



REPORT TO

CORPORATE SERVICES, STRATEGIC PLANNING AND PROPERTY COMMITTEE

EVALUATION MATRIX FOR NEW, LARGER GYMNASIUMS (ALL WARDS)

*"I can do all this through Him who gives me strength."
Philippians 4:13 (NIV)*

Created, Draft	First Tabling	Review
February 6, 2017	February 15, 2017	

P. de Cock, Comptroller, Business Services

A. Della Mora, D. Yack, J. Shanahan, J. Wujek, K. Malcolm, M. Caccamo, P. Aguiar, S. Campbell
Superintendents of Learning, Student Achievement and Well-Being

M. Silva, Comptroller, Planning and Development Services

M. Puccetti, Superintendent of Facilities Services

RECOMMENDATION REPORT

Vision:

At Toronto Catholic we transform the world through witness, faith, innovation and action.

Mission:

The Toronto Catholic District School Board is an inclusive learning community uniting home, parish and school and rooted in the love of Christ.

We educate students to grow in grace and knowledge to lead lives of faith, hope and charity.



R. McGuckin

Associate Director of Academic Affairs

A. Sangiorgio

Associate Director of Planning and Facilities

C. Jackson

Executive Superintendent of Business Services and Chief Financial Officer

Angela Gauthier

Director of Education

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report recommends evaluation criteria, with proposed weighting, to prioritize future gymnasium expansions and other program-related upgrades at schools.

Recommended criteria includes size of the existing gymnasium, current and projected school enrolment, size of gymnasium in comparison to Ministry of Education space standards based on *On the Ground* (OTG) capacity, the building's facility condition index (FCI) and deferred maintenance backlog (DFB), as well as access to other interior and exterior play space, and potential for external funding partnerships or joint development initiatives.

The cost adding a new gymnasium to an existing elementary school is approximately \$2.0 M to \$3.0 M. The cost of adding a new gymnasium for an existing secondary school would be \$ 3.0M to \$4.5M. Potential funding sources for adding a new gymnasium include Capital Priorities grants through the Ministry of Education, federal and/or provincial infrastructure grants, and/or joint initiatives with the City of Toronto and/or external partnerships with sports organizations.

The cumulative staff time dedicated to developing this report was 24 hours.

B. PURPOSE

1. On January 21, 2016 a report was presented to Corporate Services, Strategic Planning and Properties, regarding a "System-wide Approach to Under-sized Gymnasium". The report included reference to other program-related improvements such as science, arts or technology facilities at both elementary and secondary schools.
2. Staff were directed to return to the Board "*with the final evaluation matrix, taking into consideration feedback provided by Trustees, with the proposed weighting for each for replacement of under-sized gymnasium for final approval*".

C. BACKGROUND

1. As noted in the June 2016 report, 86% of the Board's existing gymnasiums are below the EDU-approved space standards, based on 10 square feet (sq. ft.)

per student for elementary schools and 12 sq. ft. per student for secondary schools.

2. The Board’s current capital program includes seven replacement schools; St John the Evangelist, St Simon, St Margaret, The Holy Trinity and St Antoine Daniel Catholic Elementary Schools and Dante Alighieri and Blessed Cardinal Newman Secondary Schools. In addition, the Board has several major additions underway at four elementary schools which include new gymnasiums; St Paschal Baylon, St Eugene, St Clement and St Augustine of Canterbury. The Ministry of Education provided the funding for the St Clement and St Augustine of Canterbury additions, including the larger gymnasium. Proceeds of Disposition funds were used for the additions and new gymnasiums at St Paschal Baylon and St Eugene.

3. Feedback from the January 2016 presentation of the report included the following – that all schools be considered fairly, regardless of the size of the school site, and that a small gymnasium may impact enrolment adversely, in which case, improving the gymnasium may attract new students. In addition, it was noted that access to an adjacent community centre gym as a criteria, may be misleading since these City-owned facilities are not controlled by the Board and there are times when school-use is restricted or not permitted. Travel time to the local community centre was also mentioned as an issue as this reduces the amount of time students have available to use the gymnasium.

4. The current EDU space plan template determines the size of the gymnasium for new school construction based on the number of approved pupil places. On average, the size of a gymnasium for a new school follows the OTG/square foot ratio as noted below:

Elementary		
Less than 350 students	3,000 sq. ft. combined space	10 square feet per student (Gym and Stage)
351 to 400 students	4,000 sq. ft. combined space	
401+ students	Enrolment x10/ sq. ft. combined space	

Secondary		
Less than 500 students	7,000 sq. ft. (Gym + Exercise Rm)	12 square feet per students (Gym and Exercise Room)
500 to 1000	8,000 sq. ft. (min) and 13,500 sq. ft.. (max)	
1000+ students	12,000 sq. ft. for a Triple Gym Area	

D. EVIDENCE/RESEARCH/ANALYSIS

1. Impact of Enrolment on Gymnasium Use and Availability: Smaller gymnasiums impact the types of games/activities that students can play within the space but also the number of students that can use the gymnasium at one time by limiting use to one classroom at a time. For high enrolment schools, this may result in students who only have access to the gymnasium once a week.

