SELPA Governing Board Meeting  
November 29, 2017  
8:30 – 10:00 a.m.  
Butte County Office of Education: Boardroom  
1859 Bird Street, Oroville CA

AGENDA

1. Call to Order .................................................................Doug Kaelin
2. Introductions ...............................................................Doug Kaelin
3. Approval of the Agenda - Action......................................Doug Kaelin  
   (2 minutes)
4. Approval of the Minutes - Action......................................Doug Kaelin  
   (2 minutes)
5. Public Comment ............................................................Doug Kaelin  
   (2 minutes)
6. Closed Session: ED/ASD Services.................................Doug Kaelin  
   Pending Litigation: Pursuant to Government Code 54956.9
7. Reopen Session.............................................................Doug Kaelin  
   (1 minute)
8. LP Funding Allocation Plan Policy - Action......................Roy Applegate  
   (20 minutes)  
   Lisa Anderson
9. Regional Units w/out Speech - Action ............................Roy Applegate  
   (15 minutes)
10. Juvenile Hall DOR for out of County Students - Info .........Roy Applegate  
    (10 minutes)
11. SELPA Director’s Report ...............................................Roy Applegate  
    (15 minutes)
   •
12. Good of the Order: Future Agenda items .......................Doug Kaelin  
    (5 minutes)
13. Adjournment ................................................................Doug Kaelin
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“WHERE CHILDREN COME FIRST”
SELPA GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
October 18, 2017
8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Butte County Office of Education: Lincoln Center Conf. Rm.
1870 Bird Street, Oroville CA

MINUTES

Attending: Roy Applegate, Tim Taylor, Lisa Anderson, Corey Willenberg, Doug Kaelin, Casey Taylor, Jim Hanlon (proxy for Kelly Staley), Ted Fredenburg, Michelle Zevely, Lily Chang, Diane Olsen, Bryan Caples, Mary Sakuma, Jordan Reeves, Mary Cox, Jennifer Foglesong (proxy for Michelle John), Minden King, & Jenny Dolan-minutes

Absent: Roger Bylund, Patsy Oxford, Josh Peete, Kathy Dahlgren, Greg Blake, Penney Chennell-Carter

Guests: Janet Peck

Handouts emailed and/or distributed at the meeting:
- Minutes from 9/19/17 Governing Board Meeting
- Agenda summary for items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
- CDE SpEd Division Monitoring Activities Summary
- Regional Services Policy
- Regional Services Policy – Major Revisions Summary
- Procedures Manual (Section II)
- Eligibility Criteria Handbook

1. Call to Order
Doug Kaelin called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

2. Introductions
Doug Kaelin welcomed the group. Introductions were made around the room.

3. Approval of the Agenda
Doug Kaelin asked for approval of the agenda.

MOTION: Corey Willenberg made a motion to approve the agenda. Jim Hanlon seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously: 8 regions / 53 votes approving; 0-No; 0-Abstaining.

4. Approval of the Minutes
Doug Kaelin asked for approval of the minutes.

MOTION: Corey Willenberg made a motion to approve the minutes. Jim Hanlon seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously: 8 regions / 53 votes approving; 0-No; 0-Abstaining.

“WHERE CHILDREN COME FIRST”
5. **Public Comment**  
There was no public comment.

6. **CDE Monitoring Summary**  
Roy Applegate introduced Lily Chang, Program Specialist, who will be the main contact for districts during this CDE monitoring process.

Lily Chang reviewed the 14 State Performance Plan Indicators (or SPPI) CDE is currently reviewing. The indicators are broken out and reviewed in different sections. PIR (Performance Indicator Review), DINC (Data Identified Noncompliance), SigDis (Significant Disproportionality), and Comprehensive Review.

Roy noted majority of the Butte districts are currently being reviewed in one or more of the above referenced sections. He added if any questions or concerns arise; please reach out to Lily or himself to clarify.

Further discussion was had regarding the process and students identified. Diane Olsen added, the Comprehensive Review and Performance Indicator Review covers the past 3 years of data and will review only students maintained in said district during that time.

