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ANNOUNCEMENT

Education Minister Karen Casey, on Friday June 8, 2007, announced that the Department of Education is reviewing standards for bussing students in the Province of Nova Scotia. She acknowledged “It is time we take a comprehensive look at all the criteria Boards use to decide who rides a school bus and who does not”.

Department spokesman Peter McLaughlin noted that the 3.6-kilometer rule had been around for about forty years and a lot has changed since then. He said “it’s come to the point in time where it’s just prudent to review that distance to see if it’s still a distance that’s reasonable”.

Parents, public and a variety of groups have generally been pleased to know that the Provincial government is looking into how far students need to walk to get to their schools.
SCOPE DEFINITION

In preparation for this review, the Department of Education prepared a scope definition with the proposed process, Appendix A, dated September 20, 2006. The objective of the Department of Education was “to review the maximum walking distance that students may be subjected to before having a right to be bussed to school under the Education Act and Regulations”.

Currently Section (1) of the Regulations Under the Education Act, Appendix B, requires School Boards to transport students (a) who live more than 3.6 kilometers from school, or (b) because of special needs or (c) in situations where a School Board determines that transportation is necessary.

This scope acknowledges that School Boards in this province interpret and fulfill this requirement in a variety of ways. As a result of the variety of interpretations and services being provided, a significant number of concerns have been voiced from parents who do not agree with a Board’s assessment and/or interpretation of who will or will not be bussed. Many of those concerned identify the variety of services provided by School Boards for students in this province and wonder why there are not consistent applications of the Regulations. Public pressure and the ease of saying yes by School Boards and staff have magnified the range of services in place.

Although a review of this distance and potential recommendations to either retain or change the distance seems a simple matter, the scope identifies more than eighteen other issues that will be raised and reviewed before the report is completed. Parents and public also raised various issues many of which are not directly connected to walking distance.

There is no question that “transportation of students is an extremely sensitive issue” and one that has the potential for encouraging parental input and causing upset.

The Department of Education acknowledges that “a maximum walking distance of 3.6 kilometers” and its various applications and interpretations by School Boards initiates the need for this review. The Department of Education recognizes that School Boards who have reduced the walking distance for their students have presumably done so under the authority of the Education Act/Regulations by simply interpreting subsection (3) to permit these adjustments. These reductions of walking distances come with a cost, not only financial but also affect services provided to all students. Currently Schools Boards are being funded so that school board expenses for transportation and revenues match.

The original scope called for two phases but with agreement from the Department of Education it has been easier to do the review in three phases. The original timeline allowed for an eleven-month process and we are pleased that we are able to conclude this review in a shorter timeframe – approximately eight months.
COMMITTEE MEMBERS/CONSULTANT

Consistent with the proposed process and the Phase 1 format of this Review, a Committee to work with and advise the Resource Consultant was selected in June.

Members of the Committee are:

1. Ann Bell  
   Halifax  
   Coordinator of Pupil Transportation  
   Halifax Regional School Board

2. Sandy Lynds  
   Truro  
   Coordinator of Pupil Transportation  
   Chignecto Central Regional School Board

   Sydney  
   Routing Technician Specialist  
   Cape Breton Victoria Regional School Board

4. Valda Christie  
   Barrington  
   Bus Driver  
   Tri County Regional School Board

5. Maurice Lake  
   Newport  
   Bus Driver  
   Annapolis Valley Regional School Board

6. Paul MacLellan  
   Halifax  
   Regional Director  
   Department of Education

7. Jan Bremner  
   Halifax  
   Manager, Financial Advisory Services  
   Department of Education

The consultant served as the resource person from outside the Boards.

Members of the Committee hold/or have held a variety of jobs, usually dealing with transportation of students and have varying interests in the transportation services.

Helene Smith has served as secretary for this report.

The Resource Consultant, Chester Sabean, is a retired school administrator having served as Assistant Superintendent of Schools in charge of Operations (including transportation) (13 years), Assistant Inspector of Schools (4 years), Elementary and Junior High School
Vice Principal and Principal (13 years) and Junior High School Teacher (5 years). During the time as Inspector of Schools, served on more than fifteen system surveys with the shared responsibility of assessing each of the School Boards' transportation services. He also assisted with the summer School Bus Driver Training Program at Commercial Safety Surveys, Masstown, for more than four years.

Committee members also participated in the private meetings held with parents/public and the consultant. One or two member(s) attended each meeting and usually would attend at least the meeting in their local area.
THE EDUCATION ACT AND REGULATIONS UNDER THE EDUCATION ACT, AUGUST 2006

The purpose of this act is to provide for a publicly funded school system whose primary mandate is to provide education programs and services for students. School Boards and schools in Nova Scotia operate under the authority of the Education Act. In Nova Scotia, School Boards are responsible for the transportation of some students from home to school and back home daily. These School Boards have a major responsibility to provide conveyance (school bus or other) to all students who live more than 3.6 kilometers from school and to special needs students and may also provide transportation for students with other needs. References from the Act and Regulations are as follows.

Appendix B identifies the appropriate legislation from the Education Act and Regulations under the Education Act. Education Act Section 64, General Responsibilities and Powers of School Boards, subsection (1) indicates that “a School Board is accountable to the Minister and responsible for the control and management of the public schools within its jurisdiction in accordance with this Act and the regulations” and subsection (2)(g) “subject to the Regulations, provide and pay for the conveyance of students to and from school”.

Section 6 of the Regulations, Transportation of Students, subsection (1) “A school board pursuant to clause 64(2)(g) of the Act shall make provision for the transportation of students either by providing the service itself, or making arrangements with some other person for such service, if (a) one or more students reside more than 3.6 km from the school to which they are to be transported; or (b) one or more students, because of special needs, require transportation irrespective of the distance; and (c) the school board determines that transportation of the students is necessary”.

Generally speaking school boards receive their authority from this Act and Regulations and while carrying out these responsibilities they just also adhere to other transportation requirements.

For example, Section 127, Suspension of School Bus Rights, directs School Board personnel as to the appropriate process to be used in the event that “the behavior of the student while on the bus endangers the safety of others using the bus”, and the eventual suspension of school bus rights for that student.

This review and subsequent recommendations must also recognize the authorities under the Act and Regulations for School Boards and if any recommendation is inconsistent with the Legislation, arrangements to change the Legislation must be initiated before boards may implement changes.
INTRODUCTION

For more than five years (and likely since 1995), various individuals or groups have recognized the need to review student transportation services as provided by School Boards within this Province in an effort to provide equitable services and consistent funding.

The latest formal review that was intended to include a full disclosure and recommendations particularly with regard to student transportation was the 2004 Hogg report (Funding Formula Framework), Appendix C. Unfortunately, Mr. Hogg concluded by suggesting “Consideration should be given to whether there is merit in another attempt, with school boards, to develop a generic transportation funding formula that is related to some measure of activity or volume that could reliably predict an appropriate level of funding for student transportation.”

The reality is that today’s student transportation services to most students in Nova Scotia’s public schools is on the whole so generous and so diversified that it is extremely difficult to survey. However, it need not be so and furthermore, since the service is financially funded in full by the Department of Education and the service originates with the responsibilities of a School Board as found in the Education Act and Regulations, there should be common objectives and outcomes associated with the service as provided by each school board. Only then would our parents and public be more confident, when examining services for other students in comparison to their children, in understanding that the transportation services in our Province were equitable and more fairly applied to all students.

Given the understanding that there will be some local issues to resolve, school boards in general should be providing equitable services to students provincially. This is a far cry from reality when an in-depth review of each area is conducted. Furthermore, through a variety of inputs we find that differences also occur within systems and now with only eight systems in the province, the big question is, How could the various applications originate? The answer is very simple. Prior to regional school boards in 1996, twenty-one (21) supervisors were overseeing transportation or prior to district boards in 1982 many more supervisors were involved. With a variety of personnel receiving requests for additional transportation of students and a variety of policies in place, or no policy at all, many different practices originated.

This review recognizes that there are many factors to be considered and that although we believe the system should be equitable, there will be some physical conditions, or exceptions, so that formal standard policies will not always be adhered to. However, we must understand that it is appropriate and prudent for the Department of Education through the Education Act and Regulations, to initiate standards that will provide guidance for school board operations in fulfilling the need for transportation services to students. Our population should then be able to look at school board systems across the Province and understand why variations could take place.
Disclaimer:

In this review, information has been provided by a large number of contributors. The writer and the committee have attempted to verify information as provided. Unfortunately, with the best possible crosschecks in place it is not always possible to guarantee that all data collected is common or appropriately provided as responses to the questions asked. So often when the persons involved receive the request to provide information, slight differences and interpretation of the questions asked have resulted in different information being provided by various persons representing different school boards across the province.

It is also important to inform the readers of this report that the review has one major objective, that being to establish the proper walking distances from home to school. At no time did the consultant or anyone else involved in this report receive directions or advice to suggest that the purpose of this review was to save funds for the provincial government. However, in reviewing the practices of school boards across the province, there is a possibility of efficiencies that could be initiated and the review would be less than accurate and complete if these efficiencies were not identified.
DEFINITIONS

Throughout the report there is the necessity to use a variety of terms and wording. In order to assure that the report and the words therein are understood, and deliver the same message to all readers, Appendix D provides the definitions as used by the Review Committee.

We recognize that the definitions that we have applied are not necessarily consistent with all terms of every user in today’s school operations. We do believe that these definitions are consistent with the understanding and utilization by a major number of the persons using or referring to them in the field, such as supervisors of transportation, head bus drivers, bus drivers and the like. Consequently, the use of common language and similar definitions will assist in future communications.
METHOD/PROCEDURE

Phase I

Phase I of the review has been identified as information gathering. The consultant initiated the review by determining that it would be most appropriate to commence by speaking with school board staff and collecting data and information from those involved. This would provide the opportunity to best know what was happening in each school board area.

Initial visits to all eight school board offices were completed in late June 2007. Each meeting offered the opportunity for the consultant to meet with a number of school board staff including the superintendents of schools, directors of operations, coordinators of transportation, finance officers, technology staff and others who are deemed appropriate to supply information regarding each school board’s transportation system.

The information collected included copies of school board policies such as Appendix E; route sheets and other printed material that the staff suggested would be helpful in telling about their transportation system. During the meetings, up to three hours in length, much information about the systems was provided. At the conclusion of each session school board staff offered to forward other detail as it became available. This all resulted in large volumes of input.

Information collected and submitted was assessed by the consultant during the summer months. During the assessment period, if questions arose, communications between the consultant and appropriate staff took place. This gave the opportunity to encourage that the best information possible would be available for the review.

School board staff participated and cooperated to the fullest extent possible. Communication lines are positive and all staff has offered to provide whatever materials are necessary for the review.

Phase II

Phase II commenced with the beginning of the school year in September. The major segment to this phase was the public consultation process. Superintendents or their designates were requested to help circulate, via school principals, a notice dated September 10, 2007, Appendix F-1, to parents/public inviting public input.

The results of this invitation were outstanding. Appendix F-2 details the information regarding submissions. Five hundred sixty-nine (569) written submissions were received along with thirty-six (36) verbal contacts. Forty-seven (47) individuals or groups made requests to have private sessions with the consultant and/or committee members. Six private sessions were held in different areas of the province concluding October 24.
The presence of the consultant in each individual area during this time also permitted further contact with school board staff and an opportunity for additional input from those persons.

Committee members received copies of each submission. The submissions are very interesting and have contributed major input to this review.

Twenty-one (21) parents/public questioned the benefits of the review and were somewhat negative in their reactions. It would be fair to note that most who responded negatively are receiving extremely generous bus services at this time and thought that the purpose of the review was to take something away.

**Phase III**

Phase III of the review will be to decide whether the 3.6-kilometer distance as identified in the Regulations under the Education Act would be the proper distance for students to walk to and from school.

Committee members do not believe that the 3.6 kilometers should be increased and in deciding whether it would remain the same or be decreased, there are a substantial number of factors that must be considered. These include whether students should walk or be bussed depending on the benefit to their health versus the safety factors associated with walking rather than bussing and various other factors.

Any change in the distance for bussing students could have an effect on each school board and the policies of that board. To initiate a change will also require an implementation process and strategy. Should the change include a different distance than presently found in the Regulations under the Act, the Legislation will require changing.

The objective of this review consultant is to have the review completed near the end of November. This will also permit time for further dialogue with school board staff.
PHASE I

This phase permitted the collection of a variety of information pertaining to the school boards’ transportation system. Initially and briefly when considering the topic of the review one assumed that we were merely dealing with the topic of how far students should walk to and from school to their homes daily. We quickly acknowledged that many parts of the school board system interlock with the transportation system.

We will briefly look at some of those areas that will affect school board bussing. It is interesting to note the large number of factors that can impact on the type of service provided for these students.

Enrolments:

Current school board student population is 135,618 students (as reported by school boards on September 30, 2007), Appendix G-1.

Declining Enrolments:

Student population in the public schools of Nova Scotia has decreased nearly 10,000 students from September 2004 to September 2007. See Appendix G-1.

Bussed Students:

More than 60% of the population of Nova Scotia schools are bussed from home to school each day; that is, more than 80,000 students. See Appendix G-2.

Number of Buses:

We supply transportation to and from school on 1,125 buses with 156 spare buses available. The regular buses not only provide transportation from home to school on a daily basis but also provide service for co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. The spare buses are available to provide a unit for use when a regular bus breaks down or is receiving planned maintenance as well as transportation for students who take part in lengthy extra-curricular trips.

Distance from School:

Approximately 10% of students bussed live less than 3.6 kilometers from school, Appendix G-4.

Time on a School Bus:

More than four hundred (400) students are on a school bus for more than one hour. Appendix E indicates present school board policies in this regard,
Appendix E-4.

Walking School:

More than sixty-one (61) schools in the province of Nova Scotia are identified as walking schools. This really means that the schools were constructed without consideration for school bussing. Consequently, the site in many cases is too small or improperly prepared for unloading and loading students on site. For many of these schools, if bussing were to become available to students the school board would need to unload and load on the side of a street until proper driveways, etc. could be available. In some cases the full size of a school site (small) would preclude that from happening.

Students on Buses pre 7:00 a.m./after 5:00 p.m.:

More than one hundred sixty-six (166) students are on school buses prior to 7 a.m. and more than twenty (20) students arrive home, off school bus runs, after 5:00 p.m.

School Hours:

A variety of school hours are in place with classes commencing as early as approximately 8 a.m. and dismissing as late as approximately 3:30 p.m.

School Board Areas/Density:

A major factor considered when reviewing school board transportation systems is the area covered (Appendix G-5) and the density of population (Appendix G-6) within this area that each school board is responsible for. For example, the large area of the Strait Board (Appendix H-1) and the lower population provides many challenges for bussing. On the other hand, the large population found in Halifax provides many options for organizing bussing in their small area. Similarly CSAP, with a small student population and providing programs across the full province (Appendix H-2) in three areas; namely, Région Sud-Ouest, Région Centrale, and Région Nord-Est, and in nineteen (19) schools, in attempting to operate buses with a totally French culture, French students only, are challenged to get students to their schools without long time-consuming drives.

