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1| Recommendation
It is recommended:

- THAT the Superintendents' Team approves Option 1 - Standardized training for lunchroom supervisors and implementing common procedures and practices for noon supervision programs.

The CBE Community Engagement Report on fees indicated that parents requested common standards to be established and consistently applied throughout all schools that provided Noon Supervision Service within the Calgary Board of Education.

## 3| Background

The Lunch Programs Development Team (LPDT) was formed in the spring of 2000 to develop a new model for providing lunch services to elementary students. Its work involved extensive consultation with parents, lunch program operators, principals, CBE representatives, the Staff Association, community representatives, the Calgary Regional Health Authority (Alberta Heath Services), the City of Calgary, and other child-serving agencies. The Team's report was submitted to the Board of Trustees on March 6, 2001, Appendix III and IV.

The recommendations of the LPDT were strongly supported by the Board of Trustees (with a modification to the fees recommended for bussed students). The Board's approval set the stage for the formation of the Lunch Programs Implementation Team (LPIT). The LPIT was given the responsibility of implementing the new lunch program by the start of the 2001-02 school year.

On December 19, 2000 the Board of Trustees endorsed the following Philosophy and Guiding Principles for elementary lunch services and from which the Building Blocks for elementary lunch services were derived:

## Philosophy

Lunch supervision services are an important part of a child's educational experience. The Calgary Board of Education, parents and community have a shared responsibility to ensure that lunch supervision service for elementary students addresses "What's Best for Children".

Guiding Principles:

1. Services - Lunch supervision includes the following services to elementary students:
(a) Supervision while they are eating lunch,
(b) Supervision while they are playing,
(c) Enhanced nutritional awareness, and
(d) Making nutritious food available to students in need.
2. Accessibility - Elementary students will be accommodated in a lunch supervision service through a "user pay" concept. (School exemption is only obtained through a review by the Superintendent's office).
3. Quality - A quality lunch supervision service:
(a) Meets the identified needs of elementary students,
(b) Provides elementary students with a healthy and safe environment to eat and play,
(c) Is supervised by qualified, caring individuals,
(d) Enhances nutritional awareness, and
(e) Provides access to nutritious food to students in need.
4. Equity - Lunch supervision service is equitable when standards for quality lunch supervision services are monitored across the system.
5. Flexibility - Lunch supervision services are flexible when individual schools provide a range of services to meet the needs of elementary students and parents.
6. Accountability - The CBE is accountable for ensuring that:
(a) Lunch supervision is available on a user pay basis,
(b) Quality standards are established for lunch supervision service, and ensure that standards are met,
(c) Individuals who work in lunch supervision services receive appropriate pay and credit for their employment service, and
(e) Lunch supervision services are provided in the schools and on school grounds, with furnishings and equipment that are safe, secure, and clean.
7. Funding - Parents are responsible for funding lunch supervision services.
8. Community Partnerships - The CBE works in partnership with the community \& child care organizations to enhance nutritional awareness and make nutritious food available to children in need and to pursue resources for parents encountering financial hardship.

## Building Blocks:

Lunchtime supervision strategies should recognize:

- That students need a safe and secure place to have their lunch break;
- That the Alberta Labour Board decision, Alberta Labour laws, and Calgary Board of Education collective agreements must be adhered to;
- The need for the program to be financially self-supporting;
- The need for program flexibility and simplicity;
- That all students accessing lunchtime supervision must pay the school's lunch supervision fee;
- That reasonable staffing ratios, a "pay for service by all users" concept, school-based implementation, and a low level of central administration involvement are key program components;
- A decentralized approach will result in greater efficiency and effectiveness;
- Any subsidy from the instruction block means that supporting a lunch supervision service is deemed to be of greater importance than directing resources into frontline teaching; and
- The need to put more dollars back into classrooms. ${ }^{1}$

[^0]The Philosophy, Guiding Principles and Building Blocks were used to guide the creation of school lunch supervision service. The Elementary Lunch Supervision Service Handbook was developed by the Lunch Programs Implementation Team (LPIT) with input from lunch supervisors, principals, other employees of the Calgary Board of Education, and volunteers to incorporate the concepts of the Philosophy, Guiding Principles and Building Blocks, At the same time the handbook was designed to give structure to and set the basic standards for a school managed self-supporting lunch supervision service.

The LPDT recommended in the March 6, 2001, Report to the Trustees that the student to supervisor ratio for all lunch programs be set at $30: 1$, with an ability to adjust the ratio to address special needs or exceptional circumstances within each program. This ratio was set using the Alberta Child Care Licensing Regulation and taking into consideration the Alberta School Act.

Provincial Acts legislating supervision of children;
Alberta Regulation 143/2008-CHILD CARE LICENSING REGULATION
For income tax purposes paid CBE noon hour supervision is considered child care.

| CHILD CARE <br> LICENSING <br> REGULATION | Ratios |  | Details |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Out of School <br> Care Program <br> Schedule 4 | Maximum <br> Kindergarten | Maximum <br> Grades <br> 1 to 6 <br> 30 | 25(1) (b)"children are, at all times, <br> under supervision that is adequate to <br> ensure their safety, well-being and <br> development." |

## Alberta School Act:

Effective supervision is one of the most basic and important priorities. It is so important that the requirement for adequate supervision that in Alberta, a School Board is governed by the School Act3 (the "Act"). The Act places specific obligations on a School Board for supervision of students. Section 45(8) obligates a School Board to provide each student with a safe and caring environment that fosters and maintains respectful and responsible behaviours.

The CBE is in the forefront of providing a quality fee for service noon supervision program. The guidance that was provided by the Lunch Programs Development Team in the Noon Supervision Lunchroom Manual was very comprehensive. The ratio at that time was set at what was referred to as the "Gold Standard" which was 30 to 1. This ratio was in place for the inaugural year of the program and was subsidized by the CBE as per attachments III \& IV. In subsequent years when the program was decentralized to the schools this was found to be very costly and this ratio ceased to be used.

While there has been a recommendation through the CBE Community Engagement process for setting guidelines for noon supervision ratios at schools, there are a number of issues to consider. Parent optics have equated that setting a ratio of staff to students = standardized service. Implied parental expectations could be described by; "The basis of a parent's decision to let his child participate in a school activity is the implied understanding that ultimately the school will not put children at risk...In terms of property, society views children as its most valuable asset, and accordingly, the responsibility and duty of care of those entrusted with them is the highest. You do not have to tell someone this as it is expected and understood by everyone."2
Bridging the gap between theory and practice for effective supervision of students however, needs to take into account the complex set of skills, knowledge, and attitudes that adults need to work effectively in school-age care. "Effective supervision is about more than watching children; it is about using techniques that promote effective supervision practices and create safe caring environments." ${ }^{3}$ This requires the staff member to be actively involved with students and have the training and knowledge required to provide safe and quality supervision. To achieve this Lunchroom staff need to have the basic foundations of what supervision is and the CBE expectations. This also requires the staff member to have knowledge of which students have potential allergies and at the same time have knowledge of students who may be at risk of harming themselves or others.

Therefore, to address best practice, standardized noon supervision service may include the following:

- Standardization of staff training
- Standardization of practices and procedures for noon supervision programs
- Student to staff ratio
- Standardization of equipment and facilities


## A. Standardization of training for Lunchroom Supervisors

The 3 year Education Plan supports standardized training for Lunchroom Supervisors:
Build Our Capacity focuses on shared standards of practice which can only come from common training. Promote a workplace culture that ensures continuous improvement in program provision, service delivery, and professional learning across the system.

[^1]The CBE has in place through Chinook Learning Services, an introductory one-day training session which introduces lunch supervisors to the philosophy and goals of the CBE's noon supervision service for elementary students. Other jurisdictions provide a skeleton synopsis of what the program should look like.

