

## Decision Points

### Sec. 9 Proposals and Secretary's Proposed Statewide Plan

#### Overview

The Secretary's proposed statewide plan was based on **51 decision points**:

- 46 Oral and written submissions under Sec. 9
  - 4 of the 46 were joint proposals that the Secretary separated into component parts because the districts, although members of the same SU, were not structurally interconnected (e.g., one elementary district was a member of a union high school district and one district was not, as with the joint proposal from the Dummerston and Vernon Districts)
- Plus 5 Separation of the 4 joint proposals into component parts resulted in an *additional* 5 decision points
- Equals 51 Separate decision points

47 of the 51 decision points involved Sec. 9 submissions that either proposed maintaining the current governance structure or asked the State Board to require merger

- 51 Separate decision points
- Minus 4 4 of the 51 decision points concerned the Sec. 9 submissions of school boards that neither proposed maintaining the current governance structure nor asked the State to require merger
- Equals 47 Decision points involving the Sec. 9 submissions that either proposed maintaining the current governance structure or asked the State Board to require merger

Of the **47 decision points** for the Sec. 9 submissions that either proposed retaining the current structure or asked to be merged, the **Secretary's proposed statewide plan**:

- **Agreed with 32**
- **Disagreed with 15**

Eleven of the 51 decision points involved three union high school districts (UHSDs) and their member elementary districts. The districts' structural interconnectedness necessitated a single recommendation for each of the three, which caused there to be **43 numbered recommendations** in the Secretary's proposed statewide plan.

- 51 Separate decision points
- Minus 11 11 of the 51 were decision points involving 3 UHSDs and their member elementary districts (*Brattleboro UHSD; Oxbow UHSD; Mount Anthony UHSD*)
- Plus 3 Translating into 3 recommendations
- Equals 43 Numbered recommendations in Secretary's proposed plan

**Traditional Union High School Districts (elementary districts have common structure)**

<b>Districts</b> <i>(Numbered as in Secretary's Proposed Plan)</i>	<b>Sec. 9 Proposal from Local Board(s)</b> <i>(Appendix F "Snapshot" page)</i>	<b>Secretary's Recommendations</b> <i>(Proposed Plan page)</i>	<b>Decision Points</b>
Brattleboro <sup>1</sup>	Create UUSD <i>(pp. 5-6)</i>		<i>Secretary agreed</i>
Dummerston <sup>2</sup>	Retain current structure <i>(pp. 7-13)</i>		<i>Secretary disagreed</i>
Guilford	Create UUSD <i>(pp. 14-15)</i>		<i>Secretary agreed</i>
Putney <sup>3</sup>	No specific proposal – but submitted analysis <i>(pp. 16-18)</i>		<i>No proposal with which Secretary could agree or disagree</i>
<b>2. Missisquoi Valley Union HSD &amp; its 3 Member Districts <sup>4</sup></b> <i>(Franklin, Highgate, Swanton)</i>	Retain current structure <i>(pp. 19-23)</i>	Create UUSD <i>(pp. 37-42)</i>	<i>Secretary disagreed</i>
<b>3. Oxbow Union HSD &amp; its 2 Member Districts <sup>5</sup></b>		Create UUSD & include BMU in it – see #21 below <i>(pp. 43-48 and 126-31)</i>	
Newbury	Retain current structure; add BMU to OESU <sup>6</sup> <i>(pp. 24-26)</i>		<i>Secretary disagreed</i>
Bradford Oxbow Union	Create UUSD & include BMU in it <i>(pp. 27-28)</i>		<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>4. Spaulding Union HSD &amp; its 2 Member Districts</b> <i>(Barre City; Barre Town)</i>	Pursue voluntary merger, round #2 <sup>7</sup> <i>(p. 29)</i>	No proposal – allow voluntary merger process to proceed <i>(pp. 49-50)</i>	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>5. Union 32 HSD &amp; its 5 Member Districts <sup>8</sup></b> <i>(Berlin; Calais; East Montpelier; Middlesex; Worcester)</i>	Retain current governance structure <i>(pp. 30-34)</i>	Create UUSD (and refers to #24 Twinfield discussion) <i>(pp. 51-59)</i>	<i>Secretary disagreed</i>

