

SPECIAL EDUCATION ANCILLARY FTE DATA VALIDATION

Presentation by:

Jerry Reeder, Executive Director of Special Services

Rio Rancho Public Schools

President, New Mexico Council of Administrators of Special Education



Jerry Reeder <jerry.reeder@rrps.net>

Urgent - Ancillary FTE

14 messages

Marcotte, Charlene, PED <Charlene.Marcotte@state.nm.us>

Mon, Feb 15, 2016 at 2:52 PM

To: Jerry Reeder <jreeder@rrps.net>

Cc: "Mutz, Mark, PED" <Mark.Mutz@state.nm.us>, "Lovato, Michael, PED" <Michael.Lovato@state.nm.us>

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached Ancillary FTE audit which was completed at 80 day. Can we please schedule some time as soon as possible to discuss the findings of the audit. Corrections to the 80 day data will be required and the 120 day data must be correct.

I will be out the office part of the day tomorrow but would appreciate if you could reply via email.

Thank you for prompt attention to this matter.

Charlene Marcotte

Education Administrator

Special Education Bureau

NM Public Education Department

Phone: [\(505\)827-3505](tel:(505)827-3505)



"This is not intended as legal advice, should not serve as the basis for decision making in specific situations, and does not create an attorney-client relationship."

District FTE Summary

	Staff FTE (including preschool)	Assistant FTE	Total FTE for assignment	Sum hours (including preschool)	FTE equivalent of sum hours (based on 35 hour week)	FTE equivalent of sum hours PLUS 15% PREP	Difference between total FTE for assignment and FTE Equivalent of sum hours (including 15% prep)
Social Work (SW, 82, 82S)	27.14 (1.00 is preschool)	N/A	27.14	377.88 hr	10.8	12.42	14.72 FTE over
Physical Therapy (PT, 91, 91S)	3.23 (0.40 is preschool)	0	3.23	27.68 hr	0.79	0.91	2.32 FTE over
Occupational Therapy (OT, 89, 89S)	7.68 (1.17 is preschool)	4.97 (1.14 is preschool)	12.65	173.27 hr	4.95	5.69	0.72 UNDER (not including Assistants); 6.96 FTE over including assistants
Audiology (AU, 86, 86S)	1.18	N/A	1.18	2.98 hr	0.09	0.1	1.08 FTE over
Psych Services (PS, 92, 92S)	9.25	N/A	9.25	1.06 hr	0.03	0.03	9.22 FTE over
Recreational Therapy (RT, 98, 98S)	4.56	N/A	4.56	75.62 hr	2.16	2.48	2.08 FTE over
Interpreting Services (IN, 88, 88S)	2.00	N/A	2	0	0	0	No Interpreting services reported- likely in error
Diagnostician (no service code, 87, 87S)	17.97	N/A	17.97	N/A- no hours reported for Diagnosticians			
Occupation (O, 90S)	0.86	N/A	0.86	8.17 hr	0.23	0.26	0.60 FTE over
Speech Services (SS, 93, 93S)	39.49 (8.28 is preschool)	5.19 (4.05 SLP-apprentices, 1.14 SLP Clinical Fellows)		924.63 hr	26.42	30.38	9.11 FTE over (not including assistants)
Speech Only (SO, 95, 95S)	7.29 (1.67 is preschool)			243.74 hr	6.96	8	0.61 FTE UNDER (not including assistants)

Not included in total calculation

34.04 FTE over (not including assistants, OR, IN, RT, or AU)

District FTE Summary

New Formula created by NMPED SEB		Hours divided by		35		35/1.15=30.43hrs required (not in statute or rule) Each ancillary provider MUST have 30.43 hours of Direct Service on caseload.	
	Staff FTE (including preschool)	Assistant FTE	Total FTE for assignment	Sum hours (including preschool)	FTE equivalent of sum hours (based on 35 hour week)	FTE equivalent of sum hours PLUS 15% PREP	Difference between total FTE for assignment and FTE Equivalent of sum hours (including 15% prep)
Social Work (SW, 82, 82S)	27.14 (1.00 is preschool)	N/A	27.14	377.88 hr	10.8	12.42	14.72 FTE over
Physical Therapy (PT, 91, 91S)	3.23 (0.40 is preschool)	0	3.23	27.68 hr	0.79	0.91	2.32 FTE over
Occupational Therapy (OT, 89, 89S)	7.68 (1.17 is preschool)	4.97 (1.14 is preschool)	12.65	173.27 hr	4.95	5.69	0.72 UNDER (not including Assistants); 6.96 FTE over including assistants
Audiology (AU, 86, 86S)	1.18	N/A	1.18	2.98 hr	0.09	0.1	1.08 FTE over
Psych Services (PS, 92, 92S)	9.25	N/A	9.25	1.06 hr	0.03	0.03	9.22 FTE over
Recreational Therapy (RT, 98, 98S)	4.56	N/A	4.56	75.62 hr	2.16	2.48	2.08 FTE over
Interpreting Services (IN, 88, 88S)	2.00	N/A	2	0	0	0	No Interpreting services reported- likely in error
Diagnostician (no service code, 87, 87S)	17.97	N/A	17.97	N/A- no hours reported for Diagnosticians			
Orientation (OR, 90, 90S)	0.86	N/A	0.86	8.17 hr	0.23	0.26	0.60 FTE over
Speech Services (SS, 93, 93S)	39.49 (8.28 is preschool)	5.19 (4.05 SLP- apprentices, 1.14 SLP Clinical Fellows)		924.63 hr	26.42	30.38	9.11 FTE over (not including assistants)
Speech Only (SO, 95, 95S)	7.29 (1.67 is preschool)			243.74 hr	6.96	8	0.61 FTE UNDER (not including assistants)

