

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals  
(text not searchable)

Mike

SPECIAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL RESTRUCTURING

EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 20, 1991

AFTERNOON

Present: Jane Amero, Roy Hibyan, Dick Sherwood (Staff)

Absent: James Storer, Mike Higgins (Staff)

Guests: Richard Fortin SAD #49 School Board  
Skip Greenlaw CSD 13 School Board  
David Jones SAD #71 School Board  
Nicholas Nadzo Portland School Board  
Philip St. Pierre Lewiston School Board  
Eunice Spooner SAD #47 School Board  
Mert Henry (Restructuring Commission Co-chair)  
Don Nicoll (Restructuring Commission Co-chair)

The subcommittee heard short presentations from Messrs. Fortin, Greenlaw, Jones, Nadzo and St. Pierre and Ms. Spooner addressing the question "What one thing, other than more money, will most improve the schools?" The guests key points are summarized below.

Mr. Nadzo

Mr. Nadzo said he has had little direct contact with the State Department of Education in two years. He hasn't seen the Department, for example, provide boards any advice on how to implement the "Common Core of Learning." He recommends, therefore, that the Department work more closely and directly with school boards to help them understand their duties and responsibilities. Noting there is a 35% annual turnover in school board members, he suggested the Department conduct regular seminars for new board members.

Mr. Nadzo also observed that 283 school boards with 1800 members is duplicative and inefficient. He suggested that sixteen county boards might be more efficient.

Finally, he said the source of school funding is a problem. There ought to be more State funding and less reliance on the local property tax.

Mr. St. Pierre

Noting that restructuring and change do not come easy, Mr. St. Pierre concurred with Mr. Nadzo's recommendation that the State Department of Education provide more direct help to school boards.

He observed that the Department tends to emphasize regulation more than technical assistance.

Mr. St. Pierre noted that regional differences affect school funding. We need a funding formula which is more equitable. It would help if the formula relied less on the property tax and more on other sources. Mr. St. Pierre also noted that, if State funding sources were more important, it would provide the State Department more opportunity to play a helping role.

He recommended we do more to educate and raise the aspirations of adults. Children need adults who aren't afraid of education. Because we have to deal with parents and students who don't want to be in school, Mr. St. Pierre hopes we can find a way to regulate and control the participation of both parents and students. There is no disincentive for non-participation; hence, we need to legislate participation. He suggested that parents receiving AFDC should

be made responsible for the attendance of their children.

Mr. St. Pierre said he is pleased with the new law to reduce the working hours of sixteen and seventeen year-olds, but it doesn't prevent students from holding two or more jobs. To prevent this, he recommends all work permits be issued through the schools.

Observing that students have no incentive to do well on the Maine Educational Assessment, Mr. St. Pierre recommends that passing the Assessment be made one of the requirements for high school graduation.

Finally, he said the State should exert pressure on school systems to offer quality education.

#### Mr. Fortin

Mr. Fortin said there are serious geographic funding disparities and the State should give greater priority to the study of the problem.

He also said the funding formula should be revised to funding more stable from year to year. The recent change which limits any reduction in State aid to a maximum of ten per cent is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Fortin believes the primary purpose of the State Department of Education ought to be communication -- getting information out to people, particularly school board members. He recommends a monthly newsletter addressed to board members.

He said school boards need more help in implementing and interpreting regulations. When a board calls the Department for advice, it often doesn't receive it. Instead, the Department tells the board to ask its lawyers.

Finally, Mr. Fortin said the Department of Education ought to provide administrators and teachers more training in the use of new technologies. He recommends that certification require competence in the use of such technologies.

#### Mr. Jones

Mr. Jones said the Department of Education could be helpful to school boards in curriculum development. SAD #71, for example, is developing a career curriculum and needs assistance in translating the Common Core of Learning into specific courses.

He observed that boards also need help with assessment. How can schools assess the competencies of students not headed for college? How can scores on the Maine Educational Assessment be translated into competencies? What curriculum ought to be designed for career bound students and how can outcomes be assessed?

Mr. Jones said districts with rapidly growing enrollments need advice on how to use existing buildings more efficiently.

He noted that transportation is problematic when districts try to offer joint courses for students from several districts. He also observed that few students from SAD #71 enroll in the regional technical center because of travel time and because they don't want to leave their friends at the high school.

Mr. Jones pointed out that the funding formula often creates tensions within a school district. For example, because Kennebunk has more students but lower property values than Kennebunkport, tensions arise concerning equity within

the district. Noting that revising the funding formula will change the nature and sources of these internal tensions, Mr. Jones urges the State to be sensitive to these problems.

Mr. Greenlaw

Mr. Greenlaw observed that Maine does not have sufficient resources to reduce its reliance on property taxes, something is wrong with the funding formula and something must be done about the State valuation.

Mr. Greenlaw said the Department of Education ought to be more involved in home schooling. There are issues about parents' competency to teach their children, particularly special needs children.

Mr. Greenlaw also believes the Department of Education ought to emphasize assistance more than regulation.

Finally, he recommended the Department of Education provide more help with in-service training. We're not giving teachers enough in-service support.

Ms. Spooner

Ms. Spooner concurs that the funding law is a problem. SAD #47 has some of the same internal tensions as those described by Mr. Jones. Because of the valuation formula, Belgrade contributes more than Oakland, but has fewer students. She pointed out, however, that if we don't rely on the property tax, there are important questions about how we are to divide up the funds.

Noting that eleventh grade students enrolled in general programs who did very well on the eighth grade Maine Educational Assessment do poorly on the eleventh grade assessment, Ms. Spooner recommended the Department of Education offer more help in raising student aspirations.

Ms. Spooner pointed out that many children today live in disadvantaged or abusive environments which preclude success in school. She recommends, therefore, that the Department of Human Services assign its child case workers by school district, rather than by human service regions.

Round Table Discussion

Ms. Amero asked "Does it make sense to have 283 school boards?"

Several persons said further centralization won't work. The citizens won't accept larger districts. One person said consolidation will only work if the funding formula can be revised to eliminate winners and losers. Another observed that the formula pits municipal issues against school issues. The agendas of municipal politicians often interfere with educational agendas. The resolution of this problem lies in having all school budgets approved directly by citizens rather than by municipal officials.

Ms. Amero asked "How do you feel about offering social services at school?"

