

McAdam Elementary Sustainability Comments from Website (Effective January 20, 2016)

David McTimoney • 2 days ago

As the sustainability study comes to an end, the time is also approaching to close this discussion board. We will plan to close it on January 20th, which will give us time to print it and include it in the final report that we are preparing. Thank you for your contributions to the study. DMcT

David McTimoney • 16 days ago

Please note; we will start to organize the documents into folders in the days and weeks ahead. This will take the shape of the final report at the conclusion of the study. If you see that something is missing that you believe should be included, please let us know. DMcT

Trevor Flynn • 2 weeks ago

Hi David, as promised, the link to the location where you can download our full presentation can be found here: <http://1drv.ms/1RqhwZb> It's rather large (approx. 130MB) but has all of the content presented this evening - including the videos - embedded within
Trevor

Trevor Flynn • 22 days ago

Hi David,
Would it be possible as well to please get a copy of the 3rd party consultant report presented at the December DEC meeting RE: review of Leo Hayes Capital expansion project. I don't see it posted anywhere on either the district or department website.
Thanks
Trevor

David McTimoney Trevor Flynn • 16 days ago

Hello Trevor, You will find it posted at the side now. Normally we get something like this posted on the DEC section of the website prior to the next public meeting...along with the other reports that are presented at that particular meeting. Is this something you would like to see included in the McAdam final report or just something you would like to review? DMcT

Trevor Flynn David McTimoney • 16 days ago

Thank you, I appreciate you posting this in advance of standard publications on the main DEC portal. The potential Leo Hayes expansion was a scenario being brought forward for discussion so we were happy to hear of the report being published in December as it allows access of the most accurate and up to date information. We can discuss after tomorrow nights presentation once you've seen the specific references as to whether it would be appropriate to include with the final report for MES or not.

Trevor Flynn • 22 days ago

Hi David - Happy Holidays. Was just reviewing our information again in preparation for the meeting next week and noted one last anomaly in the cost comparison numbers. In appendix B of the Financial Comparison considering what if, under the combined scenario facilities budget projections, the amounts for water and sewer are low. My understanding is that village applies a formula against the number of occupants/students in each of the schools to come up with annual totals for those costs. The calculation assumes a slight increase in cost, through consolidation, but calculates an overall saving of approx. 6k. This would not be the case however as the number of overall students would remain the same, and therefore the amount levied against the high school would simply increase to match the total costs from the existing configuration - with a net savings of \$0.

Thanks

Trevor

David McTimoney Trevor Flynn • 16 days ago

Hi Trevor...I am not quite sure I understand your statement but we can certainly talk on Tuesday night and if a change is required, we can make it. I read that you are suggesting that the costs for water and sewage are calculated on a per person amount and that the costs would be the same, regardless of whether the service is provided through one building or two. I wonder if there would be a threshold cost that would be saved if it was only one building compared to two? I believe that is what we assumed. I am going to ask our budget and accounting manager and Director of Finance to review the question and see if they can offer anything to the conversation...Shawn Tracey will be there on Tuesday night to further the discussion as required. Is there someone from the Village who could clarify? I am looking forward to the presentations on Tuesday. DMcT

Trevor Flynn David McTimoney • 16 days ago

Thanks David, my understanding of the cost implications are as a result of conversations with the village. I do not however have access to the specific billing formula so I am unable to confirm the exact method of calculation. This is something that the Mayor and Council members who will be present tomorrow should be able to add some clarity.

David McTimoney • a month ago

Good Morning. At this time we don't track this information for all schools in an organized manner. If you would like to choose a few sample scenarios, we could prepare them for you for comparison purposes. We simply chose a few last year to compare. We could also post these ones if you wish. DMcT

Trevor Flynn • a month ago

David, would there be a document noting summarized info related to the busing information that is being provided in each of these reviews (i.e. Average/Min/Max Travel Time, Average/Min/Max travel distance). There was some comparison information provided for a review last year - and we are able to see this data related to other schools under review, however we would appreciate a rollup of this information for each of the schools in the district if possible.

Thanks
Trevor

David McTimoney • 2 months ago

I would like to advise that I adjusted the Financial Comparison document slightly...I clarified information about a school administrator and his/her responsibility allowance should a reassignment occur due to school closure. I also added a picture of the McAdam Elementary playground.

DMcT

David McTimoney • 2 months ago

I believe this catches me up on questions unanswered...if I have missed something, please let me know in a new post. As mentioned below, my focus is now on the financial report.

DMcT

David McTimoney • 2 months ago

In response to Trevor Flynn question found below...

