



# Committee minutes

Community Financial Review Committee		
11.10.2014	6:30 PM to 8:30 PM	Brandywine Springs Teachers' Lounge
Meeting called by	Jane Rattenni, Chair	
Type of meeting	Monthly Financial Review	
Facilitator	Bill Doolittle, Community Member	
Minutes	Laura Palombo, Red Clay	
Timekeeper	Bill Doolittle, Community Member	
Attendees	Bill Doolittle, Ed Gregware, Community Members; Steven Fackenthall, RCEA Member;	
	Jill Floore, Red Clay CFO; Kelley Brake, RC Supervisor of Special Education Services	
Minutes		
	Bill Doolittle, CFRC Community Member	
Discussion:	A review of the October 2014 meeting minutes. Mr. Fackenthall moved to accept the minutes and Mr. Gregware seconded. The motion carried.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Inclusion		
	Kelley Brake, RC Supervisor of Special Education Services	
Discussion	Ms. Brake discussed the inclusion program and answered questions. See Section I attached.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Audit Update		
	Jill Floore, Red Clay CFO	
Discussion	Ms. Floore informed the committee of the current audits being performed. Findings will be brought to this committee when we receive them. See Section II attached.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Monthly Reports		
	Jill Floore, Red Clay CFO	
Discussion	Ms. Floore presented the reports for the end of October 2014. See section III attached.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Announcements		
	Jill Floore, Red Clay CFO	
	The next meeting will be held December 8, 2014 in the Brandywine Springs Teachers' Lounge.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline



# Committee minutes

## **Red Clay Community Financial Review Committee Monday, November 10, 2014**

### **I. Inclusion**

Kelley Brake distributed a summary on inclusion. The students who are 4<sup>th</sup> grade going into 5<sup>th</sup> grade have an option to stay at RPLC with transportation or they may choose to go to another school. The same is true for the AI Middle School and Conrad Middle school ELL students. If they want to choose and stay at their schools, they may, with transportation. All other programs will be moving back to their feeder schools in the fall of 2015.

The first inclusion overview council will be meeting December 15<sup>th</sup>. This council includes parents and community members. We've been working on documents in the interim and fine tuning those processes from last year. There may be a revamping of the process for the RPLC students to better transition them into their feeder schools. We are not adding more cumbersome ideas to the table, but providing as much detail as to what services each child is to receive to relay that information to the teams who are receiving the students.

Once the choice window has closed and the parents have accepted their choice location, the team will better assess services at the selected locations. The team will look at the information and decide what children can be placed in traditional classrooms, and those who need smaller classrooms as well as the supports they need. The principals of those schools will have this information in time to staff the positions needed in their schools. At this time, we are supplying impacted schools with the professional development they need to support these students when they arrive next year. As well we are supplying the adaptations of materials needed.

Mr. Doolittle asked where we stand on the technical coaching needed. Ms. Brake explained that we have a current contractor, Inclusion Focused Coaching by Amy Pleet-Odle, who works with Ms. Brake and Central School. We have an RFP currently advertised for an additional vendor for professional development. We have had several advisors on this process from New Jersey, Maryland and Arizona. We are looking for an additional vendor to help us roll out the program and fine tune it once it is up and running. We are one of the only states that have choice; therefore the process is more difficult to map out.

Ms. Brake is going to Dover in the next few days with other members of Red Clay to meet on Special Education. Delaware is currently one of the bottom 3 states providing special education to meet the needs of our students. This is based on current results and outcomes. We are tightening up on several areas of compliance. One is Indicator 13 which deals with transitions and how students do once they leave school. Also, they look



# Committee minutes

at how the IEP is written in for the supports needed for the student to get into college, career, or independent living. They will be looking at the standards-based IEP. We are trying to promote the same goals for all students rather than one that is honed in on a deficit skill. Mr. Doolittle stated that Delaware is taking one of the most progressive approaches to standards-based IEPs. It is being considered for all standards not just common core but functional standards as well. Ms. Brake stated many states voted toward common core and standards-based almost 4 years ago. The states around us have already rolled it out. Mr. Fackenthall asked if it is more broad and unspecific. Ms. Brake stated that it is very specific and could break a standard into several parts.

Mr. Fackenthall asked if the student who had consistently needed use of a calculator or multiplication chart and was receiving it, would that no longer be a goal to achieve. Ms. Brake stated that the philosophy is to give them skills and supports to get them around those challenges so that they can learn the main ideas and concepts in mathematic. What typically happens, students would get pulled out of the class for work on remediation of the deficit skills. Unfortunately, they then miss important information and opportunities in the classroom increasing the gap. We are peeling back the hierarchy of services finding the least intrusive way to support the students' needs. Mr. Fackenthall asked if that was determined by the IEP team. Ms. Brake explained that the IEP team determines the level of services provided, based on what is happening in the general education class not outside of that classroom. Often when a student has been labeled and placed in a B or C setting, the law requires us to go back and asks what is keeping us from offering this service in the general education classroom. Mr. Fackenthall asked that if you have a child in a current setting and it is not working, what plan is in place to get the services or setting the child needs. Ms. Brake explained that you then go back and see what the problem is first. The problem solving team and IEP team are then collecting data, plan interventions, and it is not necessarily needed to pull that child out of the classroom. Mr. Fackenthall stated that he hears from many of the RCEA members that we have many students with needs not identified. When you have poverty stricken children, they may be needier as they are coming from a more difficult environment. When we go to next year, we're hoping that when a child is having issues and has an observation or testing, the teacher and student aren't waiting 3 to 4 months while these teams meet to evaluate the issue. Ms. Brake stated there is a process in place for any student whether they have a label or not. If teachers are utilizing their classroom management plans first and exhausting that, then the next level goes to the building level team. That team will observe the child. They may come up with interventions. The purpose is to keep a student in the educational setting to get the services they need. They are to continually run the cycle of interventions to find out what is working and what is not. Mr. Fackenthall is concerned with the question of what is enough time to show an intervention is not working. Ms. Brake understands the frustration. Early intervention is the key and they take every teacher inquiry seriously. In some cases, the special education office is seeing a lack of implementation. Mr. Fackenthall agrees that the student needs what is in the IEP, but sometimes that is not feasible in the time constraints a teacher has. He feels the teachers are going to need more instruction on co-teaching.