7. **Regional Services Policy**  
Roy Applegate discussed the Regional Services Policy revision, he noted the draft being proposed has already been reviewed and approved by the Coordinator’s group with minor changes being made based on their feedback. Roy passed out a handout outlining the major changes of the policy. He added this is the strongest he believes the policy can be. Roy also noted the Funding Allocation revisions are still be worked through and that he will be working with Lisa Anderson to finalize and bring back in November.

Jim Hanlon expressed his concern over his original understanding that both policies would be presented together. He noted he was hesitant to vote on the Regional Services Policy while not knowing the impact it could have on the Funding Allocation policy. Roy and Lisa assured the group the Regional Services policy can stand on its own while revisions can be made to the Funding Allocation policy until the group agrees on the outcome.

Corey Willenberg maintained his belief the policies should be finalized together.

Diane Olsen clarified the Regional Services policy is a description of what the units are and what is provided while the policy to fund is a separate piece. She noted while they impact one another they are also very independent of each other.

Further discussion was had among the group.

Roy added that once a final draft is complete, he will send it out to the Governance group for review.

**MOTION:** Tim Taylor made a motion to approve the Regional Services policy. Bryan Caples seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously: 8 regions / 49 votes approving; 4-No; 0-Abstaining.
8. **Procedures Manual (Section II)**
Roy Applegate noted the changes to the Procedures Manual were minor, such as words omitted and misspellings.

MOTION: Tim Taylor made a motion to approve the Procedures Manual (Section II) as updated. Jim Hanlon seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously: 8 regions/ 53 votes approving; 0-No; 0-Abstaining.

9. **Eligibility Criteria Handbook**
Roy Applegate reviewed the Eligibility Criteria Handbook which is a new policy adopted from Yuba County. He noted it is a helpful guide to look at criteria for eligibility giving guidance for assessment. He added it would primarily be used by school Psychologists or Speech Therapists and that IEP teams may refer to it on occasion.

MOTION: Jim Hanlon made a motion to approve the Eligibility Criteria Handbook. Ted Fredenburg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously: 8 regions/ 53 votes approving; 0-No; 0-Abstaining.

10. **LEA ACHS Application**
Roy Applegate noted the application for the Achieve Charter High School was submitted over the summer. He added, in the case of LEA Status, it is not a review of the quality of the program but rather if they submitted a proper application meeting all required components. Roy noted, this is the case for the LEA ACHS Application and recommends approval when the item is brought back as an action item at the next meeting.

11. **Butte CHELPA**
Roy Applegate asked direction from the group as to what sort of role he should play in a recent request from the Charters. He was asked to look at the possibility for a different funding allocation for Charters as they feel they do not use regional services and along with that feel they shouldn't pay to the funds set aside for said services. As the Charters have expressed their preference to stay in Butte County, the question was posed could Butte County add a Charter SELPA.

Further discussion was had around the financial impact if the Charters were to leave and possible outcomes of adjusting the funding to better benefit the Charters.

The group agreed it would be beneficial for Roy to review these options further. Roy noted both El Dorado and Sonoma are willing to share their plan currently in place for their Charters. Roy to research further and bring back to the group.

12. **SELPA Director’s Report**
   - OHC – Roy noted there is a new Out of Home Care model circulating that looks promising. He will bring back further information as it is received.
   - Services for non SELPA Charters – Roy discussed continued requests for services from non SELPA Charters. He noted in the past he has declined services but posed the question to the group as to if it should be considered with a tax on the service. The group asked Roy to research further.
   - Future Agenda Items – Roy asked if there were any suggestions from the group for future items. Tim Taylor asked for further information around mental health. No other items were presented.

