

# Three School Scenario – Fund, Fix & Staff PCS, MCS and ESS with Current Configuration

## Cost of Repairs

According to the assessment conducted by AEI in September 2023, to catch up on deferred maintenance and continue to repair and maintain MCS, PCS, and ESS, it would cost approximately \$10,250 to cover immediate needs, \$1,302,197 within the next year, and \$6,843,101 within the next ten years. The approximate ten year total would be **\$8,155,548**. This figure includes an estimated \$321,100 for heating, cooling, and ventilation. The estimated cost of the comprehensive heating, ventilation, and efficiency upgrades proposed by EMC is \$7,437,120 for all three elementary schools. If the RSU chose to move forward with that additional project rather than addressing heating, cooling, and ventilation through the plan proposed by AEI, it would bring the approximate ten year total to **\$15,271,568** for the three elementary schools. RSU 16 will continue to seek out licensed and qualified HVAC contractors to provide additional feedback on the cost of heating and ventilation. RSU 16 has also begun the application process for the Revolving Renovation Fund. This grant could offset a significant portion of these costs (potentially 61.98% of certain qualifying projects). Please see the Task Force Website for more information about the Revolving Renovation Grant.

*(Source: EMC Estimate 9/25/23, AEI Summary Report, School Revolving Renovation Fund info Sheet)*

## Operational Expenses

Operational expenses would not be impacted by this scenario.

## Functional Capacity

RSU 16 currently has the functional capacity to house all students within the current configuration.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

## Utilities

3 phase power is about 2 miles from MCS and would cost between \$450,000 - \$750,000 to have it connected and installed. Not having 3 phase power limits the options available for replacing the MCS heating/ventilation system, but does not prevent RSU16 from doing so. Both PCS and ESS have access to 3 phase power.

*(Energy Management Consultants Letter 1-18-23)*

## Food Services

Food services would not be impacted by this scenario.

## Playgrounds

Playgrounds would not be impacted by this scenario.

## **Transportation**

Transportation would not be impacted by this scenario.

## **Driveline**

Driveline would not be impacted by this scenario.

## **Parking**

Parking would not be impacted by this scenario.

## **Transitions**

There are not any school transitions for PreK-6th graders under Scenario 1. Transitions remain for students who receive special programming.

## **Class Size**

According to current available data, in this scenario the average class sizes are: PCS-**16**, MCS-**15**, ESS-**15**.

*(Source: Task Force FAQ, Cost Drivers Worksheet, Class Size By School spreadsheet)*

## **Title I Funding**

Using the current income data, in this scenario, PCS qualifies for the “Targeted Assistance” Title 1 program, ESS qualifies for the “Schoolwide” Title 1 program, and MCS does not qualify for any Title 1 program. However, that can change from year to year depending upon the number of enrolled students from low-income households.

*(Source: Task Force Title 1 FAQ)*

## **Reduction in Force**

This scenario would prevent the potential of redundancies caused by consolidation. However, it is unknown whether budgetary impacts of repairing and maintaining 3 schools would compel staff reductions. It will cost an additional \$800,000- \$1,000,000 annually to support the current contractual salaries and benefits through 2027. Additionally, RSU 16 anticipates another \$400,000 per year in administrative budget requests to continue to meet student needs.

*(Source: RSU 16 Budget Documents, Task Force FAQ, RSU 16 Assistant Superintendent)*

## **Specials**

Specials would not be impacted by this scenario. Currently, MCS and ESS share a music teacher, art teacher, and physical education teacher. This would remain the same.

## **Special Education**

Special Education would remain unchanged in this scenario. For the 23-24 school year, MCS houses the K-6 Social Emotional Learning program. ESS houses the K-6 Applied Academic students. PCS houses K-6 and 7-8 Functional Life Skills programs.

*(Source: RSU 16 Assistant Superintendent)*

## **Adult Education**

Adult Education would not be impacted by this scenario. This program would remain at ESS.

## **Teacher Collaboration and Professional Development**

RSU 16 provides regular opportunities for teachers to collaborate and participate in professional development. Examples include Wednesday early release and 8 scheduled Teacher Workshop days.

*(Source: RSU 16 2023-2024 School Calendar)*

## **Family Implications**

This scenario maintains existing conditions in terms of family impacts.

