

**OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS**

**JAMES F. NOTTER  
SUPERINTENDENT**

Telephone (754) 321-2600

Facsimile: (754) 321-2701

**School Board Budget Workshop  
April 16, 2009**

**Response to Intervention**

Response to Intervention is a formal, structured, collaborative, problem solving process with intervention, delivery, driven by data and progress monitoring. It is a systematic process of instruction, guidance and reporting. Broward County Public Schools has had a collaborative problem solving process and teams at every school for over a decade. This process was never a mandate through policy to be consistent across the School District. Some schools are strong in this process where others are not.

For years, the School District tested students for disabilities and then diagnosed, giving the student an instruction plan, but lacked in good reporting for the learning continuum. This new process for intervention will do away with testing for disabilities. Response to Intervention is a tiered system of student intervention that becomes more intensive as you move up the tiers. If a student does not improve by tier 3 the student will then be tested for disabilities. All students will be diagnosed, prescribed, monitored and adjustments will be made along the way if the student does not improve. This process focuses on the entire student body. A learning program will be designed for each student's individual needs.

This process must have effective data collection, progress monitoring, and evaluation of interventions. There are support staff, which are very knowledgeable about intervention and the skills needed to implement intervention. A big piece that is needed is a data system to collect the progress of all students.

The Board wanted to know who the point person will be at each school, who will monitor the program, and who will facilitate? There will have to be a case management person. Staff is in the process of determining this and is thinking that the assistant principal would do that. Once the final plan is in place, the Board will be updated.

This mandated process, with training and other costs for the School District, is unfunded by the State. It is estimated the cost to the School District will be \$6.8 million. The fidelity of implementation will be scrutinized by the State. It is a costly program creating the infrastructure for learning needs and will require a big investment of money.

In order for this to work a buy in is needed from all schools. It usually takes two to three years to get the buy in to do the process completely right. The State is asking us to skip the buy in and just do it.

The School Board supports the premise that this is a best practice and students would benefit. They want to be successful and need to have the infrastructure and buy in piece. Doing it now, without the funds, would be a half implemented process and possibly fail.

Again, the School Board Members are asking the State to defer this unfunded program for one year until funds are available to implement the process correctly.

Material for this presentation is on the eAgenda, April 16, 2009, Budget Workshop.

## **Budget Update: Reductions**

### **Drop Extension for Teachers; Administrators**

The Superintendent handed out a list of DROP Extension employee positions for Elementary, Middle, High and Centers, which are teachers, ESE Specialists, Guidance Counselors, Media Specialists, School Psychologists, Social Workers, and Speech Language Pathologists. These are the positions of teachers and support staff who have been in the school system for 30 years, in DROP for 5 years, and possibly asking for an extension of DROP of 3 years, totaling to 233 employees as of April 15, 2009.

The Superintendent's recommended that employees in DROP, who wanted an extension, and would do so only if they went to a Title I school or Differentiated Accountability (DA) school, schools in need. These schools generally have positions that need to be filled. Those who wished to have a DROP extension would fill out a waiver, with a compelling reason to stay in the work force, and then would come before a committee who would make the determination and ultimately be approved or not approved by the Superintendent.

Board Members had a long discussion regarding the DROP extension and the number of surplus teachers whose contracts have not been renewed due to budgetary issues, reduced enrollment, increased class size limits, which are approximately 900 employees. Board Members were in agreement that the surplus teachers should have the first opportunity for the Title I or DA school positions. Although Board Members are sensitive to DROP employees, non DROP employees may be out of a job due to reduction in the work force. Board Members and the Superintendent are working on a fair and equitable decision that will consider all factors.

The status of surplus employees will be known by May 1st and whether or not what is being suggested is acceptable by the School Board's Attorney, the Union, and if further contract negotiation is needed.

Principals are waiting for the Superintendent's direction regarding the DROP employees. Areas have the schools' budgets, and staff that is dismissed from schools would have the option to go to a Title I school or go before a waiver board to determine if that person would stay at his/her school. The union contract will be followed in all determinations.

The details of the approval committee are not finalized at this time. Any approval or dismissal will ultimately have to go before the Board for approval. Board Members asked for a flow chart that would show this process and a copy of the employment waiver form. The School District would save \$5-15 million by not extending DROP for teachers and administrators.

### **Certified Personnel/Substitute Teachers**

Another cost savings suggestion brought forward by the Superintendent is that all administrators, who have a teacher certification, would be summoned to substitute for two days a month. This substitution could be attached to a particular school of choice. The Superintendent stated he will be a part of this substitute pool and also said that he has not accepted his raise and has no plans to do so during this budget crisis. This substitute suggestion would save the school district \$1.4 million a year.

### **Zero Based Budget**

A zero based budget is all money that was not used for each department at the end of the year is returned to the general fund and the new school year begins with a zero budget and only essential items are purchased. This would become part of our culture on the support side of the house. The School District would save \$1-3 million.

The Organizational Chart will be brought to the Board at the April 24th Workshop. Board Members asked that the Superintendent meet with them prior to the delivery of this item. Board Members also stated that the Organizational Chart is not final until it is approved at a Board Meeting.

Board Members wanted to make it clear that many topics have come forward regarding the budget, but no final decisions have been made. The Board wants to look at all their options and requested that there be a further conversation regarding all topics that were discussed with their suggestions and different options in the coming weeks.

Staff is requested to put in a matrix format all budget topics from recent discussions, what was suggested, and the Superintendent's recommendation, to help with this conversation. Once a consensus is made, the items will come before the Board for approval.

This would be an opportunity to cut down on a lot of duplication of effort and curb speculation from the community and employees. This matrix could be used by the Board Members to send to their constituents.

There were no materials posted for this discussion portion of the April 16, 2009 Workshop on the eAgenda.

**Status: Budget/Legislation Update**

Board Members had a telephone conference call from their Lobbyist in Tallahassee with an update regarding bills going before the Senate and House, such as: gambling, raising fees, Differentiated Accountability, Growth Management Bill, retirement, SAC Composition Bill, School Board Members' salaries, Stimulus Bill and how the funds will be used, and if the stimulus bill waiver has been received and filled out.

It was pointed out that our legislators from South Florida are promoting bills that are punitive to South Florida, such as School Board Members' salaries, where other Board Members in the State are getting an increase.

It is a frustrated legislature in Tallahassee and the bottom line is that the budget forthcoming will not hold education harmless. Board Members asked that specific bills be researched such as the teacher salary bill and teacher tenure bill.

Board Members will be continuously updated on the State's budget day by day.

JFN:jd