Suitability of Site: Site size and suitability of the site may impact whether a gymnasium addition is possible. There are City of Toronto set-back requirements that may limit whether the existing building footprint can be increased or where an addition can be placed on the site.

2. Enrolment Impact of Larger Gymnasiums: There is no evidence available at this time, to determine whether the size of the gymnasium plays a factor with regards to attracting students to a school. The size of the gymnasium does influence the number of after-school and lunch time sports activities that can be held at the school. Further research would be required in this area.
3. Alternative Outdoor Play/Sports Spaces: There are many elementary and secondary schools within the system that have access to a field and/or large play yard (for elementary schools) which can serve as an alternative space for physical activity and sports – recognizing that use of exterior play area is weather-dependent. There are a number of schools however on small school sites, with limited outdoor play or sports areas. It is important to note that the Ministry of Education does not have a square foot/per student standard for outdoor space for either elementary or secondary schools. The 2010 Expert Panel document regarding Capital Standards does reference a soccer field and/or baseball diamond for a new elementary schools and two exterior

basketball courts plus a fully irrigated playing field for football and soccer, as well as a baseball diamond and cage for secondary school. There is a Ministry standard of 5.6 square metres (60 sq. ft.) per child for childcare and Full Day Kindergarten programs. The Board’s Policy R.08 *Site School Expansion* (1968) which is currently under review, defines the minimum site size and playable area per pupil for “urban” and “suburban” schools, to the minimum of 175 square feet per pupil.

4. Costing as a Criteria: Generally, it is more cost-effective to build a new gymnasium as part of a major classroom addition project rather than building only a gymnasium addition, based on recent projects. The gymnasium costs for St Paschal Baylon Elementary School Addition were \$1.5 M. The gymnasium costs for the St Eugene were higher at \$2.5 M. though this the result of having to excavate and site the gym a few feet below grade in order to meet the City’s building height requirements. It is also important to note that Site Plan Approval may not be required to build a new gymnasium (if under 6000 sq. ft. for example), however the City may require additional building upgrades such as accessibility and possibly including some of the Toronto Green Standard requirements as part of the work, which would increase the cost.

5. Adjacent or Nearby Community Centre Facilities and/or Parks: Access to adjacent community centre space and/or park land may provide alternative physical activity space – however, the Board cannot guarantee that the school has access to City facilities when needed. Travel distance and supervision are also considerations that impact ease-of-access to a nearby facility, unless the community centre is within five minutes’ walk from the school.

E. VISION

VISION	PRINCIPLES	GOALS
To maximize capital improvement opportunities by addressing long-term accommodation needs in conjunction with the Board’s Capital	The Board’s Long Term Accommodation Plan Guiding Principles, Stewardship of Resources for equitable and fair support of all students, to deliver	To address program space deficiencies in existing schools by prioritizing highest needs; Optimize funding opportunities

VISION	PRINCIPLES	GOALS
Priorities and Long Term Accommodation Plan.	capital investment at existing schools to foster student achievement.	available from Ministry grants and external partnerships.

F. ACTION PLAN

1. The recommended Criteria Matrix for prioritizing schools for future gymnasium additions is noted below:

	Criteria	Highest Score	Lowest Score
1	Gymnasium area per OTG/Ministry Standard	Lowest ratio	
2	Enrolment projection in 10 year (2026)	Largest enrolment	Lowest enrolment
3	Facility Condition Index of School (FCI)	FCI less than 50	FCI greater than 51
4	Suitability of site to increase building footprint: ratio of Building Footprint to Available Site Area	Lowest ratio	Highest ratio
5	Space Deficiency of useable exterior play space per OTG (based on 175 sq. ft. per student)	Small school yard and field per OTG	Large school yard and/or field per OTG
6	Access to other play space in building	Multi-program Room	Lack of multi-program Room
7	LTAP recommends a major addition	Addition	No addition
8	Barrier-free access to existing gymnasium, from within the building and from exterior	No access or limited access	Barrier-free Access
9	Potential external funding opportunities with the City, infrastructure grants, community groups or sports organizations	Based on set of variables such as what existing facilities are in the area, LICO, City's Long Term Plan;	

G. METRICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

1. Upon approval by the Board, the evaluation matrix will be applied to all schools and the information will be provided in a subsequent report to Board.
2. Gymnasium size and other program-space deficiencies should be incorporated as a criteria into the Board's Capital Priorities evaluation matrix.

3. Board staff continue to explore external funding opportunities to find suitable partners for the development of joint-use sports facilities such as gymnasiums and artificial turf fields. This includes joint project opportunities with the City, to for larger gymnasiums at schools that can be used by the community after school use.

H. IMPLEMENTATION, STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

1. The subsequent report to the Board will provide priority ranking for all schools for gymnasium additions system-wide. The information will also be provided by elementary and secondary panel as well as by Trustee Ward.
2. The priority ranking will be updated annually as part of the Board's Capital Priority assessment process.

I. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. That gymnasium size in relation to the school enrolment/OTG become a criteria within the Capital Priorities evaluation matrix.
2. That the criteria matrix to prioritize future gymnasium replacements be approved as detailed in the report.