Mapping:

In attempting to provide the most efficient system, both operationally and financially, school boards have initiated a variety of school board mapping systems. Appendix H-3 shows samples of this word from the Cape Breton Victoria Board.

It is essential for board staff to identify the location of each school in their system.
along with population of the school and bussing requirements to include home location for each student to be bussed. A variety of technology is in place and school boards could generally depend on computerized mapping and routing programs to assist with the daily pick up and delivery of students from home to school and return.
With the introduction of Regional School Boards in 1996 in our province, school boards were required to develop new transportation policies which include the distances that students shall walk or be bussed from home to school and for pick ups on By Roads. In that these two items are the prime reason behind this review we will address these policies in a separate article.

We also find that school boards provide variations of courtesy bussing. This has been initiated by various persons over lengthy periods of time and often is provided as a convenience to parents or students, or supposedly often as a solution to safety factors in the absence of other bodies fulfilling their responsibilities.

One school board in the province does provide a noon-hour service for students in an urban area enabling the students to go from school to home and back again during the lunch-hour. This is provided at a cost to the parents for this service.

In addition to these factors, school board bussing staff must make arrangements for the provision of co-curricular and extra-curricular trips and some boards do provide transportation to programs such as French Immersion. Requests for student to transfer from one school to another often puts extra demands on the transportation system when they attempt (not required) to accommodate those students. Often students will come to school in the morning from one location (home) and return after school to another location, e.g. babysitter.

The consultant had the opportunity to become familiar with various transportation reviews that had been conducted in some of the board areas over the past eight years.

These reviews had various objectives such as (1) researching public input to policy changes, including walking distances from home to school and By Road walking distances, (2) to determine efficient use of bus units, (3) improve students service, (4) equalize driver work load and (5) evaluate staff services and adequacy of personnel in place.

In assessing the information provided the consultant has concluded that the transportation system provided by school boards in this province may be best described as having three problems:

1) school boards have attempted to provide transportation for students in the absence
of other bodies fulfilling their mandates in order that students can get to school “safely”

2) with declining enrolments and fewer students having the right to use a school bus, it has been easy to fill up the seats and keep the same number of busses running and

3) the current system for funding school boards, that is 100% funded based on last year’s expenses, does not encourage school boards to be economically efficient.

Many persons involved in the review have identified lack of infrastructure as a cause to need students bussed from home to school. Often school boards will provide transportation for students who live close to school when Municipal Units have not installed sidewalks. Parents often identify insufficient number of crosswalk guards; therefore, requesting bussing to move students from their home to schools. We also observe that speeding motorists have not been policed enough to discourage speeding in areas where students are walking.

In our society today, parents also wish to transfer some of their responsibilities for supervising and providing transportation to and from school for their students onto the school board.

This has all resulted in decreased walking distances and less physical activity for our students.
CURRENT SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES

The two policies of schools boards that have the greatest impact on the outcomes of this review are Walking Distance and By Road Services, consequently these two will be addressed separately.

Walking Distance:

School Boards have developed a wide range of policies to assist them in fulfilling their responsibility for providing transportation for students from home to school and return daily. Current policies of the eight school boards as applicable to walking distances are found in Appendix E-1.

In formulating these policies, School Boards have considered a variety of factors that affect the distance from home to school, for which they have decided to bus students. Consequently, all School Boards have initiated some bus stops that are less than 3.6 kilometers from school, particularly for elementary students. A number of school boards do require some secondary students to walk up to the 3.6 kilometers from home to school, particularly in more urban and suburban areas. See Appendix E-2.

As a result of these policies and the various distances used for bussing students the application is not equitable for all students in the province. In some instances they are not seen to be equitable within a board area.

In the course of this review we solicited information as to the walking distances to and from school in other provinces. We received data from the Canadian Pupil Transportation Interprovincial Survey 2004 and with requests to the individual boards we were able to update that information. This can be found in Appendix E-3.

By Road Service:

All school boards have adopted a policy for which they will provide service to students living on By Roads. Current policies as applicable to By Road Services are found in Appendix E-1.

In all School Board areas, residents often construct homes or move to locations on streets or roads that are not serviced by regular School Board runs. These often include subdivision developments, but may also be a choice to live in more remote areas.

One of the reasons for this choice of location is often to establish homes in areas that can be more economically serviced. At the same time these residents are getting away from some of the fast pace or traffic and other urban traits, as well as the possibility to benefit from a lower cost of living, to include lower taxes, etc.

Once in the new location these residents with school age children then approach the local
School Board for By Road school bus service from home to school, and become somewhat upset when it is refused.

They forget that in order to accommodate their request a number of factors must be considered. The distance must be measured and if it does not meet the policy in place the request will be turned down. Distances are determined from the end of the driveway on a By Road to the intersection of where this by Road meets the regular route.

School Board staffs also check other factors. They must review conditions of the By Road and suitability and maintenance of an appropriate turning area and determine who is or will be responsible for such, not usually the School Board.

They also need to review the route sheet of the school bus driver who could be assigned to do this extra service. In order to accommodate this request, other students on an existing run will be effected as a By Road service will take a minimum of five minutes more. This may have a major impact on how the extra service, for one or more By Roads, will effect times for other students, particularly the first pickups/last drop-offs of the day.

In summary, to add a By Road service to an existing run can automatically create a chain reaction for the whole route that must be understood and prepared for before initiating the service. Consequently what is often seen as a minor request from a parent for a new pick up on a new By Road actually involves many persons and is not always practical to approve.
PHASE II

Parental and public input, for the most part, suggested that the current walking distance requirement in Nova Scotia, that is 3.6 kilometers, should be reduced for a variety of reasons. Other input reminded us of the need to balance walking to school with the individual health requirements, particularly physical activity.

The goals of Active and Safe Routes to School (ASRTS) are to

1) reduce air pollution from vehicles
2) increase physical activity levels of our children and youth
3) increase traffic safety in school communities.

They promote these objectives and at the same time propose children have access to safe routes to school.

The Heart and Stroke Foundation of Nova Scotia, which has as one of its priorities, physical activity, tell us that Nova Scotia children and youth are not active enough for health benefits and that walking or biking to school can help students meet a significant portion of the recommended sixty minutes of daily physical activity. Physical activity is one of the most critical health problems in Nova Scotia.

With that in mind, this group would like to see the government provide convenient and safe sidewalks and bicycle paths that could support and encourage children wishing to walk or bicycle to school and in their communities over reasonable, walkable and bikable distances.

A solid majority of residents recognize that student’s health is strongly linked to communities that support active living.

Another contributor suggests the walking distance would be influenced by several things such as available sidewalks, marked crosswalks, use of crossing guards, limits for traffic flow, controlled traffic speed, suitable shoulders on the highway, elimination of sexual predators and appropriate winter care for streets and shoulders.

Other suggestions/comments taken from the input are
a) never require students to cross a 100 series highway or major intersections
b) resolve the noon-hour time/cost factor
c) have different walking distances for younger and older students
d) ensure students do not walk in unsafe conditions, both to school or to bus stops
e) only use approved and maintained pathways
f) ensure sidewalks are available
g) avoid areas where abductions may be considered
h) develop appeal process for parents not agreeing with final decision
i) have no standards at all/leave decisions to individual boards
j) ensure all students in all programs are serviced equitably
k) do not require students to cross canals, bridges, causeways and/or railway tracks
l) ensure consolidation and new school construction decisions include and involve transportation personnel
m) encourage walking pools
n) ensure school ground driveways and streets leading to the school are assessed for safety
o) ensure a new bus policy is environmentally friendly
p) consider lay of the land and avoid significant inclines
q) consider weather and other environmental factors
r) have schools provide two sets of books so as to avoid carrying heavy weights
s) apply rules and policies to one and all without prejudice
t) vary distances for urban students, who have infrastructure needs in place, from services provided to rural students
u) decreased bussing will increase parent vehicle traffic
v) calculate distances by using a standard method, streets only
w) reduce speed limits to 50 kilometers per hour in all student walking areas
x) review all current bus routes to ensure maximum loads and appropriate distances.

These comments/suggestions reasonably reflect the majority of opinions. Many parents support the status quo of today’s school boards’ policies and we would expect that given that most school boards are now bussing students for distances shorter than 3.6 kilometers

Some of the policies provide for the conveyance of students who live very close to the school. This has come about as a result of school boards responding favorably to parents who have requested transportation in the absence of appropriate infrastructure. The missing infrastructure should be supplied by other bodies and not become a responsibility of the school board.

School boards would not have been in a position to provide this extra courtesy service if enrolments had not declined or if funding had not continued in the last few years to be so generous.

We wish to acknowledge the sources for a variety of contributions. We received submissions including petitions from community groups, health organizations, safe and active living groups, medical doctors, bus drivers, day care operators, municipal councilors, municipal units, Federation of Home and School, police officers, friends and neighbors of students, Heart and Stroke Foundation, School Boards, Principals, School Advisory Councils, grandparents and many parents. For these submissions we are most thankful. We were also pleased to receive requests for private meetings and appreciated the one-on-one dialogue that took place. The sincerity of the presenters well represented a large “family” of parents and students.

Persons who participated often acknowledged that the request for bussing for students often arose as a result of some other group or body not fulfilling their mandates fully. Many commented on the fact that bussing is seen to be a dependable means for which
students can be transported to and from school.

The presentations also contained items of parental concern which are not directly related to our mandate, but since they were presented by parents with a genuine interest we would be doing a disservice to students by not relating such.

The first pertains to bus stops. Currently legislation under the Motor Carrier Act Section 14(2), “The driver of a school bus shall not stop the bus for the purpose of taking on or discharging passengers at (a) more than three placed in 1.6 km (1 mile)…” In reality this means some students may walk significant distances from their driveway to a bus stop, perhaps more than three-tenths of a kilometer. The parental concern is that this walking may be in conditions that are equally as hazardous as if walking to school. In fact, from information gathered in our review from parental presentations, the conditions under which some students walk to a school bus stop is more dangerous than conditions under which any students currently walk to school or home again.

The second concern often brought forward was the circumstances involving walking students and their right to stay at school at noon time, without costs. In fact, a significant number of presenters who were requesting a current school board walking policy to be adjusted did so on the basis that the distances, although long, did not present nearly the problem before school in the morning or after school in the afternoon as they did for noon hour. They simply suggested with long distances to walk ranging from 2.4 kilometers to 3.6 kilometers it was impossible to walk this distance from school to home and back in the short times allocated for lunch hour at the school. With a 75 minute lunch hour a good healthy secondary grade student would barely get home before they needed to return to school in order to be on time for afternoon classes, and therefore, had no time to eat lunch. The alternate to this would be to have transportation provided and many do not have that available, or to stay at school and not be assessed a supervision fee. The supervision fee was only applicable to walking students. Therefore, parents urged the distance in the Regulations under the Act be reduced so that the student would be bussed and would qualify to stay at school without paying the supervision fee.

The Committee heard, but did not address, presentations that may have had reference to staff of the school boards. We are strictly dealing with a walking distance and the factors, non personal, that directly or indirectly affect the walking distance and the policies of each school board pertaining to the walking distance.
PHASE III

In that the first two phases of the review were time spent in the collection of data, information and parents opinions, Phase III attempts to take that information and use it to address the prime objective of our report, that is to review the current walking distance (3.6 kilometers) and decide whether it should remain as is or be decreased. We have concluded that we would not recommend the distance be increased.

In this phase we are assessing the issues raised in the Scope Definition, data and suggestions from school boards and school boards staff and the information/opinions expressed during the parent/public input opportunities with the objective of identifying appropriate walking distance for students.

Recognizing that many of the factors raised may only relate to the walking distance in some small way, directly or indirectly, it is still imperative that each is referred to and that the association to walking distances is identified, where applicable. Commencing with those identified in the Scope Definitions, we will now establish that relationship, and in no particular order.

Current Bus Policies:

Walking Distances:

All school boards have established policies which involve the transportation of students such as the walking distance policy, Appendix E-1. Others may include policies applicable to co-curricular and/or extra-curricular trips, etc. all in an effort to establish standards and equitability throughout the system. As school boards provide transportation to students they wish to be seen to be doing it in a fair manner. Some parents will suggest that the provision of transportation under current board policies is not all fair. As a result, school board staffs are subject to criticism when parents believe they do not adhere to those policies that are in place. Often this occurs as a result of lack of information or less than adequate communications, particularly when a variety of conditions are considered before decisions are made.

Some school boards have indicated they wish their current policy distances for walking to remain and perhaps become the distances to be established in the Regulations under the Act. With eight different policies we don’t have a provincial standard.

Walking distances from home to school under the Regulations under the Act have been and should continue to be a standard distance. We realize to be equitable and to better consider some local conditions there may need to be some exceptions. Any local school board policy using short distances, does not necessarily recognize the exceptions for what they are,
it simply groups all students together and because there may have been an exception needed for one or more students the full student group receives the benefit of the exception. We see this as a generous provision of services by the school board but is not an efficient method by which to provide transportation.

That system also ignores the advantages of students walking to/from school, one which is the benefit from receiving daily physical activity.

We agree that to expect elementary students to walk 3.6 kilometers to school in the morning, 3.6 kilometers home and back again during lunch hour, and return home at the end of the school day 3.6 kilometers – total 14.4 kilometers, is a long distance and not practical. Similarly distances required for secondary students needs to be revised.

Parents/public in their input also often agreed with the school boards’ policies of today. We did not hear from many parents whose homes are outside of the courtesy area, more than 3.6 kilometers from school, nor did we except to as it is normal for members of our society who believe they won’t be affected to remain SILENT. The unfortunate part of this is that they and their children are affected. To provide service for more students living closer to the school automatically effects others, including time away from home, bus availability for another route, start of school hour, and late arrivals for some students.

The systems with close pickups to schools, courtesy bussing, also negate parent’s responsibility. Parents and school boards must jointly accept responsibility and that may include parents accompanying their children, or arrange for someone else to, as they walk to school. Age 5, 6 and 7-year olds usually require supervision. No one should suggest that a school board should simply take over the full parent’s responsibility. Remember parents have the first responsibility for children’s safety. This includes making sure they get to school safely.

We are recommending adjustments to a distance of 3.6 kilometers as now found in the Regulations under the Act, Appendix B. Similarly, we find no justification or need to have one distance for all students. Consequently, we are recommending a different distance for elementary students and secondary students as they walk to and from school before classes in the morning, during the noon hour and after classes at the end of the day.

In concluding appropriate walking distances from home to school and from school to home daily, morning, lunchtime and afternoon, that is four times, we have reviewed much information.
Many parents have taken the opportunity to indicate they were not against some walking but they believed the distance walked had to be reasonable and under proper conditions. This review has used the same approach. We find that a reasonable walk to school should be a walk that is fitting to the age of students involved. Grades Primary to 6 students (elementary) should not be expected to walk as far as secondary students, Grades 7 to 12.

In our review of Canadian walking distances, we noted that the average distance for elementary students was in excess of 1.6 kilometers and the average for secondary students was greater. The Safe Walking to School presentation suggested a minimum twenty-five (25) minute walk per day under reasonable conditions would be a realistic time, nearly 3.2 kilometers for secondary students.

