

# REORGANIZATION PLAN SUBMITTAL SHEET

(Each municipality in a School Union must be indicated separately.)

School Administrative Units Included in <b>APPROVED</b> Notice of Intent	School Administrative Units Submitting Reorganization Plan
MSAD # 15	MSAD # 15
SAU # 29	SAU # 29

Contact Information:

RPC Chair

Name: Wilken J Quint  
 Address: 26 HAZELHILL RD  
MINOIT, MG 04254  
 Telephone: 754-1388  
 email: quintw@minoit.k12.mg.us

ALAN B. RICH, JR  
 329 CORN'S BERRY RD  
 NEW GLoucester MA  
 04260

926-4126  
 ARKH50@AOL.COM

Date Plan Submitted: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed RSU Operational Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Initial Receipt  Revision (Version # \_\_\_\_\_)

Received: 11/30/07

Initial Review: 12/3/07

Review Completed:   /  /  

Commissioner Response

Approved  Revise & Return

Returned to SAU:   /  /  

Revisions due to Department:   /  /  

Initial Plan Received (if revision):   /  /

<u>ALBERTSON</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/19/07</u> Date	<u>SAD 15 BOARD OF DIRECTORS</u> SAU
<u>Wright</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/19/07</u> Date	<u>U29 Community Rep.</u> SAU
<u>K. Mc PRTS Chair</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/19/07</u> Date	<u>U29 Poland Rep</u> SAU
<u>K. Gilmore's, PCS Chair</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/19/07</u> Date	<u>U29 Poland Rep.</u> SAU
<u>Susan L. Callahan</u> Signature/Title	<u>11-27-07</u> Date	<u>U29 Minst Rep.</u> SAU
<u>Wendy M. Simare</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/27/07</u> Date	<u>U29 Minot Rep.</u> SAU
<u>Therese King (Wf)</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/27/07</u> Date	<u>U29 Minot Rep</u> SAU
<u>Michelle</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/27/07</u> Date	<u>U29 Poland Rep</u> SAU
<u>Don Duffin</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/27/07</u> Date	<u>U29 MECHANIC FALLS Rep</u> SAU
<u>Melvin J. Holden</u> Signature/Title	<u>11-27-07</u> Date	<u>U29 Mechanic Falls Rep</u> SAU
<u>Kate M. Byrd</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/27/07</u> Date	<u>U29 Mechanic Falls Rep.</u> SAU
<u>Gregg Allen</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/27/07</u> Date	<u>U29 Mechanic Falls</u> SAU
<u>Jarsenauet</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/27/07</u> Date	<u>U29 Mechanic Falls</u> SAU
<u>Steve JC</u> Signature/Title	<u>11/27/07</u> Date	<u>U29 Poland Rep.</u> SAU

## Reorganization Plan Cover Sheet

(Please attach Reorganization Plan as Exhibit A)

Required Elements							
Law Reference Item Number Sub- Chapter 2	Item	N/A	Complete	In Progress	Not Yet Started	Identified Barrier <sup>1</sup>	Need Assistance <sup>2</sup>
3.A(1)	SAUs included in RSU		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(2)	Size of governing body		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Composition of governing body		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Apportionment of governing body		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(3)	Method of voting of the governing body		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(4)	Composition of local school committees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Powers of local school committees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Duties of local school committees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(5)	Disposition of real & personal school property		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(6)	Disposition of existing school indebtedness (if not using provisions of section 1506)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Disposition of lease-purchase obligations (if not using provisions of section 1506)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(7)	Assignment of school personnel contracts		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Assignment of school collective bargaining agreements		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Assignment of other school contractual obligations		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(8)	Disposition of existing school funds and existing financial obligations		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(9)	Transition plan that addresses the development of a budget for the first school year		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Transition plan that addresses interim personnel policies		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(10)	Documentation of the public meeting(s) held to prepare or review reorganization plan		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(11)	Explanation of how units that approve reorganization plan will proceed if one or more units do not approve the plan		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.A(12)	Estimate of cost savings to be achieved		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.A(13)	Such other matters as the governing bodies of the school administrative units in existence on the effective date of this chapter may determine to be necessary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poland High School tuition contracts and school choice for Minot and Mechanic Falls.</li> </ul>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>1</sup> Please explain why this is a barrier and what assistance you need to remove this barrier on the next page.

<sup>2</sup> Please explain what assistance you need to complete this portion of your plan, and state from whom you need assistance, on page 3.

Parameters for Plan Development							
Law Reference Item Number Sub-Chapter 2	Item	N/A	Complete	In Progress	Not Yet Started	Identified Barrier <sup>3</sup>	Need Assistance <sup>4</sup>
3.B(1)	Enrollment meets requirements (2,500 except where circumstances justify an exception <sup>5</sup> )		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sec. XXXX-36, Parameter B	When viewed in conjunction with surrounding proposed units, may not result in one or more municipalities being denied the option to join an RSU		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.B(2)	Comprehensive programming for all students grades K - 12.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Includes at least one publicly supported high school		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.B(3)	Consistent with policies set forth in section 1451		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.B(4)	No displacement of teachers		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No displacement of students		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No closures of schools existing or operating during school year immediately preceding reorganization, except as permitted under section 1512		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sec. XXXX-26, Parameter F	The plan must address how the school administrative unit will reorganize administrative functions, duties and noninstructional personnel so that the projected expenditures of the reorganized school unit in fiscal year 2008-2009 for system administration, transportation, special education and facilities and maintenance will not have an adverse impact on the instructional program <sup>6</sup>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Collaborative Agreements							
						Yes	No
Does your plan currently include information/documentation on collaborative agreements? (not required, but encouraged)						<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Exceptions to 2,500 minimum**

**Actual number of students for which the RSU is fiscally responsible: \_\_\_\_\_**

Exception	Exception Claimed in Plan	Documentation Provided? (Please attach as Exhibit B)	
		Yes	No
Geography	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Demographics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Population Density	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Unique Circumstances	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>3</sup> Please explain why this is a barrier and what assistance you need to remove this barrier on the next page.

<sup>4</sup> Please explain what assistance you need to complete this portion of your plan, and state from whom you need assistance, on page 3.

<sup>5</sup> Please note in the *Exceptions to 2500 minimum* section on next page

<sup>6</sup> This requirement is only for those who plan to be operational as an RSU in fiscal year 2008-2009, in accordance with a Reorganization Plan that is approved by the Commissioner and by the voters.

**Explanation of Barriers –**

Please use this section to explain any/all barriers identified on the previous page as a barrier in completing your Reorganization Plan.

Law Reference/Required Element	Explanation of the barrier
A6 School Indebtedness	Nonsubsidized local debt. MSAD #15 has \$8m in local debt. Mechanic Falls and Minot may incur local debt in the near future due to potential need for school upgrades.
A7 Personnel contracts	Combination of collective bargaining contracts has the potential of increased costs for wages and benefits for all districts. In addition, PRHS has a merit pay based salary schedule. No other school in the proposed region has a similar pay scale.
A12 Cost Savings	There is a 1.2 million dollar cost shift to MSAD #15 as the result of consolidation. To date, potential savings in administration and services have not been identified but does not appear to equal the 1.2 million cost shift.
A12 Cost Savings	No standard administrative staffing chart exists for a school district of this size, resulting in difficulty in determining cost savings.
A13 Other Matters	Implications of tuition contracts and school choice for Minot and Mechanic Falls with PRHS are unclear in context of school consolidation.

**Assistance Needs –**

Please use this section to describe your needs for assistance and from whom you need assistance.

Law Reference/Required Element	Explanation of your assistance need	Assistance needed from whom?
A12 Cost Savings	Need assistance from DOE to overcome \$1.2 M cost shift from U29 to MSAD 15.	DOE
A13 Cost Savings	Need DOE to establish a standard administrative organization chart for district of this size.	DOE

## REORGANIZATION PLAN

SAU Submitting: MSAD #15 (Towns of Gray and New Gloucester) and  
Union #29 (Towns of Poland, Mechanic Falls and Minot)

Contact Information: Dennis Duquette, Superintendent Union #29 and  
Victoria Burns, Superintendent MSAD #15

Date Submitted by SAU: November 29, 2007

Proposed RSU Operational Date: Unknown

### INTRODUCTION

This reorganization plan is submitted on behalf of the Towns of Minot, Mechanic Falls, and Poland (Union #29) and the Towns of Gray and New Gloucester (MSAD #15) in accordance with the terms of the recently enacted school reorganization law. This document is still a work in progress and the plan is far from completion. Nevertheless, this report and the accompanying documents submitted regarding progress to date in the development of the reorganization plan are understood as being sufficient to meet the expectations of the Department of Education for the December 1<sup>st</sup> deadline that has been set.

Our two school districts have formed a Regionalization Planning Committee with representatives from our five towns. The Committee has met four times as a large Regionalization Planning Committee and had ten subcommittee meetings since the beginning of October 2007. Our subcommittees (Finance, Governance, Services, and Curriculum) have identified many of the issues necessary in the consolidation process, but are “in progress” or “not yet started” or “identified barrier” stage on many of them.

To date, the Regionalization Planning Committee has reviewed two recommendations that passed an informal “straw vote” process: *the size, composition and apportionment of the governing body; and the method of voting of the governing body*. A summary of discussions and recommendations from the four RPC subcommittees - Finance, Governance, District-Wide Services, and Curriculum - is attached as Appendix A.

*MSAD 15 and UNION 29 believe that the potential barriers to implementation of the consolidation law are as follows:*

1. *Cost-shifting that is currently anticipated will significantly disadvantage Gray and New Gloucester - \$1.2 million dollars - making voter passage of the reorganization plan unlikely unless this matter is resolved for current and future years.*
2. *The combination of collective bargaining contracts has the potential of increased costs for wages and benefits for all districts. PRHS's merit pay based salary schedule, in particular, presents unique challenges. No other school in the proposed region has a similar pay scale.*

3. *MSAD 15 and Union 29 send students to applied learning centers in two different districts: Portland (MSAD 15) and Lewiston (U29). The cost implication of consolidating those technical programs is unclear.*
4. *Repercussions of the current tuition contract that exists within Union 29 is not yet fully understood and may be a barrier to consolidation.*
5. *The two districts are just beginning to explore level of school indebtedness in the five communities and anticipate that resolution of that indebtedness may be a barrier to consolidation.*
6. *No standard administrative organizational chart has been established by DOE resulting in difficulty in determining administrative cost savings.*
7. *Time line requirements as currently presented under the reorganization law are difficult to meet and pose a barrier to thoughtful and successful consolidation.*
8. *Even if barriers enumerated above are addressed, it is at this time unclear whether cost savings results and property tax relief will ultimately be realized due to the cost shifting and the cost of merging personnel contracts.*
9. *A cumbersome, costly, budget validation referendum approval process – one that is not in sync with budget cycles that exist through town meeting process – is a barrier to consolidation.*

**1. The units of school administration to be included in the proposed reorganized regional school unit.**

The proposed regional school unit includes the following school administrative units:

- A. School Union #29 (Towns of Poland, Mechanic Falls, Minot)
- B. Maine School Administrative District #15 (Towns of Gray and New Gloucester)
- C. \_\_\_\_NA\_\_\_\_ Community School District.
- D. \_\_\_\_NA\_\_\_\_, a school administrative unit organized pursuant to Chapter \_\_ of the Private and Special Laws of \_\_\_\_\_, as amended.

**2. The size, composition and apportionment of the governing body.**

**COMPLETE**

**3. The method of voting of the governing body.**

**COMPLETE**

The Regionalization Planning Committee has completed its discussion of the governance options for the new RSU. The weighted voting approach recommended by the Governance Subcommittee was accepted by the RPC by straw vote. (See Appendix A)

The regional school unit board would be composed of 15 members. Each municipality in the RSU shall elect the following number of its residents to serve on the Board and their votes shall be weighted as follows:

Municipality	Population	# of Board members	Votes per member
1 Minot	2,248	3	10.28% or 3.42 vote
2 Mechanic Falls	3,138	3	14.34% or 4.78 vote
3 Poland	4,866	3	22.24% or 7.41 vote
4 New Gloucester	4,803	3	21.96% or 7.32 vote
5 Gray	6,820	3	31.18% or 10.39 vote
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>21,875</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>

Each board member shall serve a 3-year term, except that the initial terms of the members of the first regional school unit board would be staggered as provided by current law.

**4. The composition, powers and duties of any local school committees to be created.**

**NOT APPLICABLE**

The Regionalization Planning Committee decided through a “straw vote” not to create local school committees.

**5. The disposition of real and personal school property.**

**IN PROGRESS**

The Finance Subcommittee has made no recommendation for the disposition of real and personal school property. To date, the subcommittee has listed property but has not had the time to decide on the disposition. (See Appendix A and Appendix B.)

**6. The disposition of existing school indebtedness and lease-purchase obligations if the parties elect not to use the provisions of Section 1506 regarding the disposition of debt obligations.**

**IN PROGRESS AND POTENTIAL IDENTIFIED BARRIER**

The Finance Subcommittee has begun the process of identifying school debt across all five communities. Disposition and resolution of that debt has not yet been addressed and may pose a barrier to consolidation. (See Appendix A and Appendix C.)

**7. The assignment of school personnel contracts, school collective bargaining agreements and other school contractual obligations.**

**IN PROGRESS AND POTENTIAL IDENTIFIED BARRIER**

The Finance Subcommittee is in the process of reviewing personnel contracts. No recommendations have been made. A concern is the disparity in steps, wages, and benefits among the various contracts. The combination of collective bargaining contracts has the potential of increased costs for wages and benefits for all districts. In addition, PRHS has a merit pay based salary schedule. No other school in the proposed region has a similar pay scale. (See Appendix A.)

