



Chignecto-Central Regional School Board

Capital Construction Submission

2014

INDEX

Report by Operational Services.....	1
Appendix A – Submission Scoring Criteria.....	9
Appendix B – Capital Construction Projects.....	12
Appendix C – Building Conditions	15
Appendix D – Capacity & Core Programs	18
Appendix E - Efficiency.....	20
Appendix F – School Review / Community Continuation / Distinct Facilitation	21

CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION 2014

Introduction

This report to the Chignecto-Central Regional School Board provides background data and information regarding potential new school and additions/alterations projects within the Board to enable a 2014 capital submission to the province.

The Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DoE) is responsible for capital construction related to new schools and major school renewals within the province. A letter received March 25, 2014 from the Deputy Minister, Department of Education, with a request that the CCRSB submit updated capital construction priorities for 2015-16. A submission has been requested of seven potential projects of which the Department will select its priorities after considering a number of criteria. This report is to be submitted by May 5, 2014 to the province through the provincial School Capital Construction Committee.

Background

The provincial review of capital projects of facilities' needs is generally led by a School Capital Construction Committee (SCCC). This committee assists the province in prioritizing new school constructions and additions/alterations requests submitted by school boards. There has been a provincial capital needs review in each of the last two calendar years. The Province had indicated with the 2012 Capital Construction Submission this would become an annual process.

The SCCC is tasked, from a provincial perspective, to evaluate the capital requests from the school boards. They are grouped into two categories; the first category is new school construction. These are the new facilities built according to most recent version of the Department of Transportation and Infrastructure Renewal's DC 350 – Educational Facilities General Design Requirements.

The second category for the Department of Education is additions/alterations. They generally encompass two major components. The first component is a major addition to a school which represents a tangible increase to the building's size or function. The second component is an upgrade to the facility's infrastructure which can extend the buildings expected operating life by fifteen to twenty years.

The Chignecto-Central Regional School Board on April 17, 2013 approved the following capital construction priorities:

1. A school addition and alteration project of combining Highland Consolidated Middle School and Dr. W.A. MacLeod Elementary Schools.
2. Cobequid Consolidated Elementary - Addition and Alteration

3. Springhill Elementary - New school
Replacing Junction Road and West End Memorial Elementary Schools
4. Tatatamouche P – 12 - New School
Replacing North Colchester High and Tatamagouche Elementary Schools
5. Trenton P – 8 - New school
Replacing Trenton Elementary and Trenton Middle Schools
6. Pictou East P – 8 - Addition and Alteration
Consolidation of East Pictou Middle School and F.H. MacDonald Elementary
7. Hants North P-12 - New School
Replacing Hants North Rural High and Kennetcook District Elementary Schools and with the consolidation of Maitland District Elementary, Cobequid District Elementary and Rawdon Elementary Schools.

The following schools were included for information to the Department as they were part of the process. However, they were not in the top seven schools which was the maximum number of associated business plans to be provided to the Province.

8. Cobequid Education Centre - Addition and Alteration
9. Shubenacadie District Elementary - Addition and Alteration
10. Uniacke District - Addition and Alteration
11. Hants East Rural High - Addition and Alteration

The Department of Education has again requested an updated capital project priorities submission. The DOE felt it would be apt for the CCRSB to review its current priorities and need. Projects that were currently under construction and within the 2014/2015 capital announcement were to continue. Those projects that had not yet begun were to be reaffirmed and included in an updated submission.

The Province has requested that CCRSB's capital submission be a maximum of seven projects. They have further requested they be of the Board's highest priorities and preferably a mixture of new schools and addition and alteration projects. Finally, the province has requested the projects be submitted in order of priority

The Department has provided number of factors that will be used in considering the provincial

school priorities. They have also stated that a detailed business plan will be needed for each of a Board's submitted priorities with a template plan yet to be provided.

This business plan, if based on previous years, would include such items as Goals, Objective and Performance Measures, Issue and Implications, Cost/Benefits, Phases and Schedule and Project Management with numerous subsections under each. Discussion with the Department of Education has indicated that a comprehensive business case can be of assistance to them when comparing school boards' projects. Further, it is used with DoE presentation to the Treasury Board who also reviews the business case application.

