



Small urban boards study

Published September 2006

For more information contact the Alberta School Boards Association
Phone: 1.780.482.7311 Fax: 1.780.482.5659 www.asba.ab.ca

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	5
Purpose	6
Methodology	6
Identification of Issues	7
Analysis of Issues	8
Student Transportation	8
Capital	12
Renewed Funding Framework	15
Basic Education	16
Expectations	16
Economies of Scale	17
Cost and Acquisition of Staff	17
Special Education	19
Summary	21
Summary of Recommendations	23
Appendices	
Appendix 1 – Attendees at Initial Meeting	24
Appendix 2 – ASBA Policies and Directives for Action	26
Appendix 3 – Issues Identified by Boards in Attendance, Nov. 20	28
Appendix 4 – Issues Grouped and Categorized	32
Appendix 5 – Additional Issues Identified on Feb. 17	35
Appendix 6 – Charts summarizing Appendices 3, 4, and 5	38
Appendix 7 – Special Education	42
Appendix 8 – 2005/2006 C4 Max + Ben. Rank Order	52
Appendix 9 – 2005/2006 Average Teacher Salary	54
Appendix 10 – Weighted Average Teacher Training and Experience	56
Appendix 11 – Staff Acquisition Survey	62
Appendix 12 – Impact of Renewed Funding Framework – RCPA	67
Appendix 13 – School Jurisdictions Receiving Stabilization Funding	68

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In response to requests from small urban boards and as follow up to studies exploring issues facing the province's metro school boards and rural communities, the ASBA launched the Small Urban Boards Study in November 2005. Twenty-seven school boards identified themselves as small urban boards. A nine-member steering committee made up of the president and trustees and administrators from among the 27 participating boards guided the study.

The purpose of the study was to identify and explore the unique challenges facing the province's small urban boards and to identify solutions to those challenges. In addressing these questions the steering committee stipulated a key criteria – that the study findings be supported by the data gathered from the participating small urban boards and other sources.

Ultimately the study and supporting research revealed that no single issue is unique and specific to all of Alberta's small urban boards. Notwithstanding its disappointment at this finding, the steering committee recognized the value of devoting eight months to considering and exploring the issues facing Alberta's small urban boards specifically:

- the study's findings reinforced the Alberta School Boards Association's current advocacy directions and efforts – the issues affecting small urban boards are addressed in existing ASBA policy
- while there are unique issues facing individual small urban boards or small groups of small urban boards, all school boards in the province face a similar range of challenges as we strive to provide and maintain high quality education opportunities for students – but ultimately small urban school boards have much more in common with the other boards in the province than differences. This study reinforces the need for strong collective action on a wide range of issues
- there was value in exploring the “perceived” issues affecting small urban boards. While the research did not support the perceptions – it was valuable to explore these questions and deal with the myths. The value of this report lies in the research we did – we gathered facts against which to test the myths.
- the study gave the small urban boards the opportunity to talk with other small urban boards. We can explore best practices and learn from one another.
- we appreciated the opportunity to explore the concerns specific to this group – small urban boards.

Issues affecting many or all boards

As revealed and reinforced through this study, the province's small urban boards – like many or all the province's school boards -- struggle to some degree with:

- **Funding** – provincial funding is not adequate to meet the rising costs and demands placed on the educational system. The recent study commissioned by the ASBA, *Missing the mark – Funding shortfalls in Alberta's public education system*, pointed out the inadequacies of the current levels of funding and what appears to be a decline in the long term financial viability of boards.

- **Student transportation** – rising costs, parent and student expectations, difficulty in securing qualified personnel, safety issues and urban sprawl place extensive pressures on the planning and operation of student transportation systems.
- **Capital facilities** – there has been widespread concern expressed by school boards regarding the adequacy of the Plant Operation and Maintenance (PO&M) funding. The recent study commissioned by the ASBA, *Missing the mark – Alberta’s school building deficit report*, reiterated earlier findings that, “some 36 per cent of all schools in the province are near the end of their life cycle and require renewal and refurbishing”. The *School Facility Evaluation Project* conducted by the government reported in 2000 that some 50 per cent of the schools in the province were rated as being either fair or poor.

With the growth in urban areas, many new neighborhoods do not have a neighborhood school resulting in the need for increased student transportation and loss of neighborhood identity.

Non-school buildings are not recognized yet for provincial infrastructure support. The cost of acquiring and maintaining non-school buildings places a significant financial burden on school board budgets. School boards have lobbied the provincial government to provide support for non-school buildings and have not yet been successful.

- **Special education** – the demand for service and the cost of accommodating the needs of students that have not been identified for special education provincial funding but have difficulties that require special intervention, have placed a significant financial burden on school boards. Special education transportation requires some additional consideration as well.
- **Parental demands and expectations** – there are increasing expectations from parents and community members for expanded educational services and programs.
- **Salary costs and demands** – it appears as if each round of salary negotiations brings about demands for increases that exceed the rate of grant increases or the ability of boards to accommodate.
- **Implementing provincial initiatives** – class size, daily physical education, second languages and others, place demands on space and the availability of staff.
- **Coordination** – the expectations for the coordination of services with other provincial and community agencies places a significant burden on the jurisdiction staff. The administrative cap on expenditures does not provide for additional staff to meet coordination expectations and demands.

Issues affecting individual or small groups of small urban boards

Through the study a number of issues were identified that were specific to individual or small groups of small urban boards. While these issues are significant and important for the involved school boards, they were not common to small urban boards as a group. For example:

- **15 passenger vans** – some small urban boards that do not own their own busses have used 15 passenger vans for intramural and extra curricular activities. With the safety of these vans in question, alternative arrangements are necessary as the safety of students must be paramount.

- **Board boundaries which are not coterminous** – there is a perceived disadvantage in the competition for students by boards whose boundaries encompass a smaller area than a competing board. For example, in the transportation of students to its schools where students in the same geographic area are resident students of different boards but wish to attend schools in the same location.
- **Student growth and urban sprawl** – affects a limited number of the small urban boards included in the study. Slightly less than 50 per cent of the boards included in the study experienced any level of student growth over the past five years. The remainder experienced a decline in student numbers.
- **Administrative cap** – the cap on administrative expenditures was an issue for some boards in the study. However, it was noted that boards have been able to adapt as none have reported exceeding the cap.
- **Economies of scale** – small urban boards bordering the metro areas are expected to provide the same level of programs and service as the large metro boards but do not have the resources to do so. Being smaller does not provide the same economy of scale as the larger boards.
- **Annexation** – small urban boards that surround larger urban areas are impacted by annexation issues as boundaries expand. While the difficulties are recognized, there were no resolutions that could be provided and the problems are sporadic and complex.

Perception issues

The following topics were identified by school boards initially; however, ultimately emerged as perceived issues that were not supported by the research conducted for this study. For example:

- **Teacher salary costs are higher for small urban school boards –**
An examination of salary information for the 2005-2006 school year did not support the perception that teacher salary costs are high for small urban boards. Small urban boards are similar to other boards in the province in terms of salary costs.
- **Small urban boards serve a higher number of special needs students –**
Based on the data provided by school authorities to Alberta Education there does not appear to be a concentration of special needs students in small urban areas. The incidence levels vary significantly from board to board included in the study and there is not a concentration in any location or in any specific board organization.
- **Small urban boards serve a more demanding constituency –**
There is little evidence to support this perception. A cursory review of the Annual Education Results Reports tended to show parent satisfaction levels are not appreciably different in small urban boards than in other boards in the province.
- **The Renewed Funding Framework did not address the needs of the small urban boards –**
The framework has not been in place for a sufficiently long enough period to assess its impact on boards; however, in reviewing the factors that made up the framework, it was felt that the major cost drivers were considered and are included in the plan.

- **Small urban boards do not enjoy economies of scale –**
It was not possible to gather the kind of information that would either support or reject the perception that the small urban boards are hindered by a lack of a sufficient resource base to offer the same kinds of programs as other kinds of boards.
- **Small urban boards lack influence within the ASBA and the province –**
Small urban boards will have an opportunity to explore this question through the upcoming governance review to be launched in September of 2006.

In closing, while the members of the steering committee were disappointed that no specific issues emerged as unique to small urban boards, they were reassured to find that small urban boards have more in common with the other boards in the province than they have differences – and that those issues are identified and attended to in current ASBA policy and advocacy efforts.

INTRODUCTION

In 2001, the Alberta School Boards Association (ASBA) supported a study that examined the educational challenges and issues facing small rural schools located in towns, villages and hamlets of fewer than 1000 residents in province of Alberta. The information used in the study was obtained from six public school jurisdictions in addition to that obtained from provincial government departments. In March of 2003, the ASBA Board of Directors approved a study that would examine the unique challenges and issues faced by urban boards. This study was to complement the review of education in small rural schools undertaken in 2001.

When the first draft of the urban boards study report was presented in 2004, it was felt that the metro boards were in an imminently precarious position due to the impact of the Renewed Funding Framework and that immediate action was necessary. Therefore, it was decided to separate the study of the issues facing urban boards into two components.

The first component focused on an analysis of the impact of the Renewed Funding Framework on the four metro boards. The second component would explore the issues facing the small urban boards. The “Metro School Boards Study: An Analysis of the Impact of the Renewed Funding Framework” was completed in May 2005.

In June 2005, school boards were contacted and invited to self-identify as participants in a study of the issues affecting small urban boards. Twenty-seven school boards chose to participate and sent representatives to the November 20, 2005 meeting called to launch the small urban boards study. Because of the number of boards wishing to participate in the study and the significant differences in their individual circumstances, boards were placed into three categories as noted below:

Small Cities:

(jurisdictions that contained within its boundaries at least one urban centre surrounded by a reasonably large rural area)

- Battle River Regional Division No. 31
- Grande Yellowhead Regional Division No. 35
- Living Waters CRD No. 42
- Northern Light SD No. 69
- St. Thomas Aquinas RCSR No. 38
- Wetaskiwin Regional Division No. 11
- Wolf Creek SD No. 72

Suburban:

(jurisdictions that are adjacent to the metro areas – often referred to as the “donut boards”)

- Canadian Rockies RD No. 12
- Chinook’s Edge SD No. 73
- Elk Island Catholic CSR No. 41
- Elk Island PSRD No. 14
- Evergreen CSR No. 2
- Foothills SD No. 38
- Greater St. Albert CRD No. 29
- Northern Gateway RD No. 10
- Parkland SD No. 70
- Rocky View SD No. 41

Major Urban:

(jurisdictions that contain an urban centre large enough to support a daily newspaper)

Ft. McMurray RCSSD No. 33
Ft. McMurray SD No. 2833
Grande Prairie RDSSD No. 28
Grande Prairie SD No. 2575
Holy Spirit CSRD No. 4
Lethbridge SD No. 51
Medicine Hat SD. No. 76
Red Deer CRD No. 39
Red Deer Public Schools
St. Albert PSSD No. 6

See *Appendix 1 (page 24)* for a list of participants in the first meeting.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the study was to identify the issues facing small urban boards in the province, gather information and propose solutions to the ASBA Board of Directors that would result in the establishment of bylaws, policies or directives for action. In addition, it was felt that the findings would support the ASBA in working with the provincial government in order to resolve some of the very serious problems facing school boards in maintaining high quality educational programs and services.

Small urban boards feel particularly vulnerable because they are often overlooked in the competition for resources between the large metro school boards and the smaller rural boards. In many regards, they are viewed as being remarkably “average” and thus do not qualify for a number of the equity factors that are included in the *Renewed Funding Framework*. Some of the boards that participated in the study also expressed the view that small urban boards lacked political influence both at the provincial level and within the ASBA and as a result, their concerns are not taken seriously.

METHODOLOGY

The representatives of the 27 boards participating in the study agreed to the three general groupings as proposed. Recognizing that even within the three sub-groups there were significant differences between participating boards, they felt the proposed groupings were acceptable for the purposes of the study.

Establishment of a steering committee

In order to guide the study and provide advice and input, it was decided to establish a steering committee composed of:

- Two representatives from each of the sub-groups - small cities, suburban and major urban centres;
- The president of the ASBA, *ex-officio*;
- A representative from the College of Alberta School Superintendents (CASS); and
- A representative from the Association of School Business Officials of Alberta (ASBOA).

The Small Urban Boards Steering Committee

Major Urban Centres

Lloyd Baumgarten – Red Deer Catholic Regional Division
Morag Pansegrau – St. Albert Protestant Separate School District

Small Cities

Brenda Herder – Battle River Regional Division
Rob Reimer – Wetaskiwin Regional Public Schools

Suburban

Jean Boisvert – Elk Island Catholic Separate Regional Division
Wendy Metzger – Rocky View School Division

Maureen Kubinec – President ASBA – ex-officio
Kath Rhyason – Fort McMurray Public – CASS
Christine Lee – Lethbridge Public – ASBOA

The role of the steering committee

The steering committee accepted the following responsibilities:

1. To communicate and liaise with the participating boards in their respective groups.
2. To encourage small urban boards to participate actively in the study process.
3. To provide advice, counsel and support through all stages of the study process including development of study terms of reference, process, and final report.
4. To bring their individual and collective wisdom to the table in an advisory capacity.
5. To present and support the final product to the ASBA Board of Directors and broader membership.

IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES TO BE PURSUED FOR THE STUDY

At the November 20 meeting, the 27 board representatives met in their sub-groups – small cities; suburban and major urban boards – to identify issues they viewed as impacting on their ability to provide the quality educational programs and services expected and demanded by their communities. See *Appendix 3 (page 28)* for a complete summary of the issues identified at this initial meeting.

Criteria for assessing and assigning issues:

When the steering committee met February 17, it established criteria to assess and prioritize the issues that had been identified. The steering committee agreed to pursue issues that met the following criteria:

1. The issue will reflect/advance the unique interests of small urban boards;
2. There is data to make the case for change that might result in more funding;
3. There was steering committee consensus that this is an issue; and
4. The issue is not already addressed in ASBA policy.

See *Appendices 3, 4, 5 and 6 (pages 28, 32, 35 and 38)* for the first-cut of issues considered by the steering committee and a chart outlining how the steering committee assessed and assigned each issue to a specific category.

The following eight issues emerged as priority issues for the study based upon the criteria set out by the steering committee.

1. Student transportation
2. Capital
3. Renewed Funding Framework
4. Basic education
5. Expectations
6. Economies of scale
7. Acquisition and cost of staff
8. Special education

The steering committee met on May 12 to review the data that was gathered on each of the priority issues and the recommendations that were proposed to assist with problem areas. It was agreed that the draft report should be presented to representatives of the participating boards on June 6 in order to get reaction to the existing material and suggestions for additional areas that needed to be explored.

The draft report was presented to the representatives of the boards participating in the study on June 6 and reactions were invited. A number of boards submitted written responses after they had the opportunity to review the report more fully.

The steering committee met August 11 to consider the feedback received from member boards and to approve a draft report to be presented to the ASBA Board of Directors.

ANALYSIS OF ISSUES

1. Student Transportation

Student transportation was identified as a significant problem for all of the boards participating in the study. While the provincial government endorses a choice model for public education, the current transportation funding system does not facilitate implementation of this model. In addition provincial funding has not kept pace with the increasing costs of providing transportation services.

