


Finance Committee Meeting

Desert Mountain Educational Service Center

Wednesday, October 28, 2015



CAHELP

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
HEALTH & EDUCATION LINKED PROFESSIONS

**Jenae Holtz, CEO
Chair**

CAHELP JPA
17800 Highway 18
Apple Valley, CA 92307

Phone: (760) 542-6700
Fax: (760) 242-5363
<http://dmselpa.org>

**CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND EDUCATION LINKED PROFESSIONS
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
(CAHELP JPA)
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
AGENDA
October 28, 2015 • 9:00 a.m.
Desert/Mountain Educational Service Center
17800 Highway 18 • Apple Valley, CA 92307**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

- 1.1 Adoption of Agenda – October 28, 2015
- 1.2 Adoption of Minutes – March 25, 2015

2.0 COUNTY REPORTS

- 2.1 Desert/Mountain Operations Unaudited Actuals

The Desert/Mountain Operations 2014/15 actual revenues and expenditures will be presented.

- 2.2 Desert/Mountain Operations 2014/15 Fee-For-Service (FFS) Return

Desert/Mountain Operations will present the methodology used to determine the Fee-For-Service excess and the proposed 2014/15 Fee-For-Service Return per district.

3.0 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND STAFF REPORTS

- 3.1 Data Identified Noncompliance (DINCs)

It is the responsibility of the Special Education Division (SED) of CDE to ensure that school districts comply with all state and federal procedures and regulations outlined in IDEA. One monitoring method used by SED is to analyze the CASEMIS data submitted by each SELPA in December and June of each fiscal year. The 2014-15 findings of noncompliance issues and the correction action process will be discussed.

- 3.2 Educator Effectiveness Funding

AB 104, Section 58 and SB 103, Section 8 provides one time funding to school districts, charter schools, COEs and state special schools to promote educator quality and effectiveness. Entitlements are based on the number of 2014-15 Certificated FTE as reported in CALPADS. This one-time funding is to be expended by June 30, 2018 and is to be used specifically for professional

development, coaching and support service activities of teachers, administrations and para-professionals. The purpose of funding, district entitlements and conditions along with how special education programs can benefit will be discussed.

3.3 Purchase of Building Update

An update on the quest for a CAHELP facility to purchase will be provided.

3.4 2015/16 AB602 Projected Funding Distribution

An updated 2015/16 AB602 Special Education Funding Distribution for both the Desert/Mountain SELPA and the Desert/Mountain Charter SELPA will be presented. This update is based on current P2 ADA projections provided by LEA members and revised FFS information. Schedules will be presented to assist SELPA LEA members in their 1st Interim budget revisions.

3.5 Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Reports

The SEMA and SEMB reports for the Desert/Mountain SELPA and the Desert/Mountain Charter SELPA are required to be submitted to CDE by November 15th. Submission includes both the SELPA wide report as well as the individual report per each LEA member. The status of this process will be discussed.

3.6 Excess Cost Report

Federal Law requires that a district/charter must spend at least the same amount of money on a child with disabilities as it spends on a nondisabled child before accessing Federal IDEA funds. Although this requirement has been in place since the implementation of IDEA in 1975, regulations now provide clarification regarding the definition as well as the formula districts must use in the verification calculation. Beginning this fiscal year, CDE will require that an Excess Cost Report per district be submitted rather than retained at the SELPA. Status of the report will be discussed.

3.7 Federal Grant Expenditure Reports

A summary of federal grant funding and reported expenditures will be discussed.

3.8 NPS/NPA Cost Projections

A report showing prior year NPS/NPA costs and current year NPS/NPA cost projections will be discussed.

3.9 Fiscal Needs Assessment

The Finance Team of the D/M SELPA and D/M Charter SELPA are interested in providing the best fiscal assistance possible to our LEA members. A questionnaire relating to members fiscal needs will be reviewed and discussed.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 County and SELPA Regional Services Reports

4.2 Monthly Nonpublic School/Agency Expenditure Report

4.3 Monthly Nonpublic School/Agency Placement Report

4.4 Monthly Low Incidence Equipment Reimbursement Requests Report

5.0 OTHER ISSUES

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, January 27, 2016 in the Desert/Mountain Educational Service Center, Aster Room.

**DESERT/MOUNTAIN SELPA
DESERT/MOUNTAIN CHARTER SELPA
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES**

**March 25, 2015• 9:00 a.m.
Desert/Mountain Educational Service Center
17800 Highway 18, Apple Valley, CA 92307**

D/M SELPA Members Present:

Veronica Calderon	Academy for Academic Excellence
Jennifer Johnson	Adelanto SD
Ben Shelby	Apple Valley USD
Wael Elatar	Barstow USD
Linda Rosado	Bear Valley USD
Deanna Dibble	Helendale SD
Matt Fedders	Hesperia USD
Kortney Grimm	Hesperia USD
Billy Wessell	Lucerne Valley USD
Cyndi Reeves	Oro Grande SD
Nelda Colvin	Oro Grande SD
Jennifer Alvarado	SBCSS Internal Business
Grace Granados	SBCSS Internal Business
Shannon Nelson	SBCSS Internal Business
Patty Trevino	SBCSS Business Advisory Services
Randy Elphic	SBCSS Student Services
Robin Schreiner	Silver Valley USD
Diane Hannett	Snowline JUSD
Karen Winkler	Snowline JUSD
Jackie Jauregui	Victor Elementary SD
Rhonda Brooks	VVUHSD
Lauri Brown	VVUHSD

OTHERS Present:

Caroline Larson	Vavrinek/ Barstow Consultant
Roy Kim	Savantco Education
Dan Lee	Savantco Education

Staff Present:

Patty Broisma	D/M SELPA
Janet Crabtree	CAHELP JPA
Terry Davis-Low	D/M SELPA
Denise Edge	D/M SELPA

Kristine Elliott	D/M SELPA
Marina Gallegos	DMCC
Jenae Holtz	CAHELP JPA
Karen Mitchell	D/M SELPA
Linda Llamas	DMCC
Lisa Nash	D/M SELPA
Daria Raines	D/M SELPA

1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular joint meeting of the Desert/Mountain SELPA and the Desert/Mountain Charter SELPA Finance Committee was called to order by Jenae Holtz, Chairperson at 9:00 a.m., in the Desert Mountain Educational Service Center, Apple Valley, CA. The meeting Minutes for January 28, 2015, and the meeting Agenda for March 25, 2015 were adopted as presented.

2. COUNTY REPORTS

1. Desert/Mountain Operations Second Interim Update

Jennifer Alvarado, SBCSS Internal Business, presented on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014/2015 Projected Year End Actuals as of Second Interim. Jennifer reported that San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools (SBCSS) compared the Fee-for-Service (FFS) Budget to Second Interim Update. She stated the Second Interim Revenues are \$906,000 higher than anticipated, which is primarily due to an increase in numbers projected for preschool & preschool related services. A reduction of approximately \$280,000 is anticipated in expenditures, and the total projected ending balance is \$1.2 million for 2014/15. Jennifer then shared three options for how the members want to handle the \$1.2 million 2014/15 ending balance: 1) rebate the entire balance to districts based on individual district's proportionate share as billed, 2) hold a small reserve and rebate the difference, or 3) keep a reserve and roll the balance into the FFS for 2015/16.

Jenae stated based on the discussion the consensus is 1) Jennifer will send out a comparative of what the proposed options would mean for each district, 2) keep a 3.0% reserve and return excess to districts and establish a procedure for future years. Jenae further stated the proposed options will be presented to the CAHELP Governance Council in April.

Jennifer commented that since 3.0% is almost the entire balance there would not be much to compare in writing.

Janet stated in the event of an increase or decrease between estimated yearend balance and year end actuals, having something in writing is needed to establish an ongoing procedure for calculating the reserve amount and the process for returning excess FFS revenue to districts.

