AMENDED AGENDA and NOTICE
SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING

(originally posted on 3/12/26 at 3:22 p.m.;
amended on 3/13/26 at 8:30 a.m. and again on 3/16/26 at 11:00 a.m.)

This is a remote meeting, with public comment available via the meeting link.

Regular Session Meeting
Monday, March 16, 2026

LOCATION
Remote Location
Dial In: 1 301 715 8592 - Webinar ID: 837 5940 8658
URL: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83759408658

AGENDA

7:00 p.m. Open Regular Session **(Approximate Time)**

1. Public Hearing - 7:00 p.m.
   a. 2026-2027 School Choice Public Hearing (Discussion) 5 Mins
   b. 2026-2027 School Choice Vote (Discussion/Action) 5 Mins

Open Executive Session

2. Executive Session 30 Mins
   a. Motion and vote to convene in executive session and to return to open session pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws chapter 30A section 21(a) for the following purposes:
      i. Purpose (3) to discuss strategy with respect to and in preparation for collective bargaining with the Sudbury Nurses Association.
      ii. Purpose (7) to review and approve minutes from the Sudbury School Committee executive session meetings of February 5, 2026, February 9, 2026, March 2, 2026, and March 13, 2026.
      iii. Purpose (7) to comply with, or act under authority of, any general or special law or federal grant-in-aid requirements, specifically the Open Meeting Law, G.L.c. 30A 22 (f), (g), relative to the School Committee's executive session minutes for the following dates: (1) February 5, 2026 and (2) February 9, 2026.

Return to Open Session

3. Special Matters - Legislative Forum (Reports) 30 Mins
   a. Senator Jamie Eldridge and Representative Carmine Gentile
      i. Updates on initiatives that have been implemented in this past year that specifically impact the students in Sudbury Public Schools
      ii. Initiatives/Bills for upcoming year that specifically will impact the students in Sudbury Public Schools
      iii. Q&A from Members

4. Public Comment 15 Mins
   a. At the start of each regularly scheduled School Committee meeting, community members may address the Committee. Remote attendees on Zoom should use the "Raise Hand" feature (in the Reactions menu, or under "More" on mobile) and must type their full name into the Zoom name field to be called on. Per Policy BEDH, each speaker has up to three (3) minutes and must state their name and city/town. Public comment is not a discussion or debate, but an opportunity to share opinions on matters within the Committee's authority. Meetings are live-streamed and recorded for SudburyTV; participation constitutes consent to be recorded and broadcast.

5. Consent Calendar (Discussion/Action) 5 Mins
   a. Receipt of the CASE Capital Revision Notice
   b. Approval of Minutes (01/14/26, 01/15/26 and 01/20/26)

c. Policy Adoption - BGB Step 3, Action: Adopt policies JLCD, Administering Medicines to Students and IHBAA, Observations of Special Education Programs, effective immediately as presented
d. Appointment of Members to the Anti Hate / Anti Bias Task Force
e. Approval of Survey to be distributed to Parent Advisory Councils to gather input for the annual review process described in the School Committee Handbook

6. Business and Policy Matters
   a. Vote on the Agreement Between the Sudbury School Committee and the Sudbury Nurses Association And Vote to Authorize the Chair of the School Committee, in Collaboration with the Superintendent, to Draft and Issue a Press Release to the Community Based on the Outcome of the Ratification Vote (Discussion/Action) 10 Mins
   b. Climate Leader Communities Program Certification, including discussion of the Fuel Efficient Vehicle Policy adopted in 2012 and possible amendments (Discussion/Action) 30 Mins
      i. Eric Sims, Sustainability Coordinator
   c. 2025-2026 School Committee Goal: Review and evaluation of digital resources and instructional technology used in classroom and homework instruction, including data on technology product usage and recommended digital learning practices within the curriculum to support fidelity of implementation. (Discussion/Action) 20 Mins
   d. Training and Discussion on Privileged Materials; Process for Handling Records Requests with the Record Requests Officer, Including Changes Made Following the Boston Globe Matter and Other Privileged Information Redactions (Discussion/Action) 20 Mins
   e. Policy BGB, Step 3: Review Counsel Feedback on Proposed Policy Revisions Based on School Committee Input; Potential Vote to Adopt (Discussion/Action) 15 Mins
      i. IJDG, Artificial Intelligence
   f. **Extended Day Program Operation RFP**; Update & Evaluation Committee (Discussion/Action) 15 Mins
   g. Discussion Around Process of Annual Calendar Approval (Discussion/Action) 10 Mins
   h. Superintendent and School Committee Community Communication (Discussion/Action)10 Mins

7. Adjournment

"This listing of matters is those reasonably anticipated by the Chair, which may be discussed at the meeting. Not all items listed may in fact be discussed, and other items not listed may also be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law. The Chair will strive to honor timed items as best as possible."

The next School Committee Meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday, March 31, 2026**

Sudbury Public Schools
School Committee Meeting

Date: **March 16, 2026**

Agenda Item: **1a / 1b**

a. **2025-2026 School Choice Public Hearing**
b. **2025-2026 School Choice Vote**

Recommendation:

Motion to decline participation in the School Choice Program for the 2026-2027 school year and affirm SC Policy JFBB-1.

Background Information:

- **Whereas the Education Reform Act of 1993 requires the enrollment of non-resident students under the School Choice provision unless the Committee votes by June 1 not to participate; and Whereas the School Choice provision takes money away from the sending district and awards it to the receiving district; and**
- **Whereas Sudbury's per pupil expenditure is greater than the maximum allowable reimbursement, which means Sudbury taxpayers would subsidize each student; and**
- **Whereas once Sudbury accepts a pupil, it must keep the pupil through the completion of the eighth grade even though Sudbury's demographic situation might change considerably; and**
- **Whereas it is possible that the number of students could return to their sending districts or otherwise leave Sudbury, thus creating a potential income loss, now hereby be it**
- **Resolved that Sudbury School Committee respectfully declines to participate in the School Choice program.**

Attachments:

School Choice Public Hearing
JFBB-1

Action: **XX** **Report:** **Discussion:** **XX**

USA TODAY CO.

LocaliQ

PO Box 631210 Cincinnati, OH 45263-1210

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

Attn: Marilyn/Accts. Payable
Sudbury Public Schools
40 Fairbank RD
Sudbury MA 01776-5606

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS, COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX

The MetroWest/Milford Daily News, a newspaper printed and published in the city of Framingham, and of general circulation in the County of Middlesex, Norfolk and Worcester, State of Massachusetts, and personal knowledge of the facts herein state and that the notice hereto annexed was Published in said newspapers in the issue:

03/04/2026

and that the fees charged are legal.

Sworn to and subscribed before on 03/04/2026

Legal Clerk

Notary, State of WI, County of Brown

9.25.26

My commission expires

Publication Cost:	$28.29	
Tax Amount:	$0.00	
Payment Cost:	$28.29	
Order No:	12122724	# of Copies:
Customer No:	667753	0
PO #:	Julie Williams	

THIS IS NOT AN INVOICE!

Please do not use this form for payment remittance.

MARIAH VERHAGEN
Notary Public
State of Wisconsin

LEGAL NOTICE
PUBLIC HEARING

The Sudbury School Committee will hold a Public Hearing regarding the School Choice Program on Monday, March 16th at 7:00 p.m. This meeting will be held remotely.

The Education Reform Act (ERA) of 1993 mandates participation in "School Choice" unless a school district opts out by June 1. The public is invited to participate.

Brad Crozier
Superintendent
Sudbury Public Schools
AD#12122724
DN 03/04/2026

File: JFBB-1 - SCHOOL CHOICE

It is the policy of this School District **not** to admit non-resident students under the terms and conditions of the Interdistrict School Choice Law. This decision must be reaffirmed annually prior to June 1st by a vote of the School Committee following a public hearing. In the event the School Committee votes to participate, the following local conditions would apply:

1. That by May 1 of every school year, the administration will determine the number of spaces in each school available to choice students.

2. That by June 1 of every school year, a public hearing will be held to review participation in the school choice program.

3. That the selection of non-resident students for admission when the number of requests exceeds the number of available spaces be in the form of a random drawing. There will be two drawings for this purpose. The first will take place during the last week of the current school year but no later than July 1st. The second will be conducted during the week immediately preceding the opening of the next school year and will be based on the possibility of unexpected additional openings.

4. Any student who is accepted for admission under the provisions of this policy is entitled to remain in the District until completion of 8th grade except if there is a lack of funding of the program.

5. The School Committee affirms its position that it shall not discriminate in the admission of any child on the basis of *race*, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, disability, age, genetic information, active military/veteran status, marital status, familial status, pregnancy or pregnancy-related condition, homelessness, ancestry, ethnic background, national origin, or any other category protected by state or federal law, athletic performance, academic performance, or proficiency in the English language.

*race to include traits historically associated with race, including, but not limited to, hair texture, hair type, hair length and protective hairstyles.

SOURCE: MASC - Updated 2022

LEGAL REFS.: M.G.L.71:6; 71:6A; 76:6; 76:12; 76:12B
603 CMR 26:00
Acts of 2022, Chapter 117 -
https://malegislature.gov/Laws/SessionLaws/Acts/2022/Chapter117

Approved by Sudbury School Committee: October 2, 2023

Sudbury Public Schools
School Committee Meeting

Date: **March 2, 2026**

Agenda Item: **3**

Legislative Forum with Senator Jamie Eldridge and Representative Carmine Gentile

Recommendation:

Background Information:

Attachments:

Updated Questions for Legislative Forum

Action: **Report:** **XX** **Discussion:**

Questions for Legislative Forum

updated 3/13/2026

1. Bus bidding process changes to ensure districts receive more than one bid per RFP

2. Thoughts on Prop 2 1/2 limiting budgets in towns that do not have a large commercial district, specifically in negotiation years, but really overall.

3. Progress on bell to bell policy for the state to include money for schools to keep devices safely during the day.

4. Chapter 70 funding:

What current conversations are happening with regards to an inflation adjustment?

Advocate for school Districts to directly receive Chapter 70 funding without it funneling through the Town

5. Special Ed Funding & Circuit Breaker

Update on covering out-of-district transportation costs

6. Update on how the the “Fair Share” amendment is funding new education investments

7. Update on mental health supports for schools and counseling grants

8. Thoughtful use of classroom technology: set guardrails for screen time, ed tech, and instructional quality S.364

Why this matters:

I support digital literacy, but I also want stronger guardrails around when technology is actually improving learning and when it may just be replacing more effective instruction. I’m interested in how the state can help districts think more intentionally about screen time, device-based instruction, and age-appropriate classroom practice.

Forum Question:

Would you support a stronger state framework on instructional technology that includes

evidence-based guidance on screen use, procurement standards for ed-tech tools, and clearer expectations for when digital instruction should supplement rather than replace effective teaching practices.

9. Student privacy and responsible technology use: strengthen protections for student data S.364

Why this matters:

As schools use more digital platforms, districts need stronger state support on privacy, vendor expectations, and the responsible use of student and educator data.

Forum Question:

Will you support stronger statewide student-data privacy standards so districts have guidance for data privacy procurement and policy decisions.

10. Student well-being beyond the school day: address harmful social media design S.30

Why this matters:

Even though social media regulation is not strictly a school issue, schools see the effects every day in attention, anxiety, peer conflict, and student wellness.

Forum Question:

What youth social-media protections do you see as most likely to move this session? Please continue advancing youth online-safety legislation that addresses addictive design, algorithmic feeds, notifications, and privacy protections for minors.

11. Transportation and sustainability: make electric school buses financially realistic S.2358

Why this matters:

Districts are interested in cleaner transportation options, but electric only works if the state helps

address the full cost: buses, chargers, infrastructure, utility upgrades, and long-term operating costs.

Suggested forum question:

What state support would you back to help districts realistically transition to electric buses, including infrastructure, planning, and operating costs, not just one-time vehicle awards? Please support a more complete school-bus electrification strategy that includes capital funding, technical assistance, charging and utility support, and implementation help for districts.

12. School finance: protect and strengthen state aid for public schools

Why this matters:

Districts need stable, predictable state funding that reflects real costs, including staffing, transportation, special education, and core operations.

Suggested ask:

Please support growing Chapter 70 funding to keep pace with actual district costs. What actions can you take at the state level to help give school districts greater predictability when federal education funding is uncertain?

Sudbury Public Schools
School Committee Meeting

Date: **March 2, 2026**

Agenda Item: **5 - Consent Calendar**

a. Receipt of the CASE Capital Revision Notice
b. Approval of Minutes (01/14/26, 01/15/26 and 01/20/26)
c. Policy Adoption - BGB Step 3, Action: Adopt policies JLCD, Administering Medicines to Students and IHBAA, Observations of Special Education Programs, effective immediately as presented
d. Appointment of Members to the Anti Hate / Anti Bias Task Force
e. Approval of Survey to be distributed to Parent Advisory Councils to gather input for the an**nual** review process described in the School Committee Handbook

Recommendation:

Move to approve the Consent Calendar as presented / amended

Background Information:

3.c. Policy BDB: Step 3: Adoption of the following Policies: JLCD and IHBAA

Under Policy BGB, the Sudbury School Committee follows a structured, three-step process to adopt or amend district policies:

1. **Information** – The proposed policy is distributed in the agenda packet for Committee members to review. ***(We completed this step at our February 9, 2026 meeting.)***

2. **Discussion** – The policy is read and discussed at a public meeting. This includes feedback from the Superintendent and/or relevant advisory committees, and may result in suggested edits or directions for redrafting. **(We completed this step at our March 2, 2026 meeting.)**

3. **Action** – The Committee may vote to adopt or reject the policy. **(We are at this step.)**
    - If significant changes are made during this step, the Committee may choose to extend discussion.

Additional Notes:
- The Committee may suspend the above sequence in the case of emergencies.
- Once adopted, policies go into effect on a date set by the Committee to ensure time for implementation and communication.

Please note that although the School Committee tasked the administration to provide from Counsel a draft of policy JKAA, Physical Restraint of Students to be updated to reflect current laws, the administration has reported that Counsel is still working on drafting such policy and should have one ready this summer for the School Committee to potentially adopt.

3.d. Appointment of Members to the Anti Hate / Anti Bias Task Force

On February 9, 2026, the Sudbury School Committee adopted a resolution directing the Superintendent to convene an Anti-Hate / Anti-Bias Task Force, with the initial convening to occur no later than April 2026. The purpose of the Task Force is to develop recommendations to improve school culture and climate and to address antisemitism and all forms of hate and bias in Sudbury Public Schools.

The resolution provides that members of the Task Force will be appointed by the Superintendent after consultation with the School Committee and may include representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- A School Committee member
- District and/or school administrators
- District educators (from each school)
- Community and faith organizations
- Town leadership (including police)
- Community stakeholders

At the March 3, 2026 School Committee meeting, Karyn Jones was appointed as the School Committee representative to the Task Force.

