

Minutes
Orange Southwest School District (OSSD)
Regular Board Meeting on Wednesday May 13, 2026
Randolph Union Middle High School
6pm

[Click Here for the video recording of the meeting.](#)

I. Opening (6:00 pm)

Meeting called to order by board chair, Aimil Parmelee, at 6:05 pm

- Board Attendance: *Ensuring a quorum*

Board members: Ryan Anderson, Beverly Lauchner, Aimil Parmelee, Anne Kaplan, Martha Hafner, Ray Zapata, Rachel Gaidys, Rachel Fish. Administration: Michael Clark, ORC Media, Kyle Southworth. Public in person: Shirley Huang. Public attending remotely: Betsy Baker, Dan Morrison, Janni Jacobs, Sara Richards, Tammy White, Rebecca Walter, Emma Janicki.

- Meeting Purpose: Continue discussion on reconfiguration
- Review and Accept Agenda: Any changes needed? *Meeting purpose? Are these the right agenda items? Is the right amount of time allotted?*

Board agrees to add discussion of June meeting date to Board Processes.

II. Ownership Linkage (6:10)

- General Public Comment: *The Board welcomes comment but is not able to take any action. Comments limited to 3 minutes per speaker.*

No attending public had comment.

- District Reconfiguration Q&A (Discussion)

Michael Clark recaps the previous discussion, noting that the reconfiguration idea is just an idea, if it is to be explored further it will require collaboration of educators, families, communities, students, boards, etc. Ryan Anderson refers to the hand-out he brought (attached) questions he has been asked by community members. Aimil Parmelee says other people may have a number of questions as well, Ryan Anderson hopes his compilation adds to the conversation. Anne Kaplan suggests the specificity of the questions may be pre-mature, and wonders what information is needed for the board to actually decide if consideration of a reconfiguration is really an option. Aimil Parmelee suggests the board may want to consider the concept from a higher level, then if they are interested in exploring further, at that point community involvement would be needed. Ray Zapata asks how the board would inform people if there were to be public meetings? Beverly Lauchner suggests Ryan Anderson could read the overview but then allow the board to process the more in-depth concerns. Aimil Parmelee suggests several ideas for community outreach and Ryan Anderson agrees many of the questions are operational, a level the concept isn't presently at.

Martha Hafner comments that they intentionally listened to other communities (Brookfield and Braintree) and they were worried about what would happen to them? Rachel Fish notes they hear from the community that it looks as though the proposal has been made without any consideration of the challenges. They'd like to see evidence that this proposal would solve educational and behavioral issues, as well as more detail about the inequity of per pupil spending at the various campuses. There is concern this reconfiguration is being presented as a cure-all.

Michael Clark appreciates that the community thinks the reconfiguration idea is vague – it's not a proposal, it's intended to be a conversation starter, and it's exciting that the conversation is active, solid, civil and thoughtful. Michael Clark also notes if there is to be a change, that process would need to begin in September for the 27-28 year.

The conversation turns to alternative programs, Martha Hafner asks if the RAVEN program is an alternative program. Michael Clark responds that yes, RAVEN is an alternative program and would continue to operate. Michael Clark updates the board on discussion with Jamie Kinnarney, outlining that district's use of alternative programs that involve two distinct profiles – Profile 1 for K-12 that centers round support for autistic students and Profile 2 that supports students with emotional/behavioral disturbance. This program currently has 3 students, and routinely supports students in general ed that need support, and can then return to general ed.

Michael Clark discusses the shortage of special educators, a good number of provisional teaching licenses which means many educators are learning on the job. Hiring skilled people to provide more specialized support within the classroom isn't a consideration if the workforce isn't there. Martha Hafner asks what the ballpark number is for PreK, Michael Clark responds he estimates 3 classes of 20 each across all campuses. Discussion about whether Braintree is too big or too small for combined PreK and K. Ryan Anderson questions if moving PreK to Braintree would create a two-tiered program, both Aimil Parmelee and Bev Lauchner state it already is a two-tier system that is not accessible to all. Michael Clark and Aimil Parmelee discuss how partnerships are imperative to provide resources and solutions to more families, denser programs would help facilitate this.