**8. The disposition of existing school funds and existing financial obligations, including undesignated fund balances, trust funds, reserve funds and other funds appropriated for school purposes.**

**IN PROGRESS**

The Finance Subcommittee has reviewed existing school funds and financial obligations, including undesignated fund balances, trust funds, and other funds. To date, the Finance Subcommittee has made tentative recommendations only for trust funds and scholarships:

D. Scholarship Funds. SAUs shall transfer remaining balances of scholarship funds to the region. Scholarships shall be limited to the original pool of potential recipients unless otherwise provided by the donor or by applicable law.

**\*\*RECOMMENDED BY THE FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE**

E. Trust Funds. SAUs shall transfer trust funds to the region. The regional school union board shall be deemed the successor trustee for all purposes, except as provided by the trust or by applicable law. **\*\*RECOMMENDED BY THE FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE**

These recommendations have not been formally voted on by the Regionalization Planning Committee. (See Appendix A.)

**9. A transition plan that addresses the development of a budget for the first school year of the reorganized unit and interim personnel policies.**

**NOT YET STARTED**

The Regionalization Planning Committee has not started this work.

**10. Documentation of the public meeting or public meetings held to prepare or review the reorganization plan.**

Minutes of the following public meeting(s) held to prepare or review the reorganization plan are attached as Exhibit 10-A:

<b>Date of Public Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Location</b>
10/2/07	6:30 - 8:30 p.m.	Union #29
10/9/07	6:30 - 8:30 p.m.	GNG Middle School
10/11/07	7:00 - 9:00 p.m.	GNG Middle School
10/16/07	6:30 - 8:30 p.m.	GNG Middle School
10/22/07	6:30 - 8:30 p.m.	Union #29
10/23/07	6:30 - 8:30 p.m.	Union #29

<b>Date of Public Meeting</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Location</b>
10/23/07	10:00 - 12:00 p.m.	Union #29
10/29/07	6:30 - 8:30 p.m.	GNG Middle School
10/30/07	6:30 - 8:30 p.m.	Union #29
11/5/07	10:00 - 12:00 p.m.	Union #29
11/8/07	6:30 - 8:30 p.m.	Union #29
11/19/07	6:30 - 8:30 p.m.	GNG Middle School

**11. An explanation of how units that approve the reorganization plan will proceed if one or more of the proposed members of the regional school unit fail to approve the plan.**

**NOT YET STARTED**

**12. An estimate of the cost savings to be achieved by the formation of a regional school unit and how these savings will be achieved.**

**IN PROGRESS AND POTENTIAL IDENTIFIED BARRIER**

The Governance & Services Subcommittees discussed possible administrative cost savings, but no recommendations have been made due to the short timeline. In addition, no standard administrative staffing chart exists for a school district of this size resulting in difficulty in determining cost savings. (See Appendix A.)

**13-B. Cost Sharing in Regional School Units**

**IN PROGRESS AND POTENTIAL IDENTIFIED BARRIER**

The Finance Subcommittee is studying the \$1.2 million dollar cost shift from Union 29 to MSAD #15 as the result of regionalization. This is an identified barrier we cannot resolve, and state help through legislation is needed. (See Appendix A.)

**13-C. Election of initial board of directors.**

**NOT YET STARTED**

**13-D. Tuition Contracts and School Choice**

**NOT YET STARTED AND POTENTIAL IDENTIFIED BARRIER**

10 % of Minot and Mechanic Falls high school students have school choice while 90%

are tuitioned to Poland Regional High School. This arrangement is set forth by contract between the three communities of Union 29. The legal ramifications of this contract, in the context of school consolidation, are not fully understood and may be a barrier. Additionally, MSAD 15 and Union 29 are in different vocational regions. The cost implications of this organization are, likewise, not fully understood. This may be a barrier to consolidation.

**13-E. Claims and Insurance**

**NOT YET STARTED**

**13-F. Vote to submit reorganization plan to Commissioner.**

This Reorganization Plan was submitted to the Regionalization Planning Committee on November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2007. The plan was submitted to the four school boards of Union 29 and SAD 15 the following week:

Minot	November 27, 2007
Poland	November 27, 2007
Mechanic Falls	November 27, 2007
MSAD #15	November 28, 2007.

<b>Poland School Department (L)</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>61,539</b>	<b>Bus</b>	<b>36,853</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Poland School Department (L)</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>78,030</b>	<b>Computers</b>	<b>78,030</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Mechanic Falls School Department (B)</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>800,000</b>	<b>Elm Street School</b>	<b>560,000</b>	<b>2020</b>
<b>Mechanic Falls School Department (L)</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>62,176</b>	<b>Bus</b>	<b>37,242</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Mechanic Falls School Department (L)</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>57,000</b>	<b>School Union Central Office</b>	<b>51,300</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>Minot School Department (L)</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>58,206</b>	<b>Bus</b>	<b>12,099</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Minot School Department (L)</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>60,399</b>	<b>Bus</b>	<b>24,615</b>	<b>2009</b>
<b>Minot School Department (L)</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>61,631</b>	<b>Bus</b>	<b>36,916</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Minot School Department (L)</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>68,084</b>	<b>Bus</b>	<b>53,229</b>	<b>2011</b>
<b>Minot School Department (L)</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>68,587</b>	<b>Modular Building</b>	<b>59,443</b>	<b>2011</b>
<b>Minot School Department (L)</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>50,750</b>	<b>School Union Central Office</b>	<b>40,600</b>	<b>2015</b>

**Union 29 Bonds and Leases  
(B) – Bond (L) - Lease**

<b>Name of SAU</b>	<b>Year Issued</b>	<b>Original Principal Amount</b>	<b>Asset Acquired, Constructed or Renovated</b>	<b>Principal Balance as of July 1, 2007</b>	<b>Final Maturity Date</b>
<b>Poland School Department (B)</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>\$17,263,578</b>	<b>PRHS</b>	<b>\$10,358,146</b>	<b>2018</b>
<b>Poland School Department (B)</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>\$103,095</b>	<b>PCS</b>	<b>\$20,617</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Poland School Department (B)</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>\$736,422</b>	<b>PRHS</b>	<b>515,496</b>	<b>2020</b>
<b>Poland School Department (B)</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>\$242,367</b>	<b>PRHS</b>	<b>96,944</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Poland School Department (B)</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>\$1,564,000</b>	<b>PCS</b>	<b>1,317,055</b>	<b>2023</b>
<b>Poland School Department (B)</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>\$297,000</b>	<b>PRHS &amp; PCS</b>	<b>118,800</b>	<b>2009</b>
<b>Poland School Department (L)</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>58,645</b>	<b>Bus</b>	<b>12,152</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Poland School Department (L)</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>56,165</b>	<b>Bus</b>	<b>11,638</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Poland School Department (L)</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>250,000</b>	<b>School Union Building</b>	<b>113,800</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>Poland School Department (L)</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>185,500</b>	<b>Bus Dispatch Center</b>	<b>176,225</b>	<b>2024</b>

<b>School Union 29</b>	<b>Property</b>
Poland	Poland Regional High School, Bruce M. Whittier Middle School and associated lands
Poland	Poland Community School and associated lands
Mechanic Falls	Elm Street School and associated lands
Minot	Minot Consolidated School and associated lands
Poland, Mechanic Falls & Minot	School Union 29 Central Office

## MSAD#15 Property List

### District Buildings: Instructional

<b>District Buildings: Instructional</b>	<b>Floor Space Square Foot</b>	<b>Site Size</b>
High School	115,256	83 Acres
Middle School	73,866	20 Acres
Memorial School	32,815	12.8 Acres
Russell School	34,440	4.73 Acres
Dunn School	42,373	35 Acres

### District Buildings: Non Instructional

<b>District Buildings: Non - Instructional</b>	<b>Floor Space Square Foot</b>	<b>Site Size</b>
Bus Garage	N/A	N/A
Central Office	N/A	N/A

APPENDIX C

M.S.A.D. # 15

DEBT DISPOSITION (BONDS)

SAU #	YEAR ISSUED	ORIGINAL PRINCIPAL	ASSET ACQUIRED	BALANCE 7/1/2007	MATURITY DATE
msad#15	1989	\$4,490,000	Gray-New Gloucester Middle School	\$360,000	11/1/2008
msad#15	1989	\$2,360,000	Gray-New Gloucester Middle School	\$354,000	11/1/2009
msad#15	1991	\$225,000	Gray-New Gloucester Middle School	\$45,000	11/1/2010
msad#15	1992	\$125,000	Gray-New Gloucester Middle School	\$37,500	11/1/2012
msad#15	1998	\$3,075,000	Burchard Dunn Elementary School	\$1,845,000	11/1/2018

msad#15 2007 \$0,187,200 Renovations and Replacements to five Burchard school buildings 11/1/2007 \$0,187,200

TOTALS \$17,846,900 \$10,013,480

State subsidy of \$1,135,000, local of \$1,940,000  
 Local debt with no State participation  
 State revolving renovation interest free funding

TrT 11/14/07

## APPENDIX A

### **I. Status Report: Governance, Leadership & Administration Committee Members:**

David Griffiths, Union #29 – Mechanic Falls  
Colleen Quint, Community Member - Minot  
Sandy MacDonald, MSAD #15 – Gray  
Kim Moody, Union #29 - Poland  
Sherri Robinson, MSAD #15 – Gray

### **Meetings Held to Date:**

October 11<sup>th</sup>, 7:00pm – 9:00pm at Gray New Gloucester Middle School

Agenda:

Review Goal for Governance  
Review Drummond Woodsum Template  
Review 2000 Census Information for All Communities  
Review and Recommend Size & Composition of New RSU Board  
Review & Recommend Method of Voting for New RSU Board  
Determine Need/Want for Local School Communities

October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 6:30pm – 8:15pm at Union #29 Central Office

Agenda:

Final Review of Governance Options from October 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting  
Final Recommendation for New RSU Board to Present to Reorganization Committee  
Review Goal for Administration  
Begin Review of Administrative Structure of Union#19 and MSAD #15  
Identify Position Duplication, if applicable

October 29<sup>th</sup>, 6:30pm – 8:15pm at Gray New Gloucester Middle School

Agenda:

Review Accounting Information – per pupil costs  
Review Comparable Administrative Structures

- new student population of 3600+
- common geographic layout

Determine if Recommendations can be made  
Document Recommendations, if applicable

Minutes of all meetings are on record with Committee Members and respective Superintendents. All minutes are available on respective school web sites.

### **Decisions and/or Recommendations to Date:**

The Governance & Administration Subcommittee has met and discussed various governance options for a new, combined school unit. We examined current practice in the two districts, reviewed resource materials regarding governance options and discussed pros and cons of those options. The Subcommittee has narrowed down the governance options to two basic choices:

- A) Small board (9 members) with local advisory committees
- B) Larger board (15 members – 3 from each town) with weighted votes and no local advisory committees

Under *Option A* the board would be comprised of a small number of representatives from each community (1-3 members, depending on the size of the town). Each member would have one vote. This board would have a total of 9 members, making it a small and potentially efficient group. Because the board is small, however, we might want to ensure that local voices and concerns are heard. This led to the suggestion of creating local “advisory committees” which could be elected in each town. The advisory committee would not have any authority to set budget or policy or anything like that. Its role would be to advise and inform and would simply serve as a liaison between the community and/or the principal and the school board member(s). This could be especially important for towns with only one representative on the new district board.

Under *Option B* the board would be comprised of 3 representatives from each town for a total of 15 members. Each member would have a weighted vote, in proportion to the town: district population. With three members from each town, a diverse set of viewpoints would be represented and rich discussion of ideas a likely outcome. With weighted voting, we ensure that the towns with the larger populations have more say in the final outcome. While weighted voting can be a bit complex, the experience in Union 29 has been very positive. This approach would also make it less likely that local advisory committees would be necessary.

	Pro	Con
Option A	Smaller, more manageable board  Allows for local input	Some towns would only have one representative (intimidating for that one person; also concern re whether that one person would represent town or have an agenda)  Uncertainty re role of local advisory committee – something legislature may address this session
Option B	More representation and ideas from each town  Avoids confusion and extra layer of local committee	Larger board, though similar in size to what already used to  Complication of weighted votes

With these two basic governance options in mind, the Subcommittee then worked to sort out just what the voting would look like. Both options are based on notions of proportionality – we just arrive at that proportionality a bit differently under each option.

Under *Option A* we used a simple approach of beginning with each town having at least one vote, and then stepping up from there as the town populations increased. We wanted to be sure to have an odd number of board members to avoid the chances of tie votes. The proposal for Option A is outlined below: Minot and Mechanic Falls would each have one member, Poland and New Gloucester would each have two members, and Gray would have three members. The idea of doubling board membership from each community was discussed, but the Subcommittee concluded that a board of 18 members was too unwieldy and so did not recommend further consideration of that option.

Under *Option B* we took a somewhat more complex approach of weighting votes by determining the ratio of each town's population to the total district population. For example, Minot holds 10.28% of the district population and New Gloucester holds 21.96% (i.e. roughly double). Each town's total "percent" is then allocated between its three board members. This means that each board member from Minot casts a vote "worth" 3.42 percent and each board member from New Gloucester casts a vote "worth" 7.32 percent. A "yes" vote on any given issue is still determined by establishing majority support for the motion across all voting members from all five towns. Each individual's vote is simply tallied in the "yes" or "no" column and the outcome is determined by the total in each.

