

## **26-0803 Policy Decision Points**

- 1) CESAs
  - a) CESA membership
  - b) CESA names
  - c) Start-up funding
  
- 2) Facilitators—study committee formation
  - a) Funding?
  - b) Qualifications?
  - c) Direction from General Assembly
    - i) Date by which study committees need to be formed
    - ii) Date by which study committee needs to hold first meeting, if different from (c)(i)
    - iii) Suggested school district groupings—strict adherence? Suggestion? Any guidance on when/how a facilitator may deviate from “the map,” or is it all at facilitator’s discretion?
    - iv) ADM of study committee participants—2,000-4,000 students as practical?
    - v) Participants required to be contiguous?
    - vi) Participants allowed to be members of different SUs?
    - vii) Study committee membership allowed to be adjusted by facilitator after work underway?
    - viii) Report back contents
  
- 3) Study committee process/procedures
  - a) Budget—separate appropriation or self funded by members out of school budgets?
  - b) Proposed Articles of Agreement
    - i) Include requirement to include specific provisions regarding school closures and if so, what should those provisions say? Or leave to study committees to decide?
    - ii) Board size guidance?
    - iii) Guidance/requirements re representation models?
    - iv) Any other deviation from current law?
  - c) Type of school district
    - i) Require consideration of a unified union school district?
    - ii) What happens if study committee determines a UUSD is inadvisable, but maybe some other format would be advisable? Do they need to form a separate study committee? Can they just document that decision point and actually move towards forming something other than a UUSD?
      - (1) See side-by-side concept in [Act 49](#)

- iii) Does the UUSD need to include all participants in the study committee?  
What if study committee decides only 6 of the 8 member school districts are necessary? Okay if those 2 other districts remain on their own? Require new, separate study committee?
  - d) Final report of study committee
    - i) Due date for all study committees? Milestones?
    - ii) New school district advisable
      - (1) Any extra requirements on top of current law?
      - (2) Current law requires report to go to the school board of each school district with no additional direction
    - iii) New district inadvisable: require report? What should be in the report?
      - (1) Analysis of the strengths and challenges of the current structures of all “necessary” and “advisable” school districts?
      - (2) Reasons why formation of new USD would be inadvisable with ID of law/rule that was an impediment?
      - (3) If not a unanimous decision, require a dissenting report with reasons in support of forming a new USD?
      - (4) Who should the study report go to? School district members? SBE? AOE? General Assembly?
  - e) Secretary review: Current law requires advisable report and proposed articles of agreement go to Secretary, who then “shall submit them with recommendations to the State Board.” Require any specific findings or process?
  - f) State Board review
    - i) Current law requires providing study committee an opportunity to be heard, allows SBE to ask for further investigation, and allows SBE to request that the study committee amend the report or articles of agreement—deviate in anyway?
    - ii) SBE required to make any findings that differ from current law?
    - iii) SBE allowed to say no?
  - g) Vote to form union school district
    - i) Current law requires “voters of each school district identified as ‘necessary’ or ‘advisable’” to vote—deviate in anyway?
    - ii) Need to happen by a certain date?
    - iii) Report back on results? From AOE?
  - h) Guidance map
    - i) Group decisions?
    - ii) Names?
  - i) Act 73
    - i) Any changes to contingency language or dates necessary?