Blue Gum Montessori
Strategic Planning Committee

Site expansion update
Workshop Agenda

- Strategic plan progress
- Class / cycle ratios
- Feedback to date
- What do we want from a site
- The options
- Decisions still to be made
### Strategic plan update

- 2x workshops Aug 2013. Very collaborative with broad participation
- Adopted by board on 21 October 2013
- SPC set up after 2014 AGM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify ideal cycle ratio and plan towards it</td>
<td>Board has adopted 4:3:2 structure to work towards and planned progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve parent education about Montessori education</td>
<td>Postponed, pending new Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs gap on current site</td>
<td>2x parent surveys &amp; 2x staff workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for broader community involvement</td>
<td>Parent morning teas 2x weekly P&amp;C remains active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader management structure and principal succession planning</td>
<td>Principal is starting in 7 weeks!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class / Cycle Ratios – Comparisons

Perth Montessori Schools - Cycle Ratio Benchmarking

Note: Data gleaned from websites, not confirmed up to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Current student numbers</th>
<th>JP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>UP</th>
<th>Adolescent</th>
<th>IB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Gum Montessori School</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth Montessori School</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beehive Montessori School</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverlands Montessori School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Montessori School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysalis Montessori School</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treetops Montessori School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Montessori School (Kingsley)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa Mia Montessori Community School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

1. There are 9 Montessori schools in Perth with JP, MP and UP classes
2. *Every one* has a different cycle ratio!
3. Blue Gum has the most “bottom heavy” pyramid structure
4. Kingsley has an even “pillar”
5. Class sizes/retention data have not been collected – an important next step to give an idea of sustainability

The Board has settled on a target of 4:3:2
Feedback to date: 2013 Parent Satisfaction Survey

- A large variation in responses: no simple solution
- The current site is generally suitable, but Roe Hwy is a concern.
- The expected benefits (efficiency) and costs (loss of community) of a larger school are not keenly felt.
- Open ended responses:
  - like the location, ease of access and surrounding environment of the school
  - playground could be bigger and more shaded.
- When prompted parents want:
  - a water playground
  - a parents space/café
  - only 5% said that no changes are necessary
- Preference for “affordable school fees” and “excellent facilities and services” was fairly balanced (55% v 45%) indicating that the balance is OK at the moment.
Facilities
• Current site is already too small, playground space too limited, UP use area behind playgroup but it’s not ideal
• More space would definitely be required to accommodate two additional classrooms
• Possibility of acquiring land either side of current site was raised

Roe Highway
• Staff have a strong connection to the attractive natural environment surrounding the school
• Serious concern around proximity of Roe Highway development to school, elevation of development, noise etc.
• Further information needed and consultation with parents critical

Site options
• Suitable options may exist at current site if additional land can be acquired (e.g. either side of site, childcare opposite, split site for playgroup/extend-ed)
• Positive reaction to idea of new site

1st Teacher Workshop: Exploring options
### 2nd Teacher Workshop
**What do we want from a site?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium term capacity for 9 classes (4 : 3 : 2)</th>
<th>More generous staff facilities, meeting rooms, etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term capacity for an extra class (4 : 2.5 : 1.5)</td>
<td>A meeting space for parents to socialise and work (eg Board, P&amp;C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient playground space for 4:3:2 Nature play?</td>
<td>Extra flexible teaching rooms (French, computing, library, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A proper entrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Design Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easements over carpark</th>
<th>A linear “barrack” style layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A proper entrance</td>
<td>Roe 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpark such a large area</td>
<td>Connection between classes needs to be maintained / improved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responsibilities

Board
• Set objectives and strategy (i.e. 4:3:2 cycle ratio)
• Provide land, resources and budget
• Project manage / coordinate expansion

Staff / teachers
• Education & transitions
• Manage resources to optimise school effectiveness
• “functional specification” for architect / layout
• Optimise transition to minimise impact on students

Everyone
• Work collaboratively and constructively
• Put the school’s interests foremost
## BGMS Site Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>Doesn’t meet our needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2a</td>
<td>Add extra class to current site without additional buildings</td>
<td>Subject to site capacity  Temporary option only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2b</td>
<td>Add classroom(s) to current site</td>
<td>Very challenging due to easements and 2nd storey complications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Expand onto adjoining land</td>
<td>Looks possible. Request land from DoH for land on Bibra Drive side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>Add a second campus</td>
<td>Investigated buying Treasured Tots, but the new owners are not willing to sell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5</td>
<td>Move to a new site</td>
<td>Would require attractive opportunity  No real options present themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board’s short term preference

Board’s long term preference
Parent feedback on proposal: 2014 Satisfaction survey

For the short term option (to split UP and include some MP students), how much do you agree with the following (1 = disagree; 4 = agree)

- MP and UP don't really affect me, so I'm not too concerned. (feel free to skip remaining questions)
- I agree with the principle of providing extra capacity for MP and UP classes
- It's a good idea but not worth spending much money on
- It's important that we make this change urgently even if it causes some short term inconvenience and cost
- More consultation with parents is needed
- I like the proposal as it stands
Short term
add class to existing site

• License restricts us to 200 people.
  – Email assurance from City of Cockburn that we can expand for “a couple of semesters”
• Would want to retain all facilities on the site
  – Have considered moving Extend ed / playgroup off site
• Strategy
  – Split UP into two classes
  – Move some MP kids into UP early (no sooner than T3 and only if ready)
  – Considering options with Banksia / Mallee / Boab
  – Potential to “fit” an extra 10 students
• Aiming for T1 2015 start
Long term
Expand onto neighbouring site

The Board approached DoH to lease their land
## DoH Negotiations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strong preference to sell       | A bigger investment decision  
Deserves more permanent infrastructure and more thorough design                                                                                   |
| Option of short term lease      | May be signed soon  
Outside chance of getting (leased) buildings on site by 2015  
This may avoid making changes for 2015, then having to undo them for 2016                                                                         |

**Way forward:**
- Still targeting 2x UP classes by T1 2015
- Will explore option of leased classes on leased DoH land in 2015
- If 2015 is possible it may be T2 or T3 instead of T1
- Would also provide a contingency for sourcing building quotes, council approvals

**Remain flexible to ensure best outcome for our kids !!**
Questions