

Richard E. Shapiro, Esq.  
Richard E. Shapiro, LLC  
5 Mapleton Road  
(609) 919-1888

Special Counsel For Intervenors-Movants  
Boards of Education of City of Bridgeton,  
Burlington City, City of East Orange,  
City of Elizabeth, Gloucester City,  
Keansburg Borough, City of Passaic,  
State-Operated School District of Paterson,  
Pemberton Township, City of Perth Amboy,  
Town of Phillipsburg and  
City of Trenton

RAYMOND ARTHUR ABBOTT, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs

v.

FRED G. BURKE, ET AL.,

Defendants

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY

DOCKET NO. 42,170

CIVIL ACTION

**CERTIFICATION OF JOHN M. RODECKER**

John M. Rodecker, of full age, hereby certifies as follows:

1. I am the Superintendent of the City of Perth Amboy School District ("District"), which is designated an Abbott district under this Court's Abbott rulings. I make this Certification in support of the Motions of the Movants-Intervenors: (1) to intervene in this action in opposition to the State's motion for a Court Order declaring that the School

Reform Funding Act of 2008 ("SFRA") is constitutional and that the Abbott remedial orders are no longer required; and (2) for an immediate Order that the procedural protections established by Abbott v. Burke, 153 N.J. 480, 526-27 (1998), including the right of Abbott districts to seek on appeal additional funding based on a showing of demonstrated or particularized need, shall remain in effect pending a final decision on the State's Motion.

2. I have overall responsibility for implementing the Abbott programs and reforms in the District to enable all students to achieve the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards ("NJCCCS"). This includes the submission of requests in prior years for supplemental funding, based on a demonstration of particularized need, to support existing and supplemental programs, services and positions, as well as additional, demonstrably-needed programs, services and positions. The District has also sought such additional funding through the Abbott V administrative and judicial process when the Department of Education ("DOE") denied needed funding.

3. I am familiar with the demographics of the District and our student population that support the continuation of the Abbott designation, with the features of our schools that are

very different from the hypothetical school district that provides the foundation for the SFRA's formulas, with the supplemental programs and services that have been successful in the districts, with the District's prior experience in requesting supplemental funding and appealing DOE denials of that funding, and with the impact of the SFRA on the education of our students in the coming years.

4. In past years, when the District sought supplemental funding, the District and the DOE worked collaboratively to reach agreement on a supplemental funding amount that would support the District's DOE-approved budget, which included funding for effective and efficient needs-based programs, services and positions. This process enabled the District and the DOE to engage in a constructive dialogue about the educational needs of our students and to discuss specific programs, positions and services that would be needed to help our students achieve the CCCS and to overcome their socio-economic disadvantages.

5. In those few instances when the District and the DOE could not reach agreement on the appropriate amount of supplemental funding, the District had the opportunity to seek review of DOE's decision through the administrative and judicial process established by the Court and by the DOE

regulations.

6. The opportunity to discuss with the DOE the need for supplemental funding for specific programs, services and positions needed for our students, and the ability to have full administrative and judicial due process to challenge DOE denials of that needed funding, have been integral to the District's efforts to provide our students with a thorough and efficient education. Supplemental funding has also been essential to meet important needs of our students so that they can overcome the significant impediments to education as a result of their socio-economic disadvantages and benefit from the District's educational programs.

7. Contrary to the DOE's claims in the motion, the administrative and judicial appeals process has successfully worked to facilitate a productive dialogue between the DOE and our District on supplemental funding needs for our students. The mandated funding formula dictated by the SFRA provides no opportunity for the District to seek additional funding based on the demonstrable needs of our students, no matter how substantial or compelling the needs of our students are and no matter how great the obstacles that they must still overcome to benefit from our educational program.

