

**PRESENTATION TO THE  
SAN MATEO-FOSTER CITY  
SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**By: Dr. Sandee Kludt and Jack Lucas**

**February 13, 2020**



# INTERVIEW PROCESS

The information utilized for this report was compiled from 6 site visitations and 69 interviews completed over 10 days. Staff included:

- Superintendent
- Assistant Superintendent of Student Services
- Assistant Superintendent of Education Services
- Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources
- Director of Human Resources
- Chief Business Officer
- Director of Business Services
- Director of Special Education
- Program Coordinator of Special Education
- Program Specialists (5)
- Certificated Union Representative
- Classified Union Representative
- SELPA Director
- Principals (6)
- Assistant Principals (3)
- Special Day Class Teachers (SDC) (6)
- Resource Specialists (RSP) (8)
- General Education Teachers (7)
- Speech Language Therapists (3)
- Occupational Therapists (3)
- Physical Therapist
- Psychologists (5)
- Paraprofessionals and Administrative Assistants (4)
- Parents (6)
- Special Education Leadership Team Members (6)

# RECOMMENDATIONS

## VISION

- Continue work of the Special Education Advisory Committee SEDAC in developing a mission and vision for the collaborative work with the District
- Develop a vision and plan for implementation of inclusionary practices including representatives from all teaching and administrative levels as well as parents
- Develop and review with staff of each school site an action plan to increase inclusion

# RECOMMENDATIONS

## STAFFING

- Consider adding another Administrative Assistant and assigning one of the 4 to the Director of Special Education to be her Administrative Assistant
- Evaluate caseloads of psychologists as well as how many open assessments each psychologist has to complete
- Consider establishing a lead Occupational Therapist and Speech Language Pathologist
- Utilize District mentor programs or “buddy” systems for new teachers/administrators
- Move the offering of private agency contracts from the Special Education department to Human Resources

# RECOMMENDATIONS

## STAFFING CONT'D

- Consider providing additional staff, with special education knowledge, at sites with ADA less than 600 which house a larger than average number of SDC programs
- Analyze assignments for Program Specialists to determine if assignments need to be re-distributed and equalized
- Review and adjust job description for Program Specialists and share district-wide
- Consider hiring an additional Program Coordinator
- Consider hiring an Inclusion Specialist for the District
- Consider establishing co-teaching classrooms as an inclusion strategy

# RECOMMENDATIONS

## COMMUNICATION

- Provide paraeducators with background information about assigned students before beginning the work assignment
- Utilize a clear “chain of command” for staff to follow when issues arise
- Utilize the list of “whom to contact” as well as a clear definition of district staffs’ duties and distribute widely
- Establish an agreed upon response time ‘window’ for emails and phone calls
- Make an effort to be more visible in the field by doing more site visitations
- Continue holding district office inter-departmental, “discipline” group, and Leadership Team meetings with agreed upon agendas and problem solve solutions to concerns expressed by stakeholders
- Establish informal meetings with union representatives to discuss and problem solve issues which are not negotiation specific

# RECOMMENDATIONS

## CURRICULUM/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- Provide training to teachers regarding tiered interventions/MTSS
- Have School Nurse Team provide training to paraeducators on medically related procedures, as well as lifting and transferring procedures
- Provide parents with training regarding their rights and the IEP process
- Utilize Sped Leadership Team to evaluate the curricula implemented at sites
- Choose a consistent curriculum and provide training on its implementation; focus on providing explicit reading and language arts instruction
- Provide training on differentiating between language vs. disability issues and develop second language intervention programs which can be implemented prior to referring for special education assessments

# RECOMMENDATIONS

## CURRICULUM/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONT'D

- Offer in-house courses or units to help teachers become certified and provide test preparation for teachers to be able to pass certification exams
- Provide staff development for site principals and general education teachers regarding special education issues
- Utilize Sped Leadership Team to conduct a needs assessment and develop staff development training on: Section 504, accommodations, modifications, Universal Design for Learning, tiered interventions, behavior management, social skills instruction (e.g., Circle of Friends, facilitated play groups)
- Plan staff development activities for general education and special education staff regarding special education issues especially those related to Inclusion
- Train staff to calculate minutes of general education inclusion which could impact LRE findings

