

**Lamoille North Supervisory Union and  
Lamoille North Modified Unified Union District Board Meeting  
August 13, 2018  
Hyde Park Elementary School Library, Hyde Park, VT**

**Members Present:** Belvidere: Angie Evans; Cambridge: Laura Miller, Jan Sander, Bill Sander, Mark Stebbins; Eden: David Whitcomb, Jeff Hunsberger; Hyde Park: Chasity Fagnant, Patti Hayford; Lisa Barry; Johnson: Angela Lamell

**Members Absent:** Cambridge: Bernard Barnes, Sue Hamblyn-Prescott; Johnson: Mark Nielsen, Katie Orost, Eve Gagne, Bobbie Moulton; Waterville: Amanda Tilton-Martin

**Others Present:** Catherine Gallagher, Deb Clark, Charleen McFarlane, Wendy Savery, Melinda Mascolino, Brian Pena, Brian Schaffer, Dana Jewett, Dianne Reilly, Janet Murray, Sherry Lussier, Jade Hazard, Kim Hoffman, Amber Carbine-March, Chelsea Circe, Peter Lavigne, Lori Lisai, Laurie Toof, Christopher Lesauskis

**Minute Taker:** Sue Trainor

**Call to Order, Adopt the Agenda, Announcements and Public Comment:** Chair Whitcomb called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. Gallagher removed the In-District Transfer Request from the agenda, as it was no longer necessary. B. Sander made a motion to accept the amended agenda, seconded by Stebbins. The motion passed unanimously.

**Routine Business: Consent Agenda Items**

**Minutes of the June 25, 2018, Meeting, July 9 and July 31, 2018, Personnel Committee**

**Meetings:** B. Sander made a motion, seconded by J. Sander, to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

**LUHS Presentation:** Schaffer and his team made a presentation to the Board on proficiency based graduation requirements, summarizing what had been in practice for two years and was based on several decades of research in educational change. Schaffer noted that the move to proficiency based learning had caused confusion in some school districts, as it was ripping out some of the internal mechanisms that had been in practice for quite some time, while replacing them with some thoughtful research-based practices.

Schaffer provided a snapshot of graduation requirements in 2001, with 20 credits from a range of subjects being required. In 2003-2004 the graduation requirements were increased to 24 credits. In 2013, Act 77 was introduced, which guided schools to take on some challenges, such as dual enrollment. In 2014, the Educational Quality Standards was issued by the State. The EQS put the onus on schools to move their system from a Carnegie based method of graduation to a very specific set of standards. The standards outlined several areas of content that needed to be covered: literacy, math, scientific inquiry, global citizenship, physical education, health, artistic expression, and transferable skills, such as communication, collaboration and cooperation. By the Class of 2020 schools were required to have a system in place that was based on proficiency based graduation requirements.

During the 2015-2016 school year this Supervisory Union was able to participate in technical training offered by the AOE. The School Board adopted policies in 2016 with some additional guidelines. What was developed by the LNSU was not a canned program. It was the installation of a series of research based practices that also focused on attributes employers or college admission representatives were looking for. This model allowed students far more options to demonstrate their knowledge and skills and provided lessons every day that linked to the graduation standard.

Schaffer expressed his appreciation to the consultants, Central Office and Jade Hazard for their support in implementing this new system. Schaffer then reviewed the tenets that the school hoped

to accomplish in implementing a proficiency based model. These tenets included becoming clearer with the learning expectations as far as what was needed for graduation; no longer looking at student achievement through the lens of how many could pass a class, but holding students to standards over time; that the assessments used were standard based; that the school see formative assessments as a measure to demonstrate how students were learning along the way; that summative assessments at the end of a term still existed but that learning was fostered along the way; that there be a purposeful distinction between the academic skills vs. transferable skills which would be reinforced over time; that students were given multiple opportunities to improve their work and to allow them to change course; and that students were active in their decision making about their education. Teachers were now moving from being a presenter in a classroom to a facilitator who helped students meet their targets.

Peter Lavigne, the Social Studies Department Chair, reported that teaching in the world of proficiencies had altered the way he taught and assessed students quite a bit over the last couple of years. Lavigne stated that within Global Citizenship there were five proficiencies and four history performance indicators that were instructed to and assessed. Each unit within the Global Citizenship proficiency structure would use a performance indicator that made the most sense within that unit. Lavigne explained that proficiency is the graduation requirement and the performance indicators were the tools that were used to get to the proficiency. Lavigne then provided the Board with information on a document being used entitled Understanding by Design (UbD), which provided teachers with a way to structure their units so as to make teaching and learning more purposeful. The document started with the end result in mind and teachers then provided performance indicators that would outline what students could do to satisfy the proficiency. Schaffer noted that the acquisition of content had shifted over the years and now teachers were planning more purposefully to outline what students should be able to finally do with the knowledge that was being presented. Lavigne then provided a specific example of one of the units he was teaching on the renaissance where students learned information by creating a game which included creating maps with trade routes.