8. Our students will suffer if the formulaic amounts

fail to provide the needed funding for programs, services and positions that are essential for our students' success. If the SFRA will provide the needed funding, as the DOE claims, to continue all of the programs, services and positions to address the special disadvantages of our students, then there would be few, if any appeals. However, if the SFRA fails to provide that funding, then the effect of the statute is to deprive the District and its students of the fundamental right to seek additional funding to meet those needs. I do not perceive any educational justification for a curtailment in the SFRA of the due process right to seek demonstrably needed funding for our students.

9. I was quite surprised to learn that the DOE viewed the supplemental funding process as fostering an "adversarial relationship." I had always viewed the process as an opportunity for collaboration to determine the programs, services and positions required to meet the needs of our disadvantaged students. I am not aware of anything during this process that has impeded the ability of the District and the DOE to work together on a variety of issues to increase the opportunity for our students to receive a thorough and efficient education and to facilitate the ability of the District to operate in an efficient and fiscally responsible

manner.

10. Although the State claims changes in the Abbott districts, the District remains in District Factor Group ("DFG") A, based on 2000 data, which is the same DFG the District was in at the time of the original Abbott designation. The District's poverty concentration, according to the DOE still exceeds 60% (it is approximately 80.4), and, as Professor Goertz explains in her Certification, the District still possesses the requisite demographic, economic and educational characteristics for Abbott designation.

11. I am not aware of any State Board, DOE or legislative study or analysis of the criteria for Abbott designation that would justify the elimination of the District from the list of poorer urban districts designated as Abbott districts. I am also not aware of any State Board, DOE or legislative study that would support the ability of the local taxpayers in this District to provide the local fair share contemplated by the SFRA without resulting in municipal overburden.

12. I examined the single model district -- the large K-12 district -- that the DOE utilized to develop the SFRA base cost amount, as well as the at-risk funding "weight." The model district that served as the basis for SFRA's adequacy budget is not representative of the actual size and

configuration of the schools in the District. There are assumptions about the hypothetical school district that do not match the reality of our school district. For example, the model district has a projected Limited English Proficient ("LEP") population of 6.2% while the district's LEP population is 14.7%.

13. The major differences between the SFRA model district and the District are in the student enrollment and the number of elementary, middle, and high schools within this District. These differences are as follows:

- (a) The SFRA model district assumes a total student enrollment of 5,240 students for the district. The District's total regular education student enrollment is 8,671.
- (b) The SFRA model district has six elementary schools of 400 students each; the District has 5 elementary schools of 718 students each.
- (c) The two middle schools of 600 students each in the SFRA model district are not reflective of the District's 2 middle school(s) of 1,314 students each.
- (d) The SFRA model district's one high school with 1,640 students does not resemble the 1 high school(s) in the District with 2,323 students.

14. Although the DOE claims that the resources in its SFRA formulaic model exceed the resources necessary for a district to implement the Abbott V Chart of Supplemental Programs and Services, there are programs and services that are not identified as inputs in the SFRA model, but that are currently in place in the District. For example, the DOE failed to input early literacy reading blocks and assessment in determining the cost of providing a thorough and efficient education for at-risk students. These early literacy reading programs have been instrumental in boosting our achievement scores in the elementary grades. In the District, early literacy reading blocks and assessment are implemented in 5 elementary schools and this program has resource requirements, which are not accounted for in the SFRA formula.

15. The SFRA "at risk" inputs also fail to include, among others, the following positions that the District needs to serve at-risk children: community services coordinators in middle and high school; school-to-work and college transition counselor(s)/program in the high school; and an enriched nutrition program for breakfast and lunch to enable our students to be ready to learn.

16. The SFRA formulaic inputs also fails to include adequate funding for the "exemplary programs" for art, music



and special education in the District, which were identified by the Court in Abbott V as requiring special protection. Nor do the SFRA inputs provide funding for the technology positions and other technology needs and enhancements to help our students master the CCCS and compete with their peers in the wealthier districts.

17. The SFRA model district only allocates one social worker to an elementary, middle and high school, respectively, while the District has and needs 5 social workers in the elementary schools, but has no social workers in the middle schools or the high school because of the lack of funding.