# RECOMMENDATIONS

## CURRICULUM/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONT'D

- Provide training for teachers on how to accommodate and modify programs for students with exceptional needs
- Provide de-escalation training as well as analyze the need for additional support staff who can develop behavioral management systems, conduct Functional Behavioral Assessments and develop Behavioral Intervention Plans
- Plan time for general education and special education teachers to collaborate, discuss differentiation of instruction, and ways to prepare students for assessment
- Consider two additional days for mandatory training for teachers and paraeducators
- Conduct disability awareness training for students and establish a “peer buddy” system to assist included students
- Consider contacting an inclusion expert to provide training in Inclusion
- Plan training on a variety of Alternative Dispute Resolution strategies particularly Facilitated IEPs

# RECOMMENDATIONS

## PROCEDURES/COMPLIANCE

- Develop a Special Education Procedural Manual to address the need for consistency in procedures in all disciplines, as well as compensatory services
- Work with middle school RSPs to ensure that provision of service is based on child's needs rather than age of student or periods of service needed
- If RSP caseload goes above 28 make sure a CDE waiver is filed
- Closely monitor caseloads to make sure they do not surpass contract limits and if so, respond in a timely manner
- Provide careful review of paraeducators' timesheets and ensure that they are paid appropriately for extra time
- Share "all call" process District-wide to deal with elopement issues at school sites
- Clarify when 'in-house' suspensions are considered reportable suspensions
- Develop desk manuals for all Administrative Assistant positions
- Have Districts' attorney develop a template for developing compliant IEPs

# RECOMMENDATIONS

## PROCEDURES/COMPLIANCE CONT'D

- Develop procedures as well as Administrative and Teacher Procedural Manuals for key issues in Special Education
- Monitor the implementation of the PIR Plan to address the non-compliant findings in ELA and Math achievement as well as the disproportionate findings of identification of Hispanic students with ED
- Maintain district policies and procedures that reflect LRE requirements
- Analyze the assessments of Hispanics for ED eligibility to determine if the finding of eligibility is appropriate and whether the primary language has interfered with appropriate eligibility decisions
- Develop a continuum of services including additional supports for students with ED needs
- Ensure a full continuum of services is available, regardless of changes in service delivery models
- Have District's attorney continue to provide training on developing compliant IEPs and review common procedural and timeline mistakes
- Develop policy and procedures related to Parentally Placed Private School students as well as a tracking system for students and fiscal expenditures

# RECOMMENDATIONS

## FISCAL

- Conduct periodic salary comparison studies with surrounding districts
- Consider creating a separate pay schedule for Related Services Personnel (i.e. Speech/Language, OT, PT)
- Establish a tuition-service program for Speech/Language Specialists with colleges/universities
- Utilize the District reimbursement process for materials/supplies for staff
- Consider possibility of providing signing bonuses to new teachers as well as allowing new staff members to apply all work experience (both public and private) to salary schedule upon hiring
- Compile successful strategies for full inclusion and complete fiscal analysis for implementation

# STUDENTS SERVED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

**Table 1 Calculation of December 1 Special Education Pupil Count as a Percentage of SMFC CALPADS Count**

School Year	CALPADS	Special Education	Special Education % of CALPADS
2002 - 03	10,087	1,174	11.64%
2003 - 04	10,069	1,314	13.05%
2004 - 05	10,013	1,062	10.61%
2005 - 06	9,935	1,028	10.35%
2006 - 07	9,996	1,090	10.90%
2007 - 08	10,079	1,121	11.12%
2008 - 09	10,342	1,173	11.34%
2009 - 10	10,614	1,126	10.61%
2010 - 11	10,904	1,056	9.68%
2011 - 12	11,204	987	8.81%
2012 - 13	11,456	905	7.90%
2013 - 14	11,705	932	7.96%
2014 - 15	11,858	887	7.48%
2015 - 16	11,977	961	8.02%
2016 - 17	11,970	939	7.84%
2017 - 18	11,837	1,034	8.74%
2018 - 19	11,724	1,089	9.29%
<b>Difference</b>	<b>1,637</b>	<b>-85</b>	
<b>% Difference</b>	<b>16.23%</b>	<b>-7.24%</b>	

