

Special Education and Student Services

GLAWS

Special Education	Student Services
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• MSA 1, 2, and 3 were accepted into the El Dorado SELPA• Approximately 250 IEP's were re-written into SEIS from Welligent and held with parents in the first 30 days of school.• Staff and service providers were all trained on using the new SPED student information system (SEIS)• MSA1, 3, 4, 5, 6, SA have implemented a Study Skills or Advisory course for their SpEd students• MSA5 is in its 2nd year of CADETS. New staff and programs have been implemented for this SDC transition class.• Increased program delivery to moderate/severe students• Psychologists at MSA 8 and SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Training on trauma informed strategies, mental health, and restorative practices have been presented at each symposium• A resource page of all documents related to student services has been added to the accountability main page• Suicide prevention policy was written and approved• MTSS model for academics and behavior• Updated Student-Parent Handbook and Element 10 (Discipline Policy) for Charter Petitions to LACOE and LAUSD• Work with Edlogical and Mitchell Family Counseling to provide crisis team, psychological evaluations, and counseling to General Education students

MPS						
					IEP's in Welligent/SEIS	Total Enrollement
MSA-SA		119	739	16%		
MSA-SD		42	410	10%		
MSA-1		85	542	16%		
MSA-2		88	468	19%		
MSA-3		60	463	13%		
MSA-4		40	175	23%		
MSA-5		45	210	21%		
MSA-6		28	160	18%		
MSA-7		49	291	17%		
MSA-8		50	489	10%		
Total		606	3947	15%		

Encroachment

MPS	2016-2017
MSA-SA	324,000
MSA-SD	
MSA-1	56,000
MSA-2	315,000
MSA-3	172,000
MSA-4	71,000
MSA-5	97,000
MSA-6	6,000
MSA-7	80,000
MSA-8	98,000

Services and Providers 15-16

	Psych/Counseling	Speech
MSA1	30,000	15,000
MSA2	50,000	25,000
MSA3	20,000	23,000
MSA4	20,000	15,000
MSA5	10,000	10,000
MSA6	10,000	5,000
MSA7	12,000	45,000
MSA8	14,000	19,000

GROWS

Special Education	Student Services
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase spectrum of supports and services for moderate/severe students• Increase pull out, SDC, co-teaching opportunities• Use of paraprofessionals• Intervention specialists• In-housing services for counseling, psychologists, speech• Improve management of new students and Interim IEP process• Increase trainings related to SPED law and due process	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strengthen multi-tiered system of support goals and data in all core, power classes, Saturday school sessions- provide curriculum or lesson maps• Provide targeted support for incoming 6th and 9th graders• Implement a Social Emotional Learning program for all elementary and middle school students (girls empowerment and self-esteem, boys etiquette and self-regulation)• Provide a Health education and human development course for middle/high school students
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Counseling services to General ed• Social Workers to provide family support• RTI/Intervention specialists for academics and behavior

Psychiatric Evaluation Team

School	October 15- November 15
MSA SD	0
MSA SA	2
MSA1	3
MSA2	1
MSA3	1
MSA4	2
MSA5	2
MSA6	3
MSA7	2
MSA8	0

Next Steps

Special Education	Student Services
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase the spectrum of support and services to Special Education students<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Work with special education consultant to observe each school site and discuss future planning.– Do a cost analysis for each campus and in-house positions such as school psychologists and speech therapists.– Create classes/programs for moderate/severe students (study skills, SSR, co-teaching, pull out, SPED core classes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Social Emotional Learning<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work with Social Work interns and Psychologist interns to create girls empowerment groups and boy etiquette and anger management groups• Have parent training workshops on suicide prevention and mental health• Increase programs such as Etiquette and Train of thought across all campuses• Counseling Interns will work with general education students on social emotional health.• Increase training for Tier I behavior and academic interventions for classroom teachers• Strengthen the use of the SSPT model for behavior and academics• Strengthen the use of Restorative Practices:<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Include PD on restorative practices at each symposium– Train Reflection Committees on restorative practices• Hire additional intervention support for academics and behavior