This agenda item is for the School Committee to appoint the remaining members recommended by the Superintendent, consistent with the stakeholder categories outlined in the February 9, 2026 resolution.

3.f. Approval of Survey to be distributed to Parent Advisory Councils to gather input for the annual review process described in the School Committee Handbook

On November 3, 2025, the Sudbury School Committee adopted updates to the *Sudbury School Committee Handbook* outlining the communication and advisory input process for district-recognized Parent Advisory Councils (PACs), including the Sudbury Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEPAC) and the LGBTQ+ Parent Advisory Council.

As part of this process, the Handbook establishes an annual review between School Committee liaisons and PAC leadership prior to the Sudbury Annual Town Meeting. The purpose of the review is to assess the effectiveness of communication and advisory processes, identify opportunities for improved collaboration, and ensure PACs feel supported in fulfilling their advisory role.

To support this annual review, a draft survey has been developed to gather feedback from PAC leadership and members. The results will help inform the liaison review process and the written summary memo that will be included in a future School Committee meeting packet.

This agenda item is for the School Committee to review and approve the survey for distribution to the SEPAC and LGBTQ+ PAC.

Please note, the draft survey was unable to be formatted correctly to show everything correctly in the survey. The rating scales for questions 3 and 4 are from “very ineffective” to “very effective.” Question 9’s rating scale goes from “Very Unclear and Not Respectful” to “Very Clear and Respectful.”

Attachments:

CASE Capital Revision Notice February 2026
011425_Sudbury School Committee Minutes_DRAFT
011526_Sudbury School Committee Minutes_DRAFT
012026_Sudbury School Committee Minutes_DRAFT
3. DRAFT JLCD, Administering Medicines to Students
4. DRAFT IHBAA, Observations of Special Education Programs
5. DRAFT IHBAA, Clean
6. DRAFT Parent Advisory Council Annual Review Survey - Google Forms

Action:	**XX**	**Report:**		**Discussion:**	**XX**

CASE
COLLABORATIVE
Nurturing and inspiring every child to learn and grow

Central Office
120 Meriam Road
Concord, MA 01742
Tel: 978-318-1534
Fax: 978-371-7858

To: School Committee Chairs and Superintendents of CASE Collaborative Member Districts

From: Sanchita Banerjee
Executive Director, CASE Collaborative

Date: February 18, 2026

Subject: ACTION REQUIRED: Proposed Revision of the CASE Collaborative Capital Plan

Dear School Committee Chairs and Superintendents,

At its meeting on February 13, 2026, the CASE Collaborative Board of Directors voted to approve a formal revision to our existing Capital Plan. In accordance with 603 CMR 50.07 and our Articles of Agreement, I am writing to request that your School Committee place this revision on its next meeting agenda as an action item for consideration. **This revision is not a funding request.** The Board of Directors cannot direct excess funds at year end into any capital plan without a revision, so this process must come before any vote of the Board of Directors to direct funds.

Overview of the Capital Plan Revision

The primary goal of this capital plan revision is to expand the scope and funding limits of our capital reserve to ensure the long-term stability of our facilities and transportation infrastructure. In 2021, the Board of Directors and member districts approved a capital plan to build an accessible playground at the Colebrook School at 8 Post Office Rd in Acton, MA. That project was subsequently funded and completed. Since this playground project has been completed, our capital plan has also been completed; and no further projects are available for funding. The Board of Directors are looking to now revise the capital plan to include longer term projects to benefit CASE Collaborative.

The Board has identified broader strategic needs beyond the 2021 plan, proposing a total capital reserve limit of $4,365,900.

Instructional Programs

- Land Acquisition, Improvement, and Construction: $3,060,900.00
- Photocopiers and Technology Replacement: $25,000.00
- Durable Furniture and Equipment: $75,000.00

Transportation Programs

- Land Acquisition, Improvement, and Construction: $405,000.00
- Purchase of New 7D Vans: $800,000.00

Key Strategic Drivers

Van Replacement Cycle: Our transportation department must replace eight to ten vans per year to remain on a viable capital schedule for our current transportation program. With an average FY26 replacement cost of $78,954.00 per van, the capital reserve allows us to take advantage of available inventory from various vendors more effectively than individual purchase orders.

CASE
COLLABORATIVE
Nurturing and inspiring every child to learn and grow

Central Office
120 Meriam Road
Concord, MA 01742
Tel: 978-318-1534
Fax: 978-371-7858

Facility Security: The land acquisition funds are structured to allow the CASE Board of Directors to place a minimum 25% deposit to secure financing for property purchases, improvements to currently leased spaces, or new construction.

Infrastructure Maintenance: These funds will cover high-cost replacements for servers, switches, photocopiers, and specialized student equipment that exceed $10,000 in aggregate. Laptops, chrome books, and iPads are funded through the operating budget.

The Approval Process

Per 603 CMR 50.07, revising a capital plan requires two-thirds (2/3) approval of the member districts. Following guidance from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), this Capital Plan Revision must be presented as an action item at a public meeting. Member districts have a 45-day window to vote on the Capital Plan Revision; if a district does not vote to disapprove the plan within this 45-day period, it is deemed to have been approved by that member district.

Sincerely,

Sanchita Banerjee

Executive Director, CASE Collaborative

Sudbury School Committee
Meeting Minutes - DRAFT
January 14, 2026

Members Present:
Karyn Jones, Chair
Jessica McCready, Vice Chair
Nicole Burnard
Julie Durgin-Sicree
Betsy Sues

Also Present:
Brad Crozier, Superintendent
Annette Doyle, Assistant Superintendent
Don Sawyer, Director of Business and Human Resources
Stephanie Juriansz, Director of Student Services
Andy Sheehan, Town Manager
Andrea Kraemer, SEPAC Chair
Amy Ackerson, SEPAC Member
Katie Dineen, SEPAC Member
Maia Proujansky-Bell, SEPAC Member

Chair Karyn Jones opened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. and performed a roll call vote of the Committee. Julie Durgin-Sicree, Betsy Sues, Nicole Burnard, Jessica McCready and Karyn Jones all confirmed their presence.

Open Executive Session

Chair Karyn Jones motioned to enter into Executive Session and to return to open session pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws chapter 30A section 21(a) for the following purposes. Purpose 3 to discuss strategy with respect to and in preparation for collective bargaining with the Nurses' Union because an open discussion may have a detrimental effect on the bargaining position of the Committee and purpose 7 to review and approve minutes from the Sudbury School Committee executive session meeting of January 14, 2026. Vice Chair Jessica McCready seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:
Betsy Sues: Aye
Julie Durgin-Sicree: Aye
Nicole Burnard: Aye
Jessica McCready: Aye
Karyn Jones: Aye
Vote: 5-0. Motion carries.

Vice Chair Jessica McCready confirmed the Committee will enter into Executive Session and will return to open session pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws chapter 30A section 21(a) for the following purposes. Purpose 3 to discuss strategy with respect to and in preparation for collective bargaining with the Nurses' Union because an open discussion may have a detrimental effect on the bargaining position of

the Committee and purpose 7 to review and approve minutes from the Sudbury School Committee executive session meeting of January 14, 2026.

Open Regular Session

Chair Karyn Jones confirmed the Committee returned from Executive Session at 8:16 p.m.

1. Public Comment
    a. Dena Salom, shared a letter written to the School Committee and SEPAC in reference to the proposed reduction of ESY and elimination of SMILE and Explore programs.
    b. David Simon, Sudbury resident, asked for a delay in a vote to the FY27 budget to allow a solution to the proposed cuts of the summer programs.
    c. Anne Kranz, Sudbury resident, questioned whether funding could be acquired through the town, DESE or SERF to keep the summer program running. She questioned funding options and shared her concerns about changes and transparency in the decision making process.
    d. Liesje Quinto, Pendleton Road, Sudbury shared her disappointment of the canceling of the SMILE and Explore programs noting the timing of the announcement and the impact on families who aren't able to make alternative arrangements.
    e. Amy Todd, Sudbury resident, shared her disappointment in the termination of the SMILE and Explore programs. She urged the Committee to find a solution to serve all students in the community.
    f. Lindsey Giesen, Sudbury resident, shared the importance of summer programming for students with complex learning needs to help prevent regression and support ongoing development. She also shared concerns that changes to the schedule can create challenges for families who aren't able to find alternative summer options.

2. Educational and Operational Matters
    a. Director of Business and Human Resources
        i. The business office is currently working on completing the FY27 budget, continued work related to collective bargaining following the SEA ratification, including preparing contracts for signing. In addition, the office has been busy with new IRS tax reporting requirements and in preparing the RFP for after-school programming.

    b. Assistant Superintendent
        i. The Student Services departments from SPS, LSRHS, and LPS recently held a virtual information session for families of students with IEPs who will be transitioning from 8th grade to high school.
        ii. The district will host its upcoming virtual "Kickoff to Kindergarten" event to introduce incoming families to topics such as curriculum, safety, and the registration process.
        iii. ELD teacher, RL Sarafconn, has been selected to present at the MATSOL Conference on using data to support and advocate for multilingual learners.

    c. Superintendent
        i. The district recently announced the settlement of contracts with the SEA units, and the business office is now working on preparing and issuing retroactive salary payments for staff based on the new agreement.

ii. The district is also preparing for the annual student art show at central office, which will feature over 100 pieces of artwork from students across all schools. The new exhibit will be installed in late January, with an art opening for students and families scheduled for February 25.

Open Joint Meeting with the Sudbury Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEPAC)

Chair Andrea Kraemer called the SEPAC Board Meeting to order on January 14, 2026 at 8:37 p.m. She performed a Roll Call Vote of the Committee. Maia Proujansky-Bell, Katie Dineen, Amy Ackerson and Andrea Kraemer all confirmed their presence.

3. Business and Policy Matters
    a. Review of the FY27 Budget; Possible Action to Transmit a FY27 Budget to the Town by the January 16, 2026 Deadline
        i. Superintendent Crozier shared his budget slides highlighting adjustments to help reduce the budget gap to meet the Town Managers guidance.
        ii. Questions related to new hires, enrollment projections at Haynes and Noyes, the number of students currently and projected to be supported by ESPA's was asked.
        iii. Clarification was requested on DESE object line items, ESY costs and supports for students.
        iv. Additional questions related to revenue from the Explore Program, middle school enrollment driven increases, the impact of contractual settlements on the current year's budget, utility expenses, software subscriptions and clarification on circuit breaker funding.
        v. Members shared concerns about not having enough time to review the budget packet and a request was made to consider a longer, more thorough budget review process.
        vi. Stephanie Juriansz, Director of Student Services, then presented on the ESY program sharing the program's success in the past and acknowledged the concerns about being able to continue with the program. She also presented the proposed programs, services and changes.
        vii. Questions from both the School Committee and SEPAC focused on the rationale and financial analysis for program changes, ESY participation and summer 2025 budget vs spending. Clarification was requested on aides, tutoring, partnerships, alternative camps, and consideration of student regression or increased ESY needs.
        viii. Concerns were shared regarding potential loss of student gains, if the program is ending prematurely, schedule flexibility and support if not enough students enroll as well as the elimination of a program and the timeline for when this was communicated.
        ix. Town Manager, Andy Sheehan, joined the call to answer Committee questions related to passing an unbalanced budget, budget approval deadline and continued conversation about the summer program.

Close Joint Meeting with the Sudbury Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEPAC)

Chair Andrea Kraemer motioned to adjourn the SEPAC Board Meeting at 11:10 p.m. Katie Dineen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Katie Dineen: Aye
Maia Proujansky-Bell: Aye
Amy Ackerson: Aye
Andrea Kraemer: Aye

Vote: 4-0. Motion carries.

Director of Business and Human Resources, Don Sawyer, noted that related to the budget forecast, we are currently showing a significant gap between a 3% level service increase and the Town Managers Guidance with over budget projections for both FY28 and FY29. A member shared the desire for discussions about trade-offs, community priorities and strategies to bridge these gaps before the next budget cycle.

b. Review of Draft After-School Care Request for Proposals (RFP)
    i. This agenda item was not discussed.

4. Adjournment
    a. Vice Chair Jessica McCready motioned to adjourn the January 14, 2026 meeting at 11:17 p.m. Betsy Sues seconded the motion.
        i. ROLL CALL VOTE:
            1. Nicole Burnard: Aye
            2. Julie Durgin-Sicree: Aye
            3. Betsy Sues: Aye
            4. Jessica McCready: Aye
            5. Karyn Jones: Aye
                a. **Vote: 5-0**. Motion carries.

Respectfully Submitted,
Julie Williams
Executive Assistant to the Superintendent

Documents Reviewed During the January 14, 2026 School Committee Meeting

1. **Superintendent Recommended FY27 Budget**
2. **ESY Memo for Supt.**
3. **RFP_Facilities Lease_260113**

Sudbury School Committee
Meeting Minutes - DRAFT
January 15, 2026

Members Present:
Karyn Jones, Chair
Jessica McCready, Vice Chair
Nicole Burnard
Julie Durgin-Sicree
Betsy Sues

Also Present:
Brad Crozier, Superintendent
Annette Doyle, Assistant Superintendent
Don Sawyer, Director of Business and Human Resources
Stephanie Juriansz, Director of Student Services
Andy Sheehan, Town Manager
Victor Garofalo, Assistant Town Manager / Finance Director

Chair Karyn Jones opened the meeting at 7:01 p.m. and performed a roll call vote of the Committee. Jessica McCready, Julie Durgin-Sicree, Betsy Sues, Nicole Burnard and Karyn Jones all confirmed their presence.

Open Regular Session

1. Public Comment
    a. Katie Dineen thanked the School Committee for allowing SEPAC to participate in the previous day's meeting.

