

## Finance and Legislation Notes 10/13/15 – Submitted by Mindy Miller

### Purpose

How can we get more MAASE members involved? Everything we create is approved by the board. Right now we have two committees running, ESEA and IDEA workgroups. We are now asking for people to participate in two more, retention and a response to Cally's report. Indicate your interest on the sign in sheet or contact Rachel.

### 1. Office of Special Ed

John Andrejack (Diane could not come), 4094s and 4096s submitted and no state payments had to be withheld which is good. State MOE, we have to make the same amount available which has been a challenge due to Durant because there is a percentage we have to reimburse and maintain each year. The feds only see amounts, which isn't always an accurate picture. Michigan won't ever not reimburse at the same rate each year. We don't have exceptions. We can use per capita off of head count, not FTE even though reimbursements are based on FTE.

There are some new appropriations we can consider which helped us meet it, but John isn't necessarily for it because it isn't specific to SE. He is not sure he is done with his argument with the feds about meeting our percentage instead of amounts. If any of that goes away in the future it may set us back which is a concern. When you look over recent years we have increased reimbursement for SE until recently when it went down based on costs. You were able to demonstrate we have provided more and more. They don't know how to conceive anything more than adding numbers together. They seem to understand different states have different models but they aren't adjusting for that and it is rather simplistic.

Local MOE, was supposed to go into effect this year. Because of timing some will go into effect next year. Eligibility standard has always been there, through assurances, now you have to provide amounts to demonstrate that. They will get information sent out on how to do that but it will be part of next year's application. It will be similar to MOE. If you are budgeting for 15-16y you would not use the immediate prior year you

would use two years back. It gets a little complex after that. What you are determining your eligibility on is different than what you are demonstrating compliance one. Eligibility and submitting budgets will be part of next years process. Eligibility has to be demonstrated to even receive an IDEA award. So you have to budget to meet MOE and then compliance is that you actually met it at the end of the year. The feds new belief is that you have to have those budgets to ensure districts are meeting budgeting requirements for eligibility. If MDE sees budgets and districts are meeting it than they may not be eligible to get their award.

Front end: eligibility

Back end: compliance

Is this at LEA or ISD level? They are going to test eligibility in the same manner they test compliance which will be at the aggregate but they will need to figure out how they are going to do that. When you are going into a budget year and you know you have exceptions, you can address it at the budget setting level and demonstrate it then as well as when you demonstrate compliance at the end.

Significant dispro for districts not receiving federal funds- whenever MDE distributes to ISDs the ISD is considered the sub recipient and they are responsible whether you distribute funds out or not. That is something they will have to take into account and have continued conversations about. When they worked on it last year there was concern about consistency which is difficult in how you apply it at the state level. Everyone does things differently so how do you answer a consistency question 56 different ways. So if we really want consistency we have some work to do and changes to make. From a federal perspective we have to do things differently though because we can't say because it wasn't distributed that they don't have to set 15% aside.

Joanne Winkelman- Supervisor performance and accountability unit as of yesterday:

John Jaquith is coming tomorrow to do the update from the assessment office. He will talk about assessments and accommodations. He wants to

make sure we have accurate information. He will discuss RTI for SLD. Reportable scores for college, vs scores for accountability with MI accommodations.

ISD plans in electronic system summer 2016 because they are doing complaints first. Paper format will be revised to work for electronic system. They have taken out evaluation components. If you need to get it done before electronic system is available contact Nancy. You can add things that aren't required but she will point them out to you and they are complainable. MDE has taken a stance on the early literacy bill and do not support it. The OSE submitted info to Ben Williams specific language around remedial programs which would violate child find. Exceptions to take state assessments language was also pointed out.

340.1790a interpreter rule was changed and refers you to office of civil rights rules and revised rules are on LARAs website. There was no public hearing because there didn't have to be, they just had to link the MARSE rules.

2. Current Legislation/federal updates:

ESEA- the letter is complete and was distributed to membership. ESEA may be stalled because of Boehner and Duncan resigning, Kline not running for re-election, or it is also possible that it could be expedited.

IDEA- We have been working since summer institute. We have summarized where other organizations are at on particular issues. We are meeting in November to discuss innovations. New members welcome.

3. Current Legislation:

Teacher evaluation bill- looked like it was moving and now it may be stalled in the house. They tried adding into the bill that they had to pick a tool but could alternate it if made public. The MEA is not happy with that.

Critical shortage was moving but was tied to teacher evals so that may be stalled as well.

Reading and retention bill- 3 sticking points being debated at this time, literacy coaches, special education issues, smart promotion. Until those

issues are clarified and there is agreement it will continue to be up in the air.

Senate bill 528- resolving ISDs if majority of LEAs want to attach to another ISD.

Senate bill 553 an LEA could get their money back with board resolution.

#### 4. Legislative Action Committee

5 RFPs from various lobbyist groups, meeting Thursday with a rubric to rank them. They will make a recommendation to the board in the near future and do an online voting forum. \$12000 annually for lobbying has been allocated. They hope to have a decision made very quickly. This is a one year pilot. We need a more systematic means of addressing issues.

Board approved several new one pagers which will be found on the MAASE wiki

Early on funding

MOE

Special Ed Funding for 0-3 and 21-26

MTSS Literacy

MTSS Behavior

Critical Shortage

Also there:

SB 103

Seclusion Restraint

HB 4822

Eric and Dawn's State Board of Education Presentation

#### 5. Professional Development

After work in DC with CASE, MAASE developed a MLAS seminar that we run in April. Mark met with the PDSC to discuss this, they are doing a spotlight in December and then a half day in February on a larger scale educating folks about legislative action for MLAS in April.

## 6. Association Partnerships

Andy Claes: MAASE is organized around four areas, one of which is association partnerships. With regard to association partnerships, we have worked to strengthen our relationship with CEC and that is going well. We are more aligned than in the past. Andy will make a call for presenters at the March CEC annual conference tomorrow at general membership for the leadership strand for MAASE. Direct those interests to Andy or Laura. There is ongoing work around the white paper MAASE produced around mental health and partnering with community agencies. Andy will be reaching out to that coalition to continue that conversation. There are no action items around it at this time, just a desire to partner. The paper is posted on the wiki. One of the obstacles we face is having a champion to move anything forward, which may be resolved when we hire lobbying services.