

## Responses to Community Budget Forums Nov. 1 & 2 2023

The following scenarios for reconfiguring grades and schools were presented to the community on Nov. 1 and 2. Cost estimates in this first look at options are VERY approximate. They are based ONLY on average salary and benefits for teachers, learning coaches and administrators.

	Westshire Elementary School	Samuel Morey Elementary School	Rivendell Academy	Tuition	\$\$ Estimate ( ) = savings
A	PK-5 (unchanged)	PK-5 (unchanged)	6-12 (unchanged)		*
	* Expected increase over current year budget: \$1,400,000 Does not include \$400,000 in ESSER-Funded positions that end in 2024				
B	PK-5 multi-age	PK-5 multi-age	6 - 12 (unchanged)		(600,000)
	Reduce staffing by as many as 4 teachers and 4 learning coaches • Increase class sizes to 18 - 24 students • Savings of up to \$600,000 (for a net increase of \$800,000 over current year)				
C	PK, 3-5	PK-2	6-12 (unchanged)		(600,000)
	PK-2	PK, 3-5			
Students across the district are combined, younger students at one school, older at the other. Potential staffing reductions and savings are the same as in scenario B					
D	Close	PK-5	6-12 (unchanged)		(1,000,000)
	PK-5	Close			
	PK-5	Close	PK-12		
Potential savings due to reductions in teaching staff are the same as in scenarios B&C. Closing a building could save an additional \$400,000 in other staffing. Potential savings related to facilities are not yet included in this estimate. Savings in staffing of up to \$1,000,000 (for a net increase of \$400,000 over current year) Option D3 would close Samuel Morey and move those students to the Academy.					
E	PK-5 (unchanged)	PK-5 (unchanged)	6-8	9-12	1,000,000*
	Potential savings due to staff reductions: 1,700,000 Cost of tuitioning out 120 students at \$20,000/year: 2,400,000 Lost revenue from 15 students who tuition in to RA: 300,000 Net effect would be to add 1,000,000 to budget for a total increase of 2,400,000				

The charts below represent the combined responses from the online survey completed by participants in the zoom-only forum Nov. 1 and the sticky notes written by participants in the in-person forum Nov. 2.

### BENEFITS TO SCENARIO A

At an Elementary School Level, 5 star education	We keep our amazing teachers.	Wonderful! But not sure that the budget would pass.	Nothing better to invest in than education
Best option	Keeping teachers	Communities stay intact.	Don't fix what isn't broken.
Big changes are extremely hard.	Maintains the best quality of education for our students.	Positive: The least amount of work to do and easiest to implement	The staff are all amazing, the schools are conveniently located
Class size remains SMALL (this is very important to us!), good teachers keep their positions, school communities stay intact. We are happy with current programming at SME.	I would be OK with A if more opportunities were presented for our students such as elementary language, more outdoor opportunities, etc. Paying more has to yield more for the kids.	This should be the only scenario considered. Look at each school and make adjustments based on actual numbers based on each grade levels at specific schools. Westshire and SME have very different numbers and should have different scenarios.	When we have accurate numbers it seems like we will find this won't be this much of an increase. We will keep the teachers we claim to value and continue to provide quality education to the students in our care.
Everyone will be able to keep there positions and children won't have to change there surroundings	Our students are thriving (yes!!) as the board has said. If we make changes how will we guarantee that they continue to thrive?	Least disruptive to the communities & keeps some of the district's best developments intact and growing.	Allows teachers and schools to rebuild, given loss of staff and admin changes in elementary
Need a vision for status quo and increased voter involvement.	Retains the HEART of our district and best supports our students	No schools will close. Westshire is a community center/gathering place	If population increases, budget will stabilize and we won't have to adjust again.
	We know the staff does well.	Quality of education and sense of community!	Not disrupting the community as it exists now.
That this is the only scenario in which the quality of education for our children, our ability to retain high quality teachers, and the integrity of our community is not threatened.	Strong program with incredible staff providing rich opportunities meeting a wide variety of abilities. HS curriculum integrated with K-8. Continuity. Traditions. community center.	Less confusion, less change, less travel all the way around (especially for families with multiple kids). I currently work at the Academy with three kids and if I had to go to three locations to pick them up/drop them off, I would not be able to work there anymore.	