Here, more specifically, is what the two options could look like when it comes to votes:

	Total Town Population	Option A	Option B
Minot	2,248	1 member	10.28 % or 3.42 per vote
Mechanic Falls	3,138	1	14.34% or 4.78 per vote
Poland	4,866	2	22.24% or 7.41 per vote
New Gloucester	4,803	2	21.96% or 7.32 per vote
Gray	6,820	3	31.18% or 10.39 per vote

Total U29 population = 10,252

Total SAD 15 population = 11,623

### Recommendation

*The Governance & Administration Subcommittee recommends Option B.* While this option is a bit more complex, it provides good representation for all five towns, and allows for rich exchange of ideas and viewpoints, but also ensures proportionality when it comes to voting.

### Documentation Reviewed to Date:

- 2000 Census Data for Gray, New Gloucester, Poland, Mechanic Falls and Minot
- DOE Enrollment Information for MSAD #15 and Union #29
- DOE Per Pupil Information for MSAD #15 and Union #29
- Job Descriptions for Central Office staff of MSAD #15 and Union #29
- Administrative Structures for MSAD #17, MSAD# 57 and MSAD #60

### Next Steps:

Determine if Governance, Administration & Leadership Committee should continue to work separately or collaborate with Finance Committee to:

- further evaluate per pupil costs
- compare like administrative structures and potential cost savings
- evaluate how contract negotiations will impact new administration options

## **II. Status Report: Services Subcommittee**

This committee was tasked with investigating collaboration efforts regarding Instructional Technology, Special Education, Transportation, Curriculum, Professional Development and Facilities Maintenance.

### **Technology:**

It is very evident that the Gray / New Gloucester school system has a more advanced technology program. The various software programs used to help administer the district-wide services and programs has created efficient methods of organization. These programs would be beneficial in a consolidation as few, if any, of these software programs are being used in School Union 29 Schools. Due to the fact that Gray-New Gloucester currently owns most of this software; additional licensing fees will most likely be required for the software to be shared with the added schools.

Instructional technology is available in most of the schools of the proposed RSU. The ability to broadcast from facility to facility is accessible and would be beneficial for the purposes of offering programs that may not be currently available in a particular school. All schools have computers for the students to use and although lap tops are limited to certain grade levels, there appears to be an adequate supply. Computer labs vary in size and capacity from school to school. Administrative staffing levels are adequate, but a more collaborative effort may require additional data management personnel, and a couple of staff for routine and preventative maintenance.

Each school currently has adequate staff for the purpose of instruction and maintenance of the IT programs, however it is recommended that a director oversee the RSU IT program and networks the schools together.

Bulk purchasing of computers, parts and accessories might have a cost savings, however there will be additional upfront expense to syncing the entire computer system district wide.

Regarding Technology, the committee felt this area would likely realize a low level of savings.

### **Special Education:**

There doesn't appear to be any differences between the current services being offered and what could be offered in an RSU. Special Education is going to fluctuate yearly depending on the needs of the students. The same number of administration, faculty and staff will most likely be retained due to the nature of the specialized treatments. Combining part-time specialists into full-time would be an option, but not necessarily a cost reduction. Occasionally there will be opportunities to move staff from school to school for shared expertise, however both school districts are currently doing just that. There may also be opportunities for increased day-treatment options and maybe a separate day treatment program, but a

draw back to such would be the reduction in Mainecare reimbursement. The new RSU would have about 600 students requiring various degrees of special education services.

Regarding Special Education, the committee felt this area would likely realize no level of savings.

### **Transportation:**

With the merger of the five towns, a fleet 53 of buses will come together that is used to cover a vast number of miles for student transportation. A collaborative effort would seem to reduce costs for a few reasons. Gray-New Gloucester uses computer technology to configure transportation routes using "Versitran." Having this program available to each of the other schools in the district will assist in formulating the most efficient delivery of students. In theory, the new RSU would have the ability to utilize all the buses as needed and town boundary lines would no longer need to be considered therefore overlapping that is happening now could be significantly reduced.

The vehicles are currently maintained at various facilities. Maintaining the fleet should be done in one central location by school district mechanics. With the high number of vehicles, it would most likely be necessary to operate a first and second shift of vehicle maintenance due to the current limited space for such maintenance. Bulk purchasing of fuels, fluids and parts would also offer a cost savings to the RSU.

School calendars and bell schedules would need to be considered. Unless these schedules are more unified, the delivery of transportation will become problematic. Both high schools in the RSU are sending a small contingent of students to two separate vocational / technical schools out of district. Co-curricular activities could "double up" on bus trips when traveling to neighboring communities.

There are also quite a few students that are transported out of district for special needs. It is a recommendation of this committee that consideration be given to the possibility of offering needed programs within the district as a potential reduction in transportation costs.

Each community is currently managing their transportation programs with either a transportation director or a director/manager/driver. Clearly the need for a single director is warranted and a more efficient utilization of drivers would be to cross-train in the various school districts. Substitutes could be minimized due to the single transportation department as well as the number of spare buses that would be needed in the event of a mechanical failure.

Regarding Transportation, the committee felt this area would likely realize a low level of savings.

### **Professional Development:**

A consolidation would offer a greater number of opportunities for district-wide professional development. This is somewhat complicated by the various bargaining agreements and what each contract permits for development days. Naturally this issue would iron itself out after three years of bringing all the contracts into one collective unit. All schools are offered the same opportunities, but currently not all personnel have the available time to take advantage. A unified school calendar will also be necessary for this to be viable.

Regarding Professional Development, the committee felt this area would likely realize a low level of savings.

## **Facilities Maintenance:**

In a potential RSU, there are a large number of buildings and athletic fields. In School Union 29 there are three buildings used for elementary / middle school education, a middle / high school building, a building used for central administration, and a shared facility with Poland public works for maintaining vehicles. MSAD 15 has three buildings used for elementary education, a middle school, and a high school, a building for central administration, a garage, and a storage /warehousing building. Each of these building varies in age and condition. The MSAD 15 buildings are all recently upgraded and renovated, the Poland high / middle school is less than ten years old. The elementary buildings in Poland, Minot and Mechanic Falls are all older buildings with multiple additions and have varying degrees of renovation.

Central administration in Gray-New Gloucester uses "School Dude" to organize and schedule maintenance of their facilities while SU29 has no computerization. Both districts have a central office staff person for the purposes of purchasing and sub-contracting. Each of the schools has their own maintenance and custodial staff, and in most cases, an individual in each school is both a maintenance person and custodian. Generally that person is also the supervisor of the staff in that particular school. A consolidation would seem to require a district-wide facilities director / manager, individuals employed by the RSU who specialize in carpentry, plumbing and electrical to be deployed to any building in the district requiring repairs or construction. Custodial staff will be distributed accordingly including the need to hire additional part-time staff that could fill in where necessary.

Acreage is currently maintained by either groundskeepers or school maintenance staff. One team of grounds-keeping staff could be utilized to perform routine maintenance, therefore reducing the amount of equipment that is currently owned by each building. Winter snow removal is handled differently by each school. Some are assisted by their local public works staff. Grounds keeping personnel could be utilize at those facilities needing additional assistance.

Bulk purchasing for anything from cleaning supplies, to toilet tissue, classroom supplies, and heating fuel should be centralized and administered by a district wide facilities director / manager.

Regarding Facilities Maintenance, the committee felt this area would likely realize a low level of savings.

## **Food Services:**

All schools in the RSU have its own cooking facilities and staff to operate them, each varying in size and operational expenses. This is an area that will also need a central director for the purposes of menu development, purchasing and administration. Unified menus would stabilize costs and benefit from bulk purchasing.

Regarding Food Services, the committee felt this area would likely realize a low level of savings.

### **III. Status Report: Finance Subcommittee**

The Finance Subcommittee has reviewed and discussed local debt, bonds, leases, capital improvement projects, capital reserve funds, personnel contracts, and town valuations in their many subcommittee meetings. It is very clear at this point that the major hurdle to further consolidation talks is with the \$1.2 million dollar cost shift from the School Union #29 communities to the MSAD #15 communities. There was a recommendation and discussion that if our school districts were to consolidate we would need to start at a revenue neutral basis, eliminating the \$1.2 million dollar difference.

Personnel contracts are another barrier to our two districts consolidating. Presently, the teaching contracts in Minot and Mechanic Falls are much lower than the contracts in Poland, and Gray/New Gloucester. Part of the consolidation law is to have one unified teaching contract that will add approximately \$600,000 to the towns of Minot and Mechanic Falls. The costs to Poland, Gray/New Gloucester have not yet been determined.

Currently the disposition of long-term debt and leases has created another issue on which the committee has yet to determine.

The issue of local debt has not been resolved. All capital funds and undesignated fund balances, however, will remain with the communities.

Future capital improvement needs are not accessible for Union 29 in that no current long-term plans exist for the school entities of Union 29.

Properties associated with this consolidation are attached as Appendix B and Long-Term Debt is attached as Appendix C.

### **IV. Status Report: Curriculum Subcommittee**

Our curriculum sub-committee met on October 9<sup>th</sup> to explore how the current schools in our five towns serving grades K-12 might function in a new school district (RSU). Representatives introduced themselves and briefly described the vision/mission of their schools and outlined programs. After introductions and clarifying questions, members of the committees split into a K-8 group and a 9-12 group. The K-8 group found many similarities across instructional programs and structures. The K-8 group did not see any significant roadblocks in regard to philosophy or delivery of instruction. Examples of similarities include structure of schools, community based schools in U-29 as well as the two K-2 schools in MSAD #15, standards based reporting, three-way conferencing and all day kindergarten.

9-12 similarities included the intention to create a standards based curriculum, use of the Danielson teacher indicators for teacher evaluation, emphasis on interdisciplinary instruction, same block scheduling, an similar guidance structures. 9-12 differences included the # of credits for graduation, roundtable advisory program, integrated curriculum in humanities and science and standards based grading.

The curriculum sub-committee made the decision not to meet again until after the New Year when hopefully, more direction will be given to the consolidation plan between our two school districts.

GNG-PRHS 9-12 meeting

Commonalities:

1. The intention to create a standards based curriculum
2. Use of Danielson teacher indicators for teacher evaluation
3. Emphasis on interdisciplinary instruction
4. Same block schedule
5. Same number of guidance counselors

Significant differences:

PRHS	GNG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 24 credits for graduation</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 20 credits for graduation</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Extensive work with Great Maine schools project</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Heterogeneous grouping 9-12</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Honors and college prep track</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Roundtable advisory program 9-12, required for graduation</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Integrated curriculum in Humanities and Science</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Increased teacher planning of integrated lessons</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Integrated math required 9-12</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Integrated math for struggling students</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Standards based grading</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traditional grading</li></ul>

PRHS leadership expressed significant concerns around maintaining the current high school philosophy and program if consolidation occurs. How could a single school board governing 2 high schools - even if willing to support two schools with somewhat different philosophies - manage to support the differences in teacher contracts necessitated by these different approaches to delivering education to students?

**Union 29 and SAD 15 Consolidation Meeting**  
**October 2, 2007**  
**6:30 PM**  
**Poland Regional High School Library**

**Facilitator: Bob Connors, state facilitator**

**Present:**

Norm Beauparlant, Poland citizen and budget committee  
Norm Davis, Poland School Committee  
Rick Kusturin, Union 29 Business Manager  
Dennis Duquette, Union 29 Supt.  
John Hawley, Mechanic Falls Town Manager  
Sandy MacDonald, SAD 15 School Committee  
Mary Ella Jones, Poland School Committee  
Alan Rich, SAD 15 School Committee  
Mary Martin, Elm St. School Principal  
Erin Connor, Dean of Faculty, PRHS  
Dave Griffith, Mechanic Falls School Committee  
Victoria Burns, SAD 15 Superintendent  
Jim Giffune, New Gloucester  
Eda Tripp, Minot Selectwoman  
Yvette Murray, Minot School Committee  
Vicki Dean, Mechanic Falls citizen  
Dave Lunt, New Gloucester selectman  
Sherry Robinson, SAD 15 School Committee  
Terry Towle—SAD 15 Finance Director  
Rhonda Irish—Minot Town Manager  
Cari Medd-Union 29 Curriculum Coordinator  
Cathleen Manchester, Gray  
Bill Doughty, Principal Poland Regional High School/Whittier Middle School

**Opening:**

Bob Connors opens the meeting at 6:30  
Bob gives an introduction to history of legislation

**Letters of Intent:**

- Three letters of intent
  - With SAD 15 approved
  - Stand alone of Union 29 denied due to number of students
  - Denied request to merge with SAD 39 and directed them to talk with SAD 17
- Only approved plan was with SAD 15
- SAD 15 submitted
- Bob claims the only option available to comply with the law is to merge SAD 15 and School Union 29.
- Further plan must be considered by the school committees and sent to Commissioner

- In school unions, town maintains the budget control
  - Dennis refers to handout with multiple contracts for our employee bargaining units.
  - PRHS offers AP and Honors Challenge courses
  - Fear in three towns of consolidating and loss of control. Get over it by sitting and talking.
- Bob asks for questions or comments. None at this time.
- Dennis says Union 29 has already begun efficiency plans and drives to cut costs in the three towns. Union 29 budget as a whole is about 2 million more than SAD 15.