Chelsea Circe, an English teacher, then provided the Board with another game-based assessment example. The lesson centered on the Hero's Journey, a story element used in fiction. Once the student went through all the stages of the unit, they were tested on the proficiency indicator in conferences with the teacher by explaining the author's craft.

Lori Lisai, the Innovation Coordinator at the High School, Middle School and Tech Center, highlighted the changes as far as classes being offered. One option for students was to participate in YAATST, with the task being to help students, teachers and adults at the school come together to discuss how to make the school better. The Exploring Education class was created to provide students time during the day to participate. Students chose something they wanted to change in the school. They then researched the topic and visited other schools and reviewed other school models. They then presented the changes they wished to see to the decision makers at the school. Lisai also highlighted the Business Start Up class where students were able to create and run their own businesses.

Lori Toof, a Math teacher, demonstrated to the Board one of the performance indicators for the geometry proficiency. She appreciated that with proficiency based teaching she was able to assess students in a variety of ways. In one of the performance indicators, students needed to find volume and surface area of 2D or 3D shapes. They could take a traditional test, do a 2D and 3D scavenger hunt, design a town, park, recreation center, zoo, or aquarium. Students were given a scale for what they needed to do to achieve a level.

Schaffer noted that the middle and high school teachers had spent time late in the school year providing information to each other on what they were teaching to their classes. Lisai stated the

aim of this particular practice was to model the process that students would be experiencing. Schaffer then discussed the weekly schedule changes that would take effect in the new school year. The middle school, Tech Center, and high school got together to accommodate the schedules at all levels. There would now be more time for personalized learning, club attendance, and passion projects. With the revised schedule, students would now be able to attend the Tech Center while also attending high school.

Chris Lesauskis reported to the Board on the changes in summer school. This was the first year that students attended due to proficiency grading. In the past if a student failed the class, they had to redo the entire class. Sections of the class were taught and tested, but strengths and weaknesses weren't necessarily addressed. This year everything was personalized, as it was proficiency recovery, and students were working on their weaknesses. If students had issues with reading, they would work on reading proficiencies. Each student received a personalized curriculum. This approach helped students quite a bit. Lesauskis reported that students seemed to enjoy this approach. They knew what they had to do and they did it.

Chelsea Circe reported on the 9<sup>th</sup> grade interdisciplinary team that had been developed. The team's ultimate goal was to increase positive student outcomes. They were taking the team-based model, which the middle school had already ingrained in their culture, and were using that model to make it easier for students to transition to high school. They were also working to make the class units share the same themes at roughly the same time so that students received exposure to these ideas at roughly the same time. Additionally, they were combining that with their shared expectations of student behavior. Circe provided the Board with a rubric that would be used to follow a student's performance in the transferable skill of self-direction. At the end of each quarter the student would do a self-assessment, with a teacher conference to follow.

Kim Hoffman and Amber Carbine-March discussed EPIC (Educational Path I Choose) Academy, a program designed by both teachers. This program was interdisciplinary and project-based, but was outside of the traditional realm of instruction. It was student-designed, student-led, and staff supported. Students would have six weeks to work on one interdisciplinary project where they could achieve proficiencies in multiple content areas. After that time they could return to traditional classes if they wanted or they could continue with another project for six weeks. Students would work with mentors to identify which proficiencies they needed or wanted to demonstrate. Everyone was welcome to attend EPIC Academy. While some schools offer this type of program to their students, it was often limited to smaller groups. The aim of Hoffman and Carbine-March was to allow as many interested students to attend. Hoffman noted that passion drove motivation. Carbine-March stated that integrating content and skills in projects made learning meaningful and relevant.

**Other Business:** There was no other business.

**Adjourn:** The meeting adjourned at 6:13 p.m.

**Retreat Begins:** The retreat began at 6:37 p.m.

**Confidentiality Agreement:** Gallagher began the meeting by asking that all Board members sign paperwork stating they had read the confidentiality statement and reminded members of the need to know versus the right to know. Board members were reminded that if they were approached by community members their responses would only be considered a Board response if they were at a Board meeting.

**Meeting Locations:** Gallagher then discussed Board meeting locations. The original goal had been to be available to the public at each town in the District. However, there had been very little public

attendance and some Board members had difficulty getting to some of the satellite locations. The Board agreed that future meetings would be held at the Green Mountain Tech Center – CEC. Any change of location would be determined on a case-by-case basis. Meetings would continue to take place on the second and fourth Mondays of the month.