## DRAWBACKS TO SCENARIO A

continued escalating costs w/decreased enrollment	public has said a resounding no to more increases without change	Increase of 1.4 million is much too high for the community	Unsustainable
Cost out of control	doens't deal with the problem	higher tax rate	insufficient savings
Keeping things starts wound and allowing the budget to become astronomical is what got us here! Time for some dramatic changes. You'll keep losing young families if you cannot make this town affordable. School choice at high school level is desirable option to current families and will attract more families to our town.	The budget might not pass. People will not support teachers if we keep putting inaccurate numbers out that make it look like it's all our fault that our salaries are apparently (even though it's all STAFF-DO, support staff, custodians, etc.) such a high percentage of the budget.	The towns people can not continue to withstand yet again another increase in taxes - the amount of properties that have started going up for sale due to the inability to afford the current taxes	Too costly - can't keep increasing the budget to this degree (but I don't feel like any effort has been made to look at any other cost savings besides slashing staff - and there are certainly other options for significant savings)
need to decrease/flatten budget and address fewer students	Negative: It's the most expensive and no new programs or ideas	Too few students across too many buildings.	Without a vision for our education systems - help us see
No cost savings	No savings	NOT sustainable	Not sustainable.
Not sustainable. Taxes are extremely high and it's just "kicking the can" down the road and putting off inevitable decisions about streamlining district	People are generally opposed to tax increases so I don't see a budget increase happening.	A continued increase in budget without a change will be detrimental to community.	Seems totally unsustainable and people have legit gripes about rising taxes
Status quo	Tax increase?	Too expensive!	Uncontrolled costs.
Unfortunately the voters wont approve a \$1.4M increase.	We have tried this for years and it continues to push out young families due to high tax rates and property values	We still have a status quo no opportunity highschool. Low test scores and higher costs each year with no return on investment.	I love how the education is working right now but it seems we will have to spend less money.

## BENEFITS TO SCENARIO B

Did multi age before - no issues	Good option to keep both elementary buildings open.	Maintains current staff, least disruptive for students	No school is being closed.
I presume students would stay at their current school - better costs	I think multi age classes can be very beneficial to students	Least impact on the student and families day to day lifestyle	My child stays with friends and teachers he likes
Young students not needing to travel any further than they are now.	Keeping the elementary schools linked to their towns	.Each school has its own personality. Keep the schools intact.	We can maintain quality education and find other areas to cut.
Keeping the cultures of each school, keeping the school as the centerpiece in towns	Keeps students at current schools, keeps current school communities intact.	multi age, development, scholastic level, budget savings	No brainer idea to cut costs, and multi-age has educational benefits too
Keeps elementary schools local. Enables students to experience the benefits of larger class sizes; more academic opportunities.	maybe if well thought out and students could move up or down based on ability. additional teacher training.	more younger students stay at same school in their own community; also kids of varying ages can help each other	I am OK with increase but want to make sure students are getting the best experience. We will lose teachers if we keep threatening cuts.
Keeps the children closer to home	Keeps the young ones near home	Less change for the children!	Most realistic option for next year.
Multi-age when I went to SME when Rivendell first started worked just fine (from a 3rd/4th grader at the time's perspective) and I believe this could work again IF it is carefully looked at how they are split and what grade levels.	Positive: A benefit would be that advanced children have more opportunity to be in older classes to learn more advanced topics (do not have that opportunity now).	This is the only reasonable scenario but we need to talk about grade configurations or the drawbacks will outweigh any benefits. Only clear benefit: we don't close a building and bus young students way too far.	OK compromise. I feel like the board is steering the public here. Happens in neighbor towns. The cost better work out though - could be public outrage if not.
Our youngest kids can't be compromised	The least disruptive to our students and communities	Yes, reduce staffing and increase class sizes	Multi age when done right can be enriching
Keeping all grades	Less travel for the kids	This is my option 2	Not a bad option.
Better for group work. Bigger classes, more friends/social choices	I like multiage classes as long as the teachers are trained for that.	Allows students to stay in the same building they are currently attending	Older kids learn to help younger ones. I am opposed to any schools closing.
Multiage is a start but not the answer for long term.	Less change for kids, families.	Second best. Need D. O. \$ savings.	Is enriching to kids, older kids learn to help younger