Consultation with Frank Tocco

Purpose

Program Quality, Lowering Costs, Spectrum of Support and Services

- Standards and procedures can be established in the admission process as pupils enter MSA. The advantage of these procedures will afford identification of students at-risk and allow the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team an opportunity to be proactive in establishing a defensible service model for each pupil.
- Establishing a formal, clearly-defined model of Response to Intervention, as an alternative to an IEP, will demonstrate the schools' effort in providing an appropriate instructional service model in the least restrictive environment for "at risk" pupils.
- A case carrier model assigned to pupils receiving RTI support should document the provision of service, participation and success or lack thereof the student has demonstrated.
- A consistent and efficient RTI model facilitates a students' ability to matriculate through a variety of intervention strategies within the General Education program that offer educational benefit and in so doing, justify the need for a more/less substantive intervention model within General Education or Special Education services.

Partnerships

Dr. Nadia R. Jones, EdD, LMFT
*Marriage Family Therapy Department Faculty
 Associate Director of Community Partnerships
 The Chicago School of Professional Psychology*

Mental Health Champions	Focus School Workshops	Intern
<p>MFT Student Teams- 4 individuals assigned to each school</p> <p>Volunteer 20 hours per month</p> <p>5 hours per week</p> <p>4 Areas of Focus- Self Esteem/Empowerment, Anger management and self regulation, Bullying, _____</p>	<p>MSA 5 and 7- Class workshops with curriculum.</p> <p>1 dedicated person</p>	<p>1 dedicated intern for MSA7 and another valley school</p>

EDLOGICAL GROUP CORP

PROPOSAL FOR SERVICES MAGNOLIA SCIENCE ACADEMIES SPECIAL EDUCATION

November 29, 2017

To: Magnolia Public Schools

Re: Preliminary Cost Analysis Related to Magnolia Science Academies Special Education Operations (Phase 1)

Preliminary Cost Analysis – Sp. Ed. Operations

Based on preliminary observations of Special Education operations at five of the nine Magnolia Science Academy (MSA) sites, it is apparent that state and federal requirements resulting from the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act are currently being implemented. However, refinement and further development of these related regulations in the form of foundational policies, guidelines and procedures are necessary to establish a consistent and technically compliant service model that insures a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment to pupils with exceptional needs and at the same time demonstrate fiscal prudence and efficiency to support these service models.

In an effort to identify and establish priorities in refining special education operations, the following goal focus areas are recommended in the first of three phases of development and implementation that will take approximately twenty-four months to develop and implement systemic and organizational shifts:

1. Establish a consistent and technically-compliant process and procedure in the identification and provision of Special Education services for pupils with exceptional needs that demonstrates an educational benefit over time. (Preliminary cost for research, development, legal review, approval, and dissemination of information across all MSA's is estimated at **(300 hours for Total of \$45,000)**, for consultation services. (On-going Trainer of trainer model)

Examples of such processes and procedures include (but limited to) intake procedures for pupils with exceptional needs entering an MSA that have an Individualized Education Program from a California public school is changed without a multidisciplinary assessment nor written parental request for recension of special education services. Such action, places MSA at risk for potential financial liability of violating a pupils' rights to an appropriate education and an inability to defend their service model due to procedural violations.

2. Formal, written, tried intervention services provided to at-risk pupils must be documented at each MSA that demonstrates a hierarchical structure that reflects efforts made to support all students. Philosophically, Special Education should be viewed as a service model of last resort in our attempts at educating a pupil in the General Education program to the extent appropriate. This formalized process is typically referred to as a "Response to Intervention" model that supports implementation of the Common Core standards. Development and formalization of model is site specific and will require site leadership team meetings to establish their respective RTI model. Associated technical consultant services to facilitate development of realistic RTI models is approximately **(90 Hours for a Total of \$13,500)**.