This leaves 4.57 hours a week for Indirect Service, Evaluations, IEP time, travel across district or transition time in school,

Not included in total calculation

34.04 FTE over (not including assistants, OR, IN, RT, or AU)

RRPS Response to PED Related Service Audit

We appreciate the action that NMPED-SEB is taking with requiring specific caseloads and creating guidelines in the face of declining revenues, RRPS is committed to working collaboratively to solve problems. Directors across the state have asked the SEB of NMPED in the past to create this guidance. We feel that at this time guidance has not been given until after the fact (80 Day count audit) and then provide the guidance that each ancillary provider MUST have 30.43 hours of Direct Service on their caseload through the audit tool. This leaves 4.57 hours a week for indirect service, evaluations, IEP time, and travel across district or transition time in school, school meetings, district meetings, PLC time, etc.

- We agree that New Mexico school districts need a new monitoring tool for caseloads. Up to now RRPS has been using a district determined best practice to assign caseloads without specific guidance from SEB.
- We believe that we will be in violation of Maintenance of Effort both as a district and as a state. (See the MOE section) RRPS has grown from 2258 SWD to 2362 SWD on the 80 Day count and 2316 SWD to 2455 SWD on the 120 Day count. This is a newly created formula to determine caseloads in the Audit tool and not based in rule, law or in the STARS document or any other previous guidance from NMPED.
- On page 134 of the STARS Manual the formulas listed as guidelines for calculating Related Service FTE do not give the same FTE calculation as the audit tool as service hours is not a factor.
- Previous guidance “Guidelines for Calculating Related Service FTE” and “How to Figure Caseload Maximums” are only guidance to determine the SLP Related Service time as noted in the document with reference to “code 95 and 96” and no other codes.
- The audit tool requires that 30.43 hours of Direct Service on all related service caseloads to achieve compliance. This leaves 4.57 hours a week for indirect service, evaluations, IEP time, and travel across district or transition time in school, school meetings, district meetings, PLC time, etc.
- Column 5 uses 35 hours as a divisor. Elementary students are only available 27.5 hours and secondary students for 30.0 hours of instructional time, direct services and supplemental services.
- Column 6 uses 15% as allowable prep time. RRPS, believes that much more time is needed for indirect service, evaluations, IEP time, and travel across district or transition time in school, school meetings, district meetings and PLC time and would be willing to study how much time is spent in these areas.
- Initial evaluations are not prep, they are allowable direct services under IDEA. However, service time cannot be reflected as the student has not yet been identified and doesn't have an IEP. The audit tool doesn't account for this anywhere.
- IEP's are not prep, this is a requirement under IDEA and prep is required for an IEP. The audit tool doesn't account for IEP time.
- Reevaluations are a direct service but not counted in the IEP time and cannot be considered therapy time. If they are to be completed during the service time reported on the IEP, the student will miss therapy and then the missed therapy time will require compensatory services. Furthermore, since with LRE most students are served in a group/class setting, students would miss their therapy time while the others had their

reevaluations completed, again requiring compensatory services. Although, the REED process does not always require additional testing, many times parts of tests or subtests, etc. are given to substantiate the students' present levels.

- We assign a social worker full-time in each of our elementary schools because that is where students need the most intervention and support. Our elementary transition (behavior) program has one dedicated Social Worker to maintain these students in the least restrictive environment. Our high school district behavior program has one dedicated Social Worker to maintain these students in the least restrictive environment. Absent this support, the state would be paying much higher costs to serve these students in hospital and other settings.
- School Psychologists in RRPS are used as evaluators, not case managers except in critical situations. We suggest that they be treated like diagnosticians as one of their primary duties described in the IDEA is evaluation.
- Audiologists work primarily as evaluators in RRPS. They work to identify students quickly before academic achievement is impacted by hearing loss. Students who are identified require periodic checks that are not always included on service schedules. In particular, we are not allowed to submit an audiology service fact record for speech-only students who are receiving speech service due to a hearing loss.
- We have SLPs, whose primary function is evaluation and/or intervention and do not provide direct service. We ask that these FTE be taken into consideration.
- Occupational, Physical and Recreation therapists' service time requires them to be assigned to two to nine schools. Therefore, we need to allow some time for travel between sites. In your audit, you may want to include some factor for travel in a district.
- Higher caseload impacts the provision of a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) as mandated by IDEA because larger caseloads may necessitate the use of service models that are not appropriate for some students (see [IDEA's influence on student needs and expanded SLP responsibilities in schools](#))



***New Mexico Council
of Administrators
of Special Education***

Ensuring a High Quality Education for ALL Students in New Mexico

April 15, 2016

Michael Lovato
Special Education Director
Public Education Department
Special Education Bureau
120 South Federal Place, Room 206
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Dear Mr. Lovato,

Your diligence to improve the New Mexico Special Education system is appreciated. The New Mexico Council of Administrators of Special Education (NMCASE) would also like to continue being a partner in this quest. NMCASE appreciates the PED/SEB pulling constituents together both now and in the future when planning procedural changes that will affect supports and services to students with disabilities.

