

Question	Response
<p>On Mr. Mancusi's memo in response to my question: this is only regarding outplacements due to the PPT process. But how are we "doing" financially with regard to unilateral outplacements, in terms of the final results for those disagreements and the accompanying legal fees? Also, can Mr. Mancusi please explain the data which would seem to indicate that this past year, not only did outplacement go up, but that this was in the environment of our making considerable investment in programming to keep more students "home"....</p>	<p>Since the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year the following in-district special education programs have been developed and implemented: the IMPACT program at each high school and Walter Fitzgerald Campus as well as the CLC-S programs at Riverfield Elementary School and Tomlinson Middle School. These programs have enabled the school district to meet the growing social, emotional and mental health needs of several students. Although we have these in-district programs if students with ongoing and pervasive significant mental health challenges continue to struggle in his or her home school despite our programming efforts the school based PPT may recommend an out placement based on the severity of the individual student's needs that can not be met within a public school setting. Without in-district programming to address the significant needs of students with disabilities we would be unable to provide the unique programming needs for many students within the Fairfield Public Schools. These programs allow us to maintain student programming in-district as well as offer us the opportunity to return students from outplacements when appropriate. The average tuition cost of an outplacement at a state approved therapeutic day program for students with mental health challenges ranges from approximately \$63,000 - \$100,000 per student. This does not include the cost of transportation. The average cost of tuition for a day program for students with significant global developmental delays, such as students enrolled in our CLC programs across the district, ranges from \$115,000- over \$150,000. Unilateral parental placements (Settlement Agreements)</p>

are projected to increase slightly for the 2020-2021 school year, although the overall cost to the District is projected to decrease. The projected average Settlement Agreement cost to the District is approximately \$44,000. Settlement agreements generally proceed through the CSDE Mediation process and to a Due Process Hearing if parents and the school district are unable to resolve their programming differences in mediation. Mediation generally takes one full day for approximately six hours with between two and three hours of required follow-up. Mediations involve parent and District attorneys as well as a CSDE appointed mediator. The legal fees are approximately \$3000 per mediation. Throughout this process administration, in consultation with legal representation, analyzes the facts of each case and determines potential costs to the District of defending a case in a due process hearing. Cases that go to a due process hearing generally cost between \$10,000-\$15,000 per day with an average hearing lasting between seven and ten days. If a case goes to a due process hearing and the District is not the prevailing party then the District is responsible to pay reasonable costs for parent attorney fees in addition to our attorney fees and the cost of the student's tuition. Settlement Agreements generally involve a cost share arrangement between the parents and the District. The percentage of cost sharing is generally determined by analysis of facts of each individual case.

What is the PD that cost money that took place at both schools?

The money is used to pay for the required certification course for first aid/CPR for all of our coaches.

<p>Magnet school enrollment - Regarding Attachment #4: any way to calculate if that final column of numbers basically represents a net cost or savings for the district?</p>	<p>We would have savings in tuition and as long as the students are in core classes in Fairfield their costs would be minimal.</p>
<p>Non-public and magnet enrollment trends - any changes related to grade levels, transition years, schools, etc.?</p>	<p>Please see attachment. Our data did not allow us to capture enrollment from magnet schools.</p>
<p>PK for 5 year olds - can we run this as a program?</p>	<p>As far as the legality of this programming goes, the relevant statute states as follows: "The parent or person having control of a child five years of age shall have the option of not sending the child to school until the child is six years of age and the parent or person having control of a child six years of age shall have the option of not sending the child to school until the child is seven years of age. The parent or person shall exercise such option by personally appearing at the school district office and signing an option form. The school district shall provide the parent or person with information on the educational opportunities available in the school system." In other words, FPS is obligated to provide educational opportunities to any student over the age of 5. We currently fulfill this obligation through our Grade K programming. We do not recommend a PK program for five year old students</p>
<p>Average cost of subs per school for PPTs? analysis of costs associated with PPTs, instructional time, coverage, etc.?</p>	<p>We will need to gather more information for this request.</p>

<p>Total math academy costs</p>	<p>Total cost for the program in 20-21 is 2.0 FTE (total cost \$189,064: 2 X \$73,223 salary, \$20,247 benefits, \$1,062 Medicare) and \$4,000 for curriculum writing and materials. If the program were eliminated we would likely have to increase FTE at one elementary school by 1.0 to accommodate returning grade 5 students.</p>
<p>What would be the costs of providing differentiated math instruction for all students who need it?</p>	<p>In order to improve teacher capacity to provide differentiated math support for all grade 4 and 5 students we would implement a summer workshop for all classroom teachers and the elementary math/science teachers. The objective of the workshop would be to improve teachers' ability to support the instructional levels of high achieving students. Total costs for this implementation would be \$78,720 for the workshop (approximately 80 staff members X 24 hours each X \$41 curriculum rate) and \$7,000 for materials (approximately 70 classrooms X \$100 each) for a total of \$85,720.</p>
<p>Revise ECC para worksheet</p>	<p>Please see page 152 in Budget Book as well as attached spreadsheet in the Superintendent's Friday packet</p>
<p>Transportation - legal obligation to provide transportation for all students?</p>	<p>If a student does not need transportation in order to have reasonable access to school accommodations, there is no duty to provide it.</p>
<p>Transportation - can parents opt out of busing?</p>	<p>All students have the ability to opt out of transportation. However we still need to provide available seats for all transportation eligible students. This allows us to reduce the number of stops but not the number of buses. Opt out works well for non-public students.</p>
<p>Transportation - Can we charge a fee for space available?</p>	<p>Follow up is required for this. We recommend discussing in Finance Committee.</p>