3. All MSA's are required to provide a full continuum of special education services to pupils with exceptional needs. At present, pupils at the MSA's observed who may be considered Moderate/Severe are in the General Education program with the assistance of an assigned para-educator. This is a very restrictive service model and if not periodically evaluated to determine educational benefit to the pupil served, the appropriateness of such a service can be questioned (after the fact), and present significant fiscal liability on the part of MSA. Therefore, eligibility criteria should be established to insure this particular special education service is only provided where educational benefit can be measured (including health and safety). Technical consultation service to research, develop, and disseminate (not including legal review and approval process) information to the field **(60 Hours for a Total of \$9,000)**.
4. On occasion, parents/guardians of pupils with exceptional needs do not approve of the identification of their son/daughter as an individual with exceptional needs. The multidisciplinary team establishes the appropriate Special Education service model based on an assessment/evaluation driven process that is defensible in terms of how the pupil can gain educational benefit in the least restrictive environment. Sometimes this can take the form of a self-contained classroom where the pupil receives a modified instructional program and attends within this service model for at least 51% of their instructional day. Parents demanding an alternative option of placement within the General Education program with support typically do so without regard to the educational benefit the child is entitled. This sets up a potential for Special Education appeal proceeding or in some instances, parents will withdraw from their local public school and enroll at a Charter, parochial or private school to avoid the program offered by their school district. Given this scenario, parents enroll their child at an MSA program and expect the service model provided to be within the General Education program when it has been demonstrated that such a service model is inappropriate for the pupil. This presents a potential liability on the part of MSA when the student fails to demonstrate adequate yearly progress academically. MSA should implement eligibility criteria for a "self-contained" classroom that mirrors the local public school when it has been determined that such pupil can gain adequate educational benefit. Consultation service to develop eligibility criteria and service model **(45 Hours for Total of \$6,750)**.
5. Special Education continues to be an underfunded service model throughout California at both the state and federal levels. As a result, most, if not all, public school districts in California make local general fund contributions to support their special education pupil population. Often times, this encroachment can quickly become a significant draw on the general fund that presents an adverse fiscal impact to the overall operation of the educational organization. Relative to MSA, there appears to be an over identification of special education pupils at selected MSA's that is in excess of 23% of the total school population. That means that nearly 1 in 4 students is considered as an individual with exceptional needs. This situation not only raises the question of over identification of special education pupils with the California Department of Education, but creates a substantial encroachment on the organizations' general fund. As a result, a formal, functional Student Study Team needs to be in place as "gate keeper" to insure only those pupils who require special education services to benefit from their instructional program are provided such service and insure an effective, formal Response to Intervention model is in place to serve those at-risk pupils (outside of the Special Education service model). Technical consultant service cost to facilitate implementation of Student Study Team **(90 Hours for a Total of \$13,500)**.

6. MSA Fiscal personnel must be involved in understanding the paradigmatic shift in Special Education operations and collaborate with Special Education administrators.
It may be appropriate to consider an MSA-wide Special Education budget allocation and hold respective personnel responsible to operating within those budgetary constraints. However, based on the Special Education Local Plan Area Local Control Funding Formula, a review of the allocation plan is recommended to insure block grant funding and specialized funding sources are allocated appropriately to reduce local general fund contributions. Special Education Technical Consultant review of funding plan and meeting **(15 Hours for a Total of \$2,250)**.

Based on the cited recommended goal focus areas designed to establish a foundational, systems-wide, consistent program operation, an on-going program of professional development shall follow with a trainer of trainer model using internal personnel as appropriate.

Barring unforeseen circumstances, the total estimated technical consultation services for development and implementation of Phase 1 of MSA Special Education operations (12-18 months period) **Total of 600 hours and grand total dollars \$90,000.**

Please let me know should you require further information.

- * The cost figure for Consultation services does not include on-going professional development which may be absorbed by internal personnel (as appropriate) to reduce costs.