**Items that need attention:**

- Bob moves on to the list of general items we need to attend to in this process.
  - Need a subcommittee on K-8 programming see how closely they coordinate
  - Likewise 9-12 program
  - Look at district-wide services
  - Finance and budgeting—budget comes at some point
  - Looks at all of collective bargaining agreements
    - 80% of costs are personnel
  - Admin. and Leadership need to be examined
  - Governance must be addressed.
  - Other points to address
    - Area to be served
    - Comprehensive K-12 program
    - Governing board—numbers and set up
      - Policies need to be examined
      - Apportionment to be determined
        - Can use subdistricts
      - RSU board can create local school boards and determine their powers
    - Assignment of debt
    - Budget format and approval process
      - State has defined what goes in what line.
      - We have some open discussion on the state's new budget format.
- Dave Griffiths asks what would keep us from running our two distinct systems.
- Bob says nothing would stop that, but there is intent to provide more equitable opportunity.
- Jim asks if a GNG kid could go to PRHS?
- Bob says yes, but it depends on the policies the RSU sets
- Dave G asks what do we need other than shared finances
- A general discussion of informing the public and budget documents ensues.
- Bob says a reason for the budget changes in the law is to increase understandability.
- Bob goes back to the shift to a single collective bargaining agreement.
  - Example: nurses are included in some teacher contracts but not all
- Norm Davis points out the uniqueness of PRHS contract
- Alan asks if K-12 are under the same contract and Bob says yes.

- Alan asks if we assume contracts will rise to the highest level? Bob says yes, over a time.
- Cost reductions
  - Bob says 50% reductions in admin. costs and 5% in spec. ed. etc. is in the law. This is later corrected to the reductions being in state aid, but not required local cuts.
- Jim asks for a simpler presentation of costs for better comparisons
- Vicky suggests the subcommittees could do this.
- We point out that the state reduces its aid, but not require a 50% cut in central admin.
- Alan points out numbers in EPS make it difficult if not impossible to run a district a district of 2500 with the state allocations under EPS.
- Eda asks about additional local funds and who approves
- Bob says the RSU board approve it, then it goes to the people
- Eda asks if the RSU board will determine what happens in Minot?
- Bob says yes. RSU board members, though from a community, represent all the towns in the district.
- We have some general discussion of the board member mindset in school unions and SADs.
- Dave G says we're getting close to two hours. Have to get a plan to the state by Dec.
  - We know it will cost Gray-New Gloucester \$1.5 million
  - How do we get this done?
- Bob says we do it by staffing the subcommittees

#### **Subcommittee formation:**

- Subcommittee formation: there are six of them
  - Finance subcommittee
    - **Alan Rich, temporary chair**
    - Eda Tripp
    - Jim
    - Cathleen
    - Rick
    - Terry
    - Yvette Murray
    - Number crunchers from each district to staff
    - People can sit in.
    - Dana Lee, Poland town manager
    - Scott Sawyer, Poland School Committee member
  - Governance; Leadership; admin.
    - Norm Beuparlant
    - Dave Griffiths
    - Sherry Robinson
    - **Sandy MacDonald, temporary chair**
    - Colleen Quint
    - Kim Moody
  - District-wide services

#### Opening general discussion:

- Bob welcomes all and asks for introductions
  - We do this.
  - Norm B. notes this meeting conflicts with Selectmen's meeting in Poland.
- Jim asks what savings are projected
- Bob says \$36 million. He adds that goal is also larger districts that are more efficient and provide better quality.
- Dave Lunt asks why we're tossing the baby because the water is a bit dirty.
- Bob says consolidation is the law and there are penalties for noncompliance that we won't go into tonight.
- Bob says the Legislature is not likely to change this law or even accept proposals.
- Jim says we have to consider the parents out there since the citizens will decide in the end.
- Bob says it is best to get into the work. Citizen concerns are expressed via the vote.
- Norm B. asks about each town's vote and what happens if one disapproves.
- Bob says the town(s) that say "no" would be out of the new RSU.
- Vicky says the plan can say what happens if a vote fails.
- Bob says, for example, Minot could say no. The remaining towns could form RSU. Minot would suffer penalties.
- Bob says there is a rumor that the penalties could increase.

#### Twenty-year tuition agreement:

- Dave Griffiths points out the 20 tuition agreement and that consolidation does not supersede this.
- Bob notes existing tuition contracts would be honored after consolidation.
- Bob also states towns with choice will keep it.
- Eda says bill was to save money at the top but she does not see benefit to students or in buildings.
- Dave G. reminds us of the impact of TABOR. Baldacci says this is his response.

#### Union 29 welcome:

- Dennis officially welcomes GNG
  - He notes Bob, Vicky, and he have come up with ideas for saving money.
  - Initial change would cost GNG at face value. We (Union 29) would not accept this. Lots of sensitive things on each side.
  - Dennis wants to continue with due diligence and talk to the state if it does not work out.
- Bob says due diligence means you must make a legitimate effort to get consolidation done.

#### Policy objectives of the consolidation law:

- Bill as passed also have 8 policy objectives, only one if financial
  - He reads the 8 points.
- Bob points out the deadline date of Dec. 1
  - Commissioner will respond by Dec. 15
  - Local referendum on Jan. 15.
  - By July 1 2009 only RSUs and Municipal school units will exist.

**Referendum issues:**

- Alan Rich notes that plan must be prepared and voted on by Jan 15. but cannot be changed after approved by voters
- Bob says Dec. 1<sup>st</sup> date is seen as very aggressive state-wide.
- Alan says June referendum is possible, but will need completion of plan by April due to 45 days for public notice.
- Jim asks what state meant by no Unions or SADs. Towns are “delightfully independent.”

**Governance structures:**

- Bob explains the different types of school districts in Maine
  - Municipal
  - SAD
  - School Unions
  - Community School District—usually secondary
- Jim clarifies the multiple budgets and checks in school unions.
- Cathleen notes state will pay for first referendum, but not second (June) referendum.
- Dave Lunt points out Jan 15 referendum violates state election statutes.
- Cathleen asks if it can be a fairly vague plan.
- Vicky points out we could submit a plan that does not cover all points.
- Jim notes that existing contracts with teachers stay in place.
- Bob says law says by time last existing contract expires, a new RSU wide contract must exist.
- Mary Ella asks how RSU functions.
- Bob says it runs similar to an SAD.
- Dave asks about the new budget approval process and Bob explains
- Alan points out the difference is the referendum final approval
- Norm asks about resulting new school committee
- Bob says the number is determined in the plan to be submitted.
- Norm B. asks about the financing. Bob says it is based primarily on valuation.

**District/Union information:**

- Bob passes to Vicky and Dennis for info. on the district.
- Vicky refers to notebooks and info. provided by Dennis and her.
  - Vicky refers to the blurb she passed out.
  - Have 1900 kids; expect enrollments to go up a bit.
  - 350 staff
  - 5 schools
  - Says she is positive we are similar on philosophy and what we want for our kids.
  - (See Vicky’s handout for details of her comments).
- Dennis goes to his handout. Refer to this for details of his comments.
  - Started July 1
  - Hired business manager
  - Building trust
  - Astounded by support from staff, admin. and school committee
  - Renovating office services through Union 29 office.
  - Build communication with town managers; two of three are here tonight

- Norm Davis
- **John Hawley, temporary chair**
- Pat Boure
- Terry Towle
- Skip Crane
- Dana Lee
- Bob says he has no problem with the superintendents doing the K-12 program work.
- K-12 program staff –supts.
  - Vicky Dean
- Alan suggests we're all frustrated and know the financial problems. We must comply with the law. Under due diligence we must show that we comport with the law. Suggests we not make public statements about what might happen since that can hurt in the long run. Rumors can hurt this a good deal. Need to be tactfully diplomatic.
- Bob calls for temporary chairs of committees
- Bob says he'll have an item to elect a chair of the large group at next meeting
- He asks that subcommittees meet before the next large group meeting.
- Next meeting date;
  - Date is 10/16, 6:30 to 8:30- GNG Middle School

Notes taken by Bill Doughty, PRHS/WMS

## **Minutes**

### **K-12 Reorganization Program Subcommittee Report**

**Date: October 9, 2007**

**Minutes Recorded By: Victoria Burns, Superintendent**

#### Members Present:

Union #19

Dennis Duquette, Superintendent

Bill Dougherty, PRHS Principal

Cari Medd, Union 29 Curriculum Coordinator

Erin Connor, Dean of Faculty, PRHS

Brandi Beauchesne, PCS Title 1 Math

Mary Martin, Elm Street Principal

#### MSAD #15

Victoria Burns, Superintendent

Erin Chase, Director of Special Services

Joan Tremberth, Adult Education

Paul Penna, G-NG HS Principal

Dan Joseph, Russell School Principal

Donna Beeley, Memorial School Principal

Sherry Levesque, Middle School Principal

Bruce Beasley, Dunn School Principal

Victoria Burns and Dennis Duquette outlined the purpose for the meeting: explore how the current schools serving grades K-12 might function in a new district.

Representatives introduced themselves and briefly described the vision/mission of their school and outlined programs. After introductions and clarifying questions, the members of the Committee split into a K-8 group and a 9-12 group. Each group focused on the following questions:

What do we have in common?

If we merged, what current programs could benefit both districts?

Are there resources that could be used to create a new program across all schools?

#### **K-8**

The members found similarities across instructional programs and structures. K-8 did not see any significant roadblocks in regard to philosophy or delivery of instruction.

Examples of similarities include:

Structure of schools,

Community-based school especially the elementary in Union 29 as well as the two K-2 schools in MSAD #15.

Standard Based Reports

Three way Conferencing

All Day kindergarten

## NWEA 3-8

Guidance Structures  
SPED structures  
Gifted and Talented  
Response To Intervention focus  
Grade Level Team Leaders  
Responsive Classroom  
Student Advisory Teams

The K-8 members felt that there were opportunities for joint use of the following resources:

Technology (Data management)  
NWEA  
Professional Development  
Common Calendar  
SPED Programming  
English Language Learner  
Specialists  
Contracted Services  
Nurses  
Co-curricula.

Barriers to joint efforts include transportation, association rules related to different counties, calendar, teacher contracts, and issues related to local control.

## 9-12

The members found some similarities in current high school philosophies, standards-based assessments, schedules, student personalization, types of programs and teacher evaluation. Both schools were committed to providing support structures for all students and moving all students to post secondary.

Union #29 stated concerns regarding the "uniqueness" of the high school and stated the following barriers:

Graduation requirements  
Standard-based grading  
Approach to advisory groups  
Heterogeneous grouping  
Teacher contracts.

Due to the fact that this was a first meeting, it was decided that the group needed to state its "worries" regarding consolidation.

1. Loss of local control. -examples include, loss of programming valued by a particular community (such as small class size# at the Poland High School).
2. Loss of personalization due to a large geographic distance-how will administrators and specialists know their communities and their students?

3. Calendar and governance issues
4. Fear that consolidation will focus on only economic issues and not student issues.
5. Impact of regional support for specific programs (Poland High School and certain positions such as MSAD #15 special education transition coordinator.
6. Consolidation will distract energies from current school improvement goals in both districts.
7. The time and attention needed to bring diverse groups of people together in a short period of time.

**CONSOLIDATION FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING  
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2007  
6:30 – 8:30 P.M.  
GRAY-NEW GLOUCESTER MIDDLE SCHOOL**

**Subcommittee members:**

GNG

Alan Rich  
Jim Giffune  
Cathy Manchester  
Terry Towle

Union 29

Eda Tripp  
Rick Kusturin  
Yvette Murray  
Scott Sawyer  
Norm Beauparlant

**AGENDA**

1. **Evaluation of Cost Centers** Where can savings be made by sharing purchases?
2. **Methodology of Dividing Funds Raised to Pay for New RSU.**
3. **Contractual Issues** How can negotiated contracts be aligned within the RSU?

**Note:** Dr. Rich is aware that Tuesday is Selectman's meeting, however it is the only date available this week. All information will be generated to the subcommittee members prior to the Oct. 16<sup>th</sup> full meeting.

**Directions:**

- The Middle School is located at the end of Libby Hill Road. Libby Hill is on the right, approximately 12 miles south on Rt. 26 from the Poland Community School. There is a sign at the end of the road indicating where the schools are (The high school is also on Libby Hill Road on the right- drive past the high school to the end of the road.)
- If you are coming south on Rt. 100 from the Auburn area, take a right at Rt. 26 in the center of Gray- go north and bear right at the yield sign (Rt. 26A is to the left- don't take the left). Libby Hill Road is on the left.

**Proposed Regional School Unit #45  
Status Report on Governance, Leadership & Administration  
November 2007**

**Committee Members:**

David Griffiths, Union #29 – Mechanic Falls  
Colleen Quint, Community Member - Minot  
Sandy MacDonald, MSAD #15 – Gray  
Kim Moody, Union #29 - Poland  
Sherri Robinson, MSAD #15 – Gray

**Meetings Held to Date:**

October 11<sup>th</sup>, 7:00pm – 9:00pm at Gray New Gloucester Middle School

Agenda:

Review Goal for Governance  
Review Drummond Woodsum Template  
Review 2000 Census Information for All Communities  
Review and Recommend Size & Composition of New RSU Board  
Review & Recommend Method of Voting for New RSU Board  
Determine Need/Want for Local School Communities

October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 6:30pm – 8:15pm at Union #29 Central Office

Agenda:

Final Review of Governance Options from October 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting  
Final Recommendation for New RSU Board to Present to Reorganization Committee  
Review Goal for Administration  
Begin Review of Administrative Structure of Union#19 and MSAD #15  
Identify Position Duplication, if applicable

October 29<sup>th</sup>, 6:30pm – 8:15pm at Gray New Gloucester Middle School

Agenda:

Review Accounting Information – per pupil costs  
Review Comparable Administrative Structures

- new student population of 3600+
- common geographic layout

Determine if Recommendations can be made  
Document Recommendations, if applicable

Minutes of all meetings are on record with Committee Members and respective Superintendents. All minutes are available on respective school web sites.

