# Okotoks Attendance Boundary Engagement

## Questions Grouped by Theme

Questions submitted at the engagement, through the survey, or submitted through additional correspondence are included. Similar questions have been combined to avoid repetition, while retaining specific concerns raised by families. As a result, individual questions may not appear exactly as originally submitted. Feedback and recommendations were also used to inform subsequent scenario development and the boundary review process.

## 1. Grandfathering and Student Continuity

1. Will students currently enrolled at a school be grandfathered in if their address falls outside the new boundaries?

   The proposed grandfathering approach allows students enrolled at a school before the new boundaries take effect to remain at that school for the grades it offers, even if their home is in a newly designated attendance area. Families will actively declare whether they choose the designated school or their eligible grandfathered school.

2. Will current École Good Shepherd School (EGSS) students be guaranteed a place at the replacement school?

   Current EGSS students can be grandfathered to the replacement EGSS if they wish and if their grade level and program is offered. Families affected by boundary changes will be asked to declare their school choice; placement must align with the grades and programs offered in the year of attendance.

3. Will grandfathering apply to siblings, including younger children not yet attending school?

   Yes, the proposed provision extends to both current and future siblings, including children who have not yet started school. The family declaration will help CTR record sibling eligibility for long-term planning.

4. Will grandfathering apply to students in all grades or only those nearing the end of their current school placement?

   The proposed grandfathering provision applies to existing eligible students across the grades offered at the school, not only to students in their final year. It continues from year to year unless the family informs the school of a change.

5. Could new boundaries apply only to new registrations or incoming Kindergarten students?

   Revised boundaries will guide new enrolments, but CTR is not proposing to require every currently enrolled student to move immediately. Existing eligible families would be offered a choice between the newly designated school and a grandfathered school; an active declaration is required. New families will be directed to apply to their newly designated school for the 2027-2028 school year and beyond.

6. Will students who have already experienced school transitions receive special consideration?

   Continuity is central to the proposed grandfathering approach, which is intended to reduce unnecessary transitions for students who have already changed schools. Additional individual circumstances can be discussed with the school through the regular review/transfer process.

7. Will students with identified learning needs, disabilities or mental health concerns be considered for exceptions?

   Yes. Families may identify learning, disability, accessibility, or mental-health needs when seeking individual consideration. The school and division team would review support needs and available programming case by case; grandfathering provides a broader continuity option without requiring families to disclose a diagnosis.

8. Will students entering their final year at a school be permitted to remain?

   Under the proposed grandfathering arrangement, an eligible student may complete the grades offered at their current school, including the final grade. A change in the school's grade configuration or programming would still affect which grades it can serve.

9. Can families choose to remain at their current school if they provide their own transportation?

   Families eligible for grandfathering would be able to select their current school through the declaration rather than having to rely solely on a parent-transport arrangement. The division will strive to provide transportation for eligible students who are grandfathered.

10. Will transportation continue for students who are grandfathered into their current schools?

    CTR intends to make every reasonable effort to provide transportation for students who choose an eligible grandfathered school, consistent with the direction developed for this boundary change. Individual routes, stops, ride times and eligibility arrangements cannot yet be guaranteed and will be planned after declarations are collected.

11. Will children of CTR staff members continue to have the option of attending the school where their parent works?

    Grandfathering opportunities applies to all current students including those of CTR staff. Any exceptional individual requests are reviewed through our usual request process.

12. How will students and families be supported through the transition to new boundaries?

    The implementation plan includes clear school-designation notification letters, a family declaration process, and further communication on transportation, programming and schedules. Each school will plan for welcoming students and maintaining relationships.

13. How many years will it take to fully implement the new boundaries?

    Boundary changes for all schools will begin in 2027–28. EGSS English junior high will be phased in over three years as the grade progressions for K–7, 8, and 9 are populated.

# 2. School Capacity, Enrolment, and Growth Projections

1. How was the 4% annual enrolment growth assumption determined?

   The November 2 presentation used a common 4% annual growth assumption to compare the six scenarios on the same basis, using current enrolment as a starting point. This represented the predicted growth rate of Okotoks, as provided by the town. Subsequent planning has also examined a zero-growth comparison to isolate the effects of boundaries and grade configurations, against an unpredictable growth rate in growing developments.

2. Is the 4% growth rate applied equally to all schools, grades and programs?

   The 4% assumption was applied consistently in the November 2 scenario comparisons; a growth rate was not presented as a separate forecast for every school, grade, neighbourhood or program. Actual growth will not be uniform. Further modeling after the initial engagement used a zero growth rate while understanding that new development will impact growth significantly in some communities.

3. Does the growth projection reflect actual population growth in specific neighbourhoods?

   Neighbourhood assignments were reflected in the scenario distribution, but the public 4% comparison was not a neighbourhood-by-neighbourhood population forecast. Actual growth could be substantially different in D'Arcy, Wedderburn and other developments, which is why the models are estimates rather than guarantees.

4. Were current and planned residential developments considered, including D'Arcy, Wedderburn, Mountainview and other high-density communities?