The feedback from Principals identified the following competencies and skill sets that lunch supervisors should have either prior to being hired or trained in that are not included in the introductory course;

| Skills prior to hire | Training after hire |
| :--- | :--- |
| - First Aide | - Strategies for managing a large group of students |
| - English language | - Bullying strategies |
| competency | - Anaphylaxis awareness |
| - Introductory Noon | - Emergency procedures |
| Supervision Course | - WHMIS |
|  | - Types of supervision - direct and indirect |
|  | - Conflict resolution |
|  | - Job shadowing |
|  | - Problem solving techniques |
|  | - Self confidence |

Benefits and challenges of standardized training

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| • Standardized training provides a skill | • The ongoing costs related to providing |
| set for staff that will meet the | training |
| expectations of the CBE to provide |  |
| students with a safe and healthy |  |
| atmosphere for students during the |  |
| noon recess |  |
| - Well trained staff are intrinsically |  |
| motivated to do well. |  |

## B. Standardization of practices and procedures for noon supervision programs

Standardized practices and procedures should detail the regularly recurring work processes that are connected to noon supervision. They document the way activities are to be performed to facilitate quality and consistency in noon supervision for the health and safety of students. They may describe, for example, as shown in Appendix II, Active Supervision on the Playground. Examples;

- Active supervision on the playground
- Rules for lunchroom
- Rules for conflict resolution - with relies on using words rather than physical confrontation
- CBE branded posters and signage for noon supervision
- Update existing lunchroom manual to a lunchroom handbook

Benefits and challenges of standardization of practices and procedures

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| - The development and use of | . The ongoing costs related to updating |
| standardization of practices and | materials |
| procedures minimizes variation and |  |
| promotes quality through consistent |  |
| implementation of a process or |  |
| procedure within the noon supervision |  |
| program, even when there are new |  |
| staff or temporary substitutes. |  |
| - CBE branded posters and signage for |  |
| noon supervision sets the visual tone |  |
| for consistency and standardization. |  |
| Each lunchroom will have the same |  |
| visuals promoting various strategies for |  |
| the lunchroom. |  |
| - Update existing lunchroom manual to a |  |
| lunchroom handbook will provide an |  |
| easy reference guide for lunchroom |  |
| management, expectations and |  |
| strategies. |  |

## C. Student to staff ratio

The 3 year Education Plan does not support setting an inflexible ratio:
Stewarding Resources should be based on values and priorities, be data driven, responsive and sustainable.

It is not recommended that an inflexible ratio be set for staff to students but adopt the industry standard for metropolitan school boards in Alberta for noon supervision which relies on deferring back to either the Alberta School Act or applying the principle of the common-law doctrine of in loco parentis. Supervision helps to protect children from hazards or harm that may arise in their daily experiences during lunch, in play, and interactions with others. Adequate supervision means that an adult can respond immediately including when a student is distressed or is in a hazardous situation.

Factors that were considered when determining not to recommend a staff to student ratio for noon supervision;

| Duty of <br> Care | "Duty of care requires consideration of the consequences of acts and <br> omissions and to ensure that those acts or omissions do not create a <br> foreseeable risk of injury." |
| :--- | :--- |
| Standard of <br> Care | Standard of care can be defined as "the degree of care which a <br> reasonable person would exercise in similar circumstances so as to <br> avoid exposing others to an unreasonable risk or harm. In cases where <br> the person to whom the duty is owed is a child in the school board's |

[^2]|  | care, the standard of care owed to the child is that of the reasonably <br> prudent parent."5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Due | "Due Diligence simply means taking all reasonable steps to protect the <br> well-being of employees, co-workers, students and visitors. In order to <br> comply with the standard of due diligence, all reasonable precautions <br> must be taken, even to the point of exceeding generally accepted <br> practices. Due diligence requires the identification of hazards and the <br> implementation of specific preventative measures to protect employees <br> from loss, injury, illness and disease." Being diligent is not a one-time <br> thing. It has to be a way of working every day. <br> "Due Diligence is not an attitude, but a set of measurable, observable <br> actions."" |
| Industry <br> Standard | Utilizing the Alberta School Act or applying the principle of the common- <br> law doctrine of in loco parentis as a guide for supervision. <br> "As a minimum, a reasonably prudent person would know current <br> "industry standards" for an activity and communicate and apply them"8 |
| -page 16 |  |

Chart 1 - Variables in school settings

| Lunch | Playground / Outside <br> Supervision | General |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 1 lunch or a split <br> lunch <br> - if classrooms are <br> used <br> if lunch is in an | - nature of outside playground <br> activity (playground <br> equipment apparatus) <br> areas where the students <br> are engaging in the | • age and abilities of students <br> - number of students <br> additional <br> supervision/support needs <br> of some or all participants |

[^3]| open area such as a gym <br> if lunch is in multiple spaces such as open areas and hallways | activities, in particular the visibility and accessibility of these areas <br> - Trespass routes - access points to the playground area for persons with no direct link to the school Exits to be monitored for students who may be runners | due to disabilities <br> behavioural difficulties of certain students need for staff members to move between areas student traffic the ability to hire staff the ability to have enough temporary staff to fill in when necessary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

Chart 2 - Impact on schools if $50-1$ ratio is implemented
There may not be sufficient revenue to support using a strict ratio for noon supervision in smaller programs. For example, if a school has 50 students to stay for supervision, the school would hire one supervisor at a cost of $\$ 11,314$, with a fee revenue of $\$ 11,500$. Using a very strict ratio, if they had 55 students, they should be hiring a second supervisor but would only have additional fee revenue of $\$ 1,150$. Looking at the projected noon supervision enrolment for 2012-13 for each school, this will impact eight schools with fewer than 115 students in noon supervision. The schools listed below have an enrolment of between 40 and 125 students. The numbers on the $X$ axis simply represent School \#1, \#2, etc.


Chart 3 - CBE Noon Supervision Ratio from Survey

| Answer Choices | Responses |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $30-1$ | $6.6 \%$ | Noon Supervision |
| $40-1$ | $32.08 \%$ | survey indicates |
| $50-1$ | $40.57 \%$ | that 79\% of the |
| $60-1$ | $14.15 \%$ | responding schools |
| $70-1$ | $3.77 \%$ | have staff to |
| greater than 70 | $2.83 \%$ | student ratios that |

Benefits and challenges of a staff to student ratio

| - Accommodating parent optics which have equated setting a ratio of staff to students = standardized service | - The 3 year Education Plan does not support setting an inflexible ratio <br> - The mitigating circumstances that would prevent schools from achieving the ratio <br> - Justification to parents when if they deem there is not an appropriate ratio <br> - The ability to hire enough supervisors in a timely fashion <br> - Parent perception and engagement if the fees are higher in subsequent years to cover the costs because of increased staffing ratios <br> - Reviewing and setting values and priorities that could accommodate individual school settings <br> - Justification of a ratio that is not being driven by data or based on industry standards <br> - Equating that by setting a ratio of staff to students that the CBE has achieved standardized service <br> - Setting a ratio would not be responsive to the school <br> - May not be sustainable |
| :---: | :---: |

## D. Standardization of equipment and facilities

It is not recommended to set specific equipment and facilities for noon supervision programs. Other school jurisdictions have not mandated specific facilities that should come with a fee for service noon supervision program. In the original CBE Guiding Principles for Noon Supervision the following was used to define equipment and facilities; Lunch supervision services are provided in the schools and on school grounds, with furnishings and equipment that are safe, secure, and clean.

Factors that were considered when determining not to recommend setting set specific equipment and facilities for noon supervision;

| Seat for Every Child | Dependent on the following in individual school <br> settings; <br> - 1 lunch or a split lunch <br> - If classrooms are used <br> - If lunch is in an open area such as a gym <br> - If lunch is in a separate lunchroom area <br> - Space to store tables that does not impact <br> the ability to use a space such as the gym <br> - The number of drop in students utilizing the <br> lunch program <br> - The number of student staying or clubs that <br> occur after the student eat <br> - 93\% of the students staying for lunch, with <br> the exception of whole school activities, have <br> a seat for lunch. Chart 4 - page 11 |
| :--- | :--- |


| Availability of microwaves \& hot |
| :--- | :--- |
| water in each lunchroom |$|$| Dependent on the following in individual school |
| :--- |
| settings; |
| - Not every school has proper wiring to |
| facilitate the use of microwaves without |
| blowing a breaker |

Chart 4 - Percentage of Children who have a seat for lunch from Survey

| Answer Choices | Responses |
| :--- | :--- |
| Yes - all students have a seat for lunch | $92.86 \%$ |
| No - not all students have a seat for <br> lunch | $7.14 \%$ |

Benefits and challenges of standardization of equipment and facilities

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Accommodating parent <br> expectations to have every <br> student have a seat for 20 <br> minutes during the noon recess | - If a seat for every child was provided <br> based on noon supervision survey $7 \%$ of <br> the students would require additional <br> seating. An estimate of 37,000 students <br> is projected for noon supervision next |
|  | year. $7 \%=2,590$ students which equates <br> to an extra 217 table at a cost of <br> $\$ 184,500.00$. |
|  | - Finding space to store the extra tables |

## Option 1 - A\&B

- Standardization of staff training
- Standardization of practices and procedures for noon supervision programs
- Clear communication to all stakeholder groups (parents and Principals)
- Update existing lunchroom manual to a lunchroom handbook
- CBE branded posters and signage for noon supervision

The 3 year Education Plan supports Option 1. This option places more emphasis on the quality and training of the supervisors rather on the number of supervisors. We believe that by providing standardized training and standardize common practices and procedures will create a safe and healthy atmosphere for students during the noon recess. The premise of this option is that it is widely accepted that staff are an organisation's most expensive resource and as such should be valued as a very expensive asset. Deploying well trained supervisors optimize limited staffing resources and when Lunchroom Supervisors are well trained for their job they are intrinsically motivated to do well.

