



# School District No. 67 (Okanagan Skaha) BOUNDARY (CATCHMENT AREA) REVIEW

May 15, 2018

## Executive Summary

### OBJECTIVE:

The Board of Education passed the following motion on November 14, 2016 directing staff to perform a boundary review.

*“That the Board of Education direct the secretary-treasurer to prepare two reviews, one regarding transportation and one examining school catchment boundaries.”*

The results of this review were presented and discussed with the Board of Education on March 16, 2018 at which time it was decided that this information session be scheduled.

### RATIONALE:

Over the last several years the Board of Education has had the intention to review the district’s school boundaries. This would be the catchment areas that indicate which geographical areas attend which schools at the elementary level but also includes which elementary schools feed into which middle schools. Further discussion occurred during the school closure consultations held during the 2015/16 school year. Then more recently, with the impact of the Supreme Court ruling for the British Columbia Teachers Federation (BCTF) last year the Board again expressed concern regarding school capacities and catchment areas, which has resulted in this review and report.

### SCOPE:

The boundary review is an analysis of school capacities; enrolment and projected enrolments; as well as physical space and human resources available within. This review is based on both historical and Statistics Canada data collected by a demographics and enrolment projection software called Baragar Systems. This system holds current capacities and catchment areas; enrolments and several prior years enrolments; demographic information such as birth rates and cohort retention that give it the ability to perform enrolment projections for each school and therefore, future needs for space. This system can also perform enrolment projections based on “what-if” scenarios. The data used in our analysis is based on the September 2017 (2017/18 school year) enrolments.

### SUMMARY:

The analysis was performed beginning with current school capacities and September 2017 enrolment of 5,660 students district wide that includes international students attending in our district. Initial analysis indicates that 23% of students (1,289) attend schools outside of their boundary (catchment areas) by transfer policy; this number does include French Immersion students. The analysis also indicates which schools are projected to be over their spacial capacities by 25% through a 15 year projection. The analysis identified three schools that would be considered concerning; these schools are Parkway

Elementary, KVR Middle School and Giant's Head Elementary. Further, more in depth, analysis was then performed on these three schools looking for solutions that include both changing the boundaries (catchment areas) for the elementary schools, a change in feeder schools for the middle school, as well as the impact of fewer cross boundary transfers. All projections grandfather all students currently attending these schools. All results are analyzed five years in the future to 2022.

Parkway Elementary analysis was run on three scenarios. One scenario that moved a boundary line so that some students would go to Wiltse Elementary; a second scenario that would have some students going to Carmi; and a third scenario that indicates the impact of closing Parkway Elementary to cross boundary transfers (currently 77 students are cross boundary). Over time all three scenarios will result in the objective of bringing Parkway Elementary into capacity however, when factoring in the housing projects within the current Parkway catchment only the closure of transfers is responsive enough to meet this need. Closure of transfers also impacts Carmi, Wiltse and Kaleden positively.

KVR Middle School analysis was run on scenarios that looked at both the English and French Immersion (FI) tracks. Both tracks are showing increases over the next five years. Two scenarios were created including removing Carmi as a feeder school and sending these students to Skaha Lake Middle School (SLMS). And another that allowed FI to continue to grow and one that caps FI at nine divisions (three per grade). The scenario that only impacts the Carmi English track students does not accomplish the objective of capacity. The second Carmi scenario with the FI numbers capped does accomplish the objective, however, this would result in students who reside north of KVR unable to attend that school. A third scenario closed all English track cross boundary transfers but allowed FI to continue growing, transversely a fourth scenario capped FI but allowed the English track to continue growing. Neither of these scenarios performed the desired results. The best results were realized in a fifth scenario that both closes cross boundary transfers in the English track and caps the FI enrolment. This scenario comes closest in accomplishing the desired results.

Giant's Head Elementary analysis was very interesting as the data indicates that there are currently almost equal cross boundary transfers between Giant's Head (21) and Trout Creek Elementary (23). Moving/changing boundaries (catchment areas) were considered, but based on the geographical divisions such as, ravines, the highway and/or the inclusion of some of upper Summerland, that already as well as bus route possibilities, it was established that this would not be an efficient or plausible solution in this case. Further analysis occurred and resulted in only one scenario that achieved the objective. This result is to close all cross boundary transfers in to Giant's Head, but to continue to allow cross boundary transfers into Trout Creek.

## CONCLUSION:

In conclusion the Board of Education is satisfied that the current school boundaries (catchment areas) are appropriate for the next several years. The concerns at the three schools identified can be resolved by reducing the number of cross boundary transfers allowed on an annual basis. This is already within the purview of Policy #305 – Choice and Flexibility and is at the discretion of the Superintendent of Schools or designate. Policy #305 – Choice and Flexibility will be reviewed next year in our regular policy review practice. No changes are being considered at this time.