


Long Range **FACILITIES PLANNING**

School District No. 8
Public Presentation #2
November 24, 2014
Creston




Board's Visioning

- Why is a facilities plan necessary? What should it accomplish?
 - Provide best learning environment for students
 - Sustainability and stability
 - Renewal
 - Better, more pro-active delivery of services to students and stakeholders
 - More competitive, effective organization
 - Provide best workplace for employees
 - Lower the cost of ownership
 - Transfer of \$\$ from operations & capital to classrooms
 - Other



**A credible strategic facilities
plan should not focus on a
specific outcome or
preconceived solution**

Key Stages



Data – What do we know about SD8?




Inventory

- 91,900 square metres
- Schools
 - 13 Elementary Schools
 - 4 Secondary Schools
 - 3 K-10 or K-12 Schools
 - 1 Middle School
 - 3 Programs of Distributed Learning in 5 sites
 - 4 Learning Centres
- Administration Sites - 6
- Closed Sites - 7
- Vacant Land - 4

Asset - Asset Name	Asset - Year Constructed
Central Elementary	1908
Hume Elementary School	1923
Trafalgar Middle School	1924
Adam Robertson Elementary	1938
Jewett Elementary	1946
Mount Sentinel Secondary	1950
W.E. Graham Community School	1950
Salmo Elementary School	1953
Board Office Creston	1955
Kaslo Maintenance Building	1955
LV Rogers Secondary	1956
Yahk Elementary	1956
South Nelson Elementary	1960
Canyon/Lister Elementary School	1961
Al Collinson Elementary	1962
Blewett Elementary School	1962
Board Office - Nelson	1962
Rosemont Elementary School	1962
Homelink Centre (formerly South Creston Elemer	1964
Board Office - Creston	1965
Bus Garage/Maintenance Creston	1969
Maintenance Building Nelson	1970
Gordon Sargent Primary School	1971
Maintenance Building #2 Creston	1975
Brent Kennedy Elementary School	1977
Winlaw Elementary School	1978
Classroom Annex, Prince Charles Secondary	1982
Prince Charles Secondary	1983
Bus Garage District Nelson	1985
Redfish Elementary School	1987
J V Humphries Elementary/Secondary School	1994
Erickson Elementary	1996
LVR Care To Learn, Daycare Centre	1996
Salmo Secondary School	2004
Crawford Bay	2010

Asset - Asset Name	Asset - Year Constructed
Central Elementary	1908
Hume Elementary School	1923
Trafalgar Middle School	1924
Adam Robertson Elementary	1938
Jewett Elementary	1946
Mount Sentinel Secondary	1950
W.E. Graham Community School	1950
Bus Garage District Nelson	1985
Redfish Elementary School	1987
J V Humphries Elementary/Secondary School	1994
Erickson Elementary	1996
LVR Care To Learn, Daycare Centre	1996
Salmo Secondary School	2004
Crawford Bay	2010

Enrolment



Capacity Utilization

- Calculates the % of space utilized
- Indicates empty seats
- Capacity Utilization = $\frac{\text{Headcount}}{\text{\# of Spaces (Nominal Capacity)}}$

Summary of Utilization

Summary of Capacity Utilization					
Family of Schools	2011/2012	2014/2015	2018/2019	2022/2023	Empty Seats (22/23)
District	75%	71%	73%	75%	1,490
Creston	74%	68%	73%	74%	431
Salmo	60%	56%	64%	71%	134
Kaslo/Crawford Bay	55%	49%	51%	48%	330
Slocan	76%	72%	71%	75%	243
Nelson	84%	83%	81%	84%	352

Creston Family of Schools				
Year	Headcount	Nominal Capacity	Capacity Utilization	Empty Seats
11/12	1241	1685	74%	444
12/13	1197	1685	71%	488
13/14	1202	1685	71%	483
14/15	1139	1685	68%	546
15/16	1154	1685	68%	531
16/17	1163	1685	69%	522
17/18	1195	1685	71%	490
18/19	1230	1685	73%	455
19/20	1248	1685	74%	437
20/21	1250	1685	74%	435
21/22	1264	1685	75%	421
22/23	1254	1685	74%	431
23/24	1262	1685	75%	423

Adam Robertson

Year	Headcount	Nominal Capacity	Capacity Utilization	Empty Seats
11/12	352	495	71%	143
12/13	343	495	69%	152
13/14	336	495	68%	159
14/15	320	495	65%	175
15/16	332	495	67%	163
16/17	337	495	68%	158
17/18	361	495	73%	134
18/19	381	495	77%	114
19/20	388	495	78%	107
20/21	393	495	79%	102
21/22	406	495	82%	89
22/23	402	495	81%	93
23/24	409	495	83%	86