**Non-Member Elementary Districts (NMED) in Modified UUSDs (MUUSD)**

*(see Sec's proposal pages 60-62 for an overview of the structure)*

<b>Districts</b> <i>(Numbered as in Secretary's Proposed Plan)</i>	<b>Sec. 9 Proposal from Local Board(s)</b> <i>(Appendix F "Snapshot" page)</i>	<b>Secretary's Recommendations</b> <i>(Proposed Plan page)</i>	<b>Decision Points</b>
<b>7. Cambridge Elementary District (PK-6)</b>	No specific proposal submitted <i>(pp. 42-43)</i>	Ask MUUSD to accept district as PK-12 member <sup>9</sup> <i>(pp. 71-73)</i>	<i>No proposal with which Secretary could agree or disagree</i>
<b>8. Huntington Elementary District (PK-4)</b>	Retain current governance structure <i>(pp. 44-45)</i>	Ask MUUSD to accept district as PK-12 member <sup>10</sup> <i>(pp. 74-78)</i>	<i>Secretary disagreed</i>
<b>9. Orwell Elementary District (PK-8)</b>	No specific proposal submitted <i>(p. 46)</i>	Ask MUUSD to accept district as PK-12 member <sup>11</sup> <i>(pp. 79-82)</i>	<i>No proposal with which Secretary could agree or disagree <sup>12</sup></i>
<b>10. Windham Elementary District (PK-6)</b>	Retain current governance structure <i>(pp. 47-50)</i>	Ask MUUSD to accept district as PK-12 member <i>(pp. 83-88)</i>	<i>Secretary disagreed</i>

**Union School Districts with UN-Like Members** (see Sec's proposal pages 89-90)

<b>Districts</b> <i>(Numbered as in Secretary's Proposed Plan)</i>	<b>Sec. 9 Proposal from Local Board(s)</b> <i>(Appendix F "Snapshot" page)</i>	<b>Secretary's Recommendations</b> <i>(Proposed Plan page)</i>	<b>Decision Points</b>
<b>11. Bellows Falls Union HSD &amp; its 4 Member Districts</b> <i><sup>13</sup>(Athens; Grafron; Rockingham; Westminster)</i>	Retain current governance structure <i>(pp. 51-54)</i>	Retain current governance structure at this time; states SBE may have additional information (e.g., whether to create union elementary school?) <i>(pp. 91-96)</i>	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>12. Hazen Union HSD &amp; Lakeview Union ESD &amp; all Member Districts</b> <sup>14</sup> <i>(Greensboro; Hardwick; Stannard; Woodbury)</i>	Retain current governance structure <i>(pp. 55-57)</i>	Retain current governance structure at this time; states SBE may have additional information (e.g., whether to create union elementary school?) <i>(pp. 97-99)</i>	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>13. Lake Region Union HSD &amp; its 7 Member Districts</b> <i>(Albany; Barton; Brownington; Glover; Irasburg; Orleans; Westmore)</i>	Pursue voluntary merger, round #2 <sup>15</sup> <i>(pp. 58-59)</i>	No proposal – allow voluntary merger process to proceed <i>(pp. 100-01)</i>	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>14. Mount Anthony Union HSD &amp; its 5 Member Districts</b> <sup>16</sup>		Create one Union Elementary School District: Bennington, Pownal, Shaftsbury, Woodford <i>(pp. 102-08)</i>	
<i>Bennington</i> <sup>17</sup>	Create (1) UUSD with tax incentives or (2) MUUSD per study c'ees proposal <i>(pp. 60-61)</i>		<i>Secretary agreed (to extent possible)</i> <sup>18</sup>
<i>Shaftsbury</i>	Same		<i>Same</i>
<i>Woodford</i>	Same		<i>Same</i>
<i>North Bennington</i>	(1) NB would withdraw from Mount Anthony UHSD (2) SBE would then move to Battenkill as stand-alone district <i>(p. 62)</i>		<i>No proposal with which Secretary could agree or disagree</i>
<i>Pownal</i>	(1) Create a MUUSD with Pownal as an NMED <u>OR</u> (2) Create Union Elementary School District <i>(pp. 63-64)</i>		<i>Secretary agreed</i> <sup>19</sup>
<b>15. North Country Union HSD &amp; its Member Districts</b> <sup>20</sup> <i>(Brighton; Charleston; Derby; Holland; Jay; Lowell; Morgan; Newport City; Newport Town; Troy; Westfield)</i>	Retain current governance structure <i>(pp. 65-69)</i>	Create three Union Elementary Districts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brighton-Charleston</li> <li>• Derby-Holland</li> <li>• Jay-Westfield</li> </ul> <i>(pp. 109-112)</i>	<i>Secretary disagreed</i>