One of our committee members did actual samplings of walking time for different grades of students, Primary through grade 9, and found that on average, students, Grades Primary through 9 would walk 1.6 kilometers in sixteen (16) minutes. Interestingly, Grades Primary through 6 students walked 1.6 kilometers in nineteen minutes twenty-four seconds on average.

This compares well when we consider the usual walking distance for secondary students, Grades 7 to 12, would be 3.2 kilometers in a half-hour. Not only do we recognize the reasonable distance for students to walk we also distinguish the distance to be walked by different age groups.

Throughout the report we are considering appropriate provincial standards. However, even though our recommendations will apply provincial standards to walking distance we clearly appreciate that there will be cause for some adjustments for these standards when different local assessments are completed by transportation personnel in order to ensure local hazardous conditions are considered. That transportation for any students living within the walking distance will be courtesy bussing.

Even though we apply provincial standards they must be appropriate and available for adjustments when required and in doing so the results will be equitable. We have three objectives in mind, two of which are directly related to the intent of this review; namely, safety and health and a third which has an indirect impact, costs.

We wish to emphasize that it is necessary for us to consider equity, that is being fair in providing transportation for students and in doing so this does not mean everyone will be treated equally. When serious hazards are present school board staff would assess situations, case by case.
Students who live in the walking areas may be transported because it is considered hazardous to walk to school for certain grades of students. There will be occasions and situations where the transportation supervisor may need to review conditions that may be considered hazardous and make a decision and follow up with appropriate documentation. Matters dealing with lack of sidewalks, poor road shoulders, poorly maintained sidewalks, speed zones, high crime area and lack of crosswalk guards should be discussed by parents/school boards with appropriate governmental bodies in an effort to receive a solution in lieu of school bussing.

On occasion, presenters have indicated that one should not consider and compare rural with urban. In fact, some have gone so far as to say what applies in the rural area will not apply in the urban area or vice versa. We recognize conditions may be different in the two areas but both areas have cause for hazards. In all board areas we will find hazards and some will be more serious than others and in making decisions relative to walking to and from school, a few may be serious enough to encourage more bussing than others. These comparisons can be made from one board to another or they can be made from one school to another in the same board.

**We recommend that for students grades Primary to Six, the maximum walking distance be 1.6 kilometers and for secondary students grades Seven to Twelve, 3.0 kilometers.**
By Road Walking Distances:

Similarly, school boards have established policy, Appendix E-2, for the distances they expect students to walk on a By Road from home to a school bus on a regular route. We recognize that school boards use a variety of names for this “By Road”.

This review has determined that there are currently a variety of distances in the school board policies. We believe that an equitable distance to be walked on a By Road from the spot where a driveway meets the By Road to the location where the By Road meets the regular route may be included in the Regulations and that the distance should be standardized for both elementary students and secondary students.

Currently boards recognize a variety of conditions associated with By Road service. The road must be a public road maintained by the Department of Transportation or appropriate governmental body so that the condition of the road makes the road accessible for school buses on all occasions.

Travel on a By Road is also contingent on the availability and maintenance of an appropriate turning area at or prior to the location where the driveway intersects with the By Road. Many school boards currently receive commitment from the parent(s) assuring they will maintain an appropriate turning area. There will be a few public roads where school buses cannot travel because of road conditions or no adequate turning spot.

By Road travel will impact on the time required from first pick-ups to drop-offs at schools in that each By Road service requires a minimum of five minutes to complete depending on the distance traveled and the number of stops.

We recommend the By Road service be provided for elementary students who live more than .8 kilometers and secondary students who live more than 1.6 kilometers from their regular route.

Travel Time on Buses:

Currently school board policies indicate that the maximum time expected for students to travel on a school bus should be no more than one hour. See Appendix E-4. The actual time traveled by the first students to get on a school bus to school depends on a number of factors including distance traveled, number of stops, conditions of the road and number of By Roads to be serviced. In the school year 2007-2008 we find more than 400 students who are traveling on school buses for more than one hour and a
significant number are elementary students. Long times spent on a bus can impact negatively on elementary students. It may affect their health (tired and rundown), school life (ability to function), and home life (family time).

We do commend school boards for assessing the time spent on a school bus and their attempts to consider the health and comfort of students who live so far away. The real difficulty arises for a few students who live significant distances away from the school they must attend. These will be mostly secondary students and for these secondary students boards should continue to keep the time requirement on the school bus as close to a maximum of one hour as possible.

We do believe all elementary students should be transported in time frames of less than one hour and that distances traveled on a bus morning and afternoon be kept to a minimum. Children can spend quite long periods on buses and we are aware more than an hour, in some cases, simply because of the way routes are arranged. Students do not benefit from long daily trips and we need to minimize the times where possible.

Although this seems contrary to encouraging school boards to assign buses to transport more students and become more efficient, we cannot promote that type of efficiency and at the same time ask students to sacrifice by being on the bus for a real long time.

In reality, it would be deemed to be more satisfactory to ask some students who are currently receiving courtesy bussing to walk rather than require those far away students to be on a school bus for more lengthy times. Although we have referred to mornings only here, the same situation is also applicable in the afternoons.

We recommend that the travel time on buses for elementary students be kept to a maximum of one hour and that boards ensure that drivers conform.

Other Factors:

School Start/Stop Times:

Schools in Nova Scotia use a variety of school hours for instruction, some will open as early as 8:00 a.m. and other will close at approximately 3:30 p.m. School boards need to be commended for the use of a variety of start and stop times for school hours. This is often referred to as “staggered hours”.

In reality, this permits boards to operate more efficiently while
transporting students on a school bus which is on more than one run, both mornings and afternoons. Money saved from this concept should be able to be put back into other needs of the system.

For school boards not using these staggered hours, we encourage this arrangement to be expanded and for the most part will mean that most school buses will be doing at least two runs in the morning and two runs in the afternoons from two different schools. There is no requirement for buses to deliver home in afternoon the same students they pick up and bring to the school in the morning.

Leaving and Arriving Home Times:

With a range of school hours starting at 8:00 a.m. and ending at 3:30 p.m. (approximately), we should expect students would not need to leave home before 7:00 a.m. and arrive home before 5:00 p.m. However, we find more than 166 students leaving home before 7:00 a.m. and more than twenty (20) students who arrive home after 5:00 p.m.

Again, depending on school designation and program requirements, this may not always be possible for the board to accommodate for secondary students. Usually there are shorter distances for elementary students to travel to school in their zoned area.

We recommend that no elementary students be on a school bus prior to 7:00 a.m. nor after 5:00 p.m.

Arrival and Departure Times:

Transportation staff is always aware that students who arrive at a school prior to twenty minutes before first bell in the morning or remain at schools for more than twenty minutes after last bell in the afternoon can create supervision problems for the schools. Consequently, bus routing is usually planned to assist school staffs fulfill this requirement. At the same time this helps to ensure that students are not waiting at school unnecessarily at the end of the day.

With this requirement in place, school bus routing may not be as flexible as transportation supervisors would prefer and still be able to assign a bus to do second runs. Let us remember that both of these requirements exist for the benefit of students.

Catchment Area of Students:

Most school boards assign students for a school to come from a particular catchment area. This provides for the students to be assigned to attend
particular schools. Open boundaries don’t work well and makes bussing more costly.

Usually elementary students are assigned to attend a school close to their home which often provides the opportunity for some walking students and for those eligible for bussing requiring buses to travel shorter distances to get them to school. Secondary school students are often assigned to attend larger consolidated schools and some are expected to travel significantly greater distances.

Usually assigning particular schools for students to attend permits better school bus route planning. This not only ensures constant enrolment in the schools but also enables more efficient use of school buses and should provide shorter time for students to be on buses.

School boards usually provide opportunity for “some” students to transfer from one school to another. If the transfer is deemed necessary by the school board for “program” purposes, e.g. special needs students, then transportation will be provided.

Should the transfer be initiated by the student (or parent) and if approved, then transportation becomes the responsibility of the parent. In some instances school boards will attempt (not required) to help accommodate transportation for part or all of that distance, provided there are no extra costs, room on the bus on an existing route, and the student will get to an existing bus spot for pick up.

Given the large variances in geographical areas within the province that different school boards are responsible for it would not be wise to attempt to suggest travel distances by school bus for various grade groupings. One could simply assume that on average secondary students will travel further than elementary students from home to school and return again daily.

Deadhead Kilometers:

School buses will accumulate some deadhead kilometers each day. School boards on the whole attempt to hire drivers and assign them to runs in a manner that will permit the lowest accumulation of deadhead kilometers. A bus driver living in a rural area with a school bus parked at home should start the first run in the day very close to the overnight parking location, thus accumulating very few deadhead kilometers.

At the end of the morning runs following last drop-off deadhead kilometers will be driven to mid day parking and for part-time drivers this may be a considerable distance. If the driver is full-time, drivers with other school board duties during mid day, then often the bus stays close to
the school with last drop-off in morning and, therefore, decreased
deadhead kilometers. We certainly commend the boards who have taken
the initiative to decrease deadhead kilometers.

Courtesy Bussing

Often with declining enrolments, existing bus runs will have empty seats
and parents observe these buses going by their home and arriving at
schools with less than one hundred per cent capacity. Consequently,
requests for pick-up, within the provincial regulation distance of 3.6
kilometers or the school board distance found in its policy, something less
than 3.6 kilometers, come forth.

On the surface it looks like this can be provided with ease, no disruption
and a satisfactorily positive response to this request. In reality, every
additional stop extends the route time and will influence either the starting
time of the bus in the morning or its arrival at school time or its
availability to do another run and, therefore, impedes the efficiency of the
system.

Bus routes need to be developed so that arrival times at school are before
classes begin daily. Reports indicate a few cases where students arrive
late and this should not occur.

In comparison to providing courtesy bussing for students who often live
very close to a school these changes will inconvenience many more
persons than those who receive such a benefit. Consequently, it is
important to have a concrete, solid walking distance policy in place.

In requesting courtesy bussing, parents and school board transportation
staff should also remember that air quality inside school buses may be
poor and certainly significantly worse than the same students would
experience by walking. Time spent in buses is time not spent walking,
therefore, not a good practical use of time.

Walking Schools:

In the Province of Nova Scotia there are fifty-two (52) schools which are
generally referred to as walking schools. With an adjustment downward,
to the walking distance of 3.6 kilometers as found in the Regulations
under the Act, a number of these schools will have students who would
become bus students rather than walking students. Should this happen, the
buses may well be required to stop and load and unload on the street or
require site alterations to accommodate bussing.

Usually older and often urban/suburban schools were built with the idea
that most students would walk to school and, therefore, the site development did not require accommodations for school buses. Actually some of these schools currently have a small school bus service, where special needs students and others are accommodated, and the buses stop in a variety of locations, and where schools are located on or near smaller side streets this does not present a major problem.

On the other hand, if the school board were to believe that stopping and loading and unloading should not occur on the street but rather in the yard, site development for this purpose would become a priority. This would be an additional cost.
Environmental Impacts:

A number of presentations suggested that to use a school bus(es) in lieu of a number of parent vehicles, those who will drive their children to school if there is no bus available, would create an environmentally unfriendly condition in the schoolyard. There is no doubt that this could exist but everything must be taken in balance. We are not promoting driving children to school by car, we are actually suggesting that with a revised walking distance (less than 3.6 kilometers), that students should be encouraged to walk not necessarily alone, but with parents, friends and/or other students. The current situation for some school sites is one where too many parents’ vehicles are in the way for school buses to be able to get around and get out.

Of course, the ideal is to develop a separate driveway and loading and unloading zone for school buses, separate from teachers and parents vehicles, etc. This won’t diminish the burning of fuels and the emission of gases, it simply provides for better in schoolyard vehicle control.

The reality is that many parents now choose to drive their children to and from school, regardless of walking distances, many who live more than 3.6 kilometers and have school bus service available, and they will continue with that process.

Integrated Child Safety Seat Impact:

Our review considered whether or not integrated seats would have any impact on walking distances and found limited relationship between the two. In 2007 not a large number of Primary students (under 40 pounds) were assigned to buses with this seating but we expect the numbers to increase yearly as more buses are purchased and, of course, with younger age Primary student next year.

Time for students to get in and out of an integrated seat in a school bus will be greater than the time needed to either load or unload students who are not in an integrated seat, thus lengthening the time needed for school bus runs.

We also acknowledge maximum load size will be decreased up to four students when a bus is used to transport these smaller students to, or more if a monitor is engaged.

These factors may mean additional costs for transportation.

Other conditions for these students using these seats should be no different than regular and usual Primary age students on the bus.
However, I would want to acknowledge the good work done this year to initiate and accommodate this new program by the boards’ coordinators of transportation, and the school bus drivers directly involved in implementing the programs. Nova Scotia school children do benefit from the positive attributes found in most school board transportation staff. Not one single presentation made a negative remark about “school bus drivers”, nor did any submissions raise any concern over the integrated seating program. Excellent cooperation has been reported from all school board personnel.

Size of Bus Fleet:

The number of regular school buses operated by school boards and the number of spare units, along with number of students bussed, will be found in Appendix G-3 and Appendix G-2. Comparisons are made for the years 2004-2005 to 2007-2008.

During this four-year period student enrolments in the province have decreased (6.7%) by 9778 students. See Appendix G-1. During this same time the number of students bussed has dropped (5.3%) by approximately 4758 students (Appendix G-2).

On the other hand, school boards in 2007 are operating twenty-three (23) more (2%) buses on regular runs and one (1) less spare bus (Appendix G-3).

When a large drop in student population is experienced we would expect a similar drop in students bussed. We would also anticipate a drop in the number of buses operating on regular runs and the number of spare units on hand.

One does not expect the same percentage drop for all, but with over 60% of the students bussed the number of students transported should have dropped approximately 60% or 5800 students. Similarly the number of buses used on regular runs should have decreased rather than increased, and we could understand if the drop were 20 – 30 units but instead an increase of seventeen (17) more units on regular runs is in place. The number of regular buses in use should drop annually so that it reflects a constant dropping in accordance with dropping student enrolments and dropping number of students bussed. However, it is important to recognize that with the identification of additional special needs students special transportation requirements, some boards will have added buses and for that reason contributed to an increase in bus units.

To keep up with the number of buses required and the decreasing number
of students being bussed, annual examinations of bus routes, using a standardized route sheet, are required by all school boards. To help achieve this all school boards should be using a common routing computerized program and then with the assistance of bus drivers a more efficient systems service can be initiated.

Probably one cause for the increase in number of buses used on regular routes, and the number of students bussed not dropping at the same rate as student enrolment province-wide is the fact that some school boards have initiated changes to the walking distance policy and students who live handier will now be receiving school bus service. This means that school bus service throughout the province is not equitable.

**We do recommend the use of a common computerized routing system for all school boards. It will be advantageous to develop this system in conjunction with each school’s student record system.**

Spare Buses:

The number of spare buses school boards retain to have available during the year varies with each school board. On the surface many school boards appear to have more units available than they need. However, after discussions with various school board personnel and hearing the reasons for retaining a significant number of spare buses I do understand some of the rationale provided by school board staff.