The Business Plan which each proposal includes a preferred option with the project and why it is recommended. Similarly, the plan detail required also includes alternatives that were considered for recommended project. For example, why a new school is being proposed as compared to renovating or adding to an existing facility?

The weighting responses to the seven factors were identified from the school information within the Evaluation Process of this report. They relied to a large degree on the 2013 Capital Construction Submission following a brief review. There was subsequent deliberations of the Operational Services Committee and through to the Board. From that meeting a final prioritization regarding capital projects for the Board's submission will be compiled. This will include completion of the associated business plans to be forwarded to the Department of Education.

Current Status

The Province of Nova Scotia with its Capital Plan 2014-2015 provides a list of projects by department or agency. Under Education the following are listed for the CCRSB:

Bible Hill P – 4 School	-	New School
New Glasgow P – 8	-	New School
Tatamagouche P – 12	-	New School
River Hebert District High School	-	School Addition or Alteration
Dr. W.A. MacLeod P-8	-	School Addition or Alteration
West Highlands Elementary School	-	New School
West Pictou "District High" School	-	School Addition or Alteration

This included two approved projects from the 2013 CCRSB Capital Construction Submission. These are Tatamagouche P- 12 and Dr. W. A. MacLeod P-8 consolidation.

Each of these projects are in various stages of planning or actual construction. Those not scheduled for completion in 2015/2016 would continue in subsequent years subject to annual approval of actual cash flows.

The 2014-2015 Capital Plan of the Province also included a new category called “School Capital Repairs.” This category is proposed to encompass on-going maintenance repairs to schools’ infrastructure, many of which represent maintenance work that has been deferred in the past. These projects need to exceed an expense Tangible Capital Asset threshold of \$150,000 and are commonly known as TCA. The DoE has indicated there is \$15M to be allocated across the province following a brief need submission from school boards.

The CCRSB has submitted a list of 18 potential projects valued at \$4.315M. These were previously determined as part of the Major Maintenance Repair List compiled annually by the Property Services Department as part of the CCRSB budget process.

Evaluation Process

The province will consider the following factors or criteria when reviewing the school board’s submissions:

1. The condition and state of the existing facility and the value that exists for investment in its continued use.
2. The capacity of the existing facility and the costs required to increase capacity, if required for continued use.
3. The suitability of the existing facility for programming and the costs required to allow it to effectively deliver the required programming.
4. Projects which address both infrastructure (1&2) as well as programming challenges (3) in an existing facility will warrant additional consideration.
5. Projects which meet any of the above considerations and help ensure that educational programming can continue to be provided within an existing community (i.e. greater use of a P-8, P-9 or P-12 facility to replace a number of separate existing facilities in the same community) will warrant additional consideration.
6. Projects which facilitate the provision of Schools Plus, skilled trades, and/or other community initiatives and programming will warrant additional consideration.
7. Consideration of projects will be limited to available TCA funding.

The SCCC has in the past evaluated school boards’ capital construction requests according to four criteria. This included a weighting for each of the criteria of which totaled 100 points.

Discussion with DoE representatives indicate that new criteria 1), 2), 3), 4) are very similar as to the Department of Education Criteria and definitions used in 2008.

- New 1) similar to previous - Condition of (existing) buildings
- New 2) similar to previous - Capacity
- New 3) similar to previous - Core Programs and Courses
- New 4) similar to previous - Efficiency Factors

The Board has previously written the Minister of Education requesting additional definition and weightings for the seven criteria that are to be used by school boards with their Capital Construction submission. There was not substantive additional information provided. It also appears this year's correspondence and Appendix A is essentially the same as last year with one exception. This will be noted later in the report.

Last year there was 13 weeks from provincial request to their required submission date. This year this has been shortened significantly to 6 weeks with the submission response due by May 5, 2014. This presents significant challenges to getting the 2014 proposed submission to the Board Operational Services Committee through to the Board Meeting of April 8, 2014. This 2014 Capital Construction Submission therefore relies significantly on work done last year, including from Identification Reports, with any relevant changes from 2013 incorporated.

