



Vision

*All students in Colorado will become educated and productive citizens capable of succeeding in society, the workforce, and life.*

Goals

*Every student, every step of the way*



Meeting Logistics & Desired Outcomes

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Special Education Fiscal Advisory Committee (SEFAC)</b>			
<b>Date:</b>	<b>April 5, 2017</b>	<b>Time:</b>	<b>9:30-4:30</b>	<b>Location:</b> <b>Englewood SD Board Room, 4101 S. Bannock, Englewood, 80110</b>
<b>Meeting Lead:</b>	Vicki Graham, Jon Paul Burden			
<b>Meeting Participants:</b>	Heather Abraham, Sarah Belleau, Kim Boylan, Jon Paul Burden, <del>Callan Clark</del> , <del>Tamara Durbin</del> , <del>Samantha Gallagher</del> , Barb Goldsby, Vicki Graham, Tammy Johnson, <del>Toby King</del> , Nita McAuliffe, <del>Mark Rydberg</del> , Carolena Steen			
<b>Meeting Objectives:</b>	Review In-AU and Out-of-District High Cost applications			

Agenda Items and Next Steps

Time	Agenda Item	Notes & Next Steps <i>(be sure to include communication to those not at the meeting who need to know the results)</i>
9:30	Announcements	
10:00	Review of applications (discussion as applications are reviewed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For next year, provide a Master sheet checklist of IAU and OOD of the rankings to use as a checklist for the teams to check off as they review.</li> <li>Salary disparity throughout the state (teachers in Alamosa make \$30,000 a year vs. Cherry Creek, Boulder, etc.) harder to meet the threshold that way, but the impact is greater.</li> <li>For application review, put into one of three categories: Approved. Deduct. More information needed.</li> <li>For next year's webinar: stress sending both IEPs, creating a checklist as the apps and supporting documents come in so there's more time to get documents uploaded and not coming in at the last minute. A "cheat sheet" to help AUs determine if a child should meet thresholds: having a 1:1 para, transportation, etc.</li> <li>Ensure IEP and billing alignment match. Ensure the IEP dates are broken down and articulated correctly on the staff calculation page.</li> <li>Ensure that the teacher FTE is actually broken up by number of students served – listing 1 creates a flag on our part.</li> <li>How do we list para services on the IEP? Especially 1:1 or more intensive services?</li> <li>Do we need to have the supporting documents redacted?</li> <li>CSDB: would it be an OOD and how would that work for districts outside of CO Springs?</li> <li>Behavior specialists are not specified in IEPs. Direct vs. indirect</li> </ul>



		<p>clarification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research electronic storage for collections – DMS + encrypted flash drives? Maintain 5 years + current year.</li> <li>• Discrepancies with Denver Children’s Home’s invoices, difficult to determine their rate. They delineate Academic services, PPR amount and Para amount to arrive at grand totals. How does the committee feel about this? New Directors may not know they can question and refuse certain charges, or get a breakdown of what “educational costs” or “academic services” are.</li> </ul>
12:00	Working Lunch	
12:30-4:15	Continuation of application review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student who’s application has 1/6 of the para’s charges, wouldn’t the teacher’s charges also be split 1/6? What would happen if the student left? There doesn’t seem to be consistency when a student is part of a BOCES versus a single district.</li> <li>• 4 day school weeks – do they sometimes go longer than 160 days? Or 144 days?</li> <li>• CDE sets a daily rate for facility schools for the school year as well as other educational costs daily rate, but not an ESY rate. High cost does not allow other educational costs but some facilities charge ESY as the daily rate plus the other educational costs, if it is not broken out as both costs, and shows just a single rate for ESY, Jon Paul says they have allowed it, but, not if it is broken out.</li> </ul>
4:15-4:30	Next steps and plan for next meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible half day meeting for follow-up and review for new apps that are now going to rank?</li> <li>• Session at a Directors meeting – look at the IEPs yourself and make sure the breakdowns match between application and IEP details. 90% of these applications were missing the IEPs for the full year. Are they necessary? The instructions do cover most of these situations on how much of the IEP is necessary. All IEPs in this fiscal year is the decision. The committee wants consistency.</li> <li>• Collecting through the DMS is secure; is redaction necessary? Should SEFAC put together a confidentiality statement that everyone signs and provides to all the districts? Everyone is acting on behalf of CDE. Committee unanimously agrees.</li> <li>• Make sure contracts and invoices get submitted.</li> <li>• Too many questions about paras and teacher’s time breakdown in the application and not having that detail in the IEP to match it up.</li> <li>• Small districts who incur costs like measuring cups for one student who does have disabilities, can’t claim the costs because the measuring cups can be used by all students. Equipment and supplies must be specific for the particular student and would not be purchased if the student were not enrolled in the district.</li> <li>• Decisions: submission deadline and Q&amp;A deadline...if information isn’t submitted, it’s not funded. Apps considered as is. Do we need to play hardball about final application amendments? Enforce a Hard Stop Date.</li> <li>• Double check the directions. Add a file checklist cover sheet for AUs to ensure all elements are uploaded.</li> <li>• Applications under the thresholds will not be accepted.</li> <li>• For the larger districts, we could encourage them to submit applications and in the off-chance, one or two students rank, then we can request the supplemental documentation.</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One vacancy – SE (Lynette Steinhoff/Canon City) Consortium needs to make a recommendation to SBOE fill the vacancy. Jon Paul will bring it up to the Consortium on Friday, 4/7/17.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

Evaluate the Meeting:		
We stayed on track:	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes
We achieved the meeting outcomes:	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes
We clarified next steps:	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes
This meeting was time well-spent:	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes

How can we improve the next meeting?