Usually we would expect a school board to dispose of old buses each year, and that number of units to be disposed of would be the same number as new units received. With buses expected to have a twelve-year life span, ideally eight and one half percent (8 1/2%) of the buses will be replaced annually, that is 8.5 new bus units per one hundred (100) each year and a similar number of old buses to be disposed of. In ideal situations we would expect 10% of the operational fleet to be maintained as spare units, or for a fleet of approximately 1125 buses, 113 spare units in Nova Scotia. Currently including spares used by private contractors school boards have more than 156 spare units in Nova Scotia. (116 school board, 40 private contractors). Private contractors do maintain 10% of their operational fleet as spare units, therefore, the school boards’ numbers of spare units in total appear to be high.

Spare units are advantageous to have available but they also cost money to retain. Costs such as registrations, maintenance, to include inspections, and insurance all add to a school board’s annual expenditures.

Spare buses are used to replace regular buses during emergency breakdown and during times when regular buses are undergoing planned
maintenance and inspections. They also serve to provide transportation for co-curricular and extra-curricular activities that originate in the school board area but include destinations outside the school board area and for which the time required to do this trip extends beyond those hours available when schools are in session.

Areas served and locations of garages may also determine the need for more spare units.

As a guideline, school boards should consider a formula to determine number of spare units to have available. We suggest the following formulae to be helpful:

School board spare buses =  10% of operating fleet on regular runs + 1 additional unit for each garage (service area) in the school board region.

This does not apply to private contractors providing that the contract signed leaves the decision and responsibility to the contractor.

Transportation Staffing:

School boards engage staff to oversee and develop the transportation system as well as provide this service to students.

The staffs of each of the eight school boards provided us with a vast quantity of materials related to each systems operation and the varying number of transportation related employees.

The number of staff involved in the organization and administration of each system differs from system to system. Four school boards use private contractors to provide a service. Each of the private conveyors has organizational and administrative staff consequently this cost is included in the contracts that exist between each of the contractors and each of the school boards. Three of these school boards that use private conveyors, also run their own system for a part of their school board area.

School board transportation staffs receive many requests from a variety of sources for additional bus stops, additional runs on By Roads and more courtesy bussing, that is picking up students who are closer and closer to the schools. To those making the request they believe the answer should be a simple ‘yes’ and often expect an immediate response. The reality is that each and every adjustment to an existing bus route may influence other conditions within that existing route. The staff is, therefore, required to consider many factors when parents/students/others request extra conveyance/pick-ups. The following list simply identifies some of those
factors.

- School attended
- Grade
- Name of student
- Name of parent
- Civic address
- Why the request is made
- Other children with same address or nearby
- New stop of courtesy bussing
- Route that the school uses or by road
- Transfer to a different boundary
- Name of the driver(s)
- Number of passengers
- Time of first passenger on bus
- Duration of trip of first passenger to drop-off at school
- Time school commences (first bell)
- More than one run, if so, how many runs
- Driver has time to do more or does it involve overtime
- How this would change if approved and the impact on current route/passengers
- Does the request fall within policy and provincial regulations.

Our only concern relative to school board staff centered around organization/administration. Not all school boards appear to employ a staff member who is a dedicated Routing Technician Specialist. We believe this to be a position that all school boards may benefit from, and that a common program should be used province-wide.

Similarly school boards currently use their own route sheets. These need to be standardized province-wide. The Routing Technician Specialist would assist with this task. That staff member will identify students who are eligible to be bussed, where they live and help to develop full route sheets. Discussions with drivers, also contribute much valuable data to reorganization, will assist in adjusting bus routes annually so that the entire system becomes more efficient.

This will result in having more efficient routes and fewer buses being needed. The annual examination of routes also keeps the system operating in an up-to-date and current manner. By having an annual examination there will be less opportunity to increase courtesy stops and courtesy students on existing bus runs.

By having common bus route information in full detail, spare drivers are easily accommodated when needed to fill in.
The Routing Technician Specialist positions (8) should be coordinated by someone in the Department who may lend expertise and at the same time ensure that it is a common and standard program that will be used and that the route sheets will also be standard province-wide.

This also provides the opportunity to ensure distances under the Regulations are appropriately adhered to.

As the report is deemed finalized we continue to recognize the need to establish and maintain these standards. We have also recommended that the Department of Education review existing school board data as available. In doing so it would be prudent to establish a committee with the mandate to select a single transportation routing system and a common routing sheet to be used by all school boards. The establishment of this committee and the expenses for this project should be funded by the Department of Education. Likely this standard will provide a basis for future funding formula. We recognize the additional responsibility that we are directing to the Department of Education.

**We recommend a staff person solely responsible for transportation. This employee would then assist boards in standardizing reports and information and initially chair the group to pick the proper routing system.**

Co-curricular/Extra-curricular Trips:

The school boards transportation systems are often requested to provide transportation for purposes other than home to school and school to home daily. This transportation can best be described as trips and which usually are planned to be part of the mandated educational program or enhancements to the educational program (optional or sports trips).

For those trips which are a compulsory portion of the program of studies and are mandated to fulfill the requirements of a course we call co-curricular trips. A few examples of co-curricular trips are (1) transporting students from their home school to another building for regular physical education classes, (2) transporting students from their home school to an environmental area for the purpose of fulfilling requirements of Grade XII Biology, or (3) transporting students from their home school to an area site for the purpose of “hands on” educational learning (museum). These trips are a part of the compulsory curriculum which school boards will provide at no cost to the participants.

All school boards will have schools where trips are requested for extra-curricular activities so as to enrich program requirements. These optional
trips are usually planned around a program of studies topics but are not necessary to complete the requirements of a specific program.

We encourage school boards to continue providing this optional transportation when school buses are available. For the most part these trips can be accommodated between school start times in the morning and school dismissal times in the afternoon. A few extend beyond those hours and will require additional bus units (spares) and additional personnel to drive the bus.

School boards are also requested to provide transportation for students for competitive sports activities (example volleyball, basketball) and usually the time extends from the end of a school day to the conclusion of the event. Even though their trips are usually in a school zone area they still require a spare bus and driver in order to accommodate them.

The above referred to co-curricular, extra-curricular and sports trips should describe almost 100% of the trips that students will travel on.

Unlike the co-curricular trips we see the need and value for school boards to charge schools when buses are used for extra-curricular and sports trips. The cost does not need to be 100% of the gross expense involved but could be 100% of the net direct costs involved or as some school boards will do, allocate some free trips and then trips beyond that number will be on a charge basis. Some school boards also provide in the individual schools, budget allocations of funds for some extra-curricular bussing.

Charges are necessary so that the user may more appreciate that everything costs and their participation in paying that cost is a contribution to value received. It also becomes a means to help control the demand.

Optional Programming:

Apart from the trips described there may be situations where students are permitted to register in other optional programs (example French Immersion) and that program will not be provided in the home area school. Students may then need to travel to other schools in the school board jurisdiction. Most boards approve the transfer to this program with the understanding that if there is no existing bus route available to service the students then transportation will be the responsibility of the parent.

Some students are able to take advantage of existing bussing and the transfer to the other program in a new school works well. However, some students are not able to use an existing route to get to the newly chosen school and some hardships are caused. I believe that with maximum cooperation and no added runs or costs, school board staff should attempt
to accommodate transfers to this program in the alternate school.

A few boards do provide transportation and in doing so create some difficulties by extending current runs and/or keeping school buses running to the alternate school so that they are not available to assist with other regular runs.

As with all trips, our main emphasis is that the board staff need to ensure that the accommodation for trips is equitably provided. With good policies in place parents and students will not have the opportunity to think that some students are serviced while others are not. This will mean some variations, particularly services in place prior to 1996 need to be reviewed and changes made.

Submissions received through the input process do suggest there could be some variances in the services provided, not only among boards but also within the system. Simply put, establish one procedure and stay with it, to be seen to be fair.

As we approach funding, we will promote that school boards set aside funds for 100% of co-curricular trips and a portion of the cost for extra-curricular trips.

One school board does provide extra bussing for students at lunchtime. This is as a result of an agreement between parents from one area and the school board. The agreement includes the arrangement to be on a user-pay basis. Where this type of situation exists the school board must ensure that the gross expenditures involved are fully paid for by the users of this service.

(Still more to be added)

School Board Data Input:

Throughout the report we have commended school board staff for the volumes of material that they have provided. The distinct difficulty with the information provided is that it was not always consistent and comparable data and it has been necessary on many occasions to ask questions in a different format in order to obtain information that may be somewhat similar. It is evident that school boards need a common route sheet and a common computerizing routing program in order to enable the systems to be reviewed consistently.

With computerized planning, routing and mapping province-wide using a similar program, we would encourage the preparation and collection of information with standardized data. Likely this computerized planning
information would be associated with each school’s collection of student data.

The input from the schools would be shared with transportation. All input would originate with civic numbers, students’ names, student’s grade and school attending. We encourage a dedicated employee for each board to be responsible for this task.

With this process in place there would be no need to be concerned about the quality of data collected. It would be a simple task to determine the number of students who travel to school on a school bus who qualify for that transportation and the number of students who are receiving courtesy bussing or whatever detail is required.

Consistent with this will be the preparation of system maps which will identify the location of schools and their catchment areas. A review of those maps will ensure that students are assigned to attend schools handiest to their homes providing the programs they need.

Selection of School Sites:

School boards do not always use transportation supervisors or coordinators in the planning teams for new school construction and/or consolidations. The correct selection of sites has a direct impact on transportation of students and the related costs.

School site selection in the center of the area to be served and in a location where the density of student population is the highest will automatically permit more students to be walking students, involve less time for bussing and keep the average time on buses decreased.

Similarly sites will be selected that are not close to major highways or hazards which will create difficulties for walking students.

Pick-ups/Drop-offs:

Currently a number of students are picked up from home in the morning and dropped off at an alternate location in the afternoon, example babysitter. The school board’s responsibility is to pick students up from their home and drop them off at the same location in the afternoon. Service beyond that to a second location is courtesy service.

When school board staff prepare bus routes they will be responsible for the student from and to their home daily. This will be the address used in determining maximum size school bus loads. Usually the alternate drop-off spot can only be serviced if it is to an address on the same bus route.
For parents to expect pick-up in the morning from their home by one bus and drop off in the afternoon at another location by a different school bus on a different route is unreasonable. To accommodate that service staff would need to save two seats, one on each bus, for particular students. That does not provide for efficient bus service.

Special Needs Students:

All school boards report that they service the special needs students throughout their system in accordance with the Regulations under the Act and as recommended by special needs staff. For the most part these students can be transported on regular school buses serving regular runs, or on regular buses equipped with wheelchair lifts, etc.

For those who require additional attention some school boards on regular runs will have a monitor available. When special units or private cars are necessary they will also be used for this purpose. Distance from school does not apply to these students.

Considering the discussions with school board staff and receiving no negative input from parents or public regarding this service, we support the services that are in place and suggest that the current dedication to these students continue as is.

Physical Activity Needs of Students:

A number of presentations emphasized the need to balance the school bus service with the physical activity needs of students. In fact, it was pointed out on a number of occasions that to provide bussing for all students will be a disservice. For students to walk reasonable distances to school under safe conditions provides opportunity for exercise which is likely to promote better academic performance.

Walking also helps to enhance positive emotional development. To ensure that this physical activity produces positive results, appropriate facilities for this walking must be considered.

The Child- and Youth-Friendly Land-Use and Transport Plan Guidelines for Nova Scotia indicates that walking is most suitable for teenager journeys of less than 2 kilometers, a twenty-five minute walk. Similarly, for teenage youth, bicycling could well have a higher priority for distances up to five kilometers, a maximum of twenty-five minutes.

Consequently we have made our recommendations about walking distance as we considered each of these elements.
Infrastructure/Other Concerns:

Most school boards and many parent/public presentations emphasized the need for a shorter walking distance (less than 3.6 kilometers) due to the shortcomings of infrastructure, and other factors.

Some school boards were quick to note that whatever the recommendations were they needed to be fair and seen to be fair amongst the schools in this province.

Many of these conditions result in our thinking that the standard distance to be walked from home to school should be decreased from the current 3.6 kilometers to some other suitable standard. School boards have also considered these and various other factors and have deemed the walking distance needs to be less. Criteria and factors considered by the school boards included:

(1) no sidewalks or poor sidewalks
(2) poor sidewalk maintenance, particularly ice and snow

Usually the responsibility for these two areas is that of the Municipal Unit or Department of Transportation in conjunction with the taxpayers of the area. Some of our rural taxpayers have moved from urban areas, areas which include sidewalks, and in some instances to avoid paying high taxes, taxes caused by paying for sidewalks, etc. As a result school boards are looked upon to provide service in lieu.

(3) poor roadway shoulders both narrow and poorly maintained
(4) speeding cars

For those motorists who do not adhere to the school zone or the speed limit in a school zone, police need to be contacted. Currently the school zones, and the speed limit therein cover a short distance. However, it could be wise and practical for parents to request the zones from a school to be extended so that vehicle traffic would be slowed up for longer distances, thus making the area more suitable for walking. To provide a better, safer environment for children and youth, maximum traffic speeds should be much lower than are presently in force in many areas where students walk to school.

(5) lack of crosswalk guards
(6) abduction concerns

As indicated earlier younger children are not expected to walk from home to school alone and older students should be encouraged to walk in groups.
At some schools students who arrive by school bus are permitted in the building on arrival whereas walking students for the same school must remain outside until near time for classes to begin, hardly an equitable practice, and one that creates more demand for school bussing.

School Sites:

Sites for new schools should be chosen with consideration of the home location of its students. It would be ideal for the site chosen to be in the center of high-density student population and back from heavily traveled roadways. This would permit the encouragement for a large number of students to walk. The site needs to be provided with infrastructure adequate to support the student body and an appropriate number of walking students. This would include two driveways, one for school buses and one for other vehicle traffic. There should be a separate school entrance walkway. The community area around the school should also be serviced by appropriate sidewalks which would encourage and permit a larger population of walking students.

Land use and transport planners can help reduce school bus travel by ensuring higher residential densities in areas where schools are located.

Consolidations can be both positive and negative and while attempting to reduce building maintenance and the number of buildings maintained we also need to consider minimizing our costs for school bus service.

Transportation Staff Participation:

School boards are encouraged to include representatives of the transportation system when any discussion involves conveyance of students to and from school.

In addition to the presence of these persons on school site selection committees, they also need to participate in discussions relative to change of school hours and the like. Their presence should be seen as a means of cooperation and interest in economizing the use of the school bus fleet. Dollars saved from the costs of transportation enable the school board
budget to more appropriately cover educational needs.

This is seen in much the same way as providing adequate facilities, in providing good school board maintenance programs and the interest in buying school buses with standard specifications, all to help decrease spiraling costs.

Questionable Service – Unnecessary Travel:

In order to believe students are eligible for school bussing we have some variations used in determining distance traveled to school. A student living .8 kilometer from school is picked up and retained on the bus with other students while the bus proceeds by the school for 6 kilometers, turning, picks up the students and returns to the school to unload. This student is recorded as living 12.8 kilometers from the school. Another example of unnecessary lengthy travel is the student who lives .7 kilometer from school and who gets on the bus as the bus is on its way from the school to load the next group, and before unloading at the school the bus has traveled 5.7 kilometers in total, with no student living more than 3.6 kilometers from the school.