Rachel Gaidys asks what is the biggest problem here? If the Brookfield plant is in such bad shape it should be replaced, the town of Brookfield should be asked if they would be interested in approving that expense.

Aimil Parmelee asks if the board should consider supporting the elementary schools and investing in a regional high school.

- Public Comment: *The Board welcomes comment but is not able to take any action. Comments limited to 3 minutes per speaker.*

Shirley Huang, Randolph: curious if surveys or questionnaires were sent out to community members about the reconfiguration.

Emma Janicki, Braintree school: heard questions from Ryan Anderson's compilation that they hadn't considered. Moved across the country to work at Braintree school and praises students and their successes. The reconfiguration clarifies what the benefits are but they don't know what the losses may be. Educators could be more involved in their professional development to make that more successful.

Rachel Fish, Braintree board member: reads comments from Jannie Jacobs, discusses the integration of various ages and suggests that PreK could use a dedicated wing at RES to centralize the littles.

Ashley Gaboriault, Braintree: praises the idea of a learning environment designed for early learners. Email attached.

III. Board Process (7:30)

- School Safety Committee Report (Information)

Michael Clark advised the board of the submission of the school safety committee report, as negotiated in collective bargaining agreement. The committee was comprised of building administrators, facilities, Michael Clark and association members. Each meeting explored a theme, minutes were taken and then shared across campuses for input. The report is a summary of those meetings and is purely informational for the Board. Michael Clark noted that the committee was a good way for voices to be heard and concerns addressed, and they would like to continue.

- Regular Board meeting in June

The June 10 board meeting conflicts with the Brookfield 6th grade graduation and RUHS Senior Awards. The Board discussed re-scheduling so both community and board members would be able to attend.

VOTE: Ryan Anderson moves to reschedule the regular June board meeting to June 17, 2026 at 6 pm. This will be a special meeting and will be held at RES. Seconded by Ray Zapata. Motion passes unanimously.

IV. Board Education (7:40)

- Kelly Green available for July Meeting & Additional Agenda items (Discussion)

Anne Kaplan tells the board that Kelly Green (district moderator) would be happy to do a short training on Robert's Rules during in-service in July, perhaps 30-45 minutes. The board agreed that the July in-service would predominantly be training, but would also include the traditional potluck. Anne Kaplan requested that board members send questions for Kelly Green to Anne by the end of June to assist in training prep.

- Reminder of Policy Governance Virtual Training June 4, 2026 6-7 p.m. (Information)
- Policy Governance Accelerator Course through the VSBA for New Board Members & Anyone Interested (Reminder)

Anne Kaplan reminds board members to contact Central Office if they are interested in training opportunities through the VSBA.

V. Monitoring the Organization (7:55)

- 1st Read EL 2.7 (Information)

Michael Clark reports that, with the assistance of the board, the district is fully compliant.

- Financials (Information in support of EL 2.3 Financial Conditions)

Michael Clark informs the district is running a surplus, and there is money available in the facilities budget to fund the transformer project, so the use of reserve money will not be necessary. The district put the transformer project out for bid, and while several parties expressed interest, the scope of the project was too large for most of them. The district has applied for a waiver as there aren't 3 quotes for the project, but that is not expected to be a difficulty. During the review of the project, it was discovered the 20-year-old secondary transformer was installed with future use of electricity in mind – that transformer can handle the full load of the physical plant operating at 2/3 capacity. This brings the cost of the project to about \$95,000. Ray Zapata asks if this information is based on the manufacturer's rating or low-tested. Michael Clark responds that is the low test assessment.

VI. Policy Decisions for District Governance (8:10)

- All policies for a first read
 - A1 - Board Member Conflict of Interest, required
 - D6 - Class Size Policy, required
 - F1 Travel Reimbursement, required
 - F23 Capitalization of Assets, required by Auditor
 - F24 Prevention of Conflict of Interest Procurement. required by Auditor

Michael Clark notes there are approximately 20 policies that need to be reviewed by the board as they have been updated. In many cases it's just the use of gender-neutral language, in others the statutes cited have been updated. In an effort to allow the board to read and consider each policy, they will be put on the agenda 5 or so at a time so everything will have been reviewed and be up to date by fall.

