



Date: January 13, 2025
To: Board of Trustees
From: Director of Education
Subject: Rosenberg Boundary Review – Final Boundary Review Report

Type of Report:

- Decision-Making
- Monitoring
- Incidental Information concerning day-to-day operations

Type of Information:

- Information for Board of Trustees Decision-Making
- Monitoring Information of Board Policy **IV 010 “Facilities / Accommodations”**
- Information only of day-to-day operational matters delegated to the CEO

Origin: (cite Education Act and/or Board Policy or other legislation)

On October 28, 2024, the Board of Trustees approved initiating the Rosenberg Boundary Review. Staff conducted the review in accordance with APF017 “Boundary Review Process”.

In accordance with APF017, the purpose of the Final Boundary Review Report is to provide:

- summary of information contained in the Initial Boundary Review Report
- summary of comments and questions received during the public consultation phase
- final Staff Committee recommendation(s) and justification for the recommendation(s)
- a timeline for implementation of the recommended boundary change(s)
- critical path resolution of the identified accommodation issue
- Communications Plan

Policy Statement and/or Education Act/other Legislation citation:

Board Policy IV 010 [Facilities/Accommodations](#)

“...the CEO shall not ...

6. Fail to conduct accommodation reviews process (i.e. boundary review and school closures) that is not in compliance with current Ministry of Education guidelines and directives.”

APF017 [Boundary Review Process](#)



Alignment to the MYSP:

Awaken to Belong

- Every student can see themselves reflected in their learning.
- Staff experiences a positive, healthy, and inclusive workplace.
- Families are aware of and/or use the available resources to assist in navigation of the school system.

Ignite to Believe

- Every student experiences the Ontario Catholic School Graduate Expectations (OCSGEs) and the WCDSB pastoral plan within their learning environments.
- Staff are welcomed and invited to continue to be a partner in their adult faith formation journey.
- The relationship between home, parish and school is strengthened.

Strengthen to Become

- Every student reaches their full potential.
- Staff see their impact on student achievement.
- Families are engaged as active partners in our students' Catholic education journey.

Background/Comments:

The attached Final Boundary Review Report provides a fulsome overview of the boundary review process, including public engagement and feedback which informed the Staff Committee's final recommendation.

The Initial Boundary Review Report originally presented two options. However, an additional scenario was evaluated by the Staff Committee, and this Option 3 is now presented as the Staff Committee's recommendation.

Option 3 involves moving Sub-Area E from John Sweeney CES to Rosenberg CES and Sub-Areas L, M, and N from St. Josephine Bakhita CES to Rosenberg CES. There are no students currently living in Sub-Area E.

Option 3 is being recommended by the Staff Committee as it provides a more sustainable boundary solution, minimizes future disruptions, and effectively address enrolment pressures. Further, it is recommended that Grade 7 students attending St. Josephine Bakhita CES who reside in the recommended new Rosenberg elementary school boundary be allowed to remain until they finish Grade 8.

Recommendation:

The Staff Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the following:

1. That the boundaries of John Sweeney Catholic Elementary School (CES) and St. Josephine Bakhita CES be modified, and the boundary of the new Rosenberg CES be established in accordance with Option 3, effective September 1, 2025, namely:
 - a. Move Sub-Area E from John Sweeney to the new Rosenberg elementary school; and
 - b. Move Sub-Areas L, M and N from St. Josephine Bakhita to the new Rosenberg elementary school.

2. That Grade 7 students currently enrolled at St. Josephine Bakhita CES in the 2024/2025 school year, be granted legacy exception permission to finish Grade 8 at their current school. Further, said Grade 7 students will also be allowed to attend the new Rosenberg school in 2025/2026 for Grade 8.
3. That current year Grade 7 students who opt to remain at their current school be provided with transportation if they qualify in accordance with board procedure APO012 – Transportation.
4. That effective September 1, 2025, John Sweeney CES and St. Josephine CES remain capped in accordance with APA003 – Admission of Out of Boundary Students.
5. That new Out of Boundary admissions to St. Josephine Bakhita CES be considered by a special administrative level committee. Admission of Out of Boundary students in unusual and extraordinary circumstances will be considered if:
 - a. A student’s mental, physical, or academic well-being would likely be compromised if they were moved.
 - b. Upon the professional consideration of school and board staff, there is a determination that a student’s unique personal and educational needs are better served at the current school.
 - c. There are unique health and safety considerations pertaining to the student, which are better served at the current school, and which are verified by school and board staff.
6. That a Transition Planning Committee be formed to support all students who will be moving to the new Rosenberg school because of the Rosenberg Boundary Review.

Prepared/Reviewed By:

Tyrone Dowling
Director of Education

Jennifer Passy
Manager of Planning


Virina Elgawly
Planning Officer

Isabelle Lung Ler
Planning Technician

Shesh Maharaj
Executive Superintendent of Corporate Services

*4.2 DIRECTOR Monitoring Reports: Where the Board receives from the CEO a monitoring report that flows from a responsibility delegated to the Director under Board Policy – except where approval is required by the Board on a matter delegated by policy to the Board – the minutes of the Meeting at which the Report is received shall expressly provide that the Board has received and approved of the Report as an action consistent with the authority delegated to the CEO, subject in all instances to what otherwise actually occurred.



A detailed map of Kitchener, Ontario, showing school boundaries and church locations. The map is overlaid with a semi-transparent white box containing the title. The map shows various streets, including major roads like Highway 101 and Highway 64. Several churches are marked with stars and labeled, such as St. John, St. Anne (K), St. Daniel, St. Paul, St. Mark, St. Louis - St. Francis Campus, St. Bernadette, St. Aloysius, Our Lady of Grace, St. Josephine Bakhita, St. Timothy, and St. Brigid (Ayr). Schools are also labeled, including Resurrection Catholic Secondary School, St. Mary's High School, and Blessed Sacrament. Some areas are marked as 'Bused to' a specific church or school. The text 'City of Kitchener' is visible in the lower right quadrant of the map.

Rosenberg Final Boundary Review Report January 13, 2025

City
of Kitchener

Executive Summary

The Rosenberg Boundary Review Final Report provides recommendations for establishing the boundary of the new Rosenberg Catholic Elementary School (CES) and modifying the boundaries of John Sweeney CES and St. Josephine Bakhita CES.

The boundary review process, initiated on October 28, 2024, included public engagement through meetings, electronic communication, a survey, and an open house. Feedback received during the public engagement phase highlighted concerns about projected overcrowding of the new Rosenberg elementary school, walkability, legacy exceptions, as well as the cost and viability of additional bus transportation.

Two options were originally presented in the Initial Boundary Review Report. An additional scenario was evaluated, and this Final Boundary Review Report presents Option 3 as the Staff Committee's recommendation.

Option 3 involves moving Sub-Area E from John Sweeney CES to Rosenberg CES and Sub-Areas L, M, and N from St. Josephine Bakhita CES to Rosenberg CES. There are no students currently living in Sub-Area E.

Option 3 is being recommended by the Staff Committee as it provides a more sustainable boundary solution, minimizes future disruptions, and effectively address enrolment pressures. Further, it is recommended that Grade 7 students attending St. Josephine Bakhita CES who reside in the recommended new Rosenberg elementary school boundary be allowed to remain until they finish Grade 8.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1 Introduction.....	3
2 Background.....	3
2.1 Goals of the Review.....	3
2.2 Board-Wide Boundary Review Goals	3
3 Boundary Review Process	4
3.1 Staff Committee Composition.....	4
3.2 Final Boundary Review Report.....	4
3.3 Public Engagement.....	5
3.3.1 Public Engagement Schedule.....	5
3.3.2 Communication Plan	6
4 Public Input.....	6
4.1 Email.....	6
4.2 Survey.....	7
4.3 Open House.....	10
5 Background.....	10
5.1 John Sweeney CES	10
5.2 St. Josephine Bakhita CES.....	11
5.3 New Rosenberg School.....	11
5.4 Long Term Accommodation Planning.....	11
6 Analysis.....	11
6.1 Status Quo Enrolment Forecast.....	11
6.2 Sub-Areas.....	12
6.2.1 John Sweeney CES.....	12
6.2.2 St. Josephine Bakhita CES.....	13
7 Options	14
7.1 Option 1.....	14
7.2 Option 2.....	16
7.3 New - Option 3.....	17
7.3.1 Option 3 Rationale.....	19
8 Legacy Exceptions.....	19
9 Board-Operated Extended Day Programming	20
10 Conclusion.....	20
11 Recommendations.....	20

1 Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide recommendations to the Board of Trustees to establish a boundary for the new Rosenberg Catholic Elementary School (CES) and modify the boundaries of John Sweeney CES and St. Josephine Bakhita CES.

The Rosenberg Boundary Review was initiated on October 28, 2024. The review included the John Sweeney CES and St. Josephine Bakhita CES school communities. Two boundary review options were initially presented for consideration, including the identification of Option 1 as the Staff's preferred alternative.

Further consideration of the enrolment forecasts together with input from the school communities has informed the Staff Committee's recommendation that Option 3 be approved by the Board of Trustees as further outlined in this report.

2 Background

The Huron Brigadoon Boundary Review was conducted in 2021 to establish the attendance area for St. Josephine Bakhita CES. Subsequently, the board received notice of the award of funding for the new Rosenberg school in January 2022. St. Josephine Bakhita CES opened in September 2023.

At the time of the determination of the St. Josephine Bakhita CES boundary it was not known how long the award of funding to construct the Rosenberg school may take. Accordingly, the boundary decisions were undertaken based on available information yet recognized that there may be changes required in the future.

The Rosenberg Boundary Review was initiated on the basis of attempting to achieve the following local and board-wide goals:

2.1 Goals of the Review

The following goals have been established for the Rosenberg Boundary Review:

- Establish a boundary for the new Rosenberg school in advance of it opening.
- Redraw boundaries for existing schools involved in the review.
- Relieve over capacity pressures in existing schools, where possible.
- Determine attendance area boundaries that best meet board-wide boundary review goals.

2.2 Board-Wide Boundary Review Goals

The Staff Committee will have regard for the following board-wide boundary review goals:

- Providing the highest quality learning environment possible.
 - Consider program environments and how they support student achievement.
- Ensure an efficient use of system resources by balancing enrolment and facilities.
 - Maximize the use of Board-owned facilities over the long term.
 - Minimize the use of non-permanent accommodation (portables) as a long-term strategy while recognizing that it may be a necessary short-term solution.
- Provide a long-term (5 years +) accommodation solution.
- Create boundaries that maximize the number of students that can walk to school.
 - Consider the Board's existing transportation policy and how it may be impacted by or limit accommodation scenarios.

- Provide logical attendance boundaries.
 - Follow logical divides such as major roads, physical barriers, etc.
 - Recognize existing neighbourhoods wherever possible.
- Reduce operating costs (e.g., maintenance, operations, transportation, etc.).
- Develop accommodation options with consideration for Ministry of Education capital funding formulas and the Board’s long term capital plan.

3 Boundary Review Process

The boundary review has been conducted in accordance with [Administrative Procedure APF017 – Boundary Review Process](#), which reads:

“A Boundary Review is conducted when the school board is proposing the relocation (in any school year or over a number of school years) of students or grades, in which the number of students or enrolment of the grades is less than 50% of the school’s enrolment. This calculation is based on the enrolment at the time of the relocation, or the first phase of relocation carried over a number of school years.”

3.1 Staff Committee Composition

The boundary review was led by a committee of school board staff. The Staff Committee for the New Rosenberg Elementary School Boundary Review was comprised of the following members:

- Shesh Maharaj, Executive Superintendent of Corporate Services Treasurer & Chief Financial Officer
- Judy Merkel, Superintendent of Learning
- Kendra Duench, Principal, John Sweeney CES
- David Lynch, Principal, St. Josephine Bakhita CES
- Adrian Frigula, Senior Manager of Facility Services
- Anna Taylor, Manager of Construction Services
- Jennifer Passy, Manager of Planning
- Virina Elgawly, Planning Officer
- Isabelle Lung Ler, Planning Technician
- Keith Prudham, Operations Supervisor, Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR)
- Debby Gravenor, Transportation Planner – Central Area, STSWR
- Other resource staff as needed.

Rosemary Kavanagh was named as the principal for the new Rosenberg elementary school on November 11, 2024. Rosemary was included in the Staff Committee’s communication and final meeting following her appointment.

The Staff Committee held three meetings over the course of the process to review enrolment projections, transportation analysis, capacity limitations, accommodation options, identify a preferred alternative, receive and consider feedback from the school communities and reach consensus on a final recommendation that would address the goals of the review.

3.2 Final Boundary Review Report

This Final Boundary Review Report has been prepared per APF017. The report includes:

- summary of information contained in the Initial Boundary Review Report

- summary of comments and questions received during the public consultation phase
- final Staff Committee recommendation(s) and justification for the recommendation(s)
- a timeline for implementation of the recommended boundary change(s)
- critical path resolution of the identified accommodation issue
- Communications Plan

3.3 Public Engagement

In accordance with APF017, information contained in the Initial Boundary Review Report was presented to each affected school’s Catholic School Advisory Committee (CSAC) and one public open house was held to provide information and seek input on the preferred alternative.

In addition, feedback was received via email and a survey which was open from November 1 – November 29, 2024.

3.3.1 Public Engagement Schedule

The Initial Boundary Review Report was presented at the John Sweeney and St. Josephine Bakhita CSACs and at the drop-in open house.

At each meeting, input was received by members of the Staff Committee and Trustees in attendance. Additional feedback collected via electronic means was reviewed and reflected on by the Staff Committee before reaching consensus on a final recommendation.

Table 1 - Public Engagement Schedule

Date	Purpose
October 29, 2024 – January 27, 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input received via Rosenberg@wcdsb.ca
November 1 – November 29, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online public engagement survey.
St. Josephine Bakhita CSAC Tuesday, November 5, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Staff to present Initial Boundary Review Report to CSAC and receive input.
John Sweeney CSAC Tuesday, November 12, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Staff to present Initial Boundary Review Report to CSAC and receive input.
Public Open House Wednesday, November 27, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Boundary Review Report to be presented, feedback solicited from the school communities, and opportunity to address questions from the public.
Committee of the Whole Meeting Monday, January 13, 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Staff to present Final Staff Report to Board of Trustees. • Opportunity for delegations.
Board of Trustees Meeting Monday, January 27, 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Decision to be made by the Board of Trustees. • No delegations.

3.3.2 Communication Plan

The communication plan included in the Initial Boundary Review Report was implemented including:

- Establishment of a boundary review [webpage](#).
- Creation of a dedicated email address: rosenberg@wcdsb.ca.
- Notice of the initiation of the boundary review, information about the process, and how to participate was provided via the Board level Newswire, school messenger and shared via board-level social media. Information was also published on the board's webpage and school webpages.
- The Minister of Education's office was notified of the commencement of the review.
- Staff Committee and Trustee representatives attended CSAC meetings at affected schools to present the Initial Boundary Review Report and receive input.
- A drop-in public open house was hosted at John Sweeney CES to provide an opportunity for affected school community members to learn more about the review and speak with Staff Committee members and Trustee representatives.
- Boundary review webpage subscribers received update notices during the review.
- Information about the Final Boundary Review Report, Committee of the Whole and Board of Trustee meetings was distributed via Board level Newswire and school messenger. Information was also published on the board's webpage, school webpages, and shared via board-level social media.

3.3.2.1 Post Decision Communication Plan

Following the Board of Trustees decision on the boundary review, Staff will:

- Provide notice of the decision via board level Newswire, school messenger and share via board-level social media. Information will also be published on the board's webpage and school webpages.
- Publish the decision on the boundary review webpage and distribute notice to subscribers.
- Establish a Transition Committee and initiate the transition planning to support students, families and staff.

4 Public Input

4.1 Email

Thirty-one email messages were received from parents and members of the public, the redacted emails are provided in Appendix A.

The following is a summary of the key issues raised in the public comments, organized by school affiliation:

John Sweeney CES

1. Legacy Exceptions:

- Requests for legacy exceptions for Grade 7 students to remain at John Sweeney for Grade 8 to avoid multiple school changes.

2. Child Care:

- Concerns about losing access to the Rising Oaks childcare program, which is crucial for many working parents.

3. **Transportation and Walkability:**

- Safety concerns about students having to cross major roads like Bleams Road.
- Issues with the current bus system's reliability and the potential need for additional buses.
- Preference for options that allow more students to walk to school.

4. **Emotional and Social Impact:**

- Potential negative impact on students' mental health and social stability due to changing schools, especially for neurodivergent children.

5. **Capacity and Utilization:**

- Analysis showing that Option 2 better balances school capacities and reduces the need for portables.

6. **Community and Belonging:**

- Concerns about disrupting students' sense of community and belonging by moving them to a new school.

7. **Future Planning:**

- Suggestions to consider the long-term impact of boundary changes, including the potential for another new school in the area.

St. Josephine Bakhita CES

1. **Legacy Exceptions:**

- Requests for legacy exceptions for students to remain at their current school to avoid multiple relocations.

2. **Child Care:**

- Concerns about the lack of guaranteed childcare at the new Rosenberg school.

3. **Transportation and Walkability:**

- Safety concerns about students having to cross major roads.
- Issues with the current bus system's reliability.

4. **Emotional and Social Impact:**

- Potential negative impact on students' mental health and social stability due to changing schools.

4.2 Survey

A survey of school communities was open from November 1, 2024 to November 29, 2024. Respondents were asked “What are the key factors that the Staff Committee should consider when making recommendations to the Board of Trustees, including those related to legacy exceptions?”

Respondents were affiliated by school community and sub area (Appendix B). Those sub-areas considered for relocation in the various options are highlighted for reference to the mapping included herein:

Table 2 - Summary of Survey Responses by Sub-Area

Sub Area	Sub Area Comment Count
John Sweeney Sub-Area A	10
John Sweeney Sub-Area B	3
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	42
John Sweeney Sub-Area D	7
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area J	2
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area K	3
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area L	10
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area M	2
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area N	1
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area P	1
Not Identified	2
Grand Total	83

Reviewing the survey responses identified the following general themes across all sub-areas:

- **Phased Approach:** Suggestions for a phased approach to transition new enrolments to the new school while allowing current students to remain.
- **Legacy Exceptions:** Strong support for legacy exceptions for current students to minimize disruption.
- **Community and Continuity:** Emphasis on maintaining a sense of community and continuity for children’s social and academic development.
- **Transportation and Safety:** Concerns about the safety of children commuting to school and the current bus driver shortages.