   Yes, developing neighbourhoods were part of the planning context, including D'Arcy, Wedderburn and Mountainview. CTR's capital planning also identifies major future residential development; specific student yields and timing will need ongoing validation as construction and occupancy progress.

5. Were municipal census information, building permits and residential construction data used?

   CTR's public capital planning references municipal development and growth information. This rate was provided by the Town of Okotoks.

6. How does CTR account for growth in rural areas surrounding Okotoks?

   Existing rural students are included in the current enrolment baseline and the applicable attendance areas. Future rural growth is less predictable, so enrolment and new development in Foothills County must be monitored along with growth in Okotoks.

7. Have projections been compared with those of neighbouring school divisions or similar communities?

   Neighbouring school division projections did not factor into our modeling.

8. Why are schools projected to exceed capacity within four years under most scenarios?

   The underlying pressure is the distribution of a growing student population among schools with different grades, programs and capacity. Under the original 4% modelling, all six scenarios showed at least one school above 100% by Year 4; Scenarios C and D showed EGSS above capacity at opening. That does not mean every school exceeds capacity. However, growth in Okotoks across CTR’s elementary schools will continue to present capacity challenges over time. This is expected given EGSS existing as a replacement school due to facility challenges. Capacity issues will continue in our Okotoks CTR schools until new schools beyond replacement school are built.

9. What is the longer-term enrolment outlook over five, seven or ten years?

The published engagement model compares a four-year period rather than providing validated five-, seven- or ten-year school-by-school forecasts. CTR recognizes that additional K–9 capacity in Okotoks may be necessary in future capital planning, but timing and location would require further analysis and provincial approval.

10. What happens if enrolment exceeds the projections?

CTR would review actual enrolments, boundaries, grade and program placement, use of available instructional space, timetabling, and requests for modular or additional capital capacity. Any further change would involve Board decision-making and, where appropriate, engagement and communication with families.

11. What does 100% capacity mean in terms of class sizes, instructional spaces and overall school operations?

A 100% utilization figure means that calculated enrolment matches the provincially measured capacity of the facility; it does not mean every class contains the same number of students or that every room is used identically. Class sizes, specialty spaces, student needs and school timetables still determine day-to-day operating conditions.

12. How is each school's capacity determined?

The Province of Alberta calculates school capacity using the facility's instructional area and an area-per-student factor related to grades served, with rated contributions for some specialized spaces. Capacity can differ from the number of ordinary classrooms multiplied by an assumed class size.

13. Why did the reported capacity of the new EGSS change from 815 to 850 students?

Earlier EGSS capital materials referred to an 815-student project, whereas the November 2 scenario modelling explicitly used 850. Our school designed built in additional classrooms by reducing classroom size slightly, given our prioritization of class size in CTR schools.

14. Are portable classrooms included in the projected capacity figures?

During initial school design, the facility was proposed to host 815 students inclusive of modulars being built onto the site. CTR advocated for the entire building to be built with that capacity instead of opening with modulars attached.

15. What utilization rate is considered desirable or acceptable for an elementary, K–9 or junior high school?

There is no single utilization percentage that guarantees appropriate educational conditions for every school type. CTR's planning objective is to avoid opening at or above capacity where possible, preserve reasonable growth room and use all four schools responsibly while maintaining strong programs. Schools operating at or slightly above capacity are common across Alberta and in some CTR schools, and maintain high quality learning experiences with support for all students.

16. Why is JPII significantly underutilized in some scenarios while other schools are over capacity?

Most of Scenarios A–E (as presented in the engagement) leave fewer junior-high students at JPII than its rated capacity can accommodate. In the November 2 presentation, JPII's Year 4 utilization ranged from 60% to 83% under those scenarios, compared with 99% in Scenario F. Rebalancing must also consider educational fit and student transitions, not utilization alone.

17. How does the projected enrolment compare with actual enrolment and current classroom utilization at each school?

The November 2 presentation listed current enrolment and capacity as follows: EGSS 636 / 795; St. Mary's 710 / 887; St. Francis 579 / 600; JPII 815 / 935. These are 2026–27 snapshots, not the projected enrolments in the new building. They provide the baseline for understanding how each proposal redistributes students.

18. Why was the new EGSS not designed with greater capacity to accommodate future growth?

The province approved a replacement school with a defined project scope and K–9 configuration. A larger building would require a different funded scope, site, and design parameters.

19. What would school utilization look like if the current boundaries remained unchanged?

The six published scenarios did not provide a separate unchanged-boundaries utilization table. Keeping existing assignments would leave some students travelling away from neighbourhoods near the new EGSS.

20. Could different growth assumptions significantly change which scenario is most appropriate?

Yes. Higher or more localized growth may change when schools reach capacity, while a zero-growth comparison modeled after the engagement helps show the immediate redistribution caused by boundary and grade choices. CTR will need to continue monitoring growth in Okotoks across all schools into the future.

# 3. Attendance Boundaries and Specific Communities

1. What criteria were used to determine the proposed attendance boundaries?

For the engagement, the public guiding principles were regarding English and French Immersion programming, school capacity, anticipated growth, and long-term stewardship. Transportation geography and the implications for the four schools also inform the analysis. Given the desire for consistency, later models following the engagement strongly considered the desire for continuity and maintenance of established social groupings.