## **Community Implications**

This scenario maintains current elementary school communities as they exist today, but there will be financial implications to the three towns for repairing all 3 elementary schools.

**Total Estimated Cost of impacted areas in the next ten years: \$8,155,548 without EMC Efficiency Project  
OR  
\$15,271,568 with EMC Efficiency Project**

***These estimates do not include***

- Repair and maintenance recommendations at PRHS, WMS, or Central Office

## Two School Scenario - Close MCS. Fund, Fix & Staff ESS as a PreK-2 and PCS as a Grade 3-6 School.

### Cost of Repairs

According to the assessment conducted by AEI in September 2023, to catch up on deferred maintenance and continue to repair and maintain PCS and ESS, it would cost approximately \$8,550 to cover immediate needs, \$1,265,732 within the next year, and \$5,606,895 within the next ten years. The approximate ten year total would be **\$6,881,177**. This figure includes an estimated \$297,900 for heating, cooling, and ventilation. The estimated cost of the comprehensive heating, ventilation, and efficiency upgrades proposed by EMC is \$4,967,000 for PCS and ESS. If the RSU chose to move forward with that additional project rather than addressing heating, cooling, and ventilation through the plan proposed by AEI, it would bring the approximate ten year total to **\$11,848,177** for PCS and ESS. These figures do not include any repairs that need to be done at MCS to accommodate any potential administrative, storage, or transportation operations that may be conducted in the building, if closed. RSU 16 will continue to seek out licensed and qualified HVAC contractors to provide additional feedback on the cost of heating and ventilation. RSU 16 has also begun the application process for the Revolving Renovation Fund. This grant could offset a significant portion of these costs (potentially 61.98% of certain qualifying projects). Please see the Task Force Website for more information about the Revolving Renovation Grant.

*(Source: EMC Estimate 9/25/23, AEI Summary Report, School Revolving Renovation Fund info Sheet)*

### Operational Expenses

In this scenario there could be a reduction of approximately \$257,000 annually on operational expenses associated with the closure of MCS. There is the potential for additional savings of about \$200,000 on custodial staff salaries and benefits; This does not include any potential costs associated with maintaining ownership of MCS and potentially conducting administrative, storage, or transportation operations within that building. These savings would only be incurred if MCS was completely abandoned or turned over to the town of Minot. There will be additional operational expenses associated with opening a new modular for Adult Education. These costs have not been estimated to date, but will include all typical operation of plant expenses and should be considered in addition to the total expenses of this scenario. Please see the “Adult Education” section for more information.

*(Source: RSU 16 Budget Documents, Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

### Functional Capacity

In this scenario, with a reduction of 8 classroom teachers, there is sufficient space to accommodate all elementary students with only minor modifications to the existing 2 buildings. The current estimate for those renovations (including parking and driveline improvements, bathrooms, and various structural changes) is approximately **\$69,000** for PCS and **\$88,750** for ESS. There would be additional costs associated with moving school and classroom materials, and quotes for that expense are being procured. If RSU 16 chose not to reduce teachers in order to maintain smaller class sizes or if we experienced significant growth, modulares would need to be procured to accommodate those additional classrooms. Please see the “Reduction in Force” section for more information. Adult Education would need to be moved to another location. Please see the “Adult Education” section for associated information and costs.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, RSU 16 Operations Director, Two-School Costs Info Sheet)*

### Utilities

In this scenario, all RSU 16 schools would have access to 3 phase power.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

### **Building Revenue**

If the School Board voted by a 2/3 weighted majority to close MCS and Minot voters approved of the closure, RSU 16 could collect revenue from leasing the property. Minot would have to refuse ownership of MCS before the district would be permitted to sell the property. RSU 16 could also elect to use the closed school to conduct any non-educational school operations (such as administration, storage, or transportation services). If Minot voters chose not to approve the closure, they would become responsible for the cost of operating MCS.