When reviewing the feedback received more discretely by sub-area, slightly different themes emerged, and are summarized below.

John Sweeney Sub-Area A

- **Overcrowding:** Emphasis on the need to reduce overcrowding at John Sweeney by relocating more students to the new school.
- **Walkability:** Concerns about students who currently walk to school being forced to take a bus if moved.
- **Legacy Exceptions:** Requests to allow children in higher grades to remain at John Sweeney until they graduate.

John Sweeney Sub-Area B

- **Busing and Walkability:** Preference for keeping students who walk within the same school boundary and reallocating bus students to the new school.
- **Childcare:** Importance of maintaining access to childcare programs at John Sweeney.

John Sweeney Sub-Area C

- **Safety and Walkability:** Strong opposition to crossing busy roads like Bleams Road. Preference for walking to school.
- **Emotional and Social Impact:** Concerns about the negative impact on children’s mental health and social connections if moved.
- **Legacy Exceptions:** Requests for current students to remain at John Sweeney, especially those in higher grades or with siblings at the school.
- **Capacity and Overcrowding:** Concerns about the new Rosenberg school becoming overcrowded quickly.
- **Childcare:** Dependence on existing childcare programs at John Sweeney.

John Sweeney Sub-Area D (Mannheim Community)

- **Community Integration:** Emphasis on the small number of students and the desire to stay at John Sweeney to avoid further isolation.
- **Future Planning:** Concerns about potential future moves if another new school is built closer to Mannheim.
- **Equity and Access:** Importance of equitable treatment and access to community resources.

St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area J

- **Forced Transfers:** Opposition to forced transfers and the negative impact on students’ well-being.
- **Capacity Issues:** Concerns about new schools quickly becoming over capacity.

St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area K

- **Legacy Exceptions:** Requests to allow children who have already moved once to remain at St. Josephine.
- **Emotional Impact:** Concerns about the emotional toll of another school change.

St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area L

- **Emotional and Social Impact:** Strong opposition to moving children again after recent transitions. Emphasis on the emotional harm of frequent school changes.
- **Safety and Distance:** Concerns about the distance to the new school and safety issues with commuting.
- **Legacy Exceptions:** Requests for legacy exceptions to keep children at St. Josephine.

St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area M

- **Educational Continuity:** Importance of maintaining consistent academic standards and support for students’ emotional and social transitions.
- **Implementation of Transition Plans:** Suggestions for well-defined transition plans to ease the move.

St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area N

- **Proximity:** Preference for attending John Sweeney due to closer proximity and concerns about frequent school changes.

In response to community feedback regarding busing issues, STSWR staff have been actively collaborating with bus operators to ensure timely route operations. Morning runs have been adjusted to address specific concerns. STSWR will continue to closely monitor the routes associated with John Sweeney CES.

4.3 Open House


Thirty-seven attendees signed the register at the drop-in open house held on November 27, 2024, at John Sweeney CES. 36 of the 37 attendees were from the John Sweeney CES school community and the other attendee was from the St. Josephine Bakhita CES school community.

There were seven central staff, three school administrators and four trustees on hand throughout the evening to respond to questions, provide clarification and receive concerns.

5 Background

The existing boundaries for the two schools involved in this review are illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1 - Existing School Boundaries



5.1 John Sweeney CES

John Sweeney operates as a JK-8 elementary school. There is an on-site childcare centre operated by RisingOaks Early Learning (RisingOaks). Before and after school care is delivered by the school board and RisingOaks.

John Sweeney has an On the Ground (OTG) capacity of 611 pupil places. There are 5 portables on-site at John Sweeney in 2024. In September 2024, the school's enrolment was 707 with a utilization rate of 116%. As identified in Table 3, enrolment is forecasted to increase to 801 students by 2030/31.

5.2 St. Josephine Bakhita CES

St. Josephine Bakhita is a JK-8 elementary school. There is an on-site childcare center operated by YMCA of Three Rivers (YMCA). Before and after school care is delivered by the school board and the YMCA.

St. Josephine Bakhita has an OTG of 657 pupil places. There are 8 portables on-site at St. Josephine Bakhita in 2024. In September 2024, the enrolment at St. Josephine Bakhita was 810 resulting in a utilization rate of 123%. Table 3 shows that enrolment at the school is projected to increase to over 1,500 students by 2030/32.

5.3 New Rosenberg School

The new Rosenberg Catholic elementary school has been designed with an OTG of 527 pupil places. Construction of the new school located at 200 Rosenberg Way commenced in September 2024 and is scheduled to open in September 2025. The construction project also includes the new Williamsburg Community Centre in partnership with the City of Kitchener.

5.4 Long Term Accommodation Planning

The board's 2024 Long Term Accommodation Plan (LTAP) outlines future school construction priorities to address expected enrolment growth. Besides building the new Rosenberg school, the LTAP highlights the need for schools in Doon South and West Rosenberg. The board has already identified future sites for these schools. Additionally, the board will collaborate with the City of Kitchener to determine future school site needs through the Dundee Secondary Plan process.

When setting boundaries for John Sweeney, St. Josephine Bakhita, and the new Rosenberg school, these plans have been considered.

Due to significant growth in Southwest Kitchener, students might need to change schools during their elementary years as new schools are built to handle enrolment pressures.

6 Analysis

6.1 Status Quo Enrolment Forecast

Table 3 shows actual and projected enrolment versus capacity for each school under review. On the Ground (OTG) capacity refers to a school's size as determined by loading all instructional spaces within a facility to current Ministry of Education standards (based on class size and room area). OTG does not include temporary capacity such as portables, and portables are not counted in the calculation of utilization.

Review area schools are currently over capacity and enrolment is projected to increase in the short, medium, and long term.

Table 3 - Status Quo Enrolment Projection

Elementary Schools	OTG	2024			2025			2028			2030			2035		
		Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables
John Sweeney	611	707	116	5	712	117	5	769	126	7	801	131	8	923	151	13
St. Josephine Bakhita	657	810	123	8	917	140	11	1326	202	29	1528	233	38	1629	248	42
Total	1268	1517	120	13	1629	128	16	2095	165	36	2329	184	46	2552	201	55

6.2 Sub-Areas

To analyze boundary options and enrolment patterns, each existing review area elementary school boundary was divided into sub-areas. The “Home Area” label refers to the sub-area that houses the subject school site.

The Out of Boundary students attending the subject school are included in the “Home Area” enrolment.


6.2.1 John Sweeney CES

Table 4 and Figure 2 show the John Sweeney sub-areas and associated enrolment projections. Although sub-area E does not currently have students, it is anticipated to have residential development soon.

Table 4 - John Sweeney Sub Area Enrolment

John Sweeney Sub-Areas	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2034
A (JSW) - Home Area + Out of Boundary	388	381	389	389	397	394	436
B (JSW)	123	126	131	136	135	135	160
C (JSW)	175	184	183	185	191	196	232
D (JSW)	21	20	21	19	17	20	25
E (JSW)	0	0	9	16	30	34	45
TOTAL	707	712	732	744	769	779	898

Figure 2 - John Sweeney Sub Area Map




6.2.2 St. Josephine Bakhita CES

Table 5 and Figure 3 show the St. Josephine Bakhita sub-areas and associated enrolment projections. The new Rosenberg school is being constructed in sub-area M.

Table 5 - St. Josephine Bakhita Sub Area Enrolment

St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Areas	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2034
J (JBK) - Home Area + Out of Boundary	264	284	293	304	329	350	339
K (JBK)	295	307	317	322	329	323	372
L (JBK)	124	125	134	146	156	160	204
M (JBK)	39	76	158	233	303	358	524
N (JBK)	20	44	56	59	67	71	33
O (JBK)	3	3	3	4	6	7	15
P (JBK)	65	77	91	108	136	147	182
TOTAL	810	917	1053	1177	1326	1417	1669

Figure 3 - St. Josephine Bakhita Sub Area Map



7 Options

On October 28, 2024, the Initial Boundary Review Report presented two boundary change options. Option 1 was identified as Staff’s preferred alternative. Options 1 and 2 were presented throughout the public engagement phase of the boundary review. In response to the feedback received, a new scenario, Option 3, was evaluated by the Staff Committee.

7.1 Option 1

Option 1 created boundaries which kept students close to future schools, while attempting to balance enrolment between St. Josephine Bakhita and the new Rosenberg school and make the most efficient use of the newly funded school capacity. Option 1 also created a logical / contiguous boundary for both John Sweeney and the new Rosenberg school (Figure 4).

There is significant future development planned in sub-area M. The future West Rosenberg elementary school would eventually relieve projected enrolment pressure at the new Rosenberg school (Table 6).

Option 1 proposed to:

- Move Sub-Areas C, D, and E from John Sweeney to Rosenberg; and
- Move Sub-Areas L, M, and N from St. Josephine Bakhita to Rosenberg.

Figure 4 - Option 1 Map




Table 6 - Option 1 Enrolment Projection

Elementary Schools	OTG	2025			2028			2030			2035		
		Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables
John Sweeney	611	507	83%	-4	531	87%	-3	538	88%	-3	615	101%	1
St. Josephine Bakhita	657	672	102%	1	800	122%	7	873	133%	10	923	140%	12
Rosenberg New School	527	450	85%	-3	763	145%	10	918	174%	17	1015	193%	21
Total	1795	1629	91%	1	2095	117%	17	2329	130%	27	2552	142%	33

*Note: Negatives in the Portables columns represent empty classrooms. Totals only reflect portables (i.e. positive numbers only)

Advantages:

- Creates contiguous boundaries.
- Relieves more enrolment pressure from John Sweeney.
- Relieves enrolment pressure from St. Josephine Bakhita.

Disadvantages:

- Could affect approximately 340 students, but this does not factor in potential legacy exceptions.
- Sub-area L would move for the second time.
- Potential walkers in sub-area C to be redirected from John Sweeney to Rosenberg.

7.2 Option 2

As shown in Figure 5 and Table 7, Option 2 proposed to:

- Move Sub-Areas B, D, and E from John Sweeney to Rosenberg; and
- Move Sub-Areas L, M, and N from St. Josephine Bakhita to Rosenberg.

Figure 5 - Option 2 Map




Table 7 - Option 2 Enrolment Projection

Elementary Schools	OTG (Capacity)	2025			2028			2030			2035		
		Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables
John Sweeney	611	566	93%	-1	587	96%	-1	605	99%	0	686	112%	4
St. Josephine Bakhita	657	672	102%	1	800	122%	7	873	133%	10	923	140%	12
Rosenberg New School	527	392	74%	-6	707	134%	8	851	161%	14	944	179%	18

Elementary Schools	OTG (Capacity)	2025			2028			2030			2035		
		Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables
Total	1795	1629	91%	1	2095	117%	14	2329	130%	24	2552	142%	33

*Note: Negatives in the Portables columns represent empty classrooms. Totals only reflect portables (i.e. positive numbers only)

Advantages:

- Relieves enrolment pressure from John Sweeney.
- Relieves enrolment pressure from St. Josephine Bakhita.

Disadvantages:

- Could affect approximately 290 students, but this does not factor in any potential legacy exceptions.
- Sub-area L would move for the second time.
- Potential walkers in sub-area B to be redirected from John Sweeney to Rosenberg.

7.3 New - Option 3

Feedback received throughout the boundary review expressed concern about the ability of the new Rosenberg elementary school to sustain the forecasted enrolment. Further, input primarily from sub-area C families expressed concern about being relocated to the new Rosenberg elementary school only to be possibly redirected to the future West Rosenberg school. Many of those who commented about the multiple move concern recognized that in the longer term, being relocated to a school closer to their home could be expected or logical in the future. The new option also addresses concerns about the redirection of students who are currently walk eligible to John Sweeney without having to cross any major arterial roadways or require additional reliance on busing. As a result, Staff Committee explored this additional option.

Figure 6 and Table 8 further illustrate Option 3, which proposes to:

- Move Sub-Area E from John Sweeney to Rosenberg; and
- Move Sub-Areas L, M and N from St. Josephine Bakhita to Rosenberg.

Figure 6 - Option 3 Map




Table 8 - Option 3 Enrolment Projection

Elementary Schools	OTG	2025			2028			2030			2035		
		Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Utilization	Portables	Enrolment	Utilization	Portables
John Sweeney	611	712	117%	5	739	121%	6	764	125%	7	879	144%	12
St. Josephine Bakhita	657	672	102%	1	800	122%	7	873	133%	10	923	140%	12
Rosenberg New School	527	245	47%	-12	556	105%	1	692	131%	7	750	142%	10
Total	1795	1629	91%	6	2095	117%	14	2329	130%	24	2552	142%	33

*Note: Negatives in the Portables columns represent empty classrooms. Totals only reflect portables (i.e. positive numbers only)

Overall, Option 3 would result in fewer students being relocated when compared with Options 1 or 2. This will result in a lower enrolment in the opening year of the new school. However, enrolment is projected to increase quickly, and utilization is forecasted to exceed 100% by 2028.

7.3.1 Option 3 Rationale

The Staff Committee received new information after the Initial Boundary Review Report. It indicated that the new Rosenberg elementary school site will only accommodate 12 portable classrooms, with no option to add more. Therefore, the school boundary should be set based on projections to avoid exceeding the school's capacity.

The Committee also noted that determining the boundary of the future West Rosenberg school may require redirecting some students from the current John Sweeney boundary and / or future Rosenberg boundary. If this happens, affected families may be involved in a subsequent review process.

Option 3 meets the local goals of the boundary review by:

- Establishing a boundary for the new Rosenberg school in advance of its opening
- Redrawing the boundaries for existing schools involved in the review
- Reducing over capacity pressures in existing schools, where possible

Further, Option 3 addresses board-wide boundary review goals by:

- Providing the highest quality learning environment possible
- Ensuring an efficient use of system resources by balancing enrolment and utilization of all three schools in the medium and long term
- Minimizing the use of portables at the new Rosenberg elementary school in the near term
- Providing a 5+ year enrolment solution for the new Rosenberg elementary school
- Not redirecting students within walking distance to John Sweeney
- Establishing a boundary for the new Rosenberg elementary school that, to the extent possible, follows major roads
- Not increasing transportation costs to bus students within walking distance of John Sweeney nor establishing legacy exceptions that would result in additional busing costs for a prolonged period
- Ensuring an efficient use of capital resource expenditures by recognizing that the new Rosenberg elementary school will quickly reach capacity

8 Legacy Exceptions

The Staff Committee agreed that Grade 7 legacy exceptions are suitable for Option 3, following the board's standard approach to implementing boundary changes. However, no further exceptions were considered for those students who were moved to St. Josephine Bakhita as a result of the Huron-Brigadoon Boundary Review due to concerns around the ongoing enrolment pressure that would result at St. Josephine Bakhita.

Table 9 shows the adjusted Option 3 enrolment projections, assuming all Grade 7 students in Sub Areas L, M, and N stay at St. Josephine Bakhita. This results in a slight reduction in first-year enrolment at the new Rosenberg elementary school. However, the 2028 projection and future years remain unchanged, as the legacy exception affects only one grade for one year.

It's uncertain whether families will choose to have Grade 7 students stay or move to the new Rosenberg elementary school. The new Rosenberg elementary school will open for JK-8, offering a choice for Grade 8 attendance.

Table 9 - Option 3 Enrolment Projection with Grade 7 Legacy Exception

Elementary Schools	OTG (Capacity)	2025			2028			2030			2035		
		Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Util.%	Portables	Enrolment	Utilization	Portables	Enrolment	Utilization	Portables
John Sweeney	611	712	117%	5	739	121%	6	764	125%	7	879	144%	12
St. Josephine Bakhita	657	688	105%	2	800	122%	7	873	133%	10	923	140%	12
Rosenberg New School	527	229	44%	-13	556	105%	1	692	131%	7	750	142%	10
Total	1795	1629	91%	7	2095	117%	14	2329	130%	24	2552	142%	33

9 Board-Operated Extended Day Programming

The Initial Boundary Review Report and information provided throughout the public engagement phase of the review indicated that the provision of board-operated programming would be dependent on a viability. This is usually assessed in the spring after kindergarten registration.

Due to concerns about program availability and interest from families affected by boundary changes, Early Years staff confirmed that the board will run an Extended Day program at the new Rosenberg elementary school starting in September 2025.

Due to concerns about extended day care access and boundary changes, Early Years staff confirmed that affected students with board-operated extended day care in 2024/25 will be transferred to the new Rosenberg elementary school. Students currently in YMCA care, on waitlists or new registrants will follow the usual application process for 2025/26.

10 Conclusion

The Staff Committee reviewed feedback from families and noted that a future West Rosenberg school could further disrupt the Rosenberg and John Sweeney communities. The Committee decided it is important to establish a more sustainable boundary for the new school yet address immediate enrolment pressure at St. Josephine Bakhita. Therefore, the Staff Committee recommends approval of Option 3.

11 Recommendations

The Staff Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the following:

1. That the boundaries of John Sweeney Catholic Elementary School (CES) and St. Josephine Bakhita CES be modified, and the boundary of the new Rosenberg CES be established in accordance with Option 3, effective September 1, 2025, namely:
 - a. Move Sub-Area E from John Sweeney to the new Rosenberg elementary school; and
 - b. Move Sub-Areas L, M and N from St. Josephine Bakhita to the new Rosenberg elementary school.