Transportation funding is based upon attendance at a designated school and the distance from the student's residence to that designated school. In the case of the urban transportation plan, it is noted that the distance is "from the school where the child could be enrolled". The distance determined for transportation eligibility funding is based upon a distance of 2.4 kilometers. Study participants viewed the 2.4 kilometer limit as being unreasonable in the current urban environment. It is extremely difficult for school boards to balance funding with student safety and parental and community expectations.

In order to accommodate the differences in the geographical circumstances of the individual school boards, the province has developed three transportation plans with various modifications to each in order to account for differences in student circumstances. The plans are identified as being:

- Rural
- Urban
- Metro

School boards may receive funding under more than one plan should student demographics provide for this. In 2004 - 2005 school year, for the small urban boards participating in the study:

- Five received their student transportation funding totally through the Urban Transportation Plan;
- Five received their student transportation funding totally through the Rural Transportation Plan; and
- The remaining 17 received their student transportation funding through both the Urban and Rural Transportation Plans

a. Boards Receiving Funding Under the Urban Transportation Plan

The following boards received all of their provincial transportation funding under the terms and conditions of the urban transportation plan:

Grande Prairie PSD

Lethbridge PSD

Medicine Hat PSD

Red Deer Public Schools

St. Albert PSSD

All of the boards in this category are school districts whose boundaries are generally coterminous with those of the city in which they are located. For the 2003 - 2004 and 2004 - 2005 school years:

- i Four out of the five boards in the study, which received all of their transportation funding through the urban transportation plan, were able to support fully the costs of the transportation system through provincial funding support.
- ii Grande Prairie PSD, Lethbridge PSD and Medicine Hat PSD did not charge a transportation fee to students accessing the transportation system and were able to do so for less than provincial support. Red Deer Public Schools and St. Albert PSSD did charge transportation fees. However, Red Deer Public Schools did generate surplus funds from the transportation system in excess of the funds raised through transportation fees. St. Albert PSSD did require transportation fees in order to maintain its transportation system.

- iii It would appear as if the major factor in determining cost efficiency of the student transportation system is the number of ineligible passengers transported. These are students who ride the bus and do not qualify for funding because they are within the 2.4 km walk-limit or do not attend the school closest to their residence or to which they could attend.

Jurisdiction	Percentage of ineligible passengers (04/05 school year)
Grande Prairie PSD	4
Lethbridge School PSD	0
Medicine Hat PSD	0
Red Deer Public Schools	9
St. Albert PSSD	45

b. Boards Receiving Funding Under Rural Transportation Plan

The following school boards received all of their provincial transportation funding through the terms and conditions of the rural transportation plan:

Chinook's Edge RD
 Grande Yellowhead RD
 Living Waters CRD
 Northern Gateway RD
 Wolf Creek SD

- i. All of the boards that received their total transportation funding under the rural transportation plan charged a transportation fee in each of the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 school years. However, in some cases such as Chinook's Edge, the amount collected through fees is small and may represent specific circumstances.
- ii. The number of ineligible passengers transported in these jurisdictions ranged from 2.2 per cent to 35.7 per cent
- iii. These jurisdictions did not contain an urban centre of 10,000 or greater and therefore did not qualify for funds through the urban transportation plan.

c. Boards Receiving Funding Under Both the Urban and Rural Transportation Plans

The following school boards received their provincial transportation funding through both the rural and urban transportation plans:

Battle River RD	Greater St. Albert CRD
Northern Lights SD	Parkland SD
St. Thomas Aquinas RCSD	Rocky View SD
Wetaskiwin RD	Ft. McMurray RCSSD
Canadian Rockies RD	Ft. McMurray SD
Elk Island CSRD	Grande Prairie RCRD
Elk Island PSRD	Holy Spirit CSRD
Evergreen CSRD	Red Deer CRD
Foothills SD	

- i. All of the boards receiving funding through both the urban and rural transportation plans charged transportation fees with the exception of:
Canadian Rockies RD
Evergreen CSRD
Holy Spirit CSRD
- ii. All of the boards tended to report higher numbers of ineligible passengers in the urban portion of the transportation system than the rural.
- iii. It is difficult if not impossible to secure financial data that would separate the costs of the urban from the rural and match it to the revenue received.
- iv. However, there is information on the percentage of eligible and ineligible students transported in both the rural and urban components of the transportation plan. For the 2004 – 2005 school year, the percentage of ineligible passengers included in the rural component of the transportation plan ranged from a high of 9.9 per cent for Elk Island Public Regional Division to a low of 0 per cent in five of the jurisdictions included in this grouping.

The percentage of ineligible passengers transported under the urban component of the plan was generally higher with 43 per cent being reported by Wetaskiwin Regional Division to a low of 0 per cent in Battle River Regional Division and Canadian Rockies Regional Division.

d. Special Education Transportation Funding

Some of the boards included in the study group raised the issue of the restrictiveness of the provincial special education transportation funding. Funding is provided to school jurisdictions in order to address the costs associated with providing appropriate and efficient transportation for children with a disability or delay that prevents them from riding a regularly scheduled bus route. The jurisdiction is free to use the funds as they see fit. However, no student that is able to use regular transportation can ride on a bus that is funded for special education purposes. This restriction prevents other family members from boarding the bus and accompanying the disabled or delayed child to school. Special education transportation funding is provided only if the all of the passengers on the bus are unable to utilize regular transportation.

e. Recommendations

It is recommended that the Alberta School Boards Association request that the provincial government:

- i. Reduce the 2.4 kilometer requirement for eligibility for transportation funding to 1 kilometer. The 2.4 kilometer requirement does not take into account safety concerns and parental expectations in today’s environment. In urban settings a walk limit of 1 kilometer is much more reasonable and would better meet the needs and expectations of parents and students.
- ii. Support the costs of transporting students to programs of choice where boards have determined that choice is in the best interests of the student.

- iii. Review the cost pressures faced by small urban boards in providing student transportation services and determine if additional funding is required. Boards have been reporting that they anticipate significant increases in the cost of providing student transportation services and that the current level of provincial funding is inadequate. The increased costs can only be covered by increasing student transportation fees or transferring funds from other priorities.
- iv. Reassess the requirements necessary for boards to receive special education transportation funding. At the present time only students that are included in the severely disabled category can be passengers on the bus in order for a school board to receive special education transportation funding. This restriction precludes any other student from riding on the same bus.

2. Capital

The suitability and availability of school buildings was identified as a major problem facing small urban boards. Recent provincial initiatives such as established guidelines for class sizes and daily physical activity placed tremendous pressure on school boards to find sufficient school space to accommodate these mandates.

a. Condition of School Buildings

It is difficult to obtain current data about the availability and condition of school buildings. The School Facility Evaluation Project, completed in 2000, may be the best starting point. This project evaluated existing school facilities with a goal of establishing a school facility information system for use in planning and managing school facility infrastructure. The evaluations were conducted by 61 consultant teams including architectural, mechanical and electrical disciplines between November 1999 and July 2000.

The findings indicated there were significant issues with the quality of the school buildings throughout the province. It was reported that approximately 53 per cent of the school buildings were either in fair or poor condition with the remaining 47 per cent reported as being in good condition.

The following chart summarizes the status of the school buildings operated by the 27 school boards participating in the small urban boards study. **Note:** Only schools operated by the boards in urban centres were counted for the purpose of this analysis. For example, in the case of Battle River Regional Division only those schools in the City of Camrose were considered.

<u>School Board</u>	<u>No. of Schools*</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Small Cities				
Battle River	4	3	1	0
<i>(No data was available for Sparling and Ecole Sifton – either these schools were not evaluated or the results were not submitted and included in the compilation)</i>				
Grande Yellowhead	10	5	3	2
Living Waters	4	2	1	1
Northern Lights	10	7	1	2
St. Thomas Aquinas	3	2	1	0
Wetaskiwin	9	2	6	1
Wolf Creek	12	2	5	5
Suburban				
Canadian Rockies	5	2	1	2
Chinook's Edge	5	3	2	0
Elk Island Catholic	13	8	5	0
Elk Island Public	27	22	5	0
Evergreen	4	1	3	0
Foothills	11	7	2	2
Greater St. Albert CRD	15	7	8	0
Northern Gateway	4	4	0	0
Parkland	17	4	9	4
Rocky View	16	11	5	0
Major Urban				
Ft. McMurray Catholic	8	4	4	0
Ft. McMurray Public	11	4	7	0
Grande Prairie Catholic	6	3	3	0
Grande Prairie Public	9	7	2	0
Holy Spirit	9	3	2	4
Lethbridge	17	2	11	4
Medicine Hat	17	7	10	0
Red Deer Catholic	9	3	4	2
Red Deer Public	21	9	11	1
St. Albert Protestant	13	8	4	1
	289	142	116	31

The results of the School Facility Evaluation Project did not indicate that the condition of the schools operated by small urban boards were significantly different from the condition of school operated by other boards in the province. Approximately 50 per cent were rated as good and approximately 50 per cent were rated as being either fair or poor, which reflected the general provincial findings for all school buildings in the province. However, when 50 per cent of the schools were judged as being either fair or poor, a major shortfall in adequate funding and support is evident.

b. Location of School Buildings

Population growth is occurring in Alberta's urban areas, particular in the centres surrounding Edmonton and Calgary and the resource-driven economies of Grande Prairie and Fort McMurray. While Alberta's total student population has not changed over the past five years, the distribution of the student population within some of the small urban boards has changed. New subdivisions attract younger families with students and these families expect and demand schools in their neighborhood. When this is not possible, students must be transported out of their communities to schools in other areas.

Of the 27 boards participating in the study, 14 had experienced some decline in student enrollment over the past 5-year period. However, many of the urban areas experienced significant total population growth that resulted in the development of new subdivisions and expanding municipal boundaries. This geographic growth means longer bus rides for students. Without neighborhood schools, students must be transported from new subdivisions to existing school sites outside of their communities.

c. Portable classrooms

A great deal of concern has been expressed upon the reliance on portables to accommodate students and the lack of a viable replacement policy.

d. Non-school buildings

The province does not provide financial support for non-school buildings such as board administrative offices, transportation buildings, maintenance shops and storage buildings. Consequently, funds must be taken from other budget areas to acquire and support non-school facilities. While this issue has been raised a number of times with government officials, no remedy has yet occurred.

e. Recommendations

It is recommended that the Alberta School Boards Association request that the provincial government:

- i. Provide a timetable for the orderly repair and replacement of classroom portables.
- ii. Support the costs of acquiring, operating and maintaining non-school buildings.
- iii. Commit to upgrading school facilities and providing adequate support for maintenance and operation as quickly as possible.

3. Renewed Funding Framework

The Renewed Funding Framework was designed to distribute provincial funds to Alberta school authorities in order to provide educational services and programs to students. The framework was introduced for the 2004 - 2005 school year and was described in an Alberta Education news release dated March 25, 2004 as achieving the following:

“The intention of the new funding framework is to simplify the funding process, ensure equitable funding to all jurisdictions and provide jurisdictions flexibility in addressing their local needs and priorities. The new framework provides funding to school boards based on the premise that, over and above the base costs of operations jurisdictions should receive funding for significant cost factors that are beyond their control and which vary across jurisdictions.”

When the new funding framework was introduced, the province made a commitment that no school board would receive less than a two per cent increase in funding due to the implementation of the new plan. Stabilization funding was provided to ensure that this commitment was met.

Thirty-four boards received stabilization funding that totaled approximately \$18,685,000 in the 2004 – 2005 school year, as noted in *Appendix 13 (page 68)*. Of these 34, 13 were small urban boards that are included in the study. While it is difficult to determine with any accuracy as to whether or not the small urban boards were disadvantaged by the introduction of the Renewed Funding Framework, the number that received less than a 2 per cent increase and received stabilization funding does not appear to be disproportionately higher than other groups of boards in the province. However, it would appear that the major urban boards - those confined within the approximate boundaries of an urban centre - were more prone to qualify for stabilization funding. The major urban boards that received stabilization funding in 2004 - 2005 were:

- Lethbridge Public School District
- Medicine Hat Public School District
- Red Deer Public Schools
- St. Albert Protestant Separate School District

As noted in the 2005 Metro School Boards Study, the Renewed Funding Framework is based upon sound principles. However, when considering its impact on the small urban boards, some factors may not have been incorporated into the framework in order to respond to the unique needs of small urban boards. For example, while sparsity and distance are recognized as contributing to the cost of educating students in rural areas, consideration is not given for such factors as: economies of scale, parental demands and expectations, that may have a greater impact in small urban areas.

The Renewed Funding Framework is based on an allocation model that places funds into the hands of school authorities to use, as they deem necessary in order to provide for the needs of their students. In 2004-2005, the total provincial funding received by boards was allocated in the following manner:

- Basic instruction: 73.11 per cent
- Severe Disabilities: student profile: 6.12 per cent
- Transportation: rural, urban and metro: 5.55 per cent
- Small Class Size Initiative: 1.55 per cent
- ECS – Base and M/M: 1.84 per cent

As noted above, over 88 per cent of the total dollars allocated through the funding framework are distributed through these five expenditure areas with the basic instructional grant providing just under three out of every four dollars. These funds are not earmarked and are available to boards to use as they deem necessary to meet the educational needs of the students they serve.

The Renewed Funding Framework has not been in place for sufficient time in order to assess the full impact it has had on the small urban boards. It may well be that some changes will be necessary in order to ensure that funding equity is provided to the small urban boards. The Renewed Funding Framework is currently under review and the ASBA has representatives on the various groups and sub groups that are engaged in the review.

4. Basic Education

Today's parents are very demanding and insistent upon their children receiving educational services and programs that are both comprehensive and exceptional. This is particularly the case in small urban jurisdictions which is believed to have a higher percentage of upwardly mobile parents. School boards are driven to meet the demands from parents who want their children to have access to a wide range of educational programs and services.

a. Recommendation

It is recommended that the ASBA request the provincial government:

- i. To clearly define the range of educational services and programs that the Renewed Funding Framework is intended to support.

5. Expectations

In a bid to assess parental satisfaction and to get a handle on the somewhat elusive concept of parental expectations, the consultant reviewed a sample of the Annual Education Results Reports that are prepared by school jurisdictions. It would appear to indicate that parents are generally very supportive and satisfied with the education their children are receiving. The results for some of the boards participating in the small urban boards study are as follows:

Percentage of parents that are satisfied with the opportunity for students to receive a broad program of studies, including fine arts, career and technology studies, health and physical education.

Red Deer Public 85 per cent

Lethbridge Public 80 per cent

St Albert PSSD 95 per cent

Parental satisfaction with the quality of education that their child is receiving:

Rocky View 90 per cent

Battle River 77 per cent

Elk Island 87 per cent

St Albert PSSD 95 per cent

However, it is to be understood that parent responses would generally reflect the specific school their child attends. Responses are not intended to reflect satisfaction with the entire range of course offerings provided throughout the system but are specific to the question that was asked.

Giving school boards access to the tax base, as recommended by Alberta's Commission on Learning, would give school boards the flexibility to respond to parental and community expectations about the level of service they deem essential for the students in that community.

a. Recommendation

It is recommended that the ASBA:

- i. Continue efforts to restore some measure of local taxation for Alberta's school boards.

