	
Hydro	9,877.00	
<b>Total Utilities</b>		<b>35,799.00</b>
<b>Services and Supplies</b>		
Telephone	1,870.44	
School Supplies and Services	35,777.18	
Photocopying	3,687.71	
Custodial Supplies	1,366.57	
<b>Total Services and Supplies</b>		<b>42,701.90</b>
<b>Total Staff and Operating Expenditures</b>		<b>796,353.22</b>
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>		<b>-100,084.22</b>

**NOTES**

1. Revenue is based on Full Time Equivalent (FTE) student count as September 30, 2009
2. Staff is based on actual 2009-2010 salary grids and projected benefits at September 20, 2009
3. Staff does not include special education staff
4. Replacement, utilities and supplies and services are based on actual 2008-2009 operating expenses

Summary	Amount	FTE	PER FTE
Operating Grant	696,269.00	119.00	5,851.00
Staff and Operating Expenditures	796,353.22	119.00	6,692.04
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>	<b>-100,084.22</b>		<b>-841.04</b>

**Schol District No. 57 (Prince George)  
2009-2010 Revenue and Expenditure Analysis  
Hart Highlands Elementary**

<b>Revenue</b>		
Operating	1,413,016.50	
<b>Total Revenue</b>		<b>1,413,016.50</b>
<b>Staffing</b>		
Education	1,204,878.71	
Support	147,398.28	
<b>Total Staffing</b>		<b>1,352,276.99</b>
<b>Replacement</b>		
	46,382.50	
<b>Total Replacement</b>		<b>46,382.50</b>
<b>Utilities</b>		
Water/Sewer	1,220.00	
Natural Gas/Propane	27,039.00	
Hydro	17,696.00	
<b>Total Utilities</b>		<b>45,955.00</b>
<b>Services and Supplies</b>		
Telephone	1,884.46	
School Supplies and Services	43,485.00	
Photocopying	6,784.66	
Custodial Supplies	4,207.26	
<b>Total Services and Supplies</b>		<b>56,361.38</b>
<b>Total Staff and Operating Expenditures</b>		<b>1,500,975.87</b>
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>		<b>-87,959.37</b>

**NOTES**

1. Revenue is based on Full Time Equivalent (FTE) student count as September 30, 2009
2. Staff is based on actual 2009-2010 salary grids and projected benefits at September 20, 2009
3. Staff does not include special education staff
4. Replacement, utilities and supplies and services are based on actual 2008-2009 operating expenses

Summary	Amount	FTE	PER FTE
Operating Grant	1,413,016.50	241.50	5,851.00
Staff and Operating Expenditures	1,500,975.87	241.50	6,215.22
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>	<b>-87,959.37</b>		<b>-364.22</b>

**Schol District No. 57 (Prince George)  
2009-2010 Revenue and Expenditure Analysis  
Heritage Elementary**

<b>Revenue</b>		
Operating	2,343,325.50	
<b>Total Revenue</b>		<b>2,343,325.50</b>
<b>Staffing</b>		
Education	1,758,177.45	
Support	117,196.86	
<b>Total Staffing</b>		<b>1,875,374.31</b>
<b>Replacement</b>		
	54,681.16	
<b>Total Replacement</b>		<b>54,681.16</b>
<b>Utilities</b>		
Water/Sewer	2,827.00	
Natural Gas/Propane	33,387.00	
Hydro	21,324.00	
<b>Total Utilities</b>		<b>57,538.00</b>
<b>Services and Supplies</b>		
Telephone	3,076.49	
School Supplies and Services	108,681.04	
Photocopying	7,714.88	
Custodial Supplies	4,601.38	
<b>Total Services and Supplies</b>		<b>124,073.79</b>
<b>Total Staff and Operating Expenditures</b>		<b>2,111,667.26</b>
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>		<b>231,658.24</b>

**NOTES**

1. Revenue is based on Full Time Equivalent (FTE) student count as September 30, 2009
2. Staff is based on actual 2009-2010 salary grids and projected benefits at September 20, 2009
3. Staff does not include special education staff
4. Replacement, utilities and supplies and services are based on actual 2008-2009 operating expenses

Summary	Amount	FTE	PER FTE
Operating Grant	2,343,325.50	400.50	5,851.00
Staff and Operating Expenditures	2,111,667.26	400.50	5,272.58
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>	<b>231,658.24</b>		<b>578.42</b>