EdLogical Group Corp



Hector Valentin
Chief Business Officer
CC: Frank Tocco
CC: Dianne Valentin

Frank Joseph Tocco, Ed. D.
4660 Alder Avenue
Yorba Linda, California 92886
Phone: (714) 970-2616 (h) (714) 904-0131 (c)
Electronic Mail: tocco.frank@gmail.com

Academic Preparation:

Institution: University of Southern California
Degree/College: Doctorate in Education Administration and Policy Development/Rossier
School of Education
Degree Conferred: May 2002

Institution: University of California at Irvine
Degree/Credential: Educational Administration
Degree Conferred: February 1980

Institution: University of Southern California
Degree/Department: Masters of Science in Educational Psychology/Counseling – Department
of Educational Psychology
Degree Conferred: May 1978

Institution: California State University at Fullerton
Degree/College: Bachelors of Science in Experimental Psychology/Social Science
Degree Conferred: June 1975

Certifications and Licensure:

California Commission for Teacher Credentialing:
Educational Administration and Supervision (K-12) (1980)
Pupil Personnel Services with Educational Psychology/Counseling Designation (1978)
General Education Services Teaching Credential – Psychology (7-14) (1974)
Special Education Services Teaching Credential (K-Adult) (1974)

Professional Experience:

Position: Special Education Technical Consultant, Ed Logical Inc.
Date: 2013 - Present

Position: Adjunct Professor, California State University Long Beach, College of Education
Date: 1989-Present

Position: Technical Consultant, Fullerton Joint Union High School District
Date: 2016-Present

Position: Principal, University High School, Orange County Department of
Education/Irvine
Date: 2015-16 (Interim)

Professional Experience (Continued):

Position: Adjunct Professor, University of Southern California, Rossier School of Education

Position: Regional Director, Orange County Department of Education, North Orange County Special Education Local Plan Area

Date(s): February 2004 – 2013 (Retired)

Position: Director - Special Education Local Plan Area, Los Angeles County Office of Education

Date(s): 1992 – 2004

Position: Consultant – Special Education/Due Process, Los Angeles County Office of Education

Date(s): 1989 – 1992)

Position: Downey Unified School District, Site Administrator, Downey High School

Date(s): 1985 – 1989 (pt. time)

Position: Principal, Division of Special Education, Los Angeles County Office of Education

Date(s): 1985 -1989

Position: Assistant Principal, Los Angeles County Office of Education, Division of Special Education

Date(s): 1981-1985

Position: Psychologist, Division of Special Education, Los Angeles County Office of Education

Date(s): 1979-1981

Position: Psychologist, Santa Ana Unified School District

Date(s): 1978-1979

Position: Teacher – Special Education - Santa Ana Unified School District

Date(s): 1976 – 1978

Related Activities:

California Department of Education – Trainer of Trainer Special Education Technical Compliance Monitoring Systems.

California Department of Education WASC Accreditation Team Institutions of Higher Education

California Department of Education Special Education Technical Compliance Consultant

Coalition for Adequate Funding for Special Education – Steering Committee Member

Related Activities (Continued):

California Special Education Local Plan Area Administrators Organization – Steering Committee Member

Legislative Representative on Special Education, Los Angeles County Office of Education
Orange County Alliance – Orange County Department of Education – Executive Review Committee Member

Coordination, Implementation and Supervision of Countywide Professional Development Program (Orange and Los Angeles Counties)

Supervision and Administrator of Orange County Department of Education Special Education Budget Formulation, Distribution and Monitoring

Professional Development presentation to job specific groups to assure adherence to state and federal regulations related to Special Education

Professional Development training U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights.

California State Selpa Organization - Special Education Funding Model – Trainer of Trainers.

October 26, 2017

TO: Kenya Jackson, Chief Academic Advisor
Victoria Marzouk, Director, Student Services

RE: Special Education Operations Meeting Summary of 10/25/2027

I enjoyed meeting you and appreciate the time taken to discuss various operational systems related to Magnolia Science Academies. A variety of significant elements were initially identified in terms of addressing efficiency of Special Education program operations. As discussed following is a summary of points addressed.