2. Desert/Mountain Operations Budget and Proposed Fee for Service Rates

Jennifer Alvarado presented the 2015/2016 FY budgeted expenses for the FFS programs. The LCFF projected revenue is calculated based on a district average per ADA funded amount. However the actual transfer is based on grade span by district. The projected LCFF revenue transfer is 5.2 million to County Schools to offset the FFS special education cost. Jennifer then stated the County Schools FFS budget includes an estimated 3% COLA to salaries, Step and Column increases on all contracted salaries, 10% inflationary increase for Health and Welfare (H&W), a slight increase in IT user fee, and Indirect Cost increase to 12.95% of expenditures. Jennifer stated negotiations are ongoing and County Schools anticipates that the H&W will be lower than estimated in this budget. Jennifer concluded these are the budgets that will be presented to the CAHELP Governance Council in April.

3. Discussion Related to Infant Fee For Service

Jennifer Alvarado reported the Early Start program operates on an antiquated funding model. Jennifer stated this County operated Infant Program no longer receives funding sufficient to cover the cost of the program. The program remains on the FFS schedule at this time however there is no current FFS supporting the Infant Program. Jennifer stated County Schools is projecting a shortfall of \$176,000 for the 2015/16. She also commented that she will schedule a meeting with the new area director to discuss plans for supporting the Infant Program in the future.

Randy Elphic stated County Schools is exploring options for ways to collaborate with other programs to offset the cost for the Infant Program and out of FFS calculation.

Janet stated the Infant Program is funded on the old J50 Model just as it was in the early 1980s. The state has not allowed growth in the program for some time, therefore is funded on the same number of teachers and aides as it was years ago. Janet added the program only receives COLA however it is still underfunded. She further stated it is a mandated program funded on the lesser of the number of units allocated or operated.

Jenae concluded hearing no further comments, County Schools will plan to bring the Infant Program funding to the Governance Council as a discussion item.

3. ADMINISTRATOR AND STAFF REPORTS

3.1 2015/2016 D/M SELPA, D/M Charter SELPA and DMCC Proposed Budgets

Janet Crabtree presented a summary of the proposed 2015/2016 budgets as follows:

CAHELP JPA: This budget is funded by transfers from each individual programs (D/M SELPA, D/M Charter SELPA, and DMCC) for which it provides oversight. She reported 9.40 Administrative FTE are included in the CAHELP JPA budget. The total proposed revenue and expenditures are \$1,443,391 for 2015/2016. This is a new budget for the organization.

Jenae stated the three administrative positions in this budget are the Chief Executive Officer, the (interim) Chief Operations Officer, and the Business Program Manager as well as administrative support staff positions.

D/M SELPA: The D/M SELPA proposed budgets are comprised of federal, state, and local revenue totaling \$62,242,023. The total expenditures of \$62,602,103 include costs related to staffing for regional services/program specialists, X-pot staffing (including OT/PT and NPS/NPA services) and discretionary expenditures supporting SELPA activities. Janet stated the individual budget for each follow the summary.

D/M Charter SELPA: The D/M Charter SELPA budgets will change with the addition of new members for the 2015/2016 year. The regional services/program specialists, due process managers and supporting staff are currently budgeted in the D/M SELPA budgets with revenue from the D/M Charter SELPA to be transferred to support administrative activities.

Jenae stated if the five applicants being recommended for membership are approved by the Governance Council, the Charter SELPA budgets will change and an additional staff may be hired.

D/M Children's Center (DMCC): Jenae stated the Department of Behavioral Health (DBH) awarded the DMCC with contracted funding to provide an array of services for children needing services ranging from least need to most restrictive needs. The DMCC provides these services at no cost to districts.

Janet stated the 2015/2016 budgets include local revenue of \$22 million. These services are supported through AB 114 (mental health dollars) and Medi-Cal billing. There is a deficit projected for next year due to transition of some new positions added which will result in an equal amount of old positions being abolished. Additionally, the DMCC is working with the DBH to increase funding for the 2014/15 year for services being provided.

Jenae stated the DMCC has a large reserve that is being held to purchase a facility that can house the entire staff of the CAHELP, D/M SELPA, D/M Charter SELPA and DMCC in one location. She added a lease-to-own proposal is being drafted to present to the owners of the old Walmart building in Victorville owners. The Walmart building could be designed to include meeting rooms that could accommodate a district's entire staff for trainings. Jenae commented she is hopeful that Walmart may agree to partner with the CAHELP to be able to support the community in this endeavor.

Jennifer Johnson, Adelanto SD, inquired whether the D/M Operations staff would move with the CAHELP staff.

Jenae responded that D/M Operations staff would remain at the DMESC.

Wael Elatar, Barstow USD, inquired whether there were any other funds that could be used for purchasing a facility.

Jenae indicated the Governance Council (district superintendents) authorized these funds to be used to purchase property. With forming the JPA, any property purchased would be owned by the districts versus being owned by the San Bernardino County Board of Education.

3.2 Special Education Task Force Update

Karen Mitchell shared a recent California Association of School Business Officials (CASBO) Newsbreak. She stated the Special Education Task Force is proposing an equalizing of funding for support for special education across California, ensuring the availability of early intervention programs and services, and the continuance of funding of special education based on ADA but to increase the amount allocated per ADA to ensure more equitable funding. She commented that presently the D/M SELPA is one of the lowest funded SELPAs in the state.

Jenae indicated the State SELPA Administrators hired an attorney to address this issue of equalization at a statewide level.

Wael Elatar inquired whether there has been any discussion about special education transportation.

Karen responded that transportation is mentioned briefly in the newsbreak. She further clarified that one of the listed goals is to provide sufficient funds to local education agencies (LEAs) to meet the mandated special education transportation costs. The primary focus is on equalizing the funding.

Wael stated Barstow's transportation is exceeding \$4,000 per student.

Hearing that several districts are concerned for special education transportation costs, Jenae stated she can raise the topic of transportation at the State SELPA Administrators meetings and bring back information to this group.

3.3. AB 602 Certification 2012/2013

Karen Mitchell presented the AB602 Schedules for FY2012/2013 Annual R2. She stated there was no change in certified. ADA of \$102,013 but the AB602 funding per ADA for 2012/13 increased to \$615.21. She stated the prior certifications included an unanticipated deficit factor, decreasing the per ADA funded amount approximately \$25. This deficit is now fully funded.

3.4. AB 602 Certification 2013/2014

Karen Mitchell presented the AB602 Schedules for FY2013/2014 Annual. She stated there was a slight decline in ADA and the per ADA for 2013/2014 was \$618.01 per ADA. Karen stated the SELPA again loss revenue as a result of the deficit factor certified in June 2014. Karen stated the D/M Charter SELPA has a 2013/2014 Annual P-2 report following the D/M SELPA reports.

3.5. AB 602 Certification 2014/2015

Karen Mitchell presented the AB602 Schedules for FY2014/2015 P-1 and P-2. She stated there was another deficit factor at the P-1 Certification. She explained the allocation model. She stated the SELPA equalizes per ADA and the amount per ADA is estimated at \$620.27. Karen specified the SELPA will reimburse some of the Small District Protection to larger districts if excess funds available. Karen further clarified that property tax goes to County Schools as a revenue offset to AB602 funding. Karen also explained there were 685 preschool students at the December 2014 Pupil Count and there was a total of \$311,154 in federal preschool dollars, and \$508,784 in local preschool entitlement funds. She concluded the individual by-district reports follow the SELPA-wide reports.

Jenae stated the SELPA website is being reconfigured and will include a business/fiscal page where districts will be able to access reports and other fiscally related information quickly. Jenae stated the updated website is scheduled to be up and running by June 30th.