**Schol District No. 57 (Prince George)  
2009-2010 Revenue and Expenditure Analysis  
Nukko Lake Elementary**

<b>Revenue</b>		
Operating	450,527.00	
<b>Total Revenue</b>		<b>450,527.00</b>
<b>Staffing</b>		
Education	444,222.41	
Support	91,403.76	
<b>Total Staffing</b>		<b>535,626.17</b>
<b>Replacement</b>		
	12,835.00	
<b>Total Replacement</b>		<b>12,835.00</b>
<b>Utilities</b>		
Water/Sewer		
Natural Gas/Propane	29,121.00	
Hydro	15,865.00	
<b>Total Utilities</b>		<b>44,986.00</b>
<b>Services and Supplies</b>		
Telephone	1,204.05	
School Supplies and Services	12,179.29	
Photocopying	2,792.51	
Custodial Supplies	2,562.50	
<b>Total Services and Supplies</b>		<b>18,738.35</b>
<b>Total Staff and Operating Expenditures</b>		<b>612,185.52</b>
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>		<b>-161,658.52</b>

**NOTES**

1. Revenue is based on Full Time Equivalent (FTE) student count as September 30, 2009
2. Staff is based on actual 2009-2010 salary grids and projected benefits at September 20, 2009
3. Staff does not include special education staff
4. Replacement, utilities and supplies and services are based on actual 2008-2009 operating expenses

Summary	Amount	FTE	PER FTE
Operating Grant	450,527.00	77.00	5,851.00
Staff and Operating Expenditures	612,185.52	77.00	7,950.46
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>	<b>-161,658.52</b>		<b>-2,099.46</b>

**Schol District No. 57 (Prince George)  
2009-2010 Revenue and Expenditure Analysis  
Prince George Secondary**

<b>Revenue</b>		
Operating	7,650,913.88	
<b>Total Revenue</b>		<b>7,650,913.88</b>
<b>Staffing</b>		
Education	5,073,085.48	
Support	811,461.75	
<b>Total Staffing</b>		<b>5,884,547.23</b>
<b>Replacement</b>		
	208,719.19	
<b>Total Replacement</b>		<b>208,719.19</b>
<b>Utilities</b>		
Water/Sewer	11,288.00	
Natural Gas/Propane	125,209.00	
Hydro	120,678.00	
<b>Total Utilities</b>		<b>257,175.00</b>
<b>Services and Supplies</b>		
Telephone	14,898.34	
School Supplies and Services	548,168.60	
Photocopying	39,765.49	
Custodial Supplies	20,004.36	
<b>Total Services and Supplies</b>		<b>622,836.79</b>
<b>Total Staff and Operating Expenditures</b>		<b>6,973,278.21</b>
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>		<b>677,635.67</b>

**NOTES**

1. Revenue is based on Full Time Equivalent (FTE) student count as September 30, 2009
2. Staff is based on actual 2009-2010 salary grids and projected benefits at September 20, 2009
3. Staff does not include special education staff
4. Replacement, utilities and supplies and services are based on actual 2008-2009 operating expenses

<b>Summary</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>PER FTE</b>
Operating Grant	7,650,913.88	1,307.63	5,851.00
Staff and Operating Expenditures	6,973,278.21	1,307.63	5,332.78
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>	<b>677,635.67</b>		<b>518.22</b>

**Schol District No. 57 (Prince George)  
2009-2010 Revenue and Expenditure Analysis  
Salmon Valley Elementary**

<b>Revenue</b>		
Operating	<b>172,604.50</b>	
<b>Total Revenue</b>		<b>172,604.50</b>
<b>Staffing</b>		
Education	256,947.77	
Support	50,075.76	
<b>Total Staffing</b>		<b>307,023.53</b>
<b>Replacement</b>		
	4,376.74	
<b>Total Replacement</b>		<b>4,376.74</b>
<b>Utilities</b>		
Water/Sewer		
Natural Gas/Propane	8,145.00	
Hydro	6,454.00	
<b>Total Utilities</b>		<b>14,599.00</b>
<b>Services and Supplies</b>		
Telephone	1,673.07	
School Supplies and Services	13,901.34	
Photocopying	2,576.72	
Custodial Supplies	986.31	
<b>Total Services and Supplies</b>		<b>19,137.44</b>
<b>Total Staff and Operating Expenditures</b>		<b>345,136.71</b>
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>		<b>-172,532.21</b>