VII. Monitoring the Board (8:20)

- *Board Self-Evaluation: Monitoring compliance with Board Governance Process and Board Management Delegation Policies.*

The board discusses the current evaluation policy. Anne Kaplan notes that each time the board does a self-evaluation it should be considered a review, and the review date on that policy should be updated.

- BMD 3.1 Unity of Control– Self Evaluation (Action)
- Updated board self evaluation (Discussion)

It is suggested that at the end of each meeting, the board could do a quick “look back” at that particular meeting.

VIII. Consent Agenda (8:30)

Board motion -- I move to approve the Consent Agenda

- Vote on acceptance of Consent Agenda: *Items that the Board has previously delegated to the Superintendent, but that an external authority requires the Board to approve. The entire Consent Agenda is adopted by one motion, without discussion. However, an item can be removed from the Consent Agenda for discussion with a majority vote GP 4.3.4.*
- Approve Minutes from April 15, 2026 and May 4, 2026
- New Hires/Resignations
- Environmental Controls - Use of Reserve Funds
- Approval of Fay and Rose Cowdrey Fund accounting

VOTE: Anne Kaplan moves to accept the consent agenda as presented. Seconded by Ryan Anderson. Motion passes unanimously.

IX. Closing/Incidental Information (8:45)

- Superintendent's Report
 - Ends Snapshot

Michael Clark reports to the board that the radon results have come back after mitigation at Brookfield School and all readings are below the Health Department's action level. The Up for Learning group attended the Power 2 Summit last week and is now preparing for their keynote address for the spring conference of the Vermont Superintendents Association. The students continue to gather data and share their vision with boards and leadership teams.

H.949, the Yield Bill, was also an item for discussion. With the decision to buy down the tax rate comes more decisions, the Senate proposes to use 100% of the earmarked funds from the education fund to alleviate tax stress on Vermonters now, while the House wants to use 50% now, and then 50% next year. Either plan will leave the education fund short-funded. Michael Clark urges everyone to write to their representatives and express their concern.

- Action Item Recap (discussion)

Michael Clark – come to the board with information about what could work better, what are the biggest hurdles. Anne Kaplan asks what is unique to Vermont that the district is trying to overcome, what models other districts are using that geography, demographics might make difficult here? Aimil Parmelee wants thoughts about what opportunities could be had by doing something differently, the district's strength and weaknesses. Rachel Fish requests input from school staff, Martha Hafner would like information about the possibility of a reconfiguration splitting apart a team that works well together. Ray Zapata summarizes what the board is looking for.

- Action Item Recap (charge)

Michael Clark will come to the next meeting ready to discuss with board about what the district's barriers are, what the strengths and weaknesses are and how can the district reconcile that for each campus?

Without any further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:46 pm.

X. Executive Session (If needed)

Future Meetings

- Agenda Planning Meeting Tuesday June 2nd @ 5:30
- Special Board Meeting: 6pm June 17, 2026 at RES

Respectfully submitted:

Kyle M Southworth

Kyle Southworth, Administrative Assistant

5/15/26

Compiled Community Questions from April - May for the OSSD Board and District

Regarding the District Restructuring Proposal

Ryan Anderson
5/13/2026

Overview of Community Concerns

When community members asked about this proposal, a consistent set of concerns emerged.

Community and proportionality. Small rural schools are community anchors. Losing one and repurposing another affects community identity, property values, the district's ability to attract young families, and town budgets. The mixed-age mentoring culture at Braintree is a real educational positive that would be traded away. The question community members keep asking is what Brookfield and Braintree families specifically get in return, and we have not yet answered that concretely.

The alternative program. Dedicated capacity for approximately 16 students with dedicated staff creates predictable institutional pressure to fill those seats. Strict entry and exit criteria, demographic tracking, re-integration metrics, and independent oversight need to be ironclad commitments rather than aspirations. Board member Rachel Fish's concerns about inclusive education and the ableism inherent in more restrictive placements are substantive and deserve more time.

Transportation and daily life. Consolidating all PreK and Kindergarten to Braintree creates real daily burdens that will need to be fully addressed. The district does not currently bus PreK students. Ride times on rural Vermont roads in winter are significant, and current Brookfield pickups are already at 6:30 am and widely avoided. Families with children in multiple grade bands would be navigating different schools in different towns. A Kindergartner on a long rural bus ride is a different situation than an older child. The simple things like picking up a sick kid and volunteering in the school become much harder when your child's school is in a different town.