2. That Grade 7 students currently enrolled at St. Josephine Bakhita CES in the 2024/2025 school year, be granted legacy exception permission to finish Grade 8 at their current school. Further, said Grade 7 students will also be allowed to attend the new Rosenberg school in 2025/2026 for Grade 8.
3. That current year Grade 7 students who opt to remain at their current school be provided with transportation if they qualify in accordance with board procedure APO012 – Transportation.
4. That effective September 1, 2025, John Sweeney CES and St. Josephine CES remain capped in accordance with APA003 – Admission of Out of Boundary Students.
5. That new Out of Boundary admissions to St. Josephine Bakhita CES be considered by a special administrative level committee. Admission of Out of Boundary students in unusual and extraordinary circumstances will be considered if:
 - a. A student’s mental, physical, or academic well-being would likely be compromised if they were moved.
 - b. Upon the professional consideration of school and board staff, there is a determination that a student’s unique personal and educational needs are better served at the current school.
 - c. There are unique health and safety considerations pertaining to the student, which are better served at the current school, and which are verified by school and board staff.
6. That a Transition Planning Committee be formed to support all students who will be moving to the new Rosenberg school because of the Rosenberg Boundary Review.

Appendix A

Ongoing Public Comments (EXTERNAL)

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
1.	October 29, 2024	Leanne Pinto	John Sweeney	<p>Good afternoon [REDACTED]</p> <p>I have a question in regards to the new Rosenberg school.</p> <p>We are currently in sub area C and my [REDACTED] is attending John Sweeney. Assuming Option 1 for the boundary comes in to play [REDACTED] should technically be going to Rosenberg in September of 2025. [REDACTED] will be going into grade 8 in September of 2025. [REDACTED] has gone to John Sweeney since [REDACTED] entered Junior Kindergarten. Would this be considered a legacy exception for [REDACTED] to stay in John Sweeney?</p> <p>I would really rather [REDACTED] not have to switch schools for one year.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p> <p>Leanne Pinto [REDACTED] Kitchener.</p>	<p>Good Afternoon Leanne,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>At this time, no legacy exceptions have been recommended. However, the Board's past practice has included granting grade 7 students a legacy exception to remain at their current school to finish grade 8. The intention is to avoid having students move schools two years in a row due to a boundary review decision.</p> <p>Have a great day. Virina Elgawly</p>
2.	October 30, 2024	Tammy Ackernecht	John Sweeney	<p>There is no mention of a new child care center at the Rosenberg school.</p> <p>Is there an outside provider for daycare? Example, Rising Oaks is currently working at John Sweeney. No provider was mentioned.</p> <p>Tammy Ackernecht</p>	<p>Good Afternoon Tammy,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>The new Rosenberg CES will not have a child care centre attached to the school. However, there may be WCDSB operated extended day for</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
					<p>school-aged children, subject to viability.</p> <p>Have a great day. Virina Elgawly</p>
3.	October 31, 2024	Janio Garcia	John Sweeney	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>My name is Janio Garcia. I have [REDACTED] children that attend John Sweeney. We live on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which would be changed to a Rosenberg School zone according to your preferred option. I'm strongly against this option.</p> <p>The C zone should stay as part of the John Sweeney district. It is in close proximity to the school and attached to the A zone. That whole area should stay at John Sweeney.</p> <p>My children do not bus, we take them to school every morning so a bus route is not a concern for us. We highly prefer not to take the bus anyway. I have spoken with my children's parents and most if not all of them would avoid a rezoning and I would find it very difficult and unfair to uproot my children from their current school and classmates. My [REDACTED] especially deals with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and has been lucky to have found friends at John Sweeney. Taking [REDACTED] away from that would be challenging and hurtful to [REDACTED]</p> <p>If this restricting goes through, we would need to be get a legacy exemption to continue attending John Sweeney and as a parent I am asking you to strongly consider my request but also what this can and will do to not only my, but many other children.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Janio Garcia.</p>	<p>Good Morning Janio,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. No decision has been made yet and we value your input. Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Although a portion of sub-area C is within John Sweeney's walking distance, staff's intent was to provide enrolment relief to John Sweeney despite its compact boundary.</p> <p>At this time, no legacy exceptions have been recommended but will be considered as part of the final report to the Board of Trustees in January. However, the Board's past practice has included granting grade 7 students a legacy exception to remain at their current school to finish grade 8.</p> <p>Have a great day. Virina Elgawly</p>
4.	November 1, 2024	Tammy Ackernecht	John Sweeney	<p>Virina,</p> <p>Thanks for responding to my email.</p>	<p>Good Morning Tammy,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. No</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>Child care is a necessity. We need a guaranteed spot.</p> <p>Child care is not an after thought. Given how difficult it is to find spaces. Our children have been going to rising oaks since [REDACTED]</p> <p>For the board to not GUARANTEE spaces for families who currently have care at rising oaks is short sighted. There should be an exemption made for students who are attending Rising oaks, if these families cannot be guaranteed child care spaces at the new school.</p>	<p>decision has been made yet and we value your input. Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>At this time, no legacy exceptions have been recommended but will be considered as part of the final report to the Board of Trustees in January. While past practice has not provided legacy exceptions for child care, staff does understand that this is important for many families.</p> <p>The board's ability to offer extended day programming will depend program viability based on interest from existing and future WCDSB families.</p> <p>Have a great day. Virina Elgawly</p>
5.	November 4, 2024	Christopher Hein	[REDACTED]	<p>Dear Members of the Board,</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of concerned parents and community members regarding the proposed changes in school boundaries affecting John Sweeney CES and St. Josephine Bakhita CES as outlined in the October 28, 2024, Initial Boundary Review Report. We respectfully request that the Board reconsider requiring current students to change schools as part of this boundary review. While we recognize the need to establish boundaries for the new Rosenberg Catholic elementary school, we believe that allowing current students to stay in their present schools aligns better with the Board's Multi-Year Strategic Plan (MYSP) and the overarching goals for student development.</p> <p>The MYSP for 2022-2025 emphasizes inclusivity, stability, and a commitment to nurturing each student's sense of belonging and potential. For instance, under the "Awaken to Belong" pillar, the Board seeks to ensure that every student feels included and reflected in their learning environment. Forcing students to relocate, especially those who have already undergone</p>	<p>Good Morning Christopher,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. No decision has been made yet and we value your input. Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Have a great day. Virina Elgawly</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>boundary adjustments in recent years, disrupts this sense of belonging. Maintaining continuity by allowing current students to remain in their familiar environment supports a stable and positive experience, one that fosters their social, emotional, and academic growth.</p> <p>Additionally, the boundary review document states that the primary objectives are to address overcapacity issues and optimize the use of new and existing facilities. However, we urge the Board to adopt a phased approach for this transition, enabling new enrollments to gradually fill spaces at the new Rosenberg school rather than displacing established students. Such an approach aligns with MYSP goals, including "Strengthen to Become," where each child's unique needs and potential are nurtured within a consistent learning environment.</p> <p>Relocating these students can lead to increased transportation costs, added commute times, and reduced student engagement, as they are distanced from their current communities and support networks. This displacement does not align with the boundary review goals to maximize walkability and neighborhood integrity for students, which fosters greater participation and community investment. A transition plan allowing current students to remain until they complete their school years better supports both these goals and the MYSP's "Ignite to Believe" mission to guide every student toward their full potential within a faith-based, stable learning environment.</p> <p>In conclusion, we kindly urge the Board to consider a "grandfathering" approach for existing students at John Sweeney CES and St. Josephine Bakhita CES. This would allow them to remain in their current schools while still creating room for future enrollments in the new Rosenberg facility. This solution not only honors the goals set forth by the Board's strategic plan but also supports the well-being of our children, who benefit greatly from consistency and familiarity in their educational experience.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this request in the spirit of fostering stability, inclusivity, and the well-being of our students and families.</p> <p>Sincerely, Christopher Hein</p> <p>Some additional analysis below regarding the report recommendations,</p> <p>[If students were not be grandfathered in (which I and other concerned parents in our affected neighborhoods strongly urge), Considering the goals that are set-out in the planning document i would contest that option 2 aligns more closely with these goals]</p>	

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>ENSURE EFFICIENT USE OF SYSTEM RESOURCES + PROVIDE A LONG TERM ACCOMMODATION SOLUTION</p> <p>- Option 1 under-utilizes John Sweeney until 2035 while significantly over-utilizing Rosenberg Until the same time period, option 2 provides much more balance for utilization for these 2 schools.</p> <p>-> Option 1 average utilization until 2035 Rosenberg = 149%, Sweeney = 89%</p> <p>-> Option 2 average utilization until 2035 Rosenberg = 137%, Sweeney = 100%</p> <p>Option 2 certainly has better balance and although Rosenberg is more empty space initially in this option, in Option 1 it is immediately significantly overloaded only 3 years later, quite unbalanced and option 1 is not a 5 year solution, more of a 2 year solution Additionally, if John sweeny is only 80% utilized in Option 1, does that mean a significant amount of staff is also affected in this decision? I would suggest maintaining the best near full load for this school (as in option 2) is a much more sustainable solution for students AND staff.</p> <p>CREATE BOUNDARIES THAT MAXIMIZE THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS THAT CAN WALK TO SCHOOL</p> <p>- Neither Area C or B would be able to walk to the new Rosenberg school over the next few years with the significant construction and lack of development in area M in this area (roads and paths don't exist, and would we be walking on beams road under construction?, and i would point out that most students wouldn't be able to walk this distance anyways as it is too far.</p> <p>- Even if we assume all students involved could walk, Moving area C impacts more students than area B (340 vs. 290 students)</p> <p>PROVIDE LOGICAL ATTENDANCE BOUNDARIES</p> <p>- this option it would appear option 1 would make more sense since it is closer geographically to the new school. The report does mention a future school in the west area of section M. i am assuming then at this point group C would then again undergo a boundary review and they would then expect to be moved AGAIN as them attending Rosenberg would then not make a logical attendance boundary?</p>	

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>REDUCE OPERATING COSTS AND CAPITAL COSTS</p> <p>- Option 2 results in 3 LESS new portables until 2035. I am not sure the capital costs involved in new portables but i assume less is better. Also option 2 results in less negative portable numbers in John Sweeny. would this the capital cost of dismantling the current portables at john sweeny or would they just sit empty for 10 years? option 2 utilizes current assets more logically and reduces capital cost of either new portables or moving existing portables.</p> <p>- Option 2 also results in less portables being used overall which would result in less additional heating, cooling, electrical and maintenance costs.</p>	
6.	November 5, 2024	Joe Henhoeffer	John Sweeney	<p>Hello</p> <p>I have provided feedback about the Rosenberg School boundary review in the attached pdf document.</p> <p>Thank you for your review and consideration, Joe Henhoeffer [REDACTED]</p> <p><u>Attachment Content:</u></p> <p>November 4, 2024</p> <p>Hello –</p> <p>I am a parent of [REDACTED] children who attend John Sweeney and live in sub-area “D” (we live in Wilmot Township – just outside the City of Kitchener).</p> <p>I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on the Rosenberg School Boundary Review.</p> <p>I am writing to request that Sub-Area D remain at John Sweeney School. Please see my rationale below.</p> <p>I look forward to discussing this further at the scheduled engagement opportunities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students in Sub Area D do not live in Kitchener. These students live in Wilmot Township – they are a minority that is segregated from their Kitchener peers in many ways <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Students in Wilmot Township (Mannheim) are currently segregated from their Kitchener peers in many ways, they are a small minority; having them switch schools will put them at a significant disadvantage from their peers <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Different sports teams ii. Different libraries and library programs iii. Different community centre programs 	<p>Good Afternoon Joe,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. No decision has been made yet and we value your input. Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jennifer Passy</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>iv. Different recreation programs (skating lessons, swimming lessons etc.)</p> <p>2. The students in Sub Area D represent only about 2% of the school population – these students can be accommodated at John Sweeney</p> <p>a. As evidenced by the student enrollment projections in Sub Area “D” (total enrollment ranges from 17 to 25 students over the next seven years - there is not going to be development in Sub Area D - meaning that the number of students is minimal today - and will remain minimal</p> <p>b. This is also supported by the Region of Waterloo’s countryside line</p> <p>3. A new Catholic school “West Rosenberg” is planned</p> <p>a. Per the Rosenberg Secondary Plan (city of Kitchener) - the site reserved is closer to Mannheim than the current new school - resulting in noncontiguous boundaries in the future unless students in Sub Area D switch schools again</p> <p>i. https://app2.kitchener.ca/AppDocs/OpenData/AMANDADataSets/517839_Urban%20Design%20Brief%20Updated.pdf</p> <p>4. A new Catholic school will open in Baden (Wilmot)</p> <p>a. A new Catholic elementary school is being built in Wilmot (Baden) - the boundaries for this school remain unknown - though they will impact Wilmot Township (which includes Mannheim)</p> <p>b. Long term accommodation plan: https://www.wcdsb.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/36/2024/06/2024-Long-Term-Accommodation-Plan-2024-05-13-1.pdf</p> <p>5. There is more capacity at John Sweeney - having Sub Area D stay at John Sweeney will help manage capacity between schools</p> <p>a. The board’s projection shows that by 2030 (under preferred option 1):</p> <p>i. John Sweeny: 88% utilization and no portables</p> <p>ii. Rosenberg School: 174% utilization and seventeen portables</p> <p>Thank you, Joe Henhoeffter</p>	
7.	November 5, 2024	Shannon Gmach		<p>Hello, We received notice of a boundary review survey. Where can we complete the survey? Thanks, Shannon Gmach</p>	<p>Good Afternoon Shannon,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. Here is the survey link, which is also posted on the dedicated Rosenberg Boundary Review Webpage. We encourage you</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
					<p>to provide feedback before the survey closes on November 29th.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p>
8.	November 7, 2024	Craig & Katie Kibble	John Sweeney	<p>Good Morning!</p> <p>I'm writing to you in response to the recent notice of the boundary review taking place in our area. Our [REDACTED] is in Grade [REDACTED] at John Sweeny. After reviewing the boundary review documents, I'm not sure why Option 1 is preferred.</p> <p>The main priority should be to hit as few children as possible. Option B does that by 20% less students and should be considered the primary plan. Option 1 would also make some children (L) relocate a second time. Our [REDACTED] is in Grade [REDACTED] and our next door neighbors have students in [REDACTED] and Grade [REDACTED] which have already had to relocate. My [REDACTED] has had major [REDACTED] entire life and based on the preferred plan (we are in C), [REDACTED] would have to relocate after just getting into a routine. Having all of [REDACTED] friends (who in Option 1 would stay), would have a massive impact on [REDACTED] mental health. I think there needs to be a lot more consideration to option 2, as the first option hits more kids but is "convenient to circle on a map and draw the boundary for planners." Having this really be the only definitive difference in options while also hitting 20-30% more children, is unacceptable. Having children relocate is a massive deal and there is no point to affect more kids than needed. Option 2 would also allow for more walking traffic to the school, which is a big deal given the congestion in that area in the morning and after school. If Option 1 is what is decided there needs to be a clear legacy definition for kids to petition to stay at the school they are already at, especially given the mental health of some children.</p> <p>There is also massive development in that new area south of Bleams which will require a new school in 5 years. Moving more kids in option 1 will make it so that Rosenberg will have to re-do the accommodation plan again, where if option 2 was taken, it gives more room to house future kids from that area.</p> <p>It really boils down to this:</p> <p>Option 1's only difference in the positive is " Creates contiguous boundaries." aka easier to see on a map....while hitting 20-30% more kids.</p>	<p>Good afternoon Craig & Katie,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. No decision has been made yet and we value your input.</p> <p>Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>Option 2 affects less children, makes it so that children in (L) don't have to move a SECOND time, but is harder to define when drawing the map.</p> <p>I have no idea why Option 1 is the consideration here and hope that more analysis can be done about the real impact, which should be about the number of children that have to have their life impacted.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Craig & Katie Kibble (and many families in the area)</p>	
9.	November 7, 2024	Janio Garcia	John Sweeney	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>Thank you for your reply. While I understand that the priority of the planners is enrolment relief, it should be said that the children and families involved aren't mere numbers, stats or lines on a map. I believe the human, mental and emotional toll a decision like this is costly. Although it seems inevitable that lots of people will suffer because of this I believe it's important to keep the number of those effected to a minimum.</p> <p>According to the current options the preferred option which would move zone C would effect many more kids and families than the option where B is moved. About 20%-30% more children. While also only giving zone L children about 5 more years until it's reevaluated for another move due to the developing area around Bleams. This means having to potentially attend 3 different schools before they graduate grade 8. Not to mention the children who have already been to 2 separate schools before having to move to Rosenberg. With a potential 4th different school on the horizon.</p> <p>As mentioned, the neighbouring areas around Rosenberg are still in development. They are continuing to build there with many more families and children moving in. All of which will end up going there in the near future. While the children who are currently enrolled at John Sweeney and at the very least walking distance should have the privilege of continuing their education at their current school. It also seems to me that zone B is a bit further distance to John Sweeney than C and if they are already bussing to school then having to bus to a different location won't inconvenience their travel much, if at all.</p> <p>I have spoken with many families in zone C and not one wants their children to move schools. We will definitely make our voices heard at the meeting and hope that we will be taken into consideration when making these decisions. Thank you for your time.</p>	<p>Good afternoon Janio,</p> <p>Thank you for the additional comments. These will also be shared with the Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>Regards,</p> <p>Janio Garcia</p>	
10.	November 8, 2024	Michelle Maeck	St. Josephine Bakhita	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Thank you so much for reading my input.</p> <p>I have a few concerns regarding boundaries and those in JBK Section L. The addresses are actually in fact closer to JBK than the new school Rosenberg. For children who don't take the bus and get dropped off and picked up from school and both themselves and their siblings attend the Y day care program (toddlers and afterschool program) its puts a lot of pressure on the parents to have to do drop off and pick up of children at two separate locations.</p> <p>Is there a possibility for a legacy exception to occur in these situations to continue to have a non-bussed child whose younger sibling and themselves attend the Y program?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration!</p> <p>Mich</p>	<p>Good afternoon Michelle,</p> <p>The Staff Committee will continue to review and consider input on legacy exceptions. However, we can advise that previous boundary changes have not accommodated exceptions based on child care arrangements.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p>
11.	November 14, 2024	Lisa Wollziefer	St. Josephine Bakhita	<p>Hello!</p> <p>I'd like to provide some feedback on the proposed boundary review and opening of the new school in Rosenberg, as a parent of children at St. Josephine Bakhita.</p> <p>Change and unpredictability can be stressful, and for some of the 150+ students proposed to move, this will be their 3rd school in 3 years. Students will potentially be separated from very meaningful relationships with friends and staff that they've built over the 2 years. This stress and anxiety may present challenges (including behaviour) in new classrooms and/or at home.</p> <p>If possible, I believe that students who will now fall outside of their current school boundary be given a legacy choice to remain at their current school (with the understanding that no bussing will be available) or transfer to the new school. This happens for grade 7 and 8 students normally, but under these circumstances, I believe that all students' families should be given this choice.</p>	<p>Good afternoon Lisa,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. No decision has been made yet and we value your input.</p> <p>The Staff Committee is carefully reviewing and considering all input on legacy exceptions.</p> <p>Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p>