16. **Good of the Order: Future Agenda Items**
None at this time.
17. **Adjournment**

Hearing no further comments, Doug Kaelin adjourned the meeting at 9:44 a.m.
From: Matthew P. Juhl-Darlington [mailto:mdarlington@dwkesq.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 2:28 PM
To: Roy Applegate <rapplegate@bcoe.org>
Subject: FW: Question

Hi Roy,

Per the terms of the contract, since the contract expires between the parties on June 30, 2018 (See page 30 of Master Contract), there is no technical obligation on the SELPA’s part to officially notify the NPS of its unwillingness to continue to contract with it for the 2018-19 school year. However, since this Master Contract states at the beginning of the agreement that it is for the 2017-18 school year (See page 1-2 of the Master Contract), but within the body of the contract has a start date of July 1, 2016, the safest route to take would be to provide reasonable notice to the NPS that the SELPA would like to terminate the contract before June 30, 2018, and that it intends not to contract with the NPS into the future. The 20 day termination language which appears at page 6 of the Master Contract is not applicable to your current question posed as I assume, based upon your communication, that you do not wish to terminate the agreement “for cause.”

In your email communication below, you also indicate that the reason why the SELPA is terminating the Master Contract with the NPS is because the SELPA would like to create its own equivalent program. While we believe this is a reasonable proposition, and in the best interest of the SELPA, our only warning is to make sure that the SELPA has an equivalent program set-up, and in place, and, as necessary, approved by the appropriate agencies if need-be, prior to terminating the Master Contract with the current NPS.

I will call you as a follow up to this email. Please let me know if you have any follow up questions.

Thanks,
Matt

Matthew P. Juhl-Darlington
Attorney at Law
DANNIS WOLIVER KELLEY
2485 Notre Dame Boulevard, Suite 370-A
Chico, CA  95928
TEL     530.343.3334 (Office)
TEL     530.513.2939 (Cell)
FAX     530.924.4784
mdarlington@DWKesq.com
www.DWKesq.com
PREPARED BY: Roy Applegate

MEETING DATE: 11.29.17

AGENDA ITEM: 8

TOPIC/ISSUE: LP Funding Allocation Plan Policy

BACKGROUND: The is the final step in the significant revisions made to the regional services policies. In October, the Governance approved the actual policy and as a consequence of changes in that policy, revisions were necessary to the funding allocation policy. Included in your packet is revenue distribution estimate for 18-19 based on the current information we have. It is important to realize it is highly likely the specific numbers will change after the next regional count review that has started and will be presented at the January Governance.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Significant changes in the calculation methodologies for regional unit rates and in some cases revenue distributions to districts (see revenue distribution estimate). Districts who might otherwise lose regional dollars had these effects mitigated using a supplemental funding mechanism with funds from OHC.

COORDINATING COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION: None

SELPA RECOMMENDATION: Approve
The first priority of the Butte County SELPA is to provide the highest quality educationally appropriate programs and services possible within the available funding limits resources. The SELPA recognizes, however, that the cost of providing special education programs exceeds available funding sources. With this in mind, it is critical that the SELPA facilitate cooperation and communication among the participating LEAs to address the funding of special education programs. This communication must provide information which will assist all LEAs in making appropriate fiscal decisions in order to provide special education services to the students that they serve.

Definitions

AB602: Assembly Bill 602 provides the funding calculation methodology for special education revenue based on county-wide funded Period 2 (P-2) and select Annual Average Daily Attendance (ADA). For purposes of this allocation plan, total AB602 funding will be the amount of money generated by county-wide ADA.

Regional SELPA Programs: County-wide special education programs operated by Butte County Office of Education (BCOE) and programs operated by Local Education Agencies (LEA’s) as a result of program transfers in 20012012 and any subsequent program transfers approved by the Governance Council in the future. Regional programs and services that are Governance approved.

Regional Provider (RP): A Local Education Agency (LEA) operating a regional SELPA program.

District LEA Programs: Programs operated by districts other than those obtained as a result of a program transfer. Special Education services that are created and funded solely with local LEA funds.

Unfunded Costs (billback): The difference between income and expenses.

Other Funding Sources: There is additional special education funding amounts based on other factors than county-wide ADA. Examples of these funding sources are SELPA, Low Incidence, and Out of Home Care. Special Education funding other than AB602 funds used to support regional programs.