*(Source: MRSA 20-A §1512, §4102 and §4103, Drummond Woodsum Informational Sheet)*

### **Food Services**

If meal times at schools were staggered and additional cold storage was procured at ESS, both elementary schools would be able to accommodate the number of students for meals.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

### **Playgrounds**

In this scenario, playground equipment would need to be moved from MCS and redistributed to new grade level schools. ESS has the largest playground footprint in RSU 16 (43,246 sq ft) and would be able to accommodate the additional students and equipment. Additionally, the Pre-K playground at ESS would need to be moved to the back or lower playground area. The PCS playground has a footprint of 18,206 sq ft. and can sufficiently accommodate grade 3-6 students. The approximate cost to move and renovate the playgrounds is **\$167,750**.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, Task Force Spatial Comparison Worksheet, Cost Drivers Worksheet)*

### **Transportation**

In this scenario, there would be opportunities to reorganize bus routes for all elementary students. A potential solution would be 3 staggered bus runs to accommodate staggered start times at BMW/PRHS, ESS, and PCS. This arrangement could potentially reduce bus times since all drivers would be on each elementary run. Another potential arrangement would be all students being bussed to their current hometown elementary school and then a second run to their grade level school. There are financial implications to running a third bus route including increased fuel cost, increased driver cost, and wear and tear on buses. The approximate cost of a third bus run would be \$267,000 annually (**\$2,670,000** over a ten year period). RSU 16 is currently seeking definitive answers on how transportation would be affected by this scenario, including eventually creating sample bus runs to ensure that they do not exceed the maximum time allowed by our policy.

*(Source: Transportation Analysis in Task Force FAQ)*

### **Driveline**

The increase in cars and buses in this scenario would require some reconfiguration of the driveline and bus loading/unloading zones at ESS. The cost of this is reflected in the "Functional Capacity" section.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

### **Parking**

Additional parking would be required at ESS to accommodate this scenario. The cost of this is reflected in the “Functional Capacity” section.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

## **Transitions**

This scenario would result in students experiencing an additional transition in their elementary years. They would attend ESS PreK-2 and PCS 3-6. A growing body of evidence points to significant achievement loss during each transition year and that students benefit when their school contains a larger grade span as opposed to a smaller grade span.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, Task Force Grade Level Configuration Analysis)*

## **Class Size**

In this scenario, using current data, the projected class sizes at ESS (grades PreK-2) would be an average of **17** and at PCS (grades 3-6) would be an average of **19**. Current class sizes for the 2023-24 school year (without consolidation) show average class sizes of PCS-**16**, MCS-**15**, ESS-**15**.

*(Source Task Force Data Packet, Cost Drivers Worksheet, Class Size By School Spreadsheet)*

## **Title Comparability**

In this scenario and using the current income data, PCS and ESS would each qualify for the “Targeted Assistance” program. However, that can change from year to year depending upon the number of enrolled students from low-income households.

*(Source: Task Force FAQ-Title I Questions)*

## **Reduction in Force**

There would be opportunities to reduce staffing costs in this scenario. These include a potential annual savings of \$342,000 on redundant administrative and support positions at ESS and MCS and \$600,000 on 8 classroom teacher positions (assuming an average salary and benefit package of \$75,000), for an annual total of \$942,000. The approximate ten year savings could amount to **\$9,420,000**. If RSU 16 chose not to reduce teachers in order to maintain smaller class sizes, these savings might not occur in full and modularity may need to be procured to accommodate those additional classrooms.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, Task Force Staffing FAQ, RSU 16 Operations Director, RSU 16 Budget Documents)*

## **Specials**

MCS and ESS currently share Art, Music, and PE teachers. In this scenario, there would be no changes to staffing, but there would be an opportunity for those teachers to remain at one facility all week,

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, RSU 16 Assistant Superintendent)*

## **Special Education**

In this scenario, Special Education services would remain the same except they would follow grade level structure. Each elementary school would offer Applied Academics, Functional Life Skills, Social Emotional Learning, and Resource Room Classrooms at either the K-2 level or 3-6 level. Staff would be redistributed to accommodate.  
*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, RSU 16 Assistant Superintendent)*

### **Adult Education**

Adult Ed would require a new location to allow space for the additional elementary students in this scenario. RSU 16 obtained a quote for a 4 classroom modular to house Adult Education from Schiavi on 10/5/23. They estimated a cost of \$757,250 for the modular. Necessary site work was estimated to cost approximately \$153,000 by Task Force Member, Bob Klar. This brings the estimated total cost of a modular addition for Adult Education to **\$910,250**. This assumes that RSU16 will be able to place the modular on existing property (such as PCS or Central Office). This location has not been determined. This number does not include the operational expenses of this new location (as noted in the “Operational Expenses” section), these expenses have not been estimated to date, but should be considered as part of the final cost.