	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>I don't think that over time this would present too much of a difference for any one school, as we know that with housing constantly being built in this area, all schools will likely be capped (or over) at some point. Hence the proposed school on New Dundee Road, meant to again alleviate pressures on these schools.</p> <p>Additionally, the students who transferred to St. Josephine Bakhita have already endured a year of building construction, without use of a gym, library, field/yard, etc. Moving to Rosenberg would mean yet another year of this.</p> <p>I'm hopeful that these things will be considered.</p> <p>Thanks!</p> <p>Lisa</p>	Sincerely, Jennifer Passy
12.	November 17, 2024	Olivia Valtas	John Sweeney	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I see the public consultation session for the John Sweeney boundary review is Nov 27 from 4-8pm. We are parents of a child at John Sweeney that is possibly being moved and we want to hear the reasoning and have a say. Are we suppose to attend for the full 4 hours or what time is our part of it? We will be needing to arrange childcare for it.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Olivia Valtas</p>	<p>Good afternoon Olivia,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review.</p> <p>The format of the public open house is a drop-in. You may attend any time between 4 and 8pm to review the display boards and speak with school board staff.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p>
13.	November 18, 2024	Renita Dsouza	John Sweeney	<p>Dear Planning Staff</p> <p>I hope this email finds you well. I am writing as a concerned parent regarding the upcoming changes to the school boundaries and their potential impact on students and families.</p> <p>While I understand the need for adjustments to accommodate the growing community, I have a few concerns I would like to address:</p> <p>1. School Facilities and Resources • Will the new school be equipped with the same level of facilities and resources as the current school?</p>	<p>Good afternoon Renita,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. We truly value your input and want to assure you that no decision has been made yet.</p> <p>The new Rosenberg school will offer similar resources and opportunities as</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>For example, will there be comparable support staff, extracurricular programs, and infrastructure to ensure a smooth transition for students?</p> <p>2. Impact on My [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] • My [REDACTED] currently in [REDACTED] has settled well into [REDACTED] current school after we moved [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. The supportive environment and familiarity have been key to [REDACTED] emotional well-being and academic success. A change of school at this critical stage may disrupt [REDACTED] progress, especially as [REDACTED] prepares for [REDACTED]. I worry about the effect this transition may have on [REDACTED].</p> <p>3. Request for Exemptions Could the board consider granting exemptions for students transitioning to Grades 7 and 8, rather than limiting it to just Grade 8?</p> <p>This would allow families to choose continuity for students who have already established themselves in the current school. I kindly request clarification on these points and ask that the board take these concerns into consideration when finalizing the plans for boundary changes.</p> <p>4. Construction Near the New School • With construction happening around the new school, I am concerned about how noise and dust could impact students' ability to focus and maintain a healthy learning environment.</p> <p>Has the board assessed these potential disruptions, and are there plans in place to mitigate these issues, such as noise barriers or air quality measures?</p> <p>I have already attended the meeting on Nov 12th presented by the planning team at John Sweeney Catholic school and will try to attend the Open house on Nov 27th. But would like to put forward this concern in writing .</p> <p>Thank you for your time and understanding. I look forward to your response.</p> <p>Sincerely, Renita Dsouza Concerned Parent</p>	<p>our existing schools. Support staff will be allocated based on enrolment and student needs. While extracurricular activities depend on staff availability and may vary from school to school, the new school will provide a range of opportunities for students.</p> <p>The Staff Committee is carefully reviewing and considering all input on legacy exceptions.</p> <p>Most of the residential construction near the school is complete, but there will be some ongoing work on the school site after it opens. Rest assured, contractors are restricted from performing noisy or invasive work during school hours.</p> <p>Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and the Board of Trustees before any decisions are made.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p>
14.	November 19, 2024	Renita Dsouza	John Sweeney	<p>Dear Jennifer</p> <p>Thank you for your response.</p>	No response required.

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>I appreciate that my concerns along with all the other parents will be considered before making a final decision.</p> <p>Looking forward to hearing from the planning team in January 2025 about the upcoming plan for the school.</p> <p>Have a great week ahead .</p> <p>Thanks & Regards Renita</p>	
15.	November 20, 2024	Vanessa Dwyer	John Sweeney	<p>I am in no way agreeable to Option 1 as it affects more students especially those longstanding students in zone c for John Sweeney. These student are in graduation year. It is unfair and unkind and unethical. Those students should be grandfathered in.</p> <p>Regards from an enraged parent!!!!</p> <p>Vanessa Dwyer</p>	<p>Good morning Vanessa,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. No decision has been made yet and we value your input.</p> <p>The Staff Committee is carefully reviewing and considering all input on legacy exceptions, including allowing current Grade 7 students to remain in their home school for Grade 8.</p> <p>Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p>
16.	November 20, 2024	Rita H	John Sweeney	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I live off of Ottawa st south [REDACTED] - does that mean option 1 keeps us with John Sweeney?</p> <p>How do we vote to keep a school we like?</p>	<p>Good morning Rita,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. No decision has been made yet and we value your input.</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
					<p>The address provided is within Sub-Area C. Option 1 would direct Sub-Area C students to attend the new Rosenberg school, while in Option 2 the area would remain with John Sweeney.</p> <p>You may also share your input via the survey which is linked from the boundary review webpage. The survey is open until November 29th.</p> <p>Further, your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p>
17.	November 20, 2024	Kristen Ruttgaizer	John Sweeney	<p>Hello, I submitted the survey but it was suggested to also send an email with more details.</p> <p>Option 2 needs to be given a more serious evaluation. Option 1 has a disadvantage of more buses being required, which leads to children having to cross a major road (one group Ottawa St and the other group Bleams Rd) and by 2027 student enrollment numbers are significantly higher in Rosenberg, compared to what Option 2 would offer. Please see further explanations below:</p> <p>More buses are required for Option 1 as both sections of JSW-B & JSW-C will require buses for grades 4-8. Where Option 2 only JSW-B would require bus to Rosenberg; where JSW-C all 4-8 grades are within walking distance. We are already seeing a strain on the bus system where there are significant delays, some have been over an hour late in the morning, leading to children missing valuable class time.</p> <p>Option 2 removes a significant amount of students having to cross a major street. In Option 1 both JSW-B and JSW-C will be required to cross a major street: B will need to cross Ottawa St</p>	<p>Good morning Kristen,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. No decision has been made yet and we value your input.</p> <p>The Staff Committee will review your email and suggested alternative.</p> <p>Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>																																																																																																				
				<p>and C will need to cross Bleams Rd. Option 2 will remove this risk. (Though a bus will be needed, it would still be 1 less from Option 1 given the note above.)</p> <p>Finally, the capacity for the schools are going to have a major discrepancy by 2027, but even within 1 year, 2026 in Option 1 Rosenberg will be 106% capacity, where JSW is only 83%. In Option 2 capacity remains below 100% for both schools until 2027. Rosenberg will be over capacity at 116%, though high, it is lower than 125% with option 1. Option 2 keeps JSW below 100% capacity up until at least 2029/30. See chart below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>OPTION 1</th> <th>2024</th> <th>2025</th> <th>2026</th> <th>2027</th> <th>2028</th> <th>2029</th> <th>2034</th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>John Sweeney (A&B)</td> <td>511</td> <td>507</td> <td>520</td> <td>525</td> <td>532</td> <td>529</td> <td>596</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rosenburg (C,D,E,L,M,N)</td> <td>379</td> <td>449</td> <td>561</td> <td>658</td> <td>764</td> <td>839</td> <td>1063</td> <td>Rosenburg Capacity</td> <td>527</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capacity JS</td> <td></td> <td>83%</td> <td>83%</td> <td>83%</td> <td>83%</td> <td>83%</td> <td>83%</td> <td>John Sweeney</td> <td>608</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capacity Ros</td> <td></td> <td>85%</td> <td>106%</td> <td>125%</td> <td>145%</td> <td>159%</td> <td>202%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>OPTION 2</th> <th>2024</th> <th>2025</th> <th>2026</th> <th>2027</th> <th>2028</th> <th>2029</th> <th>2034</th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>John Sweeney (A&C)</td> <td>563</td> <td>565</td> <td>572</td> <td>574</td> <td>588</td> <td>590</td> <td>668</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rosenburg (B,D,E,L,M,N)</td> <td>327</td> <td>391</td> <td>509</td> <td>609</td> <td>708</td> <td>776</td> <td>991</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capacity JS</td> <td></td> <td>93%</td> <td>94%</td> <td>94%</td> <td>97%</td> <td>97%</td> <td>110%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capacity Ros</td> <td></td> <td>74%</td> <td>97%</td> <td>116%</td> <td>134%</td> <td>148%</td> <td>188%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>*Numbers are based on the material provided on the Rosenberg Boundary Review page</i></p> <p>Alternatively, is there an opportunity to look at a 3rd option? One suggestion is relooking at the sub areas that could align better to have more walkers going to each school. Currently Sub Area JSW-A has a significant portion who can walk to JSW or to Rosenberg; where JSW-C there are a portion who are walking distance to JSW, but not Roseburg. There is also a section is JSW-B that will require a bus to JSW for grades 4-8. If instead the subareas are relooked at based on the walking map, a part of JSW-A could go to Rosenberg as walkers (k-3 would still be bused, but they are bused to JSW given being over 0.8km), the bus section in JSW-B going to Rosenberg (as a bus is required to them no matter what) which could open up all of JSW-C to go to JSW and be walkers (4-8). This will reduce 1 bus being required and have more walkers supporting environment requirements. There is still the concern of students having to cross a major road as option 1 has, but it does get more walkers overall.</p> <p>To help explain the above I have attached an example of the map to help show the border. The red border line would be the 2 sections. The section that now has purple lines going through would all go to John Sweeney and all are walking distance from grades 4-8. The section that has green lines going through would lead to the small section that was once JSW-A being walkers to Rosenberg, and the once JSW-B taking the bus to John Sweeney, will now move to Rosenberg, but again they were showing as out of the boundary for walking to John Sweeney so this doesn't create an additional bus being needed.</p>	OPTION 1	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2034			John Sweeney (A&B)	511	507	520	525	532	529	596			Rosenburg (C,D,E,L,M,N)	379	449	561	658	764	839	1063	Rosenburg Capacity	527	Capacity JS		83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	John Sweeney	608	Capacity Ros		85%	106%	125%	145%	159%	202%			OPTION 2	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2034			John Sweeney (A&C)	563	565	572	574	588	590	668			Rosenburg (B,D,E,L,M,N)	327	391	509	609	708	776	991			Capacity JS		93%	94%	94%	97%	97%	110%			Capacity Ros		74%	97%	116%	134%	148%	188%			
OPTION 1	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2034																																																																																																		
John Sweeney (A&B)	511	507	520	525	532	529	596																																																																																																		
Rosenburg (C,D,E,L,M,N)	379	449	561	658	764	839	1063	Rosenburg Capacity	527																																																																																																
Capacity JS		83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	John Sweeney	608																																																																																																
Capacity Ros		85%	106%	125%	145%	159%	202%																																																																																																		
OPTION 2	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2034																																																																																																		
John Sweeney (A&C)	563	565	572	574	588	590	668																																																																																																		
Rosenburg (B,D,E,L,M,N)	327	391	509	609	708	776	991																																																																																																		
Capacity JS		93%	94%	94%	97%	97%	110%																																																																																																		
Capacity Ros		74%	97%	116%	134%	148%	188%																																																																																																		

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Kristen</p> <p>Option 3:</p> 	
18.	November 21, 2024	Kristy Rusbourne	John Sweeney	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Kristy Rusbourne and I have [REDACTED] children, aged [REDACTED] that currently go to John Sweeney. We are in subsection C and in the proposed Option 1, we would be moving to Rosenberg for the September 2025 term. I would like to respectfully present my opposition to this with the following information I hope you will consider.</p> <p>Option 1 of the proposed boundary review does not consider that these students in Subsection C would now have to cross a busy road to get to the new Rosenberg school from our area. Crossing Bleams at the best of times is a nightmare, but with the current and ongoing construction taking place on this road for the next few years at least, this will be exponentially worse. We are unable to drive our children to school and were looking forward to next year as they would be walkers with their group of friends from the neighbourhood to John Sweeney. There is no way the students from our area can safely walk to Rosenberg and would need to take a bus. We currently do not have enough bus drivers to account for absences due to</p>	<p>Good morning Kristy,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review. No decision has been made yet and we value your input.</p> <p>We appreciate your concerns about transportation and the impact of adding an additional run. The expectation is that, based on the information shared, we would not require an additional bus to be added. Rather, an existing bus would do another run with the same driver. This would not add the same</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>sickness and vacation, what will the plan be to staff up the bus company to account for this new school? With the construction mentioned above, the bus will also have to take a longer, out of the way route which we are not comfortable with. With the focus on walkability, moving subsection C to Rosenberg does not make sense.</p> <p>This move to a new school would also be very detrimental to my children's mental health. We moved here from [REDACTED] during Covid, were isolated with only our neighbours to connect with, and they have become my children's best friends. They all go to John Sweeney and have made an amazing friend group and connections there.</p> <p>[REDACTED] and do not do well with change or transitions. They also [REDACTED] and I am concerned that this move away from friends and stability will negatively impact their mental health. They are currently able to go to the neighbourhood park, see their friends from school, and feel a connection to our community. We will not have this moving across Bleams, almost 3km away. We most certainly will not be visiting the new school's park on the weekend or after school. The teachers and staff at John Sweeney know my kids and their needs after them having gone there for the last 5 years. We have finally gotten to a point with my [REDACTED] where [REDACTED] feels comfortable going to school, accepted by [REDACTED] peers and excited to learn. Should [REDACTED] have to start all over somewhere else, [REDACTED] will most certainly [REDACTED] and we will be starting all over again [REDACTED] to assist [REDACTED] with this massive change.</p> <p>I truly hope that Option 2 will be given more consideration. We have done substantial research and found that with respect to capacity, within 1 year, 2026, Rosenberg will be overcapacity by 106% with option 1; where option 2 both schools are still under capacity. Option 2 continues to have John Sweeney under 100% capacity until at least 2029. Rosenberg will continue to rise but not be as high. This alone makes Option 2 a more appropriate option. I have attached a spreadsheet that one of our neighbours have worked on evidencing this.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration and I truly hope that the decision has not already been made. Please consider the alternate options available and as presented by myself and what I hope are other parents also voicing their concerns.</p> <p>Thank you, Kristy Rusbourne</p>	<p>pressure in the system as requiring another bus.</p> <p>Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p>
19.	November 23, 2024	Ben Rusbourne	John Sweeney	Hello,	Good morning Ben,


	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>My name is Ben Rusbourne. I have [REDACTED] children that attend John Sweeney. [REDACTED] have been in the school since Junior Kindergarten. We live in subsection C, and it looks like we will be moving our children to the new school when it is completed.</p> <p>A few of our neighbours and I attended the meeting at John Sweeney a few weeks ago, and listened to the presentation and had a chance to listen to parent feedback and questions, as well as the answers. I am not a parent that will complain without listening to both sides.</p> <p>While there are certainly some tangible benefits of going to a new school, I would like to present several points that came up in the meeting and the discussion, that think shine a light on some alternatives that may not have been considered, and questions that remain unanswered:</p> <p>Buses</p> <p>We love our bus driver. We are on bus [REDACTED] When [REDACTED] is on vacation, the entire week falls apart and buses are not just a little bit late, but they are extremely late. Even when [REDACTED] is not on vacation, we can rarely go a full week without a late bus.</p> <p>Being a bus driver is a thankless job. The schools cannot find enough bus drivers today. My [REDACTED] is going into [REDACTED] and is about to be a walker. We will likely have [REDACTED] walk with friends that are on our street.</p> <p>Question: If we can't find enough bus drivers to manage the kids up to grade 3 who take the bus today, how are we going to find enough bus drivers to bus the kids from our area to this new school from JK to grade 8?</p> <p>The simple answer if you won't. Someone from the trustee group acknowledged themselves that busing is a problem and she has to drive her kids to school because the bus is unreliable more often than not. You will not find enough drivers. It is disruptive for the kids to be late for school and it is already happening frequently, even with a good bus driver.</p> <p>I hope that [REDACTED] who drives route [REDACTED] can be acknowledged for the great job [REDACTED] does. It isn't an easy task, but we all love [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] is a trusted figure to get our children safely to and from school, and as on time as possible.</p> <p>Walkability</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review.</p> <p>Thank you as well for sharing your appreciation for the hard work of bus drivers. We understand your concerns about transportation and the impact of adding an additional run. The expectation is that, based on the information shared, we would not require an additional bus to be added. Rather, an existing bus would make another run with the same driver. This would not add the same pressure to the system as requiring another bus.</p> <p>In the short term, as work is done to improve Bleams Road, it may be necessary to transport students, however, it is hoped that the improvements will provide more opportunity for active transportation. Any Adult School Crossing Guard support would be reviewed with the City of Kitchener prior to the school opening.</p> <p>It is recognized that school moves can be difficult on both parents / guardians and students. The board has a long-standing practice of establishing a transition working group to support students and families through a school move to address individual needs and ease the adjustment.</p> <p>The boundary review process utilizes feedback, like your message, survey</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>If you refer to the walking web, our children in subsection C are able to walk to school. The goal of the schools was always walkability to ensure families and children can easily walk to and from school.</p> <p>Question: How are the children from subsection C going to walk by themselves across Bleams Road safely, when the road itself is only getting busier every month that goes by?</p> <p>The simple answer is, the won't be able to safely walk to school. Does anyone involved in the decision actually live in this area? I would have to bet they don't, because anyone that actually lived in this area would agree that this makes no sense.</p> <p>Walking is good for our health and also to give children a sense of responsibility and independence. You are taking this away from subsection C with Option 1.</p> <p>Community</p> <p>In the meeting at the school, someone doing the presentation said that "they want to have children from the school see each other in the community and at the local parks".</p> <p>We live in subsection C. We can't walk past the local park without seeing classmates of my children, resulting in us stopping for a bit so they can play or just speak with their peers.</p> <p>Question: When are students in subsection C ever going to run into school friends from Rosenberg at the local park when the Rosenberg students live on the other side of Bleams for the most part?</p> <p>The simple answer is they will never see the students from Rosenberg because they live in a different community, in an area that we would never go to on non-school days, before or after school.</p> <p>If we do this school move, my kids will be seeing friends from John Sweeney at the park after school, not Rosenberg.</p> <p>Stability</p> <p>Children thrive on stability. You won't find many people who disagree that students constantly moving schools isn't going to be a detriment to their mental health, friendships and other intangibles of life.</p>	<p>responses and input such as that received at the school council meetings and public open house to collect perspectives from affected school communities. This feedback is reviewed and considered in the Staff Committee's determination of a final recommendation to the Board of Trustees.</p> <p>No decision has been made yet and we value your input. Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>My [redacted] started [redacted] at John Sweeney right at the start of the pandemic. [redacted] did [redacted] remotely from home. [redacted] school journey really started in [redacted] while life was still returning to normal.</p> <p>It is only now, in [redacted], that [redacted] has truly settled into the school and feels like [redacted] belongs there. [redacted] would not be the only one in this situation.</p> <p>Question: How does it provide stability to students who have endured the pandemic, to pick them up and put them in a new school right as they are finally settling in to John Sweeney and feel that they belong there?</p> <p>The simple answer is, this will cause instability, potentially taking the children years to feel at home at this new school. This will lead to poor education results, anxiety, lost friends and a lack of community well being.</p> <p>[redacted] of my children are [redacted] and [redacted] from [redacted] [redacted] is on an [redacted] and the [redacted] [redacted]. They do not deal with change well. I have been in the classes and on field trips, and they are certainly not the only kids in the class or school that are going to suffer from the same issues. The familiarity of school and their friends is what keeps them feeling safe.</p> <p>Data and Overcrowding</p> <p>Please refer to the attached document our neighbour put together that highlights the projected enrollment trends for the local schools.</p> <p>Question: Did anyone on the school board actually look at the numbers to see how sending subsection C to the new school would create a worse overcrowding problem at the new school than leaving them at John Sweeney?</p> <p>The simple answer is, this does not seem to have been considered.</p> <p>Before and After School Care</p> <p>There is no before and after school care set up at the new school yet. It was said the first priority was to build the school, then finish the community center.</p>	