AB 602 AB602 Allocation Formula

AB 602 AB602 funding for special education, which consists of state entitlement, federal local assistance money funds and local property taxes is allocated in the following manner:

1. SELPA Administration, Staff Development and Low Incidence Equipment and Services: The SELPA Administration, Staff Development and Low Incidence Equipment and Services allocation is first deducted from the total AB602 funding.
Butte County Special Education Local Plan Area

FUNDING ALLOCATION PLAN

2. Regional Program Allocation: The Regional Program Allocation is calculated and deducted second from the AB602 funding. Regional program revenue shall be calculated at 42% of 29% of the total AB602 revenue, net of SELPA Administration, Staff Development and Low Incidence Equipment and Services. The amount of this regional program revenue allocated to Regional Providers shall be based on "regional units" as assigned by the SELPA Governance Committee. Regional unit rates differ for type of service provided (Severe, Non-severe, Resource Specialist Program, and Designated Instructional Service). Every effort shall be made to maintain unit rates at values consistent with historical unit rates.

Note: The 42% was the percentage of AB602 revenue allocated to regional programs in 2010-11. The regional unit funding rate will be calculated by dividing the 42% 29% of the remaining AB602 funds by the total number of approved units and will be recalculated annually. Two funded units will be set aside annually initially, in the event a new regional unit is needed mid-year. The SELPA Governance shall also have the authority to grant further funded regional units at any time if the need arises.

AB602 Allocation to LEAs: The remaining balance of AB602 revenues shall be distributed to LEA's based on funded P-2 ADA and will be recalculated annually by the SELPA Administrative Unit (AU) beginning in the 2012-13 school year. The allocation to LEA's may be net of a contribution to SELPA administration if required (see Other Funding Sources #1 below).

For three years beginning in the 2012-13 fiscal year and ending in the 2014-15 fiscal year, LEAs whose special education funding was reduced by more than 20% using the P-2 ADA calculation when compared to funding in the 2011-12 school year shall receive 80% of the difference capped at a maximum amount of $100,000. This "hold harmless" adjustment for these reduced revenue LEAs shall be paid with Out of Home Care (OHC) funds.

Other Funding Sources:

1. SELPA Administration: The SELPA administration receives revenue in an amount equal to CDE P-2 recertification the specific funding exhibit for Program Specialist/Regional Services funding exhibit of (?). Any difference between revenue and expenses for SELPA administration shall be covered by a contribution from total AB602 funds. The SELPA administrative budget is approved annually by the SELPA governing board.

2. Low Incidence Materials & Equipment: Low Incidence (LI) Services receives revenue in an amount equal to the specific funding exhibit for Low Incidence Materials and Equipment. The SELPA shall administrate Low Incidence funds in accordance with the Low Incidence policy. The funding rate will be set at the P-2 CDE recertification to be held at the same rate when Low Incidence Equip & Service was apportioned in XXXX (add year) when it was provided in separate exhibits and will be transferred to the SELPA from AB602 funds.

Out of Home Care: Out of Home Care (OHC) receives revenue in an amount equal to the specific funding exhibit for Out of Home Care Funding. OHC funds will be maintained at the SELPA and distributed at the discretion of the Governance.
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FUNDING ALLOCATION PLAN

- Students placed in LCI group homes within a Butte County SELPA member district by an out of county agency that receive services from an NPA/NPS will be funded/reimbursed 100% from Out of Home Care dollars less the ADA Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) funding for these students.

4. Federal IDEALocal Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Staff Development Grants, SELPA: Grants for Low Incidence Services and Staff Development are allocated to the SELPA. These funds will transfer to the SELPA. The funding rate will be at the P-2 CDE recertification amount and will be transferred to the SELPA from AB602 funds.

2. Federal IDEA Grants, Other Preschool & Infant: Grants for Pre-school and Infant programs are allocated to the LEA(s) operating the program. These grants will be allocated to regional providers of Infant and Preschool services.

5. Federal IDEALocal Assistance Grants Other: Forty percent of the Federal Local Assistance Grant is allocated to the Butte County Office of Education (BCOE) first. The remaining federal IDEA grants will be allocated to LEAs based on prior year P-2 ADA.