2. Continued Business and Policy Matters
    a. Review of the FY27 Budget; Action to Transmit a FY27 Budget to the Town by the January 16, 2026 Deadline
        i. Discussion around the FY27 budget continued.
        ii. The Committee's questions surrounded potential staff and administrative reductions, whether smaller budget areas had been examined to close the gap, the number of meetings attended with the town manager and if potential additional funding was discussed.
        iii. Related to summer programming, questions focused on student attendance comparisons, the purpose and scope of the summer bridge program, expected outcomes with Park and Rec Department, and potential program costs and risks if the budget could not fully support a feasible program.
        iv. Clarification on aid staffing and support levels was asked. Concerns related to how information would be submitted to the Committee to support decision-making and the timing of communication related to program endings was discussed.

v. Town Manager, Andy Sheehan, shared with the Committee that after a review of the FY27 operating budget with Victor Garofalo, they were able to revise the budget guidance for SPS to 4.17% resulting in an additional $200,000.00 aimed at sustaining summer programming for students. He also revised guidance for the Town and LSRHS. He shared a desire for better communication and collaboration with SPS and the School Committee to align priorities.

vi. Questions related to the additional funds given could be used for other purposes and whether the funds needed to be returned if the program ends up net neutral. Manager Sheehan confirmed that the Committee has final authority over how the budget is spent and the money does not need to be returned as it becomes part of the base budget going forward.

vii. Additional clarifying questions surrounded override dollar amounts and concerns about fiscal responsibility. Clarification from the Town was provided on how the additional funding was secured and the Committee shared their thanks to the Town Manager for the additional funding.

viii. Members engaged in discussion surrounding how the additional $200,000 should be allocated and agreed at reviewing all options with some suggesting that the first priority should be summer bridge program options and others sharing a desire to potentially support multiple needs in the budget.

ix. Administration confirmed discussions surrounding the summer program would continue and will return to the Committee with options and updates so a final decision can be made before information is shared with families.

x. Director of Business and Human Resources, Don Sawyer, confirmed with Andy and Victor that with the additional funds, the FY27 proposed budget is $49,252,426.00 and his recommendation is to place the additional funds in the ESY budget account line with the option to move it during a budget reset if needed.

xi. Vice Chair Jessica McCready motions to approve the FY27 School Committee budget of $49.252,426.00. Betsy Sues seconded the motion.

1. ROLL CALL VOTE:
    a. Nicole Burnard: Aye
    b. Julie Durgin-Sicree: Aye
    c. Betsy Sues: Aye
    d. Jessica McCready: Aye
    e. Karyn Jones: Aye
        i. **Vote: 5-0.** Motion carries.

3. Adjournment
    a. Vice Chair Jessica McCready motioned to adjourn the January 15, 2026 School Committee meeting at 9:34 p.m. Julie Durgin-Sicree seconded the motion.
        i. ROLL CALL VOTE:
            1. Betsy Sues: Aye
            2. Julie Durgin-Sicree: Aye
            3. Nicole Burnard: Aye
            4. Jessica McCready: Aye
            5. Karyn Jones: Aye
                a. **Vote: 5-0.** Motion carries.

Respectfully Submitted,
Julie Williams
Executive Assistant to the Superintendent

Documents Reviewed During the January 15, 2026 School Committee Meeting

1. **None**

Sudbury School Committee
Meeting Minutes - DRAFT
January 20, 2026

Members Present:
Karyn Jones, Chair
Jessica McCready, Vice Chair
Nicole Burnard
Julie Durgin-Sicree
Betsy Sues

Also Present:
Brad Crozier, Superintendent
Annette Doyle, Assistant Superintendent
Don Sawyer, Director of Business and Human Resources

Open Regular Session
Chair Karyn Jones opened the meeting at 7:01 p.m. Vice Chair Jessica McCready performed a roll call vote of the Committee. Nicole Burnard, Betsy Sues, Julie Durgin-Sicree, Karyn Jones and Jessica McCready all confirmed their presence.

1. Public Comment
    a. Laura Willard, Sudbury resident, shared concerns about the reliance of technology in classrooms. She urged the district to conduct an EdTech audit, prioritize print and paper based learning and ensure digital tools are evidence based before approving.

2. Special Matters
    a. Review Superintendent's Recommended Annual Town Meeting Articles
        i. Combined Facilities Director, Sandra Duran, shared the FY27 proposed capital items and small cap recurring items which include school safety, fire alarm and emergency lighting system enhancements, building management and system capital repairs.
        ii. Questions surrounded how capital projects are funded, including whether they are part of the operating budget or require warrant articles. Additional questions were raised about the buzzer system, how events would be handled with the new badge access system, and plans for carpet replacement.
        iii. Clarification on the transition from a small cap budget to a maintenance budget and what that means for SPS was asked as well as the status of the Curtis Solar Canopy project, the accessible pathway grant, when pricing for projects will be finalized and who is responsible for submitting warrant articles.
    b. 2025-2026 School Committee Goal: Review and Potentially Vote on the SPS Capital Plan
        i. Ms. Duran then reviewed a capital plan presentation.
        ii. Questions surrounding building maintenance, voting on the plan and how does that work with potential fluctuations, and clarification on UDL was asked.

iii. Vice Chair Jessica McCready motioned for the Sudbury School Committee to vote to approve the 15 year capital plan for SPS as presented. Betsy Sues seconded the motion.
    1. ROLL CALL VOTE:
        a. Julie Durgin-Sicree: Aye
        b. Nicole Burnard: Aye
        c. Betsy Sues: Aye
        d. Jessica McCready: Aye
        e. Karyn Jones: Aye
            i. **Vote: 5-0**. Motion carries.

3. Consent Calendar
    a. School Committee Mid-Year Report
    b. Meeting Minutes (10/06/25, 11/24/25 and 12/04/25)
        i. A request was made to review the mid-year goals and the 10/6/25 meeting minutes for clarification on items related to the Capital Plan in the mid-year goals, as well as clarification on Vote 5D.
        ii. The requested changes were reviewed and approved.
        iii. Vice Chair Jessica McCready motioned to approve the items on the Consent Calendar as amended. Betsy Sues seconded the motion.
            1. ROLL CALL VOTE:
                a. Jessica McCready: Aye
                b. Julie Durgin-Sicree: Aye
                c. Betsy Sues: Aye
                d. Nicole Burnard: No
                e. Karyn Jones: Aye
                    i. **Vote: 4-1.** Motion carries.

4. Business and Policy Matters
    a. Policy BGB, Step 1: Informational Only
        i. New - BDFC, Parent Advisory Councils, ELPAC
        ii. New - INJDG Generative Artificial Intelligence Policy for Teachers and Students
        iii. IHBAA, Observations of Special Education Programs
        iv. AD, Mission Statement
        v. CBI, Evaluation of the Superintendent
            1. This agenda item is informational only. The policies were reviewed by the Committee.

    b. Review of the FY27 Budget and potential options for the Budget Book
        i. Superintendent Crozier shared tiered initiatives recommended by administration if budgetary restrictions lightened.
        ii. Questions surrounding estimated amount of caseloads, leadership stipends, co-teaching, responsible use of technology, and if the District would consider a technology audit was asked.
        iii. Clarification on the approval of tiers and subscriptions was asked.

c. Review of Draft After-School Care Request for Proposals (RFP), Prepared by the Administration; Possible Action to Approve the RFP and Authorize the Superintendent or their delegate to issue the RFP and Establish and Evaluation Committee
    i. Questions related to attorney review for legal clarification, morning and afternoon programs and the size of the evaluation committee was asked.
    ii. Clarifying questions were raised regarding the lease agreement language, vacation weeks and related costs, as well as who reviews the contracts.
    iii. The Committee shared their desire for collaboration between potential providers and the schools.
    iv. Vice Chair Jessica McCready motioned that the Sudbury School Committee vote to approve the After-School Care RFP as amended and authorize the Superintendent or his delegate to issue it in accordance with applicable procurement requirements and within the timeline approved by the School Committee. Julie Durgin-Sicree seconded the motion.
        1. ROLL CALL VOTE:
            a. Betsy Sues: Aye
            b. Nicole Burnard: Aye
            c. Jessica McCready: Aye
            d. Julie Durgin-Sicree: Aye
            e. Karyn Jones: Aye
                i. **Vote: 5-0.** Motion carries.

    v. Vice Chair Jessica McCready motioned to authorize the Superintendent or his delegate to form an evaluation committee to review and score proposals within the timeline approved by the School Committee. Betsy Sues seconded the motion.
        1. ROLL CALL VOTE:
            a. Julie Durgin-Sicree: Aye
            b. Nicole Burnard: Aye
            c. Betsy Sues: Aye
            d. Jessica McCready: Aye
            e. Karyn Jones: Aye
                i. **Vote: 5-0.** Motion carries.

d. Discussion and Potential Vote on the 2026-2027 School Calendar
    i. The School Calendar was brought back for review after the suggested changes were added.
    ii. Small changes were discussed and approved.
    iii. Vice Chair Jessica McCready motioned to approve the 26-27 School Calendar as amended. Betsy Sues seconded the motion.
        1. ROLL CALL VOTE:
            a. Nicole Burnard: Aye
            b. Julie Durgin-Sicree: Aye
            c. Betsy Sues: Aye
            d. Jessica McCready: Aye
            e. Karyn Jones: Aye
                i. **Vote: 5-0.** Motion carries.

e. 2025-2026 School Committee Goal: After-School Care and enrichment: Initial Findings on Space Usage, Peer District Practices, and Local Provider Landscape
    i. Questions related to bus routes, options for transporting students to providers (including out-of-district providers), licensure, enrichment offerings, and financial aid were discussed.
    ii. This will be brought back to an agenda in March for additional review.

f. Review At-A-Glance Newsletter and Letter to Update Community about Adopted Policies; Discussion if School Committee webpages need to be updated.
    i. The Committee reviewed the newsletter and family letter. This will be presented in a future Consent Calendar for approval.

5. Adjournment
    a. Vice Chair Jessica McCready motioned to adjourn the January 20, 2026 School Committee meeting at 10:37 p.m. Betsy Sues seconded the motion.
        i. ROLL CALL VOTE:
            1. Nicole Burnard: Aye
            2. Betsy Sues: Aye
            3. Jessica McCready: Aye
            4. Julie Durgin-Sicree: Aye
            5. Karyn Jones: Aye
                a. **Vote: 5-0.** Motion carries.

Respectfully Submitted,
Julie Williams
Executive Assistant to the Superintendent

Documents Reviewed During the January 20, 2026 School Committee Meeting

1. **FY27 SC CIP Presentation 1.20.2025.Version 2**
2. **FY27 Capital Project Submission Form - CIP_FY27_SPS FAC 1 Carpet Replacement**
3. **FY27 Capital Project Submission Form - CIP_FY27_SPS_FAC 2 VCT Flooring Replacement (1)**
4. **FY27 Capital Project Submission Form - CIP_FY27_SPS_FAC 3 Bathroom Partitions and Replacements**
5. **FY27 Capital Project Submission Form - CIP_FY27_SPS FAC 4 Painting**
6. **FY27 Capital Project Submission Form - CIP_FY27_SPS FAC 5 Ceiling Tile Replacement**
7. **FY27 Capital Project Submission Form - CIP_FY27_SPS FAC 6 Schools Exterior Metal Doors**
8. **FY27 Capital Project Submission Form - CIP_FY27_SPS FAC 7 School Safety Enhancements**
9. **FY27 Capital Project Submission Form - CIP_FY27_SPS FAC 8 Boiler Replacements Loring and Curtis**
10. **FY27 Capital Project Submission Form - CIP_FY27_SPS FAC 8 Fire Alarm and Emergency Lighting System EnhancementsBDA Installations .xlsx - CIP Submission Form (2)**
11. **FY27 Capital Project Submission Form - CIP_FY27_SPS FAC 9 Building Management System Capital Repairs**
12. **1- 2025-2026 School Committee Goals - Capital Plan**
13. **SPS Facilities FY27 - 5-15 Year Capital Plan**

14. SPS FY27 Capital Plan
15. SPS Facility and non Facility Related items FY27 - 5-15 Year Capital Plan
16. 1- 2025-2026 School Committee Goals Mid-Year Report
17. 100625_Sudbury School Committee Minutes_DRAFT (1)
18. 112425_Sudbury School Committee Minutes_DRAFT
19. 120425_Sudbury School Committee Minutes_DRAFT
20. 1- CBI
21. 1-DRAFT_ BDFC
22. 2-DRAFT IJNDG
23. 3-AD
24. RFP_Facilities Lease_260113 (1)
25. 2026-2027 School Calendar_DRAFT
26. 1- 2025-2026 Goal Area_ Responsibilities_After-School Care & Enrichment (2) (2)
27. 2 - Peer District Memo
28. 3-SPS_Afterschool_Care_Provider_Outreach_Package 1.16.26 FINAL
29. 4 - Afterschool Space Usage .docx
30. 5- Stakeholder Engagement
31. January 2026 At-A-Glance.docx
32. Community Letter DRAFT

File: JLCD - ADMINISTERING MEDICINES TO STUDENTS

The School District Nurse Leader is designated as the supervisor of the district medication administration program. The School District Nurse Leader, in consultation with the School Physician, shall recommend procedures to be adopted by the Sudbury School Committee that include the following:

- documentation of the administration of medications;
- response to a medication emergency;
- storage of medications;
- reporting/documentation of medication errors;
- dissemination of information to parents/guardians (including an outline of the District's medication policy;
- procedures for resolving questions/disagreements between the school and a parent/guardian regarding medication administration.

It is the district policy that medication may not be administered to students while at school unless such medicine is given to them by the school nurse acting under specific written request of the parent or guardian and under the written orders of the student's personal physician, with the exception of certain medications which may be self-administered by the student after approval by the school nurse and in consultation with the parent/guardian and the student's physician. If a student has been approved for self-administration and self-carry, a student who needs medication during the school day may be reminded to take the medicine by the school nurse or other individual designated by the school nurse in the student's medical administration plan. This provision only applies when the school nurse has a medical administration plan in place for the student. No one but the school nurse, and those others listed in the medical administration plan acting within the above restriction, may give any medication to any student.

Exceptions:

The school district shall, through the School District Nurse Leader, register with the Dept. of Public Health and train personnel in the use of epinephrine auto-injectors. The School District Nurse Leader will develop a written protocol which complies with medical directives and regulations from the Dept. of Public Health.

The school district will, in conjunction with the School Physician and the School District Nurse Leader, stock nasal naloxone (Narcan) and trained medical personnel and first responders may administer nasal naloxone to individuals experiencing a life-threatening opiate overdose in a school setting. The School District Nurse Leader will develop a written protocol which complies with medical directives and regulations from the Dept. of Public Health.

The District will permit delegation by the School Nurse of medication administration to unlicensed school personnel only if the District registers with the Massachusetts Department of

Public Health (DPH) pursuant to applicable regulation, and complies with the requirements of 105 CMR 210.004

Following consultation with the school nurse, students who fall into the following exceptions may self-carry and self-administer the following medications:

1. Students with asthma or other respiratory diseases may possess and administer prescription inhalers.

2. Students with cystic fibrosis may possess and administer prescription enzyme supplements.

3. Students with diabetes may possess and administer glucose monitoring tests and insulin delivery systems.

4. Students with life-threatening allergies may possess and administer epinephrine.

The District School Nurse Leader and Superintendent shall monitor compliance with this policy and applicable procedures, periodically review program effectiveness, and report to the School Committee.

The policy and procedures shall be reviewed at least every two years, and whenever required by changes in law/regulation or District practice.

REFERENCES:

105 CMR 210.00 et seq.

Approved by the School Committee on DATE

File: IHBAA - OBSERVATIONS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The District respects the right of parents/caretakers to observe their children's current or proposed education program and recognizes district responsibility to maintain the safety, privacy and integrity of its students and programming. In order to balance parent/caretaker rights and district responsibilities, the following rules will be followed:

1. Parents' request for themselves or their evaluators to observe their child(ren), current program, or a potential placement must be made at least five school days in advance with the Director of Student Services or designee and/or Principal.