Canyon				
Year	Headcount	Nominal Capacity	Capacity Utilization	Empty Seats
11/12	154	195	79%	41
12/13	140	195	72%	55
13/14	147	195	75%	48
14/15	123	195	63%	72
15/16	118	195	61%	77
16/17	114	195	58%	81
17/18	114	195	58%	81
18/19	111	195	57%	84
19/20	107	195	55%	88
20/21	111	195	57%	84
21/22	114	195	58%	81
22/23	113	195	58%	82
23/24	113	195	58%	82

Erickson				
Year	Headcount	Nominal Capacity	Capacity Utilization	Empty Seats
11/12	179	220	81%	41
12/13	168	220	76%	52
13/14	178	220	81%	42
14/15	198	220	90%	22
15/16	201	220	91%	19
16/17	202	220	92%	18
17/18	198	220	90%	22
18/19	199	220	90%	21
19/20	192	220	87%	28
20/21	186	220	85%	34
21/22	186	220	85%	34
22/23	185	220	84%	35
23/24	185	220	84%	35


Yahk				
Year	Headcount	Nominal Capacity	Capacity Utilization	Empty Seats
11/12	18	50	36%	32
12/13	13	50	26%	37
13/14	19	50	38%	31
14/15	10	50	20%	40
15/16	9	50	18%	41
16/17	10	50	20%	40
17/18	8	50	16%	42
18/19	10	50	20%	40
19/20	12	50	24%	38
20/21	13	50	26%	37
21/22	12	50	24%	38
22/23	12	50	24%	38
23/24	11	50	22%	39

PCSS				
Year	Headcount	Nominal Capacity	Capacity Utilization	Empty Seats
11/12	538	725	74%	187
12/13	533	725	74%	192
13/14	522	725	72%	203
14/15	488	725	67%	237
15/16	494	725	68%	231
16/17	500	725	69%	225
17/18	514	725	71%	211
18/19	529	725	73%	196
19/20	549	725	76%	176
20/21	547	725	75%	178
21/22	546	725	75%	179
22/23	542	725	75%	183
23/24	544	725	75%	181

CAPACITY UTILIZATION OVER TIME



CAPACITY UTILIZATION OVER TIME



Summary of Unutilized Space

Summary of Capacity Utilization		
Family of Schools	Empty Seats (22/23)	Underutilized (22/23)
District	1,490	25%
Creston	431	26%
Salmo	134	29%
Kaslo/Crawford Bay	330	52%
Slocan	243	25%
Nelson	352	16%

Funding

- Capital upgrades are funded three ways:
 1. Ministry of Education/Minister of Finance major capital money (scarce)
 2. Annual Facilities Grant (\$1.3 million/year; unable to carry forward)
 3. Operating funds (\$4.69 million budget 14/15)

Facility Condition

- **VFA is a contractor for the Ministry of Education**
 - **Performs a cycle of facility audits**
 - **Maintains database of all assets**
- **VFA audited SD8 in June 2014**
- **Industry perspective**
- **Need operations crew critical eye to challenge VFA data**
- **Annual Facilities Grant spending is now tied to this data**

Facility Condition Index

- Facility Condition Index: **the lower the better** condition your building
- FCI =
$$\frac{\text{Deferred Maintenance Costs ("Requirements")}}{\text{Cost to Rebuild ("Replacement")}}$$
- Deferred Maintenance Costs = future repairs to keep asset functioning
- Replacement = cost to build "like kind"
- NOTE: MOE replacement likely would not rebuild exactly what we have now; would replace at current design build standards per the capital branch

SD08 - Facilities Condition Index (FCI) Ranking		
		FCI
Crawford Bay	CB	0%
Salmo Secondary	Salmo	0%
Maintenance - Kaslo	Kaslo	8%
Erickson	Creston	11%
Mount Sentinel	Slocan	11%
LV Rogers	Nelson	14%
WE Graham	Slocan	14%
Brent Kennedy	Slocan	15%
South Creston	Creston	17%
Adam Robertson	Creston	18%
JV Humphries	Kaslo	18%
PCSS	Creston	19%
Bus Garage - Nelson	Nelson	22%
Redfish	Nelson	23%
Maintenance - Nelson	Nelson	27%
South Nelson	Nelson	27%
Hume	Nelson	29%
Gordon Sargent	Nelson	30%
Canyon Lister	Creston	31%
Jewett	Kaslo	31%
Central	Nelson	31%
Board Office - Creston	Creston	33%
Maintenance - Creston	Creston	36%
Board Office - Nelson	Nelson	36%
Rosemont	Nelson	36%
Traflagar	Nelson	37%
Winlaw	Slocan	37%
Blewett	Nelson	38%
Al Collinson	Nelson	40%
Yahk	Creston	42%
Salmo Elementary	Salmo	56%