## Option 2 - A\&B\&C

- Standardization of staff training
- Standardization of practices and procedures for noon supervision programs
- Clear communication to all stakeholder groups (parents and Principals)
- Update existing lunchroom manual to a lunchroom handbook
- CBE branded posters and signage for noon supervision
- 50 to 1 is used as a guideline as is presently indicated by the CBE Noon Supervision survey.

The 3 year Education Plan does not support setting an inflexible ratio as presented in Option 2. Stewarding Resources should be based on values and priorities, be data driven, responsive and sustainable. Setting ratios of any kind are difficult to mitigate on a daily basis. Principals have indicated that it is challenging to hire staff for this position, sometimes waiting as long as 3 months for staff to be hired. Setting an inflexible ratio may not be sustainable.

## Option 3 - A\&B\&C\&D

- Standardization of staff training
- Standardization of practices and procedures for noon supervision programs
- Clear communication to all stakeholder groups (parents and Principals)
- Update existing lunchroom manual to a lunchroom handbook
- CBE branded posters and signage for noon supervision
- 50 to 1 is used as a guideline as is presently indicated by the CBE Noon Supervision survey.
- Standardization of equipment and facilities

The 3 year Education Plan does not support Option 3. Stewarding Resources should be based on values and priorities, be data driven, responsive and sustainable. This will be the most expensive option and may not be sustainable.

## Option 1 - \$53,700.00

| Item | Projected cost | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Update Lunchroom Manual | $250 \times \$ 6.00$ per manual | $\$ 1,500.00$ |
| Posters and signage | 160 schools $\times 20.00$ | $\$ 3,200.00$ |
| Staff training | 2 hrs. $\times 600$ staff @ \$20.00 / hr. | $\$ 24,000.00$ |
| Training coordinator | .5 centralized staff member | $\$ 25,000.00$ |
| Total Financial Impact |  | $\$ 53,700.00$ |

Option 2 - \$339,700.00

| Item | Projected cost | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Update Lunchroom Manual | $250 \times \$ 6.00$ per manual | \$ 1,500.00 |
| Posters and signage | 160 schools X \$20.00 | \$ 3,200.00 |
| Staff training | $2 \mathrm{hrs}$. X 600 staff @ \$20.00 / hr. | \$24,000.00 |
| Training coordinator | . 5 centralized staff member | \$25,000.00 |
| Recruitment of additional Lunch Supervisors | Based on 20\% of schools above $50-1$ ratio $=$ minimum 26 new staff to be hired at a cost of $\$ 12,000.00 /$ year. This cost in not built into the noon supervision fee structure so would be a direct cost to the schools | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 286,000.00 \\ & \text { (Minimum } \\ & \text { stand-alone } \\ & \text { financial } \\ & \text { impact) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Financial Impact |  | \$339,700.00 |

Option 3 -\$524,200.00 +++

| Item | Projected cost | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Update Lunchroom Manual | $250 \times \$ 6.00$ per manual | $\$ 1,500.00$ |
| Posters and signage | 160 schools $\times 20.00$ | $\$ 3,200.00$ |
| Staff training | 2 hrs. $\times 600$ staff $@ \$ 20.00 /$ hr. | $\$ 24,000.00$ |
| Training coordinator | .5 centralized staff member | $\$ 25,000.00$ |
| Recruitment of additional <br> Lunch Supervisors | Based on $20 \%$ of schools above <br> $50-1$ ratio = minimum 26 new staff <br> to be hired at a cost of <br> $\$ 12,000.00 /$ year. This cost in not <br> built into the noon supervision fee <br> structure so would be a direct <br> cost to the schools | $\$ 286,000.00$ |
| Seat for every child | 2,590 students which equates to <br> an extra 217 tables at a cost of <br> $\$ 850.00$ per table | $\$ 184,500.00$ <br> (Minimum stand- <br> alone financial <br> impact) |
| Standardized equipment | These costs need to be <br> calculated based on the needs of <br> the school which could include <br> equipment and wiring | +++ <br> (Financial <br> impact can only <br> be through <br> school by <br> school <br> assessment ) |
| Total Financial Impact | $\$ 524,200.00$ <br> +++ |  |

Communication of the final approved recommendations to all stakeholder groups (parents, school principals).

Option 1

- Review and development of operational practices and procedures
- Creation and filling of new training position
- Assessment of training and development needs of lunchroom supervisors
- Enhancement of existing training programs

Option 2 which includes setting a ratio of staff to students is;

- Review and development of operational practices and procedures
- Creation and filling of new training position
- Assessment of training and development needs of lunchroom supervisors
- Enhancement of existing training programs
- Recruitment of additional Lunchroom Supervisors
- Impact of ratio on decentralized budgets

Option 3 which includes standardization of seating and facilities is:

- Review and development of operational practices and procedures
- Creation and filling of new training position
- Assessment of training and development needs of lunchroom supervisors
- Enhancement of existing training programs
- Recruitment of additional Lunchroom Supervisors
- Impact of ratio on decentralized budgets
- School- by-school assessment of the optimal location and the needs relative to space, furnishings, equipment and storage
- Funding for furnishings and equipment

The standardization of training for lunchroom staff and setting common practices and procedures will give the CBE a cost effective sustainable methodology for setting standards for noon supervision. This option places more emphasis on the quality and training of the supervisors rather on the number of supervisors. We believe that by providing standardized training and standardize common practices and procedures will create a safe and healthy atmosphere for students during the noon recess. Standardize Noon Supervision through staff training and deploying staff to provide the maximum coverage and safety based on the principles of active supervision will be a more cost effective way to provide standardized noon supervision for students.

## CATHY FABER <br> SUPERINTENDENT, LEARNING INNOVATION CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

Attachment I: Industry Standards, Comparative Staff to Student Ratios for School Boards in Alberta

| Organization \& Governance Document | Program | Ratios | Details |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Calgary Catholic School Division | Noon-Hour Supervision | No ratio The Principal shall ensure that the designated supervisor, if not a certificated teacher, is supervised by a certificated teacher at all times. | The Principal shall ensure that each person involved in noon-hour supervision has a full understanding of and the ability to discharge his/her duties and responsibilities. |
| Edmonton Public CODE: IHFA.AR CODE: IH.BP | Supervision of Students <br> Supervision of Elementary and Junior High Students During Lunch | No ratio <br> Schools shall provide lunch-time supervision at school for elementary and junior high students whose parents request the service and pay the required fees. | The Principal shall ensure adequate supervision for the duration of the operational day; that is, that period of time extending from a minimum of fifteen minutes prior to the commencement of instruction to a minimum of five minutes following the conclusion of the instructional day, inclusive of recesses and the noon hour. |
| Rocky View Schools POLICY IHFAB | Parent-sponsored lunch room supervision programs | No ratio | Provision must be made to ensure that adequate supervision is provided daily. The ratio of adult supervisors to children will be determined by the parent group in consultation with the Principal or his designate. At least one teacher shall be on supervision at all times during the noon recess. |


| Red Deer Public <br> Schools <br> Policy and Regulation <br> 4.02 .05 | Student <br> Supervision | No ratio <br> The principal and staff <br> are empowered to <br> establish reasonable <br> rules and regulations <br> to protect and to <br> control the pupils of <br> the school. | The Board of Trustees <br> supports the position <br> that the principal and <br> staff stand in loco <br> parentis when pupils <br> are in their charge and <br> that the principal and <br> staff should exercise <br> such supervision and <br> regulation over the <br> pupils as may be <br> necessary to ensure <br> the safety of the pupils <br> and a satisfactory <br> climate for learning. <br> The principal and staff <br> are empowered to <br> establish reasonable <br> rules and regulations <br> to protect and to <br> control the pupils of <br> the school. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | A minimum of one |  |


$>$ School wide rules for the playground need to be agreed to, embraced and understood by all supervising adults. Inconsistency can cause confusion for both the students and adults.
$\checkmark \quad$ Rules need to be consistent and fair.