The Board has expressed its desire to submit a prioritized list with weighted criteria. A Capital Construction Criteria was then developed based on the similarities of new criteria to the previous and for the three additional criteria. These are indicated in Appendix A.

Operational Services staff through their service provision and with school consultation has a thorough understanding of the condition of CCRSB buildings. Annually, this is used in developing a Major Maintenance Project list for repairs within the Board's operational funding. Larger repair and infrastructure replacement work is often identified, though also is often deferred due to the magnitude and financial resources required.

A Building Condition Index has been compiled with eleven categories related to school facilities. This was previously used in the School Review Processes of 2012 and 2013. The ratings for each school are indicated in Appendix C. A description of the evaluation process for the conditions of the schools is also included.

Educational Services through the Family of Schools Supervisors (FoSS), provided recommendations for projects as additions/alterations and for consolidation of facilities with new schools and with the first four criteria. FoSS consideration was given to the other criteria (of 5) and 6). Past consultation with associated stakeholders at regional and school levels enabled them to develop potential capital construction projects for their respective families.

On April 3, 2013 the Minister of Education submitted to the school boards a number of requests regarding the school-review process. This included the suspension of the school-review process for schools identified for review in 2013-14. This would be subject to a further provincial review which did take place in the latter part of 2013 and early 2014 led by Mr. Bob Fowler and commonly known as the Fowler school closure report. Previously the CCRSB in its capital submission has indicated a number of schools that were being consolidated as part of a capital construction process and provided a weighting for this potential as indicated with a provincial factor.

For the 2014 CCRSB submission this weighting has not been included with the Board’s capital priorities while awaiting the outcome of the Fowler report. However, there is one exception related to Pictou East P-8 and the consolidation of East Pictou Middle School and F.H. MacDonald Elementary School. The Board in March 2013 identified East Pictou Middle for further review as the result of a previous school review. At that time the community suggested an additional option of combining these schools at the F.H.MacDonald location.

On March 26, 2014 the CCRSB passed a motion to close East Pictou Middle School no later than five years from that date. There are renovations required at the FHM site. Due to this and with the completion of the school review process for EPM, it was felt there should still be a weighting for completion of a school review process applied to this project.

The Family of School Supervisors, respective Board members and staff confirmed with last year’s capital process that the schools and School Advisory Councils are aware of the relevant capital construction submission. Previously there has been correspondence received from the Town of Springhill indicating their support for a new school.

Results

The criteria were used in developing the rankings for the projects with new schools and additions/alterations. The results can be seen in Appendix B. There are nine new school and addition/alteration projects to be considered for the seven projects requested by the province.

It may be beneficial to consider the list as an ordinate ranking with the data acquired in the short period to develop the report. The relative difference in some of the quantitative values with the numerical rankings may not be significant. A more comprehensive review with some of the rating factors within a criterion may further substantiate or differentiate these schools in the rankings.

Recommendation

This report is submitted to the Board for its review and as the basis for its submission of the capital construction needs to the Department of Education. The rankings are indicated on Appendix B – Proposed CCRSB Capital Construction Projects – 2014.

The following schools, listed in priority, to be submitted to the Department of Education for capital construction consideration.

1. Pictou East P - 8 - Addition and Alteration
Consolidation of East Pictou Middle School and F.H. MacDonald at the latter site.

2. Springhill Elementary - New School
Replacing Junction Road and West End Memorial Elementary Schools.

3. Cobequid Consolidated Elementary - Addition and Alteration
Upgrade of facility and systems to account for deferred maintenance.
4. Trenton P – 8 - New School
Replacing Trenton Elementary and Trenton Middle Schools.
5. Hants North P-12 - New School
Replacing Hants North Rural High and Kennetcook District Elementary Schools and with the consolidation of Maitland District Elementary, Cobequid District Elementary and Rawdon Elementary Schools.
6. Cobequid Educational Centre - Addition and Alteration
Upgrade of facility and systems to account for deferred maintenance on a 1970s era facility to extend the largest school in the province operating life span.
7. Shubenacadie District Elementary - Addition and Alteration
Upgrade of facility and systems to account for deferred maintenance.