With the annual estimated funding allocation, two projects were near the top of the list to be funded in 2015. This past year the replacement of a roof at McAdam High (which had some roof leaks) was a priority 1 project. The next project on the priority list as a 1 is the repointing of brick walls at McAdam High. It is on the list submitted for this coming year and it will depend on the funding allocation if it happens in the next fiscal year or the year after. Capital Improvement lists are also subject to DEC approval.

As per the annual reviews of schools and inspections of schools, the roof recap project and the boiler replacements were identified and added to McAdam

Elementary's list to be prioritized into the projects across ASD-W.

DMcT

David McTimoney • 2 months ago

Yes, I am working at the cost document. If you want to see what the final product should look like, you can see the Nackawic document...I did that one first. For McAdam, I have some of the information in already. The potential annual savings in global school budgets for instruction and operational costs if the elementary were to close in favor of a K-12 school is about \$53 700. We are not projecting any savings in transportation if the move were to occur. There would be some savings in school administrator costs, with the loss of one principal responsibility allowance. A vice-principal responsibility allowance would be added, however. There would be one less administrative assistant and less custodial staff. I will present these costs when finalizing the document as well as any other staff changes that would occur when it is examined closely. I also list the capital avoidance costs (presented in the power point) as well as an estimate of costs needed to get the high school ready to receive younger students. It is this last amount that is taking some time to organize. Hopefully this posting will provide some information and please know that I want to complete the report ASAP.

DMcT

David McTimoney • 2 months ago

Please note that some transportation historical documentation was posted to the right.

DMcT

David McTimoney • 2 months ago

I have examined the rooms carefully to try and determine the appropriate number to be used when describing the number of "classrooms". On the infrastructure document, we are showing 6 classrooms out of 13 in use.

On the top floor, Rooms 305, 308 and 309 are very clearly considered classrooms. It is also clear that Rooms

301 and 304 are not considered classrooms as they are a Food's Lab and Science Lab, respectively.

There is a large classroom (302-303) that could be considered 1, 2 or 3 classrooms. Whereas the far end is an area for music (a specialty room), it is appropriate to call it two classrooms, even though it is wide open at this time. Some would say that it is one classroom. Room 307 is a classroom that has been changed into a second resource room.

With all of this said, the count for classrooms on the top floor would be 6.

On the main floor, Rooms 201, 202, 203, 205, and 206 would be considered classrooms. Although Room 204 is of classroom size, it is used as a resource room. This would make the count for the main floor as 5 classrooms. The library is not considered a classroom.

On the bottom floor, we find the gym, cafeteria and computer lab area. There are two large computer areas and they are big enough that one could classify each space as one classroom area that includes a computer lab attached to each. This leaves the count on the bottom floor as 2 classrooms.

When described in this way, 13 is a reasonable number for describing the number of classrooms. Not in this count would be the gym, the cafeteria, two halves of large computer labs, the shop, the library, one resource room, the staff room, the conference room, the science lab, the home-ec room and the far third of the big room which is where music is taught.

5 of the 13 rooms described are being used as classroom teacher locations for 4 out of 5 times per day, which would be classified as full use of the room (the 5th period is their preparation period). 5 of 13 rooms described are being used as classroom teacher locations for 2 or 3 out of 5

times per day which would could be classified as partial use of the classroom; either shared by a few teachers or they use other rooms (gym, shop, etc.).

I will post this statement to the right as a document.

DMcT

Becky Barker McIntyre • 2 months ago

Just wondering when we will get the information on how much it would cost if the elementary school was to close and and the high school was turned into a K-12 school.

David McTimoney • 2 months ago

We have found some formal documentation that discusses changes in catchment area. It will be posted to the right either tonight or tomorrow morning. I am still working on the capital improvement project

question and the rooms at McAdam High question...I hope to have some answers soon.

DMcT

David McTimoney • 3 months ago

The student to teacher ratio includes all students to all FTE (classroom, guidance, resource and administration). This is consistent for all of our presentations. While this is one measure for consideration, enrolment and class size is also presented in different ways in the presentation. On slide 6, the actual numbers per grade are presented, current and historical. On slide 8, the number of classrooms in use is presented. Slide 12 shows information on minimum, maximum and average class size for this year and last. Although not in the presentation, I can also give you the actual class size and configurations for 2015-16 and 2014-15, per classroom. This year at McAdam Elementary, we have: K=18, 1/2=14, 2/3=12, 3/4=11, 5=9 for a total of 64 students. For 2014, we had: K/1=15, 1/2=13, 2/3=13, 4=11, 5=12 for a total of 64. The Nackawic presentation shows a student:teacher ratio that includes all FTE assigned to the school, as well. The FTE changed this year at the three Nackawic schools, but the original number of FTE provided in the ratios prior to reducing it to a comparison of :1 is accurate (I double checked it again). Our presentation to Nackawic was done prior to September 30, so we went with last year numbers for enrolment...then, for consistency, we followed suit for the other presentations when creating similar slides. We will always do our best to present accurate information and comparisons. We recognize that errors can occur and will happily correct them if brought to our attention.