One person said the State must co-ordinate child services and education. Another pointed out that many schools are now providing social services at school for which they receive no State reimbursement.

Ms. Amero asked whether it would be useful to change school schedules.

One person noted that the school day hasn't gotten any longer, but we're cramming more into it. Another suggested we might eliminate either the February or April vacations to obtain a longer school year.

Ms. Amero then asked whether such changes should be mandated or whether there are incentives which could be used to encourage districts to change schedules.

It was generally agreed that districts now have the authority to change schedules, but teacher contracts would prevent it.

Ms. Amero asked whether the State could reduce administrative costs by reforming administrative responsibilities.

It was noted that a lot administrative costs pertain to law suits. It was also noted that many more pertain to the preparation of individual special education programs.

Ms. Amero asked how more parental participation could be encouraged.

One suggestion was for employers to provide released time both for parents and others to work with the schools. It was also noted that some districts have paid coordinators to involve people in the schools.

Ms. Amero asked whether there are ways to save money by forming regional purchasing agreements or sharing resources.

One person, noting that two adjacent cities will meet this fall to discuss sharing both municipal and school resources, said it would be helpful if the State could perform a mediating role in such discussions. Another said sharing in staff development programs would be useful. Also, he said, school boards ought to get together more often, if only, to talk. It was pointed out that there used to be regional school board associations with regular meetings. One person said two towns were entering into a joint fixed price contract for heating oil and gasoline. He thinks the State might fruitfully negotiate such contracts for municipalities and districts.

Ms. Amero asked whether choice offers any benefits.

One person said choice would make sense if schools specialized in their curricula, but then transportation would become a problem. Another asked what criteria would be used to decide who would be accepted at popular schools. A third person said choice would increase the segregation of good and poor students, since the Maine Educational Scores would encourage migration. However, another with free choice in his district said he hadn't seen that happen.

**SPECIAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL RESTRUCTURING**  
**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES MINUTES**

**SEPTEMBER 20, 1991**

**Present:** Jane Amero, Roy Hibyan, Michael Higgins (staff),  
Dick Sherwood (staff)

**Absent:** James Storer

**Guests:** Iver Carlsen, Joe Mattis, Chris Toy, Bob Young

The subcommittee and its guests (all principals of nearby schools) spent the morning discussing K-12 education in Maine. Following is a summary of remarks made by each.

**Joe Mattis, Principal, James H. Bean School (Elementary)**

Mr. Mattis stressed the need for establishing a statewide set of standards that articulate what children need to know, and when they need to know it. He sees confusion among educators concerning appropriate curriculum and a need for new measures of progress, observing that the standard reporting measures (grades of A,B,C, etc.) don't adequately measure progress.

He suggested that schools give serious consideration to restructuring the traditional school year. One example would be a series of 8 week modules followed by 2 weeks of teacher training and collaboration. He noted that such a system (in connection with a shortened summer vacation or several short periods of vacation spaced throughout the year) would better suit the learning patterns of young students and provide greater opportunities for professional development of teachers.

Mr. Mattis also suggested that a shift in thinking about education from learning as knowledge to learning for application - how do we put knowledge together and use it - may be necessary. He urged the subcommittee and educators in general to challenge traditional ideas concerning the school calendar, reporting systems and curriculum.

**Chris Toy, Principal, Hall-Dale Middle School**

Mr. Toy also suggested that restructuring the school year could be beneficial. He noted that the current school calendar evolved when America was an agrarian society. A trimester system with breaks in between might better meet the needs of the late 20th and 21st centuries.

He cited focusing on schools as community centers as a means of better utilizing school resources, increasing understanding and support among citizens for the schools' mission, and of enriching the learning community.

**Bob Young, Principal, Cony High School**

Mr. Young offered several prescriptions for school change:

- \* Education must be a priority at the local, state and federal level if education is to be transformed.
- \* Define what essential skills students should learn in grades K-12. We haven't done that yet.
- \* Refocus emphasis and money on children ages 0 to 8. ("That's where the game is won or lost")
- \* The state needs to do better at ensuring that educational opportunities are equalized statewide. Mr. Young believes that in general, students in the north have fewer opportunities and resources.
- \* Schools need to do better at helping students make the transition from high school to life after high school.
- \* High school students should prove proficiency in key subject areas.

**Iver Carlsen, Principal, Region 10 Vocational Program**

Mr. Carlsen offered several suggestions for change:

- \* Schools need greater flexibility in day to day operations. He suggested that schools might be run more like a business. He also observed that state requirements for certification of vocational teachers are a barrier to hiring the best teachers. He suggested greater flexibility at the local level in hiring.
- \* Greater emphasis must be placed on students and student needs at the pre-K and elementary grade levels.
- \* Schools should emphasize a core of competencies approach and strive to help students apply what they learn.

The subcommittee and its guests engaged in a wide ranging discussion of K-12 education following presentations by each of the principals. The following points were discussed.

- \* There is a natural and usually positive tension between local and state control of education, but in some areas (like teacher certification) a better definition of who is in control is needed.
- \* Ways that educators think about education may have to undergo fundamental change if schools are to be revitalized. For instance, at the early grade levels teachers tend to think in terms of teaching grade 2 or grade 3 students, whereas at the high school level teachers teach a particular subject. There is a fundamental difference between teaching a subject and teaching a student.

- \* A certification process based on teacher performance might be preferable to the current system. However, such a system would require establishment of an agreed upon set of standards, outcomes or competencies statewide.
- \* The role of the family in educating children needs to be reinforced and built into the education system. Parents need to be included in the schools and family aspirations and social issues need to be addressed.
- \* The high school academic program needs to be better integrated with vocational / technical education.
- \* A model of education that would ensure equal inputs statewide in the schools was discussed. Equal class size, salaries, materials and resources would be necessary in such a model.

SPECIAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL RESTRUCTURING  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 13, 1991

Present: Jame Amero, Roy Hibyan, Michael Higgins (staff),  
Dick Sherwood (staff)

Absent: James Storer

Guests: Morning: Peter Walsh, Janice Cross, Jennifer Van  
Dusen, Rachel Curtis, Betsy Squibb, Sue  
Mackey-Andrews, Cheryl Leeman  
Afternoon: President Connick

The subcommittee and its guests spent the morning discussing pre-schol services in Maine. Following are brief summaries of the remarks made by each guest.