**Table 2 Comparison of December 1 SMFC Significant Disability Counts and Autism Counts to Total Special Education Pupil Count**

School Year	Total Special Education Count	Total Significant Disability Count	Significant Disability %	Autism Count	Autism % of Total Count
2002 - 03	1,174	98	8.35%	33	2.81%
2003 - 04	1,314	122	9.28%	54	4.11%
2004 - 05	1,062	120	11.30%	58	5.46%
2005 - 06	1,028	159	15.47%	76	7.39%
2006 - 07	1,090	173	15.87%	90	8.26%
2007 - 08	1,121	210	18.73%	119	10.62%
2008 - 09	1,173	227	19.35%	125	10.66%
2009 - 10	1,126	215	19.09%	126	11.19%
2010 - 11	1,056	211	19.98%	117	11.08%
2011 - 12	987	213	21.58%	116	11.75%
2012 - 13	905	243	26.85%	132	14.59%
2013 - 14	932	255	27.36%	152	16.31%
2014 - 15	887	249	28.07%	152	17.14%
2015 - 16	961	283	29.45%	166	17.27%
2016 - 17	939	267	28.43%	171	18.21%
2017 - 18	1,034	302	29.21%	199	19.25%
2018 - 19	1,089	334	30.67%	218	20.02%
<b>Difference</b>	<b>-85</b>	<b>236</b>		<b>185</b>	
<b>% Difference</b>	<b>-7.24%</b>	<b>240.82%</b>		<b>560.61%</b>	

Significant disability count includes all disabilities except language & speech, other health impaired and learning disabilities.

- The district is somewhat unique in that the percentage of students served in special education declined over the 17-year period from 11.64% to 9.29%. During the same time period, the total state special education percentage of students served increased from 10.81% to 12.85 %.
- During the same period, the count of students with significant disabilities increased by 236 and the percentage of total count increased from 8.35% to 30.67%. Statewide the percentage of total increased from 14.67% to 28.39%.

# SPECIAL EDUCATION EXPENDITURE AND REVENUE COMPARISON

- There are three sources of special education funding: State, Federal and General Fund
- State and Federal funds are a fixed sum allocated each school year. The General Fund always covers the remaining cost
- Total SMFC special education costs increased by \$7.68M over the nine-year period
- Total State and Federal revenue increased by only \$1.24M
- The general fund contribution increased by \$6.45M
- The SMFC general fund percentage of total expenditures in all school years was higher than the statewide percentage

<b>Expenditure Comparison</b>							
Goal	5001	5060	5730	5750	5770	7141 - 42	Total
School Year	Unspecified	Program Specialist	Preschool	Low Incidence	Nonsevere	Program Payments	Expenditures
2018 - 19	\$ 2,143,551	\$ 611,300	\$ 1,779,202	\$ 2,736,990	\$ 16,488,576	\$ 998,315	\$ 24,757,933
2017 - 18	\$ 4,518,910	\$ 603,122	\$ 1,540,782	\$ 2,700,707	\$ 15,645,194	\$ 1,208,581	\$ 26,217,297
2016 - 17	\$ 3,110,973	\$ 511,644	\$ 1,360,257	\$ 3,487,763	\$ 13,523,263	\$ 1,433,822	\$ 23,427,722
2015 - 16	\$ 4,814,247	\$ 480,877	\$ 1,025,830	\$ 4,473,288	\$ 11,262,881	\$ 1,235,106	\$ 23,292,230
2014 - 15	\$ 2,929,194	\$ 473,390	\$ 948,471	\$ 4,431,352	\$ 10,009,433	\$ 1,651,628	\$ 20,443,468
2013 - 14	\$ 2,403,312	\$ 337,493	\$ 772,589	\$ 3,516,204	\$ 9,425,212	\$ 1,717,236	\$ 18,172,046
2012 - 13	\$ 1,638,561	\$ 316,575	\$ 793,680	\$ 3,403,538	\$ 9,335,345	\$ 1,611,310	\$ 17,099,010
2011 - 12	\$ 1,552,301	\$ 106,144	\$ 680,494	\$ 3,203,196	\$ 9,614,263	\$ 1,554,553	\$ 16,710,950
2010 - 11	\$ 2,034,598	\$ 8,535	\$ 769,585	\$ 3,560,828	\$ 9,432,617	\$ 1,274,452	\$ 17,080,614
Difference	\$ 108,953	\$ 602,765	\$ 1,009,617	\$ (823,838)	\$ 7,055,959	\$ (276,137)	\$ 7,677,319
% Change	5.36%	7062.42%	131.19%	-23.14%	74.80%	-21.67%	44.95%