6. Economies of Scale

Is there an optimal size for a school jurisdiction? The study was unable to determine if there was a measure that would identify an optimal size for a school jurisdiction that would enable it to provide a range of educational services and programs that would meet the needs of its student body and the demands and expectations of parents. It is understandable that a small jurisdiction would be unable to provide the same level of programming that would be available in a large jurisdiction. But it was beyond the scope of this study to deal economies of scale and program offerings.

7. Cost and Acquisition of Staff

Staffing costs are the largest single expenditure for all school boards in the province. Participants in the small urban boards study identified this as being particularly critical for them because competition for staff forces boards to expend a great deal more time and effort to recruit staff and to pay increased salaries and benefits if they wish to attract qualified candidates.

a. Teacher Salaries

Teacher salaries were identified as being significantly onerous due to:

- i. *Higher than average levels of years of teaching experience.*
It was reported that once teachers secure teaching positions in small urban areas, they were less likely to leave for other geographic areas in order to obtain employment. The small urban areas provide a wide range of services and are often viewed as desirable locations in which to reside.
- ii. *Increased levels of teacher training for salary purposes.*
Teachers in small urban jurisdictions were reported as having increased years of educational training, as there are improved opportunities for teachers to access university courses due to the proximity of universities and other learning institutions. It becomes much easier therefore to increase educational training.

Research Findings:

Based upon the years of teacher experience and educational training information for the teaching staff of Alberta school jurisdictions as of September 30, 2005, it was found that the salary and benefits paid to teachers was not significantly higher in small urban jurisdictions than in other boards across the province. As noted in *Appendix 9 (pages 54 and 55)* the 2005-2006 salary and benefits paid to a teacher with four years of training and maximum experience does not appear to be determined by jurisdiction size or type.

Of the 23 small urban jurisdictions that were included in the rank ordering of provincial school jurisdictions, 12 were above the median provincial salary and benefit package and 11 were below. Four of the jurisdictions participating in the study were not ranked, as the information was not available.

As of September 30, 2005 the weighted average teacher training in the province was 4.77 years. Twenty-one of the 27 small urban boards participating in the study had more teachers with less than the provincial weighted average years of teacher training. The weighted average teacher experience in the province was 8.20 years. As noted in *Appendix 10 (page 56)* 17 of the 27 boards participating in the study had more teachers with higher weighted years of teacher experience than the provincial average.

Based upon the 2005 - 2006 average teacher salary for the 56 school jurisdictions for which information was available, 13 of the small urban boards in the study were above the median provincial average salary and 10 were below. Again four of the jurisdictions participating in the study were not ranked, as the information was not available. As noted in *Appendix 8 (page 52)* the highest average salary was \$71,903 and the lowest was \$59,143, which indicates significant variation across the province. However, 82 per cent of all boards lie within a \$5,000 band surrounding the per teacher average salary. The median jurisdiction average salary was \$68,505.

Based upon the evidence, it does not appear as if teacher salary grids are significantly higher or different in small urban boards than they are in other boards in the province. But due to increased levels of experience, the average teacher costs are slightly higher for small urban boards as a group. Teacher salary costs are driven by a wide variety of factors with jurisdiction type being just one.

b. Acquisition of Staff

At the initial issues identification meeting in November, many of the small urban boards indicated they were experiencing difficulty securing non-certificated staff, with special emphasis on bus drivers, caretakers and trades people. The steering committee pursued this issue by surveying the 27 school boards participating in the study to gather data necessary to determine the severity of the problem.

The survey instrument was sent out to all of the participating boards at the end of March. Twenty-four of the 27 school boards responded. See *Appendix 11 (page 62)* for the survey results.

Survey Summary:

The results of the survey demonstrated that all of the small urban boards do not experience the same levels of difficulty in securing adequate and/or qualified staff. The two areas where boards identified the most difficulties in securing staff were for bus drivers and qualified caretakers. Seventeen of the boards indicated difficulty in securing qualified care-taking staff, while six stated they did not and one stated not applicable, as it was a contractor problem. A number of boards indicated that the problem of securing qualified bus drivers was a problem for the contractors that provide the service although not directly for them selves. Overall, there were more negative responses than positive responses, which identified that difficulties experienced by boards were not common to all boards nor was it common to any single group included in the study. In total:

69 responses – yes – we experience difficulty
84 responses – no – we do not experience difficulty
13 responses – n/a – we do not have direct responsibility for this area
2 responses – yes and no – in some components of the area and not in others

Small urban boards experience in this area reflects the general Alberta experience overall. There is a high demand for staff due to the general buoyant economy in Alberta, which has an overall unemployment rate of around 4.2 per cent.

8. Special Education

All three sub-groups in the small urban boards study identified special education and the challenge of providing the necessary programs and services to special needs students and their families as a major issue. Some of the issues raised include:

- a. **The jurisdiction profiles** established to identify the number of severely disabled students for funding purposes are outdated and should be reviewed.
- b. **The incidence and costs of providing educational services** and programs to those students presenting mild and moderate disabilities was identified as an issue that affected all boards. Very often the cost of meeting the needs of such students exceeded that of providing for the students that received severely disabled funding.
- c. **Special education transportation** and the manner in which transportation funding is determined is deemed to be inadequate and not responsive to jurisdiction needs.
- d. **Incidence of severely disabled students**
Study participants felt the small urban boards served a higher incidence of severely disabled students because of the availability of medical and family support services, availability of educational programs, housing and transportation.

Research data outlined in *Appendix 7 (page 42)* reveals a wide range of incidence levels among and between the small urban boards included in the study. As well higher incidence levels are not associated with any particular type of jurisdiction: rural, urban or metro

Of the 27 jurisdictions participating in the small urban boards study:

- i. The incidence level in the 2001 – 2002 school year ranged from a low of .84 per cent to a high of 6.36 per cent.
- ii. The incidence level in the 2003 – 2004 school year ranged from a low of .96 per cent to a high of 7.95 per cent.
- iii. The boards in the **suburban group** reported the lowest overall average student incidence (average of average):
 - i. 2001 – 2002 of 1.91 per cent
 - ii. 2003 – 2004 of 2.14 per cent

- iv. The boards in the **small cities group** reported the highest overall average student incidence (average of average):
 - i. 2001 – 2002 of 3.87 per cent (range of 2.90 to 6.36)
 - ii. 2003 – 2004 of 4.72 per cent (range of 3.43 to 7.95)

Appendix 7 (page 42) provides specific information for all of the 27 boards participating in the study. Based upon the evidence, it is extremely difficult to identify issues that would relate specifically to small urban boards.

e. Mild and moderate students

Under the Renewed Funding Framework, there is no designated special funding for students that are categorized as having mild or moderate disabilities and they are funded through the basic instructional grant. The gifted and talented are included in this group. Boards are required to code students that are determined to present mild and moderate disabilities, therefore incidence levels can be ascertained.

It is estimated that there is an approximately 10 per cent incidence level within the province. When there was an identification of a grant (03/04) it was deemed to be \$375 for funded student. Identification of funding for mild and moderate disabled students is no longer being done and the funding is part of the basic per student grant and its use is to be determined by the board. Based upon the information being provided by school boards across the province, the number of students being coded as mild and moderate is slightly declining. However, it is reported that a number of these students require significant and costly intervention although they do not meet the requirements, or definition, of being coded as severe. As a result, some additional funding is necessary to recognize the financial burden placed on jurisdictions in meeting the needs of students requiring additional supports.

f. Recommendations

It is recommended that the ASBA request the provincial government to:

- i. Review the individual profiles of school jurisdictions identifying the number of severely disabled student in order to ensure that they are up to date.

The jurisdiction profiles were established approximately five years ago and a review to determine if they are still valid.

- ii. Assess the wide range of student issues that are included in the mild and moderate disabilities category in order to determine if a new category is warranted in order to provide boards with the financial assistance to support these students.

SUMMARY

There is little doubt that small urban boards are under extreme pressure to secure the resources necessary to maintain the quality educational programs and services they are providing. The demands of parents, the needs of the students and initiatives of the provincial government challenge the board's ability to meet expectations and requirements.

It has been difficult to identify areas that are either specific or primarily applicable to small urban boards. Most of the problem areas that were identified through the meetings of the steering committee and members of boards included in the study, impact on the majority of school boards in the province, if not all.

Adequacy of funding appears to be the major issue facing all boards. Driven by demands, parental and community expectations and provincial requirements and having to meet these with inadequate funding, is a major challenge.

A number of the issues and concerns initially identified, as being primarily specific to small urban boards is not strongly supported by the data:

Teacher Salaries

- Teachers in small urban boards do not have increased years of teacher training – as of September 30, 2005 the average teacher weighted years of training was 4.77. Of the 27 boards in a study – 21 have lower average weighted years of teacher training and six had higher.
- Teachers in small urban boards did have more years of teacher experience than the weighted average for the province which was 8.20. Of the 27 boards in the study – 16 have a higher weighted average and 11 are lower.
- Average teacher salaries as of March 2006 in the province ranged from \$71,903 to \$59,143 for the 56 boards for which data was available. The median salary was for the 56 boards was 68,505. Of the boards in the small urban boards study – 13 were above the median salary and 10 were below.
- On a rank order of the C4Max + Benefits – 12 of the small urban boards in the study were above the median value and 11 were below.
- Teacher costs are slightly higher in the small urban boards overall – but it is difficult to make a compelling case based on this data.

Student Transportation

There does not appear to be a single issue that primarily affects the small urban boards.

- There are issues that affect all boards and these are:
 - 2.4 km walk eligibility for transportation funding,
 - no transportation funding for programs or schools of choice, and
 - eligibility to receive special education transportation funding.
- The 15-passenger van issue has been raised by some of the boards included in the study as being an issue for small urban boards, but this is a safety factor and the 15-passenger van safety record has been raised by the Alberta School Boards Insurance Exchange (ASBIE). Therefore it is not an issue specific to small urban boards but impacts on all boards that made use of such vans.

- The major drivers in determining student transportation issues and costs:
 - geographic factors – roadways, surrounding commercial and industrial areas, traffic patterns,
 - requests and expectations of parents,
 - board policy decisions, including the transportation of students not eligible for transportation funding, and
 - location of programs.

Capital

- Provincially this is an issue – facilities have not been maintained at the level that most boards would have deemed to be necessary.
- Location of schools in the wrong place – or not in the right place – it is hard to get accurate data on this – most of it is anecdotal – we know that new subdivisions are without schools and we also know that a number would not have a sufficient number of students to support a neighbourhood school.
- The reliance on, and lack of availability of, portables is a major issue for some boards. There is a critical need for a provincial policy for the scheduled replacement of portables.
- Student enrolment has not increased significantly in the majority of boards included in the study. In fact a number experienced a loss of students. However, a decline in student numbers does not result in decreased costs for the acquisition and maintenance of capital facilities.

Acquisition of Staff

On the survey regarding challenges related to acquiring staff that was completed for this study, no single area emerged as a problem or concern for all the 24 school boards that responded.

- 17 school boards did report difficulty in securing the services of qualified care-taking staff.
- 12 school boards said they experienced difficulty in securing qualified bus drivers.

Overall the results of this survey appear to be influenced by location within the province and with an unemployment rate provincially around 4.2 per cent, labour is in short supply.

- Small cities reported a slightly higher level of difficulty securing staff – including attracting teachers.
- All school boards reported the need to be proactive when it came to attracting staff.

Special Needs Students

A review of the material that was available did not indicate that there was an unusual concentration of special needs students in small urban centres.

- The boards in the “small cities group” reported the highest incidence level of severely disabled students.
- A review of the costing levels indicated that the “profile system” probably worked reasonably well.
- Data on the numbers of mild and moderate students are not reliable and difficult to compare differences between jurisdictions.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the ASBA request the provincial government to:

1. Reduce the 2.4 kilometer requirement for eligibility for transportation funding to 1 kilometer. The 2.4 kilometer requirement does not take into account safety concerns and parental expectations in today's environment. In urban settings a walk limit of 1 kilometer is much more reasonable and would better meet the needs and expectations of parents and students.
2. Support the costs of transporting students to programs of choice where boards have determined that choice is in the best interests of the student.
3. Review the cost pressures faced by small urban boards in providing student transportation services and determine if additional funding is required. Boards have been reporting that they anticipate significant increases in the cost of providing student transportation services and that provincial funding is inadequate. The increased costs can only be covered by increasing student transportation fees or transferring funds from other expenditure areas.
4. Reassess the requirements for the qualification to receive special education transportation funding.
5. Provide a timetable for the orderly repair and replacement of classroom portables.
6. Support the costs of acquiring, operating and maintaining non-school buildings.
7. Commit to upgrading school facilities and providing adequate support for maintenance and operation.
8. Clearly define the range of educational services and programs that the Renewed Funding Framework is intended to support.
9. Restore access by school boards to the local tax base in order to fund those programs and services that are not supported by the Renewed Funding Framework.
10. Review the individual student profiles of school jurisdictions identifying the number of severely disabled student eligible for provincial funding in order to ensure that they are up to date. The jurisdiction profiles were established approximately five years ago and a review to determine if they are still valid.
11. Assess the wide range of student issues that are included in the mild and moderate disabilities category in order to determine if a new category is warranted in order to provide boards with the financial assistance to support these students

Appendices

Appendix 1

Attendees at Initial Meeting on November 20, 2005

1. Red Deer Catholic Regional Division No. 39
Lloyd Baumgarten – Trustee
2. St. Albert PSSD No. 6
Morag Pansegrau – Board Chair
3. Fort McMurray RCSSD No. 32
Geraldine Carbery – Board Chair
4. Fort McMurray School District No. 2833
Rhonda Reich – Board Vice Chair
5. Grande Prairie Public School District No. 2357
John Lehnert – Board Chair
6. Grande Prairie RCSSD No. 28
Derek Dyck – Trustee
Karl Germann – School Superintendent
7. Holy Spirit RCS Regional Division No. 4
Arnie Bergen-Henengouwen – Trustee
8. Lethbridge School District No. 51
Maureen Calder – Board Chair
9. Medicine Hat School District No. 76
Gitta Hashizume – Board Chair
10. Red Deer Public Schools
Dick Lemke – Trustee
11. Battle River Regional Division No. 31
Brenda Herder – Board Chair
12. Wetaskiwin Regional Division No. 11
Rob Reimer – Board Chair
Terry Pearson – Superintendent
13. Grande Yellowhead Regional Division No. 35
Shirley Mahon – Board Chair
14. Living Waters Catholic Regional Division No. 42
Peggy Robinson – Trustee
15. Northern Lights School Division No. 69
Walter Hrycauk – Board Chair
16. St. Thomas Aquinas RCS Regional Division No. 38
Maria Lentz – Trustee

17. Wolf Creek School Division No. 72
Donna Peterson – Trustee
Karin Engen – Trustee
18. Elk Island CS Regional Division No. 41
Jean Boisvert – Board Vice-Chair
19. Rocky View School Division No. 41
Wendy Metzger – Trustee
20. Canadian Rockies Regional Division No. 12
Kim Bater – Board Chair
21. Chinook’s Edge School Division No. 73
Jackie Swainson – Board Chair
22. Elk Island PS Regional Division No. 14
Pat McLauchlan – Board Chair
23. Evergreen CSR Division No. 2
Caren Mueller – Board Chair
24. Foothills School Division No. 38
Jerry Muelaner – Board Chair
25. Greater St. Albert Catholic Regional Division No. 29
Rosaleen McEvoy – Board Vice-Chair
26. Northern Gateway Regional Division No. 10
Terry Slemko – Board Vice-Chair
27. Parkland School Division No. 70
Sharon Cornelius – Trustee

Support

Suzanne Lundrigan – Manager Communications
Kimberly Ayers – Administrative Assistant
Steve Cymbol – Consultant

Appendix 2

ASBA Policies and Directives for Action

The ASBA is currently addressing, or has addressed, some of the issues identified by the school boards participating in the small urban boards study. One of the criteria developed by the steering committee for taking an item forward for further study was that “The issue is not already addressed in ASBA policy”. Below is a listing of the relevant ASBA policies and directives for action.