**NOTES**

1. Revenue is based on Full Time Equivalent (FTE) student count as September 30, 2009
2. Staff is based on actual 2009-2010 salary grids and projected benefits at September 20, 2009
3. Staff does not include special education staff
4. Replacement, utilities and supplies and services are based on actual 2008-2009 operating expenses

<b>Summary</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>PER FTE</b>
Operating Grant	172,604.50	29.50	5,851.00
Staff and Operating Expenditures	345,136.71	29.50	11,699.55
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>	<b>-172,532.21</b>		<b>-5,848.55</b>

**Schol District No. 57 (Prince George)  
2009-2010 Revenue and Expenditure Analysis  
Shady Valley Elementary**

<b>Revenue</b>		
Operating	<b>128,722.00</b>	
<b>Total Revenue</b>		<b>128,722.00</b>
<b>Staffing</b>		
Education	172,843.88	
Support	60,240.48	
<b>Total Staffing</b>		<b>233,084.36</b>
<b>Replacement</b>		
	12,958.00	
<b>Total Replacement</b>		<b>12,958.00</b>
<b>Utilities</b>		
Water/Sewer		
Natural Gas/Propane	7,447.00	
Hydro	8,363.00	
<b>Total Utilities</b>		<b>15,810.00</b>
<b>Services and Supplies</b>		
Telephone	1,962.64	
School Supplies and Services	15,875.45	
Photocopying	2,933.20	
Custodial Supplies	1,150.11	
<b>Total Services and Supplies</b>		<b>21,921.40</b>
<b>Total Staff and Operating Expenditures</b>		<b>283,773.76</b>
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>		<b>-155,051.76</b>

**NOTES**

1. Revenue is based on Full Time Equivalent (FTE) student count as September 30, 2009
2. Staff is based on actual 2009-2010 salary grids and projected benefits at September 20, 2009
3. Staff does not include special education staff
4. Replacement, utilities and supplies and services are based on actual 2008-2009 operating expenses

Summary	Amount	FTE	PER FTE
Operating Grant	128,722.00	22.00	5,851.00
Staff and Operating Expenditures	283,773.76	22.00	12,898.81
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>	<b>-155,051.76</b>		<b>-7,047.81</b>

**Schol District No. 57 (Prince George)  
2009-2010 Revenue and Expenditure Analysis  
Springwood Elementary**

<b>Revenue</b>		
Operating	<b>746,002.50</b>	
<b>Total Revenue</b>		<b>746,002.50</b>
<b>Staffing</b>		
Education	620,277.31	
Support	110,739.36	
<b>Total Staffing</b>		<b>731,016.67</b>
<b>Replacement</b>		
	21,181.00	
<b>Total Replacement</b>		<b>21,181.00</b>
<b>Utilities</b>		
Water/Sewer	1,046.00	
Natural Gas/Propane	10,960.00	
Hydro	13,860.00	
<b>Total Utilities</b>		<b>25,866.00</b>
<b>Services and Supplies</b>		
Telephone	1,866.99	
School Supplies and Services	22,824.21	
Photocopying	3,349.26	
Custodial Supplies	2,058.32	
<b>Total Services and Supplies</b>		<b>30,098.78</b>
<b>Total Staff and Operating Expenditures</b>		<b>808,162.45</b>
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>		<b>-62,159.95</b>

**NOTES**

1. Revenue is based on Full Time Equivalent (FTE) student count as September 30, 2009
2. Staff is based on actual 2009-2010 salary grids and projected benefits at September 20, 2009
3. Staff does not include special education staff
4. Replacement, utilities and supplies and services are based on actual 2008-2009 operating expenses

Summary	Amount	FTE	PER FTE
Operating Grant	746,002.50	127.50	5,851.00
Staff and Operating Expenditures	808,162.45	127.50	6,338.53
<b>Net Surplus (Deficit)</b>	<b>-62,159.95</b>		<b>-487.53</b>

# Neighbourhood Learning Centres Stakeholder Forum, January 27, 2010 Meeting Summary

## Participants:

See attached list

The Neighbourhood Learning Centre (NLC) Forum was held on January 27, 2010 from 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., at the offices of SET BC, 105-1750 West 75th Ave, Vancouver.

