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Introduction

The Looking Inward document was drafted in the fall of 2012 and released for public review and input in April of 2013. Public information sessions, information sessions for the NSTU and CUPE Unions, School Advisory Council focus groups, student focus groups, Principal's information and input sessions and public input sessions in each of the seven Families of Schools marked the efforts of the Cape Breton-Victoria Regional School Board to engage the educational stakeholders in this planning process.

Looking Inward is a planning framework for long term facility provision and system sustainability in a time of changing demographics.

The original document contained 32 scenarios designed to start the conversation with respect to long term facility requirements within the School Board. With the completion of the first round of consultations, fifty additional scenarios were put forth for consideration. These were generated from the SAC focus groups, school based administrators and public input sessions. Two web based surveys generated another four hundred responses to variables associated with attempting to establish a long range plan that would be responsive to the challenges facing the School Board.

Staff reviewed all the scenarios, generated a series of proposals for further consideration, shared the input received with the School Board, and in April of 2014 released a document entitled" Looking Inward- Disposition of Scenarios to Family of Schools Suggested Solutions" . The document also contained proposals as to how school facilities within each Family of Schools could be configured to accommodate students on the long term.

Public reaction to the proposals for each Family of Schools was sought by once again engaging stakeholders in the process. Student Accommodation Study Groups were established in each Family of Schools. The mandate of each Student Accommodation Study Group (SASG) was threefold:

a) To continue the multi-part conversation of stakeholder engagement by soliciting input from educational partners on proposals designed to sustain required school facilities and to protect/maintain programs and services for students.

b) To provide the Family of Schools Student Accommodation Study Group with an opportunity to reflect on the proposals with a view to commenting on the identified proposal(s) or suggesting viable alternatives.

c) To afford educational stakeholders the opportunity to generate a response document on the evolving plan including recommendations for the consideration of the Board.
RIVERVIEW FAMILY OF SCHOOLS SCENARIOS

Looking Inward Scenarios

Original scenarios from the Looking Inward document include:

Scenario 13  Examine the impact of enrolment shifts over the next three years relative to the viability of retaining the junior high program at George D. Lewis School.

Scenario 14  To examine if the development of the recommendation with respect to the future of the Riverside Elementary P3 School would impact the future of the George D. Lewis School in Louisbourg.

Scenario 15  As neighbouring schools—*Sydney River, Shipyard or Riverside*—are positioned to accommodate any and/or all Marion Bridge students, identify Marion Bridge School for inclusion in a school review process.

Scenario 16  Consistent with the ideology to protect small rural schools that benefit from financial resources designed to support sustainability, retain Marion Bridge School as a rural school.

Scenario 17  As enrolment continues to decline at MacLennan, examine the feasibility of combining MacLennan Junior High School students at Malcolm Munroe Junior High and identify MacLennan for inclusion in a school review process.

Scenario 18  Examine the option of housing all of the students attending the East Bay School and Mountainview Elementary under one roof at Mountainview Elementary School and identify East Bay Elementary School for inclusion in a school review process.

Scenario 19  Examine the establishment of school boundaries associated with the Mira Road School with a view to identifying Mira Road School for inclusion in a school review process, and an examination of the possibility of disseminating the school population in accordance with the outcome of the boundary review should the decision ultimately be made to include Mira Road in the school review process.

Public Scenarios

Public consultation on the original scenarios for the Riverview Family of Schools resulted in the identification of the following Public Scenarios:

Public Scenario 2

Examine the option of rerouting students who live along Route 327 including Prime Brook, Dutch Brook, Front Lake, and Caribou Marsh Road from Sydney River Elementary to Marion Bridge School.
Public Scenario 3

Examine the option of establishing George D. Lewis School as a full service community school housing the P-9 student body and accommodating other educational partners who can contribute to the growth and development of the student body as well as support community members.

Public Scenario 4

Examine the option of housing all of the students attending the East Bay School and Mountainview Elementary under one roof at East Bay and identify the Mountainview Elementary School for inclusion in a school review process.

Public Scenario 5

Examine enrolment numbers in each school attendance zone for all schools within the Riverview Family of Schools with a view to adjusting the numbers to accurately reflect students that should be attending the local community school.

Public Scenario 6

Examine the feasibility of consolidating some board-owned and managed non-school facilities to affect cost savings and create operating efficiency.

Public Scenario 7

Examine the option of establishing MacLennan Junior High as the late French Immersion Center to serve students from the Riverview and Sydney Families of Schools.

Public Scenario 8

Examine the option of creating George D. Lewis as a French Immersion Center housing an Early Immersion and Late Immersion program in a primary to grade nine setting.

Public Scenario 9

Examine the option of creating Riverside Elementary School as a French Immersion Center housing an Early French Immersion Program and Late French Immersion Program in a primary to grade 8/grade 9 setting (depending on Board direction for grade configuration).

Administrative Scenarios

School Administrators identified six additional scenarios including Administrative Scenario 2 in the Riverview Family of Schools.

Administrative Scenario 2

Examine the option of creating a P-8 or P-9 community school to serve the Westmount area consistent with the grade level configuration model to be adopted by the Board.
School Advisory Council Consultation Scenarios

Consultation with the School Advisory Councils in the Riverview Family of Schools resulted in the development of two additional scenarios.

SAC Scenario 5

Examine the option of transferring Grade Primary to 6 students from George D. Lewis to Riverside and establish George D. Lewis as a late French Immersion School.

SAC Scenario 11

Examine the option of creating a P-8 or P-9 school to serve all students along Route 327 (Marion Bridge) and Route 22 (Louisbourg Highway).

ABOUT US

Participants in the Student Accommodation Study Group for the Riverview Family of Schools included:

Alan Stanwick          Mountainview
Joyce Lively           Mountainview/East Bay
Stephanie MacQuarrie  Mountainview
Teresa Murphy          East Bay
Daniel Beaton          Mountainview/East Bay
Lori Fortune           East Bay
Margie MacNeil         Coxheath
Ann Sajotovich         Coxheath
Heather MacDonald      Coxheath
Janelle Osborne        Coxheath
Mikki Armishaw         Sydney River
Dale McPhail           Sydney River
Joe Chisholm           Riverview
Clare MacDougall       Riverview
Jan MacGillivary       Riverview
Stephen MacDougall     Robin Foote
Melanie Dolan          Robin Foote
Rod Beresford          Robin Foote
Judy Martin            Robin Foote
Donald Phillip          Robin Foote/MacLennan
Ray Phillip            Robin Foote/MacLennan
Brent Mombourquette    MacLennan
Paula Matheson  MacLennan
Lee Cantwell  Malcolm Munroe
Eileen Burns  Malcolm Munroe
Donna Sheppard  Malcolm Munroe
Nancy O’Quinn  Malcolm Munroe

Tanya Jamieson  Marion Bridge
Walter MacLeod  Marion Bridge
Lorali Boone  Marion Bridge

Heather Peters  Mira Road
Paul Mombourquette  Mira Road
Andrea Hutchinson  Mira Road
Steve Murphy  Mira Road
John Wolodka  Mira Road

Donna Sullivan  Riverside
Donald Hanson  Riverside
Colleen MacKenzie  Riverside
Leslie Shepard  Riverside

Michelle Leamon  George D. Lewis
Lloydette MacDonald  George D. Lewis
Karen Skinner  George D. Lewis
Paul Gartland  George D. Lewis
Ellen Cross  George D. Lewis
Cheryl Hutt  George D. Lewis

Cathy Viva  CBVRSB Coordinator
Kurt Kublek  CBVRSB Coordinator
Lynn Crawford  CBVRSB Coordinator

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. Integrity
2. Equity
3. Responsiveness
4. Sustainability
5. Transparency
6. Adequacy
7. Accountability
8. Stewardship
VALUES AND BELIEFS
1. Student learning/achievement is our primary concern.
2. Parents/Community members should be engaged in addressing issues facing the Board.
3. Need to manage the stock of school buildings.
4. Engaged parents help improve the focus on education
5. Maintain a school in a community.
6. Establishing a new school community is an option to be considered.
7. Major consideration for transportation of students.

PROPOSALS

Recognizing that we did not have to deal with the new propose grade level configuration model at this time, we turned our attention to the five proposals identified for our group to consider.

Proposal 1
Retention of a Primary to Grade 9 school on Route 22 to serve students currently served by George D. Lewis School and Riverside Elementary.

No specific scenario served as a basis for this proposal

Proposal 2

House all the Mountainview Elementary and East Bay Elementary students in one facility at Mountainview.

The source of this proposal is Looking Inward, Scenario 18.

Proposal 3

To create a Primary to Grade 9 school at the MacLennan Junior High facility to serve Westmount students.

Source for this proposal is Administrative Scenario 2.

Proposal 4

Relocate students attending Mira Road Elementary to Sydney River Elementary.

This proposal has no specific scenario associated with it.

Mira Road SAC have identified an Alternate Proposal for consideration by the Board.

Proposal 5

To retain Marion Bridge School.
The source of this proposal is Looking Inward, Scenario 16.

**PROPOSAL 1**

Retention of a Primary to grade 9 school on Route 22 to serve students currently served by George D. Lewis and Riverside Elementary.

**INITIAL REACTION**

The George D. Lewis School Community sees potential for housing the P-9 student population from Route 22 catchment area in a refurbished board owned school facility.

The Riverside School Community believes that the more centrally located Riverside facility can be expanded to include any middle school configuration that might be adopted by the Board.

Both School Communities (George D. Lewis and Riverside) see this as a divisive proposal that will result in one school community or the other losing its school.

