

Castlebar and Norseman Program Area Review – Summary of Questions and Responses

Theme	Issue	Question	Response
Consultation	Timing	<p>What responsibilities do the school and TDSB take in the lack of communication regarding this substantial change and the impact on the families who are in the new proposed boundaries? How can this decision/recommendation be made without properly and thoroughly consulting the community that is being impacted?</p>	<p>The TDSB is committed to public engagement and consultation. Community meetings leading up to the current Program Area Review Team (PART) process were held on June 9, 2016, March 29, 2017 and May 29, 2017 and were intended to keep the community informed on plans for the Norseman addition, interim use of the Castlebar site and the timeline for the formal study and public process for the longer term plan for Castlebar. These presentations and timelines have been posted to the Norseman JMS website for the community's information. The public meeting is the main opportunity in the formal PART process for the public to ask questions, raise concerns, and provide feedback. Letters regarding the public meeting were mailed via Canada Post to all addresses potentially affected by the proposed boundary, and sent home through all students via back pack circulation. Beyond the public meeting there is an opportunity to provide feedback to the PART through the feedback forms provided at the public meeting or as you have done through the accommodationsreviews@tdsb.on.ca email address. There is also an opportunity to provide feedback directly to the Board of Trustees through the delegation process either through written submission or in person at the Planning and Priorities Committee meeting where the PARTs recommendations will be considered. It is the Board of Trustees who makes the final decision about changes to boundaries.</p>
		<p>Why was the PART formed in 2017 when all major communications from the TDSB informed that this would not be examined until the 2019-2020 school year?</p>	<p>The Long Term Program and Accommodation Strategy (LTPAS) represents an annual review and prioritization of projects to be undertaken over the 10-year planning window of the document. The scope of projects is reviewed and updated annually as well as the year in which studies have been prioritized to be conducted. Trustee's approve the LTPAS annually.</p>
		<p>The projection enrollment number have not really changed at all, why are we deviating from the strategies presented to review PART in 2019-2021? Why did this PART committee formation start happening 3-4 years in advance? What was the drivers to deviate from the published TDSB studies, especially when there were no enrollment forecast changes? The plan put forward from the TDSB always said JK-3 would be evaluated in 2020, I am not sure where the JK-5 recommendation is coming from?</p>	<p>As you have noted the 2016-2024 approved LTPAS identified: "Explore a review of the holding strategy introduced at the Norseman JMS/Castlebar 'campus' to determine if it is required in perpetuity to accommodate continued enrolment pressure, or, if the community is better served through the introduction of a new JK-3 standalone school on the Castlebar school site." To be conducted in 2019-2020 school year.</p> <p>The most current 2017-2025 approved LTPAS (approved by the Trustees on June 23, 2017) indicates: "Explore a review of the holding strategy introduced at the Norseman JMS/Castlebar 'campus' to determine if it is required in perpetuity to accommodate continued enrolment pressure, or, if the community is better served through the introduction of a new JK-3 or JK-5 standalone school on the Castlebar school site." To be conducted in the 2017-18 school year.</p> <p>The timing of the review was amended during LTPAS discussions last spring and the intent of moving up the review was to provide the community with some certainty and clarity about the future of the Castlebar site prior to the completion of the addition. The grade range was always intended to be a major consideration of the review and JK-5 was identified to align with the transition point for Sunnylea students to Norseman for grade 6.</p>