2. ~~The Director of Student Services or designee shall contact the parent(s) for initial scheduling conversation within five (5) days of receipt of the parents' request.~~

3. When a parent requests an observation of a special needs student or program, the Director of Student Services or designee will seek approval from ~~from the Director of Special Education and~~ the building principal before it is processed. Such approval may only be withheld for those reasons outlined within state and federal law and DESE guidance.~~regulation~~.

4. The Director of Student Services or designee and/or Principal will work with the classroom teacher and the observer to set up the specifics of the observation (including, but not limited to, scheduling and placement of the observer in the classroom).

5. The number, frequency, dates, and duration of observation periods will be determined on an individual student basis in accordance with law and regulation and in consideration of preserving the integrity of the school progams. The start and end time of observation periods and a schedule of observation periods will be stated in advance. In order to minimize classroom or student disruption, the length of individual observation periods may be limited.

6. The observer must sign a form setting out district expectations for the observation, including the need to refrain from interrupting the educational environment and maintaining student privacy. Observers may not audio or visually record during an observation and may not take photographs.

7. If the observer is an evaluator,~~ not the parent,~~ the parent must sign a release for the evaluator ~~individual~~ to observe.

8. The number of observers at any one time may be limited.

9. The observer will be informed that they is not to interfere with the educational environment of the classroom. If their presence presents a problem, they will be asked to leave. This notice is particularly important, since the presence of parents can influence both the performance of their child(ren) and those of others.

10. The observer will be asked to submit their report of the observation in advance of any follow-up TEAM meeting.

11. The observer will be informed that they are there to evaluate the appropriateness of a specific educational program to meet the needs of an individual child. Theythey are not is not there to evaluate a teacher's ability to perform their contractual job duties.

12. The observer will be instructed regarding the disclosure of confidential or personally identifiable information relating to other children. Staff must be mindful of removing materials which may be part of students' records from plain view. ~~In the event that removal is not possible the observer may be asked to sign a non-disclosure agreement.~~

13. A school administrator, or designee, also will observe at the same time and take notes as to what is observed, paying particular attention to note anything that is non-typical concerning the period. This observation summary will be placed in the student's file and provided to the parent(s) prior to any follow-up TEAM meeting. .

LEGAL REF.: MGL 71B:3
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Technical Assistance Advisory SPED 2009-2 dated January 8, 2009

CROSS REF.: KI, Visitors to Schools

NOTE: The following quotes from the DESE Advisory are important points of understanding to the implementation of this policy.

"School districts and parents have reported that, typically, observations are between one and four hours. While useful as a general rule, the Department recommends that district policies and practices specify that the duration and extent of observations will be determined on an individual basis. Districts should avoid rigid adherence to defined time limits regardless of the student's needs and settings to be observed. The complexities of the child's needs, as well as the program or programs to be observed, should determine what the observation will entail and what amount of time is needed to complete it. Discussion between school staff and the parent or designee is a good starting point for resolving the issue."

"The observation law states that districts may not condition or restrict program observations except when necessary to protect:

- the safety of children in the program during the observation;
- the integrity of the program during the observation;
- and children in the program from disclosure by an observer of confidential or personally identifiable information they may obtain while observing the program."

File: IHBAA - OBSERVATIONS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The District respects the right of parents/caretakers to observe their children's current or proposed education program and recognizes district responsibility to maintain the safety, privacy and integrity of its students and programming. In order to balance parent/caretaker rights and district responsibilities, the following rules will be followed:

1. Parents' request for themselves or their evaluators to observe their child(ren), current program, or a potential placement must be made at least five school days in advance with the Director of Student Services or designee and/or Principal.
2. The Director of Student Services or designee shall contact the parent(s) for initial-scheduling-conversation within five (5) days of receipt of the parents' request.
3. When a parent requests an observation of a special needs student or program, the Director of Student Services or designee will seek approval from from the Director of Special Education-and-the building principal before it is processed. Such approval may only be withheld for those reasons outlined within state and federal law and DESE guidance.regulation.
4. The Director of Student Services or designee and/or Principal will work with the classroom teacher and the observer to set up the specifics of the observation (including, but not limited to, scheduling and placement of the observer in the classroom).
5. The number, frequency, dates, and duration of observation periods will be determined on an individual student basis in accordance with law and regulation and in consideration of preserving the integrity of the school programs. The start and end time of observation periods and a schedule of observation periods will be stated in advance. In order to minimize classroom or student disruption, the length of individual observation periods may be limited.
6. The observer must sign a form setting out district expectations for the observation, including the need to refrain from interrupting the educational environment and maintaining student privacy. Observers may not audio or visually record during an observation and may not take photographs.
7. If the observer is an evaluator, not the parent, the parent must sign a release for the evaluator individual to observe.
8. The number of observers at any one time may be limited.
9. The observer will be informed that they is not to interfere with the educational environment of the classroom. If their presence presents a problem, they will be asked to leave. This notice is particularly important, since the presence of parents can influence both the performance of their child(ren) and those of others.
10. The observer will be asked to submit their report of the observation in advance of any follow-up TEAM meeting.
11. The observer will be informed that they are there to evaluate the appropriateness of a specific educational program to meet the needs of an individual child. They are not is not there to evaluate a teacher's ability to perform their contractual job duties.

DRAFT

12. The observer will be instructed regarding the disclosure of confidential or personally identifiable information relating to other children. Staff must be mindful of removing materials which may be part of students' records from plain view. In the event that removal is not possible the observer may be asked to sign a non-disclosure agreement.
13. A school administrator, or designee, also will observe at the same time and take notes as to what is observed, paying particular attention to note anything that is non-typical concerning the period. This observation summary will be placed in the student's file and provided to the parent(s) prior to any follow-up TEAM meeting..

LEGAL REF.:
MGL 71B:3
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Technical Assistance Advisory SPED 2009-2 dated January 8, 2009

CROSS REF.:
KI, Visitors to Schools

NOTE:
The following quotes from the DESE Advisory are important points of understanding to the implementation of this policy.

"School districts and parents have reported that, typically, observations are between one and four hours. While useful as a general rule, the Department recommends that district policies and practices specify that the duration and extent of observations will be determined on an individual basis. Districts should avoid rigid adherence to defined time limits regardless of the student's needs and settings to be observed. The complexities of the child's needs, as well as the program or programs to be observed, should determine what the observation will entail and what amount of time is needed to complete it. Discussion between school staff and the parent or designee is a good starting point for resolving the issue."

"The observation law states that districts may not condition or restrict program observations except when necessary to protect:

- the safety of children in the program during the observation;
- the integrity of the program during the observation;
- and children in the program from disclosure by an observer of confidential or personally identifiable information they may obtain while observing the program."

DRAFT

Parent Advisory Council Annual Review Survey

This survey is part of the annual review process described in the Sudbury School Committee Handbook. Feedback will help the School Committee evaluate communication and advisory processes and identify opportunities for improvement in collaboration with Parent Advisory Councils.

* Indicates required question

1. Which Parent Advisory Council are you affiliated with? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ SEPAC
- ◯ LGBTQ+ PAC
- ◯ Both

2. What is your role in the PAC? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ PAC leadership
- ◯ PAC member
- ◯ Other

3. How effective is communication between your PAC and the School Committee liaison? *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Very effective

4. How clear is the process for sharing input or concerns from your PAC with the School Committee? *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Very effective

5. Do you feel your PAC has appropriate opportunities to share feedback with the School Committee (meetings, written advisories, etc.)? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ Somewhat
- ◯ No

6. What communication methods have been most helpful? Select all that apply: *

Check all that apply.

- [ ] School Committee meetings
- [ ] Written advisories
- [ ] Liaison communication
- [ ] Joint meetings
- [ ] Email updates
- [ ] Other

7. Do you feel the School Committee considers input provided by your PAC? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ Sometimes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Not Sure

8. Have there been opportunities this year for your PAC to provide input on policies, programs, or decisions affecting students and families? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Not Sure

9. If your PAC provided input this year, do you feel the process was clear and respectful? *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Very Clear and Respectful

10. Do you feel your PAC has the support it needs to fulfill its advisory role? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ Somewhat
- ◯ No

11. What types of support would be most helpful from the School Committee or district? *
Select all that apply:

Check all that apply.

- ☐ Clearer communication
- ☐ More opportunities for input
- ☐ Earlier notification on agenda topics
- ☐ Joint meetings with the School Committee
- ☐ Administrative Support
- ☐ More communication or opportunities with Administrative Liaison
- ☐ Other

12. What has worked well in the relationship between the School Committee and your PAC this year? *

13. What could be improved in communication or collaboration between the School Committee and PACs? *

14. Are there topics or issues where your PAC would like more engagement with the School Committee? *

15. Please share any additional comments or recommendations.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Sudbury Public Schools
School Committee Meeting

Date: **March 2, 2026**

Agenda Item: **6a**

Vote on the Agreement Between the Sudbury School Committee and the Sudbury Nurses Association and vote to authorize the Chair of the School Committee, in collaboration with the Superintendent, to draft and issue a Press Release to the community based on the outcome of the ratification vote

Recommendation:

Move to accept and approve the Memorandum of Agreement between the Sudbury School Committee and the Sudbury Nurses Association signed by the Subcommittee Chair on March 12, 2026.

Move to authorize the Chair of the School Committee in collaboration with the Superintendent to draft and issue a press release to the community based on the outcome of the Sudbury Nurses Association ratification vote.

Background Information:

Attachments:

Action: **XX** **Report:** **Discussion:** **XX**

Sudbury Public Schools
School Committee Meeting

Date: **March 2, 2026**

Agenda Item: **6b**

Climate Leader Communities Program Certification, including discussion of the Fuel Efficient Vehicle Policy adopted in 2012 and possible amendments

Eric Sims, Sustainability Coordinator

Recommendation:

Move to direct the Superintendent to meet with the Superintendent of the Lincoln-Sudbury Regional School District, or their designee, and the Town Manager, or their designee, to review the proposed Zero-Emission Vehicle First Policy; consult with Counsel; and bring back proposed redlines to the current Fuel Efficient Vehicle Policy for the School Committee's consideration at the April School Committee meeting for potential adoption.

Background Information:

The purpose of this agenda item is to provide background on a request from the Town's Sustainability Coordinator related to Sudbury's application for certification through the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources (DOER) Climate Leader Communities Program.

The Climate Leader Communities program recognizes municipalities that demonstrate leadership in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and advancing energy efficiency, particularly through the decarbonization of buildings and transportation. If Sudbury is certified, the Town would become eligible for up to $1 million in technical assistance and grant funding that could support improvements to municipal and school facilities as well as vehicle fleets.

One of the requirements of the program is that participating municipalities and their school districts adopt a Zero-Emission Vehicle (ZEV) First Policy. The proposed policy establishes a framework to guide vehicle purchasing decisions over time by ensuring that, when vehicles are scheduled for replacement through the normal capital planning process, electric vehicles are considered first when appropriate for the intended use.

The policy does not require the purchase of electric vehicles or mandate immediate changes to existing fleets. Instead, it establishes an "electric-first" hierarchy for vehicle procurement, meaning electric vehicles are prioritized when feasible, followed by plug-in hybrid and hybrid options. If those technologies do not meet operational needs, the most fuel-efficient conventional vehicle available may be selected. As a result, adoption of the policy does not

commit the district to purchasing electric vehicles, but ensures that lower-emission options are evaluated when vehicles are replaced.

The proposed policy would replace the Town's Fuel Efficient Vehicle Policy adopted in 2012, which was implemented as part of Sudbury's designation as a Massachusetts Green Community. That earlier policy focused primarily on purchasing vehicles with higher fuel efficiency to reduce gasoline consumption. The proposed policy reflects the evolution of vehicle technology and state climate policy over the past decade by placing greater emphasis on reducing greenhouse gas emissions through electric and other low-emission vehicle options where feasible.

In addition to adopting the ZEV First Policy, the Climate Leader Communities program requires the Town to develop a municipal decarbonization roadmap outlining how municipal buildings and fleets will transition away from fossil fuels over time. School facilities and vehicles are typically included as part of the municipality's overall building and fleet portfolio.

Based on information provided by the district, the Sudbury Public Schools fleet currently consists of one vehicle, and therefore participation in this effort is not expected to have significant operational or financial implications for the district.

The Town is also seeking adoption of the policy from the Lincoln-Sudbury Regional School District and the Sudbury Select Board as part of the broader certification application.

The Town plans to submit its Climate Leader Communities certification application later this spring, so this request is being brought to the School Committee now to allow time for discussion and consideration prior to the application deadline.

This agenda item is intended to allow the Committee to review the proposed policy and, if the Committee is supportive, direct the Superintendent to participate in the Town's Climate Leader Communities certification process, including coordination with the Town on the ZEV First Policy and related planning efforts.

Attachments:

2- Fuel-Efficient-Vehicle-Policy-SPS-2012
3-SPS-memo-Zero-Emissions-Vehicle-First-policy-3-10-26
4- SPS-Zero-Emissions-Vehicle-First-Policy-adoption-letter-draft.docx
5. Sudbury-Zero-Emissions-Vehicle-First-Policy-draft.docx

Action: **XX** **Report:** **Discussion:** **XX**

Sudbury Public Schools

40 Fairbank Road
Sudbury, Massachusetts 01776
Phone: (978) 639-3211
Fax: (978) 443-9001

Anne S. Wilson, Ph.D.
Superintendent of Schools
anne_wilson@sudbury.k12.ma.us

MA Department of Energy Resources
Green Communities Division
100 Cambridge Street – Suite 1040
Boston, MA 02114

February 1, 2012

To Whom this May Concern:

Please be advised that the Public Schools of Sudbury hereby adopted the attached Fuel Efficiency Vehicle Policy at an Open Meeting of the Sudbury School Committee on February 1, 2012.

Thank you,

Anne S. Wilson, Ph.D.
Superintendent of Schools

TOWN OF SUDBURY SUDBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS LINCOLN SUDBURY REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL **FUEL EFFICIENT VEHICLE POLICY** **2012**	
Effective Date	May 12, 2010
Revisions	January 27, 2012
Approval Date	FEB. 1 2012
Effective Date	FEB. 1 2012

SUDBURY's FUEL EFFICIENT VEHICLE POLICY

POLICY STATEMENT

In an effort to reduce the towns fuel consumption and energy costs:
The Sudbury School Committee hereby adopts this policy to purchase only fuel efficient vehicles to meet this goal. This Fuel Efficient Vehicle Replacement Policy was developed and approved by the Town of Sudbury, the Sudbury Public School Committee and the Lincoln Sudbury Regional High School in May 2010. These entities shall continue to follow the policy as amended including the most recent Green Communities Division Guidance.