Both Riverside and George D. Lewis see the implementation of this proposal resulting in increased travel time for one or the other group of students.

Both George D. Lewis and Riverside School Communities believe that open boundaries contribute to enrolment decline.

**STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>George D. Lewis</strong></td>
<td>Travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George D. Lewis has separate area for Elementary and Middle School students</td>
<td>Boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher population density in area of Louisbourg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency response in located in community( fire, medical responders, police)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical facilities available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Riverside</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building is in excellent condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside would be centrally located</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately sized classrooms exist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance of natural light is present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-to-date amenities and facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very large green space enough to entertain several levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of students (elementary, middle and/or junior high)

OPPORTUNITIES

To address the excess space issue which exists in this area of the board.

IMPACTS

Impact on Students

Additional travel time
More opportunities for Student Leadership

Program Delivery Spaces

If Riverside was identified as the location for a P-9 or P-8 school along Route 22, program spaces consistent with a Junior High School or Middle School would need to be added to Riverside School. These spaces include an area for Tech Ed, Family Studies, Multi-purpose space, Science Demonstration classroom, language classroom (French), as well as a Youth Health Centre space.

If George D. Lewis was identified as the location for a P-9 or P-8 school along Route 22, an assessment of the residual value in the school would have to be made. Fourteen instructional spaces would need to be refurbished and reconfigured to provide for a student population of 260-290. Either an additional classroom wing would be needed and existing specialists spaces refurbished and the classrooms could be refurbished and a wing to house specialist subject areas could be constructed.

George D. Lewis has 29,465 square feet and was built in 1968. George D Lewis has 14 (one capable of being divided) classroom spaces plus a gymnasium. George D. Lewis has 87 students based on September 30, 2014 enrolment figures. If George D. Lewis is chosen to accommodate P-5, 6-8, it would need refurbishment.

Riverside has 46,785 square feet. Riverside has 14 classrooms plus a gymnasium and cafeteria. Riverside has several specialist spaces. Riverside has 166 students based on September 30, 2014 enrolment figures.

Community

If George D. Lewis were to close, the community of Louisbourg would lose its school.
At Riverside a new school community was formed when it was opened. Now a new school community would have to be formed.

**Staffing**

The 2014-2015 classroom teaching complement of George D. Lewis is 6. The 2014-2015 classroom teaching complement of Riverside School is 8 plus 1 Learning Centre teacher.

The new collective agreement would provide protection and ease of procedure for teaching staff in the event of position changes or displaced staff.

**Implementation Timelines**

In response to the question to identify specific timelines for the respective proposals, we learned that no specific time exists. The factors contributing to the lack of a specific time were highlighted for us. They include:

1. Looking Inward is a process designed to establish a planning framework for long term facility provision and system sustainability. The last phase of input, namely the response to proposals/options, will not be completed until the fall.
2. The Board has not yet committed to a number of elements that could find their way into a long term facilities plan e.g. grade level configuration.
3. The Board has set direction for the SASG’s in each Family of Schools to examine proposals designed to create schools with sufficient enrolment to support equitable programs and services for students, redefine the organizational structure of schools within each Family of Schools, and complete responsive input to options/proposals to help inform decision-making by the Board.
4. In the Minister’s response to the Fowler Report on School Review, Minister Casey indicated each school board would be required to develop a long term facilities and education service plan by April 2015.
5. The input from the SASG’s will be of great assistance to the Board in establishing a long term plan for CBVRSB.
6. A timeline exist for the Board to advise government with respect to the future requirements of the Board in relation to the P3 schools:
   - Sherwood Park Education Center - November 2015
   - The other 6 P3 schools - November 2016

While no specific timeline for the implementation of each proposal could be identified, we learned that consideration of Grade 9-12 reconfiguration for Riverview can now be advanced by two years from the original projection as noted on Page 37 of Looking Inward.
If the proposed grade configuration was implemented, Malcolm Munroe would become a P-8 facility, George D. Lewis or Riverside could be a P-8 facility. MacLennan Jr High could become a P-8 facility. The remaining elementary schools would be P-5 facilities.

COSTS

Operating Costs

The operating costs for George D. Lewis for 2012-2013 were $125,000

The operating costs for Riverside School for 2012-2013 were $267,000

Capital Costs

We questioned the costs associated with creating the appropriate instructional spaces at Riverside and refurbishing George D. Lewis with respect to housing a P-9 or P-8 student population at either facility.

George D. Lewis – A full scale building assessment would need to be done to determine the residual value in a building constructed in 1968. Based on current renovation cost, the estimate to renovate George D. Lewis would range from 3.7 to 5.0 million dollars. Additional program spaces that would need to be constructed would cost approximately 3.6 million dollars.

To provide a P-9 or P-8 facility at the George D. Lewis site would range between 7.3 and 8.6 million dollars. (Subject to a full scale building assessment.)

Riverside Elementary – Sufficient classroom space exists to accommodate a P-9 or P-8 student population anticipated to be in the area of 287 students if P-9 (260 students if based on P-8) utilizing September 30, 2013 enrolment figures.

To purchase Riverside at the end of the initial lease would cost the Province 3.04 million dollars. To create the specialists learning spaces (Tech Ed, Family Studies, Science Lab, Multi-purpose Room, and Youth Health Centre) plus gross-up square footage is estimated to cost in the area of 2 million dollars. This figure does not include a new gym nor would the current gym be expanded under this proposal. These are only estimates without the benefit of a full building assessment.

Transportation
If either facility was to be established as the P-8 facility for Route 22, Louisbourg and area, the P-8 students would be transported from Riverside to George D. Lewis or vise versa. Grade 9 students from George D. Lewis would be transported to Riverview High School.

UNKNOWNWS WITH RESPECT TO THIS PROPOSAL

1. Why wouldn’t the Grade 9 students be included at Riverview High as with other Families of Schools? With the present population there would not be room but what about the next few years?
2. Will the Board identify Riverside as a facility needed to accommodate Route 22 and area students or will the Board favour the refurbishment of an existing board owned school (George D. Lewis) to house Route 22 and area students?
**PROPOSAL 2**

House all the Mountainview Elementary and East Bay Elementary students in one facility at Mountainview.

**INITIAL REACTION**

The school is the centre of the community. The catchment area for the school is currently very large (Islandview to Irish Cove).

East Bay did not feel distances were considered and that the impact on the community of East Bay was not considered.

**STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for all students, particularly, those with special needs.</td>
<td>Culture of East Bay unique therefore it is a weakness to the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation distance/time response did not contain specific information being sought</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPPORTUNITIES**

The issue of excess space could be addressed.

**IMPACTS**

**Students**

Students in this catchment area would be uprooted from their community school setting.

Time on buses would increase for students by more than 20 minutes between schools.
Program Delivery Spaces

The existing space is functional for the needs of East Bay students.

East Bay representatives of the Study Group indicated that the floor in East Bay Multipurpose Room is satisfactory and not in need of replacement.

Community

Loss of a major community asset.

Less community participation in the life of the school is anticipated.

Staffing


The new collective agreement would provide protection and ease of procedure for teaching staff in the event of position changes or displaced staff.

Implementation Timelines

In response to the question to identify specific timelines for the respective proposals, we learned that no specific time exists. The factors contributing to the lack of a specific time for this proposal are the same as noted in Proposal 1.

While no specific timeline for the implementation of each proposal could be identified, we learned that consideration of Grade 9-12 reconfiguration for Riverview can now be advanced by two years from the original projection as noted on Page 37 of Looking Inward.

COSTS

Operating Costs

The operating costs for Mountainview for 2012-2013 were $230,000

The operating costs for East Bay for 2012-2013 were $89,000

East Bay has 15,400 square feet and was built in 1965.
Mountainview had 31,630 square feet and was opened in 1990.

Capital Costs

No additional capital costs would be incurred at Mountainview in order to accommodate the East Bay students in the Mountainview building.

Transportation

The expansive catchment area of the East Bay School creates a concern in the minds of some Student Accommodation Study Group members, particularly, as it relates to transporting students to and from school. Concern was expressed that travel times may be substantially increased as bus runs are restructured and a new transfer point established if the East Bay School was closed.

Current times for East Bay are not anticipated to change if the school was to remain opened (approximately ½ hour travel time for most students being transported to East Bay School. Currently, one student travels over 1 hour.)

UNKNOWNS WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSAL # 2

What are the specific pick up and drop off times for East Bay students if the East Bay students were to attend Mountainview Elementary School?
**PROPOSAL 3**

To create a Primary to Grade 9 school at the MacLennan School facility to serve Westmount students.

**INITIAL REACTION**

Concern about what school space would be best suited to be the chosen building.

Concern about potential loss of a school (one building or the other) that has served students from their area very well up to the present time.

**STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School remains in Westmount</td>
<td>Lack of playground space at MacLennan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacLennan has accessibility issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of middle school program space at Robin Foote.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPPORTUNITY**

To renovate existing program space to have more appropriate program space.

To reduce excess square footage while maintaining a school in the community.

**IMPACTS**

**Students**

Parental concern of having P-9 or P-8 students together.

**Program Delivery Spaces**

Based on September 30, 2014 enrolment figures MacLennan has 90 students and Robin Foote has 131 students.
If one school existed in the community with a Primary to Grade 8 enrolment (based on 2014 statistics) the total projected enrolment would be 226 students.

MacLennan is a 38,716 square feet building with 12 classrooms, Music Room, Art Room, Library, Family Studies, Tech Education, Computer room and gym.

