

**Potential Education Policy Provisions**  
**Section by Section Summary**  
(Draft 3.1; 4/23/14)

Secs. 1–8 (pp. 1–8). SU and District Responsibilities. These sections clarify and reassign responsibilities of supervisory union boards, supervisory unions, superintendents, and state boards. Among other changes, they:

- divide current SU board responsibilities into policy-making duties assigned to the board and implementation duties assigned to the SU for which the superintendent is then made directly responsible
- clarify that the SU is solely responsible for some duties and remove the ability to seek a waiver to allow districts to perform the duties on their own behalf
- shift / clarify responsibilities for the care and maintenance of school buildings (goods and services) so that all would be the responsibility of the SU
- rewrite current language that has been amended many times so that it is stated in a more straightforward, consistent manner

Secs. 9–10. SU Collaboration (ALTERNATIVE language). Current law encourages SUs to collaborate to provide services jointly. Agreements are required to include a cost–benefit analysis.

Option #1 (pp. 9–10): Requires each SU to enter into an agreement with at least one other SU to provide the following services jointly: professional development; procurement and distribution of goods and operational services; transportation; and other appropriate services).

Option #2 (pp. 10–11): Requires the Secretary to group SUs into SU Service Regions. Then requires each SU Service Region to provide the following services jointly: professional development; procurement and distribution of goods and operational services; transportation; and other appropriate services).

Sec. 11 (pp.12–13). This section would create a penalty to be assessed against a school district if the Secretary determines that the district failed to comply with law [needs to be specified if is assessed for particular violations or any violation]. The penalty would be equal to one percent of a district’s total education spending and would be added to the numerator of the ratio used to calculate the district’s “district spending adjustment” – in the same manner as the excess spending penalty is assessed.

Sec. 12 (p. 13). SU consolidation. This section directs the State Board of Ed to use its current statutory authority to readjust all SU boundaries to create no more than 20 SUs statewide. Full implementation would be by July 1, 2019.

Sec. 13–15 (pp. 14–15). Paraprofessionals. Sec. 13 prohibits the use of Education Fund dollars to pay for persons hired to provide assistance in the classroom who are not employed as licensed teachers or to provide special education services. Sec. 14 permits other, non-Education Fund dollars to be used for this purpose. Sec. 15 excludes funds used for this purpose from the definition of “education spending” for purposes of calculating the district’s tax rate.

Sec. 16 (pp. 16–18). Special Education Funding; Pilot Project. Sec. 16 creates a pilot program designed to encourage reduced special education expenditures through the use of best practices to provide special education services in the general classroom setting. Pursuant to a process and criteria to be developed by the Secretary of Education, and notwithstanding the provisions of 16 V.S.A. § 2961, the Secretary would be authorized to provide to the districts within up to four supervisory unions an enhanced mainstream block grant (Enhanced Grant) that is [up to] 50 percent greater than the amount calculated pursuant to that section.

Sec. 17 (p. 19). Education Fund expenditures. Section 17. requires the Agency of Education to identify \$1,000,000.00 in planned expenditures from the Education Fund that is improperly identified as education spending. The Education Fund shall reflect that reduction in fiscal year 2015 and the tax rate and Ed Fund payment shall be adjusted for any district that has improperly categorized its spending.

*Various effective dates - TBD*