Peter Walsh - Department of Human Services  
Mr. Walsh focused on two major points:

- 1) Reorganization of services for children at the state level. He advocates creation of a single department responsible for providing services to children and their families.
- 2) Regional / local coordination of services for children and families with a unified point of entry to the system for all users.

He also advocated strengthening the day care system so that mentoring and education of small providers can occur.

Janice Cross - Department of Education

Ms. Cross focused on efforts by the department to strengthen parental involvement in their children's education - both in the home and schools. She discussed programs offered by the department on parent training, seminars for businesses on improving parenting skills and school based child care for teen parents.

Jennifer Van Dusen - Department of Education

Ms. Van Dusen stressed the need for children to be healthy and nurtured as prerequisites to learning and the importance of educating parents about child raising, particularly the youngest parents. To ensure that every child enters school ready to learn, she advocates the following actions:

- \* Recognize publicly that every child comes to school already learning and ready to learn more.
- \* Develop a family policy that embraces the importance of parenting through encouragement of parental leave, child care support, and parent involvement in education.
- \* Continue to support existing efforts to reduce infant

- mortality, low birthweight and other threats to children.
- \* Continue to support existing efforts to ensure that schools are ready for the children.
  - \* Continue to support efforts to reduce the adolescent pregnancy rate and to care for the needs of very young parents and their children.
  - \* Examine the need for comprehensive support services to all parents, including education on child development.

Rachel Curtis - Department of Human Services

Ms. Curtis focused on the need to strengthen the system of health care for children in Maine. She described the Well Child clinics around the state and the importance of the department's education efforts concerning healthy lifestyles, pre-natal care and parenting skills.

Betsy Squibb - University of Maine at Farmington

Prof. Squibb made several suggestions for ensuring that every child who begins school is ready to learn.

Prior to School Entry

- 1) Adequate nutrition, pre-natal care and health care are critical. Programs that deliver those services need to be better organized.
- 2) Screening and services for children at risk may need additional funding and better coordination.
- 3) High quality childcare is needed, both prior to school age and before and after school. Greater coordination and funding is necessary.
- 4) Preschool programs are needed to provide stimulation for children in the form of a school-like experience prior to school entry. A coordinated effort to look at each community's offerings should be undertaken.

Upon Entry

- 1) Create developmentally appropriate curriculum for all children.
- 2) Develop state certification for teachers and care givers working with preschoolers through grade 3.
- 3) Reexamine standardized tests and assessment tools of young children's learning and development.
- 4) Include parents in the school process - as partners and policy makers.

Sue Mackey-Andrews - Child Development Services, Dept. of Edu.

Ms. Mackey-Andrews described the CDS system and its provision of services to preschool handicapped children. She advocated a comprehensive policy on families and children in Maine that addresses tough policy questions concerning allocation of scarce resources. She disagreed somewhat with Peter Walsh concerning formation of a one department concept for delivery of services to children and families, arguing that sometimes different departments have expertise that might be missing in a super department.

Cheryl Leeman - Head Start

Ms. Leeman described the Head Start program and its 4 major components: education, health, parent involvement and social services. She noted that the program has moved toward a greater emphasis on family issues in recent years. She advocates development of a state policy on transitioning preschool children into the public schools, public schools developing better relationships with preschools, and creation of a comprehensive system of early childhood services that includes programs for parents. Ms. Leeman suggested that the Head Start program offers a good model for delivering the kinds of services to children spoken of by the other speakers.

The subcommittee spent an hour in the afternoon with President Connick from UMA discussing the interactive television system (ITV). President Connick provided an overview of ITV's development and explained the reasoning that led to the televised community college system adopted by the University of Maine System. He described the technical workings of the system and the special emphasis on teaching the system requires. He also cited student tracking done by UMA that shows students at remote ITV sites generally perform at high levels.

President Connick argued for development of an ITV users consortium that would develop policy concerning new uses for the ITV system. The group discussed use of the system by the legislature, by state agencies and others, agreeing that non academic uses of the system should increase and a consortium play a prominent role in policy and management.

**SPECIAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL RESTRUCTURING**

**EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES**

**SEPTEMBER 6, 1991**

Present: Jane Amero, Roy Hibyan, James Storer, Michael Higgins (staff), Dick Sherwood (staff)

Absent: None

Guests: Eve Bither, Ken Curtis, John Fitzsimmons, Robert Woodbury

The subcommittee heard presentations from Commissioner Bither, Chancellor Woodbury, Governor Curtis and President Fitzsimmons. Following is a summary of key points raised by each.

**Commissioner Bither**

Commissioner Bither provided an overview of the Department's progress in several of its areas of obligation and reviewed the subcommittee's areas of interest document. Following is a summary of the Commissioner's observations and recommendations.

- The department is increasingly focusing on student outcomes. This is reflected in the department mission statement, in the Common Core of Learning (which has gained wide acceptance by schools) and in growing interest and participation in restructuring.
- Education mandates have been waived for selected schools (such as those participating in the Southern Maine Partnership) in return for local adoption of student outcome measures. Although restructuring is an exciting and important development, widespread adoption of restructuring will be somewhat slowed by the labor intensive nature of the enterprise.
- The department views its three primary functions as providing leadership, technical assistance and regulation, in that order.
- Changes in the department's role have created a need for flexibility and changes in responsibilities of department staff. Some changes have occurred, but staff structures are partially fixed by statute, inhibiting greater flexibility.
- In an effort to enhance preschool education in Maine, the Commissioner advocates establishment of Head Start within the department.

- Incentives for consolidating school districts should again be provided. The Commissioner advocates further development of school administrative districts (SADs) and discussed some of the structural problems inherent in school unions and consolidated school districts.
- Expanded use of computer links should be used to connect the department with school districts, thereby decreasing the need for burdensome forms and other paperwork. The Commissioner also would like funds to develop a computerized certification system.
- Regional department offices should be expanded to provide service throughout the state, rather than focusing all the department's staff and facilities in Augusta.
- The Commissioner should be "required" rather than "permitted" to address the Legislature annually concerning the status of K-12 education. An annual address to the Legislature would promote accountability and visibility.

### **Chancellor Woodbury**

Chancellor Woodbury discussed the following 4 points with the subcommittee.

