

State of California
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 323-3562
CSM 2 (2/91)

INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM FORM

For Official Use Only	
RECEIVED	
NOV 09 2001	
Claim	COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES 916-413698-46

Local Agency or School District Submitting Claim

MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT, CLAIMANT ID# S24070

Contact Person

Steve Smith, Mandated Cost Systems, Inc.

Telephone No.

(916) 487-4435

Address

**444 W 23RD STREET
MERCED, CA 95340**

Representative Organization to be Notified

Mandated Cost Systems, Inc.

2275 Watt Avenue Suite C

Sacramento, CA 95825

(916) 487-4435

This claim alleges an incorrect reduction of a reimbursement claim filed with the State Controller's Office pursuant to section 17561 of the Government Code. This incorrect reduction claim is filed pursuant to section 17551(b) of the Government Code.

CLAIM IDENTIFICATION: Specify Statute or Executive Order

Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983, Education Code Section 35160.5

<u>Fiscal Year*</u>	<u>Amount of the Incorrect Reduction</u>
1995/96	\$39,018

*More than one fiscal year may be claimed.

IMPORTANT: PLEASE SEE INSTRUCTION AND FILING REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPLETING AN INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM ON THE REVERSE SIDE.

Name and Title of Authorized Representative

Telephone No.

Steve Smith, Mandated Cost Systems, Inc.

(916) 487-4435

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date

Steve Smith

11/9/01

Incorrect Reduction Claim

Merced City Elementary School District, Claimant ID# S24070

Certification of Teacher Evaluators' Demonstrated Competence

Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983

COSM No. SB90-4136

1995/96 Fiscal Year

I. Brief Description of the Disallowed Costs:

The Merced City Elementary School District (hereinafter "District" or "Claimant") filed a claim for reimbursement under the Certification of Teacher Evaluators' Demonstrated Competence mandated reimbursement program (Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983; COSM No. SB90-4136) for fiscal year 1995/96. By letter dated December 30, 1998, the State Controller (SCO) disallowed \$39,018 of costs for training probationary teachers and associated indirect costs claimed under the Probationary Certificated Policies component of this program. The State Controller has taken the position that the parameters and guidelines "do not provide reimbursement for probationary teacher training costs." Claimant argues, as further outlined below, that the Controller incorrectly reduced its claim because the probationary training costs are authorized by the parameters and guidelines and are consistent with allowable costs of a number of other reimbursement programs.

II. The Mandate:

Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983 added section 35160.5 to the Education Code. (See Exhibit "A"). Section 35160.5 required school districts, as a condition for receipt of school apportionments, to adopt rules and regulations establishing policies regarding:

- a. The certification of the demonstrated competence of administrators who would be conducting teacher evaluations;
- b. Assurances that probationary teachers will have their needs for training, assistance, and evaluations recognized and met by the district; and
- c. Filing of parent complaints regarding district employees.

On September 20, 1984 the San Jose Unified School District filed a test claim with the Board of Control alleging that Chapter 498/83 imposed reimbursable state mandated costs. On September 26, 1985 the Commission on State Mandates approved the test claim and on October 24, 1985 adopted its Statement of Decision. (See Exhibit "B"). Parameters and guidelines for this program were originally adopted on April 24, 1986. (See Exhibit "C"). These parameters and guidelines were subsequently amended on January 24, 1991 (See Exhibit "D"). The Education Trailer Bill to the Budget Act of 1996, effective July 22, 1996, (Chapter 204, Statutes of 1996) repealed this mandate effective with the 1996/97 fiscal year. The State Controller's Office Claiming Instructions in effect for the 1995/96 claim year are attached (See Exhibit "E").

III. The District's Claim, State Controller's Review and Reconsideration

The filing deadline with the State Controller's Office for 1995/96 Certification of Teacher Evaluators' Demonstrated Competence mandated reimbursement program was November 30, 1996. The late filing deadline (with requisite 10% penalty not to exceed \$1,000) was December 1, 1997. The District submitted its 1995/96 claim within the annual filing period. The District claimed costs under the three reimbursable components plus associated indirect costs of totaling \$83,776.

In a letter dated August 5, 1998, SCO denied \$63,393 in claimed costs. (See Exhibit "F"). The reasons cited for the adjustments were :

Indirect Costs Overstated	\$1,133
No Supporting Documentation	\$24,375
Non-Reimbursable Item	\$37,885

Due to the lack of specificity in this letter, a copy of the SCO claim review working papers was obtained in order to determine the specific claim line items that were disallowed. (See Exhibit "G").

On October 13, 1998, Mandated Cost Systems, Inc., representing the District submitted a letter to SCO requesting reconsideration and reinstatement of all disallowed costs (See Exhibit "H").

On December 30, 1998 SCO completed its reconsideration of its claim adjustments and issued a final adjustment letter which did not reinstate any costs for probationary teachers time when receiving training. (See Exhibit "I").

IV. The Issue in Dispute:

The specific issue being disputed deals with the following question:

Is the cost of probationary teachers receiving the mandated additional training a reimbursable cost under the Probationary Certificated Employee Policies component of the Certification of Teacher Evaluators' Demonstrated Competence mandated cost program?

V. Claimant's Position

Claimant argues, as further outlined below, the cost of probationary teachers receiving the mandated additional training is a reimbursable cost under the Probationary Certificated Employee Policies component of the Certification of Teacher Evaluators' Demonstrated Competence mandated cost program because the probationary training costs are authorized by the parameters and guidelines and are consistent with allowable costs of a number of other reimbursement programs.

It should be noted that the SCO disallowed probationary teacher training costs claiming the "parameters and guidelines do not provide for reimbursement" of these costs. The SCO is not claiming that these costs are excessive or unreasonable under Government Code section 17561(d). Therefore, the only issue before the COSM is whether the parameter and guidelines "provide for reimbursement" for the cost of probationary teacher training costs.

VI. The State Controller's Position

By letter dated December 30, 1998 the Controller has disallowed the cost of probationary teachers receiving the mandated additional training stating that:

“The amount of \$37,885 for salaries and benefits of probationary teachers in training is disallowed. Parameters and guidelines do not provide for reimbursement for probationary teachers training costs. In lieu of that, the P's & G's reimburse the cost of substitute teachers while the probationary teachers attend training activities.”

VII. Parameters and Guidelines and Claiming Instructions

A. The Parameters and Guidelines

Section V (Reimbursable Costs) of the parameters and guidelines for the Certification of Teacher Evaluators' Demonstrated Competence mandated cost program state in relevant part as follows:

“Training, assisting and evaluating probationary teachers over and above that usually provided to permanent teachers by the district or county office of education.

* * *

Registration fees and travel costs of probationary teachers attending training activities.

* * *

Costs of substitute teachers provided for probationary teachers so that they might attend training activities including visitations to other teacher's classrooms to observe teaching techniques (limited to three such visitations per semester).

B. The Claiming Instructions

Section 5 (Reimbursable Components) of the claiming instructions for the Certification of Teacher Evaluators' Demonstrated Competence mandated cost program state in relevant part as follows:

“The costs of training, assisting and evaluating probationary teachers, over and above that provided to permanent teaches, are reimbursable. The salary and benefits of personnel, not including the site principal, plus training materials and clerical services used to train, assist and evaluate probationary teachers are reimbursable. The cost of consultants for the purpose of training and assisting probationary teachers, if personnel with the required skills are not available with the school district or county office, is reimbursable. Registration fees, travel costs, and the cost of substitute teachers provided so that they can attend training activities, including visitation to observe other teacher's teaching techniques, are reimbursable. Visitations are limited to three visitations per semester.”

VIII. Claimant's Analysis

The District's claim for costs attributable to probationary teacher training can be broken down into two types of costs. "Category A" costs consist of probationary teachers receiving one-on-one training and mentoring (over and above that provided to permanent teachers) during the course of their regular workday. "Category B" costs are probationary teachers costs related to working extra hours and a longer work year due to the mandated additional training requirements of Chapter 498/83.

A. Argument for Reimbursing Category A Probationary Teacher Costs

In its October 13, 1998 reconsideration letter to SCO, Mandated Cost Systems, Inc. argued on behalf of the District that disallowed probationary teacher costs under Category A totaling \$27,353 should be reinstated.

Category A costs consist of probationary teachers receiving one-on-one training and mentoring (over and above that provided to permanent teachers) during the course of their regular workday. The parameters and guidelines clearly and explicitly allow for these costs when they provide as reimbursable costs those "costs of training probationary teachers, over and above that provided to permanent teachers, are reimbursable." The COSM should be guided by the common rule of interpretation which provides that where express provisions of a rule are clear and unambiguous the explicit meaning of those provisions, interpreted in their ordinary and popular sense, controls the interpretation. (See, *Borg v. Transamerica Ins. Co.*, 47 Cal.App.4th 448, 455, 54 Cal.Rptr.2d 811).

B. Argument for Reimbursing Category B Probationary Teacher Costs

In its October 13, 1998 reconsideration letter to SCO, Mandated Cost Systems, Inc. argued on behalf of the District that disallowed probationary teacher costs under Category B totaling \$11,665 should be reinstated.

Category B costs are probationary teachers costs related to working extra hours and a longer work year due to the mandated additional training requirements of Chapter 498/83. Specifically, as a requirement of the mandate, all first year probationary teachers work a 186 day year (two extra 7.5 hour days each year for teacher training) while permanent teachers work a 184 day year. The probationary teachers were paid for working the two extra days.

In the case of category B costs, there is a clearly identifiable increased cost incurred by the District related to compensating probationary teachers for the additional time receiving the mandated training. The Commission on State Mandates has recently reaffirmed that these types of costs are reimbursable.

In the *Physical Performance Testing* program the Commission explicitly recognized that mandates that befall teachers create reimbursable costs if the District increases the teacher's workday or work year. In addressing this issue the Commission's Statement of Decision states in pertinent part as follows:

"The manual (State Administrative Manual) defines costs as ".....all additional expenses for which either supplemental financing or the redirection of existing staff or resources ...is required." Because the school days or school year is not extended to accommodate the time

required to administer physical performance tests, there are no additional costs as defined by the manual.”

“Further, the Commission found that neither the school day or the school year is extended to accommodate the time required to administer and score the physical performance tests, school districts incur no increased reimbursable costs when classroom teachers administer the physical fitness tests.”

Although the Commission concluded that teacher time during the school day implementing the *Physical Performance* mandate was not reimbursable, the Commission did recognize that teacher time attending training after the regular school day is reimbursable. In support of Claimant’s argument the Commission concluded that:

“Increased costs for substitute teacher time during the school day or for teacher stipends to attend training sessions outside the regular school day (after school or on Saturday) are eligible for reimbursement. However, the labor time of the teacher spent in attending training sessions during that teachers’ normal classroom hours is not reimbursable.” (Emphasis added).¹

By way of further support for Claimant’s position, the Commission has stated in its parameters and guidelines for *American Government Course Document Requirements* that:

“Either the cost of providing a substitute teacher for each teacher who attends a training session during the teacher’s normal classroom periods or the additional payments made to each teacher who attends a training session outside the teacher’s normal classroom period (after school or on Saturday) is reimbursable.” (Emphasis added).

The above-cited sections of Commission parameters and guidelines fully support Claimant’s claim for reimbursement for those “additional payments made to each teacher who attends a training session outside the teacher’s normal classroom period (after school or on Saturday).” These two programs illustrate the fact that if a district has incurred some type of identifiable increased cost related to a fixed environment employee (i.e., teachers) then that identifiable increased cost shall be considered a reimbursable mandated cost pursuant to Article XIII B, section 6 of the State Constitution whether it is substitute costs, overtime pay, stipends, or as in this case, an expanded work year specifically due to the mandate of additional training for probationary teachers.