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>Question: What are families in subsection C going to do for before and after school care, when their kids could have just walked home before with their friends and gone to a neighbours house after school?</p> <p>The simple answer is, this has not been considered.</p> <p>What are some alternative solutions?</p> <p>It does not seem to considered that this is a short term solution to a long term problem.</p> <p>Question: Has anyone from the school board polled parents in the areas that could be moved to the new school, like ours, and ask how many would like to go to the new school?</p> <p>My guess is this hasn't happened, but you may find that there would be enough parents that would like their children to go to the new school, that it could solve the overcrowding problem immediately, without impacting the children who would prefer to stay.</p> <p>Question: With an even newer school likely to be built in a few years (West Rosenberg), students in subsection C would likely get moved AGAIN... Could those in walking distance not at least wait until West Rosenberg is built before considering a school change?</p> <p>It does not make sense to move them. Children in subsection C should be staying at John Sweeney due to walkability if nothing else. When West Rosenberg is opened, it will be closer than Rosenberg. You will be moving children in subection C just to move them again potentially. This makes absolutely no sense at all.</p> <p>Question: If option 2 keeps John Sweeney under capacity until 2029, which is likely around when West Rosenberg is built, why would you create a problem just to shuffle kids between schools?</p> <p>The above question highlights that you are creating two problems by doing this move.</p> <p>Question: Has anyone from the school board considered what it would look like if existing students that are in walking distance can stay at John Sweeney, while any newly enrolled students would go to the new school?</p> <p>This would potentially solve the problem of overcrowding, while filling up the new school. It would also ensure students that are already at John Sweeney are not interrupted in their school</p>	

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>journey, while students who have never been there due to being new to the area or just starting JK, can become part of the new school community.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns above, and some of the reasonable questions that have not seemingly been answered or considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2 keeps children that are in walking distance of John Sweeney, able to continue walking with their friends and family • Option 2 keeps children from the community, in their community, with their friends from the community, and building a sense of belonging in their community • Option 2 will not require any additional bus drivers be found, of which this is a major issue today • Option 2 will have less overcrowding at Rosenberg over time • Option 2 keeps existing children in the school they have grown up in, with their friends that they see in the parks and out playing in the streets or in front of their houses • Option 2 means subsection C (and other impacted groups) do not need to get across a busy main road to get to and from school every day, in all weather conditions • Option 2 allows for more flexibility for all the additional families that will be moving to the newer neighbourhoods to go to Rosenberg, to take part in the community building that will go on in their community, which is not our community <p>I could continue to list reasons, however even if nothing else than walkability, subsection C should be staying at John Sweeney, before factoring in all these other very sensible reasons that they should be staying.</p> <p>It feels like the schoolboard has made the decision and is just going through the motions now so they can say they did what they had to do to advise parents and have open communication. I hope that the lip service to "no decision being made yet" is true, because there are so many reasons that subsection C should be staying, that it would be negligent of the schoolboard to move them and would be extremely disappointing for many families.</p> <p>I will be at the next open house meeting to discuss the above. I look forwards to seeing you all there, and would be happy to sit down and discuss the above in person or over the phone. The stability and continued community involvement of my children is very important to me, and I think this would be a short sighted mistake to move subsection C to the new school, in the community that they don't live in.</p>	

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>										
				<p>Thank you,</p> <p>Ben Rusbourne </p>											
20.	November 26, 2024	Dave Reiter	John Sweeney	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am a parent for students that may be affected by the zoning change for the John Sweeney/Rosenberg school. I have done some analysis on the differences between the 2 options outlined in the WCDSB report. The below information shows that Option 2 makes more sense financially and relieves overcrowding pressure to Rosenberg school. I have also included a number of questions at the end that I was hoping could be answered.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Option 1</th> <th>Option 2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> Year 2025 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 102% </td> <td> Year 2025: Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 102% </td> </tr> <tr> <td> Portable difference between Option 2: 0 </td> <td> Portable difference between Option 1: 0 </td> </tr> <tr> <td> Students Impacted: 340 </td> <td> Students Impacted: 290 (15.9% less) </td> </tr> <tr> <td> Year 2028 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 122% Rosenberg New School – 145% </td> <td> Year 2028 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 122% Rosenberg New School – 134% (7.9% less than Option 1) </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Option 1	Option 2	Year 2025 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 102%	Year 2025: Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 102%	Portable difference between Option 2: 0	Portable difference between Option 1: 0	Students Impacted: 340	Students Impacted: 290 (15.9% less)	Year 2028 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 122% Rosenberg New School – 145%	Year 2028 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 122% Rosenberg New School – 134% (7.9% less than Option 1)	<p>Good morning Dave,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Rosenberg Boundary Review.</p> <p>As you had identified the two scenarios are quite similar and the contiguous nature of the Option 1 boundary was preferred by the Staff Committee. The proximity to a future West Rosenberg school made the contiguous boundary logical in the longer term as well.</p> <p>The board has not conducted tests of EMF levels at the Rosenberg site. The school building is located no closer to the hydro corridor than nearby housing in the Wildflowers subdivision or other communities throughout the region.</p> <p>The Staff Committee is carefully reviewing and considering all input on legacy exceptions, including allowing current Grade 7 students to remain in their home school for Grade 8.</p> <p>Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>
Option 1	Option 2														
Year 2025 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 102%	Year 2025: Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 102%														
Portable difference between Option 2: 0	Portable difference between Option 1: 0														
Students Impacted: 340	Students Impacted: 290 (15.9% less)														
Year 2028 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 122% Rosenberg New School – 145%	Year 2028 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 122% Rosenberg New School – 134% (7.9% less than Option 1)														

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>						
				<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Portable difference between Option 2: +3</td> <td>Portable difference between Option 1: -3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 2030 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 133% Rosenberg New School – 174%</td> <td>Year 2030 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 133% Rosenberg New School – 161%(7.8% less than Option 1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Portable difference between Option 2: +3</td> <td>Portable difference between Option 1: -3</td> </tr> </table> <p>Notable Differences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Option 1 would require 3 Extra Portables for 2028, 2029, and 2030, possibly ranging from \$500-\$1000 per portable per month, if leased over a 3 year time period, could cost between \$54,000 and \$108,000. · Year 2028 increases Rosenberg capacity by +7.9% in Option 1. · Year 2030 increases Rosenberg capacity by +7.8% in Option 1. · 50 more students (15.9% more) are impacted in Option 1 initially. · If future development completes the second Rosenerg school (West Rosenberg), for Option 1, some students in sub-area C would be uprooted/relocated twice, due to proximity. · 58 more students (37.4% more) would need to be bused in Option 1 as opposed to Option 2 in 2025. With sub-area C containing 184 students and sub-area B containing 126 students in 2025, an additional bus would be required for Option 1 (calculating 72 students per bus). If the rate is \$2 per student per day for bus services, if the number of school days per year is 194, that could cost an extra \$22,500 for Option 1 for 2025. <p>Inquiry:</p> <p>From the analysis provided by WCDSB, the only clearly visible differentiating advantage outlined in Option 1 is the <i>contiguous boundary creation</i>. There appears to be a substantial</p>	Portable difference between Option 2: +3	Portable difference between Option 1: -3	Year 2030 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 133% Rosenberg New School – 174%	Year 2030 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 133% Rosenberg New School – 161%(7.8% less than Option 1)	Portable difference between Option 2: +3	Portable difference between Option 1: -3	Jennifer Passy
Portable difference between Option 2: +3	Portable difference between Option 1: -3										
Year 2030 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 133% Rosenberg New School – 174%	Year 2030 Schools at over capacity: St. Josephine Bakhita – 133% Rosenberg New School – 161%(7.8% less than Option 1)										
Portable difference between Option 2: +3	Portable difference between Option 1: -3										

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>number of financial downsides to Option 1 and no asymmetrical downsides to Option 2, aside from contiguous boundaries being maintained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · What is the financial impact of contiguous boundaries versus non-contiguous boundaries, if any, and does its prioritization come with financial benefits that offset the financial losses potentially incurred in Option1? · With the hydro corridor running through the Rosenberg school yard, will younger students be eligible for an exception due to increased health risks posed by the EMF levels of the hydro towers? Have the EMF levels been tested and if so, what are they? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reference: https://www.thestar.com/life/health-wellness/city-tests-schools-near-hydro-corridor/article_0e5d7f44-e116-556c-945f-e196e810a639.html <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § “studies have shown the risk of leukemia in children increases if they’re exposed to average levels, year-round, above 3 or 4 mG” · If Option 1 is chosen, can legacy exceptions be made for students in sub-area C that are within walking distance to John Sweeney to help alleviate busing pressures due to the lack of drivers? · Given the data in the report, it is unclear why Option 1 is the preferred choice, as Option 2 appears to have a substantially larger number of upsides. <p>Thank you, Dave Reiter</p>	
21.	November 26, 2024	Rita H	John Sweeney	<p>I am a bit confused on the map it shows we are in red, on ottawa street... does that mean we should stay same school?</p> <p>We did not receive any letters or anything about this...</p>	<p>Good morning Rita,</p> <p>Your street address places your home within Sub-Area C. The preferred alternative presented in the October 28, 2024, report would redirect Sub-Area C students from John Sweeney to the new Rosenberg school. The Option 1 map shows this area becoming part of the purple / Rosenberg boundary.</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
					<p>We've moved away from sending information home in backpacks. Now, you can find all the latest updates on the school board's Newswire, school messenger, board and school webpages, school council agendas, and social media posts.</p> <p>Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jennifer Passy</p>
22.	November 26, 2024	Scott Ruttgaizer	John Sweeney	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I've included the information as I see it when reviewing the document.</p> <p>Option 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased Busing Requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Both JSW-B and JSW-C require buses for grades 4-8. ○ Strain on the existing bus system already causes delays, some exceeding an hour, leading to students missing class time. • Safety Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ JSW-B students must cross Ottawa St. ○ JSW-C students must cross Bleams Rd. • Enrollment and Capacity Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ By 2027, Rosenberg will be at 125% capacity, compared to 83% at JSW. ○ Significant imbalance in student distribution across schools. 	<p>Good morning Scott,</p> <p>Thank you for your additional feedback.</p> <p>Your comments will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jennifer Passy</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>Option 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced Busing Needs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Only JSW-B requires a bus to Rosenberg. ○ JSW-C students (grades 4-8) are within walking distance to JSW. • Improved Safety: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Eliminates the need for students to cross major roads (Ottawa St and Bleams Rd). • Better Capacity Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Both schools remain below capacity until 2027. ○ By 2027, Rosenberg is at 116% capacity (lower than Option 1's 125%). ○ JSW stays below 100% until at least 2029/30. <p>Based on the information provided, Option #2 requires less busing and an improvement on future capacity concerns. This should be the primary option based on this information.</p> <p>Thank You, Scott Ruttgaizer [REDACTED]</p>	
23.	December 2, 2024	Devon Jorge	John Sweeney	<p>Good evening, boundary review committee,</p> <p>I'd like to start by expressing my concerns about moving Sub Area C to the new school through a three-minute story.</p> <p>This story begins with a little girl who is deeply loved by her family and has a great home where she feels safe. She has a mother and father who are very attuned and noticed very early on that their daughter was showing signs of neurodivergence; they wouldn't fully know what it was or the degree until later, but are immediately proactive and connect with her school.</p>	<p>Good morning Devon,</p> <p>Thank you for sharing your experience and comments.</p> <p>I am reaching out to you to formally obtain your informed consent, in writing, to allow us to publicly publish your full submission, without redaction, as we discussed at the open house.</p>


	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>Thanks to her proactive parents She is attending a school where the educators are aware of her needs, she works closely with the teachers and support staff in her community. The educators assist getting her parents in the right direction for a psychological assessment. She begins to develop relationships with peers, teachers, the resource office, and principals. She is usually waving and high-fiving as she happily makes her way into the school. Eventually she has an IEP that is being implemented, and she is set on a trajectory to be successful in her early years of education. That is until she is suddenly informed that she has to move schools—news that devastated and rocked her. For the average child, this news would be upsetting, but for a neurodivergent child who has been struggling in ways most kids are lucky to be unaware of, it takes a child out at the knees in a way you can't possibly anticipate unless you've lived through her struggles. After informing her daughter of the move, her mother sat down with her and held her as she bawled. Literally, hours later being curled up in a ball on her mother, after crying until she couldn't cry anymore and only felt numb, she lifted her head to see that her mother's shirt was soaked with her tears.</p> <p>She moved schools, as it was out of her control, and not long after, she started to struggle to feel a sense of belonging in her new community. She felt profound anxiety and stress daily but kept silent and to herself because nothing could be done. She attempted to make connections and friends, although it was really hard, as the other kids had years of knowing each other and she didn't, the teachers and supportive staff had no idea who she was. She often found herself on the outside of other kids' friendships. While this might sound trivial, it seeped into further anxiety, stress, and difficulty with school performance. What she really needed was for someone to really know her, to help her feel like she belonged, to help her out of her neurodivergent shell. She needed to be seen as being good and being wanted, she needed to feel like she belonged even with her learning and social limitations.</p> <p>At this point, you might be thinking, “Unfortunately, the majority of kids experience a boundary review or move schools at some point in their academic career”—and you could be right. But this little girl, after two years of being in her new school, was informed that she had to move schools again. She had to process and work through the stress and anxiety of moving schools yet again and what that would mean. The good news is that this move would bring her back to her old school with her old friends, right? Wrong. She moved back to her old school only to find that it looked like her old school but everything was completely different and was like she never attended to begin with. Teachers had moved on and/or forgotten her; friends had developed closer bonds at an age where cliques and bullying became more prominent. There was so much that was the same, and yet everything was so different. And if she felt like she didn't belong before, she had no idea that the next three years would be years of extreme stress and rejection—and it further showed in her academics and her emotional well-being.</p>	<p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p> <p><i>*printed in entirety with permission*</i></p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>At this point, I'm sure you have guessed that that little girl is me. I wish I could tell you that things got easier for that little girl, but they definitely did not. The feeling and sense of not belonging are something that I struggle with today and have been doing years of therapy for. The one upside is that that neurodivergent child, who went against the advice of a psychologist to drop out of university, is now a well-regarded and sought-out trauma therapist within this very community. It was an incredibly difficult journey as a neurodivergent person to get here, but I stand here today as the voice of a parent, therapist, and a neurodivergent person who went through the traumatic experience of being moved twice. I wish to speak for every child in Sub Area C who will be subject to moving schools twice and who are struggling with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADHD • ASD • Dysgraphia • Dyslexia • Intellectual Disabilities • OCD • Sensory processing • Social Anxiety • Tourette syndrome • Mental health conditions <p>And the list goes on.</p> <p>I stand before you as someone who can speak to personal experience as to what it's like to be a neurodivergent child that was moved schools twice. But I also stand here as a mental health professional and want to advocate for children within our community who are experiencing other challenges that go beyond being neurodivergence. As a therapist, I've worked with adults and children who have parents or siblings who are bullies, children who are experiencing sexual abuse, emotional abuse, physical abuse, poverty, neglect, grief, family separation, family dysfunction, food insecurity, housing insecurity and their school is their <u>refuge</u>. Can you, or will you, try to imagine what it would be like for them to have to move schools twice?</p> <p>Maslow's hierarchy of needs identifies that people need a sense of love and belonging as a foundation to a person's sense of well-being, and schools, for children facing life difficulties, are where they find their sense of belonging. I beg you to see the harm that moving Sub Area C twice can have. I beg you not to see us as just numbers. I understand it's not realistic or reasonable to say there is never a circumstance where it's absolutely necessary, but what I</p>	