- The subcommittee should place additional emphasis on the crucial importance of investment in human capital. The Chancellor argues that we must think of state functions as both an investment (in human resources) responsibility and a current services responsibility.
- If point 1 is true, then we must ask what in the structure and process of state government supports or impedes investment in human capital. The Chancellor cited the following characteristics of state government as noteworthy.
  1. The organization and governance of higher education in Maine is as good as anywhere in the country.
  2. Approximately 70% of state budgets go to health, human services, corrections and K-12 education. It is nearly impossible to diminish that level of funding to those areas. That leaves approximately 30% of state budgets for discretionary funding, and higher education receives approximately 10% of that. Until some change occurs in our thinking about the 70%, higher education funding will continue to be squeezed.
  3. The current structure of the state budget into a part 1 and part 2 is flawed because it makes the assumption that everything you're doing (part 1) is fine and everything new (part 2) is questionable.

4. There is no capital budget. Capital budgeting is done via referendum, which is an inefficient and politicized process.

5. There is no state mechanism other than the biennial budget for planning spending for higher education. The Chancellor cited work done in other states that would impose a 5 year spending cycle in the budget as a preferable model.

6. Maine ranks 50th in state investment in research.

- Restructuring in higher education should not focus on ideas like closing the university campuses at Fort Kent or Machias (proposals that have been discredited because of the enormous negative effect on the region's economic, social, and cultural life), but on the development of interactive television, the library system (URSUS) and the changing nature of staffing needs. The Chancellor mentioned the increased need for highly trained, flexible professionals and the decreased need for clerical workers. He also mentioned the need to further expand the use of the ITV system beyond the university, perhaps through the incorporation of a separate consortium to establish ITV policy.
- The portrait of collaboration between educational institutions is changing. Connections between the university and K-12 system, and the university and technical college system are increasing rapidly. He cited fiscal incentives and the increased pressure for accountability from the state as two reasons for the increase in collaboration.

### **Governor Curtis**

The Governor began by observing that any recommendations the subcommittee might make cannot be made strictly in the context of delivering education services. We have to look beyond education to the state's historically low wages, under employment, low aspirations and related family problems and make a commitment to addressing the social issues as part of the whole education structure.

The Governor made four other major points:

- The state's tax policy is a major problem. The question that needs to be asked is "what's the most efficient use of tax money for everybody". The Governor cited the current effort by the Muskie Institute at USM to educate the public and the legislature about the kinds of revenue sources that are most efficient as an example of the direction we should take, rather than looking to simply increase taxes.

- The higher goal of education is education for its own sake. The lesser goal for post secondary education is to make education as relative as possible to present and future needs. In keeping with that goal, there needs to be greater integration in Maine between what we need now and in the future and how we spend money on post secondary education. The Governor suspects that that might result in increased spending on vocational and technical education.
- State government needs to do more planning than it currently does. Planning needs to be stressed so that we can know what kind of workforce is needed and offer educational programs designed to adequately train them.
- Educational institutions need to do a better job of marketing what they're currently doing - to students, to the private sector and to the legislature. By doing so, institutions establish a relevancy that attracts students.

#### **President Fitzsimmons**

President Fitzsimmons began with an overview of the technical college system, noting that the system is only 5 years old. Following are several of the key issues he thinks deserve consideration by the commission.

- Funding for the technical college system is woefully inadequate. The President noted that a recently completed Commission report identifies the need for 60,000 college trained technicians in Maine by the end of the decade, but the technical colleges can only produce 13,000 through this decade at their current graduation rate. To increase the number of graduates to meet those needs, expansion of programs (and greater funding) is necessary.
- Training of the state's workforce is inadequate. The President observed that while Maine takes great pride in the work ethic of its workforce, we do not invest nearly enough in training them. He believes the technical colleges can play a crucial role in increasing the level of worker training.
- The technical colleges are increasingly becoming an entry point for students who go on to the university system and the Maine Maritime Academy. As a result, he sees the technical college system is an integral part of a "seamless approach" to education in the state.
- Coordination of resources between the technical college system and other higher education institutions in the state is impressive and increasing.
- The ITV system doesn't match up as well with the technical

college system for several reasons. One is the hands-on nature of much of what is taught in the system and the obvious inability of ITV to provide that. Another is the fee structure of the present system that directs 60% of tuition back to UMA.

- Better preparation of post secondary school students is crucial (a point echoed by Governor Curtis and Chancellor Woodbury). All three systems spend significant amounts of money on improving math and writing skills, skills that are basic prerequisites to any post secondary education.
- A philosophical decision needs to be made in the state concerning how we view education. Many states are beginning to understand that education is an economic development tool. As a result, they charge lower tuition, recognizing the long term value of educating citizens. The President is worried that Maine's rising tuition costs will prohibit students from attending institutions of higher education and at the same time will weaken the state's economic development efforts.

The subcommittee asked its guests to comment on the concept of an education appropriation committee or some other alternative to the present structure. Although there was some discussion of possible ways to give the education committee of the legislature a more formal role in the process, there was no interest in specific structural changes. Questioning by the subcommittee revealed that the Department of Education spent significant amounts of time before the education and appropriations committees, often reviewing identical material. There was some agreement that the current system causes some inefficiencies and duplication. (Staff has already been asked to provide information of possible alternative structures used in other states.)

**SPECIAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL RESTRUCTURING**

**EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES**

**AUGUST 30, 1991**

**Present:** Jane Amero, Roy Hibyan, James Storer, Michael Higgins (staff), Dick Sherwood (staff)

**Absent:** None

**Guests:** Henry Bourgeois, Paul Hazelton, Dorothy Moore, Don Nicoll (Restructuring Commission Co-chair)

The subcommittee heard half hour presentations from Mr. Bourgeois, Prof. Hazelton and Dean Moore. Following is a summary of key points raised by each.

**Prof. Hazelton**

Prof. Hazelton began by making brief comments concerning the subcommittee's goals. He pointed out that education funding (Goal 2) must not only be adequate and equitable, it must be consistent as well. He also discussed one of the problems of providing adequate training of a skilled and adaptable work force (Goal 4), observing that vocational training is often the victim of a local tyranny that attempts to shape training to fit only the current local need. What's needed instead is vocational education that teaches adaptability, that prepares workers for employment inside and outside the state and that is sensitively tuned to post secondary vocational educational.