## BENEFITS TO SCENARIO B Continued

Keeps students within their communities and limits travel time for elementary students.	Families do not have extra driving by closing a school. Multi age classrooms are better for students.	Focus on scenario B for next year. May be doable. Then scenario C as the next step. Look at other cuts in district.	Allows for appropriate supports for all our students, especially those with extra needs.
---	---	---	--

## DRAWBACKS TO SCENARIO B

Are Multi-age classrooms truly beneficial to students? How can teachers be supported in making this transition, especially when there is a large variety of learning levels and student needs.	I do not think it would work well for the younger grades as reading and writing are so new at that time and the ranges can vary so much. I also would not think it would be fair or wise to separate classes based on academic levels, it should be a fair mix of kids in each section.	Don't feel as if combining classes will work well - kids need to stay all together in age appropriate class - they will be unable to get needed attention if too many students to each teacher.	I'm not too excited by multi-age. There is already enough differentiation in the classrooms as single-age. I worry that there would be an even greater spread of instruction and no one would be well-served.
classrooms too big and room for those already struggling to fall further behind	not thrilled about losing teachers yet accept may happen	Not changing anything at the Academy. Hello, the Academy is the biggest expense!	much more difficult to meet the needs of each learner in elementary
Current staff is not trained to teach multi age classrooms. I would pull my kids from district if this scenario takes place.	Seems like a lot is sacrificed in elementary educational experience for not much gain in \$\$	Hard enough to teach the range of abilities in a one-grade classroom. In this scenario, advanced 5th graders won't keep advancing.	Negative: Would be an increase in some already tough classrooms with behavioral issues
Not sustainable. Taxes are extremely high and it's just "kicking the can" down the road and putting off inevitable decisions about streamlining district	This scenario represents an extreme option that undervalues our children and is highly disrespectful to the teachers that will have to deal with teaching multiple grades simultaneously.	I don't not think this is a great option. Still the same amount of kids needing help, less teachers/paras, but more kids in each class. My child benefits from having a small class with more one on one teacher attention.	I do not like this idea. My child benefits from a smaller class with more one on one teacher attention. I do not think this option is beneficial. Bigger classes, and less teachers/paras.
Larger class sizes are not as good	Loss of staff uninterested in multi age.	Our youngest kids can't be compromised	NOT ENOUGH COST SAVINGS
Worst option: multi-age	too large of classrooms		

## DRAWBACKS TO SCENARIO B Continued

Multiage has always been forced, short-lived and educationally ineffective.	This is likely not going to be beneficial to students. Cut special ed and language.	teacher student interaction will suffer, children don't learn at the same pace	Teachers expected to teach multi grades in one room, students fall through the cracks
If we take away staff and resources now (as with the other scenarios) we may not get those back in the future.	Numbers fluctuate year to year. There will be years that multiage classes will help because you can combine grades but other years you won't be able to combine classes.	Ridiculously short-sighted. As class sizes vary, so will grade configurations. Will be unable to retain staff and will create unnecessary stress and chaos.	Doubling class sizes-quality teachers will leave. Families will look into alternative schooling options where their child's education is truly valued.
Not thrilled at the thought of my young child competing in class with an older student.	How would teachers feel about teaching multiage and would they need special training?	We need to invest in multiage teaching PD for our teachers - you cannot just throw them into it.	The increase in the budget seems inaccurate - too high, so it won't be this bad. New weighted average will also help.
Unclear how this would work - more students but it appears less support?	Still too much administration and building costs per pupil	Doesn't benefit the students or the taxpayers	

