

Glenn County SELPA Governance Committee Meeting

Capay, Glenn County Office of Education, Hamilton Unified, Lake, Orland Unified, Plaza, Princeton, Stony Creek, Willows Unified
Minutes from March 15, 2022 at 9:00 am

<u>MEMBERS PRESENT:</u>	Tracey Quarne	Superintendent
	Jacki Campos	SELPA Director
	Jeremy Powell	Hamilton Unified School District
	Emmett Koerperich	Willows Unified School District
	Korey Williams	Princeton Joint Unified School District
	Jim Scribner	Capay Elementary
	Patrick Conklin	Plaza Elementary
	Victor Perry	Orland Unified School District
	Nikol Baker	Lake Elementary
	Kevin Triance	Stony Creek

MEMBERS ABSENT:

DESIGNEES PRESENT: Alex Hinely (Princeton)

OTHERS PRESENT: Judy Holzapfel, Randy Jones, Judy Corum, Shirley Diaz, Alex Hinely, Christine Fears, Debbie Costello, Dusty Thompson, Ruby Vasquez, Ronnie Stenquist, Jen Cox, Ryan Bentz, Suzanne Tefs

- 1.0 Call to Order: 9:01**
- 2.0 Pledge of Allegiance**
- 3.0 Welcome, Introductions and Roll Call**
- 4.0 Approve February 15, 2022 SELPA Meeting Minutes**

Jim Scribner (Capay) Approved, Tracey Quarne seconded
All in favor
- 5.0 Discussion/Action Items**

5.1 2022-2023 Allocation Model: The AB 602 template was released 3/14/22 with updated revenues, the draft allocation plan has been updated with these new revenues for review, discussion and possibly approval today. Victor Perry (OUSD) mentioned that he appreciates the savings in the budget and the increase in revenue. Patrick Conklin (Plaza) wanted to know if OUSD agrees this is the best allocation model. Victor reported that OUSD position is this is not the most equitable model. Debbie agreed that there is validity to Victor's concerns because of the way the allocation model calculates revenue and the SDC transfer dollars and how those are applied. Debbie asserted the model is a benefit for the small districts and the change with APPE was a step in the right direction. Debbie stated Model B would have resulted in significant impact to HUSD, but it may have been more equitable. Jeremy moved to approve. Patrick seconded. No discussion.
Victor opposed. Tracey abstained. All others in favor. Motion carries. Motion #167-22 is approved.
- 5.2 Learning Recovery and Alternative Dispute Resolution grants: *periodic update on activities and expenditures for these grants.***

Jacki provided the latest updates on the grant driven activities. A new series on Restorative Practices began this March and will run for 4 weeks. Jacki will be sending the link for the legal training for general education administrators and as there is no participant cap, districts are encouraged to send it out to many staff members. Jacki is still waiting on getting some school logos and once all logos are in place the Child Find brochures will be printed and distributed. Jacki asked the group if there were other activities the districts needed in these 2 grant areas. Jen Cox (OUSD) questioned if the funds could be used for students on 504 plans. Jacki clarified the funds had to be spent on students identified with special needs. Jennifer Cox clarified she was looking for training around 504 as part of dispute prevention around students with disabilities. Jacki confirmed this would be allowable and she will work to set up training for the districts.

5.3 Hybrid meeting option: *the committee would like to continue to offer a virtual attendance option for members and the public.*

Jacki asked the group if they would like to continue to offer a virtual option for attendance for required members. Tracey clarified we need to vote to continue virtual attendance. Nikol stated she would like to discontinue virtual attendance for SELPA and that districts can send a designee. Jim Scribner (Capay) motioned to continue to offer virtual attendance to the members. Tracey seconded. No Discussion. Victor and Nikol opposed.

Kevin Triance (Stony Creek) abstained. All others in favor. Motion carries. Motion #168-22 is approved.