NMCASE advocates that future committee partnerships with the PED/SEB and school districts allow for the opportunity to be present and along with a sufficient timeframe to discuss the issues more deeply with brainstorming, planning and consensus for viable solutions including supports for implementation.

NMCASE voices concern with the following and advocates for supports as indicated:

The general idea that school districts are being dishonest or gaming the system when there a couple of "Bad Eggs" spoiling the current system. This general conception should not spur the need to change the entire system.

The Spring Budget Workshop presentation on *Guidelines for Calculating FTE for Special Education Related Services* during March 30 – April 1, 2016 left many of the state's Directors of Special Education confused and concerned and have asked NMCASE to help with remediating the concerns.

The rate of speed at which the process to change the *Guidelines for Calculating FTE for Special Education Related Services* has taken place. NMCASE supports Directors of Special Education and advocates for their voice and years of collective experience in the field to be sought out when such matters may significantly impact special education supports and services. While an FTE Calculation Committee had been created to review drafted information over a half day, NMCASE supports more in-depth conversations occur in order to achieve outcomes that are compliant and fiscally responsible while taking into consideration expertise from all perspectives.

Options for FTE calculation in the near future appear to be potentially limited to a finite, prescriptive formula (which appears to be "one size fits all") as opposed to the current STARS Manual which allows for a choice one of three of methods to calculate FTE. NMCASE advocates that each unique school district and each unique related service group be allowed to use a variety of methods of documentation for the anticipated documentation requirements of the new FTE calculation formula while defining consistent elements that are necessary to document which should be determined by a group of knowledgeable stakeholders.

NMCASE advocates that all school districts receive training from the PED/SEB on the changes during the 2016-17 school year and that no significant changes be fully implemented until the 2017-18 school year.

It is understood that "Direct Services" documented in the IEP include, but are not limited to the following: direct services per a student's IEP, evaluations and reevaluations, travel related to direct services, travel for contractors, required meetings relevant to students with disabilities (IEP staffings, etc.), collaboration with teaching staff as identified in the student IEP. It is understood that service logs must be kept in order to document the above Direct Services. The concern by Directors of Special Education is that Related Services cannot be finitely calculated through a formula as the role of the Related Services Providers encompasses many additional job duties that are not deemed "direct service" to students with disabilities. We are concerned about such activities as safely escorting students to and from service locations, sharing impromptu informal observations with other providers, and occasionally lending expertise to district-level teams for general review of special education programs and processes. Must all these activities, direct (as indicated above) and indirect (workload), now appear on the IEP in order to be considered part of an ancillary provider's FTE?

The current rule explicitly mentions that "preparation time" is an allowable component of total FTE and this was not discussed in the presentation. We believe that this needs to remain in the calculations.

Districts build caseloads knowing that they will grow larger during the school year. Are we going to be asked to reduce our FTE at earlier counts since caseloads are usually are not "full" at the beginning of the school year and then have to adjust the FTE up again at later count dates and potentially risk not being able to fill those positions due to lack of available related service providers? Districts are concerned about the type of documentation needed at the beginning of the year to justify their FTE and the continued documentation to prove the FTE is valid.

A few examples in the *Guidelines for Calculating FTE for Special Education Related Services* presentation are confusing:

- The examples in slide 12 only state that "direct service" plus "travel" equal an FTE. Should directors assume that the word "direct service" account for direct services per a student's IEP, evaluations and reevaluations, travel related to direct services, travel for contractors, required meetings relevant to students with disabilities (IEP staffings, etc.), collaboration with teaching staff as identified in the student IEP as described in slides 5 & 6?
- The example in slide 4, "Staff who is only at school one full day per five-day week would be 0.20 (or 20%) of an FTE", eludes to old bullet 2 that is now removed. How was this calculation formulated as directors are not to use those calculations?

An initial concern during the Audit was that Related Service Providers were completing too many administrative tasks. This new rule will create an additional administrative burden on the related service staff and SE administrators in districts. Related Service staff will now be spending more time calculating their service time rather than giving the service that is required of them. Directors of districts will now have to gather documentation to justify FTEs (extended contracts, service logs, etc.) instead of attending to the many other duties they have.

Continued concerns arise regarding the loss of the previous formulas to calculate FTE (**see below in bold**) as they helped districts figure the FTE for staff that are on extended contract to ensure that we are meeting Part C to B Transition and summer testing to ensure 60 day evaluations are completed.

“Figure out the total time you are hiring this person, using one of these methods.

• By hours per week: If you are paying this person for preparation time and travel time per week, in addition to direct service time, include this in your total. Divide this total by the LEA workweek for teachers. This is the total FTE for this person.

• By total days: Figure out the total number of days you are hiring this person for a year. Divide by the total number of days in a typical teacher contract.

This is the total FTE for this person.

• By total hours: Figure out the total numbers of hours you are hiring this person for a year. Divide by the total number of hours in a typical teacher contract. This is the total FTE for this person.”