4.P.01 Funding

The Alberta School Boards Association believes that the current level for funding of education does not meet the needs of students in Early Childhood Services to grade 12.

4.D.03 Funding (Special Needs Programs)

That the Alberta School Boards Association urge the Government of Alberta to enhance its commitment to provide necessary funding to meet the increasing needs of mild, moderate and severe disabled students.

4.P.04 Access (Core Education)

The Alberta School Boards Association believes that Alberta Education should establish a basic, core level of education and adequate funding to support the public education system so that all students in Alberta, regardless of **geographic** location, have access to quality public education.

4.D.06 Funding (Advocacy Plan to Increase)

That the Alberta School Boards Association continue its coordinated provincial advocacy plan to immediately increase government funding to education.

4.P.08 (Severe Special Needs)

The Alberta School Boards Association believes there should be additional funds allocated to the grade 1 – 12 Severe Special Needs category to allow for funding decisions for student programs that are consistent with Program Unit Funds that are available for students enrolled in ECS programs.

4.D.12 Funding (Capital Block)

The Alberta School Boards Association believes that the current capital block funding must be expanded to cover the costs of current debt, both principal and interest, owing on non instructional facilities and; That future consideration for funding construction of non instructional facilities - be it new construction, additions or modernization - be funded through Alberta Infrastructure following agreed-upon criteria similar to that established for instructional facilities.

5.D.01 Transportation Funding (Rural)

The Alberta School Boards Association believes the minimum distance limit for transportation funding for K-6 students should be reduced to 1.6 km (1 mile) from the designated school.

5.D.02 Transportation Grant Indexed to Fuel Cost Adjustments

Be it resolved that the ASBA urge Alberta Education to index transportation grants to the price of fuel.

6.D.01 Capital Funding

The Alberta School Boards Association endorses the recommendations identified in the Government of Alberta's "*Report on a New School Facilities Capital Plan*" and believes that the government should implement the remaining recommendations of the report immediately, namely to provide funding for:

1. the elimination of the current backlog of school maintenance and modernization projects without further delay, and
2. a separate pool of funds for maintaining and modernizing existing facilities. This fund would be equal to the private sector rate of 2 percent of facility replacement value as a baseline annual budget.

And further, the Alberta School Boards Association endorses the March 2005 report by Russ Wiebe entitled, "The Funding and Costs of Plant Operations and Maintenance in Alberta's Schools", and requests that government take immediate action to provide financial relief to the province's school boards.

6.P.04 Scheduled Replacement of Portable Classrooms

The Alberta School Boards Association supports the replacement, by Alberta Infrastructure, of portable classrooms on a scheduled basis.

6.D.14 Funding Model for School Board Capital Projects

That the ASBA request the Alberta government to change the current process of funding school board capital projects by creating, in consultation with ASBA, a funding model which gives school boards annual, sustained funding.

7EM/SGM 06 Funding of Alberta School Infrastructure Deficit

That, given the recently announced provincial government budget surplus, the ASBA request the Alberta government to provide immediate and sufficient additional funding for school modernization and capital projects to address the serious and growing infrastructure deficit affecting all school boards.

Appendix 3

Issues Identified by Boards in Attendance November 20, 2005

Small Cities

Steering Committee Representatives

Brenda Herder, Battle River

Rob Reimer, Wetaskiwin

Participating Boards

Battle River

Grande Yellowhead

Living Waters

Northern Lights

St. Thomas Aquinas

Wetaskiwin

Wolf Creek

Issues identified

Transportation

Rural vs urban transportation factor

- Loss of funding
- No “public” transportation available
- Ineligibility 2.4 km limit is unreasonable
- Low socio-economic cannot pay fees
- Route stays same but fewer students (funding decreases)
- Loss of special education designation transportation funding (stupid rule)

Declining enrolments

Resource based communities are growing quickly

Funding the capital component of small high schools

Funding programming for small high schools

Special needs

- Profile is outdated
- High percentages of students cannot be easily grouped because of distances

O and M funding

- Funding based on student numbers
- Needs to be combination of students and meterage

Capital funding

- Costs escalating

Human resources

- Not available: bus drivers, custodians, maintenance

Suburban

Steering Committee Representatives

Jean Boisvert, Elk Island Catholic Schools

Wendy Metzger, Rocky View School Division

Participating Boards

Canadian Rockies

Chinook's Edge

Elk Island Catholic

Elk Island Public

Evergreen

Foothills

Greater St. Albert Catholic

Northern Gateway

Parkland

Rocky View

Issues identified

Renewed funding framework:

- Mild and moderate needs
- Special needs
- First nations funding

Grants to special needs students K to Grade 1 (decrease in funding). Formula is incorrect -- boards heavily subsidize special needs/ Suburban boards are a "magnet" for special needs students due to lower living costs and availability of programs – small schools – better programs.

First nations funding: problem with self-designation.

Small schools by necessity

- Proximity to large urban areas

Transportation

- Funding model
- When center gets to 10K plus population funding changes. Walk limits rural vs urban funding

Small high schools/CEU's funding

- Comprehensive funding

Lower enrolment in rural areas

New categories --- ESL (sub-categories)

Infrastructure/Modernization/Facility utilization

Funding Framework disadvantages rural vs. urban vs metro. Capital needs

Unable to provide consistent program offerings throughout division/region

School of choice

Building schools in urban fringes

- Annexation concerns (by large cities)

How can we make win-win for community?

- Catholic and public schools in small communities

Technology

- Program choices

Class size initiatives

Staff teacher movements

- Rural vs. urban
- Dollars prof. staff grid

Transportation Special Needs Students

AUMA removal of Education Taxes

Major Urban Centres

Steering Committee Representatives

Lloyd Baumgarten, Red Deer Catholic

Morag Pansegrau, St. Albert Protestant Schools

Participating Boards

Ft. McMurray Catholic

Ft. McMurray Public

Grande Prairie Catholic

Grande Prairie Public

Holy Spirit

Lethbridge Public

Medicine Hat Public

Red Deer Catholic

Red Deer Public

St. Albert PSSD

Issues identified

Program magnets

Capital

Program competition

- Special needs funding
- Greener pastures
- Parental demands

PD opportunities re university proximity

Consortia funding

Rapid growth

- Classrooms
- Legislation class size initiative

Partner in community

(4 per cent cap on administrative costs inadequate)

Transportation issues

- Funding
- 15 passenger vans

Choice programs vs. transportation issues

Walk limits

Collaborative programs

Cost of living issues

Staff recruitment/retention
No PO&M for non-instructional buildings-administration and transportation
Average teacher costs
Support staff costs and issues
AUMA move on tax front
Funding framework (transitional)
Percent of special needs
ASEBP issues – this group of boards subsidizing other boards in ASEBP

Appendix 4

Issues Identified On November 20

(Grouped and categorized by steering committee)

Transportation

1. no public transportation system available – urban issue (might this be viewed as being rural as well?)
2. 2.4 km walk limit is unreasonable –urban issue and rural?
3. bus fees place an unreasonable burden on poor families – urban issue (might it be viewed as universal?)
4. as number of students decreases – bus route stays the same – but revenue declines – rural issue
5. special education designated transportation funding – stupid rule – universal issue
6. loss, or lack, of funding for transportation – universal issue
7. transportation system is not adequately funded – universal issue
8. change from to transportation funding when the population reaches 10,000 –urban
9. transportation of special needs students – universal
10. limit on the use of the 15 passenger vans – universal
11. transportation issues and lack of alternatives deter choice of programs – universal issue

Capital

1. funding capital component of small high schools – universal issue
2. funding is not keeping pace with the increased costs of capital requirements – universal issue
3. small schools by necessity – proximity to large urban centres – rural issue
4. infrastructure, modernization, facility utilization – universal issue
5. funding framework disadvantages rural vs. urban vs. metro - capital needs –rural issue (is there an urban component to this one as well?)
6. building schools in urban fringes – annexation concerns – urban issue
7. capital needs not being met – universal issue

PO&M Funding

1. funding is not adequate – needs to be placed on both student numbers and area – universal issue
2. no PO&M support for non-instructional buildings – universal issue

Special Education

1. jurisdiction profile (severely disabled) is not updated – universal issue
2. students cannot be easily grouped because of the distances between them and the facility where the program is being offered – rural issue and urban
3. mild and moderate needs not being addressed – universal issue
4. demand for special need services is higher because of increased numbers – magnet because of lower living costs – housing – program availability – small schools – urban issue and rural issue
5. percentage of special needs students – universal issue

Funding

1. funding programming for small high schools – universal issue
2. CEU funding – small high schools – universal issue
3. loss of enrolment in rural areas – resulting in fewer dollars – universal issue
4. class size initiatives – leads to an increase in the number of classrooms - universal issue
5. funding framework is transitional - universal

Growth

rapid growth in resource based communities – places a high demand on services and facilities (could also be bedroom communities) – urban issue

Human Resources

1. shortage of available staff – bus drivers, custodians, maintenance – universal issue
2. staff – teacher movement from rural to urban – impacts on grid placements – rural - urban issue
3. professional development opportunities due to location near universities – impact on grid placement – urban issue
4. staff recruitment/retention – universal issue
5. average teacher costs – universal issue
6. support staff costs and issues – universal issue

First Nations Funding

difficulty with self-identification – universal issue

ESL Funding

new sub-categories – universal issue

Other

1. technology – program choices - urban issue
2. schools of choice – urban issue
3. comprehensive funding – lower enrolment in rural areas (not sure what issue is being raised here)– rural issue
4. unable to provide consistent program offering throughout division/region – rural issue
5. how can we make a win-win for communities – Catholic and public schools in small communities – rural issue and urban issue
6. program competition – special needs, greener pastures, parental demands – universal issue
7. partner in community – 4 per cent cap on administration costs is not adequate – universal issue
8. collaborative programs (professional development) – universal issue
9. cost of living – universal issue

Appendix 5

Additional Issues Identified at the February 17 Meeting *(As submitted by participating boards and steering committee members)*

Red Deer Public

- We believe it is essential that the study restrict itself to issues that are specific to small urban boards only as opposed common issues faced by all jurisdictions in the province. Having said that, we believe major urban centres face a number of similar issues that metro boards do.
- Growth of new neighborhoods and awkward locations as population shifts: the need to have schools in the right neighbourhoods at the right time within changing communities.
- Concerns with jurisdiction boundaries: major urban centres often times serve students living in the “doughnut” communities surrounding the city. While considered “non-residents”, there is a desire and expectation by families that they can access education and related services in the urban jurisdiction.
- Transportation complexities: including duplication of transportation services, the need to be able to provide transportation services outside of boundaries, and potential need to consider establishment of a regional transportation authority.
- High incidence of students with highly complex needs: information provided in Appendix 5 of the Urban Boards Study (2004) confirms a higher incidence rate for students with severe disabilities in major urban centre, even more so than metro boards. We would appreciate updated information to assess the current situation.
- High incidence of high needs students from low socioeconomic backgrounds: urban centres face unique issues related to poverty, low socioeconomic status, aboriginal populations, new immigrants. Many of the students present special and unique needs.
- Lack of critical mass for economies of scale: there are expectations to offer a wide and full range of programs and services yet limited numbers affect their viability and feasibility.
- Lack of identifiable equity factors in the funding formula magnifies the per student funding shortfall.
- Lack of a voice with government and within the ASBA (both at the zone and provincial level): there are challenges in articulating the unique perspectives of major urban centres when you are the only jurisdiction of this type in the zone. We believe there is the need to establish a separate Major Urban Zone within the ASBA to allow these jurisdictions to work together on issues and provided a common voice.

Grande Yellowhead

- Availability (or lack of) portables in order to meet class size initiative.

Northern Lights

- Federal Funding for aboriginals special education is severely lacking, thus we are trying to compensate for this shortfall by spending our provincial grant money on this and cluster grouping kids as a necessity in order to help them all on our thin dime. The Federal government has to not only recognize this but also increase the funding for these students which would free up some of our resources. (They felt that this wasn't outlined clearly enough in the summary of the November meeting.)

Living Waters

- Commented that transportation isn't an issue for them since it is contracted out to the public board.
- Increasing enrolments was their main concern.

Battle River

- Population decline affects funding levels, provision of alternative programs a challenge and the expectation of transportation to go with it.
- Difficult to allocate dollars to schools when have the economy of scale in the city yet have small schools in sparse areas who are unable to see this same advantage.

St. Albert Protestant Public

- Class size initiative – provincial driven, but boards have to cover the cost, often means split grades in small schools.
- Teacher salaries and placement on the grid, urban areas are attractive living places and thus teachers are expensive and if close to a university, easy to get to 6th year and thus, very expensive teachers.
- Funding for mild and moderate insufficient as numbers are growing.
- Cost of living in metro areas and standards of living – high teachers expectations.
- Economy of scale – none, often not practical in small urban areas, compared to large city boards.
- Very high parental expectations – academic and other extra programs and services are expected/demanded; also parents expect before and after school care but new class initiative has forced us to take this space back for classrooms.
- Cost of support staff salaries – experts reside in the metro areas – competition for trades persons – means increased wage demands and difficulty in getting and keeping support staff; have to also compete with neighbouring districts – CUPE contracts, they compare what we pay to what neighbouring Boards pay, but some of us have all our staff with CUPE whereas neighbouring more has 'contracted out' which keeps labour costs down.

- Job opportunities out of the district – hard to get and keep staff – other job opportunities.
- School closures vs. growth in new sub divisions – schools are in the wrong places and parents still want/expect neighbourhood schools.
- Bussing – walk limits, major road ways, no efficient local public – means expensive transportation costs and have to compete with neighbouring school districts – parental choice, they shop around; parent concern over student safety, may be over concern – paranoia, but means parents want door-to-door bussing and cannot ask students to use local transit buses as they are not available.
- Basic funding is insufficient – falling behind – a redistribution only – Peter to pay Paul – those boards such as St. Albert which are ‘normal’ do not get any extra money from other factors therefore it is essential that the basic funding grant is sufficient otherwise they fall behind boards that get \$ from these factors – a very big concern for ‘normal’ small urban boards such as St. Albert – every student in the province is entitled to the same level of education, needs to be more room in provincial formula to address local needs.
- Special interagency funding is insufficient to meet student needs; we think we have more special needs students in urban areas than in rural areas.
- Small rural schools cost the rest of us money as money comes out of the total pot available for public education and these boards now have no incentive to close small schools.
- Utilization formula – not appropriate today; when you get a new school you have same number of students but have to pay costs of running another building; urban areas are growth areas for new schools/student numbers increasing compared to rural schools which are in decline.
- No support for non-teaching buildings (especially outreach schools which cater to needs of at risk students – desire to raise high school completion figures).
- Lack of voice in ASBA for small urban boards.