Commenting upon the subcommittee's interest in coordination of resources between the state's educational delivery systems (Area 1), Prof. Hazelton believes there are academic cultural barriers that make coordination difficult. Those barriers include the actual physical location of particular schools and programs and the placement of programs within institutions.

Prof. Hazelton warned the subcommittee to resist any temptation to permit the expanded use of technology (Area 3) to dominate its deliberations. While aware of its importance, he believes other groups are working hard at expanding and promoting technology, and that there are other fundamental matters with which the subcommittee should concern itself.

Concerning Area 4 (life-long learning), Prof. Hazelton believes the concept should include services to pre-school children (ages 0-5). He argues for a single system of education in Maine, not run by a single board, but coordinated in such a way as to constitute a system that students can move in and out of

without major disruption and disorientation. The need for such a system is evident in light of the number of students who drop out of high school then return to complete their degree, the growing need for training and retraining programs, and the great interest in learning for pleasure and self-enrichment. Such a system would, in his view, be sensible and efficient because it recognizes that current patterns of participation in education no longer fit the old stereotypes of high school, college then a lifetime of work.

### **Dean Moore**

Dean Moore began by stating that the subcommittee's preamble rightly emphasizes the need for educators to "work together", noting that good things are happening where educators, parents, business people and others are collaborating. She cited the Southern Maine Partnership as an example of the benefits of collaboration.

Like Prof. Hazelton, Dean Moore believes education funding (Goal 2) is a critical issue. She argues, however, that additional funding sources are necessary beyond state and local sources. She mentioned financial contributions from business as one possible source, but feels that business can also make significant contributions through their expertise and experience.

Concerning the 4th goal (development of an adaptable workforce) Dean Moore stressed the need not just to teach discrete skills, but to prepare students to think independently and to think about what their unique talents are. She noted the importance at the K-12 level of the role of guidance counselors in helping students discover their particular talents and interests.

Dean Moore emphasized the need to deal directly with the inequities that exist between schools with substantial resources and those without. She offered as an example the delivery of a graduate program in education by USM professors at UMFK, pointing out that there are substitutes for establishing new departments or building new structures to deliver academic programs.

Dean Moore noted that development of technology is crucial in Maine if the state is to adequately prepare its students for the 21st century. She argues that the current generation of children are fascinated by computing - its their medium - and we ought to capitalize on that interest by stretching their understanding of its uses.

Life-long learning was of particular importance to Dean Moore. She pointed out that we often learn differently, at different rates and learn best at different times. Our goal, she

believes, should not be to graduate 90% of our high school students "on time", but to create a system that permits people to return for education when they're ready to learn. The traditional education system doesn't work for everyone, according to Dean Moore, and alternatives to the traditional model should be available not just to students who drop out, but to high school and college students for whom the traditional tracks have lost meaning.

Dean Moore discussed the changing nature of teaching in the state, observing that until recently teaching was a lonely profession. She sees a new vitality and interest in teaching and in education and believes that needs to be nurtured and promoted. One way to do that is to encourage participation by parents, communities and business.

### **Mr. Bourgeois**

Mr. Bourgeois began by asserting that the most important thing state government does is educate elementary and secondary students. If that assertion is correct, then the question of the nature of the state's role in promoting education must be examined. Mr. Bourgeois argues that the role of state government is to enable, encourage and support fundamental change in education at the local level. To accomplish fundamental reform, communities may need financing, technical support, speakers, outside advice, and leadership. Much of this can come from the state, but the driving force behind education must be identification of the learning outcomes communities identify for their children and a local commitment to achieving the goals which will produce those outcomes.

The Coalition for Excellence in Education, of which Mr. Bourgeois is a member, is currently engaged in carrying out this program in selected sites in Maine. It emphasizes collaboration, local responsibility and authority for establishing education policy. It also encourages communities to move boldly toward meeting their needs, and discourages tinkering at the margins of the education system, arguing instead that communities should "go for the jugular" in achieving change. The Coalition believes that if communities are provided support and guidance, they'll make choices for educating their students that are appropriate for them. It supports the new national education goals established by the President and the Congress, with the proviso that communities adopt the goals "in their own way."

A general discussion among guests and subcommittee members followed the three presentations. Among the points raised were the following.

**School Choice** Choice was discussed in the context of choice between schools and choice within a school. There was some

sentiment that a choice between schools would create competition, which would in turn force schools to improve in much the same way that a market system forces businesses to improve or perish. Some challenged that theory, observing that less effective schools would likely continue to teach students whose parents fail to make good choices or cannot take advantage of other choices. There was some concern that the promise of school choice is something of a mirage, and that we need not give up on the current system so easily.

**State Dept. of Education** Prof. Hazelton reviewed some of the changes that have occurred in the locus of educational policy making authority in the last decade, asserting that the executive and legislative branches of Maine government have gained considerable power over education policy during that period. He believes that the role of the department is confused and that the state board of education has been by-passed on key issues. He made several recommendations for change, including the following:

- Teacher certification should be outlined in broad terms permitting schools greater freedom in selecting teachers.
- Curriculum development should occur at the local level.
- Local school boards should be responsible for determining how students' academic progress is assessed rather than depending on standard measurement techniques like SATs and the MEA.

There was some agreement that the state board of education needs more authority, and some concern that the commissioner of education shouldn't be a political appointee. The group discussed some of the structural differences in governance between the University System, Technical College System, Maine Maritime Academy and K-12, noting that the relationship and therefore the evolution of policy between the boards and chief executive officers of the first three is relatively consanguine, while the relationship between the Commissioner of Education and the state board is not nearly so close. The subcommittee requested that staff provide additional information on the role of the various education boards.

**Education Appropriation Committee** The subcommittee asked guests to comment on the concept of an education appropriation committee that would assume in some form the present duties of the appropriations committee concerning the expenditure of state funds for education. The concept was originally suggested to the subcommittee by an earlier guest as an alternative to the current system that requires the appropriations committee to decide on funding a host of complex programs without adequate time for study. There was no support for the proposal among the guests, but there was recognition that the current appropriation process has been criticized by many inside and outside the legislature. The committee asked staff to begin a preliminary review of alternative structures employed by other state legislatures that might better tie policy analysis and decision making to the budget process.

SPECIAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL RESTRUCTURING  
EDUCATION AND CULTURAL SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES

AUGUST 26, 1991

Present: Jane Amero, Roy Hibyan, James Storer, Michael Higgins (staff), Dick Sherwood (staff)

Absent: None

Guests: Tom Edwards, Judith Lucarelli, Leo Martin

The subcommittee invited comments from the three superintendents on the 5 areas of investigation proposed by the subcommittee. Following is a summary of key points raised in the discussion.

The meeting began with a discussion of the various configurations of the public schools. School administrative districts (SADs) and school unions were the primary models discussed. No attempt was made to judge the value of either, but the subcommittee did ask for opinions on the effectiveness of each. There was agreement that SADs offer certain economies of scale and that they are less complicated to administer than school unions due to the adoption of unified policies, administration by a single board, and greater freedom from municipal control. It was observed that school unions present unique governance problems which will become more complex as specialization in curriculum and administration increase. On the other hand, unions provide opportunities for local control that are absent in SADs. Problems of transporting students long distances and gaining agreement between towns in SADs were discussed. Some of the historical reasons for the current mix of different school systems were also discussed. The subcommittee requested that staff provide additional information on public school configurations statewide.

Regional differences in educational opportunities were discussed. Participants observed that larger districts generally have more opportunities and isolated districts fewer opportunities. Tax base was seen as a limiting or enhancing factor that also affects opportunities. The need for and interest in technology was seen as high in isolated areas, although awareness of technology opportunities and provision of funding were cited as problems. Some solutions included financial incentives from the state and grant applications to various foundations or the federal government.

The issues of promoting technical and vocational education were

discussed at length. Although there is an increased need for a better technically trained workforce and growing enrollment in post-secondary technical schools, interest in technical education at the secondary level is not keeping pace. Transportation to regional technical centers was cited as a problem, along with social attitudes that tend to stigmatize technical students.

The group discussed changing concepts concerning curriculum for public school students. Movement away from "tracking" in grades K-10 and towards more homogeneous academic offerings, followed by specialization in grades 11 & 12 was one model discussed. Participants pointed to the problems created by general level courses, in particular how they fail to prepare students for further education, life and work after school. There was considerable interest in the idea of maintaining general level courses, but only in connection with strong counseling and guidance aimed at moving students toward academic programs that challenge and better prepare them for life after high school. All the superintendents noted a growing interest on the part of teachers to try and work with more heterogeneous groups of students in the classroom and to work cooperatively with each other (both in team teaching and in planning) to achieve goals.

The group talked at length about "choice", both in the context of program choice within school districts and between school districts. There was some sentiment that choice between school districts cannot occur until the state funds education at a higher level, for instance at a level equal to the average operating cost per pupil statewide. (The current average operating cost per pupil is \$4900.) Unless funding increases to that or some other level that surpasses present amounts, the disparity in state aid between different school districts will prevent the movement of some students to schools outside their district. Choice as a market mechanism that awards excellent schools and penalizes poor quality schools was discussed, with recognition that one negative result of such a mechanism is the experience of students who for a variety of reasons must attend a poorer quality school. It was also observed that the market effect of implementing choice may be overstated. There may be a strong reaction to the opportunity initially, but without parental interest and involvement, which is never guaranteed, the opportunity for choice may not be taken. In spite of this ambiguity, there was agreement that educational choice would lead to greater accountability on the part of school districts.

There was some discussion of the role of the state department of education in assisting local school districts in their efforts. It was observed that as a result of new laws and mandates, their role has changed from one of providing general assistance to more functions of a regulatory nature. It was

also noted that some of the present reporting requirements are felt to be cumbersome and can lead to inefficiencies at the district level.

There was mention that the adult education subsidy formerly provided by the state was eliminated during the last legislative session.

The group talked briefly about the concept of equity, with one member noting that there is some danger of confusing equity with mediocrity, or put another way, our focus has shifted to pulling everyone up to a certain level, which can have the unwanted effect of pulling some school districts down. One solution to that phenomenon is maintaining financial incentives for excellence through state education funding.

The group ended the session with a discussion of some of the complex problems involved in funding special education. There was some sentiment that greater state funding of special education is necessary, and that there is some pressure exerted by parents to have their students designated as special education students because of the level of individual attention which results.

SPECIAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL RESTRUCTURING

Education Subcommittee Minutes

August 23, 1991

Present: Jane Amero, Roy Hibyan, James Storer, Michael Higgins (staff), Dick Sherwood (staff)

Absent: None

Guests: Sen. Steven Estes, Rep. Nat Crowley, Rep. Omar Norton

The subcommittee invited comments from its legislative guests on the 5 areas of investigation proposed by the subcommittee. Following is a summary of key points raised in the three hour discussion.

The meeting began with a general discussion of the increased cooperation between the Maine Technical College System, the University of Maine System and the Maine Maritime Academy. Although these contacts and contacts between the technical colleges and the public schools are producing positive results, there was a consensus that contacts at the board or top levels of institutions are not enough to fully integrate post secondary educational delivery systems in the state. There was agreement that board contacts should lead to closer working relationships between institutions at all levels. There was also agreement that the legislature's education committee could use its influence to promote greater cooperation and coordination.

Some concern was expressed regarding whether the missions of the post secondary educational institutions are clear and widely understood. The general feeling was that educational missions are becoming clearer, but that considerable overlap on the program level still exists.

There was some discussion concerning the state's commitment to teacher education and recognition that promotion of teacher education is growing stronger and more progressive at some institutions.

The group discussed at some length the organization of the vocational technical centers at the high school level and their relative under-utilization contrasted with bulging enrollments at the technical colleges. The need to travel considerable distances from a student's high school to a vocational technical center, the rigid structure of some high school

schedules which makes taking classes at the home school and the technical center difficult, the separation from a student's peer group, the difficulty in participating in athletics and the lack of awareness of vocational technical opportunities were all cited as reasons for under-utilization. Some support for comprehensive schools that include technical education was expressed, but there was agreement that financial constraints come into play here. The group concluded that some vocational technical regions and centers are working better than others and agreed to return to this issue at a later time.

The discussion moved from the delivery of technical education to the organization of public schools into SADs, School Unions, and other configurations. It was noted that financial pressures force school units to consider greater regionalization, but that there is a strong countervailing sentiment favoring smaller schools. It was observed that the state no longer provides financial incentives to school units for combining as it did when the creation of SADs began in earnest in the 1960's. There was some interest in exploring possible incentives for further regionalization.