PURPOSE

To establish a requirement that the Town of Sudbury purchase only fuel efficient vehicles for municipal/school use whenever such vehicles are commercially available and practicable.

APPLICABILITY

This policy applies to all divisions and departments of the Town of Sudbury, Sudbury Public Schools, and Lincoln Sudbury Regional High School.

GUIDELINES

All departments / divisions shall purchase only fuel-efficient vehicles for municipal use whenever such vehicles are commercially available and practicable.

The Town of Sudbury will maintain an annual vehicle inventory for non-exempt vehicles and a plan for replacing these vehicles with vehicles that meet, at a minimum, the fuel efficiency ratings contained in the most recent guidance for Criteria 4 published by the MA Department of Energy Resources' Green Communities Division. The fuel efficiency ratings contained therein are based on the most recently

published US Environmental Protection Agency combined city and highway MPG ratings for vehicles.

The Green Communities' Guidance for Criteria 4 shall be checked for updates prior to ordering replacement vehicles.

DEFINITIONS

Combined city and highway MPG (EPA Combined fuel economy): Combined Fuel Economy means the fuel economy from driving a combination of 43% city and 57% highway miles and is calculated as follows:

=1/((0.43/City MPG)+(0.57/Ihighway MPG))

Drive System: The manner in which mechanical power is directly transmitted from the drive shaft to the wheels. The following codes are used in the drive field:

AWD = All Wheel Drive: four-wheel drive automatically controlled by the vehicle powertrain system
4WD = 4-Wheel Drive: driver selectable four-wheel drive with 2-wheel drive option
2WD = 2-Wheel Drive

Heavy-duty vehicle: A vehicle with a manufacturer's gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of more than 8,500 pounds.

***NOTE:** The EPA maintains a database on vehicle fuel efficiency that is updated occasionally throughout the year, as new models are released. As increasing numbers of fuel efficient vehicle models are released the minimum combined MPG requirements of the Green Communities Act will be revised upwards. Thus, the Town of Sudbury check for updates prior to ordering new vehicles.

Exemptions

Heavy-duty vehicles, including fire trucks, ambulances, and some public works trucks that meet the definition of Heavy-duty vehicle.

Police cruisers, passenger vans and cargo vans are exempt from this criterion as fuel efficient models are not currently available. However, we commit to purchasing fuel efficient police cruisers, passenger vans and cargo vans when they become commercially available. Police and fire department administrative vehicles are NOT exempt and must meet fuel efficient requirements.

Inventory: Town of Sudbury Vehicle Inventory 2012

ID	Manufacturer & Model	Model Year	Year Purchased	Drive System	Weight Class	MPG[1]	Annual Miles Driven	Total Fuel Consumption gallons	Vehi
	FORD EXPEDITION 4 WD	1997	1997	4 WD	7200	13.4	2900	216	TECHNOLOG
	FORD EXPLORER XLT	2000	2000	4 WD	5,540	12.2	2405	197.3	ASSESSORS
	FORD RANGER PICKUP	1999	1999	4 WD	5,120	16	2000	125	BOARD OF H
	FORD EXPLORER	2002	2002	4 WD	5,840	17	14,359	843	BOARD OF H
	Chevy Silverado 4 WD	**2012**	**2012**	**4 WD**	**5356**	**17**	**2115**	**125**	**BUILDING**
	FORD CROWN VICTORIA 2 WD	2005	2005	2 WD	5500	13.2	2530	192	BUILDING
	FORD EXPLORER 4 WD	2002	2002	4 WD	5840	12.4	5052	406.8	BUILDING

.	FORD CROWN VICTORIA 2 WD	2003	2003	2 WD	5500	14	2715	193.3	BUILDING
.	FORD Explorer 2WD	2002	2002	2 WD	4684	20.3	5453	269.2	BUILDING
0.	FORD EXPLORER 2 WD	2000	2000	2 WD	5984	15.4			DPW
1.	CHEVROLET TAHOE	2002	2002	4 WD	6900	14	17877	1276	DPW
2.	CHEVROLET SILVERADO 4X4 PICKUP	2004	2004	4 WD		14.6	4700	596	DPW
3.	FORD EXPLORER	2005	2005	4 WD		15			DPW
4.	CHEVROLET TAHOE	2005	2005	4 WD		12.6	7400	585	ENGINEERING
5.	CHEVROLET GMT400	2000	2000	4 WD					HIGHWAY
6.	CHEVROLET 1-TON	2001	2001	4 WD					HIGHWAY
7.	CHEVROLET CK3500	2001	2001	4 WD					HIGHWAY
8.	CHEVROLET SILVERADO	2002	2002	4 WD		11.5	2112	299	HIGHWAY
9.	CHEVROLET CK25753	2005	2005	4 WD		11	7985	726	HIGHWAY
0.	CHEVROLET SILVERADO	2006	2006	4 WD	5,366	14.6	11249	770	HIGHWAY
1.	CHEVROLET SILVERADO	2008	2008	4 WD	6,343	17.5	12000	685	HIGHWAY
2.	CHEVROLET SILVERADO	2007	2007	4 WD	6,073	17	4700	276	PARKS AND GROUNDS

3.	HARLEY DAVIDSON	2002	2002	NA	NA	55	3700	68	POLICE Motorcycle
4.	**FORD FUSION HYBRID**	**2011**	**2011**	**2 WD**	**5,000**	**23**	**4500**	**196**	**POLICE Admin**
5.	FORD CROWN VICTORIA	2005	2005	2 WD	5,000	16	8004	920	POLICE Cruiser
6.	FORD FIVE HUNDRED	2006	2006	2 WD	5,000	21.3	16456	772	POLICE ADMN.
7.	FORD EXPLORER	2007	2007	2 WD	5,000	17.9	17858	1976	POLICE Cruiser
8.	FORD FIVE HUNDRED SEDAN	2007	2007	2 WD	5,000	19			POLICE Cruiser
9.	FORD CROWN VICTORIA	2008	2008	2 WD	5000	18	15048	836	POLICE Cruiser
0.	FORD TAURUS	2008	2008	2 WD	5,000	19	14000	737	POLICE ADMN.
1.	FORD CROWN VICTORIA	2008	2008	2 WD	5,000	18	40098	2228	POLICE Cruiser
2.	FORD CROWN VICTORIA	2008	2008	2 WD	5,000	18	41001	2278	POLICE Cruiser
3.	FORD CROWN VICTORIA	2009	2009	2 WD	5,000	19	46222	2432	POLICE Cruiser
4.	FORD ESCAPE	2009	2009	2 WD	5,000	20.4	45000	2206	POLICE Cruiser
5.	FORD CROWN VICTORIA	2009	2009	2 WD	5,000	19	49076	2583	POLICE Cruiser
6.	**FORD TAURUS**	**2011**	**2011**	**2 WD**	**5,000**	**19**	**14000**	**737**	**POLICE Cruiser**
7.	**FORD CROWN VICTORIA**	**2011**	**2011**	**2 WD**	**5,000**	**19**	**45000**	**2368**	**POLICE Cruiser**
8.	CHEVROLET TAHOE	2005	2005	4 WD	6900	14.5	7622	525	FIRE
9.	**CHEVROLET TAHOE - CAR 3**	**2011**	**2011**	**4 WD**	**7300**	**16**	**11698**	**731**	**FIRE**
0.	CHEVROLET SILVERADO	2008	2008	4 WD	6500	16	4333	645	FIRE
1.	CHEVROLET TAHOE	2007	2007	4 WD	7300	16	9500	1567	FIRE
2.	CHEVROLET GMT 400 CHASSIS	1999	1999	2 WD					SCHOOL
3.	GMC G3500 VAN	1989	1989	2 WD					SCHOOL
4.	FORD E350	1994	1994	2 WD					SCHOOL
5.	FORD E250	1998	1998	2 WD		14	8064	576	SCHOOL
6.	CHEVROLET ASTRO (CARGO) VAN	2001	2001	2 WD	5,600	15	2610	174	SCHOOL

7.	FORD ECONOVAN	2002	2002	2 WD	4,100	16.5	10527	638	SCHOOL
8.	FORD ECOVAN	2006	2006	2 WD		14.6	11096	760	SCHOOL
9.	FORD ECOVAN	2006	2006	2 WD		14.6	11096	760	SCHOOL

Vehicles in gray rows are exempt from the Fuel Efficient Vehicle Policy. Exempt vehicles include: 1) Heavy-duty vehicles such as fire-trucks, ambulances, and public works trucks 2) Police cruisers are exempt from this criterion. However, municipalities must commit to purchasing fuel efficient cruisers when they become commercially available. Police department administrative vehicles must meet fuel efficient requirements

1. Departments/Divisions may use EPA combined MPG estimates or actual combined MPG.

SOURCE: Town of Sudbury, Fleet Schedule

NOTE: Departments/Divisions may use EPA combined MPG estimates or actual combined MPG.

FUEL EFFICIENT VEHICLE REPLACEMENT PLAN

Vehicles shall be replaced when they are no longer operable and new vehicles purchased will be fuel efficient and reflect the most recent Green Communities Division Guidance. The Town of Sudbury, Sudbury Public Schools and the Lincoln Sudbury Regional High School shall replace all non-exempt vehicles with fuel efficient vehicles as defined by the DOER Green Communities Division. This plan shall be reviewed by the Town and School Districts on an annual basis.

It is anticipated that most non-exempt vehicles listed in the 2012 vehicle inventory list will be replaced at some time over the next fifteen years. The vehicle list will be updated to reflect changes in the fleet.

VEHICLE INVENTORY FUTURE REPLACEMENT PLAN

The Town of Sudbury, the Sudbury Public Schools and the Lincoln Sudbury regional School District, should they acquire non-exempt vehicles in the future, are committed to purchasing non-exempt vehicles that meet the most recent guidance for Criteria 4 published by the MA Department of Energy Resources' Green Communities Division.

REFERENCE

Green Communities Grant Program Guidance - Criteria 4 (dated 10/17/11 or later)
www.mass.gov/energy/greencommunities
For GC Qualifying fleet questions, contact Stephen Russell, stephen.russell@state.ma.us

TOWN OF SUDBURY

Office of the Town Manager

www.sudbury.ma.us

278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776-1843
Tel: 978-639-3381
Fax: 978-443-0756
Email: townmanager@sudbury.ma.us

Andrew J. Sheehan
Town Manager

Date: March 10, 2026

To: Sudbury School Committee

From: Eric Simms, Sustainability Coordinator

Subject: Zero-Emissions Vehicle First Policy

On behalf of the Town of Sudbury, this is a request for the Sudbury School Committee to consider the adoption of a new 'Zero-Emissions Vehicle First Policy'. The policy is intended to help structure the transition of our Town and school fleets to all-electric or other environmentally advantageous vehicles (e.g., hybrid, highest fuel efficiency) to reduce carbon emissions and air pollution, and to reduce the higher fuel and maintenance costs associated with traditional internal combustion engine vehicles. The policy applies primarily to light-duty passenger vehicles, and **does not require** that electric vehicles be purchased – only that electric vehicle options be given first consideration and pursued if deemed appropriate for the intended use. The new policy will serve to guide the decision-making process for the acquisition of new vehicles in coordination with the capital planning process as current vehicles are scheduled to be replaced.

The proposed policy will replace the existing "Fuel Efficient Vehicle Policy' that was adopted in 2012 by the Select Board, Sudbury Public Schools, and the Lincoln-Sudbury Regional School District. A commitment to adopt that policy was a requirement for Sudbury to be designated as a Massachusetts 'Green Community' in 2010, which has allowed the Town to access funding from that program for energy efficiency investments in our municipal buildings and fleet.

Adoption of the new policy will serve several important and complementary purposes:

- The policy supports the Town's commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting sustainable practices and operations as referenced in the 2022 Climate Emergency Declaration and the 2023 Sudbury Climate Mobilization Action Plan.
- Updating the policy will reflect the significant advances in the technology, capabilities, availability, financial incentives, and adoption of all-electric and hybrid vehicles and charging infrastructure in recent years that will accelerate our fleet decarbonization.
- Adopting the new policy is a requirement for the Town to apply to the Massachusetts Dept. of Energy Resources (DOER) to receive new Climate Leader Communities program certification, which would 1) recognize Sudbury as a municipal leader in sustainability, and 2) make the Town eligible to apply for up to $1M for technical assistance and grant

funding for municipal and school building and fleet improvements that support decarbonization efforts.

Copies of the existing vehicle policy and the proposed new policy have been included. Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to discuss the policy.

[Sudbury Public Schools letterhead]

MA Department of Energy Resources
Green Communities Division
100 Cambridge Street – 9th floor
Boston, MA 02114

[Date of letter]

Please be advised that the Public Schools of the Town of Sudbury hereby adopted the attached Zero-Emissions Vehicle First Policy.

Thank you.

Brad Crozier
Sudbury Public School Superintendent

Town of Sudbury Zero-Emission Vehicle First Policy

Town of Sudbury / Sudbury Public Schools / Lincoln-Sudbury Regional School District **ZERO-EMISSION VEHICLE FIRST POLICY**	
Effective Date	
Select Board Approval Date	

DRAFT

1) DEFINITIONS

a) **Acquisition** - In the context of this guideline, acquisition refers to the purchase or lease of on-road vehicles (whether used or new) by and for the (town/school district) either to replace an existing fleet vehicle or to expand a fleet.

b) **Alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs)** - Dedicated, flexible fuel, or dual-fuel vehicles designed to operate on at least one alternative fuel (such as electricity, biodiesel, propane, or natural gas) to reduce carbon emissions.

c) **Battery electric vehicle (BEV)** – An electric vehicle that draws propulsion energy solely from an on- board electrical energy storage device during operation that is charged from an external source of electricity.

d) **Electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) or electric vehicle charging station** – An electric component assembly or cluster of component assemblies designed specifically to charge batteries within electric vehicles by permitting the transfer of electric energy to a battery or other storage device in an electric vehicle.

e) **Exempt vehicles** - Vehicles that are exempt from the Green Communities Fuel Efficient Vehicle Policy include off-road vehicles, motorcycles and heavy-duty vehicles with a manufacturer's gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of more than 8,500 pounds. Examples include fire engines, ambulances, and some public works vehicles.

f) **Fleet vehicles** - In the context of this guideline, refers to on road vehicle assets owned or leased and operated by the (town/school district).

g) **Fuel-cell electric vehicle (FCEV or FCV)** - An electric vehicle that draws propulsion energy solely from an on-board energy storage device during operation, where energy stored as hydrogen is converted to electricity by a fuel cell, that is recharged from an external source of hydrogen.

h) **Fuel Efficient Vehicle (FEV) Policy** - Issued by the Department of Energy Resources (DOER) to fulfill the requirements of the Green Communities Act. The FEV Policy requires designated Green Communities to acquire fuel-efficient vehicles; applies to all light-duty vehicle acquisitions with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of 8,500 pounds or less.

i) **Gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR)** - The maximum safe operating weight of a vehicle, as specified by the manufacturer, including passenger and cargo loads.

j) **Heavy-duty vehicle** – A vehicle with a manufacturer's gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of more than 8,500 pounds.

k) **Hybrid electric vehicle (HEV)** - Powered by an internal combustion engine and a small electric motor that uses energy stored in a battery. Under light load, for instance during initial acceleration, only electricity is consumed. The vehicle is typically fueled with gasoline to operate the internal combustion engine, and the battery is charged through the engine and regenerative braking, not by plugging in.

l) **Light-duty vehicle**– A vehicle with a GVWR of less than 8,500 pounds.

m) **Plug-in hybrid electric vehicle (PHEV) –** An electric vehicle with an on-board electrical energy storage device that can be recharged from an external source of electricity and that also has the capability to run on another fuel.