Given the wide range of abilities, needs, and skill-levels we are already seeing in our classrooms post the COVID 19 pandemic, it will be incredibly difficult for teachers to support all of our students in a multi-age setting without TRAINING and the time necessary to make this philosophical and instructional shift. I worry that not only will the diverse needs of our students not be met, but that families will move out of district to find an educational setting that has the resources to do so. We will also lose teachers if we ask them to absorb a class of 24 students without an increase in learning coaches and no training on how to scaffold and differentiate for multiple ages.

### BENEFITS TO SCENARIO C

Better utilization of all buildings, limits student disruption, combines all grade levels	Consolidate the logistics for busing and have additional savings.	Unified program for all elementary students.
If this option is considered, SME should be the older classroom school as it has a larger in size and has a larger gym for athletics. It's also closer to the academy where kids will be attending soon.	Positive: Shares the burden of travel amongst parents of both schools , the class grows up together for the entire length of their time in school	This is my vote if Scenario A can't be maintained. I think it would be greatly beneficial for PK not to have a long commute.
Keeps all the schools open	Keeps the younger ones nearer home	Help mitigate fluctuating (and small) class sizes.
Seems the least difficult to implement.	Students in same age groups can stay together	There would be room to grow grade levels.
Like this option as it allows for the most efficient combination of students into grades. All 1st graders are together so can be in one class if possible, but if two are needed they can be evenly split. Also keeps students together throughout their Rivendell career.		

### DRAWBACKS TO SCENARIO C

No one will want to drive that far. This district is very spread out.	This is just silly. We don't need 3 buildings for our small district.	class sizee too large, and hand book states (or it did a 12:1 ratio)	This won't fly with Orford. Westshire is 45 minutes from east Orford
Detrimental to students to move frequently. Parents with multiple kids would be bouncing between three schools.	Families could have young kids in different schools and major increase in traveling and bus time	For parents with students in multiple grade school, this will add additional commute time.	The transportation logistics for a family make this a non viable option.
Driving further is harder on families	It will cause more traveling.	little kids on loooong bus rides	Long bus rides for your students.
Hard for families with a kid in 1st Grade and 4th Grade, for example	Negative: Tough for the young kids that have to travel so much	Not enough personal attention for students/ stressed teachers	Families could have 3 different schools for pickup/dropoff
Bussing nightmare and bad for families with elementary aged children close in age	too much disruption moving elementary students every 3 years until middle school	Parents will never go for this. It's not what is best for students or teachers.	This is so much travel time for our youngest students no matter how you dice it