*(Source Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, Schiavi Estimate, Bob Klar-Modular Project Review)*

### **Teacher Collaboration and Professional Development**

RSU 16 currently provides regular opportunities for teachers to collaborate and participate in professional development. Examples include Wednesday early release and 8 scheduled Teacher Workshop days. However, there is some evidence suggesting that grade level configured schools provide teachers more opportunities to narrow the focus of their curriculum and collaborate with a larger number of teachers. There is also increased ability to match students to teachers based on teaching and learning styles.

*(Source: RSU 16 2023-2024 School Calendar, Task Force Staffing FAQ, Task Force Grade Level Configuration Analysis)*

### **Family Implications**

This scenario would potentially separate siblings at the elementary level. Families with multiple elementary aged students utilizing driveline may need to do two drop-offs/pickups at two schools. Busing may require staggered pickup/drop-off times.

*(Source Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, Transportation Analysis in Task Force FAQ)*

### **Community Implications**

This scenario would end all current elementary communities. Two new school communities would need to be developed and fostered, including relationships with the larger communities (i.e. PTA groups, community volunteers, fundraising efforts, etc).

*(Source: Building Thriving Elementary Schools, AEI Assessment)*

**Total Estimated Cost of impacted areas in the next ten years: \$10,786,927 without EMC Efficiency Project  
Including potential Reduction in Force Savings -\$9,420,000 = **\$1,366,927 without EMC Efficiency Project****

OR

**\$15,753,927 with EMC Efficiency Project**

**Including potential Reduction in Force Savings -\$9,420,000 = \$6,333,927 with EMC Efficiency Project**

***These estimates do not include***

- The cost of repairing MCS to the degree that may be required to conduct administrative, storage, or transportation operations
- Moving Costs
- Potential additional modulars needed for elementary students if RSU 16 chose not to reduce teachers in order to maintain smaller class sizes or in case of significant growth.
- Repair and maintenance recommendations at PRHS, WMS, or Central Office

Working Document



Working Document

**As of August 15, 2023 – Scenario 2 has been eliminated, through consensus, by the Futures Task Force**

**Scenario 2 - Consolidate MCS into ESS. Fund, Fix & Staff ESS & PCS with Current Configuration**

**Cost of Repairs**

According to current data, it would cost approximately \$6,505,500 to catch up on deferred maintenance and continue to repair PCS and ESS through 2030 (this figure DOES NOT include heating repairs). The estimated cost of heating repairs is \$4,967,000 for PCS and ESS. This puts the approximate total at **\$11,472,500** for the 2 elementary schools.

*(Source: Task Force Budget FAQ, RSU 16 Operations Director and Assistant Superintendent)*

**Operational Expenses**

In Scenario 2 there could be a reduction of approximately \$257,121 annually on operational expenses associated with the closure of MCS. There is the potential for additional savings on custodial staff salaries and benefits. Those are noted in the “Reduction in Force” section.

*(Source: RSU 16 Budget Documents, Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

**Functional Capacity**

In Scenario 2, funds would be needed for a modular addition to accommodate the additional students at ESS. The cost of this addition and any other renovations to ESS cannot be determined until more information is available to submit to contractors.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, RSU 16 Operations Director)*

**Utilities**

In Scenario 2, all RSU 16 schools would have access to 3 phase power.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

**Building Revenue**

If 2/3 of the School Board voted to close MCS and Minot voters approved of the closure, RSU 16 could collect revenue from leasing the property. Minot would have to refuse ownership of MCS before the district would be permitted to sell the property.

*(Source: MRSA 20-A §1512, §4102 and §4103)*

**Food Services**

If meal times at ESS were staggered and additional cold storage was procured, ESS would be able to accommodate the additional students.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

**Playgrounds**

In Scenario 2, playground equipment would be moved from MCS to accommodate additional children. The ESS PreK playground would also be relocated (3,549sqft) for parking. The ESS playground has a footprint of 43,246 sq ft, PCS playground has a footprint of 18,206 sq ft. With this in mind, there will be sufficient space at ESS to accommodate the additional students.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, Task Force Spatial Comparison Worksheet)*

## **Transportation**

In Scenario 2, there would be opportunities to reorganize bus routes for ESS and MCS students. If MCS students remained on their current route and drove directly to ESS instead of MCS, this could result in up to 10 minutes of additional time on the bus. If routes were adjusted for efficiency, there is a potential for a decrease in ride time.

