

**PARENTS FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION
MANDATE RELIEF COMMITTEE**

EDUCATE AND ADVOCATE

AGENDA

January 25, 2012

10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

1. Welcome

- **Dr. Peter J. Mustich, Rye Neck Superintendent “Why Are We Here?”**
- **Patty Nashelsky, Rye Neck PTSA President - Overview of the Rye Neck Advocacy Work**

2. PPS Committee:

- **Julie O’Shea: Review Letters / Strategy**
- **Sample Letters / Formats – Links**

3. Next Steps for Rye Neck

- **Start E-Mail Campaign**
- **Introductory Community Letter**
- **Mailing Dates**
- **Contact Legislators**
- **Follow Up**

DRAFT

8 Individual Districts, Many Shared Services

Cooperation of Sound Shore Districts Epitomizes Efficiency

Governor Cuomo has made bold headlines since coming into office about the need for school district managers to exercise 'efficiency.' State Education Commissioner John King visited southern Westchester in the late Fall and told reporters that from his vantage point, a countywide school district for Westchester "could save money."

Given their positions, these individuals are forced to offer broad-based remarks. Unfortunately, this means they don't recognize that many of the goals they seek for public schools are either being realized on a regular basis or are well under way, exclusive of the already-existing efficiencies that occur through the use of BOCES.

For the past 20 years, eight districts in the Sound Shore region have been working together to both enhance our educational opportunities and realize economic efficiencies. This extraordinary model has enabled each district to improve, as well as develop cost efficiencies that have benefited our students and our communities.

Our staffs, our boards and our PTAs come together regularly to work on advocacy and sharing with professional training and support opportunities. These district leaders have come to depend on one another for solutions that will benefit both the individual districts and the region's communities as a whole.

Examples of this work abound. The driver of the collaboration is a regular meeting of the Superintendents to discuss/implement a wide variety of topics. Ongoing successes that have materially benefited all school districts include the following:

Districtwide

- Joint professional development opportunities for our professional staff and Boards.
- School leadership activities for legislative advocacy
- Sharing the cost of experts for curriculum and instruction development and APPR
- Development of an emergency information system at no cost to the districts
- Development of local programs at a reduced tuition rate while improving the quality of the programs for our students, and minimizing transportation and support personnel costs.

Special Services

- Set an annual tuition rate for the consortium districts that is consistently lower than our local BOCES and private programs, while creating superior programs in our own districts
- Development of specialized programs that are more effective than BOCES or other agencies'

work in moving our students back into the mainstream

Athletics

- Development of ongoing professional development for the mandated coaches' courses, with 100% of our coaches meeting the state mandate as a result, at minimum cost to the districts.
- Sharing of equipment, supplies, facilities and fields at no cost to consortium districts
- Partnering on joint transportation
- Development of a joint bidding procedure for supplies and equipment
- Shared professional development opportunities for parents of athletes
- Development of merged teams, which offer opportunities that any one school would not be able to offer, at a much reduced cost

Personnel

- Sharing the most recent personnel practices/requirements, along with candidate
- Development of shared software purchasing
- Development and implementation of professional development for staff on state and federal mandated requirements
- Sharing of costs and procedures for fingerprinting, hiring and dismissal procedures, advertising for positions, and related effort

Business

- Development of joint RFP for professional services
- Sharing information concerning contractors and maintenance contracts
- Cooperative concerning health insurance and vendors
- Sharing of auditing practices and legal information
- Development of joint transportation routes
- Sharing of budget information and state information concerning tax and levy rates. We share recent comptroller opinions and practices of how to deal effectively with changes.

Principals/Building Management

- Sharing best practices and teaching and learning models
- Sharing evaluation models and practice
- Negotiations with school-based vendors to provide consistent products, good pricing
- Sharing of professional development opportunities
- Sharing of course work where possible for students including distance learning

Why does this model work? If you ask the Superintendents and the Boards, they will say it is because of regular communication in the interest of cost-effectiveness and quality. Though our districts and communities are largely similar, they are protective of their own local control, and appreciate the advantages of this type of collaboration without another bureaucratic structure. In other words: they are dubious of getting satisfaction from a large system, and have found the success in the 'virtual' consolidation as it is currently practiced.

Dear Rye Neck Parents:

We are at a critical juncture for public education in New York State. Schools and local governments face tremendous financial stress. With the goal of limiting property tax increases throughout the state, a tax levy cap has been imposed. This exposes our schools to the risk of eliminating important programs. To balance the impact of the tax levy cap, the state must provide meaningful mandate relief so that schools retain the ability to satisfy local educational needs, priorities and values. It is up to us, as parents and citizens, to encourage our elected officials to support legislation that allows school districts to eliminate unnecessary and onerous mandates.

Rye Neck has partnered with a consortium of lower Hudson Valley school districts to push for mandate relief. Several burdensome and costly mandates have been identified as a starting point for reform. These mandates are related to transportation, special education and pension/healthcare fiscal reform.

Did you know...

17% of the Rye Neck 2011/12 school budget or approximately \$6 million result from state mandates.

Presently local taxpayers fund 204 New York State special education mandates that exceed federal law. Over the last five years, special education costs in New York have skyrocketed 40% as a result of these mandates.

In the four years ending 2011/2012 the annual defined pension costs in Rye Neck are projected to increase from approximately \$1.4 million to \$2.4 million.

In addition to special needs students, Rye Neck is required to transport private and parochial school students within a 15 -mile radius of our district at a budgeted cost of \$865,353 for this school year. The state used to cover 90% of these mandated transportation costs; now funding is at less than 10%.

The financial burden of these mandates is passed onto the taxpayer at the local level. It is time to tell Albany ENOUGH!!

How you can make a difference:

It is critical that taxpayers communicate with our elected officials. In the coming weeks, Rye Neck's *Parents for Public Education* will send a series of emails informing you on specific mandate reforms and provide links to prepared letters that you can forward via email to your legislators.

Participate in the democratic process and have your voice heard! Change will come if the voices of taxpayers who value public education and fiscal responsibility are active and strong. Your children's education will benefit greatly from your thoughtful participation.

Respectfully,

Parents for Public Education Mandate Relief Committee

TRANSPORTATION MANDATE RELIEF

*Please note, required fields are in red.

Dear Elected Representative:

As a parent in the Rye Neck School District, I am deeply concerned about the financial burden that New York State education mandates place on our local community. To balance the impact of the tax levy cap, the state must provide meaningful mandate relief so that we can maintain the quality of our schools.

I am particularly concerned about the state's mandate that requires our district to fund transportation for any private or parochial school student who resides within a 15-mile radius. For Rye Neck, this comes at an annual cost of \$865,353. By reducing the mileage requirement from 15 miles to 5 miles and limiting special education out-of-district transportation when a free appropriate education is provided in district, my district would realize an annual savings of \$296,524. For a district of our small size, this would make a tremendous difference in being able to preserve programs and services that I value.

The tax levy cap, coupled with the burden of funding existing state mandates, will force our district to eliminate much of what is so important to the essence of a Rye Neck education...and what is so valuable to me and my child.


Please enact legislation that would provide TRANSPORTATION MANDATE RELIEF to our school district.

Name:

Home Address:

(line 2)

City

State -- Choose State -- 

Zip Code

School District:

Email Address:

Date

Send me a copy?

SPECIAL EDUCATION MANDATE RELIEF

*Please note, required fields are in red.

Dear Elected Representative:

As a parent in the Rye Neck School District, I am deeply concerned about the financial burden that New York State education mandates place on our local community. To balance the impact of the tax levy cap, the state must provide meaningful mandate relief so that we can maintain the quality of our schools.