## DRAWBACKS TO SCENARIO C Continued

<p>I think this option would be tough on young kids making the transition between schools. I also worry about the commute.</p>	<p>Least favorable, all buildings with operational expenses but further drive/families divided into more schools</p>	<p>Lots of switching of schools. Less consistent for the children, which is key. Long bus ride for Vershire students to fairlee being so young</p>	<p>having multiple elementary age children in 2 different elementary schools would be logistically difficult for working families</p>
<p>Too much changing schools for my family</p>	<p>NOT ENOUGH COST SAVINGS</p>	<p>Our youngest kids can't be compromised</p>	<p>Too confusing!</p>
<p>Not sustainable. Taxes are extremely high and it's just "kicking the can" down the road and putting off inevitable decisions about streamlining district</p>	<p>Older children should be at SME where the facility is larger and the gym is larger as well for athletics. It is also closer to the academy where they will be going soon.</p>	<p>This scenario is a VERY difficult one for families with multiple children in elementary school. It is important to me that my elementary age children go to school at the SAME location. This would be difficult for drop off, pick up, attending school events.</p>	<p>Very hard to imagine how the drive time would work out with families who have kids in both schools. Busses are a mess, and have a terrible reputation for discipline problems</p>
<p>Still operating too much real estate</p>	<p>Young students on bus too long.</p>	<p>Very difficult to transport kids in this situation.</p>	<p>Too much traveling for all towns</p>
<p>Too much travel, confusion and not appealing to people wanting to move to town with so much changing around.</p>	<p>Transportation nightmare, inefficient, very difficult for families with multiple children</p>	<p>Very challenging/impossible for families with children in different grades. Loss of local community cohesion.</p>	<p>Too much administration and building cost per pupil</p>
<p>Transportation issues - but we drove our kids to Orford for daily extra curriculars.</p>	<p>This would be very difficult in terms of transportation. It is also major disruption for students, teachers, and families. Entire cultures will change, and this shift will be arduous and slow. Once again, this kind of shift REQUIRES investment in trainings and reinvention of cultural norms. Changes such as these cannot, or should not, happen quickly and out of desperation.</p>		

## BENEFITS TO SCENARIO D

saves the most money	More savings.	most potential savings	Saves money
A benefit of all PK-5 in one building would level the playing field in terms of equity and access to classroom experience,	Rivendell elementary would operate as one instead of two different schools with two different cultures.	Most efficient use of increasingly limited financial resources. Unfortunately this seems like the best option Gets closer to current numbers. .	declining enrollment (only increase if people move to area for k-8) so combine and save on cost of operations and staffing. Students come together later anyways
The most economical	Reduce staffing costs	Resources are consolidated	not too difficult to implement.
Makes the most financial sense and reduces long term capital expenses of having so many buildings	Best for kids and tax payers. More typical class sizes and less administrators.	Best Choice given substantial initial savings, plus savings on building operations	w/reduced enrollment closing a school seems to make sense. Also, savings of closing a building
A reduction in building costs - we really don't need three school buildings	Fiscally responsible, provides level service to kids	Close Westshire! sell the building. Why isn't this mentioned? Empty building = \$\$	Likely biggest budget impact - includes less costs for physical plant, buildings and grounds
YES - either close WE or keep WE and move SM to Rivendell. Benefit of closing WE is those students get to learn together throughout	Yes increase class sizes and reduce overlap and waste - this is going in the right direction but not nearly far enough.	All students at elementary level would be socially connected and be more competitive for a learning proficiency education	WSE is a safe place away from highway, building does not pose risk due to building structure, students get more and feel like they are supported in all needs
Good to have all elementary students in one building	Keep all ages together - very important for development	Strengthens community by combining the elementary population	I would support closing a school due to enrollment decreased
	Closing a school and increasing class sizes, reduce teachers	Allows all students to for relationships with students from all towns	Rent one school building to business and utilize income to help offset costs.
Both the young students will gain more friends	Closing a building will be a cost savings benefit.	Consolidation helps with overhead.	critical to save money and decrease burden of taxes
Brings all kids together of same age group	Cost Savings, consistent leadership	Close SME. Westshire is a newer school	Only valid option for my tax option
Reduce admin costs, building costs	It is the only thing that makes sense	Close SME as WSE is a much newer school	
Keep Westshire open, close SME and move all to WSE. WSE has a better campus, more outside space, newer building with more family connection, staff feel this saves the most and keeps community together		The only option that brings the budget down in a meaningful way, but it still falls short of acceptable and needs more creative cuts in the future. Our tax base cannot sustain the growth	