6.0 Committee Reports: Fiscal Oversight Committee:

6.0 Indirect Costs: *presentation and discussion of positions, pools and costs associated with the indirect cost.*

Jacki began a brief review of the documents presented at Fiscal oversight. Victor wanted more information about the indirect cost for MAA and wanted to know why that would be included in the indirect cost calculation. Victor wanted to know why there are 8 tech support assistant positions listed and if those staff actually serve the Student Services department. Victor wanted information about the vehicle pool support and why that was included in the indirect Christine Fears (OUSD) asked about the educator effectiveness grant and the percentage for Student Services. Randy Jones (GCOE) explained that the Superintendent has discretion on how those funds are expended or which department they are assigned to. Debbie stated a concern that those new funds could increase overall costs and therefore increase the indirect costs. Jacki clarified that if any funds were to come to student services they would be used to fund existing programs like mentoring or funding the intern cost with CSUC.

Debbie stated that she was told that the indirect of 13% is due to the classified settlement. She was the person who brought this issue to the counties attention. She is unclear about why the settlement cost and the ongoing cost have increased the indirect rate by 4%. Debbie wants to know if this significant costs will be ongoing. Tracey stated he did approve the rate and the costs are for services provided. He also stated the overall SELPA costs went up and that increases the cost for indirect costs. He explained that he could not provide more details about the settlement. Debbie questioned why he could not provide more information as everyone is a public employee paid with public funds. Tracey explained that the settlement was completed using legal advice. Debbie wants more information about how compensation for those positions compare to other counties. Tracey explained it is similar to other counties.

Jeremy would like more information about the \$129,000 Tracey proposed contributing to the indirect costs for SELPA and if that would also contribute to the increase to the indirect rate. Debbie would like to know the cost difference between 2021 to 2022. Debbie asked about other programs and their indirect rates with the county. Randy explained that ASES is not an indirect cost because it is a pass through program and the 8% the county office keeps is to covers the coordinator to manage the grant. Victor stated the districts are not receiving the services and support they should. He would like the county office to look at other revenues for covering these costs instead of charging the districts. Patrick asked if this topic was a topic for SELPA or the Superintendent meeting.

Christine is requesting a list of the programs that make up the 61%. The ICR includes the list of the other programs that also benefit from the positions listed. Jim stated he needs to have more information about the connection between what is on paper versus the services provided. Randy stated that all county offices work differently and provide different levels of services. Christine reported that OUSD is paying 36% of the indirect costs.

Debbie asked again what the total amount for the settlement and the ongoing costs. Randy stated of the 4% increase, 1 ½ percent is the true-up piece. ICR form is carried over adjustment.

Debbie asked about page 10, of the indirect report with a \$2.3 million working budget, actual \$2.9 million and would like to know where the \$600,000 are being used. Randy explained that it is for salaries and benefits.

Victor asked again if there were some positions that can be removed from the indirect calculation. Patrick wants to know if these positions solely serve SELPA. Debbie clarified that these positions could serve any program at GCOE and that is not the way indirect is calculated, GCOE does not do a direct charge for services. Christine stated OUSD was already paying for these services through the special education cost and the amount of indirect cost to SELPA is higher than the total.

Tracey presented the possibility of having FICMAT come in and review the indirect process as an option. They could look at all the positions and methodology around indirect to verify the county offices practices. Tracey stated that the purpose of GCOE is to support the districts. Tracey stated that GCOE has many programs and support including the staff in the TREE who support districts. If the indirect rate were lower

those services may not be able to be funded. Jeremy would like GCOE to expedite the solution to this process. Nikol Baker would like a deeper understanding of indirect costs rates. Tracey stated this conversation can continue to the next superintendent's meeting.

7.0 Information Items

7.1 GCOE Fiscal Report-On target

7.2 OUSD Fiscal Report-On target

7.3 Staff/Program Updates & Changes

7.3.1 GCOE-Looking for Teachers, Speech Therapist, Mill Street opening

7.3.2 OUSD-Fully staffed

7.4 Communications-

8.0 Public and Committee Comments on Non-Agenda Items: None

9.0 Adjournment: 10:54 am

Public may comment on agenda items during discussion; any non-agenda public comments will be heard under Item 8.0.

***** Next Meeting Date April 26th 2022, Orland, CA – 9:00am. *****