3.6. Projected AB 602 Certification 2015/2016

Karen Mitchell presented the AB602 Schedules for FY 2015/16 Projections. The SELPA projected ADA is \$101,435 and assuming there is no deficit factor, the per ADA will be \$632.64. Karen stated the proposed increased FFS rates which will go to the Governance Council in April, have been incorporated in the

apportionment projections. She further stated there is not a projection for increase in federal dollars. There was a drop in one of the federal grants in 2014/2015. Karen then stated the details for purchased services on Schedule D and the Served by & for reports were delivered to the special education directors for review. The SELPA will make correction based on input from the special education directors. Karen stated the Small District Protection is estimated at 1.5 million with a \$400,000 rebate to the large districts for the small district protection.

3.7. Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Policy and Procedure and Other MOE Issues

Karen Mitchell presented the D/M SELPA Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Policy and Procedure. She stated every member district has to meet MOE at SEMA & SEMB. Karen further stated if a district does not meet MOE, the CDE will invoice district for the shortfall. Karen then shared the MOE template for charter members to refer to. The SELPA conducted a test MOE in the SACS software for districts' information. Karen then stated the SELPA is planning to do another test in August.

Matt Fedders, Hesperia USD, inquired whether reinstating furlough days would cause an increase.

Karen stated yes and that any large increases should be reviewed. Karen encouraged districts to thoroughly review all expenditures for special needs students to ensure that they are coded correctly. She then stated a two-year comparison of federal grant awards and multi-year pupil count to FTEs report were included for additional information. Karen stated she will drop the blank worksheet in each district's dropbox.

Discussion followed on whether one-time bonuses can be used as an allowable reduction.

Jenae stated the SELPA will follow up on the one-time bonuses and using the 5000 goal codes. She concluded the SELPA will get an answer and email the district CBOs and directors of special education.

3.8. Annual Budget Plan

Karen Mitchell presented a draft version of the Annual Budget Plan (ABP) for FY 2015/2016 for the Desert/Mountain SELPA and Charter SELPA. She stated the CDE requires SELPAs to submit an ABP annually. Karen concluded the ABPs will be presented for Public Hearing at the CAHELP Governance Council Meeting in April.

3.9 Proportionate Share for Parentally Placed Private School Students

Karen Mitchell presented the draft FY2014/15 Proportionate Share for Parentally Placed Private School multi-year report. She reminded the committee members about the need to transfer expenses for proportionate share funds. Karen stated the consensus was to provide speech services for eligible parentally placed private school students. She concluded that CBOs may contact her should they have any questions regarding this report.

4. INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 Calendar of Due Dates for Reports due to the SELPA

4.2 Proposed 2015/2016 Finance Committee Calendar of Meetings

Jenae Holtz stated CAHELP is considering scheduling separate Finance Committee meetings for the SELPA and the Charter SELPA. She encouraged CBOs to inform the SELPA about any items they would like to address at the committee meetings.

4.3 Monthly Nonpublic School/Agency Expenditure Report

4.4 Monthly Nonpublic School/Agency Placement Report

4.5 Low Incidence Reimbursement Request Deadline Memo

4.6 County and SELPA Regional Services

4.7 NPS/NPA Estimates through Year End with Residential Costs Breakdown

4.8 Served By and For Other Districts Report

4.9 AB 602 Apportionment Transfers

4.10 Desert/Mountain SELPA Forms

4.10.1 Low Incidence Equipment Pre-Approval / Reimbursement Form (D/M 86A) <http://www.dmselpa.org/resources/86A.pdf>

4.10.2 Low Incidence Pre-Approval Request for Mobile Computing Device (D/M 86B) <http://www.dmselpa.org/resources/86B.pdf>

4.10.3 Assistive Technology Assessment and Independent Educational Assessment (IEE) Reimbursement Form (D/M 83)

<http://www.dmselpa.org/resources/83.pdf>

5. OTHER ISSUES

None.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Having no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:26 am.

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, October 28, 2015, in the Desert/Mountain Educational Services Center.

Item 2.1 D/M Operations
Unaudited Actuals

San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools

Desert Mountain County Operated Special Education Program
2014-15 FFS YEAR END ACTUALS

OCTOBER 2015

			SAI SERVICES > 50% SDC	CDS SPEC EDUCATION SERVICES RSP ONLY	RELATED SERVICES DIS	ITINERANT	1 TO 1 AIDE SERVICES	PRESCHOOL SDC	PRESCHOOL RELATED SERVICES DIS	EARLY START	TOTAL	
2014-15 RATE			\$ 20,245	\$ 8,592	\$ 3,813	\$ 4,392	\$ 48,344	\$ 15,045	\$ 1,560	N/A - State Funded		
1												
2	OBJECT	EXPENSE										
3	1000-1999	Certificated Salaries	5,545,522	46,646	1,629,893	470,955	-	1,170,990	442,686	414,355	9,721,048	
4	2000-2999	Classified Salaries	3,270,100	-	216,300	75,997	2,211,481	696,877	9,784	118,760	6,599,299	
5	3000-3999	Employee Benefits	3,930,660	14,787	604,444	227,437	1,333,240	827,039	129,419	230,033	7,297,059	
6	4000-4999	Books & Supplies	65,339	300	5,466	2,921	-	11,479	2,502	3,282	91,289	
7	5000-5999	Services & Other Operating Expenditures	46,082	148	388,492	21,128	308	615	6,119	31,182	494,074	
8	6000-6999	Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9												
10		Sub total	12,857,704	61,881	2,844,594	798,438	3,545,029	2,707,000	590,511	797,613	24,202,770	
11		% of Total	0.64142	N/A	0.14190	0.03983	0.17685	0.82092	0.17908	N/A		
12												
13		Allocated Cost (GL 5001 & 5730; FN 2100, 2105, 2700, 8100)	1,756,502	0	388,603	109,075	484,290	140,333	30,612	45,495	2,954,910	
14		Sub total 1000-5000 costs	14,614,207	61,881	3,233,197	907,513	4,029,318	2,847,333	621,123	843,107	27,157,679	
15												
16	7300-7380	Indirect Cost @ 9.86%	1,440,961	0	318,793	89,481	397,291	280,747	61,243	83,130	2,671,646	
17												
18		TOTAL EXPENSE	16,055,167	61,881	3,551,990	996,994	4,426,609	3,128,080	682,366	926,238	29,829,325	
19												
20	RESOURCE	OBJECT	REVENUE									
21	6500	8097	Property Tax Revenue	1,744,500		385,947	108,330	480,980			2,719,758	
22	3310	8181	Federal Local Assistance	723,247		160,009	44,912	199,408			1,127,576	
23	6500	8311	AB602 FFS Revenue	11,793,485	122,441	2,402,562	733,974	3,521,487	3,249,688	593,481	22,417,118	
24	6500	8311	AB602 Base per ADA Revenue	71,338	42,765						114,103	
25	6500	8319	AB602 Prior Year	(19,399.99)		(4,291.99)	(1,204.70)	(5,348.82)			(30,245.50)	
26			Total FFS Revenue (Lines 20-24)	14,313,170	165,206	2,944,226	886,011	4,196,527	3,249,688	593,481	26,348,310	
27												
28			LCFF Distribution (based on % of total expense of applicable program)	0.64142		0.14190	0.03983	0.17685				
29	6500	8011	Local Control Funding Formula Revenue	3,118,805		689,994	193,672	859,893			4,862,364	
30	6500	8019	Prior Year Revenue Limit Fall Out	5,111		1,131	317	1,409			7,968	
31	3315	8182	Federal Preschool					102,898	22,446		125,344	
32	3320	8182	Preschool Local Entitlement					178,043	38,839		216,882	
33	3385	8182	Part C Early Intervention							37,210	37,210	
34	6510	8311	Infant I-50 Apportionment							786,434	786,434	
35	6513	8182	Federal Preschool - Backfill for RS 3315								0	
36	6515	8590	Infant Discretionary							24,609	24,609	
37	9285	8677	Infant RC Contract							3,603	3,603	
38	6512	8590	Mental Health								0	
39	6500	8699	All other local revenue	530							530	
40	6500	8677	Interagency Svcs Between LEA's	7,120							7,120	
41	6500	8311	Journal from Restricted (JCS Transfer)	(71,338)							(71,338)	
42	6500	8989	Contribution from Unrestricted	11,640	300						11,940	
43			14/15 Beginning Balance	11,936						97,815	109,751	
44			TOTAL REVENUE:	\$ 17,396,974	\$ 165,506	\$ 3,635,350	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 5,057,830	\$ 3,530,629	\$ 654,766	\$ 949,671	\$ 32,470,726
45												
46			2014-15 Ending Balance (Revenue - Expense)	1,341,806	103,625	83,361	83,007	631,221	402,549	(27,600)	23,433	2,641,401
47												
48			Number of Students Served	704	14	773	202	87	216	381		
49			2014-15 Approved Rates	\$ 20,245	\$ 8,592	\$ 3,813	\$ 4,392	\$ 48,344	\$ 15,045	\$ 1,560		
50			FFS generated using approved rates	\$ 14,261,232	\$ 122,441	\$ 2,948,518	\$ 887,216	\$ 4,201,876	\$ 3,249,688	\$ 593,481	\$ 26,264,452	