One issue that particularly concerns me is the number of state mandates related to special education that exceed federal law. These 204 mandates, funded by local taxpayers, place an added financial burden on our community. At the time many of these mandates were put in place, Congress funded up to 40% of the average per pupil expenditure. With the decrease and/or elimination of state and federal aid and the imposition of the tax levy cap, these mandated services are funded with dollars taken away from my district's general education program. A revised system without these costly (and in many ways outdated) mandates would better serve our special needs students.

For example, eliminate state mandated class sizes for students with disabilities and resource rooms while maintaining a full continuum of services. These mandated ratios are generic and do not address the individual needs of the students. In addition, I urge you to amend Education Law 3602 that creates entitlement for special education students enrolled in private schools. Costs for these placements should be aligned with the cost of comparable programs offered by the district of residence or local BOCES.

Finally, adopt the federal standard for a child's initial evaluation. This will provide Committees on Special Education with the flexibility to determine what specific assessments to offer based on the reasons for referral and the student's need.

The above suggestions are just a starting point, but would provide much needed relief to taxpayers. Overall, I believe that New York State special education mandates should be aligned with federal standards. As is, the tax levy cap, coupled with the burden of funding existing state mandates such as those mentioned, will force our district to eliminate much of what is so important to the essence of a Rye Neck education...and what is so valuable to me and my child.

Please enact legislation that would provide SPECIAL EDUCATION MANDATE RELIEF to our school district.

Name:

.....

Home Address:

.....

(line 2)

.....

City

.....

State

-- Choose State -- 

Zip Code

.....

School District:

.....

Email Address:

.....

PENSION/HEALTHCARE FISCAL REFORM

*Please note, required fields are in red.

Dear Elected Representative:

As a parent in the Rye Neck School District, I am deeply concerned about the financial burden that New York State education mandates place on our local community. To balance the impact of the tax levy cap, the state must provide meaningful mandate relief so that we can maintain the quality of our schools.

I am particularly concerned about the drastic escalation in pension and health care costs that districts are facing. In the four years ending 2011-12, the annual defined benefit pension costs in Rye Neck are projected to have increased from approximately \$1.4 million to \$2.4 million – a 71% increase. Similarly, health care benefit costs in Westchester County have continued to escalate steeply.

The district has implemented several initiatives over the past few years in an effort to contain costs. With the tax levy cap in place however, Rye Neck will be forced to make difficult choices affecting my children's education by eliminating non-mandated programs and services that I value - that is, unless significant relief is provided in the areas of employee salaries and benefits, as this comprises the largest portion of our district budget.

The legislature has the power to reform pension system contributions, easing the spikes that occur based upon market conditions. The legislature also has the power to compel districts to use a state-created healthcare plan for its employees, which would effectively curb the steep increases we are experiencing as relatively small employers.

With this in mind, I ask that you please enact legislation that would offer relief by: 1) Stabilizing pension costs on a year-to-year basis by requiring a minimum contribution (rollback to pre-1998 rates); 2) Establishing a window for a 55/25 "exit clause" for tier 3 and 4 members who are 55 and older (in 2011) to create "entry" opportunities for new tier 5 and 6 TRS contributors; and 3) Cap health care premium costs with a statewide plan and limited employer contributions.

Please enact legislation that would provide PENSION/HEALTH CARE REFORM to our school district.

Name:

Home Address:

(line 2)

City

State -- Choose State -- 

Zip Code

School District:

Email Address:

Date:

EMAIL: RegentPhillips@mail.nysed.gov

The Honorable Merryl Tisch
9 East 79th St.
New York City, NY 10021
(212) 879-9414; FAX (212) 628-2188
EMAIL: RegentTisch@mail.nysed.gov

Dear Chancellor Tisch:

House of Representatives

- #17 The Honorable Eliot L. Engel
Rayburn House Office Building, Rm. 2161
Washington, D. C. 20515
(202) 225-2464; FAX (202) 225-5513
EMAIL: ny17@legislators.com
- #18 The Honorable Nita Lowey
Rayburn House Office Building, Rm. 2365
Washington, D. C. 20515
(202) 225-6506; FAX (202) 225-0546
EMAIL: nita.lowey@mail.house.gov
- #19 The Honorable Nan Hayworth
Longworth House Office Building, Rm. 1440
Washington, D. C. 20515
(202) 225-5441; FAX (202) 225-3289
EMAIL: nan.hayworth@mail.house.gov

3655 Johnson Avenue
Bronx, NY 10463
(718) 796-9700 Fax (718) 796-5134

222 Mamaroneck Avenue, Suite 310
White Plains, New York 10605
(914) 428-1707 Fax (914) 328-1505

255 Main Street, Room, 3232G
Goshen, NY 10924
(845) 291-4100; FAX (845) 291-4164

U. S. Senate

The Honorable Kirsten Gillibrand
Russell Senate Office Building, Suite 478
Washington, D. C. 20510
(202) 224-4451; FAX (202) 228-0282
EMAIL: senator@gillibrand.senate.gov

The Honorable Charles Schumer
Hart Senate Office Building, Room 322
Washington, D. C. 20510
(202) 224-6542; FAX (202) 228-3027
EMAIL: senator@schumer.senate.gov

The President

President Barack Obama
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D. C. 20500
(202) 456-1414

Dear President Obama: or
Dear Mr. President:

The Honorable John Sampson
Senate Democratic Leader
Legislative Office Building, Rm. 907
Albany, NY 12247
(518) 455-2788; FAX (518) 426-6806
EMAIL: sampson@senate.state.ny.us

Dear Senator Sampson:

The Honorable John Flanagan
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
Legislative Office Building, Rm. 805
Albany, NY 12247
(518) 455-2071; FAX (518) 426-6904
EMAIL: flanagan@senate.state.ny.us

Dear Senator Flanagan:

Assembly

The Honorable Sheldon Silver
Speaker of the Assembly
Legislative Office Building, Rm. 932
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-3791; FAX (518) 455-5459
EMAIL: speaker@assembly.state.ny.us

Dear Mr. Silver: or Dear Mr. Speaker:

The Honorable Ron Canestrari
Assembly Majority Leader
Legislative Office Building, Rm. 928
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-4474; FAX (518) 455-4727
Email: canestr@assembly.state.ny.us

The Honorable Brian Kolb
Assembly Minority Leader
Legislative Office Building, Rm. 933
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-3751; FAX (518) 455-3750
EMAIL: kolbb@assembly.state.ny.us

The Honorable Catherine T. Nolan
Chairwoman, Assembly Education Committee
Legislative Office Building, Rm. 836
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-4851; FAX (518) 455-3847
EMAIL: nolanc@assembly.state.ny.us

Area Regent , at-large Regent, and Chancellor who live nearby

The Honorable Harry Phillips, III
71 Hawthorne Way
Hartsdale, NY 10530
(914) 948-0486; FAX (914) 288-0908

Dear Regent Phillips:

- #101 The Honorable Kevin A. Cahill
 Legislative Office Building, Room 713
 Albany, NY 12248
 (518) 455-4436; FAX (518) 455-5576
 EMAIL: cahillk@assembly.state.ny.us
- Governor Clinton Building, Suite G-4
 1 Albany Avenue
 Kingston, NY 12401
 (845) 338-9610
 FAX (845) 338-9590
- #102 The Honorable Marcus Molinaro
 Legislative Office Building, Room 532
 Albany, NY 12248
 (518) 455-5177; FAX (518) 455-5418
 EMAIL: molinarm@assembly.state.ny.us
- 7578 North Broadway, Suite 4
 Red Hook, NY 12571
 (845) 758-9790
 FAX (845) 758-9794
- #103 The Honorable Joel M. Miller
 Legislative Office Building, Room 437
 Albany, NY 12248
 (518) 455-5725; FAX (518) 455-5729
 EMAIL: millerj@assembly.state.ny.us
- 3 Neptune Road, Suite A19E
 Poughkeepsie, NY 12601
 (845) 463-1635
 FAX (845) 463-1638

New York State Senate

- #40 The Honorable Greg Ball
 Legislative Office Building, Room 817
 Albany, NY 12247
 (518) 455-3111; FAX (518) 426-6977
 EMAIL: gball@nysenate.gov
 Scheduler: Gerry
- 1441 Route 22, Suite 205
 Brewster, NY 10509
 (845) 279-3773; FAX (845) 279-7156
- #41 The Honorable Stephen M. Saland
 Capitol Office Building, Room 504
 Albany, NY 12247
 (518) 455-2411; FAX (518) 426-6920
 EMAIL: saland@nysenate.gov
- 3 Neptune Road, Suite A19B
 Poughkeepsie, NY 12601
 (845) 463-0840; FAX (845) 463-3438

New York State Legislative Leaders and Education Committee Chairmen

Governor

The Honorable Andrew M. Cuomo
 NY State Capitol Building
 Albany, NY 12224
 (518) 474-8390;
 Fax (518) 474-1513
 To email: go to WPSBA website under Legislative Advocacy/Government Officials,
 click on link to Gov Cuomo and fill out email form.

