



Minutes
Governing Board Meeting
January 9, 2018
County Schools Office, Room 217



1.0 The meeting was called to order by chair Jeff Winfield at 3:06 pm

2.0 Flag Salute

3.0 Establishment of Quorum

Attending:

Governing Board:

- Joe Aldridge
- Marguerite Bulkin
- Pat Chabot
- Robert Griffith
- Carla Haakma
- Rick Hennes
- Sharon Johnson
- Contessa Pelfrey
- Dave Urquhart
- Jeff Winfield

Staff: Dr. Blaine Cowick, Executive Director
Jeanie Smith, Executive Assistant
Lisa Rico, Asst. Supt. of Business Services
Jordan Mulder, Special Education Coordinator

Guests: Pamela Ivie

4.0 Public Comment

None

5.0 Consent Agenda (Attachments)

Motion to accept the consent agenda as presented: Rick Hennes

Seconded: Tessa Pelfrey

Ayes: Winfield, Urquhart, Pelfrey, Johnson, Hennes, Haakma, Griffith, Chabot, Bulkin, Aldridge

Noes: none

6.0 Public Comment Regarding Closed Session Items

None

7.0 Adjourn to Closed Session

7.1 CANCELLED

8.0 Information/Discussion Items

8.1 Jack Lucas Presentation

Mr. Lucas presented information about data gathered when he visited the county several weeks ago. Research indicated that special education funding is not keeping up with the need for services. The Governor has not been willing to put money on the special education side comparable to the LCFF and general education side. The special education population is not growing, but we have more high cost students now.

Mr. Lucas then presented six documents with data.

Document 1: Maintenance of Effort Expenditure and Revenue Comparison. This shows the progression of increasing costs. MOE funds can be used to supplement, but not supplant. State average of local percent of total expenditures is about 61%. We are right in line with that number.

Mr. Lucas pointed out that any kind of allocation plan our county develops is not going to bring in any more money. It just means some people will get more and some will get less. It's just a redistribution of funds.

Document 2: Resident District Percentage of Special Education Pupil Count. SELPA is at 13.61 percent. The state is at 12.10 percent. We are not that far off; however, we should take a look at over identification at some point. Pay attention to the referral patterns during the school year.

Document 3: A Calculation of Program Service Costs based on 2016-2017 data. Our county has a unique way of allocating costs per ADA. He suggests that we change that. It is not a good way to do business. A different methodology for computing costs per program would be beneficial. ADA and special education costs don't correspond at all. Costs are usually divided into four categories: direct provider classroom; designated instruction, program support staff, and administrative staff. We have not been segregating the SELPA office costs from the county office costs. Those need to be separated. SELPA should come to the Governing Board with a budget of costs each year for the board's approval. That would be funded off the top, and the rest is for program

Document 4: Allocation of TCOE Program Costs using Classroom and Related Services Counts Compared to Actual 16-17 District Charge. This is a comparison document between the current allocation plan and his proposed allocation. If it shows an excess cost calculation for your district, it means you are putting money into those programs whether you have students in them or not. In a full cost model, you pay just for the kids that are served. The SELPA can designate a proportion of the cost as an insurance policy, i.e. half based on ADA and half on pupil count.

Document 5: Revenue Simulation Allocation Summary. All allocation numbers in the chart are based on ADA.

Document 6: Allocation of TCOE Full Program Costs Using Classroom and Related Services County. If we went to a full cost model, this chart shows what it would look like.

Some of the superintendents pointed out some miscalculations in his numbers. Mr. Lucas is going to redo the documents that are affected and resubmit those to the board.

Going forward, please show these numbers to your business people and see if they have any input for Jack. At this time, he doesn't have enough information to tell the superintendents the pros and cons of taking back programs. If we look at block costs, it would have to be managed and recalculated regularly. It could be very time consuming.

Mr. Lucas advised that we want to get to a place when our methodology is equitable and fair. His job is to try and give the superintendents the information they need to make that decision and develop that methodology. Related services need to be thought out very carefully. There would probably one district who would be the hub and parcel out those services to the districts. If you begin implementing the change one piece at a time, what is left over becomes more costly to the county. He reiterated that working together is critical.

8.2 Foothill Leadership Application to El Dorado County CHELPA

Last year, FLA indicated to the SELPA that they were planning on moving to the El Dorado CHELPA. They are still in that process and moving forward with that move.

9.0 Standing Agenda Items

9.1 CAC Report to the Board

None

9.2 Caseloads, Assessment, and Enrollment Updates

No comments

10.0 SELPA Director's Report – Dr. Blaine Cowick

Dr. Cowick indicated that we have had some speech service problems at one of the districts. We owe some make-up sessions and will work on those needs over the next few weeks.

The high school districts have requested that appropriate staff of all the feeder elementary schools participate in a ½ day session to work on transition IEPs for 8th grade students moving into 9th grade. It will be in February. Districts indicated they would be willing to do that.

11.0 Comments from Council Members

None.

12.0 Adjournment at 4:32 pm

Next Tuolumne County SELPA Meeting Date: February 13, 2018

Closed Session 3:00 p.m. (if required)

Open Session 3:00 p.m. **or immediately following Closed Session**

Tuolumne County Office of Education, Room #217

175 Fairview Lane, Sonoma, CA 95370 209-536-2040