### 1. **Welcome & introductions**

The participants were welcomed by Claire Avison and Doug Stewart from the Ministry of Education. All participants introduced themselves.

### 2. **Opening remarks**

Paige MacFarlane and Keith Miller, Assistant Deputy Ministers from the Ministry of Education, provided introductory remarks, emphasizing the opportunity to learn and to build on the good work that has already been done in schools and districts across the Province. The NLC initiative is a “work in progress” with meetings such as this forum providing input to what the initiative will look like. All of these discussions need to consider the current context of limited resources.

### 3. **Plan for the day**

Paul Pallan, the forum facilitator, outlined the objectives for the day:

- beginning the dialogue;
- learning from the experience of participants; and
- getting advice on how to increase the number of NLCs and their successful operation.

### 4. **Neighbourhood Learning Centres context**

Claire Avison presented an overview of the NLC initiative.

### 5. **Learning from experience**

Four presentations provided an opportunity to learn from the extensive experience of the participants.

Burnaby SD and Surrey SD each provided an overview of their school district’s program for community schools/education. They highlighted what they had learned from their many years of experience and, in particular, the strong network of partnerships which had been developed.

Revelstoke SD discussed the work to date on a new NLC under development in their school district, highlighting their process for engaging the larger community and other partners.

Kim Schonert Reichl of UBC concluded the presentations by summarizing the research in this area and the contributions that community schools and community involvement can make to student success.

All presenters provided power point presentations that will be made available to participants.

## 6. Recap: key learnings

The Learning from Experience presentations identified the importance of:

- strong leadership
- clarity of purpose
- building relationships
- excellent communications
- strong, collaborative partnerships, with shared perspectives
- community engagement and community development
- responding to unique needs of each community (i.e. one size does not fit all)
- recognizing the continuum of community school and other NLC-like models in BC
- reaching out to those “hard to reach” members of the school and community
- approaching NLCs and community schools as a concept or strategy—not as a set of programs
- using a strength-based philosophy
- sustainability and continuous improvement at NLC level
- recognizing positive impact that NLCs can have on learning and development
- all ministries and agencies of government supporting the NLC concept
- providing appropriate support and resources to support NLCs

## 7. Identification of challenges and issues

The afternoon focused on identifying the challenges and issues that need to be addressed to expand the number of NLCs and to support their success.

The participants opted to identify challenges and issues in small groups and then report back to the plenary. The small groups summarized their discussions on flip charts that were collected by the Ministry after this session.

The most commonly occurring challenges and issues were:

- Collective agreement and liability issues
  - supporting volunteers within these constraints
- Communication
  - clear advice/direction is needed on how to move from concept to reality
  - materials are needed to build understanding of the concept in and amongst communities and senior decision makers
- Funding
  - some funding will be necessary to plan and develop NLCs
  - sources could include government, school districts or other partners, or a reallocation of existing resources.

- How to:
  - change the culture in schools and communities to view schools as community assets, and to move from a student focus to a student, family and community focus
  - build the capacity and skill sets of staff to work effectively in this environment.
  - develop and sustain leadership and identify champions in the system.
  - implement new initiatives when workloads are high and resources in short supply.
- Leasing issues
  - need to address how to facilitate so that leasing space is attractive and viable for other partners.
- Policy issues
  - framework that describes the overall direction of the initiative and the relationship to community schools, School Community Connections, etc., is needed
- Zoning issues

## 8. Strategies for overcoming the challenges

In a plenary session, meeting participants provided advice and recommendations for addressing some of the challenges identified in the small group session:

### Communications

- enhance the profile of NLCs; position as part of larger picture of BC's future
- broad public awareness of vision is needed – supported by evidence and research
- develop boilerplate communications and presentation materials

### Cross-government

- tie NLC to other priority areas, providing a unified vision, and positioning as a whole-of-government initiative
- engage other key ministries and agencies
- address funding as a cross-government issue
- long-term government leadership and sustainable commitments are needed, providing a clear direction for the future.
- examine what has already been done re: cross-government initiatives
- market the resource of existing school space to other agencies

### Funding

- provide incentives for schools to become NLCs
- provide dedicated funding within ministry/government budgets
- provide incentive at local planning level
- any granting program must be straight-forward
- provide incentive funding to enable tours of operating NLC's on the ground connecting "novices" with those who are experienced