The Claimant’s argument is further bolstered by the erroneous conclusion made by the Controller that reimbursement of substitute teacher time is made “in lieu” of reimbursement for probationary teacher time attending the training. Here, the Claimant is making a claim for probationary teacher time attending training that occurred after the regular work day or after the end of the regular work year when a substitute teacher is not needed. With no substitute costs the Claimant is not provided any reimbursement “in lieu” of reimbursement

¹ See page 6 of the Physical Performance Testing Program parameters and guidelines adopted by the Commission on State Mandates on September 24, 1998.

of probationary teacher time attending the trainings. Moreover, and as outlined above, the Commission has explicitly recognized that Districts are entitled to reimbursement for **both** substitute teacher time (for costs incurred during the fixed environment) and other identifiable costs for teachers that occur outside the regular work day (e.g. nights, weekends, and at the end of the school year).

IX. Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing, Claimant respectfully requests that the COSM find:


1. Claimant submitted its Certification of Teacher Evaluators' Demonstrated Competence claims for reimbursement in compliance with the State Controller's claiming instructions.
2. Claimant submitted the requisite documentation in support of its claim for reimbursement.
3. That the State Controller incorrectly reduced claimant's reimbursement claim when it disallowed costs for training probationary teachers claimed under the Probationary Certificated Policies component of this program.

Claimant respectfully requests that the COSM determine that SCO incorrectly reduced the claimant's Teacher Evaluator claim and direct Commission Staff, in accordance with COSM's regulations, to submit a letter to the Controller requesting that the costs of the claim be reinstated.

CERTIFICATION

I certify by my signature below that the statements made in this document are true and correct of my own knowledge, or as to all other matters, I believe them to be true and correct based upon information and belief.

Executed on November 9, 2001, at Sacramento, CA.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S Smith", positioned above a horizontal line.

Steve Smith, Mandated Cost Systems, Inc.

Exhibit A

Code, to read:

35160.5. On or before December 1, 1984, the governing board of each school district shall, as a condition for the receipt of school apportionments from the State School Fund, adopt rules and regulations establishing school district policies as they relate to the following:

(a) Certification that personnel assigned to evaluate teachers have demonstrated competence in instructional methodologies and evaluation for teachers they are assigned to evaluate. The determination of whether school personnel meet the district's adopted policies shall be made by the governing board.

(b) The establishment of district policies ensuring that each probationary certificated employee is assigned to a school within the district with assurances that his or her status as a new teacher and his or her potential needs for training, assistance, and evaluations will be recognized by the district.

(c) The establishment of policies and procedures which parents or guardians of pupils enrolled in the district may use to present complaints regarding employees of the district. These policies and procedures shall provide for appropriate mechanisms to respond to and where possible to resolve, the complaints. These policies and procedures shall be established in consultation with employee organizations.

1 Code, to read:
 2 35160.5. On or before December 1, 1984, the
 3 governing board of each school district shall, as a
 4 condition for the receipt of school apportionments from
 5 the State School Fund, adopt rules and regulations
 6 establishing school district policies as they relate to the
 7 following:
 8 (a) Certification that personnel assigned to evaluating
 9 teachers have demonstrated competence in instructional
 10 methodologies and evaluation for teachers they are
 11 assigned to evaluate. The determination of whether
 12 school personnel meet the district's adopted policies shall
 13 be made by the governing board.
 14 (b) The establishment of district policies ensuring that
 15 each probationary certificated employee is assigned to a
 16 school within the district with assurances that his or her
 17 status as a new teacher and his or her potential needs for
 18 training, assistance, and evaluations will be recognized by
 19 the district.
 20 (c) The establishment of policies and procedures
 21 which parents or guardians of pupils enrolled in the
 22 district may use to present complaints regarding
 23 employees of the district. These policies and procedures
 24 shall provide for appropriate mechanisms to respond to
 25 and where possible to resolve, the complaints. These
 26 policies and procedures shall be established in
 27 consultation with employee organizations.
 28 The governing board of each school district shall
 29 annually review the school district policies adopted
 30 pursuant to the requirements of this section.
 31 SEC. 13. Section 39363 of the Education Code, as
 32 amended to read:
 33 39363. The funds derived from the sale of surplus
 34 property shall be used for capital outlay or for costs of
 35 maintenance of school district property that does
 36 recur within a five-year period. Proceeds from a lease of
 37 school district property with an option to purchase may
 38 be deposited into a restricted fund for the routine repair
 39 and maintenance of district facilities, as defined by the

State Allocation Board, for up to a five-year period. In
 addition, the proceeds may be deposited in the general
 fund of the district for any general fund purpose if the
 school district governing board and the State Allocation
 Board have determined that the district has no
 anticipated need for additional sites or building
 construction for the five-year period following such sale
 or lease, and the district has no major deferred
 maintenance requirements.
 SEC. 14. Section 42238 of the Education Code is
 repealed.
 SEC. 15. Section 42238 is added to the Education
 Code, to read:
 (a) For the 1983-84 fiscal year, the county
 superintendent of schools shall determine a revenue limit
 for each school district in the county pursuant to this
 section.
 (b) The base revenue limit for the 1983-84 fiscal year
 shall be determined by adding the following amounts:
 (1) The revenue limit per unit of average daily
 attendance for the 1982-83 fiscal year determined
 pursuant to Item 6100-101-001 of the Budget Act of 1982.
 (2) The inflation adjustment specified in Section
 42238.1.
 (3) The equalization adjustment specified in Section
 42238.4.
 (c) The base revenue limit for each district
 determined in subdivision (b) shall be multiplied by the
 district average daily attendance computed as specified
 in Section 42238.5.
 (d) The amount determined in subdivision (c) shall
 be increased by the minimum revenue guarantee
 adjustment specified in Section 42238.2.
 (e) The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall
 apportion to each school district the amount determined
 in this section less the sum of:
 (1) The district's property tax revenue received
 pursuant to Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 95) of
 Part 0.5 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.
 (2) The amount, if any, received pursuant to Part 18.5

Exhibit B

Hearing: 10/24/85
Date Filed: 09/20/84
Staff: Rose Mary Swart
WP 0592A

Proposed Statement of Decision
Adopted Mandate
(Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983)
Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence

The Commission on State Mandates, at its September 26, 1985 hearing, determined that a reimbursable mandate exists in Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983, Education Code Section 35160.5.

Member Creighton moved to find a mandate. Members Aceituno, Carlyle and Creighton voted aye, Chairman Huff voted no. The motion carried.

BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

CLAIM OF:

SAN JOSE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Claimant

SB 90-4136

PROPOSED DECISION

This claim was heard by the Commission on State Mandates (commission) on September 26, 1985, in Sacramento, California, during a regularly scheduled meeting of the commission. William A. Doyle appeared on behalf of the San Jose Unified School District.

Evidence both oral and documentary having been introduced, the matter submitted, and vote taken, the commission finds:

I.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The test claim was filed with the Board of Control on September 20, 1984, by the San Jose Unified School District.

2. The subject of the claim is Statutes of 1983, Chapter 498 (Education Code section 35160.5).

3. Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983, added Education Code section 35160.5 which requires the following actions in order for districts to receive school apportionments. On or before December 1, 1984, each school district shall adopt rules and regulations establishing district policy regarding:

(a) certification that teacher evaluators have demonstrated competence in methodologies needed to evaluate teachers.

(b) district policies ensuring that all new, probationary teachers are assigned to schools where their potential special needs for training, assistance and evaluations will be met.

(c) policies which parents and guardians of pupils may use to present and resolve complaints regarding employees of the district.

Section 35160.5 also requires the governing board of each school district to annually review the policies adopted pursuant to the section.

4. The claimant incurred costs as a result of training teacher evaluators to meet the newly adopted standards as specified in Finding 3.

5. None of the requisites for denying a claim, as specified in Government Code section 17556, subdivision (a), were established.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

1. The commission has jurisdiction to decide the claim under authority of Government Code section 17630.

2. The commission found that Education Code section 35160.5, as added by Statutes of 1983, Chapter 498 constitutes a reimbursable state mandate. Furthermore the commission found that only the activities necessary to implement section 35160.5 constitute a higher level of service pursuant to Government Code section 17514 and are, therefore, reimbursable.

3. The commission determined that only the higher level of service required by section 35160.5 in each school district is reimbursable. Those activities and functions already performed prior to the effective date of section 35160.5 do not constitute a higher level of service and are therefore not reimbursable.

4. The finding of a reimbursable state mandate does not mean that all increased costs claimed will be reimbursed. Reimbursement, if any, is subject to commission approval of parameters and guidelines for reimbursement of the claim, and a statewide cost estimate; legislative appropriation; a timely-filed claim for reimbursement; and subsequent review of the claim by the State Controller.

Exhibit C

Hearing: 4/24/86
SB 90-4136
Staff: Rose Mary Swart
WP 1029A

PROPOSED PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES
Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983
Education Code Section 35160.5
Certification of Teacher Evaluators' Demonstrated Competence

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983 created a state mandate in Education Code Section 35160.5 by requiring that in order to receive apportionments, school districts adopt rules establishing district policy regarding: certification of teacher evaluators' demonstrated competence, probationary teachers, and a complaint process which parents and guardians of pupils may use to present and resolve complaints regarding employees of the district.

Commission staff has suggested amendments to the claimant's proposed parameters and guidelines, and recommends that the commission adopt the parameters and guidelines as amended. The claimant agrees with staff's proposed parameters and guidelines.

The Department of Finance (DOF) has suggested changes to staff's proposed parameters and guidelines.

Claimant

San Jose Unified School District

Chronology

- 9/20/84 Claim filed with Board of Control.
- 10/12/84 Claim continued pending Board of Control decision regarding multiple filings issue for Chapter 498/83; and, due to transition to Commission on State Mandates.
- 3/21/85 Claim continued due to lack of input from State Department of Education (SDE).
- 5/25/85 Claim continued due to lack of input from SDE.
- 7/25/85 Commission on State Mandates hearing cancelled.

- 8/22/85 Claim held-over to 9/26/85 hearing due to tie-vote.
- 9/26/85 Mandate approved by Commission on State Mandates.
- 10/24/85 Statement of Decision adopted (Attachment E).
- 12/2/85 Proposed parameters and guidelines submitted by San Jose Unified School District.
- 1/13/86 Conference to discuss proposed parameters and guidelines.
- 1/31/86 Amended proposed parameters and guidelines submitted by San Jose Unified School District (Attachment C).
- 3/27/86 Claim continued by the commission due to late filing of recommendation by DOF (Attachment F).

Statement of Claim

Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983 (Attachment B) required school districts to adopt rules and regulations to certify that personnel assigned to evaluate teachers have demonstrated specified competence in instructional methodologies and in the evaluation of teachers. School districts must also adopt rules to establish policies and procedures which parents or guardians of pupils enrolled in the district may use to present complaints regarding employees of the district and to provide for appropriate mechanisms to respond to, and where possible, resolve the complaints.

Staff Analysis

Staff is recommending several changes to the claimant's proposed parameters and guidelines (Attachment C).

A complete set of staff's proposed parameters and guidelines are attached (Attachment A).

Following is a summary and analysis of staff's suggested changes and DOF's suggested changes to the claimant's proposal. Additions are shown by underlining, deletions by strikeout. Staff agrees with and has added the claimant's suggested language in Sections V., B., I, and IX., of this proposal. The claimant submitted this proposed language (Attachment G) in its rebuttal to the DOF recommendation.

Section III. Eligible Claimants

All school districts and county offices of education as defined by Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2208.5, that incurred mandated costs as a result of implementing Chapter 498/83, Education Code Section 35160.5.

Since Chapter 498/83 affected numerous code sections, it is important for accuracy and clarity to include the affected code section(s) in any description or discussion of the impact of Chapter 498/83. This is a nonsubstantive change.

* * *

Section V. Reimbursable Costs

A., 2., a. Time of district administrators spent in certification training excluding classroom observation *(including classroom observation when it is part of the training package)*.

Staff proposes: 1) deletion of language from this section which would reimburse for "classroom observation" and; 2) a specific exclusion statement precluding such payment. Staff is making this proposal because classroom observation is part of the administrator's usual responsibility and a basic function of the job. It is important for administrators to practice the skills they have acquired in training, but according to staff of SDE, administrators typically practice this, and other skills, on the job. School administrators are actually performing two functions by incorporating the practice into their usual work. Since the administrator is continuing the same work routine which took place prior to the certification training, it seems unreasonable to expect this time to be recognized as a function mandated by Chapter 498/83. At this point the administrators are back at work and providing the services for which they are paid. The claimant agrees with this change.

