

# 2017-2018



Kelly Joseph, Special Education Accountability  
Specialist

[kelly.joseph@esc20.net](mailto:kelly.joseph@esc20.net)

210-370-5664

Amy Strauch, Special Education Field Service Agent

[amy.strauch@esc20.net](mailto:amy.strauch@esc20.net)

210-370-5440

Darlene Redclift, Special Education Coordinator

[darlene.redclift@esc20.net](mailto:darlene.redclift@esc20.net)

210-370-5456

Dawn White, Special Education Coordinator

[dawn.white@esc20.net](mailto:dawn.white@esc20.net)

210-370-5402

## **SPECIAL EDUCATION REVIEW BOERNE ISD**

The review process supports district-level continuous improvement efforts in the area of Special Education. The process included interviews of teams that are representative of the school district, including multi-disciplinary educator teams and a parent team, classroom observations of select students with disabilities, review of district demographic data, eligibility folders, service logs, and local policies and guidelines. This report describes program highlights and identified trend areas for improvement that will be shared with a district selected Special Education Task Force.

# Program Highlights:

## Boerne ISD

### 1. **Strong Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP) Development in the Individual Education Program (IEP)**

Across the district, it was evident that a strong understanding exists of the importance of the PLAAFP. This was seen in folder reviews and heard in all stakeholder interviews. PLAAFPs consistently reflected thoughtful data collection, input from various stakeholders in the student's educational program, and indications of how the student's disability was impacting his/her education. Some PLAAFPs included visual representations of the data collection. For example, at the secondary level, Likert scales were seen in some IEPs.

### 2. **Identification of Accommodations in the IEP**

Several stakeholders reported the use of a campus/case manager developed "accommodations at a glance" pages to summarize the accommodations a student needed in each subject area. This document was reported as being especially helpful to general education teachers. At the secondary level, accommodations were especially specific and targeted to student needs identified in the PLAAFP.

### 3. **Strong IEP Goal Development When Based on Broad Skill Needs**

IEP goals that were focused on broad skills that were identified as a critical need in a student's PLAAFP were written very clearly and in a manner that appeared to clear to the service provider. For example, student goals focused on increasing reading comprehension were generally written in a manner that could be implemented for the full duration of the IEP goal period, allowing for data collection throughout the year instead of during isolated lessons that taught specific skills that do not span a school year. These types of goals were seen most often at the elementary level.

### 4. **Integration of Dyslexia Assessment and Services into IEPs**

Throughout the district, the IEPs of students who were dually eligible for special education and dyslexia services were observed to have had dyslexia assessment and services integrated throughout. Dyslexia was not treated as a separate, isolated process, nor was dyslexia treated as a non-related disability that did not impact the student's special education programming. Instead the two programs were integrated, allowing the student to be seen as a "whole child" rather than being treated separately by two programs. Additionally, these services were observed as occurring in coordination with each other, and not simply being documented in IEPs as such.

### 5. **Evidence of Utilization of IEP-Required Supports and Strategies**

Throughout the district, the use of IEP required supports and strategies was evident on every campus. All classroom visits were unannounced quick "snapshot style" visits, meaning they were not designed to last the full lesson cycle. Despite that, the use of accommodations, including assistive technology (AT) was consistently observed. Additionally, the coordinated use of IEP-required behavior management strategies from Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) were also observed. For example, a student whose BIP referenced the use of a point sheet was observed; the point sheet was visibly used by the staff and student.

**6. Classroom Management and Student Engagement in Instruction**

Instruction was focused and engaging within general education and special education classroom settings. The use of instructional technology was also widely used within many classrooms. Flexible seating, including varied heights of desks and chairs, as well as varied options for chairs and fidgets/bands for foot rests, was seen in many classrooms and at various grade levels. This allows some flexibility for student movement and comfort, further increasing student engagement and decreasing interruptions to instruction. Teachers were observed to have effective classroom management strategies in place.

**7. Staff Rapport with Students**

It was clear that all Boerne staff, including campus administrators, general education teachers, special education teachers, Speech Language Pathologists (SLPs), program specialists, evaluation staff, and special education department staff knew the students and had a positive relationship with each student. They clearly understood the students' needs. All the classroom observations reflected a positive and engaging rapport with all students.

**8. Staff Relationships/Professional Rapport**

It was overwhelmingly clear that all Boerne ISD staff, including campus administrators, general education teachers, special education teachers, SLPs, program specialists, evaluation staff, and special education department staff have a great deal of concern for one another's workloads and want to prevent burnout and turnover rates of their colleagues. All groups feel that their workloads are increasing, but general educators referred to their special education colleagues' workloads as being an even greater increase. Every stakeholder group, including parents, spoke very highly of the current Special Education Director and Assistant Director, including how accessible and responsive they are, while simultaneously expressing concern for their continually growing workload in light of the increase in general education and special education populations.

# Trend 1: District Program Coordination

## **Trend Description: District Program Coordination**

A coordinated effort to standardize local processes to ensure continuity within the Special Education program. These processes should include a clear outline of how the district will implement special education practices, a communication system to share processes with all district staff, a method to monitor that the processes are implemented consistently across all campuses throughout the school district, and a method to evaluate processes and revise as needed.