- Example: At recess students are allowed to slide down a hill but at lunch they are not.
$>$ Supervision of students on the playground needs to be deliberate and active.
$\checkmark$ Keep moving - Movement should be planned, constant and deliberate. Vary the patterns of movement from day to day.
- Example: Supervisors should not gather I one area and chat
$\checkmark$ Keep scanning the playground for potential problems. Look and listen using constant visual movement and pay attention to visual indicators of behaviour issues.
- Example: Use of personal cell phone while on supervision distracts from active supervision
$\checkmark$ Target known problem areas, activities and individuals
- Example: Include blind spots in the regular routine
$\checkmark$ Recognize situations that may precede problem behaviour. Verbal cues may also indicate negative behaviour. Listen for angry or plaintive tones of voice, arguing, and panicked and bossy voices or commands
- Example: Aggression may be preceded by arguing, rough play and overcompetitiveness.
$\checkmark$ Know individual students who have been identified as having particular difficulties.
> Positive contact with students focuses attention on and increases the likelihood of positive behaviour while decreasing the incidence of inappropriate behaviour.
$\checkmark$ Actively project a friendly, helpful, open demeanour that communicates caring, trust and respect and allows for the ability to provide "friendly" reminders to help check behaviour before it becomes a problem.
- Example: A positive contact can be as simple as, "Good afternoon Taylor". Using a student's name conveys that they are a person. Asking how their soccer game or social event went last night all conveys to the student that you care.
> Corrective actions need to happen immediately or as soon as possible after observing the targeted behaviour.
$\checkmark \quad$ Corrective actions need to be consistent and applied fairly by all supervisors.
$\checkmark$ Try using positive corrective statements to increase the likelihood that students will engage in the positive behaviour.
- Example: Actively listen to the student's answer about the problem behavior. There may be more to the story than meets the eye.


## CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION

## PUBLIC BOARD MEETING REPORT TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Tuesday, March 6, 2001

## REPORT ON LUNCH PROGRAMS DEVELOPMENT 2000-2001 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Lunch Programs Development Team (LPDT) was formed in the spring of 2000 to develop a new model for providing lunch services to elementary students of the Calgary Board of Education.

The recommendations of the LPDT are based on extensive consultations with stakeholders and the active participation of parents, lunch program operators, principals, CBE representatives, the Staff Association, community representatives, the CRHA and City of Calgary, and other child-serving agencies.

## Why are lunch programs important?

The LPDT believes the lunch period is an important part of a child's educational experience, providing students with an opportunity to socialize with friends, to "re-fuel" for the rest of the school day, and to play. Many educators believe the lunch period has a direct impact on behavior and learning in the classroom.

Students require a range of services over lunch. All students need to be properly supervised by qualified, caring people while they are eating. They require supervision while they participate in indoor activities over the lunch period, and monitoring on the playground before school resumes. When students arrive at a program without their lunches, they need to be fed.

Hunger is a significant problem for many children attending Calgary's public schools.
Alleviating child hunger is a shared responsibility requiring the coordinated efforts of parents, the CBE, the community, and government.

## The Current Situation

Approximately 24,300 elementary students of the Calgary Board of Education stay at school for lunch. This represents nearly $60 \%$ of the 42,200 students who attend CBE elementary schools. Those who stay at school over lunch are bused by the $\operatorname{CBE}(10,500)$ or require lunch services for other reasons $(13,800)$.

At the present time, lunch services for elementary students are provided by a combination of CBE-operated programs (59), parent-operated programs (110), and programs provided by contracted service providers ( 21 programs by 14 providers). The vast majority of programs are provided on school premises.

Fees for lunch services vary by service provider. Parents of bused students are required to pay transportation fees (currently $\$ 90$ per year) and receive lunch services by CBE staff at no additional charge. Lunch fees for walk limit students (provided by parent-operated programs) average $\$ 25$ per month - the maximum allowable fee for such programs is $\$ 27$ per month (plus a $\$ 3$ annual activity fee). Fees charged by contracted service providers vary based on the range of services they provide.

The annual cost to the CBE for supervision of bused students is currently $\$ 1.94$ million, or approximately $\$ 19$ per month for each bused student.

## Student to Supervisor Ratio

Most stakeholders believe a low student to supervisor ratio is essential to a safe, high quality lunch program. CBE-operated programs currently provide supervision based on a student to supervisor ratio of $46: 1$. The student to supervisor ratio for parent-operated programs varies, the average being approximately $25: 1$. The student/supervisor ratio for contracted service providers is also considerably lower than CBE-operated programs.

The LPDT recommends the student to supervisor ratio for all lunch programs be set at 30:1, with an ability to adjust the ratio to address special needs or exceptional circumstances within each program.

## User Fees and Infrastructure Funding

The LPDT proposes that parents contribute to funding the operating costs of lunch programs through user fees, while the CBE pay for the costs of providing space, furnishings and equipment for lunch programs.

## Fee Schedule

The proposed fee schedule is the most contentious element of the new lunch program. Many parents of bused students feel it is unfair to charge lunch fees in addition to the transportation fees they pay to have their children bused to school. Conversely, many parents of walk limit students believe it is unfair to maintain a differential between the lunch fees of bused and walk limit students, since both groups of students are accessing the same lunch services.

The LPDT believes that "bused versus non-bused" should not be the sole consideration in deciding who should fund lunch programs. The current fee arrangement polarizes parents and detracts from developing lunch programs that are best for children. To achieve equity, the LPDT recommends the differential in lunch program fees between bused and walk limit students be reduced and eventually eliminated.

For walk limit students, the LPDT recommends the full-time monthly fee for lunch services be set at $\$ 25$ per month for the 2001-02 school year. This fee represents the estimated monthly cost per student of providing lunch supervision, based on the recommended student to supervisor ratio of 30:1. This fee represents no increase (or a slight decrease) in lunch fees for students currently attending $75 \%$ of the parent-operated lunch programs.

For bused students, the LPDT recommends that user fees be set at a combined transportation and lunch fee of $\$ 15$ per month for the 2001-02 school year. This is an increase of $\$ 6$ per month for bused students, and represents the increase in staffing costs incurred in reducing the supervision ratio from $46: 1$ to $30: 1$. In the second year of the
program, the LPDT is recommending that combined fees for bused students be set at the same amount as lunch program fees charged to walk limit students.

## Subsidizing Staff Costs

The LPDT recommends the CBE continue to subsidize (at $\$ 1.94$ million per year) the costs of staffing lunch programs for the first two years of the new lunch program (2001-02 and 2002-03).

In the first year, the subsidy will cover the shortfall in lunch revenues resulting from:
(1) lunch fees for bused students being offset by transportation fees (\$9 per student per month), and
(2) the phasing in of lunch program fees for bused students (\$10 per student per month).

In the second year, item (2) above will no longer apply, and the resulting funds may be used to reduce lunch fees for walk limit students to approximately $\$ 21$ per month. This reduction in lunch fees for walk limit students, coupled with a modest increase in lunch program fees for bused students, may enable the combined fees of bused students to be the same as lunch fees of walk limit students by the second year of the new program.

The following charts show the proposed realignment of the CBE subsidy and fees for parents of bused and walk limit (WL) students during the first two years of the new program.


If a portion of the $\$ 1.94$ subsidy can be redirected to transportation fees for elementary students, the CBE subsidy and fee realignment could be as follows:


## Provincial Support

The LPDT believes the requirement for user fees and lunch programs subsidies can be traced to insufficient funding by the provincial government. The Team recommends the CBE pursue more funding from the Province to reduce user fees and offset the costs of lunch programs in elementary schools.

## Financial Impact of Recommendations

The projected revenues and expenses for the new lunch program (for 2001-02) are attached to the final report as Appendix IX.

There are many variables that influence the setting of user fees. Changing a single variable can have a dramatic effect on the costs and fees of the lunch program. Appendix $X$ illustrates the sequence of fee decisions followed by the LPDT, and its final recommendation on each of the key variables. Appendix X also includes other fee and funding options, and their estimated effects on fees for bused and walk limit students.