Senate

The Honorable Dean Skelos
 President Pro Tem & Majority Leader
 Legislative Office Building, Rm. 909
 Albany, NY 12247
 (518) 455-3171; FAX (518) 426-6950
 EMAIL: skelos@nysenate.gov

Dear Senator Skelos:

ROCKLAND COUNTY

New York State Assembly

- #94 The Honorable Kenneth Zebrowski
Legislative Office Building, Room 631
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-5735; FAX (518) 455-5561
EMAIL: zebrowskik@assembly.state.ny.us
- 67 North Main St.
New City, NY 10956
(845) 634-9791
FAX (845) 634-1091
- #95 The Honorable Ellen Jaffee
Legislative Office Building, Room 650
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-5118; FAX (518) 455-5119
EMAIL: jaffeee@assembly.state.ny.us
- 1 Blue Hill Plaza, Ste 1116
POB 1549
Pearl River, NY 10965
(845) 624-4601
FAX (845) 624-2911
- #96 The Honorable Nancy Calhoun
Legislative Office Building, Room 525
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-5441; FAX (518) 455-5884
EMAIL: calhoun@assembly.state.ny.us
- 1012 Little Britain Rd, Suite 900
New Windsor, NY 12553
(845) 567-3141
FAX (845) 567-3910
- #97 The Honorable Annie Rabbitt
Legislative Office Building, Room 719
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-5991; FAX (518) 455-5929
EMAIL: rabbitta@assembly.state.ny.us
- 41 High St.
Goshen, NY 10924
(845) 291-3631
FAX (845) 291-0992

New York State Senate

- #38 The Honorable David Carlucci
Legislative Office Building, Room 302
Albany, NY 12247
(518) 455-2991; FAX (518) 426-6737
EMAIL: carlucci@nysenate.gov
- 95 South Middletown Rd
Nanuet, NY 10954
(845) 623-3627; FAX (845) 624-0424

DUTCHESS COUNTY

New York State Assembly

- #99 The Honorable Steve Katz
Legislative Office Building, Room 531
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-5783; FAX (518) 455-5543
EMAIL: katzs@assembly.state.ny.us
- 2392 Route 6
Brewster, NY 10509
(845) 279-5301
FAX (845) 279-5486
- #100 The Honorable Tom Kirwan
Legislative Office Building, Room 431
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-5762; FAX (518) 455-5593
EMAIL: kirwant@assembly.state.ny.us

#93 The Honorable Michael J. Spano
Legislative Office Building, Room 454
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-3662; FAX (518) 455-5499
EMAIL: spanom@assembly.state.ny.us
Scheduler: Nancy

35 E. Grassy Sprain Road, Room 406B
Yonkers, NY 10710
(914) 779-8805; FAX (914) 779-8859

#99 The Honorable Steve Katz
Legislative Office Building, Room 531
Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-5783; FAX (518) 455-5543
EMAIL: katzs@assembly.state.ny.us

2392 Route 6
Brewster, NY 10509
(845) 279-5301
FAX (845) 279-5486

New York State Senate

#34 The Honorable Jeffrey D. Klein
Legislative Office Building, Room 304
Albany, NY 12247
(518) 455-3595; FAX (518) 426-6887
(800) 718-2039
EMAIL: jdklein@senate.state.ny.us
Scheduler: Pena

3612 E. Tremont Avenue
Bronx, NY 10465
(718) 822-2049; FAX (718) 822-2321

#35 The Honorable Andrea Stewart-Cousins
Legislative Office Building, Room 615
Albany, NY 12247
(518) 455-2585; FAX (518) 426-6811
EMAIL: scousins@senate.state.ny.us
Scheduler: Kate Glazer (Albany); Dana (district)

28 Wells Avenue, Building 3
Yonkers, NY 10701
(914) 423-4031; FAX (914) 423-0979

#36 The Honorable Ruth Hassell-Thompson
Legislative Office Building, Room 707
Albany, NY 12247
(518) 455-2061; FAX (518) 426-6998
EMAIL: hassellt@senate.state.ny.us
Scheduler: Donna Drayton

959 E 233rd St
Bronx, NY 10466-3207
(718) 547-8854, FAX (718) 515-2718

#37 The Honorable Suzi Oppenheimer
State Capitol Building, Room 414
Albany, NY 12247
(518) 455-2031; FAX (518) 426-6860
EMAIL: oppenhei@senate.state.ny.us
Scheduler: Karen McGough (Albany); Lelanie (district)

222 Grace Church Street, 3rd Floor
Port Chester, NY 10573
(914) 934-5250; FAX (914) 934-5256

#40 The Honorable Greg Ball
Legislative Office Building, Room 817
Albany, NY 12247
(518) 455-3111; FAX (518) 426-6977
EMAIL: gball@nysenate.gov
Scheduler: Gerry

1441 Route 22, Suite 205
Brewster, NY 10509
(845) 279-3773; FAX (845) 279-7156

NY AREA LEGISLATORS
2010-2011

The 2010-2011 area State Legislators, Governor, Members of Congress and the Senate are listed with their addresses, phone and fax numbers. In addresses, all elected officials are The Honorable. For members of the Assembly and Members of Congress, the greeting should be Dear Mr., Mrs., or Ms. For the Governor, the greeting should be Dear Governor or Dear Governor Paterson. For both state and federal senators, the greeting is Dear Senator _____. For the Regents, the greeting is Dear Regent _____.

WESTCHESTER AND PUTNAM

New York State Assembly

- #87 The Honorable James Gary Pretlow
Legislative Office Building, Room 845 Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-5291; FAX (518) 455-5447
EMAIL: pretloj@assembly.state.ny.us
Scheduler: Nitisha/Monique
6 Gramatan Ave., Suite 407
Mt. Vernon, NY 10550
(914) 667-0127; FAX (914) 667-0209
- #88 The Honorable Amy Paulin
Legislative Office Building, Room 626 Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-5585; FAX (518) 455-5409
EMAIL: paulina@assembly.state.ny.us
Scheduler: Barbara (out of district office)
700 White Plains Road, Room 252
Scarsdale, NY 10583
(914) 723-1115; FAX (914) 723-2665
- #89 The Honorable Robert Castelli
Legislative Office Building, Room 820 Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-5397; FAX (518) 455-5041
EMAIL: castellir@assembly.state.ny.us
Scheduler: Lindsay (out of district office)
4 New King Street, Suite 125
White Plains, NY 10604
(914) 686-7335; FAX (914) 686-0046
- #90 The Honorable Sandra R. Galef
Legislative Office Building, Room 641 Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-5348; FAX (518) 455-5728
EMAIL: galefs@assembly.state.ny.us
Scheduler: Rebecca
2 Church Street
Ossining, NY 10562
(914) 941-1111; FAX (914) 941-9132
- #91 The Honorable George S. Latimer
Legislative Office Building, Room 656 Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-4897; FAX (518) 455-4861
EMAIL: latimerg@assembly.state.ny.us
Scheduler: Cathy
933 Mamaroneck Avenue, Suite 102
Mamaroneck, NY 10543
(914) 777-3832; FAX (914) 777-5416
- #92 The Honorable Thomas J. Abinanti
Legislative Office Building, Room 631 Albany, NY 12248
(518) 455-5753; FAX (518) 455-5920
EMAIL: abinantit@assembly.state.ny.us
Scheduler: Kathy Conroy
303 South Broadway, Suite 229
Tarrytown, NY 10591
(914) 631-1605; FAX (914) 631-1609