However, DOF asserts in its recommendation that Chapter 498/83, Education Code Section 35160.5 does not require that administrators participate in any training (Attachment F). Staff would point out that this issue was addressed by the commission during the test claim phase of this mandate. The commission decided that Chapter 498/83 does require that training be provided for administrators functioning as teacher evaluators. See the commission's Statement of Decision, Attachment E, Part I, 3., (b), which addresses this issue. Therefore, since the matter has previously been resolved by the commission, staff will not address it in this analysis.

* * *

V. B. The establishment of district or county office of education policies ensuring that each probationary certificated employee is assigned to a school within the district with assurances that his or her status as a new teacher and his or her potential needs for training, assistance, and evaluations will be recognized by the district or county office of education.

1. Training, assisting and evaluating probationary teachers over and above that usually provided to permanent teachers by the district or county office of education. The cost of services or activities provided to probationary teachers and which are funded by the Mentor Teacher Program can not be claimed as a reimbursement cost.

This change is being proposed by the claimant in response to a concern expressed by DOF. The DOF recommendation makes the following statement regarding this section:

Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983 only requires that a school district establish policies ensuring that a new teacher's training, assistance and evaluation needs will be recognized. It does not demand that those policies exceed whatever currently is provided by school districts to new teachers. Claims that propose reimbursement for activities beyond those required by a school district prior to adoption of "expanded" policies are essentially claims for discretionary acts. As such, these activity costs should not be reimbursable.

The DOF concern here is about the level of training that will be reimbursed. Again, this is an issue which has been decided by the commission as part of the test claim. The commission, in its statement of decision on the test claim determined that training costs are reimbursable. In addition, it is established that any claim for reimbursement of activities beyond those mandated is not acceptable and will not be reimbursed. Nor are activities which are already being reimbursed going to be doubly reimbursed. However, in response to the DOF concern and to provide clarification the claimant has suggested the new language regarding the Mentor Teacher Program. Any activities already funded through that or any other programs may not be reimbursed through these parameters and guidelines. The proposed parameters and guidelines, in Section V.B.1. clearly prohibit double funding of activities by allowing reimbursement only for "Training, assisting and evaluating probationary teachers over and above that usually provided ...". Emphasis added. Additionally, Education Code Section 44496(a)(3) prohibits a mentor teacher from participating in any evaluation of other teachers.

* * *

- B. 1. c. One third of the time spent by site administrators training, assisting or evaluating probationary teachers.

The DOF recommendation states that the proposed parameters and guidelines, in Section B.1., would provide reimbursement for an activity which is now clearly a responsibility of administrative school personnel. This activity is the evaluation of probationary teachers. The proposed parameters and guidelines indicate that one third of the time spent by site administrators training, assisting or evaluating probationary teachers is reimbursable.

According to the claimant this is not an arbitrary number because "the additional one third of the time spent by administrators during the two year probationary period performing the mandated activities (training, assistance and evaluation) is caused by performing all the mandated activities within a two year period [Section 44882(b)] rather than in the pre-Chapter 498/83 three year period of time."

Education Code Section 44882(b), in pertinent part, referred to above, shortened the probationary period for teachers as follows:

- (b) Every employee of a school district of any type or class having an average daily attendance of 250 or more who, after having been employed by the district for two complete consecutive school years in a position or positions requiring certification qualifications, is reelected for the next succeeding school year be classified as and become a permanent employee of the district.

Staff does not find it necessary to change this portion of the proposal. The proposed parameters and guidelines will provide reimbursement only for activities required by Chapter 498/83.

* * *

- C. The establishment of policies and procedures which parents or guardians of pupils enrolled in the district may use to present complaints regarding employees of the district that provide for appropriate mechanisms to respond to, and where possible resolve, the complaints.
 1. Cost of meetings and activities over and above those that would have been required prior to the adoption of rules and regulations by the governing board of the school district or county office of education in compliance with Education Code Section 35160.5. These costs shall include the cost of notification of parents and pupils of complaint procedures, the time of school district or county office of education personnel involved in these meetings and activities including mileage, supplies and when necessary specialized training of personnel to adequately respond to complaints of pupils and parents regarding employees.

Regarding above Section V.C.1 of the proposed parameters and guidelines, DOF suggested the following language:

"These costs may be reimbursed if prior policies did not provide a procedure for parents and pupils to present complaints regarding employees or mechanisms for response or resolution to the complaints."

Prior practice has not been a determining factor in past decisions of the commission or its predecessor Board of Control. The commission has determined that a stated policy and process for complaints regarding employees of the district is, in this case, a state-mandated activity. The proposed parameters and guidelines articulate that which is required and that which is reimbursable, in accordance with the commission's fundings. There is an exclusion in this portion of the proposed parameters and guidelines for any

activities or meetings previously required by other laws. Staff asserts that the proposed language will facilitate identification and reimbursement of the mandated activities of Chapter 498/83 but will preclude payment of other functions not required by Chapter 498/83.

* * *

VII. Professional and Consultant Services.

Claimants shall separately show the name of professionals or consultants, specify the functions which the consultants performed relative to the mandate, length of appointment, and the itemized costs for such services. Invoices must be submitted as supporting documentation with the claim. The maximum reimbursable fee for contracted services is ~~\$95~~ \$65 per hour, adjusted annually by the GNP Deflator. Those claims which are based on annual retainers shall contain a certification that the fee is no greater than the above maximum. Reasonable expenses will also be paid as identified on the monthly billings of consultants.

Staff is suggesting the \$65 per hour limit because, according to SDE staff, teacher evaluator training of administrators has been offered at no cost through educational associations which are funded by SDE, and the training is available through commercial providers at a maximum \$500 per day rate. Therefore, it was felt that the claimant's allowance of up to \$95 per hour for contracted services was too high. The \$65 per hour maximum has been verified by staff through a telephone survey to be well within the industry average required by the State Administrative Manual for state contracts. Staff's proposal therefore, includes replacement language establishing a \$65 per hour ceiling, as indicated above. The claimant agrees with this change.

* * *

Staff has also added a Section VIII, Offsetting Savings. This is standard language for parameters and guidelines and merely guarantees that any savings the claimant realizes as a result of fulfilling the mandate will be identified and used to offset costs of the program. The claimant concurs.

* * *

Section IX, Required Certification, which was also added by staff is standard, "boilerplate" language which is needed in all parameters and guidelines to insure the validity of future claims. The claimant concurs.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the adoption of staff's proposed parameters and guidelines. Staff's proposed parameters and guidelines incorporate an editorial change and language which would:

1. preclude paying teacher evaluator's salaries while they perform classroom observation;
2. limit consultant's fees to a maximum of \$65 per hour;
3. add a standard Section VIII Offsetting Savings;
4. Add a Section IX Supporting Data for Claims requiring documentation that a claimant has attempted to secure "no cost consultant services", and;
5. add a Section X Required Certification.

Exhibit D

Adopted: 4/24/86
Amended: 1/24/91
WP 1080A

PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES
Education Code Section 35160.5
Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983
Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence

I. Summary of Mandate

In enacting Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983 the Legislature required each school district and county office of education to adopt rules and regulations; to certify that personnel assigned to evaluate teachers have demonstrated specified competence in instructional methodologies and in the evaluation of teachers; to ensure that each probationary teacher was assigned to a school with assurances that his or her status as a new teacher and his or her potential needs for training, assistance, and evaluations will be recognized by the district or county office of education; and to establish policies and procedures which parents or guardians of pupils enrolled in the district may use to present complaints regarding employees of the district and to provide for appropriate mechanisms to respond to, and where possible resolve, the complaints.

II. Commission on State Mandates Decision

A. The Commission found that Education Code section 35160.5, as added by Statutes of 1983, Chapter 498 constitutes a reimbursable state mandate. Furthermore, the Commission found that only the activities necessary to implement section 35160.5 constitute a higher level of service pursuant to Government Code section 17514 and are, therefore, reimbursable.

B. The Commission determined that only the higher level of service required by section 35160.5 in each school district or county office of education is reimbursable. Those activities and functions already performed prior to the effective date of section 35160.5 do not constitute a higher level of service and are therefore not reimbursable.

C. The finding of a reimbursable state mandate does not mean that all increased costs claimed will be reimbursed. Reimbursement, if any, is subject to Commission approval of parameters and guidelines for reimbursement of the claim, and a statewide cost estimate; legislative appropriation; a timely-filed claim for reimbursement; and subsequent review of the claim by the State Controller.

III. Eligible Claimants

All school districts and county offices of education as defined by Revenue and Taxation Code section 2208.5, that incurred mandated costs as a result of implementing Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983, Education Code section 35160.5.

IV. Period of Reimbursement

All costs incurred on or after July 28, 1983. If total costs for a given fiscal year total less than \$200.00 no reimbursement shall be allowed, except as provided for in Revenue and Taxation Code section 2233, which allows County Superintendents and County fiscal officers to consolidate claims of school districts and special districts that, taken individually, are less than \$201.00.

V. Reimbursable Costs

A. Certification that personnel assigned to evaluate teachers have demonstrated competence in instructional methodologies and evaluation for teachers they are assigned to evaluate. The determination of whether school personnel meet the district's adopted policies shall be made by the governing board.

1. Adoption of rules and regulations establishing school district and/or county office of education policies and annual review of these policies.

a. Time and direct expenses of school district or county office of education personnel necessary for the preparation, discussion and distribution of proposed rules and regulations and the annual review of adopted school district and county office of education policies adopted pursuant to the requirements of this section.

2. Training programs provided for administrators to meet the certification requirements adopted by the governing board of the school district or county office of education in conformance with Education Code section 35160.5. Individual administrator training expenses to meet certification requirements shall be allowed for a maximum of ten days (eighty hours) of training in any three year period.

a. Time of district administrators spent in certification training excluding classroom observation.

b. Mileage to and return, meals and materials for administrators attending locally provided training sessions. The reimbursement shall be the same as that provided for by the District for other District activities.

c. Transportation, meals, housing and cost of training for administrators if certification training is not locally available. The reimbursement shall follow the same rules as provided by the State of California for its employees when traveling on business.

d. Consultant fees, materials, travel, meals and housing for trainers contracted with to train district administrators locally.

e. Preparation and presentation time, mileage, meals, clerical costs and materials for district employees utilized as trainers of administrators for certification.

B. The establishment of district or county office of education policies ensuring that each probationary certificated employee is assigned to a school within the district with assurances that his or her status as a new teacher and his or her potential needs for training, assistance, and evaluations will be recognized by the district or county office of education.

1. Training, assisting and evaluating probationary teachers over and above that usually provided to permanent teachers by the district or county office of education. Copies of the approved previous policy and a copy of the subsequent policy must be included with claims for reimbursement. The cost of services or activities provided to probationary teachers funded by the Mentor Teacher Program can not be claimed as a reimbursable cost.

a. Time provided by personnel, other than the site principal, to train, assist or evaluate probationary teachers.

b. Training materials and clerical services for probationary teachers.

c. Registration fees and travel costs of probationary teachers attending training activities.

d. Costs of substitute teachers provided for probationary teachers so that they might attend training activities including visitations to

other teachers' classrooms to observe teaching techniques (limited to three such visitations per semester).

e. Costs of consultants provided to train and assist probationary teachers if personnel with the required skills are not available within the school district or county office of education.

C. The establishment of policies and procedures which parents or guardians of pupils enrolled in the district may use to present complaints regarding employees of the district that provide for appropriate mechanisms to respond to, and where possible resolve, the complaints.

1. Cost of meetings and activities over and above those that would have been required prior to the adoption of rules and regulations by the governing board of the school district or county office of education in compliance with Education Code section 35160.5. These costs shall include the cost of notification of parents and pupils of complaint procedures, the time of school district or county office of education personnel involved in these meetings and activities including mileage, supplies and when necessary specialized training of personnel to adequately respond to complaints of pupils and parents regarding employees.