**Safety Grant:** Gallagher reported that the SU had received almost \$150,000 from the Safety Grant Approval Committee, an amount which may have been more funding than any other SU. Three projects were not approved. Hyde Park Elementary School did not receive funding for external cameras and an evacuation chair and Gallagher would follow up to find out why they were not approved.

**Restorative Justice:** Gallagher informed the Board that the Supervisory Union had been invited to be a pilot for restorative practices and restorative justice, along with Burlington and Chittenden. Gallagher asked the Department of Health why this SU had been invited to participate and was told it was because of the work that the SU was beginning to do with restorative practices and justice. This was a coup for the LNMUUSD. Jon Kidde was well known in the restorative justice field. If the SU were to hire him for a basic in-service he would be hard to afford. This grant would provide the SU with Kidde’s technical assistance for the entire year. This pilot program would be for the middle and high school students and would look at how to introduce restorative practices to students who have substance use and abuse issues. Gallagher stated the big push at in-service would be restorative practices so that the school community of students had the ability to repair relationships and repair any harm done. The Safety and Wellness Committee had been looking at what made a safe school. Gallagher believed that having safe buildings was a piece of how to make the school safe, but having a culture where students communicated with each other and had one person in their midst with whom they felt safe, along with a culture of kindness, communication and receptiveness, could help to identify someone who might cause harm to self or others. The push was to marry the safety initiatives with helping students access the education they need.

**Hyde Park Representative to the Board:** Gallagher reported there was a Hyde Park representative opening on the LNMUUSD/LNSU Board. Andrew Beaupre would be leaving and Gallagher thanked him for his wisdom and input. The opening was advertised and someone needed to be appointed by the Selectboard and School Board within thirty days. The deadline for letters of interest was August 20<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Work for the Year:**

**Committee Organization:** Gallagher reported that David Whitcomb could not sit on a particular committee because he needed to be involved in all of them, so Whitcomb and Gallagher would do rotations through the committees. The Policy and Legal Committee would go by the wayside because all required policies have been put into practice. As far as the Communications Committee, any communication with the media had to go through Whitcomb and Gallagher so a small committee would be fine. A Negotiations Committee needed to be formed. The NEA was interested in having fewer Board members at the table. Gallagher said when the number of participants grew too large it could be difficult to communicate. Other supervisory unions may just have the Board Chair and the Union negotiator do the negotiation. In other cases it could be the Superintendent, the Board Chair, the Union negotiator and a teacher. The Committee could be large but the Board might want to think about having fewer people at the table. Last year, Sue Prescott was the designated speaker. That worked well as there was less room for interpretation or confusion. Gallagher asked if any Board members wished to be on the Committee. She noted that Orost had expressed an interest in being on the Committee and Prescott would continue to participate. B. Sander stated he would like to participate. McFarlane reported that both the support staff and teachers were up for negotiations this year. Whitcomb stated he wanted to be on the Committee. Fagnant reported she would be available to serve as an alternate.

The remaining committees were: Safe and Drug-Free School Committee, Personnel Committee, and Operations, Facilities and Technology. The Curriculum Committee would be very active this year, especially with the final unfolding of proficiencies. Gallagher noted there was a Finance Committee, a Budget Committee, and a Bond Committee with many of the same members on all three. Clark stated these often involved large dollar items and she recommended folding them into one committee. The Finance Committee only had four Board members. Clark recommended increasing that number. She recommended including the Operations, Facilities and Technology items in as well, especially during budget time. Gallagher stated a Committee list would be revised and distributed.

**Work for the Board:** Gallagher stated that many of the four goals and objectives developed last year had been met. Gallagher would provide the Board some suggestions for new or continuing action items that could be discussed at the next meeting. Committee meeting times would be determined at the next Board meeting. McFarlane noted that Prescott needed to put out the SU's intent to negotiate. The dates were August 22<sup>nd</sup> and September 6<sup>th</sup>.

**In-Service LNSU Day:** Gallagher reported that Hazard had organized an in-service with speakers Heather Hobart and Mark Scott from the Lamoille Restorative Center presenting from 9:00 a.m. to noon. After the presentation, participants would transition to their building to have an afternoon session on multi-tiered systems of support that would tie into restorative practices.

**Evaluation Plan:** Gallagher stated they were unveiling a new supervision and evaluation plan for teachers. The State would now be using the SU's plan as the model evaluation plan. It used a coaching model where teachers identified what learning they would like to accomplish and how it would be accomplished. It also included observations and yearly goals. Savery worked on a subcommittee all last year to develop the evaluation plan and the Union reviewed and commented on it as well.

**Adjourn:** B. Sander made a motion, seconded by Lamell, to adjourn the meeting at 7:06 p.m. The motion passed unanimously. Members of the Board then took a guided tour of the remodeled Hyde Park Elementary School with Principal Reilly.