

**Lamoille South Supervisory Union
Optional Education Structures Committee
June 23, 2010 @ Lake Elmore School**

Present: Max Cohen, Olivia DiRienzo, Abby Fitzgerald, Paul Griswold, David Jaqua, JB McKinley, Kate Osborne, Susan Titterton, Dr. Raymond Proulx

Absent: Penny Bishop, Emily Bradbury, Jeff Dacales, Sharron Scott, Reeves Larson

Facilitator: Ray Proulx

Note-taker: Susan Titterton

AGENDA

1. Review and approve minutes of June 9, 2010
2. Goals for Committee Work (brief discussion)
3. Exploration of Options (apply David Jaqua's template)
4. Review Critical Path Schedule
5. Next Meeting Date (July 14, 2010, 6-8 p.m. @ Lake Elmore School)

Agenda item	Notes	Action taken
1	Minutes were reviewed	Approved w/o changes
2	<p>1. Discussion of major issue we're trying to address/ why we're doing this work included these comments from different committee members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statewide interest in restructuring; we need to be ahead of the curve; political leaders are telling us something • Need to have governance models align with trends including decreased number of students, cost per pupil, sustaining programs • Sustaining quality=need to keep programs and courses • Need diversity of programs and number of teachers to teach them • We are responding to legislative and financial pressures • State and U.S. are not addressing the real problem— student/teacher ratio • Explore problems, including governance structures, but also include creative ways of providing instruction, i.e. Johnson State College, distance learning, dual enrollment, choice, etc... • We most likely won't find substantial savings of money, but collaborating will improve quality • If it's not broke, don't fix it. <p>2. Discussion of the goal of our work included the following comments: To come up with a recommendation for LSSU board. We're trying to be a safe group for exploring the issues, talking about this challenging topic. Our work is non-binding, but we want to try to come up with a consensus (among this group) of what a "best option" might be. After we make our recommendation—depending on what the LSSU Board chooses to do with that recommendation—there is intended to be a phase 2 study (for which the "Peltz" Bill provides funding.)</p>	Discussion; no action required.

<p>3</p>	<p>The template was described. (See attachments sent by Ray Proulx) The purpose of the template is to provide a process to help the committee to evaluate the three different options we are currently studying (unified union school district, union schools, and joint contract).</p> <p>There was a discussion of two ways to create a unified union: one allows the unified union board to make decisions about school configurations (although that may be delayed for 3-4 years); the other in the “Pelz” bill does not allow the board to unilaterally make a decision without the approval of the voters.</p> <p>A question was raised about Elmore to which Ray responded: Elmore could decide to be in an “advisory” capacity, while Stowe and Morrisville are “necessary” in any decisions.</p> <p>In response to a question, Ray described Joint Contract (JC) There are 7; Barstow is the oldest (includes towns of Chittenden and Mendon). There have been 4 formed recently, as a result of studies like this. A JC is formed by 2 or more school boards that agree to jointly operate 2 or more schools. You can build in any conditions you want. One board operates the school; it is made up of representation from the member boards. (Example: LSSU board, Elmore board, Stowe board, Morrystown board, plus JC board.) The only HS that had a JC was Whitingham/ Wilmington; they recently formed a Union School District. The JC process specifies how budgets and building ownership is handled. A JC is easier to form and easier to revoke than the other options. Most form a JC with the intention of exploring a union. Once a JC is formed, it lasts until a community decides to make a change.</p> <p>In response to a question about union high schools, Ray shared that in the 1970’s there were many union high schools formed when the state provided a financial incentive, funding for new buildings, etc.</p> <p>We decided to work with David’s templates to help us to think through the Joint Contract option. (See attached notes on Joint Contract)</p>	<p>Decided at last meeting which options to explore now: 1) unified union school district, 2) union school district, 3) joint contract</p> <p>Decided to use David’s template to help us to explore</p> <p>Decided to begin with joint contract option</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>David and Ray developed a draft “critical path” (timeline) for the committee’s work, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orientation (April, May) • Identify options (6/9) • Characterize & assess options (6/23) • Characterize & assess options (7/14) • Prioritize / select options for public review (8/25) • Establish communication plan (9/8) • Public meeting 1 (9/22) • Refine based on feedback (10/13) • Public meeting 2 (10/27) 	<p>Revisit at next meeting and adjust</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare/ review final report (11/10 &11/17) • Present report to LSSU board (12/8) <p>Emily offered to develop a communication approach. We discussed using the expertise of Paul Costello of the VT Rural Development Council to tap his experience in Addison NW to help design the public meetings. Ray suggested Paul’s help might be more fitting for the Phase 2 study. Ray suggested he ask Emily to contact Paul to tap into his expertise as she develops her communication plan.</p>	<p>Take Emily up on her offer and Ray will ask Emily to contact Paul Costello to inform her planning</p>
5	<p>AGENDA for next meeting, July 14, 6-8 p.m. @ Elmore School</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approve minutes 2. Committee resignation 3. Finish characterizing Joint Contract; pros and cons 4. Characterize unified union school district: pros and cons 5. Characterize union school district: pros and cons 6. Review critical path, discuss and adjust 7. Plan for next meeting 	