2. Why was each neighbourhood assigned to its proposed school?

In the engagement, each proposed assignment was tested for its impact on overall enrolment and program distribution, rather than being based on distance alone.

3. Why is Mountainview proposed to move away from St. Francis when many students already attend there?

Decisions for specific communities were based on geographic location, transportation, and future capacity balancing across all Okotoks schools in CTR.

4. Why are Air Ranch and Ranchers Rise excluded from the new EGSS boundary under some scenarios?

Decisions for specific communities were based on geographic location, transportation, and future capacity balancing across all Okotoks schools in CTR.

5. Could Air Ranch and Ranchers Rise remain within the EGSS boundary?

   Decisions for specific communities were based on geographic location, transportation, and future capacity balancing across all Okotoks schools in CTR.

6. Could Wedderburn be assigned to St. Francis instead of EGSS?

   Decisions for specific communities were based on geographic location, transportation, and future capacity balancing across all Okotoks schools in CTR.

7. Could other developing communities, including Drake Landing, be considered for the St. Francis boundary?

   Decisions for specific communities were based on geographic location, transportation, and future capacity balancing across all Okotoks schools in CTR.

8. Why was Crystal Green selected for reassignment to St. Francis in Scenario B?

   Scenario B tested further geographic redistribution than Scenario A, with a somewhat higher projected utilization at St. Francis. Decisions for specific communities were based on geographic location, transportation, and future capacity balancing across all Okotoks schools in CTR.

9. Could Crystal Green students continue attending JPII for junior high?

   Current students eligible for grandfathering could be offered the choice to remain at JPII for grades and programing it provides, depending on the approved policy and program configuration. Future or new students would follow the approved designated route unless a transfer is approved.

10. Why are some newer developments assigned to EGSS while established neighbourhoods are reassigned elsewhere?

    New and established neighbourhoods create different immediate and future enrolment demands. The scenarios seek to balance those demands while using the new space at EGSS. Decisions for specific communities were based on geographic location, transportation, and future capacity balancing across all Okotoks schools in CTR.

11. Could Okotoks be divided geographically to allow students to attend schools in the north or south of town?

    A north–south geographic division is a reasonable concept to test, but schools differ in grade configuration, French Immersion and capacity, and rural student population. Geography alone will not create equal utilization or support every program pathway.

12. Why is the west side of 48th Street not consistently assigned to one attendance area?

    The scenarios were built around overall school utilization, program pathways and existing school capacities, not exclusively a single road as a boundary. Decisions for specific communities were based on geographic location, transportation, and future capacity balancing across all Okotoks schools in CTR.

13. Could students living east of 48th Street continue attending St. Mary's?

    Families eligible for grandfathering would have the option to remain at their current school; a request outside both designation and grandfathering would need a transfer decision.

14. Where will students in Green Haven, Cornerstone, Sandstone and other communities not clearly identified on the maps attend?

    Communities will be explicitly listed in any boundary decision by the board, and a map will outline the boundary areas. Any further questions regarding communities can be asked of school principals who can provide or seek that detailed information.

15. How will future residential developments affect boundary assignments?

    New developments will be assigned a designated school as they are incorporated into approved attendance areas. Growth and occupancy will be tracked so that future enrolment does not rely solely on an outdated projection.

16. Will attendance boundaries be reviewed again as new neighbourhoods develop?

    Yes, the division will continue to review enrolment at each school and address attendance boundaries again when material growth or operational circumstances warrant it. The intention, however, is to make a sustainable decision that reduces the need for repeated changes to established families.

17. Will families be permitted to request attendance at a school outside their assigned boundary?

    Yes. Families may request attendance outside their designated area. As with process, the family selects a designated or eligible grandfathered school on the declaration; any different school requires a separate transfer request with reasons and a case-by-case decision.

18. What criteria will be used to approve or deny requests for exceptions?

    Factors may include space, program availability, student needs, family circumstances, and transportation implications.

19. If a family moves from one neighbourhood to another, can their children remain at their current school?

    A family's initial eligibility for grandfathering will be established through the declaration. Later moves out of or into neighbourhoods will require further consideration and processes.

20. Could families currently attending St. Francis retain the option of attending that school even if the new boundaries assign them elsewhere?

    Yes. The proposed grandfathering approach would allow currently enrolled eligible St. Francis students to choose to remain there, including current and future siblings under the stated family provision. New students without eligibility would follow the adopted boundary or seek an approved transfer.

# 4. French Immersion Programming

## Program structure and location

1. What is CTR's long-term K–12 vision for French Immersion?

   CTR's objective is a strong, accessible and sustainable K–12 French Immersion pathway. Currently Early French Immersion runs K–6 at EGSS, Grades 7–9 at JPII and Grades 10–12 at Holy Trinity Academy; Late French Immersion begins in Grade 7 at JPII. The board’s decision continues these configurations.

2. Does CTR favour a single-track French Immersion school or a dual-track model with English and French programming together?