## **Findings:**

- 1) Operating Guidelines were reviewed; they primarily restated the law and included a district contact rather than including how the law is implemented in the district and who is responsible for implementing it.
- 2) All interview groups reported that the Licensed Specialists in School Psychology (LSSPs) and Educational Diagnostician perform duties that are typically performed by a program coordinator on their assigned campuses. All reported that the evaluation staff roles included assisting with parent special education calls/questions, answering legal questions, attending/facilitating all Admission, Review and Dismissal (ARD) meetings, reviewing ARDs for compliance, and answering special education procedural questions. While the evaluation staff reported a high level of communication with central office staff, there was no reported time in their schedules for dissemination of this information at the campus level. Thus, communication was inconsistent from campus to campus in regard to district policies and procedures.

***Implications:*** Staff and parents expressed frustration with the lack of systemic processes that are implemented consistently throughout the district. This could potentially impact the school climate and program effectiveness. Processes currently appear to be person-dependent and the Operating Guidelines refer to people rather than to specific procedures or processes. This creates challenges in replicating consistent procedures and in training newly hired or newly transferred staff. Parents also expressed challenges when students transfer from one campus to another, such as moving from elementary to middle school or middle school to high school and encountering new processes.

- 3) Although service logs are being utilized at a high level for services that have Student Health and Related Services (SHARS) involved, there was not a standardized district format being utilized. Some service providers are using the log from the district software while others are creating their own. There is no district administrative review of logs to ensure services are implemented as written in the Individual Education Plan (IEP).
- 4) For instructional services such as inclusion and co-teach, there is no district or campus administrative requirement that service logs be utilized, although a few service providers reported that they chose to keep their own individual records. It was reported across interview groups that there is an expectation that if the teacher/paraprofessional is present, the service is provided. There is no campus or central office administrative review of documentation of special education services.

***Implications:*** IDEA-B 34 CFR §300.17 (d) requires that a student must receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) with services delivered in conformity with his/her IEP. Failure to document these services would make it impossible to prove FAPE was delivered when responding to a parent complaint, due process or judicial proceedings and potentially require the district to provide compensatory services.

- 5) There appears to be no administrative process for proactively reviewing timelines for annual ARDs and evaluations. It was reported that on several occasions staff were notified of missed timelines by the SHARS billing company and no administrator ever expressed awareness.

***Implications:*** IDEA-B 34 CFR §300.324 requires that an IEP must be reviewed no less than annually. Failure to do so could result in parent complaint, due process or judicial proceedings and potentially require the district to provide compensatory services.

- 6) Through classroom observations and interviews, it was evident that the implementation of services (special education and other support services such as Response to Intervention (RtI)) was campus dependent. Explanations varied for criteria on considerations for intervention determination, considerations for behavioral support, discipline tracking/manifestation determinations, timelines and procedures for distribution of IEPs, etc. A written process for moving students to a specialized unit was provided to us by the Special Education Department, but throughout stakeholder interviews, only one person expressed awareness of this document. A district-wide written process for RtI was also provided to us by the Special Education Department, but throughout stakeholder interviews, this process was not referenced.

***Implications:*** This has the potential to add to inconsistency when students have to transfer campuses in order to meet ARD-requirements for a specific special education instructional arrangement and the new campus may follow different procedures for special education. This adds to parent frustrations expressed with having to transport their child/children (if siblings are involved) for longer periods of time and acclimate to new procedures and providers.

- 7) While the district has a full continuum of services, as mandated by Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), this full continuum is not available at every campus. However, every campus seems to be making great efforts to meet the full continuum of student needs based on their currently allocated resources, regardless of the currently available continuum of services on that campus. All interview groups expressed concern with the lack of access to the same resources/instructional settings on each campus. In some situations, parents expressed that rather than have their child/children (if siblings are involved) move from the home campus to a campus where the instructional arrangement was available, they stayed at their home campus where providers were familiar with their students and their students were familiar with the procedures.

***Implications:*** Due to the lack of a full continuum of service options at the campus level, other students may not be receiving the services outlined in their IEP as special education teachers/paraprofessionals who were providing inclusion services are pulled to serve other students. This could potentially be a violation of IDEA-B 34 CFR §300.17(d) that states that FAPE means special education and related services are provided in conformity with a student's IEP.

