

Appendix B

Case	Cost Effectiveness	Educational Effectiveness	Governance
<p>I. Expand Union 26</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amherst, Leverett, Pelham, and Shutesbury in a four-town elementary union • 6 elementary schools • Superintendent/central office shared between Union and Region • Elementary budget and school committee for each town • Single central office for all schools in four towns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Net costs/savings insignificant relative to four towns' school budgets totaling \$52.8 million • Estimated \$204,000 in additional administrative costs • But Leverett and Shutesbury would bring \$213,000 in current resources • Net savings of \$9,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased K-12 articulation, coordination of curriculum, professional development, special education, preparation of all students for middle school • Greater administrative complexity raises concerns about administrative focus • Superintendent/central office works with five budgets and school committees, compared with three now • State reports and record-keeping on five separate units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local control over each town's elementary school preserved to a significant extent, though unified superintendent/central office would likely lead to less variety of approaches. • Protection against closure of any one town's elementary school • Representation on Union school committee may be contentious – state law appears to mandate 3 members per town in a superintendency union • Improve capacity for long-term planning through regional School Committee
<p>II. Single K-12 Region</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amherst, Leverett, Pelham, and Shutesbury in a four-town K-12 region • 8 schools total • One budget • One regional school committee • Single central office for all schools in four towns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Net costs/savings not insignificant but not sufficiently large to solely justify this option • Estimates range from net cost of \$20,000 to net savings of \$230,000 • Costs include bringing all teachers to same salary scale • Savings include partial state reimbursement for all regional transportation • Some question about whether all savings quantified (e.g., savings from single SPED department and administrative efficiencies) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum K-12 articulation, coordination of curriculum, professional development, special education, preparation of all students for middle school • Single administration, budget, and school committee reduces complexity, duplication of effort; increases focus • Greater flexibility regarding boundary lines for elementary schools, transportation, use of buildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greatest concerns about loss of local control communities now have for educating youngest students in their towns • Significant challenge designing regional agreement representing one larger town and three smaller towns • As with current 7-12 Region, budget reviewed by four finance committees and approved by four town meetings • Trust between four towns will be important • Provides long-term planning capacity

Case	• Cost Effectiveness	• Educational Effectiveness	• Governance
<p>III. Single K-12 Region, close Pelham school, move all sixth-graders to middle school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amherst, Leverett, Pelham, and Shutesbury in a four-town K-12 region • 7 schools total – 5 elementary, 1 MS, and 1 HS • One budget • One regional school committee • Single central office for all schools in four towns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated savings from closing an elementary school of \$406,000, in addition to the savings or minus the cost of implementing a K-12 region • Does not include the cost of debt payments on Pelham’s relatively new building; if debt could not be transferred to new user, savings would be much lower 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brings middle school to more traditional 3-year model • Maximum K-12 articulation, coordination of curriculum, professional development, special education, preparation of all students for middle school • Single administration, budget, and school committee reduces complexity, duplication of effort; increases focus • Greatest flexibility regarding boundary lines for elementary schools, transportation, use of buildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same governance issues as Case II • Additional issues involved in closing Pelham elementary school
<p>IV. Current structure; take other actions to improve articulation and achieve operational efficiencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leverett and Shutesbury elementary schools in separate K-6 union from Amherst, Pelham, and Region schools • Two superintendents/ central offices supervise elementary students who come together in 7th grade under one of them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to current budget and financing structure • Requires continued aggressive school choice program to maintain Pelham and Leverett Schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires cooperation of 2 Superintendents, 8 principals, and their staff to achieve coordination, articulation, and efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continues tradition of town-elected School Committees providing guidance for education • Provides no formal mechanism for planning as a four-town community committed to one regional secondary district • Requires regular four-town meetings of School Committees, Select Boards, and Finance Committees to assure effective planning