Robin Foote is a 18,666 square feet building with 7 instructional groups. It has an Administration area, gym, 12 classrooms, and Resource Room. Some of the classrooms have been repurposed – 1 Music Room, Library, Art Room, and French Room.

**Community**

The Westmount community was pleased that this proposal recommends a school be retained in the Westmount area.

A community meeting was held in Westmount to discuss the challenges facing the Board with respect to excess capacity in the Westmount area. It is understood that before any plan is finalized, a detailed assessment of the buildings would be required and capital funding would be requested to make changes in the preferred site should the Board elect to include this proposal in its long range plan. The community sees value in continuing to be engaged in any plan with respect to sustaining and improving Westmount school facilities.

**Staffing**


The new collective agreement would provide protection and ease of procedure for teaching staff in the event of position changes or displaced staff.

**Implementation Timelines**

In response to the question to identify specific timelines for the respective proposals, we learned that no specific time exists. The factors contributing to the lack of a specific time for this proposal are the same as noted in Proposal 1.

While no specific timeline for the implementation of each proposal could be identified, we learned that consideration of Grade 9-12 reconfiguration for Riverview can now be advanced by two years from the original projection as noted on Page 37 of Looking Inward.
COSTS

Operating Costs

The operating costs for MacLennan for 2012-2013 were $168,000

The operating costs for Robin Foote for 2012-2013 were $128,000

Capital Costs

If Robin Foote building were to be considered as a facility to house the P-9 or P-8 Westmount Community School, the following program spaces would have to be added:
   - Library
   - Language classrooms
   - Family Studies
   - Learning Centre
   - Technical Education
   - Multi-purpose room
   - A science demonstration classroom/lab
   - Visual Arts
   - Gymnasium
   - Cafeteria
   - Youth Health Center space

The existing classroom area would be refurbished. A determination would be made as to how best to reconfigure the existing gym space (e.g. library/cafeteria, multi-purpose space).

Should the concept proposed create a P-9 or P-8 community school for Westmount be received favourably, the first order of business would be to have both existing facilities (buildings and operating systems) evaluated to determine the residual value and to identify the preferred site. A cost estimate would also accompany this assessment.

MacLennan Junior High School has benefitted from a number of capital improvements. The main entrance doors were replaced, the sprinkler tanks removed, four sections of the roof were replaced, office renovations occurred, a new electrical service was installed, and windows were upgraded.
Additional work required includes refurbishing interior finishes, replacing classroom doors, video and public address upgrades, and the need for improved ventilation. The greatest challenge to be addressed is the accessibility issue by installing an elevator.

To identify cost estimates, a detailed facilities assessment would need to be conducted prior to the development of a business case for funding for capital improvements. Preliminary figures dating back to 2010, place the cost estimate in the range of $600,000.

**Transportation**

No change in time and distance as schools are located on adjoining properties.

**UNKNOWNs WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSAL 3**

1. Would the necessary renovations be made in time?
2. How would the building, that would be used, be chosen.
**PROPOSAL 4**

Relocate students attending Mira Road Elementary to Sydney River Elementary

**INITIAL REACTION**

Members of the Study Committee disagree with north boundary on George Street, Tower Heights.

Mira Road SAC strongly disagrees with this proposal.

Mira Road School is strategically located bordering Brookland Elementary which is situated on the north and Shipyard to its west. While Mira Road School has, historically, been a “County” school and falls within the Riverview Family of Schools, members of the Student Accommodation Study Group representing their area believe that Mira Road School can play a vital role in accommodating students in the Sydney Family of Schools should the P-5, 6-8, and 9-12 grade level configuration become a reality system wide.

An Alternate Proposal has been generated by the Mira Road SAC spelling out the concept and rationale for the consideration of the Board.

**STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>Transportation distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPPORTUNITIES**

To reduce excess capacity within the Riverview Family of Schools.

**IMPACTS**

Students
Students moving out of community which would end the tradition of the presence of a school in the community for nearly a century. Additional travel time for students would result if Mira Road School students attended Sydney River Elementary School.

**Program Delivery Spaces**

Mira Road has 18,500 square feet. Mira Road has a Grade Primary/Resource Room with a bathroom. It has a Library, Music Room, and a gym with a multipurpose floor. Renovations were recently completed on boys’, girls’, and staff bathrooms. All program spaces consistent with an elementary school program are available at Mira Road School.

Sydney River has 46,070 square feet. All program spaces, consistent with an elementary school, are available at Sydney River Elementary School. Major recent renovations have taken place on two floors and foyer washrooms.

Based on September 30, 2014 enrolment figures, there are 129 students at Mira Road and 320 at Sydney River. If the Sydney River School housed Mira Road students in a Primary to 5 instructional setting, the enrolment is projected to be 377 students.

**Community**

History of Mira Road School not being considered. Boundaries being considered are historically incorrect.

**Staffing**

The 2014-2015 classroom teaching complement of Mira Road is 7.
The 2014-2015 classroom teaching complement of Sydney River is 14 plus 1 Learning Centre teacher.

The new collective agreement would provide protection and ease of procedure for teaching staff in the event of position changes or displaced staff.

**Implementation Timelines**

In response to the question to identify specific timelines for the respective proposals, we learned that no specific time exists. The factors contributing to the lack of a specific time for this proposal are the same as noted in Proposal 1.
While no specific timeline for the implementation of each proposal could be identified, we learned that consideration of Grade 9-12 reconfiguration for Riverview can now be advanced by two years from the original projection as noted on Page 37 of Looking Inward.

COSTS

Operating Costs

The operating costs for Mira Road for 2012-2013 were $123,000

The operating costs for Sydney River for 2012-2013 were $305,000

Capital Costs

No additional Capital costs would be incurred at Sydney River Elementary if Mira Road students were to be accommodated there.

Transportation

Busing to Mira Road School is under 15 minutes. All students are within 10 km.

If students go to Sydney River – an additional 7.1 km, approximately 10 additional minutes

UNKNOWN WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSAL # 4

Mira Road SAC questions the ability of Sydney River to comfortably accommodate 449 plus students.
PROPOSAL 5

To retain the Marion Bridge School

INITIAL REACTION

Positive

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 funding, annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPPORTUNITIES

To retain a small rural school. To minimize time on school buses for Two Rivers and area students.

IMPACTS

Students

No impact

Program Delivery Spaces

Marion Bridge was constructed in 1960 and expanded in 1989. Enrolment as of September 30, 2014 is 73 students. Marion Bridge has 10 instructional areas.

Community

Parents are happy to have a voice in the Looking Inward process.

Staffing

The 2014-2015 classroom teaching complement of Marion Bridge is 4.
Implementation Timelines

In response to the question to identify specific timelines for the respective proposals, we learned that no specific time exists. The factors contributing to the lack of a specific time for this proposal are the same as noted in Proposal 1.

While no specific timeline for the implementation of each proposal could be identified, we learned that consideration of Grade 9-12 reconfiguration for Riverview can now be advanced by two years from the original projection as noted on Page 37 of Looking Inward.

COSTS

Operating Costs

The operating costs for Marion Bridge 2012-2013 were $85,000.

Capital Costs

Capital items identified as being required in the 2010 Facilities Review document will be addressed as resources become available.

Transportation

No change is anticipated in this area.

UNKNOWN WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSAL # 5
ALTERNATE PROPOSAL 1 FROM MIRA ROAD SAC

1. We begin with Sherwood Park Education Centre by building on the proposal for “Review for Closure” and as in Scenarios 21 & 22 for the Sydney Family of Schools, we would suggest that Sherwood Park Education Centre be returned to the owner.

2. Building on Proposals #6-8, Scenarios 23, Public 12 and suggest that Brookland Elementary be considered as middle school, grades 6-8.

3. Building on Scenario #20, Proposal 9-12, Sydney Academy would accommodate all 9-12 students in the Sydney Family of Schools.

4. Building on Scenario #23, Public 12, make Shipyard Elementary a P-5 school plus some of Brookland students based on a boundary realignment.

5. We suggest making Mira Road Elementary a P-5 school plus some Brookland students based on a boundary realignment.

6. Cusack Elementary could maintain its status quo or be able to accommodate students from Brookland, if necessary.

7. Mira Road Elementary students will attend Malcolm Munroe Jr High based on a boundary realignment to include students from Brookland Elementary.

RATIONAL

1. Mira Road Elementary is a brick building built in 1978. The building does not appear to be it’s age. It is extremely clean, is in very good physical condition, and is free of any maintenance concerns.

2. The schools has a large, fully fenced property and playing field in the back of the school.

3. The school has a library and music room.

4. The gym is in excellent condition and has a multipurpose floor and a stage.

5. There is a Grade Primary/Resource Room with a bathroom.

6. Renovations were recently completed on both boys’ and girls’ bathrooms and staff bathrooms.

7. This scenario would build on existing scenarios and allow the students to be educated in their community.

8. Children will spend less time on buses, as opposed to Scenario 19.

9. Mira Road could accommodate some of the students from Hills Road, Albert Bridge area, if Riverside Elementary were to close.

10. Mira Road Elementary students would attend Malcolm Munroe Junior High School. Since the building of Sherwood Park Education Centre (SPEC), some students of Mira Road Elementary were made to attend SPEC while the rest of their classmates were made to attend Malcolm Munroe Junior High.

11. Mira Road Elementary School has been the centre of our community since the original school was built in 1917. This scenario allows an “anchor” school such as Mira Road Elementary to be maintained which is important to the students’ education in small communities.
ALTERNATE PROPOSAL 2 FROM GEORGE D. LEWIS SAC

To explore the opportunities to retain George D. Lewis as a “hub” school consistent with the efforts of the Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic site which is in the process of exploring re-location options to the Town of Louisbourg.

