

Vision

*All students in Colorado will become educated and productive citizens capable of   
succeeding in society, the workforce, and life.*

Goals

*Every student, every step of the way*

Meeting Logistics & Desired Outcomes

**Start strong**

**Read by**

**third grade**

**Meet or**

**exceed standards**

**Graduate**

**Ready**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Meeting:** | **HOUSE BILL 14-1292 : FPP Sub-Committee Meeting V Minutes** | | | | |
| **Date:** | **12-8-2014** | **Time:** | **1:00-3:30** | **Location:** | [**Colorado Talking Book Library**](http://www2.cde.state.co.us/ctbl/)**:**   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | 180 Sheridan Blvd, Denver, CO 80226 | |
| **Meeting Lead:** |  | | | | |
| **Meeting Participants:** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Tracy John | Peyton 23JT | | Donna Villamor | Littleton 6 | | Terry Kimber | Widefield 3 | | Kristine Githara | Cherry Creek 5 | | Joanne Vergunst | Fountain 8 | | Kathleen Askelson | Jefferson County R-1 | | Jane Frederick | St. Vrain Valley Re-1J | | Gina Lanier | Adams 12 | | Terry Buswell | Centennial BOCES | | Molly Janzen | Poudre R1 | | Scott Smith | Douglas County | |  |  | | Adam Williams | Colorado Department of Education | | Scott Lee | Colorado Department of Education | | Leanne Emm | Colorado Department of Education | | Jennifer Okes | Colorado Department of Education | | | | | |
| **Meeting Objectives:**  *(Is a meeting necessary to accomplish the objectives?)* | Continued discussion on implementation of HB1292 | | | | |

Agenda Items and Next Steps

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Agenda Item** | **Notes & Next Steps** *(be sure to include communication to those not at the meeting who need to know the results)* |
|  |  |  |
| **30 minutes** | * Data Buckets: Major Categories * Cascading data | Sub-committee had further discussion about the bolded levels of data which will be used to create a meaningful website view by the software vendor. Handout provided covering conceptual pie charts to show how data should “cascade”: Expenditures by Program type/Support and Instructional Programs by Object/Salaries and Benefits by Program/Support and Instructional Salaries and Benefits by Bolded Job Class – which would in turn be drillable down to the unique school code.  The overall purpose is equity. People want to see equity at unique school sites. |
| **60 minutes** | * RFI update * When to post the 2015 Template? * Revenue reporting at unique school site – update? | The RFI will be posted in CORE and on the Bids system by December 11th. All known software vendors will be notified. The RFI will be posted on the CDE website/School Finance/Financial Transparency. Vendor Questions and clarifications cutoff date is January 7. CDE responses due posted by January 14.  Discussion was had about creating a district implementation guide – a critical dates and tasks for districts to keep in mind. The Department will present a draft of this at the next sub-committee meeting in early February.  Discussion on revenue reporting at the unique school site: again, the overall purpose is equity. How many resources are going to this school, and to this school and to this school? EG Title Funds. The unanimous feeling is that the Chart of Accounts already allows for revenue reporting to be done at the unique school site when that is appropriate, and that no change needs to be made to the Chart of Accounts. Perhaps the RFP needs to address how revenues will be shown? – perhaps something along the lines of an “Amazon” type filter to allow a user to pick a unique school to drill down into revenue tied to that school (gifts, grant and donations). An updated revenue reporting draft recommendation will be given at the February sub-committee meeting. |
| **60 minutes** | * Efficiency ideas around data collections? Jeffco to lead this item * Pilot Districts – who might be able to supply FY14-15 data with unique school code expenditures? * Who will sit on RFP | Jeffco led a discussion on efficiencies in how the software vendor will gather LEP financial information. The unanimous feeling is that if districts submit their financial data to CDE which includes expenditures tied to unique school sites, then the most efficient and economic way to provide that information to the vendor is to have CDE provide it, and not to have the vendor “scrape” excel files off 200+ LEP websites on an annual basis. Key elements of the conversation:   * The FPP committee is committed to transparency and supporting the statutory requirements put forth in HB 14-1292. * The subcommittee has worked diligently to meet the requirements efficiently while being thoughtful of the impacts on individual districts. * Based on the review of the FPP subcommittee, we are recommending that the ADE data to be used in the transparency website be collected from one location, the Department of Education. * Efficiency would be gained for the vendor to receive audited, validated data from one source. Requiring individual districts to provide the data a second time would be inefficient and could create data reliance issues. * The committee understands this would require a change in the existing legislation but based on the work completed to date, feels it would be worthwhile to pursue this change.   A letter will be drafted to the House and Senate Education Committees regarding this consensus.  Pilot districts: Cherry Creek, Fountain, Adams 12, St. Vrain and Jeffco indicated they would be able to provide FY13-14 data with expenditures tied to the unique school code. With more districts available to do this for the FY14-15 data, and ultimately every district required to populate the FY15-16 data with expenditures tied to the unique school code.  Possible RFP Participants: Districts that have expressed interest: Cherry Creek, Jefferson County, Widefield, Poudre, Centennial BOCES, Douglas County  Next sub-committee meeting: early February. A doodle survey will be sent prior to Christmas. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluate the Meeting:** | | |  | **How can we improve the next meeting?** |
| We stayed on track: | * No | * Yes |  |
| We achieved the meeting outcomes: | * No | * Yes |
| We clarified next steps: | * No | * Yes |
| This meeting was time well-spent: | * No | * Yes |