MANDATE CATEGORY



RECOMMENDATIONS



EXAMPLES OF SAVINGS

► Unfunded and Underfunded Mandate Legislation – Mitigation & Prevention

- Require a "review" of new mandates that includes a comprehensive cost analysis and the definitive funding source
- Freeze and review all currently proposed and pending mandates

In 2008-09, taxpayers in eight LHCSS districts funded **\$117 million in mandates**; a one-third reduction of these costs would **return \$39 million dollars to taxpayers** and schools.

20% relief in mandates for LHCSS districts in 2011-12 would have yielded **\$1 billion in reduced costs**.

A sample of **six LHCSS districts** estimated that **4 years of expenses** to implement Race to the Top/APPR would cost **\$10 million dollars**.

► Transportation

- Fund or reduce mileage limits (**15 to 5 miles**) for private school out-of-district transportation
- Allow consolidation of services under established contracts
- Limit special ed out-of-district transportation when free appropriate education is provided

A sample of 14 LHCSS districts reported a **one-year savings** would be over **\$3.5 million dollars**.

This legislation could yield between **\$500 and \$800 million** for districts in NYS.

A sample of 16 LHCSS districts reported an annual savings of **\$1.5 million dollars**.

► Fiscal Reform

- Allow districts to establish TRS Reserve Fund
- Legislate pension reform/TRS contribution restoration (pre-1998)
- Cap/control health care premium costs with a statewide plan and limited employer contributions
- Establish a 55/25 "exit clause" for Tier 3/4 members who are 55 and older (in 2011) to create "entry" opportunities for new Tier 5 & "6" TRS contributors.

TRS Reserve would add to fiscal predictability.

For 2011-12, a single district with 3500 students estimated a **retirement fund contribution increase of \$1.5 million**.

In the average LHCSS school district, health care premium costs are projected to increase by 7.5% in 2012-13. The district will be required to contribute an approximated \$700,000 which is equivalent to almost 1% of the tax levy.

► Special Education

- Eliminate mandated class sizes for students with disabilities and resource rooms while maintaining a continuum of services and supports for students
- Amend **Ed Law 3602** that creates entitlement to special education for students parentally placed in private schools (Cap district contributions to out-of-district placements when comparable programs are offered by the district of residence)
- Eliminate the requirement that an individual evaluation includes specific assessments as prescribed by **Ed Law 4402(1)9B(3)(A)**.
- Amend the law (**A.5396-A/S.5972-A; Chapter 583**) that shifted burden of proof from parents to schools and that is counter to 2007 Supreme Court decision

Over the past 4-5 years special education costs in NYS have grown by 40% as a result of unfunded New York State mandates – **7 billion dollars** to over **10 billion dollars** per year during this period.

NYS has 204 special education mandates that exceed federal law. Savings to average to large-sized districts will be in the millions while the quality of education will be uncompromised.

BUDGET GAPS AND TAX CAP FACTS

Over the past three years...

- Thirty (30) LHCSS districts have cut almost **\$179 million** in programs and eliminated **1,559 staff**, costing districts almost **\$11 million** in unemployment costs.
- These same districts lost over **\$300 million dollars** in state and federal aid in order to meet the tax cap threshold, a sample of **32 LHCSS districts** have projected the need to close budget gaps by **almost \$78 million** for the 2012-13 budget year.

The costs of Unfunded Mandates

- There are over **150 unfunded mandates** equivalent to between 17 to 20% of a district's budget.
- LHCSS school district budgets totaled **\$5.7 BILLION DOLLARS** in 2011-12.
- **20% reduction in mandates** would yield over **\$1 BILLION dollars** in reduced costs.
- **10% reduction in mandates** would yield **\$568 million dollars** in reduced costs.
- A sample of six LHCSS Rockland school districts received less than **\$400,000** for four years of RITTI and APPR implementation costs. These same districts estimated that such costs during this period would reach almost **\$10 million**.
- **204** New York State mandates in special education exceed the federal IDEA law.
 - Special education costs have risen by 40% in the last 5 years in New York.
- In Westchester County, the average cost of a **general education** student has risen from **\$10,495 to \$13,800**.
- In Westchester County, the average cost of a **special education** student has risen from **\$27,955 to \$40,000**.
- New York State special education costs have risen from **\$7 to over 10 billion dollars** per year during this same time period.

Please visit www.lhcss.org for Comprehensive Report!



Lower Hudson Council
of School Superintendents

www.lhcss.org



Lower Hudson Council
of School Superintendents

**MANDATE
RELIEF**
B U D G E T G A P S
P R O G R A M C U T S
S T A F F E L I M I N A T I O N
R I S I N G U N E M P L O Y M E N T C O S T S
L O S S O F S T A T E & F E D E R A L A I D

**LOWER HUDSON COUNCIL OF
SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS**

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MANDATE RELIEF

December 2011

Lower Hudson Council of School Superintendents (LHCSS)

Recommendations for Mandate Relief

Table of Contents

- I. LHCSS Districts' Management of the Economic Crisis
- II. The Tax Cap-Gap
- III. Unfunded and Underfunded Mandates
- IV. LHCSS Proposal for Mandate Relief
 - I. Freeze and Restrict New or Pending Legislated Unfunded Mandates
 - II. Transportation Funding Reforms
 - III. Fiscal
 - IV. Special Education
- V. Long-Term Mandate Relief
- VI. Summary of LHCSS Recommendations

Lower Hudson Council of School Superintendents (LHCSS)

Recommendations for Mandate Relief

I. LHCSS Districts' Management of the Economic Crisis

How has the economic downturn over the past three years impacted LHCSS districts and how have districts responded?

Since 2008 in response to the financial hardships that have affected communities in the Lower Hudson Valley, school districts have made significant cuts to their school budgets:

- A sample of thirty (30) LHCSS districts have cut over **\$178 MILLION** in program and staffing costs.
 - **1,559 positions** were eliminated, leading to **\$10.7 MILLION** in unemployment costs to districts

During this same period of time, the thirty school districts in this sample experienced **A REDUCTION OF STATE AND FEDERAL AID OF OVER \$300 MILLION**:

Appendix A click here:

[http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/Rockland County Schools Budget Reductions Appendix A.pdf](http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/Rockland%20County%20Schools%20Budget%20Reductions%20Appendix%20A.pdf);

[http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/Westchester County Schools Data Appendix A.pdf](http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/Westchester%20County%20Schools%20Data%20Appendix%20A.pdf)

II. The Tax Cap-Gap

In 2011 the New York State Legislature approved a tax levy cap in response to the concerns of homeowners and businesses that rising costs associated with the existing property tax-driven model of school funding were unsustainable.

What are the limits of the tax cap?

- The cap will restrict a district's ability to exceed a tax levy limit of approximately 2% unless 60% of those voting override a proposed budget that exceeds the legislated cap.
- Should a budget fail to gain community support after a second vote, the school district will be restricted to a levy that is no greater than the previous year and must adhere to contingency budget requirements.
- A 0% increase is essentially double the amount that a district would have to cut to make the cap formula. A district that has to cut \$2.5 million dollars will have to cut close to \$5 million under the tax cap formula should the budget be defeated.