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>plead is that you don't just see us as numbers that you can shift around. Please consider moving sub area B first and moving sub area C later (when the future school is built very close to sub area C), that way neither community is moved twice.</p> <p>Sub area B also has less students than sub area C and would therefore have less immediate impact on school walkability, and number of students who are forced to change schools.</p> <p>However, my sense is that you are looking to move Sub area C (given that it is labelled the 'preferred option'). Given that there will be another new school built very close to sub area C in the next few years, it seems in-avoidable that sub area C would then be moved again as it is very geographically close to this new school location (making the 2nd school change in only a few years). I am aware that the funding has not been given yet for this new new school etc etc, but given the housing needs and the massive development in this area it is an inevitability.</p> <p>My request would be to consider moving a different sub area at this time, and leaving the move of sub-area C to when that new school is built. Or if you do move us, then please place a restriction for Sub area C to not move again within 6 years or something. That way each area is only moved one time and minimizing the change of uprooting our children yet again.</p> <p>The idea of my daughters, one of whom is showing signs of similar neurodivergence as myself, going through the same kind of forced transitions twice, makes me feel like things haven't changed much since the 1990s when it happened to me. On behalf of that neurodivergent child and as a mental health therapist, please do better than what was done to me.</p> <p>Warm Regards,</p> <p>Devon Jorge</p> <p>Sub - Area C</p>	
24.	December 3, 2024	Rita H	John Sweeney	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I know the survey closed but For what is worth, please choose option 2...</p> <p>Thank you, Rita</p>	<p>Good morning Rita,</p> <p>Your comment will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
					Jennifer Passy
25.	December 3, 2024	Rita Hadaya	John Sweeney	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I vote option 2, as makes more sense.</p> <p>Please take this into consideration.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>Good morning Rita,</p> <p>Your comment will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jennifer Passy</p>
26.	December 3, 2024	Karolen Najarian	John Sweeney	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>Option 2 makes more sense to keep.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Good morning Karolen,</p> <p>Your comment will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jennifer Passy</p>
27.	December 3, 2024	Levon Njarian	John Sweeney	<p>Good Evening,</p> <p>Option 2 makes most sense to me</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>Good afternoon Levon,</p> <p>Your comment will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jennifer Passy</p>
28.	December 3, 2024	Jayeeta Dasgupta	St. Josephine Bakhita	<p>Hello Ms.Lema,</p> <p>Based on the update on Waterloo catholic school board in the below link, I am reaching out to you for further information.</p>	<p>Good morning Jayeeta,</p> <p>Thank you for reaching out for more information on the Waterloo Catholic</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>We've purchased the [REDACTED] property in Rosenberg area and our lot number is [REDACTED]. Please find the attached agreement and final copy. The planned date of getting the property is [REDACTED].</p> <p>My [REDACTED] is right now studying in [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] is in [REDACTED] which is [REDACTED].</p> <p>So, from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] will be moving in Rosenberg kitchener and hence I want to enquire if [REDACTED] default school as per the home address in Rosenberg property [REDACTED] will be this NEW CATHOLIC SCHOOL. If so, then I would like to know the name of the school and then I can submit the online registration form on Jan 2025.</p> <p>Looking forward to hearing from you.</p>	<p>District School Board's new school in the Rosenberg / Wildflowers area.</p> <p>The new Catholic elementary school at <u>200 Rosenberg Way</u> is under construction now and is planned to open in September 2025. The review to determine the boundary area is still underway and is expected to conclude with a decision by the Board on January 27, 2025. We would encourage you to review information that has been posted online and subscribe to updates from the <u>boundary review webpage</u>.</p> <p>Following the board's January 27th decision, clear direction will be available for new online registrations.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer</p>
29.	December 6, 2024	Darryl Ackernecht	John Sweeney	<p>Jennifer, Tracey and Bob,</p> <p>Thanks for discussing our concerns during the public open house last Wednesday November 25th.</p> <p>Recapping our situation:</p> <p>We have [REDACTED] children at John Sweeney in [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. We live in the [REDACTED] area C, 1.6 km away from John Sweeney and 3 km from the new Rosenberg school. Our kids have attended Rising Oaks at John Sweeney since September 2022. They're in before and after care as well as summer camp.</p> <p>Tammy is a front line healthcare worker, which means leaving our house at 6am and returning at 7:30pm. Darryl works full time, 40 percent of that time in an office in Cambridge (which could</p>	<p>Good afternoon Darryl,</p> <p>Thank you for sharing your comments, further to discussions at the drop-in open house.</p> <p>This additional information will be shared with the Boundary Review Staff Committee and Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>revert to 100 percent at any time). On days that Tammy works Darryl must do both drop off and pick up of the kids.</p> <p>We rely on the access to Rising Oaks child care at John Sweeney - both before and after school and the guaranteed access to summer childcare that it grants - to manage our daily obligations. We had to go on a waitlist to get access to this childcare.</p> <p>Sending our kids to an out of area school further away with NO guarantee of before/after school childcare and summer care, risks our employment status. There is no justifiable reason for redirecting our kids to a school further away where they lose guaranteed access to childcare.</p> <p>Ideally area C should continue to attend John Sweeney (option 2), instead of being sent to a school on the other side of both John Sweeney and Bleams Rd. It's also difficult to understand this proposed move when there will be yet another elementary school built directly south of area C, which would potentially cause the boundary to change again. This could cause our children to have yet another change in school.</p> <p>Based on our discussions last Wednesday, we're asking that due to our circumstances that our kids be granted a legacy exception to continue to attend John Sweeney where they retain guaranteed access to childcare.</p> <p>Darryl and Tammy Ackernecht </p>	
30.	December 11, 2024	Dave Reiter	John Sweeney	<p>Hi Jennifer,</p> <p>Thank you for the response.</p> <p>Yes, there are a few substantial financial differences between the two options, with Option 1 having the potential to cost tens of thousands of dollars more, over a multi-year period.</p> <p>I appreciate being able to provide feedback on the two options and look forward to the review by the committee and the board where they may find that Option 2 could use those saved resources from Option 1 to further enrich students at Rosenberg school, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional books, learning materials, STEM supplies, etc. - Music or art supplies - Gym equipment or play structures 	No response required.

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				Once again, thank you for the opportunity to be heard. Dave	
31.	December 26, 2024	Judd Thomas	John Sweeney	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Judd Thomas. I reside on [REDACTED] which is in Sub-Area C for John Sweeney. I have a child graduated from John Sweeney and currently in [REDACTED] at St. Mary's. I have [REDACTED] children currently enrolled at John Sweeney as well as [REDACTED] to enroll in John Sweeney in [REDACTED] years. I am concerned with the proposed sub-area realignments as they negatively affect the community, the environment and the well-being of the current students at John Sweeney Catholic School. I plan on covering these concerns at the board meeting January 13th. I have been able to gather a lot of information online to support these points. However, there is some information that is unavailable. If you wouldn't mind, could you please answer the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What were the factors determining whether a public or catholic school should be built in Rosenberg? Is there a report that is available online or that can be sent to me assessing the need for a catholic school in the Rosenberg location? 2. If one of the proposed shuffling of the sub area's is approved, are the boundaries going to have to be realigned again once all of the houses are built and occupied in the Bleams subdivision (Sub area M JBK)? 3. Why is it proposed that so many students at John Sweeney are to be pulled out, is at capacity? What is the current target capacity and current max capacity for the number of students at John Sweeney? 4. How many kids go to John Sweeney who are on a boundary exemption? 5. What are the total number of students, classrooms and students per classroom at John Sweeney each of the past 5 years? 6. Can you provide the Walking Map for John Sweeney showing the areas where students in grades 5 thru 8 have to walk to school and aren't bused? 7. How many current students at John Sweeney who live in Sub Area B, walk to school? 8. How many current students at John Sweeney who live in Sub Area C, walk to school? 9. I currently have a child in before and after school daycare at Rising Oaks in John Sweeney. If we were forced to go to Rosenberg, what accommodations would be made for our family so that we would have access to these services at the new school? 10. What is the process required for splitting up one sub-area into two sub-areas? It appears that it would be necessary to maximize the number of students who can walk to school and reduce the number of buses, regardless of how the new sub-areas are distributed. 	<p>Good morning Judd,</p> <p>The Waterloo Catholic District School Board was involved in the City of Kitchener's development of the Rosenberg Community Plan in 2011 and identified interest in a Catholic elementary school site at that time. Once Mattamy's development proceeded, we were able to acquire the Rosenberg school site.</p> <p>The board made a successful business case to the Ministry of Education to construct the new Rosenberg elementary school and was awarded funding in 2022.</p> <p>The background material contained in the Initial Boundary Review report and the board's annual Long Term Accommodation Plan substantiate the enrolment projections and pressures faced by schools in Southwest Kitchener.</p> <p>Throughout the review we have been transparent that future growth may require further realignment of boundaries. There is a future Catholic school site further west in the Rosenberg area and establishing the boundary may impact the Rosenberg school boundary. A future boundary</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
				<p>11. Is there any assurance that new non catholic families moving into the new M JBK Sub Area that have children attend Rosenberg are putting their tax dollars towards Catholic School Board and not the Public School Board?</p> <p>I do require this information in preparation for the board meeting on January 13th. It would be much appreciated if I could have this information by January 3rd.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Judd</p>	<p>review process would be required to consider how that boundary is drawn and which areas would be considered to attend.</p> <p>The proposed redirection of John Sweeney students was proposed to address forecasted enrolment pressure at John Sweeney and support the enrolment at the new Rosenberg school.</p> <p>There are approximately 10 students attending John Sweeney from outside the school's boundary. The school has been capped to Out of Boundary enrolment for many years due to enrolment exceeding capacity.</p> <p>John Sweeney's enrolment since 2020 is as follows:</p> <p>2020 - 741 2021 – 676* (Covid impacted enrolment) 2022 - 707 2023 – 697 2024 – 707</p> <p>Due to variable Ministry of Education class size criteria based on division (i.e. JK/SK, 1-3, 4-8), the number of students per classroom is not a measure that the board uses. Rather, the relationship between capacity and enrolment as a percentage is reflected in our boundary review report. Further the number of portables is a further</p>

	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>School Affiliation</u>	<u>Email Content</u>	<u>Response</u>
					<p>indicator of the utilization of the school's utilization.</p> <p>A walking web reflecting the 1.6km walk distance is available on the boundary review webpage.</p> <p>In Area C, approximately 52% of students are walk eligible. In Area B, approximately 36% of students are walk eligible.</p> <p>The Final Boundary Review Report will provide information with regard to future extended day programming and access.</p> <p>Staff are able, where appropriate, to split up sub-areas.</p> <p>Where eligible, there is a requirement that families direct school support to the English Catholic school board. However, funding is received on a per pupil basis regardless of the direction of property taxes.</p> <p>Your comment will be shared with the Board of Trustees before any decision is made.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jennifer Passy</p>

Appendix B

What Sub-Area do you live in? Please refer to John Sweeney's Sub-Area Map <https://www.wcdsb.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/36/2024/10/John-Sweeney-Sub-Areas-2024-10-17.pdf> or St. Josephine Bakhita's ...

What are the key factors the Staff Committee should consider when making recommendations to the Board of Trustees, including those related to implementation and legacy exceptions?

John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>My name is . I have █ children that attend John Sweeney. We live on █ which would be changed to a Rosenberg School zone according to your preferred option. I'm strongly against this option.</p> <p>The C zone should stay as part of the John Sweeney district. It is in close proximity to the school and attached to the A zone. That whole area should stay at John Sweeney.</p> <p>My children do not bus, we take them to school every morning so a bus route is not a concern for us. We highly prefer not to take the bus anyway. I have spoken with my children's parents and most if not all of them would avoid a rezoning and I would find it very difficult and unfair to uproot my children from their current school and classmates. My █ especially deals with █ and has been lucky to have found friends at John Sweeney. Taking █ away from that would be challenging and hurtful to █</p> <p>If this restricting goes through, we would need to be get a legacy exemption to continue attending John Sweeney and as a parent I am asking you to strongly consider my request but also what this can and will do to not only my, but many other children.</p> <p>Regards,</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area A	<p>John Sweeney is extremely overcrowded and more areas should be arranged to go to a new school.</p>
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area L	<p>In Sub-Area L, these children have already moved from Blessed Sacrament to St. Josephine. They've finally established routines and friends again, to have to be moved again to a school (for my children) that is further away than St. Josephine. Please reconsider the impact on Sub-Area L, as looking at the options it appears there is zero option to keep them at St. Josephine. Please consider the emotional impact on the children that have already had to move 2 years ago, to have to move yet again. Please note Sub-Area L will not be growing anytime soon, so numbers should stay relatively the same over the years and not increase like other Sub-Areas</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>Right now we can walk to John Sweeny school and this is a huge factor for our family. Our children are young but I would hope as they proceed to the upper grades that they would be able to walk home on their own from school. If we are moved, walking would be far and not be safe as I believe it is set that Bleams will be 4 lanes with roundabouts. We want to stay in our community at John Sweeney.</p> <p>I received an email on Wednesday from the board that the area between Bleams, Fischer Hallman and Strasburg that was originally "bussed to Blessed Sacrament" is now being moved to John Sweeny to avoid being part of this boundary review. I do not understand that decision at all. If there are no students there currently then it impacts no one to have them be part of the new Rosenberg school. It is also close by. Why would they not go to Rosenberg? Why is it a priority that students who do not even exist there yet be spared going through the boundary change over considering the impact on current students? Also why would more potential students be added to John Sweeny when the point of this boundary change is to reduce John Sweeny's numbers? The impact on current students should be a priority to be minimized over potential future students who would be changing schools with their housing move regardless.</p> <p>Being able to go to the same school in our neighbourhood for all of elementary education is important to our family and impacted where we chose to live. We want our children to be able to be part of a consistent community as close to where they live as possible so that they can form lifelong friendships and relationships. We believe this sets our children up with a strong foundation including strong values, connection to self and others, and a sense of security that allows them the confidence, trust, and values to thrive in high school and beyond. One of our children is in █. █ has had a rough start to the school year and has taken a long time to adjust. █ has just started to settle in and enjoy school. We love that the 2 year kindergarten program has consistency in classmates and educators to provide a strong foundation for school and █ identity as a learner and child. █ has a wonderful educator team whom █ loves at John Sweeney as well as many budding friendships. I am strongly against moving █ next year. There needs to be a trusting relationship for our █ to learn and having her start over again at such a young age would erode that and set █ back. The early years need to be a priority. This is where we set children up for success, not toss them around as collateral because of adult decisions. █ does not need another change and needs to continue to build trust and security where █ is. In the very least, I would like her to be able to finish the kindergarten program at █ current school, so granted "legacy exemption" for 1 year for 2025/2026 year until █ starts grade 1.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>Option 1 of the proposed boundary review does not consider that these students in section C would now have to cross a busy road to get to Rosenberg. I would never allow my kids to cross Bleams to get to school as this road is an absolute nightmare at the best of times, but add construction to that (which will take years to complete) and then it's even worse. My husband and I cannot drive our children to school with our work schedules and walking is how we commute to school. Our children are able to walk to school with a group of friends they have grown up with since JK on a familiar route that we as parents are comfortable with to John Sweeney. If we want to focus on walkability then moving subsection C to Rosenberg does not take this into consideration. A compromise could be allowing the current John Sweeney students, no matter the grade, to finish their time there and any new to school or new enrolling students would need to go to Rosenberg. This move would also personally be very detrimental to my children's mental health as █ and do not so well with transitions or changes. Having them move schools, be away from their friends, and essentially start all over would impact them greatly.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>Crossing Bleams road as my child is currently a walker in grade 5 to John Sweeney</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area A	<p>Allowing children over Grade for to stay at their original school and not forced to change.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>Removing a child from their community by cutting a very odd piece of the map out of an obvious community within the borders of main roads (ottawa, trussler, bleams, Fischer hallman).</p> <p>Area C is known to be the largest supporter financially to John Sweeney regarding fundraising and donations.</p> <p>Residents within area C will have natural reduction rates. We have low turnover of housing, so as the 5 houses next to me have their children graduate, no new students will move in/occupy seats. We are long time owners here and we all intend to remain.</p> <p>Higher turnover/rentals on opposite side of Ottawa resulting in regular introduction of new students.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>My █ is currently in █ and will be entering █ in 2025. █ has attended John Sweeney since █ started junior kindergarten. We are in sub area C (█). We would greatly appreciate if a legacy exception was available so █ doesn't have to switch schools for one year. Thank you for your time.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area A	<p>Transitioning school can be a significant adjustments for students. My children have established strong connections with their teachers and peers which play a vital role in their development. We urge the committe to consider alternatives that would allow my kids to remain at their current school.</p>

What Sub-Area do you live in? Please refer to John Sweeney's Sub-Area Map <https://www.wcdsb.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/36/2024/10/John-Sweeney-Sub-Areas-2024-10-17.pdf> or St. Josephine Bakhita's ...

What are the key factors the Staff Committee should consider when making recommendations to the Board of Trustees, including those related to implementation and legacy exceptions?