Transportation - cost savings from increasing walking distance a 1/4 mile?	There would be no cost savings if we continued to provide space available as an option.
Transportation - avg, ridership broken out by am/pm	Please see attachment.
Cost of dugouts	We have requested bids and intend to have a response by Tuesday evening.
Sq ft of FLHS locker room proposal	Approximately 1050 sq ft with additional storage of 600 sq ft.
Itemized list of FLHS locker room proposal costs	Please see attachment
Solution for unbudgeted maintenance costs	We will be prepared to discuss a possible solution Tuesday evening.
I would like to see the breakout of costs from the new HS guard greeter contract. My ultimate aim would be to strip out the funds for the extra duties of walking security, which if I read the panel correctly was not requested by the current administration and seems to be unnecessary. However, I also understand if these costs are already bundled in a new, signed contract and can't be removed.	The contractor is not able to give us a price breakdown. He explained that the way he bid on the contract was for an hourly rate based on the service offered. He did not break out the service but rather the type of guard required to complete all the requirements of the contract. Although this administration did not ask for the added service of walking the building, we are happy with the guard getting up and interacting with the students. In addition, some other value-added services include handling the sign-in of the visitors and the notifications to the person that the visitor is there to see. This frees up the visitors going into the office and tying up staff to have visitors sign in a second time and then making notifications.
Why is CO administration at 2.5% salary increase when FSAA is 1.94%?	2.5% reflects this year's actual increase. 2% was budgeted for 20-21.
Please provide a copy of the PPE chart	Please see attachment

<p>Our back up material for this year's maintenance projects states that that project is now on hold pending Parks and Rec plans. What is the plan for that project as it is not on the tier 1, tier 2 or tier 3 maintenance list? What will students use if that project is not done prior to season? Is Ludlowe able to host meets for that event in its current condition?</p>	<p>We intend to repair the shot put area this year.</p>
<p>How old is the Warde shot put and discus area? Is it compliant for use?</p>	<p>We do not know its age. Some repairs were completed last year. It is compliant for use.</p>
<p>What is the square footage of the current outdoor unit at Warde?</p>	<p>The storage shed is 2,326 square feet.</p>
<p>Some of older boilers, what is their current inspection status? Any concerns on any of our boilers for next year? I know we are going to start adding these back onto the waterfall, but since they are not there now just checking that we don't anticipate any issues at this time? In particular; 2 at Woods, 1 at Mill Hill, 2 at Sherman, and 3 at Tomlinson.</p>	<p>After the failure at Mill Hill we have re-inspected the identified boilers and believe they are fine.</p>
<p>Have unexpected maintenance costs increased over the years?</p>	<p>We believe so but we do not have accurate information for years prior to 18-19.</p>

Have the grade 4 Math Academy students for next year been identified yet? If not when will that occur? I'd like to have analysis of those who qualified and what was the reason they chose not to attend. The budget maintains 13 and 13 for each class next year. What were the obstacles and is there any way to alleviate them? Also, the publicly available math achievement data shows only a slight gender difference in elementary school, and then flips for all three years of middle school. This indicates, to me at least, something off in what is being used in the identification process. Are more parents of girls overriding middle school teacher recommended Math placement than parents of boys? I think there needs to be a lot more analysis of what's happening and how we better balance this offering.

4th Grade Math Academy students have not yet been selected. The process will begin in the beginning of March. We do not have information on why families chose not to attend. Anecdotally, many families expressed a desire to keep their child with friends in their home school the last two years of elementary. The district guidelines for class size is 25 students in grade 4. Forty invitations were sent last year, and thirteen families accepted. The class size of 25 students still holds for this year. The gender discrepancy is noticed and raises many questions for us. The identification process will need to be adjusted this year because the timeline for identification is moved up. One reason for the identification adjustment is that the grade 3 SBA results used last year will not be available in time to meet the adjusted timeline. The gender question will be looked at closely during the process

Also, the publicly available math achievement data shows only a slight gender difference in elementary school, and then flips for all three years of middle school. This indicates, to me at least, something off in what is being used in the identification process. Are more parents of girls overriding middle school teacher recommended Math placement than parents of boys? I think there needs to be a lot more analysis of what's happening and how we better balance this offering.

We continue to look into the gender discrepancies with the all students.

Gifted teachers... The FTE actual/proposed hasn't changed yet there is a universal decrease throughout the elementary schools. Can you explain this decrease. How many students per ES qualify for gifted, do all who qualify participate?

The identification process is consistent from year to year. Students are automatically identified if they receive a score of 135+ on either CogAT or NNAT3. (33 students in 2019, 25 students in 2020) There is a drop in requests for review from 89 (six qualified) to 49 students (three qualified) from 2018-2019 to 2019-2020 for eligible students (score range 125-134). There are approximately the same number of students who qualified for the review process (100 in 18-19, 105 and in 19-20). There was no change in the review process. Numbers fluctuate based on grade level size, by school and from year to year. One student at the elementary level opted out of services.