How does the tax cap compare to other states?

For information on how New York's tax cap formula compares to other states, see Appendix B to view a Comparative Table. Click here: [http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/Comparison of Tax Cap Provisions Appendix B.pdf](http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/Comparison%20of%20Tax%20Cap%20Provisions%20Appendix%20B.pdf)

How will the current-cap formula impact LHCSS districts?

A sample of a LHCSS district with a \$70 million dollar tax levy in 2011-12 demonstrates that under the new formula, the district will be allowed to raise it by approximately \$1.4 million dollars for the 2012-13 year. At the outset of budget planning, the district faces the following unfunded costs beyond its control:

Health premium cost increases	=	\$666,000
Employee Retirement System contribution increases	=	\$174,000
<u>Teachers Retirement System contribution increases</u>	=	<u>\$1,320,000</u>
Total	=	\$2,160,000

The total increase in just these three categories is equivalent to 3%. At this point there is no consideration of contractual increases, rising energy costs, increased enrollment, maintenance, and the costs of many new unfunded or underfunded mandates, such as APPR. (In the case of this sample district, the teachers' union had already agreed to a year and one-half of salary freezes.)

In order to stay under the tax cap and meet its legal, contractual, and regulatory obligations, every district in New York State will need to close a "Tax Cap Gap". To do this, districts will continue to make reductions in programs, eliminate staffing, postpone maintenance and facility work, and delay purchases, among other fiscal decisions.

What are the projected 2012-13 estimated tax cap-gap reductions for schools to stay under the levy cap?

- In a sample of **32 LHCSS school districts**, in order to meet the tax levy threshold under the new tax cap formula, these districts will need to reduce an estimated **\$78 million**.
- If these districts fail to get more than 50% of the vote, the aggregate reductions will amount to an estimated **\$122 million**.

(See Appendix C for additional information:)

http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/tax_levy_budget_data_appendixc.pdf

Under the current tax cap formula, this pattern of school funding reductions will continue indefinitely. With the unlikelihood of increased revenues for school funding in the near future, mandate relief is essential.

III. Unfunded and Underfunded Mandates

How can the tax cap's impact be mitigated by mandate relief and what is New York State doing to achieve it?

Governor Cuomo has recognized that a tax cap will be deleterious to New York's public education system unless there is significant mandate relief. In the spring of 2011, he charged a mandate relief committee with the following:

The Mandate Relief Redesign team will focus on the New York State's service delivery structure that requires school districts, local governments and other local taxing districts to administer and fund mandated programs. The Team will look for ways to reduce the costs of mandated programs on schools and local governments by determining how school districts and local governments may be given greater ability to control costs. The Team will also look at the reason for delays in state reimbursement for mandated programs and at the practice of cost-shifting of mandated programs.

(While addressing unfunded mandates will forestall the dire implications of the blunt instrument approach of the New York State tax cap, we recognize that this is only a temporary mitigation and does not address the underlying systemic challenges that are a part of the major cost drivers of school district budgets.)

What is the extent of unfunded or underfunded mandates in New York State that impact the education economy in the Lower Hudson Valley?

- There are **151 State and Federal public school unfunded or underfunded mandates** under the following categories: *Administration, Business, Facilities, Health/Safety, School-wide Instruction, Technology, Human Resources, Non-public Schools, and Transportation.*

Appendix D click here:

http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/Mandates_Frequently_Raised_in_Discussions_1_27_11_Appendix_D.pdf

- In 2008-09, a group of nine Westchester school districts (READ) analyzed the costs of the unfunded mandates.

Appendix E click here:

http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/District_Survey_Unfunded_Mandates_Appendix_E.pdf

- Mandates were equivalent to 17% of a district's total budget;
- In 2008-09, taxpayers in the READ districts funded **\$117 million of mandates**;
- If these eight districts could have cut just a third of these costs, a **\$39 million dollar savings** would have been returned to taxpayers to provide greater efficiencies for schools.
- **IF EXTRAPOLATED TO ALL LHCSS DISTRICTS IN 2011-12 WITH A 20% REDUCTION IN MANDATES, THE SAVINGS WOULD HAVE BEEN OVER \$1 BILLION.**

- In 2010, Rockland County school districts analyzed the amount of Race to the Top funding that they had been awarded to implement the new Common Core Standards and the newly legislated teacher and principal evaluation system.
 - Six of the eight districts reported 4 years of funding of approximately **\$400,000**.
- Six of the eight districts calculated that 4 years of local expenses to implement Race to the Top and the APPR approximated **\$10 million dollars**.

Appendix F click here:

http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/Mandated_Costs_State_&_Fed_Laws_&_Reforms_Chart_Appendix_F.pdf

- 204 New York State mandates in special education exceed the federal IDEA law.
 - Special education costs have risen by 40% in last 5 years in New York:
 - In Westchester County, the average cost of a general education student has risen from \$10,495 to \$13,800;
 - In Westchester County, the average cost of a special education student has risen from \$27,955 to \$40,000.
- In March 2011, *The Council of Special Education Administrators* developed recommendations to provide relief while maintaining quality services.

Appendix G click here:

http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/Council_of_NY_Sp_Ed_Admin_Appendix_G.pdf

- In 2011, the New York State Education department compiled a summary of **200 state statutes that either supersede or are not mandated by federal law**.

Appendix H click here:

http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/NYSED_Summary_of_State_Statutes_Appendix_H.pdf

IV. LHCSS Proposal for Realistic Mandate Relief to Mitigate the Impact of the Tax Cap

What are the broad categories for relief?

The Lower Hudson Council of School Superintendents propose mandate relief in four areas:

- **UNFUNDED AND UNDERFUNDED MANDATE LEGISLATION – MITIGATION & PREVENTION**
- **TRANSPORTATION**
- **FISCAL REFORM**
- **SPECIAL EDUCATION**

What are LHCSS Recommendations for Immediate Relief?

I. FREEZE AND RESTRICT NEW OR PENDING LEGISLATED UNFUNDED MANDATES

Since legislation of the tax cap, the following unfunded mandates have been proposed or legislated:

- **Printing of state assessments**
- **Scoring of state assessments**
- **Security of state assessments**
- **Concussion management and training**
- **Anti-bullying regulations (Dignity for All Students Act)**

Mandates are written with good intentions; however, in better economic times providing funding for these ideas was less challenging. It has been said that we are in a fiscal period defined as the “new normal”. Those who propose new mandates, however well-intentioned, must also identify the funding sources and provide a well-researched plan that considers both the long-term and in-kind costs to school districts. Unless this happens, there will be a continual escalation of costs.

LHCSS Proposals

#1 – A REVISION OF CURRENT LEGISLATION THAT REQUIRES A “REVIEW” OF NEW MANDATE COSTS THAT INCLUDES A COMPREHENSIVE COST ANALYSIS AND A DETERMINATION OF THE FUNDING SOURCE.

#2 – A FREEZE AND REVIEW OF ALL CURRENTLY PROPOSED AND PENDING MANDATES.

II. TRANSPORTATION FUNDING REFORMS

Current Law

In New York State school districts are obligated to provide transportation for K-8 students who live more than two(2) miles from school and for 9-12 students who live more than three(3) miles from school. If defined "child safety zones" are established, transportation limits will be reduced. Voters also have the option of approving lower limits.

During better economic times districts expanded their services with the support of taxpayers and voters. School districts also received funding for up to 90% of transportation costs for those students transported according to the state's mileage limits or within the child safety zones. Over the past several years, the state aid has decreased by two-thirds.

School districts are also required to provide transportation to private schools. In some cases transportation is out of the state or to other counties. The costs to districts have risen significantly over the past several years while transportation aid has decreased.