## Conclusion

The Lunch Programs Development Team believes the proposed new lunch program is comprehensive in its scope and addresses student needs relative to accessibility, safety and quality. The recommended fee structure attempts to balance the interests of parents of bused and non-bused students, and recognizes the shared responsibility of parents, the CBE and the provincial government to properly fund lunch programs.
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## I. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the report of the Lunch Programs Development Team (LPDT) be received as information.
2. Accessibility - That lunch programs be offered in every elementary school and available to all registered students, commencing with the 2001-02 school year.
3. Parent Involvement - That parents remain closely connected to lunch programs as employees, volunteers, or representatives on school and system advisory committees.
4. Program Quality - That program standards and a comprehensive training program be developed to ensure that lunch services are high quality and provided by qualified, caring individuals.
5. Nutrition and Food Provisions - That lunch programs enhance nutritional awareness among students and provide food to any student who is without food over the lunch period.
6. Supervision - That lunch programs provide supervision to students while they are eating lunch, based on a student to supervisor ratio of 30:1.
7. Program Delivery - That lunch programs be operated by the Calgary Board of Education (CBE), or contracted to a limited number of independent operators who currently offer lunch programs as one element of a broader package of services.
8. Partnerships - That the CBE encourage partnerships with private, public and non-profit organizations to:
a) Enhance nutritional awareness,
b) Provide food to students who are without food over the lunch period, and
c) Offset the cost of fee waivers for parents unable to pay fees for elementary school lunch programs.
9. Accountability - That:
a) Principals be responsible for lunch programs within their schools and be given sufficient resources to manage its day-to-day operation.
b) Each lunch program employ one or more Lead Supervisors to assist the Principals in the day-to-day operation and administration of the lunch program.
c) The CBE establish a new position entitled System Lunch Program Coordinator to promote safe, high quality lunch programs consistently across the system.
d) A System Advisory Committee on Lunch Programs be established to advise the CBE on ways to enhance the high quality and safety of lunch programs in elementary schools, and provide input regarding student/supervisor ratios and user fees.
10. User Fees - That parents contribute to the funding of lunch programs through user fees, and that such fees be directed toward the costs of lunch program staff, supplies, and administrative costs directly attributable to lunch programs.
11. Funding for Infrastructure - That the CBE be responsible for the infrastructure costs of providing space, furnishings and equipment for lunch programs.
12. Fee Structure - That fees for lunch programs be approved as follows:

## Year One (2001-02)

a) Combined fees charged to bused students for transportation and lunch programs be set at $\$ 15$ per month for each student registered in the program on a full-time basis.
b) Fees charged to walk limit students for lunch programs be set at $\$ 25$ per month for each student registered in the program on a full-time basis.
c) Fees charged to non-bused (eligible) students for lunch programs be set at $\$ 15$ per month for each student registered in the program on a full-time basis.
d) Drop-in fees for registered students be set at $\$ 3$ per day, with an option to purchase coupons at a discounted rate.
e) Parents who cannot afford user fees for lunch programs be able to apply to have their fees waived by the CBE.
f) A maximum family rate be set based on the lunch fees of two students.
g) Individual lunch programs be allowed to continue charging and collecting an annual activity fee of $\$ 3$ per student to offset the costs of additional materials and supplies for their program.

## Year Two (2002-03)

h) The CBE set lunch fees such that the combined fees charged to parents of bused students for transportation and lunch programs are the same as lunch fees charged for walk limit and non-bused (eligible) students.
i) The CBE review drop-in fees, the fee waiver process, the maximum family rate, and the annual activity fee based on the costs and performance of lunch programs during Year One and the recommendations of the System Advisory Committee on Lunch Programs.
13. Subsidizing Staff Costs - That the CBE continue to subsidize staff costs for lunch
programs as follows:
Years One (2001-02) and Two (2002-03)
a) The CBE continue to subsidize (at current levels) the costs associated with staffing lunch programs, and if possible reallocate a portion of the subsidy toward the elimination of transportation fees for elementary students.

## Subsequent Years

b) The CBE determine the need for a subsidy in subsequent years based on the actual costs of lunch programs in 2001-02 and 2002-03, the funding received from the Government of Alberta and partnerships, and the funding needed to maintain appropriate ratios and user fees.
14. Provincial Support - That the CBE seek funding support from the Government of Alberta to:
a) Reduce user fees and offset the costs of lunch programs in elementary schools, and
b) Eliminate transportation fees for elementary school students.
15. Employment Service - That the CBE and Staff Association negotiate a process to recognize the employment service of persons previously employed by parent-operated programs.
16. Implementation - That the administration proceed with developing operational policies to enable the implementation of a new model of service delivery for lunch programs in Calgary Board of Education elementary schools commencing at the start of the 2001-02 school year.

## II. ISSUE(S)

The Lunch Programs Development Team has designed a new model of service delivery for lunch programs in elementary schools after extensive consultation with stakeholders. The LPDT requests the approval of its recommendations to enable the CBE to proceed with firstphase implementation at the start of the 2001-02 school year.

## III. BACKGROUND

The Lunch Programs Development Team was formed in the spring of 2000 to achieve the following goals:

1. To develop a comprehensive model for providing lunch services for elementary students of the Calgary Board of Education,
2. To ensure that lunch services:

- Focus on what is best for students - Are equitable
- Are universally accessible - Are affordable
- Are safe - Are provided by qualified supervisors
- Are high quality - Respect CBE labour relations
- Are flexible
- Accommodate current and future needs

3. To encourage extensive involvement by stakeholders and the broader community in developing the model,
4. To be active participants in the broader community initiative to feed Calgary's children.

The LPDT is composed of parents, lunch program operators and supervisors, principals, CBE representatives, the Staff Association, community representatives, and representatives of the

Calgary Regional Health Authority, the City of Calgary, and child serving agencies. The names of Team members are included as Appendix I.

The LPDT's work proceeded through the following stages:

1. Getting Started - between May and October, 2000, the LPDT focused on bringing together the members of the team, defining its process, collecting background information, and participating in various activities organized by the Feeding Calgary's Children initiative.
2. Philosophy and Guiding Principles - in early November, the LPDT developed a draft Philosophy and Guiding Principles to provide a framework for the detailed design of the new lunch program. The Philosophy and Guiding Principles (Appendix II) were presented at the November Stakeholder Feedback sessions, and approved in principle by the Board of Trustees at its December 19, 2000 meeting.
3. Stakeholder Feedback Sessions - in November, the LPDT hosted eight evening sessions to gather feedback on the Philosophy and Guiding Principles from parents, lunchroom operators and supervisors, and school principals. The sessions included a broad discussion of issues relating to the quality and funding of lunch programs, and the responsibilities of the CBE, parents, community and government. Over 400 participants attended these sessions, providing verbal and written feedback to the LPDT.
4. Draft Proposal - in December and January 2001, the LPDT compiled the results of the November Stakeholder Feedback Sessions, distributed a survey to all lunch program operators, conducted site visits of lunch programs, and began the detailed design of a draft proposal.
5. Public Information Sessions - In late January, the LPDT presented its Draft Proposal at four Public Information Sessions. Between 300 and 400 people attended these sessions. Participants were invited to provide direct feedback at the meetings and to respond to a survey on the highlights of the Draft Proposal.
6. Final Proposal and Recommendations - In February 2001, the LPDT compiled the results of the feedback and surveys, and developed its final proposal and recommendations.

The Highlights of the Final Proposal is attached to this report as Appendix III. The Detailed Proposal of the LPDT is attached as Appendix IV. A summary of the differences between the Team's draft and final proposals is included as Appendix V .

Approximately 600 people responded to the January survey. The survey results are included as Appendix VI and VII.

A summary of the feedback provided by participants at the January Public Information Sessions is attached as Appendix VIII.

## IV. ANALYSIS

## 1. THE CURRENT SITUATION

## a) Why are lunch programs important?

The Lunch Programs Development Team believes that the lunch period is an important part of a
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child's educational experience. Providing lunch programs that are "best for children" is a shared responsibility of the CBE, parents and the community. This philosophy was endorsed by the Board of Trustees on December 19, 2000, and has guided the development of the final proposal.

The lunch period provides students with an opportunity to socialize with friends, to re-energize and "re-fuel" for the rest of the school day, and to play. Many educators have reported that the lunch period has a direct impact on behavior and learning in the classroom.

Students require a range of services over lunch. All students need to be properly supervised by qualified, caring people while they are eating. They require supervision while they participate in indoor activities over the lunch period, and monitoring on the playground before school resumes. When students arrive at a lunch program without their lunches, they need to be fed.