   The six scenarios tested dual-track and alternative program placements; they do not establish an enduring preference for one structural model. Given the resounding desire for grandfathering, EGSS will not be able to also support junior high French programming, which will continue at JPII.

3. Could all K–9 French Immersion students attend EGSS?

   This was tested in the public scenarios. Scenario C, with K–9 English and French Immersion at EGSS, projected 112% use on opening and 126% in Year 4; locating all K–9 French Immersion at EGSS therefore presents significant capacity concerns under that model. Further modeling that included grandfathering and staggered junior high grades would also make hosting junior high French Immersion at EGSS unfeasible.

4. Could JPII become a K–9 French Immersion school?

   This was not one of the six presented scenarios as a fully developed program model. This would require significant building modifications which are not sustainable in the current CTR capital budget.

5. Could French Immersion be offered at St. Mary's to reduce enrolment pressure at EGSS?

   Introducing French Immersion at St. Mary's would be a significant new program decision, involving cohort viability, qualified staffing, student transfers and continuity across grades.

6. Why was a model with French Immersion K–6 at EGSS and Grades 7–9 at JPII considered preferable in some scenarios?

   The sessions shared at the engagement sessions did not indicate a preferred scenario, but rather the benefits and challenges of each. Keeping K–6 French Immersion at EGSS and Grades 7–9 at JPII preserves the existing pathway and uses available junior-high capacity, rather than shifting the entire K–9 program into EGSS.

7. Would keeping all French Immersion students together improve language development, continuity and mentorship?

   A single K–9 site could make cross-grade activities and mentorship easier, but it would not by itself guarantee higher proficiency. It also concentrates enrolment and staffing at one building; the 2026 scenario analysis showed important EGSS capacity costs. The current division of elementary and junior high French Immersion students at two different sites is yielding high results for students given the exceptional teaching experiences occurring in the bilingual model.

8. Would maintaining French Immersion across multiple schools improve access and reduce capacity concerns?

   Multiple sites can improve geographic access or distribute enrolment, but smaller cohorts can complicate timetabling, staffing. and program breadth. The division must weigh those trade-offs rather than assume that one approach is always better.

9. How would each scenario affect the availability of French Immersion teachers, educational assistants and specialized resources?

   Teacher assignment, bilingual staffing availability, cohort sizes, and other supports will be considered after the program location is settled. The engagement scenarios did not provide school-by-school staffing allocations; those are part of subsequent operational planning and cannot be finalized until the 2027 budget is provided in the new year.

10. How would families with one child in French Immersion and another in English programming be accommodated?

    The proposed declaration protects eligible grandfathering for both English and French Immersion families, including siblings. Families with children in different programs would receive school and transportation information, but identical school placement or specific transportation arrangements for all children cannot be guaranteed.

11. Could a student switch from English to French Immersion or vice versa after boundaries are implemented?

    A program change can be requested and would depend on the student's background, language readiness, grade, and program availability. Switching from English into established French Immersion grades is not automatically possible without an appropriate entry pathway and academic review.

12. Would families be able to request French Immersion placement outside their assigned boundary?

    French Immersion programming in any grade will occur at only one school and would automatically be the assigned school for any French Immersion student.

## Late French Immersion and program continuity

13. Will late French Immersion continue to be offered?

    Late French Immersion is currently offered at JPII starting in Grade 7. This will continue in the new boundary determinations.

14. At which school would late French Immersion be located?

    Late French Immersion is currently offered at JPII starting in Grade 7. This will continue in the new boundary determinations.

15. How would the different scenarios affect enrolment in late French Immersion?

    Late French Immersion is currently offered at JPII starting in Grade 7. This will continue in the new boundary determinations.

16. Would changing schools multiple times discourage students from entering or continuing French Immersion?

    Late French Immersion is currently offered at JPII starting in Grade 7. This will continue in the new boundary determinations. It is possible that a transfer to a new school may positively or negatively impact any family's decision to continue or begin their child in French Immersion programming.

17. How many students currently leave French Immersion between Grades 6 and 7 or before high school?

    There is typically loss of language students at any significant grade transition point. Over the past few years in CTR, French Immersion enrolment numbers decrease by 0-3 students between grade 6 and 7, with an additional 14-16 students entering in Late French Immersion.

18. How would CTR support students continuing French Immersion into high school?

The pathway continues into Holy Trinity Academy, where French Immersion courses are offered in Grades 10–12. JPII and HTA staff can support student course selection and communicate high-school program requirements well ahead of transition.

### Program quality and outcomes

19. How does CTR define functional bilingualism?

Functional bilingualism generally refers to an ability to communicate effectively in French in authentic contexts across listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Students in French Immersion programming within Alberta are assessed with the French Immersion curriculum, which includes Provincial Achievement Tests (PAT) in grades 6 and 9.

20. What French-language proficiency should students achieve by the end of Grades 6, 9 and 12?

Expectations are linked to Alberta French Immersion curricular outcomes.

21. How many students currently achieve those proficiency expectations?

In CTR, 91.4% of students are achieving at the acceptable standard on the grade 6 PAT, with 11.4% at the level of excellence. 81.8% of students are achieving at the acceptable standard on the grade 6 PAT, with 9.1% at the level of excellence. These scores are above the provincial average across all categories.