The financial case is speculative but the loss is tangible. There are no clear net operating savings from closing Brookfield itself yet. An \$800,000 figure was mentioned which represents potential avoidance of out-of-district placement costs, but only if the alternative programs succeed in keeping students in district. When you add Braintree renovations, increased transportation, transition costs, and potential property value effects on Brookfield's grand list contribution, the net benefit is genuinely uncertain. On a \$27 million budget, that may be a thin justification for the level of disruption being asked of these communities.

The Town of Brookfield. The Brookfield building's future is not purely an educational question. It has implications for town planning, community resources, property values, and municipal finances. Brookfield's elected and appointed community leaders should have a genuine seat at this table, and we should understand clearly what turning the building over to the town actually means legally and financially before we describe it as a community asset.

The shadow of Act 72. Reorganizing now risks having to reorganize again if state-level decisions change the framework. Waiting for clarity has genuine merit.

The Political Reality. Essentially, what impact to passing future budgets do we anticipate if Brookfield and Braintree residents feel they no longer have a school?

Displaced staff. The proposal has significant implications for staff currently employed at Brookfield and Braintree, and those employees deserve to know what commitments the district is prepared to make.

I. Proportionality: What Do Brookfield and Braintree Families Get?

This is the question community members ask most consistently, and it deserves a direct answer.

1. Brookfield has approximately 100 students. Braintree has approximately 100 students. These are functioning schools serving intact communities. The proposal asks the families of those 200 students to accept extended daily bus rides for their youngest children, the closure of a school that is the primary community anchor in Brookfield, the fundamental repurposing of a school that the Braintree community has built a distinctive

educational culture around over many years, and all of the uncertainty and disruption that comes with a reorganization of this magnitude.

What tangible problem does this solve for a Brookfield family? What does a Braintree family actually get? The community has heard professional density as a concept and world class early childhood as an aspiration, which are good. What is something real, demonstrable, and near-term that a parent can point to and say that is why it was worth the disruption to my family and my community? Until that question has a clear and convincing answer specific to these communities, the case has not been made.

2. A teacher at the April meeting made the point that the mixed-age model at Braintree, where older students mentor younger ones and read to each other, is genuinely valuable and would be lost (1:08:41). A Braintree fourth grader said the same thing directly and movingly (1:10:02). How has the proposal accounted for what is lost, not just what is gained? Is there a version of this proposal that preserves some of what makes these schools distinctively valuable while still addressing the district's legitimate concerns?
3. Brookfield sits at the northern edge of this district, geographically closer in many ways to Williamstown than to Randolph or Braintree. Before the board proceeds on the assumption that Brookfield's future lies entirely within OSSD, should any consideration be given to whether Brookfield students might be better served by alignment with the supervisory union to the north? What would that process look like? If we are genuinely open to all options for Brookfield's future, that should be one of them.

II. The Alternative Programs: Educational and Ethical Questions

4. Board member Rachel Fish raised at the April meeting a fundamental question about the educational and ethical premise of this proposal. She stated directly that segregating students into alternative programs is ableist, that it represents segregation of disabled students from non-disabled students, and that the research supports more inclusive services rather than more restrictive ones (2:23:52). She indicated this is her area of professional expertise. Should the board formally commission an independent review of the proposed alternative program model from a special education law and inclusive education research perspective before proceeding further?

5. The financial case for this proposal rests on the alternative programs successfully reducing out-of-district placements. The educational case, as articulated by board member Fish, suggests that the research supports moving toward more inclusive services rather than more restrictive ones. These two positions are in direct tension. How does the board reconcile the financial argument for alternative programs with the educational argument against increased restrictiveness? Is there a risk that creating a more restrictive environment generates institutional pressure to fill it in ways that undermine both the educational and financial goals of the proposal?
 6. Who makes placement decisions for the alternative programs, and are those decision-makers independent of the budget pressure to fill the programs and achieve the cost avoidance that justifies the proposal financially?
 7. Should the board require regular reporting on how many students are in each program, for how long, what their re-integration outcomes are, and whether out-of-district placements have actually decreased as a result?
 8. What are the legal protections and due process rights for families whose children are being considered for placement but would not prefer the alternative program? Do families have access to an independent advocate?
 9. What triggers a formal board review if the programs consistently run near capacity or if out-of-district placements do not decrease as projected? Who decides whether outcomes reflect the programs working as intended?
 10. We mentioned at the April meeting that the Bethel district is piloting a similar model (59:18). Anne suggested inviting someone from Bethel to speak to the board. Is that scheduled?
-

