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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Directors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Brand Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Bodie Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Sills Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyse Shuster School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Charlupski School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Wickman Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Rigby Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Czajkowski Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca McFall Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Wong Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Fisher Gomberg School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Wilson Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Echelson School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Fitzgerald Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Heller School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Evans Superintendent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advisory Council

| Maya Minkin School Committee Acton-Boxborough Regional School District |
| Ann Guay School Committee Arlington Public Schools |
| John Phelan Superintendent Belmont Public Schools |
| David Model School Committee Brookline Public Schools |
| Kathleen Snook School Committee Concord Public Schools, CC Regional |
| Jessie Steigerwald School Committee Lexington Public Schools |
| Timothy Christenfeld School Committee Lincoln Public Schools |
| Patricia Mostue School Committee Lincoln-Sudbury Regional School District |
| David Fleishman Superintendent Newton Public Schools |
| Lucie St. George School Committee Sudbury Public Schools |
| Margaret Donnelly School Committee Waltham Public Schools |
| Elizabeth Yusem School Committee Watertown Public Schools |
| John Brackett Superintendent Weston Public Schools |
| Cindy Bohne School Committee Winchester Public Schools |

EDCO Collaborative:

Colleen Dolan        David King        Thomas Markham
Judith Vaillancourt  James Sullivan     Rick Atkins
1.0 CALL TO ORDER 10:30 AM
1.1 Public Participation – none
Colleen Dolan acknowledged that Joan Wickman would be leaving Carlisle Public Schools and John Brackett would be leaving Weston Public Schools. She thanked them for their service to EDCO.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SESSION
2.1 A motion was made by Joan Wickman and seconded by Helen Charlupski to invite the Advisory Council to participate in the discussion in executive session.
A motion was made by Joan Wickman and seconded by Helen Charlupski to enter into executive session for the purpose of developing strategy for contract negotiations with the executive director and to reconvene in open session. A roll call vote was taken with all present voting in the affirmative.

3.0 ACTION ITEMS
3.1 Approval/Acceptance of Minutes
A motion was made by Bella Wong and seconded by Joan Wickman to approve minutes of the Board of Directors meeting on 4.28.16. The motion carried unanimously.

3.2 Acceptance of Executive Finance Committee Minutes:
A motion was made by Kathleen Bodie and seconded by Bella Wong to accept minutes of the Executive Finance Committee meeting on 4.12.16. The motion carried unanimously.

3.3 Approval of employee actions:
A motion was made by Bella Wong and seconded by Kathleen Bodie to approve employee actions as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

3.4 FY 17 Budget
A motion was made by Rebecca McFall and seconded by John Phelan to approve FY17 budget as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

3.5 Membership Assessments FY17
A motion was made by Ed Heller and seconded by Bella Wong to approve Membership Assessments for FY17 as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

3.6 Tuition Rates FY17
A motion was made by Joan Wickman and seconded by Jon Sills to approve Tuition Rates for FY17 as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

3.7 EDCO Collaborative Employee Handbook
A motion was made by Kathleen Bodie and seconded by Jon Sills to approve EDCO Collaborative Employee Handbook as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

4.0 NEW BUSINESS
4.1 Future Management Systems, Inc.: Presentation of CASE, EDCO, LABBB Collaborative (CELC)
Study by Lyle Kirkman, President of Future Management Systems, Peter Holland, Patricia Aubin and David Jackson.

The presentation began with Peter Holland providing an overview of three scenarios of a CELC merger: Consolidation/Merger Program, Partnership, and Shared Central Services.

Mr. Holland explained that the research was compiled from the following sources:
• Surveys of 142 LABBB stakeholders, 73 CASE stakeholders and 45 EDCO stakeholders
• 75 Interviews
• Document Reviews
• Financial Review

Stakeholders included the Executive Directors, HR Managers, Parents, Staff, Superintendents, School Committee members and Special Education Directors.

Overall, Pat Aubin explained that consolidation was not recommended for LABBB Collaborative as the findings indicated little to no benefit to LABBB and it is able to sustain a healthy budget and program.

CASE Collaborative would have limited benefits to a consolidated program and EDCO Collaborative would benefit the most from consolidation especially in terms of Special Education programs.

A CASE/EDCO consolidation might help EDCO financially and would help CASE Collaborative in terms of space/facility. It would also provide “one stop shopping” combining Professional Development and Special Education programs.

The benefits to a consolidation might include:
• An opportunity for new leadership
• Improved board governance – less meetings to attend
• Greater advocacy

Some challenges to a consolidation might include:
• The space issue would not be entirely resolved as classroom space in a public school setting would still be needed
• Some CASE districts may not join a consolidated collaborative
• Union negotiations would increase personnel costs
• Geography would be a challenge for student and staff
• Consolidation process could take a considerable amount of time

Currently there are existing program partnerships that are already working well, namely:
• CELC Professional Development
• Transportation Program
• Shared Spaced between LABBB and EDCO
• Shared Financial and HR Management between LABBB and EDCO

Results from the study did find several opportunities for other potential partnerships, such as:
• A collaboration between Colebrook High School and North Crossing Academy
• Programs servicing adult ages 18 – 22
• An Enhanced CELC Program
• Meetings among Program Administrators
• Wrap Around Services
• Language based classrooms
• Transition support for students nearing 22
• Programs supporting Post 22
• 45 day program for Middle School students
• School Refusal programs for students within school setting that are anxious and depressed
• Increase in Consultation services

David Jackson presented information in regards to Shared Central Services – Financial Management Services and Human Resources.