## **Considerations/Recommendations:**

- Consider revising the District Special Education Operating Guidelines to provide clear direction around district-wide processes. The District Operating Guidelines appear to restate the law and include a district contract person rather than include how the law is implemented in the district. Templates for the Operating Guidelines are located within the Texas Education Agency (TEA) vetted Legal Framework at:  
<http://framework.esc18.net/display/Webforms/LandingPage.aspx>
  - Contact the ESC-20 Special Education Accountability Specialist for technical assistance with a process for development and revision of Operating Guidelines, if needed.
  - This should include the development or revision of Operating Guidelines and/or other written district-wide administrative processes for Response to Intervention (RtI), Rehabilitation Act of 1973 Section 504, dyslexia, and behavioral supports/discipline tracking.
    - Contact the ESC-20 RtI/Section 504 Specialist for technical assistance, if needed.
    - Contact the ESC-20 Dyslexia Specialist for technical assistance, if needed.
    - Contact the ESC-20 Behavior Team for technical assistance, if needed.
- Consider development of a procedure for dissemination and ongoing training of Operating Guidelines/written district administrative processes in a consistent district-wide manner.
- Consider the development of a universal service log used across the district. This may include reviewing logs being used by existing staff members and/or adopting the use of a log existing within current software systems. This universal log should be streamlined to include only the required elements which include: Date, Duration, and Lesson Objective. This should also include a pre-populated heading which includes the IEP required frequency and duration and Annual Goal for easy reference. Provide ongoing training for all staff, including paraprofessionals, to ensure fidelity of implementation.
  - Furthermore, consider implementing a campus and district administrative process to track the service logs.
  - This administrative review should ensure that when staff and/or student schedules are changed during the school year, all students on the campus continue to receive the frequency and duration of special education services that are documented in their IEPs.
  - Contact the ESC-20 Special Education Accountability Specialist for technical assistance with a process for documenting/tracking provision of service delivery, if needed.
- Consider development of a consistent districtwide process for tracking special education required timelines.
- Consider development of a coordinated method of communication between the special education department and campus staff to ensure consistent information and implementation of the special education program across the district. This should include information regarding:
  - Process and timelines for dissemination of IEP to campus staff; and
  - How a student is considered for transferring between campuses due to availability of instructional settings.

## Trend 2: Consistency of Individual Education Program (IEP) Development and Implementation

### **Trend Description: Consistency of IEP Development & Implementation**

An IEP is the written document that is completed by an Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee for every student receiving special education services. Some of the requirements that the IEP must address are: a statement of the student's Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP), Measurable Annual Goals, Supplementary Aids and Services, Transition Services, Placement Decisions, and Participation in State/District Assessments. IEP decisions are based on student data to assure that the needs of the student are the primary consideration. This IEP is then used by the teacher/service provider to implement an individualized education program while ensuring access to the general curriculum. Therefore, this document should be developed and implemented in a consistent manner to ensure seamless transition for students with disabilities within the district.

### **Findings:**

- 1) Through interviews and reviews of documentation provided, it was discovered that there is no clear districtwide procedure for documentation of delivery of special education services. Although service logs are being utilized at a high level for services that have Student Health and Related Service (SHARS) involved, there was not a standardized district format being utilized. Some service providers are using the log from the district software while others are creating their own. For instructional services such as inclusion and co-teach, there is no district or campus administrative requirement that service logs be utilized, although a few service providers reported that they chose to keep their own individual records. It was reported across interview groups that there is an informal expectation that if the service provider is present, the service is provided as required by the Individual Education Plan (IEP). Therefore, there is inconsistent or no documentation that the IEP was implemented as written.

**Implications:** *This is a compliance requirement from the Texas Education Agency Monitoring Division. Failure to document services could result in a parent complaint, due process or judicial proceedings and potentially require the district to provide compensatory services.*

- 2) Through a review of eligibility folders, it was discovered that IEP development is inconsistent across campuses. Some findings are:
  - IEP goals at the secondary level were often written with a narrow aspect of a lesson instead of a broader concept that aligned with the entire curriculum of the course. For example, "...will determine the relationship of angles and find their values..."
  - Additionally, at the secondary level, it was discovered through interviews that data collection for progress reporting on such goals was often accomplished via review of

grades on assignments that covered this material (review in Gradebook) rather than in conjunction specially designed instruction/special education services that were provided.

- Instances where special education services provided in areas that students do not have annual goals and/or students that have annual goals in areas in which they receive no special education services. This was specific to special education instructional services.
- Transition planning does not appear to be individualized in some areas. For the folders reviewed, instruction, development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives, acquisition of daily living skills, and agency referral all seem to read the same. Some annual goals related to transition appear to be part of the coordinated set of activities rather than an annual goal. For example, several were to research something and report to a case manager. Additionally, some post-secondary goals were not measurable but seemed to read as the child's preferences/interests. For example, "[Student] has no employment history. [Student] is not sure if he'd like to attend college. [Student] is interested in working..."
- Through a review of eligibility folders, it was discovered that many elementary students have in excess of 25 accommodations listed, with some having over 90.
- Through interviews and classroom observations, it was discovered that there is some potential confusion in regard to the difference in accommodations and modifications.

***Implications:*** 34 CFR §300.320 requires that an IEP include a student's annual goals (based on the Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP)), progress monitoring of those goals, transition services, and specially designed instruction to implement these goals, including accommodations and modifications. The individualization and specificity in development and consistency in documentation of IEPs leads to greater ease and more effective implementation.

- 3) Through a review of eligibility folders and interviews, it was discovered that while re-evaluation timelines are being met, requests for further assessment through the (review of existing evaluation data) REED process only occurs when continued or additional eligibility is in question without regard to the other required component of the REED process such as educational need, informing the PLAAFP, and additions and modifications to special education and/or related services.