# Committee minutes

Ms. Brake agrees but also noted that we will have to look into tiered instruction and differentiated instruction. That training was given 6-7 years ago here, but we will revisit it. Alternative assessments and formative checks as well. Mr. Fackenthall is concerned where the time for these will come from. Ms. Brake explained that it is a collaborative effort and her offices as well as the classroom teachers are involved. Mr. Doolittle interjected that the teacher has the right to call an IEP or 504 plan meeting at any time to help with an intervention issue.

Ms. Brake stated that there are more students than ever with 504 plans, and that does not come with extra funding. Her staff is working with administrators not to place all of those students in one classroom. Mr. Fackenthall currently works at RPLC and sees the needs of these students. When a teacher is dual certified, they can be seen as doing 2 roles, but they are one person with other students in the classroom. He is concerned with the time each child will require. He feels the teachers will need not only training on how to handle the students' needs but co-teaching training as well. Ms. Brake feels that tiered instruction will also be needed to start. Mr. Doolittle stated that if there is time needed for case management that should also be documented in the IEP. That may trip the IEP from basic to intensive and will provide the funding needed to cover the support.

Ms. Brake also stated that we have therapists, some within Red Clay and others contracted in to support the students. Those therapists should also be helping with the common core of the student while providing their speech or physical or occupational therapies such as verbal skills, which are necessary for all three therapies.

Ms. Brake invited anyone at the meeting or the groups they represent to email her with questions. Her staff is eager to work with teams from the receiving schools.

Mr. Doolittle thanked Ms. Brake for her time.

Mr. Fackenthall asked Ms. Floore about the funding for the special need students. Will it be the virtual funding and follow each student. Ms. Floore stated that funding is listed as Organization 9554 and 9558. Ms. Floore stated Meadowood will remain as is but we are working on whether RPLC and Central will continue as virtual schools. There are pros and cons. In an audit, it would be easy to show any expenditure in the special school is tuition funded. As students move, we have to do more legwork to show who is eligible for the special funding. Logistically and the message you send by keeping it separate, is another issue. There should be no financial incentive to keep it separate. As the district works on planning, Ms. Floore will report back in late spring.

## **II. Audit Update**

The auditors are in our buildings as this is our regular audit season. They are auditing debt service which is major capital. Local and federal funds are also being audited in the regular cycle. Local tax is being audited as well. We do not have their findings at this



# Committee minutes

time. We have had our exit meetings and Ms. Floore will bring the findings to this committee when we get them.

## **III. Monthly Reports**

Ms. Floore presented the October 2014 end of month reports. We expect to be at 33% at this time of the year. Ms. Floore explained that the taxes are in, but she cautions the appearance. Tuition funds show just fewer than 93% in. Local funds show 98.25%. Charter school payments are drawn directly from the revenue side, not as an expense. Therefore, that local portion is high and will shrink because we have not had that payment taken from our revenue at this time.

Division II is lower and will not increase as our overall units did not grow. It is the first year in several we are not up units because there has been an increase in charter enrollments. The same is true for Division III is as well.

High schools are expending higher due to athletic budgets encumbering funds for the seasons.

Ms. Floore explained that when major capital is loaded as a project, it stays FY13/FY14 or whatever year they loaded as. We now have a line item at the bottom of expenses that states previous year expenses at \$12 million. If you look month to month, you can see the encumbrance goes down as the expense goes up and items are paid. Ms. Floore handed out a report and explained the bulk of this is major capital. In future meetings we will discuss a possibly different way to view this on the report.

On the federal, FY13 is now completely closed. All programs are at 100% except a few Debbie Roberts discussed with partnership zone schools. On Page 5, Title 1 lists budgeted \$4.9 million but expended \$5 million. October is when new federal funds begin and we can back date our expenses to July & August. We submitted our grant in July. We have the funding now, but not when this report was made. Next month, this report will show the Title 1 not in the negative as we will show the new funding received. These are payroll funds. We continue to pay those employees and let the appropriation go into the negative, which the state system allows.

Next month, Ms. Floore will present the final budget.

## **IV. Announcements**

Our next meeting will be held at Brandywine Springs School teachers' lounge on Monday, December 8, 2014 at 6:30 PM.

There have been no public inquiries to the CFRC.