SELPA Administration Allocation Details

4. SELPA Administration: The SELPA administration receives revenue in an amount equal to the CDE P-2 recertification funding exhibit of the 2012-13 Program Specialist/Regional Services in 2012-13: $49,454 (historical allocation) and funded Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) from AB602 funds. Any difference between revenue and expenses for SELPA administration shall be covered by a contribution from total AB602 funds. The SELPA administration budget is approved annually by the SELPA governing board.

5. Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Staff Development: The funding rate will be at the P-2 CDE recertification amount and transferred to the SELPA from AB602 funds.

6. Inter-SELPA NPS Transfers

NPS placed students are the financial responsibility of the district of origin in the event the student moves from one LEA to another LEA within the SELPA during the course of a school year. These costs will include the extended school year session (ESY) if the district of origin agreed to ESY in the placing IEP, including that portion of the ESY that may extend into the following fiscal year. The district of origin’s responsibility ends at the close of the school year, including ESY if applicable.
FUNDING ALLOCATION PLAN

If the student requires a new IEP meeting, any additional services added to the student’s IEP will be the responsibility of the receiving district. The district of origin will retain its responsibility for the portion of services they agree to provide in the placing IEP.

For NPS transfers to or from another SELPA: SELPA will follow funding responsibilities required under Education Code 56325(C) (C). The financial responsibility for the NPS placement will remain with the district of origin for the remainder of the school year.

Billback Procedures

Whenever a district places a student in a program outside of their District of Residence, that district is responsible for a share of any program deficit incurred by the District of Service. Billback formulas contained in this policy will be used by all LEAs in the SELPA.

Formulas

Unfunded program costs will be addressed in the following manner:

- Regional SELPA Programs: These include Severe (SH-SDC), Non-Severe (NSH-SDC), Resource Specialist (RSP), and Designated Instructional Services (DIS), Occupational Therapists (OT), Assistive Technology (AT), Preschool and Infant programs. Unfunded costs are converted to a ‘Cost per Student’ amount and billed to individual districts based on average student enrollment.

- District Programs: (This applies to students placed in District operated vs. Regional programs outside their District of Residence through the Interdistrict Placement process.) Unfunded costs are converted to a ‘Cost per Student’ amount and billed to individual districts based on average student enrollment.

- SELPA Office: Unfunded costs in the SELPA budget will be funded from the AB 602 allocation.

- Educationally Related Mental Health Services: In the event all educationally related mental health revenues are exhausted in a given fiscal year, excess costs for these services shall be paid by the district of residence based on fees for the services rendered to the student(s). The costs of these services will be billed to the district within 30 days of the receipt of the services costs by the service provider.

- Note: The formula for determining bill backs is located in Appendix A the Billback Calculation section of this document.

Revenue Limit for ADA Local Control Funding Formula ADA

Whenever a student in a special day class is mainstreamed on a regular basis into a general education classroom during the instructional day for academic or non-academic purposes, the district operating the general education program will receive the revenue limit Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) per ADA for their local program. Revenue limit LCFF funds generated for students attending a regional program full-time will be determined through the Regional Provider’s...
student information system LCFF Calculator and be applied in calculating billbacks (This includes the revenue generated by the regional provider’s students and students from participating districts). How the SELPA was funded (prior year or current year) and the program start date shall be taken into consideration when applying the LCFF ADA funds offset. The program start date shall be taken into consideration when applying the LCFF ADA funds offset, as the SELPA is funded on either current year or prior year ADA. The application of the LCFF ADA funds offset will be affected by how the SELPA is funded in a particular year. Evidence of attendance assignment must be clearly documented in each student’s IEP.

Billback Information Cycle
Billback Enrollment Pupil Counts: All Regional Providers (RPs) will complete data extracts for enrollment of students participating in their programs from the SEIS program four times during the fiscal year. Specifically, the pupil count data extracts (enrollment lists) will be done for the calendar dates: October 1st, December 1st, February 1st, and April 1st. LEAs will have an opportunity to review the enrollment lists and make corrections for two weeks after the lists are distributed. Regional Providers should contact participating districts at least two weeks prior to extracting enrollment reports allowing districts to make corrections and/or verify accuracy of information in the SEIS program.