2. Costs shall not be allowed for meetings and activities required by categorical program and/or special education rules and regulations.

VI. Offsetting Savings

Any offsetting savings the claimants experience as a result of this statute must be deducted from the costs claimed.

VII. Professional and Consultant Services

Claimants shall separately show the name of professionals or consultants, specify the functions which the consultants performed relative to the mandate, length of appointment, and the itemized costs for such services. Invoices must be submitted as supporting documentation with the claim. The maximum reimbursable fee for contracted services is \$65 per hour, adjusted annually by the GNP Deflator. Those claims which are based on annual retainers shall contain a certification that the fee is no greater than the above maximum. Reasonable expenses will also be paid as identified on the monthly billings of consultants.

VIII. Allowable Overhead Costs

The overhead cost for all of the above reimbursable costs shall be the Non-Restrictive Indirect Cost Rate from the J-41A.

IX. Supporting Data for Claims

Effective July 1, 1986 documentation shall be provided that a request for no cost consultant services similar to those submitted for reimbursement was made by the district to the State Department of Education at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to the need for consultant services and that the district was notified that such consultant service was not available at the time requested or that the District did not receive a response to its request within twenty (20) calendar days after the request had been received by the State Department of Education.

X. State Controller's Office Required Certification

An authorized representative of the claimant will be required to provide a certification of claim, as specified in the State Controller's claiming instructions, for those costs mandated by the state contained herein.

Education Code Section 44882(b), in pertinent part, referred to above, shortened the probationary period for teachers as follows:

- (b) Every employee of a school district of any type or class having an average daily attendance of 250 or more who, after having been employed by the district for two complete consecutive school years in a position or positions requiring certification qualifications, is reelected for the next succeeding school year be classified as and become a permanent employee of the district.

Staff does not find it necessary to change this portion of the proposal. The proposed parameters and guidelines will provide reimbursement only for activities required by Chapter 498/83.

* * *

- C. The establishment of policies and procedures which parents or guardians of pupils enrolled in the district may use to present complaints regarding employees of the district that provide for appropriate mechanisms to respond to, and where possible resolve, the complaints.

- 1. Cost of meetings and activities over and above those that would have been required prior to the adoption of rules and regulations by the governing board of the school district or county office of education in compliance with Education Code Section 35160.5. These costs shall include the cost of notification of parents and pupils of complaint procedures, the time of school district or county office of education personnel involved in these meetings and activities including mileage, supplies and when necessary specialized training of personnel to adequately respond to complaints of pupils and parents regarding employees.

Regarding above Section V.C.1 of the proposed parameters and guidelines, DOF suggested the following language:

"These costs may be reimbursed if prior policies did not provide a procedure for parents and pupils to present complaints regarding employees or mechanisms for response or resolution to the complaints."

Prior practice has not been a determining factor in past decisions of the commission or its predecessor Board of Control. The commission has determined that a stated policy and process for complaints regarding employees of the district is, in this case, a state-mandated activity. The proposed parameters and guidelines articulate that which is required and that which is reimbursable, in accordance with the commission's fundings. There is an exclusion in this portion of the proposed parameters and guidelines for any

activities or meetings previously required by other laws. Staff asserts that the proposed language will facilitate identification and reimbursement of the mandated activities of Chapter 498/83 but will preclude payment of other functions not required by Chapter 498/83.

* * *

VII. Professional and Consultant Services.

Claimants shall separately show the name of professionals or consultants, specify the functions which the consultants performed relative to the mandate, length of appointment, and the itemized costs for such services. Invoices must be submitted as supporting documentation with the claim. The maximum reimbursable fee for contracted services is ~~\$95~~ \$65 per hour, adjusted annually by the GNP Deflator. Those claims which are based on annual retainers shall contain a certification that the fee is no greater than the above maximum. Reasonable expenses will also be paid as identified on the monthly billings of consultants.

Staff is suggesting the \$65 per hour limit because, according to SDE staff, teacher evaluator training of administrators has been offered at no cost through educational associations which are funded by SDE, and the training is available through commercial providers at a maximum \$500 per day rate. Therefore, it was felt that the claimant's allowance of up to \$95 per hour for contracted services was too high. The \$65 per hour maximum has been verified by staff through a telephone survey to be well within the industry average required by the State Administrative Manual for state contracts. Staff's proposal therefore, includes replacement language establishing a \$65 per hour ceiling, as indicated above. The claimant agrees with this change.

* * *

Staff has also added a Section VIII, Offsetting Savings. This is standard language for parameters and guidelines and merely guarantees that any savings the claimant realizes as a result of fulfilling the mandate will be identified and used to offset costs of the program. The claimant concurs.

* * *

Section IX, Required Certification, which was also added by staff is standard, "boilerplate" language which is needed in all parameters and guidelines to insure the validity of future claims. The claimant concurs.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the adoption of staff's proposed parameters and guidelines. Staff's proposed parameters and guidelines incorporate an editorial change and language which would:

1. preclude paying teacher evaluator's salaries while they perform classroom observation;
2. limit consultant's fees to a maximum of \$65 per hour;
3. add a standard Section VIII Offsetting Savings;
4. Add a Section IX Supporting Data for Claims requiring documentation that a claimant has attempted to secure "no cost consultant services", and;
5. add a Section X Required Certification.

Exhibit E

Certification Teacher Evaluators' Demonstrated Competence

1. Summary of Chapter 498/83

This Chapter, which added Section 35160.5 to the Education Code, required the governing board of each school district, on or before December 1, 1984, to adopt rules and regulations establishing school district policies regarding teacher evaluation, training and complaints regarding employees.

On September 26, 1985, the Commission on State Mandates determined that Chapter 498/83 imposed a new program and costs on school districts and that these costs are reimbursable pursuant to Section 17561 of the Government Code.

2. Eligible Claimants

Any school district or county office of education which incurs increased costs as a result of this mandate is eligible to claim reimbursement for those costs.

3. Appropriations

Claims may only be filed with the State Controller's Office for programs that have been funded by the State Budget Act or by special legislation. To determine funding availability for the current fiscal year, refer to the schedule "Appropriation for State Mandated Cost Programs" in the "Annual Claiming Instructions for State Mandated Costs" issued in mid-September of each year to superintendents of schools.

4. Types of Claims

A. Reimbursement and Estimated Claims

An eligible claimant may file a reimbursement claim or an estimated claim as specified below. A reimbursement claim details the costs actually incurred for the previous fiscal year. An estimated claim shows the costs to be incurred for the current fiscal year.

- A claim for reimbursement or an estimate must exceed \$200 per fiscal year. However, a county superintendent of schools, as fiscal agent for the school district, may submit a combined claim in excess of \$200 on behalf of school districts within the county even if the individual district's claim does not exceed \$200. The combined claim must show the individual claim costs for each school district. Once a combined claim is filed, all subsequent claims for the same mandate must be filed in a combined form. A school district may withdraw from the combined claim form by providing a written notice to the county superintendent of schools and the Controller, at least 180 days prior to the deadline for filing the claim, of its intent to file a separate claim.

B. Filing Deadline

Refer to item 3 "Appropriations" to determine if the program is funded for the current fiscal year. If funding is available, an estimated claim may be filed as follows:

- An estimated claim must be filed with the State Controller's Office and postmarked by **November 30** of the fiscal year in which costs are to be incurred. Timely filed estimated claims will be paid before late claims.

After having received payment for the estimated claim, the claimant must file a reimbursement claim by November 30 of the following fiscal year. If the district fails to file a reimbursement claim by November 30 of the following fiscal year, monies received must be returned to the State. If no estimated claim was filed, the district may file a reimbursement claim detailing the actual costs incurred for the fiscal year, provided there was an appropriation for the program for that fiscal year. See item 3 above.

- A reimbursement claim must be filed with the State Controller's Office and postmarked by **November 30** following the fiscal year in which costs were incurred. If a claim is filed after the deadline, but by November 30 of the succeeding fiscal year, the approved claim will be reduced by 10% but not to exceed \$1,000. If the claim is filed more than one year after the deadline, the claim can not be accepted.

5. Reimbursable Components

The governing board of each school district was required, as a condition of receiving apportionments from the State School Fund, to adopt rules and regulations regarding teacher evaluation training and complaints regarding employees.

A. Competence in Instructional Methodology

Education Code Section 35160.5(a)(1) requires certification of personnel assigned to evaluate teachers that have demonstrated competence in instructional methodology and evaluation of teachers.

(1) Adoption of Rules and Regulations.

The costs of preparation, discussion and distribution of the proposed rules and regulations, the adoption of the rules and regulations establishing education policies, and the annual revision of these policies are reimbursable. The determination of whether school personnel meet the district's adopted policies shall be made by the governing board.

(2) Teacher Evaluator Certification Training Programs

The costs of training programs provided to administrators for the purpose of meeting certification requirements adopted by the governing board are reimbursable. Eligible costs include: salaries and benefits paid to administrators during certification training; mileage, meals and materials for attending locally provided training sessions; transportation, meals and lodging for attending training not available locally; contracts for administrators to be trained locally (consultant fees, materials, travel, meals and lodging for trainers); and salaries and benefits for preparation and presentation, plus mileage, meals, clerical support and material used in training by district employees used as trainers.

Training expenses for an administrator are allowed a maximum of ten days (80 hours) in any three year period. The reimbursable travel costs of attending a local training session shall be the same as provided by the district for other district activities. The reimbursement for non-local training shall be the same as provided for business travel by employees of the State of California.

B. Probationary Certificated Employee Policies

Education Code Section 35160.5(a)(2) requires the establishment of district or county office of education policies ensuring that each probationary certificated employee is assigned to a school within the district with assurances that his or her status as a new teacher and his or her potential needs for training, assistance and evaluations will be recognized.

(1) Adoption of Rules and Regulations

The cost of preparation, discussion and distribution of the proposed rules and regulations, the adoption of rules and regulations establishing education policies and the annual review of these policies are reimbursable. Copies of the approved previous policy and the subsequent policy must be included with claims for reimbursement.

(2) Training, Assisting and Evaluating Probationary Teachers

The costs of training, assisting and evaluating probationary teachers, over and above that provided to permanent teachers, are reimbursable. The salary and benefits of personnel, not including the site principal, plus training materials and clerical services used to train, assist or evaluate probationary teachers are reimbursable. The cost of consultants for the purpose of training and assisting probationary teachers, if personnel with the required skills are not available within the school district or county office of education, is reimbursable. Registration fees, travel costs and the cost of substitute teachers provided for probationary teachers so that they can attend training activities, including visitation to observe other teacher's teaching techniques, are reimbursable. Visitations are limited to three visitations per semester.

C. Parental Complaint Policies

Education Code Section 35160.5(a)(3) requires policies and procedures for enrolled pupils' parents or guardians to present employee complaints. The policies and procedures provide response mechanisms and, where possible, resolve the complaint.

(1) Adoption and Review of Rules and Regulations

The costs of preparation, discussion and distribution of the proposed rules and regulations, the adoption of the rules and regulations establishing education policies and the annual policy review are reimbursable.

(2) Resolution of Complaints

The cost of meetings and activities over and above those that would have been required prior to the adoption of rules and regulations by the claimant in compliance with Education Code Section 35160.5 are reimbursable.

These costs shall include:

- ☐ notification costs of parent and pupil complaint procedures
- ☐ claimant costs of time, mileage, supplies and specialized training to respond to parent and pupil complaints.

Meeting and activity costs required by categorical programs and/or special education rules and regulations are not eligible for this program.

6. Reimbursement Limitations

Any offsetting savings or reimbursement the claimant received from any source, as a result of this mandate, must be deducted from the amount claimed.

7. Cost Elements of a Claim

Contracted services for training evaluators are not reimbursable, unless the claimant can document that the State Department of Education was unable to provide the consultant services or the Department failed to respond to the claimant's request within the following time period. The claimant must request consultant services from the State Department of Education at least thirty calendar days prior to the need for the consultant services and the district must have been notified by the Department that the requested consultant services were not available at the time of the request. If the claimant did not receive a response to their request within twenty calendar days after the request was received by the Department, contracted service expenses are reimbursable.