SD08 - Facilities Condition Index (FCI) Ranking		
		FCI
Crawford Bay	CB	0%
Salmo Secondary	Salmo	0%
Maintenance - Kaslo	Kaslo	8%
Erickson	Creston	11%
Mount Sentinel	Slocan	11%
<hr/>		
Traflagar	Nelson	37%
Winlaw	Slocan	37%
Blewett	Nelson	38%
Al Collinson	Nelson	40%
Yahk	Creston	42%
Salmo Elementary	Salmo	56%

SD08 - Facilities Condition Index (FCI) Ranking		
		FCI
Erickson	Creston	11%
South Creston	Creston	17%
Adam Robertson	Creston	18%
PCSS	Creston	19%
Canyon Lister	Creston	31%
Board Office - Creston	Creston	33%
Maintenance - Creston	Creston	36%
Yahk	Creston	42%

SD08 - Facilities Condition Index (FCI) Ranking		
		FCI
Crawford Bay	CB/Kaslo	0%
Maintenance - Kaslo	CB/Kaslo	8%
JV Humphries	CB/Kaslo	18%
Jewett	CB/Kaslo	31%

SD08 - Facilities Condition Index (FCI) Ranking		
		FCI
LV Rogers	Nelson	14%
Bus Garage - Nelson	Nelson	22%
Redfish	Nelson	23%
Maintenance - Nelson	Nelson	27%
South Nelson	Nelson	27%
Hume	Nelson	29%
Gordon Sargent	Nelson	30%
Central	Nelson	31%
Board Office - Nelson	Nelson	36%
Rosemont	Nelson	36%
Trafalgar	Nelson	37%
Blewett	Nelson	38%
Al Collinson	Nelson	40%

SD08 - Facilities Condition Index (FCI) Ranking			
		FCI	
Salmo Secondary	Salmo		0%
Salmo Elementary	Salmo		56%

SD08 - Facilities Condition Index (FCI) Ranking		
		FCI
Mount Sentinel	Slocan	11%
WE Graham	Slocan	14%
Brent Kennedy	Slocan	15%
Winlaw	Slocan	37%

Deferred Maintenance Costs

- District-wide: \$52.7 million
- Annual AFG grant: \$1.3
- 40.54 years worth of repairs
- Does not take into account “immediate” repairs of \$12.6 million taking 10 years to address



Requirements Crosstab Report *by Category and Priority*

Category and Priority	1- Immediate	2- Short Term	3- Long Term	4- Recommended	5- Does Not Meet Current Codes / Standards	Total
Accessibility	1,102	0	0	19,132	588,410	608,644
Air and Water Quality	0	0	0	13,974	0	13,974
Appearance	0	1,672	0	0	0	1,672
Asbestos	0	0	0	8,341	0	8,341
Beyond Useful Life	12,395,695	5,545,305	32,490,553	0	0	50,431,553
Building Code	0	0	0	0	1,071,266	1,071,266
Capacity/Design	0	0	96,882	0	0	96,882
Energy	0	0	0	207,428	0	207,428
Life Safety	184,290	0	0	0	0	184,290
Maintenance	0	3,289	3,108	0	0	6,397
Modernization	0	27,370	0	51,159	0	78,529
Reliability	40,678	3,688	0	0	0	44,366
Total	12,621,765	5,581,324	32,590,543	300,034	1,659,676	52,753,342

Critical Failures

- With so many immediate needs and limited capital funding, SD8 experiences critical failures and lost instructional days due to school closures:

Site	Issue	School Year	Number of Days of Instruction Lost	Approx. Cost
Blewett Elementary	Sewer system failure	2012-2013	0	\$80,000
WE Graham Elementary	Water supply failure	2013-2014	2	\$10,000
WE Graham Elementary	Propane tank valve failure	2012-2013	1	\$2,000
Jewett Elementary	Sewer system failure	2013-2014	1	\$2,500
Jewett Elementary	Propane failure	2012-2013	2	
Hume Elementary	Activity room mold	2012-2013	0	\$180,000
Yahk Elementary	Sewer system failure	2013-2014	2	\$7,500
Trafalgar Middle School	Plugged storm drain #1	2012-2013	0.5	\$25,000
Trafalgar Middle School	Plugged storm drain #2	2013-2014	0	\$1,000
Trafalgar Middle School	Boiler coil failure	2010-2011	Partial site restriction	\$3,000
Winlaw Elementary	Water supply failure	2013-2014	2.5	

\$311,000

- \$50.4 million of the \$52.7 million in deferred maintenance costs = systems beyond their useful life = more critical failures.




Requirements Crosstab Report *by System Group and Priority*

System Group and Priority	1- Immediate	2- Short Term	3- Long Term	4- Recommended	5- Does Not Meet Current Codes / Standards	Total
Electrical System	762,893	1,831,004	10,307,124	242,809	58,437	13,202,267
Equipment	0	10,758	43,722	0	0	54,480
Equipment and Furnishings	1,423,156	0	3,768,069	0	0	5,191,225
Exterior Enclosure	5,148,184	1,138,457	3,234,858	0	171,731	9,693,230
Fire Protection	0	3,665	60,894	0	374,582	439,141
HVAC System	59,351	592,937	5,400,087	11,336	62,711	6,126,422
Interior Construction and Conveyance	3,811,914	1,268,901	4,660,985	8,341	759,143	10,509,284
Plumbing System	8,443	119,305	3,211,016	18,416	2,105	3,359,285
Site	1,377,213	616,297	1,829,244	0	4,174	3,826,928
Special Construction	0	0	73,045	0	0	73,045
Structure	25,645	0	1,499	0	12,506	39,650
Not Applicable	4,966	0	0	19,132	214,287	238,385
Total	12,621,765	5,581,324	32,590,543	300,034	1,659,676	52,753,342


Requirements Crosstab Report *by Category and System Group*

Category and System Group	Electrical System	Equipment	Equipment and Furnishings	Exterior Enclosure	Fire Protection	HVAC System	Interior Construction and Conveyance	Plumbing System	Site	Special Construction	Structure	Not Applicable	Total
Accessibility	0	0	0	159,192	0	0	308,374	0	4,174	0	6,200	130,704	608,644
Air and Water Quality	0	0	0	0	0	11,336	0	2,638	0	0	0	0	13,974
Appearance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,672	0	0	0	0	0	1,672
Asbestos	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,341	0	0	0	0	0	8,341
Beyond Useful Life	12,762,539	54,480	5,191,225	9,380,569	64,559	6,021,242	9,703,733	3,335,475	3,819,646	73,045	25,040	0	50,431,553
Building Code	58,437	0	0	12,539	374,582	62,711	450,769	2,105	0	0	6,306	103,817	1,071,266
Capacity/ Design	0	0	0	96,882	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96,882
Energy	207,428	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207,428
Life Safety	111,112	0	0	0	0	31,133	36,077	0	0	0	2,104	3,864	184,290
Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,289	3,108	0	0	0	6,397
Modernization	62,751	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,778	0	0	0	0	78,529
Reliability	0	0	0	44,048	0	0	318	0	0	0	0	0	44,366
Total	13,202,267	54,480	5,191,225	9,693,230	439,141	6,126,422	10,509,284	3,359,285	3,826,928	73,045	39,650	238,385	52,753,342


Total Cost of Deferred Maintenance




Total Deferred Maintenance Costs per Seat if 100% Utilization




Total Cost of Deferred Maintenance by 14/15 Headcount




Total Deferred Maintenance Costs per Square Metre





Adding Value with Facilities Planning

1. Human resources
2. Direct service to students
3. Investment in asset base
4. Improve physical learning environment



School Facilities that Support Operations


- Flooring – no carpet; concrete floors/terrazzo
- Envelope – concrete block, metal cladding, insulated roll shutters
- Mechanical – Large with ease of access, heated slab, classroom ventilators and air handlers to augment, high efficiency boilers, geothermal, remote access
- Custodial – built in vacuum, drop lighting, standard water temperature, classroom regulated heat, sufficient size closets with floor sinks, washable paint, concrete washroom surfaces
- Technology – dedicated communication room, multiple drops in classrooms, cooling in server rooms, fibre links, cable trays, hardwired clocks, audio systems in all rooms
- Electrical – large room with ease of access and cooling, generator backup, cable trays and conduit, redundancy, LED & T5 lighting (dimmable), occupancy sensors, remote access
- Roof – flat roof, interior access, limited skylights, limited roof penetrations