  

<b>Revenue Comparison</b>							
School Year	AB 602	Mental Health	Local Assistance	Local Asst Private School	Local Staff Development	Federal Preschool	Preschool Local Entitlement
2018 - 19	\$ 5,568,527	\$ 249,326	\$ 1,940,058	\$ 31,897		\$ 60,217	\$ 187,560
2017 - 18	\$ 5,602,680	\$ 249,489	\$ 1,938,308	\$ 37,156		\$ 60,217	\$ 187,560
2016 - 17	\$ 5,590,663	\$ 192,935	\$ 1,973,880	\$ 16,432		\$ 61,084	\$ 193,008
2015 - 16	\$ 5,529,516	\$ 26,775	\$ 1,956,680	\$ 13,326		\$ 57,728	\$ 116,690
2014 - 15	\$ 5,305,757	\$ 31,611	\$ 1,863,304	\$ 14,101		\$ 77,047	\$ 143,291
2013 - 14	\$ 5,142,728	\$ 5,601	\$ 1,847,690	\$ 10,265	\$ -	\$ 70,859	\$ 131,784
2012 - 13	\$ 4,791,469	\$ 55,256	\$ 1,888,981	\$ 13,493	\$ 4,005	\$ 74,498	\$ 151,241
2011 - 12	\$ 4,724,374	\$ 54,849	\$ 1,872,355	\$ 19,709	\$ 3,975	\$ 79,206	\$ 151,666
2010 - 11	\$ 4,679,602		\$ 1,856,612	\$ 18,566	\$ 4,037	\$ 80,974	\$ 154,360
Difference	\$ 888,925	\$ 194,477	\$ 83,446	\$ 13,331	\$ (4,037)	\$ (20,757)	\$ 33,200
% Change	19.00%	354.57%	4.49%	71.80%	-100.00%	-25.63%	21.51%

  

School Year	Preschool Staff Development	One-time Preschool	Total State & Federal Revenue	General Fund Contribution	General fund % of Total Expenditures	State Percentage
2018 - 19	\$ 692		\$ 8,038,277	\$ 16,719,656	67.53%	
2017 - 18	\$ 692		\$ 8,076,103	\$ 18,141,193	69.20%	65.88%
2016 - 17	\$ 688		\$ 8,028,689	\$ 15,399,033	65.73%	64.45%
2015 - 16	\$ 682		\$ 7,701,396	\$ 15,590,833	66.94%	61.80%
2014 - 15	\$ 897		\$ 7,436,008	\$ 13,007,460	63.63%	58.92%
2013 - 14	\$ 825	\$ 5,601	\$ 7,215,353	\$ 10,956,693	60.29%	55.85%
2012 - 13	\$ 816		\$ 6,979,758	\$ 10,119,251	59.18%	52.52%
2011 - 12	\$ 967		\$ 6,907,101	\$ 9,803,849	58.67%	52.15%
2010 - 11	\$ 1,810		\$ 6,795,961	\$ 10,284,653	60.21%	52.71%
Difference	\$ (1,118)	\$ -	\$ 1,242,316	\$ 6,435,003		
% Change	-61.76%		18.28%	62.57%		