These first seven projects would have comprehensive business plans developed and submitted to the Province as its 2014 Capital Construction Submission.

Additional Potential Projects

The following facilities have also been identified from the CCRSB family of schools for as potential capital construction projects as indicated on Appendix B. They did not rate as high as the first seven projects and if accepted by the Board, will not receive an accompanying business case. However, they will be identified through this report which is provided to the Department of Education.

8. Uniacke District - Addition and Alteration
Upgrade of facility and systems to account for deferred maintenance.
9. Hants East Rural High - Addition and Alteration
Upgrade of facility and systems to account for deferred maintenance.

Skilled Trades Program

The Department of Education and Early Childhood Development had previously requested potential sites to provide a Skilled Trades program. CCRSB had submitted during the summer of 2013 a response that a program will be delivered at North Nova Education Centre. This location would require some infrastructure upgrades, which most likely would exceed the accounting tangible capital asset level of \$150,000.

The mechanism for program approval and associated funding requires clarification. Within a school capital construction submission, a skilled trades' lab alone would not receive a ranking high enough to meet the seven highest priorities. This would be the situation with its location at NNEC at a school opened in 2005 with a good physical condition rating.

It was also assumed the Province through their request of the Boards has a funding designation and source already determined. The criteria for provincial determination of possible program locations are apparently different from those factors used with new schools and additions and alterations. This would also preclude the need for the CCRSB to submit a business case.

Nonetheless, technically by exceeding the TCA level this requires some capital funding mechanism. Further discussions with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development are needed.

MAR 20 2014

Mr. Gary Clarke, Superintendent
Chignecto-Central Regional School Board
60 Lorne Street
Truro, NS B2N 3K3

Dear Mr. Clarke:

The Minister will soon send your Board Chair a request for your board to submit updated capital project priorities for 2015-16. The Department of Education and Early Childhood Development will select its priorities after considering the following:

1. The condition and state of the existing facility and the value that exists for investment in its continued use.
2. The capacity of the existing facility and the costs required to increase capacity, if required for continued use.
3. The suitability of the existing facility for programming and the costs required to allow it to effectively deliver the required programming.
4. Projects which address both infrastructure (1 & 2), as well as programming challenges (3) in an existing facility, will warrant additional consideration.
5. Projects which meet any of the above considerations and help ensure that educational programming can continue to be provided within an existing community (i.e., greater use of a P-8, P-9 or P-12 facility to replace a number of separate existing facilities in the same community) will warrant additional consideration.
6. Projects which facilitate the provision of SchoolsPlus, skilled trades, and/or other community initiatives and programming will warrant additional consideration.
7. Consideration of projects will be limited to the available TCA funding.

Further to this, the evaluation process conducted by the School Capital Construction Committee and the Tangible Capital Assets Committee will be guided by the criteria categories outlined in Appendix A (enclosed).

Boards should be aware that Treasury Board is, once again, requiring business cases for all submitted priorities. We will provide you with this business case template shortly.

RECEIVED
MAR 5 2 2014
CCRSB
Superintendent's Office

RECEIVED
MAR 25 2014
CCRSB
Superintendent's Office

Mr. Gary Clarke
Page 2

There is no need to submit projects which are currently under construction, as the department will look after incorporating the related cash flows into the provincial TCA process. These projects represent a draw on our future capital allocations, so the amount of room for projects not already under construction may be minimal in any given year, depending on the overall provincial capital allocation and how much of this allocation is directed towards schools versus other provincial priorities.

Please note that if a project request was submitted last year but not approved, it must be resubmitted as part of this process in order to be further considered for funding. It is fine to resubmit the project using last year's template. Please note on your priority list to use the business case from 2014-15.

Capital projects, which are funded out of the department's capital repair envelope (\$15.0M), will be dealt with through a separate process. Direction on how to provide these board needs have already been sent by the Facilities Management group to your Operations directors.