***Implications:*** 34 CFR §300.305 (a)(2)(iii)(B) requires that the REED process include whether the child continues to need special education and related services. 34 CFR §300.305 (a)(2)(ii) requires that the REED process include the present levels of academic achievement and related developmental needs of the child; and 34 CFR §300.305 (a)(2)(iv) requires that the REED process include whether any additions or modifications to the special education and related services are needed to enable the child to meet the measurable annual goals set out in the IEP of the child and to participate, as appropriate, in the general education curriculum.

## **Considerations/Recommendations:**

- Consider the development of a universal service log used across the district. This may include reviewing logs being used by existing staff members and/or adopting the use of a log existing within current software systems. This universal log should be streamlined to include only the required elements which include: Date, Duration, and Lesson Objective. This should also include a pre-populated heading which includes the IEP required frequency and duration and Annual Goal for easy reference. Provide ongoing training for all staff, including paraprofessionals, to ensure fidelity of implementation.
  - Contact the ESC-20 Special Education Accountability Specialist for technical assistance with a process for documenting/tracking provision of service delivery, if needed.
- Consider training for special education staff related to use of the PLAAFP to develop IEP goals, progress monitoring IEP goals, and development and delivery of specially designed instruction based on these IEP goals. The district should consider using internal staff (such as those in the Highlights) and build upon the existing district strengths (such as those in the Highlights - strong PLAAFPs across the district, strong goal development at elementary levels, strong accommodation links to needs at secondary level) to ensure consistency and build capacity. The district should consider face-to-face training and technical assistance as well as use of the following free TEA-vetted resources related to annual goals and the ARD/IEP process:
  - The *IEP Annual Goal Development Question and Answer* document at: <https://projects.esc20.net/page/pgc.IEPs>. This document will help staff to ensure needs identified in the student's PLAAFP are used to develop appropriate goals and inform specially designed instruction.
  - The *IEP Goal Development in Texas* (Online Training). Information about this free training is located at: <https://projects.esc20.net/page/pgc.IEPs>
  - The *Grading and Progress Monitoring for Students with Disabilities* document at: <https://projects.esc20.net/page/pgc.IEPs>
    - Contact the ESC-20 Special Education Curriculum and Instruction Team for technical assistance, if needed.
- Consider providing a joint staff development opportunity for general educators and special educators, including paraprofessionals, related to the development and implementation of accommodations and modifications. The campus administrator would benefit from attending this session with their staff to ensure fidelity of implementation.
  - Contact the ESC-20 Special Education Curriculum and Instruction Team for technical assistance, if needed
- Consider expanding the use of the "accommodations at a glance" document (noted in Program Highlights) to all campuses and/or develop an "IEP at a glance" type document to build upon the existing district strengths to ensure consistency and build capacity. This document should be used across campuses and distributed with the IEP before school starts, as is the current practice.
- Consider providing training for members of the ARD committee, including the evaluation staff, on the required elements of the REED process. The district should consider face-to-face training and technical assistance as well as use of the following free resources:
  - *Special Education Reevaluation Process Flowchart* located at: [https://www.esc20.net/page/ci\\_se.EvaluationResources](https://www.esc20.net/page/ci_se.EvaluationResources)
  - *Navigating the REED Process - Online Course* located at: [https://txr20.escworks.net/catalog/session.aspx?session\\_id=43706](https://txr20.escworks.net/catalog/session.aspx?session_id=43706)
    - Contact the ESC-20 Evaluation Specialist for technical assistance, if needed.

## Trend 3: Staffing Considerations

### **Trend Description: Staffing Considerations**

Staffing considerations for students with disabilities can vary based on individualized need. The current Texas rule leaves the determination for caseload for these services to the local education agency (LEA). The results of any needs assessment for staffing of special education programs should:

- be based on individual student needs as documented in the Individual Education Plan (IEP);
- apply to a full continuum of services; and
- ensure the provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE).

Additionally, staffing considerations should take into consideration support from central office to campus level staff as well as administrative time to monitor IEP development and implementation.

### **Findings:**

- 1) While we were unable to review service logs to confirm (since there are no service logs for instructional services), it was reported across interview groups that frequency and duration of previously scheduled services is impacted when special education teachers or paraprofessionals are unavailable when assigned to a newly enrolled student and/or a student whose schedule has changed. This was especially evident at campuses where efforts were being made to meet the full continuum of student needs without access to the full continuum of instructional settings on that specific campus. These students may have stayed at their home campuses for various reasons such as parental preference, lack of consistent understanding of transfer procedure, and/or verbal denial of transfer either due to lack of space or lack of interventions tried previously.

***Implications:*** Due to the lack of a full continuum of service options at the campus level, other students may not be receiving the services outlined in their IEP as special education teachers/paraprofessionals who were providing services are pulled to serve other students. This could potentially be a violation of IDEA-B 34 CFR §300.17(d) that states that FAPE means special education and related services are provided in conformity with a student's IEP. Additionally, this contributes to the overall district culture and climate which ultimately impacts teacher burnout and student services.