Given the amount of state resources expended on education and concern that the appropriations committee of the legislature does not have time to become adequately informed on complex education issues, the group discussed the concept of a separate education appropriation committee with an education research office to study education policy and budget matters, based in part on the new Kentucky model. The committee asked staff for more information concerning this model.

The group next discussed opportunities for expanded use of technology in education. The subcommittee has been looking at two aspects of technological development: delivery of technology and integration of technology into academic programs. The possibility of acquiring federal and private funds to aid in this effort was mentioned. Also, the use of the ITV system by municipalities and the creation of a users consortium to promote coordination was discussed.

Expanded use of school facilities was discussed in the context of the growing phenomenon of life-long learning. It was observed that some schools are heavily used by the community while others are barely used. The benefits of students taking courses with adults and taking courses at different times in the day or evening were mentioned. There was agreement that the need to use school facilities as centers for educating adults and training and retraining workers will increase and that this is already creating some difficulties for schools forced to cut back on their activities because of flat funding of education.

On the subject of coordination between government agencies and the education system, it was observed that much better coordination and more funding is necessary to deal with the complex problems faced by children prior to entering school. There was agreement that expanded efforts to provide services for parents and children would lead to a decrease in the social and educational problems encountered in the schools.

There was also discussion of the increasing costs of providing special education services for K-12 students and the financial crisis that can result in school districts. Some group members felt that achieving a proper balance between legitimate special education needs and the educational needs of other students is becoming increasingly difficult as special education costs are skyrocketing.

The group ended its session with a discussion of Kentucky's reforming of its state board of education and department of education and the implications that might have for Maine. Kentucky has strengthened its state board and altered the focus of its department of education. It was also noted that legal challenges to state education funding is on the rise across the country and that there is some concern that challenges to Maine's funding formula could occur. Material concerning the Kentucky plan was left with the subcommittee for further review.

SPECIAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL RESTRUCTURING

Education Subcommittee Minutes

August 9, 1991

Present: Jane Amero, Roy Hibyan, James Storer, Michael Higgins  
(staff), Dick Sherwood (staff)

Absent: None

The Subcommittee began the meeting with a discussion of public input into its deliberations. Discussion of this topic continued throughout the meeting. Following is a tentative list of people the subcommittee will ask to meet with us. Others will be added over time.

August 23 morning 9:30 a.m. 45 minutes a piece

Committee  
Contact Person

Jim	Paul Hazelton, Professor of Education (retired) Bowdoin College
Dick	Henry Bourgeois, Director, Maine Development Foundation

August 23 afternoon 1 p.m.

Committee  
Contact Person

Mike	Sen. Steven Estes, Chair, Education Committee
Mike	Rep. Nat Crowley, Chair, Education Committee
Mike	Sen. Linda Brawn
Mike	Rep. Omar Norton

August 26 morning 9:30 p.m. (mike will arrange space)

Committee  
Contact Person

Dick	Stan Sawyer, Superintendent, Turner
Dick	Duke Albanese, Superintendent, Oakland
Dick	Judy Lucarelli, Superintendent, Dear Isle/Stonington
Dick	Tom Edwards, Superintendent, Portland

September 6 morning 9:30 a.m.

Committee  
Contact Person

Dick	Robert Woodbury, Chancellor, University of Maine System
Dick	Eve Bither, Commissioner of Education
Jim	Ken Curtis, President Maine Maritime Academy
Dick	John Fitzsimmons, President, Maine Technical College System

Dick Sherwood will send each of the invites a formal invitation and a copy of the subcommittee's preamble and revised area of investigation.

There was also discussion of various methods of gaining input from the general public. Public hearings, questionnaires, contests and meetings with editorial boards were all mentioned. The subcommittee will discuss this matter at future meetings with an eye toward action in mid October or early November.

The subcommittee agreed that members should review each meeting's minutes before releasing them to the Commission and interested parties. Staff will send a draft of the minutes to each subcommittee member one working day after the meeting. Suggested changes must be received by staff within 4 working days so that minutes may be mailed with all other Commission materials every other Monday.

The subcommittee added several people and groups to its list of interested parties. The list includes the following:

Contact Person

Mary Ann Hass	University of Maine System
Alice Kirkpatrick	Maine Technical College System
Greg Scott	Maine Department of Education
Henry Bourgeois	Maine Development Foundation
Ken Curtis	Maine Maritime Academy
Dan Calderwood	Maine School Management
Steve Krause	Maine Teachers Association
Richard Tyles	Maine State Principles Association
Sen. Steve Estes	Chair, Legislature's Education Committee
Rep. Nat Crowley	Chair, Legislature's Education Committee
Sen. Linda Brawn	Legislature's Education Committee
Sen. Dale McCormick	Legislature's Education Committee
Rep. Wendy Ault	Legislature's Education Committee
Rep. Alvin Barth	Legislature's Education Committee
Rep. Mary Cahill	Legislature's Education Committee
Rep. James Handy	Legislature's Education Committee
Rep. Omar Norton	Legislature's Education Committee
Rep. John O'Dea	Legislature's Education Committee
Rep. William O'Gara	Legislature's Education Committee
Rep. James Oliver	Legislature's Education Committee
Rep. Sophia Douglass Pfeiffer	Education Committee

Maine Library Association  
Maine Science and Technology Commission  
Maine Endowment for the Arts  
Maine Humanities Council

The Subcommittee spent considerable time clarifying the five areas of investigation outlined at the last meeting. Following is a revised version of the areas of investigation, preceded by a preamble.

### Preamble

In an era of limited financial resources and increasing demands for quality education, it is imperative that all institutions within Maine's educational delivery system work together to more efficiently and effectively deliver education services. Although Maine is recognized as a leader in educational reform, an unprecedented commitment to education must occur if the State is to meet the 6 National Goals for Education adopted by the President, the nation's Governors and the Congress.

### Area I Coordination of Resources

There is an apparent lack of coordination in the use of resources by the state's educational delivery systems. The subcommittee wishes to explore the potential links which may be forged between the state's educational institutions so that faculty, academic programs, buildings and facilities, and cultural resources may be shared. Specifically, the subcommittee will attempt to answer the following questions:

- What are the barriers to sharing resources?
- What incentives for sharing resources exist?
- How can further cooperation be encouraged?