Additionally, the April 13, 2016 Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) meeting discussion appeared to indicate that the audit was not an extraordinary event and that this is something they do annually. However, the impact of this audit has created what appears to be a disconnect between school districts and PED/SEB as evidenced by those who were in attendance at the LFC meeting and the public comments.

Again, NMCASE would like to be a partner to improve the New Mexico Special Education system with SEB. Please do not let a few “bad eggs” spoil a system that has worked well for New Mexico school districts. Please let us know how we can support the SEB in ensuring viable services and supports for our students in most need.

Sincerely,

NMCASE Officers

Jerry Reeder
President

Christina Velasquez
President Elect

Shelley Baquet
Secretary

Teresa Carmack
Treasurer

Christa Kulidge
Membership Chair

Jacqueline Denton
Legislative Representative

Diane Vallejos
Web Master

Theresa Griffin-Golden
Past President

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

What district do you represent?	What was the date that the audit/review was sent to your district?
Las Cruces Public Schools	02/15/2016
Artesia	02/18/2016
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	02/17/2016
Lovington	None, I called due to the rumor of an audit.
Cobre	14.9
Aztec	02/19/2016
Anthony Charter School (556-001)	03/07/2016
Taos municipal schools	02/16/2016
Los Alamos	03/07/2016
Health Leadership High School	05/27/2016
New Mexico Connections Academy	04/28/2016
Lordsburg Municipal Schools	?
Portales Municipal Schools	I believe we received notification late on Friday, February 5th and were told it needed to be changed by 120 day on February 10th.
APS- ACE Leadership Highschool	03/14/2016
	Early December
Tularosa Municipal Schools	12/15/2015
Ruidoso	03/01/2016
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	02/17/2016
Rio Rancho Public Schools	02/15/2016
Hatch Valley Public Schools	I heard of it first through the SWREC but received an email from my SEB Educ Administrator on February 17. This is also when I found out she was my new Educ Admin.
The ASK Academy	02/17/2016
Deming	Never sent. Came later through REC.
Roswell	2-17-2016; a spreadsheet was emailed with no explanation

80 Day - Tuesday, December 1, 2015

120 Day - Wednesday, February 10, 2016

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

What district do you represent?	What was your FTE prior to the 80 Day?
Las Cruces Public Schools	on the 40th 141.68
Artesia	22
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	0.62
Lovington	
Cobre	10.7
Aztec	15.09
Anthony Charter School (556-001)	0.5
Taos municipal schools	15.71
Los Alamos	25.82
Health Leadership High School	
New Mexico Connections Academy	not sure
Lordsburg Municipal Schools	2.35
Portales Municipal Schools	4.14
APS- ACE Leadership Highschool	2.55
	I was not the coordinator at the time, but from what I can tell it was 27.92
Tularosa Municipal Schools	3.78
Ruidoso	9.13
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	1.35
Rio Rancho Public Schools	104.81
Hatch Valley Public Schools	4.11
The ASK Academy	1.5
Deming	24.12
Roswell	15 social workers

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

What district do you represent?	Were you asked to reduce your 80 Day FTE?	Were you asked to increase your 80 Day FTE?
Las Cruces Public Schools	Yes	No
Artesia	Yes	No
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	Yes	No
Lovington	No	No
Cobre	Yes	No
Aztec	Yes	No
Anthony Charter School (556-001)	No	No
Taos municipal schools	Yes	No
Los Alamos	No	No
Health Leadership High School	No	No
New Mexico Connections Academy	Yes	No
Lordsburg Municipal Schools	Yes	No
Portales Municipal Schools	Yes	No
APS- ACE Leadership Highschool	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Tularosa Municipal Schools	No	No
Ruidoso	No	No
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	No	No
Rio Rancho Public Schools	No	No
Hatch Valley Public Schools	Yes	No
The ASK Academy	Yes	No
Deming	No	No
Roswell	Yes	

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

What district do you represent?	According to the audit/review, how much was your district over/under on your 80 Day FTE?	Under:
Las Cruces Public Schools	Over: 62.8	
Artesia	5.32	
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	0.13	
Lovington	Even	
Cobre	4	
Aztec	5.45	
Anthony Charter School (556-001)		0.232
Taos municipal schools	6.17	
Los Alamos	1.8 FTE	
Health Leadership High School		
New Mexico Connections Academy	.5 and .2	
Lordsburg Municipal Schools	Approximately .7	
Portales Municipal Schools	.70 after much deliberation, initial report said 2.0	
APS- ACE Leadership Highschool	0.5	
	2 OT FTE	
Tularosa Municipal Schools	1.66	1.07
Ruidoso	0.99	
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	It was a district calculation error, not associated with PED FTE audit.	
Rio Rancho Public Schools	34.04	
Hatch Valley Public Schools	0.3	
The ASK Academy	0.21	
Deming	12.38	
Roswell	11.24 social workers	

.Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

What district do you represent?	How much did you lose or gain on your 80 Day FTE?
Las Cruces Public Schools	Gain 3.1 contract FTE
Artesia	We didn't have to change it.
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	n/a
Lovington	None
Cobre	Lost 4
Aztec	We chose not to change
Anthony Charter School (556-001)	N/A
Taos municipal schools	we did not reopen to change 80 day
Los Alamos	Asked to adjust 120 Day prior to validation
Health Leadership High School	
New Mexico Connections Academy	not sure
Lordsburg Municipal Schools	Lost 0.7 FTE
Portales Municipal Schools	Lost 0.7
APS- ACE Leadership Highschool	Lost 0.5
	x
Tularosa Municipal Schools	Lost 0.59
Ruidoso	N/A
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	Lost 0.62 FTE
Rio Rancho Public Schools	0
Hatch Valley Public Schools	Lost 0.3
The ASK Academy	Lost 0.21
Deming	1 - PED decided to leave it and address on 120D
Roswell	Lost 11.24 social workers