- 2) Perceptions from all interview groups were that the evaluation staff at each campus are essentially the campus special education coordinators, with duties that are often attributed to a district-level program coordinator.
- Examples of such duties are being the liaison for special education information between central office and their campus, reviewing Admission, Review, Dismissal (ARD) paperwork for compliance, ARD coordinator, Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) submissions, ARD trainings, coordination of ARD process (scheduling of ARDs through placement of students), answering parent calls/concerns, answering special education compliance questions, and student transfers.
  - Additionally, at the high school level, it was reported that the campus Licensed Specialists in School Psychology (LSSPs) are also used as behavior specialists when a student who receives special education services has any behavioral need or requires restraint.
  - Additionally, interviews revealed that evaluation staff may be hesitant to indicate a need for a psychological evaluation or counseling/psychological services as they are busy doing clerical work or program management during and thus unable to provide these services.
  - Staff acknowledged that some evaluation services could potentially be provided by an LSSP intern. Interns are difficult to recruit due to lack of pay offered by the district (as compared to neighboring districts that offer stipends for interns) as well as the teacher pay scale that current LSSPs receive. Additionally, the concern was raised that there was not additional time in LSSP schedules for required supervision of an intern.
  - In general, it was reported that 10-15% of evaluation staff time was spent conducting evaluations, with the rest of their time spent on program coordination and clerical duties. This was true for all nine full-time equivalent (FTE) evaluation staff.

***Implications:*** 34 CFR §300.111(a)(1)(i) requires children with disabilities must be identified, located, and evaluated. This includes a child already identified with a disability who is suspected of having any additional disabilities. 34 CFR §300.305 (a)(2)(iv) requires that the REED process include whether any additions or modifications to the special education and related services are needed; this would include counseling and/or psychological services. These findings have the potential to impact child find requirements and required timeline compliance as monitored by SPP 11, 12 and reevaluation timelines. This could additionally inform why the REEDs do not seem to often result in a request for additional formal evaluation. Additionally, this contributes to the overall school culture and climate which ultimately impacts student services. Potential staff turnover creates additional costs in training and potential violations of IEP implementation when staff are unavailable to provide IEP-required services.

3) Staffing:

- a. It was reported that while numbers of students in special education have increased special education staffing numbers have not. *Figure 1* below provides a comparison of the percentage of growth in the population of students who receive special education services (using Fall PEIMS Snapshot data) and the percentage of growth in teachers who provide special education services (using Boerne ISD Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data). Note: Full data used for this Figure, including comparison to state and regional FTEs for special education teachers, is located in *Appendix A*.

**Figure 1**  
**Student Growth and Teacher Growth**  
**Boerne ISD Special Education Program**  
**2012-2013 through 2017-2018**

School Year	Student Growth Percentage in Special Education Program*	Teacher Growth Percentage in Special Education Program**	Difference Between Teacher Growth and Student Growth in Special Education Program
2017-2018	+16.4%	Not yet available	Not yet available
2016-2017	+22.36%	+3.24%	-19.12%
2015-2016	+3.27%	+19.33%	+16.06%
2014-2015	+1.29%	+15.28%	+13.99
2013-2014	+6.89%	+14.04%	+7.15
2012-2013	NA	NA	NA

Data Sources:

\*Boerne ISD TSDS PEIMS Fall Data Submissions retrieved from OnData Suite 3/20/2018

\*\*Texas Academic Performance Reports (TAPRs), Boerne ISD District Reports, 2012-2013 through 2016-2017

**Implications:** *The data indicates growth in special education teachers surpassed growth in students who receive special education services until 2016-2017, when the trends reversed. This likely leads to the perception of all stakeholder groups that while numbers of students in special education have increased special education staffing numbers have not.*

- b. All stakeholder groups involved in elementary programming reported that the largest increase in growth of students eligible for special education services was at the age who participate in Preschool Programs for Children with Disabilities (PPCD) services (ages 3-5). Figure 2 below shows the percentage of growth of students in PPCD over the last five years (using Fall PEIMS snapshot data). Note: Full data used for this Figure is located in Appendix B.

**Figure 2**  
**PPCD Growth and Special Education Program Growth**  
**Boerne ISD**  
**2012-2013 through 2017-2018**

School Year	PPCD Student Growth Percentage	Special Education Program Student Growth Percentage
2017-2018	+8.13%	+16.4%
2016-2017	+40.98%	+22.36%
2015-2016	+15.09%	+3.27%
2014-2015	-5.35%	+1.29%
2013-2014	+30.23%	+6.89%
2012-2013	NA	NA

Data Sources:  
 Boerne ISD TSDS PEIMS Fall Data Submissions,  
 retrieved from OnData Suite 3/19/2018

**Implications:** The data above indicates that PPCD is typically growing at a faster rate (average of 17.82% over the school years above) than the overall special education population (10.04% over the school years above). It is worth noting that the overall special education population growth is inclusive of the PPCD population growth. This high PPCD population growth supports the perception of these stakeholder groups that the largest increase in growth of students eligible for special education services was at the age who participate in PPCD services. As these students move to higher grade levels, additional stakeholder groups will likely feel this same impact on staffing for evaluation, instructional, related services, and administrative positions. Additional data suggests this growth pattern is demonstrated in elementary cohorts. See Figure 3 below, which shows students who receive special education services by grade level for the last five school years (using PEIMS Fall Snapshot Data).