18. The SFRA at-risk weight is based on an input of one parent liaison at the elementary, and no resources for parent involvement in middle and high schools. In the District, parent involvement is critical for recruiting parents to join parent participation programs, fostering parenting skills and career development, and increasing parental education to support student learning at home. There are currently 5 parent liaisons at the elementary level, 2 parent liaisons at the middle school, and 1 parent liaison at the high school.

19. The SFRA model does not include any of the additional resources or costs related to elementary Whole School Reform ("WSR") or to the mandated Secondary Education Initiative

("SEI") in middle and high schools. Elementary WSR requires implementation of a model program or alternative design, and SEI consists of establishing smaller learning communities within schools; providing ongoing support to students and their families; and increasing the academic rigor of curriculum and instruction. In the District, the elementary schools have implemented whole school reform models. The SEI is implemented in both the middle and high schools in my district. However, there is no input in the SFRA for the additional costs relating to these educational programs.

20. The implementation of required Abbott programs and reforms has already resulted in progress in the District:

- Bilingual Education program was selected as model by DOE;
- McGinnis Middle School was named a "Benchmark" School by New Jersey Chamber of Commerce;
- 4 of 5 elementary schools achieved adequate yearly progress under the No Child Left Behind Act;
- 10% increase in High School LEP test scores; and
- E.J. Patten named national Title I distinguished school.

21. Despite this progress, the District still requires the Abbott remedies and adequate funding to meet the special

needs of our students and to overcome their severe disadvantages.

22. In addition, improvements in the more advanced grades are just beginning. The DOE, in response to the Abbott X, mediation agreement, only just established the SEI in 2005 and its implementation in middle and high schools in Abbott districts is starting to have a positive educational impact at these levels.

23 Under the SFRA, the cuts in the District's overall budget will be even more drastic in the next two school years, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. As a result, more and more current approved foundational and supplemental programs, services, and positions will need to be cut.

24. I am also concerned that because of SFRA's approach to special education, the District will be unable to raise sufficient local fair share to meet additional special education expenses and will be compelled to reallocate regular education funding, at-risk funding and other SFRA revenues from our already strapped budgets to satisfy the federal and state mandates for special education. In the past, the District could seek supplemental funding to address those special education needs and to avoid reallocations from the budgets for regular education and supplemental programs, services and

positions. That opportunity is no longer available to the District under the SFRA.

25. Without the ability to demonstrate the need for Abbott supplemental funding, the District will likely have no alternative but to reduce and/or eliminate needed programs, services and positions/staff in 2008-09, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 in order to address budget shortfalls under the SFRA. As the transitional "adjustment aid" decreases or is not appropriated (since there is no assurance of such aid), reliance on local fair share increases, and budget shortfalls grow, the District faces the realistic prospect of eliminating all the Abbott remedial positions, programs and services and losing all the gains in educational programs, services, positions and progress obtained under the Abbott remedial mandates.

26. Since the implementation of the Abbott mandates, the DOE has never analyzed or assessed in the District the implementation, effectiveness or costs of foundational and supplemental programs, services, and positions required and demonstrably needed for our students. Therefore, I do not understand how the DOE, without actual data on the needs and realities in the Abbott districts, could have arrived at a formulaic base amount for regular education or at the formulaic

weight for providing those additional programs, services and positions needed to meet our students' disadvantages with sufficient accuracy to deprive us of any right to appeal for additional, needed funding.

27. In sum, the SFRA formulaic approach requires the District to make severe and drastic cuts in programs services and positions that will prevent us from implementing the Abbott mandates, requires the abandonment or reduction of current programs, services and positions to implement the Abbott mandates, threatens the progress we have made in this District under the Abbott decisions, and precludes the District from seeking supplemental funding for demonstrably needed programs and services for our students beyond what the SFRA formulas allow.

I hereby certify that the foregoing statements made by me are true. I am aware that if any of the foregoing statements are willfully false, I am subject to punishment.



John M. Rodecker

Dated: May 13, 2008