22. Will CTR consider independent French-language assessments, such as DELF?

No decision to implement DELF division-wide was announced in the boundary engagement.

23. Would CTR fund proficiency assessments for students?

No decision to implement DELF division-wide was announced in the boundary engagement.

24. How will students' listening, speaking, reading and writing skills be assessed?

French Immersion learning is assessed through classroom work and demonstrations of language proficiency in listening, speaking, reading and writing, aligned with the applicable curriculum and provincial examinations.

25. What steps will CTR take when student French-language proficiency stalls or declines?

Strong results measured against provincial standards do not indicate a potential decline in proficiency.

26. Will assessment results and participation trends be shared with families and the Board?

Relevant participation and achievement trends are reviewed annually by administration across all programs and in all schools.

27. How will assessment information be used to improve programming, staffing and student learning?

CTR's results indicate a high commitment by the division, administrators, teachers, and staff to support strong instructional and assessment in all programs.

## 5. Grade Configurations and Educational Programming

1. Why is the new EGSS planned as a K–9 school?

   The replacement EGSS was approved as a K–9 facility, allowing the division to accommodate additional grades and respond to Okotoks growth. That approved long-term capacity does not necessarily require the entire K–9 English configuration to open in the first school year.

2. Could EGSS remain K–6, with Grades 7–9 attending JPII?

   Yes, this was among the broad planning alternatives. However, the approved decision has EGSS growing toward K–9 English over time, while JPII's English junior-high enrolment changes as cohorts move.

3. Could EGSS begin with fewer grades and add grades over time?

   Yes. The boundary decision establishes EGSS with K–7 English in the first year and adding Grades 8 and 9 in the following two years.

4. Would a K–5 configuration at EGSS and St. Mary's provide a better enrolment balance?

   A K–5 model at St. Mary's with Grade 6 at JPII was specifically tested in Scenario F, which distributed enrolment more evenly but raised family concerns about moving younger students.

5. Why does Scenario F move Grade 6 students from St. Mary's to JPII but not Grade 6 English students from EGSS?

   Scenario F was designed as a specific modelling test: St. Mary's would become K–5 and JPII would serve English Grades 6–9, while EGSS English stayed K–6 and EGSS carried K–9 French Immersion. It was not a statement that Grade 6 students at the two schools differ developmentally, nor a final recommendation.

6. Should all Grade 6 English students transition at the same time?

   Grandfathering, new registration, and transfer processes will allow for consistency of current students and families, with immediate boundary changes for families new to CTR.

7. What are the educational advantages and disadvantages of a Grades 6–9 school?

   A Grades 6–9 school may offer access to older-student facilities, broader electives, and a stable four-year middle-years community. Challenges can include the developmental gap between Grade 6 and Grade 9, scheduling, recreational space, and a more complex transition for some students.

8. Are Grade 6 students developmentally ready to attend school alongside Grades 7–9?

   Many Grade 6 students can thrive in a well-planned middle-years setting, but readiness varies. Age-appropriate supervision, classroom organization, recreation, student supports and the preservation of positive peer relationships would be essential. Other CTR schools successfully have mixed groupings with grade 6 attending with higher grades.

9. Would Grade 6 students at JPII have a traditional homeroom or rotate between subject teachers?

   The specific Grade 6 instructional model was not determined through the boundary scenarios and is not supported in the board’s final decision.

10. Would JPII provide appropriate playground, recreational and instructional spaces for Grade 6 students?

    JPII's existing facilities will not host grade 6 in the final decision, and such facility considerations will not be required.

11. Would students have the option of attending JPII rather than remaining in a K–9 school?

Families can identify their designated or eligible grandfathered school under the proposed declaration. Attendance at another school simply by preference would require a transfer request, available programming and approval; JPII is not automatically an optional pathway for every student.

12. How would a K–9 model affect junior high independence, programming and school identity?

A K–9 school can build continuity, mentorship, and a shared Catholic identity, while junior-high students still need age-appropriate leadership, electives, space and independence. EGSS would develop a distinct junior high experience as grades are added.

13. What options, such as band, jazz, fine arts, shops, athletics and practical arts, will be offered at the new EGSS?

The engagement presentation states that EGSS will offer programming and options typical of a K–9 school. Final courses, including band, fine arts, practical arts, athletics and shops, depend on usable facilities, qualified staff, timetable and student interest; a definitive list has not yet been approved.

14. Would students moving from JPII to EGSS lose access to programs they currently enjoy?

Programming may differ between sites, and identical option offerings cannot be guaranteed year to year or school to school. Typical junior high optional courses will be held in both sites, with some local variability across the full breadth of courses.

15. Could a Grades 9–12 high school configuration reduce pressure on junior high facilities?

Moving Grade 9 from a junior-high school to a Grades 9–12 high school could reduce Grade 9 demand at junior-high sites, but would transfer that demand to an already pressured high-school system.

16. How would changes to future high school configurations influence the attendance boundary decision?

Holy Trinity Academy currently serves Grades 10–12, and CTR is advocating for additional high-school capacity. High-school capital decisions and future grade models may affect the system over time, but the Fall 2027 boundary decision must work with the facilities and program commitments now available.