Billback statements by program category will be provided to districts participating in regional programs 30 days after each enrollment report is extracted. A sample statement is provided in Appendix B. If not provided in the billback, districts may request and are entitled to all of the information contained in the sample billback statement in Appendix B. A billback estimate will be provided at each budget period (Original, 1st Interim, 2nd Interim, and Estimated Actuals). Prior year pupil counts will be used for the Original and 1st Interim billback estimates. The current year October and December pupil counts will be used for the 2nd Interim billback estimate. The current year October, December and February (if available) pupil counts will be used for the Estimated Actuals estimate.

Billback Calculations

Billback calculations shall include the following:

1. Revenues: Include AB602 funding, federal local assistance grant, LCFF funds, program transfers, applicable federal grants and local revenue.
2. Expenditures: Include certificated and classified salaries, employee benefits, books, materials and supplies, services and other operating expenditures, direct support/indirect costs and other outgo/financing uses.
3. The deficit or amount to bill back is the excess of expenditures over revenues.
4. The billback per student is calculated by dividing the average of the total number of students in the program into the deficit to arrive at a billback amount per student.
5. The applicable billback to the district of residence is calculated by multiplying the billback per student (#4) by the number of students from each district of residence.

Billing/Payment Schedule

Billbacks will be based on current year excess costs with two cash collections completed during the fiscal year. The first invoice or S-transfer will be completed in January for 50% of the estimated total billback for the current year and any prior year difference. The second cash collection either by invoice or S-transfer will be completed in June for the remaining 50% of the current year estimate.
If a prior year adjustment is calculated for a district that is no longer receiving services from the Regional Provider, the prior year adjustment shall be invoiced or reimbursed within 630 days of the Regional Provider closing their books.

Regional Providers will distribute the final billback for the fiscal year within 75 days of the fiscal year end.

All Regional Providers may use the S-transfer process for collecting payments from districts receiving regional services. If a dispute arises regarding billback calculations, RPs and districts may submit the matter for dispute resolution according to the local plan.

Prior year corrections will be processed by the Administrative Unit within 60 days of the annual CDE recertification in February.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Name</th>
<th>Current Units</th>
<th>New Units</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Current Regional Unit Dollars (UI Est)</th>
<th>Proposed Regional Unit Dollars</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>OHC Supplement</th>
<th>Current Preschool Dollars (UI Est)</th>
<th>Proposed Preschool Dollars</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Gain/(Loss)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achieve Charter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hold harmless, no affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs Unified</td>
<td>- 1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66,764</td>
<td>66,764</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Added 1.0 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE Schools*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE Regional</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>2,296,821</td>
<td>1,869,339</td>
<td>(427,482)</td>
<td>246,296</td>
<td>39,786</td>
<td>38,506</td>
<td>(1,280)</td>
<td>(182,466)</td>
<td>Unit value decreased, added 10 Infant unit &amp; 1.40 units. Addition of Infant unit does not have increased funding. Proportionate share of OHC funds offset unit value loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico Unified</td>
<td>42.04</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>65.04</td>
<td>3,630,027</td>
<td>4,342,331</td>
<td>712,304</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>232,348</td>
<td>224,878</td>
<td>(7,470)</td>
<td>704,834</td>
<td>Unit value decreased, added net 23 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico Country Day Charter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE Butte Charter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Unified</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>77,712</td>
<td>60,088</td>
<td>(17,624)</td>
<td>10,154</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(7,470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feather Falls</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hold harmless, no affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Feather</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gridley Unified</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>215,868</td>
<td>166,910</td>
<td>(48,958)</td>
<td>28,207</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unit value decreased. Proportionate share of OHC funds offset unit value loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord Charter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroville Elementary</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>1,079,337</td>
<td>901,314</td>
<td>(178,023)</td>
<td>102,569</td>
<td>143,229</td>
<td>154,026</td>
<td>10,797</td>
<td>(64,657)</td>
<td>Unit value decreased, added 1.00 AB602 unit &amp; .40 Preschool unit. Proportionate share of OHC funds offset unit value loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroville High</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>207,233</td>
<td>160,234</td>
<td>(46,999)</td>
<td>27,079</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(19,920)</td>
<td>Unit value decreased. Proportionate share of OHC funds offset unit value loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palermo</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>172,694</td>
<td>133,528</td>
<td>(39,166)</td>
<td>22,566</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(16,600)</td>
<td>Unit value decreased. Proportionate share of OHC funds offset unit value loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Unified</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>1,010,260</td>
<td>914,666</td>
<td>(95,594)</td>
<td>55,077</td>
<td>63,657</td>
<td>61,610</td>
<td>(2,047)</td>
<td>(42,564)</td>
<td>Unit value decreased, added 2.00 units. Proportionate share of OHC funds offset unit value loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hold harmless, no affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermalito</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>172,694</td>
<td>133,528</td>
<td>(39,166)</td>
<td>22,566</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(16,600)</td>
<td>Unit value decreased. Proportionate share of OHC funds offset unit value loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>102.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>131.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,862,464</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,748,702</strong></td>
<td><strong>(113,444)</strong></td>
<td><strong>514,514</strong></td>
<td><strong>479,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>479,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>400,570</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELPA Unit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>86,347</td>
<td>66,764</td>
<td>(19,583)</td>
<td>11,283</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(8,300)</td>
<td>Unit value decreased. Proportionate share of OHC funds offset unit value loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated Units</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>133,527</td>
<td>133,527</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>133,527</td>
<td>Added 2.00 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>134.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,948,993</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,948,993</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>525,797</strong></td>
<td><strong>479,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>479,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>525,797</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Gain** 912,595
**Total Loss** (912,595)
**Funded amount** 525,797
**Unfunded amount** (386,798)
SELPA GOVERNING BOARD MEETING