Trevor Flynn • 3 months ago

Hi David - there seems to be another discrepancy with the information that was presented in the first meeting. On slide 9 it notes the resource numbers used to determine the # of teacher FTEs employed which is leveraged in the Student/Teacher ratio values/comparisons. I note that the amounts for "Administration" are included in the calculation for McAdam. I originally thought this strange however assumed the calculation would have been applied the same across all schools - so the comparison would essentially be accurate. However if I examine the proposal presented to Nackawic (Slide 15 and 18-20) it would appear these "Administration amounts are not used" (though it's tough to confirm 100% for sure since the values presented are for 2015-16 but the comparison numbers late shown are specific to 2014-16). Could you please confirm the proper method for calculating these values - and more importantly that it is being applied consistently across all schools. Where this value is being presented as a suggested measure of "sustainability" it's obviously very important that the calculation and comparisons are accurate.

Thanks

Trevor

David McTimoney • 3 months ago

The Kindergarten enrolment at McAdam Elementary School on September 30, 2014, was 10 students. At the end of October, 2014, 15 children were registered for Kindergarten for the following year. By May, 2015, this number of registrations was up to 18. The number remained constant and there are 18

Kindergarten students as of September 30, 2015. As of today, there are 8 children who have registered for Kindergarten for next year.

DMcT

David McTimoney • 3 months ago

Thank you for pointing out the error on the McAdam Infrastructure documents...an inaccurate map is attached to them and we will correct this and repost. Three new maps have been attached at the right...these are cleaner copies of catchment area maps and are up-to-date...for McAdam, Harvey and showing the two together.

DMcT

David McTimoney • 3 months ago

I have also seen the questions related to McAdam High and available space. I will post when I have had a chance to review carefully, reflecting on your comments made. I have asked for help from the facilities team to address the number of questions below.

DMcT

Trevor Flynn David McTimoney • 3 months ago

Much appreciated David, thanks

David McTimoney • 3 months ago

I will gather information on the questions below related to historical capital improvement projects and share once I have it.

DMcT

David McTimoney • 3 months ago

Enrolment projections are mostly based on moving students forward by grade level, as a cohort. When it comes to kindergarten projections, we do our best to look at historical data and trends and try to estimate it in a reasonable way. We continue to search for a more accurate way to do this, although it has served us fairly well. With the opportunity for students to register for Kindergarten in October of the previous year, we also have some valuable information. I will post the number of Kindergarten registrations we have for 2016-17 once I get the information. If community members have a good estimate of the number of students projected to come in over the next 1-5 years, we welcome that

information. It could be posted here or be a part of a presentation on December 3. Feel free to share information in any way. The current K-class of 18 gives rise to a projected increase in enrolment over the next number of years as this big class will move together as a cohort.

DMcT

David McTimoney • 3 months ago

Thank you for the update, Trevor. I understand the only question you want addressed is when did the catchment area change and you would like us to provide a more accurate map. I will see what I can find out and post again when I have more information.

DMcT

David McTimoney • 3 months ago

The DEC was appreciative of the feedback provided below (the poll of elementary parents regarding Harvey vs. McAdam). You may recall the DEC had some conversations about this at Public Meeting #1 on October 8th and they wanted to hear more thoughts about the ideas of Harvey vs. McAdam should they choose to make a recommendation to the Minister to close McAdam Elementary School. While it was reasonable to mention both the Harvey and McAdam options in introducing the study, narrowing down the scope of the study can be beneficial to all those engaged and, in fact, this is what the DEC did tonight at their monthly public meeting. The Council passed a motion that calls for staff to focus only on the K-12 McAdam "What-If" option and not research the Harvey scenario any further.

DMcT

Becky Barker McIntyre • 3 months ago

The PSSC sent out letters to all the parents at the elementary school and asked if Option 3 was chosen..close the school where would you prefer to have your children sent..Harvey elementary or a k-12 school in McAdam. I received 47 back out of 64 and all 47 wanted their children to stay in McAdam. Why would we want our children bused out of the community to a school that needs 1.2 million dollars in repairs and upgrades,not able to drink the water and does not have proper sprinkler system. Our building is in great shape and has been looked after very well by staff and students. Also going to Harvey would put that school in the 93% capacity which is not ideal.

