



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>September 28, 2017</b>	<b>Time:</b>	<b>9:00-4:00</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>Englewood SD Board Room</b>
<b>Meeting Lead:</b>	Vicki Graham, Jon Paul Burden				
<b>Meeting Participants:</b>	Heather Abraham, Sarah Belleau, Kim Boylan, Jon Paul Burden, Callan Clark, Tamara Durbin, Paul Foster, Samantha Gallagher, Barb Goldsby, Vicki Graham, Tammy Johnson, Nita McAuliffe, Mark Rydberg, Carolena Steen, Lynnette Steinhoff				
<b>Meeting Objectives:</b>	16-17 Debrief and Legislative Report preparation and discussion				

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>
9:00	Announcements and history of SEFAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome to Lynnette Steinhoff and Dr. Paul Foster</li> <li>Committee started in 2006, the work began in 2004 to get funding for high cost. Purpose was not only to get extra funding for high cost students, but also to capture data. In 2016, the committee was “sunset”, had to go back to the Legislature to continue, approval was granted for 5 years. If current public school funding models get completely redone, it could impact SEFAC. The high cost reimbursements happen a year after the fact, which doesn’t help build anything. Only a 1/3 of AUs actually get money, which is a short win, not a long win for students. Increase Tier A to \$1500 to reflect the CPE of Denver-Greeley. Tier B doubled to around \$2000, but is going down because of more students. Encouraging more applications for data and also to spread the money further. There isn’t much incentive yet. Streamlining could be problematic by not getting enough data.</li> <li>The Consortium may conduct a high cost survey to the field. At first the Consortium wasn’t inclined, arguing the data wouldn’t be meaningful. Good data is valuable. Colorado School Finance Project and Colorado Supreme Court’s decisions regarding financing and the impact of growth. The funding gap continues to widen.</li> </ul>
9:15	16-17 debrief and what we’ve learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>High Cost application webinar</b> was beneficial; will conduct another webinar for January, before application releases in early February. Flow-chart of “Funding Likelihood” to be shared during webinar. Webinar will be pre-recorded this year and we’ll conduct “office hours” for follow-up. Discussions about lessening the burden of completing the apps. What’s the average number of applications that actually do get funded? Is there some way to capture the data without having dozens and dozens of apps submitted? Making this a 2-step process could be helpful...perhaps a spreadsheet instead of an application? The applications involve several staff members in getting the information. Collecting the supporting documentation is very time-consuming as well. Having a spreadsheet that districts could use to project their costs,</li> </ul>



		<p>and ultimately help them decide which students should be submitted in the applications. The simpler, the better, especially now because more responsibilities are being given to fewer staff to save money. Vicki could compose a projected percentage per district. Make it very clear that the spreadsheet is NOT a high cost application, only a guide to inform and also collect preliminary information and if that data is valuable. 6 % of students in the state have autism, it's 9% in Poudre, making a big impact. This spreadsheet would be a tool for the districts, but if we collect that information, we need EDAC approval. Would this spreadsheet be a duplication of effort? Is it the charge of SEFAC to collect this information? Statute doesn't direct to collect, or not collect. SSN programs alone could probably show thresholds are being met because salaries are higher than 2006. If a particular student left the district, that program or para would dissolve. If this, then that type of guidance. Averaging costs of all paras is not accurate. Each one-on-one para needs to be attached to one application. The overall costs of doing business has increased, Tier B funding has gone down. The committee's recommendations to the state legislature have gone nowhere. Smaller districts with no center-based programs have a unique hardship in meeting LRE requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Redacting supporting documentation – outcome of discussion with Jill Stacey, Data Privacy Analyst.</b> Received confidentiality documents from all committee members.</li> <li>• <b>Any suggested deletions, additions or changes to the application?</b> Materials: anything that was asked for reimbursement should be documented in the IEPs, but because of lack of center-based programs, some materials are needed and not specifically in the IEPs. Guidance about scenarios like measuring cups in math instruction, how to get reimbursed for costs like these? Not a consumable, could be used over and over for other students...if the student wasn't there, would measuring cups be purchased? Could be used for gen ed students. This can get foggy – an iPad can be reused, if the student moves, but I wouldn't have purchased the iPad if the student weren't here.</li> <li>• <b>Discuss PPR reduction in funding formula – pros and cons – decision/vote?</b> Little districts get a lower rate, reimbursement for PPR shouldn't be awarded. PPR is based on equalization, though. What are districts responsible for and what exceeds that? That's all that should be reimbursed. What if the formula stays, but we back out the state average of \$10,000 at the very end? It seems more equitable to apply to all applications. Don't deduct PPR, get the final number, then deduct the state average? Committee wants to see those scenarios. Don't back out PPR, because expenditures aren't Gen Ed. Want to incentivize efficiency. Vicki will put together scenarios for next meeting to inform whether thresholds need adjustment, and PPR reduction.</li> <li>• <b>Create a Standards of Review for April's meeting – what raises red flags during application review? Begin documentation for review standards.</b> Goal is to have consistency. Many IPEs were too vague to support various claims. Bolstering the guidance is a step in the right direction. Add in language in the instructions that the committee will be looking for that specific evidence. If the IEP indicates the need for adult supervision, if this is provided as evidence of a 1-to-1 para, we will need further clarification. Articulate that this is a unique need. This cost would disappear if the student left. The IEP should be clear about the unique needs of this student. The committee recognizes the difficulty and challenges with getting this type of specificity in the IEPs. These needs can appear in different areas of the IEP. Everyone who reviews the applications have different approaches, but ultimately the committee won't question an IEP team. With such high turnover of Directors, this could be a good breakout session for a Directors meeting, fall would be ideal before the high cost application process begins in January-February. Also discuss Educational Orphans. Vicki will work on adding language to the instructions for the committee to review at the next meeting.</li> </ul>
--	--	---



---

12:00	Working Lunch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Legislative report</li></ul>
12:00-3:45	Focus on Legislative Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Work on legislative report – Tier B has been fairly stable, can the committee look at the past 3 or 4 years or so? Would it be beneficial to put the Recommendations portion at the beginning of the report? That would put the emphasis where the legislators would see it right away. Use more actionable words, be more direct. We are back to 13-14 funding levels...wrong direction. Delicate balance in not being too negative in the wording and directives. Focus on requesting more money should be to benefit all, not the few.</li></ul>
3:45-4:00	Good of the Order and plan for next meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Conclusion of the Legislative Report – final touches.</li><li>• October 26<sup>th</sup> meeting will be a Zoom meeting instead of in-person.</li></ul>