### Networking

- continue providing opportunities to share information, expertise, and successes
- reconvene this group again
- enable stakeholder/community partners to talk to one another across regions – access to resource people
- enable network of communities and school districts
- consider developing online network or list serve of interested people

### Partnerships

- continue the dialogue with stakeholders about NLCs and provide additional information—NLCs are still a well kept secret to many.
- build on existing partnerships including: community literacy tables, early learning tables, etc.
- broaden consultation with rural communities and local governments
- engage UBCM, and consider opportunities to profile NLCs at next UBCM convention
- create and share business case to help engage business/corporate sector and other non-traditional partners

### Policy Framework

- overall policy framework should be developed with local-level input, and should avoid being too proscriptive
- support the development of solutions at the community level; encourage local flexibility and creativity; “meet people where they are”
- principals are key to success of NLC
- consider capacity of local governments
- build on what’s been done re community development – Legacies Now etc
- consider literacy coordination model
- tenants and partners must be protected from early lease terminations when/if school needs space

### Tools

- identify and share best practices from work that is already occurring
- identify models of community collaboration, for example Revelstoke’s step by step process
- provide template tools – ie: lease agreements
- consider video clips and other online format resources
- share Burnaby’s key’s to successful community schools
- share supporting research
- provide resource kit for local governments
- tap into learning communities research (Ron Faris)

**9. Summary and next steps**

Participants agreed that the forum provided a very valuable opportunity for dialogue, and expressed a desire for continued engagement. It was recommended that the Ministry of Education take a more active role in promoting NLCs—perhaps through a website, newsletters or additional meetings.

The Ministry will continue to engage stakeholders through further forums, small work groups, advisory bodies, or by other methods.

Participants endorsed the Ministry of Education’s efforts to engage other ministries in NLCs, and its role as a broker of information, tools and better practices for schools, districts and communities. Participants expressed support for the Ministry to foster networking and provide for a continuum of models in its vision.

**10. Adjournment**

Paige MacFarlane thanked the participants for their important contributions for the day. Meeting adjourned.

**Neighbourhood Learning Centres  
Stakeholder Forum, January 27, 2010  
Participant List**

Claire Avison	BC Ministry of Education
Steve Boyd	Surrey School District, Association for Community Education in British Columbia (ACE BC)
Linda Buchanan	BC School Trustees Association (BCSTA)
Ted Cadwallader	BC Ministry of Education
Jeff Calbick	United Way of the Lower Mainland
Kathy Cassels	Directorate of Agencies for School Health in British Columbia (DASH BC)
Anne Cooper	Revelstoke School District
Dan Derpak	BC School Superintendents Association
Deborah Garrity	British Columbia Confederation of Parent Advisory Councils (BCCPAC)
Lynn Green	Vancouver School Board
Enzo Guerriero	Association for Community Education in BC (ACE BC)
Stephen Hansen	BC School Trustees Association (BCSTA)
Samantha Hartley-Folz	BC Healthy Living Alliance
Charlotte Henay	Prince George School District
Pat Horstead	Surrey School District
Deborah Irvine	United Way of the Lower Mainland
Tom Jensen	BC Ministry of Community and Rural Development
Nadine Kainz	BC Ministry of Community and Rural Development
Brenda Le Claire	2010 Legacies Now
Karen Linkert	First Nations Education Steering Committee (FNESC)
Paige MacFarlane	BC Ministry of Education
Gary MacIsaac	Union of British Columbia Municipalities (UBCM)
Debra Martel	Vancouver School Board
Keith Miller	BC Ministry of Education
Paul Pallan	Facilitator
Mac Petrie	BC Association of School Business Officials (BCASBO)
Ron Pound	British Columbia Public School Employers' Association (BCPSEA)
Mary Lynn Rimer	BC School Trustees Association (BCSTA)
Kim Schonert-Reichl	University of British Columbia
Joan Selby	City of Burnaby
Elizabeth Shannon	Association for Community Education in British Columbia (ACE BC)
Doug Stewart	BC Ministry of Education
Janey Talbot	Burnaby School District
Jim Taylor	Association for Community Education in British Columbia (ACE BC)
Kim Weatherby	BC Ministry of Education
Ted Whiteland	BC Principals' and Vice-Principals' Association
Paul Whitney	Vancouver Public Library
Irene Young	BC Association of School Business Officials (BCASBO)