Competition – re parental choice – more money has to be spent on marketing schools in our current competitive model of education (government driven) – competition not only between jurisdictions but also within jurisdictions.

Appendix 6

Charts illustrating committee assessment and assignment of issues identified by board representatives at November 20 meeting and subsequently by individual boards and steering committee members

The committee assessed each issues as **universal** (affecting all boards in the province); **urban** (affecting the study group); **rural** (affecting geographic area outside of an urban area)

Transportation				
Issue	Universal	Rural	Urban	Comment
No public transportation system available		√	√	
2.4 km walk limit is unreasonable		√	√	
Bus fees place an unreasonable burden on poor families	√			
As number of students decreases – bus route stays the same – but revenue declines		√	√	
Special education designated transportation funding – stupid rule	√			
Loss, or lack, of funding for transportation	√			
Transportation system is not adequately funded	√			
Change from/to different transportation funding when the population reaches 10,000			√	
Transportation of special needs students	√			
Limit on the use of the 15 passenger vans	√			
Transportation issues and lack of alternatives deter choice of programs	√			

Capital				
Issue	Universal	Rural	Urban	Comment
Funding capital component of small high schools	√			
Funding is not keeping pace with the increased costs of capital requirements	√			
Small schools by necessity – proximity to large urban centres		√		
Infrastructure, modernization, facility utilization	√			
Funding framework disadvantages rural vs urban vs metro - capital needs		√	√	
Building schools in urban fringes – annexation concerns			√	
Capital needs not being met	√			

PO&M Funding				
Issue	Universal	Rural	Urban	Comment
Funding is not adequate – needs to be placed on both student numbers and area	√			
No PO&M support for non-instructional buildings	√			

Special Education				
Issue	Universal	Rural	Urban	Comment
Jurisdiction profile (severely disabled) is not updated	√			
Students cannot be easily grouped because of the distances between them and the facility where the program is being offered		√	√	
Mild and moderate needs not being addressed	√			
Demand for special need services is higher because of increased numbers magnet because of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lower living costs - housing - program availability - small schools 		√	√	
Percentage of special needs students	√			

Funding				
Issue	Universal	Rural	Urban	Comment
Funding programming for small high schools	√			
CEU funding – small high schools	√			
Loss of enrolment in rural areas– resulting in fewer dollars	√			
Class size initiatives – leads to an increase in the number of classrooms	√			
Funding framework is transitional	√			

Growth				
Issue	Universal	Rural	Urban	Comment
Rapid growth in resource based communities – places a high demand on services and facilities (could also be bedroom communities)			√	

Human Resources				
Issue	Universal	Rural	Urban	Comment
Shortage of available staff – bus drivers, custodians, maintenance	√			
Staff – teacher movement from rural to urban – impacts on grid placements		√	√	
Professional development opportunities due to location near universities			√	
Staff recruitment/retention	√			
Average teacher costs	√			
Support staff costs and issues	√			

First Nations Funding				
Issue	Universal	Rural	Urban	Comment
Difficulty with self-identification	√			

ESL Funding				
Issue	Universal	Rural	Urban	Comment
New sub-categories	√			

Other				
Issue	Universal	Rural	Urban	Comment
Technology – program choices			√	
Schools of choice			√	<i>Impact of being close to regions that offer choice</i>
Comprehensive funding – lower enrolment in rural areas		√		
Unable to provide consistent program offering throughout division/region	√			
How can we make a win-win for communities Catholic and public schools in small communities		√	√	
Program competition – special needs, greener pastures, parental demands	√			
Partnership role in communities – (4 per cent cap on administration costs is not adequate to support participation by central office staff)	√			
Collaborative programs (Professional development)	√			
Cost of living	√			

Issues submitted subsequent to the November 20 meeting

Additional issues submitted by participating boards	Response
Focus study on issues that impact small urban boards	Steering committee to consider
Challenge of responding to shifting populations	Explore in infrastructure section
Serve doughnut communities – responding to expectations	Explore in pressures facing urban centers
Transportation: duplication of service, service beyond boundaries	Explore in transportation section
High incidence of students with complex special needs	Explore in study
High incidence of students with complex needs/low socio economic backgrounds	Explore in study
Lack of economies of scale for urban centres	Explore in pressures facing urban centers
Lack of identifiable equity factors – in the funding formula magnifies per student funding shortfall	Explore in section dealing with the funding framework
Lack of vice with government and within the ASBA	Address in review of ASBA governance
Availability/lack of portables to respond to class size initiative	Explore in infrastructure section
Federal funding for aboriginal students severely lacking	One-off issue
Dealing with declining enrolments	
Jurisdictions serving urban and rural areas imbalance of economies of scale – challenge of allocating dollars	Explore in pressures facing urban centres
Class size initiative	Explore in infrastructure section
Teacher salaries and placement on grid in areas close to university – teachers get sixth year – expensive on salary grid	Explore in section on staff costs
Funding for mild and moderate	Explore in study
Cost of living in metro areas and standards of living – teacher expectations	Include in pressures facing urban centres
No economies of scale in urban areas as compared with metro areas	Include in pressures facing urban centres
Cost of support staff salaries, competition for staff with neighbouring jurisdictions	Include in section on staff costs
Hard to get and keep staff	Include in section on staff costs
Schools in wrong places and parents expect neighbourhood schools	Include in infrastructure section
Transportation – walk limits, crossing major roadways, no efficient public transport	Include in transportation section
School boards who don't have “special” factors not rewarded through funding framework	Include in funding framework section
No incentive to close small schools in rural areas with support funding	
Utilization formula not appropriate – growth areas	Include in infrastructure section
No funding for non-teaching buildings	Include in infrastructure section
Competition with other jurisdictions and within jurisdiction for students	Include in pressures facing urban centres

Appendix 7

Special Education

1. Severe Disabilities Funding

Background

Prior to the 2001 – 2002 school year, funding was provided to jurisdictions based upon the number of students that were specifically identified as falling into one of the defined severely disabled categories. The amount of funding per student varied from category to category. The process was deemed to be too time consuming and costly. In response to the concerns that were being raised in regard to the special education area by jurisdictions, schools, parents and special interest organizations, the Minister of Learning called for a complete review.

A committee consisting of members from a wide range of interests was formed and requested to conduct a review into funding procedures for special education. The initial purpose of the review was to discover ways to streamline administrative processes and reduce unnecessary paperwork for school authorities. A report entitled, *Shaping the Future for Students with Special Needs: A Review of Special Education in Alberta: Final Report*, was produced and submitted to the Minister for action.

For students with severe disabilities, the following recommendations were made:

- The current funding model for students with severe disabilities should be changed.
- Alberta Learning, in collaboration with school jurisdictions, should establish an individual jurisdiction profile that includes historical data on students with severe disabilities served plus a pattern of growth over the past five years of students with severe disabilities. Based on the pattern of growth over the past five years, projections for funding additional students would be included.
- For school jurisdictions, whose profile changes significantly, Alberta Learning, in collaboration with the jurisdiction, would review the profile and adjust funding either way.
- During the 2000/2001 school year, Alberta Learning should phase-in the model, as appropriate, with school jurisdictions to learn how well this model of funding works prior to full implementation.
- Additional funding should be provided to increase the rate of funding for students with severe emotional/behavioral disabilities to the same level for all students with severe disabilities.

Concern has been expressed by a number of school jurisdictions that the profiles are not current and do not accurately reflect the number of students that are severely disabled and are receiving, or require, service. There is a provision that permits a school jurisdiction to request that Alberta Education undertake an audit if it feels that the incidence level is not correct. However, jurisdictions whose incidence is below the established department level are not inclined to request an audit. Therefore, it is believed that there is a level of unfairness occurring across the province – there are some school jurisdictions that are benefiting from the profile approach to providing funding.

Based on data provided by the school jurisdictions participating in the small urban boards study to Alberta Education, the following observations can be made:

1. The incidence level in the 2001 – 2002 school year ranged from a low of .84 to a high of 6.36.
2. The incidence level in the 2003 – 2004 school year ranged from a low of .96 to a high of 7.95.
3. The average cost per student in the 2001 – 2002 school year ranged from a low of \$4,931 to a high of \$35,456.
4. The average cost per student in the 2003 – 2004 school year ranged from a low of \$9,720 to a high of \$32,916.
5. The boards in the “suburban group” reported the lowest overall average student incidence (an average of averages):
 - a. 2001 – 2002 of 1.91 per cent
 - b. 2003 – 2004 of 2.14 per cent
6. The boards in the “small cities group” reported the highest overall average student incidence (an average of averages):
 - a. 2001 – 2002 of 3.87 per cent
 - b. 2003 – 2004 of 4.72 per cent
7. The boards in the major urban reported an overall student incidence level average of (an average of averages):
 - a. 2001 – 2002 of 2.72 per cent
 - b. 2003 – 2004 of 3.13 per cent
8. The overall provincial funding provided to severely disabled funding in 2004 – 2005 was approximately \$216,000,000 or 6.12 per cent of the total funding received by school boards.
9. The incidence levels in the jurisdiction profiles have been increased by the province every year since profiles were instituted:

2002 – 2003 = 10 per cent

2003 – 2004 = 8 per cent

2004 – 2005 = 7 per cent

2005 – 2006 = 4 per cent

10. The provincial incidence levels were:

2001 – 2002 = 2.29 per cent

2002 – 2003 = 2.51 per cent

2003 – 2004 = 2.72 per cent

2004 – 2005 = 2.92 per cent

Small Cities

1. Battle River Regional Division No. 31

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:
- | | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | 4.19 per cent | \$12,422.60 per student |
| 2003 – 2004 | 5.13 per cent | \$13,439.94 per student |
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue:
- | | |
|-------------|-------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | (\$227,724) |
| 2003 – 2004 | (\$21,478) |

2. Grande Yellowhead Regional Division No. 35

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:
- | | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | 3.09 per cent | \$11,070.61 per student |
| 2003 – 2004 | 3.89 per cent | \$13,563.58 per student |
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue
- | | |
|-------------|------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | \$123,215 |
| 2003 – 2004 | (\$37,969) |

3. Living Waters CRD No. 42

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:
- | | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | 3.21 per cent | \$17,475.45 per student |
| 2003 – 2004 | 3.76 per cent | \$19,799.12 per student |
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue
- | | |
|-------------|-------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | (\$416,038) |
| 2003 – 2004 | (\$541,604) |

4. Northern Light SD No. 69

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:
- | | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | 4.34 per cent | \$11,430.85 per student |
| 2003 – 2004 | 5.32 per cent | \$13,382.00 per student |
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue
- | | |
|-------------|-------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | \$0 |
| 2003 – 2004 | (\$361,703) |

5. St. Thomas Aquinas RCSR No. 38

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:
- | | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | 3.01 per cent | \$13,794.29 per student |
| 2003 – 2004 | 3.43 per cent | \$15,372.71 per student |

- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$116,058)
2003 – 2004	(\$89,367)

6. Wetaskiwin Regional Division No. 11

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	6.36 per cent	\$11,922.58 per student
2003 – 2004	7.95 per cent	\$17,540.70 per student
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$44,091)
2003 – 2004	(\$1,279,633)

7. Wolf Creek SD No. 72

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	2.90 per cent	\$12,139.43 per student
2003 – 2004	3.55 per cent	\$16,944.54 per student
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	\$12,673
2003 – 2004	(\$761,187)

Suburban

1. Canadian Rockies RD No. 12

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	2.76 per cent	\$13,339.85 per student
2003 – 2004	1.95 per cent	\$24,213.26 per student
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$115,093)
2003 – 2004	(\$455,995)

2. Chinook's Edge SD No. 73

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	2.08 per cent	\$13,838.04 per student
2003 – 2004	2.54 per cent	\$14,903.85 per student
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$470,621)
2003 – 2004	(\$369,723)

3. Elk Island Catholic CSRD No. 41

a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	2.47 per cent	\$20,075.38 per student
2003 – 2004	2.89 per cent	\$24,207.35 per student

b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$1,166,357)
2003 – 2004	(\$1,572,232)

4. Elk Island PSRD No. 14

a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	2.22 per cent	\$18,701.40 per student
2003 – 2004	2.64 per cent	\$14,429.24 per student

b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$2,196,175)
2003 – 2004	(\$428,009)

5. Evergreen CSRD No. 2

a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	1.25 per cent	\$25,988.38 per student
2003 – 2004	1.43 per cent	\$32,916.70 per student

b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$363,040)
2003 – 2004	(\$603,621)

6. Foothills SD No. 38

a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	1.97 per cent	\$13,744.17 per student
2003 – 2004	2.37 per cent	\$28,153.37 per student

b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$225,499)
2003 – 2004	(\$2,199,959)

7. Greater St. Albert CRD No. 29

a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	1.46 per cent	\$27,995.43 per student
2003 – 2004	1.83 per cent	\$27,395.22 per student

b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$1,682,576)
2003 – 2004	(\$1,781,081)

8. Northern Gateway RD No. 10

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:
- | | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | 2.30 per cent | \$15,462.85 per student |
| 2003 – 2004 | 2.75 per cent | \$20,145.65 per student |
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue
- | | |
|-------------|-------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | (\$445,355) |
| 2003 – 2004 | (\$996,285) |

9. Parkland SD No. 70

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:
- | | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | 1.70 per cent | \$11,487.07 per student |
| 2003 – 2004 | 2.00 per cent | \$13,907.90 per student |
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue
- | | |
|-------------|-----------|
| 2001 – 2002 | \$125,257 |
| 2003 – 2004 | (\$8,507) |

10. Rocky View SD No. 41

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:
- | | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | 0.84 per cent | \$22,775.56 per student |
| 2003 – 2004 | 0.96 per cent | \$24,567.03 per student |
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue
- | | |
|-------------|---------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | (\$1,219,947) |
| 2003 – 2004 | (\$1,541,297) |

Major Urban

1. Ft. McMurray RCSSD No. 33

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:
- | | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | 2.32 per cent | \$16,727.23 per student |
| 2003 – 2004 | 2.54 per cent | \$22,963.28 per student |
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue
- | | |
|-------------|-------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | (\$427,745) |
| 2003 – 2004 | (\$956,211) |

2. Ft. McMurray SD No. 2833

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:
- | | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 2001 – 2002 | 4.43 per cent | \$12,588.02 per student |
| 2003 – 2004 | 5.09 per cent | \$9,720.41 per student |

- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$120,256)
2003 – 2004	(\$956,211)

3. Grande Prairie RDSSD No. 28

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	2.07 per cent	\$4,931.80 per student
2003 – 2004	1.44 per cent	\$13,724.12 per student
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$88,306)
2003 – 2004	(\$15,839)

4. Grande Prairie SD No. 2575

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	1.27 per cent	\$35,456.23 per student
2003 – 2004	2.52 per cent	\$13,405.70 per student
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$52,726)
2003 – 2004	(\$3,183)

5. Holy Spirit CSRD No. 4

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	3.11 per cent	\$11,415.74 per student
2003 – 2004	3.65 per cent	\$13,272.70 per student
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	\$0
2003 – 2004	\$0

6. Lethbridge SD No. 51

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	2.72 per cent	\$14,743.26 per student
2003 – 2004	3.21 per cent	\$15,241.03 per student
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$583,133)
2003 – 2004	(\$475,567)

7. Medicine Hat SD. No. 76

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	1.75 per cent	\$15,584.84 per student
2003 – 2004	2.07 per cent	\$19,816.22 per student

- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$452,448)
2003 – 2004	(\$475,567)

8. Red Deer CRD No. 39

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	4.30 per cent	\$10,887.63 per student
2003 – 2004	4.64 per cent	\$10,777.16 per student
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	\$92,103
2003 – 2004	\$643,656

9. Red Deer Public Schools

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	3.21 per cent	\$14,102.68 per student
2003 – 2004	3.76 per cent	\$15,546.77 per student
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$747,037)
2003 – 2004	(\$669,521)

10. St. Albert PSSD No. 6

- a. Incidence of Severely Disabled Students reported and cost:

2001 – 2002	2.04 per cent	\$12,010.09 per student
2003 – 2004	2.37 per cent	\$11,746.16 per student
- b. Cost in comparison to revenue

2001 – 2002	(\$21,714)
2003 – 2004	\$248,811

Provincial

2001 – 2003
 Incidence rate 2.29 per cent
 Cost \$13,491
 Cost over revenue (\$17,807,705)

2003 – 2004
 Incidence rate 2.72 per cent
 Cost \$15,265
 Cost over revenue (\$19,262,010)

2. Mild and Moderate Disabilities Funding

Under the current funding framework there is no designated funding for students that are categorized as having mild or moderate disabilities – the gifted and talented are included in this group. However boards are required to code students that are determined to present mild and moderate disabilities.