# REVIEW OF EXPENDITURES

**Table 5 Comparison of SMFC Expenditures by SACS Object Code**

	<u>1000-1999</u>	<u>2000-1999</u>	<u>3000-3999</u>	<u>4000-4999</u>	<u>5000-5999</u>	<u>6000-6999</u>	
	Certificated	Classified	Employee	Books &	Services	Capital	Total
<u>School Year</u>	<u>Salaries</u>	<u>Salaries</u>	<u>Benefits</u>	<u>Supplies</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>	<u>Outlay</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>
2018 - 19	\$ 6,134,527	\$2,722,264	\$3,112,570	\$ 84,308	\$ 11,697,594	\$ 8,355	\$ 23,759,618
2017 - 18	\$ 5,742,787	\$2,800,688	\$3,271,733	\$ 47,484	\$ 10,717,984		\$ 22,580,675
2016 - 17	\$ 5,496,881	\$2,544,491	\$3,153,253	\$ 47,196	\$ 8,208,299		\$ 19,450,120
2015 - 16	\$ 5,529,298	\$2,631,411	\$3,062,849	\$ 41,495	\$ 6,432,216		\$ 17,697,269
2014 - 15	\$ 5,639,832	\$2,509,963	\$2,712,914	\$ 98,960	\$ 5,113,331	\$ 175,157	\$ 16,250,157
2013 - 14	\$ 5,004,046	\$2,288,171	\$2,394,577	\$ 149,532	\$ 4,649,598		\$ 14,485,924
2012 - 13	\$ 4,983,869	\$2,212,237	\$2,298,449	\$ 111,352	\$ 4,717,715		\$ 14,323,623
2011 - 12	\$ 4,611,496	\$2,109,596	\$2,409,175	\$ 136,557	\$ 4,835,504		\$ 14,102,328
2010 - 11	\$ 4,718,793	\$2,414,107	\$1,983,238	\$ 98,400	\$ 4,929,927	\$ 14,652	\$ 14,159,115
Difference	\$ 1,415,734	\$ 308,157	\$1,129,333	\$ (14,092)	\$ 6,767,667	\$ (6,296)	\$ 9,606,799
% Change	30.00%	12.76%	56.94%	-14.32%	137.28%	-42.97%	67.85%

- The SACS object field classifies expenditures according to the types of items purchased or services obtained.
- Expenditures were compared by Object code for the nine-year period.
- The largest increase in cost was for the 5000 Services Object series with an increase of \$6.77 million.
- Object 5000 expenditures capture non-salary costs and include contract services.
- In 2018-19 Object 5000 expenditures were 49.23% of total special education expenditures.

# REVIEW OF EXPENDITURES

**Table 6 Comparison of SMFC SACS 5000 Object Code Expenditures by Function Code**

School Year	Travel & Conference	NPS/NPA Contracts	Transportation Contracts	Special Ed SDC RSP Classes	Other Special Ed Services	Psychologist Nurse Services	School Administration	Instructional Supervision	Total Expenditures
2018 - 19	\$ 18,455	\$ 2,673,579	\$ 1,786,426	\$ 4,065,171	\$ 1,680,307	\$ 1,171,725	\$ 291,955	\$ 9,975	\$ 11,697,594
2017 - 18	\$ 18,616	\$ 5,119,871	\$ 1,623,342	\$ 1,448,183	\$ 1,533,548	\$ 672,715	\$ 301,110	\$ 600	\$ 10,717,984
2016 - 17	\$ 16,514	\$ 3,757,862	\$ 1,443,827	\$ 590,795	\$ 1,303,882	\$ 782,644	\$ 312,164	\$ 610	\$ 8,208,299
2015 - 16	\$ 17,009	\$ 2,630,795	\$ 1,358,089	\$ 263,269	\$ 1,326,520	\$ 661,039	\$ 174,895	\$ 600	\$ 6,432,216
2014 - 15	\$ 17,616	\$ 3,682,491	\$ 1,239,755	\$ 700	\$ 10	\$ 35	\$ 172,724		\$ 5,113,331
2013 - 14	\$ 11,512	\$ 3,247,766	\$ 1,171,835	\$ (108,920)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 327,405		\$ 4,649,598
2012 - 13	\$ 10,989	\$ 3,094,260	\$ 1,155,533	\$ 1,183	\$ 70,721	\$ -	\$ 385,029		\$ 4,717,715
2011 - 12	\$ 10,502	\$ 3,238,654	\$ 1,059,973	\$ 20,546	\$ 31,000	\$ 19,657	\$ 455,172		\$ 4,835,504
2010 - 11	\$ 14,034	\$ 3,381,058	\$ 1,152,125	\$ 81,523	\$ 80,000	\$ -	\$ 221,187		\$ 4,929,927
Difference	\$ 4,421	\$ (707,479)	\$ 634,301	\$ 3,983,648	\$ 1,600,307		\$ 70,768		\$ 6,767,667
% Change	31.50%	-20.92%	55.05%	4886.52%	2000.38%		31.99%		137.28%