RATIONAL

Should the Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic site re-locate to the George D. Lewis site, the School Advisory Council from George D. Lewis School suggest, at worst, this “hub” school site would be cost neutral. With new construction, the opportunity would exist to create a presentation area similar to that which exists at Guysborough Academy where an African Friendship Centre has been established.

The board could explore other options with respect to service provision for students along Route 22 and area.

Retention of George D. Lewis would permit the Board to look at retention of Grade 7 and 8 English Program students at George D. Lewis.

This alternate proposal would see Grade 9 students from the Louisbourg catchment area attend Riverview High School.

A P-8 school in Louisbourg would facilitate a student transportation system best suited to student needs.

A Louisbourg School site is deemed by Louisbourg representatives to be a safer site as it has low radon readings, is located in a 50km/30km traffic zone and has an active emergency response located in the community.
ALTERNATE PROPOSAL 3 – FROM RIVERSIDE PARENTS AND SAC

To examine the Business Case and supporting information that enhances the proposal to retain Riverside Elementary as the Route 22 school.

Rationale:

This proposal acknowledges the challenges facing the Cape Breton-Victoria Regional School Board with respect to demographics, excess capacity and finances with respect to sustaining programs and services for students in facilities over the long term.

This proposal recognizes that student achievement and the improvement of outcomes for students remain the primary focus of the School Board. Inequities exist within the system and the right-sizing of the system is intended to redirect resources to create a balance in the provision of programs and services to students.

Our Business Case is constructed around the following considerations:

a) Student learning
b) Financial
c) Community
d) Student safety
e) Emergency services
f) Transportation
g) Future considerations

Student Learning

a) Once organizational reconfiguration is completed, it is expected that equitable instructional environments, program offerings, and pupil-teacher ratio will be established.

b) As per the announcement of Jan 5 2015, CBVRSB will be implementing the Middle School model. Riverside has the capacity to accommodate this model.

c) The transition students from Marion Bridge (leaving Grades 5 and 6) can be accommodated at Riverside for the middle school model which is approximately 30 kids - (Gr 6 - 11, Gr 7 – 19)

d) Increase catchment area to include students of Morrison Road who may be impacted from the closure of Mira Road.

e) Riverside will experience enhanced educational programming with the proposed integration of Brilliant Labs into the classrooms. The labs incorporate workspaces for future labour market needs in marine biology, coding, robotics and other engineering components. These labs will be sponsored (funded) by Louisbourg Seafoods.
Financial

Riverside Elementary has financial advantages.

a) Sinking fund residuals (capital repairs/technology) could be used to offset the capital purchase price at the end of the initial lease.

b) Capital cost estimates to procure and add to Riverside are less than the estimates to refurbish and expand George D. Lewis. Cost to Refurbish Riverside vs GDL has a variance of $2.26 - 3.56m in savings.

c) Riverside operating costs are consistent with other new/refurbished facilities and can not be accurately compared to that of GDL.

d) An excerpt from Riverview Family of Schools Public Input Session, November 26, 2014, shows a response from a School Board Representative regarding the Provinces perogative to purchase P3 schools.

Community

A new Mira and area school community was developed with the construction of Riverside in 2000. This new, stronger Riverside School community has been extensively involved in the Looking Inward process and this engagement has manifested itself in broad based community support for the retention of Riverside as the Route 22 school. 89% of the voices brought forward at the public meeting at Riverview were in favor of Riverside retention.

The new Mira school community was created as a result of 3 other community school closures (Main a dieu, Catalone and Albert Bridge)

With the creation of Riverside School in 2000, the Albert Bridge community has enjoyed an increase in general population of 11.4% (census 2001-2011 comparison) while other areas like Louisbourg decreased by 11.3% (census 2001-2011 comparison).

Many parents state that Riverside was their principle decision to reside in Mira

Many of these same parents stated that they would exit the area or transfer their child to a different school if Riverside were to close.

Riverside can house community Health Services, or Community Centers for other Provincial offices and also small Business center. Riverside is also exploring options for the introduction of an early education facility within the school.
Student Safety

Safety differences exist between schools where there are “walkers” and “all bused students”. Schools with walking students permit movement off school grounds for lunch hour. Louisbourg Tourism increases traffic in the town during May, June, Sept and Oct increasing traffic and unknown strangers in the area.

Riverside has controlled access to the school for arrival and departure by bus or parent drop off only. They also remain on site for lunch time.

Emergency Services

Both Louisbourg and the Albert Bridge areas are serviced by volunteer fire departments and police patrols are spread across the entire Mira catchment area.

Riverside is closer to acute care services, regional police services (CBRM), and full time fire service staff whereas it is 13.2 kms to riverside and 32 kms to GDL.

Riverside has fire protection with a Fire Group of 4 departments dispatched simultaneously where as GDL is serviced by the single Department.

Transportation

Riverside currently serves as a transfer point for students being transported to secondary school settings.

Riverside is the most central location for the entire catchment area.

Situating the Route 22 student population in GDL would increase time on buses for many Riverside students by 22 minutes.

This is the direct travel time from Riverside to George D. Lewis. Their time on a bus would change to between 30 minutes to 1 hour 22 minutes.

George D Lewis students be moved to Riverside Elementary some students would see a reduction in their bus time by 22 minutes. They would also no longer require a wait for transfer.
Future Considerations

Riverside is strategically positioned in the area of the Mira where the general population is increasing and is centrally located providing greater opportunity for catchment area adjustments should changes in the funding formula necessitate re-alignment.

The potential exists that the Hogg Funding Formula could change and negatively impact Marion Bridge School. If this was to occur, Riverside is positioned to accommodate Marion Bridge students.
In Response to the Report on 2000 and Beyond, the Route 22 Study group concluded: “However, although there is disagreement on some points, all communities have committed themselves to the consensus that if change is necessary, then a new centrally located elementary school is the only viable option.”
SUGGESTED FOLLOW-UP CONSIDERATIONS: GRADE LEVEL CONFIGURATION

Members of our Student Accommodation Study Group noted, with interest, that among the five proposals provided to us for review, reflection and input, there was no specific reference to Riverview High School being a 9-12 school. Our first inquiry of our Coordinators was:

- Why wouldn’t Grade 9 students be included at Riverview High as with other Families of Schools?

This inquiry prompted Board Staff to follow-up on changing circumstances with respect to Riverview High School.

1. Over a two year period, since Looking Inward was penned, enrolment declines and changes in staffing formulas have resulted in nine (9) fewer classroom teachers being assigned to Riverview High School.
2. With nine fewer staff occupying space at Riverview, Operations staff, supported by school administration, conducted a detailed analysis of instructional spaces at Riverview and determined that the anticipated Grade 9 enrolment ranging from 250 to 270 for 2015-2016 could be accommodated at Riverview High School beginning in September 2015-2016 with only minor building modifications.

While the Board has not made a decision on grade level configuration, this information creates an opportunity for the Board, sooner than later, to revisit the proposal put forth for consideration by the Student Accommodation Study Group for the Riverview Family of Schools. The ability of Riverview High to accommodate Grade 9 students as part of a 9-12 grade configuration service delivery model also address the equity piece raised by other Families of Schools when consideration of a different service delivery model.

A LOOK AHEAD

If the Board was to implement a P-5, 6-8/P-8, 9-12 grade level configuration based on 2014 September enrolment and the proposals under review by the Student Accommodation Study Group, the Riverview Family of Schools would, in our opinion, look something like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Projected Enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverview High</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Munroe</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLennan</td>
<td>P-8</td>
<td>226 (116+110)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
George D. Lewis or Riverside   P-8   222 (88+134)
Mountainview-East Bay Complex   P-5   237 (205+32)
Coxheath   P-5   283
Marion Bridge   P-5   54
Sydney River-Mira Road   P-5   377 (267+110)

The implementation of these proposals would result in approximately 3000 students to be served by the Riverview Family of Schools being housed in eight buildings rather than the twelve buildings currently being utilized. The building capacity no longer required under this set of proposals would range from 86,031 square feet to 103,351 square feet. The annual operating savings utilizing 2012-2013 figures would range from four hundred sixty–five thousand dollars ($465,000.) to six hundred seven thousand dollars ($607,000.).

It is recognized that if a P-5, 6-8/P-8, 9-12 grade configuration is adopted by the Board that all schools within the Riverview Family of Schools would be impacted.

**IMPACT OF ALTERNATE PROPOSAL 1**

If Mira Road's alternate proposal was accepted by the Board the projected French Enrolment for grades 6 and 7 would not impact the Riverview Family of Schools as this proposal calls for Mira Road students to attend middle and secondary school in the Riverview Family of Schools.

The Riverview Family of Schools projected enrolment would drop to approximately 2875 if Mira Road School was considered part of the Sydney Family of Schools. Under this proposal Mira Road would not be included in calculations with respect to excess capacity reductions in the Riverview Family of Schools. The new square foot reduction range within the Riverview Family of Schools would range from 67,531 to 84851 square feet.
“Hub” School Guidelines/Criteria

Alternate Proposal 2 identifies George D. Lewis as a potential Hub School site. For purposes of this Alternate Proposal, the “Hub” school falls under the guidelines and criteria as set out by the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development and is described as follows:

The reasonable and sustainable use of public school space that does not impede the delivery of the public school program, is financially and operationally viable, and is supported through a strong business case from the community.

The guidelines and criteria reference the following:

- Alignment with the primary purpose of a public school;
- Identifies eligible partners;
- Outlines evaluation criteria for a “Hub” school proposal;
- Describes the general eligibility criteria;
- Insists on demonstrable financial viability/sustainability;
- Defines roles and responsibilities;
- Outlines minimum proposal requirements;
- Sets out timelines;
- Culminates in signed agreement.