*(Source: Transportation Analysis in Task Force FAQ)*

## **Driveline**

The increase in cars and buses would require reconfiguration of driveline and bus loading and unloading zones at ESS.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

## **Parking**

Additional parking would be required at ESS to accommodate this scenario.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

## **Transitions**

In Scenario 2, MCS students would experience a single transition at the time of consolidation.

## **Class Size**

Based on enrollment numbers for 2023-24 and on the current number of teachers, an ESS/MCS consolidated school would have an average class size of 16 and PCS would remain at 16. This does not take into account the potential reduction of up to 7 teacher positions. Enrollment numbers are dynamic, so these figures are approximate.

*(Source: Student and Staffing Analysis in Task Force FAQ)*

## **Title 1 Funding**

Under Scenario 2 and using current income data, PCS and a consolidated ESS+MCS would each qualify for the “Targeted Assistance” program. However, that can change from year to year depending upon the number of enrolled students from low-income households.

*(Source: Task Force Budget FAQ)*

## **Reduction in Force**

There would be opportunities to reduce some staffing costs in Scenario 2. These include a potential annual savings of \$340,568 on redundant positions at ESS and MCS, \$240,000 on 3 classroom teacher positions, and \$200,752 on custodial staff salaries and benefits for an approximate total of **\$781,320**.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, Task Force Staffing FAQ, RSU 16 Operations Director, RSU 16 Budget Documents)*

## **Specials**

MCS and ESS currently share Art, Music, and PE teachers. In Scenario 2, there would be no changes to staffing, but there would be an opportunity for those teachers to remain at one facility all week.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, RSU 16 Assistant Superintendent)*

## **Special Education**

In Scenario 2, elementary programming would remain the same. For the 23-24 school year, MCS will house the K-4/5 Social Emotional Learning program. ESS will house the Applied Academic students K-6. PCS will house the K-6 and 7-8 Functional Life Skills programs.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, RSU 16 Assistant Superintendent)*

### **Adult Education**

Adult Ed would require a new location to allow space for the additional elementary students in Scenario 2.

*(Source Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

### **Teacher Collaboration and Professional Development**

In Scenario 2, RSU 16 would continue to provide regular opportunities for teachers to collaborate and participate in professional development. Examples include Wednesday early release and 8 scheduled Teacher Workshop days. Combining teaching staff at ESS and MCS, potentially provides them access to additional collaborative resources.

*(Source: RSU 16 2023-2024 School Calendar, Task Force Staffing FAQ)*

### **Family Implications**

In Scenario 2, sibling groups would not be separated at the elementary level. Family impacts would remain as they are today.

### **Community Implications**

Scenario 2 would eliminate the singular MCS community and a new ESS+MCS community would need to be developed and fostered, including relationships with the larger communities (ie PTA groups, community volunteers, fundraising efforts, etc). There will also be financial implications to the three towns for repairing 2 elementary schools.

*(Source: Building Thriving Elementary Schools)*

Working Document

**As of August 15, 2023 – Scenario 4 has been eliminated, through consensus, by the Futures Task Force**

Scenario 4 - Fund, Fix & Staff ESS as a Grade Pre-K-2 School, PCS as a Grade 3-4 School and MCS as a Grade 5-6 School

### **Cost of Repairs**

According to current data, it would cost approximately \$8,332,200 to catch up on deferred maintenance and continue to repair all three elementary schools through 2030 (this figure DOES NOT include heating repairs). The estimated cost of heating repairs is \$7,437,120 for all 3 elementary schools. This puts the approximate total at **\$15,769,320** for the 3 elementary schools.

*(Source: Task Force Budget FAQ, RSU 16 Operations Director and Assistant Superintendent)*

### **Operational Expenses**

Operational expenses would not be significantly impacted by Scenario 4.

### **Functional Capacity**

In Scenario 4, funds would be needed for renovations at ESS to accommodate the new grade levels and Special Education Programming. The cost of these renovations can not be determined until more information is available to submit to contractors.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, RSU 16 Operations Director)*

### **Utilities**

3 phase power is about 2 miles from MCS and would cost between \$450,000 - \$750,000 to have it connected and installed. Not having 3 phase power limits the options available for replacing the MCS heating/venting system. Both PCS and ESS have access to 3 phase power and face no such limitations. In Scenario 4, RSU 16 would continue to face the challenge of operating a school (MCS) without access to 3 Phase Power.