There is a situation where students travel by school bus by a suitable school with a suitable program to reach their school of designation, simply to remain at a school in their zone, in their municipal unit.

Students should always travel the most direct route possible to get to school. There is no advantage to leave students on a bus when not fully loaded to go pick up other students, and in fact, this could be a problem if a breakdown or accident were to occur.

School zones do not need to be the boundaries of a county, municipality, town, city or village. The school zone boundaries should always be the area nearest to a school providing the program needed. A simple boundary line should not prevent students from attending the handiest school unless we have a serious overcrowding in the other school that a student may chose to attend.

These examples also inflate the distances that students live from school, and for these three examples suggest all live more than 3.6 kilometers from school where that is not the facts, we have one at .8 kilometer, one at .7 kilometer (all of that group within 3.6 kilometers), and the last group probably within 1 kilometer of an alternate school rather than the more than 3.6 kilometers they are now bussed to school.

With the use of civic numbers and appropriate programming this type of data will become more evident.
Funding:

Currently school boards are provided with sufficient funding to meet their transportation needs. This is accomplished by simply basing revenue on the expenses of two years ago and adding an inflation factor. This process does not provide encouragement for school boards to be efficient or more economical.

Technically a number of factors could be considered when developing a funding formula. These include

- size of school board area
- total enrolment of system
- number of transported students, excluding courtesy students
- number of loaded kilometers, excluding deadhead kilometers
- school bus maintenance program, number of garages.

In addition we will recognize that every system has a number of special needs students of whom some will require special transportation arrangements to and from school. School boards currently provide this service and knowingly accumulate additional cost for such. There is no reason to question or reduce these costs.

Therefore, the expected services to be funded for would include transportation for

- eligible students to and from school
- special needs students to and from school requiring special transportation
- co-curricular activities
- extra-curricular activities (partial).

These cost areas will automatically be intended to include maintenance costs for the transportation fleet including garages, etc.

Historically funding for school boards by the province included a portion of the total funds to meet the annual costs. The difference not provided by the province would be paid by the individual boards from their other revenues.

In fact, the 3.6 kilometers (2.25 miles) found in the Regulations under the Act probably started as a funding formula as well as the Regulation for which students must be transported to school. In the past the amount of approved loaded distance was a factor in determining funding to boards. For school boards who wished to enhance the service they paid the extra amounts from school board funds.
Substantial differences between provincial funding and school board expenses were evident until 2006-2007. For 2006-2007 and again in 2007-2008 funding was sufficient to meet 100% of the board’s transportation needs.

The unfortunate situation arises when we now consider standardizing school board’s entitlement for all eight boards.

The fact that all boards were funded with sufficient funds to meet their annual costs and operated with different walking policies automatically indicates they were not funded equitably.

In the examination of bus routes, time of each trip, loaded kilometers, area services and load sizes we were able to conclude that the walking distance policy of each school board has a direct impact on the percentage of the total students bussed, and the average number of students per bus.

School boards with shorter walking distance policies bus a large percentage of the total students in each system. School boards with longer walking distance policies bus a smaller percentage. School boards bus fewer urban students than rural students. See Appendix G-7.

School boards with larger geographical areas will service fewer students per bus, and those with smaller areas will service more students per bus.

Any formula for funding will need to consider these variances.

Today’s funding rewards those school boards (the students) with short walking distances and punishes those school boards (students) who have walking distance policies that force students to walk greater distances. Similarly the current school boards cost per student, Appendix G-8, reflects a wide variation of costs to move students to and from school.

Although the CSAP School Board incurs the greatest cost per student for transportation the small enrolment with the largest geographical area to serve automatically forces the cost per student to be very high in comparison to the costs for other school board. This could be decreased if it were possible to split or assign some transportation responsibilities particularly in more remote areas with the other school boards having responsibilities for and jurisdiction over the English (students) transportation in the area. However, in discussion with CSAP representatives, I find that would not be in keeping with the desired policy objectives and mandate of the CSAP School Board and the culture mandate where the operational desire is to provide a French environment for these students and be with other French speaking individuals throughout the “full school day”. In that the Department of Education is
initially and ultimately responsible for all eligible transportation of students this may be an area that the Department of Education would wish to pursue.
SUMMARY

Over the past eight months there has been opportunity to review Nova Scotia School Boards’ eight transportation systems as they provide the movement of over 86,000 students from home to school and return again daily. In addition discussions also included references to the less than 50,000 students who either walk to school or receive drives to schools in private automobiles daily. The major objective of this review was to determine what the “walking distance” from home to school as found in the Regulations under the Education Act should be. It has been apparent from the beginning that school boards in general have decided that the “walking distance” for students should be less than the 3.6 kilometers as found in the Regulations under the Education Act.

Unfortunately, and without assigning blame to anyone, eight school boards decided to examine this topic and came up with eight different conclusions and therefore developed policies based on each individual board’s opinion.

In a province as small as Nova Scotia, and admittedly with some variances in terrain, school board area, population, infrastructure features, etc., it is both practical and reasonable for the 86,000+ students to be provided student transportation with standards that are deemed and seen to be equitable province-wide. This is not the situation today.

Most parents whose students attend schools in school board jurisdictions where the distances to be walked are shorter and seemingly very generous praise those policies. On occasion a few parents from those same areas suggest that all services are not equitable. Very few parents suggested the distances should be shorter and very few parents thought those current policy distances should be lengthened.

On the other hand we heard from a number of parents whose students attend school in school board areas where the current policies call for much larger walking distances. It was not surprising to hear that they would be looking for shorter walking distances. However, it is interesting to note that they thought the walking distance should be decreased but not to distances anywhere near the shorter distances used in some of our school board policies of today.

Coupled with the above opinions were those that encouraged the walking distance (3.6 kilometers) to remain the same or a few even thought it could be increased. These groups often referred to the need for students to walk so as to gain the benefits of physical fitness and help to overcome the predominant overweight problems. We were told that “we are the second most obese (province) in the country, and childhood obesity is growing at an alarming and dangerous rate”, source Child- and Youth-Friendly Land-Use and Transport Planning Guidelines for Nova Scotia.

We also were informed of the more serious environmental problems that could occur at schools when thirty parents with thirty cars would drive their students to school versus the decreased pollution caused by one school bus or the lesser pollution if those students walked or used a bicycle.
Interestingly, when we develop guidelines and recommend a “walking distance” we are also suggesting that those students within that distance do “WALK”. It is not wrong for students to receive that exercise and gain that physical fitness and help to positively develop themselves and presumably discourage them from being so overweight.

Consequently, we were faced with making decisions and subsequently recommendations that would appear to be in the best interest of the “whole” student.

Often parents encouraged short walking distances because they were in the best interest of the parents. When students were bussed it might mean that the responsibility only existed from the house to the bus stop, but when walking that responsibility was in place until the student arrived at school. When bussing was provided the school board accepted the responsibility much sooner. We do sympathize with and fully understand the needs for bussing from some parents, where both parents are away from the home and at work when students go to school and return home. Parents welcome bus journeys for their children because they can leave for work earlier knowing that someone else is responsible for their children. We also know for those that have younger children at home that fulfilling the need in ensuring older youngsters get to school properly can be a challenge and require some assistance, but the school board should not be seen as the only option.

We have indicated earlier that the 3.6 kilometer distance in the Regulations under the Education Act as in place today is longer than we believe it should be but not necessarily for all of the reasons that school boards have decreased their distances in their policies or for all the reasons that parents believe it needs to be decreased.

Often school boards have decreased the distance as a result of public/parent pressure and because the buses in operation over the route, have had a significant number of empty seats. While policies of school boards were rewritten to accommodate lesser walking distances, school board enrolments decreased and the number of buses in operation increased.

Parents have also requested buses because various hazards have been cited as making it unsafe for students to walk to school from various homes.

We have heard the difficulties with lack of infrastructure, particularly no sidewalks. Sidewalks are not the responsibility of a school board. They are the responsibility of another government department and are often obtained as a result of a number of taxpayers requesting it and at the same time making a commitment to help pay for them. So, if sidewalks are needed in order to ensure that students get to school properly and parents don’t wish to pay for them, they find it easier to look for school bus service at the expense of the school board.

Interestingly, we also have bussing where some sidewalks are in place and the distance to school is minimal.
Another very vocal concern was that of speeding in the areas where students walk to school. Usually one would think the solution to this is to call the appropriate police department and request regular patrols each morning, noon and afternoon. With a few tickets and the accompanying fines many drivers do slow down. Of course, to accompany this could be the request for lower speed limits in the area of walking students and the expansion of the “posted” school zone areas. Both are practical solutions to this concern.

Various municipal units provide crosswalk guards to assist students to cross busy streets as they go to school or leave the school grounds (morning, noon and after school). Usually these crosswalk guards are found at intersections or crosswalks closer to the schools. On occasion parents have requested school bussing to fill a void when these crosswalk guards are not in place. They believed the streets to be crossed were not suitable for children to cross on their own because the children were too young to be responsible or they believed vehicular traffic did not adequately recognize the presence of small children. Again, the request for crosswalk guards should go to the Municipal Unit involved rather than the school board be requested to provide bussing.

We have no difficulty in recognizing the need for students to get to school safely, but to do it does not dictate the school board must make all the concessions. There are many hazards to consider, and these are often no different between 8:00 – 9:30 a.m., during lunch breaks, or between 2:00 – 4:00 p.m., Monday to Friday, as they will be on Saturdays or Sundays or evenings or summer holidays when many of the same children do use the same avenue to go places as they would to go to school and return again.

In determining an appropriate distance to be used as a walking distance we looked at pupils in each grade level and how far they are usually able and expected to walk. Generally, an able-bodied adult or teenage child will walk 1.6 kilometers in less than fifteen (15) minutes and younger children, ages 6 to 12 will require more time, usually twenty (20) minutes for the 1.6 kilometers. Of course weather, traffic, weight of book bags, etc. will influence these times. A walking time of up to thirty (30) minutes to school is not unreasonable provided conditions are favorable and equitable. Our recommendations are based on this conclusion, that the distance suggested as practical for walking or bicycling to and from school are within a half hour each way.

To help us consider and more appropriately determine proper walking distance, one member of the committees visited a school during exercise time and actually timed distances for a number of the students, from various grades. Her findings indicate

Where By Roads are involved we have also considered the fact that students will walk from home to a bus stop and then be bussed to school, quite different than going directly to school, so adjusted these distances to reflect that variance. Students living on By Roads, of course, only become eligible for bussing after the initial distance of home to
school qualifies. In that By Roads are often streets in a subdivision the point of entry of that By Road to the regular route should also be deemed to be the bus stop and those others on the regular route be adjusted accordingly. This way the greater volume of students who may gather at the bus stop will remain on the By Road area until after the bus has stopped for pickup.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As per the information provided in this report we wish to make the following recommendations:

1. We recommend that school boards examine the number of spare school buses in an attempt to decrease the number on hand. We provide a formula as a guideline.
2. We recommend that the Department of Education engage a staff person, transportation director, to assist and coordinate school board’s transportation services.
3. We recommend each school board employ a Routing Technician Specialist.
4. We recommend that school boards develop a common computerized routing system.
5. We recommend, where possible, delivery of pupils to school no more than twenty (20) minutes prior to the first bell and for delivery home, students leave the school no more than twenty (20) minutes after the last bell.
6. We recommend, where possible, and particularly for elementary, student not be picked up from the bus stop before 7:00 a.m. and not be dropped off at a bus stop after 5:00 p.m.
7. We recommend, where possible, and particularly elementary, students’ travel time on a school bus be limited to a maximum of one hour.
8. (a) We recommend transportation on a By Road (public roadway) for elementary students who live more than eight-tenths of a kilometer from the regular route and for secondary students who live more than 1.6 kilometers from the regular route and where the bus stop is outside the walking distance from home to school.
   (b) We recommend the By Road service to be provided when a suitable turning spot is available at or prior to the driveway of the last student and that the turning spot be maintained for school board us by the parent or some other means acceptable to the school board.
   (c) We recommend that the By Road services be provided when appropriate time is available with no undue time delays for other students. In the event that time is not available for the school bus to provide the service, the school board will consider other means of service.
9. We recommend that the walking distance for elementary students be 1.6 kilometers and for secondary students, 3.0 kilometers. That is Section 6 of the Regulations, subsection (1)(a) be changed to read “one more elementary students who reside more than 1.6 kilometers from the school to which they are to be transported and one or more secondary students reside more than 3.0 kilometers from the school to which they are to be transported”.
10. We recommend that Section 6, subsection (1)© remain as worded, therefore, elementary students living closer than 1.6 kilometers or secondary students living closer than 3.0 kilometers and where hazardous conditions prevail, school board staff,
where and when requested, review each situation on a one by one basis and where necessary accommodate with school board provided transportation.

11. We recommend that Section 6, subsection (1)© referring to the transportation of special needs students wording remain as is.

12. We recommend that courtesy bussing and courtesy stops be initiated in conjunction with number 10.

13. We recommend that funding for school boards be based on
   (a) transportation of eligible students from home to school and school to home daily
   (b) the transportation of special needs students
   (c) transportation for costs for co-curricular activities
   (d) part of the cost to transport students for extra-curricular activities.

We believe that these recommendations will assist the Department of Education and school boards in providing a more equitable service to students in need to be transported from home to school and school to home on a daily basis.
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APPENDIX A

Nova Scotia Department of Education
Scope Definition
Student Walking Distance Review

Proposed Process:

The study timeline will be greatly dependent on the number and quality of the resource people available, as well as the amount of time they can devote to this study. Obviously, it will also depend on the final approved scope. Currently the Facilities Branch of the Department of Education does not have adequate resources to properly complete this project.

PHASE 1 (Information gathering)

Timeline: 3 Months

1. To ensure correct information and to obtain a buy-in at the end of the process, involve board staff in a study.

2. Set a committee consisting of:
   a) One board transportation supervisor
   b) One board technology representative
   c) One resource transportation person from outside the boards
   d) One bus driver or head bus driver
   e) DOE representation
   f) DOE finance representative

3. Review and document the policies and practices of each board related to walking distance

4. Determine the extent by which additional information gathering will need to be made if the distance is changed (some boards have most information, some have very little)

September 20, 2006
Proposed Process:

The study timeline will be greatly dependent on the number and quality of the resource people available, as well as the amount of time they can devote to this study. Obviously, it will also depend on the final approved scope. Currently the Facilities Branch of the Department of Education does not have adequate resources to properly complete this project.

**PHASE 1 (Information gathering)**

*Timeline: 3 Months*

1. To ensure correct information and to obtain a buy-in at the end of the process, involve board staff in a study.

2. Set a committee consisting of:
   a) One board transportation supervisor
   b) One board technology representative
   c) One resource transportation person from outside the boards
   d) One bus driver or head bus driver
   e) DOE representation
   f) DOE finance representative

3. Review and document the policies and practices of each board related to walking distance

4. Determine the extent by which additional information gathering will need to be made if the distance is changed (some boards have most information, some have very little)
PHASE 2 (Impact and recommendations)

Timeline: 8 Months

1. Determine proposed walking new distance
2. Evaluate impact of this change on each board
3. Public consultation process
4. Determine implementation process and strategy
5. Recommend specific language for policy change
policy of a guarantee company, approved by the Governor in Council pursuant to the Sureties Act, in such amount as is prescribed by the school board, but in no case less than the amount of one hundred thousand dollars. 1995-96, c. 1, s. 61.