## b) Addressing hunger and nutritional needs

Through its participation in the Feeding Calgary's Children initiative, it is clear to the LPDT that hunger is a significant problem in our elementary schools. Feeding Calgary's Children estimates that 6,600 children in Calgary between the ages of 0 and 17 are in need of food and assistance every day. Another 9,500 children in Calgary experience intermittent hunger needs that are not met. Many of these children are of school age and attend CBE schools.

A number of community-based responses are in place to help alleviate some of problems associated with child hunger in Calgary. For example, the Boys and Girls Community Services FANS program provides food free of charge to over 100 schools in the Calgary area. Individual school programs vary from an emergency food shelf to full hot lunch programs. Initiatives like the FANS program need to be encouraged and expanded under a new lunch program for elementary school students.

According to a February 2000 study prepared for the Canadian Living Foundation:
"Access to nutritious food during school hours affects school-age children in two important ways. First, a morning or noon meal contributes to both quantity and quality of the total required intake of energy, protein, carbohydrates and micronutrients such as iron and calcium (Chao and Vanderkooy, 1989). Second, school feeding initiatives are generally believed to enhance the cognitive functioning of children, especially the speed and accuracy of information retrieval in working memory."

Many students arrive at lunch programs without food or with food that doesn't meet their nutritional needs. The LPDT believes it is a shared responsibility to ensure that all students have access to sufficient, nutritious food over the lunch period. Many resources exist within the broader community to meet these needs.

## c) Current Lunch Programs

Approximately 24,300 elementary students of the Calgary Board of Education currently stay at school for lunch. This represents nearly $60 \%$ of the 42,200 students who attend CBE elementary schools. Those who stay at school over lunch are bused by the CBE $(10,500)$ or require lunch services for other reasons $(13,800)$.

At the present time, lunch services for elementary students are provided by a combination of CBE-operated programs (59), parent-operated programs (110), and programs provided by contracted service providers (21 programs by 14 providers). CBE-operated programs provide supervision based on a student to supervisor ratio of 46:1. The student to supervisor ratio for parent-operated programs varies, with most programs providing supervision in the range of $25: 1$. The student/supervisor ratio for contracted service providers is also considerably lower than CBE-operated programs. The overwhelming majority of programs are provided on school premises.

Fees for lunch services vary by service provider. Parents of bused students are required to pay transportation fees (currently $\$ 90$ per year) and receive lunch services (provided by CBE staff) at no additional charge. Lunch fees for walk limit students (provided by parent-operated programs) currently average $\$ 25$ per month - the maximum allowable fee for such programs is $\$ 27$ per month (plus a $\$ 3$ annual activity fee). Fees charged by contracted service providers vary based on the range of services they provide.

The annual cost to the CBE for supervision of bused students is currently $\$ 1.94$ million.

## 2. THE WORK OF THE TEAM

Members of the LPDT have committed many hours of their personal and professional time to attending meetings, gathering information, organizing feedback sessions, and communicating with stakeholders. The Lunch Programs Development Team has met on 14 occasions. A subcommittee of the Team, known as the Agenda Planning Committee, has met on 15 occasions to plan meetings of the larger group and to bring forward proposals for the LPDT's consideration. There has been significant interaction with parents, the staff of lunch programs, program operators, principals and other stakeholders through feedback sessions, individual meetings, emails, and telephone conversations. The LPDT has compiled and evaluated the results of several surveys.

Throughout this process, the Team has tried to keep "What's best for children" at the forefront of its work, and to balance the needs of the different stakeholder groups.

The LPDT has faced a number of challenges:
a) Tight timelines - the LPDT has been directed to develop a new model for elementary school lunch programs for implementation at the start of the 2001-02 school year. This tight timeline has challenged the Team's ability to gather information, communicate with stakeholders, achieve consensus on issues, and address the many complexities associated with the delivery of lunch programs.
b) Lack of standardized information - Lunch programs are currently delivered by a variety of service providers. Although certain practices are common to all programs, each service provider has maintained individual records on full-time and drop-in usage, number of supervisory staff, revenues and expenses, and other factors that affect fees and program costs.
c) Other issues affecting lunch program delivery - Parents of bused students are required to pay transportation fees to have their children bused to schools outside of their immediate community. The LPDT's mandate does not include
providing recommendations on busing, school boundaries, or transportation fees. Nonetheless, these issues have affected the ability of the Team to develop proposals that are seen to be balanced, fair and equitable by all stakeholders.
d) Design versus implementation issues - The mandate of the LPDT has been to design "what" a new model of lunch program services should look like. Although the Team may offer suggestions on "how" the new program may be implemented, the actual method of introducing the new program will be the CBE's responsibility following approval by the Board of Trustees. Although the LPDT has focused its energies on design considerations, stakeholders have been seeking specific details on how the new program will work in practice. The LPDT has responded to these inquiries by including some details on implementation in its final proposal.

## 3. FEEDBACK FROM STAKEHOLDERS

A number of themes have emerged from the November 2000 and January 2001 sessions with stakeholders:

- Parents want to remain connected to lunch programs and have a strong voice in their operation.
- High standards (incorporating the best practices of existing programs) need to be applied consistently across all lunch programs.
- Flexibility needs to exist in the operation of individual lunch programs to accommodate local conditions, the desires of parents, and the needs of children.
- Lunch supervisors must be well trained and qualified to work with young children. Training must be comprehensive and continuous.
- There needs to be an adequate substitute roster.
- There must be a consistent application of codes of conduct in lunchrooms.
- Health and safety standards set by the City of Calgary and the Calgary Regional Health Authority must be met or exceeded.
- Nutritional awareness must be a joint effort among the school, parents and external agencies, and not an add-on curriculum for students.
- The student to supervisor ratio must be reduced from 46:1 as the standard for CBE-operated programs.
- Personnel must be hired to oversee the program administration at the system level and to facilitate the hiring, monitoring and evaluating of supervisors.
- Schools must be provided with adequate lunch-program staff to attend to administration of the program as well as day- to-day operations.
- Increased workload of expanded service should not be downloaded to existing school staff.
- Contracted service organizations should continue to play a role in lunch programs.
- External agencies should be involved in food provision (e.g. FANS, Duck Soup) and nutritional awareness.
- Funding is a shared responsibility of parents, the CBE, the provincial government and the community.
- There needs to be greater equity in lunch fees paid by parents of bused and nonbused students.
- Parents of bused students should not be required to pay lunch fees, since they
have no choice as to whether their child stays at school for lunch.
- User fees for lunch programs should be the same for all users, regardless of whether or not the students are bused to the school.
- Fee waivers should be applied for families who cannot afford to pay full service fees.
- Lunch programs should not become revenue generators for the CBE.
- The provincial government and CBE should fund the infrastructure costs of lunch programs.
- Well furnished, appropriately equipped and clean lunchrooms must be provided. Dedicated spaces are preferred.


## 4. HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FINAL PROPOSAL

## a) Accessibility

One of the key goals of the LPDT is to provide universal accessibility to lunch programs for all elementary students. Accessibility is consistent with the philosophy that lunch programs are part of a child's educational experience, and recognizes the need for high quality lunch services across the school system. The LPDT has responded to this need by recommending that lunch programs be offered in every elementary school and open to every student commencing with the 2001-02 school year.

## b) Parent Involvement

For many years, parents have been involved in lunch programs as service providers, employees, and volunteers. Parent participation contributes to program quality and provides a connection to the local community. The LPDT endorses the continued involvement of parents as employees, volunteers, or lunch program representatives on school and system advisory committees. There is strong support for this recommendation among respondents to the January survey.

## c) Program Quality and Supervision

Participants at the November Stakeholder Feedback Sessions were asked "What does a quality lunch program look like?" Many participants indicated that quality depends on a low student to supervisor ratio, proper training for lunch program staff, and clear and consistently applied program standards. The LPDT is proposing that the CBE establish high quality and safety standards for all lunch programs, and that mechanisms be put in place to ensure they are consistently applied across the system. The Team recommends the enhancement of existing training programs. Both areas are addressed in detail within its final proposal.

The LPDT is recommending that the initial student to supervisor ratio for all lunch programs be set at 30:1, with an ability to make adjustments to the ratio to address special needs or exceptional circumstances within each program. To some parent-operated and contracted programs, this standard represents an increase in the ratio their programs currently enjoy. To CBE-operated programs, this represents a significant improvement over the current 46:1 ratio. The LPDT is proposing that a tracking system be established for individual programs to monitor actual ratios and make adjustments to staffing levels as needed.