*(Energy Management Consultants Letter 1-18-23)*

### **Food Services**

Food services would not be significantly impacted by Scenario 4.

### **Playgrounds**

In Scenario 4, playground equipment would need to be evaluated and potentially moved based on grade level configurations.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

### **Transportation**

In Scenario 4 there would be opportunities to reorganize bus routes for all elementary students. A potential solution would be staggered bus runs to accommodate staggered start times at each school. This arrangement could potentially reduce bus times since all drivers would be on each elementary run. Another potential arrangement would be all students being bussed to their current hometown elementary school and then a second run to their grade level school. There are financial implications to running a third bus route including increased fuel cost, increased driver cost, and wear and tear on buses. The approximate cost of a third bus run would be **\$267,000** annually.

*(Source: Transportation Analysis in Task Force FAQ)*

## **Driveline**

In Scenario 4, the potential increase in driveline vehicles may require some reconfiguration of the drivelines.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

## **Parking**

Parking would not be impacted by Scenario 4

## **Transitions**

Scenario 4 would result in students experiencing two additional transitions in their elementary years. They would attend ESS PreK-2, PCS 3-4, and MCS 5-6. A growing body of evidence points to significant achievement loss during each transition year and that students benefit when their school contains a larger grade span as opposed to a smaller grade span.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, Task Force Grade Level Configuration Analysis)*

## **Class Size**

In Scenario 4, projected class sizes at ESS (grades PreK-2) would be 15, at PCS (grades 3-4) they would be 15, and at MCS (grades 5-6) they would be 17.14. Current projections for the 2023-24 school year (without consolidation) show average class sizes of 16 (ESS), 17 (MCS), and 17 (PCS).

*(Source Task Force Data Packet and Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

## **Title I Comparability**

Under Scenario 4 and using current data it is unclear which, if any, of the 3 elementary schools would qualify for Title I funds.

*(Source: Task Force FAQ-Title I Questions)*

## **Reduction in Force**

There is an opportunity for the reduction of one grade level teacher at the 5-6 level in Scenario 4 for a savings of approximately **\$80,000**.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

## **Specials**

RSU 16 currently employs 2 elementary level Art, Music, and PE teachers. In Scenario 4, those two teachers would have to be shared among the 3 schools, or additional specials teachers would need to be hired.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, RSU 16 Assistant Superintendent)*

## **Special Education**

In Scenario 4, Special Education services would remain the same except they would follow grade level structure. Each elementary school would offer Applied Academics, Functional Life Skills, Social Emotional Learning, and Resource Room Classrooms at either the K-2 level, 3-4, level, or 5-6 level. Staff would be redistributed to accommodate.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, RSU 16 Assistant Superintendent)*

## **Adult Education**

In Scenario 4, Adult Education would be moved to PCS.

*(Source: Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis)*

### **Teacher Collaboration and Professional Development**

RSU 16 currently provides regular opportunities for teachers to collaborate and participate in professional development. Examples include Wednesday early release and 8 scheduled Teacher Workshop days. However, there is some evidence suggesting that grade level configured schools provide teachers more opportunities to narrow the focus of their curriculum and collaborate with a larger number of teachers. There is also increased ability to match students to teachers based on teaching and learning styles.

*(Source: RSU 16 2023-2024 School Calendar, Task Force Staffing FAQ, Task Force Grade Level Configuration Analysis)*

### **Family Implications**

Scenario 4 would potentially separate siblings at the elementary level. Families with multiple elementary aged students utilizing driveline may need to do up to three drop-offs/pickups at three schools. Busing may require staggered pickup/drop-off times.

*(Source Functional Capacity Subgroup Analysis, Transportation Analysis in Task Force FAQ)*

### **Community Implications**

Scenario 4 would end all current elementary communities. Three new school communities would need to be developed and fostered, including relationships with the larger communities (ie PTA groups, community volunteers, fundraising efforts, etc). There will also be financial implications to the three towns for repairing 3 elementary schools.

*(Source: Building Thriving Elementary Schools)*

Working Document