**Figure 3**  
**Students who Receive Special Education Services by Grade Level**  
**(Kindergarten through 12th Grade)**  
**Boerne ISD**  
**2013-2014 through 2017-2018**

Grade	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Kindergarten	21	30	33	48	62
First	35	28	28	45	47
Second	34	43	31	56	61
Third	40	38	44	48	76
Fourth	50	42	49	48	64
Fifth	44	54	43	54	68
Sixth	56	38	58	51	70
Seventh	36	61	36	57	55
Eighth	34	35	60	41	60
Ninth	35	40	35	62	45
Tenth	38	37	37	41	60
Eleventh	33	31	29	33	37
Twelfth	38	37	36	41	44

Data Source:

Boerne ISD TSDS PEIMS Fall Data Submissions retrieved from OnData Suite 3/19/2018

- c. All stakeholder groups reported that the increase in students who receive special education services was due to high rate of transfers to the district. Several stakeholders specifically stated that families are choosing to move to the district for the special education programming. *Figure 4* below shows a comparison of Boerne ISD’s mobility rate versus the State mobility rate for the last five school years.

**Figure 4**  
**Student Mobility Rates**  
**Boerne ISD and Texas**  
**2012-2013 through 2016-2017**

School Year	District Mobility Rate	State Mobility Rate	Difference Between Boerne ISD Mobility Rate and State Mobility Rate
2016-2017	8.0%	16.2%	-8.2%
2015-2016	8.3%	16.5%	-8.2%
2014-2015	8.4%	16.9%	-8.5%
2013-2014	7.9%	17.1%	-9.2%
2012-2013	9.3%	17.9%	-8.6%

Data Sources:  
 Texas Academic Performance Reports (TAPRs) Boerne ISD Campus Reports,  
 2012-2013 through 2016-2017

**Implications:** *The data above indicates that Boerne ISD’s mobility rate is approximately half of the state’s mobility rate. This shows that in general, when students transfer into the district, they remain enrolled. The low mobility rate makes it more likely that as students move to higher grade levels, additional stakeholder groups will likely feel a high impact on staffing for evaluation, instructional, related services, and administrative positions.*

Mobility rate is lower than reported by stakeholders; therefore, additional data was analyzed to examine the special education growth. *Figure 5* shows the district growth rate versus the growth of students who receive special education services for the last five school years (using PEIMS Fall Snapshot data). *Figure 6* shows the initial evaluations completed in Boerne ISD over the last five school years.

**Figure 5**  
**Boerne ISD District Enrollment Growth Rates**  
**2012-2013 through 2017-2018**

School Year	District Enrollment	District Enrollment Growth Percentage	Special Education Program Student Enrollment	Special Education Program Student Growth Percentage	Difference in Special Education Program Student Growth and District Enrollment Growth
2017-2018	8687	4.6%	809	16.4%	+11.8%
2016-2017	8300	5.04%	695	22.36%	+17.32%
2015-2016	7902	5.46%	568	3.27%	-2.19%
2014-2015	7493	3.65%	550	1.29%	-2.36%
2013-2014	7229	1.9%	543	6.89%	+4.99%
2012-2013	7094	N/A	508	NA	NA

Data Source:  
 Boerne ISD TSDS PEIMS Fall Data Submissions,  
 retrieved from OnData Suite 3/19/2018

**Figure 6**  
**Initial Evaluations for Special Education Services**  
**Boerne ISD**  
**2012-2013 through 2016-2017**

School Year	Number of Initial Evaluations Completed (ages 3-21)*	Number of Referrals from Part C/ECI Referred to District**
2016-2017	167	10
2015-2016	163	15
2014-2015	106	8
2013-2014	86	5
2012-2013	91	10

Data Sources:  
 Boerne ISD SPP Indicator 11\* & 12\*\* Submissions,  
 retrieved 3/19/2018

**Implications:** *The data in Figure 5 indicates that growth of students who receive special education services is greater than the overall district growth. It is worth noting that the overall district population growth is inclusive of the special education growth. The data in Figure 6 indicates that the largest amount of growth in initial referrals coming from existing students within the district. Mobility rates do not appear to be the largest factor affecting the growth rate of the special education population in Boerne ISD.*

- 4) It was reported that there is a high number of students who receive speech services. It was further reported that both the caseload and the workload of Speech Language Pathologists (SLPs) has increased in the last several years.
- The speech services and speech evaluations for this population are distributed amongst nine FTEs currently (one of which is a speech-language pathology assistants (SLPA)).
  - Seven full time SLPs are responsible for the full ARD process, for all students who receive speech services only.
  - Seven full time SLPs are also responsible for service provision, including IEP progress monitoring of speech services for students who receive other speech services, as well as Medicaid billing, if applicable, for services provided.