### Area II Geographic Issues

- 1) The subcommittee will examine the question of whether schools in the state are efficiently organized geographically. This question concerns not just the configurations of our public schools (organized as school administrative districts, municipal schools, school unions, etc.), but also higher education. The possibility of sharing resources between geographical areas may also be explored.

- 2) The subcommittee is also interested in whether geographical differences influence the educational delivery system. Some possible questions include:
- Are there regional differences in terms of educational opportunity?
  - Do regional differences influence the kinds of educational opportunities that ought to be provided?

### Area III Opportunities for Expanded Use of Technological Development in Communications

To maintain a quality educational system, we must encourage the wise use of developing technologies. Many questions should be asked concerning the use of technology in education.

- Are there mechanisms in place to promote the use of existing technologies?
- Are potential technology users aware of the advantages of ITV, URSUS, and NOVANET?
- What are other states doing concerning the exchange of information between state and local governments, state and public organizations, etc.?
- How does Maine compare with the rest of the nation in information exchange?

### Area IV Life-Long Learning

The subcommittee plans to study the realities of life-long learning in Maine. Attention will be focused on adult education, worker training and retraining, and the concept of pursuing further education (formal academic, informal and cultural) for the joy of learning. Some questions may include:

- What are the opportunities for life-long learning in Maine?
- What are the opportunities for training or retraining?
- What are the barriers to both?
- What incentives might be developed?
- Who is responsible for promoting life-long learning and providing training and retraining?

### Area V Coordination Between Government and Educational Institutions

The subcommittee will examine current efforts at coordination between educational institutions and government agencies dealing with labor, corrections, health and human services, and similar areas. As with other areas, the subcommittee will ask:

- What are the opportunities for greater coordination?
- What are the barriers?
- What are the incentives?
- Can greater efficiencies be gained?
- Who should take the lead in the effort?

The subcommittee reviewed the 5 hypotheses adopted at the last meeting. Members agreed that rewriting the hypotheses as a set of goals for the state seems more practical than their current structure as rebuttable presumptions. Consequently, the hypotheses now read as follows:

1. State investment in human capital must be adequate and educational services (broadly defined) at all levels must be rational and well-coordinated.
2. Education programs in the state must be funded from sources that are adequate and equitable.
3. The state must establish appropriate minimum levels of educational opportunity and performance.
4. Maine workers must be adequately trained to meet the state's present and future needs for a skilled and adaptable work force.
5. All citizens must have access to and opportunities for lifelong cultural and educational opportunities.

The subcommittee also modified the function statement to read as follows:

It is the responsibility of state government to serve the citizenry of the state, its human resources, through investment in a comprehensive system of quality education and cultural opportunities that are accessible, equitable and effective.

The subcommittee will meet again on Friday August 23rd.

# SPECIAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL RESTRUCTURING

## Education Subcommittee Minutes

July 29, 1991

Present: Jane Amero, Roy Hibyan, James Storer, Michael Higgins (staff)

Absent: None

The Subcommittee began its deliberations with a discussion of the education function statement. After considerable discussion, the statement was adjusted to read as follows:

It is the responsibility of state government to serve the citizenry of the state, its human resources, through investment in a comprehensive system of education and cultural opportunities that is accessible, equitable and effective.

Members agreed with the general proposition that the education system should be accessible to all Maine citizens regardless of geographical location; that the level of educational opportunity and program quality should be consistent throughout the state; and that given the limited resources available to education, effective use of those resources is crucial.

There was considerable discussion concerning the need for state accountability to Maine citizens. There were two contexts in which accountability was discussed. The first concerned the state's obligation to account to its citizens for the expenditure of state funds for education by establishing standards and measuring progress toward meeting those standards. The second focused on the problem of the state holding the localities accountable for fulfilling mandates, but failing to provide funding to achieve the task. There was general agreement that accountability, mandates and the relationship between state and local government are important issues to which the committee will return.

The subcommittee spent considerable time examining possible areas of investigation. Although some refinement is still necessary, the following five topics were tentatively agreed upon:

1. Coordinated use of resources between public schools, the University of Maine System, the Technical College System and Maine Maritime Academy.
2. Opportunities of Regionalism. This concept is connected to resource sharing between the public education entities described in area 1, but extends to the possibility of different configurations of public schools and post-secondary schools.
3. Development and use of technology. Considerable emphasis will be placed upon further uses of interactive television, telecommunications and computing.
4. Life-long learning concept. Adult education, worker training, recreation and cultural amenities are included in this area.
5. Coordination between educational institutions and social agencies. The subcommittee will examine the relationship between formal education and the education efforts undertaken by various state and nonprofit agencies and organizations.

The subcommittee was satisfied with the four illustrative hypotheses stated in the July 23 memo from the Commission chairs. However, the subcommittee did add a fifth hypothesis. The five are as follows:

1. State investment in human capital is adequate and educational services (broadly defined) at all levels are rational and well-coordinated.
2. Education programs in the state are funded from sources that are adequate and equitable.
3. The state has succeeded in establishing appropriate minimum levels of educational opportunity and performance.
4. Maine workers are adequately trained to meet the state's present and future needs for a skilled and adaptable work force.
5. All citizens have access to and opportunities for lifelong cultural and educational opportunities.

The subcommittee talked in broad terms concerning several themes, including the state's role in ensuring quality in education, establishment of education standards, and education funding (both K-12 and post-secondary). Although further discussion on these and other subjects is planned, there was agreement that limited time and resources will preclude detailed study of many deserving topics.

The subcommittee requested that staff assemble several reports and readings for review prior to the Commission's August 9 meeting. They include the Department of Education's 1991 Performance Report, the "National Goals for Education" document, two technology reports completed by the University of Maine System - "Breaking the Barriers" and "Making Connections", and a Technical College System report, "Investing in Maine's Workforce".

The subcommittee also discussed future meetings with interested groups. Among those mentioned were representatives from the board of trustees of the University of Maine System, the Technical College System, school board members and the Maine Development Foundation. Further details concerning visits will be worked out at future subcommittee meetings.

The next subcommittee meeting will take place on August 9 during the Special Commission on Governmental Restructuring's biweekly session.

2956GEA