Any proposal for use of available space in a public school must demonstrate how it will:

- Result in no increase to capital or operational costs for the school board or province as compared to the board’s plan regarding the school facility;
- Allow the school board to achieve cost savings;
- Not create additional or unreasonable management expectations on the school board.

A copy of the Hub School Model to guidelines and criteria is attached in Appendix “A”.
Riverview High School

Participants: 103 registered

The Riverview Family of Schools Student Accommodation Study Group was provided with five (5) proposals by the School Board for review and consideration. Throughout the process, two SAC’s submitted one alternate proposal each. These will be scrutinized by Senior Staff as is the case with all scenarios and proposals. Comments, input, and questions by 37 people were made at the input session.

1. Proposal 1

Retention of a Primary to Grade 9 school on Route 22 to serve students currently served by George D. Lewis and Riverside Elementary.

With the additional information provided within the report that Riverview High School is positioned to accept Grade 9 students as early as 2015, participants recognized that their comments were to be addressed to a P-8 school facility for Route 22.

One parent from George D. Lewis noted that the report did not address the student achievement issue. George D. Lewis was reported, by a parent, as having the highest Grade 8 Math scores. This parent concluded with a comment that this process is all about money.

A parent noted that George D. Lewis is only twenty minutes from Sydney. Another parent noted the trauma centre is only 10 minutes away from Riverside vs 25 minutes from Louisbourg.

Another parent expressed concerns about the Riverside P3 lease wondering how it would be handled.

Another participant wondered if the P3 lease would be in place until 2020.

Another parent noted that her children had gone through a P-9 school in which older students were nurturing and supportive of younger children.

Eight (8) participants spoke about the value of Riverside School to students living along Route 22.

Three parents indicated they moved to the Albert Bridge catchment area because of the existence of the Riverside School. Parents spoke positively about the school, its learning culture, supportive staff, and location.
One parent suggested that it did not make a lot of sense to continue to think about moving farther from the center of service as increased transportation would result.

One Riverside parent cited the latest census information noting that the demographics show Albert Bridge growing by 11% while Louisbourg was declining in population by approximately the same percentage.

One parent noted that taxpayers will be expecting the Board to look closely at cost estimates/financial disparity between the two sites.

One parent noted that the Riverside School community, like East Bay, is a school community of former school communities.

Another parent noted Riverside is a huge part of the Mira community.

One participant thought the most modern and up-to-date facility should be considered when making a decision.

Another individual expressed the hope that the Board would be transparent when it comes to their decision making.

2. Proposal 2

House Mountainview and East Bay Elementary students in one facility at Mountainview.

One parent expressed concern about the unfairness in the Hogg Funding Formula with respect to rural school funding. This parent noted East Bay was part of a complex and ineligible for funding. She wondered if there was any anticipated change in the Hogg Funding Formula that might favour East Bay in the future.

One parent expressed a concern with respect to travel times as noted in the report. She is concerned the Board won’t take into consideration the actual travel times. She stressed the need for the provision of actual times and accurate information so that parents are appropriately informed.

One parent indicated her preference was to keep kids in small school settings. She did not want children on school buses for long periods of time.

One participant wanted to know when would be the earliest date East Bay would close. The response indicated that September 2016 would be the earliest possible date the school could close and that would depend on the outcome of a school review process.

Another individual questioned whether East Bay would get the benefit of a full School Review. Under new guidelines, it would be part of the Riverview Family of Schools review process and receive full review considerations in accordance with guidelines.
3. Proposal 3

To create a Primary to Grade 9 school at the MacLennan Junior High facility to serve Westmount students.

With the additional information provided in the draft report of the Riverview Student Accommodation Study Group, it was apparent that Riverview High was positioned in 2015 to accept Grade 9 students. The comments and questions with respect to this proposal now referred to a P-8 school facility in Westmount.

A parent who currently has children at Robin Foote Elementary expressed some concern about a P-8 school for the Westmount community. The parent stated, definitely, that Board funds should go for programs and not buildings.

The P-8 concern centers around separation issues for 5 year olds and teenagers.

This parent believes the administration and staff at Robin Foote are excellent. She wants green space for the children and she encourages the Board to move slowly to ensure the change is executed in the best interest of all the children.

4. Proposal 4

Relocate students attending Mira Road Elementary to Sydney River Elementary.

A parent with a child who has special needs voiced her concern with respect to busing Mira Road students to Sydney River. This parent can volunteer at Mira Road, have her child in a class with low enrolment and feel confident that the building is safe and secure. She sees no advantage to her child attending Sydney River Elementary.

Another parent suggests that Mira Road School provides an appropriate setting for her child. It is a small school, community based, and has a rich history in the community. Not having a cafeteria is not an issue for this parent.

Another supporter of the Mira Road School also spoke of this history of the school in the community, a need to look at the numbers now and for the future. There was recognition that the school may be considered for closure at some time in the future, but the time is not now. This supporter believes Mira Road is strategically located to serve the needs of the Board as noted in Alternate Proposal 1.

Another parent thought it important that if Mira Road was identified for possible closure, parents should have a choice where their children attend school.

5. Proposal 5

To retain Marion Bridge School

No comments or input was made with respect to this proposal.
6. **Alternate Proposal 1 - Mira Road Proposal**

   - To close Sherwood Park
   - To consider Brookland as the 6-8 middle school
   - To reconfigure Sydney Academy to 9-12
   - To make Shipyard a P-5 plus some student from Brookland based on boundary realignment
   - Make Mira Road a P-5 school in the Sydney Family of Schools
   - Cusack Elementary to become P-5
   - Mira Road students to attend Malcolm Munroe on boundary realignment as middle school.

   One proponent of the Mira Road School spoke of the strategic location of the Mira Road School to serving the needs of the Board in either the Riverview Family of Schools (Route 22 solution) or Sydney Family of Schools (P-5 overload).

7. **Alternate Proposal 2**

   Explore the opportunity to retain George D. Lewis as a Hub School.

   Some participants in the meeting recognized that the potential to create a Hub School does exist at George D. Lewis.

   Questions posed focussed on the state of readiness of the school to receive partners, impacts on neighboring schools, and concrete inquires with respect to potential tenants.

   One participant questioned whether the Fortress of Louisbourg had made enquires with respect to the Hub concept. To date, there is no confirmation of a direct inquiry to the Board.

   It was recognized that there is considerable work to do in realizing this potential, but if realized, a school in a community would be maintained as a community pillar.

**Topics for consideration:**

1. **P3 Leases**

   Questions arose with respect to the Riverside P3 lease.
   a) If George D. Lewis is retained, what happens to Riverside lease?

   Lease is allowed to run its course until 2020. No expected early buy-out
b) Does Riverside maintain status quo until 2020?

   No change would be expected unless another indication came from government.

c) Wouldn’t it be cheaper to buy the school?

   That is the prerogative of the government.

2. Transportation

   Student transportation is a major consideration of speakers from the East Bay School catchment area. They are calling for actual pick-up/drop off times to be identified so that a transportation picture can be determined.

   Several parents from Mira Road see no purpose in transporting students from Mira Road to Sydney River.

   Parents in the Riverside area identified transportation as a concern because the George D Lewis solution takes kids farther afield by bus.

   A new plan to deal with transfer points would have to be initiated if Riverside was to close.

3. Grade Level Configuration

   9-12  - Five parents/participants spoke against the 9-12 grade configuration for Riverview High School. Three of the parents/participants identified the age span (13-20) as too great and two were concerned about students being adequately prepared. Three identified the need for separation of Grade 9s from other students via separate entrances and isolated wings. Mingling time should be held to a minimum. One believed Grade 9 students were vulnerable and easily led.

   6-8   - A Coxheath parent indicated she was not in favor of Grade 5 students leaving an elementary school environment to attend a middle school. She noted children are anxious and parents are concerned.

   Another parent expressed that Grade 6 students were not ready to become part of a 6-8 middle school.

   One parent noted that if this was a decision of the Board to create a 6-8 middle school, lead time of up to a year should be provided to prepare students and allow for all adjustments to be made.
Other Considerations:

1. Divisiveness

Three speakers spoke to the divisive nature of Board Proposal 1 on Route 22 communities.

2. Smaller Class Sizes

Two participants hoped the outcome would be smaller class sizes.

3. Population/Demographics

Two speakers called for the Board to look at the population shifts and demographics in the Riverview Family of Schools when deciding on facilities are being made.


Two individuals from Route 22 catchment area identified this issue as being central to the debate rather than a focus on students.

One Riverside speaker noted the difference in the capital cost to sustain Riverside as compared to George D. Lewis.

5. Timelines

One parent indicated if grade re-configuration was to occur, it should be done sooner than later to reduce the anxiety levels.
Riverview Family of Schools
Post Public Meeting Input
November 27 to December 19, 2014

The Riverview Family of Schools School Accommodation Study Group public meeting was held on November 26, 2014, at Riverview High School.

From November 27 to December 19, 2014, the Riverview Family of Schools made additional input to the proposals and discussions held on November 26, 2014.

1. Alternate Proposal 3

The Riverside parents submitted a proposal recommending Riverside be the P-8 schools for Route 22.

2. Riverside Parent/SAC inquires

The Riverside SAC and parents directed a series of inquiries to Board staff and “Looking Inward” facilitator for information. These inquiries related to:

a) Busing
b) Operational costs for George D Lewis/Riverside
c) 2000 and Beyond
d) Marion Bridge School review
e) Participants at Riverview SASG public meeting
f) Class configuration – Mathematics scores

The provision of the responses to questions posed generated a flurry of e-mails for clarification or additional information.