Bella Wong wanted to know why positions such as Technology Director and Director of Professional Development were not included? David Jackson responded that those types of positions were considered a program level position.

Final Comments and Recommendations: Based on the study, consolidation is not recommended for LABBB. Consolidation brings some potential benefits to CASE but would benefit EDCO the most.

Recommendations to EDCO include a reduction in the Administrative structure, renegotiation of the lease, and better utilization of the facility. EDCO is not considered a good consolidation partner due to declining equity and long-range debt.

Superintendents face potential conflicts of interest serving multiple collaborative boards as well as their own districts. Collaborative boards need a tighter process for overseeing leadership, finances and the culture of collaboratives. Other insights derived from the study include:

• Leadership Matters – Potential new leaders need entrepreneurial skills
• CASE and LABBB programs require classroom space for new and existing programs
• There are 11 program partnerships that can expand the reach and effectiveness of all (3) collaboratives, better serve teachers and students and provide more revenue
• EDCO can diversify Professional Development programs by offering satellite programs
• There is a need for a more creative approach to scheduling board meetings and time constraints

Jon Sills inquired as to whether not EDCO districts have been approached to provide space (Watertown, Winchester, Weston, Waltham)? Superintendents replied they have no space available.

Diane Fischer Gomberg commented that some items mentioned didn’t make sense to her. For example, shifting EDCO’s brand from PD doesn’t seem right.

Lyle Kirkman responded that the suggestion is not to shift away from PD but that PD can’t close the gap in budget and therefore there is a need to diversify.

A request was made to disaggregate some of the survey data. How did the survey results of “stakeholders” breakdown among the categories?

Peter Holland agreed that the survey results were downplayed. There was a breakdown by board members, etc. but based on the number of responses received, the data was skewed.

Bella Wong inquired as to how many superintendents were interviewed and added that you can’t separate out board members from superintendents.
Kathleen Bodie expressed an appreciation for the work that has been done because it is helpful in figuring out next steps as there is a strong interest in these collaboratives thriving. She suggested there may be a need for some time over the summer to meet and discuss next steps.

John Phelan commented that it is helpful to hear this information a second time as he attended the LABBB meeting as well. He stated that he sensed a little defensiveness in the room and reiterated Lyles' comments about an objective view and doesn't necessarily mean “good” or “bad”.

Jon Sills appreciated the info as well and acknowledged the opportunities presented here to work together.

Colleen Dolan expressed her expectations for a draft and prepared a follow-up as EDCO felt there were some inaccuracies and possibly some biases. In particular, the following issues from the report stand out as problematic:

1. Ms. Dolan stated that the wording that in 2015 “EDCO asked LABBB to take over the transportation program” could be interpreted incorrectly.

2. On the topic of serving on multiple boards, Ms. Dolan stressed that DESE provided board training and that EDCO worked with lawyers around guidelines.

3. Ms. Dolan also noted that some statements were inaccurate, for example the post-22 program. The Collaborative Study called for in legislation does not allow for provision of post-22 services.

4. EDCO questions the comment that CASE finances are solid; while the statement may be accurate, it does not address high tuition rates and declining student enrollment.

5. EDCO would like to reiterate the request for additional data made at the May meeting and would like disaggregated data.

6. In addition, there is need to be sure apples are being compared to apples. For example, LABBB’s administrative costs are contracted and therefore are in a different line item than EDCO’s.

7. Finally, EDCO acknowledges the occupancy costs are high but feels it is important when looking forward to the needs of providing space for future programs.

Lyle Kirkman indicated that specific data may not really affect big picture but agreed to go back and correct any inaccuracies.

Judith Vaillancourt provided clarification on Administrative costs and in particular the funding of her position as Associate Executive Director. It is not entirely funded through Central Administration only. Ms. Vaillancourt also pointed out that Gerry Mazor’s position at LABBB is not included in LABBB administrative costs and that the IT Director is included in EDCO Central Administration costs as well as LABBB. It does not feel like a fair comparison when comparing administrative costs.
Thomas Markham added that the total run by the business office’s 36 million budget is not included in FMS report. It is included in three pieces, EDCO, LABBB and Transportation but when looking at the total we are talking 2.9%.

Rebecca McFall noted that the recommendations don’t seem like financial recommendations — they appear more programmatic.

Thomas Markham responded that it was his obligation is to provide transparent data and there were omissions and inaccuracies included in the report that should be noted.

Colleen Dolan added that EDCO does not see the fact that our NCA program is not located within a public school setting as disadvantageous because enrollment is increasing and the program provides an alternative to a public high school. The Partners Program will be coming to the EDCO facility as well and enrollment is anticipated to increase. In addition, the geography of where students are coming from is expanding.

Judith Vaillancourt noted that recommendations were based on pros and cons but some of the information was inaccurate and one can’t make informed programmatic decisions without all of the data.

Dianne Fischer Gomberg asked for clarification on whether or not one of the recommendations was to cut administrative costs. Mr. Kirkman stated that they were only providing information.

The question was asked if board members from LABBB and CASE were concerned about inaccuracies when the information was presented at their meetings and Jon Sills replied that there concerns about the space issues and adequate research into the options.

Lyle Kirkman stated that they did not hear that LABBB or CASE felt the financial data was inaccurate.

Kathleen Bodie concluded the discussion by stating that EDCO is a very valuable organization that has gone through many recent changes. She added that rent is an issue with EDCO that does provide a burden but it can be handled and having the space provides a lot of opportunities for growth.

5.0 ADJOURNMENT -
A motion was made by Joan Wickman and seconded by Rebecca McFall to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Mullaley

date 9.20.16