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

What district do you represent?	What was your FTE prior to the 120 Day?
Las Cruces Public Schools	on the 80th day the districts contract FTE was 144.78
Artesia	Same
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	0.47
Lovington	
Cobre	14.9
Aztec	15.09
Anthony Charter School (556-001)	0.5
Taos municipal schools	15.17
Los Alamos	25.74
Health Leadership High School	
New Mexico Connections Academy	not sure
Lordsburg Municipal Schools	2.35
Portales Municipal Schools	4.14
APS- ACE Leadership Highschool	1.95
Tularosa Municipal Schools	3.78
Ruidoso	9.13
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	0.73
Rio Rancho Public Schools	104.81
Hatch Valley Public Schools	4.12
The ASK Academy	1.29
Deming	25.26
Roswell	We adjusted based on 80 FTE calculation requirement

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

What district do you represent?	Were you asked to reduce your 120 Day FTE?	Were you asked to increase your 120 Day FTE?
Las Cruces Public Schools	Yes	No
Artesia	Yes	
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	No	No
Lovington	Yes	No
Cobre	Yes	No
Aztec	Yes	No
Anthony Charter School (556-001)	No	No
Taos municipal schools	Yes	No
Los Alamos	Yes	No
Health Leadership High School		
New Mexico Connections Academy	N/A Already reduced at 80 Day	No
Lordsburg Municipal Schools	Yes	No
Portales Municipal Schools	Yes	No
APS- ACE Leadership Highschool	No	No
		No
Tularosa Municipal Schools	Yes	No
Ruidoso	Yes	Yes
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	N/A Already reduced at 80 Day	No
Rio Rancho Public Schools	Yes	No
Hatch Valley Public Schools	No	No
The ASK Academy	N/A Already reduced at 80 Day	No
Deming	Yes	No
Roswell	N/A Already reduced at 80 Day	

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

What district do you represent?	How much did you lose or gain on your 120 Day FTE?
Las Cruces Public Schools	from the 80th to 120th day Lost 7.28
Artesia	In the end they said the amount was negligible.
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	n/a
Lovington	Lost 4.5
Cobre	Lost 4
Aztec	Even
Anthony Charter School (556-001)	N/A
Taos municipal schools	Lost 6.17
Los Alamos	Lost 1.8 FTE
Health Leadership High School	
New Mexico Connections Academy	
Lordsburg Municipal Schools	Lost .7 FTE
Portales Municipal Schools	Lost .70 after much deliberation, initial report said 2.0
APS- ACE Leadership Highschool	
	Lost 3
Tularosa Municipal Schools	X
Ruidoso	Lost 0.7
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	Gain 1.04
Rio Rancho Public Schools	Lost 2.22
Hatch Valley Public Schools	
The ASK Academy	Reduced at the 80 day
Deming	Lost 1.5
Roswell	

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

What district do you represent?	If your district went ahead and changed the data based on PED's recommendation for 80th day, how were you advised to calculate FTE for subsequent years?
Las Cruces Public Schools	The district did not change the data, however, initial guidance via PED webinar on 2/16/2016 stated that districts are required to 1) add direct service time 2) add travel time (not including school to school) 3) add 5 hours of prep time 4) sum 1-3 /related service providers work week
Artesia	SEB ended up telling us that the amount we were over was cancelled out by the amount we were under reporting so "it's a wash". We were told that in the future we would calculate FTE strictly by the hours in the employed week divided by the hours of direct service and any additional time would need to have documentation justifying the additional time.
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	We did not change the 80 day FTE calculation; however, we did change the 120 FTE calculation with guidance from NMPED/RECIX for subsequent year resulting in an initial loss of .15. Recalculation at 120 day allowed for an increase with new guidance from NMPED/RECIX for allowable activities that impacted FTE calculations.
Lovington	I refused to change 80th day report due to the validation of the 80th day report.
Cobre	As per PED
Aztec	
Anthony Charter School (556-001)	N/A
Taos municipal schools	to document ALL hours in service logs to justify all FTE time we pay was related to directly to Special ed and divide total hrs of service per week by the work week hours.
Los Alamos	NMPED did not contact us until after the 120th day. They required that we change the FTE reported for 120 day before they would agree to validate our data and send it to School Budget. We were told that detailed logs of time spent must be kept to justify that reported time is directly related to support through the IEP to students with disabilities.
Health Leadership High School	
New Mexico Connections Academy	they gave us a long formula in a training that was very confusing.
Lordsburg Municipal Schools	
Portales Municipal Schools	Using therapy hours plus planning/travel time divided by 35
APS- ACE Leadership Highschool	We did not change the way we were calculating our FTE.