### BENEFITS TO SCENARIO D3

Appears to have a good amount of savings and option 3 provides least travel increase.	3rd row because we can't expect Westshire families to travel to the Academy for 13 years.	Best overall savings, limit family travel, only consider moving SME to RA	Best option: Westshire PK-5, close Samuel Morey, Academy 6-12
I do like the idea of possibly closing SME and sending those children to the Academy. Many of the younger children have older siblings there as well so this would be very convenient for pick ups and drop offs.	By moving Sam Morey to RA you maintain a community hub for West Fairlee and Vershire while maintaining a community hub for Fairlee and Orford. By "community hub" I take it that the reader understand the educational, cultural, social, and civic nuances of the word "hub."nces of "	D3 keeps kids close to home but offers significant cost savings as well as closing a building. More info needed on building overhead ( cost difference on which building closes) to fully assess	Would be okay with SME going to Academy. It doesn't seem like it would affect students or parents much. Sorry for the loss of some SME staff but closing a building may make a lot of sense.
Closing SME and shifting those to RA would minimize travel issues	Better option to consolidate. Move SME to the Academy, close the elementary and leave WES.	D3 is the my favorite option. Good cost savings and doesn't make anyone drive too far.	logistically best for families in vershire, keeping WES open and closing SME
PK-12, less travel then going to WES - larger cost savings when you look toward selling the building	Those living on their prospective sides of town(s) would be close to their childs' school	Option 3 - best for all 4 towns in regard to taxes, kids/families and bus routes. Q: Does this scenario keep ESSER?	This is my option 1, proposing to close SME, to go to RA
Move SME to Rivendell Academy - then one less facility.	Young kids won't have such a long commute	Close oen school - SME, have PK-12 at RA	Close SME, PK-12 at Rivendell
Fair for all four towns, local building for both areas	Save staff and building costs, keep kids close to home	Like the idea of closing Morey and consolidating transport.	Everyone stays in their own community
Easier logistics for families with multiple children	Closing SME, PK-12 at RA sounds like a good compromise	Fairlee is more convenient and centrally located for life activities in general. I don't mind the idea of closing SME and sending those kids to the academy. This doesn't seem like a bad option as many younger kids have older sibling already at the academy anyway which would be easier for commuting They should not go to WES.	

## DRAWBACKS TO SCENARIO D

Academy would need significant renovation to accommodate elementary school.	Teachers will quit and this will be devastating to the community. Closing a school shouldn't be an option.	Class sizes would likely be over 24 at many grade levels.	This is most economical but Vershire students should Not have to go to SME
Building cost still exist.	Cramped conditions	Transportation	Some will need to drive.
increased travel for two towns doesn't seem ideal. Seems like kids riding the Bus would have to spend a ridiculous amount of time both ways.	closing schools can adversely affect communities & some kids/families have to travel further	I do NOT think SME parents should have to drive to WES where it is completely out of the way to bring their kids to and from school.	Were you to move SM to RA, it is posited that administration costs we be gained. Does that mean the considerable administraion burdens will be place on the Dean and Principal?
Closing Westshire would create a tremendous transportation issue, with some students required to be on the bus for upwards of an hour. This does not seem like equitable access to education. Transportation equity must be considered.	the commute could be a lot for some. I also wonder about capacity of either building to comfortably manage the entire population. I was under the impression that the 6th grade moved to RA in part due to space issues.	Horrrifying and the estimated savings shown here are simplified to the point that the values shown are not useful for making a decision about such a dramatic change.	PK-12 - there aren't enough bathrooms in the lower building for the bathroom needs of those developmental levels - PK, K have bathrooms in their rooms currently
possible increase in enrollment	Driving farther is harder on families	Loss to community if school closes.	Negative: Travel time for young kids
Devastating to the local community and town; untenable for families at one end of the district to commute to the other end for PK-12	DO NOT CLOSE WESTSHIRE! It would be detrimental to the community. It is the hidden gem of our district.	It doesn't seem as though class size would increase in option 3 - is this a correct assumption?	None. Closing is a huge cost savings and merging elementary schools allows students to learn and grow together
If numbers do grow in the future, would there be enough room for students at the academy?	In the long run of construction and maintenance, how much will this actually save?	increased commuting distance; disgruntled families	oppose school closure that increases commute for any age, esp for younger students