LHCSS Proposals

#1 – PRIVATE SCHOOL OUT-OF-DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION - FUND or REDUCE MILEAGE LIMITS (15 TO 5 MILES)

Example

On October 21, The New York Times reported that the Hackley School in Tarrytown was recruiting students from New York City and promising "free" transportation. The Masters School in Dobbs Ferry is running recruitment ads that make similar promises. The taxpayers of New York are essentially subsidizing transportation costs that can be absorbed in the operating costs of these private for-profit schools.

New York State taxpayers should not be subsidizing private school transportation that is excessive and that financially benefits the private school investors, trustees, and parents who have chosen these as alternative to their local public school.

Savings

- A sample of eleven (11) Westchester districts reported a one-year savings would be almost **\$2,762,996**
- A sample of six (6) Rockland districts reported a one-year savings would be **\$1, 180,755**

#2 – ALLOW CONSOLIDATION & REGIONALIZATION OF SERVICES UNDER ESTABLISHED CONTRACTS

Current Law

The current law requires New York school districts to engage in competitive bidding over a threshold amount. While districts may use the pre-authorized vendors on the state contract as alternates, they are restricted from using out-of-state or national cooperative contracts by schools or governments.

LHCSS Proposal

Legislation should be drafted to authorize school districts and local governments to “piggyback” on contracts entered into by other states and localities. They should also be allowed to purchase through national purchasing cooperatives or contracts. This would spark competition.

Savings

- According to the National Association of Counties, savings from cooperative bidding could range from 7 to 30% for transportation, as well as similar contracted services.
- In New York, 10 to 14% of school expenditures of **\$53.9 billion** (2008-09) would have been eligible for cooperative bidding which is worth between **\$5.4 and \$7.5 billion**. With just 10% savings, this legislation could yield between **\$500 and \$800 million** for districts – about the amount of money that the state received for Race to the Top funding over four years.

#3 – LIMIT OUT-OF-DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION WHEN FREE APPROPRIATE EDUCATION IS OFFERED

Current Law

Schools are required to provide students with a FREE APPROPRIATE EDUCATION (FAPE). There are times when parents prefer that their children be enrolled in schools that have programs that exceed FAPE. In New York State, districts must fund this transportation, especially if parents unilaterally place children.

Example

Between 2006 and 2009, after reaching a settlement before entering into a costly and protracted impartial legal hearing, one LHCSS, in an effort to minimize its legal costs, agreed to provide **transportation costs to a family that wanted their child to attend an exclusive Westchester private school that addresses learning disabilities. The amount totaled \$139,000 – above state aid – for five years.** (These costs were in addition to the **tuition of \$166,000** for the same period. Identical services for a reading disability were offered in the district.) **The five year total for one child was over \$300,000.**

LHCSS Proposal

As the state does not have the revenue to subsidize transportation, and federal government has not provided funding for transportation, there would be significant financial relief to districts if there was legislation to reduce mileage limits from the current **50 mile limit to a 25 mile limit**. If a district offers a similar program that meets FAPE criteria, it would be responsible for funding transportation for no more than the 25 miles. Yet, if a child needed a placement that could not be provided by a district within the 25 mile radius, the district would be responsible for the additional miles up to 50.

Savings

- A sample of seventeen (17) LHCSS districts reported a one-year savings of over **\$1.5 million**.

III. FISCAL

#1 – ENABLE DISTRICTS TO ESTABLISH TRS RESERVE FUND

Current Law

New York State allows districts to establish an Employee Retirement System (ERS) reserve fund. With this fund, districts are able to set aside monies when there are unexpected or significant increases in a district's annual contribution to the ERS. Currently, there is no law that allows for the establishment of a Teachers Retirement System (TRS) reserve fund.

LHCSS Proposal

What are the fiscal benefits of allowing school districts to establish a Teachers Retirement System (TRS) reserve fund?

- It would allow districts to manage their resources in order to flatten out the annual spikes attributed to significant rate increases;
- It would provide "certainty" by allowing districts to budget at a consistent rate, instead of being subjected to changes in market conditions due to the five year "smoothing formula"

Example

2009-10 contribution rate 6.19%

2010-11 contribution rate 8.62% - 39 % increase in rates

2011-12 contribution rate 11.11% - 29% increase in rates

- This would avoid the need for districts to have to react each year to rate changes, especially those that spike up, when they could budget at an average rate.
- A TRS reserve fund would protect districts from the ebbs and flows of the market. If the average rate was 10%, any savings could be used to fund a future year in which rates exceeded 10%. This would prevent draining general fund budgets and impacting student programs.
- In the years in which the rates are atypically low, districts would be able to budget higher and put away the savings for the years when the rates increase through the use of the TRS reserve.
- The reserve will assist in protecting a district against increasing contribution rates.

#2 – PENSION REFORM/TRS CONTRIBUTION RESTORATION

Current Law

Public school employees receive a defined benefit pension plan through participation in TRS for teachers or ERS for other employees. School districts make mandatory contributions on behalf of their employees. The rates are determined annually through actuarial valuations of assets and liabilities; consequently, school officials have no control over the fluctuation of these rates which can unexpectedly drive up district costs.

The employees' contribution rate is 0% for those employees with ten or more years who contributed up to 3% for their first ten years. As a result, all rising costs are paid by the school district with the money coming from the general fund.

LHCSS Proposal

- **Stabilize pension costs by requiring a minimum contribution (rollback to pre-1998 rates)**
- **Establish a window for a 55/25 "exit clause" for tier 3 and 4 members who are 55 and older (in 2011) to create "entry" opportunities for new tier 5 & "6" TRS contributors.**

Savings

According to the Empire Center for New York State Policy, tax-funded annual contributions to TRS will quadruple over the next five years. According to the NYSSBA, TRS contributions have accelerated from 0.36 percent of total teacher payroll in the 2002-03 school year to 8.6 percent in 2010-11, an increase of 2,300%.

Example

In an average-sized LHCSS school district (3500 students), the projected increase in 2012-13 ERS is 19.6% for a one year budgetary increase of **\$173,644**. For TRS, the contribution increase is 33.25% for a one year increase of **\$1,319,481**. **The total increase in retirement fund contributions for this district is estimated at \$1.5 million.**

(Over the last three year period, this district has paid \$10.5 million towards its pension obligations.)

Given that an average-sized district is draining almost **\$1.5 million dollars** from its budget for retirement fund contributions, translated across the state, there would be an extraordinary savings. **For this one district, the \$1.5 million dollars is equivalent to 2% of its levy.**

#3 – CAP/CONTROL HEALTH CARE PREMIUM COSTS WITH A STATEWIDE PLAN AND LIMITED EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS

Current Law

Health insurance coverage is collectively bargained. However, because of rising premium costs, it is difficult for school districts to plan for and fund rates that rise over the life of a contract.

LHCSS Proposals

- Establish a statewide premium contribution limit.
- Develop a statewide “global payment plan” that would place a limit on the amount that health care providers could budget for each patient’s care. Health-care networks would receive an annual fee for the care of each patient with higher payments for patients deemed at higher risk and with bonus-payments for high-quality and preventative care.

Savings

In the average LHCSS school district, health care premium costs are projected to increase by 7.5% in 2012-13. The district will be required to contribute an approximated \$700,000 which is equivalent to almost 1% of the tax levy.

IV. SPECIAL EDUCATION

Part B of IDEA originally authorized Congress to contribute up to 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure. Federal funding is about 17% which is almost \$10.5 billion short of full funding and would need a 139 percent increase to be fully funded.

At present local taxpayers fund the 204 New York State mandates that exceed the federal law. Without additional aid and the imposition of the tax levy cap, these mandated services are funded with dollars that are drained from the regular education program.

#1 – CLASS SIZE MANDATE FLEXIBILITY – Eliminate state mandated class sizes for students with disabilities and resource rooms while maintaining a full continuum of services and supports for students with disabilities.

