

Option A: K-8, 9-12

1. What do you see that is best for students?
   - (2) Less travel time for students for K-8
   - (3) Great to have a Dean of students
   - K-8 model can be effective
   - Kids would probably enjoy K-8
   - (4) Possibility of buddy classes, giving the older students leadership positions and role models
   - Positive social implication for the middle school ages being with the younger grades
   - K-8 would have a longer culture of childhood

2. What do you see that is challenging for students?
   - Younger kids dating older kids
   - (2) Not having a preschool in each community, long travel
   - Hold back eighth graders, not having high school roll models to look up to
   - (2) Can be detrimental to be in one school that long
   - Small social circles
   - Few options of teachers
   - (2) Students being sent back to the schools they came from
   - Longer separation of the towns with students coming together in the 9th grade
   - Sharing teachers for the arts
   - Foreign language teacher being shared and there would be little choice for students
   - Not appropriate size gyms and fields
   - Lose opportunity for middle school children to take high school options
   - Physically fitting students into the building
   - Always with the same kids K-8
   - Fewer “fresh starts” for students
   - Nursing care for students would be challenging
   - Crowded schools
   - 6-8 graders have no role models
   - 6-8 graders are at a different social level and the younger students do not need to witness it
   - Large preschools are not an ideal situation
   - Difficult to merge students from different towns
   - Less choice due to few teachers and traveling teachers
   - Less connection with students for traveling teachers

3. Anything else?
   - Doesn’t save any money
   - Physically, not enough room
Option B: PK-6, 7-12

1. What do you see that is best for students?
   - (9) 6th graders have another year of elementary
   - (6) PK stays where they are, less travel
   - Younger kids being in their own community longer
   - More continuity for shared staff for 7-12 graders
   - Interested and capable 7-8 graders have the opportunity to be placed in more challenging classes
   - Least amount of change out of all the options (for elementary)
   - Being under one principal emphasizes 7 – 12 connection, plus having dean of students

2. What do you see that is challenging for students?
   - 7-8 graders being put with the older kids
   - May not benefit students by waiting another year to mix kids from all towns
   - Fear of losing some middle school teachers
   - Lack of space in high school building. Would require a lot of facility work.
   - What would happen to kids needing additional support?
   - Potential loss of current kid-friendly principals.
   - High school students not a good influence on 7th graders.
   - Why change what’s been set up for good reason? Used research to establish current systems. Now we’re using same research to advocate for a different set up.
   - All research notes importance of separate middle school. Middle school students would really suffer.
   - Who is the author of these plans? Ray Proulx? The superintendent? The school board?
   - I see all three plans as disastrous for the kids.
   - Locker room combining middle school and high school kids unmonitored. Not a good idea.
   - Seventh-graders might be intimidated by older kids.
   - Younger kids (7th – 8th) would feel less empowered losing own space.
   - NESAC praised existing school community and now we’re going to change that. New community would not be the one we were accredited for.
   - Having 6th grade with K – 5 can be a little funky.
   - Worked hard to get administrator in middle school, seems to be working, now we’re going to change it.
   - One principal, 7 – 12, tends to focus on higher kids
   - Is so much faculty change good for students?

3. Anything else?
Option C:

- What do you see that is best for students?
- Don’t see anything that’s good.
- Might be good to mix the kids. Common grades.
- I think they’d get to see lot of the beautiful countryside.
- Entire student body would be together from the start to form bonds and alliances.
- Older kids able to help in preschool.
- Wonder if it would be better to have the youngest at WES and the older kids at SME closer to Academy.

1. What do you see that is challenging for students?
- Travel would be an issue for the younger kids.
- Middle school would be too far away from high school.
- Teacher morale from all the changes
- All kids will be travelling a lot.
- WES facilities least suitable for middle grades.
- Constant travel for shared staff.
- Some kids will be socially branded from day one. No chance for fresh start at Middle School.
- District built on research that was considered best. Why change that now.
- One of selling pieces of the district was the current set up of community schools.
- Might lose Piermont School tuition students who wouldn’t want to travel to WES.

2. Anything else?

Option D – Group suggestions for change.

- Renovate back wing for district offices. Leave the rest the same.
- Wouldn’t lose that much. Only losing three classrooms. But are throwing the gym away. Community won’t support that. We need that gym. To reconfigure everything because we’re losing three classrooms doesn’t make sense. High school currently has two empty classrooms.
- Bond for gym would be a bargain in current economy. Will cost more for other options than it would to renovate the problem wing.
- Might lose accreditation, because we are accredited as a 6 – 12 school.
- Current set up works well, why change it?
- Academy has great community feeling. All the buildings are great.
- Of all the proposed changes, leaving 6th graders at the elementary schools makes the most sense.
Conclusion:
- Keep it totally the same as it is now.
- Keep it the same, but let 6th grade students stay at current elementary schools.
- If cost is an issue, some teachers are willing to exchange pay for fewer school days.