III. Transportation and Family Impact

11. This proposal sends all district PreK and Kindergarten students from Randolph, Brookfield, and Braintree to Braintree. What is the actual, realistic bus ride time for a

Kindergartner traveling from Randolph to Braintree? From Brookfield to Braintree? A parent at the April meeting confirmed that the current bus pickup in parts of Brookfield is already 6:30 am and that almost nobody takes it because it is too early (1:11:10). If routes are extended to reach Braintree, what does that pickup time become?

12. At what point does the length of a bus ride become developmentally inappropriate for a five year old? Should we consult early childhood development specialists on that specific question?
13. The superintendent suggested at the April meeting that the board could set an executive limitation on maximum bus ride time and model routes around that (45:39). That conversation should happen before any vote. What is the maximum ride time the board believes is appropriate for a five year old, and can the district demonstrate that Braintree is reachable within that limit from all points in the district?
14. A family with a Kindergartner going to Braintree and a second grader going to RES will have children on two different buses running two different routes to two different schools. Do those buses arrive home at the same time, or is a parent waiting for two separate arrivals at potentially very different times?
15. If PreK students cannot be bused, what is the realistic enrollment in the three PreK classrooms proposed for Braintree? We cannot assume the same people who plan to use Brookfield or Randolph preK will be willing to travel to Braintree. Does that campus reach the scale needed for its educational rationale, including professional density, collaborative expertise, and a world class early childhood campus, to actually function? Put simply, do we actually anticipate Brookfield and Randolph PreK families driving to Braintree every day or is the projected kindergarten population alone enough to justify the consolidation?
16. How many families in this district have children in multiple grade bands who would face split school situations under this proposal? Is this worth taking some kind of census or counting? What is the realistic daily experience for those families, particularly those with a PreK child who cannot be bused and an older child who can?

IV. The Financial Case

The financial argument for this proposal rests on a critical assumption that the community does not believe has been adequately examined.

17. The superintendent stated at the April meeting that the district increased out-of-district education costs by \$800,000 in the budget we just passed, representing the cost of placements for students not on one of our campuses (51:35). The proposal's financial case appears to rest on the argument that in-district alternative programs could avoid that cost by keeping students in district. Is that a correct understanding of the financial argument, and is that the primary financial justification for this proposal?
18. If so, are we sure that in-district alternative programs of this design actually reduce out-of-district placements rather than running alongside them? Is there a scenario where a student's needs exceed what the in-house alternative program can provide and an out-of-district placement is still required? We acknowledged at the April meeting that alternative programs have a documented tendency to fill up without releasing students (2:29:07). If the programs fill with students who would not otherwise have gone out of district, or if out-of-district placements continue alongside the new programs, there is no financial benefit at all. What prevents that outcome, and what happens to the financial case if it occurs?
19. Has this financial analysis been reviewed by an independent party, or does it come entirely from district administration? Would an independent review give the community greater confidence in the numbers before any vote is taken?
20. Has any modeling been done of the property value effect of closing Brookfield and what it means for Brookfield's contribution to the grand list and district tax revenue over time? Is there a scenario in which property value decline and reduced tax revenue offset a meaningful portion of the projected cost avoidance?
21. The superintendent indicated at the April meeting that if out-of-district placement costs remain at current levels, he will face cutting another \$550,000 and finding 28 more students in next year's budget (52:33). Can the board be presented with a clear picture of what the district looks like financially if this proposal does not move forward? What specific cuts are anticipated, and what is the realistic budget trajectory? The community

deserves to understand the consequences of inaction as well as the case for the proposal.