Minutes and other records

62 (1) A copy of the minutes of a meeting of a school board certified by the secretary of the school board to be a true copy, or an extract from the minutes similarly certified, is admissible in evidence without proof of the signature or appointment of the secretary and is prima facie proof of the matters stated in the copy or extract.

(2) The books, records, and accounts of a school board, of a committee of a school board, or of the secretary of a school board or committee of the school board, including gross salaries of its employees and members of the school board and its committees, including employment and personal services contracts of employees but not including personnel records, shall be open to the inspection of any person without fee at all reasonable times. 1995-96, c. 1, s. 62; 2002, c. 5, s. 8.

By-laws respecting records

63 (1) Subject to this Act and the Government Records Act, a school board may make by-laws with respect to the preservation, destruction or disposal of records of the school board.

(2) A school board shall not authorize the destruction of

(a) documents, plans and surveying records pertaining to or affecting the title to real property;

(b) records required to be kept by the provisions of any Act;

(c) records less than six years old;

(d) minutes, by-laws or resolutions of the school board;

(e) records relating to school attendance by students;

(f) records relating to student progress; or

(g) records relating to the employment and service of teachers.

(3) No record of a school board shall be destroyed pursuant to a by-law of the school board unless

(a) the secretary of the school board has submitted to the school board the secretary's certificate stating that the secretary has personally examined the records proposed to be destroyed and that, in the secretary's opinion, there is nothing of value therein; and

(b) the school board has approved the destruction of the records referred to in the certificate. 1995-96, c. 1, s. 63.

GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND POWERS OF SCHOOL BOARDS

Duties and powers

64 (1) A school board is accountable to the Minister and responsible for the control and management of the public schools within its jurisdiction in accordance with this Act and the regulations.

(2) A school board shall, in accordance with this Act and the regulations,

(a) make provision for the education and instruction of all students enrolled in its schools and programs;

(b) ensure that its schools adhere to the provincial program of studies;

(c) promote excellence in education;

(d) develop and implement educational programs for students with special needs within regular instructional settings with their peers in age, in accordance with the regulations and the Minister's policies and guidelines;

(e) develop short and long term plans for the provision of barrier-free access to and within educational facilities;

(f) promote its schools as safe, quality learning environments and as community resources;

(g) subject to the regulations, provide and pay for the conveyance of students to and from school;

(h) pay for the boarding of students in accordance with the regulations;

(i) pay the tuition of students educated in public schools operated by other boards or authorities in accordance with the regulations;

(j) provide regional services to assist public schools;

(k) subject to any applicable collective agreement in effect when this Act comes into force, establish and follow a fair-hiring policy;

(l) hire and pay the superintendent, principals, teachers and other staff;
policy of a guarantee company, approved by the Governor in Council pursuant to the Sureties Act, in such amount as is prescribed by the school board, but in no case less than the amount of one hundred thousand dollars. 1995-96, c. 1, s. 61.

Minutes and other records

62 (1) A copy of the minutes of a meeting of a school board certified by the secretary of the school board to be a true copy, or an extract from the minutes similarly certified, is admissible in evidence without proof of the signature or appointment of the secretary and is prima facie proof of the matters stated in the copy or extract.

(2) The books, records and accounts of a school board, of a committee of a school board and of the secretary of a school board or committee of the school board, including gross salaries of its employees and members of the school board and its committees, including employment and personal services contracts of employees but not including personnel records, shall be open to the inspection of any person without fee at all reasonable times. 1995-96, c. 1, s. 62; 2002, c. 5, s. 8.

By-laws respecting records

63 (1) Subject to this Act and the Government Records Act, a school board may make by-laws with respect to the preservation, destruction or disposal of records of the school board.

(2) A school board shall not authorize the destruction of

(a) documents, plans and surveying records pertaining to or affecting the title to real property;

(b) records required to be kept by the provisions of any Act;

(c) records less than six years old;

(d) minutes, by-laws or resolutions of the school board;

(e) records relating to school attendance by students;

(f) records relating to student progress; or

(g) records relating to the employment and service of teachers.

(3) No record of a school board shall be destroyed pursuant to a by-law of the school board unless

(a) the secretary of the school board has submitted to the school board the secretary's certificate stating that the secretary has personally examined the records proposed to be destroyed and that, in the secretary's opinion, there is nothing of value therein; and

(b) the school board has approved the destruction of the records referred to in the certificate. 1995-96, c. 1, s. 63.

GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND POWERS OF SCHOOL BOARDS

Duties and powers

64 (1) A school board is accountable to the Minister and responsible for the control and management of the public schools within its jurisdiction in accordance with this Act and the regulations.

(2) A school board shall, in accordance with this Act and the regulations,

(a) make provision for the education and instruction of all students enrolled in its schools and programs;

(b) ensure that its schools adhere to the provincial program of studies;

(c) promote excellence in education;

(d) develop and implement educational programs for students with special needs within regular instructional settings with their peers in age, in accordance with the regulations and the Minister's policies and guidelines;

(e) develop short and long term plans for the provision of barrier-free access to and within educational facilities;

(f) promote its schools as safe, quality learning environments and as community resources;

(g) subject to the regulations, provide and pay for the conveyance of students to and from school;

(h) pay for the boarding of students in accordance with the regulations;

(i) pay the tuition of students educated in public schools operated by other boards or authorities in accordance with the regulations;

(j) provide regional services to assist public schools;

(k) subject to any applicable collective agreement in effect when this Act comes into force, establish and follow a fair-hiring policy;

(l) hire and pay the superintendent, principals, teachers and other staff;
(4) Where the suspension of a student begins within two months of the end of the school academic year, the period of time for which a school board may extend the suspension under subsection (3) may include a portion of the next academic year.

(5) The school board shall notify the student, the parents of the student, the student's teachers, the principal or person in charge of the school of its decision under subsection (3) within three days of the meeting at which the decision was made.

(6) Where the school board decides under subsection (3) to extend the suspension of the student, the school board shall include in its notice under subsection (5)

(a) the period for which the student is to be further suspended;

(b) the reasons for the decision to further suspend the student; and

(c) the right of the student and of the student's parents to appeal the decision.

(7) When a student or the parent of a student has been notified of the suspension of the student pursuant to (5), the student or the parent may, within seven days of receiving such notice, appeal the suspension to the school board.

(8) The school board shall, upon receipt of a notice of appeal pursuant to subsection (7)

(a) immediately notify the parent of the student and the student of the time and place of the hearing of the appeal and the right of the student or parent, or both, to appear in person with or without counsel;

(b) within ten days of receipt of the notice of appeal, hold a hearing and confirm, revoke or vary the decision of the school board.

(9) Within three clear days of the hearing, the school board shall notify the student, the student's parent, the student's counsel, the student's teachers and the principal or person in charge of the school of its decision, which decision shall be final and binding. 1995-96, c. 1, s. 124.

Manner of exercising certain powers and duties

125 (1) The powers and duties of the school board set out in subsections 123(3) and 124(3) may be performed

(a) if so directed by the school board, by one or more committees consisting of the superintendent and two members of the school board, one of whom shall act as chair of the committee;

(b) if so directed by the school board, by the school advisory council of the school or a committee of the school advisory council;

(c) with the approval of the Minister, by one or more committees of persons designated by office or named by the school board.

(2) The powers and duties of the school board set out in subsection 124(8) may be performed, if so directed by the school board, by one or more committees consisting of the superintendent and two members of the school board, one of whom shall act as chair of the committee. 1995-96, c. 1, s. 125.

Alternative educational arrangements

126 Where a student is suspended for more than five school days, the school board, in consultation with the student's parent, shall make every reasonable effort to provide alternative arrangements for the education of the student, in accordance with the regulations. 1995-96, c. 1, s. 126.

Suspension of school bus rights

127 (1) The principal of a public school, or such other supervisory person as may be designated by the school board, may suspend a student's right to use the school bus if, in that person's judgement, the student has refused to comply with reasonable rules or regulations of the school board or directions given by the bus driver or if, in that person's judgement, the behaviour of the student while on the bus endangers the safety of others using the bus.

(2) A person who suspends a student's right pursuant to subsection (1) to use the school bus shall report this action immediately to the school board and inform the student's parent by the speediest method convenient of that person's action.

(3) Where the student's right to use the school bus has been suspended for a period of more than two days, the student and the student's parent shall be notified in writing of the reason for the suspension and, where the suspension is for a period of more than five school days, of the right of appeal pursuant to subsection (4).
(h) "major endorsement" means an endorsement requiring a minimum of 30 credit hours of study in a discipline in a subject field and 6 credit hours of teaching methodology in that subject field;

(i) "minor endorsement" means an endorsement requiring a minimum of 18 credit hours of study in a discipline in a subject field and 3 credit hours in the teaching methodology of that subject field;

(j) "post-July 31, 2000 certification system" means the teacher's certification system prescribed in this subsection and Sections 30A to 30R;

(k) "pre-August 1, 2000 certification system" means the teacher's certification system prescribed in Sections 14, 15, 24 to 29, 32 and 33;

(l) "subject field" means a field of study representing related disciplines;

(m) "upgrading program" means a degree program, certificate program or integrated program undertaken by a person to obtain a higher class of teacher's certificate.


(3) For the purposes of interpretation of Sections 30A to 30R,

(a) "one full course" equals 6 credit hours of study or 1/5 of one year of study; and

(b) "one year" equals 5 full courses of study or 30 credit hours of study.


Limiting age for public schools

3 (1) A child who has attained the age of five years on or before the first day of October in any year shall be deemed to be a person over five years of age for the purpose of subsection 5(2) of the Act during the ensuing school year, and a child who has not attained the age of five years on or before the first day of October in any year shall not be deemed to be a person over five years of age for the purpose of subsection 5(2) of the ensuing school year or for the purpose of these regulations.

(2) Despite subsection (1), a child who will attain the age of five years by December 31 of the school year in which enrolment is requested and who has previously been legally enrolled in a program equivalent to Nova Scotia grade primary in a public school in another jurisdiction and has received a regular progress assessment from that school, shall be admitted to the appropriate grade as determined by the school board.

Teaching aids and materials

4 Each school board shall provide teaching aids, materials and supplies, and repair and maintain equipment required to conduct the prescribed school program in classrooms, school libraries, laboratories, music rooms, audio-visual rooms, gymnasiums and auditoriums, and other areas in which the program or portions of the program are conducted.

Professional instructional staff

5 (1) Each school board shall, subject to any agreements between a school board and the Nova Scotia Teachers' Union pursuant to the Teachers' Collective Bargaining Act, provide teachers holding authority from the Minister for the courses prescribed in Section 48 of the Ministerial Education Act Regulations, and for such courses and services listed in Section 49 of the Ministerial Education Act Regulations, provided by the board.

(2) A day on which school has been closed by order of the Minister, a school board or its representative, or another proper authority, shall be deemed to be a school day for the purpose of determining the number of consecutive school days taught by a substitute teacher.

(3) A substitute teacher engaged by a school board or a person holding authority from a school board shall be paid one-half of a day's salary, if the teacher comes to the school and the school has been closed owing to weather conditions or other unforeseen cause, without notice to the teacher.

Transportation of students

6 (1) A school board pursuant to clause 64(2)(g) of the Act shall make provision for the transportation of students either by providing the service itself, or making arrangements with some other person for such service, if

(a) one or more students reside more than 3.6 km from the school to which they are to be transported; or

(b) one or more students, because of special needs, require transportation irrespective of the distance; and

(c) the school board determines that transportation of the students is necessary.
STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

Introduction

School boards spent $49,793,000 on transporting students in the fiscal year 2003-04. These expenses represented 5.6% of all school board expenditures in that year.

Student transportation is primarily provided by direct employees of school boards. Transportation is also provided through contracts with private sector transporters. These contracted services amounted to $19,553,000 or 39.2% of spending on transportation. The use of private contracts varies among boards. Halifax contracts for all of its transportation services, 21% of Chignecto-Central services are contracted, and Annapolis and CSAP are in between. In the other boards, private sector conveyance was limited to more specific instances requiring special arrangements that were more effectively provided by private sources.

Student transportation expenses for 2003-04 were distributed among the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Type</th>
<th>2003-04 Expense</th>
<th>% of Total Transportation Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>$21,504,000</td>
<td>43.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract conveyance</td>
<td>19,553,000</td>
<td>39.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle operating expenses</td>
<td>4,986,000</td>
<td>10.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle repairs and maintenance</td>
<td>2,895,000</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage expenses</td>
<td>319,000</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td>536,000</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$49,793,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If spending on contract conveyance was excluded, salaries and benefits account for 71.1% of all the remaining expenses.
A number of factors impact on transportation costs. The number of students who require transportation varies among school boards. The dispersion of students within the area served by a board and the location of schools relative to the homes of students are factors influencing the number of buses required and distances the buses are required to travel. Geography and road systems are additional factors.

Some of the relevant factors for each board are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Board</th>
<th>Number of Buses (1)</th>
<th>Students requiring transportation</th>
<th>Students transported - % of enrolment</th>
<th>Average distance transported (in kilometres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Breton-Victoria</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11,277</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>9,355</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chignecto-Central</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>17,543</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>22,563</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis Valley</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>15,089</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>14,086</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acadien provincial</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1235</strong></td>
<td><strong>93,972</strong></td>
<td><strong>63%</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes "spare" buses, those not scheduled for regular routes.

The Department of Education approves the number of school buses for each school board, except for routes serviced by contract conveyance. The capital cost of these buses, except buses for routes serviced by contract conveyance, is the responsibility of the Department. The Department's process for the replacement of buses is designed to replace a bus after twelve and one half years of use.
Current Nova Scotia Method

Student transportation operating costs are included in baseline funding and the 1999 method. The 1999 method accounts for about 25% of transportation funding and the remaining 75% is from baseline funding. The approach used for transportation funding in baseline funding was a fixed dollar amount ($36,900) per approved buses on regular runs.

The 1999 method starts with a calculation of the school campus drawing area (square mileage of a board divided by the number of school campuses) as a percentage of the provincial average drawing area. This factor is multiplied by a dollar rate and by the board's enrolment. A capital component was added to the formula at the rate of 13% of the calculated operating funding.

Several years ago, government accounting standards changed requiring that the cost of capital assets be amortized over their estimated useful lives rather than as a one time expense when the asset was acquired. This approach resulted in the capital component on the 1999 model being discontinued. School buses are now purchased by the Department through a combined tender for the entire annual replacement requirement for all school boards.

Some school boards have chosen to purchase transportation services rather than provide the service by way of their direct employees and ownership of buses. Buses purchased by the Department replace only those buses operated directly by boards. There are no buses provided for those routes serviced by contracted transportation service. Some boards, who are heavy users of contract transportation, believe that the capital cost component of their contracts have not been fully recognized in the funding they receive, although some funding adjustments have been made by the Department in an attempt to address this issue.
Discussion of possible approaches

Transportation funding formulas are exceedingly difficult to design effectively. This is evidenced by the variation and complexity in approaches by other provinces, the fact that the method is under review in one jurisdiction, and being tested in another. Further, the methods historically used in Nova Scotia have been subjected to a number of changes.