Current Law

According to a 2011 report by the *Council of New York Special Education Administrators*:

“In 1975, when the IDEA (then EHA) was first signed into law, its emphasis was on the identification, evaluation and placement of students with disabilities, many of whom were excluded from education altogether. In New York, the system created to implement the federal law, adopted a segregated delivery model, which provided for smaller classes exclusively serving students with disabilities, whose teachers were certified K-12 in special education. Until the early 1990s the only standard or expectation guiding the instructional programs offered to such students, was the IEP. There were no obligations to provide them access to the general curriculum and no requirement or expectation that they take state tests. Consequently, the instruction they received often was not a means to an end (earning a high school diploma).

By the late 1990s, the federal law shifted its focus from identification, evaluation, and placement to a comprehensive system that stressed equality and access to the same standards and instructional programs for all students, whether or not disabled. The message was clear – states could no longer maintain a double standard, one for students with disabilities and another one for the rest of the student population.

Yet, due to its early commitment to a structure built on separate classes for students with disabilities, New York found itself behind. Notably, it was not until the early 1990s that New York even included in its regulatory scheme the original 1975 federal mandate that prohibits the removal of students with disabilities from regular classes, except when, due to the severity of a disability or extent of need, the student could not receive educational benefits even with supports and services. Without ever abandoning its original commitment to a structure that provided for small segregated classrooms, New York has spent years struggling with how to raise standards and outcomes for students with disabilities and to decrease the time they spend in separate schools and classes.

With the passage of No Child Left Behind and federally-defined standards for special education teachers that require competencies in core curriculum areas, New York’s antiquated system of segregated classes faced a new series of challenges. To address it, the State Education Department added to its continuum

of services an integrated co-teaching model in 2009.¹ That addition to New York's continuum was the first in years, which followed another mandate relief initiative that resulted in the addition of a 15:1 class size option. From the 1970s, however, New York maintains to this day mandated class sizes ranging from 6:1:1 to 15:1 with several prescribed class sizes in between NYCRR.200.6(h)(4)."

The system we have maintained rules without reason. The rules governing class sizes not only tie the hands of local districts, they eliminate opportunities for replacing them with innovative models, built on current research, that are designed to raise achievement for all students concurrently in order to meet state standards.

"We recognize the reasons the State introduced special education through the development of small segregated classes in the 1970s. However, with its long standing commitment and recognition of the benefits of educating students with disabilities with their peers, and the introduction of accountability and standards applicable to all students at the federal level, we find New York's continued enforcement of mandated class sizes for students with disabilities a major impediment to the fundamental changes we need to make. While we continue to urge a complete overhaul of the current continuum of services, we seek the immediate reinstatement of the regulation that previously allowed districts to impose changes in class size upon notification to the Department. For now, a reinstatement of the flexibility the regulation provided will result in immediate cost savings and a significant reduction in paperwork."

LHCSS Proposal

- Eliminate state mandated class sizes for students with disabilities and resource rooms:

Eliminating state mandated class sizes for students with disabilities and resource rooms while maintaining a full continuum of services and supports for students with disabilities will provide significant fiscal benefits to districts. The established and mandated ratios are generic and do not respond to the individual needs of the students.

- Reinstatement of Education Law §4402(2)(d) and (6) which offered some flexibility to larger school districts, allowing them to increase class sizes upon notice to parents and to the Commissioner. The law ended via a sunset provision on July 1, 2010. At a minimum, we urge that these provisions be renewed.
- School districts need the same flexibility and adaptability as charter schools that operate without the costly restrictions and mandates that have been legislated. Such flexibility will also enable schools to be innovative and creative while ensuring accountability and performance.

¹ That model requires a special education certified teacher and a general education teacher to work together in a class that allows no more than 12 identified students with disabilities. (The Regents recently promulgated a regulation in December that allows districts to secure a variance or waive the limit) to attend general education classes.

Savings

Example: The reduction of **one teacher in a Westchester school district saves over \$100,000 for salary and benefits**. Students with disabilities often have like needs and can receive services without compromising instructional quality. Restrictive class sizes have no basis in research; therefore, there is no effective rationale for the current class size limitations.

#2 – Relieve Districts of Disproportionately High Private Placement Costs

Current Law

According to the Council of New York Special Education Administrators, “Historically, New York offered special education services for students with disabilities whose parents enrolled them in nonpublic schools from their districts of residence (Educ. Law §3602-c). The 2004 amendments to IDEA created a new mandate that required the school district where a nonpublic school was located to consult with nonpublic schools and to provide special education supports up to a prorated share of its federal IDEA dollars.

Instead of conforming New York’s system to federal law, our State took its existing system of entitlements and simply shifted its previous mandate from the district of residence to provide individual entitlements to special education services for such students along with full due process protections (which are not in federal law) to the district where the nonpublic school is located, thus creating a new and highly complex bureaucracy that requires the transfer of payments between districts to reimburse the cost of services only. For students parentally placed who require summer services, New York has no provision, leaving families who must work with their district of location during the school year to return to their districts of residence to secure them. The system is disjointed and extraordinarily complex. Despite the federal law, which essentially pays for itself, New York’s amendments place new and costly obligations on school districts while adding a new layer of demands for fiscal management.

LHCSS Proposal

- In its place, we urge New York to amend state law to reflect federal law. If the State wishes to subsidize the federal dollars available to support students with disabilities enrolled by their parents in nonpublic schools, it can do so by following the federal model and extending state aid to those students to augment the federal share without shifting any additional cost to the local taxpayer. (Unlike the provision that requires a transfer of funds from the district of residence to the district of location (or through state aid, where necessary) NY law authorizes a parent who disagrees with the recommendation for services offered from the district of location to obtain a full due process hearing to challenge it. However, New York law provides no mechanism to reimburse that district for its due process costs in the event it chooses to defend the program it offered.)
- Amend Education law 3602 that creates entitlement to special education for students parentally placed in private schools and cap district costs for out-of-district placements to no more than the cost of comparable programs offered by the district of residence or local BOCES.

EXAMPLE A

In 2009, a parent in a LHCSS district unilaterally placed his child in an out-of-state private school that was not state-approved. The tuition exceeded \$125,000. The parent and their legal counsel asserted that the school district should be responsible for all costs associated with the placement. (TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD THE STATE LIMIT OR PROHIBIT PARENTAL LATITUDE IN PLACING A CHILD IN A PROGRAM OF THEIR CHOICE? HOW SHOULD THIS BURDEN FALL ON THE SCHOOL DISTRICT?)

EXAMPLE B

In the fall of 2011, parents of a student in a LHCSS district, without warning, unilaterally placed their student in a residential private school. The student was recommended to continue within a special education program in the district. There were no significant needs that the district could not address and was addressing with other children. The parent then obtained counsel and indicated that they intended in the future to hold the district accountable for all costs associated with their placement. The cost of the program is over \$60,000 per year. This figure does not include any legal fees that the district may have to incur to defend its program or related transportation costs.

Savings

While it is difficult to identify a consistent or regional savings, there are many districts that are faced with these cases that can drain significant dollars from both the general and regular education budgets for tuition and transportation for a single child that will cost well over **\$100,000 per year**. In this period of austerity when teachers are being excessed at unprecedented rates, the costs of one student's program could be equivalent to the cost of a teacher who will impact many children.

#3 – Individual Evaluation with Specific Assessments

Current Law

Education law 4402(1)9b)(3)(a) requires specific assessments upon the referral of any student suspected of a disability (social history, psychological assessment or evaluation, physical examination and classroom observation) without exception, and a functional behavior assessment upon an initial referral when the student's behavior impedes learning.

