

2004: SB3

Memorandum to: Senior Business Officials
From: Drew Nameth
Date: March 24, 2004
Subject: School Renewal Initiative

As you are aware, for the past 18 months, the renewal needs of all schools in the province have been assessed through inspections carried out by qualified building professionals as part of the Ministry's School Renewal Initiative. The information collected through that process is currently being compiled into databases which will be incorporated into the ReCAPP asset management software and a final report by Physical Planning Technologies, Inc. (PPTI), the consulting firm that oversaw this work.

I am writing at this time to seek additional information to complement this analysis in two distinct areas.

Renewal Work Completed before the School Inspections

In an ideal world, all schools would have been inspected on the same day by the same group of inspectors to ensure consistency. Clearly that was not possible. To address this issue, PPTI implemented a comprehensive quality assurance process to ensure that all schools were looked at in the same way.

A spreadsheet of all schools in your board which were inspected as part of the school renewal initiative and the date on which each was inspected can be found on the Ministry's FTP site at: <ftp://ftp.edu.gov.on.ca/sfis/renewal2004>. A sample for explanatory purposes is attached.

It is recognized that some boards may have undertaken some repair work at a school between the commencement of the inspection process in Fall 2002 and the date on which the school was inspected. In most cases, this is likely to apply only to schools inspected after August 31, 2003. Others notified the Ministry of Education of their intention to carry out needed repairs prior to this initiative and had received written acknowledgement from the Ministry indicating that moving quickly to address deficiencies would not be included in an assessment of need for such work if a change in funding for school renewal were made in the future.

Boards that have undertaken such work are invited to make the Ministry aware of the cost and nature of these repairs at each school. Please advise the Business Services Branch by noon, April 15, 2004 of the cost and nature of repair work done at schools **between September 1, 2002 (or, if applicable, the date of the acknowledgement letter issued by the Ministry of Education) and the date on which the school was inspected** by entering the information in the appropriate columns (Columns L and M in blue) in the spreadsheet for your board. **Boards are advised that documentation in support of these submissions should be kept readily available should the Ministry have questions or require additional information regarding specific projects.**

Expenditures recorded for an individual school should relate to school renewal projects as described in Regulation 446/98, Section 1 or Section 2(1) (a) and conform to the parameters used for the School Renewal Report on the School Facilities Information System (SFIS). A school renewal project would normally cost more than \$10,000 and convey a benefit over more than one year to a single facility.

Shared Facilities

A number of facilities across the province accommodate two or more schools. Some facilities are used by a single board to provide both elementary and secondary school programming; other facilities are shared by two boards. Because arrangements to cover the cost of repair work may vary from site to site, it is not possible at this time to accurately distribute the renewal needs of shared schools across boards or across panels at this time. Accordingly in the ReCAPP databases, the total of the renewal needs of shared facilities will be attributed to the board that completed the Asset Review Tool (ART) for the school building. No renewal costs are attributed per school as identified by the SFIS number.

It is recognized that it will be necessary to pro-rate these costs between panels or between boards as the case may be in order to accurately measure a board's total renewal requirements. At this time our intention is to pro-rate on the basis of school capacity unless doing so is not consistent with agreements that boards sharing schools have made. Please advise my office by noon on April 15, 2004 if your board believes that pro-rating renewal costs of a shared school on the basis of capacity is inappropriate, and document the distribution approach which your board believes should be used. Please ensure that your partner board is aware of and agrees with this approach.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Lygia Dallip at 416-325-2017 (Lygia.Dallip@edu.gov.on.ca) or Susan Peschken at 416-325-8589 (Susan.Peschken@edu.gov.on.ca).

Original signed by

Drew Nameth
Director
Business Services Branch

cc. Directors of Education
Senior Planning Official