- The SACS Function code describes the activities or services performed to accomplish a set of objectives or goal.
- The most significant Function activity increase was \$3.99 million for the cost of employing SDC and RSP teachers from agencies.
- Agency employment for other special education services including language and speech and occupational therapy began in 2015-16 with the cost increasing by \$350,000 over the four-year period. It was the same pattern for employment of nurses and psychologists.
- Transportation costs increased by \$634,000 over the nine years.

# REVIEW OF EXPENDITURES

Comparison of Special Education Costs per Pupil and Percentage of Total District Costs				
2018 - 19				
	SMFC	Evergreen School Dist	Roseville City	Fullerton School Dist
<b>Total Special Education Costs</b>	<b>\$ 24,757,933</b>	<b>\$ 14,732,738</b>	<b>\$ 24,528,066</b>	<b>\$ 28,061,969</b>
<b>Pupil Count</b>	<b>1,087</b>	<b>910</b>	<b>1,471</b>	<b>1,568</b>
<b>Average Cost per Pupil</b>	<b>\$ 22,776.39</b>	<b>\$ 16,189.82</b>	<b>\$ 16,674.42</b>	<b>\$ 17,896.66</b>
<b>Total District Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 136,681,781</b>	<b>\$ 115,112,630</b>	<b>\$ 112,743,534</b>	<b>\$ 146,916,754</b>
<b>Special Ed Percentage of Total Expenditures</b>	<b>18.11%</b>	<b>12.80%</b>	<b>21.76%</b>	<b>19.10%</b>

- SMFC was compared to three elementary school districts of similar size.
- The average special education cost per pupil was at least \$4,900 higher than the three comparison districts.
- The SMFC special education cost as a percentage of total district cost was higher than one district, similar to a second district and less than the third district.

Comparison of 2018 - 19 SACS Object 5000 Code Expenditures by Function Code									
				Special Ed	Other	Psychologist			
<u>District</u>	<u>Travel &amp; Conference</u>	<u>NPS/NPA Contracts</u>	<u>Transportation Contracts</u>	<u>Special Ed SDC RSP Classes</u>	<u>Other Special Ed Services</u>	<u>Psychologist Nurse Services</u>	<u>School Administration</u>	<u>Instructional supervision</u>	<u>Total Expenditures</u>
<b>SMFC</b>	\$ 18,455	\$ 2,673,579	\$ 1,786,426	\$ 4,065,171	\$ 1,680,307	\$ 1,171,725	\$ 291,955	\$ 9,975	\$ 11,697,594
<b>Evergreen Sch Dist</b>	\$ 7,784	\$ 868,182		\$ 1,100		\$ 656,535		\$ 51,182	\$ 1,584,782
<b>Roseville City</b>	\$ 38,099	\$ 690,831	\$ 846,675	\$ 10,825	\$ 569,187	\$ 262,796	\$ 17,120		\$ 2,435,532
<b>Fullerton Sch Dist</b>	\$ 48,980	\$ 836,448	\$ 2,162,206	\$ 150	\$ 268,742	\$ 274,966		\$ 230,514	\$ 3,822,006

- A comparison of the special education costs by Object code indicated SMFC had a much higher 5000 Object code cost.
- A comparison of 5000 Object code costs by Function code indicated the difference was due to the large SMFC nonpublic school cost and the cost of hiring teaching staff through agencies.

# NEXT STEPS

- **Share Results to Develop Action Plan**

1. **Share with Special Ed Leadership Team, SEDAC Leadership Team, District Leadership, and SELPA**
2. **Prioritize Recommendations with Stakeholders**
3. **Set Timelines, Determine Resources and Assign Responsibilities**
4. **Create Communication Plan for All Stakeholders**
5. **Provide Update to Board in March 2020**

**QUESTIONS?**