# 6. Student Well-Being and School Communities

1. How will student mental health be considered in the final boundary decision?

Student well-being is a guiding principle, not simply a secondary consideration. Grandfathering, sibling continuity, staged entry, and clear transition supports are intended to reduce unnecessary disruption while allowing the division to manage facilities responsibly.

2. Have child development specialists or psychologists been consulted about the effects of school transitions?

Care for student well-being and learning within our faith-centered communities are at the core of all decisions in CTR.

3. How will CTR reduce the impact of separating established friendship groups?

   Grandfathering is intended to let eligible students remain with existing school communities, which can also protect friendship groups. For students who move, schools can use cohort-based orientation, peer connections and intentional classroom transitions where practical.

4. What supports will be available to students with autism, learning disabilities, anxiety or other identified needs?

   Students will continue to have access to learning support and student-wellness services according to their assessed needs. Plans for students with individual programming, medical or accessibility needs are always transferred carefully between sending and receiving schools, in partnership with families.

5. How will continuity of learning supports and relationships with school staff be maintained?

   School teams can coordinate transition meetings, share appropriate learning and support documentation, and identify a contact person at the receiving school. The goal is continuity of educational support even if the specific staff members or building change.

6. What consideration will be given to students who have attended the same school for several years?

   A student's years of established relationships are directly relevant to the grandfathering included within the board’s decision. Eligible currently enrolled students would be able to choose to remain at their school for its offered grades, rather than being moved solely because a boundary line changes.

7. How will families who purchased homes based on existing attendance boundaries be considered?

   CTR recognizes that families make long-term decisions based partly on school access. Boundaries are nonetheless subject to change as enrolment and facility needs evolve. The proposed grandfathering approach seeks to respect existing family commitments without guaranteeing future geographic boundaries in perpetuity.

8. How will students who have already experienced significant educational disruption be supported?

   Students with significant past transitions or individual vulnerabilities can be discussed with school leadership. General grandfathering and additional case-by-case support are intended to reduce the risk of another difficult change.

9. What consideration will be given to families who have volunteered, fundraised or contributed financially to the new EGSS?

   The Board recognizes families' time, fundraising and commitment to school communities. Those contributions matter to school identity and relationships, but do not create an independent entitlement to a particular attendance boundary; continuity measures are proposed for eligible families generally.

10. How will CTR maintain a sense of belonging and community for students required to change schools?

    Receiving schools can prioritize welcoming activities, school visits, peer mentorship, classroom connections, accessible family communication and staff attention to student belonging. The transition should reflect CTR's Catholic commitment to the dignity of every child. Again the decision to grandfather current students and siblings is meant to provide increased consistency for CTR students.

# 7. Transportation and Family Logistics

1. How will each scenario affect bus routes and student travel times?

   Specific routes and ride times cannot be finalized until the Board approves boundaries, families submit declarations, and confirmed enrolments are known. Transportation planners will consider safe stops, student needs, travel time and efficient routing, and communicate details ahead of the 2027–28 school year during their normal planning time during the new calendar year.

2. Why would students from communities such as Air Ranch be transported across town when they currently attend EGSS?

   A route that appears to cross town may reflect the enrolment and capacity balance created by a particular scenario, rather than proximity alone. Existing Air Ranch families eligible for grandfathering would have a continuity choice under the new boundaries. CTR transportation planning and communication will occur into the new year once declarations have been given and route development occurs.

3. Why would students from Crystal Green be transported to St. Francis rather than an in-town school?

   The possible Crystal Green assignment was a geographic enrolment-balancing test, not a final routing decision. Crystal Green families remain at St. Mary's. CTR transportation planning and communication will occur into the new year once declarations have been given and route development occurs.

4. Will cross-boundary transportation continue to be available?

   CTR cross-boundary transportation are exceptional, annually reviewed services. For this particular boundary transition, CTR intends to strive to provide transportation to eligible grandfathered students, with routes being planned in the new calendar year.

5. Will transportation be provided to students who are grandfathered into their current schools?

   CTR intends to make every reasonable effort to transport students who select an eligible grandfathered school. This is a planning commitment, not a guarantee of every address, stop, route or ride time; details will follow family declarations and route design.

6. How will transportation be managed for siblings attending different schools?

   Transportation will be assessed using the schools, ages, and addresses of each child. Different schools may require different routes or family arrangements; existing optional dual-service and childcare transportation rules may also apply.

7. Will CTR consider walking and cycling distances when determining attendance boundaries?

   Yes. Walkability, route access and safe travel are relevant factors in considering school geography. Under current CTR guidelines, basic designated-school transportation eligibility generally depends on home-to-school driving distance and grade level.

8. Have traffic congestion, major road crossings and pedestrian safety been considered?

   Pedestrian safety, route design, major crossings and traffic are appropriate considerations. The consultation focused on boundaries rather than detailed route engineering. Safe crossings and traffic flow were considered by the Town and province during early design phases. These will continue to be monitored by CTR once the school is operational.