The exception is ECS where there is earmarked funding for students do receive additional funding if they are coded as being mild/moderate. The rates are as follows:

2004 – 2005 = \$2,154.00

2005 – 2006 = \$2,197.00

For the boards participating in the small urban boards study the average percentage of ECS students classified as being mild/moderate during the period 1997 – 2005 is as follows:

Small Cities

1. Battle River Regional Division No. 31	7.05 per cent
2. Grande Yellowhead Regional Division No. 35	15.24 per cent
3. Living Waters CRD No. 42	11.33 per cent
4. Northern Light SD No. 69	18.17 per cent
5. St. Thomas Aquinas RCSR No. 38	11.37 per cent
6. Wetaskiwin Regional Division No. 11	11.71 per cent
7. Wolf Creek SD No. 72	13.09 per cent

Suburban

1. Canadian Rockies RD No. 12	19.50 per cent
2. Chinook's Edge SD No. 73	12.93 per cent
3. Elk Island Catholic CSR No. 41	9.33 per cent
4. Elk Island PSRD No. 14	12.88 per cent
5. Evergreen CSR No. 2	4.56 per cent
6. Foothills SD No. 38	9.11 per cent
7. Greater St. Albert CRD No. 29	8.21 per cent
8. Northern Gateway RD No. 10	10.48 per cent
9. Parkland SD No. 70	8.12 per cent
10. Rocky View SD No. 41	17.61 per cent

Major Urban

1. Ft. McMurray RCSSD No. 33	31.98 per cent
2. Ft. McMurray SD No. 2833	31.91 per cent
3. Grande Prairie RDSSD No. 28	15.64 per cent
4. Grande Prairie SD No. 2575	15.88 per cent
5. Holy Spirit CSR No. 4	15.60 per cent
6. Lethbridge SD No. 51	18.05 per cent
7. Medicine Hat SD. No. 76	17.21 per cent
8. Red Deer CRD No. 39	24.33 per cent
9. Red Deer Public Schools	7.25 per cent
10. St. Albert PSSD No. 6	8.38 per cent

It is extremely difficult to obtain comparable information on the number of mild and moderate students – grades 1 to 12 – are in the province. Some comparable information was sought during the course of the metro study, but this proved to be extremely difficult. For example, the non-metro boards reported 16.3 per cent of their students as mild/moderate or gifted and talented in 2001 – 2002. In 2003 – 2004, the number reported was 10.6 per cent. In terms of student numbers, there was a decline of 15,407 in two years from 44,756 to 29,349.

A major problem in dealing with the entire issue of special needs students is the lack of comparable information from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Appendix 8
2005/06 C4 Max + Benefits
Ranked by Salary
As of May 17, 2006

Note: Jurisdictions participating in the small urban boards study are underlined.

1. NORTHLAND SD	\$81,742	30. LIVINGSTONE RANGE SD	\$78,683
2. <u>FORT MCMURRAY PUBLIC</u>	\$81,245	31. <u>NORTHERN GATEWAY RD</u>	\$78,683
3. <u>MEDICINE HAT SD</u>	\$79,888	32. CHRIST THE REDEEMER CSRD	\$78,678
4. FORT VERMILION SD	\$79,684	33. <u>FOOTHILLS SD</u>	\$78,652
5. PEACE RIVER SD	\$79,584	34. <u>ST. THOMAS AQUINAS RCSRD</u>	\$78,650
6. <u>FORT MCMURRAY RCSSD</u>	\$79,507	35. BUFFALO TRAIL RD	\$78,631
7. <u>LIVING WATERS CRD</u>	\$79,493	36. <u>NORTHERN LIGHTS SD</u>	\$78,609
8. <u>GRANDE PRAIRIE RCSSD</u>	\$79,458	37. ST. PAUL ERD	\$78,580
9. PEACE WAPITI RD	\$79,352	38. NORTH-WEST FRANC. ER #1	\$78,564
10. CALGARY RCSSD	\$79,325	39. GRASSLANDS RD	\$78,544
11. MEDICINE HAT CSRD	\$79,163	40. <u>RED DEER PUBLIC SCHOOLS</u>	\$78,530
12. <u>GREATER ST. ALBERT CRD</u>	\$79,140	41. <u>BATTLE RIVER RD</u>	\$78,518
13. LAKELAND RCSSD	\$79,038	42. PEMBINA HILLS RD	\$78,497
14. GREATER SOUTHERN SEPARATE	\$78,994	43. PALLISER RD	\$78,491
15. EAST CENTRAL ALBERTA CSSD	\$78,972	44. <u>HOLY SPIRIT CSRD</u>	\$78,489
16. STURGEON SD	\$78,957	45. <u>LETHBRIDGE SD</u>	\$78,487
17. GREATER SOUTHERN PUBLIC	\$78,922	46. EAST CENTRAL FRANC. ER #3	\$78,486
18. GREATER NORTH CENTRAL	\$78,920	47. <u>GRANDE YELLOWHEAD RD</u>	\$78,386
19. <u>ST. ALBERT PSSD</u>	\$78,895	48. EDMONTON CRD	\$78,360
20. HOLY FAMILY CRD	\$78,874	49. CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION	\$78,356
21. <u>WETASKIWIN RD</u>	\$78,849	50. EDMONTON SD	\$78,315
22. PRAIRIE LAND RD	\$78,828	51. <u>ELK ISLAND PSRD</u>	\$78,250
23. <u>PARKLAND SD</u>	\$78,807	52. ASPEN VIEW RD	\$78,204
24. <u>RED DEER RCSSD</u>	\$78,773	53. BLACK GOLD RD	\$78,098
25. <u>WOLF CREEK RD</u>	\$78,732	54. HORIZON SD	\$78,068
26. WILD ROSE SD	\$78,722	55. <u>ROCKY VIEW SD</u>	\$77,845
27. <u>ELK ISLAND CSRD</u>	\$78,718	56. CLEARVIEW SD	\$77,835
28. <u>CHINOOK'S EDGE RD</u>	\$78,700	57. WESTWIND SD	\$77,794
29. HIGH PRAIRIE SD	\$78,687	58. PRAIRIE ROSE SD	\$77,774

Data was not available and therefore not included for the following 4 school boards:

CANADIAN ROCKIES
EVERGREEN RD

GRANDE PRAIRIE PUBLIC
GOLDEN HILLS

Appendix 8
2006/07 C4 Max + Benefits
Ranked Salary
As of May 17, 2006

Note: Jurisdictions participating in the small urban boards study are underlined.

1. NORTHLAND SD	\$84,765	22. <u>NORTHERN GATEWAY RD</u>	\$81,303
2. <u>FORT MCMURRAY PUBLIC SD</u>	\$83,738	23. <u>WOLF CREEK RD</u>	\$81,255
3. <u>MEDICINE HAT SD</u>	\$82,636	24. <u>FOOTHILLS SD</u>	\$81,247
4. PEACE RIVER SD	\$82,121	25. <u>ST. ALBERT PSSD</u>	\$81,237
5. <u>LIVING WATERS CRD</u>	\$82,069	26. GREATER SOUTHERN PUBLIC	\$81,232
6. STURGEON SD	\$81,827	27. GREATER NORTH CENTRAL	\$81,229
7. PEACE WAPITI RD	\$81,785	28. PALLISER RD	\$81,211
8. <u>FORT MCMURRAY RCSSD</u>	\$81,762	29. CHRIST THE REDEEMER CSRD	\$81,198
9. <u>GREATER ST. ALBERT CRD</u>	\$81,588	30. LIVINGSTONE RANGE SD	\$81,145
10. MEDICINE HAT CSRD	\$81,588	31. <u>GRANDE YELLOWHEAD RD</u>	\$81,139
11. ST. THOMAS AQUINAS RCSRD	\$81,472	32. GREATER SOUTHERN SEPARATE	\$81,132
12. LAKELAND RCSSD	\$81,427	33. ST. PAUL ERD	\$81,086
13. <u>ELK ISLAND CSRD</u>	\$81,399	34. <u>BATTLE RIVER RD</u>	\$81,031
14. <u>HOLY SPIRIT CSRD</u>	\$81,382	35. <u>RED DEER RCSSD</u>	\$81,027
15. <u>LETHBRIDGE SD</u>	\$81,378	36. GRASSLANDS RD	\$80,949
16. PRAIRIE LAND RD	\$81,373	37. CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION	\$80,914
17. <u>WETASKIWIN RD</u>	\$81,346	38. <u>ROCKY VIEW SD</u>	\$80,720
18. <u>ELK ISLAND PSRD</u>	\$81,344	39. PRAIRIE ROSE SD	\$80,178
19. EAST CENTRAL ALBERTA CSSD	\$81,341	40. CLEARVIEW SD	\$79,848
20. HIGH PRAIRIE SD	\$81,322	41. WESTWIND SD	\$79,436
21. EDMONTON CRD	\$81,322		

Data was not available and therefore not included for the following 21 school boards:

ASPEN VIEW RD	EDMONTON SD	HORIZON SD
BLACK GOLD RD	<u>EVERGREEN RD</u>	<u>NORTHERN LIGHTS SD</u>
BUFFALO TRAIL RD	FORT VERMILION SD	NORTH-WEST FRANC. ER #1
CALGARY RCSSD	GOLDEN HILLS	<u>PARKLAND SD</u>
<u>CANADIAN ROCKIES</u>	<u>GRANDE PRAIRIE PUBLIC</u>	PEMBINA HILLS RD
<u>CHINOOK'S EDGE RD</u>	<u>GRANDE PRAIRIE RCSSD</u>	<u>RED DEER PUBLIC SCHOOLS</u>
EAST CENTRAL FRANC. ER #3	HOLY FAMILY CRD	WILD ROSE SD

Appendix 9 2005/06 Average Salary

Ranked Salary

As of May 17, 2006

1. EAST CENTRAL ALBERTA CSSD	\$71,903	30. BLACK GOLD RD	\$68,389
2. LIVINGSTONE RANGE SD	\$71,784	31. <u>PARKLAND SD</u>	\$68,306
3. PALLISER RD	\$70,547	32. <u>ST. ALBERT PSSD</u>	\$68,178
4. PEACE RIVER SD	\$70,069	33. <u>WETASKIWIN RD</u>	\$68,149
5. PRAIRIE ROSE SD	\$69,995	34. <u>ST. THOMAS AQUINAS RCSR</u>	\$68,139
6. <u>RED DEER PUBLIC SCHOOLS</u>	\$69,723	35. CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION	\$67,934
7. WESTWIND SD	\$69,709	36. EDMONTON SD	\$67,930
8. <u>WOLF CREEK RD</u>	\$69,501	37. EDMONTON CRD	\$67,799
9. <u>BATTLE RIVER RD</u>	\$69,468	38. BUFFALO TRAIL RD	\$67,683
10. CLEARVIEW SD	\$69,403	39. <u>ROCKY VIEW SD</u>	\$67,346
11. PRAIRIE LAND RD	\$69,384	40. ASPEN VIEW RD	\$67,147
12. PEMBINA HILLS RD	\$69,300	41. <u>FORT MCMURRAY PUBLIC</u>	\$66,972
13. MEDICINE HAT CSR	\$69,226	42. CALGARY RCSSD	\$66,968
14. WILD ROSE SD	\$69,183	43. FORT VERMILION SD	\$66,913
15. <u>ELK ISLAND PSRD</u>	\$69,141	44. ST. PAUL ERD	\$66,721
16. <u>MEDICINE HAT PSD</u>	\$68,924	45. HORIZON SD	\$66,379
17. PEACE WAPITI RD	\$68,913	46. <u>LIVING WATERS CRD</u>	\$66,221
18. <u>GRANDE YELLOWHEAD RD</u>	\$68,852	47. <u>NORTHERN LIGHTS SD</u>	\$66,120
19. <u>CHINOOK'S EDGE RD</u>	\$68,810	48. <u>GRANDE PRAIRIE RCSSD</u>	\$65,841
20. GRASSLANDS RD	\$68,810	49. <u>FORT MCMURRAY RCSSD</u>	\$65,356
21. <u>HOLY SPIRIT CSR</u>	\$68,780	50. LAKELAND RCSSD	\$64,889
22. <u>LETHBRIDGE SD</u>	\$68,678	51. <u>RED DEER RCSSD</u>	\$64,307
23. <u>NORTHERN GATEWAY RD</u>	\$68,628	52. EAST CENTRAL FRANC. ER #3	\$64,211
24. <u>ELK ISLAND CSR</u>	\$68,571	53. GREATER NORTH CENTRAL	\$63,971
25. STURGEON SD	\$68,551	54. HOLY FAMILY CRD	\$63,752
26. <u>FOOTHILLS SD</u>	\$68,549	55. GREATER SOUTHERN PUBLIC	\$62,592
27. HIGH PRAIRIE SD	\$68,515	56. NORTH-WEST FRANC. ER #1	\$61,818
28. NORTHLAND SD	\$68,506	57. CHRIST THE REDEEMER CSR	\$61,464
29. <u>GREATER ST. ALBERT CRD</u>	\$68,505	58. GREATER SOUTHERN SEPARATE	\$59,143