Given that we request input for capital planning annually, you should focus your request on your highest priorities and those that can move forward most quickly. As such, the department is asking you to submit *a maximum of seven (7) priorities for your board*. A response is requested by Monday, May 5, 2014. Projects will be chosen on a province-wide basis.

We believe that providing your priorities in this manner will aid all of us in focusing our efforts around what we can achieve within our fiscal context, while providing a large enough number of projects to weigh individual board priorities from a provincial perspective. The capital funding allocated to priorities in each board will depend on the priorities of that board relative to the priorities provided by other boards after review on an overall provincial basis.

Yours truly,



Frank Dunn
Acting Deputy Minister

Enclosure

c: Joe MacEachern
Darrell MacDonald

Appendix A – Evaluation Categories

1. Rationale

Why the capital expenditure is necessary. Why this particular solution is being proposed.

1. The degree to which project need has been thought out and demonstrated.
2. The severity of the consequences (risks) of not addressing the issue or realizing the opportunity.
3. The degree to which other options for achieving the same goal have been evaluated.
4. The rationale for choosing the proposed option among other viable options.
5. The degree to which the project has been scoped and understanding of the current context.

2. Benefits and Costs – Expected Project Outcomes

Completeness and degree to which benefits and costs have been identified.

1. The ROI for government as a whole.
2. The extent and type of benefits that is not quantifiable in terms of dollar savings.
3. The extent and type of liabilities that arise as a result of the project are not quantifiable in terms of dollar costs.

3. Project Risk

Probability of success (certainty of realizing benefits/mitigating adverse risks if project undertaken).

1. The extent of inter-dependencies and impacts on other programs, services, policies and legislation, etc., and the proposed means for addressing adverse impacts or implementing required changes.
2. The extent and nature of stakeholder impacts and the proposed approach to managing associated risks.
3. The extent and plan to deal with associated resource needs (people, space, etc.).
4. The degree to which information technology and information management needs are understood.
5. Adequacy of project management and risk management processes and project planning.
6. The extent of organizational changes required as a result of the project and the plan for implementing the project as a result.
7. The degree of cost certainty.
8. The uniqueness of the proposed undertaking and level of familiarity with the principal and supporting technologies (if applicable).

4. Alignment with Priorities

The extent to which the project aligns with: current government priorities; department priorities as stated in its business plan; and the Technology and Information Strategy (if applicable).

5. Overall Suitability

Completeness and extent to which the proposal provides confirmation of the necessity and suitability of the project.

Appendix B

School Capital Construction

Schools	Individual Scoring Criteria								
		Building Conditions	Capacity	Core Programs & Courses	Efficiency	Community Continuation	Distinct Facilitation	* School Review	Total
Cobequid Consolidated Elementary	A	21.0	10	22.5	0	10	0	0	63.5
Cobequid Educational Centre	A	17.4	10	5	0	10	10	0	52.4
Cobequid District Elementary	N	14.3	10	10	15	0	0	0	49.3
East Pictou Middle School	A	21.3	10	5	15	10	10	10	81.3
Frank H. MacDonald Elementary	A	12.6	10	5	15	10	10	10	72.6
Hants East Rural High	A	13.4	10	5	0	10	0	0	38.4
Hants North Rural High	N	15.8	10	10	15	10	0	0	60.8
Junction Road Elementary	N	7.7	10	17.5	15	10	0	0	60.2
Maitland District Elementary	N	11.3	10	10	15	0	0	0	46.3
Rawdon District Elementary	N	15.5	10	10	15	0	0	0	50.5
Shubenacadie District Elementary	A	13.8	10	15	0	10	0	0	48.8
Trenton Elementary	N	12.5	10	10	15	10	5	0	62.5
Trenton Middle School	N	13.1	10	10	15	10	5	0	63.1

Schools	Individual Scoring Criteria								
		Building Conditions	Capacity	Core Programs & Courses	Efficiency	Community Continuation	Distinct Facilitation	* School Review	Total
Uniacke District	A	18.3	10	5	0	10	0	0	43.3
West End Memorial	N	15.5	10	25	15	10	0	0	75.5