John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>Schools are supposed to be walkable distance from home. How are kids from section C going to walk to school without having to play frogger crossing a busy street? It makes zero sense whatsoever.</p> <p>My [redacted] starts walking next year and has a group of friends [redacted] can safely walk to and from school with at John Sweeney. This won't be an option if [redacted] moves schools.</p> <p>My children are [redacted] and every year has gotten slightly better since JK due to being familiar. We chose the area we live in today so that the kids could go JK through their senior elementary school years at the same school. This will disrupt their well being and mental wellness, not to mention the same for many other children in the same situation. I'm certain many others chose to move to this area so their kids could be at that school.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>If anything, it would make sense to grandfather the children who are already in the school so that they can finish elementary school there, and have new kids go to the new school.</p> <p>Hello. I would like my child to remain at the same school John Sweeney Sub-area C. Our [redacted] does not want to move to other school.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area A	<p>Busing - with current shortages in bus drivers, the board should be looking to keep walking students from becoming bus students.</p> <p>Safety - crossing Bleams Rd from subsection A for those that will not qualify for busing will be completely unsafe, even with a crossing guard. Bleams Rd is currently under construction, which will take several months, and afterwards will be a series of roundabouts, which is not ideal for students to be crossing.</p> <p>Length of time at school - in Sept 2025 I will have been a parent of a John Sweeney student for 16 years. My oldest [redacted] attended Sweeney from Jk-8, and my [redacted] who also started JK at Sweeney will be entering in [redacted] It would be downright cruel to expect [redacted] to go to a new school for [redacted] final year of elementary school. NO Grade 8 student should be forced to a new school to graduate</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>It is extremely important not to pull children out of their existing comfortable, safe and familiar school surroundings. Any NEW students entering the school board may be given the new boundary. Offer a choice for anyone who prefers to switch schools as there may be children preferring to leave and be elsewhere. A lot of these decisions will inconvenience and upset a lot of families. The new school location has a large subdivision which isn't even complete yet. There will be plenty of kids to fill this new school without the need of John Sweeney overflow.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>I have [redacted] children that attend John Sweeney. We live on [redacted] which would be changed to a Rosenberg School zone according to your preferred option. I'm strongly against this option.</p> <p>The C zone should stay as part of the John Sweeney district. It is in close proximity to the school we see many families that walk to school everyday that live on our street. It seems unreasonable to switch our children to a school where they are forced to bus and are further away.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>I have spoken with other parents and most if not all of them would avoid a rezoning and I would find it very difficult and unfair to uproot my children from their current school and classmates. My [redacted] especially deals with [redacted] and has been lucky to have found friends at John Sweeney.m, [redacted] is thriving there both socially and academically. Taking [redacted] away from that would be challenging and hurtful.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>As a parent I am asking you to strongly consider my request but also what this can and will do to not only my, but many other children in this zone.</p>
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area L	<p>Most of the kids are already established in terms of friends and familiarity with school so for kids from Grade 6-8 they should have an option continue in current school or switch if it's not within their boundary.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>Keeping older kids with their friends (maybe staying at the same school) and not having to cross Fischer-Hallman road because there needs to be another crossing guard there. It is a tragedy waiting to happen.</p>
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area L	<p>Being able to walk to school safely! Children not crossing busy roads! And distance of walk</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>The walking distance to the Rosenberg school is too far compared to St Josephine. To make a child switch schools again after just two years is cruel. Especially when the school they are in is closer in proximity to their home. Please reconsider and remove the St Josephine sub area L from the Rosenberg boundary.</p> <p>Dear Members of the Board,</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of concerned parents and community members regarding the proposed changes in school boundaries affecting John Sweeney CES and St. Josephine Bakhita CES as outlined in the October 28, 2024, Initial Boundary Review Report. We respectfully request that the Board reconsider requiring current students to change schools as part of this boundary review. While we recognize the need to establish boundaries for the new Rosenberg Catholic elementary school, we believe that allowing current students to stay in their present schools aligns better with the Board's Multi-Year Strategic Plan (MYSP) and the overarching goals for student development.</p> <p>The MYSP for 2022-2025 emphasizes inclusivity, stability, and a commitment to nurturing each student's sense of belonging and potential. For instance, under the "Awaken to Belong" pillar, the Board seeks to ensure that every student feels included and reflected in their learning environment. Forcing students to relocate, especially those who have already undergone boundary adjustments in recent years, disrupts this sense of belonging. Maintaining continuity by allowing current students to remain in their familiar environment supports a stable and positive experience, one that fosters their social, emotional, and academic growth.</p> <p>Additionally, the boundary review document states that the primary objectives are to address overcapacity issues and optimize the use of new and existing facilities. However, we urge the Board to adopt a phased approach for this transition, enabling new enrollments to gradually fill spaces at the new Rosenberg school rather than displacing established students. Such an approach aligns with MYSP goals, including "Strengthen to Become," where each child's unique needs and potential are nurtured within a consistent learning environment.</p> <p>Relocating these students can lead to increased transportation costs, added commute times, and reduced student engagement, as they are distanced from their current communities and support networks. This displacement does not align with the boundary review goals to maximize walkability and neighborhood integrity for students, which fosters greater participation and community investment. A transition plan allowing current students to remain until they complete their school years better supports both these goals and the MYSP's "Ignite to Believe" mission to guide every student toward their full potential within a faith-based, stable learning environment.</p> <p>In conclusion, we kindly urge the Board to consider a "grandfathering" approach for existing students at John Sweeney CES and St. Josephine Bakhita CES. This would allow them to remain in their current schools while still creating room for future enrollments in the new Rosenberg facility. This solution not only honors the goals set forth by the Board's strategic plan but also supports the well-being of our children, who benefit greatly from consistency and familiarity in their educational experience.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this request in the spirit of fostering stability, inclusivity, and the well-being of our students and families.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

What Sub-Area do you live in? Please refer to John Sweeney's Sub-Area Map <https://www.wcdsb.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/36/2024/10/John-Sweeney-Sub-Areas-2024-10-17.pdf> or St. Josephine Bakhita's ...

What are the key factors the Staff Committee should consider when making recommendations to the Board of Trustees, including those related to implementation and legacy exceptions?

St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area L	<p>It's unfair to the children to have to change school for the second time in 2 years. My child will be going to ██████ in September 2025, and if they need to change schools again, it'll be Third school. They have just established their roots at St Josephine Bakhita and it's unfair to make them change the school again. This change should benefit the children, and removing them from friends and familiar surroundings is harmful. Not all children adapt to changes well, and school boards should take this into consideration. Changes are difficult, but forceful changes for the second time are hurtful and damaging.</p> <p>Also, there is no safe way to get to new Rosenberg school without bus or car. In emergency situations, when car or bus is not available, our families are able to walk children to and from school. This will not be possible if our neighborhood has to move to Rosenberg school.</p> <p>We are also greatly concerned with school being built with such close proximity to power lines. It is not safe for children to spend over 6 hrs a day right under power lines which emit electric and magnetic field.</p> <p>Most importantly, we should have an option which school to attend. Same as done in other regions such as Oakville. If house falls between 2 school boundaries, it's up to the parents to choose which school they want their children to attend.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>legacy exceptions should be done on a family by family basis, and should take into account younger children and the impact of moving schools for them. the board should always be looking at moving kids who are already crossing a major road to a bus to Rosenburg, perhaps D JSW or B JSW. they could be on a bus up Ottawa -> Trussler -> Huron</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>Right now we can walk to John Sweeney school and this is a huge factor for our family. Our children are young but I would hope as they proceed to the upper grades that they would be able to walk home on their own from school. If we are moved, walking would be far and not be safe as I believe it is set that Bleams will be 4 lanes with roundabouts. We want to stay in our community at John Sweeney.</p> <p>I received an email on Wednesday from the board that the area between Bleams, Fischer Hallman and Strasburg that was originally "bussed to Blessed Sacrament" is now being moved to John Sweeney to avoid being part of this boundary review. I do not understand that decision at all. If there are no students there currently then it impacts no one to have them be part of the new Rosenburg school. It is also close by. Why would they not go to Rosenburg? Why is it a priority that students who do not even exist there yet be spared going through the boundary change over considering the impact on current students? Also why would more potential students be added to John Sweeney when the point of this boundary change is to reduce John Sweeney's numbers? The impact on current students should be a priority to be minimized over potential future students who would be changing schools with their housing move regardless.</p> <p>Being able to go to the same school in our neighbourhood for all of elementary education is important to our family and impacted where we chose to live. We want our children to be able to be part of a consistent community as close to where they live as possible so that they can form lifelong friendships and relationships. We believe this sets our children up with a strong foundation including strong values, connection to self and others, and a sense of security that allows them the confidence, trust, and values to thrive in high school and beyond. One of our children is in ██████. ██████ has had a rough start to the school year and has taken a long time to adjust. ██████ has just started to settle in and enjoy school. We love that the 2 year kindergarten program has consistency in classmates and educators to provide a strong foundation for school and ██████ identity as a learner and child. ██████ has a wonderful educator team whom ██████ loves at John Sweeney as well as many budding friendships. I am strongly against moving ██████ next year. There needs to be a trusting relationship for our ██████ to learn and having ██████ start over again at such a young age would erode that and ██████ her back. The early years need to be a priority. This is where we set children up for success, not toss them around as collateral because of adult decisions. ██████ does not need another change and needs to continue to build trust and security where ██████ is. In the very least, I would like ██████ to be able to finish the kindergarten program at ██████ current school, so granted "legacy exemption" for 1 year for 2025/2026 year until ██████ starts grade 1.</p>
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area J	<p>I strongly urge the Staff Committee to refrain from forcing students to switch schools if families are willing to make arrangements to have children arrive at the existing school without the need for school buses. Forced transplanting of students in order to satisfy new boundaries is harmful to the students well being.</p> <p>Often the end result is the new school ends up over capacity and portables are brought in to satisfy the increased student levels. If some students are allowed to remain at their previous school, upon request, they can alleviate this need for portables and also prevent removing them from the school they have spent many years at.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>School boundary changes with forces transfers are not good for anyone.</p> <p>The main issue is JSW Sub Area C is only 19 min away from John Sweeney whereas 37 mins away from Rosenbeg. Doesn't it make sense to keep Sub area C to JSW? Further, with Option 1, the capacity of Rosenberg at the end of 5 years is at 193% with 17 portable classes. I don't think it's a favorable approach for kids and teachers when the whole school looks more like a portable carnival than a school. During emergencies, at least one parent can make a walk of 19 min to pick kids and the kid can make it back. But imagine a 37 min for a JK kid?</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>The main issue is JSW Sub Area C is only 19 min away from John Sweeney whereas 37 mins away from Rosenbeg. Doesn't it make sense to keep Sub area C to JSW? Further, with Option 1, the capacity of Rosenberg at the end of 5 years is at 193% with 17 portable classes. I don't think it's a favorable approach for kids and teachers when there are 17 portables. During emergencies, at least one parent can make a walk of 19 min to pick kids and the kid can make it back. But imagine a 37 min walk for a JK kid?</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>-Walking distance vs more buses. If certain zones already need a bus to school then they should be looked at first to be moved to the new school. Since there is a shortage of bus drivers.</p> <p>-Daycare needs. If a child is already enrolled in Rising Oaks at John Sweeney they should not be moved to another school to keep consistency and with the difficulty of finding a new center.</p> <p>-What about the number of homes going in right around the new school? Would those homes not be in the catchment zone for the new school?</p> <p>-Considering the demographic of the community, especially in the new build area, is a new Catholic school really needed? Will there be enough Catholic children in that area to attend the new school?</p>
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area L	<p>1. I think Sub-Area L should be moved back to the St. Josephine Bakita boundary, or students/families in the area should have the option of a legacy exception. Please don't make those kids move again.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>2. Legacy exceptions should be given to families where they have a child at the YMCA at St. Josephine Bakita (an infant or toddler etc.) where they're required to go to the school daily.</p> <p>The main priority should be to hit as few children as possible. Option B does that by 20% less students and should be considered the primary plan. Option 1 would also make some children (L) relocate a second time. Our ██████ is in ██████ and our next door neighbors have students in ██████ and ██████ which have already had to relocate. My ██████ has had major ██████ ██████ entire life and based on the preferred plan (we are in C), ██████ would have to relocate after just getting into a routine. Having all of ██████ friends (who in Option 1 would stay), would have a massive impact on ██████ mental health. I think there needs to be a lot more consideration to option 2, as the first option hits more kids but is "convenient to circle on a map and draw the boundary for admins." Having this really be the only definitive difference in options while also hitting 20-30% more children, is unacceptable. Having children relocate is a massive deal and there is no point to effect more kids than needed. Option 2 would also allow for more walking traffic to the school, which is a big deal given the congestion in that area in the morning and after school. If Option 1 is what is decided there needs to be a clear legacy definition for kids to petition to stay at the school they are already at, especially given the mental health of some children.</p>
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area K	<p>really worried that a legacy exception wont be permitted if first child attends SJB and second child attends the Y day care. If we have to move our oldest we still have to return to SJB to pick up our youngest. We would like to keep them at the same school.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>No matter what boundary decision is made children currently enrolled in a school should be allowed to remain at their current school if they choose to do so.</p>

What Sub-Area do you live in? Please refer to John Sweeney's Sub-Area Map <https://www.wcdsb.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/36/2024/10/John-Sweeney-Sub-Areas-2024-10-17.pdf> or St. Josephine Bakhita's ...

What are the key factors the Staff Committee should consider when making recommendations to the Board of Trustees, including those related to implementation and legacy exceptions?

John Sweeney Sub-Area D	Please do not change the boundary for Mannheim community, and allow children to continue attending John Sweeney. The children have established relationships to their peers and teachers, changing the boundary would disrupt their learning and community.
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area L	Children's benefits(resent movements,progress in learning), distance from schools,parents opinions in anonymous surveys....
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area L	- Planning for next few years considering population growth so that kids do not have to switch schools frequently - Distance to the school (kids at walkable distance from school to be bused to a newer school)
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	Exceptions be made for those children who already have child care at Rising Oaks. Care is impossible to find and those families have already been waiting on lists for years to get their children care. Our children have been going to Rising Oaks since my return to work from maternity leave in [REDACTED] It is short sighted of the board to be opening a new school without any mention of before and after school care. Especially subsidized care. There should be a daycare attached to this school and no school should EVER be built without a daycare attached to it. There are not enough spaces in this region to begin with.
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area M	Educational Continuity: Emphasize the importance of maintaining consistent academic standards and ensuring the new school offers the same or better curriculum, programs, and resources that will benefit my daughter's learning experience. Emotional and Social Transition: Highlight the need for a smooth transition, including support for adapting to a new environment, making new friends, and potentially joining new extracurricular activities, which are crucial for students' emotional and social well-being. Implementation of Transition Plans: Suggest that a well-defined plan for helping students adjust, including orientation sessions, counseling support, and guidance from teachers, could ease the move and reduce stress.
John Sweeney Sub-Area D	Wilmot township families (Mannheim) are a very small group - with very strong parent support to stay at John Sweeney for numerous reasons - one of which is that our kids are already isolated from their peers in terms of municipal services (sports, libraries, parks, community centres etc.). It would be especially hard for them to resettle at a new school. Additionally, the West Rosenberg school will be even closer to Mannheim - another move in the future would be bad for our kids.
John Sweeney Sub-Area D	As a parent with children in Mannheim Sub area D, I believe the Staff Committee should carefully consider the following key factors when making recommendations to the Board of Trustees: 1. Capacity and Utilization: •Balanced Enrollment: The committee should ensure that schools are neither overcrowded nor underutilized. For example, John Sweeney Catholic School is projected to be at 88% utilization by 2030, without needing portables. In contrast, the new Rosenberg school is expected to reach 174% utilization with 17 portables. Managing enrollment effectively will prevent resource strain and support optimal learning conditions. •Accommodation Feasibility: Maintaining the current student population, including my children, at John Sweeney is feasible. The sub-area we represent accounts for only about 2% of the school's enrollment, which can be accommodated without impacting capacity. 2. Student Stability and Well-Being: •Continuity and Academic Progress: Relocating my children and other students from Mannheim would disrupt their education, social connections, and emotional health. Keeping them at John Sweeney supports consistency in their academic and social development. •Community Integration: Mannheim students are already a minority and face separation from their Kitchener peers in various aspects. Moving them to a different school would further isolate them, negatively impacting their sense of belonging and participation in shared community activities. 3. Geographical and Logistical Considerations: •Proximity and Commuting: The new school boundaries should be practical for families. The Rosenberg Secondary Plan indicates that the site reserved for a new school is closer to Mannheim than the current school, which could create noncontiguous boundaries and result in my children facing another potential move in the future. •Transportation Impact: The committee should consider the impact on transportation and daily logistics. Keeping Mannheim students at John Sweeney helps maintain manageable travel distances, preventing increased absenteeism and added stress on families. 4. Regional and Long-Term Planning: •Alignment with Regional Plans: Recommendations should align with the Region of Waterloo's countryside line, which indicates minimal development in areas like Sub Area D. With projected student numbers staying low over the next seven years, maintaining the current placement at John Sweeney is justified. •Future Boundary Changes: The upcoming Catholic elementary school in Baden (Wilmot) should be considered, as future boundary adjustments could affect Wilmot Township students, including those from Mannheim. Moving my children now could mean further disruptions if additional transitions are required later. 5. Equity and Access to Resources: •Fair Treatment for Minority Students: My children and other students from Mannheim are already a small minority. Moving them to another school would increase this isolation and limit their access to shared community programs, sports teams, library activities, and recreational opportunities enjoyed by their Kitchener peers. Keeping them at John Sweeney supports equitable treatment and access. 6. Resource Management: •Sustainable Use of Facilities: The committee's recommendations should prioritize sustainable use of current school facilities. Keeping my children and other Mannheim students at John Sweeney avoids the need for portables or expansions that could strain resources. Conclusion: As a parent advocating for my children and other Mannheim students, I urge the Staff Committee to consider the importance of stability, community ties, and practical logistics. Maintaining our placement at John Sweeney supports balanced school capacity, student well-being, and educational continuity. Ensuring that my children and their peers remain in an environment where they can thrive aligns with regional planning, effective resource use, and equitable treatment.

What Sub-Area do you live in? Please refer to John Sweeney's Sub-Area Map <https://www.wcdsb.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/36/2024/10/John-Sweeney-Sub-Areas-2024-10-17.pdf> or St. Josephine Bakhita's ...

What are the key factors the Staff Committee should consider when making recommendations to the Board of Trustees, including those related to implementation and legacy exceptions?