San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools

Desert Mountain County Operated Special Education Program
2014-15 FFS YEAR END ACTUALS

OCTOBER 2015

51
52
53
54
55
56

2014-15 Ending Balance	\$	2,641,401.24
Less 3% of 15/16 Expenditures - RESERVE	\$	(992,781.00)
Less Early Start Ending Balance	\$	(23,433.00)
Balance to be returned	\$	<u>1,625,187.24</u>

FEE FOR SERVICE BUDGET to ACTUALS COMPARISON - 2014-15

SELPA	Desert Mountain				Budget	Actuals	+Increase/ -Decrease
A. REVENUES							
					October 2014	October 2015	
	RS	OB	GL	FC			
1. AB602 Special Ed Funding	6500	8311	5001	0000	\$ 25,047,079	\$ 26,378,556	\$ 1,331,477
2. Property Tax Transfer	6500	8097	5001	0000		\$ 3,039,575	\$ 3,039,575
3. Property Tax Transfer Adjustment between 2014-15 P-2 and Annual						\$ (319,817)	\$ (319,817)
4. Federal IDEA (Local Assistance Entitlement)	3310	8181	5001	0000		\$ 1,127,576	
5. Net State Aid (A1-A2+A3-A4)	6500	8311	5001	0000		\$ 22,531,221	\$ 22,531,221
6. LCFF ADA Revenue Transfer	6500	8710	5001	0000	\$ 4,769,562	\$ 4,862,364	\$ 92,802
7. Prior Year Revenue Limit Fall Out	6500	8019	5001	0000	\$ -	\$ 7,968	\$ 7,968
8. Federal Preschool	3315	8182	5730	0000	\$ 133,164	\$ 125,344	\$ (7,820)
9. Preschool Local Entitlement	3320	8182	5730	0000	\$ 206,861	\$ 216,882	\$ 10,021
10. Infant Part C	3385	8182	5710	0000	\$ 37,210	\$ 37,210	\$ -
11. Infant State Apportionment	6510	8311	5710	0000	\$ 794,081	\$ 786,434	\$ (7,647)
12. Federal Preschool - Backfill for RS 3315	6513	8182	5730	0000	\$ 13,869	\$ -	\$ (13,869)
13. Staff Development	6535	8590	5001	0000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
14. Other State	6500	8590	5001	0000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
15. Infant Discretionary	6515	8590	5710	0000	\$ 24,976	\$ 24,609	\$ (367)
16. Parent Infant Program (Local Contract)	9285	8677	5710	0000	\$ 9,409	\$ 3,603	\$ (5,806)
17. Local Revenue - Interagency Agreements	6500	8677	5001	0000		\$ 7,120	\$ 7,120
18. Other Local Revenue	6500	8699	5001	0000	\$ -	\$ 530	\$ 530
19. Contrib. frm Unrestricted - Tier III flex programs	6500	8981	5001	0000	\$ -	\$ 11,940	\$ 11,940
20. Contrib. to Juvenile Hall (ADA Transfer)	6500	8311	5770	0000	\$ -	\$ (71,338)	\$ (71,338)
TOTAL REVENUES (excludes A2, A3, A4, A5)					\$ 31,036,211	\$ 32,391,221	\$ 1,355,011
B. EXPENDITURES							
1. SAI Services - SDC					\$ 17,137,726	\$ 16,055,167	\$ (1,082,559)
2. CDS - RSP					\$ 68,739	\$ 61,881	\$ (6,858)
3. Related Services - DIS					\$ 3,522,493	\$ 3,551,990	\$ 29,497
4. Itinerant					\$ 968,845	\$ 996,994	\$ 28,149
5. 1:1 Aide Services					\$ 4,948,996	\$ 4,426,609	\$ (522,387)
6. Preschool SDC					\$ 2,962,927	\$ 3,128,080	\$ 165,153
7. Preschool Related Services - DIS					\$ 572,747	\$ 682,366	\$ 109,619
8. Early Start (NO FFS)					\$ 940,426	\$ 926,238	\$ (14,188)
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					\$ 31,122,899	\$ 29,829,325	\$ (1,293,574)
C. PRIOR YEAR ADJUSTMENTS							
a. Prior Year AB602 Revenue Funding Adjustment	6500	8319	5001	0000	\$ -	\$ (30,246)	\$ (30,246)
b. 2014-15 Beginning Balance					\$ 109,750	\$ 109,751	\$ 1
TOTAL PRIOR YEAR ADJUSTMENTS					\$ 109,750	\$ 79,506	\$ (30,245)
D. 2014-15 ENDING BALANCE							
1. Total Revenues (Section A)					\$ 31,036,211	\$ 32,391,221	\$ 1,355,010
2. Total Prior Year Revenue Adjustments (Section C)					\$ -	\$ 79,506	\$ 79,506
3. Total Expenditures (Section B)					\$ 31,122,899	\$ 29,829,325	\$ 1,293,574
4. 2014-15 Ending Balance (D1+D2-D3)					\$ (86,688)	\$ 2,641,402	\$ 2,728,090
Components of Ending Balance							
a. SAI Services - SDC					\$ -	\$ 1,341,806	\$ 1,341,806
b. RSP					\$ -	\$ 103,625	\$ 103,625
b. Related Services DIS					\$ -	\$ 83,361	\$ 83,361
c. Itinerant					\$ -	\$ 83,007	\$ 83,007
d. 1:1 Aide Services					\$ -	\$ 631,221	\$ 631,221
e. Preschool					\$ -	\$ 402,549	\$ 402,549
f. Preschool Related Services - DIS					\$ -	\$ (27,600)	\$ (27,600)
e. Early Start					\$ -	\$ 23,433	\$ 23,433
Net Fee For Service Ending Balance (Less Early Start)					\$ -	\$ 2,617,969	\$ 2,514,344

Service Counts	Budget	Actual	Diff	Rate	Revenue +/-
SAI Services - SDC	694	704	10	20,245	202,450
CDS - RSP	8	14	6	8,592	51,552
Related Services - DIS	758	773	15	3,813	57,195
Itinerant	181	202	21	4,392	92,232
1:1 Aide Services	84	87	3	48,344	145,032
Preschool SDC	178	216	38	15,045	571,710
Preschool Related Services - DIS	323	381	58	1,560	90,480
Early Start (NO FFS)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

ADA	
Budget	618.24
Final ADA	642.92

Item 2.2 D/M Operations
2014/15 Fee-For-Service Return

San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools
Desert Mountain County Operated Special Education Program