N - New School Construction

A - Addition/Alteration

***NOTE: The School Review Process is currently being reviewed by the Province. East Pictou Middle and F.H. MacDonald Elementary Schools have been rated because they have completed the School Review Process as of March 31, 2014.**

Appendix B1 -Proposed CCRSB Capital Construction Projects - 2014

Combined Scoring Criteria										
	Schools		Condition of (Existing) Buildings	Capacity	Core Programs & Courses	Efficiency	Community Continuation	Distinct Facilitation	School Review*	Total
1	Pictou East P-8	A	17	10	5	15	10	5	10	72
	<i>(East Pictou Middle School & F.H. MacDonald Elementary)</i>									
2	Springhill Elementary	N	11.6	10	21.3	15	10	0	0	67.9
	<i>(Junction Road Elementary & West End Memorial)</i>									
3	Cobequid Consolidated Elementary	A	21	10	22.5	0	10	0	0	63.5
4	Trenton P - 8	N	12.8	10	10	15	10	5	0	62.8
	<i>(Trenton Elementary & Trenton Middle School)</i>									
5	Hants North P - 12	N	15.2	10	10	15	2.5	0	0	52.7
	<i>(Cobequid District Elementary, Hants North/Kennetcook, Maitland District Elementary & Rawdon District Elementary)</i>									
6	Cobequid Educational Centre	A	17.4	10	5	0	10	10	0	52.4
7	Shubenacadie District Elementary	A	13.8	10	15	0	10	0	0	48.8
8	Uniacke District	A	18.3	10	5	0	10	0	0	43.3
9	Hants East Rural High School	A	13.4	10	5	0	10	0	0	38.4

**NOTE: The School Review Process is currently being reviewed by the Province. East Pictou Middle and F.H. MacDonald Elementary Schools have been rated because they have completed the School Review Process as of March 31, 2014.*

Appendix C

Building Conditions

A. Building Conditions – The condition and state of the existing facility and the value that exists for investment in its continued use.

This is understood to be the same criteria as previously used by the DOE Capital Construction Committee.

The condition of the existing buildings is an important part of the decision-making process. The health and safety of children from an environmental and hygiene perspective, combined with the safety and comfort from a building structural and condition point of view, area as important to the education process as is the subject matter they are taught. The integration of students with a full range of physical and mental abilities in our educational system necessitates that the facilities are completely accessible. A primary consideration is for the facility to contribute to a safe, supportive learning environment. Aesthetics, air quality, and building atmosphere are also factors considered.

Factors previously considered by the provincial Capital Construction Committee under these criteria were those that required expenditures costing more than regular maintenance and repair procedures.

The relative condition of these schools was determined by calculating a condition index for each of the twenty schools identified in the 2012 CCRSB School Review process.

Background information on the calculation of the condition index is as follows:

- Eleven building “system” categories were assigned a maximum point value according to the approximately cost percentage that would be represented in a building replacement or renovation project. For example, if the total roof system required replacement it would represent 14% of construction costs.

The assigned percentages of the building system categories and associated evaluation considerations are as follows:

- Accessibility (6%)
 - Maximum points for accessibility to all areas of building including washrooms on all levels. Accessibility at all entrances also required.
- Cladding (8%)
 - Durable materials such as brick and steel assigned a greater value than those requiring increased maintenance such as wood.

- Doors & Windows (6%)
- Grounds (6%)
- Electrical (12%)
- Fire Alarm & Communication Systems (4%)
- Heating (8%)
- Interior (24%)
- Plumbing (6%)
- Roofing (14%)
- Ventilation (6%)
- Exterior doors and windows and associated hardware evaluated.
- Access roadways, parking lots, walkways, and playfields assessed.
- Supply and distribution system and lighting evaluated.
- Heating equipment, distribution system, and associated controls assessed.
- Floors, Ceilings, Interior Doors and Finishes evaluated.
- Distribution System and Fixtures assessed.
- Condition and age of roofing system considered.
- Existing system evaluated.

Property Services Staff assigned values to all eleven categories on the basis of condition. For example, if the total roof system required requirement 0 points would be assigned. If 50% of the roof area required replacement, seven points would be assigned.

