



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

Meeting:	Special Education Fiscal Advisory Committee (SEFAC)
Date:	April 5, 2018 Time 9:00-4:00
Meeting Lead:	Vicki Graham, Jon Paul Burden
Meeting Participants:	Heather Abraham, Sarah Belleau, Kim Boylan, Moira Blake, Jon Paul Burden, Callan Clark, Tamara Durbin, Paul Foster, Samantha Gallagher, Vicki Graham, Tammy Johnson, Nita McAuliffe, Mark Rydberg, Carolena Steen, Lynnette Steinhoff
Meeting Objectives:	Review IAU and OOD 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>
9:00	Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions of committee members.
9:15-??	Application Review/Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the committee meet right after the deadline to review the initial submissions? Applications are largely incomplete right off the bat. Should incomplete applications not be considered? Committee does not want to meet right after the deadline to do initial reviews. The Special Ed Directors' meeting would be a good place to emphasize the importance of complete applications. The applications are burdensome, but is it too extreme to just reject them without giving the district an opportunity to provide what's missing? Could the committee create a review window before the deadline to give the districts time to have the applications checked and gather all information before the deadline? One application can involve several people, the process is very complex, intentions are good, but there will be human error. Typically the business managers start the process, which has become more complex. CDE reviewing the applications first is equitable, and consistent. How can the committee collect the information, make it less burdensome, but still accountable. You're looking in the rearview mirror of looking at the service for the student from a year prior. Facility Schools not being in Enrich adds another layer of difficulty. Can the timeframe be expanded? Add time for error reviews? Probably not because of all other due dates involved with ranking the applications, doesn't give much room to move. Should the application be available in July to begin looking at who the high cost students are, still wouldn't be submitted until after the Audited Expenditures are submitted, but it would give districts more time to work on the apps and have them on their radar. March 1 deadline for Audited Expenditures is for the districts, School Finance still needs some time before they are released to us. Could the deadline be moved to February 1st? Spring break always falls in the window of when follow-up information is needed. Rankings still can't be run until after March 1st. The State Board submission process is more cumbersome and time-consuming, allocations must be submitted to the SBOE in May for June allocations. We do leave decisions up to the committee. Statute



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>
		<p>reads that the applications would be reviewed by the committee. How much extra follow-up is truly needed? Could deadlines be staged per region so an initial review could be done as they are submitted, not having all of them due on the same day? What can be reasonably assumed with expenditures? A \$93,000 related service provider SHOULD have a contract...does the committee absolutely have to see it? Instructions have always included the request for contracts, invoices, both IEPs, the statute reads that they can't get more than they paid. Should districts be asked to prorate based on the IEP in place for the majority of the year? Should there be a "snapshot" date like December count? That could work against districts too. Local policy would be in place and we know that a contract would be in place. Since other educational costs are not reimbursed, how would the committee know the rates without seeing the contract? Having a review period could be helpful, maybe more ESSU people could be trained to review in the weeks after the deadline. Having the application ready in July, and having it on the radar could be really helpful...districts know who their high cost students are, granted there will be a few who move in and move out, but there would be time to adjust. Transportation is the biggest issue, finding notes, invoices, etc is still cumbersome. What tools could CDE provide to the districts to help collect everything? Convincing reviewers of the expenses is defensive and difficult.</p>
12:00pm	Working Lunch/Application Review/Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OOD – No contract for ESY – is it safe to assume there was a contract with Firefly that wasn't included? Benefit of the doubt that there is a contract? • Student that is wheelchair-bound usually needs para support on the bus, if the para was charged completely to the one student, there might need to be more specificity in the IEP.
	Application Review/Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application could be reformatted to resemble the IEP Service Delivery grid. Could affect how the hourly rate would apply and calculate. • Deadhead time in bus routes in special transportation really CAN be high miles, high driver and bus aide salaries. • Supplies and equipment – fence on a playground...permanent structure, not specific to one student, not allowable for reimbursement. • Seeing the comments in the spreadsheets is valuable...it shows a trend that IAU, a lot of the comments were about bus driver salaries, ESY, aides on the buses not supported in IEP, costs related to a BCBA, bus route miles being prorated. Because one student might live 92 miles from the Center-Based program, the other students aren't riding the bus that long. • ESY really muddies the waters in the IAU applications. Because ESY falls at the very beginning and very end of the year. • This last year, districts passed bond and mill levies, budgets went up – that affects high cost applications that meet thresholds. Mill levies WILL affect, not bonds. • Do grants affect general funds...? Do IDEA funds affect? Where can districts shoot themselves in the foot with high cost applications? • No applications were denied by the committee. • Should the voluntary cost tab be eliminated? Did it discourage AUs from applying? Mention it in the legislative report that we believe it could have lowered the overall number of applications. • Overlap between what work the Consortium is doing versus what SEFAC is doing legislatively. State dollars would cover 70%, local dollars 30%, which is opposite of what's happening now. Being knowledgeable of what the superintendents and consortium are up to with the legislature, would help this committee with the legislative recommendations. Because there are groups researching how to spend special education money wisely, it would be beneficial to know the work going on out there.
3:45-4:00	Good of the Order and plan for next meeting	