DRAFT

n) **Telematics** - A system that is installed in a vehicle that records and transmits information about the vehicle such as the current odometer, maintenance needs, and fuel/electricity consumption.

o) **Zero emission vehicle (ZEV) –** Zero emission vehicles include battery electric vehicles, plug-in hybrid electric vehicles, and fuel-cell electric vehicles; if the most recent definition of ZEVs per the Massachusetts Zero Emission Vehicle Commission diverges from this scope, the Commission definition shall take precedence.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Zero-Emission First Vehicle Policy is to set standards and guidelines for the purchase, operation, and maintenance of the Town of Sudbury, Sudbury Public Schools, and Lincoln-Sudbury Regional School District fleet vehicles that will advance the economic, energy, and climate sustainability of municipal operations by achieving long-term reductions in energy costs, energy consumption, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The primary objectives of this policy are to:

- Accelerate the adoption of emissions-reduction technologies and the transition of the fleet to all electric or other environmentally advantageous vehicles
- Minimize the long-term environmental and financial impacts of fleet vehicles
- Optimize the composition of the fleet to achieve maximum fuel efficiency
- Advance the installation of electric charging infrastructure across municipal facilities
- Prioritize the utilization of grants, rebates, and incentives to support the acquisition of vehicles and technologies that will improve efficiency and reduce GHG emissions.

This policy shall not require a department to take any action which conflicts with local, state, or federal requirements nor mandate the procurement of products that do not perform adequately for their intended use, exclude adequate purchasing competition, or require the purchase of vehicles that are not commercially available or practicable.

APPLICABILITY

This policy applies to all divisions and departments of the Town of Sudbury, Sudbury Public

DRAFT

Schools, and Lincoln-Sudbury Regional School District. It applies to road-worthy passenger vehicles, pick up and utility trucks, and SUVs. It does not apply to specialized equipment or off-road vehicles.

GUIDELINES VEHICLE PROCUREMENT

I. Electric-first procurement

Vehicle procurement should be prioritized as follows:

1. Battery-electric vehicle (BEV)
2. Plug-in hybrid vehicle (PHEV)
3. Hybrid electric vehicle (HEV) or other alternative fuel vehicle (AFV)
4. Standard vehicle operated by an internal combustion engine fueled by fossil fuels

The fleet policy is electric-first, meaning that electric vehicles shall be prioritized when the Town of Sudbury, Sudbury Public Schools, and Lincoln-Sudbury Regional School District purchases or leases light-duty vehicles for its operations, followed by plug-in hybrid vehicles, then hybrid electric or other alternative fuel vehicle.

II. Fuel-efficient requirements for standard vehicles

If it is determined that a ZEV does not meet operational needs, the purchased or leased vehicle must be the most fuel-efficient class, drive train, and model available that will fulfill the intended municipal function. When determining the most fuel-efficient vehicle for a given class, the municipality will utilize the fuel efficiency limits contained in the most recent guidance for the Fuel-Efficient Vehicle Policy established by DOER's Green Communities Division.

These limits are based on the most recently published U.S. Environmental Protection Agency combined city and highway MPG ratings (see www.fueleconomy.gov). The EPA maintains a database on vehicle fuel efficiency that is updated throughout the year as new models are released.

III. Exempt Vehicles

Vehicles exempt from the fuel efficiency requirements above include:

- Any vehicle with emergency response capabilities (i.e. vehicles with radios, computers, emergency lights, and sirens) Note: Police cruisers are exempt, only if fuel-efficient pursuit-rated cruisers are not commercially available
- Heavy-duty trucks, such as fire trucks, ambulances, and public works trucks
- Off-road vehicles

DRAFT

While exempt vehicles are not required to meet the specific MPG requirements described above (Section II), exempt vehicles should prioritize vehicle procurement as outlined in this policy (Section I).

All other vehicles, including pickup trucks, vans, and police/fire administrative vehicles are not exempt and therefore must comply with the fuel efficiency requirements of this policy.

If purchasing a standard vehicle, exempt vehicle purchases should prioritize the most fuel-efficient model available and consider fuel-reduction and emissions-reduction technology, such as diesel particle filters, selective catalytic reduction systems, exhaust gas recirculation, NOx absorbers, oxidation catalysts, anti-idling devices, etc.

Where opportunities exist, particularly if grants and new technologies are or become available, the Town should pilot electric options for heavy-duty and exempt vehicles.

IV. Inventory

As required by the DOER Green Communities program, the Town of Sudbury will maintain an annual vehicle inventory for ALL vehicles and a plan for replacing any vehicles with vehicles that adhere to the ZEV hierarchy established by this policy. The Town of Sudbury will review on an annual basis the Vehicle Inventory, along with this policy to plan for new acquisitions as part of planning for the new fiscal year budget.

This inventory will include the following information: model, make, model year, month and year purchased, VIN, drive system, weight class, miles per gallon, annual miles driven, total fuel consumption, department, vehicle function.

V. Zero-Emission First Replacement Plan

All vehicles shall be replaced with following the electric-first hierarchy as indicated by this policy. Vehicles shall be replaced when they are no longer operable and will not be recycled from one municipal department to another unless the recycled replacement is more efficient than the vehicle it is replacing. In addition, when considering vehicle replacement, the function of the vehicle will be reviewed for potential replacement with a more fuel-efficient vehicle, including a zero-emission non-exempt vehicle.

Where possible, efforts will be made to install charging equipment at locations convenient for vehicle users to minimize operational inefficiencies.

The Town shall take advantage of grant funding to offset the upfront costs of electric vehicles and charging apparatus.

DRAFT

VI. **Questions / Enforcement**

All inquiries should be directed to the Sustainability Office. This policy is enforced by the Town of Sudbury Town Manager.

DRAFT

Sudbury Public Schools
School Committee Meeting

Date: **March 2, 2026**

Agenda Item: **6c**

Review and evaluation of digital resources and instructional technology used in classroom and homework instruction, including data on technology product usage and recommended digital learning practices within the curriculum to support fidelity of implementation

Recommendation:

Background Information:

At the School Committee's January 26, 2026 meeting, the Committee requested additional information regarding the use of instructional technology during the school day. Specifically, the Committee asked for information regarding how frequently technology is used for instruction, including assignments completed during the school day and for homework.

The Committee also requested information regarding the District's adopted curriculum resources and the extent to which those programs require the use of technology, such as Chromebooks, in order to implement the curriculum with fidelity. In addition, the Committee requested clarification regarding whether the technology-based components of these instructional programs are used synchronously within classroom instruction or asynchronously as part of independent student work. The Committee also wanted to review or better understand what procedures or guidelines are in place around instructional technology use in the classrooms.

This agenda item provides an opportunity for the Committee to receive this information and better understand how technology is incorporated into instructional practice across the District.

Attachments:

1-2025-2026 School Committee Goals Mid-Year Target Update
Technology Follow Up for School Committee

Action:	**XX**	**Report:**		**Discussion:**	**XX**

			received a presentation from the SPS Mathematics Curriculum Coordinator at its December 8, 2025 meeting	
Review and evaluate the integration of digital resources and instructional technology in classroom instruction. Monitor the implementation of Policy JICJ – *Student Use of Technology in Schools*.	School Committee, Superintendent School Committee, Superintendent	The School Committee will receive a report outlining current practices, alignment with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, and implementation of digital citizenship objectives as outlined in Policy IJNDB. The School Committee will receive at least three updates throughout the school year during the Superintendent's Report at a fall, winter, and spring meeting. Summaries will be reflected in meeting minutes.	School Committee receives presentation Two Superintendent updates provided summarizing how policy is being implemented, including communication with families, exemption procedures, enforcement practices, and impacts on teacher, learning, and social climate. **COMPLETED** The School Committee enhanced its understanding of Policy JIJC implementation and digital citizenship through a presentation from the SPS Technology Director at its November 3, 2025 meeting. The Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent have provided periodic updates in their district reports in relation to the teaching of digital citizenship.	Summarize findings Propose next steps The Committee will review feedback and consider next steps to support consistent implementation districtwide. **IN PROGRESS** A follow-up presentation on instructional technology integration is scheduled for January 26, 2026 to continue oversight.

TO: Brad Crozier, Superintendent
FROM: Annette Doyle, Assistant Superintendent
RE: Technology Follow Up Questions
DATE: March 16, 2026

In response to the questions raised by the School Committee following our Technology Integration presentation on January 26, 2026, I submit the following information.

Research on screen time in schools generally **does not recommend strict universal time limits** during the school day. Instead, most health and education organizations emphasize **how technology is used** (active vs. passive) and **maintaining balance** with other forms of learning.

> **Active Use** involves critical thinking and includes activities such as immersive simulations, media production, design work (presentations/recordings), interactive reading/math tools with immediate feedback, coding, and peer collaboration (shared documents/group presentations).
>
> **Passive Use** includes activities such as filling out digital worksheets or consuming digital content without accompanying reflection, imagination, or participation.

In SPS, technology is used in ways that **support active learning, student engagement, and strong classroom relationships.** Screen use does not replace the core experiences that build community and learning: conversation, collaboration, movement, and hands-on exploration.

Current SPS Practices:

- Students do not use devices during unstructured time (recess, snack, etc).
- Students do not have opportunities for recreational use of technology outside of specific middle school clubs. Games are not allowed at school or home when using a school issued device.
- Personal devices (cell phones, smartwatches, etc) may not be used during school hours.
- Student devices are filtered to prevent access to social media, AI platforms, streaming services, games, etc.; students gain access to Youtube during Term 1 of grade 8.
- Student login to school devices is restricted (blocked) during late night hours.
- Middle school teachers use Blocksi to monitor student technology usage. Family-facing Blocksi may be ready for Fall 2026; currently being tested with a few Curtis families.
- Personal devices cannot be connected to Chromebooks.

We believe technology works best when it:

- Supports Active Teaching and Learning
- Allows students to collaborate and discuss ideas
- Is integrated into structured routines and transitions
- Leads to student thinking, creating, or explaining
- Is balanced with movement, talk, and hands-on learning

To provide a sense of how many minutes students are on a Chromebook, our technology department gathered the following information as a snapshot between February 1 - March 5, 2026 (not including February vacation week):

Approximate range of device usage from the elementary grade level carts (sample from the past month):

Grade Level	Approximate Range Per School Day
preK	0
K & 1	Up to 20 minutes
2 & 3	Up to 30 minutes
4	Up to 40 minutes
5	Up to 50 minutes

Approximate range of device usage in the middle school 1:1 program (sample from the past month):

6, 7 & 8	Up to 90 minutes during the school day

To note more specifically how technology is used in our classrooms, please see the following examples:

1. In elementary science, teachers use technology for video content for the anchor phenomena if a live demonstration is not possible; however, the majority of work is hands-on, non-technology-based learning.
2. In OpenSciEd at the middle school, students use resources for data collection, digital simulations, and video content. This is guided by the teacher and balanced with the majority of time dedicated to student discussions, written work (paper/pencil), and hands-on laboratories.
3. In elementary math, there is very little technology use other than Math Fact Lab in grades 2-5; Math Fact Lab sessions are 13 minutes or less and happen up to 3 times per week.
4. In middle school math, technology use varies by course level, unit, and lesson, but all classes have students doing paper/pencil tasks daily or almost daily. Students primarily use Amplify and IXL. Technology provides opportunities for immediate feedback, offers opportunities to manipulate formulas and graphs, and provides interactive representations.
5. In elementary ELA and social studies, students use real books and engage in paper/pencil tasks daily. There is regular use of technology for research and creating digital artifacts (documents, presentations, etc.), as well as keyboarding work in Typing Club 2-3 times per week for 10 minutes.
6. In middle school ELA, students use Google Suite for final draft writing assignments. In social studies, they use the online Atlas and web resources for research for approximately 3 sessions per unit. They use the online textbook for a few class sessions per unit for animated resources, but teachers commonly print pages from the textbook to use the hard copies in class.
7. Across the district, social-emotional learning (SEL) is intentionally designed to be relationship-centered and primarily discussion-based. The emphasis is on community-building and involves interactive activities without technology other than the grade 7-8 self-reflection which is done via Aperture, an online platform.

Sudbury Public Schools
School Committee Meeting

Date: **March 2, 2026**

Agenda Item: **6d**

Training and discussion on privileged materials; process for handling records requests with Record Requests Officer, including changes made following the Boston Globe matter and other privileged information redactions

Recommendation:

Move that the Sudbury School Committee request training from District Counsel regarding attorney-client privilege, including the handling of privileged communications and procedures to follow if privileged information is inadvertently received or disclosed.

Background Information:

In late 2024, *The Boston Globe* published an investigative article examining the use of settlement agreements in special education matters across Massachusetts school districts. As part of that reporting, the newspaper obtained settlement agreements through public records requests submitted to districts across the Commonwealth and published redacted versions of those documents.

Sudbury Public Schools was among the districts that provided documents in response to a public records request. Records released by the District in response to a 2023 public records request contained incomplete redactions, which resulted in student and family names remaining visible in documents that were later published by *The Boston Globe*. Once this issue was identified, the documents were updated with additional redactions and the District undertook a review of its internal procedures related to document handling and redaction.

Student records are protected under the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), which requires school districts to safeguard personally identifiable information contained in student records and limits the disclosure of such information without consent, except in circumstances permitted by law.

Following the review conducted after the Globe reporting, the District reported that it strengthened its procedures for responding to public records requests. All requests are now formally processed through the District's Records Access Officer (RAO). The Superintendent

communicated that documents that may contain sensitive information are compiled through the RAO and reviewed and redacted using professional redaction software, with oversight from District counsel, to ensure compliance with FERPA and applicable state public records laws.

Shortly after these updated procedures were communicated, a document subject to attorney-client privilege was released in response to a public records request without appropriate redactions or review by District counsel.