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

Tularosa Municipal Schools	Our district did not change the data after having a meeting with Michael Levato, Special Education Director at SEB. We were unable to change the FTE at the present time but indicated that we would appropriately adjust Ancillary FTE when submitting the request for ancillary services to our local REC, Region IX Education Cooperative Group.
Ruidoso	No.
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	The district was not notified to change related service FTE for any proceeding years.
Rio Rancho Public Schools	We were initially advised that the only direct service was what was recorded as direct service time in the IEP. We were advised that the STARS Manual will be changed and that the Formulas would be changed. Future advisement would be given at the Spring Budget Workshop.
Hatch Valley Public Schools	We did not change any of our data, as our data had already been verified. They did clarify on COTA vs. OT calculations and reporting. Still a gray area for Social Workers, though.
The ASK Academy	Direct service time as reported in STARS divided by teacher contract hours.
Deming	Only counting face-to-face hours as indicated on the IEP service page. Cannot count supervision, or evaluations (except for school psychs). Can only allow one hour per day prep time to account for IEP attendance, IEP preparation, and any other required paperwork. CAN count travel to and from district as well as in-district.
Roswell	using hours per week as selection a. below

NMPED Audit/Review Survey

Which of the 3 formulas did you use prior to the audit/review? (You may select more than one answer)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
a. By hours per week: If you are paying this person for preparation time and travel time per week, in addition to direct service time, include this in your total. Divide this total by the LEA workweek for teachers. This is the total FTE for this person.	38.1%	8
b. By total days: Figure out the total number of days you are hiring this person for a year. Divide by the total number of days in a typical teacher contract. This is the total FTE for this person.	42.9%	9
c. By total hours: Figure out the total numbers of hours you are hiring this person for a year. Divide by the total number of hours in a typical teacher contract. This is the total FTE for this person.	19.0%	4
d. All Three	23.8%	5
<i>answered question</i>		21
<i>skipped question</i>		2

NMPED Audit/Review Survey

Which of the 3 formulas were you allowed to use after the audit/review? (You may select more than one answer)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
a. By hours per week: If you are paying this person for preparation time and travel time per week, in addition to direct service time, include this in your total. Divide this total by the LEA workweek for teachers. This is the total FTE for this person.	80.0%	16
b. By total days: Figure out the total number of days you are hiring this person for a year. Divide by the total number of days in a typical teacher contract. This is the total FTE for this person.	5.0%	1
c. By total hours: Figure out the total numbers of hours you are hiring this person for a year. Divide by the total number of hours in a typical teacher contract. This is the total FTE for this person.	15.0%	3
d. All Three	10.0%	2
<i>answered question</i>		20
<i>skipped question</i>		3

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

What district do you represent?	Did your district challenge PED's recommendations?	What was the result of your challenge?
Las Cruces Public Schools	Yes	The information provided to PED was ultimately verified.
Artesia	Yes	We challenged changing the FTE's in writing and via a phone conference. We then were contacted by the EA saying because what we were over was cancelled by what we are under, we would not be required to change our 80 or 120 day reports but that in the future we would be expected to justify FTE differences.
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	Yes	results pending
Lovington	Yes	They found irregularities with the first FTE review.
Cobre	Yes	Told that we must comply or funding would be withheld and an in depth audit for services would be conducted by SEB
Aztec	Yes	We did not change our fte data
Anthony Charter School (556-001)	No	N/A
Taos municipal schools	Yes	no response. without documentation they would accept, (service logs) they stuck by their direct service + 15% allowance. It did not help that we had some glaring misreports such as a social worker who had been moved to regular ed but whose position code had not changed. I really could not argue with them since they were adamant on what they would or would not accept.
Los Alamos	Yes	Originally, using the one point of data reported in the Service Fact Template, the NMPED found that we would not be funded for 10 FTE. By providing service logs and clarifying services that were not reported in the Service Fact Template but actually met the definition of a related service, the unfunded FTE was reduced to 1.8 FTE.
Health Leadership High School		
New Mexico Connections Academy	No	
Lordsburg Municipal Schools	No	
Portales Municipal Schools	Yes	We lost but did not have to adjust the full 2.0, we had to adjust .70 FTE down.
APS- ACE Leadership Highschool	No	

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

Tularosa Municipal Schools	Yes	We were able to keep the FTE's as is for the remainder of this year, knowing that the FTE's would change to the PED's request next year.
Ruidoso	Yes	No reply
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	No	
Rio Rancho Public Schools	Yes	<p>We did not lose 34.04 FTE, we only lost 2.22 FTE. RRPS was allowed to create a worksheet that had additional time that could be classified under direct services that included: (Total Direct Service Hours, Prep time, Eval Time, "IDEA Documentation Time, Caseload x 15 min ea, Additional time from Special Factors, Supplementary Aids and Services, Supports for School Personnel & PWN, Travel Time, IEP Services not captured in STARS, Other) these helped RRPS bring up the FTE of the Related Service Staff. RRPS did have mistakes in the FTE calculations that had to be corrected. Below are the changes that PED requested reductions to the RRPS FTE: Request to remove from report; (SLP) 1.26 FTE (OT) 0.54 FTE Total Decrease of 1.80 FTE Below are several Related Service Providers that supervise assistants (COTA or ASL) that we submitted for approval to increase their related service FTE due to advisement from SEB: ASL Supervisors: (SLP) Increase from 0.29 FTE to 1.43 FTE (SLP) Increase from 0.59 to 1.22 FTE (SLP) Increase from 0.74 to 1.88 FTE Total Increase of 2.91 FTE COTA Supervisors: (OT) Increase from 1.14 to 1.77 (OT) Increase from 1.14 to 1.79 (OT) Increase from 1.14 to 1.38 Total Increase of 1.52 FTE</p>
Hatch Valley Public Schools	Yes	Never heard back.
The ASK Academy	No	N/A
Deming	No	As Special Education Director, I questioned the PED about the change in formula and job descriptions. However, my superintendent later spoke with them and agreed to comply. We ended up not losing so many positions as PED allowed us to add in travel and almost all of our ancillary staff travel. As a result, our final loss was minimal.
Roswell	No	