The examination of methods used in other provinces indicates that in the provinces with active transportation funding formulas, there is significant data retention and verification required. While this approach might imply increased precision, it is not simple (in the case of Alberta, not easily understood) and the predictability of funding is compromised by the complexity of the formulas. Perhaps more important, additional costs and effort would be experienced by boards and the Department alike in the gathering, reporting and reviewing of information.

The introduction highlights an interesting and significant ratio. Excluding contracted conveyance, 71% of student transportation costs are for salaries and benefits. This indicates that the costs of student transportation are largely determined by the number of buses in operation and the salaries of the people assigned to the buses. It also indicates that the number of students transported and the distance travelled are lesser factors. The previous method used in the baseline funding (a dollar amount per approved bus) seems to have recognized these cost characteristics.

The remaining 28.9% of transportation costs also contain items that are more related to the number of buses than distance travelled or students transported. Items such as insurance, licences and garage costs related to the number of buses. The costs that can be considered related to distances travelled would include fuel, tires and repairs and maintenance. These types of costs amounted to $6,469,000 or 21.4% of the non contract conveyance costs of boards.

An extensive variety of methods were tested to determine whether there was a commonality among the factors that could reasonably predict the transportation costs of a board. Using the 2003-04 actual transportation costs as a base, comparisons were made to the following factors:

- per bus costs;
- transported student;
- average kilometre per student travelled;
- kilometres travelled times students transported; and
- costs per drawing area factor.

None of the ratios or factors, or combination of ratios and factors, generated a formula amount that was consistently near the current level of costs of each board.
Nova Scotia Regional School Boards Formula Funding Framework

Considering that the variety of approaches did not produce satisfactory results and the apparent experiences of other jurisdictions, a specific predictive formula for transportation costs does not seem possible, based on the data currently available. In the absence of a reliable formula, the least punitive approach is to rely on the actual costs recorded by the boards.

Recommended Approach

Numerous ratios and factors were tested to determine if they would generate a formula that could reliably be used to calculate funding for student transportation. These factors produced inconsistent results. The variances that the formulas produced would have increased funding for some boards but, reduced funding for others. The school boards negatively and positively affected was dependent on the method used.

While the recommended approach is little improvement over the current approach, it prevents indiscriminate impacts on boards because of the method chosen.

Recommendation

Student transportation costs should be funded on the basis of 2003-04 actual costs, increased annually by a factor that reflects salary and operating cost changes.

Suggestions for future consideration

The recommended approach does not satisfy the principle of “responsiveness.” Constructing a responsive formula would put the principle of “equity” in jeopardy due to the wide variation in results for boards depending on the various scenarios modelled.

While this review has been unsuccessful in providing a formula that is based on some measure of activity that influences and could predict transportation funding, future work with school boards could provide an approach that is more appropriately related to a measure that could predict reliable transportation funding.

Suggestion

Consideration should be given to whether there is merit is another attempt, with school boards, to develop a generic transportation funding formula that is related to some measure of activity or volume that could reliably predict an appropriate level of funding for student transportation.
The recommended approach will not adversely impact most school boards, particularly when the declining enrolment environment is considered. However, while the trend has been and is projected to be a decline in students, CSAP has had two years where its enrolment has increased. Should this trend continue, the recommended approach should be modified to account for enrolment increases.

CSAP, because of its provincial rather than regional mandate, often makes arrangements for the transportation of students with other boards. Transportation funding should reflect a transfer of funding among boards to account for these and any other arrangements.

**Suggestion**

The Department of Education should review actual and projected enrolment changes for CSAP and arrangements among boards for the transport of other board's students, and adjust student transportation funding to reflect any changes accordingly.

School boards who used contracted conveyance have submitted that they are negatively affected because they believe funding does not consider the capital component of the cost of contracted conveyance. The Department of Education has provided special funding consideration, both inside the grant formula and directly to private conveyers, to address the issue. Nevertheless, some disagreement remains.

The recommended approach, because actual costs are used as a base, accounts for the capital component of contract conveyance. If future changes are made to the formula for student transportation, it should indicate how capital costs are dealt with for both contract conveyance and transportation provided directly by boards.

One approach might include the amortization costs, currently the responsibility of the Department, in the determination of the rates used in any transportation formula. This method would ensure that the capital component of costs is included in the base rates and formula. After the formula is applied, the final grant amount should be adjusted in those boards where the amortization costs are assumed by the Department.

**Suggestion**

Any future transportation formula should detail how the capital costs of transportation are funded for both contract conveyance and for services provided directly by boards.

Consideration should be given to including the amount of amortization costs paid for by the Department of Education in the calculation of the formula rates but, adjust the final payment to those boards who benefit from the amortization paid by the Department.
Student Transportation - Recommended Approach

\[
\text{Student Transportation} = \text{Student transportation - 2003-04 actual costs per board} \times \text{Annual transportation cost Escalator} = \text{Student Transportation Allotment}
\]

- amount to be determined by Department of Education
## APPENDIX D

### DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect:</td>
<td>influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect:</td>
<td>result, issue, to bring to pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal:</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable:</td>
<td>just, right, fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-road:</td>
<td>public street/road where students live off regular routes and the bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>may go in, turn around, and return to regular route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Roads:</td>
<td>roads which are not maintained by government bodies, particularly found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in subdivisions, trailer parks, etc. where road ownership remains with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the residents or developer (owner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Roads:</td>
<td>roads or streets maintained by government bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular Activities:</td>
<td>those activities as mandated in the program of studies which will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fulfill requirements for a course or grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular Activities:</td>
<td>those activities that enrich program requirements and/or provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities for students to participate in school scheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activities, e.g. sports, school trips, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy Bussing:</td>
<td>the provision of conveyance by School Boards for students who live less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>than 3.6 kilometers from the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy Runs:</td>
<td>those runs that originate to provide conveyance for students all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within 3.6 kilometers from a school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy Stops:</td>
<td>those bus stops that are less than 3.6 kilometers from a student’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>designated school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadhead kilometers:</td>
<td>distance bus travels from overnight parking to first pickup in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>morning and distance bus travels from last drop-off in morning to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid day parking and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distance bus travels from mid day parking to first school for pickup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in afternoon and distance bus travels from last drop-off in afternoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to overnight parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Loaded Kilometers: distance bus travels in morning from first pickup to last drop-off at last school in morning and distance bus travels from first school pickup in afternoon to last student drop-off in afternoon

Designated School Boundary: the geographical area, where students are assigned and expected to attend school, in which appropriate programming is provided

This is the area in which the home of the student and the school is located and usually the closest school providing the appropriate programs.

Distance from School: the actual and shortest distance from a student’s home (where a driveway meets public road) to the School by means of public streets and/or maintained public walkways

Eligibility Address: the actual civic address where students usually and normally reside

Elementary students: students enrolled in a public school in grades Primary through Six

Secondary students: students enrolled in a public school in grades Seven through Twelve

Special Needs Students: those students who exhibit exceptionalities that may require adaptations to facilities, equipment and/or support services. The exceptionalities may be in the areas of cognitive and emotional impairment, behavioral disorders, and learning and physical disabilities

Walking School: any school where most students will not be bussed to school. Students will walk to school, bicycle to school, or be provided by drives or use community transportation such as taxies, transit, etc.
APPENDIX E-1

ANNAPOLIS VALLEY REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD

The Annapolis Valley Regional School Board believes that the Board is responsible for the safe, transportation of students to and from their normal place of residence within the school boundaries established for their school and residence. The provision of transportation is subject to the requirements of Regulations under the Education Act, Paragraph 6 (1) which states that the Board shall make provision for transportation if:

(a) one or more students reside 3.6 km from the school to which they are to be transported; or 
(b) one or more students, because of special needs, require transportation irrespective of the distance; and 
(c) the Board determines that transportation of the student(s) is necessary.

The Annapolis Valley Regional School Board believes that transportation of students who have been granted permission to attend a school outside of the school boundaries established for their residence shall be the responsibility of the parent or guardian.

The Annapolis Valley Regional School Board believes that the establishment of bus stops is subject to the Motor Carrier Act Regulations made under Sub Section 27 (3) of the Motor Carrier Act. Specifically in Paragraph 14 (2) the driver of a school bus shall not stop the bus for the purpose of taking on or discharging passengers at:

(a) more than three places in 1.6 km (1 mile); or 
(b) at a place that has not been designated as a loading or off-loading station by the Board's Transportation Authority.

The Annapolis Valley Regional School Board believes that students are expected to walk a reasonable distance to school or to an established school bus stop. Consequently, the Board believes that:

(a) it is reasonable to expect that all students who reside within one km of the school will walk to school, 
(b) it is reasonable to expect that service will not be provided on a side road unless students reside more than 0.6 km from the main road, the side road must be maintained by the Department of Transportation and there must be an adequate and safe turn around location for the bus as determined by the Board's Transportation Authority; and 
(c) it is reasonable to expect that established school bus stops shall be a minimum of 0.3 km apart (subject to a maximum of three places in 1.6 km).
CAPE BRETON-VICTORIA REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD

1. Bussing will be provided to Grades Pr.-6 students who live 1.0 kilometers from the school or bus stop.

   Bussing will be provided to Grades 7-12 students who live 2.5 kilometers or more from the school or bus stop.

   Bussing will be provided for students living off the main bus route, i.e. off-route or subdivision, if:
   - the branch road is a Nova Scotia Department of Transportation listed road and properly maintained;
   - there is a suitable bus turn-around near the location of the last pick-up;
   - the student is in Grade Pr.-6 and the distance is greater than 1.0 km from the intersection
   - or the student is in Grade 7-12 and is greater than 2.5 km from the intersection.

No bus stop will be closer than 1.0 kilometers from the school for Grades P-6 students or 2.5 kilometers from the school for Grades 7-12 students.

The Board is not obligated to provide transportation for students who transfer to a school other than the one serving their area. Accommodations for approved programs will be considered.

School buses are to be used only for the purpose of transporting students to and from school and for related purposes within the limits of the license issued to the Board.

Related Guidelines

The Regulations under the Education Act require school boards to provide transportation to students:
- who live more than 3.6 kilometers from the school to which they are being transported;
- who require transportation, irrespective of distance because of special needs;
- or if the School Board determines that transportation is necessary.

In addition, the Regulations under the Motor Carrier Act provide that the driver of a school bus shall not stop the bus for the purpose of taking on or discharging passengers at:
- More than three places in 1.6 kilometers (1 mile) or;
- A place that has not been designated as a loading station by a school board or other authority by or on whose behalf the bus is operated.
CHIGNECTO CENTRAL REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD

B) Eligibility for Bussing

1. Conveyance will be provided to all middle and high school students residing more than 3.6 km from the school serving the area in which they reside.

2. Conveyance will be provided to elementary students residing more than 2 km from the school serving the area in which they reside.

3. School buses are to be used only for the purpose of transporting students to and from school and other such uses as outlined in these Administrative Procedures or directed by the Board in writing.

C) Scheduling and Routing

1. The development of bus schedules and routes shall be determined by Student Transportation staff under the direction of the Coordinator of Student Transportation.

2. In the development of schedules and routes, Student Transportation Staff will consult with the Family of Schools Supervisor and individual school Principals.

3. Consideration, during the development of routes and schedules, will be given to efficiently and effectively utilize transportation resources that result in an equitable service to students and schools.

4. Service may be provided off the main bus route, on side roads, in subdivisions, or on by-roads, for elementary students more than 2 km from the school serving the area in which they reside, and 0.8 km from the main route, as determined by the Coordinator of Student Transportation (or designate), subject to C) 3.

5. Service may be provided off the main bus route, on side roads, in subdivisions, or on by-roads, for middle and secondary school students more than 3.6 km from the school serving the area in which they reside, and 1.6 km from the main route, as determined by the Coordinator of Student Transportation (or designate), subject to C) 3.

6. Transportation services will not be provided off route, on side roads, in subdivisions, or on by-roads, unless the road is properly maintained and in a condition for the bus or vehicle to travel safely, and a suitable turning place is available and maintained at no cost to the Board. The determination of these standards is to be made by the Coordinator of Student Transportation (or designate).
4. Distances

4.1 Dans la mesure du possible, pour calculer les distances de la maison à l'école, nous utiliserons les routes publiques les plus courtes entre la demeure de l'élève et l'entrée principale de l'école.

4.2 Tous les élèves vivant à plus de 1,6 km de l'école auront accès au transport.

4.3 Les élèves n'auront pas à marcher plus de 1 km pour se rendre de la maison à leur arrêt d'autobus.

5. Durée des trajets

Le CSAP a pour objectif de limiter à une heure la durée maximale d'un trajet de transport. Les arrêts de courtoisie * (voir 6.6) ne devront en aucun cas augmenter la durée du trajet au-delà d'une heure.

6. Trajets

6.1. Dans la mesure du possible, les trajets d'autobus seront organisés de sorte que les autobus circulent dans le sens où il y a le moins de circulation.

6.2 Les autobus ne circuleront pas sur une route qui ne répond pas aux normes sécuritaires et autres du ministère du Transport de la Nouvelle-Écosse. Dans le cas de routes sans issue, les autobus ne pourront s'y engager que s'il existe un endroit où ils peuvent tourner de bord en toute sécurité.

6.3 L'autobus ne circulera pas sur les routes et les croisants longs de moins d'un kilomètre.

6.4 Il y aura un maximum de 3 arrêts par 1,6 km. Il doit y avoir au moins 0,624 km entre deux arrêts. (Référence: Alinéa 14 (2) (e) - Regulations of the Motor Carrier Act)

6.5 Les élèves devront monter et descendre au même arrêt d'autobus le matin et le soir, selon les modalités établies. Un service de courtoisie* pourra être disponible s'il y a de la place sur l'autobus. Ce service sera établi au début de l'année scolaire selon les modalités établies.

6.6 Dans le cas des élèves vivant à l'intérieur du 1,6 km, un service de courtoisie * pourra être offert selon la disponibilité des places, en donnant priorité aux élèves qui demeurent le plus loin. Ce service sera établi au début de l'année scolaire selon les modalités établies.
4. Distances

4.1 Wherever possible, in calculating distances from the home to the school, we will utilize the shortest public routes between the student’s home and the school’s principle entrance.

4.2 All students living in excess of 1.6 km from the school will have access to transport.

4.3 The students will not have to walk more than 1 km from their bus stop to their home.

5. Trip Length

CSAP objective is to limit the maximum trip length to one hour. Courtesy stops* (see 6.6) should not, in any situation, extend the trip to over one hour.

6. Bus Routes

6.1 Whenever possible bus routes will be organized in such a way that buses travel in the direction of least circulation.

6.2 Buses will not travel on routes that do not comply with safety regulations of the Nova Scotia ministry of Transportation. Buses will not travel on dead-end streets unless an area exists where they can turn around with the outmost safety.