Data was not available and therefore not included for the following 4 school boards:

CANADIAN ROCKIES

EVERGREEN RD

GRANDE PRAIRIE PUBLIC

GOLDEN HILLS

Appendix 9 2006/07 Average Salary

Ranked Salary

As of May 17, 2006

1. LIVINGSTONE RANGE SD	\$73,794	22. GREATER SOUTHERN PUBLIC	\$70,633
2. EAST CENTRAL ALBERTA CSSD	\$73,731	23. <u>FOOTHILLS SD</u>	\$70,592
3. PALLISER RD	\$72,495	24. NORTHLAND SD	\$70,575
4. PEACE RIVER SD	\$72,137	25. EDMONTON CRD	\$70,552
5. <u>WOLF CREEK RD</u>	\$71,825	26. HIGH PRAIRIE SD	\$70,502
6. PRAIRIE ROSE SD	\$71,752	27. STURGEON SD	\$70,447
7. PRAIRIE LAND RD	\$71,627	28. <u>WETASKIWIN RD</u>	\$70,319
8. <u>ELK ISLAND PSRD</u>	\$71,579	29. <u>ST. THOMAS AQUINAS RCSRD</u>	\$70,283
9. <u>BATTLE RIVER RD</u>	\$71,413	30. CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION	\$70,105
10. MEDICINE HAT CSRD	\$71,303	31. <u>ST. ALBERT PSSD</u>	\$70,058
11. CLEARVIEW SD	\$71,231	32. <u>ROCKY VIEW SD</u>	\$69,485
12. WESTWIND SD	\$71,169	33. <u>FORT MCMURRAY PUBLIC SD</u>	\$69,163
13. <u>MEDICINE HAT SD</u>	\$71,089	34. ST. PAUL ERD	\$68,566
14. PEACE WAPITI RD	\$71,068	35. <u>LIVING WATERS CRD</u>	\$68,504
15. <u>GRANDE YELLOWHEAD RD</u>	\$71,034	36. <u>FORT MCMURRAY RCSSD</u>	\$67,448
16. GRASSLANDS RD	\$70,946	37. LAKELAND RCSSD	\$66,803
		<u>RED DEER RCSSD</u>	
17. HOLY SPIRIT CSRD	\$70,789	38.	\$66,427
18. <u>NORTHERN GATEWAY RD</u>	\$70,783	39. GREATER NORTH CENTRAL	\$65,954
19. <u>ELK ISLAND CSRD</u>	\$70,767	40. CHRIST THE REDEEMER CSRD	\$63,570
20. <u>LETHBRIDGE SD</u>	\$70,707	41. GREATER SOUTHERN SEPARATE	\$60,838
21. GREATER ST. ALBERT CRD	\$70,651		

Data was not available and therefore not included for the following 21 school boards:

ASPEN VIEW RD	EDMONTON SD	HORIZON SD
BLACK GOLD RD	<u>EVERGREEN RD</u>	<u>NORTHERN LIGHTS SD</u>
BUFFALO TRAIL RD	FORT VERMILION SD	NORTH-WEST FRANCO. ER #1
CALGARY RCSSD	GOLDEN HILLS	<u>PARKLAND SD</u>
<u>CANADIAN ROCKIES</u>	<u>GRANDE PRAIRIE PUBLIC</u>	PEMBINA HILLS RD
<u>CHINOOK'S EDGE RD</u>	<u>GRANDE PRAIRIE RCSSD</u>	<u>RED DEER PUBLIC SCHOOLS</u>
EAST CENTRAL FRANCO. ER #3	HOLY FAMILY CRD	WILD ROSE SD

Appendix 10
Weighted Average Teacher Training and Experience
As of September 30, 2005

SCHOOL BOARD	TEACHERS	TEACHER TRAINING	TEACHING EXPERIENCE
ASPEN VIEW RD	181.77	4.57	8.12
<u>BATTLE RIVER RD</u>	432.08	4.62	8.89
BLACK GOLD RD	483.27	4.60	8.50
BUFFALO TRAIL RD	279.75	4.38	8.43
CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION	5688.83	5.04	8.04
CALGARY RCSSD	2490.40	4.98	7.79
<u>CANADIAN ROCKIES RD</u>	145.57	4.81	9.05
<u>CHINOOK'S EDGE RD</u>	593.38	4.58	8.89
CHRIST THE REDEEMER CSRD	326.30	4.83	5.70
CLEARVIEW SD	164.70	4.50	9.41
EAST CENTRAL ALBERTA CSSD	136.99	4.54	9.59
EAST CENTRAL FRANC. ER	50.01	4.30	6.68
EDMONTON CRD	1839.54	4.69	8.40
EDMONTON SD	4334.69	4.71	8.46
<u>ELK ISLAND CSRD</u>	315.55	4.75	8.54
<u>ELK ISLAND PSRD</u>	853.27	4.69	8.91
<u>EVERGREEN CSRD</u>	176.87	4.46	6.74
<u>FOOTHILLS SD</u>	371.16	4.88	8.39
<u>FORT MCMURRAY RCSSD</u>	244.92	4.84	6.99
<u>FORT MCMURRAY SD</u>	264.30	4.69	7.07
FORT VERMILION SD	222.23	4.89	5.17
GOLDEN HILLS RD	381.12	4.68	8.37
<u>GRANDE PRAIRIE PUBLIC SD</u>	204.21	4.54	7.09
<u>GRANDE PRAIRIE RCSSD</u>	373.00	4.71	6.95
<u>GRANDE YELLOWHEAD RD</u>	301.14	4.62	8.85
GRASSLANDS RD	207.37	4.64	8.76
GREATER NORTH CENTRAL FRANC. ER	127.80	4.58	6.88
GREATER SOUTHERN PUBLIC	52.80	4.49	5.12
GREATER SOUTHERN SEPARATE	53.75	4.72	6.01
<u>GREATER ST. ALBERT CRD</u>	376.33	4.59	8.82
HIGH PRAIRIE SD	224.00	4.45	8.57
HOLY FAMILY CRD	143.25	4.65	7.00
<u>HOLY SPIRIT CSRD</u>	253.15	4.79	8.54
HORIZON SD	214.28	4.83	7.63
LAKELAND RCSSD	116.73	4.44	7.10
<u>LETHBRIDGE SD</u>	467.59	4.96	8.31
<u>LIVING WATERS CRD</u>	104.30	4.56	7.86
LIVINGSTONE RANGE SD	240.47	4.81	9.72
MEDICINE HAT CSRD	157.86	4.70	8.23
<u>MEDICINE HAT SD</u>	372.48	4.82	7.78
<u>NORTHERN GATEWAY RD</u>	306.73	4.48	8.52
<u>NORTHERN LIGHTS SD</u>	343.12	4.68	7.53
NORTHLAND SD	250.80	4.75	6.98

Appendix 10

Weighted Average Teacher Training and Experience

As of September 30, 2005

NORTHWEST FRANCOPHONE ER	27.09	4.52	5.83
PALLISER RD	209.31	4.77	9.21
<u>PARKLAND SD</u>	496.26	4.57	8.53
PEACE RIVER SD	182.50	4.65	8.57
PEACE WAPITI SD	329.62	4.51	7.96
PEMBINA HILLS RD	284.01	4.47	8.95
PRAIRIE LAND RD	135.13	4.58	8.94
PRAIRIE ROSE SD	231.26	4.63	9.24
<u>RED DEER RCSSD</u>	350.48	4.64	7.25
<u>RED DEER PUBLIC SCHOOLS</u>	526.26	4.70	8.98
<u>ROCKY VIEW SD</u>	855.70	4.92	7.99
<u>ST THOMAS AQUINAS RCSR</u>	272.00	4.53	8.46
<u>ST. ALBERT PSSD</u>	257.05	4.47	8.01
ST. PAUL ERD	138.89	4.48	8.64
STURGEON SD	369.31	4.71	8.24
WESTWIND SD	240.80	4.81	9.01
<u>WETASKIWIN RD</u>	277.09	4.60	8.58
WILD ROSE SD	288.50	4.60	8.77
<u>WOLF CREEK RD</u>	405.03	4.57	9.04
Weighted Avg Teacher Training		4.77	
Weighted Avg Teacher Experience			8.20

Appendix 10
Weighted Average Teacher Training
Ranked by teacher training
As of September 30, 2005

SCHOOL BOARD	TEACHERS	TEACHER TRAINING
1. CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION	5688.83	5.04
2. CALGARY RCSSD	2490.40	4.98
3. <u>LETHBRIDGE SD</u>	467.59	4.96
4. <u>ROCKY VIEW SD</u>	855.70	4.92
5. FORT VERMILION SD	222.23	4.89
6. <u>FOOTHILLS SD</u>	371.16	4.88
7. <u>FORT MCMURRAY RCSSD</u>	244.92	4.84
8. HORIZON SD	214.28	4.83
9. CHRIST THE REDEEMER CSRD	326.30	4.83
10. <u>MEDICINE HAT SD</u>	372.48	4.82
11. LIVINGSTONE RANGE SD	240.47	4.81
12. WESTWIND SD	240.80	4.81
13. <u>CANADIAN ROCKIES RD</u>	145.57	4.81
14. <u>HOLY SPIRIT CSRD</u>	253.15	4.79
15. PALLISER RD	209.31	4.77
16. <u>ELK ISLAND CSRD</u>	315.55	4.75
17. NORTHLAND SD	250.80	4.75
18. GREATER SOUTHERN PUBLIC	53.75	4.72
19. <u>GRANDE PRAIRIE PUBLIC SD</u>	373.00	4.71
20. <u>ST. ALBERT PSSD</u>	369.31	4.71
21. EDMONTON PSD	4334.69	4.71
22. MEDICINE HAT CSRD	157.86	4.70
23. <u>RED DEER PUBLIC SCHOOLS</u>	526.26	4.70
24. EDMONTON CRD	1839.54	4.69
25. <u>FORT MCMURRAY SD</u>	264.30	4.69
26. <u>ELK ISLAND PSRD</u>	853.27	4.69
27. GOLDEN HILLS RD	381.12	4.68
28. <u>NORTHERN LIGHTS SD</u>	343.12	4.68
29. PEACE RIVER SD	182.50	4.65
30. HOLY FAMILY CRD	143.25	4.65
31. <u>RED DEER RCSSD</u>	350.48	4.64
32. GRASSLANDS RD	207.37	4.64
33. PRAIRIE ROSE SD	231.26	4.63
34. <u>GRANDE YELLOWHEAD RD</u>	301.14	4.62
35. <u>BATTLE RIVER RD</u>	432.08	4.62
36. BLACK GOLD RD	483.27	4.60
37. WILD ROSE SD	288.50	4.60
38. <u>WETASKIWIN RD</u>	277.09	4.60
39. <u>GREATER ST. ALBERT CRD</u>	376.33	4.59
40. GREATER NORTH CENTRAL FRANC. ER	127.80	4.58
41. PRAIRIE LAND RD	135.13	4.58
42. <u>CHINOOK'S EDGE RD</u>	593.38	4.58

Appendix 10
Weighted Average Teacher Training
Ranked by teacher training
As of September 30, 2005

43. <u>WOLF CREEK RD</u>	405.03	4.57
44. ASPEN VIEW RD	181.77	4.57
45. <u>PARKLAND SD</u>	496.26	4.57
46. <u>LIVING WATERS CRD</u>	104.30	4.56
47. <u>GRANDE PRAIRIE RCSSD</u>	204.21	4.54
48. EAST CENTRAL ALBERTA CSSD	136.99	4.54
49. STURGEON SD	272.00	4.53
50. NORTHWEST FRANCOPHONE ER	27.09	4.52
51. PEACE WAPITI SD	329.62	4.51
52. CLEARVIEW SD	164.70	4.50
53. GREATER SOUTHERN SEPARATE	52.80	4.49
54. <u>ST THOMAS AQUINAS RCSR</u>	138.89	4.48
55. <u>NORTHERN GATEWAY RD</u>	306.73	4.48
56. PEMBINA HILLS RD	284.01	4.47
57. ST. PAUL ERD	257.05	4.47
58. <u>EVERGREEN CSR</u>	176.87	4.46
59. HIGH PRAIRIE SD	224.00	4.45
60. LAKELAND RCSSD	116.73	4.44
61. BUFFALO TRAIL RD	279.75	4.38
62. EAST CENTRAL FRANCO. ER	50.01	4.30

Appendix 10
Weighted Average Teacher Experience
Ranked by teacher training
As of September 30, 2005

SCHOOL BOARD	TEACHERS	TEACHING EXPERIENCE
1. LIVINGSTONE RANGE SD	240.47	9.72
2. EAST CENTRAL ALBERTA CSSD	136.99	9.59
3. CLEARVIEW SD	164.70	9.41
4. PRAIRIE ROSE SD	231.26	9.24
5. PALLISER RD	209.31	9.21
6. <u>CANADIAN ROCKIES RD</u>	145.57	9.05
7. <u>WOLF CREEK RD</u>	405.03	9.04
8. WESTWIND SD	240.80	9.01
9. <u>RED DEER PUBLIC SCHOOLS</u>	526.26	8.98
10. PEMBINA HILLS RD	284.01	8.95
11. PRAIRIE LAND RD	135.13	8.94
12. <u>ELK ISLAND PSRD</u>	853.27	8.91
13. <u>BATTLE RIVER RD</u>	432.08	8.89
14. <u>CHINOOK'S EDGE RD</u>	593.38	8.89
15. <u>GRANDE YELLOWHEAD RD</u>	301.14	8.85
16. <u>GREATER ST. ALBERT CRD</u>	376.33	8.82
17. WILD ROSE SD	288.50	8.77
18. GRASSLANDS RD	207.37	8.76
19. ST. PAUL ERD	138.89	8.64
20. <u>WETASKIWIN RD</u>	277.09	8.58
21. PEACE RIVER SD	182.50	8.57
22. HIGH PRAIRIE SD	224.00	8.57
23. <u>ELK ISLAND CSRD</u>	315.55	8.54
24. <u>HOLY SPIRIT CSRD</u>	253.15	8.54
25. <u>PARKLAND SD</u>	496.26	8.53
26. <u>NORTHERN GATEWAY RD</u>	306.73	8.52
27. BLACK GOLD RD	483.27	8.50
28. <u>ST THOMAS AQUINAS RCSRD</u>	272.00	8.46
29. EDMONTON SD	4334.69	8.46
30. BUFFALO TRAIL RD	279.75	8.43
31. EDMONTON CRD	1839.54	8.40
32. <u>FOOTHILLS SD</u>	371.16	8.39
33. GOLDEN HILLS RD	381.12	8.37
34. <u>LETHBRIDGE SD</u>	467.59	8.31
35. STURGEON SD	369.31	8.24
36. MEDICINE HAT CSRD	157.86	8.23
37. ASPEN VIEW RD	181.77	8.12
38. CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION	5688.83	8.04
39. <u>ST. ALBERT PSSD</u>	257.05	8.01
40. <u>ROCKY VIEW SD</u>	855.70	7.99
41. PEACE WAPITI SD	329.62	7.96
42. <u>LIVING WATERS CRD</u>	104.30	7.86
43. CALGARY RCSSD	2490.40	7.79

Appendix 10
Weighted Average Teacher Experience
Ranked by teacher training
 As of September 30, 2005

44. <u>MEDICINE HAT SD</u>	372.48	7.78
45. HORIZON SD	214.28	7.63
46. <u>NORTHERN LIGHTS SD</u>	343.12	7.53
47. <u>RED DEER RCSSD</u>	350.48	7.25
48. LAKELAND RCSSD	116.73	7.10
49. <u>GRANDE PRAIRIE PUBLIC SD</u>	204.21	7.09
50. <u>FORT MCMURRAY SD</u>	264.30	7.07
51. HOLY FAMILY CRD	143.25	7.00
52. <u>FORT MCMURRAY RCSSD</u>	244.92	6.99
53. NORTHLAND SD	250.80	6.98
54. <u>GRANDE PRAIRIE RCSSD</u>	373.00	6.95
55. GREATER NORTH CENTRAL FRANC. ER	127.80	6.88
56. <u>EVERGREEN CSRD</u>	176.87	6.74
57. EAST CENTRAL FRANC. ER	50.01	6.68
58. GREATER SOUTHERN SEPARATE	53.75	6.01
59. NORTHWEST FRANCOPHONE ER	27.09	5.83
60. CHRIST THE REDEEMER CSRD	326.30	5.70
61. FORT VERMILION SD	222.23	5.17
62. GREATER SOUTHERN PUBLIC	52.80	5.12

Appendix 11

Results of Staff Acquisition Survey

Small urban boards study

Survey: Hiring staff - Summary

Question: Does your jurisdiction	Yes	No	N/A	Yes & No
1. Experience difficulty in securing qualified teachers?	9	14		1
2. Experience difficulty in securing qualified bus drivers?	12	3	9	
3. Experience difficulty in securing qualified teaching assistants (aides, paraprofessionals)?	10	14		
4. Experience difficulty in securing qualified care-taking staff?	17	6	1	
5. Experience difficulty in securing qualified support staff?	8	15		1
6. Experience difficulty in securing qualified trades staff?	9	12	3	
7. Experience difficulty in securing central office staff?	4	20		

Additional comments

#1

- In specialty areas.
- At times in specialty areas.