Unlike state regulations, federal law mandates the use of a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental and academic information, and technically sound instruments that may assess the relative contribution of cognitive and behavioral factors prior to any determination of eligibility or development of an IEP. In addition, with the introduction of Response to Intervention (RTI) as an alternative and effective researched based method for identifying students with learning disabilities, (soon to be mandated in New York for students K-4) the elimination of prescribed testing will result in immediate cost savings by eliminating a mandate to perform specific tests regardless of the need to do so.

LHCSS Proposal

Eliminate the requirement that an individual evaluation include specific assessments as prescribed by state regulation.

- If psychologists did not have to provide a psychological examination for every child that is referred to the CSE, there is a greater probability that additional and direct support can be provided to some fragile children who are now placed in costly out of district settings. Currently many referrals come from parents, but the children do not qualify under the regulations for students with disabilities.
- With the increased rigor of the common core standards, it reasonable to expect that parents will seek services through the CSE, thus the requirements for assessments should rely more on RTI data than a psychological exam. When the regulations were first written, RTI was not in existence.

Savings

This is a matter of shifting funding that is currently being used for red tape to supporting the needs of students. If psychologists had the time and could be assigned to working with students with emotional or cognitive disabilities, then it would be less likely that a district would have to fund such services through additional psychologists or by sending the students out of district. The effect of these mandates is interrelated in terms of impact on the quality of a child's education and costs to the district.

#4 – Relieve School Districts of the Burden of Proof

Current Law

2007-Burden of Proof This law places the burden of proof with the school district or state agency at an impartial hearing to determine whether a student with disabilities has received the appropriate educational services required by law. Under the measure, there is a legal presumption that the special education program and services developed by the district and offered to the student are inappropriate unless and until the district proves that they are appropriate. This legislation provides that burden of proof is only placed on the parent or guardian when he or she is seeking tuition reimbursement for an alternative educational placement that was not agreed upon by the school district or state agency. (A.5396-A/S.5972-A; Chapter 583) Even then, the parent's burden of proof only relates to the private school for which tuition reimbursement is sought. The district's recommendations continue to be presumed to be inappropriate.

This law is in response to a Supreme Court decision that overruled a 1998 New York 2nd Circuit Court decision: *Walczak v. Florida Union Free School District*, 142 F. 3d 119,122 (2nd Cir. 1998) that, "school authorities have the **burden** of supporting the proposed IEP".

However, the US Supreme Court **2005** decision in *Schaffer v. Weast*, concerning the **burden** of proof in an impartial hearing , written by Justice O'Connor and joined by five other justices, determined that "The burden of proof in an administrative hearing challenging an IEP is properly placed upon the party seeking relief." The Schaffer decision thus reverses the longstanding rule in NYS articulated in *Walczak v. Florida Union Free School District*. Justice O'Connor wrote that it is improper for the courts "to assume that every IEP is invalid until the school district demonstrates that it is not." While the party seeking relief is typically the parents, in some cases it may instead be the school district. For example, if the school district commences a hearing to override the parents' refusal to consent to an evaluation, the burden of persuading the Impartial Hearing Officer rests with the district.

The Court rejected arguments that placing the burden on the party seeking relief will work against parents. Justice O'Connor acknowledged that school districts have a "natural advantage" in information and expertise over parents, but she also found that the IDEA gives parents many procedural protections (e.g. right to review records, right to an independent education evaluation, etc.) which operate to level the playing field between parents and school officials.

LHCSS Proposal

Amend the law that shifted burden of proof from parents to schools and that is counter to the 2007 Supreme Court Decision.

Savings

Since the burden of proof was shifted to the schools, there has been a 40% increase in special education costs. Even a portion of this increase would dramatically reduce the weight of these mandated costs.

V. LONG-TERM MANDATE RELIEF

What are the mandate relief items that should be considered in the long-term?

School districts need immediate relief. The aforementioned proposals provide options for legislators and policy-makers to immediately implement. At the same time, the LHCSS has also identified a set of recommendations for mandate relief that may require greater review and analysis and may be subject to greater political scrutiny. These recommendations can be reviewed in Appendix I.

Appendix I click here:

http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/Summary_of_Long_term_Items_Appendix_I.pdf

VI. Summary of LHCSS Recommendations

Click here: http://www.lhcss.org/positionpapers/LHCSS_Unfunded_Mandate_Relief_Summary.pdf

December 2011



Working Together for
Quality Public Education and Academic Excellence



LHCSS President

January 19, 2012

Mr. Louis N. Wool
Harrison CSD
50 Union Avenue
Harrison, NY 10528
Phone: (914) 630-3023
Fax: (914) 835-5893

Governor Andrew Cuomo
Albany, New York 12234

Dear Governor Cuomo:

NCCSS President

Dr. Herb R. Brown
Oceanside UFSD
145 Merle Avenue
Oceanside, New York 11572
Phone: (516) 678-1215
Fax: (516) 678-7503
hbrown@oceansideschols.org

Thank you for your leadership in revising the tax code in order to assure a greater level of state support for our schools. This legislation advances your commitment to providing an equitable education for our diverse student population. We also appreciate your recognition that the property tax cap must be accompanied by a substantive plan to relieve school districts of burdensome unfunded and underfunded mandates.

In November leaders of superintendent organizations representing 700,000 students in 199 school districts in the Long Island counties of Nassau and Suffolk, and the counties of the lower Hudson Valley - Westchester, Rockland, Putnam, and Dutchess gathered to respond to your call for a plan to provide mandate relief. This tri-region coalition developed a comprehensive proposal for mandate relief that will yield substantial savings in the short term. To meet the longer-term challenges, we concur with your assessment that structural reform is needed to ensure accountability, sustainability, and cost containment. Our plan also provides proposals for structural changes which align with your vision.

SCSSA President

Dr. Alan B. Groveman
Connetquot CSD
780 Ocean Avenue
Bohemia, New York 11716
Phone: (631) 244-2215 Ext. 3508
Fax: (631) 589-0683
jkelly@ccsdi.org

Enclosed are three documents that highlight the proposal, including a more comprehensive white paper that provides detailed and comprehensive recommendations. This information has been distributed to legislators and constituents throughout our region. The white paper provides a common mandate relief agenda developed and endorsed by this coalition of school districts and addresses sustainability via structural changes.

Your commitment to improving public education is evident; we hope to partner in helping you reach that goal. We applaud your efforts to improve public school accountability and to create a sustainable and prudent fiscal model. The enclosed resources offer a roadmap to help ensure that all students will receive a 21st-century education.

As you know, our coalition's membership boasts some of the finest schools in the nation and in the world. Like you, our communities have high expectations for their children and their schools. Emphatic in the state of the state address is your commitment to creating an exemplar system of public education predicated on accountability and affordability. We believe your vision to create a system of public education that empowers citizens to contribute to their community and society is a sure path to a viable economy and vibrant society.

These documents also provide evidence that districts have heeded your call to minimize property tax increases by exercising every available leadership option including, reducing reserves, re-negotiating employee contracts, and, even as the course of last resort, cutting programs and staff. The report illustrates that districts in the tri-region coalition have made hundreds of millions of dollars in cuts, but the laws governing public education still require both short-term relief and systemic structural reform if we are to continue to improve upon delivering high-quality education.

We offer our assistance in your pursuit to make New York, once again, the Empire State. Our leadership offers you its extensive experience in public education and in reforming systems. We offer an unwavering commitment to collaborate in developing new ways of ensuring accountability and excellence. We agree that action in pursuit of mandate relief and significant structural changes must occur in this legislative session. We seek to participate in crafting a dynamic reform agenda that achieves high performance and accountability in a model of prudent and fiscal sustainability. We stand ready and willing to partner with you in the service of the children of New York.

Sincerely,

Alan B. Groveman

Dr. Alan B. Groveman, President
Suffolk County School Superintendents Association

Herb Brown

Dr. Herb R. Brown, President
Nassau County Council of School Superintendents

Louis N. Wool

Louis N. Wool, President
Lower Hudson Council of
School Superintendents