School Facilities that Support Learning

Ideas for today and tomorrow



Organizing for Learning



The Future of the physical Learning Environment: School Facilities that Support the User (2011)

Dynamic Learning Spaces

- Flexible furniture solutions
- Context-driven
- The notion of “classes” and “class size” will morph into organization for learning; learning spaces need to be flexible in order to accommodate this shift
- Seamless access to technology
- Emphasis on many ways to organize – individual, in groups, working spaces, collaboration spaces
- Break-out spaces to provide “retreat” time for individuals or small groups
- Dispersed learning environments within the school building, and throughout the community
- Mobility options for students and staff (online learning environments, access to business operations and functions)
- Mobility options for staff and students allow us to think ‘outside of school walls’ – creating options for virtual and physical attendance
- Do all programs need classroom space? As we recognize community partnerships as critical to learning, how does this impact our space design?

Community Partnerships – Shared Spaces

- Facilities need to reflect the local context; districts need to be prepared to understand that a facility that serves one community well, may not necessarily be replicated with success in other communities
- Community Service Organizations who work closely with schools may be co-located in school buildings
- Public libraries and school libraries often duplicate services; can they co-locate and service community and schools?
- Can more than one program – with different pedagogical perspectives, be located in one facility?

What do ALL students need?

- Strong learning relationships
- Safe, supportive, healthy learning environments
- Access to learning opportunities that meet their needs and challenge them at their level
- Access to curriculum and support

What do SOME students need?

- Are needs different based on age level?
- Are needs different based on personalization?
- Are needs different based on level of support required?
- Are needs different based on learning outcomes?

What do FEW students need?

- Are there ways to combine services with local colleges, community partners to meet specialized needs?

Guiding Principles in Action

Research proven approaches

Collaborative

Collaborative inquiry
Communities of practice
Collaborative planning protocols
Collaboration hubs

Sustained

Institutes/ series/courses
Coaches
Demonstration/ modeling
Mentors

Connected

Moderated Networks
Learning showcases, fairs, rounds
Cross cluster sharing
Social media

Personalized

Choice
Access
Resources
Goals

Face to Face

Blended

Virtual



Meeting the Needs of Students

Models

- Inquiry
- Problem based
- Experiential
- Simulations
- ...

Design Skills


- Universal design
- Scaffolding
- **Gradual release of responsibility**
- ...

Teaching strategies

- Cooperative learning
- Graphic organizers
- Reciprocal teaching
- Thinking skills
-

Assessment

- Formative
- Summative
- ...



Models

- Co design by learning partners
- Blended learning
- On line learning
- ...

Strategies

- Learning partnerships
- collaboration tools
- Threaded discussions
- Blogs, wikis
- Apps
- Gaming
- ...

Assessment

- Feedback analytics
- Self assessment
- Peer assessment
- ...

What's happening in your schools?

The Nature of Learning

The LEARNER at the center

Learning is SOCIAL

EMOTION plays a Key Role in Learning

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES matter in Learning

ALL Learners need CHALLENGE

Learners need CLARITY and MEANINGFUL FEEDBACK


Learners need to see CONNECTIONS





SD8 Kootenay Lake: Refresh, Repurpose, Reinvent?

Susanne Maguire
Teacher
School District 8
November, 2014



“Alongside quality teaching and purposeful leadership, decent school environments inspire pupils to give their best and properly enable our teachers to teach.”

T. Goddard, Director, British Council for School

Environment

**Some images and
information to
inspire...**






Trends Affecting School Environment

Of the many changes underway in education, two trends in particular are revolutionizing the design of the learning environment:

***The shift from the teacher as a “sole practitioner” to interactive team teaching**

***The recognition that students have a variety of learning styles requiring varied and flexible learning situations.**

Each of these trends poses significant challenges to the design of the learning environment—and in turn opens up broad opportunities for innovation.



Photography: Anders Sune Berg
Architecture: Bosch & Fjord

Photography: Anders Sune Berg
Architecture: Bosch & Fjord



Environmental Impacts on Academic Success


Research by University of Salford, England, 2012



Classroom environment found to have a **25%** impact on student performance

- 6 out of 10 parameters had a significant impact. They are:

- Light – 12%
- Choice – 10%
- Complexity – 17%
- Colour 18%
- Flexibility – 17%
- Connection – 26%






The fundamental building block of almost every single school in this country is the classroom.