3. Additions to Meeting Notes

Two individuals submitted additions/clarification requests to the meeting notes. The changes/wording clarifications were made.

4. Enhancing the Riverside Proposal

This document was developed to support the proposal put forth by a Riverside parent denoting that Riverside is a viable option as a school for Route 22. This document designed to support the Riverside proposal as the school to be retained for Route 22 and area students has 10 identified factors:

• High community support
• Census data supporting Riverside
• Cost savings for refurbishment
• Transportation advantages
• New grade configuration welcomed
• Redefined boundary suggestions
• Consideration for future funding formulas
• Private sector partnership opportunities
• Integration of community based services
• Conclusion from previous consultation

High Turnout

At the public session, Riverside appeared organized and prepared to protect the presence of a school for the Mira area communities.

Census Data

The Albert Bridge area was noted as increasing in population by 11.4% while Louisbourg declined by 11.3%.

Riverside is seen to be centrally located and benefits from close proximity to “first responders”.

Cost Savings

The retention of Riverside is viewed by Riverside supporters as a cost saving in comparisons to other Route 22 options. The savings variance is estimated to be 2.26 – 3.56 million.

Residual from sinking funds for Riverside could be used to offset the purchase price of the Riverside School.

Transportation

Retention of Riverside would eliminate an additional 22 minutes being added to some students currently attending Riverside.

Support for P-8 Model

Riverside parents support the establishment of a P-8 school model in the Riverside School to minimize the number of student transitions.

Riverside also supports George D Lewis as a Hub school with a P-3 student population.

Catchment Area

An opportunity exists to extend the Riverside catchment area to include the students from the Morrison Road back to Riverside.

Funding Formula Changes
The potential exists that the Hogg Funding Formula could change and negatively impact Marion Bridge School. If this was to occur, Riverside is positioned to accommodate Marion Bridge students.

Additional P3 Opportunities

The potential to enhance program opportunities for students at Riverside exists through discussions with Brilliant Labs, a not for profit organization interested in growing technology skills through a growing global movement.

Integration of Community Based Services

The potential for Riverside to serve as a community service centre for child care, health, and governmental services in a rural setting is limitless.

Conclusion from Previous Consultations

In response to the report on 2000 and Beyond, the Route 22 study group concluded.

However, although there is disagreement on some points, all communities have committed themselves to the consensus that if change is necessary, then a new centrally located elementary school is the only viable option.

5. Correspondence

Ten (10) individuals sent letters of support and/or testimonials with respect to the Riverside School. Three (3) parents indicated that their children, all with special needs, are supported and cared for very well at Riverside. Three (3) parents acknowledged the benefits of the after school program that exists at Riverside. Two (2) individuals indicated the school facility is newer, brighter, and provides an inviting atmosphere for students. Two (2) individuals indicated the school is the right size and strategically located. These individuals did not wish to see the school closed.
APPENDIX A

Nova Scotia Department of Education and Early Childhood Development

GUIDELINES and CRITERIA

for a Hub School Model to Guide the Use of School Space

Purpose

This document contains criteria and guidelines for school boards and communities in preparing and evaluating proposals for use of available space in public school buildings.

The main function of public school buildings is to deliver the public school program, however the department supports the use of available space in public school buildings in a way that is appropriate, transparent, operationally and financially viable, sustainable, and most importantly, supportive of student learning and an appropriate school climate.

It is expected that this document will be used when opportunities for use of available space in public school buildings are identified through such processes as long-range planning and family of schools reviews undertaken by school boards.

The Hub School Model

The term Hub School is used in a variety of ways across the province and in jurisdictions outside Nova Scotia. For the purposes of these guidelines and criteria when the term Hub School is used it means:

The reasonable and sustainable use of public school space that does not impede the delivery of the public school program, is financially and operationally viable, and is supported through a strong business case from the community.

The primary purpose of a public school building is to provide the public school program to students. Any proposal for use of available space in a public school building must align with this purpose and ensure that the public school program will continue to be offered in a safe and secure learning environment. Within that context, any proposal brought forward by an organization, business or individual must demonstrate how it can support the following:

- An environment that is in the best interests of students;
- An environment that does not negatively impact student learning and engagement;
- A strong relationship between schools boards and, as applicable, community partners, business partners, municipalities, and the public;
- Improved service delivery for families and communities; and
- Reasonable and appropriate use of public infrastructure through increased flexibility, accessibility and utilization.

Any proposal for use of available space in a public school must also clearly demonstrate how it will:
• Result in no increase to capital or operational costs for the school board or the province, as compared to the board's plans regarding that school facility;
• Allow school boards to achieve cost savings; and
• Not create additional, unreasonable management responsibilities for the school board.

There may be cases where a board has determined that a potential school closure would make available resources (e.g. financial, human resources) that will better allow it to meet the educational needs of students across the board as a whole (not limited to that one school). A proposal for use of the available space in the public school must demonstrate how the proposed use of the space in the public school building will permit the board to meet the educational needs of students across the board as a whole.

School boards will ensure that use of available space in a public school is consistent with supporting student learning and is aligned with the culture and climate of the school and the school community. Proposals for use of available space in a public school that would not be acceptable include, but are not limited to, those that:

• infringe on the delivery of the public school program and services to students
• provide competing education services or services that target public school students
• infringe unduly on the economic viability of local business enterprise
• could bring the school reputation into disrepute
• are likely to cause damage or risk to students, staff, school buildings or property
• create excessive noise or pose a nuisance to nearby residents
• are illegal.

Eligible Partners/Groups

The success of a hub school model requires strong community leadership and a willingness by all partners to work toward an effective model for students, families, and the community. Although not intended to be a comprehensive list, the following is an initial list of potential partners, groups (for-profit and not-for-profit), businesses, or individuals from which a proposal for use of available school space could be generally acceptable:

• Federal, provincial or municipal government departments and agencies
• Wrap-around education services (e.g. Early Years, Adult Learning, EAL)
• Community organizations
• Organizations supporting culture and the arts
• Local businesses providing services to families, students and children
• Sport and recreation providers
• Other groups as determined by the school board

Evaluation Criteria for a Hub School Proposal

This section outlines the criteria upon which proposals will be evaluated by a school board. The primary responsibility of school boards is to deliver the public school program in a safe and secure learning environment. School boards should only consider proposals submitted to them if the proposal meets the minimum requirements as outlined in this document.

The proposal must be complete before it is submitted to the school board. Further, if more than one group, business or individual is proposing use of available space in the school building, those proposals should be coordinated such that the proposal outlines a comprehensive approach with one primary applicant. It is not the responsibility of the school board to create proposals or attempt to integrate individual proposals into a comprehensive whole regarding alternate use of available space in a school building. A municipality or some other official body may serve as a coordinating body where more than one group, business or individual is proposing uses of the available school space.

General Eligibility Criteria

School boards will evaluate and determine if a proposal for use of available school space in a public school is suitable. In addition to the primary consideration of value to support student learning, the following criteria will be applied to guide the decision to accept or reject the proposal:

• The health and safety of students and staff is not at risk.
• The proposal will not compromise the school's ability to deliver the public school program.
• The proposal is appropriate for the school setting and respects the mission and vision of the school board.
• The proposal aligns with the policies and long-range planning of the school board.
• The proposal does not interfere with the school board's strategy for student achievement.

All proposed uses of available space in a public school building must be in accordance with the Education Act and Regulations, ministerial and school board policies, and any other relevant legislation, and relevant processes and policies respecting the construction and management of school facilities.
Financial Viability and Sustainability Criteria

Proposals must demonstrate financial viability, and the ability of the group/business/individual submitting the proposal to meet any related financial obligations in a sustainable way over the proposed term of use.

The proposal must clearly demonstrate:

- The source of funding for the proposal;

- Evidence that the funding for the proposal has been secured or will be secured prior to any finalized agreement; and

- Evidence of the financial viability and sustainability of the proposal, including sufficient cash flow to support the operation of the alternate use.

Boards are not expected to incur additional operating or capital costs to support the proposed use of available space in the school building beyond the costs required to deliver the public school program. School boards may use some discretion in supporting proposals based on their strategies and budgets to support student achievement. Costs will be recovered by school boards from the applicants to cover all incremental costs to the board for both capital and operating expenditures. This may include costs such as administrative costs, legal costs, construction/engineering costs, and property taxes (if applicable).

Additional costs required for things such as renovations to protect student safety (arising due to the proposal), provision of appropriate washrooms and other amenities, entrance and requirements, and any other changes required to make the space suitable for the proposed use shall be borne by the group, business, or individual submitting the proposal.

Building Use Criteria

Proposals must outline anticipated facility requirements. This would include things such as the location, the size and type of space required, methods of access to the school building (entrance and egress), and required facility amenities.

Facility requirements as outlined in the proposal will be considered based on the following criteria:

- How student and school staff safety will be maintained, including confirmation of criminal reference and child abuse registry checks for any employee or volunteer associated with the alternate use

- Condition of the facility

- Configuration of space

- Separation of space between educational and non-educational uses of the facility
• Zoning and site use restrictions
• Anticipated vehicle and pedestrian traffic, including required parking
• Accessibility

Proposals must outline any anticipated modifications required to the school building in order to implement the proposed use. Proposals must also include a costing of these modifications based on estimates that the school board would normally apply based on past practice. School boards and those developing the proposal should work together to reach agreement on what a reasonable cost estimate would be for anticipated modifications for the purposes of proposal development, ensuring adherence to current codes and standards for school facilities. School boards and the province will continue to determine design and construction standards for modifications to public school buildings. School board assessments of costs will prevail in the case of disagreement.