John Sweeney Sub-Area D	<p>As a parent with children in Sub area D, I believe the Staff Committee should carefully consider the following key factors when making recommendations to the Board of Trustees:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity and Utilization: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balanced Enrollment: The committee should ensure that schools are neither overcrowded nor underutilized. For example, John Sweeney Catholic School is projected to be at 88% utilization by 2030, without needing portables. In contrast, the new Rosenberg school is expected to reach 174% utilization with 17 portables. Managing enrollment effectively will prevent resource strain and support optimal learning conditions. Accommodation Feasibility: Maintaining the current student population, including my children, at John Sweeney is feasible. The sub-area we represent accounts for only about 2% of the school's enrollment, which can be accommodated without impacting capacity. Student Stability and Well-Being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuity and Academic Progress: Relocating my children and other students from Mannheim would disrupt their education, social connections, and emotional health. Keeping them at John Sweeney supports consistency in their academic and social development. Community Integration: Mannheim students are already a minority and face separation from their Kitchener peers in various aspects. Moving them to a different school would further isolate them, negatively impacting their sense of belonging and participation in shared community activities. Geographical and Logistical Considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity and Commuting: The new school boundaries should be practical for families. The Rosenberg Secondary Plan indicates that the site reserved for a new school is closer to Mannheim than the current school, which could create noncontiguous boundaries and result in my children facing another potential move in the future. Transportation Impact: The committee should consider the impact on transportation and daily logistics. Keeping Mannheim students at John Sweeney helps maintain manageable travel distances, preventing increased absenteeism and added stress on families. Regional and Long-Term Planning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment with Regional Plans: Recommendations should align with the Region of Waterloo's countryside line, which indicates minimal development in areas like Sub Area D. With projected student numbers staying low over the next seven years, maintaining the current placement at John Sweeney is justified. Future Boundary Changes: The upcoming Catholic elementary school in Baden (Wilmot) should be considered, as future boundary adjustments could affect Wilmot Township students, including those from Mannheim. Moving my children now could mean further disruptions if additional transitions are required later. Equity and Access to Resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fair Treatment for Minority Students: My children and other students from Mannheim are already a small minority. Moving them to another school would increase this isolation and limit their access to shared community programs, sports teams, library activities, and recreational opportunities enjoyed by their Kitchener peers. Keeping them at John Sweeney supports equitable treatment and access. Resource Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable Use of Facilities: The committee's recommendations should prioritize sustainable use of current school facilities. Keeping my children and other Mannheim students at John Sweeney avoids the need for portables or expansions that could strain resources. <p>Conclusion: As a parent advocating for my children and other Mannheim students, I urge the Staff Committee to consider the importance of stability, community ties, and practical logistics. Maintaining our placement at John Sweeney supports balanced school capacity, student well-being, and educational continuity. Ensuring that my children and their peers remain in an environment where they can thrive aligns with regional planning, effective resource use, and equitable treatment.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	Minimize disruption to existing students. Some are 'covid' children who did not have the opportunity to socialize but are now thriving at John Sweeney. Specific requests have been made in some instances for John Sweeney and planned as part of parenting arrangements. Moving to Rosenberg would be problematic.
John Sweeney Sub-Area A	Consider the overlap of John Sweeney and Rosenberg has the communities are attached to each other with borderline houses
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	I believe the proximity of the new school to my home will significantly benefit my family, as my daughter will be able to attend school with her friends and neighbours. Since this will be her [redacted] year in school, having a familiar and nearby environment will greatly support her adaptation and provide a positive start to her educational journey.
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area M	They need to balance the load of students equally and not overwhelm any school now or in the future. Every school should share the load if overloaded with students
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area J	I just hate that all these kids need to go through another school zone change again in such a short period of time. But I understand it's needed due to the growth in population and school registrations
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	Having the new school nearby would be incredibly helpful for our family, especially since this will be our [redacted] year. [redacted] friends are like family to us, as we don't have extended family support here in Canada. Being able to attend the same school as [redacted] friends would provide [redacted] with a sense of comfort and familiarity, which would be essential for [redacted] transition and adaptation.
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area L	Busing and distance
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	Despite proximity, students in our area are better at John Sweeney, as for students who walk to school they would not need to be crossing Bleams Road to get to school or additional busing
John Sweeney Sub-Area A	John Sweeney is extremely overcrowded. Please when you make a decision on boundaries keep it in mind! More kids from this school should be relocated to a new school. The best decision would be to arrange boundaries that way, that the school stops using portables at all.
John Sweeney Sub-Area B	Location of students (homes) and bussing / access to bussing. Perhaps walkers to either school could stay within that school boundary and bus students could be reallocated to the new school.
Not applicable	The reasoning behind why a child should be allowed to continue their education with in the school. Medical, mental or any interruptions that mat affect their well being and whom already attend the school.
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	Anyone that only has a year or two left should be able to remain at their current school if preferred.
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	My [redacted] will have [redacted] years left & [redacted] doesn't want to change schools, [redacted] is looking forward to graduating as a cardinal. Hope you will consider this to students who are almost finished elementary school & want to finish at John Sweeney
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	Location of children already attending the school. Safety of children. They should not have to cross Bleams road. The roundabouts will only temporarily slow traffic then cars will speed in between the roundabouts. Crossing at roundabouts is dangerous for adults and children
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	Long standing student in last year to graduate. Walking distance and unfair to move my child. I'm angered.
John Sweeney Sub-Area A	Walking distance, it doesn't make sense to move students who walk to students who need to take a bus especially when there is usually no parking available in the area.
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area N	Our kids are being bussed too far for both Josephine and the new Rosenburgh school. Our sub area should be attending John Sweeney school. I'm surprised that we are still not considered for John Sweeney. This area is devolping so quickly and more housing planned and being built. Having our children switching schools constantly is not good for them in terms of mental health, building friendships. Switching to the public board is something we are considering.
John Sweeney Sub-Area B	Lots of change has happeend in 5 years to our kids (covid etc) Keep boundry as is, ask for voluntary transfers. Take all the new built houses from trussler and bleams 2 huge subdivisions as boundery to new school.
John Sweeney Sub-Area A	People that are within the A zone and walking distance of the school should be able to stay.

What Sub-Area do you live in? Please refer to John Sweeney's Sub-Area Map https://www.wcdsb.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/36/2024/10/John-Sweeney-Sub-Areas-2024-10-17.pdf or St. Josephine Bakhita's ...	What are the key factors the Staff Committee should consider when making recommendations to the Board of Trustees, including those related to implementation and legacy exceptions?
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>Option 2 needs to be given a more serious evaluation. Option 1 has a disadvantage of more buses being required, leads to children having to cross a major road (one group Ottawa St and the other group Bleams Rd) and by 2027 student enrollment numbers are significantly higher in Rosenberg, compared to what Option 2 would offer. Please see further explanations below:</p> <p>More buses are required for Option 1 as both sections of JSW-B & JSW-C will require buses for grades 4-8. Where Option 2 only JSW-B would require bus to Rosenberg; where JSW-C all 4-8 are within walking distance. We are already seeing a strain on the bus system where there are significant delays, some have been over an hour late in the morning, leading to children missing valuable class time.</p> <p>Option 2 removes a significant amount of students having to cross a major street. In Option 1 both JSW-B and JSW-C will be required to cross a major street: B will need to cross Ottawa St and C will need to cross Bleams Rd. Option 2 will remove this risk. (Though a bus will be needed, it would still be 1 less from Option 1 given the note above.)</p> <p>Finally, the capacity for the schools are going to have a major discrepancy by 2027, but even within 1 year, 2026 in Option 1 Rosenberg will be 106% capacity, where JSW is only 83%. In Option 2 capacity remains below 100% for both schools until 2027. Rosenberg will be at 116%, though high is lower than 125% with option 1. Option 2 keeps JSW below 100% capacity up until at least 2029/30.</p> <p>Alternatively, is there an opportunity to look at a 3rd option? One suggestion is relooking at the sub areas that could align better to have more walkers going to each school. Currently Sub Area JSW-A has a significant portion who can walk to JSW or to Rosenberg; where JSW-C there are a portion who are walking distance to JSW, but not Roseburg. There is a also a section is JSW-B that will require a bus to JSW. If instead the subareas are relooked at based on the walking map, a part of JSW-A could go to Rosenberg as walkers, the bus section in JSW-B going to Rosenberg (as a bus is required to no matter what) which could open up all of JSW-B to go to JSW and be walkers. This will reduce 1 bus being required and have more walkers supporting environment requirements</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area D	Why involve Mannheim?? Such a small amount of students coming from this area. Most children in Mannheim go to the Public board.
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	I live in John Sweeney section C and according the proposed option 1, we would be excluded from John Sweeney next year for [REDACTED] I disagree with this because there are kids that are geographically further away and are still able to attend the school in [REDACTED] I am in favor for option 2 which includes my area. Me and the kids often walk or bike to school which not only cuts down on emissions but its a time we enjoy doing in the morning together. Thank you for reading this and I hope you consider this as part of the final decision
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area L	Closer to St. JOSEPHINE BAKHITA
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area L	Stability for children - frequently changing schools and staff is disruptive for many children .
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	Key factors to include is the overall cost, John Sweeney capacity, and walking web. In this case, option 2 should be considered as it would be lower cost, and keeps a contiguous border between subsections JBK N and JSW B, allowing those students to form a community outside of school. Subsection C will not be in any walking distance community with their peers if moved to Rosenberg school and will be isolated from their peers. I strongly encourage reconsidering option 2 or at least allowing exceptions for subsection C to remain at John Sweeney until Rosenberg West is built.
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	The school should consider the financial costs associated with Option 1, maintaining the walking web, and overcrowding associated with Option 1. For legacy exceptions, the walking web should be included for students within walking distance of John Sweeney.
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	Given that busing capacity is already a problem, and that schools going over capacity will cause future problems, Options #2 is seemingly the best option and I struggle to understand why it is not being given primary consideration.
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	Childcare - as a parent who works full time 8-4:30 and partner works 7-4 we currently rely on the childcare at rising oaks before and after school programs. Our children are [REDACTED] and we do not have an adult that can get them on the bus or any way to get them to school without this impacting our jobs. This is a major concern for us.
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>We are also concerned about capacity as it appears that Rosenberg would be over capacity in a couple of years after opening.</p> <p>-No before and after school care. We have no way to get our kids to and from school or on the bus and we depend on the rising oaks care for both our kids.</p> <p>-Rosenberg school is going to be over capacity once the sub division is complete which will in turn have my child move school again.</p> <p>-I refuse to put my children through a school change.</p> <p>-I would like both to be grandfathered into John Sweeney school.</p>
St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area P	Need more information regarding this question
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>We live [REDACTED] km away from John Sweeney and [REDACTED] km from the new school. We have children in [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Our kids have attended Rising Oaks John Sweeney since [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p> <p>My wife is a [REDACTED] who leaves the house at 6am and returns at 7:30pm.</p> <p>I work full time, in an office in [REDACTED]</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area C	<p>We rely on the access to Rising Oaks child care at John Sweeney - both before and after school and the guaranteed access to summer childcare that it grants. We had to go on a waitlist to get access to this childcare.</p> <p>Sending our kids to an out of area school further away with no guarantee of before/after school childcare and summer care risks our employment status.</p> <p>There is no justifiable reason for re-directing our kids to a school further away where they lose guaranteed access to childcare.</p>
John Sweeney Sub-Area A	Whebe
John Sweeney Sub-Area B	As a parent of children in sub-area B, I would like my children to bike/walk to school as they get older. This is impossible at Rosenberg. Also it should be important to keep logical boundaries rather than have a slice of B attend Rosenberg, only for that same sub-area to have to move again once boundaries are considered for the future west Rosenberg school. Another consideration is the child care center at John Sweeney and the extended hours they provide. These are factors we had to consider when choosing a home and school, which may not may not be available at Rosenberg.
John Sweeney Sub-Area D	Looking into the future development of Rosenberg growth, keeping Mannheim students at John Sweeney makes sense. Area D is projected to stay with similar number of students, so we don't take much room in these large schools. Why are we considering to move these students when they may have to move when another, closer new school is currently being projected based on future growth of numbers for the Rosenberg area. Moving these students just doesn't make sense based on the projected numbers.

What Sub-Area do you live in? Please refer to John Sweeney's Sub-Area Map <https://www.wcdsb.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/36/2024/10/John-Sweeney-Sub-Areas-2024-10-17.pdf> or St. Josephine Bakhita's ...

What are the key factors the Staff Committee should consider when making recommendations to the Board of Trustees, including those related to implementation and legacy exceptions?

Option 2 is our preferred option. There are a number of factors I would like to present to support this option:

1. Sub-area C going from walking to school at John Sweeney to having to be bussed to the Rosenberg school
2. The potential for sub-area C to have to move schools more than once when the west Rosenberg school comes on line
3. The status quo option for John Sweeney to keep the same boundary until 2030 has 8 portables which they have about 6 portables now (is status quo an option for John Sweeney boundary?)
4. The preferred option has John Sweeney sitting with 4 open classrooms in the projection for 2025 whereas option 2 has it sitting at 1 open classroom
5. In the projections for Option 2 it only has John Sweeney looking at 4 portable by 2035 and by then the west Rosenberg school should be built
6. Option 2 spreads the pressures out a little bit more than the preferred option. When looking at 2030 projections John Sweeney sits just below capacity and has a lower number of portables required at the new Rosenberg school.

We would prefer:

Option 2 to be chosen or a legacy option to be chosen

John Sweeney Sub-Area C

Legacy options could include:

1. Anyone living in sub-area C as of enrolment for the 2025-2026 school year gets 'grandfathered' into John Sweeney. Any new enrolments from that sub-area will be directed to the new Rosenberg school
2. Anyone going into grade 7 or 8 in 2025 get to stay at John Sweeney as well as any siblings that attend the school. Don't want to separate siblings in different schools.
3. Give the option for sub-area C if they want to stay at John Sweeney (opt in) or the opportunity to attend the new Rosenberg school
4. If your before and or after school care provider resides in the John Sweeney boundary you should still be allowed to attend John Sweeney. Especially considering there is no definitive options for before or after school care at the new Rosenberg school.

Other points to support a legacy option:

- mental wellness of the children should be an important factor when considering switching them away from their friends

In conclusion, we support Option #2 or the first legacy option as outlined in this submission. Option 2 does the best job in spreading out the enrolment for John Sweeney and the new Rosenberg school. The fact that our children can walk to and from school by attending John Sweeney is a serious factor, as opposed to them being bussed to the new Rosenberg school.

Thank you for taking our submission into consideration.

John Sweeney Sub-Area C

With another school potentially being built in Rosenberg west will I'm the students in sub area c be asked to move again. Would prefer to only have to go through one move. Currently sub area c is waking distance. Option 2 affects less students. Option 1 has Rosenberg significantly over capacity by year 3 vs option 2

I just attended the meeting held at John Sweeney. I have several concerns with future planing of the schools. The biggest issue is that the new schools being built in new neighbourhoods will never truly fix the problem of overcrowding. They are built way too small for the amount of kids in demand of attending and not enough of them. Suggestion of finishing the neighbourhood build entirely then asses who needs to be moved at all. And revise your planning division to current demand of bigger school sizes and or more schools.

John Sweeney Sub-Area C

It is not fair for families to be uprooted and most of all not be given a choice! A choice should be the only option when asking existing students to move to a different school. You teach students not to bully others and here you are bullying the families into corners they have no way out of. This makes no sense at all to open a brand new school and have to move the kids from it the following year because it is already overcrowded !!! Clearly your planning needs to be revised and looked at again if this is the issue that comes up each year. Josephine Bakhita has opened last year and is already at over capacity!?!

Once again thank you for allowing us to voice our concerns. My entire neighbourhood along with Mannheim is very much against this decision of moving boundaries. My child is crying and terrified because he doesn't want to go to a new school or be separated from his friends and teachers. He has grown to love over the last 4 years at Sweeney. He is also within walking distance of Sweeney and this works for my family situation. Adding a bus, that is by the way not reliable these days, is something that will not work for our family working situation. Allow a choice and take all the new sign ups to attend the new school. This should alleviate some congestion from Sweeney but to be honest your solution of yearly boundary reviews and building small schools in young family neighbourhood is quite useless and acts as a wet bandaid.

I think this is unfair- if i did not hear from another mom i would NOT have even known about this, chnaging a school for a kid is HUGE i know doesnt impact you but it does for the kids.

Not applicable

This is being handled inappropriatly as no one was notified of the potential changes. Before gou go any further people should be notified PRIOR to the decision

Option 2 is best if means anything.

St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area K

Don't move kids who had to move to St Josephine - they should get 1st choice on staying there. My child was supposed to start [redacted] at another Catholic school for 1 year, but we kept [redacted] home to send her directly to St Josephine. It took a whole year for [redacted] to transition & get accustomed to St Josephine & now [redacted] loves it there, so we don't want to have to do all of that again. If parents moved their kids from other schools for their own choice or if they're not Christian, or if they don't live in this area, they shouldn't get to stay, they should move to the new school.

St. Josephine Bakhita Sub-Area K

I'm not sure honestly , I just want my kid to stay at st Josephine

John Sweeney Sub-Area C

We are within walking distance to John Sweeney and should not be forced to attend a school much farther away that we can no longer walk to.

John Sweeney Sub-Area C

We have put down roots in our area, our children have friends at their school and it would be devastating for us to disrupt this.

Having a student who's attended at least [redacted] (that's half of the [redacted] years period of elementary school) at the school needs to be allowed to continue/graduate at their school; non-bus students

What Sub-Area do you live in? Please refer to John Sweeney's Sub-Area Map <https://www.wcdsb.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/36/2024/10/John-Sweeney-Sub-Areas-2024-10-17.pdf> or St. Josephine Bakhita's ...

What are the key factors the Staff Committee should consider when making recommendations to the Board of Trustees, including those related to implementation and legacy exceptions?

John Sweeney Sub-Area D

1. Materiality of the impact of inclusion or exclusion of each Sub-Area, based on the student population of each sub area. For example if a sub-area has small population of students, there should be more weight apportioned to accommodating the concerns of students and parents/guardians.
2. Potential for further students move due to planned upcoming new schools. It is preferable to minimize student moves. For example if there is a new school going to be built closer to a zone, then consider moving the students to that new school, rather than move them twice.
3. Travel distance to school should be minimized. Ideally students should be assigned to the geographically closest school.
4. The Staff Committee should carefully reflect on feedback from all key stakeholders and objectively balance the needs of stakeholders in their recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

John Sweeney Sub-Area A

Walkability