**Single Town Districts that Pay Tuition for All Students, PK-12** (see Sec's proposal pages 113-14)

<b>Districts</b> <i>(Numbered as in Secretary's Proposed Plan)</i>	<b>Sec. 9 Proposal from Local Board(s)</b> <i>(Appendix F "Snapshot" page)</i>	<b>Secretary's Recommendations</b> <i>(Proposed Plan page)</i>	<b>Decision Points</b>
<b>16. Pittsfield District</b>	Retain current governance structure (pp. 70-71)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 115-16)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>17. Sandgate District</b>	Retain current governance structure (pp. 72-73)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 117-18)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>18. Searsburg District</b>	Retain current governance structure (pp. 74-76)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 119-20)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>19. Stratton District</b>	Retain current governance structure (pp. 77-79)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 121-22)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>20. Winhall District</b>	Create UUSD with any district that will allow district to remain a PK-12 noperating district in Bennington Rutland SU (pp. 80-81)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 123-24)	<i>Secretary disagreed</i> <sup>21</sup>

**Districts for which Merger is "Possible" – But is Merger "Practicable"? And / Or is Retaining the Same Structure "Best"?** (see Sec's proposal page 125)

<b>Districts</b> <i>(Numbered as in Secretary's Proposed Plan)</i>	<b>Sec. 9 Proposal from Local Board(s)</b> <i>(Appendix F "Snapshot" page)</i>	<b>Secretary's Recommendations</b> <i>(Proposed Plan page)</i>	<b>Decision Points</b>
<b>21. Blue Mountain UUSD</b> (Groton; Ryegate; Wells River)	Retain current governance structure; remain as its own SD (pp. 82-85)	Create UUSD with Oxbow Districts <sup>22</sup> (pp. 126-31)	<i>Secretary disagreed</i> <sup>23</sup>
<b>22. Cabot District</b> <sup>24</sup>	Retain current governance structure (pp. 86-89)	Create UUSD with #23 Danville (pp. 132-42)	<i>Secretary disagreed</i>
<b>23. Danville District</b> <sup>25</sup>	Retain current governance structure (pp. 90-94)	Create UUSD with #22 Cabot (pp. 132-42)	<i>Secretary disagreed</i>
<b>24. Twinfield UUSD</b> <sup>26</sup> (Marshfield; Plainfield)	Create UUSD (pp. 95-97)	Create UUSD – but does not decide with which other districts (pp. 132-42)	<i>Secretary agreed (BUT postpones details)</i>
<b>25. Craftsbury District</b> <sup>27</sup>	Retain current governance structure (p. 98)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 143-45)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>26. Elmore-Morristown UUSD and Stowe District</b> <sup>28</sup>	Retain current governance structures (pp. 99-101)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 146-49)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>27. Enosburgh District and Richford District</b> <sup>29</sup>	Retain current governance structures (pp. 102-108)	Create UUSD (pp. 150-56)	<i>Secretary disagreed</i>
<b>28. Fairfax District; and Fletcher District; and Georgia District</b> <sup>30</sup>	Retain current governance structures (pp. 109-111)	Retain current governance structures (pp. 157-60)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>29. Hartland District and Weathersfield District</b> <sup>31</sup>	Retain current governance structures (pp. 112-16)	Retain current governance structures (pp. 161-65)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>

<b>30. Montgomery District</b> <sup>32</sup>	Retain current governance structure (pp. 117-20)	Merge into UUSD already created by Bakersfield & Berkshire (pp. 168-73)	<i>Secretary disagreed</i>
<b>31. Sheldon District</b> <sup>33</sup>	Retain current governance structure (p. 121)	Merge into UUSD already created by Bakersfield & Berkshire (pp. 174-79)	<i>Secretary disagreed</i>
<b>32. Stamford District</b> <sup>34</sup>	Pursue interstate contract with MA district (p. 122)	No proposal – allow process to proceed (pp. 180-81)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>33. Waits River Valley UUSD</b> (Corinth and Topsham)	Retain current governance structure; possibly move to a new SU (pp. 123-25)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 182-84)	<i>Secretary agreed</i> <sup>35</sup>