Initially, based on the reported percentage of special education pupils identified in attendance at the various MSA sites, it appears there may be an over identification of individuals with exceptional needs. This situation is a potential source of technical non-compliance with the California Department of Education. Standards and procedures can be established in the admission process as pupils enter MSA. The advantage of these procedures will afford identification of students at-risk and allow the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team an opportunity to be proactive in establishing a defensible service model for each pupil. Such procedures can also serve as technical compliance measures in the provision of appropriate services for those students entering with existing IEP's and enhance communication with parents/guardians in terms of what may be considered an appropriate instructional service model for their son/daughter. Establishing a formal, clearly-defined model of Response to Intervention, as an alternative to an IEP, will demonstrate the schools' effort in providing an appropriate instructional service model in the least restrictive environment for "at risk" pupils. A case carrier model assigned to pupils receiving RTI support should document the provision of service, participation and success or lack thereof the student has demonstrated. A consistent and efficient RTI model facilitates a students' ability to matriculate through a variety of intervention strategies within the General Education program that offer educational benefit and in so doing, justify the need for a more/less substantive intervention model within General Education or Special Education services.

1. The MSA has the right to deny a request for special education services under certain circumstances - in that - where sufficient evaluation data that is current and appropriately related to a specific request is on file, the existing evaluation documentation may be adequate in making the determination for a specific designated instructional service versus initiating a complete update of evaluation in the area of suspect disability. It is critical that site case managers assigned exercise caution in these circumstances as the agency must be able to justify and defend the denial of the need for additional assessment information and inform the parent/legal guardian of this decision. Field personnel must communicate with central office administration to insure appropriate implementation of this process.

2. Establishing consistent screening procedures by internal staff that can communicate with a pupils' previous school district or agency can facilitate clarification of the status of the pupil and family and in turn, provide staff proactive, insightful and appropriate information in the determination of a pupils' educational needs.
3. Students enrolling from other school districts/agencies with an existing IEP should have a screening process that allows for an initial placement in the program for thirty days. Once it has been determined by the IEP team that the service model is appropriate, the IEP can be developed relative to the current service model. However, it should be noted that pupils with an existing IEP designating Special Day Class service model, be considered to require a like service model. If the MSA does not offer this service model, a multi-disciplinary assessment should be implemented to determine whether a change in the service model is appropriate. Transfer provisions from one like program to another within California apply in this instance. Further discussion on this process is necessary.
4. A number of student cases were discussed in terms of their status was presented. For purposes of confidentiality no student identifiable information was provided. Potential options were discussed. No pupil file information was presented or available. The nature of these cases demonstrate a need for a proactive approach in the standardization and implementation of processes and procedures related to pupils with exceptional needs at the site level. These are technically complex and sensitive cases. Central office administration must be communicated with in a timely manner in order to diminish potential problematic issues. Special education attorney services to provide technical/legal assistance to the MSA on such cases is currently used in an effort to address students' needs and the potential liability that could arise.
5. Given the need for analysis of systemic operational procedures in the provision of Special Education services, it was recommended that internal MSA administration and staff (in conjunction with technical consultation where appropriate) prioritize operational issues that will promote fiscal and instructional prudence across all MSA's.
6. As these priorities are become evident, it is strongly recommended to include fiscal administration in this process to insure a clear understanding of why changes are being recommended with an estimate of associated costs and whether such proposals are realistic. Once a budget has been established and approved, priority programmatic recommendations should begin.*

* Please note that systemic changes in a schools' culture is a slow process and often best addressed at the beginning of the school year.

Page 3 of 3 October 25, 2017

Recommendation for follow up meeting to discuss potential fiscal impact and/or related costs to be determined. Dr. Tocco will await notification by MSA in moving forward.

Sincerely,

Dr. Frank Tocco, Technical Consultant, Edlogical Inc.

**Preliminary Proposal for the Refinement of Special Education Program Operations –
Magnolia Science Academy – Santa Ana (MSA-SA) DRAFT 11/21/17**

I. Purpose of Proposal

DRAFT 1 11/21/17

The purpose of this proposal is to analyze current Special Education operation practices within the Magnolia Science Academy (MSASA) to identify and establish foundational elements designed to refine, improve and streamline operations in a manner that meet related state and federal requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act and in a fiscally prudent manner.