Agenda Item Summary

PREPARED BY: Roy Applegate

MEETING DATE: 11.29.17

AGENDA ITEM: 9

TOPIC/ ISSUE: Regional Units w/out Speech

BACKGROUND: The Governance Board requested in April that a committee be formed to study the impact of removing the speech units from the regional funded services. Several calculation models were reviewed and the committee is recommending implementation of the one included in your packet. It basically drops the percentage of regional dollars from 42% to 29% and redistributes the remaining 13% to districts through the regular 602 ADA distribution.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Most districts gained in revenue from this funding calculation while three districts and BCOE have losses between $5,900 to $23,300. The committee recommends for districts losing over $25,000 that a 2 year phase-in be in place for the districts such that OHC would cover 50% of the loss in the first year.

COORDINATING COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION: N/A

SELPA RECOMMENDATION: Approve
## Change in Revenues - Removal of Speech Units
### 2017-18 AB 602 Model, First Interim
**11/2/2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Name</th>
<th>Current State AB 602 Dollars (11 Est)</th>
<th>Proposed State AB 602 Dollars</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Current Regional Unit Dollars (11 Est)</th>
<th>Proposed Regional Unit Dollars</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Gain/(Loss)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achieve Charter</td>
<td>68,649</td>
<td>90,162</td>
<td>21,513</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,513</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>40,629</td>
<td>40,629</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hold harmless, no affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs Unified</td>
<td>173,418</td>
<td>227,761</td>
<td>54,343</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54,343</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE Schools*</td>
<td>103,690</td>
<td>136,182</td>
<td>32,492</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,492</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE Regional</td>
<td>16,830</td>
<td>22,104</td>
<td>5,274</td>
<td>2,296,821</td>
<td>2,058,534</td>
<td>(238,287)</td>
<td>(233,013)</td>
<td>Value of speech units exceeds per ADA amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico Unified</td>
<td>3,788,135</td>
<td>4,975,189</td>
<td>1,187,054</td>
<td>3,630,027</td>
<td>2,473,691</td>
<td>(1,156,336)</td>
<td>30,718</td>
<td>Per ADA amount exceeds value of speech units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico Country Day Charter</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>216,705</td>
<td>51,705</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51,705</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE Butte Charter</td>
<td>236,014</td>
<td>309,972</td>
<td>73,958</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73,958</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Unified</td>
<td>287,703</td>
<td>377,858</td>
<td>90,155</td>
<td>77,712</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(77,712)</td>
<td>12,443</td>
<td>Per ADA amount exceeds value of speech units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feather Falls</td>
<td>42,531</td>
<td>42,531</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hold harmless, no affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Feather</td>
<td>39,120</td>
<td>39,120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hold harmless, no affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gridley Unified</td>
<td>582,517</td>
<td>765,055</td>
<td>182,538</td>
<td>215,868</td>
<td>85,773</td>
<td>(130,095)</td>
<td>52,443</td>
<td>Per ADA amount exceeds value of speech units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>85,256</td>
<td>111,971</td>
<td>26,715</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,715</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord Charter</td>