The maximum reimbursable fee for contracted services in 1983/84 was \$ 65 per hour, to be adjusted annually by the GNP Deflator through the claim year. The current rate is shown on Form TE-1, Claim Summary. Claimants will receive a revised claim form each year with a revised rate. Claims which are based on annual retainer must contain a certification that the fee is no greater than the allowable maximum fee per hour.

8. Claiming Forms and Instructions

The diagram "Illustration of Claim Forms", provides a graphical presentation of forms required to be filed with a claim. A claimant may submit a computer generated report in substitution for Form TE-1 and Form TE-2, provided the format of the report and data fields contained within the report are identical to the claim forms included with these instructions. The claim forms provided with these instructions should be duplicated and used by the claimant to file an estimated or reimbursement claim. The State Controller's Office will revise the manual and claim forms as necessary.

A. Form TE-2, Component/Activity Cost Detail

This form is used to segregate the detailed costs by claim component. In some mandates, specific reimbursable activities have been identified for each component. The expenses reported on this form must be supported by cost and time records. Copies of supporting documentation specified in the claiming instructions must be submitted with

the claims.

For audit purposes, all supporting documents must be retained for a period of two years after the end of the calendar year in which the reimbursement claim was filed or last amended, whichever is later. Such documents shall be made available to the State Controller's Office on request.

B. Form TE-1, Claim Summary


This form is used to summarize direct costs by claim component and compute allowable indirect costs for the mandate. Claim statistics shall identify the work performed for costs claimed.

School districts and local offices of education may compute the amount of indirect costs utilizing the State Department of Education's Annual Program Cost Data Report J-380 or J-580 rate, as applicable. The cost data on this form are carried forward to form FAM-27.

C. Form FAM-27, Claim for Payment

Form FAM-27 contains a certification that must be signed by an authorized representative of the district. All applicable information from form TE-1 must be carried forward to this form for the State Controller's Office to process the claim for payment.

Illustration of Claim Forms



CLAIM FOR PAYMENT
 Pursuant to Government Code Section 17561
Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence
CLAIM FOR PAYMENT

For State Controller Use only

(19) Program Number 00009
 (20) Date Filed _____/_____/_____
 (21) Signature Present

(01) Claimant Identification Number: _____

(02) Mailing Address _____

Claimant Name _____

County of Location _____

Street Address or P. O. Box _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

Reimbursement Claim Data	
(22) TE-1, (04)(1)(d)	
(23) TE-1, (04)(2)(d)	
(24) TE-1, (04)(3)(d)	
(25) TE-1, (05)(d)	
(26) TE-1, (06)	
(27) TE-1, (11)	
(28)	
(29)	
(30)	
(31)	
(32)	
(33)	
(34)	
(35)	
(36)	
(37)	

Type of Claim	Estimated Claim	Reimbursement Claim
	(03) Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	(09) Reimbursement <input type="checkbox"/>
	(04) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>
	(05) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>
Fiscal Year of Cost	(06) 19____/____	(12) 19____/____
Total Claimed Amount	(07)	(13)
Less: 10% Late Penalty, but not to exceed \$1000 (if applicable)		(14)
Less: Estimate Payment Received		(15)
Net Claimed Amount		(16)
Due from State	(08)	(17)
Due to State		(18)

(38) CERTIFICATION OF CLAIM:

In accordance with the provisions of Government Code 17561, I certify that I am the person authorized by the school district to file claims with the State of California for costs mandated by Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983; and certify under penalty of perjury that I have not violated any of the provisions of Government Code Sections 1090 through 1096, inclusive.

I further certify that there were no applications for nor any grants or payments received, other than from the claimant, for reimbursement of costs claimed herein; and such costs are for a new program or increased level of service of an existing program mandated by Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983.

The amount of Estimated Claim and/or Reimbursement Claim are hereby claimed from the State for payment of estimated and/or actual costs for the mandated program of Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983, set forth on the attached statements.

Signature of Authorized Representative _____ Date _____

Type or Print Name _____ Title _____

(39) Name of Contact Person for Claim _____ Telephone Number _____

Ext. _____

CERTIFICATION OF TEACHER EVALUATOR'S DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE

FORM

Certification Claim Form

FAM-27

Pursuant to Government Code Section 17561

- (01) Leave blank
- (02) A set of mailing labels with the claimant's I.D. number and address have been enclosed with the claiming instructions. The mailing labels are designed to speed processing and prevent common errors that delay payment. Affix the label provided at the place indicated on form FAM-27. Cross out any errors and print the correct information on the label. Add any missing address items, except county of location and a person's name. If you didn't receive labels, print or type your agency's mailing address.
- (03) If filing an original estimated Claim, enter an " X " in the box on line (03) Estimated.
- (04) If filing an original estimated Claim on behalf of districts within the county, enter an " X " in the box on line (04) Combined.
- (05) If filing an amended claim to an original estimated or combined claim, enter an " X " in the box on line (05) Amended. Leave boxes (03) and (04) blank.
- (06) Enter the current fiscal year in which costs are to be incurred.
- (07) Enter the amount of estimated claim from form TE-1, line (11).
- (08) Enter the same amount as shown on line (07).
- (09) If filing an original reimbursement claim, enter an " X " in the box on line (09) Reimbursement.
- (10) If filing an original reimbursement claim on behalf of districts within the county, enter an " X " in the box on line (10) combined.
- (11) If filing an amended claim to an original reimbursement or combined claim on behalf of districts within the county, enter an " X " in the box on line (11) combined.
- (12) Enter the fiscal year for which actual costs are being claimed. If actual costs for more than one fiscal year are being claimed, complete a separate form FAM-27 for each fiscal year.
- (13) Enter the amount of the reimbursement claim from form TE-1, line (11).
- (14) If a reimbursement claim is filed after November 30 following the fiscal year in which costs were incurred, the claim must be reduced by a late penalty. Enter either the product of multiplying line (13) by the factor 0.10 [10% penalty] or \$1,000, whichever is less.
- (15) If filing a reimbursement claim and have previously filed an estimated claim for the same fiscal year, enter the amount received for estimated claim, otherwise enter a zero.
- (16) Enter the result of subtracting the sum of line (14) and line (15) from line (13).
- (17) If line (16) Net Claimed Amount is positive, enter that amount on line (17) Due from State.
- (18) If line (16) Net Claimed Amount is negative, enter that amount on line (18) Due to State.
- (22) through (37) for the Reimbursement claim

Bring forward cost information as specified in the left-hand column of lines (22) through (37) for the reimbursement claim [e.g., TE-1, (04)(1)(d), means the information is located on form TE-1, line (04)(1)(d)]. Enter the information on the same line but in the right-hand column. Cost information should be rounded to the nearest dollar, (i.e., no cents). Indirect costs percentage should be shown as a whole number and without the percent symbol (i.e., 7.548% should be shown as 8). The claim cannot be processed for payment unless this data block is correct and complete.

- (38) Read the statement "Certification of Claim". If the statement is true, the claim must be dated, signed by the agency's authorized representative and must include the person's name and title, typed or printed. Claims cannot be paid unless accompanied by a signed certification.
- (39) Enter the name of the person and telephone number that this office should contact if additional information is required.

SUBMIT A SIGNED ORIGINAL AND A COPY OF FORM FAM-27 AND A COPY OF ALL OTHER FORMS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS TO:

*Address, if delivery is by:
U.S. Postal Service*

KATHLEEN CONNELL
Controller of California
Division of Accounting and Reporting
P.O. Box 942850
Sacramento, CA 94250-5875

*Address, if delivery is by:
Other delivery service*

KATHLEEN CONNELL
Controller of California
Division of Accounting and Reporting
3301 C Street, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95816

CERTIFICATION OF TEACHER EVALUATORS' DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE				FORM TE-1	
CLAIM SUMMARY					
Instructions					
(01) Claimant		(02) Type of Claim		Fiscal Year	
		Reimbursement <input type="checkbox"/>		19__/__	
		Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>			
Claim Statistics					
(03) Professional and Consultant Services Certification				Yes	No
(a) Is the fee claimed for contracted services, including claims based on annual retainer, greater than \$98.27 per hour for the 1995/96 fiscal year?					
(b) If yes, explain.					
Direct Costs		Object Accounts			
(04) Reimbursable Components:		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		Salaries and Benefits	Materials and Supplies	Contracted Services	Total
1. Competence in Instructional Methodology					
2. Probationary Certified Employee Policies					
3. Parental Complaint Policies					
(05) Total Direct Costs					
Indirect Costs					
(06) Indirect Cost Rate		[From J-380 or J-580]			%
(07) Total Indirect Costs		[Line (06) x ((line (05)(d) - line (05)(c)))]			
(08) Total Direct and Indirect Costs		[Line (05)(d) + line (07)]			
Cost Reduction					
(09) Less: Offsetting Savings, if applicable					
(10) Less: Other Reimbursements, if applicable					
(11) Total Claimed Amount		[Line (08) - (Line (09) + Line (10))]			

CERTIFICATION OF TEACHER EVALUATORS' DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE CLAIM SUMMARY Instructions	FORM TE-1
--	----------------------------

- (01) Enter the name of the claimant.
- (02) Type of Claim. Check a box, Reimbursement or Estimated, to identify the type of claim being filed. Enter the fiscal year of costs.
- Form TE-1 must be filed for a reimbursement claim. Do not complete form TE-1 if you are filing an estimated claim and the estimate does not exceed the previous fiscal year's actual costs by more than 10%. Simply enter the amount of the estimated claim on form FAM-27, line (07). However, if the estimated claim exceeds the previous fiscal year's actual costs by more than 10%, form TE-1 must be completed and a statement attached explaining the increased costs. Without this information the high estimated claim will automatically be reduced to 110% of the previous fiscal year's actual costs.
- (03) (a) Answer yes or no.
(b) If yes, explain contract terms or annual retainer.
- (04) Reimbursable Components. For each reimbursable component, enter the totals from form TE-2, line (05) columns (d) and (e) and (f). Total each row.
- (05) Total Direct Costs. Total block (05) columns (a) through (d).
- (06) Indirect Cost Rate. Enter the indirect cost rate from the Department of Education form J-380 or J-580, as applicable, for the fiscal year of the costs.
- (07) Total Indirect Costs. Enter the result of multiplying the difference of Total Direct Costs, line (05)(d) and Contracted Services, line (05)(c) by the Indirect Cost Rate, line (06).
- (08) Total Direct and Indirect Costs. Enter the sum of Total Direct Costs, line (05)(d) and Total Indirect Costs, line (07).
- (09) Less: Offsetting Savings, if applicable. Enter the total savings experienced by the claimant as a direct result of this mandate. Submit a detailed schedule of savings with the claim.
- (10) Less: Other Reimbursements, if applicable. Enter the amount of other reimbursements received from any source (i.e., service fees collected, federal funds, other state funds, etc.) which reimbursed any portion of the mandated cost program. Submit a detailed schedule of the reimbursement sources and amounts.
- (11) Total Claimed Amount. Subtract the sum of Offsetting Savings, line (09), and Other Reimbursements, line (10), from Total Direct and Indirect Costs, line (08). Enter the remainder of this line and carry the amount forward to form FAM-27, line (13) for the Reimbursement Claim.

MANDATED COSTS CERTIFICATION OF TEACHER EVALUATORS' DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM TE-2
---	----------------------------

(01) Claimant	(02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred
---------------	--------------------------------------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Competence in Instructional Methodology

2. Probationary Certificated Employee Policies

3. Parental Complaint Policies

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services

(05) Total	<input type="text"/>	Subtotal	<input type="text"/>	Page: _____ of _____		
------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--	--

CERTIFICATION OF TEACHER EVALUATORS' DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL Instructions	FORM TE-2
---	----------------------------

- (01) Enter the name of the claimant.
- (02) Enter the fiscal year for which costs were incurred.
- (03) Reimbursable Components. Check the box which indicates the cost component being claimed. Check only one box per form. A separate form TE-2 shall be prepared for each component which applies.
- (04) Description of Expenses. The following table identifies the type of information required to support reimbursable costs. To detail costs for the component activity box "checked" in block (03), enter the employee names, position titles, a brief description of their activities performed, actual time spent by each employee, productive hourly rates, fringe benefits, supplies used, contract services, etc. Maximum reimbursable fee for contracted services is \$98.27 per hour for 1995/96 f.y. For audit purposes, all supporting documents must be retained by the claimant for a period of not less than two years after the end of the calendar year in which the reimbursement claim was filed or last amended, whichever is later. Such documents shall be made available to the State Controller's Office on request.