II. Background

The preliminary information presented in this proposal is based on a site observation of the Special Education services model at the Magnolia Science Academy located in Santa Ana (MSASA), California. The team members involved in the site observation was made up of MSA administrative personnel, site certificated staff, and EdLogical Inc. Technical Consultant. The administrative personnel included Victoria Marsouk, Kenya Jackson, Meg Bristow and Laura Betsabe-Schlottman. Selected Special Education teachers were also included. Classroom observations were made at the elementary and secondary levels. Interviews included special education teacher-specialists and designated instructional service providers. Upon completion of the collected information, Ms. Marsouk led the team in a debriefing discussion session of the data compiled to identify areas of need. This information laid the foundation for identifying and establishing priority-focus areas.

As a result of the team debriefing discussion, it is apparent that the MSA-SA Special Education service model offers a continuum of services based on individual student need using an integration/blended model within General Education program. General Education, Special Education staff appear to demonstrate a sincere and dedicated affect in their efforts to serve the needs of pupils assigned. Via the Individualized Education Planning (IEP) process, Special Education pupils are provided a myriad of Designated Instructional Services (DIS) within the General Education setting.

III. Preliminary Findings

Following is a summary of select preliminary findings reported by staff that establish the need for justification of consideration for refining current practices in the Special Education operations at the MSA-SA site:

- The total student population of the MSASA site was reported to be 739 pupils (grades P-12). Of this student population, 22% are identified as pupils with exceptional needs requiring an IEP. This is a significant number of special education pupils that raises potential for the over identification of pupils as individuals with exceptional needs with the California Department of Education Technical Compliance Unit. Typically, 10-14 percent of pupils within a school is a ratio that represents an appropriate number of such pupils.

III. Preliminary Findings (Continued)

- Selected teachers observed conveyed a concern that the dynamics of individual special education pupils presents a significant challenge to their efforts to effectively implement their instructional curriculum. A need for professional development was a repeated theme communicated in understanding how to meet the educational needs of pupils who demonstrate weaknesses in specific learning processes. In addition, clarification is needed to appropriately apply provisions for classroom accommodations vs. classroom modifications via the IEP process.
- Assessment-driven data justifying the type and level of related services was observed to be inconsistently documented in the IEP. A relationship between the related service provided a pupil and the adequacy of “Educational Benefit” in the provision of Special Education services was not consistently documented. As a result, the determination whether related services provided are effective become a subjective issue and difficult to defend, modify or terminate.
- Intake procedures for the enrollment of pupils with exceptional needs with an existing IEP are not screened to ascertain the appropriateness of the educational model offered within the MSASA program with accommodations. As a result, a pupil with an educationally significant exceptionality entering the MSASA program is offered participation within the General Education program with related special education services without a multi-disciplinary assessment to determine the appropriateness of the service model offered. This may constitute a change in placement which potentially violates the pupils’ right to a “free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment” thereby creating a violation of state and federal requirements and potential liability on the part of MSA (unless appropriately documented in the IEP). Though parents may request all Special Education services be withdrawn (via the IEP process), the appropriateness of such action may not be in the best interests of the pupils’ education establishing an inability to provide a service model the pupil may benefit from more effectively and a service model that is not adequately defensible.
- The MSASA does not offer a special education service model for pupils whose disabling condition is considered as Moderate-Severe in nature (e.g. self-contained classroom for pupils requiring special education services greater than 51% of their instructional day). As a result, those pupils entering the program from school districts who have documented such a service model, may very likely be under-served or inappropriately served within the General

III. Preliminary Findings (Continued):

Education program. In these instances, educational benefit of the services offered, is difficult to defend in terms of educational benefit thereby creating potential liability and a breach of state and federal regulations as they apply. This is also the case with those pupils entering the MSASA program with an existing IEP who are identified with Mild-Moderate disabling conditions who previously received special education services within a special class for up to 49% of their instructional day (e.g. Resource Specialist Program vs. an itinerant push-in model of instruction within the General Education setting.).