Who seriously believes that locking 25 students in a small room with one adult for several hours each day is the best way for them to be “educated”?

In the 21st century, education is about project-based learning, connections with peers around the world, service learning, independent research, design and creativity, and, more than anything else, critical thinking and challenges to old assumptions.

Photography: Re
Architecture: Re-





...structures will be “learning communities” characterized by adaptable spaces, small learning groups, new technologies, and environments conducive to both contemplation and interaction.



10 Things in School That Should Be Obsolete

- 1. Computer Labs**
- 2. Learning in prescribed places**
- 3. Teacher-centred classrooms**
- 4. Isolated classrooms**
- 5. Department organization**
- 6. School Corridors**
- 7. Traditional school libraries**
- 8. Dark, indoor gyms**
- 9. Institutional food service**
- 10. Large restrooms**

<http://blogs.kqed.org/mindshift/2012/07/10-things-in-school-that-should-be-obsolete/>



Don't Just Rebuild Schools Reinvent Them

Create personalized learning communities

Make technology ubiquitous

**Connect with the outdoors for health, fitness,
and improved academics**

Focus on student comfort.

Treat teachers like professionals.

Engage parents and the community.

http://www.fieldingnair.com/Press/Education_Week_

“Because architecture can facilitate the transmission of cultural values, we need to look at what our present school buildings are saying to our children. We expect schools to prepare children for living in a democratic society, yet we provide a learning environment that resembles a police state – hard, overly durable, fenced...”

A. Taylor, 1993

“The principle goal of education is to create men who are capable of doing new things, not simply repeating what other generations have done – men who are creative, inventive and discovers.”

Jean Piaget

Key Stages

Analyzing

Data
Scenarios
Learning
Impact
Business Case

Planning

Decision
Making
Phasing
Flexibility

Acting

Implementation
Feedback
Evaluate
Adjust

Scenarios

- Otherwise known as options, ideas, variations
- Challenges status quo to add value to the system
- We need you to think about what options the Board should consider



Scenarios

Re-Configuration

- Addresses areas of growth pressure (Winlaw/Blewett)
- May not involve closure
- May better meet learner needs
- If no closure, may or may not save money to add value to student learning

Closure – School or Space

- Involves closure of a building or space within a building
- Saves money (staffing, utilities, deferred maintenance costs) to add value to learning environment and direct service to students
- Unloads future liability by unloading capital costs

Scorecard

- Way by which to measure one scenario against another
- Business case approach, not merely cost driven
 - Long term view
 - Linked to student expectations and goals
 - Optimizes asset use
 - Organizational performance

SD8 Facilities Plan			
Evaluation Criteria			
Weighting: 50% Board, 25% PVP, 25% Senior Leadership - 2014 09 08			
Group	Individual Criteria	Reference	Weight
Economic 22%	1. Minimize total net capital costs over planning horizon	Basic	9%
	2. Minimize total initial capital expenditure	Basic	5%
	3. Minimized total operational cost over planning horizon	Basic	9%
Educational 40%	4. Maximize the range of opportunities	Principle	9%
	5. Best meet the developmental needs of each age group	Principle	10%
	6. Minimize the distance to school for elementary students	Principle	7%
	7. Provide schools within preferred capacity ranges	Principle	4%
	8. Minimize the number of transitions between schools	Principle	5%
	9. Promote a unified community	Principle	5%
Operational 19%	10. Improve the safety and quality of educational facilities	Basic	11%
	11. Maximize the sustainability of school facilities	Principle	8%
Strategic 19%	12. Maximize the potential to respond to future change	Principle	6%
	13. Maximize potential partnership opportunities	Principle	5%
	14. Minimize implementation risks	Basic	3%
	15. Minimize disruption due to construction projects	Basic	2%
	16. Maximize the potential for broad community acceptance	Basic	3%

Other Considerations

- Strong starts
- Tenants
- Catchment
- Transfer policy
- Transportation
- Disposal of property
- Funding line items like small community supplements
- Existing partnerships
- Distributed learning in South Creston and Central Elementary Schools

Next Steps

- Give us feedback on the data – is there more you need to know?
- Give us your ideas for scenarios by January 5, 2015
- How to submit?
 - Email facilities@sd8.bc.ca
 - Fax 250-352-6686
 - Mail 570 Johnstone Road, Nelson BC, V1L 6J2



Thank you!