22. Has any financial modeling been done of the full costs of this proposal, including renovation at Braintree, increased transportation, administrative restructuring, and transition costs, set against the projected cost avoidance from reduced out-of-district placements? What is the realistic timeline to any net benefit, and what assumptions does that model rest on? In short, how much money will we actually save, and when?

V. The Town of Brookfield

23. Have we made any outreach to the Brookfield selectboard and planning commission to discuss what closure of the school might mean for the town? The Brookfield building's future is not purely an educational question. It has implications for town planning, community resources, property values, and municipal finances that those bodies have a legitimate interest in. If that conversation has not yet happened, the board should commit to initiating it so that Brookfield's elected and appointed community leaders have a genuine seat at this table. Should this also happen with Braintree since the building's use is fundamentally changing?
 24. The proposal states that the Brookfield building would be turned over to the community. A parent at the April meeting made the point that this simply shifts the cost of the building from the school budget to the town budget (1:01:26). What does that transfer mean legally and financially? Has the town of Brookfield been formally consulted about whether it wants or can afford to take on that responsibility?
 25. If the building's structural condition is serious enough to at least influence the decision to close it as a school, is it actually in good enough condition to serve meaningful community purposes? Or are we telling Brookfield residents their building will become a lasting community asset when the same structural concerns that make it unsuitable as a school may make it unsuitable for other uses as well?
-

VI. Act 72 and the Broader State Context

26. Do we yet know what Act 72 might ultimately require of this district, specifically around supervisory union structures, funding formulas, and consolidation requirements? Is there a realistic possibility that structural investments made under this proposal could be superseded by state-mandated changes within a few years, resulting in two rounds of significant disruption in a short time frame?

In short, given the unresolved nature of Act 72, is now the right moment to commit to this level of structural change? What is the case for moving forward before the state's intentions are clear?

27. The possibility of a regional high school combining RUHS with neighboring districts was raised at the April meeting (48:52). Should the board be making structural decisions about elementary education before the high school question is resolved? Does it make sense to address one before the other?

VII. Community Sustainability and Political Reality

28. The long-term success of any restructuring depends on community trust and buy-in. If Brookfield and Braintree come to feel that this district has eliminated or fundamentally transformed their schools while continuing to ask for their tax dollars, what is the board's assessment of the effect on budget approval in those towns? A restructuring that avoids costs on paper but produces repeated failed budgets and prolonged community conflict does not actually improve the district's financial position. Has the full political risk been considered?

VIII. Displaced Staff

29. What happens to staff currently employed at Brookfield and Braintree under this proposal? Which positions are eliminated, which are reassigned, and what commitments is the district prepared to make to those employees?



Michael Clark <mclark@orangesouthwest.org>

Support for Proposed District Reorganization Plan

2 messages

Ashley Gaboriault <bunnyboopygab24@gmail.com>
To: Michael Clark <mclark@orangesouthwest.org>
Cc: Chris G <chrisgab24@gmail.com>

Mon, May 11, 2026 at 9:20 AM

Dear Members of the School Board,

I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed district reorganization plan to group students by developmental stages across the district.

As a parent of a preschool student, I have had firsthand experience with the challenges that arise when very young children share space and transitions with significantly older students. While I appreciate the efforts of school staff, the current structure creates situations where preschool-aged children are navigating entry and dismissal alongside much older students, which can lead to congestion, reduced visibility, and less controlled transitions. These are not just logistical concerns—they directly impact safety, supervision, and a child's sense of security.

The proposed model offers a thoughtful and developmentally appropriate alternative. Grouping Pre-K and Kindergarten students together allows for an environment designed specifically for early learners. This includes not only physical considerations—such as classroom setup, building flow, and accessibility—but also the ability to create systems and routines that match the needs of young children.

Equally important is the benefit to staff. Having educators working alongside peers who teach the same age group fosters stronger collaboration, consistency, and shared problem-solving. Rather than being isolated across multiple buildings, teachers can support one another, align practices, and better meet the needs of their students.

From a broader perspective, this model creates clearer structure across the district. Students progress through defined developmental groupings rather than being mixed across wide age ranges in a single building. This reduces unnecessary complexity and allows each school to focus on doing one stage of education well.