## DRAWBACKS TO SCENARIO D Continued

<p>You will lose teachers if you expect them to teach 24 students. Highly qualified teachers will not be able to target all the needs in that classroom. Having one principal run 2 buildings does not work. Go talk to other school districts who are doing it.</p>	<p>SME should NOT close and send the children to WES. WES, although very nice, is not centrally located for anything. This would be a huge inconvenience for parents, sports activities, emergencies, and so on.</p>	<p>The elementary school that is most logical to close (WES), is the better school as far as location (not near 91 and outdoor learning space) and admin</p>	<p>This scenario does not consider the cost to each community of what would happen to the property on which the closed school stands. This could easily turn into a loss that would cut into savings if the property does not sell or cannot be repurposed.</p>
<p>These discussions might cause another mass exodus of great teachers</p>	<p>Travel time could be difficult depending on which closing takes place.</p>	<p>Way too long of a drive to Fairlee from Vershire for young kids</p>	<p>Too much change. Families stretched out too far to transport.</p>
<p>Our youngest kids can't be compromised</p>	<p>Close a small town school</p>	<p>Who pays for the building that is not used?</p>	<p>Increased travel time for kids</p>
<p>Overworked teachers and administrators will leave the district and it will make it hard to hire new staff</p>	<p>Logistics - parents' commute? bus routes? both may be longer times for people!</p>	<p>Important to be cautious of having small children on buses for a large part of their day</p>	<p>Closing local elementary would discourage new families with children</p>
<p>Bad for small communities. The teachers help the kids and know the families.</p>	<p>Can't bus Vershire elementary kids to SME. Not an option - too far!</p>	<p>Bad idea to have half the elementary kids at RA - disadvantage for Vershire and West Fairlee kids.</p>	<p>Closing Westshire will severely alienate and disadvantage West Fairlee and Vershire</p>
<p>What happens when enrollment goes up? Where do students go once we have one school and not enough room?</p>	<p>What happens if numbers of students start to increase? Once you close a building, you can't come back.</p>	<p>Not a fan of the third line with a PK at RA. Programming at RA serving High School, Middle School, and Elementary School (6) age children as one unified school has demanded more time and energy. Adding another entity (PK) further disperses unification efforts and sets up an additional island within the building.</p>	

## BENEFITS TO SCENARIO E

Allows families and children to choose their education structure.	Better educational opportunities for our students.	Constant student #'s declining. Right look.	Expanded academic, social, and curricular opportunities for 9-12.
As stated in the meeting, the numbers here need to be reevaluated. If 9-12 is going to be tuitioned out then we obviously don't need to keep all 3 schools. We are in this position because the board hasn't made the tough decisions that we've needed. The fact that most of these scenarios still involve an increase in the budget for next year is ridiculous	I 100% agree with tuitioning highschool out. Our kids need more opportunities in this world that a small highschool can't provide. Also, NH kids should have a right to NH education not just Vermont. I don't agree with maintaining 3 schools. The academy is large enough for k-8. Sell elementary schools.	More diverse education for our highschool kids. Can make more viable financially by consolidating elementary schools. Could assess impact of non enrolled students in district using census data..	Yes- this is inevitable due to decreasing student population and offers best options for the students. Will attract more families to the area. Time to put our investment into K-8 and accept that the academy is not meeting the needs of our current community.
Worked in the past.	students could go to school of their choosing, for some closer to home & community	Sharon Academy	Like the idea of older students being at bigger HS
provides possibly a more enriched high school experience with larger student body, and possibly more opportunities for extra curricular/sports. Can eliminate two buildings and their cost of operation and maintenance	These numbers are off - I would be interested in knowing more about this option if the numbers are fixed. There is double counting of expenses.	We have small elementary classes where smallness is a virtue, and then for HS kids get to go to a bigger school with more peers and opportunities	Positive: An enhanced education opportunity. I feel that a private type of school would give the students more opportunities than our school is able to
I would like to see this more there must be a savings with the students numbers will be decreasing over the next years	Older students have more choice and opportunity for sports, academics, etc. Save on electrical expense in school, staff cuts., etc.	Eliminating 9-12 staff would be a decrease and a much more learning proficient education, tuitioning students out	Expanded opportunities for older students. Keep the elementary schools small and local.