Object/ Subobject Accounts	Columns						Submit these supporting documents with the claim
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	
Salaries	Employee Name	Hourly Rate	Hours Worked	Salaries = Hourly Rate x Hours Worked			
Benefits	Title Activities Performed	Benefit Rate		Benefits = Benefit Rate x Salaries			
Materials and Supplies	Description of Supplies Used	Unit Cost	Quantity Used		Cost = Unit Cost x Quantity Consumed		
Contracted Services	Name of Contractor Specific Tasks Performed	Hourly Rate	Hours Worked Inclusive Dates of Service			Itemized Cost of Services Performed	Invoice

- (05) Total line (04), columns (d), (e) and (f) and enter the sum on this line. Check the appropriate box to indicate if the amount is a total or subtotal. If more than one form is needed for the component/activity, number each page. Enter totals from line (05), columns (d), (e) and (f) to form TE-1, block (04) columns (a), (b) and (c) in the appropriate row.

Exhibit F



S24070

**KATHLEEN CONNELL
CONTROLLER OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DIVISION OF ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING**

AUGUST 5, 1998

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MERCED CITY ELEM SCH DIST
MERCED COUNTY
444 W 23RD ST
MERCED CA 95340

DEAR CLAIMANT:

RE: CERT TEACHERS EVAL CH 498/83

WE HAVE REVIEWED YOUR 1995/1996 FISCAL YEAR REIMBURSEMENT CLAIM FOR THE MANDATED COST PROGRAM REFERENCED ABOVE. THE RESULTS OF OUR REVIEW ARE AS FOLLOWS:

AMOUNT CLAIMED	83,776.00
LESS: TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS (DETAIL ON PAGE 2)	- 63,393.00
CLAIM AMOUNT APPROVED	20,383.00
LESS: TOTAL PRIOR PAYMENTS (DETAIL ON PAGE 2)	37,644.00
AMOUNT DUE STATE	\$ 17,261.00

PLEASE REMIT A WARRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$ 17,261.00 WITHIN 30 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF THIS LETTER, PAYABLE TO THE STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE, DIVISION OF ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING, P.O. BOX 942850, SACRAMENTO, CA 94250-5875 WITH A COPY OF THIS LETTER. FAILURE TO REMIT THE AMOUNT DUE WILL RESULT IN OUR OFFICE PROCEEDING TO OFFSET THE AMOUNT FROM THE NEXT PAYMENTS DUE TO YOUR AGENCY FOR STATE MANDATED COST PROGRAMS.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CONTACT EDUARDO ANTONIO AT (916) 323-0755 OR IN WRITING AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

SINCERELY,

JEFF YEE,
MANAGER

ADJUSTMENT TO CLAIM:		
INDIRECT COSTS OVERSTATED	-	1,133.00*
NO SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION	-	24,375.00
NON-REIMBURSABLE ITEM	-	37,885.00*
LESS: TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS		63,393.00
PRIOR PAYMENTS:		
SCHEDULE NO. MA60717A		
PAID 05-15-1997		37,462.00
SCHEDULE NO. MA50716E		
PAID 01-26-1996		182.00
LESS: TOTAL PRIOR PAYMENTS		37,644.00

Exhibit G

CLAIM FOR PAYMENT
 Pursuant to Government Code Section 17561
 Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence

(19) Program Number 00009
 (20) Date Filed _____ / _____ / _____
 (21) Signature Present

L
A
B
E
L
H
E
R
E

(01) Claimant Identification Number:
S24070

(02) Mailing Address

Claimant Name
MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD

County Of Location
MERCED

Street Address or P.O. Box
444 W. 23RD ST.

City State Zip Code
MERCED CA 95340

Reimbursement Claim Data	
(22) TE-1,(04)(1)(d)	11,343
(23) TE-2,(04)(2)(d)	38,562
(24) TE-1,(04)(3)(d)	32,146
(25) TE-1,(05)(d)	82,051
(26) TE-1,(06)	2,9900

Type of Claim	Estimated Claim	Reimbursement Claim	
63393 (03) Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> (04) Combined <input type="checkbox"/> (05) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(09) Reimbursement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(27) TE-1,(11)	83,776
	(10) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(28)	
	(11) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(29)	
		(30)	
		(31)	
Fiscal Year of Cost	(06) 19 ____ / ____	(12) 19 95 / 96	(31)
Total Claimed Amount	(07)	(13) \$ 20383 83,776	(32) <i>J</i>
Less: 10% Late Penalty, but not to Exceed \$1000 (if applicable)	(14)		(33)
Less: Estimate Payment Received	(15)	\$ 182	(34)
Net Claimed Amount	(16)	\$ 37644 17261 83,594	(35)
Due From State	(08)	(17) \$ 83,594	(36)
Due to State	(18)	17261	(37)

(38) CERTIFICATION OF CLAIM

In accordance with the provisions of Government Code 17561, I certify that I am the person authorized by the school district to file claims with the State of California for costs mandated by Chapter 498 Statutes of 1983; and certify under penalty of perjury that I have not violated any of the provisions of Government Code Sections 1090 to 1096, inclusive.

I further certify that there were no applications for nor any grant or payments received, other than from the claimant for reimbursement of costs claimed herein; and such costs are for a new program or increased level of service of an existing program mandated by Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983.

The amounts for Estimated Claim and/or Reimbursement Claim are hereby claimed from the State for payment of estimated and/or actual costs for the mandated program of Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983, set forth on the attached statements.

Signature of Authorized Representative
Monna Lis

MONA LIS
 Type or Print Name

(39) Name of Contact Person For Claim
 Steve Smith, Mandated Cost Systems

Date
 11/26/96

DIRECTOR, FISCAL SERVICES
 Title

Telephone Number
 916-487-4435 Ext. _____

MANDATED COSTS

**Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence
CLAIM SUMMARY**

**FORM
TE-1**

(01) Claimant:
S24070
MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD

(02) Type of Claim: Reimbursement Estimated
Fiscal Year: 19 95 / 96

Claim Statistics

(03) Professional and Consultant Services Certifications:

a. Is the fee claimed for contracted services, including claims based on an annual retainer, greater than \$98.27 per hour for the 1995/96 fiscal year?

Yes	No
	X

b. If yes, explain.

Direct Costs

(04) Reimbursable Components:

- 1. Certification of Teacher Evaluators
- 2. Probationary Certified Employee Policies
- 3. Parental Complaint Policies

Cost Elements				
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	
Salaries and Benefits	Supplies	Contracted Services	Total	
11,343	0	0	11,343	
677 38,562	0	0	677 38,562	
7,771	0	24,375	32,146	
<i>9894-37885</i>				
57,676 19,791	0	84,375	82,051 19,791	

(05) Total Direct Costs

Indirect Costs

(06) Indirect Cost Rate	J-380 or J-580, as applicable	2.9900 %
(07) Indirect Costs	{[Line (05)(d) - line (05)(c)] x line (06)}	1,725 592
(08) Total Costs:	{Line (05)(d) + line (07)}	83,776 20383

Cost Reduction

- (09) Less: Offsetting Savings, if applicable
- (10) Less: Other Reimbursements, if applicable

(11) Total Claimed Amount: {Line(08) - [Line(09) + line(10)]} ~~83,776~~
20383

MANDATED COSTS

Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence

**FORM
TE-2**

COMPONENT / ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

(01) Claimant: **MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD** (02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: **95-96**

(03) Reimbursable Component: Competence in Instructional Methodology
 Probationary Certificated Employee Policies
 Parental Complaint Policies

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Activities Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	Cost Elements		
			(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
TEACHER EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION TRAINING					
ANDERSON B/LEARNING DIR	31.74	5.75	183		
ASSALI A/ASSIST PRINC	43.03	5.75	247		
ATKINSON, P/ PRINCIPAL	38.97	8.00	312		
BURROWS, S/PRINCIPAL	51.40	8.00	411		
COPE, L/ASST PRINCIPAL	42.82	15.75	674		
COPE, S/PRINCIPAL	38.97	8.00	312		
COWLES, J/PRINCIPAL	46.12	8.00	369		
DOSSETTI, A/ PRINCIPAL	43.54	8.00	348		
DOYLE, J- ASST. SUPERINTENDENT	50.80	10.00	508		
FLORES, R/ PRINCIPAL	47.11	8.00	377		
FULLER, S/ PRINCIPAL	47.03	8.00	376		
GRACIA B/ASSIST PRINC	43.03	5.75	247		
GRAVE, T/DIRECTOR	46.90	8.00	375		
GUEVARA, P/COORDINATOR	42.65	8.00	341		
HADLEY, C/PRINCIPAL	44.58	8.00	357		
INDERBITEON MA/ASST PRINCE	43.03	5.75	247		
JONES M/ASSIST PRINCIPAL	42.82	5.75	246		
KNAUF, K/PRINCIPAL	43.54	8.00	348		
MORRIS J/ASSIST PRINC	42.82	5.75	246		
NEMOEDE, N/PRINCIPAL	49.55	8.00	396		
OWEN, S/PRINCIPAL	44.03	8.00	352		
PARGA-DURAN, R/PRINCIPAL	47.16	8.00	377		
PARKER, T/PRINCIPAL	47.16	8.00	377		
PENNING S/LEARNING DIR	42.55	5.75	245		
PETERSON, S/ PRINCIPAL	46.68	8.00	373		
RAHILLY N/CUR COORDINATOR	46.98	8.00	376		
SCOTT M/LEARNING DIR	40.09	5.75	231		
SPICER G/ASSIST PRINC	41.96	5.75	241		
SPINARDI S/ASSIST PRINC	41.98	5.75	241		
STORM B/ASSIST PRINC	43.03	5.75	247		
STOWELL, D/PRINCIPAL	37.42	8.00	299		
TAYLOR M/ASSIST PRINCIPAL	43.55	5.75	250		

(05) Total Subtotal

MANDATED COSTS

**FORM
TE-2**

**Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence
COMPONENT / ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

(01) Claimant: **MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD** (02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: **95 - 96**

(03) Reimbursable Component: Competence in Instructional Methodology
 Probationary Certificated Employee Policies
 Parental Complaint Policies

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). Cost Elements

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Activities Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
WILLIAMS, B/ASST PRIN	38.71	5.75	223		
WILSON, S/PRINCIPAL	45.07	8.00	361		
WRIGHT, M/ ADMINISTRATOR	28.77	8.00	230		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 1 of 1 \$ 814 0 0

MANDATED COSTS

FORM

Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence

TE-2

COMPONENT / ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

(01) Claimant: **MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD**

(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: **95 - 96**

(03) Reimbursable Component: Competence in Instructional Methodology
 Probationary Certificated Employee Policies
 Parental Complaint Policies

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).