Implementation	New developments	<p>Perhaps the school and the TBSB are not interested in making people fully aware, so that the proposal can be quietly passed to accomplish what was originally intended? How do I know that my concerns were presented to the PART and taken into consideration? There was no line of questioning and no form of feedback. Why was a community meeting with the PART parent team members not held? This would have provided each area representative with a full perspective of the concerns from parents/community members in their area and not just what the perceived concerns may have been?</p>	<p>All feedback has been presented to the PART members and has also been posted to the review webpage for the Norseman/Castlebar PART. Staff put together a summary of the issues and concerns raised as well as the responses provided. Feedback received will also be reflected in the PART report considered by the Board of Trustee.</p> <p>Parent representatives on the PART were chosen to represent those affected by the proposed boundary change. Two representatives are from within the new proposed Castlebar boundary and the other two are from the existing Norseman boundary.</p>
		<p>New development should go out of the school area, which is consistent with previous TDSB decisions, in an over capacity school zone like Norseman. Was this reviewed as an option?</p>	<p>The redirection of new development is an option the TDSB considers when there is no ability for the local school to accommodate students anticipated from the new units. Between the 12 additional classrooms being constructed on Norseman and the 12 classrooms available at Castlebar we do not currently anticipate the need to redirect any of the known residential development applications to a school with space outside of the area.</p>
		<p>New development should go out of the school area in an over capacity school like Norseman. Was this reviewed as an option? Send the JK to Grade 5 in that new development to Castlebar - they will be new students to either school and the integration into a new school is inevitable regardless of what school they attend. Why should the children that already attend Norseman be displaced?</p>	<p>The majority of the known new development (8 of 13 applications) in the current Norseman attendance area has been captured in the proposed Castlebar JK to grade 5 boundary.</p>
		<p>Why is it not an option to have new development addresses part of the Castlebar catchment, instead of them having the priority of attending a school that they are already not a part of?</p>	<p>All known future development has been factored into the enrolment projections used in the analysis presented during the PART process (both working and community meetings). The analysis is not intended to offer a definitive assertion about the need for a portable (or portables) but to suggest based on what is currently known that additional space may be required and the near term solution for any potential shortage of space would be to use portables. Both the Local Feasibility Team (staff process) and the PART have contemplated the potential for portables on both the Norseman (post-addition) and Castlebar site.</p>
		<p>We are simply pushing the current Norseman problem to Castlebar. Was the expected future development considered by PART?</p>	<p>All known future development has been factored into the enrolment projections used in the analysis presented during the PART process (both working and community meetings). The analysis is not intended to offer a definitive assertion about the need for a portable (or portables) but to suggest based on what is currently known that additional space may be required and the near term solution for any potential shortage of space would be to use portables. Both the Local Feasibility Team (staff process) and the PART have contemplated the potential for portables on both the Norseman (post-addition) and Castlebar site.</p>