The results of the January survey indicate there is strong support among stakeholders for a 30:1 ratio with adjustments for special needs and circumstances.

## d) Nutrition and Food Provision

Lunch programs provide an opportunity to teach students the value of good nutrition and promote healthy eating habits. Nutritional awareness and health promotion could become a natural feature of lunch programs by drawing upon resources that exist within the community and by including a nutritional component in the training of lunch supervisors.

Virtually every lunch program has some form of "emergency shelf" to feed children who fail to bring their lunch to school. In many cases, this is sufficient to meet the needs of students. However, there is growing evidence to suggest that a substantial portion of the elementary school population is arriving at school hungry, and many families lack the resources to provide a nutritional lunch on a regular basis. This is a societal problem that requires a coordinated response by the CBE, government, and the broader community.

The LPDT is proposing that the CBE establish a System Advisory Committee on Lunch Programs to bring together parents, CBE representatives, and members of various child-serving organizations. One of the critical roles of the Advisory Committee will be to encourage partnerships between the CBE (or individual schools) and private, public, and non-profit agencies to address hunger issues, and to break down institutional barriers that get in the way of providing food to children in need.

## e) Program Delivery

The LPDT is recommending that lunch programs be operated by the Calgary Board of Education or contracted to a limited number of independent operators who currently offer lunch programs as one element of a broader package of services. This recommendation is consistent with the March 2000 findings of the Labour Relations Board representative, and the agreement reached by the CBE and the Staff Association in May of 2000.

## f) Partnerships

The LPDT is recommending that the CBE forge partnerships with private, public and non-profit agencies to promote nutritional awareness and provide food to children in need. This recommendation is consistent with the shared responsibility philosophy. In addition, the LPDT proposes that these agencies be approached to contribute funding to offset the cost of fee waivers for parents unable to pay fees for elementary school lunch programs.

## g) Accountability

One of the themes that emerged from stakeholder feedback sessions was the need to establish clear lines of authority and responsibility for lunch programs. The LPDT proposes that school principals be responsible for lunch programs within their schools, and be given sufficient resources to manage its day-to-day operations. Sufficient resources include appointing one or more Lead Supervisors in each school to assist the principals with the administration and ongoing operation of the lunch program.

The LPDT believes that a high quality lunch program requires the commitment of system resources to assist individual schools, to provide resources for training and developing supervisors, to develop and continually enhance program standards, and to ensure their consistent application. The LPDT is recommending that a new position of System Lunch Program Coordinator be established for this purpose.

In addition to forging partnerships, a System Advisory Committee on Lunch Programs is needed to bring together the expertise that exists within and outside the CBE with respect to lunch programs. The LPDT is proposing that the Advisory Committee sponsor a series of public information sessions in March 2002 to provide stakeholders with information on the performance of the new lunch program. On an ongoing basis, the Committee will provide recommendations to the CBE on such issues as lunch fees and student/supervisor ratios.

## h) User Fees and Infrastructure Funding

The LPDT is proposing that parents contribute to funding the operating costs of lunch programs through user fees, while the CBE maintains responsibility for the costs of providing space, furnishings and equipment for lunch programs. The results of the January survey show strong support among stakeholders for this approach.

Stakeholders have expressed concern that the new lunch program represents a "cash grab" by the Calgary Board of Education. If the new lunch program generates revenue in excess of its cost of operation, the LPDT recommends that excess funds be re-invested in the program to eliminate the CBE subsidy, reduce user fees, or enhance the student to supervisor ratio.

## i) Fee Schedule

The proposed fee schedule is the most contentious element of the new lunch program. Many parents of bused students feel it is unfair to charge lunch fees in addition to the transportation fees they pay to have their children bused to school. Conversely, many parents of walk limit students believe it is unfair to maintain a differential between the lunch fees of bused and walk limit students, since both groups of students are accessing the same lunch services. This polarization of opinion was evident during the January public information sessions and is reflected in the results of the January survey.

The current arrangement, in which the CBE fully funds lunch programs for bused students, and parents fully fund the costs of supervising their walk limit students, appears to be based on the premise that bused students "have no choice" but to stay at school for lunch, while walk limit students are able to freely choose whether to stay or go home. The degree of choice appears to be the determining factor over whether parents or the CBE fund the operating costs of lunch programs.

At present, $44 \%$ of walk limit students remain at school over the lunch period - this high percentage suggests there are many reasons (unrelated to busing) why lunch services are needed. Many parents of walk limit students argue passionately that their needs for lunch programs are as equally compelling as bused students. They argue that, as a result of their personal circumstances, they too "have no choice" about requiring lunch programs for their children.

The high percentage of walk limit students who stay at school for lunch suggests that, given the choice, a significant number of bused parents would also require lunch programs for their children, for reasons unrelated to busing.

The LPDT believes that "bused versus non-bused" should not be the sole consideration in deciding who should fund lunch programs. The current fee arrangement polarizes parents and shifts the focus away from developing lunch programs that are "best for children".

There is a need to narrow the gap and achieve greater equity in the lunch program fees paid by bused and walk limit students. The move towards fee equity needs to be carefully managed to minimize the financial impact on parents and the CBE.

For walk limit students, the LPDT is recommending the full-time monthly fee for lunch services be set at $\$ 25$ per month for the 2001-02 school year. This fee represents the estimated monthly cost per student of providing lunch supervision, based on the recommended student to supervisor ratio of 30:1. This fee represents no increase (or a slight decrease) in lunch fees for students currently attending $75 \%$ of the parent-operated lunch programs.

For bused students, the LPDT is recommending that user fees for bused students be set at a combined transportation and lunch fee of $\$ 15$ per month for the 2001-02 school year. This represents an increase of $\$ 6$ per month over the transportation fees charged to bused parents for the 2000-01 school year. In the second year of the program, the LPDT is recommending that combined fees for bused students be set at the same amount as lunch program fees charged to walk limit students.

The proposed two-year phase-in period (to achieve equity in combined fees) is a shortening of the three-year phase-in period proposed by the LPDT in January. The Team believes a shorter phase in period is reasonable if the CBE is able to continue allocating its $\$ 1.94$ million subsidy to lunch programs in each of the first two years. This would enable combined transportation and lunch fees to be set below $\$ 25$ per month in the second year of the program.

In addition to its proposed fee schedule for full-time students, the LPDT is recommending that daily drop-in fees be set at $\$ 3$ per student. In order to reduce the need for lunch supervisors to handle cash, the Team is proposing that coupon books be available for purchase at a discounted rate of $\$ 2$ per coupon.

In response to feedback from stakeholders, the LPDT is recommending a family rate for lunch programs be based on the cost of two students. In addition, the Team is proposing that a fee waiver process be available to parents of students who cannot afford user fees.

## j) Subsidizing Staff Costs

In its draft proposal, the LPDT recommended that the CBE continue to subsidize the costs associated with staffing lunch programs for 2001-02, and then begin redirecting the $\$ 1.94$ million subsidy into instruction. The LPDT is now recommending (by a narrow majority of LPDT members) that the subsidy remain at current levels for the first two years of the new program (2001-02 and 2002-03), for the following reasons.
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In the first year of the new lunch program, the CBE's subsidy will cover the shortfall in revenues resulting from (1) lunch fees for bused students being offset by transportation fees, and (2) the phasing in of lunch program fees for bused students. It is expected that enhancements to the student to supervisor ratio for bused students (from $46: 1$ to $30: 1$ ) will be funded by the $\$ 6$ per month increase in lunch fees for bused students.

In the second year of the program, the current subsidy may be used to reduce lunch fees for walk limit students to approximately $\$ 21$ per month. This reduction in lunch fees, coupled with a modest increase in lunch program fees for bused students, may enable the combined fees of bused students to be the same as lunch fees of walk limit students by the second year of the new program. In other words, the subsidy in the second year will be directed toward reducing lunch program fees for walk limit students and narrowing the gap in lunch fees between bused and walk limit students.

As an alternative consideration, the LPDT is recommending that a portion of the current subsidy be applied to eliminating transportation fees for bused students. This redirection of funds would not increase or decrease the amount of the CBE subsidy, but rather would allow the entire fee paid by bused students to be directed to lunch programs.