14/15 Fee-For Service Return

District	SAI Services	% of Services	Total Return	CDS-RSP	% of Services	Total Return	Related Services DIS	% of Services	Total Return	Itinerant	% of Services	Total Return	1:1 Aides	% of Services	Total Return	Preschool	% of Services	Total Return	Preschool Related Services	% of Services	Total Return	Grand Total
			\$ 1,341,806			\$ 103,625			\$ 83,361			\$ 83,007			\$ 631,221			\$ 402,549			\$ (27,600)	
Adelanto Elementary	80	12%	\$162,731	0.33	2.34%	\$2,424	86	13%	\$10,451	12	8%	\$6,225	6	7%	\$43,095	33	16%	\$63,965	74	22%	(\$5,997)	\$282,895
Apple Valley Unified	112	17%	\$229,387	4.42	30.99%	\$32,118	112	16%	\$13,659	14	9%	\$7,263	11	13%	\$84,923	20	10%	\$38,475	69	20%	(\$5,571)	\$400,255
Baker Valley Unified*	0	0%	\$0	0.00	0.00%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	\$0
Barstow Unified	17	3%	\$33,838	0.33	2.34%	\$2,424	21	3%	\$2,567	5	3%	\$2,335	2	2%	\$14,576	12	6%	\$22,765	61	18%	(\$4,970)	\$73,535
Bear Valley Unified	11	2%	\$23,126	0.17	1.17%	\$1,212	12	2%	\$1,477	5	3%	\$2,594	2	3%	\$16,478	2	1%	\$4,328	3	1%	(\$263)	\$48,951
Excelsior	0	0%	\$0	0.00	0.00%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	5	3%	\$2,335	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	\$2,335
Helendale Elementary*	0	0%	\$0	0.00	0.00%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	\$0
Hesperia Unified	109	17%	\$222,586	0.17	1.17%	\$1,212	53	8%	\$6,478	43	27%	\$22,308	16	19%	\$119,146	20	9%	\$37,674	18	5%	(\$1,472)	\$407,932
Lucerne Valley Unified	20	3%	\$ 40,810.22	0.08	0.58%	\$606	27	4%	\$3,331	3	2%	\$ 1,296.98	4	4%	\$ 2,244.40	1	1%	\$ 2,244.40	4	1%	\$ (337.66)	\$74,568
Needles*	0	0%	\$0	0.00	0.00%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	\$0
Oro Grande Elementary	5	1%	\$10,203	0.00	0.00%	\$0	3	0%	\$316	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	\$10,518
Silver Valley Unified	0	0%	\$0	0.00	0.00%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	1	1%	\$519	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	\$519
Snowline Jt. Unified	96	15%	\$ 195,378.94	1.33	9.36%	\$9,696	107	16%	\$13,130	8	5%	\$ 3,890.94	12	14%	\$ 89,993.30	24	11%	\$ 46,170.49	31	9%	\$ (2,525.68)	\$355,733
Trona Jt. Unified*	0	0%	\$ -	0.00	0.00%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%	\$ -	0	0%	\$ -	0	0%	\$ -	0	0%	\$ -	\$0
Victor Elementary	144	22%	\$ 292,983.39	0.50	3.51%	\$3,636	203	30%	\$24,813	12	7%	\$ 5,966.10	17	20%	\$ 126,751.13	97	46%	\$ 186,926.36	80	23%	\$ (6,462.77)	\$634,613
Victor Valley Union High	64	10%	\$ 130,762.75	6.92	48.54%	\$50,298	58	9%	\$7,140	55	34%	\$ 28,274.13	14	17%	\$ 109,639.73	0	0%	\$ -	0	0%	\$ -	\$326,114
Total	658	100%	\$1,341,806	14	100%	\$103,625	682	100%	\$83,361	160	100%	\$ 83,007	83	100%	\$ 631,221	209	100%	\$402,549	341	100%	\$ (27,600)	\$2,617,968

*Districts receiving small school district protection are not included in the calculated return. Service counts have been removed for these districts and funds are reallocated to the remaining districts.

District	Col. A Total 2014-15 Ending Balance	Col. B Less 3% of 15-16 FFS Expenses - Reserve	Col. C Balance to Return
2014-15	\$ 2,617,968	Reserve = \$992,781	Balance - \$1,625,188
Adelanto Elementary	\$ 282,894.83	\$ 107,279	\$ 175,616.02
Apple Valley Unified	\$ 400,254.77	\$ 151,784	\$ 248,470.95
Baker Valley Unified	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Barstow Unified	\$ 73,534.52	\$ 27,886	\$ 45,648.90
Bear Valley Unified	\$ 48,951.44	\$ 18,563	\$ 30,388.17
Excelsior	\$ 2,334.56	\$ 885	\$ 1,449.25
Helendale Elementary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Hesperia Unified	\$ 407,931.67	\$ 154,695	\$ 253,236.64
Lucerne Valley Unified	\$ 74,568.44	\$ 28,278	\$ 46,290.74
Needles	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Oro Grande Elementary	\$ 10,518.32	\$ 3,989	\$ 6,529.58
Silver Valley Unified	\$ 518.79	\$ 197	\$ 322.06
Snowline Jt. Unified	\$ 355,733.42	\$ 134,901	\$ 220,832.91
Trona Jt. Unified	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Victor Elementary	\$ 634,612.83	\$ 240,657	\$ 393,956.22
Victor Valley Union High	\$ 326,114.46	\$ 123,668	\$ 202,445.99
Subtotal	\$2,617,968	\$ 992,781	\$ 1,625,187
Early Start	\$23,433		
Total	\$2,641,401		

Item 3.1 Data Identified Noncompliance (DINCs)

Daria Raines

Subject: FW: 2014-15 Data Identified Noncompliance Notification (SELPA)

From: CASEMIS [<mailto:CASEMIS@cde.ca.gov>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2015 11:52 AM

To: Jenae Holtz

Subject: 2014-15 Data Identified Noncompliance Notification (SELPA)

September 23, 2015

Ted Alejandre, Superintendent
San Bernardino County Schools
601 North E Street
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0020

Dear Superintendent Alejandre,

One of the major responsibilities of the Special Education Division (SED) in the California Department of Education (CDE) is to monitor school districts to ensure that procedural guarantees of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) are followed. The CDE uses multiple methods to carry out its monitoring responsibilities. One of the monitoring activities is to analyze student level data submitted to the California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS). The SED has reviewed the CASEMIS June 2015 and the December 2014 student level data submissions for compliance with state and federal requirements. Specifically, the data was analyzed in relationship to three compliance indicators from the California State Performance Plan:

- Indicator 11: One hundred percent of children were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.
- Indicator 12: One hundred percent of children referred by Part C prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, have an Individual Education Plan (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthday.
- Indicator 13: One hundred percent of youth aged 16 and above have an IEP that includes the eight required elements of secondary transition planning.

In addition, the CASEMIS data was analyzed for compliance with the state and federal timeframe requirements for:

- Annual IEP meeting
- Triennial re-evaluation to determine the student's continued eligibility

Noncompliant findings were identified for the San Bernardino County Schools School District. The district must correct the identified noncompliant student level finding(s). The list of students with noncompliance finding(s), along with a corrective action tracking Web application can be accessed at:

<https://www2.cde.ca.gov/dinc/logon.aspx>

For confidentiality purposes, the district's password to access the DINC Web site will be sent in a separate e-mail.

To assist the district, a compliance technical assistance guide (CTAG), which provides detailed information and instructions on how the district is to proceed in correcting, documenting, and reporting the corrective actions is posted at <ftp://ftp.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/ds/NCTAG.docx>. Please read the CTAG carefully prior to starting any corrective action process.

If you have questions on this regarding completing corrective actions, please contact the district's FMTA consultant. The list of assigned FMTA consultants can be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/qa/fmtacncnt.asp>.