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

What district do you represent?	If your district challenged PED's recommendation and worked with PED to work on current calculations, how were you advised to calculate FTE moving forward?
Las Cruces Public Schools	initial guidance via PED webinar on 2/16/2016 stated that districts are required to 1) add direct service time 2) add travel time (not including school to school) 3) add 5 hours of prep time 4) sum 1-3 /related service providers work week however, the criteria changed via several conversations as to what the district could or could not count as service time. This created much confusion.
Artesia	We were told there would be training on how we were going to be calculating FTE in the future which there was at Spring Budget which is the total hours employed for the week divided by the total number of service hours with justification of all hours that are not direct services as reported by times on IEP's.
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	using hours per week with new allowances for prep time, travel, IEPs and evaluations.
Lovington	Was not advised beside the what the webinar presented.
Cobre	Only use contact hours on IEP
Aztec	We weren't
Anthony Charter School (556-001)	N/A
Taos municipal schools	
Los Alamos	We were advised to keep detailed service logs.
Health Leadership High School	
New Mexico Connections Academy	
Lordsburg Municipal Schools	
Portales Municipal Schools	By hours per week, direct service time plus prep/indirect service time (must be substantiated with logs) and travel time divided by total number of hours per week.
APS- ACE Leadership Highschool	
Tularosa Municipal Schools	We were advised to calculate FTE as indicated in questions 13 and 14.
Ruidoso	No guidance has been provided.
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	
Rio Rancho Public Schools	That we would be allowed to utilize our document (with documentation to back it up) to justify our related service FTE. More information was going to be given to us at Spring Budget Workshop.
Hatch Valley Public Schools	n/a - see # 17.
The ASK Academy	N/A
Deming	NA
Roswell	

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

What district do you represent?	How did the calculations affect your district's Special Ed services?
Las Cruces Public Schools	Currently there as been no affect, however, based upon PED memo dated June 7, 2016, the PED may request supporting documentation in addition to STARS submission.
Artesia	If we would have adjusted the FTE to their calculations, it would have cost our district \$532,000. They have insisted that we have not be able to count COTA's in our FTE in the past but when I have looked at previous years, we have always been funded with them in our count through STARS.
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	Our FTE will increase
Lovington	Had to discharge a physical therapist and 3 social workers.
Cobre	SPED director lost
Aztec	N/A
Anthony Charter School (556-001)	N/A
Taos municipal schools	
Los Alamos	We will have to increase case loads for next year based on lost FTE. Related service providers will also not be able to spend as much time supporting the students on their caseloads because of the time required to keep such detailed activity logs that go beyond the service time documented on individual student IEPs, i.e. evaluations, report writing, observations and data collection required for progress monitoring, consultation to teachers and parents, IEP meeting attendance, etc.
Health Leadership High School	
New Mexico Connections Academy	
Lordsburg Municipal Schools	
Portales Municipal Schools	We were able to compensate but barely. Kids will still be take care of for this coming year but I do not know where we will stand for the following years.
APS- ACE Leadership Highschool	We managed to increase our Speech ours even though we decreased our Social Work hours. We have had to cut corners on our service providers, figuring out how to support them in serving their caseload while cutting their paid hours.
Tularosa Municipal Schools	When calculating according to questions 13 and 14, our district was closure to the FTE's as indicated in the Audit Summary Report.
Ruidoso	It was a reduction in FTE.
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	
Rio Rancho Public Schools	The loss of 2.22 FTE will affect future services as NM Schools are on a prior year funding model. We didn't have to cut staff this year but it may be a consideration for next year with the reduction in FTE on the 120 day count that equals to approximately \$100,000 to the RRPS budget
Hatch Valley Public Schools	We didn't change any services.

· Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

The ASK Academy	The majority of SE funding comes out of operational funds so there was no impact in service delivery.
Deming	Reducing social worker positions by 1.5 means other social workers must cover for those removed. It also means a total change in what our social workers do: from supporting staff, parent and families to face-to-face therapy.
Roswell	I have moved social workers into general ed positions.