Attorney-client privilege protects confidential communications between a public body and its legal counsel when those communications are made for the purpose of obtaining or providing legal advice. This protection applies to written and verbal communications, including emails, memoranda, phone calls, and meetings with counsel. Privileged communications may not be disclosed outside of those communications unless the privilege is formally waived. For a public body such as a School Committee, attorney-client privilege may only be waived by a vote of the Committee.

This agenda item is intended to provide the School Committee with an overview of:

- The processes that were in place prior to the *Boston Globe* reporting;
- The procedural and training changes implemented following the District's review; and
- The steps the administration will take to ensure that confidential student information and privileged communications are consistently protected in future public records responses.

The Committee will also discuss whether it would be beneficial to schedule a training with District counsel regarding attorney-client privilege, including guidance on how privileged communications should be handled and what steps should be taken if privileged information is inadvertently received or disclosed. The Committee may vote on whether to request such training, which would be held in Executive Session.

Attachments:

Action:	**XX**	**Report:**		**Discussion:**	**XX**

Sudbury Public Schools
School Committee Meeting

Date: **March 2, 2026**

Agenda Item: **6e**

Policy BGB, Step 3: Review counsel feedback on proposed policy revisions based on School Committee input; potential vote to adopt
IJDG, Artificial Intelligence

Recommendation:

Move to adopt policy IJNDG as presented / amended.

Background Information:

Under Policy BGB, the Sudbury School Committee follows a structured, three-step process to adopt or amend district policies:

1. **Information** – The proposed policy is distributed in the agenda packet for Committee members to review. **(1/20/2026)**

2. **Discussion** – The policy is read and discussed at a public meeting. This includes feedback from the Superintendent and/or relevant advisory committees, and may result in suggested edits or directions for redrafting. **(1/26/2026)**

At the January 26, 2026 School Committee meeting, the Committee discussed draft policy IJNDG, Artificial Development policy as developed by the Policy Subcommittee related to the use of generative artificial intelligence in instruction and district operations. It was decided that Committee members could email the Chair to share specific feedback and considerations to share with legal counsel for review as part of drafting a potential policy framework.

The considerations shared with counsel included, but were not limited to:

- Including a definition of generative AI.
- Clarifying responsibility for the use of AI tools, noting that while generative AI tools may be used to support learning and instruction when permitted, responsibility for the accuracy, appropriateness, and integrity of work remains with the teacher or student using the tool.
- Establishing a process for vetting and approving generative AI tools used by students and staff, including review of data privacy protections and compliance with applicable laws such as the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA), which requires parental consent for children

under age 13.
- Maintaining a publicly accessible list of approved digital tools, including generative AI platforms and educational technology tools that incorporate AI, describing their intended use, grade-level access, approval process, and applicable data privacy policies.
- Addressing the potential for bias in AI systems, including recognition that AI outputs can unintentionally reinforce historical patterns of exclusion, misrepresentation, or injustice.
- Incorporating bias analysis into the procurement or approval process for AI tools.
- Considering periodic evaluation of generative AI tools, potentially through the use of standardized prompts to review outputs for bias and other concerns.

3. **Action** – The Committee may vote to adopt or reject the policy.
    - If significant changes are made during this step, the Committee may choose to extend discussion. **(We are at this step.)**

This agenda item is for the School Committee to review counsel's feedback and discuss next steps, including possible vote for policy adoption.

Additional Notes:
- The Committee may suspend the above sequence in the case of emergencies.
- Once adopted, policies go into effect on a date set by the Committee to ensure time for implementation and communication.

Attachments:

1. DRAFT_ Policy Subcommittee IJNDG
2. Counsel Review IJNDG

Action: **XX** **Report:** **Discussion:** **XX**

DRAFT Reviewed at the 1/26/2026 School Committee Meeting from Policy Subcommittee

IJNDG – Artificial Intelligence

Sudbury Public Schools recognizes the increasing role of artificial intelligence (AI), including generative artificial intelligence, in education, work, and civic life. When used thoughtfully and responsibly, AI has the potential to enhance teaching and learning, support creativity and problem-solving, increase efficiency, and expand access to educational opportunities.

The District is committed to ensuring that the use of artificial intelligence supports high academic standards, ethical practice, and equitable access to learning for all students, including students with disabilities, multilingual learners, and other students who may rely on instructional supports or accommodations, and does not exacerbate bias, inequity, or barriers to participation.

Accordingly, Sudbury Public Schools will incorporate age-appropriate instruction related to AI literacy, ethical use, and the critical evaluation of AI-generated content into relevant aspects of the K–8 curriculum, consistent with the Massachusetts Digital Literacy and Computer Science Curriculum Framework.

Given the evolving and rapidly changing nature of artificial intelligence, the School Committee directs the Superintendent or designee to develop, implement, and periodically update developmentally appropriate administrative procedures or guidelines governing the instructional and professional use of AI by students and staff. Such procedures or guidelines shall address, as appropriate, ethical and responsible use, academic integrity and transparency, data privacy and student protections, accessibility and equitable use, and awareness of bias, accuracy limitations, and misinformation risks.

These administrative procedures or guidelines shall be reviewed regularly to ensure alignment with emerging best practices, legal requirements, and educational research, and shall be communicated to students, families, and staff through appropriate district publications, including the Family Handbook.

The School Committee retains oversight of this policy and shall periodically review the policy and any related administrative procedures or guidelines to ensure continued alignment with legal requirements, educational best practices, and community values.

LEGAL REFS.:

M.G.L. c. 71
Title I and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act
Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA)

IJNDB -USE OF TECHNOLOGY IN INSTRUCTION

IJNDC - ACCEPTABLE USE OF DIGITAL RESOURCES

DRAFT

Counsel Review IJNDG

IJNDG – Artificial Intelligence

Sudbury Public Schools recognizes the increasing role of artificial intelligence (AI), including generative artificial intelligence, in education, work, and civic life. When used thoughtfully and responsibly, AI has the potential to enhance teaching and learning, support creativity and problem-solving, increase efficiency, and expand access to educational opportunities.

The District is committed to ensuring that the use of artificial intelligence supports high academic standards, ethical practice, and equitable access to learning for all students, including students with disabilities, multilingual learners, and other students who may rely on instructional supports or accommodations, and does not exacerbate bias, inequity, or barriers to participation.

Accordingly, Sudbury Public Schools will incorporate age-appropriate instruction related to AI literacy, ethical use, and the critical evaluation of AI-generated content into relevant aspects of the K–8 curriculum, consistent with the Massachusetts Digital Literacy and Computer Science Curriculum Framework, and in accordance with guidance of the DESE Office of Educational Technology.

Given the evolving and rapidly changing nature of artificial intelligence, the School Committee directs the Superintendent or designee to develop, implement, and periodically update developmentally appropriate administrative procedures or guidelines governing the instructional and professional use of AI by students and staff. Such procedures or guidelines shall address, as appropriate, the centering of human expertise, teaching AI literacy, the use of professional judgment and expertise by staff in the application of AI, ethical and responsible use, academic integrity and honesty, on-line use of AI by students, transparency, data privacy and student protections, accessibility and equitable use, and awareness of bias, accuracy limitations, and misinformation risks.

These administrative procedures and ~~or~~ guidelines shall be reviewed regularly to ensure alignment with emerging best practices, legal requirements, and educational research, and shall be clearly communicated to students, families, and staff through appropriate district publications, including the Family Handbook.

The School Committee retains oversight of this policy and shall periodically review the policy and any related administrative procedures or guidelines to ensure continued alignment with legal requirements, educational best practices, and community values.

LEGAL REFS.:

M.G.L. c. 71
Title I and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act
Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA)

DRAFT

IJNDB -USE OF TECHNOLOGY IN INSTRUCTION

IJNDC - ACCEPTABLE USE OF DIGITAL RESOURCES

DRAFT

Sudbury Public Schools
School Committee Meeting

Date: **March 2, 2026**

Agenda Item: **6f**

Extended Day Program Operation RFP; Update & Evaluation Committee

Recommendation:

Background Information:

Sudbury Public Schools is currently conducting a procurement process for the operation of the District's extended day program through a Request for Proposals (RFP). Because this arrangement involves the use of school facilities and the provision of services to students and families, the procurement must be conducted in accordance with Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 30B (Uniform Procurement Act).

Chapter 30B establishes the procedures municipalities and school districts must follow when procuring services and awarding certain contracts. The law is intended to ensure that procurements are conducted in a fair, transparent, and competitive manner, and that contracts are awarded based solely on the criteria set forth in the RFP.

Under Chapter 30B, the Procurement Officer is responsible for overseeing the procurement process and ensuring compliance with the requirements of the law. The Procurement Officer will establish an evaluation committee to review and score proposals in accordance with the published evaluation criteria. Evaluation committee members review proposals and assign scores based only on the criteria set forth in the RFP.

Because members of the evaluation committee are participating in an official procurement process on behalf of the District, it is important that their review be conducted in a neutral and objective manner consistent with the requirements of Massachusetts procurement law. Evaluation committee members must base their review solely on the information contained in the submitted proposals and the established evaluation criteria.

Because evaluation committee members serve in an official capacity on behalf of the District, it is also important that their participation reflects both actual impartiality and the appearance of impartiality. Care

should be taken to ensure that the composition of the evaluation committee supports an objective review process and maintains public confidence in the integrity of the procurement.

As part of this agenda item, the Committee will receive an update regarding the procurement process and the formation of the evaluation committee, including any guidance or training that may be provided to individuals serving on the evaluation committee regarding their responsibilities under Chapter 30B, such as maintaining neutrality, avoiding bias or the appearance of bias, and evaluating proposals solely on the basis of the criteria contained in the RFP.

Following the evaluation process, the evaluation committee typically provides a recommendation based on the scoring and evaluation criteria contained in the RFP. The School Committee, as the public body responsible for the use of school facilities and related agreements, may then review the recommendation and take action consistent with the RFP and applicable law.

This agenda item is intended to provide the School Committee with an update regarding the Extended Day Program Operation RFP and the formation of the evaluation committee, and to review the legal framework governing the procurement process.

Attachments:

Chapter 30B

Action:	**XX**	**Report:**		**Discussion:**	**XX**

Sudbury Public Schools
School Committee Meeting

Date: **March 2, 2026**

Agenda Item: **6g**

Discussion around process of annual calendar approval

Recommendation:

Background Information:

From the Tri-District Calendar Review Subcommittee Charge:

The SPS members of the Tri-District Calendar Review Subcommittee will present a proposed process to the full School Committee by March 2026 for review. Upon approval, the final process may be incorporated into the Sudbury School Committee Handbook.

Attachments:

Calendar Review -- School Committee Handbook Draft

Action: **XX** **Report:** **Discussion:** **XX**

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION

Section D. Annual Agenda Items and Regular Business:

School Calendar Review and Approval

In carrying out its calendar review responsibilities, the School Committee recognizes that its core responsibility is to steward a calendar that best supports the educational needs of students and creates the conditions for the best possible educational outcomes for all, consistent with the safe and effective operation of the schools. The School Committee also recognizes that calendar decisions affect not only operations and instructional continuity, but also the district's commitment to belonging, inclusion, and respect for the diverse religious and cultural traditions represented in the SPS community. The annual review process should therefore support a calendar-development approach that is transparent, data-informed, and mindful both of educational continuity and operational feasibility and of the importance of ensuring that all students and families feel seen, respected, and welcomed in Sudbury Public Schools.

The School Committee shall annually review and approve the district calendar for the upcoming school year. At the conclusion of each school year, typically in June or July, the Administration shall provide an analysis of student and staff absence data, disaggregated by school and by staffing categories relevant to substitute coverage, including the average daily absence rate for the year and the absence rate for each individual instructional day. In addition to the full-year presentation, the data shall be separately presented for dates of interest, including broadly observed religious or cultural observance days and any other dates identified by the School Committee for review. The data shall be aggregated annually and presented with a rolling comparison. The Administration shall also provide context for dates on which staff absences may affect the safe operation of a school, or on which student absences may significantly affect educational equity or the quality of instruction.

At least once every five years, and more frequently if requested by the School Committee, the Administration shall survey instructional staff regarding religious and cultural observance dates they prospectively expect to take off, regardless of whether those dates are already designated as no-school days. Such survey shall include, at minimum, Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, Diwali, Lunar New Year, Good Friday, Eid al-Fitr, and Eid al-Adha, as well as any additional dates identified by the Committee or requested by the community for review. The survey shall distinguish between dates instructional staff expect to take off and dates they believe they possibly will take off.

Each summer, the School Committee shall review the absence data and any relevant survey results and instruct the Superintendent to develop a proposed calendar based on the Committee's determination of no school days that best support safe and effective school operations and the needs of the SPS student population.

In developing the proposed calendar, the SPS Administration shall also review professional development days with Lincoln-Sudbury Regional High School administration to identify opportunities for alignment where feasible, recognizing that contractual constraints may limit alignment in some cases.

The Administration shall then present a proposed calendar to the School Committee for approval, identifying no-school days for vacation periods, state and federal holidays, professional development, and any religious or cultural observances recognized by SPS, as well as all early release days, half days, and other significant calendar elements. If operationally feasible, the School Committee may approve up to two years of calendars at one time.

Committee Information Gathering:

The original request and responses are included for background. Responses are presented verbatim, with salutations removed, and are not attributed to individual authors.

All,

The Calendar Review Subcommittee is developing a clear and sustainable framework to guide future calendar governance.

We are seeking your input to help shape this framework before bringing it back to the full Committee.
To clarify scope, there are two components to calendar work:

1. Annual Calendar Approval – the yearly review and approval of the upcoming school calendar.
2. Comprehensive Calendar Review – a broader evaluation of no-school days. This is periodic and not intended to occur annually.

The framework under development is focused specifically on the annual calendar approval process.

Framework considerations are identified below. **Please share input by March 10th.** Please note the following in regards to your input:

- *All feedback will be shared in full within a future subcommittee and/or full Committee packet.*
- *Responses will not be attributed by name.*
- *You do not need to respond to every prompt. Please share as much or as little input as you wish.*

1. Data for Annual Calendar Approval
Please identify any data you believe should be included in the annual review and how often they should be examined.
Absentee data has been discussed as a potential recurring data set. Please suggest specific guidance on what information is necessary to support informed annual approval. Example considerations include:

- *What absentee data should be reviewed (students, instructors, nurses, other staff, substitute-dependent roles, etc.)?*
- *Should data be reviewed for all instructional days or only selected/high-absence dates?*
- *Would year-over-year or multi-year comparative data be helpful? At what frequency?*
- *What level of detail is needed (e.g., percent and number absent by date, baseline averages, breakdowns by school or role)?*
- *Do you have preferences for how data should be presented (e.g., full-year daily charts, summary tables, trend analysis)?*

2. Timing, Structure, and Operational Considerations
Should calendar-related data be reviewed annually as a standing agenda item, or on a periodic basis? If on a periodic basis, at what frequency?