<td>52,444</td>
<td>68,877</td>
<td>16,433</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,433</td>
<td>No units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroville Elementary</td>
<td>768,968</td>
<td>1,009,932</td>
<td>240,964</td>
<td>1,079,337</td>
<td>651,875</td>
<td>(427,462)</td>
<td>(186,498)</td>
<td>Value of speech units exceeds per ADA amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroville High</td>
<td>598,393</td>
<td>785,906</td>
<td>187,513</td>
<td>207,233</td>
<td>171,546</td>
<td>(35,687)</td>
<td>151,826</td>
<td>Per ADA amount exceeds value of speech units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palermo</td>
<td>360,184</td>
<td>473,051</td>
<td>112,867</td>
<td>172,694</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(172,694)</td>
<td>(59,827)</td>
<td>Value of speech units exceeds per ADA amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Unified</td>
<td>1,124,635</td>
<td>1,477,051</td>
<td>352,416</td>
<td>1,010,260</td>
<td>651,875</td>
<td>(358,385)</td>
<td>(5,969)</td>
<td>Value of speech units exceeds per ADA amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer</td>
<td>43,712</td>
<td>43,712</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hold harmless, no affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermalito</td>
<td>427,575</td>
<td>561,561</td>
<td>133,986</td>
<td>172,694</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(172,694)</td>
<td>(38,708)</td>
<td>Value of speech units exceeds per ADA amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,005,403</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,775,328</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,769,925</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,862,646</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,093,294</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2,769,352)</strong></td>
<td><strong>574</strong></td>
<td><strong>(574)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SELPA Unit
- **SELPA Unit**
  - 86,347
  - 85,773
  - **(574)**

### Grand Total
- **Grand Total**
  - 8,948,993
  - 6,179,067
  - **(2,769,926)**
  - **(0)**
SELPA GOVERNING BOARD MEETING

Agenda Item Summary

PREPARED BY: Roy Applegate

MEETING DATE: 11.29.17

AGENDA ITEM: 10

TOPIC/ ISSUE: Juvenile Hall DOR for out of County Students

BACKGROUND: BCOE has a student in juvenile hall who was placed there from out of the county and BCOE. She needed to know the DOR for billback purposes and we found no references in either statute or policy specifying who the DOR actually is. I asked our attorney to weigh in and it appears he could not find any legal references to this students DOR (see email in your packet). Rather assigning it to the DOR of the surrogate, I suggest we leave the billback unassigned to any district which will increase the billback slightly for all districts.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Minimal - in my memory, this kind of circumstance has not come up.

COORDINATING COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION: N/A

SELPA RECOMMENDATION: N/A
Hi Roy,

We have researched this, and reviewed the applicable Ed. Code standards, and the Local Plan for Butte COE’s SELPA, and couldn’t find anything that spoke to FAPE responsibilities for students in juvenile hall, who haven’t had an originating DOR within the county.

An area that we found applicable for bill-back responsibility purposes is under Ed. Code section 56028. Under Ed Code 56028, the definition of a “parent” includes “a surrogate parent who has been appointed pursuant to Section 7579.5 or 7579.6.” Under this standard, it would appear that the DOR would be established by the surrogate parent’s residence, and therefore should be the billed-back District.

I will call you as a follow up.

Thanks,
Matt

Matthew P. Juhl-Darlington
Attorney at Law

DANNIS WOLIVER KELLEY
2485 Notre Dame Boulevard, Suite 370-A
Chico, CA  95928