**Decisions and/or Recommendations to Date:**

The Governance & Administration Subcommittee has met and discussed various governance options for a new, combined school unit. We examined current practice in the two districts, reviewed resource materials regarding governance options and discussed pros and cons of those options. The Subcommittee has narrowed down the governance options to two basic choices:

- A) Small board (9 members) with local advisory committees
- B) Larger board (15 members – 3 from each town) with weighted votes and no local advisory committees

Under *Option A* the board would be comprised of a small number of representatives from each community (1-3 members, depending on the size of the town). Each member would have one vote. This board would have a total of 9 members, making it a small and potentially efficient group. Because the board is small, however, we might want to ensure that local voices and concerns are heard. This led to the suggestion of creating local “advisory committees” which could be elected in each town. The advisory committee would not have any authority to set budget or policy or anything like that. Its role would be to advise and inform and would simply serve as a liaison between the community and/or the principal and the school board member(s). This could be especially important for towns with only one representative on the new district board.

Under *Option B* the board would be comprised of 3 representatives from each town for a total of 15 members. Each member would have a weighted vote, in proportion to the town:district population. With three members from each town, a diverse set of viewpoints would be represented and rich discussion of ideas a likely outcome. With weighted voting, we ensure that the towns with the larger populations have more say in the final outcome. While weighted voting can be a bit complex, the experience in Union 29 has been very positive. This approach would also make it less likely that local advisory committees would be necessary.

	Pro	Con
Option A	Smaller, more manageable board  Allows for local input	Some towns would only have one representative (intimidating for that one person; also concern re whether that one person would represent town or have an agenda)  Uncertainty re role of local advisory committee – something legislature may address this session
Option B	More representation and ideas from each town	Larger board, though similar in size to what already used to

	Avoids confusion and extra layer of local committee	Complication of weighted votes
--	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------

With these two basic governance options in mind, the Subcommittee then worked to sort out just what the voting would look like. Both options are based on notions of proportionality – we just arrive at that proportionality a bit differently under each option.

Under *Option A* we used a simple approach of beginning with each town having at least one vote, and then stepping up from there as the town populations increased. We wanted to be sure to have an odd number of board members to avoid the chances of tie votes. The proposal for Option A is outlined below: Minot and Mechanic Falls would each have one member, Poland and New Gloucester would each have two members, and Gray would have three members. The idea of doubling board membership from each community was discussed, but the Subcommittee concluded that a board of 18 members was too unwieldy and so did not recommend further consideration of that option.

Under *Option B* we took a somewhat more complex approach of weighting votes by determining the ratio of each town’s population to the total district population. For example, Minot holds 10.28% of the district population and New Gloucester holds 21.96% (i.e. roughly double). Each town’s total “percent” is then allocated between its three board members. This means that each board member from Minot casts a vote “worth” 3.42 percent and each board member from New Gloucester casts a vote “worth” 7.32 percent. A “yes” vote on any given issue is still determined by establishing majority support for the motion across all voting members from all five towns. Each individual’s vote is simply tallied in the “yes” or “no” column and the outcome is determined by the total in each.

Here, more specifically, is what the two options could look like when it comes to votes:

	Total Town Population	Option A	Option B
Minot	2,248	1 member	10.28 % or 3.42 per vote
Mechanic Falls	3,138	1	14.34% or 4.78 per vote
Poland	4,866	2	22.24% or 7.41 per vote
New Gloucester	4,803	2	21.96% or 7.32 per vote
Gray	6,820	3	31.18% or 10.39 per vote

Total U29 population = 10,252

Total SAD 15 population = 11,623

Recommendation

**The Governance & Administration Subcommittee recommends *Option B*.** While this option is a bit more complex, it provides good representation for all five towns, and allows for rich exchange of ideas and viewpoints, but also ensures proportionality when it comes to voting.

This recommendation was favorably acknowledged and accepted via a straw poll by the Reorganization Planning Committee during the October 30<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Documentation Reviewed to Date:**

- 2000 Census Data for Gray, New Gloucester, Poland, Mechanic Falls and Minot
- DOE Enrollment Information for MSAD #15 and Union #29
- DOE Per Pupil Information for MSAD #15 and Union #29
- Job Descriptions for Central Office staff of MSAD #15 and Union #29
- Administrative Structures for MSAD #17, MSAD# 57 and MSAD #60

**Next Steps:**

Determine if Governance, Administration & Leadership Committee should continue to work separately or collaborate with Finance Committee to:

- further evaluate per pupil costs
- compare like administrative structures and potential cost savings
- evaluate how contract negotiations will impact new administration options

Noted + Verki + Steve 11  
10-29-07 ✓

**Consolidation Meeting between School Union 29 and MSAD 15, Gray/New  
Gloucester  
Tuesday 10/16/07 6:30 PM at GNG Middle School**

**Present:**

Terry Towle, GNG Finance Manager  
Jim Giffune, GNG Selectman  
Steve Holbrook, Minot School Committee  
Eda Tripp, Minot Selectwoman  
Colleen Quint, Minot Citizen  
Karen Caprio, GNG School Committee  
Todd Bennett, GNG School Committee  
Rick Kusturin, U29 Business Manager  
Sharon Vandermay, GNG School Committee?  
Bill Doughty, PRHS/WMS principal, U29  
Kim Moody, Poland School Committee  
Sandy MacDonald, GNG School Committee  
John Hawley, Mechanic Falls Town Manager  
Norm Beauparlant, Poland citizen  
Bob Connors, state-appointed facilitator  
Alan Rich, GNG School Committee  
Dave Griffiths, Mechanic Falls School Committee  
Vicky Burns, MSAD 15 Superintendent  
Dennis Duquette, Union 29 Superintendent

**Bob Connors began with an update and overview:**

- Dec. 1<sup>st</sup> is the deadline for submitting consolidation plans
- All units must submit a plan
- DoE expects the plans to be incomplete
- DoE will send out a template of the things to be in the plan
- Low receivers/high receivers—Bob expects some legislation to smooth this out
- 60 odd bills (titles only) have been submitted to change the consolidation law
- Bob says legislative leadership says no major changes will be made in the consolidation law.
- Group of 10 decides on what goes to short session of legis. in January
- Norm B. asks if the state says publicly that plans won't be complete.
  - Bob says facilitators have heard this.
- Questions:
  - Alan asks if legis. leaders are involved in the decision not consider major changes.
  - Colleen confirms that they are.
- **Elections**
  - Bob says we need a chair and recorder/ secretary.
  - Bob suggests we need a name for the group
  - Bob asks for thoughts on the chair and suggests co-chairs.
  - Steve suggests Colleen as co-chair
    - Colleen says she will serve
  - Alan Rich volunteers

- Bob declares Alan and Colleen to be co-chairs by acclamation.
- Bill is elected secretary/recorder for the meetings
  - Co-chairs will check meeting notes before distribution.
- **Supt. comments**
  - -Vicky mentions that Lois Snow-Mellow asks for a meeting with Supt.s and high school principals on the consolidation law.
  - Alan suggests representatives from both districts attend including legislators from all the towns
  - Dennis says the Legislators want input on the new legislation about consolidation.
  - Norm B asks if we have info. on the proposed legis.?
  - Dennis says no
  - Kim says citizenry will have an influence on the bills that move through to consideration.
  
- **Questions:**
  - Steve asks if we'll tell the truth or paint it rosy.
  - Dennis says we tell the truth.
  - Bob says Commissioner has the power to impose penalties for non-compliance.
  - Meeting with the Legislators is Nov. 8<sup>th</sup> at 9 AM.
  
- **Subcommittee reports**
  - **Curriculum and Program**
    - Vicky describes in brief the process and refers to notes from 9-12 meeting.
    - Dennis points out commonalities and differences
      - Programs have similarities such as guidance and gifted and talented
      - Transportation
      - K-8 discussion was positive
      - High Schools meeting
        - Same philosophy on college,
        - Uniqueness of PRHS
          - Significant program and structural differences exist between the two high schools.
      - Vicky sees clearly the difference in Union approach and district approach
      - Great worry on loss of local control and loss of class sizes.
      - She see a common commitment to personalization
      - Calendars and governance are different between the two schools.
      - Vicky acknowledges a number of unique programs at PRHS.
      - No agreement to come back together for another meeting emerged.
      - Vicky suggests that work on special education and technology could benefit both schools.

- Bill gives examples of major differences between the two schools
  - Graduation requirements
    - PRHS has 24; GNG has 20, a 20% difference.
    - PRHS includes
      - 4 years of English, science, math, advisory (Roundtable) and co-curricular.
      - 2 years of World Language
      - 1 semester of technology
      - 1.5 years of Wellness
      - 2 years of arts
  - Roundtable advisory
    - GNG does not have one
    - PRHS: every day 30 minutes; same advisor over 4 years; major project each year including public presentations in sophomore and senior years that are required for graduation.
  - Teachers' contract
    - State's only performance pay contract. No performance, no pay increase.
    - Advisory (Roundtable) as part of regular teaching load. Grade level team planning time during the day
    - After school professional development every Tuesday.
    - 10 days professional development per year.
- Vicky says she does not see these as barriers
- Several comments on high school programs were made
- Dave G asks if a single contract is required in the new RSU.
  - Bob says yes under the law.
- Jim asks when the contracts will run out
  - GNG runs out this year
  - PCS/WMS runs out this year.
  - PRHS runs out June 2009.
- Bob explains the details of contracts running out and the transition to a single contract.
- Bob points out that contracts are to be considered by the finance subcommittee.
- Kim asks if the state has a study on the financial impact of this contract consolidation.
- Eda says Kim's question is important and that mill rates must be considered also.
- Colleen points out that legislators will need to know these impacts to make wise decisions.
- Kim notes that GNG, with a weighted vote, could vote out Roundtable, for example.
- Vicky says the question is whether you believe in personalization. She says if the fundamental belief system is the same, then how you do it could be different.
- Vicky says the Commissioner's vision for high school graduation requirements could make all this different.
- Steve says we can't control future boards.

- Colleen says the report out could say the philosophy could be the same with different manifestations.
- The minutes reflect that the common beliefs on direction can be different in manifestation.
- Todd says two issues are controlling finances and the form programs will take.
- Bob says RSU board will be the overall controlling board. RSU Board will decide what your budget will be.
- John Hawley asks if we have influence.

### **Governance Admin/Leadership subcommittee**

- Met on 10/11 with good representation and attendance.
  - Reviewed Drummond Woodsum information.
  - Reviewed 2000 census
  - Most talk was about existing board functioning
    - How weighted votes work
    - Worked through some options but not for tonight.
    - Spent time on how often committees meet
    - Agreed to chew on the options until the next time they meet.
    - Discussed admin. at the local central offices
    - Will invite supts. to next meeting to talk about org. charts
      - Where are similar or doubled positions
    - 10; /22 at 6:30 at Poland CO is next meeting.
      - Goal is to return a recommendation, possibly with options, to the larger group.
  - Dave points out that population indicates GNG would have the majority, likely by one member.
  - Get population figures from Dave
  - Get numbers of members from Dave
  - Colleen confirms good progress was made in the first meeting.
  - Alan asks if we have resources from state that will check that governance proposals are legal.
  - Sandy says we have quite a few options.
  - Kim asks if we could have org. charts and job descriptions prior to Monday night so they can be reviewed.
  - Steve asks when we give input to the subcommittee.
    - Sandy says come to the meeting
    - Steve says he prefers the larger number of members.

### **Finance**

- Terry Towle, Rick, Norm B. and Alan Rich
  - Reviewed governance control structures
  - Reviewed admin. programs, finance programs, maintenance programs.
  - Both use good accounting systems
  - Reviewed items that are fixed costs such as oil, electricity.
  - Volume discounts already running well in both districts
  - Consensus reached that a tax neutral method was needed to raise the funds for a new RSU.
    - GNG raises on town's value, not number of students
    - Gray pays about 66% due to different valuations

- Alan Rich says this difference in valuation methods must be addressed for anything else in finance to work.
- U29 uses enrollment and valuations
- Alan says GNG paying 1.2 million more and Union 29 less will not work.
- If state does not change the subsidy distribution, then the voters may choose the penalty over the higher taxes.
- The state would need to increase GNG subsidy to make the changes tax neutral.
- Terry estimates the penalty for non-consolidation in GNG would be \$300,000 to \$500,000.
- Eda points out that she did not get notice of the last finance committee.
- Alan says team will set next meeting date tonight
- Questions:
  - Sandy asks if we know what options we have to balance the tax burden.
  - Jim asks when the voters will get to act on this.
  - Bob says it will be in January or June
  - Eda notes we could agree that this won't work.
  - Colleen assumes town should go forward with their budget plans
  - Bob claims budget format must follow what's in the law.
  - Dave asks Rick what the penalties would be in Union 29.
  - Rick says his estimate for one town is \$1 million.
- **District-wide services—John Hawley**
  - Met last Friday
  - Curriculum to be passed on to others
  - Likewise special ed. to go on to someone else
  - Transport, maint. facilities remained
  - Some good opportunities exist
    - For example, 3 Union 29 towns each have a transport manager
    - GNG uses 1 and a computer program
    - 54 School buses across both with 9 spares.
      - Why have so many?
      - Maint. of buses is different
        - Poland does own, GNG does own
        - Minot, McFalls contract out
      - Could combine some bus routes, even across town lines
    - Maint.
      - Differences in staffing levels
      - PRHS has a maint. person and groundskeepers
      - John says GNG has some needs and we might share
      - GNG has a good maint. scheduling computer program.
      - Took a look at buildings
        - GNG has renovated seriously
        - PRHS is almost brand new
        - Minot, McFalls are a bit more aged.
    - Expects committee to meet again next week.