Roles and Responsibilities

School Boards

School boards have authority to make a variety of decisions regarding the use of school facilities. These Guidelines and Criteria are intended to support boards in considering proposals for use of available space in public school buildings, within the authority provided to them under the Education Act and applicable regulations.

In following these Criteria and Guidelines, school boards are required to evaluate proposals received to ensure they are aligned with legislation and regulations governing the operations of school boards and public school buildings, as well as any other school board policies or processes related to school facilities. Furthermore, school boards must review and evaluate proposals to ensure that they complement (or enhance) school culture and climate and are cohesive with the Board's strategic plan and business plan.

School boards will provide clarity on how they are implementing these Guidelines and Criteria, including the administrative procedures, processes, timelines for applications, and contact information, on board websites.

Proposal Applicant

An applicant may be:
  • A group, business, public service, or individual; or
  • A coordinating body officially representing group(s), businesses, public service(s) or Individual(s)

In either case, the applicant may only proceed with a proposal where they believe they meet all of the eligibility requirements outlined in this document.

It is the responsibility of communities, in collaboration or consultation with their local municipality as appropriate, to fully develop their proposals within the timelines provided, before advancing them to the school board for consideration.
Minimum Proposal Requirements

An applicant wishing to propose a Hub model for available space in a public school building must submit a detailed proposal to the school board that explicitly references and demonstrates conformity with these Guidelines and Criteria. Applicants must provide all supporting materials necessary to meet this requirement, such as business plans and/or proof of all financial and funding considerations (e.g. line of credit at bank, grants).

A comprehensive proposal would include, at a minimum, the following elements:

- an executive summary
- a background section providing context and the rationale for the application, as well as an overview of the applicant (e.g. group, business, individual)
- a project description: how will the space be used, by whom and for what purpose or activity, for how long, and during what hours
- a cost/benefit analysis - quantitative (financial cost and benefit) and qualitative (non-financial benefits and cost)
- a financial plan, with evidence of financial viability and sustainability over the term of the agreement
- an analysis of financial risks
- an analysis of non-financial risks (e.g. health and safety, security)
- an analysis of impacts on stakeholders (including the school and the school community)
- an acknowledgement that the proposed use would occur with the appropriate insurance requirements, as determined by the board (i.e. School Insurance Program)
- an implementation strategy
- an operating model

Note that the cost/benefit analysis referenced above will assist the board in understanding the applicant’s assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, and why the applicant deemed this approach to be the most appropriate. It will also assist the school board in their assessment as to why this proposal is a sound investment, and will support its understanding of the range of alternative approaches the applicant considered.

Timelines

School boards must provide adequate time for communities to prepare a proposal for submission to a school board and for the board to review the proposal. In general, the following timeframes would be appropriate:

- Development of comprehensive and complete proposal by group/business/individual and presentation at a public board meeting - At least 8 months
- School Board's consideration of the proposal - At least 2 months
Boards may choose to extend these timeframes depending on the associated processes. Boards will identify if there is a potential for space to become available. This notification from the board will serve to initiate the timeframes noted above.

Individuals or groups who are preparing a proposal should notify the school board that a proposal is under development. A school board may request periodic updates from a proposal applicant prior to receiving the formal proposal.

**Agreement for Building Use**

Once a proposal has been accepted by the school board, the school board will be responsible for ensuring that the approved proposal is outlined in an appropriate agreement that:

- Is in accordance with the provisions contained in the Education Act and Regulations
- Protects the rights and responsibilities of the school board
- Provides clear terms and conditions to the party or parties entering into the agreement regarding their rights and responsibilities as tenants, including financial obligations (rents, construction, etc.)
- Outlines maintenance standards and responsibilities for the duration of the agreement
- Ensure the applicability of school board policies and procedures (e.g. criminal records checks, child abuse registry checks, conflict of interest) and other relevant matters (e.g. insurance requirements)
- Outlines provisions for termination of the agreement by either party
- Includes any other terms and conditions which are to the fulfilment of the proposal.

Depending on the proposed relationship and use of the facility school boards must ensure that any appropriate approvals of the Minister or any other party as required by legislation, regulations, or policies are acquired before entering into an agreement.
APPENDIX B

Riverside Elementary School versus George D Lewis School

SUMMARY
The Cape Breton Victoria Regional School Board (CBVRSB) are currently undergoing public consultation on a “Planning Framework for Long-Term Facility Provision and Systems Sustainability in a Time of Changing Demographics” titled “LOOKING INWARD”. This LOOKING INWARD process proposes the “Retention of a Primary to grade 9 school on Route 22 to serve students currently served by the George D Lewis and Riverside Elementary”. Based on the considerations outlined in this document, Riverside Elementary School should be retained as a P-9 school.

BACKGROUND

• The reality of declining enrollment, financial constraints and aging/inadequate infrastructure has forced the CBVRSB to initiate a review process to determine long term facility provision and systems sustainability.

• In April 2013 the CBVRSB released a consultant report titled “LOOKING INWARD”. This report outlined 32 potential scenarios that could aid them in achieving the sustainability they desire.

• In April 2014 the CBVRSB released another “LOOKING INWARD – Disposition of Scenarios”. This report included an additional 21 Scenarios offered via Public Input Sessions, 6 offered from the CBVRSB Administration and 23 offered from various School Advisory Groups; a total of 82 scenarios of which 18 pertained to the Riverview Family of Schools.

• In the Spring 2013 Family of Schools Student Accommodation Study Groups were formed to continue the conversations, reflect on the proposals and generate a response for consideration by the CBVRSB.

• The Riverview Family of Schools Working Group were presented with only 5 scenarios for consideration, 2 of which were essentially new and had no specific scenario from the LOOKING INWARD documents as a basis.

• Proposal 1 states “Retention of a Primary to grade 9 school on Route 22 to serve students currently served by the George D Lewis and Riverside Elementary”.

• The CBVRSB presented the Riverview Family of Schools Student Accommodation Study Group Draft Report to the community on November 26 at Riverview High School.

• The community has until December 19 to provide input back to the CBVRSB.
CONSIDERATIONS

Student Learning:

• It is the expectation that once a decision is made and implemented either school will have the same learning amenities and offer provided to the students. The standards of this offer are not yet clear to the community however.

• It is noted in the Minutes of the November 26, 2014 public consultation meeting that a parent advised that George D Lewis has “the highest Grade 8 Math scores”. If true, this is a great achievement for George D Lewis and can undoubtedly be attributed to the small class sizes in this school. In a class such as Riverside’s Grade 6 class there are 29 students to 1 teacher, compared to George D Lewis Grade 5/6 Split of only 14 students to 1 teacher. It would be expected that this ratio would allow for such success throughout all the grades, but unfortunately it is unlikely that successes such as this will be maintained once the schools are amalgamated and the class sizes increase.

Financial:

• According to the “P-3 Bundled Learning Centres Amended and restated Service Agreement date June 8th, 1999” a Capital Repairs and Replacement Sinking Fund was established and $0.60 per square foot per annum was deposited into this account. Riverside Elementary School being 46,785 square feet means that $28,071 was deposited into this account each year for Riverside Elementary School alone, a total of $561,420 for the duration of the lease. Upon expiration of the lease the Province will receive 40% of any remaining funds in this account, funds which in turn can be put towards the purchasing of the building or the required capital addition.

• According to the “P-3 Bundled Learning Centres Amended and restated Service Agreement date June 8th, 1999” a Technology Refresh Sinking Fund was established and $0.75 per square foot per annum was deposited into this account. Riverside Elementary School being 46,785 square feet means that $35,088 was deposited into this account each year for Riverside Elementary School alone, a total of $701,775 for the duration of the lease. Upon expiration of the lease the Province any remaining funds in this account are to be returned to the Province, funds which in turn can be put towards the purchasing of the building or the required capital addition.

• According to the “Riverview Family of Schools Student Accommodation Study Group Draft Report” it would cost $3.7M to $5.6M in renovations and $3.6M for additional space for George D Lewis to accommodate a P-8 or P-9 school. According to this same report it will cost $3.04M for the Province to purchase the Riverside School and $2M for additional space to accommodate a P-8 or P-9 school. From an asset acquisition and retrofit perspective, retaining Riverside Elementary costs $2.26M to $3.56M less than investing in George D Lewis.
According to the “Riverview Family of Schools Student Accommodation Study Group Draft Report” Riverside Elementary has an operating cost of $267,000 in 2012/13 and George D Lewis has an operating cost of $125,000 (Should be $138,000 – see below) for the same period. An analysis of the operating expenditures of each school has revealed that variance is attributed largely to the heating fuel/electrical and custodial wages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Riverside Elementary</th>
<th></th>
<th>George D Lewis</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3 Year Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>6,714</td>
<td>6,368</td>
<td>6,011</td>
<td>6,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating Fuel</td>
<td>42,426</td>
<td>51,464</td>
<td>53,330</td>
<td>49,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer/Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>46,929</td>
<td>49,654</td>
<td>51,484</td>
<td>49,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (Goods/Services)</td>
<td>15,345</td>
<td>15,793</td>
<td>16,241</td>
<td>15,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Removal</td>
<td>5,345</td>
<td>5,463</td>
<td>5,725</td>
<td>5,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage Removal</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial Supplies</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>3,985</td>
<td>3,324</td>
<td>3,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Wages</td>
<td>103,292</td>
<td>104,288</td>
<td>106,369</td>
<td>104,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>2,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227,472</td>
<td>241,218</td>
<td>247,545</td>
<td>238,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Maintenance (Goods/Services)</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>12,514</td>
<td>19,323</td>
<td>10,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>228,360</td>
<td>253,733</td>
<td>266,868</td>
<td>249,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Square Foot</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon further recollection and gathering of info it is determined that we are not comparing apples to apples in this comparison and other factors need to be given further consideration when attempting to determine their significance.