Cost Elements

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Activities Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
TRAIN, ASSIST AND EVALUATE PROB. TEACHERS					
AMPARAN, A/TEACHER	34.79	40.50	1409		
ARZAMENDI G/TEACHER	30.25	16.25	492		
ARZANENDI F/TEACHER	29.71	16.50	490		
BLACK, SCOTT/TEACHER	28.14	27.50	774		
CHAVEZ C/TEACHER	32.52	17.50	569		
CHOULAMOUNTRY, S/TEACHER	30.33	35.50	1076		
COPE, L/ASST PRINCIPAL	42.82	1.25	54		
COTTA T/TEACHER	30.25	108.00	3267		
DANIEL K/TEACHER	31.14	24.75	771		
DIAZ B/TEACHER	30.25	11.25	340		
DOYLE, J- ASST. SUPERINTENDENT	50.80	7.50	381		
FLETCHER M/TEACHER	33.13	22.50	745		
FRANCA, D/ TEACHER	29.79	43.00	1281		
GUEVARA, P/COORDINATOR	42.65	5.00	213		
GUTIERREZ R/TEACHER	33.67	15.75	530		
HAWLEY, C/ TEACHER	36.93	28.75	1062		
HILLEGEIST C/TEACHER	37.97	40.50	1538		
HOWARD S/TEACHER	28.89	25.00	722		
HUBBARD K/TEACHER	27.43	13.25	363		
JOHNSON S/TEACHER	35.11	40.50	1422		
LILLARD K/TEACHER	30.20	17.50	529		
MAHAN D/TEACHER	32.80	40.50	1328		
MONDO, M/ TEACHER	32.07	35.25	1130		
MORGAN S/TEACHER	30.25	40.50	1225		
MORRIS J/ASSIST PRINC	42.82	0.67	29		
MOYLE T/TEACHER	34.55	27.50	950		
MUNOZ J/TEACHER	29.11	40.50	1179		
MURPHY L/TEACHER	28.86	20.00	577		
NAYDEN G/TEACHER	30.25	40.50	1225		
NEIVAH R/TEACHER	30.25	10.75	325		
NEWARK, R/ TEACHER	30.93	4.00	124		
PANYANOUVONG P/TEACHER	30.25	19.25	582		

(05) Total Subtotal

Page: 1 of 1

\$ 26,702 0 0

677

MANDATED COSTS

**Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence
COMPONENT / ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

**FORM
TE-2**

(01) Claimant: **MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD**

(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: **95 - 96**

(03) Reimbursable Component: Competence in Instructional Methodology
 Probationary Certificated Employee Policies
 Parental Complaint Policies

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).

Cost Elements

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Activities Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
PHOMMAVONGSAY, K/ TEACHER	30.93	14.00	433		
POOL B/TEACHER	37.97	25.25	959		
POWER K/TEACHER	32.57	13.00	423		
PRYOR R/TEACHER	30.25	13.50	408		
ROMERO, D/ TEACHER	32.36	20.25	656		
SALDIVAR-TORRES T/TEACHER	30.00	14.00	420		
SALM, C/ TEACHER	30.08	23.75	714		
SEALE, T/ TEACHER	31.51	16.75	528		
SILVERIA L/TEACHER	23.77	40.50	963		
SODHI L/TEACHER	27.06	40.50	1096		
SOLIS, J/ TEACHER	33.76	12.00	406		
STAPP, L/ TEACHER	38.08	21.00	800		
STOCKING S/TEACHER	38.03	16.67	633		
TEJEDA A/TEACHER	30.25	17.50	530		
WALTMAN C/TEACHER	34.26	23.00	788		
WHITAKER, M/TEACHER	32.14	30.50	981		
WHITE A/TEACHER	31.71	23.50	745		
WOOD S/TEACHER	37.68	10.00	377		

(05) Total Subtotal

Page: 1 of 1

\$ 11,860 0 0

MANDATED COSTS

**Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence
COMPONENT / ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

**FORM
TE-2**

(01) Claimant: **MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD**

(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: **95 - 96**

(03) Reimbursable Component: Competence in Instructional Methodology
 Probationary Certificated Employee Policies
 Parental Complaint Policies

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).

Cost Elements

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Activities Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
RESOLVE COMPLAINTS OVER PRE SB813 LEVELS					
ALEXANDER, D/SECRETARY	21.29	0.25	5		
ATKINSON, ANDELSON, /ATTORNEY	75.00	176.25			13221
ATKINSON, ANDELSON, /ATTORNEY	98.27	112.75			11079
ATKINSON, P/ PRINCIPAL	38.97	2.83	110		
BRANTLEY M/TEACHER	47.08	1.00	47		
BROUGHTON, I/SECTY	24.64	23.08	568		
COPE, L/ASST PRINCIPAL	42.82	3.00	128		
COPE, S/PRINCIPAL	38.97	3.50	136		
COWLES, J/PRINCIPAL	46.12	5.00	231		
DOSSETTI, A/ PRINCIPAL	43.54	9.92	433		
DOYLE, J- ASST. SUPERINTENDENT	50.80	33.17	1685		
FLORES, R/ PRINCIPAL	47.11	47.49	2237		
FREDETTE F/COUNSELOR	43.38	1.00	43		
GRAVE, T/DIRECTOR	46.90	13.00	609		
HADLEY, C/PRINCIPAL	44.58	2.25	100		
JONES M/ASSIST PRINCIPAL	42.82	4.17	179		
KRONICK, MOSKOVITZ/ATTORNEY	100.00	0.75			
NEMOEDE, N/PRINCIPAL	49.55	7.66	379		75
OWEN, S/PRINCIPAL	44.03	7.08	312		
RANK, C/ TEACHER	47.08	4.00	188		
SPICER G/ASSIST PRINC	41.96	9.08	381		

(05) Total Subtotal

Page: 1 of 1

\$ 7,771 0 24,375

Exhibit H

October 13, 1998

Jeff Yee
Manager, Local Reimbursement Section
Division of Accounting and Reporting
State Controller's Office
P.O. Box 942850
Sacramento, CA 94250-5875

RE: **Reconsideration Request (CTE 98-3)**

Dear Mr. Yee:

The Merced City Elementary School District, Claimant ID S24070 received a letter dated August 5, 1998 that disallowed costs on its 1995/96 Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence Chapter 498/83 claim as follows:

1A) 1 st & 2 nd year Probationary Teacher Time Disallowed	\$ 27,353
1B) 2 day Training Time Disallowed for 1 st year Probationary Teachers	\$ 11,665
2) Contracted Services	\$ 24,374
Total	\$ 63,392

On August 31, 1998 one of my staff met with Eduardo Antonio to obtain the composition of this adjustment and to copy the work papers used in reviewing this claim.

Issue #1 A & B - Probationary Teacher Time Disallowed:

The Claiming Instructions and Parameters & Guidelines are silent on whether the time spent by probationary teachers is reimbursable. We feel strongly that these are legitimate costs of the mandate and that they are reimbursable. The State Controller's Office Claiming Instructions state that:

"The costs of training, assisting and evaluating probationary teachers, over and above that provided to permanent teachers, are reimbursable".

A) The time spent by probationary teachers receiving additional training and assistance would be included as a cost of training, assisting and evaluating probationary teachers.

B) In addition, the district requires its 1st year probationary teachers to work two extra 7.5 hour days each fiscal year. Permanent teachers work a 184 day work year, while the 1st year probationary teachers work a 186 day work year. These training sessions exceed what is provided to permanent teachers and there are costs incurred by the district.

There is an identifiable increased cost to the school district for these extra days worked by probationary teachers and these extra days worked are specifically attributable to the mandate of probationary teacher training. Recent Commission on State Mandates rulings on test claims that involve teacher training costs have indicated that if the district incurs an increased cost of some kind (i.e. substitutes, stipends, overtime pay or an extended work year) then this identifiable increased cost would be reimbursable.

The probationary teachers are identified on the attached claim with a "P1" for 1st year teachers or "P2" for 2nd year teachers.

Issue #2 - Contracted Services Disallowed:

Our records indicate that the required invoices for contracted services were sent to your office with the claim. I also have our signed transmittal form that shows your office's receipt of the claim and attached backup documentation. Prior to sending your office any claim that requires supporting documentation, we double check to make sure that we have attached the required backup. We have resubmitted these invoices with this letter.

According to the claiming instructions for the following component:

Parental Complaint Policies


"The cost of meetings and activities over and above those that would have been required prior to the adoption of rules and regulation by the claimant in compliance with Education Code Section 35160.5 are reimbursable."

Conclusion:

Based on the additional information and clarifications listed above, I request that **\$63,393 in incorrectly reduced costs be reinstated.** Please notify me within three weeks (October 30, 1998) of the State Controller's Office's decision on this matter. In the absence of a response within three weeks, we will assume that you intend to stand by this adjustment and not reinstate these costs.

If you have any questions or need any additional information, please contact me at (916) 487-4435.

Sincerely,



Steve Smith
President
Mandated Cost Systems, Inc.

Enclosures

cc: Mona M. Lis, Merced City Elementary School District

CLAIM FOR PAYMENT
 Pursuant to Government Code Section 17561
Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence

(19) Program Number 00009
 (20) Date Filed _____ / _____ / _____
 (21) Signature Present

L
A
B
E
L
H
E
R
E

(01) Claimant Identification Number:
S24070

(02) Mailing Address

Claimant Name
MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD

County Of Location
MERCED

Street Address or P.O. Box
444 W. 23RD ST.

City State Zip Code
MERCED CA 95340

Reimbursement Claim Data	
(22) TE-1,(04)(1)(d)	11,343
(23) TE-2,(04)(2)(d)	38,562
(24) TE-1,(04)(3)(d)	32,146
(25) TE-1,(05)(d)	82,051
(26) TE-1,(06)	2,9900

Type of Claim	Estimated Claim	Reimbursement Claim	
63393 (03) Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> (04) Combined <input type="checkbox"/> (05) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(09) Reimbursement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(27) TE-1,(11)	83,776
	(10) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(28)	
	(11) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(29)	
		(30)	
		(31)	
Fiscal Year of Cost	(06) 19 ____ / ____	(12) 19 95 / 96	(31)
Total Claimed Amount	(07)	(13) \$ 20383 83,776	(32) <i>JK</i>
Less: 10% Late Penalty, but not to Exceed \$1000 (if applicable)		(14)	(33)
Less: Estimate Payment Received		(15) \$ 182	(34)
Net Claimed Amount		(16) \$ 37644 17261 83,594	(35)
Due From State	(08)	(17) \$ 83,594	(36)
Due to State		(18) 17261	(37) <i>JK</i>

(38) CERTIFICATION OF CLAIM

In accordance with the provisions of Government Code 17561, I certify that I am the person authorized by the school district to file claims with the State of California for costs mandated by Chapter 498 Statutes of 1983; and certify under penalty of perjury that I have not violated any of the provisions of Government Code Sections 1090 to 1096, inclusive.

I further certify that there were no applications for nor any grant or payments received, other than from the claimant for reimbursement of costs claimed herein; and such costs are for a new program or increased level of service of an existing program mandated by Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983.

The amounts for Estimated Claim and/or Reimbursement Claim are hereby claimed from the State for payment of estimated and/or actual costs for the mandated program of Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983, set forth on the attached statements.

Signature of Authorized Representative: *Monna Lis* Date: 11/26/96
 MONA LIS DIRECTOR, FISCAL SERVICES
 Type or Print Name Title
 (39) Name of Contact Person For Claim Telephone Number
 Steve Smith, Mandated Cost Systems 916-487-4435 Ext. _____

MANDATED COSTS

**Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence
CLAIM SUMMARY**

**FORM
TE-1**

(01) Claimant:
S24070
MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD

(02) Type of Claim:
Reimbursement
Estimated

Fiscal Year:
19 95 / 96

Claim Statistics

(03) Professional and Consultant Services Certifications:

a. Is the fee claimed for contracted services, including claims based on an annual retainer, greater than \$98.27 per hour for the 1995/96 fiscal year?

Yes	No
	X

b. If yes, explain.