Currently, transportation fees paid by elementary students total $\$ 1$ million, or $50 \%$ of the CBE subsidy for lunch supervision of bused students. Reallocating a portion of the CBE subsidy to eliminate transportation fees, and having the fees paid by bused students directed entirely into the lunch program, will begin the process of "de-linking" transportation and lunch program fees. Depending on the individual circumstances of parents, having bused parents pay fees directly into the lunch program may enable them to claim lunch fees as a child care expense for tax purposes.

It is important to note that, based on current cost assumptions, the requirement to subsidize the staff costs of lunch programs will cease at the point that all users (bused and non-bused) are paying $\$ 25$ per month for lunch services at a 30:1 ratio.

## k) Provincial Support

The LPDT believes the requirement for user fees and subsidies for lunch programs can be traced to insufficient funding by the provincial government. The Team recommends the CBE pursue more funding from the Government of Alberta to reduce user fees and offset the costs of lunch programs in elementary schools.

The report of the 1999 Children's Forum, (co-chaired by Colleen Klein) contains specific references to the importance of lunch programs. The report, entitled "First Circle - Uniting for Children", includes the following recommendations under its Poverty and Physical Needs section:
19. That within the next year, lunch programs will be implemented in schools, with training and nutritional information, to effectively address the impact of poverty on children in Alberta.
20. That every child have access to a daily nutritional lunch at school.
21. That province-wide school/community lunch/food programs be implemented.
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The report also contains recommendations to eliminate school-related fees:
12. That within the next year, additional costs for going to school be eliminated for all Alberta students.
13. That within the next year, full, free funding for public and separate schools be provided to ensure that no school-related fees will be charged to Alberta students.

The requirement for parents of bused students to pay transportation fees represents a significant barrier to achieving fee equity in lunch programs. The polarization and conflict over user fees for lunch programs could be significantly reduced if the Government of Alberta provided sufficient funding to eliminate transportation fees for elementary students.

## I) Employment Service

The November Stakeholder Feedback Sessions were attended by a significant number of people employed by parent-operated lunch programs. Many of these people possess considerable experience in lunch programs and questioned how they would be treated when the CBE assumed responsibility for the operation of all lunch programs in 2001-02.

Based on this feedback, the LPDT is recommending that the CBE and Staff Association negotiate a process to recognize the employment service of persons previously employed by parent-operated programs, and that this process be fully communicated to people currently employed within parent-operated programs.

## V. FINANCIAL IMPACT

## a) Projected Revenues and Expenses

The projected revenues and expenses for the new lunch program (for 2001-02) are attached to this report as Appendix IX. The appendix contains:

- Estimated revenues and expenses of lunch programs during the first year of operation,
- A summary of assumptions used in the calculation of revenues and expenses, and
- Other variables that may affect the actual financial experience of lunch programs in the first year.

The Lunch Programs Development Team has not calculated revenues and expenses during the second and subsequent years of the new program. Such an estimate is difficult
to forecast, given the number of variables that could affect the financial performance of lunch programs in future years. Some of these variables include:

- Demand for full-time lunch services
- Demand for drop-in lunch services
- Levels of funding from the Province of Alberta for lunch programs and transportation
- Funding support from partnerships
- Lunch program fees
- Transportation fees
- Adjustments to the student to supervisor ratio
- Adjustments to staffing levels to accommodate special needs and circumstances
- Rates of pay of Lead Supervisors and Lunch Supervisors
- Decisions relating to the CBE subsidy of lunch program staff costs
- Decisions relating to fee equity between bused and walk limit students
- Administration costs
- Fee waivers and family maximums

The LPDT believes a more precise forecast of future revenues and expenses will be possible following the first six months of operation of the new lunch program.

## b) Other Fee and Funding Options

The Lunch Programs Development Team discovered early in its deliberations that student/supervisor ratios, fees for bused and walk limit students, the phasing in of fee increases, and the level of subsidy required to support lunch programs are interrelated and significantly affect program costs. Changing any of these variables has a dramatic impact on the revenues and expenses of lunch programs.

In order to manage this complexity, the LPDT considered each of these variables in the following sequence:

- The Team began by considering the appropriate student to supervisor ratio - this variable has a strong influence on the quality of lunch programs and "what's best for children".
- A decision on ratio was followed by considering the issue of fee equity - this variable has a strong influence on whether the new program will be seen as fair and equitable among parents, and whether fees will be affordable.
- A decision on fee equity was followed by considering the issue of the CBE's subsidy of staff costs. A decision on the level and extent of the CBE subsidy will affect the setting of fees and any phase-in period.
- Finally, decisions on ratio, fee equity and the subsidy led to a decision on a phase in period for bused students.

Appendix X illustrates the sequence of fee decisions followed by the LPDT, and its final recommendation on each of these variables. Appendix $X$ also includes other fee and funding options, and their estimated effects on fees for bused and walk limit students.

## VI. IMPLEMENTATION CONSEQUENCES

The Lunch Programs Development Team has identified the following implementation issues for the CBE's consideration:

- Communication of the final report of the LPDT and approved recommendations to all stakeholder groups (parents, current lunch program service providers, school principals,
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child serving agencies etc.)

- Formation of a team to manage and coordinate the implementation process
- Development of operational policies and program standards to guide the new program
- Creation and filling of new positions (Lead Supervisor and System Lunch Program Coordinator positions)
- Recruitment of additional Lunch Supervisors
- Conclusion of negotiations between the CBE and Staff Association on the recognition of previous employment experience of supervisors in parent-operated lunch programs
- Coordination of registration processes for transportation and lunch programs (if lunch and transportation fees for bused students are combined)
- Development of information systems to track attendance and maintain financial information on individual lunch program
- School- by-school assessment of the optimal location of lunch programs and needs relative to space, furnishings and equipment
- Consultation with existing parent-operated programs on the retention or disposition of furnishings, equipment, and other assets acquired by the POLP's
- Assessment of training and development needs of lunch program staff, and enhancement of existing training programs
- Formation of the System Advisory Committee on Lunch Programs
- Initiation of discussions with the Government of Alberta on options to reduce user fees, lower lunch program costs, and eliminate transportation fees


## VII. CONCLUSION

The final proposal and recommendations of the Lunch Programs Development Team are based on extensive consultations with stakeholders and the active participation of parents, lunch program operators, principals, CBE representatives, the Staff Association, community representatives, the CRHA and City of Calgary, and other child-serving agencies.

The Team believes the proposed new lunch program is comprehensive in its scope and addresses student needs relative to accessibility, safety, and quality. The recommended fee structure attempts to balance the interests of parents of bused and non-bused students, and recognizes the shared responsibility of parents, the CBE and the provincial government to properly fund lunch programs.

The Lunch Program Development Team believes that the new design achieves the goal of "what's best for children".

DR. DONNA M. MICHAELS
CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

# BOARD OF EDUCATION School District \#33 (Chilliwack) 512.1 ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION Supervision of Students during Noon Intermission BOARD/C.T.A. COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT: 

The Board/C.T.A. Collective Agreement recognizes a teacher's right to a duty free period during the regularly scheduled noon intermission. (Article D.6)

## SELECTION OF SUPERVISION ASSISTANTS:

The District recognizes the need to recruit and select supervision assistants who meet the criteria to fulfill the duties and responsibilities and who have the required knowledge, abilities and skills as outlined in the job description for Supervision Assistant. (CUPE Job Description)

## ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF TRAINING:

There are two levels of responsibility for introduction and training for Supervision
Assistants-District and School. This will include but not be limited to:

## District:

1. 

Basic orientation to the supervision task
2.

Basic first aid
3.

Conflict resolution
4.

Intervention techniques
5.

Process for notification if absent

## School:

1. 

Zones to be supervised
2.

Responsibility and authority in the school setting
3.

Provision of basic supply kit
4.

Confidentiality
5.

Stranger awareness
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6.

School security
7.

Medical alerts
8.

Emergency procedures

## Levels of Service:

The Superintendent or designate is authorized to staff schools with Supervision Assistants according to the formula below. Individual school or site conditions and/or extenuating circumstances may make adjustments upward or downward necessary.

Enrolment is based on headcount.

| Less than 175 | 1 Supervisor |
| :---: | :---: |
| $175-250$ | 2 Supervisors |
| $251-450$ | 3 Supervisors |
| $451-650$ | 4 Supervisors |
| $651-850$ | 5 Supervisors |
| More than 850 | To be determined |

Administrative Regulation 512.1 - Supervision of Students During Noon Intermission Page 2
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