1. The heating system, ventilation system, air conditioning and HVAC systems in George D Lewis either do not exist or are not of the same standard as Riverside Elementary and would have to be brought up to building code if the school was to undergo a large renovation. This would then put the costs of operating these units in lines with that of Riverside.
2. The cost of heating fuel and electricity is in lines with that of other P-3 schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Heating Fuel</th>
<th>Cost Per Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>46,785</td>
<td>53,329</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee</td>
<td>50,581</td>
<td>56,788</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>57,913</td>
<td>70,747</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Electricity</th>
<th>Cost Per Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>46,785</td>
<td>51,484</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee</td>
<td>50,581</td>
<td>56,453</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>57,913</td>
<td>63,159</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Riverside Elementary has additional amenities, such as a cafeteria, with electrical equipment increasing the power consumption.
4. Custodial wages, being those mainly of janitorial workers, would increase with an expansion to the school.
5. Riverside Elementary, being a P-3 leased school, is binded by an operating agreement to incur certain operating costs that George D Lewis would not be, such as annual painting.

Community:

- In 1996-97 discussions began around the amalgamation of Catalone School, Main a Dieu School, Albert Bridge School, George D Lewis School and Marion Bridge School. Marion Bridge and George D Lewis opted out of the proposal and Catalone School, Main a Dieu School and Albert Bridge School chose to close their schools and create a consolidated P-3 school “Riverside Elementary School”. This decision was not taken lightly by the communities, but the sacrifice was felt necessary to support the CBVRSB and secure the education of the children in the communities. The amalgamation has brought the 3 former communities together to form a larger stronger community, which has been clearly demonstrated through the LOOKING INWARD consultations.

- On November 26, 2014 the Riverview Family of Schools Student Accommodation Study Group Draft Report was presented to the communities. 103 community participants attended this meeting. A quick headcount at the meeting revealed that approximately 70 of these participants (or 70%) were there on behalf of Riverside Elementary, an overwhelming community response. The support represented by the remaining 30% was split amongst the other 11 schools in the Riverview Family of Schools.

- According to the Minutes of the November 26, 2014 public consultation meeting 20 concerns/comments were made regarding Proposal 1 - Retention of a Primary to grade 9 school on Route 22 to serve students currently served by the George D Lewis and
Riverside Elementary. 1 of these comments was regarding grade configuration, 2 was supporting George D Lewis and 17 comments were supporting Riverside. 89% of the voices brought forward on this proposal were in favor of the retention of Riverside Elementary.

• Although not quoted in the minutes of the November 26, 2014 public consultation meeting, an interesting fact was brought forward during the discussion that is well worth repeating here. According to the 2001 and 2011 Census of Albert Bridge and Louisbourg there has been an increase in population of 11.4% in Albert Bridge community while a decrease in population of 11.3% in Louisbourg community for the same time period. Several individuals at the meeting attested that they are included in this 11.4% and moved to Albert Bridge so their children could attend Riverside.

Student Safety:

• Although George D Lewis is in a 50Km/30Km traffic zone, students are permitted to leave the school premises during lunch hour. Furthermore, during May, June, Sept and Oct the Fortress of Louisbourg is open increasing traffic and unknown strangers in the area. At Riverside the students are not permitted to leave the school property.

Emergency Service:

• Fire Service – Both Louisbourg and Albert Bridge have VOLUNTEER Fire Departments in their communities. As well, both communities are essentially equally distanced from the Bateston VOLUNTEER Fire Department. Riverside however, is positioned approximately 19 km closer to Marion Bridge VOLUNTEER Fire Department and Mira Road VOLUNTEER Fire Department than George D Lewis. Furthermore, the dispatch practices of the 2 areas are different and provide more response coverage for the Albert Bridge area. Unfortunately these are all volunteer fire departments and many are staffed with firemen who have full time jobs. The closest paid staffed Fire Department would be Sydney Fire Department. The Sydney Fire Department is 15Km from Riverside Elementary and 34 from George D Lewis.

• Police Service – It is understood that there is one police officier per shift patrolling the Albert Bridge – Louisbourg area. This police officer could conceivably be anywhere between these communities at any given time so neither community is seen to have an advantage. Response time could vary from 0 to 20 minutes for either school pending on location of the officer on duty. Riverside, however, is 19km closer to Sydney where any additional backup would be disbursed from.

• Health Service – Riverside is only 16Km from the Municipalities Acute Care and Emergency Center – Cape Breton Regional Hospital. George D Lewis is over double the distance from this same facility.
Transportation:

- Riverside Elementary currently acts as the transfer hub for students being transported to Junior High and High Schools in Sydney. If Riverside Elementary is not retained a new bus depot will have to be established, which may result in additional infrastructure and costs.
- Should the Riverside Elementary students be moved to George D. Lewis they could see an addition of their time on a bus of 22 minutes. Should the George D Lewis students be moved to Riverside Elementary some students would see a reduction in their bus time by 22 minutes. They would also no longer require a wait for transfer.

Future Consideration:

- Riverside is centrally located providing greater opportunity for reasonable catchment area adjustments to ensure that the rural school has full enrollment.
- If the HOGG formula is adjusted and the Marion Bridge School is no longer are eligible for special funding, the students could be transferred to Riverside while keeping the travel distance reasonable.
- According to the 2001 and 2011 Census of Albert Bridge and Louisbourg there has been an increase in population of 11.4% in Albert Bridge community while a decrease in population of 11.3% in Louisbourg community for the same time period. If this trend were to continue for the next 10 years Louisbourg would have a population of 913, while Albert Bridge would have almost double the residents, 1727.

RECOMMENDATION

Due to declining student enrollment, financial constraints and aging/inadequate infrastructure the CBVRSB is faced with the challenge of creating a planning framework for long-term facility provision and systems sustainability in a time of changing demographics. The above considerations clearly demonstrate that the course of action required to achieve this goal is to retain Riverside Elementary as the Route 22 school.
## Enhancing the Riverside Proposal

### Riverside | George D Lewis
---|---
**Construction**
- Constructed in 2000, 46,785 sq ft
- Lease buyout $3.04m
- Renovation $2m
- Constructed in 1968, 29,465 sq ft
- Renovations $7.3 – 8.6M

**Location**
- Centrally located for all communities
- Increased Emergency Response
  - 32km to George D Lewis
- Emergency Response

**Community Support**
- High AB support at public meetings
- Integration of community based services
- United to protect Riverside
- Local resistance to closure of George D Lewis

**Brilliant Labs**
- Technology integration into the classrooms
- Pilot for CBV13B
- First ever partnership with School Board, Brilliant Labs, and local Private Sector
- No support for Brilliant Labs

**Configuration**
- Riverside to be P-8
- Middle School model, then direct MB students to AB for Gr. 6, 7, 8
- George D Lewis – Hub School P-3

**Census Data**
- Albert Bridge INCREASED 11.4%
- Parents stated they would leave this catchment area if Riverside were to close
- Louisbourg DECREASED by 11.3%
Brilliant Labs are creative, technology enhanced learning commons and workshops in schools. Based on the concept of MakerSpaces, Brilliant Labs will enable schools to join a growing global movement. The maker movement emphasizes learning through doing in a collaborative, peer-led, social environment. The goal is to make learning fun and relevant to the student by using tools, materials and technologies in new ways to solve everyday challenges.

MakerSpaces offer students the chance to engage in STEAM (science, technology, engineering, entrepreneurship, arts and mathematics) education in a manner different to a traditional educational setting. They allow students to take a more participatory and experiential approach, to think creatively, to collaborate with their peers, and to look for do-it-yourself solutions to problems as opposed to following a predetermined path.

While the applications of a makerSpace for those interested in technology and IT seem obvious, it is important to realize that makerSpaces are cross-curricular and are not about learning to use technology itself. MakerSpaces are about encouraging MakerEd and the creative people who use them to explore the intersection of traditionally separate areas of specialization — such as metal working, fashion, art, woodworking, computer programming, robotics, textiles, wearable electronics, engineering and audio/video engineering.
All Brilliant Labs are customized to meet the needs and interests of the students, the teachers, the school, and the surrounding community. They aim to not only support existing scholastic interests and areas of learning. A Brilliant contains all the interdisciplinary tools necessary and come in any shape or size.
December 1, 2014

Rachael Craig
Brilliant Labs
Halifax NS

Dear Ms Craig,

I am writing today to express the Kennedy Group’s interest in becoming a partner in Brilliant Lab’s efforts in Eastern Nova Scotia and Cape Breton.

As you are likely aware, we have been approached by community members in areas where our firm operates to see if we can assist in filling any programming gaps and to help ensure that Brilliant Labs efforts are properly resourced.

We are open to exploring a pilot project with Brilliant Labs.

To this end, we have also spoken with the leadership at Cape Breton University about ways in which the Kennedy Group can contribute to furthering unique K-12 programming in the communities that we operate.

The Kennedy Group looks forward to dialogue on how a community-rooted group of companies such as ours can contribute to strengthening our schools and creating innovative opportunities for our children.

We look forward to speaking in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

Dannie Hansen
VP Sustainability & Public Affairs
The Kennedy Group of Companies