- An active, structured Student Study Team (a function of the General Education Program), was reported not to be in place at the MSASA program. As a result, students demonstrating various problems in the classroom are considered for a special education service model without prior documentation of prior interventions within the General Education program. This creates a potential for the inappropriate identification of a suspect disability when in reality may be an issue that can be addressed within the General Education program without necessarily identifying the pupil as an individual with exceptional needs. This situation creates a potential for liability on the schools' part.
- Though a variety of educational interventions are offered at the MSASA program, a formal, written and tired school-wide Response to Intervention service model is needed to establish a defensible service model for pupils demonstrating a variety of challenges within the classroom (including Special Education as an option for intervention). The concept of an effective RTI model acknowledges the need for a hierarchical system of educational support that attempts to serve pupils within the least restrictive environment.
- Written standards and parameters in the determination of the assignment of an individual para-educator for a student with exceptional needs are not formalized. This may present a challenge in the assessment process in establishing an appropriate level of support (via the IEP process).

IV. Priority Focus Areas

As a result of the observed elements of program operations noted above at the MSASA site, the debriefing team is recommending a structured system of support designed to establish a foundation that facilitates and promotes aspects of:

1. Increased efficiency related to site rules, regulations and guidelines.
2. Certificated personnel and non-certificated personnel collaboration with adequate, on-going integrated provisions of professional development that will promote consistency in providing support to pupils that are at risk and those with exceptional needs.
3. Provisions to establish a formalized system of support that addresses the social/emotional needs of students at risk.
4. As is typical of educationally-related proposals designed to establish foundational systems of change to enhance the overall operations of an instructional program, a step-by-step action plan are next steps in this process.
5. In order to develop a realistic program implementation plan based on data-driven results, fiscal personnel must be involved in order for program personnel to obtain an understanding of related costs necessary to prioritize the needed program elements in a cost-effective manner and the potential return on the invested funds in the overall operation of the school. For example, program administrators should have an in-depth understanding of the Local Control Funding Formula that provides the basic funding for Special Education operations. In addition, an understanding of the local general fund contribution that supports the special education program beyond its categorical allocations will serve as a goal in our efforts to reduce special education cost over-runs and insure an effort to maximize the efficiency of systems to be put in place. It is recommended that a meeting be convened with the appropriate fiscal and program personnel be convened to establish a common goal in the development and implementation of a plan to effectively address the priority focus areas determined as noted above in a cost effective and accountable manner.

***Next Steps Notes For Victoria/Kenya's consideration):**

Examples of program priority operational elements (Once funding has been allocated prioritize with cabinet level administration): Order of elements noted below are not in order of significance.

- a. Written guidelines on how to review in-coming students.
- b. Written guidelines on how to conduct Administrative Transfer; In-take IEP meetings.
- c. Written protocol addressing suicidal ideation among students.
- d. Written standards for the use of individualized physical health care/behavior support (1-1 paraeducators).
- e. Written procedures for Student Study Team functions and documentation procedures.
- f. Maximizing funding allocated under categorical allocations (e.g. Low Incidence Equipment/Services, Educationally-Related Mental Health funds.).
- g. Position specifications for non-certificated personnel assigned to pupils and/or certificated personnel.
- h. Multi-disciplinary assessment practices related to identified disabling conditions and writing defensible pupil evaluations.
- i. How to integrate parent/guardian as a meaningful support to students in the implementation of the IEP process.
- j. Site-level protocol in dealing with difficult stakeholders and/or potential liability cases.
- k. Understanding community resources in supporting students/families at risk.
- l. Understanding differences between CFR 504 and IEP provisions and program modifications vs. accommodations and their respective implications in the pupils instructional program and commencement/graduation requirements.
- m. Writing defensible Transition to Adult plans via the IEP process.
- n. Roles and responsibilities of support personnel – Maximizing resources to meet the needs of pupils at risk.

*** Please call should you have need for clarification or need for changes in this information.**