Figure 7 below shows the total percentage of students who are eligible for special education services and receiving speech services (speech indicator codes 1 and 2 for the last five school years (using Fall PEIMS Snapshot Data), with a comparison to regional data. Figure 8 below shows the growth of students in Boerne ISD who receive speech services by the last five school years (using Fall Public Education Information Management Service (PEIMS) Snapshot Data). Note: Full data used for these Figures, including specific numbers and the breakdown of students by Speech Indicator Code, are in Appendix C.

**Figure 7**  
**Students Receiving Speech Services\***  
**Boerne ISD and Region 20**  
**2013-2014 through 2017-2018**

School Year	District Percentage of Students Receiving Speech Services	Region 20 Percentage Students Receiving Speech Services	Difference Between District and Region 20 Percentage of Students Receiving Speech Services
2017-2018	51.1%	48.2%	+2.9%
2016-2017	50%	47.9%	+2.1%
2015-2016	44.7%	47.5%	+0.2%
2014-2015	42%	47.1%	-5.1%
2013-2014	46.9%	47.6%	-0.07%

Data Source:  
Boerne ISD TSDS PEIMS Fall Data Submissions,  
retrieved from OnData Suite 3/19/2018

\*data only includes students who are eligible for special education services and receiving speech services (speech indicator codes 1 & 2)

**Figure 8**  
**Student Growth - Students Receiving Speech Services and Overall Students Receiving Special Education Services\***  
**Boerne ISD**  
**2012-2013 through 2017-2018**

School Year	Growth Percentage of Students Receiving Speech Services	Growth Percentage of Students Receiving Special Education Services
2017-2018	+19.02%	+16.4%
2016-2017	+37.15%	+22.36%
2015-2016	+9.52%	+3.27%
2014-2015	-9.41%	+1.29%
2013-2014	+19.71%	+6.89%
2012-2013	NA	NA

Data Source:

Boerne ISD TSDS PEIMS Fall Data Submissions,  
retrieved from OnData Suite 3/19/2018

\*data only includes students who are eligible for special education services and receiving speech services (speech indicator codes 1 & 2)

**Implications:** *The data in Figure 7 indicates an increase in the Boerne ISD percentage of students who receive speech services over the last four school years. The district numbers compared the regional numbers do not show a large disparity, but do indicate a potential trend over the last three years of the district surpassing the regional average. The data in Figures 8 above indicates that students who receive speech therapy is typically growing at a faster rate (average of 15.19% over the school years above) than the overall special education population (10.04% over the school years above). It is worth noting that the overall special education population growth is inclusive of the speech population growth. This high speech population growth supports the perception of these stakeholder groups of the large number of students receiving speech services.*

- 5) Many stakeholder groups reported that students who receive special education services are clustered in general education classes due to special education staff scheduling for inclusive/co-teach services. This was reported as having the following results:
- Some general education classes end up with 50% or more of special education students. Some secondary campuses reported that students who had modified content and were served in general education settings were on the special education teacher's roster while other secondary campuses reported these students were on the general education teacher's roster. These separate sections in the system sometimes hid the student ratios as well as the total number of students in the classroom.
  - When students move from class to class, especially at the secondary level, they sometimes remain with the same peer group for most/all classes due to this clustering, resulting in student disputes; and
  - If a service provider's schedule is changed due to a student needing more intensive support and/or a newly enrolled student causing a campus schedule change because a specific service or instructional setting is not available on that campus, a large number of students are potentially missing IEP-required services.

***Implications:*** While there is no legal requirement on student ratios in a general education setting (outside of the PPCD setting), the impacts e overall district culture and climate which ultimately impacts teacher burnout and student services as well as student behavior. Regarding the potential for students to miss services, IDEA-B 34 CFR §300.17 (d) requires that a student must receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) with services delivered in conformity with his/her IEP. Failure to do so could result in parent complaint, due process or judicial proceedings and potentially require the district to provide compensatory services.

## **Considerations/Recommendations:**

- Consider analyzing the use of evaluation staff for campus duties based on the highly specialized training and background required for their professional licensure.
  - Contact the ESC-20 Evaluation Specialist for technical assistance, if needed.
- Consider creating a process to continuously examine staffing needs that may evolve throughout the year due to changing student needs and placements. This process needs to include campus administrators and be based on the IEP-prescribed services of students. This should include looking at trending student cohort growth to help project future staffing needs.
  - The following free resources are available on the ESC-20 website at: [https://www.esc20.net/page/ci\\_se.StaffingConsiderations](https://www.esc20.net/page/ci_se.StaffingConsiderations)
    - Special Education Staffing Analysis & Accompanying Instructions
    - Weighted Caseload Worksheet
    - OT, PT, and SLP Caseload Considerations
- Consider development, implementation, and training of a consistent process on scheduling for students who receive special education services in general education settings. This should include a consistent process for assigning students to teacher rosters with consideration as new students enter the district or as needs change.
- Consider analyzing the current duties of the Special Education Director and Assistant Director to ensure adequate time to develop, disseminate, and monitor implementation of all special education procedures consistently throughout the district.
- Consider how best to manage the increasing growth in early childhood and speech evaluations and provision of these services. This might include utilization of a caseload and workload analysis at the district level.
  - Contact the ESC-20 PPDC Team for technical assistance, if needed.
  - Contact the ESC-20 Speech Specialist for technical assistance, if needed.