As a parent, what stands out most to me is that this plan prioritizes alignment—aligning environments, expectations, and support systems with the actual needs of the children in them. That is something I strongly value and fully support.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Ashley Gaboriault

Michael Clark <mclark@orangesouthwest.org>
To: Ashley Gaboriault <bunnyboopygab24@gmail.com>

Mon, May 11, 2026 at 11:21 AM

Ashley
Thank you for the nice note.
[Quoted text hidden]

--
Michael J. Clark
Orange Southwest School District

Ends Snapshot

May 2026 Update

At its October 2025 meeting, the Orange Southwest School District (OSSD) Board adopted the following amended Ends for the district. The administration believes it is essential to keep the Board regularly informed about specific progress toward achieving these Ends.

To that end, in addition to the traditional annual End-of-Year Ends Report, the administration will prepare an Ends Snapshot Report to share with the Board at each monthly meeting. These monthly reports are not intended to capture every initiative or activity related to the Ends across the district. Rather, they will highlight selected examples of ongoing work to help the administration, Board, educators, students, and the broader community better understand how we are ensuring that OSSD graduates possess strong academic and essential life skills and are prepared to actively contribute to their communities.

We anticipate that the format and content of these reports will evolve over time to provide a more comprehensive and efficient picture of our progress. We welcome your feedback as we refine this process.

Policy Title 1.0 Ends Statement:

All students of Orange Southwest Schools will graduate with strong academic and essential life skills, prepared to actively contribute to their communities, as supported by community-approved resources.

The above will be achieved through the following priorities:

- 1.1 A rigorous academic foundation
 - 1.1.1 ELA (Reading, writing, listening, communicating)
 - 1.1.2 Mathematics
 - 1.1.3 Science and technology
 - 1.1.4 Social studies
 - 1.1.5 Arts
- 1.2 Life skills, personal development and self-care
 - 1.2.1 Vocational skills
 - 1.2.2 Wellness
 - 1.2.3 Financial literacy
 - 1.2.4 Self-direction
 - 1.2.5 Social-emotional skills
 - 1.2.6 Critical thinking, curiosity, and creativity
- 1.3 Community engagement and global citizenship
 - 1.3.1 Global awareness (including world languages)
 - 1.3.2 Civics

- 1.3.3 Community involvement
- 1.3.4 Care for the environment
- 1.3.5 Respect for and inclusion of diversity

May Snap Shot

1.1 A rigorous academic foundation

1.1.1 ELA (Reading, writing, listening, communicating)

- RES: One of our 3rd/4th grade classroom researched a passion project. They created presentations and shared out at a parent presentation the first week of May.
- RU: Students in grade 9 English are reading the book the Bean Trees by Barbara Kingsolver and have been drafting persuasive essays on the topics of their choice relevant to their lives.
- RU: Students in grade 8 English have been engaging in a career exploration unit through collaboration between Student Services and the English Department.
- RTCC: Embedded ELA in all Tech Programs/Tech Project Final Presentations
Elec: Lab Reports, Newela (weekly), NEC Interpretation CJ Multi-suspect Interview project, Collins Writing PD for all staff, Wrap-Up of Marzano Resources PD for all staff.

1.1.2 Mathematics

- BRK: Our grade levels have been finishing up units in Bridges math and have all taken end of unit assessments. Assessments for STAR 360 Math and PNOA are also being completed to see progress over the last school year.
- RES: Our grade levels have been finishing up units in Bridges math and have all taken end of unit assessments.
- RU: 9th grade - learning to rearrange multi variable equations and solving inequalities.
- RU: Precalculus is learning quadratic formula and AP Stats is learning chi squared
- RTCC: Elec: Box fill calculations, Transformer calculations, solar calculations, Material list pricing, Conductor sizing, Conduit fill, Ohms Law, Series/Parallel circuit calculations
- OSSD: Star Testing Window this month

1.1.3 Science and technology

- BRK: Guest Speaker from Vermont Energy Education Program (VEEP) for 3/4 STEM Class on energy transfer
- RES: First grade has been studying a lights and shadows unit. The 5th/6th graders are engaging with the stem teacher on an electric circuit unit. Our 3rd/4th graders have been working on an animal adaptations unit and went to explore bird adaptations at Vins this last week.