Trevor Flynn • 3 months ago

Hi David - Just wanted to post a quick note to let you know that I removed a couple of my questions posted to the board last evening. I was able to gather so clarifications from other members at our committee meeting this evening. Wanted to note their removal in case you had staff already working on

answers. Based on the number of queries you have across all of the different studies I expect you won't be disappointed to to have a couple less to deal with.

Trevor Flynn • 3 months ago

Would you please provide clarification related to the change in catchment area noted on Slide 36 of the Presentation. When specifically was this change implemented? Additionally would you be able to provide a more accurate cartographic depiction of the updated catchment area post this change. The map provided in the presentation on Slide 40 was cut off, and the map included in the updated Infrastructure Demographics document (updated October 20, 2015) still shows the former catchments area which includes the Reynolds Road.

Ryan Wright • 3 months ago

I was curious as to how the projected enrolment is calculated. Do you use an estimate or do you use population statistics based on child births in the province?

David McTimoney • 3 months ago

We updated the collection of documents found to the right of this page. Among them, you will find one that is called "McAdam Elementary Capital Improvement List". This is the list of capital improvement ideas we have in our database. Each year, the facilities team presents a prioritized list to the DEC for approval to submit to the province for consideration of annual projects to be done. We have hundreds of projects for our 70 schools. Our team prioritizes as 1, 2, 3, with 1's being the highest priorities. You will see these rankings on the new document. The "1's" amount to \$106 000 as an estimate to the costs. The "2's" are estimated to be around \$275 000 and the "3's" are estimated to be around \$75 000.

DMcT

Trevor Flynn David McTimoney • 3 months ago

Thank you for the updated information related to the Capital Improvements List. Based on the three priority "1" items listed could you confirm how many of these items were listed at a similar priority of "1" last fiscal year. Were any of these items submitted to the Department as part of the Proposed Capital Improvement Projects List for 2015. Were any of these submitted as part of this years Proposed Projects list for 2016?

David McTimoney • 3 months ago

We reviewed the number of classrooms carefully to determine the most accurate description of the McAdam Elementary School Functional Capacity rating. The formal documents include 10 classrooms as the official count...it was likely the library that was not counted and the Art/Music/Science room as well as the Computer Lab that were counted (in addition to the eight other classrooms). The definition for classrooms doesn't include a specialized room that a class would attend as a whole. As such, it could be accurate to say that the Computer Lab and the Art/Music/Science room are not defined as "classrooms". This would make a reasonable count to be 8 rooms. (The definition notes a Computer Lab for a middle school but not for an elementary school...however, McAdam Elementary does use the Computer Lab as a separate, specialized room. I suspect that if a ninth classroom was required, this would return to its original use as a classroom). As such, a revised functional capacity rating for 2014-15 would be 33.3%. $\{64 / (24 \times 8)\}$.

Our facilities team is reviewing the capital improvement ideas in the database to determine priorities. It should be posted very soon.

DMcT

Trevor Flynn David McTimoney • 3 months ago

Thank you David - could you please additionally confirm that the current number of classrooms at McAdam High School is 9? I know when the question was raised at the presentation it was thought there were 13 available. I understand it was correctly updated to be 9 as part of last years review process - this is additionally reflected in the September 2015 ASD-W-EL6 Monitoring Report. It is important that this number is accurate as it will impact the in-depth costing analysis you are currently completing related to What-If scenarios involving MHS. It additionally impacts the accuracy of the information presented on page 17 - specifically related to functional capacity analysis on the MHS what-if option (It appears to have been calculated based on a classroom size of 13 for MHS and not 9).

David McTimoney • 3 months ago

Yes, information is forth-coming. The last of four Public Meetings (#1) was held last night in Burton and I am now switching focus to updating information from questions raised at meetings before launching into a few weeks of building reports. What I have found to date includes:

1. The dollar values for water/ sewage were accurate. The value from three years ago (\$3250) was showing half the cost (in comparison to next two year) due to the fact that the other half was paid in the previous fiscal year. Whereas we only went back three years, it didn't show.
2. The longest ride time going home on the bus is 40 minutes, as opposed to 28 minutes. An error in the departure time that was logged in the Versa Trans database led us to this mistake and it has been corrected in the database.
3. In the days ahead, I am going to list the priority values (1, 2, 3) for the capital improvement projects in our hopper for McAdam Elementary as well as confirm the actual number of classrooms that should be used for the functional capacity rating. I am also going to double check that all documents we have to date are posted at the right.

4. In the weeks ahead, I am going to build a detailed "what if" report.

DMcT

Trevor Flynn • 3 months ago

I note there have been no updates to the information provided during the first meeting. Are these forthcoming or should we request clarifications again here in the online forum. I believe it's important to the integrity of the process to ensure that all of the "facts" provided and meant to inform the DEC's eventual decision are agreed upon and as accurate as possible.

Thanks