Castlebar and Norseman Program Area Review – Summary of Questions and Responses

Theme	Issue	Question	Response
Implementation	Grand parenting	Is it possible to “grandfather” some students who have already spent years at Norseman and let them continue there without causing them unnecessary stress and anxiety and moving them back and forth between schools?	Providing grand parenting for students currently attending Norseman is not feasible as the students residing within the proposed boundary are required to create a viable program and to efficiently utilise space if Castlebar is to be a standalone school. There would not be a sufficient number of new students moving into the proposed Castlebar attendance area to run a viable standalone school and the site would be significantly under-utilized.
		Would there be a option to have current students stay at Norseman if they are within the new boundaries for Castlebar?	
		I don't understand why you wouldn't consider the idea of grandfathering those who are already attending Norseman and have the change only affect newcomers to the community ?	
	Extra-curricular	My child is in the before and after-school YMCA program at Norseman - will there YMCA be program at Castlebar as well?	Yes, there will be a before and after-school YMCA program and junior teams for students at Castlebar.
Will junior teams be available to her if she was to go to Castlebar?			
Options	Enrolment	Option status quo Feb 8th presentation: Since it was already determined in previous utilization studies that Norseman would not be over capacity on status quo, how with is it possible with 42 less students in 2019, than previous studies, that Norseman with the status quo arrangement is over capacity?	The Status Quo Option projected enrolments suggest Norseman would be overutilized in the long-term at (105%) with a deficit of 2 rooms. Castlebar would be at acceptable utilization in the long-term (81%) with a surplus of 3 rooms. The Status Quo Option is not over capacity in 2019. Norseman in the Status Quo Option becomes overutilised due to incoming development by 2022.
	Boundary	I also have a hard time understanding why option 2 grades JK-5 is the preferred option. This splits up the south corridor. Even people affected in option 3 have mentioned that plan makes the most sense. So how was option 2 decided?	Option 2 boundary is considered the preferred option for the following reasons: - Attendance boundary will be cohesively bound by major roads/utility-corridor - Attempts to maintain students on the same side of a street/block attending the same homeschool (boundary follows streets and physical features- not property lines) - Neighbours on the same side of the street are not sent to different schools - Boundary contains and can accommodate the majority of new developments
	Grade Range	What about moving all junior grades (JK-SK-1) to Castlebar and reconfiguring Norseman as a more senior school? What about making Castlebar a stand alone or satellite middle school for grades 6-8? Were these options considered? If not, why not? If they were ruled out, why? Were renovations at Castlebar School considered to turn that school into a grade 6-8 while keeping Norseman as a JK-Grade 5? Or were any other possible grade combinations considered between the two schools to avoid splitting the boundary?	Several options for grade ranges were contemplated during the analysis that led to the interim relocation of grades 4 and 5. Options to explore relocation of kindergarten grades, primary grades, as well as grade 6-8 were contemplated. Cost associated with fitting up kindergarten classrooms given the investment that had already been made to implement full day kindergarten at Norsemen could not be justified. Both the primary (grade 1 to 3) cohorts and the grade 6 to 8 cohort are projected to be approximately 300 (roughly 100 per grade) and Castlebar’s capacity is 239 (with all 12 classrooms).
Students	Out of Catchment students	What has been done to address those students who attend Norseman using addresses that are within the catchment, but they do not physically live at these addresses?	If we are aware of a family who does not physically live where they say they do, or if a family has moved, we require the two pieces of mail to verify their address as we do when a child originally registers.
	Multiple Transitions	This seems like a rather unique situation where students will be removed from Norseman and then asked to return again in Grade 6. Most students will leave a school and never return to it. Are there any similar scenarios at another school in Ontario that can be reviewed to determine impacts of this change on students, teachers and the community?	The scenario of reopening a closed site in such close proximity to an operating junior middle school is fairly unique to the best of our knowledge. Relocating students is necessary when opening a new school. It requires the students that will populate the new school to be removed from a holding school(s). Most new public elementary schools in Ontario are planned to serve kindergarten to grade 8 so it is difficult to identify examples where students would transition back to a middle school. We are not aware of similar examples of students relocating to a junior school and then rejoining the school they left for middle school grades.
	Multiple Transitions/ Well-being	I have two children, who will both experience this potential boundary change very differently than their friends and the Norseman cohort they began school with. How does this contribute to the continuity of my children’s educational experience and learning process? My daughter will be required to make three very unique transitions in the course of a three year period.	We will need to work to support in a unique way considering individual student needs. Major change and varied transition will happen for some with the first year of a boundary change and then change/transition should be minimized from there. School identified several actions they would take to support this transition including careful placing of students in classes with other students who will be attending Castlebar in the following year, continued interaction with Castlebar as a “sister” school (kind of like learning buddies but of the same age), our continued transition day for all students moving from grade 5 to grade 6 (Sunnylea, Norseman, Castlebar).
	Well-being	Have you considered how parents and teachers can address this new proposal that will soon be confirmed and brought up in the school yard? What have you put together for parents and teachers in the way of a toolkit and Q&A to deal with telling children they will be separated from friends and no longer be a part of Norseman?	We can certainly explore putting together a Q&A to support student transition and moving forward. We will consult with varied staff – in school and central to prepare a document.

Castlebar and Norseman Program Area Review – Summary of Questions and Responses

Theme	Issue	Question	Response
Students	Enrolment	Look closely at the children that are in Grade 2 and 3 currently and do an impact analysis on how many are actually IMPACTED by the transfer to Castlebar. How large is that number?	Given the proposed implementation date of September 2019 the proposed boundary change would only affect students residing within the boundary and currently attending Norseman in Kindergarten through grade 3 (grade 5's in September 2019). As of October 31st 2017 this represented:
		What is the current percentage of children attending Norseman that this move would affect ?	JK – 21 SK – 23 Gr 1 – 26 Gr 2 – 17 Gr 3 – 26 This is a total of 133 current students, or roughly 15% of the total October 31, 2017 enrolment of 745. The above numbers do not include the coming 2 years of JKs that would also be included at Castlebar or any new students who were expected to move into the proposed boundary for Castlebar.