Sincerely,

/s/

Chris Drouin, Associate Director
Special Education Division

CD/slr

cc: Jenae Holtz , SELPA Director
Donna DeMartini, FMTA Administrator



Special Education Division

2014-15 Data Identified Noncompliance (DINC) Overview

Presented by the Assessment, Evaluation, and Support Unit



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Purpose


- What's and why's of DINC
- Indicators and More!
- Roles and responsibilities
- Review Web site
- Next Steps



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

What is DINC

- Federally Required Noncompliance Reporting
- Process by which the Special Education Division (SED) identifies and notifies districts of noncompliance and provides a place to report correction





TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

DINC Indicators

- Indicators:
 - 60 day timeline (Ind. 11)
 - Part C to Part B transition (Ind. 12)
 - Secondary Transition (Ind. 13)
- Also Timely IEPs and Triennial Reviews



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

60 Day Timeline

- Indicator 11 – 60 day timeline
 - CASEMIS June data
 - All students referred during the year
 - Compare the student's initial evaluation with the date of parental consent
 - There are authorized delays



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

CASEMIS Fields for Indicator 11

A-28 PRNT_CSNT Date district received parent consent for initial evaluation for Part B special education services, for ages 3–22.

Definition:	It is the date the district/school received parent consent for the most recent initial evaluation eligibility for special education services for Part B (ages 3–22).
--------------------	--

A-29 INIT_EVAL Date of IEP Team meeting to review initial evaluation and determine eligibility for Part B special education services, for ages 3–22.

Definition:	The date of the IEP team meeting to review initial evaluation and determine eligibility for special education services for Part B (ages 3–22).
--------------------	--



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

CASEMIS Fields for Indicator 11

A-30 EVLDLAY Reason the initial evaluation is beyond 60-day time line	
Definition:	This is the reason the initial evaluation should be considered timely.
Purpose:	To comply with the requirements under IDEA (34 CFR 300.341 (c)(1)).
Valid Format & Codes:	<p>CC (2-digit character code)</p> <p>Reason for delay:</p> <p>10 Parent did not make child available</p> <p>20 Official school break of more than five days</p> <p>30 Transfer</p> <p>90 Other (SELPA must list reason in district summary report to CDE)</p> <p>Note: This Field may be left blank for students whose initial evaluation was completed within 60 days or whose initial evaluation was untimely.</p>
Comment:	This Field must be completed for each student whose initial evaluation date exceeds 60 days from the date the parent provided consent to evaluate and should be considered timely.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

C to B Transition

- Indicator 12 – Part C to Part B
 - CASEMIS June data
 - Also includes DDS data
 - Children who were 3 years old
 - There are authorized delays



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

SPP Indicator 12

Monitoring Priority - Effective General Supervision Part B/Effective Transition.

Indicator - Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B (LEA notified pursuant to IDEA Section 637(a)(9)(A) for Part B eligibility determination).
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.
- e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b – d – e)] times 100.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

CASEMIS Fields for Indicator 12

A-13 BIRTHDATE Student's date of birth	
Definition:	The actual, official, or recorded date of birth of the student.
Purpose:	To calculate age of the student at any date, to comply with the requirements of the state and federal laws.

A-36 LAST_IEP Date of student's last complete IEP meeting	
Definition:	It is the date when the last IEP, IFSP, or ISP (if the student is placed in a private school by a parent) meeting was held for the student. It would most likely be the student's latest annual or triennial review of the IEP. All data on a student record shall be obtained from the IEP/IFSP/ISP document resulting from this meeting. In absence of an IEP date, this date may also be the last placement date.
Purpose:	To determine the length of time the student has been in the current program; to research and analyze historical profiles of students with common characteristics using past years' data.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Delay Fields


A-31 TDBLAY Reason for IEP in place after child's third birthday	
Definition:	This is the reason the initial evaluation is beyond child's third birthday and should be considered timely.
Purpose:	To comply with the requirements under IDEA (34 CFR 300.124 (b)).
Valid Format & Codes:	<p>CC (2-digit character code)</p> <p>Reason for delay:</p> <p>10 Parent refused to consent</p> <p>20 Parent did not make child available</p> <p>90 Other (SELPA must list reason in district summary report to CDE)</p> <p>Note: This Field may be left blank for students whose initial IEP was completed by their third birthday or whose IEP was untimely.</p>
Comment:	This Field must be completed for each student who was served by Part C and who turns three during the reporting year (July 1 through June 30) and whose IEP occurs after their third birthday.
Verified:	The entry in this Field must be one of the codes listed for this Field; otherwise, an error will result. If IEP was not late and an entry is made an error will result



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Transition Elements

- Indicator 13 – Secondary Transition
 - CASEMIS June data
 - Students with IEPs 16+
 - Age checked against exit date
 - 8 Transition Elements
 - Must be “Yes” to all but #8, may be NA



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Eight Elements of Transition

- 1. Is there an appropriate measurable post-secondary goal or goals that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living?
- 2. Is (are) the post-secondary goal(s) updated annually?
- 3. Is there evidence that the measurable post-secondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment?
- 4. Are there transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her post-secondary goal(s)?
- 5. Do the transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her post-secondary goal(s)?
- 6. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) related to the student's transition services needs?
- 7. Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed?
- 8. If appropriate, is there evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority?



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Timely IEPs and Triennials

- Timely IEPs and Triennials:
 - Based on last_iep and last_eval fields from June 30 CASEMIS
 - Takes into account exit dates for students



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Annual IEP

A-36 LAST_IEP Date of student's last complete IEP meeting

Definition:	It is the date when the last IEP, IFSP, or ISP (if the student is placed in a private school by a parent) meeting was held for the student. It would most likely be the student's latest annual or triennial review of the IEP. All data on a student record shall be obtained from the IEP/IFSP/ISP document resulting from this meeting. In absence of an IEP date, this date may also be the last placement date.
Purpose:	To determine the length of time the student has been in the current program; to research and analyze historical profiles of students with common characteristics using past years' data.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Annual IEP Delay Codes

A-66 IEPDELAY Reason the annual IEP is untimely	
Definition:	This is the reason the annual IEP should be considered timely.
Purpose:	To comply with the requirements under IDEA (34 <i>CFR</i> 300.301 (c)(1)).
Valid Format & Codes:	<p>CC (2-digit character code)</p> <p>Reason for delay:</p> <p>10 Timely IEP; another IEP held after timely IEP</p> <p>20 Parent contacted-did not attend</p> <p>30 Transfer</p> <p>90 Other (SELPA must list reason in district summary report to CDE)</p> <p>Note: This Field may be left blank for students whose annual IEP was timely.</p>
Comment:	This Field must be completed for each student whose last IEP was late and should be considered timely . (optional December 2014)
Verified:	An entry in this Field must be one of the codes listed for this Field; otherwise an error will result.

Triennial IEP



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

A-37 LAST_EVAL Date of the latest determination of initial or continued eligibility for special education.	
Definition:	<p>For determination of continued eligibility in special education, the date in this Field shall be the date of such determination of continued eligibility, which in most or all cases will be an IEP team meeting date. This determination, also known as a triennial review, shall be made at least once every three years and more frequently if warranted or if requested by the student's parents or teacher.</p> <p>Notwithstanding certain procedural requirements, the members of the IEP team may determine continued eligibility without a meeting. In such cases, the date in this Field shall be the date when the members of the IEP team reached agreement on continued eligibility. The members of the IEP team are not required to hold a meeting to determine continued eligibility if all of the following are true:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The members of the IEP team have previously agreed that determination of continued eligibility is to be based upon a summary of existing data• No new assessment has been conducted• The determination of continued eligibility is not expected to result in any changes to the student's existing IEP, and• The student's parents have not requested an IEP team meeting for the purpose of determining continued eligibility.
Purpose:	To monitor three-year re-evaluation of students with disabilities as per the federal requirements under IDEA.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Triennial Delay Codes