9. Could school proximity be prioritized over other considerations?

   Proximity should have substantial weight, particularly for younger students, but must be considered alongside capacity, continuity, suitable programming and rural service. Grandfathering has been made a priority in the board's decision.

10. Will families be allowed to transport their children to a preferred school rather than use assigned bus transportation?

    Families may choose to transport a student themselves. That does not automatically create admission rights at any chosen school: families must select a designated or eligible grandfathered school, or obtain approval for another transfer.

11. How will changes affect before- and after-school care, childcare arrangements and extracurricular activities?

    Boundary changes can affect childcare and family schedules. CTR are providing school-assignment decisions early so families can make plans; school transport to childcare is governed by specific capacity, route, and catchment conditions and cannot be promised for every arrangement.

12. Will rural students continue receiving transportation to their current schools?

    Current rural students eligible for grandfathering would have an option to stay in their present school under the proposed approach. Rural students' school placements are unchanged in the board's decision and transportation for these students will also continue.

# 8. Rural Students, Calgary Students and Admission Priorities

1. What attendance boundaries apply to families living outside Okotoks?

   Rural students' school placements are unchanged in the board's decision. Grandfathering and transfer request processes for students attending other schools will apply to these students also.

2. Where will students living in Blackie, Priddis, De Winton, Foothills County and other surrounding communities attend?

   Rural students' school placements are unchanged in the board's decision. Grandfathering and transfer request processes for students attending other schools will apply to these students also.

3. How will rural students currently attending EGSS, St. Mary's, St. Francis or JPII be affected?

   Rural students' school placements are unchanged in the board's decision. Grandfathering and transfer request processes for students attending other schools will apply to these students also.

4. Will students living outside Okotoks be grandfathered into their existing schools?

   Rural students' school placements are unchanged in the board's decision. Grandfathering and transfer request processes for students attending other schools will apply to these students also.

5. How will rural students access French Immersion?

   The current and future pathway is K–6 at EGSS and Grades 7–9 at JPII, with high school French Immersion at Holy Trinity Academy.

6. How many students currently attending Okotoks Catholic schools live in Calgary?

   Of the 3249 students in Okotoks schools, 122 are residing in Calgary.

7. How many students attending St. Francis reside outside Okotoks or Foothills County?

   Of the 577 students attending St. Francis, 59 are residing outside of Okotoks or Foothills County.

8. Will CTR continue accepting students from Calgary when Okotoks schools are approaching capacity?

   Admission of non-resident students depends on space, programming, and CTR procedures. CTR must first assess its ability to accommodate students within attendance boundaries and those addressed by other CTR procedures.

9. Will admission priority be given to Catholic students and families residing within the attendance boundaries?

   Yes. Admission of non-resident students depends on space, programming, and CTR procedures. CTR must first assess its ability to accommodate students within attendance boundaries and those addressed by other CTR procedures.

10. How are non-Catholic students considered when school capacity is limited?

    CTR welcomes non-Catholic students where sufficient space and programming are available. Administrative Procedure STU 22 describes a review of available resources and facilities, with resident

11. Will changes to admission priorities affect existing students or only future registrations?

    The proposed grandfathering measure is designed to protect eligible existing students, while new registrations would be assessed using the approved boundaries and admission processes.

12. Could changes to Calgary enrolment significantly affect school utilization, particularly at St. Francis?

    Potentially, however, we prioritize our resident in-boundary and grandfathered families and accept out-of-area non-resident students only when space and resources allow.

# 9. Facilities, Capital Planning and Long-Term Sustainability

1. Why was the replacement EGSS not constructed with sufficient space to accommodate projected growth for a longer period?

   The replacement project was funded and designed within a provincial approval and capacity scope. CTR cannot simply add classrooms to the contract without considering site, design, cost and government authorization. The school is the largest possible facility on the allocated site.

2. What opportunities exist to expand the new EGSS?

   No expansion commitment has been provided by the province nor would the land site allow for expansion.

3. Is there sufficient land and infrastructure to accommodate future portable classrooms?

   No, as the school site is too small to accommodate future modular classrooms.

4. What will happen if EGSS exceeds capacity shortly after opening?

   CTR would monitor actual enrolment, reallocate available space appropriately, and possibly review intake and boundary arrangements, while potentially advocating for another K-6 or K-9 school in the future. The division aims to avoid opening EGSS above capacity; this was an important reason the original scenarios were compared.

5. Is another elementary or junior high school anticipated for Okotoks?

   CTR recognizes the likelihood of needing another K–9 school in Okotoks as the community grows. This is an appropriate consideration for future three-year capital plans, but there is not yet an approved new project, site or opening date to announce.

6. What is the anticipated timeline for future school construction?

   New-school timing is dependent on CTR's capital plan and the province's capital planning, approval, design, construction, and site readiness processes. CTR can advocate and identify need, but cannot give a reliable opening date before a project is approved and funded.

7. What will happen to the existing EGSS building and property?

   The school will be demolished and the land returned back to the municipality.

8. Could the existing EGSS facility continue to be used for educational programming?

   The school will be demolished and the land returned back to the municipality.