**Districts for Which Merger is Not “Possible” or Not “Practicable” or Both**

<b>Districts</b> <i>(Numbered as in Secretary’s Proposed Plan)</i>	<b>Sec. 9 Proposal from Local Board(s)</b> <i>(Appendix F “Snapshot” page)</i>	<b>Secretary’s Recommendations</b> <i>(Proposed Plan page)</i>	<b>Decision Points</b>
<b>34. Arlington District</b>	Retain current governance structure (pp. 126-28)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 185-86)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>35. Canaan District</b>	Retain current governance structure (p. 129)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 185-86)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>36. Coventry District</b> <sup>36</sup>	Retain current governance structure (p. 130)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 185-86)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>37. Sharon District</b>	Retain current governance structure (pp. 131-33)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 185-86)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>38. South Hero District</b>	Retain current governance structure (pp. 134-36)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 185-86)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>39. Strafford District</b>	Retain current governance structure (pp. 137-38)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 185-86)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>40. Thetford District</b>	Retain current governance structure (p. 139)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 185-86)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>41. Vernon District</b> <sup>37</sup>	Retain current governance structure (p. 140)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 185-86)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>42. Windsor / West Windsor UUSD</b>	Retain current governance structure (p. 141)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 185-86)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>
<b>43. Wolcott District</b> <sup>38</sup>	Retain current governance structure (p. 142)	Retain current governance structure (pp. 185-86)	<i>Secretary agreed</i>

<sup>1</sup> Current members of the board are split, but a majority of the board favored creating a UUSD

<sup>2</sup> Submitted “AGS proposal” with #41 Vernon

<sup>3</sup> At the Sec 10 conversation, the board agreed a change is needed; no consensus on nature of change

<sup>4</sup> Submitted proposal for “Enhanced AGS” with #31 Sheldon;

No § 706 committee / No merger vote

Voters voted on the following question in November 2017 (see Secretary’s Proposed Plan, p.38, fn.37):

---

Should the [Town] School District, with other members of the Franklin Northwest Supervisory Union, propose to the Vermont State Board of Education to enhance the current operation of the Franklin, Highgate, MVU, Sheldon and Swanton school boards (which is an enhance Alternative Governance Structure as defined in the Act 46/49 law)?

<sup>5</sup> No merger vote

<sup>6</sup> SBE acted on 2<sup>nd</sup> part of request regarding SU boundaries before Secretary issued Proposed Plan

<sup>7</sup> Merger vote scheduled for November 6, 2018

<sup>8</sup> No merger vote

<sup>9</sup> Could be an SD if merged

<sup>10</sup> Could be an SD if merged

<sup>11</sup> Could be an SD if merged

<sup>12</sup> No consensus among board members

<sup>13</sup> Merger vote: Athens, Grafton, and Westminster – No; Rockingham - Yes

<sup>14</sup> Submitted joint proposal with #25 Craftsbury and #43 Wolcott

<sup>15</sup> Merger vote scheduled for November 6, 2018

<sup>16</sup> Merger vote:

- Bennington – Yes
- Pownal – No (Y-N difference of 4 votes)
- Shaftsbury – Yes
- Woodford – No (Y-N difference of 2 votes in initial vote and & 4 votes on reconsideration)
- North Bennington – board did not warn vote

<sup>17</sup> Bennington, Shaftsbury, and Woodford participated jointly in one Sec. 10 Conversation, but submitted separate written documents under Sec. 9. Because they participated jointly, the Secretary's Statewide Plan counted the three proposals as one proposal – for a total of 44 submissions under Sec. 9 (Proposal, pp. 6-7). This document focuses on decision points and so has counted each Sec. 9 submission separately – for a total of 46 submissions.

<sup>18</sup> (1) Cannot create UUSD because of NB tuitioning status (2) Not clear if there is authority for State Board to create a MUUSD

<sup>19</sup> (1) Not clear if there is authority to create a MUUSD; (2) agreed with District

<sup>20</sup> Submitted joint proposal with #36 Coventry

<sup>21</sup> Secretary proposes that district remain a PK-12 nonoperating district in the B-R SU – so accepted district's proposal to that extent

<sup>22</sup> Secretary stated it was "particularly difficult decision"

<sup>23</sup> State Board acted on SU issue before Secretary issued Proposed Plan

<sup>24</sup> Merger vote: Cabot and Danville – No; Twinfield - Yes

<sup>25</sup> Merger vote: Cabot and Danville – No; Twinfield - Yes

<sup>26</sup> Merger vote: Cabot and Danville – No; Twinfield - Yes

<sup>27</sup> See also Secretary's recommendation #12

<sup>28</sup> Districts submitted joint proposal

<sup>29</sup> Districts submitted joint proposal

<sup>30</sup> Districts submitted joint proposal

<sup>31</sup> Districts submitted joint proposal

<sup>32</sup> Voters rejected merger with Bakersfield & Berkshire – 137 Yes – 151 No

<sup>33</sup> See also Secretary's recommendation #2

<sup>34</sup> Voters rejected merger with Halifax and Readsboro

<sup>35</sup> The Secretary's Proposed Plan did not address SU boundaries

<sup>36</sup> See also Secretary's recommendation #15

<sup>37</sup> Submitted "AGS proposal" with #1 Dummerston

<sup>38</sup> See also Secretary's recommendation #12