A-67 TRIDELAY Reason the triennial evaluation is untimely	
Definition:	This is the reason the triennial evaluation is late and should be considered timely.
Purpose:	To comply with the requirements under IDEA (<i>34 CFR 300.124 (b)</i>).
Valid Format & Codes:	<p>CC (2-digit character code)</p> <p>Reason for delay:</p> <p>10 Timely IEP; another IEP held after timely IEP</p> <p>20 Parent contacted-did not attend</p> <p>30 Transfer</p> <p>90 Other (SELPA must list reason in district summary report to CDE)</p> <p>Note: This Field may be left blank for students whose triennial evaluation was timely.</p>
Comment:	This Field must be completed for each student whose triennial evaluation was late and should be considered timely. (optional December 2014)
Verified:	The entry in this Field must be one of the codes listed for this Field; otherwise, an error will result.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Roles and Responsibilities

- The CDE determines and notifies LEAs of noncompliances
- LEAs make and provide evidence of corrections via website
- FMTA assist the LEAs and approve their submission



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

DINC Web site

- Web Application Changes
 - 60 Day Timeline
 - Compliance Plan

<https://www2.cde.ca.gov/dinc/logon.aspx>



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Web site Authorities

- LEA – Enter, Submit
- SELPA – Enter, Submit
- FMTA – Enter, Approve, Unlock



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Web site Responsibilities

- SELPA/LEA
 - Provide evidence/date/location
- SED: AES
 - Technical Support (passwords, etc.)
- SED: FMTA
 - Approval of evidence/date/location



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Web site issues

- Passwords:
 - Copy/Paste Method
- Mac and downloads
 - Text file



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Next Steps

- Due Date Nov 30th
- December 1st CASEMIS submission

Item 3.2 Educator Effectiveness Funding



CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION

TOM TORLAKSON
STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

October 1, 2015

Dear County and District Superintendents of Schools, Charter School Administrators, and State Special School Superintendents:

2015–16 EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS FUNDING

The purpose of this letter is to notify local educational agencies (LEAs) that the 2015–16 Educator Effectiveness entitlement has been posted. The Educator Effectiveness funding is available to county offices of education, school districts, charter schools (both direct and locally funded), and state special schools that reported full-time equivalent (FTE) certificated staff in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) for the 2014–15 fiscal year (FY). The Educator Effectiveness funds are specifically to be used for professional development, coaching, and support services, as outlined in Section 58 of Assembly Bill (AB) 104, Chapter 13, statutes of 2015 and amended by Section 8 of Senate Bill (SB) 103, Chapter 324, statutes of 2015.

The California Department of Education (CDE) will apportion funds to eligible LEAs in two installments. The first apportionment reflecting approximately 80 percent of each LEA's entitlement will be released in December 2015. Remaining funds will be released in March 2016. The 2015–16 calculated funding rate is approximately \$1,466 per FTE. LEAs have three years to spend the funds.

Educator Effectiveness details may be accessed on the Educator Effectiveness Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/ca/educatoreffectiveness.asp>.

There is no requirement to submit additional information in order to receive Educator Effectiveness funding. However, there are conditions of funding, described on the Educator Effectiveness Web page, which include developing a local plan and submitting expenditure information in the future.

AB 104, Section 58 and SB 103, Section 8 appropriate \$490,000,000 for the Educator Effectiveness program in FY 2015–16. The funds can be used for the following purposes:

- Beginning teacher and administrator support and mentoring, including, but not limited to, programs that support new teacher and administrator ability to teach or lead effectively

and to meet induction requirements adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and pursuant to Section 44259 of the California *Education Code (EC)*.

- Professional development, coaching, and support services for teachers who have been identified as needing improvement or additional support by LEAs.
- Professional development for teachers and administrators that is aligned to the state content standards adopted pursuant to sections 51226, 60605, 60605.1, 60605.2, 60605.3, 60605.8, 60605.11, 60605.85, as that Section read on June 30, 2014, and 60811.3, as that Section read on June 30, 2013, of the *EC*.
- To promote educator quality and effectiveness, including, but not limited to, training on mentoring and coaching certificated staff and training certificated staff to support effective teaching and learning.

Allocation of funds is based on an equal amount per certificated FTE, which cannot exceed an LEA's total certificated staff count, as reported in CALPADS during the 2014–15 FY. Instances in which the FTE for one staff member was greater than one have been adjusted to a maximum of one. In addition, the CDE identified and contacted select LEAs based on data anomalies. In some instances amended data was obtained from the select LEAs. Due to necessary adjustments, the certificated FTE used to calculate the Educator Effectiveness funding will not be an exact match with the FTE information available in the DataQuest system. The certificated FTE numbers used in the calculation of funds will be posted on the CDE's Educator Effectiveness Web page.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Ruthann Munsterman, Fiscal Assistant, Categorical Allocations & Management Assistance Unit, by phone at 916-324-6178 or by email at rmunsterman@cde.ca.gov, or Julie Klein-Briggs, Fiscal Consultant, Categorical Allocations & Management Assistance Unit, by phone at 916-323-6191 or by email at jbriggs@cde.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Peter Foggiato, Director
School Fiscal Services Division

Last Reviewed: Friday, October 2, 2015

Educator Effectiveness FAQs

Questions and answers regarding Educator Effectiveness.

1. [Who is eligible to receive Educator Effectiveness funds?](#)

School districts, county offices of education, charter schools, and state special schools with full-time equivalent (FTE) certificated staff are eligible to receive Educator Effectiveness funds. The staff counts were calculated by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction using data submitted to the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) for the 2014–15 fiscal year.

2. [Are employees of Regional Occupational Centers and Programs Joint Powers Agencies included?](#)

No. Only school districts, county offices of education, charter schools, and state special schools with full-time equivalent (FTE) certificated staff are eligible to receive Educator Effectiveness funds.

3. [Are there conditions placed on local educational agencies \(LEAs\) receiving the Educator Effectiveness funds?](#)

As a condition of receiving Educator Effectiveness funds, a school district, county office of education, charter school, or state special school is required to:

1. Develop and adopt a plan delineating how the Educator Effectiveness funds will be spent. The plan must be explained in a public meeting of the governing board of the school district or county board of education, or governing body of the charter school, before its adoption in a subsequent public meeting.
2. On or before July 1, 2018, report detailed expenditure information to the California Department of Education (CDE), including, but not limited to, specific purchases made and the number of teachers, administrators, or paraprofessional educators that received professional development.

4. [Does a recipient of funds have to submit its local plan for the Educator Effectiveness Fund to the CDE?](#)

No. The local plan for the Educator Effectiveness funds needs to be heard in a public meeting of the governing board of the school district, the county board of education, or governing body of the charter school, before its adoption in a subsequent public meeting.

5. [How will the Educator Effectiveness funding be calculated?](#)

Allocation of funds is based on an equal amount per certificated FTE, which cannot exceed an LEA's total certificated staff count, as reported in CALPADS during the 2014–15 fiscal year. Staff with an FTE greater than one was adjusted to one FTE. In addition, the CDE identified and contacted select LEAs based on data anomalies. In some

instances amended data was obtained from the select LEAs. Due to necessary adjustments, the certificated FTE used to calculate the Educator Effectiveness funding will not be an exact match with the FTE information available in the DataQuest system. The certificated FTE numbers used in the calculation of funds will be posted on the CDE's Educator Effectiveness Web page. The 2015–16 calculated funding rate is approximately \$1,466 per certificated FTE.

6. **[We made an error when we reported our certificated staff data last year. Can we amend our data now and get a revised entitlement?](#)**

No. The CDE is not accepting amendments to the staff data used to calculate the entitlement. You may contact Ruthann Munsterman, Fiscal Assistant, by e-mail at rmunsterman@cde.ca.gov if you would like to discuss your situation further.

7. **[When can LEAs expect to receive the Educator Effectiveness funds?](#)**

The CDE plans to issue the first apportionment (80 percent of funds) in December 2015, and a second apportionment (20 percent of funds) in March 2016.