9. How will the future replacement or expansion of Holy Trinity Academy influence elementary and junior high planning?

   Holy Trinity Academy's significant enrolment pressure and CTR's advocacy for another high-school solution are related parts of long-term Okotoks capital planning. Those capital needs do not create immediately available K–9 seats and are not considered in the scope of the 2027 elementary/junior-high boundary implementation.

10. What financial and operational considerations are included when comparing scenarios?

    The scenarios affect staffing allocations, program viability, transportation routing, facility utilization, instructional resources, and the number and timing of student moves. The division must balance educational and family impacts with responsible use of existing buildings and available resources.

11. How will the division ensure that new boundaries provide a sustainable solution rather than requiring another major change within a few years?

    CTR is considering system-wide capacity, grade configurations, family grandfathering, phased implementation and monitoring of new growth rather than an isolated one-year fix. No boundary can eliminate the need for future capital investment if Okotoks grows substantially.

# 10. Engagement, Decision-Making and Implementation

1. What criteria will the Board use to evaluate the six scenarios?

   The guiding principles are student continuity, keeping communities together where reasonable, English/French Immersion pathways, capacity, growth and long-term stewardship. The Board has considered family feedback together with educational implications, projections, operational viability, and phased implementation.

2. How will feedback gathered through the engagement session and written submissions be considered?

   Feedback from approximately 150 participants at the November 2 event, as well as 120 written and online submissions, are grouped into key themes and considered with the scenario analysis. These guided administration and the board to consider other scenarios that included grandfathering and staggered junior high grade entry at EGSS.

3. Will the Board explain how feedback influenced the final decision?

   CTR has provided a detailed letter to all current families at the impacted schools, which is also posted on the schools' websites. The decision communication will explain the major considerations, where feedback influenced changes, and how the selected approach addresses continuity, French Immersion, capacity, and implementation. Feedback and questions, along with the engagement presentation, are fully shared on the CTR website.

4. Why were the existing boundaries not included as a comparison scenario?

   The meeting focused on alternative assignments prompted by opening a new K–9 building at a new location.

5. Could additional scenarios or modifications to the existing scenarios be considered?

   Additional modeling following the engagement was based on community feedback and ultimately led to the board's decision to grandfather and stagger junior high entry into EGSS.

6. Could the division combine elements from multiple scenarios?

   Additional modeling following the engagement were based on community feedback and ultimately led to the board's decision to grandfather and stagger junior high entry into EGSS.

7. Would a comparison showing the current boundaries alongside each proposal be made available?

   The presentation shown at the engagement is posted on the CTR website, including the boundaries within these proposals. The final decision also shows the boundaries and impacted communities.

8. Why do some scenarios have similar boundary maps but different enrolment projections?

   Utilization depends not only on the map but also on which grades and programs are located at each site. For example, moving junior-high French Immersion or Grade 6 cohorts can substantially change enrolment without a major change in the elementary attendance map.

9. Will the Board consider alternatives that minimize the number of current students required to move?

   Yes. Avoiding unnecessary moves was a prominent theme in the feedback. The grandfathering arrangement, including current and future siblings, is intended to preserve continuity while the Board considers its responsibilities for programs and facilities.

10. Could families directly affected by proposed changes be surveyed or consulted further?

    Families were able to attend the November 2 event and submit feedback online through November 10. This feedback allowed the division to provide grandfathering opportunities while managing growth. Registration begins in December, requiring board decisions and family declarations to guide enrolment projections and operational decisions that are required by January.

11. Will there be another opportunity for community engagement before the final decision?

    Families were able to attend the November 2 event and submit feedback online through November 10. This feedback allowed the division to provide grandfathering opportunities while managing growth. Registration begins in December, requiring board decisions and family declarations to guide enrolment projections and operational decisions that are required by January.

12. How will the Board distinguish between repeated submissions and feedback from individual families?

    The consultation is designed to identify distinct concerns, reasons and themes rather than simply count how often a preferred option appears.

13. How will the final decision be communicated to families?

    CTR has provided a detailed letter to all current families at the impacted schools, which is also posted on the schools' websites. The decision communication will explain the major considerations, where feedback influenced changes, and how the selected approach addresses continuity, French Immersion, capacity, and implementation. Feedback and questions, along with the engagement presentation, are fully shared on the CTR website.

14. When will families know which school their children will attend?

    In late November, CTR provided a detailed letter to all current families at the impacted schools, which is also posted on the schools' websites. The decision communication explained the major considerations, where feedback influenced changes, and how the selected approach addresses continuity, French Immersion, capacity, and implementation.

15. Will parents receive clear information about grandfathering, transportation, registration and exceptions?

    These are addressed in the letter to families.

16. What is the implementation timeline for the new boundaries?

    The new EGSS is targeted to open in Fall 2027. The boundary changes take effect for 2027–28, while EGSS English junior high grows by one grade per year from a K–7 start.

17. Will the Board revisit the boundaries if growth or enrolment differs significantly from projections?

    Yes, the Board retains the ability to reassess boundaries if actual growth, school utilization or programs differ materially from expectations. The aim is to provide stability for existing families through the proposed