3. Instructor Survey (Religious & Cultural Observances)
During the recent Tri-District review, an instructor survey was used to help inform calendar decisions. The survey collected forward-looking or leading indicators of anticipated absences for upcoming school years to reassess whether current no-school days continue to correspond with high absence patterns.
Should this survey be repeated in the future? If so, at what frequency? Are there survey design elements or data breakdowns that would support clearer analysis and decision-making?

4. Additional Considerations
Should the annual calendar approval process scope include the next two years worth of calendars?
Should the annual calendar review framework address alignment between LS and SPS? If so, in what way?
Should the annual calendar review framework address public requests for no school days? If so, in what way?
Are there any other data points, operational concerns, or structural considerations the subcommittee should account for?

1. Data for Annual Calendar Approval

Absentee data:

I do think absenteeism should be a recurring data set, but with targeted guardrails so that it remains actionable rather than overwhelming. My suggestions:

- **Which populations:** Students, instructors, and substitute-dependent roles. Including nurses and essential support staff could also be valuable since no-school days can materially affect coverage.
- **Scope of days:** I'd recommend *two* cuts:
  - **Full-year daily rates** (to track general patterns and identify emerging trends), and
  - **A focused review of historically high-variance days** (e.g., religious/cultural observances, winter weather transition days, the days immediately before/after long weekends, etc.).
- **Comparative views:** Year-over-year comparisons for at least the prior **3–5 years** would help ensure we're not reacting to outliers.
- **Level of detail:**
  - % absent + raw number absent
  - Broken down by school and staff role (student/instructor/critical ops roles)
  - A baseline average for context (e.g., "typical Thursday" or "typical week in October").
- **Presentation format:**
  - A **summary table** with key takeaways
  - **Trend lines** for multi-year patterns
  - A **yellow-flag list** of dates that consistently produce higher-than-average absence

This ensures the data supports—not drives—the decision, and avoids creating unnecessary complexity.

2. Timing, Structure, and Operational Considerations

Given the relatively small number of variables that shift year to year, I think an **annual standing agenda item** makes sense, with a **deeper review every 3 years** to ensure assumptions are still correct.
A predictable cadence helps ensure transparency while avoiding analysis fatigue.

3. Instructor Survey (Religious & Cultural Observances)

The instructor survey was helpful as a forward-looking tool, but I don't think it needs to be annual. My suggestion:

- **Every 2–3 years**, or sooner if demographic shifts or enrollment data suggest meaningful change
- **Useful design elements could include:**
  - Clear distinction between *anticipated personal absences* and *observance-related patterns*
  - Optional free-text fields to capture nuance
  - A simple "severity/likelihood" rating scale
  - Breakdowns by role and school to identify localized impact

This strikes a good balance between honoring community diversity and managing operational load.

4. Additional Considerations

- **Multi-year calendar review**: Reviewing the next **two years** could help with planning, consistency, and reducing rework—especially given how early families and staff plan.
- **Alignment between LS and SPS**: Yes, where feasible. Differences will inevitably exist, but early coordination can reduce downstream confusion for families who span both districts.
- **Public requests for no-school days**: It would be helpful to have a **clear criteria rubric** published ahead of time (e.g., data thresholds, instructional time impacts, staffing implications, equity considerations). Making the process transparent manages expectations and improves trust.
- **Other data points:**
  - Enrollment projections that may affect staffing coverage
  - State-mandated instructional hour requirements
  - Weather-related patterns (e.g., typical snow days)
  - Transportation or contractual constraints that could be affected by shifting days

1. Data for Annual Calendar Approval
-- I believe the nurses, members of units A, B, C (teachers, paraprofessionals and custodians) and building level substitutes should be surveyed. If there are other subs that they typically rely upon but are not building level that is appropriate to ask them as well.
-- I would ask these individuals about their known days off for the given year. Perhaps having options of 'definitely working' or 'may be working' 'definitely not working.' I understand that it may not be 100% inclusive of days they would be off but it would give the clearest picture we can gather. The question could list major holidays and religious or cultural observances with an option for 'other' to be filled in manually. I suppose we could use the list of holidays we received from the discussion this year. And any new email requests we get can be added to the list each year.
-- I would gather these data yearly so we can track over time. It may be that after 5 or so years we do not need to gather the data any each year but that remains to be seen. I would gather the data at the same time each year, perhaps 3 months before the calendar is coming before the full committee to provide time to analyze the data.
-- Data could be presented by role as a district and per individual school for dates of high absence. The important piece in my mind is separating out days that have more than the number of absences that the Superintendent says is impossible to open schools. For example - if Brad says we cannot staff school safely with 33% of teachers out, or 50% of paraprofessionals out, then we sort the data on the days that report those percentages. Raw numbers can be shared with the committee but only for reference in the packet. Raw data need not be presented formally unless committee members have questions and they can then refer to the raw data as needed.
-- When data are presented to the committee, it could be nice to have any prior years' data as a reference. The data can be averaged (and error bars added) for previous data collection (e.g. years 1, 2, and 3) and then the current year separated out. That way we can see if there is a trend towards the same days every year such that we can space out when we survey the staff

2. Timing, Structure, and Operational Considerations

I think this should be a standing agenda item each year. A routine could be established whereby we send out the short survey to the staff, the calendar subcommittee analyze the data, and then the full committee receives a presentation from the subcommittee which informs the no school days for the superintendent. These events could happen so the community understands the full process and knows when to expect the calendar for planning purposes.

3. Instructor Survey (Religious & Cultural Observances)
I may have confused this answer with my answer for question 1 above. I do not think we need to survey the students, only the staff.

4. Additional Considerations
-- I would like to see one year at a time until such time as we have solid data (maybe 5 years worth?)
-- It would be ideal to align with LS but we saw from this year's discussions that we have different needs as a population so it may not be possible. Perhaps worth it for the chair of SPS and the chair of LS to have a quick meeting to see if possible. I would not hold up our calendar in order to align.
--Public requests can be added to the running list of days that staff may not be in school.

My primary recommendation is that the annual review be grounded in more complete and better-structured data from the administration.

In particular, absence data should be provided for all instructional days, not only for selected dates that have already been identified as days of interest. Reviewing all school days is important because it allows the Committee to understand whether absence rates on a religious or cultural observance are meaningfully different from ordinary patterns or from other high-absence days, such as the day before or after an established school break. Without that broader context, it is difficult to evaluate whether a specific day truly warrants consideration as a no-school day.

I also think the absence data should include both student and instructor absences. There may be circumstances in which a no-school day is justified not only because of staffing or operational concerns, but because of significant student absences tied to religious or cultural observance. While safe school operations are clearly an important factor, the review process should also consider whether the district is serving students equitably and supporting the diversity of the student population in how education is delivered.

To support meaningful analysis, the data should be broken out in greater detail rather than presented only in aggregate. At a minimum, it would be helpful to see:

- student absences and instructor absences separately;
- breakouts by school;
- breakouts by role category, especially identifying positions that require substitutes or otherwise create operational strain when absent;
- daily rates and counts, with comparison to baseline averages and year-over-year trends.

This level of detail is necessary to understand not only whether absences are elevated, but also what the operational impact is across buildings and staffing groups. Aggregate data alone makes it difficult to evaluate the real effect on school operations and student access.

With respect to the instructor survey, I do think it should be repeated in the future, and annually would be appropriate if the Committee intends to conduct an annual calendar approval review. However, the survey should be designed in a way that makes the results easy to analyze. In particular, individual dates or observances should be separately listed as response options, and the survey should avoid relying on an open-ended “other” field where staff may write dates in many different formats. That kind of write-in structure makes the data inefficient and difficult to analyze consistently. A structured, multiple-selection format with clearly listed observances would produce more reliable and usable results.

As with the absence data, survey results should also be broken out by school and by role category, including positions that require substitutes. That information is important to understanding the operational implications of anticipated absences rather than simply the total number of responses districtwide.
On timing and structure, I support making calendar-related data review a standing annual agenda item. Because calendar decisions affect family planning, staffing, and operations, a predictable annual review process is helpful. I also think it makes sense for the process to consider calendars two years in advance where possible, particularly for the most predictable no-school dates, so that families and staff have more certainty.

Finally, I think the framework should allow the Committee to consider public requests for no-school days, but those requests should be evaluated against a consistent set of criteria and data, including student and staff absence patterns, operational impact, and equity considerations.

Overall, I would encourage the handbook to include a review that is operationally practical and student-centered: one that uses complete data, presents that data in an analyzable format, and accounts for both staffing realities and the district’s responsibility to serve a diverse student population equitably.

Sudbury Public Schools
School Committee Meeting

Date: **March 2, 2026**

Agenda Item: **6h**

Superintendent and School Committee Community Communication

Recommendation:
Move to approve the Superintendent and School Committee Community Communication as presented / amended.

Background Information:

Attachments:

DRAFT SPS Family Communication

Garofalo Email

Action: **XX** **Report:** **Discussion:** **XX**

Dear Sudbury Families,

We are writing to clarify several School Committee responsibilities that have recently been the subject of public discussion. These responsibilities are governed by Massachusetts law, not by private preference or informal practice.

First, under Massachusetts law, the School Committee is responsible for employing the Superintendent and setting the terms of the Superintendent's contract and compensation. As provided in M.G.L. c. 71, § 59, the School Committee "shall employ a superintendent of schools and fix his compensation." Massachusetts law also provides that the School Committee has "the power to select" the Superintendent. M.G.L. c. 71, § 37.

Second, Massachusetts Open Meeting Law allows certain discussions to occur in executive session rather than in open session. One of those permitted purposes is to conduct "strategy sessions in preparation for negotiations with nonunion personnel" and "contract negotiations with nonunion personnel." M.G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(2). Because the Superintendent is a nonunion employee, contract discussions may legally occur in executive session. The law also allows related minutes and materials to remain confidential while disclosure would jeopardize the Committee's negotiating position. M.G.L. c. 30A, § 22.

Third, Massachusetts procurement law requires school districts to use a competitive process for certain contracts above specified dollar thresholds. For municipal and regional school districts, contracts over $100,000 must be procured through a competitive sealed bid or proposal process under M.G.L. c. 30B, §§ 5–6. This means that when the district issues an RFP for a qualifying contract, it is doing so because state law requires a competitive process, not because it is targeting any particular provider.

We understand that these processes can sometimes feel frustrating or unclear, especially when the law limits what may be discussed publicly in real time. We hope this explanation helps clarify that the School Committee is carrying out legal responsibilities established by the Commonwealth and remains committed to transparency wherever the law permits.

We encourage families with questions to reach out directly to the School Committee so that we can provide accurate information and an official response. As information may circulate through unofficial channels, including social media and other informal sources, we encourage community members to confirm questions directly with the Committee whenever possible.

Sincerely,

Sudbury School Committee

Karyn Jones
Jessica McCready
Nicole Burnard
Julie Durgin-Sicree
Elizabeth Sues

Julie Williams <julie_williams@sudbury.k12.ma.us>

Fwd: Response to SPS email

1 message

Karyn Jones <karyn_jones@sudbury.k12.ma.us> Mon, Mar 16, 2026 at 11:58 AM
To: Julie Williams <julie_williams@sudbury.k12.ma.us>

can you also put this email in the packet under the community communication?

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Garofalo, Victor** <GarofaloV@sudbury.ma.us>
Date: Mon, Mar 2, 2026 at 2:11 PM
Subject: RE: Response to SPS email
To: Karyn Jones <karyn_jones@sudbury.k12.ma.us>, Sheehan, Andy <SheehanA@sudbury.ma.us>

Karyn,

I am writing to formally correct several material inaccuracies contained in Ms. Burnard's email regarding the fiscal projections presented at the January 14–15 meetings.

First, the figures cited in her summary mischaracterize the relationship between the FY28 and FY29 projected deficits. The Town presented an anticipated FY28 structural deficit of approximately $3.0 million. The projected FY29 deficit of approximately $5.2 million was inclusive of the FY28 imbalance if left unresolved, it was not presented as an additional deficit on top of FY28.

Stating that FY28 ($3.0M) and FY29 ($5.2M) should be aggregated to total $8.3 million is incorrect. If the FY28 deficit were resolved, the projected FY29 structural gap would be approximately $2.2 million, not $5.2 million. The email's aggregation materially overstates the fiscal outlook.

Second, the FY28 deficit projection reflects the School Department's submitted budget forecast, which assumes a 4.48% increase, and 3.66% in FY29. No formal budget guidance has yet been issued by the Town Manager. The 4.48% and 3.66% growth rate exceeds the level of growth assumed for the Town and LS budgets (which reflect approximately 3%). Any formal guidance issued would likely reduce the projected deficit from the currently modeled amount. Therefore, presenting the FY28 and FY29 deficit as a fixed or finalized figure is inaccurate.

Third, with respect to the referenced $800,000 related to the SEA agreement:
The contract provision provides for an additional 2% increase contingent upon the passage of an override. By definition, a contingent increase tied to override approval is not a structural deficit. If an override does not pass, the 2% increase does not occur. Characterizing this contingent provision as an existing deficit obligation is incorrect and materially misleading.

Finally, the additional FY27 guidance discussed at the meeting is already incorporated into the multi-year projections. It is not additive beyond the projected deficits previously presented.

To summarize clearly:

- FY28 projected structural deficit: ~ $3.0M
- FY29 projected deficit if FY28 is resolved: ~ $2.2M
- FY29 projected deficit if FY28 is not resolved: ~ $5.2M
- There is no factual basis for a $9M projected override requirement.

The assertion that the Town is projecting a $9 million override impact is not supported by the data presented at the public meetings.

Given the importance of accurate financial information during override discussions, it is critical that projections are represented precisely and not aggregated in a manner that materially misstates the Town's fiscal position.

Respectfully,
Victor

Victor Garofalo

Assistant Town Manager/Finance Director

Town of Sudbury

278 Old Sudbury Road

Sudbury MA 01776

Phone: (978) 639-3377

--
Karyn Jones
Chair, Sudbury School Committee

This email is intended for educational use only and must comply with the Sudbury Public Schools policies and state/federal laws. Please be advised that under Massachusetts Law, any email created or received by an employee of Sudbury is considered a public record. *Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact the sender and delete all copies.*

If you need to translate this information, copy and paste it into Google Translate.
The link to Google Translate is http://translate.google.com/

Si necesita traducir esta información, cópiela y péguela en el Traductor de Google.
El enlace al traductor de Google es http://translate.google.com/

Se você precisar traduzir essas informações, copie e cole no Google Translate.
O link para o tradutor do Google é http://translate.google.com/

This email is intended for educational use only and must comply with the Sudbury Public Schools policies and state/federal laws. Please be advised that under Massachusetts Law, any email created or received by an employee of Sudbury is considered a public record. All email correspondence is subject to the requirements of M.G.L. Chapter 66. This email may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact the sender and delete all copies.