Condition index is defined as 100 minus the total points of all categories and prorated to a value from 0 to 30. The greater the value of the index indicates an increase in the declining condition of existing major building components.

Appendix C - Condition of Buildings

Location	Accessibility		Cladding		Doors & Windows		Grounds	Electrical	Fire Alarm & P/A		Heating	Interior	Plumbing	Roofing	Ventilation	Total	Condition Index
	6.0	8.0	6.0	6.0	12.0	4.0			8.0	24.0							
Cobequid Consolidated	5.5	1.0	2.6	4.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	30.1	21.0				
East Pictou Middle	3.5	6.5	3.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	4.0	4.0	29.0	21.3				
Uniacke District	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	6.0	2.0	9.0	4.0	39.0	18.3				
Tatamagouche Elementary	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	3.0	1.0	1.0	6.0	2.0	7.0	4.0	41.0	17.7				
Cobequid Educational Centre	3.0	6.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	2.0	5.0	4.0	42.0	17.4				
Hants North Rural High	4.0	7.0	5.0	3.5	2.0	1.0	3.0	12.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	47.5	15.8				
West End Memorial Elem.	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.5	8.0	2.0	10.0	4.0	48.5	15.5				
Rawdon District Elementary	4.0	4.5	3.0	2.0	6.0	1.0	4.0	10.0	4.0	6.5	3.5	48.5	15.5				
Cobequid District	0.0	6.0	4.0	5.5	6.0	1.5	4.0	10.0	4.0	8.0	3.5	52.5	14.3				
Shubenacadie District	4.5	6.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	12.0	2.0	8.0	4.0	54.0	13.8				
Trenton Middle	4.0	6.0	2.0	5.0	9.0	2.5	3.0	10.0	3.5	8.0	3.5	56.5	13.1				
Hants East Rural High	4.5	7.5	6.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	12.0	2.0	5.5	4.0	55.5	13.4				
F H MacDonald Elementary	4.5	7.5	5.0	3.0	7.0	2.0	1.0	12.0	2.0	10.0	4.0	58.0	12.6				
Trenton Elementary	6.0	8.0	2.0	4.0	8.0	2.5	2.0	12.0	3.5	7.0	3.5	58.5	12.5				
Dr. W.A. MacLeod Elementary	6.0	8.0	4.0	2.5	9.0	3.0	5.0	13.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	61.0	11.7				
North Colchester High School	3.0	8.0	6.0	4.0	6.0	2.0	4.0	10.0	4.0	11.5	3.5	62.0	11.4				
Maitland District Elementary	5.0	8.0	4.0	3.5	6.0	2.5	4.0	12.0	4.0	10.0	3.5	62.5	11.3				
Walter Duggan	6.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	8.0	3.0	6.0	14.0	4.0	12.0	3.5	70.0	9.0				
Highland Consolidated	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	3.0	3.0	12.0	3.0	13.0	3.5	68.5	9.5				
Junction Rd Elementary	5.5	7.5	5.5	3.5	7.5	1.5	6.5	18.0	3.0	11.0	5.0	74.5	7.7				
G.R. Saunders Elementary	6.0	7.0	4.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	8.0	22.0	6.0	13.0	6.0	93.0	2.1				

Appendix D

Scoring Criteria – Capacity & Core Programs

- B. Capacity - The capacity of the existing facility and the costs required to increase capacity, if required for continued use.**

This is understood to be the same criteria as previously used by the DOE Capital Construction Committee.

The availability of space in a school, school sub-system, or general area to house students who have a right to education is a critical factor. Generally, individual schools have a design capacity or there will be other regulations or legislation which will place an upper limit on the number of students that can be housed in any one building. However, boards should seriously consider adjusting school boundaries to overcome overcrowding problems or offering a more efficient and effective educational program. To reflect the impact of resources being allocated on the basis of square footage per student and to adjust for declining enrolment on the school system, boards must give serious consideration to grade level reconfiguration in existing facilities to maximize the use of appropriate instructional space.

The capacity ranking is also influenced by a severe building condition problem that could result in the closure of a school where there are no alternative facilities available to accommodate the affected students.