# Appendix A: Complete Student Enrollment and Teacher Data

The following data was used in Trend 3, Finding 3a (Figure 1).

**Figure A1**  
**Boerne ISD, Region 20, and State**  
**Special Education Enrollment Percentages**  
**2012-2013 through 2017-2018**

School Year	District Enrollment*	District Special Education Program Enrollment*	District Percentage of Students Receiving Special Education Services	District Percentage of Students Receiving Special Education Services**	State Percentage of Students Receiving Special Education Services**
2017-2018	8687	809	8.37%	Not yet available	Not yet available
2016-2017	8300	695	8.37%	9.8%	8.6%
2015-2016	7902	568	7.18%	9.6%	8.6%
2014-2015	7493	550	7.34%	9.5%	8.5%
2013-2014	7229	543	7.51%	9.4%	8.5%
2012-2013	7094	508	7.16%	9.5%	8.5%

Data Sources:

\*Boerne ISD TSDS PEIMS Fall Data Submissions, retrieved from OnData Suite 3/19/2018

\*\*Texas Academic Performance Reports (TAPRs), Region 20 Reports 2012-2013 through 2016-2017 Region 20 Reports

**Figure A2**  
**Boerne ISD, Region 20, and State**  
**Special Education Teacher Percentages**  
**2012-2013 through 2016-2017**

School Year	District Special Education Teacher FTEs*	District Special Education Teacher Percentage *	Region 20 Special Education Teacher Percentage**	State Special Education Teacher Percentage**
2016-2017	66.9	12.9%	8.6%	9.8%
2015-2016	64.8	13%	9.1%	9.6%
2014-2015	54.3	11.5%	9.5%	9.5%
2013-2014	47.1	10.4%	10.6%	9.4%
2012-2013	41.3	9.4%	10.6%	9.5%

Data Sources:

\*Texas Academic Performance Reports (TAPRs), Boerne ISD District Reports  
2012-2013 through 2016-2017

\*\*Texas Academic Performance Reports (TAPRs), Region 20 Reports  
2012-2013 through 2016-2017

## Appendix B: Complete PPCD Student Enrollment Data

The following data was used in Trend 3, Finding 3b (Figure 2).

**Figure B1**

### PPCD Population Percentage of Special Education Population Boerne ISD, Region 20, and State 2012-2013 through 2017-2018

School Year	District Number of PPCD Students *	District PPCD Percentage of Special Education Population*	Region 20 PPCD Percentage of Special Education Population**	State PPCD Percentage of Special Education Population**
2017-2018	93	11.50%	Not yet available	Not yet available
2016-2017	86	12.37%	Not yet available	Not yet available
2015-2016	61	10.74%	9.88%	9.44%
2014-2015	53	9.66%	9.45%	9.43%
2013-2014	56	10.31%	9.76%	9.65%
2012-2013	43	8.46%	10.07%	10.00%

Data Sources:

\*Boerne ISD TSDS PEIMS Fall Data Submissions,  
retrieved from OnData Suite 3/19/2018

\*\*TEAL Application Special Education Adhoc Reporting System,  
retrieved 3/19/2018

# Appendix C: Complete Speech Student Enrollment Data

The following data was used in Trend 3, Finding 4 (Figures 7 and 8).

**Figure C1**  
**Students Receiving Speech Services\***  
**Boerne ISD**  
**2013-2014 through 2017-2018**

School Year	District Total Students Receiving Special Education Services	Students Receiving Only Speech Services (Speech Indicator 1)	Speech only %	Students Receiving Speech and Additional SE Services (Speech Indicator 2)	Speech and Additional Services %	Total Students Receiving Speech Services	Total % of Students Receiving Speech Services
2017-2018	809	166	20.5%	247	30.6%	413	51.1%
2016-2017	695	136	19.6%	211	30.4%	347	50%
2015-2016	568	85	15.1%	168	29.6%	253	44.7%
2014-2015	550	80	14.5%	151	27.5%	231	42%
2013-2014	543	86	15.8%	169	31.1%	255	46.9%

Data Source:  
Boerne ISD TSDS PEIMS Fall Data Submissions,  
retrieved from OnData Suite 3/19/2018

\*data only includes students who are eligible for special education services and receiving speech services

**Figure C2**  
**Students Receiving Speech Services\***  
**Region 20**  
**2013-2014 through 2017-2018**

School Year	Speech only % (Speech Indicator 1)	Speech and Additional SE Services % (Speech Indicator 2)	Total % Receiving Speech Services Region 20
2017-2018	19%	29.2%	48.2%
2016-2017	19.3%	28.6%	47.9%
2015-2016	19.2%	28.3%	47.5%
2014-2015	19.2%	27.9%	47.1%
2013-2014	19.5%	28%	47.6%

Data Source:  
Region 20 (aggregate total) TSDS PEIMS Fall Data Submissions,  
retrieved from OnData Suite 3/19/2018

\*data only includes students who are eligible for special education services and receiving speech services