8. **[How long do I have to spend the funds?](#)**

Funds may be expended anytime during the 2015–16, 2016–17, and 2017–18 fiscal years. A final expenditure report will be due at the end of the 2017–18 fiscal year. Any funds not expended by June 30, 2018 must be returned to the CDE.

9. **[What are the allowable uses of the Educator Effectiveness funds?](#)**

Educator Effectiveness funds may be used to support the professional development of certificated teachers, administrators, and paraprofessional educators. Funds can be expended for any of the following purposes:

1. Beginning teacher and administrator support and mentoring, including, but not limited to, programs that support new teacher and administrator ability to teach or lead effectively and to meet induction requirements adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and pursuant to Section 44259 of the Education Code.
2. Professional development, coaching, and support services for teachers who have been identified as needing improvement or additional support by local educational agencies.
3. Professional development for teachers and administrators that is aligned to the state content standards adopted pursuant to Sections 51226, 60605, 60605.1, 60605.2, 60605.3, 60605.08, 60605.11, 60605.85, as that section read on June 30, 2014, and 60811.3, as that section read on June 30, 2013, of the *Education Code*.
4. To promote educator quality and effectiveness, including, but not limited to, training on mentoring and coaching certificated staff and training certificated staff to support effective teaching and learning.

10. **[Can funds be spent on paraprofessionals?](#)**

Although the distribution of funds was based only on certificated staff; in order to promote educator quality and effectiveness, it is allowable to expend funds on training for administrators, teachers, or paraprofessional educators.

11. **Will these funds be subject to a state audit?**

Yes. The Educator Effectiveness funds are subject to the annual audits required by *EC* Section 41020.

12. **Where can I find more information on the Educator Effectiveness funds?**

Language governing the allocation and use of the Educator Effectiveness funds can be found in SB 103, Section 8 and AB 104, Section 58.

13. **Where can I find information on the final expenditure report?**

The CDE is currently developing the format and content of the final expenditure report. At a minimum, the law requires that the number of teachers, administrators, and paraprofessional educators that received professional development must be reported. Information will be posted as soon as it becomes available.

Questions: Ruthann Munsterman | rmunsterman@cde.ca.gov | 916-324-6178
Last Reviewed: Friday, October 2, 2015

**SCHEDULE OF ENTITLEMENTS FOR EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS
FOR PARTICIPATING LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES
FISCAL YEAR 2015-16**

County Code	District Code	School Code	Charter Number	Fund Type	Vendor Number	Local Educational Agency Name	Certificated Staff FTE Counts (1)	2015-16 Educator Effectiveness Entitlement	80% Payment Scheduled for December	20% Payment Scheduled for March
36	10363	0000000				San Bernardino County Office of Education	325.81	\$ 477,809	\$ 382,247	\$ 95,562
36	10363	0115808	0903	D	C903	Norton Space and Aeronautics Academy	33.50	\$ 49,129	\$ 39,303	\$ 9,826
36	67587	0000000				Adelanto Elementary	374.50	\$ 549,214	\$ 439,371	\$ 109,843
36	67587	0120592	1147	D	S147	Alta Vista Public	68.00	\$ 99,724	\$ 79,779	\$ 19,945
36	67587	0128462	1520	D	S520	Taylton High Desert Academy/Adelanto	10.50	\$ 15,399	\$ 12,319	\$ 3,080
36	67587	6111918	1522	D	S522	Desert Trails Preparatory Academy	24.50	\$ 35,930	\$ 28,744	\$ 7,186
36	67611	0000000				Barstow Unified	270.47	\$ 396,651	\$ 317,321	\$ 79,330
36	67637	0000000				Bear Valley Unified	116.66	\$ 171,085	\$ 136,868	\$ 34,217
36	67736	0000000				Helendale Elementary	30.40	\$ 44,582	\$ 35,666	\$ 8,916
36	67736	0116723	0968	L		Academy of Careers and Exploration	14.90	\$ 21,851	\$ 17,481	\$ 4,370
36	67736	0128439	1592	D	S592	Empire Springs Charter	29.51	\$ 43,277	\$ 34,622	\$ 8,655
36	67736	0130948	1679	L		Independence Charter Academy	2.40	\$ 3,520	\$ 2,816	\$ 704
36	67736	0131151	1691	D		Alta Vista South Public Charter	14.00	\$ 20,531	\$ 16,425	\$ 4,106
36	67801	0000000				Needles Unified	43.33	\$ 63,545	\$ 50,836	\$ 12,709
36	67827	0000000				Oro Grande Elementary	21.40	\$ 31,384	\$ 25,107	\$ 6,277
36	67827	0111807	0762	D	C762	Mojave River Academy	73.20	\$ 107,350	\$ 85,880	\$ 21,470
36	67827	0113928	0855	L		Riverside Preparatory	116.09	\$ 170,249	\$ 136,199	\$ 34,050
36	67892	0000000				Trona Joint Unified	21.58	\$ 31,648	\$ 25,318	\$ 6,330
36	67918	0000000				Victor Elementary	500.16	\$ 733,498	\$ 586,798	\$ 146,700
36	67918	6101927	0309	L		Sixth Street Prep	11.00	\$ 16,132	\$ 12,906	\$ 3,226
36	67918	6118350	0296	L		Mountain View Montessori Charter	9.00	\$ 13,199	\$ 10,559	\$ 2,640
36	67934	0000000				Victor Valley Union High	438.84	\$ 643,571	\$ 514,857	\$ 128,714
36	67934	3630670	0013	D	C013	Options for Youth-Victorville Charter	185.00	\$ 271,307	\$ 217,046	\$ 54,261
36	67934	3630761	0074	D	C074	Excelsior Charter	85.00	\$ 124,655	\$ 99,724	\$ 24,931
36	73858	0000000				Baker Valley Unified	15.50	\$ 22,731	\$ 18,185	\$ 4,546
36	73890	0000000				Silver Valley Unified	157.50	\$ 230,978	\$ 184,782	\$ 46,196
36	73957	0000000				Snowline Joint Unified	411.59	\$ 603,608	\$ 482,886	\$ 120,722
36	75044	0000000				Hesperia Unified	973.58	\$ 1,427,781	\$ 1,142,225	\$ 285,556
36	75044	0107516	0671	D	C671	Summit Leadership Academy-High Desert	13.75	\$ 20,165	\$ 16,132	\$ 4,033
36	75044	0112441	0801	D	C801	Pathways to College	17.00	\$ 24,931	\$ 19,945	\$ 4,986
36	75044	0114389	0885	D	C885	Mirus Secondary	14.70	\$ 21,558	\$ 17,246	\$ 4,312
36	75044	0116707	0971	D	C971	Encore Jr./Sr. High School for the Performing and Visual Arts	44.30	\$ 64,967	\$ 51,974	\$ 12,993
36	75044	0118059	1034	D	S034	LaVerne Elementary Preparatory Academy	23.00	\$ 33,730	\$ 26,984	\$ 6,746
36	75051	0000000				Lucerne Valley Unified	41.40	\$ 60,714	\$ 48,571	\$ 12,143
36	75051	0115089	0905	D	C905	Sky Mountain Charter	97.50	\$ 142,986	\$ 114,389	\$ 28,597
36	75077	0000000				Apple Valley Unified	618.68	\$ 907,311	\$ 725,849	\$ 181,462
36	75077	3631207	0127	D	C127	Academy for Academic Excellence	75.50	\$ 110,723	\$ 88,578	\$ 22,145
							5,323.75	7,807,423.00	6,245,938.00	1,561,485.00

(1) CDE identified and contacted select LEAs based on data anomalies.
In some instances amended data was obtained from the select LEAs.

California Department of Education
School Fiscal Services Division
October 2015

Item 3.3 Purchase of
Building Update Report &
Discussion Only- No handout

Item 3.4 2015/16 AB602
Projected Funding
Distribution