- Colleen asks about possible changes in pick up and was told it was a tender subject.
- Steve asks about the advantages of a computer system.
- Dennis says Versitran will analyze the current routes and find efficiencies. Computer recalculates the route to get the best deal.
- Dennis says we might save \$75,000.
- Next meeting date needed and the options fly.
  - Oct. 30<sup>th</sup>. at 6:30 at PCS in the multi purpose room
  - Same agenda as tonight.
    - Facilitator's update
    - Superintendents' updates
    - Subcommittee reports
      - Finance
      - Governance
      - District-wide services
  - Supts will confirm the date and send it out.
- Name idea
  - Colleen proposes RSU 44.

Notes taken by Bill Doughty.

NOV - 8 2007

**SAD 15 & Union 29 Administration & Governance  
Minutes  
October 22, 2007**

Meeting held at Union 29 Central Office Conference Room, 6:30 PM

**Members Present:** Sandy MacDonald, *Gray*; Sherri Robinson, *Gray*; Colleen Quint, *Minot*; Dave Griffiths, *Mechanic Falls*; Kim Moody, *Poland*  
**Guests:** Vickie Burns, Dennis Duquette & Terry Towle

Sandy opened meeting

Passed out: agenda

Governance options chart created by Colleen

Organization charts

Reviewed minutes and then discussed the goals for tonight's meeting.

A lot of discussion to start the meeting reviewing our recommendations of last meeting. Went over the RSU board that was discussed...weighted voting or not, size of board, how will we present our suggestions to the larger committee. Had a lot of dialogue about what the larger committee will be doing, how it will vote and make decisions; when our recommendations will go to communities and how they will vote. Went over the comparison chart that Colleen put together...we will use it to show our thought process and what we have come up with options for the RSU Board. All agreed that the comparison document provided a good summary of the committee's discussion. Everyone concurred with continuing to support the weighted vote recommendation.

Moved on to organizational charts and job descriptions that were provided. Was difficult to compare them and see what each school district currently has. Discussed how we would measure what is part of Central Office expenses. Terry recommended that we use the budget info provided by the State...the coding defines what falls under what part of the budget and the state breaks down everything. That will be much simpler and where we decided to start... We will get the info and look at everything that is listed as a central office expense and begin our comparison there. We will look job descriptions later.

\*Will need to get reports on central office and administration reports. Admin costs are everything that is non-instructional.

Decided to come up with a goal for our group...what do we need to have done by 12/1/07?

- Need to come up with a leadership chart but have no idea what that is supposed to look like. Hoping that the state will have a template
- Will get information on district of comparable size to see how they run and to get an idea on the cost of running, (what does a region as large as our RSU look like?)
- Will try to breakdown the current costs of administration, (using budget info), and find the best way to restructure for greatest savings...get specific figures
- Look at the cost of technology and grants and find out what will happen to that money. Look at the tech schools we are using, PATHS & LRTC, and compare costs.
- Try to be creative in our solutions. Will look at all the details before making recommendations.

We had further discussion clarifying how each of our organizations currently work; how we establish policy now. Reviewed the way that the various boards ran in Union 29 and the Board in SAD 15...how many meetings each had, what each was in charge of, number of contracts, etc.

**Need for next meeting:**

- Accounting reports from Terry & Dennis. Will need to see administrative costs broken down...figure percentage per pupil; look at everything non-educational
- The organizational chart of districts with about 3500 students; look at administrative costs
- Any template from the state showing what they want units to look like

Next meeting 6:30 on Nov. 29 at the GNG Middle School. I will try to get the library and if not available will book a classroom

Adjourned

NOV - 8 2007

G

**SAD 15 & Union 29 Administration & Governance  
Minutes  
October 29, 2007**

Meeting held at GNGMS, 6:30 PM

**Members Present:** Sandy MacDonald, *Gray*; Sherri Robinson, *Gray*; Colleen Quint, *Minot*; Dave Griffiths, *Mechanic Falls*

Information was distributed from the superintendents:

- Financial breakdown per pupil expenditures
- EPS Calculation templates
- Comparison of administrative structure for districts of approx. 3500 students
- Other assorted info

The meeting was a fairly informal discussion of the information provided. We spent most time on the per pupil expenditures for our current school units that Terry Towle provided. The sheet was broken down by town and compared with the state average. We reviewed and found that we needed further clarification of info and came up with about seven questions that needed to be answered. Sandi sent the questions to Dennis & Vicki for answers.

Questions:

1. Why is the cost of regular instruction so different between the towns, especially for Mechanic Falls?
2. What makes up "other instruction"?
3. Is the high debt in Poland only due to the high school or is there something else?
4. What is included under student/staff support?
5. When will the debt for GNG from the high school renovation be showing up?
6. Can we get a breakdown of the costs for Union 29 as one unit, not as individual towns?
7. As we consider the consolidation of administration, are we looking at all administrative categories or just what is contained in category 2320 on the accounting reports?

Once we get an answer to these questions we will be able to compare the information a little better. Want to make sure that we are looking at the correct info and compare "apples to apples".

Discussed where exactly savings are supposed to come from...just Central Office and, if so, how will that work. Didn't seem reasonable that only cost savings would be expected from that one source. Talked a bit about the effects of cutting central office and possible job loss but did not want to discuss that yet, way too early. Once we can compare things accurately will need to see how jobs can be consolidated.

Felt that we were pretty much done with the governance part and could make our recommendation for a board with 3 members from each town and a weighted vote. As far as the administrative decisions, could not go forward without the answers to questions and without some clarification from the main group on what is needed. We need to know what information is required for the 12/1 deadline and make sure that we have that. Will bring the information to the regional meeting and see what else we need to do...many things we are discussing now are also being discussed by finance so will wait to see what more we need.

Next meeting will be set up after consolidation board meets on 10/30 if needed

Adjourned

## **School Consolidation**

**Sub Committee: District-wide Services**

**Meeting: Tuesday, October, 23, 2007, SAD 15 Offices**

**Present: Pat Boyle, Dana Lee, Vicki Burns, Karen Caprio, Norm Davis, Craig Moore, Terry Towle, John Hawley**

**Absent: Skip Crane**

Meeting began at 10a.m.

Minutes of the previous meeting were reviewed and accepted.

Discussion took place regarding out-of-district transportation needs. GNG transports students on two buses to Portland (PASS), and uses vans to take students to Falmouth, Bath and the old Pineland Center and one additional van to PASS. U29 buses students to Lewiston and Raymond.

It was suggested that more in-depth discussion regarding Special Ed transportation be taken up at the next meeting and with the SE Directors from each district.

The question of contracting transportation services came up and GNG had previous tried but found it to be more costly. Poland used to use Western Maine Transportation.

With the increased population of SE students, it was asked about the feasibility of offering programs in house instead of busing elsewhere. With the consolidation, one of the district administration offices will become vacant. Possibility of using it for special education?

Discussion took place regarding conflicting school calendars and bell schedules. It was questioned how storm days would be dealt with as weather conditions can be vastly different from one end of the district to the other. More compatible schedules would make it easier to share transportation services, shared classes and programs, extra curricular activities and the Distance Learning Program. This could also help with teacher development.

Combined co-curricular activities could be offered for programs that would only have a limited number of students in a particular school. Would we consolidate competitive teams? It was determined that if there were enough students to create a team at a school we would be similar to Portland and Deering.

Another idea for transportation savings was busing more than one team when traveling to areas where competitions are in close proximity. This was tried in the past and Coaches seemed to have an issue with the concept.

Discussion took place about technology and the ability to expand the Distance Learning Program. We looked at the number of positions and staff. The only potential savings we could estimate was having a district wide director and having teachers and techs in the schools. We looked at management programs. GNG has many programs to assist with all aspects of administration. The programs would have to be put in all the schools for ease of administration from the central offices.

We looked at computers in the classrooms and laptops issued to students. There are computer labs in various locations throughout the district but not every school has one, not all schools have student issued laptops. Some schools would need IT upgrades to be able to use administration software programs.

Potential savings could be recognized with bulk purchase of computers, as needed.

Library programs were briefly discussed and it seems to make sense that one certified librarian could supervise the local school's libraries that will be overseen by Ed techs.

We also took a look at food service. Using the administrative software Nutrakids, menus could be uniform district wide for potential savings in food purchasing. One nutritionist / director for the district could oversee cooks in the schools. Concern was expressed for the potential loss of Title One funding due to the change in number of free or reduced lunches.

A spreadsheet was made available showing the cost per student expenses for each school in the proposed RSU.

The next meeting we'll take a closer look at professional development, special education and capital improvements and begin to draft the report of recommendations for potential cost savings in a consolidation.

Next meeting will be Tuesday, November 6<sup>th</sup>, 10:00 am and Union 29 offices.

10 12 30 <sup>29</sup> Union 29  
' ~~revised~~  
all set per Sharon 10/24/07

Reorganization Planning Committee  
Finance Subcommittee Minutes  
Date of Meeting: October 23, 2007  
Union 29 Central Office  
Minutes Taken By: Victoria Burns

Members Present: Dr. A. Rich, R. Kusturin, T. Towle, J. Giffune, N. Beau, E. Tripp and V. Burns

Community Members Present: Sharon Vandermay, NG and Rhonda Irish, Minot

Dr. Rich presented an overview of the agenda and made introductions.

The financial template prepared by the state was reviewed. A brief discussion regarding the process for state valuation was conducted. The members considered the 1.2 million dollar cost shift to the Towns of Gray and New Gloucester. They considered looking at a new formula using pupil and valuation to neutralize the cost shift. The Committee was concerned, that due to state law for funding, this would not work. The Committee felt that perhaps a new way to allocate the local share might create a neutral cost. Population was looked as a possible factor in a new formula.

It was suggested that savings in other areas may offset the subsidy costs, but it is unlikely that there is a 1.2 million dollar savings.

Mr. Kusturin suggested that the only way to begin the discussion was to take the 1.2 million dollars off the table and ask the state to come up with an answer for the cost shift. The Committee agreed for the moment to put that barrier aside and look at other issues.

Local debt is a barrier. MSAD #15 has a local debt associated with the Facilities Upgrade and Renovation Bond ready for payment in 08-09. Mr. Towle reminded the Committee that Gray-New Gloucester would be paying the majority portion of any state subsidized debt incurred by the Poland HS.

Per Pupil Expenditures for MSAD #15 and Union #29 Towns were reviewed. There is a difference in per pupil expenditures.

Even though there seems to be an overwhelming barrier of cost shift to Gray and New Gloucester, the Committee unanimously agreed to go forward with the problem solving process. There is no option due to the requirement of the law and the penalties imposed by not complying. Dr. Rich asked that we look at a combination of valuation and per pupil to see if we can find a solution to the cost shift.

Sharon Vandermay summarized the discussion thus far:

1. 1.2 million cost shift to Gray and New Gloucester will be set aside in order to ask the state to help find a solution.
2. Local Debt Amounts must be addressed.

3. Savings from administration and transportation will be funneled into this Committee from Governance and Systems.
4. Penalties for saying "no" are a factor.
5. Any savings will be deducted from the cost shift to see if that makes a difference to Gray and New Gloucester.
6. It was decided that any capital resources should stay with the towns.
7. Reorganization costs must not be forgotten in the total financial picture
  - a. New organizational chart and mid management positions

The Committee agreed that its job was to take a realistic approach to reorganization issues. Penalties for each town were briefly discussed. Mr. Kusturin passed out a letter from the Commissioner dated July 31 clarifying reorganization implementation and the penalties for not conforming. High receivers of subsidy would be impacted such as Minot and Mechanic Falls.

Summary:

1. The 1.2 million is the largest barrier to consolidation. The State must make the cost shift go away by working out a new formula.
2. Personnel costs due to merging contracts are a barrier. This cost will stay with the reorganized District.
3. The Committee will get the additional local funds distributions to review a next meeting.
4. Savings through governance and systems will funnel into the Finance Committee from the Governance and Systems Committees.
5. The responsibility for Local Debt must be resolved.
6. Capital Assets and reserves should stay in the Towns that raised them

The next meeting for Finance will be November 8 at MSAD #15 Central Office (6:30-8:30)

# **Regional Planning Committee Meeting**

**MSAD # 15/School Union #29**

**Consolidation Planning**

**Tuesday, October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

**6:30 – 8:30**

**Poland Community School**

**1250 Maine Street**

**Poland, ME 04274**

.....

GOAL: To develop a plan for the consolidation of the two school districts in conformance with State Law and to determine how expenditures can be reduced while student learning is improved.