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

<p>Did you attend the IDEA-B Application, Ancillary Services and A/B Mem Calculations session at the Spring Budget Workshop?</p>	<p>Please state your comments, questions or concerns with the "Guidelines for Calculating FTE for Special Education Related Services" PowerPoint Presentation at the Spring Budget Workshop.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Concerns: 1) new guidance contradicted prior guidance 2) Guidelines for calculating FTE was unclear 3) PED did not furnish or prescribe the required forms to capture supporting justification for related service time outside of STARS</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>I left feeling like the rules were suddenly changed mid stream and this is how it is going to be. No discussion! They are right and we are wrong! They are going to offer guidance on how we are to provide "justification" but I doubt we get it. They are turning the related services FTE into a fee for service plan which is not how it was presented at the new director's institute I attended in August of 2009!</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>There has been no guidance for behavioral health services.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>It was good to finally get some guidance on what was or was not acceptable. it still seems as though they are making up the rules as they go and reserving the right to challenge and FTE calculations based on their interpretations of what is appropriate services</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>The presentation was very directive and "threatening". The term, "I will push back on that" was used repeatedly when there was a perceived misuse of related service time. We were told that we would have to justify every minute of the related service time through logs. There was no understanding of the effect this would have on services to students and although a template and additional guidance was promised, it has not been provided. Concerns regarding the effect of this audit on MOE was downplayed even though the effect on MOE for districts and for the state as a result of the 2010 special education audit was significant.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>It is my concern that they are trying to fit services, direct and indirect, into a mold, or equation, and that is not how special education works. By its nature we are individualized and are required to be a part of the RTI process. This new method of calculating FTE is not allowing for that process because schools cannot fund those positions except through Special Education.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>It was clear. We will need to provide extensive logs to document all service hours. I am working with my ancillary staff to create better documentation tools.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Psych's not being able to perform psycho educational evaluations without diag. license The burden of extra documentation to support their work day</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>I went to the first session. Guidance was not provided.</p>

Special Education Related Service FTE Survey

Yes	I understand that I have the PED Powerpoint presentation and attended the session for information purposes but there has been no final statement to our district concerning what will be the final method of calculation for sped related services. This includes the PVREC sped coordinator who has been acting in behalf of the district at other discussions concerning this process.
Yes	Mr. Lovato promised us a log for all our ancillary to log in their extra time, travel, IEP writing, etc.HOWEVER, as of this date we have not heard from him and have not received this "log".

Special Education Related Service FTE Suvey

Please submit any other information that you would like to share that was not asked above:

PED attempt to provide clear guidance regarding the related service documentation has fallen short (PED memo June 7, 2016), although, several attempts have been made. Interpretation remains on the reader of the memo. In addition, PED resistance to modify page 134 of the STARS manual, which clearly states "choose one of the following methods" for calculating the related service FTE, is further evidence this will continue to be an issue in the future.

We have guidelines on how to qualify students for all special services with the exception of behavioral health. PED states it's up the district to determine the need of behavioral health, however, the feeling of restricting how to calculate a 'quality of behavioral life' service as a another service such as speech is not justified.

SEB is making arbitrary decisions with no input from districts. SEB is illegally changing the funding formula without going through legislature. SEB is using personnel to make local SPED decisions that have no practical experience. SEB is using their sense of ultimate power to coerce districts. There are no federal requirements to calculate FTE as NM SEB is requiring. The shame is that services will be reduced for the neediest of populations in our schools

We have been told we would receive more guidance; at this time, we have not. I meet with other local directors, and we are trying to figure out how to move forward. One district has created their own formula; the rest of us are still waiting to see if we are provided with one (not just what was in STARS) that addresses travel, IEP time, etc.

PED has been very reluctant to help us determine LEA MOE calculations they are late in their reports and verbal guidance i have gotten from PED indicate this audit may qualify as an MOE exception but i feel very uncertain on the guidance I am getting. It conflicts with advice past directors have given. It does seem like they are making up rules as they go. This is very disturbing to me as we try to navigate through an exceptionally high MOE base I inherited, and make plans to reduce it over time. I am convinced no one at PED understands MOE especially my ed liason. I still challenge PED' timing on this audit. IT was very heavy handed and did not allow district's to plan for a significant revenue drop. We have had to deal with extreme union and community feedback and I do feel that PED hung us out to dry on this with little advance warning. My final question is how is this whole process tied to State MOE. Was this all a \$\$ grab from district's to satisfy the state MOE shortfall and how will the state ensure these monies are returned to special education.

The approach is similar to the audit of 2010 implying that districts are "gaming the system": to generate additional income. A more student-centered approach would be appreciated. Please do not attach my comments to our district. I am concerned about calling attention to the district and generating even more scrutiny than has already been applied. We are strong rule followers in this district and our school board was very upset about the change in the rules used for calculating related service time that affected service to students and budget without notice.

I was told by the Spec Ed Board that we should not be providing so much social work to our students. If it is documented in their IEP as being necessary, it is unethical for them to tell me that.

I am concerned about how to capture information to support FTE calculation. Additionally, will the supporting documentation for FTE be considered an educational record for a student and so available to parents. I am unclear how to represent services in an IEP and to calculate service level. How will this be captured in STARS?

Special Education Related Service FTE Suvey

As a charter school with a rural school schedule, our students receive 32 hours of classroom instruction per week. Fridays are half days and optional for students who need additional tutoring, need to make-up tests, or want to come in to work on projects. These days are not counted as instructional days but are teacher contract days. We contract for ancillary services so if students are not required to be on campus, I am not going to pay \$75 per hour for ancillary staff to come and sit through content meetings. It is unduly punitive to base this calculation on teacher contract days when those are days that services will not be provided.

It was a very stressful period. Having PED ask for FTE's to be changed retroactively (at first for 80D) and then immediately (120D) was very time-consuming and worrying from both a financial, staff, and student services standpoint.