Direct Costs

Cost Elements

(04) Reimbursable Components:

	(a) Salaries and Benefits	(b) Supplies	(c) Contracted Services	(d) Total
1. Certification of Teacher Evaluators	11,343	0	0	11,343
2. Probationary Certified Employee Policies	38,562 ⁶⁷⁷	0	0	38,562 ⁶⁷⁷
3. Parental Complaint Policies	7,771	0	24,375	32,146 ⁷⁷⁷
(05) Total Direct Costs	57,676 ¹⁹⁷⁹¹	0	24,375	82,051 ¹⁹⁷⁹¹

Indirect Costs

(06) Indirect Cost Rate	J-380 or J-580, as applicable	2.9900 %
(07) Indirect Costs	[[Line (05)(d) - line (05)(c)] x line (06)]	1,725 ⁵⁹²
(08) Total Costs:	[Line (05)(d) + line (07)]	83,776 ²⁰³⁸³

Cost Reduction

(09) Less: Offsetting Savings, if applicable		
(10) Less: Other Reimbursements, if applicable		
(11) Total Claimed Amount:	[Line(08) - [Line(09) + line(10)]]	83,776 ²⁰³⁸³

MANDATED COSTS

**Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence
COMPONENT / ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

**FORM
TE-2**

(01) Claimant: **MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD** (02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: **95 - 96**

(03) Reimbursable Component: Competence in Instructional Methodology
 Probationary Certificated Employee Policies
 Parental Complaint Policies

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). Cost Elements

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Activities Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
TEACHER EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION TRAINING					
ANDERSON B/LEARNING DIR	31.74	5.75	183		
ASSALI A/ASSIST PRINC	43.03	5.75	247		
ATKINSON, P/ PRINCIPAL	38.97	8.00	312		
BURROWS, S/PRINCIPAL	51.40	8.00	411		
COPE, L/ASST PRINCIPAL	42.82	15.75	674		
COPE, S/PRINCIPAL	38.97	8.00	312		
COWLES, J/PRINCIPAL	46.12	8.00	369		
DOSSETTI, A/ PRINCIPAL	43.54	8.00	348		
DOYLE, J- ASST. SUPERINTENDENT	50.80	10.00	508		
FLORES, R/ PRINCIPAL	47.11	8.00	377		
FULLER, S/ PRINCIPAL	47.03	8.00	376		
GRACIA B/ASSIST PRINC	43.03	5.75	247		
GRAVE, T/DIRECTOR	46.90	8.00	375		
GUEVARA, P/COORDINATOR	42.65	8.00	341		
HADLEY, C/PRINCIPAL	44.58	8.00	357		
INDERBITEON MA/ASST PRINCE	43.03	5.75	247		
JONES M/ASSIST PRINCIPAL	42.82	5.75	246		
KNAUF, K/PRINCIPAL	43.54	8.00	348		
MORRIS J/ASSIST PRINC	42.82	5.75	246		
NEMOEDE, N/PRINCIPAL	49.55	8.00	396		
OWEN, S/PRINCIPAL	44.03	8.00	352		
PARGA-DURAN, R/PRINCIPAL	47.16	8.00	377		
PARKER, T/PRINCIPAL	47.16	8.00	377		
PENNING S/LEARNING DIR	42.55	5.75	245		
PETERSON, S/ PRINCIPAL	46.68	8.00	373		
RAHILLY N/CUR COORDINATOR	46.98	8.00	376		
SCOTT M/LEARNING DIR	40.09	5.75	231		
SPICER G/ASSIST PRINC	41.96	5.75	241		
SPINARDI S/ASSIST PRINC	41.98	5.75	241		
STORM B/ASSIST PRINC	43.03	5.75	247		
STOWELL, D/PRINCIPAL	37.42	8.00	299		
TAYLOR M/ASSIST PRINCIPAL	43.55	5.75	250		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 1 of 1 \$ 10,529 0 0

MANDATED COSTS

**FORM
TE-2**

**Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence
COMPONENT / ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

(01) Claimant: **MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD** (02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: **95-96**

(03) Reimbursable Component: Competence in Instructional Methodology
 Probationary Certificated Employee Policies
 Parental Complaint Policies

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). Cost Elements

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Activities Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
WILLIAMS, B/ASST PRIN	38.71	5.75	223		
WILSON, S/PRINCIPAL	45.07	8.00	361		
WRIGHT, M/ ADMINISTRATOR	28.77	8.00	230		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 1 of 1 \$ 814 0 0

MANDATED COSTS

**FORM
TE-2**

**Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence
COMPONENT / ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

(01) Claimant: **MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD**

(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: **95-96**

(03) Reimbursable Component: Competence in Instructional Methodology
 Probationary Certificated Employee Policies
 Parental Complaint Policies

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).

Cost Elements

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Activities Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
TRAIN, ASSIST AND EVALUATE PROB. TEACHERS					
P1 AMPARAN, A/TEACHER	34.79	40.50	1409		
P2 ARZAMENDI G/TEACHER	30.25	16.25	492		
P1 ARZANENDI F/TEACHER	29.71	16.50	490		
P1 BLACK, SCOTT/TEACHER	28.14	27.50	774		
P2 CHAVEZ C/TEACHER	32.52	17.50	569		
P1 CHOULAMOUNTRY, S/TEACHER	30.33	35.50	1076		
COPE, L/ASST PRINCIPAL	42.82	1.25	54		
P1 COTTA T/TEACHER	30.25	108.00	3267		
P1 DANIEL K/TEACHER	31.14	24.75	771		
P2 DIAZ B/TEACHER	30.25	11.25	340		
DOYLE, J- ASST. SUPERINTENDENT	50.80	7.50	381		
P1 FLETCHER M/TEACHER	33.13	22.50	745		
P1 FRANCA, D/ TEACHER	29.79	43.00	1281		
GUEVARA, P/COORDINATOR	42.65	5.00	213		
P2 GUTIERREZ R/TEACHER	33.67	15.75	530		
P1 HAWLEY, C/ TEACHER	36.93	28.75	1062		
P1 HILLEGEIST C/TEACHER	37.97	40.50	1538		
P1 HOWARD S/TEACHER	28.89	25.00	722		
P2 HUBBARD K/TEACHER	27.43	13.25	363		
P1 JOHNSON S/TEACHER	35.11	40.50	1422		
P2 LILLARD K/TEACHER	30.20	17.50	529		
P1 MAHAN D/TEACHER	32.80	40.50	1328		
P1 MONDO, M/ TEACHER	32.07	35.25	1130		
P1 MORGAN S/TEACHER	30.25	40.50	1225		
MORRIS J/ASSIST PRINC	42.82	0.67	29		
P1 MOYLE T/TEACHER	34.55	27.50	950		
P1 MUNOZ J/TEACHER	29.11	40.50	1179		
P1 MURPHY L/TEACHER	28.86	20.00	577		
P1 NAYDEN G/TEACHER	30.25	40.50	1225		
P2 NEIVAH R/TEACHER	30.25	10.75	325		
2 NEWARK, R/ TEACHER	30.93	4.00	124		
P2 PANYANOUVONG P/TEACHER	30.25	19.25	582		

(05) Total Subtotal

Page: 1 of 1

\$ 26,702 0 0

MANDATED COSTS

**Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence
COMPONENT / ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

**FORM
TE-2**

(01) Claimant: **MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD**

(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: **95-96**

(03) Reimbursable Component: Competence in Instructional Methodology
 Probationary Certificated Employee Policies
 Parental Complaint Policies

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).

Cost Elements

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Activities Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	Cost Elements		
			(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
P2 PHOMMAVONGSAY, K/ TEACHER	30.93	14.00	433		
P1 POOL B/TEACHER	37.97	25.25	959		
P2 POWER K/TEACHER	32.57	13.00	423		
P2 PRYOR R/TEACHER	30.25	13.50	408		
P2 ROMERO, D/ TEACHER	32.36	20.25	656		
P2 SALDIVAR-TORRES T/TEACHER	30.00	14.00	420		
P2 SALM, C/ TEACHER	30.08	23.75	714		
P2 SEALE, T/ TEACHER	31.51	16.75	528		
P1 SILVERIA L/TEACHER	23.77	40.50	963		
P1 SODHI L/TEACHER	27.06	40.50	1096		
P2 SOLIS, J/ TEACHER	33.76	12.00	406		
P2 STAPP, L/ TEACHER	38.08	21.00	800		
P2 STOCKING S/TEACHER	38.03	16.67	633		
P2 TEJEDA A/TEACHER	30.25	17.50	530		
P1 WALTMAN C/TEACHER	34.26	23.00	788		
P1 WHITAKER, M/TEACHER	32.14	30.50	981		
P1 WHITE A/TEACHER	31.71	23.50	745		
P2 WOOD S/TEACHER	37.68	10.00	377		

(05) Total Subtotal

MANDATED COSTS

**Certification of Teacher Evaluator's Demonstrated Competence
COMPONENT / ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

**FORM
TE-2**

(01) Claimant: **MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SD**

(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 95 - 96

(03) Reimbursable Component: Competence in Instructional Methodology
 Probationary Certificated Employee Policies
 Parental Complaint Policies

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).

Cost Elements

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Activities Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
RESOLVE COMPLAINTS OVER PRE SB813 LEVELS					
ALEXANDER, D/SECRETARY	21.29	0.25	5		
ATKINSON, ANDELSON, /ATTORNEY	75.00	176.25			
ATKINSON, ANDELSON, /ATTORNEY	98.27	112.75			13221
ATKINSON, P/ PRINCIPAL	38.97	2.83	110		11079
BRANTLEY M/TEACHER	47.08	1.00	47		
BROUGHTON, I/SECTY	24.64	23.08	568		
COPE, L/ASST PRINCIPAL	42.82	3.00	128		
COPE, S/PRINCIPAL	38.97	3.50	136		
COWLES, J/PRINCIPAL	46.12	5.00	231		
DOSSETTI, A/ PRINCIPAL	43.54	9.92	433		
DOYLE, J- ASST. SUPERINTENDENT	50.80	33.17	1685		
FLORES, R/ PRINCIPAL	47.11	47.49	2237		
FREDETTE F/COUNSELOR	43.38	1.00	43		
GRAVE, T/DIRECTOR	46.90	13.00	609		
HADLEY, C/PRINCIPAL	44.58	2.25	100		
JONES M/ASSIST PRINCIPAL	42.82	4.17	179		
KRONICK, MOSKOVITZ/ATTORNEY	100.00	0.75			
NEMOEDE, N/PRINCIPAL	49.55	7.66	379		75
OWEN, S/PRINCIPAL	44.03	7.08	312		
RANK, C/ TEACHER	47.08	4.00	188		
SPICER G/ASSIST PRINC	41.96	9.08	381		

(05) Total Subtotal

Page: 1 of 1

\$ 7,771

0 24,375

Exhibit I



KATHLEEN CONNELL
Controller of the State of California

December 30, 1998

Mr. Steve Smith
President
Mandated Cost Systems, Inc.
2275 Watt Avenue, Suite C
Sacramento, CA 95825

Dear Mr. Smith:

RE: NOTICE OF CLAIM ADJUSTMENT
MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
CHAPTER 498/83 CERTIFICATION OF TEACHER EVALUATORS
FISCAL YEAR 1995-96

This is in reply to your letter dated October 13, 1998 regarding the above claim for reimbursement of mandated cost program. The result of our review is as follows:

Amount Claimed

\$83,776

Adjustment to Claim:

Probationary Certificated Employee Policies

The amount of \$37,885 for salaries and benefits of probationary teachers in training is disallowed. Parameters and guidelines do not provide reimbursement for probationary teachers training costs. In lieu of that, the P's & G's reimburse the cost of substitute teachers while the probationary teachers attend training activities.

-37,885

The claim of \$24,375 for Resolution of Parental Complaints is questionable. There was no description of services performed by attorney services as required by the mandate. The invoices submitted with the claim did not provide any indication as to number of parental complaints nor the nature of those parental complaints. In addition, invoice costs were not traceable to items listed on the tape total of \$24,374.

-24,375

Sub-total on Adjustment for Direct Costs		-\$62,260
Adjustment of Indirect Costs	(\$1,725-\$592)	-1,133
Total Adjustment for Claim		-\$63,393
Approved Claim		\$20,383
Less: Prior Payment of 1/26/96 & 5/15/97		-37,644
Amount Due State		<u>-\$17,261</u>

If you have any questions, please contact Eduardo Antonio at (916) 323-0755 or in writing at the State Controller's Office, Attn: Local Reimbursements Section, Division of Accounting and Reporting, P.O. Box 942850, Sacramento, CA 94250-5875.

Sincerely,



JEFF YEE, Manager
Local Reimbursements Section

JY:ea

cc: Mona Lis, Merced City Elementary School District