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Preparation of and process for approving December 1<sup>st</sup> report
3. Discussion of process by which Consolidation Committee will make decisions
4. Reports from sub-committees and discussion
  - a. Curriculum/programs
  - b. Governance
  - c. Finance and budgeting
  - d. Services
5. Next meetings

10/30/07

Present:

Jim Giffune, GNG Citizen  
Steve Holbrook, Minot School Committee  
Eda Tripp, Minot Selectwoman  
Colleen Quint, Minot Citizen  
Sharon Vandermay, GNG School Committee?  
Bill Doughty, PRHS/WMS principal, U29  
Kim Moody, Poland School Committee  
Sandy MacDonald, GNG School Committee  
John Hawley, Mechanic Falls Town Manager  
Norm Beuparlant, Poland citizen  
Bob Connors, state-appointed facilitator  
Alan Rich, GNG School Committee  
Vicky Burns, MSAD 15 Superintendent  
Dennis Duquette, Union 29 Superintendent  
Ayesha Farag-Davis, PCS principal  
Mary Martin, Elm Street School Principal  
Wendy Sanborn, Poland Selectwoman  
Dave Griffiths, McFalls School Committee  
Norm Davis, Poland School Committee  
Rick Kusturin, U29 Business manager  
Mary Ella Jones, Poland School Committee  
Karen Caprio, Dir. of Curr. and Staff Dev.  
Sheryl Robinson, MSAD 15 School Committee  
Sharon Vandermay, MSAD 15 School Committee  
Rhonda Irish, Minot town clerk

**Colleen speaking as Co-Chair on evening arrangements:**

Before subcommittee reports we have agenda items on

1. Preparation and process for approving Dec. 1<sup>st</sup> report
2. Discussion on how the Consolidation Committee will make decisions, particularly post Dec. 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Colleen asks Bob Connors what the state expects on Dec. 1<sup>st</sup>:**

- Bob passes out the draft Reorganization Plan template from the state
- He has said to the Supts. that we should follow the outline in Drummond Woodsum (DWM) materials on what to include.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> page quotes the sections of the law
- He explains the form as now in draft
- Page three has section on Exceptions to 2,500 minimum
  - Barriers list included and a section on assistance needed.
- These three pages are the cover sheet for the details in DWM materials
- Bob says state will likely look only at the cover pages.
  - He says the state expects the chances are "slim to none and none does not exist" for any Dec. 1<sup>st</sup> plans to be complete.
- Colleen asks what to submit besides checking off the boxes.

- Bob refers to the DWM materials
  - Bob says no further template is expected from the state.
  - He says the details on needed backup are in the DWM materials
- Colleen asks the subcommittees to prepare materials for their areas and send to chair and supts.
  - Dana requests that subcommittee chairs do the drafting.
- **Group agrees by assent to this process**
- Alan Rich says draft from finance subcommittee will be completed at their next meeting. We need to follow the law to meet due diligence. Whatever outcome, we'll do best to meet our obligations.
- Colleen refers to calendars for Dec. 1<sup>st</sup> deadline
  - Union 29 School Committee to meet Tuesday that week (Nov. 27<sup>th</sup>)
  - SAD 15 Board to meet Wed that week (Nov. 28<sup>th</sup>)
  - Proposed Dec. 1<sup>st</sup> plan needs to circulate prior to those dates.
  - Colleen suggest the full draft be done by 11/19
  - This means week of 11/12 for this group to review before circulating
  - This means next week (Week of 11/5) subcommittees must complete their reports
- Bob says he doubts state will "take you to the woodshed" for being a bit late with the Dec. 1<sup>st</sup> deadline.
- He suggests the postmark be before Dec. 1<sup>st</sup>.
- Alan Rich requests that subcommittees complete their reports next week. The report then comes back to us to meet the timeline Colleen has outlined.
- We search for dates and hit conflicts with other selectmen/women/School Comm. meetings.
- Colleen asks for the group's pleasure on the next meeting date
- **Meeting is set for Monday 11/19/07 at 6:30 PM at GNG Middle School**
- Steve asks if state will hold us to what's in the plan?
- Bob says no, the state expects a work in progress.
- **Subcommittee reports will be submitted to Superintendent's by 11/9.**

**Next item: Discuss process for full committee to make decisions**

- Colleen outlines some options such a majority, majority of those present, weighted vote, consensus, etc. She asks for opinions from the group.
- Dana asks what kind of decisions we might make.
- Alan gives example such as what we do with funds already in place such as capital reserve accounts. We'll have to decide what to do with those funds.
- If we don't act the funds accrue to the new RSU Board.
- Kim asks about the weighted votes. She would like to hear finance committee report first. The best decision process may depend on this. The weighted vote could be good in the RSU, but we are not the RSU yet.
- **Vicky and Dennis are asked by the Co-chairs give full list of members on the Consolidation Committee from each town.**
- Norm B. reminds us that we take this to the towns for their vote. Therefore we might need something by consensus since it must be palatable to the towns.
- Jim asks if we have the authority to determine the asset value.
- Alan says we have authority to develop the plan to go to the towns.
- Dana asks if the decisions we make will go to the voters as our plan.

- The answer from Colleen and Alan is yes.
- Dana says we need to make this good for the voters.
  - If we are split, then voters wonder why
  - If we keep ours and you keep yours that sends a strange message
  - Best course is with all of us to be solidly behind this plan.
- Alan and Dana agree that we walk the razor's edge
- Norm B. emphasizes the need for us to be in this together.
- Sherry agrees with consensus. She asks to clarify the membership
- Bill asks for clarity on the approval process for the Dec. 1<sup>st</sup> plan.
  - Reorganization Comm. will submit the plan
  - School Committees receive the plan for their comment and thoughts before it gets submitted.
- Jim asks if it is a problem that no one was elected to this committee
- Alan says all we can do is follow the law as written even with its vagueness.
- We discuss examples of the major financial decisions to be made.

## **Subcommittee Reports**

- **Curriculum and Programs Report:**
  - Dennis says we decided not to meet for obvious meetings
  - **Governance Report**
    - Sandy refers to the recommendations from the governance comm.
    - Conversation with full group was helpful
    - They discussed two options, the small board and the larger one with weighted votes.
      - Option 1 has only one rep. from some towns
      - Option 2 has 15 members with votes weighted by town population
    - Group Recommends Option 2 for 15 members.
    - Norm notes that Option 1 would be a problem with an "advisory" committee because we would have trouble staffing it.
    - Alan also endorses Option 2. He suggests we might decide this tonight.
  - We agree by acclaim to include option B in our Dec. 1<sup>st</sup> plan for full group approval
  - **Administration Report**
    - Sandy says they are studying information from the Central Offices (CO).
    - Terry Towle provided information from COs of districts of 3700 to 3800 kids.
    - Three districts responded. Subcommittee started working on aligning our current positions with the sample districts.
      - Colleen points out that EPS (Essential Programs and Services) formula and ratios are not available yet either.
    - Dave says he notes doubling the number of students does not double the number of needed CO staff.
    - We discuss this comparison extensively.
  - Bob says state will come out with some model for system administration
  - Sandy points out that the brief survey did not include building administration.
  - Colleen points out that this is the piece where people could lose jobs. She says we need to do our homework well on this and deal with other issues first.

- Norm B. notes we have to be aware that building people might be doing some of the CO work.

### **Finance Subcommittee Report:**

- Alan says they reviewed the finance template
  - Discussed the process of valuation and state/local differences in town valuation.
  - Tried to find a formula to balance the tax shift
  - Tax shift would be a \$1.2 million increase to GNG in favor of U29 towns.
  - Unless this goes away nothing else will happen
  - **The full committee agreed by acclain that nothing else should happen till this is done.**
  - Could include a recommendation to have special legislation to make up for this difference.
  - Alan says this is not unique to us
  - If the \$1.2 million problem is solved, we can move to other things
  - Elephant in the finance room is the reworked contracts. This generates other costs
    - By end of three years from the first RSU contract, there must be a uniform contract.
    - Alan suggests the most likely outcome is all moving to the highest contract.
      - For example, U29 health benefit could be the highest.
  - Salaries could cause a geometric increase. He estimates this could offset all savings from CO reductions.
  - Alan says problem on debt being shared with more flowing to GNG could be unsolvable.
  - They are discussing what CO might look like to compare to the combination of existing structures.
  - Steve asks if GNG has rainy day fund and Minot has an impact fee, what happens?
  - Alan says that is a decision of the committee
  - Steve asks if RSU can take town fields that school kids play on
  - Alan says only if the town agrees to it.
  - On capital assets and reserves they reached agreement that these should be reserved to the communities that raised them.
  - He asks for comments or agreement.
  - Wendy says she agrees with that.
  - Dana says he thinks the \$1.2 million plan for state legislation should be in the draft plan.
  - Bob points out that all 60 bills related to consolidation have been killed by the legislative leadership. They have directed Ed. Comm. and Ed. Dept. to develop a single bill to tweak consolidation.
  - Bob says we have \$15000 available for legal fees.
  - Vicky asks if a list of the reserve-like accounts might be very helpful
  - Alan also notes lots of scholarships and bequests need to be resolved.
  - Dealing with the property of the districts is the next big issue

- He suggests selling some of this might be a good idea to get funds for the towns.
  - We ask administrators to generate a list of assets.
- Questions on Finance
  - Bill points out the performance pay in the PRHS
    - He asks about \$1.2 for one year or into the future
  - Alan says this must go into the future to be offset the continuing valuation differences in the towns.
  - Kim asks that we find out what others are doing.
  - Bob says SAD 17 is going alone as an alternative program.
  - Vicky says many districts are finding the same issue.
    - Additional local funds are needed
  - Steve asks Bob about SAD 39 and SAD 17
    - Bob says SAD 39 is hanging out there with nowhere to turn right now.
  - Bob says MSMA voted to sign the petition circulating to repeal consolidation.
  - Dennis says the Commissioner has heard this very directly from the Supts.
- Alan updates on penalties for non-compliance
  - This is based on state subsidy
  - Terry points out SAD 15 is already below the 53% level.
  - Greatest impact would be on towns getting more than 55% from the state. Minot, Mechanic Falls may be in this group.
  - Dana asks where U29 towns would be on this
    - Dennis says he will get this tomorrow
  - Finance Comm. will meet next week on 11/8.

### **District Services**

- No conclusions
- Transportation
  - U29 kids to LRTC
  - SAD 15 to Portland
- Co-curricular—
  - Looked at Portland model of two high schools
- Discussed
  - Food service
  - Libraries
- Next meeting is next week.
- John points out there seem to be some management positions the might be reduced
- Barrier is no common calendar and no common voc. Tech. school
- We discuss some other options that might provide some savings.
- Dave says no matter what happens we should pursue these savings.

**Last item: next meeting is Monday 11/19 at GNG MS.**

Notes taken by Bill Doughty

*Mailed  
to Wendy  
10-2-07*

**Lauren Hendry**

---

**From:** "Dennis Duquette" <dennis\_duquette@roadrunner.com>  
**To:** "YvetteMurrayW" <asstclerk@minotme.org>; "BillDoughty" <bdoughty@poland-hs.u29.k12.me.us>; "DanBlanchard" <pidanny@adelphia.net>; "Dennis Duquette" <dennis\_duquette@adelphia.net>; <dgriff66@msn.com>; "joyce crane" <JCRANE@KW.COM>; "kimMoody" <kim@drcme.org>; "lauren" <lhendry@adelphia.net>; "Mary Martin" <marymartin@elm-street.u29.k12.me.us>; "Norm Beauparlant" <nbeau@ci.lewiston.me.us>; "Norm Davis" <normdavis@aol.com>; "Rick Kusturin " <rick\_kusturin@roadrunner.com>; "SueCallahanW" <scallahan@auburnschl.edu>; "susancallahan" <minotcallahan@aol.com>; "WendySanborn" <wsdigger@yahoo.com>; "Yvette Murray" <Yymurray@prodigy.net>; "vicki dean" <vdean1@verizon.net>; "Colleen Quint" <cquint@mitchellinstitute.org>; "DanaLee" <dlee@polandtownoffice.org>; "john hawley" <jchawley@roadrunner.com>; "kelly crockett" <kelly.crockett@raymondmaine.org>; "Rhonda Irish" <admin@minotme.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2007 9:36 AM  
**Subject:** Governance subcommittee report

**Consolidation members,**

**I am passing this information on to you from the Governance subcommittee. This information will be reviewed at this evenings meeting which will be held at Poland Community School, 6:30. Let me know if you have any questions.**

**Thanks!**

**Dennis**

The Governance & Administration SubCommittee has met and discussed various governance options for a new, combined school unit. We examined current practice in the two districts, reviewed resource materials regarding governance options and discussed pros and cons of those options. The Subcommittee has narrowed down the governance options to two basic choices:

- A) Small board (9 members) with local advisory committees
- B) Larger board (15 members – 3 from each town) with weighted votes and no local advisory committees

Under *Option A* the board would be comprised of a small number of representatives from each community (1-3 members, depending on the size of the town). Each member would have one vote. This board would have a total of 9 members, making it a small and potentially efficient group. Because the board is small, however, we might want to ensure that local voices and concerns are heard. This led to the suggestion of creating local "advisory committees" which could be elected in each town. The advisory committee would not have any authority to set budget or policy or anything like that. Its role would be to advise and inform and would simply serve as a liaison between the community and/or the principal and the school board member(s). This could be especially important for towns with only one representative on the new district board.

Under *Option B* the board would be comprised of 3 representatives from each town for a total of 15 members. Each member would have a weighted vote, in proportion to the town:district population. With three members from each town, a diverse set of viewpoints would be represented and rich discussion of ideas a likely outcome. With weighted voting, we ensure that the towns with the larger

10/30/2007

populations have more say in the final outcome. While weighted voting can be a bit complex, the experience in Union 29 has been very positive. This approach would also make it less likely that local advisory committees would be necessary.

	Pro	Con
Option A	Smaller, more manageable board  Allows for local input	Some towns would only have one representative (intimidating for that one person; also concern re whether that one person would represent town or have an agenda)  Uncertainty re role of local advisory committee – something legislature may address this session
Option B	More representation and ideas from each town  Avoids confusion and extra layer of local committee	Larger board, though similar in size to what already used to  Complication of weighted votes

With these two basic governance options in mind, the SubCommittee then worked to sort out just what the voting would look like. Both options are based on notions of proportionality – we just arrive at that proportionality a bit differently under each option.