6.3 Buses will not travel on routes and crescents of less than one kilometer.

6.4 There will be a maximum of 3 stops per 1.6 km. There must be at least 0.624 km between two stops. (Reference: paragraph 14 (2) (a) - Regulations of the Motor Vehicle Carrier)

6.5 The students will have to enter and exit at the same bus stop mornings and afternoon, within the established way. A courtesy service* can be available if there is room on the bus.

6.6 In the case of those students who live within the 1.6 km, a courtesy service* can be offered depending on space availability. This service will be established at the start of the school year based on established methods.
1.1 Pupil Transportation Management is a responsibility of the Operations Department.

1.2 The Co-ordinator of Pupil Transportation is responsible for administration of the contracted transportation services and management of transportation policy, regulations and procedures, including school bus scheduling, routing and bus stops.

1.3 The contractors of the pupil transportation service are responsible for the maintenance and safe operation of all company-owned vehicles, allocation of routes to company drivers and compliance by the drivers in conforming to the scheduled routes and time of routes.

2. STUDENT TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

2.1 In accordance with the Education Act and Regulations (June 1997), pupil Transportation will be provided to secondary students who live 3.6 kilometres or more from school.

2.2 Beyond the requirements of the Education Act and Regulations (June 1997) referred to in 2.1, the Board will provide pupil transportation to elementary students who live 2.4 kilometres or more from school.

2.3 School buses are to be used only for the purpose of transporting students to and from school, and other such uses as directed by the Board in writing from time to time.

4. OFF-ROUTE BUSSING

4.1 School buses will not proceed into an off-route road or subdivision for the purpose of picking up or unloading pupils unless such pupils live more than 0.8 kilometres therein, as circumstances permit, and more that 3.6 kilometres from school for secondary or 2.4 kilometres from school for elementary.

4.1.1 The condition of the road must be such that the bus can safely travel, and a suitable turning place must be available and maintained at no cost to the Board. (to be determined by Co-ordinator of Pupil Transportation)
The Board establishes the following walking distance criteria for students:

1. In communities where there are no sidewalks present, the Board will provide transportation to students who live 1.6 kilometres or further from the school that serves their catchment area.

2. In incorporated towns and communities where there are sidewalks provided, the Board will provide transportation to elementary students who live 1.6 kilometres or further from the school that serves their catchment area.

3. In incorporated towns and other communities where there are sidewalks provided, the Board will not provide transportation to junior and senior high students.

4. Courtesy busing may be extended to students who do not meet the walking distance criteria outlined above, provided:
   - there is room on the bus,
   - the addition of new stops does not result in greater than 3 stops per 1.6 kilometre, and
   - the Transportation Manager or designate determines the stop location is safe.

5. The Board recognizes that there are no sidewalks in some areas, shoulders of the road are narrow in other areas, and these conditions may raise concerns about pedestrian safety. Requests for courtesy stops in affected areas will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

6. Requests for bus stops to accommodate students with special cognitive or physical challenges will be assessed on their own merit.

Bus service will be provided on a side road if students reside more than 0.8 km from the main road, the side road is maintained by the Department of Transportation and there is / are adequate and safe turn around location(s) for the bus, as determined by the Transportation Manager.
2.4 Schedules:

Bus drivers shall have a time schedule based on normal travel conditions and shall make every effort to maintain that schedule. Some adjustments for winter travel are expected.

2.5 Eligibility for Bussing:

2.5.1 Pupil Transportation will be provided to Grades 9 to 12 students who live 1.6 kilometers or more from the school serving their area.

2.5.2 Pupil Transportation will be provided to P to eight students who live 0.8 kilometers or more from the school serving their area.

2.7 Spur Route Service:

School buses will not proceed into an off-route road or subdivision for the purpose of pickup or unloading pupils unless such pupils live more than 0.8 kilometers therein. Off-route listed road service will only be considered where the condition of the road is such that the bus can travel safely and with a suitable turning place maintained at no cost to the Board.
1.1 Student transportation will be provided to Grades 8 to 12 students who live 1.6 kilometres or more from the school serving their area.

1.2 Student Transportation will be provided to P to 7 students who live 0.8 kilometres or more from the school serving their area.

3.0 SIDE ROAD SERVICE

School buses will not proceed into any off-road or sub-division for the purpose of pick-up or unloading students unless such student(s) live more than 0.8 kilometres therein. In addition, such side road service is extended to those where the condition of the road is such that the bus can travel safely and is maintained by Department of Transportation with a suitable turning place maintained at no cost to the Board.
NOVA SCOTIA SCHOOL BOARDS WALKING DISTANCES SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Board</th>
<th>TO/FROM SCHOOL</th>
<th>ON BY ROAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-6</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>1 km</td>
<td>1 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBV</td>
<td>1 km</td>
<td>2.5 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>2 km</td>
<td>3.6 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>1.6 km</td>
<td>1.6 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2.4 km</td>
<td>3.6 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>1.6 km</td>
<td>1.6 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>.8 km</td>
<td>1.6 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WALKING DISTANCE TO AND FROM SCHOOL

**Canadian Pupil Transportation Inter-Provincial Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>2.4 km</td>
<td>2.4 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>1.6 km</td>
<td>1.6 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>3.6 km</td>
<td>In review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Prince Edward Island  | 1.0 for Elementary  
                       | 1.6 for Secondary | 1.0 for Elementary  
                       |               | 1.6 for Secondary |
| Quebec                | No standard  | No standard  |
| Ontario               | No standard  | No standard  |
| Manitoba              | 1.6 km       | 1.6 km       |
| Alberta               | 2.4 km       | 2.4 km       |
| Saskatchewan          | School divisions establish their own criteria | School divisions establish their own criteria |
| British Columbia      | No standard  | No standard  |
| Yukon                 | 3.2 km       | 3.2 km       |
TIME ON A SCHOOL BUS

1. **Annapolis Valley RSB Policy 202.4-5**
   Board-provided transportation routes shall be designed to minimize student travel time and normally shall not exceed 60 minutes, however, school boundaries may dictate additional travel time.

2. **Cape Breton-Victoria RSB** - No policy found to date
   Guideline is “attempt to maintain maximum time on a school bus to one hour.”

3. **Chignecto-Central RSB Policy 05-T-02-E1**
   Students will normally be on a bus for one (1) hour or less in their regular travel to and from school.

4. **CSAP Policy 240-5**
   Le CSAP a pour objectif de limiter à une heure la durée maximale d’un trajet de transport. Les arrêts de courtoisie *(voir 6.6) ne devront en aucun cas augmenter la durée du trajet au-delà d’une heure.

5. **Halifax RSB Policy 5.3**
   Every effort will be made to minimise pupil time on a bus. (Where possible,) no pupil shall be picked up any earlier than one hour before school starts or delivered to their home bus stop any later than one hour after school is dismissed.

6. **South Shore RSB** - No policy found to date

7. **Strait RSB Policy 2, Section 2.1**
   Students should ride on a school bus for less than one hour during regular travel to and from school. Exceptions may be required where particular geographic and demographic circumstances dictate.

8. **Tri-County RSB Policy 500.02, Section 2**
   Bus routes, so far as possible, shall be designed to minimize student travel time.
September 10, 2007

**Nova Scotia Department of Education Student Walking Distance Review**

Education Minister Karen Casey has announced a review of the maximum walking distance that students may be subjected to before having a right to be bussed to school under the Education Act and Regulations. Currently the Regulations under the Education Act states that a school board shall make provision for the conveyance of students if they reside more than 3.6 kilometers from the school, or because of special needs require conveyance irrespective of distance. School boards may also determine conveyance of the students is necessary for other reasons.

The eight school boards, in fulfilling their responsibilities, have generated various policies. In some situations students who live less than 3.6 kilometers are receiving school bus service to and from their homes to schools.

Resource Consultant for this review is Chester Sabean. Phase One of the review includes a determination of existing policies and practices now in place for each school board. Phase Two provides for the opportunity to receive public input as well as confirm data collected. This will be followed by determining if a new walking distance should be proposed and any affects a new distance could generate. A final report with recommendations will be made to the Minister of Education.

Parents/public are invited to submit their opinions as to whether or not the walking distance as established in the Regulations under the Education Act (3.6 kilometers) should remain the same or be changed (increased or decreased). Should you wish to contribute to this review by submitting your opinions and giving the reasons, you may do so by mail, email or fax (up to **September 28**) to:

Department of Education
Student Walking Distance Review
Chester Sabean
60 Lorne Street, Suite 3
Truro, NS B2N 3K3
Email: morrislj@gov.ns.ca
Fax: 902-893-6104

For persons or groups (maximum five representatives per group) who desire to follow up their formal written submission by speaking directly with the Review Consultant and other Committee representatives, arrangements will be made for that to be done privately in each school board area. Those sessions will take place in late September to mid-October. Kindly indicate that desire at the time your formal submission is forwarded or by fax or email or call 902-893-5890. You will be advised of the place, date and time of the private meetings when the schedule is finalized.

Thank you,
Chester Sabean
## Information regarding Submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Board</th>
<th>Number of Submissions</th>
<th>Requests to make Presentations</th>
<th># who accepted &amp; showed</th>
<th># of persons attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBV</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>569</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G-I

SCHOOL BOARD STUDENT POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>16463</td>
<td>16259</td>
<td>15936</td>
<td>15420</td>
<td>-516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBV</td>
<td>18468</td>
<td>17882</td>
<td>17068</td>
<td>16727</td>
<td>-341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>24800</td>
<td>24415</td>
<td>23912</td>
<td>23172</td>
<td>-740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>4121</td>
<td>4153</td>
<td>4124</td>
<td>4242</td>
<td>+118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>55577</td>
<td>54389</td>
<td>53283</td>
<td>52655</td>
<td>-628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>8651</td>
<td>8371</td>
<td>8160</td>
<td>7882</td>
<td>-278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>8940</td>
<td>8584</td>
<td>8245</td>
<td>7871</td>
<td>-374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>8370</td>
<td>8251</td>
<td>7933</td>
<td>7649</td>
<td>-284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145,396</td>
<td>142,304</td>
<td>138,661</td>
<td>135,618</td>
<td>-3043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrolments for 2004-2005, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 are as provided by the Department of Education. Enrolments for 2007-2008 are as provided by school boards as of September 30, 2007.

PRIMARY STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBV</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>3675</td>
<td>3478</td>
<td>3439</td>
<td>3316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9303</td>
<td>9056</td>
<td>8661</td>
<td>8392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall enrolments 2004-2007 have decreased by 9,778 students. Primary enrolments for the four-year period declined 911 students.
## APPENDIX G-2

### Students Bussed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>13892</td>
<td>13775</td>
<td>13655</td>
<td>-1043</td>
<td>-234</td>
<td>-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBV</td>
<td>10200</td>
<td>8178</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>-1741</td>
<td>-2200</td>
<td>-178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>18846</td>
<td>16710</td>
<td>16762</td>
<td>-1628</td>
<td>-2120</td>
<td>+52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>2246</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4081</td>
<td>+121</td>
<td>+1835</td>
<td>+81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>21730</td>
<td>21106</td>
<td>22000</td>
<td>-2922</td>
<td>+270</td>
<td>+894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>7653</td>
<td>7390</td>
<td>7390</td>
<td>-769</td>
<td>-263</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>8509</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>7410</td>
<td>-1069</td>
<td>-1099</td>
<td>-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>7765</td>
<td>7020</td>
<td>-721</td>
<td>-180</td>
<td>-745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G-3

Number of Regular Buses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95*</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBV</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>29**</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>223*</td>
<td>241*</td>
<td>243*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>1058**</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>15**</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Spare Buses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>10 + 8*</td>
<td>10 + 8*</td>
<td>10 + 10*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBV</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>29 + 6*</td>
<td>30 + 6*</td>
<td>30 + 6*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>6 +</td>
<td>7 +</td>
<td>7 +</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0 + 26*</td>
<td>0 + 24*</td>
<td>0 + 24*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Private Contractors
** CSAP contract not included
APPENDIX G-4

Bussed Students Who Live Less Than 3.6 Kilometers From School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Board</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number Students</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Bussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1512 - 77%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M*</td>
<td>175 - 9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>265 - 14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBV</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1000 est.</td>
<td>Est. 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1000 - 45%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1210 - 55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>212 - 87.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>29 - 12.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2000 est.</td>
<td>Est. 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1000 est.</td>
<td>Est. 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1000 est.</td>
<td>Est. 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>268 - 70%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>115 - 30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Middle School

NOTE: Most school boards do not have this information readily available, therefore, estimates used. They may be somewhat lower than what the actual numbers will be.
APPENDIX G-5

SCHOOL BOARD AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Board</th>
<th>Square Kilometers</th>
<th>Students per Square Kilometer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>6578</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBV</td>
<td>5240</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>12456</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>N/A - All Nova Scotia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>5250</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>10770</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>6896</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chignecto-Central Regional School Board
Annapolis Valley Regional School Board
Strait District School Board
Cape Breton-Victoria Regional School Board
Halifax Regional School Board
South Shore District School Board
Tri-County District School Board
Conseil scolaire acadien provincial
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## APPENDIX G-6

Number of Bussed Students per Square Kilometer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Board</th>
<th>Number of Bussed Students</th>
<th>Number of Bussed Students per Square Kilometer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>13655 6578</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBV</td>
<td>8000 5240</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>16762 12688</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>4081</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>22000 5520</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>7390 5250</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>7410 10770</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>7020 6896</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX G-7

**Bussed Students Comparisons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Board</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Total Bussed</th>
<th>% Bussed</th>
<th>Number of Buses</th>
<th>Average Students Per Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>15420</td>
<td>13655</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBV</td>
<td>16727</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>23172</td>
<td>16762</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>4242</td>
<td>4081</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>52655</td>
<td>22000</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>7882</td>
<td>7390</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>7871</td>
<td>7410</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>7649</td>
<td>7020</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX G-8**

Cost Per Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Board</th>
<th>Funding* Bussed Students</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>8136000 13655</td>
<td>$595.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBV</td>
<td>6723000 8000</td>
<td>$840.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>10615200 16762</td>
<td>$633.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>4545100 4081</td>
<td>$1113.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>13898800 22000</td>
<td>$631.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>5554000 7390</td>
<td>$751.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>6585900 7410</td>
<td>$888.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>4725400 7020</td>
<td>$673.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funding is 2007-2008
Number of Students Bussed is 2007-2008
Les Écoles
Bureaux du CSP
CSP
Region Nord-Est
Region Centrale
Region Sud-Ouest
Atincal (18)
Sydney
Chéticamp (17)
Pomquet
(16)
Truro
(15)
Greenwood
(10)
Pointe-de-Fidéline
(6)
Saint-Léonard
(7)
Santemarille
(8)
Sambroons (9)
River-axx
Wedgeport
(4)
Tusket (5)
Pembroke
(3)
Béauregard
(11)
Bridgewater
(12 - 13 - 14)
Halifax / Dartmouth
Première en Nouvelle-Écosse
Une éducation en français langue
acadien provincial
Conseil scolaire
accadéne.ca
http://www.csp.ad/edollect/
Glace Bay Elementary
Non Bussing Area

92 Students Currently Bussed are Within Walking Distance of School.
61 Students Currently Bussed are within 1km Walking Distance from School.