#2

- Contracted services. However, contractors have some problem getting drivers.
- We contract out.
- Contractor.

#4

- Not enough contractors in the business, Contractors having trouble finding people to work when wages are high in other jobs.
- Contracted services. Contractors cannot pay enough in this economy.

6

- Not enough trades people – higher wages in oil patch.
- Currently not experiencing a problem; not replacing staff.

Summary of questions 8 through 11.

Which of the above-noted groups presents the most critical problem in staffing?
- Teachers – Administration and Math/Science, Bus Drivers, Support staff – secretarial.
- We do not experience problems securing qualified staff, however, it is difficult to offer competitive wages in light of the inadequate funding the school district receives.
- #1, #3 – most critical, #2, #7 – Second, #4, 5, 6 – Third.
- Teachers would be the most critical followed by Teacher Assistants with high level skills for high level student needs.
- Bus drivers are hard to find. Contractor has the problem.
- Caretaking
- Specialty teachers, CTS teachers, School counsellors/psychologists.
- Bus drivers, custodians, teachers, teaching assistants (All). We live in Grande Prairie.
- Custodial. We contract this out and our contractor can't keep staff.
- Teachers, specifically with training in Chem, Physics, French Immersion, Fabrication (IA), Band.
- Finding qualified bus drivers and custodians is the most challenging, however, trades staff will become more difficult as wages rise in Alberta
- Maintenance Personnel, care-taking staff, specialist teachers (Math, French, Cree).
- The most critical problems in RVSD would pertain to hiring qualified trades and caretaking staff due to the vast competition in construction within the Calgary area.
- None.
- Probably securing bus drivers.
- 1. Math, science and vocational teachers who require journeyman certification; 2. Qualified custodians; 3. Payroll and accounts payable personnel.
- Right now we are having trouble with student support workers.
- Custodial Staff.
- Teachers – particularly Catholic and speciality areas.
- Teachers in some subject areas or program areas ie: French Immersion, Sr Science and Math; Very few trained T.A. in areas. Caretaking Contractors – Wages are higher in oilfield and finding it difficult to attract new contractors given the type of work and the funding available. Driver retention is an issue given high wages in the area however, it is even more difficult to find suitable people to train as drivers. It is virtually impossible to find qualified bus drivers.
- Qualified bus drivers – across the division; Substitute teachers at high school level; Caretakers in one of our communities.
- PT Bus Drivers, Casual staff in the support areas and trades areas. Teachers – French Immersion, FSL, Japanese, Special Education, Counsellors, High school math, English.

What steps has your board undertaken in order to secure qualified staff?
- Extensive advertising; Increased salaries for caretakers; teaching assistants and support staff.
- Our district has introduced a new classification for caretaking staff; increased advertising to secure caretaking staff; increased wages to attract staff, which has implications for contract negotiations.
- We are not having difficulty in acquiring staff.
- 1. Extensive advertising; 2. Career Fairs; 3. Moving allowance; 4. Cost of living allowance; 5. Housing; 6. Resettlement assistance; 7. Bursaries.
- We gave a web based application process that produces a wider variety of candidates than previously. We attend recruitment fairs. We are building the capacity of our school leaders to select the best candidates. We maintain favourable collective agreements.
- We have role descriptions. We advertise on-line; Education Canada, in the papers and in schools.
- Advertise.
- CTS teachers: Advertising out-of-province; School psychologists: Providing psychologist supervisors for chartering process.
- Advertise, recruitment seminars, pay for mileage for interviews; Cherry pick other organizations.
- For teachers our H.R. department goes to post-secondary institutions to secure staff for hard to fill positions ie. French Immersion.
- Extended our recruiting area to include Saskatchewan. Increased our web advertising as well.
- We train, review salaries.
- We advertise Canada Wide.
- RVSD: attends recruiting sessions at Universities and Community Colleges; advertises in the large daily newspapers in Calgary and Edmonton, in local newspapers and via the internet; seeks out prospective employees through existing employees.
- None.
- Extensive advertising, building support structures for teachers to administrators that make Wolf Creek attractive.
- Developed a reputation featuring a positive work environment.
- None; investigating what we need to do.
- We are out and about at recruitment fairs. We stay in very close touch with our college and university and go to them often to recruit support staff.
- Extensive Advertising.
- Career Fairs; District office on-line.
- Extensive advertising – online – newspaper; training programs offered locally. Job fairs and a bonus to drivers when they find a new driver.
- Tried to be competitive in terms of salary; Advertising on EducationCanada.com; Attend career fairs; Stay competitive (Salary & Benefits) with overlapping and surrounding jurisdictions.
- Bus Drivers – Ensure we are paying competitively; Teachers and support staff – More external recruitment efforts; Career fairs; Advertising in newspapers; Approaching post secondary institutes directly for graduating students.

Has your board implemented any measures that assist in retaining staff and reducing staff turnover?

- Pension plan for all non-teaching staff, Leadership courses to encourage promotions from within.
- Yes, an Organization Health Committee; a Healthy Interactions Program; have included all support staff in all initiatives, the Board has made extra effort to include all staff in functions; included goal statements in our Three Year Education Plan; and have recognized the many contributions of staff in various ways.
- New teacher formation, Mentoring programs, leadership development programs.
- 1. Assisted with community efforts to reduce housing costs; 2. Partnership to provide transitional housing; 3. Professional development; 4. Salary advances 5. Collective agreement allowances - #1 in AB; 6. PLC's.
- Retaining staff is not an issue for this board. We have lost several school administrators to secondments at Alberta Education.
- We have staff orientations, mentoring programs and buddy systems.
- Nothing unusual other than staff appreciation days, mentorship's etc.
- Implemented health spending accounts for both teaching and classified (support) staff; Board reopened the grid of the teachers' collective agreement and increased classified salaries to make salaries more competitive.
- Added 7 per cent to various categories on support staff grid (on top of a 3 per cent raise).
- No.
- We have a mentorship program in place where teachers and their mentors are trained to work together and 3 half days are allocated during the course of the school year for them to meet.
- Relationships – continue to develop.
- Good salary with 100 per cent benefits, Professional Development Opportunities, Exit Interviews.
- RVSD has over the past few months actively engaged all support staff in a review of our Terms of Employment, which governs their working conditions. We have identified areas of concern and are building on areas considered to be the strengths of RVSD. The Board is demonstrating that all staff are valued employees.
- None.
- See above (*Extensive advertising, building support structures for teachers to administrators that make Wolf Creek attractive.*), include Early Intervention Pilot from ASEBP, Human Resources Priority One, Counselling for employees, 3-year mentorship program for teachers and administration.
- No.
- Not specifically, we do not have a high turnover.
- We do plenty of mentoring and lots of PD support for all groups so they can stay current and build capacity.
- We do not have a large staff turn over.
- Revised staffing procedures; Instructional Leadership – impact relations
- Staff turnover not an issue. Offering retirement incentives to certificated staff.
- Our Division does a lot of PD Assistance (Monetary) re: retraining or upgrading.
- More focus on support staff for professional development activities; Leadership development programs; Support secondments; Recognition events for bus drivers.

Do you have any suggestions for those boards that are experiencing difficulty in securing the services of qualified staff?

- No
- Ensure people feel valued and are members of a team; and increased funding.
- Assist to relocate; Attend job fairs.
- You might pay for people to be trained in areas of difficulty to hire qualified people.
- Very difficult to offer competitive wages in a “booming” economy.
- No.
- I hear some boards are providing incentives, housing, travel etc.
- Finances prove to be a barrier for everyone.
- No.
- Unfortunately most Boards in the Calgary area are faced with the serious challenge of finding qualified candidates in the above indicated areas. Due to the high employment rate all employers are attempting to hire for positions with a very shallow pool to draw from in the Calgary area. Due to the shortage of labourers, there are very limited options.
- No.
- See above (*include Early Intervention Pilot from ASEBP, Priority One, Counselling for employees, 3 year mentorship program for teachers and administration.*)
- In this heated economy, there may be some short term hiring problems in certain areas (job classification). The school boards need to be seen as long term, stable employers with a very reasonable salary and benefit package.
- ASBA/CASS/ASBOA should host a “good ideas/strategies” workshop next year on the topic. Bring in an H.R. specialist as a keynote.
- I wish them well but there are inherent problems in being a rural district and being able to hire qualified staff. No real suggestions.
- Use EducationCanada.com; Website – widens the area you recruit from. Might need to use incentives – living allowances etc. Stay competitive – Difficult I know.
- Established partnerships with post secondary institutions and more actively market your school jurisdiction to prospective candidates.

Appendix 12

Impact of Renewed Funding Framework – RCPA

RCPA – stands for Relative Cost of Purchasing Goods and Services Adjustment. The adjustment is calculated by Alberta Education using a price index that is applied to a percentage of the provincial funding received. No board is be negatively affected by application of the factor. The City of Red Deer is the base point and has a constant value of 1.

Small Cities

Battle River Regional Division No. 31	1.1 per cent
Grande Yellowhead Regional Division No. 35	5.1 per cent
Living Waters CRD No. 42	3.1 per cent
Northern Light SD No. 69	1.2 per cent
St. Thomas Aquinas RCSR No. 38	1.2 per cent
Wetaskiwin Regional Division No. 11	1.1 per cent
Wolf Creek SD No. 72	0.0 per cent

Suburban

Canadian Rockies RD No. 12	23.0 per cent
Chinook's Edge SD No. 73	0.0 per cent
Elk Island Catholic CSR No. 41	2.1 per cent
Elk Island PSRD No. 14	2.2 per cent
Evergreen CSR No. 2	2.1 per cent
Foothills SD No. 38	2.2 per cent
Greater St. Albert CRD No. 29	2.3 per cent
Northern Gateway RD No. 10	0.3 per cent
Parkland SD No. 70	2.2 per cent
Rocky View SD No. 41	7.0 per cent

Major Urban

Ft. McMurray RCSSD No. 33	11.8 per cent
Ft. McMurray SD No. 2833	11.8 per cent
Grande Prairie RDSSD No. 28	2.7 per cent
Grande Prairie SD No. 2575	2.7 per cent
Holy Spirit CSR No. 4	0.1 per cent
Lethbridge SD No. 51	0.0 per cent
Medicine Hat SD. No. 76	0.0 per cent
Red Deer CRD No. 39	0.0 per cent
Red Deer Public Schools	0.0 per cent
St. Albert PSSD No. 6	2.4 per cent

Comparators

Edmonton SD	2.2 per cent
Calgary SD	7.5 per cent
Golden Hills SD	3.6 per cent
Pembina Hills	0.0 per cent

Appendix 13

Boards That Received Stabilization Funding In 2004-2005

Note: the boards that participated in the study and received stabilization funding are indicated by an *

Recipient	Allocation_Amount
Aspen View Regional Division No. 19	\$ 349,000.00
* Battle River Regional Division No. 31	\$ 67,000.00
Black Gold Regional Division No. 18	\$ 52,000.00
Boyle Street Education Centre	\$ 8,000.00
Buffalo Trail Public Schools Regional Division No. 28	\$ 743,000.00
* Chinook's Edge School Division No. 73	\$ 258,000.00
Clearview School Division No. 71	\$ 567,000.00
* Elk Island Catholic Separate Regional Division No. 41	\$ 225,000.00
* Elk Island Public Schools Regional Division No. 14	\$ 1,042,000.00
* Evergreen Catholic Separate Regional Division No. 2	\$ 31,000.00
* Foothills School Division No. 38	\$ 220,000.00
Fort Vermilion School Division No. 52	\$ 1,071,000.00
Grasslands Regional Division No. 6	\$ 528,000.00
Greater North Central Francophone Education Region No. 2	\$ 321,000.00
Greater Southern Separate Catholic Francophone Education Region No. 4	\$ 58,000.00
* Greater St. Albert Catholic Regional Division No. 29	\$ 278,000.00
Holy Spirit Roman Catholic Separate Regional Division No. 4	\$ 60,000.00
Lakeland Roman Catholic Separate School District No. 150	\$ 625,000.00
* Lethbridge School District No. 51	\$ 758,000.00
Livingstone Range School Division No. 68	\$ 735,000.00
Lloydminster Public School Division	\$ 11,000.00
* Medicine Hat Public School District No. 76	\$ 719,000.00
Mother Earth's Children's Charter School Society	\$ 48,000.00
* Northern Gateway Regional Division No. 10	\$ 1,240,000.00
Palliser Regional Division No. 26	\$ 402,000.00
Pembina Hills Regional Division No. 7	\$ 117,000.00
Prairie Land Regional Division No. 25	\$ 1,451,000.00
Prairie Rose Regional Division No. 8	\$ 3,811,000.00
* Red Deer Public Schools	\$ 486,000.00
* St. Albert Protestant Separate School District No. 6	\$ 50,000.00
St. Paul Education Regional Division No. 1	\$ 350,000.00
Sturgeon School Division No. 24	\$ 336,000.00
Westwind School Division No. 74	\$ 526,000.00
Wild Rose School Division No. 66	\$ 1,142,000.00
	\$ 18,685,000.00