Under *Option A* we used a simple approach of beginning with each town having at least one vote, and then stepping up from there as the town populations increased. We wanted to be sure to have an odd number of board members to avoid the chances of tie votes. The proposal for Option A is outlined below: Minot and Mechanic Falls would each have one member, Poland and New Gloucester would each have two members, and Gray would have three members. The idea of doubling board membership from each community was discussed, but the SubCommittee concluded that a board of 18 members was too unwieldy and so did not recommend further consideration of that option.

Under *Option B* we took a somewhat more complex approach of weighting votes by determining the ratio of each town's population to the total district population. For example, Minot holds 10.28% of the district population and New Gloucester holds 21.96% (i.e. roughly double). Each town's total "percent" is then allocated between its three board members. This means that each board member from Minot casts a vote "worth" 3.42 percent and each board member from New Gloucester casts a vote "worth" 7.32 percent. A "yes" vote on any given issue is still determined by establishing majority support for the motion across all voting members from all five towns. Each individual's vote is simply tallied in the "yes" or "no" column and the outcome is determined by the total in each.

Here, more specifically, is what the two options could look like when it comes to votes:

	Total Town Population	Option A	Option B
Minot	2,248	1 member	10.28 % or 3.42 per vote
Mechanic Falls	3,138	1	14.34% or 4.78 per vote
Poland	4,866	2	22.24% or 7.41 per vote
New Gloucester	4,803	2	21.96% or 7.32 per vote
Gray	6,820	3	31.18% or 10.39 per vote

Total U29 population = 10,252

Total SAD 15 population = 11,623

Recommendation

***The Governance & Administration Subcommittee recommends Option B.*** While this option is a bit more complex, it provides good representation for all five towns, and allows for rich exchange of ideas and viewpoints, but also ensures proportionality when it comes to voting.

**Draft Report  
Services Committee  
November 5, 2007**

This committee was tasked with investigating collaboration efforts regarding Instructional Technology, Special Education, Transportation, Curriculum, Professional Development and Facilities Maintenance.

**Technology:**

It is very evident that the Gray / New Gloucester school system has a more progressed technology program. The various software programs used to help administer the district wide services and programs has created efficient methods of organization. These programs would be beneficial in a consolidation as few, if any, of these software programs are being used in School Union 29 Schools. Due to the fact the Gray New Gloucester currently owns most of this software, additional licensing fees will most likely be required for the software to be shared with the added schools.

Instructional technology is available in most of the schools of the proposed RSU. The ability to broadcast from facility to facility is accessible and would be beneficial for the purposes of offering programs that may not be currently available in a particular school. All schools have computers for the students to use and although lap tops are limited to certain grade levels, there appears to be an adequate supply. Computer labs vary in size and capacity from school to school. Staffing levels are adequate but a more collaborative effort with a single IT director / manager would seem appropriate in a consolidation.

Each school currently has adequate staff for the purpose of instruction and maintenance of the IT programs however it is recommended that a director oversee the RSU IT program and networks the schools together. Bulk purchasing of computers, parts and accessories might be a cost savings.

**Special Education:**

**Transportation:**

With the merger of the five towns, a fleet 53 of buses will come together that is used to cover a vast number of miles for student transportation. A collaborative effort would seem to reduce costs for a few reasons. Gray New Gloucester uses computer technology to configure transportation routes using "Versitran". Having this program available to each of the other schools in the district will assist in formulating the most efficient delivery of students. In theory, the new RSU would have the ability to utilize all the buses as needed and town boundary lines would no longer need to be considered therefore overlapping that is happening now could be significantly reduced.

The vehicles are currently maintained at various facilities. Maintaining the fleet should be done in one central location by school district mechanics. With the high number of vehicles, it would most likely be

necessary to operate a first and second shift of vehicle maintenance due to the current limited space for such maintenance. Bulk purchasing of fuels, fluids and parts would also offer a cost savings to the RSU.

School calendars and bell schedules would need to be considered. Unless these schedules are more unified, the delivery of transportation will become problematic. Both high schools in the RSU are sending a small contingent of students to two separate vocational / technical schools out of district. Co-curricular activities could "double up" on bus trips when traveling to neighboring communities.

There are also quite a few students that are transported out of district for special needs. It is a recommendation of this committee that consideration be given to the possibility of offering needed programs within the district as a potential reduction in transportation costs.

Each community is currently managing their transportation programs with either a transportation director or a director/manager/driver. Clearly the need for a single director is warranted and a more efficient utilization of drivers would be to cross train in the various school districts. Substitutes could be minimized due to the single transportation department as well as the number of spare buses that would be needed in the event of a mechanical failure.

### **Curriculum:**

This committee opted not to discuss curriculum as it would be covered by another committee.

### **Professional Development:**

### **Facilities Maintenance:**

In a potential RSU, there are a large number of buildings and athletic fields. In School Union 29 there are three buildings used for elementary / middle school education, a middle / high school building, a building used for central administration, and a shared facility with Poland public works for maintaining vehicles. MSAD 15 has three buildings used for elementary education, a middle school, and a high school, a building for central administration, a garage, and a storage /warehousing building. Each of these building varies in age and condition. The MSAD 15 buildings are all recently upgraded and renovated, the Poland high / middle school is less than ten years old. The elementary buildings in Poland, Minot and Mechanic Falls are all older buildings with multiple additions and various degrees of renovation.

Central administration in Gray New Gloucester uses "School Dude" to organize and schedule maintenance of their facilities while U29 has no computerization. Both districts have a central office staff person for the purposes of purchasing and sub-contracting. Each of the schools has their own maintenance and custodial staff and in most cases an individual in each school is both a maintenance person and custodian. Generally that person is also the supervisor of the staff in that particular school. A consolidation would seem to require a district wide facilities director / manager, individuals employed

by the RSU who specialize in carpentry, plumbing and electrical to be deployed to any building in the district requiring repairs or construction. Custodial staff will be distributed accordingly including the need to hire additional part time staff that could fill in where necessary.

Acreage is currently maintained by either groundskeepers or school maintenance staff. One team of grounds keeping staff could be utilized to perform routine maintenance therefore reducing the amount of equipment that is currently owned by each building. Winter snow removal is completed differently by each school. Some are assisted by their local public works staff. Grounds keeping personnel could be utilize at those facilities needing additional assistance.

Bulk purchasing for anything from cleaning supplies, to toilet tissue, classroom supplies, and heating fuel should be centralized and administered by a district wide facilities director / manager.

### **Food Services:**

All schools in the RSU have its own cooking facilities and staff to operate them, each varying in size and operational expenses. This is an area that will also need a central director for the purposes of menu development, purchasing and administration. Unified menus would stabilize costs and benefit from bulk purchasing.

A consolidation will also change how the district is considered for Title One funding and the number of free and reduced lunch numbers will change.

Reorganization Planning Committee  
Finance Subcommittee Minutes  
Date of Meeting: November 8, 2007  
Union 29 Central Office  
Minutes Taken By: Victoria Burns

Members Present: Dr. A. Rich, R. Kusturin, T. Towle, J. Giffune, and V. Burns, Yvette Murray, Minot, Rhonda Irish, Minot  
Community Members Present: None

Dr. Rich presented an overview of the agenda and made introductions.  
One of the purposes of the meeting is to get a picture of local debt. In addition, the Committee should consider any new debt that may be needed in the future.

Mr. Towle presented an overview of local debt and leases for MSAD #15.

Jim G. asked if the debt and leases can be put into a yearly cost and projected over time. The Committee wishes to put all the debt information in a format to see where adjustments might be made to offset the cost of consolidation.

Terry Towle shared with the Committee previous discussions that local debt should be kept with towns. Terry said that MSAD #15 would absorb 57% of that difference-\$400,000. He raised the question "should all debt be thrown everything into the pot and see who has the advantage".

Another factor are the renovations and current conditions of the buildings. Minot and Mechanic Falls may have to add capital improvements and it must be kept on the table. There is no capital plan at present in Minot. Mr. Kusturin will provide bonds, leases for Union 29. The Committee will first pull together the numbers and then make decisions regarding the balancing of debts.

Dr. Rich also wanted the per pupil costs without local debt. Mr. Towle will get those numbers.

#### **Disposition of real and personal school property**

Minot-has land around the school and a recreation field. They have a well. It is at the town garage. The RSU will have to pay for the water or dig a well.

MSAD #15 is the trustee of the Town library and it is leased to the Town for up to 100 years. There was a question of return of property such as the current Sinclair Act. After the towns list the property, it can be decided what will happen to the property if it is no longer needed for the RSU.

Mr. Towle wonders if the amount of land associated with the school will be considered by the state-so many acres per pupil. Will enough land have to be ceded to make up the school property?

Capital and maintenance plans were discussed. Minot, Mechanic Falls and Poland do not have maintenance and capital maintenance plans. Mr. Towle and Mr. Kusturin will list the property.

The Alternative Ed program at Mechanic Falls will need to be addressed as well as the recreation fields that would not go with Minot. The schools will still use them, however.

**Summary:**

Mr. Kusturin will look into the acreage needed for schools.

**School Indebtedness**

Mr. Towle and Mr. Kusturin will list the Bonds, notes and Lease Purchase Agreements

\*Check out the capital needs of Mechanic Falls and Minot

**Personnel Contracts**

It is estimated that a new RSU will require an addition \$315,000 for teachers and does not include benefits. The Committee will have to consider the impact of contracts at a later meeting. Mr. Towle and Mr. Kusturin will bring the information to the Committee for analysis.

The Committee expressed concerns that contracts are not a one cost increase. Savings from consolidation has to offset the increased costs through personnel contracts.

**School Funds**

**Agreement-**

The Committee discussed Capital Reserve Funds-might it be thrown in to offset other costs? \*No agreement yet.

Undesignated balances will remain with the towns. \*Agreement

**Summer Teachers Salaries:**

The Committee discussed unfunded obligations. None of the towns have money in the yearly budget to pay the complete obligation for teacher's salaries that incur over the summer.

Did not have time to address school funds

**In summary:**

1. Alan will prepare the Finance Committee's portion of the RSU's Reorganization plan.
2. Terry and Rick will take the template and provide the information for Dr. Rich by November 14. They will create a list of debt, property etc.
3. Mr. Towle and Mr. Kusturin will prepare the costs of merging the personnel contracts.

## **Reorganization Planning Meeting with School Union 29 and SAD 15 11/19/07**

### **Present:**

Colleen Quint, Vicki Dean, Alan Rich, Vicky Burns; Rick Kusturin; Bob Connors; Dennis Duquette, Dave Griffiths, Sandy MacDonald, Norm Davis, Kim Moody, Bill Dougherty, Mary Martin, Sheryl Robinson, and Sharon Vandermay.

### **Opening and updates:**

Colleen announced the plan for the evening is to review and revise the draft Reorganization Plan.

Vicky spoke with the state through Norm Higgins today. He passed her to Jim Rier for help on the finances. Vicky proposed dates and times to meet with Jim in Augusta. Intent is to meet with Jim Rier on how the finances and costs are figured.

Both Rier and Higgins said that the state plans legislative changes to fix the cost sharing formula.

Colleen reports two PRHS students interviewed the governor on consolidation.

### **Considering the draft plan:**

- Colleen notes that this is an acceptable format
- We add a bullet for the differences between the high schools
- Dennis/Vicky will keep changes on master copies.
- We note some difficulty with different versions of the draft document.
- Colleen asks that section numbers be cleared up by the superintendents.
- Colleen steps quickly through the sections asking for comments or questions.
  - Disposition of assets and debt is listed as a barrier
  - Kim asks that under section 6 we clarify the reference to appendix A
  - Dennis says we'll have the plan organization clarified following tonight.
  - Colleen asks Dennis to add a sentence under the contracts section about the merit pay contract at PRHS. She gave him suggested language.
  - Kim suggests this be an identified barrier also and we agree.
  - Budget development section of the draft is not yet started.
  - #9 is to document public meetings. Vicky is working on such documents.
    - We clarify that we should include notes from minutes of the Reorganization Planning Committee and subcommittees and other meetings that refer to this work.
  - Dave asks for inclusion of language that governance subcommittee discussed possible administrative savings.
  - For #12 Colleen suggests we identify a barrier based on unclear cost estimates and lack of a template for admin. costs from the state.
  - We affirm once again that the cost sharing offset of \$1.2 million be solved permanently.
  - Existing tuition contracts for PRHS in particular are critically important to the cost sharing formula in the districts.
    - Alan Rich suggests we need a legal opinion on tuition contracts.
    - Colleen provided language to Dennis and Vicky on this item.

- We add tonight's meeting to the list of meetings we have held.
- We discuss the impact of sending kids to two different vocational centers, particularly since Lewiston Regional Trade Center does not charge.
  - Colleen recommends a sentence added to 13B. We agree.
    - We also add this as a barrier for the first page.
    - Colleen suggests listing the barriers with those unique to us listed first.
- **We shift to the plan cover sheet.**
  - We ask for assistance on the cost savings line 3.A(12)
  - Dave suggests we make more explicit the need for the state's admin. template.
  - Norm Davis asks about the Union 29 Supt. Office.
  - Alan says it may become the Central Office if we consolidate.
- **We shift to talking about the updated subcommittee reports.**
  - Bill asks that we include the chart showing the major differences in high schools in the curriculum report.
  - Colleen suggests we add some language to explain the chart and include it.
- **Colleen adjourns us at 7:37 PM.**

Notes taken by Bill Doughty