- RU: Students in 10th grade Biology have been applying their knowledge of genetics by creating models that show how specific genes impact the creatures they chose to create.
- RES: Elec: Tech project presentations CJ VR Drone Simulator and Drone Proficiency continue
- OSSD: NGSS Science wrapping up at RTCC

1.1.4 Social studies

- RES: Our 5th/6th graders have been studying the precursors of the Revolutionary War and have engaged in debates on whether they feel the loyalists or patriots had the greatest evidence to support their arguments. The grade team is visiting Fort Ticonderoga at the end of May.
- RU: Students in 9th Grade US History have been studying about Manifest Destiny and the Louisiana Purchase.
- RTCC: CUL: Family Tree recipe project to work with family and source ingredients CJ Policing in America project
- OSSD: OSSD is adopting the VT SS Framework for K-8 with the addition of PreK guidance.

1.1.5 Arts

- RU: Spring Musical production 7-12, Young Playwrights Festival in Burlington. Spring Musical Little Shop of Horrors, Graduation music preparation for performance.
- RTCC: Tech Project Open House Night at RTCC/Arts Component for all Students CJ Virtual Reality Persistent World Reveal and Presentation

1.2 Life skills, personal development and self-care

1.2.1 Vocational skills

- RTCC: CJ Hobbies that enhance career skills project
- RU: Grade 8 students have been engaging in Career Exploration with support from Student Services. Grade 10 will begin similar lessons in early May.

1.2.2 Wellness

- OSSD: Belonging PD with PreK-6 with UVEI
- RU: Students will attend a Bright Futures event hosted by Bethel Mills and the Vermont Construction Academy. Students will learn about careers in the trades and post secondary opportunities related to them.
- RTCC: CUL: Catering events Elec: Weekly individual academic and SEL 1:1 checkin with program teacher CJ Ride-alongs PD

1.2.3 Financial literacy

- RU: Students in On Your Own have been completing her financial literacy curriculum with upper grades students.
- Citizen's bank to come in to pre-tech to talk about banking for ICC.

1.2.4 Self-direction

- RTCC: RTCC Career Fair for Hiring.
- RU: Students are pulling together the final portions of their Senior Project Capstones. They will defend their projects and present their work on May 22 and 23rd.

1.2.5 Social-emotional skills

- RU: Student Services is utilizing Call Back time with grade 8 students to build empathy and understand the nuances of consent.

1.2.6 Critical thinking, curiosity, and creativity

- RU: Students in 9th grade English have been learning to analyze texts and think critically about the social media that they access and consume.
- RTCC: CUL: Menu Development for Restaurant Design Elec: Circuit wiring concepts CJ Virtual Reality Tech Projects Persistent World implementation

1.3 Community engagement and global citizenship

1.3.1 Global awareness (including world languages)

- RU: Students who will travel to Shizukuishi Japan in June continue to regularly attend culture lessons in order to learn more about Japanese culture before they travel.
- RTCC: CUL: Tropical fruits and their applications

1.3.2 Civics

- RU: 9th grade students visited the Vermont Statehouse to learn more about how our state government works.
- RTCC: Popular Sovereignty - Exploring the various voting systems in the world. CJ The Ever Changing CJ Systems project

1.3.3 Community involvement

- RU: Students in the Economic Justice PBL testified about access to affordable housing at the State House. They researched this topic and interviewed a local community member who is currently unhoused.
- RTCC: RTCC Farmstand Opens Near Central Office

1.3.4 Care for the environment

- RU: Students in the Economic Justice and Racial Justice PBLs are planning a youth rally to amplify youth voice in our communities.
- RTCC: CUL: Composting program with cafeteria to feed local chickens

1.3.5 Respect for and inclusion of diversity

- OSSD: UVEI Staff Action Research K-6
- BRN: Providing parental information about behaviors that could lead if not corrected to HHB but doing this from a proactive point of view and an educational point of view. We're providing resources, speaking points, and workbook pages.

- BRK: Presented about Green Up day to school and gave out bags to pick up trash
- RU: The Racial Justice and Economic Justice PBLs are partnering to host a rally to amplify youth voice in Central Vermont.
- RTCC: Asian American History Month