This criterion is based predominately on the instructional space in the facility to meet the needs of those students attending the school. The design capacity of schools in some situations has changed significantly for many schools, since their original construction, particularly in older schools.

Schools may have also gone under additions/alterations from the original configuration which has reduced the original designed capacity. The criteria rating used by senior management in this report are:

- 10 points for very minor or no capacity issues
- 20 points for capacity issues which can be worked around in the short term
- 30 points where the school enrollment is exceeding school capacity

C. Core Programs - The suitability of the existing facility for programming and the costs required to allow it to effectively deliver the required programming.

This is understood to be the same criteria as previously used by the DOE Capital Construction Committee.

This takes into account the ability of the core program and courses be offered in the school, sub-system or in a neighboring school in close proximity. The Capital Construction Committee considers the requirements associated with the educational program and service delivery as articulated in the Nova Scotia Public School Program

This criterion is rated on the ability of core programs to be appropriately provided at each school. Core programs, in some instances, have changed or been added since a facility was originally opened. This may require improved and enhanced program spaces which cannot be accommodated with existing configuration and infrastructure.

Educational Services, within each family of schools, made a qualitative assessment of current program space. This was assisted by a comparison to the current program space assignment based on the DOE DC 350 Educational Facilities General Design Requirement. From this a quantitative assessment of each schools rating was made with a maximum of 25 points. A high score indicates significant deficiencies in the ability to deliver the required programs.

Appendix E

Submission Scoring Criteria – Efficiency

D. Efficiency Factors – Projects which address both infrastructure (A&B) as well as programming challenges (C) in an existing facility will warrant additional consideration.

This is understood to be the same criteria as previously used by the DOE Capital Construction Committee.

The preceding criteria involve an efficiency factor of operation. For example, there may be a real cost benefit or a cost avoidance in consolidating schools. This considers factors such as consolidation of schools, reducing square footage, custodial and educational staffing, semestering, reducing support sharing and the increased use of technology. Further, reducing the overall square footage of schools and/or reducing bussing costs could be included.

Staff reductions or reallocations resulting from consolidations are also a significant efficiency. There may also be an “economy of scale” with school consolidation that provides educational services of greater efficiency or value. Efficiency may also be a factor during a school review process.

Senior management has made an assumption that combining schools will likely improve efficiencies in operations and programs. Where a new school is being proposed to replace more than one existing facility, a maximum rating of 15 points is given.

Efficiency can be either with construction of a new facility or through additions/alterations of an existing site. The province may consider the latter to be more cost efficient than new school construction. There is less potential for operational efficiencies and, if upgraded there may even be increased resources required, where there is no consolidation of schools. In this situation the potential projects are given 0 points for efficiency.

Appendix F

School Review / Community Continuation / Distinct Facilitation

E. School Review - Projects which are, or are anticipated to be, required as a result of school reviews where the reviews have identified programming benefits for students or reduced operating costs. This is only being applied this year due to the ongoing Fowler Report to apply to the Pictou East P-8 project.

This is understood to be a new criterion for the province and has been preliminarily indicated to include the preceding four factors.

It may also be consider a “value added” for the province when considering the business plan case.

Value Added 10 points

F. Community Continuation - Projects which meet any of the above considerations and help ensure that educational programming can continue to be provided within an existing community (i.e. greater use of a P-8, P-9 or P-12 facility to replace a number of separate existing facilities in the same community) will warrant additional consideration.

This is understood to be a new criterion for the province and has been preliminarily indicated to include the preceding four factors.

It may also be consider a “value added” for the province when considering the business plan case.

Value Added 10 points

G. Distinct Facilitation - Projects which facilitate the provision of Schools Plus, skilled trades, and/or other community initiatives and programming will warrant additional consideration.

This is understood to be a new criterion for the province and has been preliminarily indicated to include the preceding four factors.

It may also be consider a “value added” for the province when considering the business plan case. An example of a community initiative would be a municipality wanting to add a public library to a new school or addition or alteration.

There has been no determination within the CCRSB as to the location of an additional skilled trades or Schools Plus locations.

Value Added 10 points

Page 21

Page 16