## DRAWBACKS TO SCENARIO E

<p>ABSOLUTELY NOT!! Goes against the main reason Fairlee wanted to form this district in the first place, takes away our control of budget and academic decisions for our students, leaves us completely at the mercy of receiving schools, and breaks apart our student and overall community. (And far too costly)</p>	<p>My family is absolutely NOT in favor of closing the high school. This would hurt the community spirit, community connections and collaborations. Also, likely not cost savings.</p>	<p>Disintegration of the community center Further widening of the socioeconomic gap. Those with money will take their tuition dollars to private schools or some schools will only accept our " good " students. What schools are even accepting tuition student. More competition for selective programs. Better teams for instance but few opportunities for our students to participate.</p>	<p>Eliminates all our Sports success and spirit. Our teams have developed into very competitive teams, willing a State Championship last year, both Soccer teams in the Semi finals this year, we have great success and it would all get wiped away. Terrible option!</p>
<p>expense...</p>	<p>Lose too many teachers</p>	<p>way too costly</p>	<p>Maybe more expensive?</p>
<p>increased budget, potential increase students moving into district for school choice</p>	<p>Many, many drawbacks. Against the articles of agreement and way more costly.</p>	<p>Unfortunate to let go of a vision that we put so much effort into bringing to life</p>	<p>NO. TOO EXPENSIVE. Not sustainable and too many unknown variables</p>
<p>Negative: Hard for some families to travel out of the area for schooling</p>	<p>Loss of community for high school ages and their parents.</p>	<p>No real cost savings and unknown cost of private tutions.</p>	<p>TOO EXPENSIVE and too many variables cannot control for.</p>
<p>Terrible idea and we lose a vital part (our high school students) of our communities to somewhere else.</p>	<p>Seems to have no benefit. Increases cost, decreases quality of education and undermines community</p>	<p>Significant increases in the expenses to the district and loss of local control and governance. This would create division between our communities.</p>	<p>Unattractive to outsider moving into the school district, therefore increased chance of decreased student population.</p>
<p>No savings. Doesn't seem affordable to consider.</p>	<p>Too expense - not enough gain</p>	<p>Data need to be more thorough</p>	<p>Silly to keep a large school open for 3 grades</p>
<p>Terrible for tax payers, job losses, specials and community</p>	<p>This is not an option we should even explore.</p>	<p>Too many variables to work against this</p>	<p>Would like to see tuition numbers to surrounding high schools</p>
<p>Too expensive</p>	<p>seems a lot more expensive</p>	<p>This scenario clearly benefits nobody whatsoever.</p>	<p>Too expensive</p>
<p>Keeping too many administration jobs.</p>	<p>Too costly all the way around.</p>	<p>Doesn't seem worth considering.</p>	

**DRAWBACKS TO SCENARIO E Continued**

<p>This could be viable if you closed SME and moved them to the academy building.</p>	<p>Better to keep high school students and try to attract more tuition students.</p>	<p>Leave this option for later years when enrollment gets smaller</p>	<p>Not being willing to completely close the academy.</p>
<p>Some staff will lose their jobs and the high schoolers might not want to tuition out, those are very important grades of school where they make important decisions</p>	<p>Absolutely not - reverts back to the problem we had before we formed the district and breaks apart our community.</p>	<p>Class sizes are decreasing wich would make tuition decrease - why use a number that will not accurately reflect the future?</p>	<p>This is the worst option. It destroys the community that has been created. I do not have kids, and i am not interested in paying even more to send a parent's child to the school of their choice.</p>