

**"The definition of 'thorough and efficient' is not static..."**

# **Determining the Cost of an Adequate Education: *Yet Another* Failed Attempt**



**June 2001**

**"The general assembly shall make such provisions, by taxation, or otherwise, as, ... will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools throughout the State..."**

**Article VI, Section 2 of the Ohio Constitution**

**Ohio Coalition for Equity & Adequacy of School Funding**

100 S. Third St. Columbus, Ohio 43215 ☎614-228-6540 ☎614-228-6542 fax ☎ohioeanda@aol.com ☎www.ohiocoalition.org

Larry Miller, Chairperson

William L. Phillis, Executive Director

**"...will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools throughout the state."**



I. Introduction \_\_\_\_\_ Page 3

II. The Study Process \_\_\_\_\_ Page 4

    How Were the 127 School Districts Selected \_\_\_\_\_ Page 5

III. Some Vital Statistics of the 127 Districts \_\_\_\_\_ Page 6

IV. How Adequate are the Essential Learning  
Resources in the 127 “Model” School Districts \_\_\_\_\_ Page 7

    Facilities Survey of 127 School Districts \_\_\_\_\_ Page 15

    The Superintendents Speak Out \_\_\_\_\_ Page 19

V. Conclusions and Recommendations \_\_\_\_\_ Page 21

VI. References \_\_\_\_\_ Page 23

VII. Appendices

    A. Survey Form: Adapted from the Basket of  
    Essential Learning Resources Grid \_\_\_\_\_ Page 24

    B. The 127 “Model” School Districts \_\_\_\_\_ Page 26

**DETERMINING THE COST OF AN ADEQUATE EDUCATION:  
YET ANOTHER FAILED ATTEMPT  
JUNE 2001**

**INTRODUCTION**

To the casual observer, “fumbling” might seem to be an accurate descriptor of the General Assembly’s attempts to comply with the Ohio Supreme Court’s second directive (May 2000) to design a school funding system that would guarantee to each school district sufficient resources to provide a standards-defined level of educational opportunity for all school children in the state. A review of the proposals put forward, with one exception, suggests another explanation: rather than focusing upon the cost of an adequate education, legislators have deliberately engaged in a so-called “rational” process to establish base per pupil costs for an adequate education that, in reality, represents pursuit of a funding plan which is simply “affordable.” Another name for this approach is residual budgeting, a process which the Court has held to be unacceptable.

Each of the legislative proposals claims to address the Supreme Court’s ruling and create a constitutional funding system for the state’s public schools. A common characteristic of the plans, however, is that all have related their funding proposals to expenditures of a group of school districts selected according to their performance on state educational standards. The search for the “right” group of school districts is clearly reflected in the chart below:

| <u>Plan</u>                                 | <u>No. of districts</u> | <u>Criteria</u>  | <u>Base Cost*</u> |
|---|-------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Governor Taft                               | 43                      | Meet 20 of 27 1999 standards                                   | \$4,466           |
| Senate Bill 2                               | 122                     | Meet 17 of 18 1996 standards                                   | \$4,481           |
| House Committee<br>(Householder)            | 45                      | Meet all 18 original standards<br>in 1999                      | \$5,560           |
| Am. Sub. HB 94<br>(House/Senate Compromise) | 127**                   | Meet 17 of 18 1996 standards;<br>meet 20 of 27 1999 standards; | \$4,814           |

---

\*FY 2002 figures.

\*\*Note: Seven of the 127 districts were “close” to meeting the established criteria but did not actually do so. The seven were below average in expenditures per pupil, thus lowering the derived per pupil costs.

Am. Sub. HB 94, the Compromise Bill, is clearly the legislative vehicle chosen by lawmakers to respond to the Court’s directives. It is worthy of note that the House Committee (Householder) proposal, which was based on 45 high performing school districts meeting all of the 18 original state standards, addressed the key issues in the current unconstitutional funding system, but was rejected by the Governor and leadership of the House and Senate in favor of the compromise bill.

In April 2001, the Ohio Coalition for Equity & Adequacy of School Funding (E&A Coalition) conducted and published an analysis of the characteristics of the 122 school districts selected as the basis for school funding in Senate Bill 2. Seventy-nine (65 percent) of the 122 school districts are included in 127 district-group comprising the foundation for the Am. Sub HB 94 (House/Senate Compromise) fund-

ing bill. Thus, 43 school districts were dropped from the Senate Bill 2 list and 48 new school districts were added to create the grouping of 127 districts. It is obvious that when this approach to establishing a school funding system is used the outcomes will vary with the characteristics of the school districts selected, as will the consequences for the public school students in Ohio. Higher performing school districts provide greater educational opportunities for students than do lower performing ones, and these differences are reflected in the funding plans put forth.

The purpose of this study, like that published in April 2001, is a straightforward one: to examine in-depth the characteristics of the 127 so-called “model” school districts upon which Am. Sub. HB 94, as introduced, makes its case for remedying Ohio’s unconstitutional school funding system. As noted in the earlier report, the E&A Coalition has consistently argued that the “thorough and efficient” clause in the Ohio Constitution sets a high standard and that any remedy for the currently unconstitutional system will, by definition, be based on the actual costs of the essential learning resources inherent in a thorough and efficient system of common schools. If an inferential approach to “costing out” an adequate education is used, only high performing districts likely to possess the essential learning resources necessary for those desired outcomes should be considered for analysis.

The criteria (frequently called “screens”) applied in Am. Sub. HB 94 selected one-fifth of the state’s school districts as the basis for its cost computations. The question remains: Do these 127 “model” districts, when taken collectively, represent a level of adequacy upon which a constitutional system of school funding can be based? The E&A Coalition believes that this methodology is flawed and, if Am. Sub. HB 94 or a similar measure is enacted, the standards of opportunity to which all school children in Ohio are entitled will still be missing. The findings of this study, like its predecessor of April 2001, strongly support that position.

## THE STUDY PROCESS

### Background

Over a period of nearly two years, the Coalition engaged thousands of Ohioans through town meetings and two statewide conferences in a process to define, in terms of learning resources, the meaning of a “thorough and efficient” system of education. These deliberations, published in October 1999 in a document entitled *Basket of Essential Learning Resources for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Basket), identified in comprehensive detail the resources which the E&A Coalition believes would establish constitutional **Standards of Opportunity** for all of Ohio’s public school children. In the summer and early fall of 2000, the E&A Coalition identified 30 of Ohio’s highest performing and 30 of its lowest performing school districts to assess the differences in learning resources available to students in the two categories of school districts.\* The findings of that study were published in January 2001 under the title *The Urgent Necessity for Developing and Adopting Standards of Educational Opportunities for Ohio School Children*. (The differences in the availability of essential learning resources in the two groups of districts were striking!)\*\*

In early January 2001, the E&A Coalition conducted a survey of the 122 “successful” districts selected to provide the basis for school funding in Senate Bill 2 in order to assess the adequacy in those districts of the essential learning resources which had been identified in the Basket. The findings of that study

\* The districts were selected on the basis of the following three output and two input variables: percent of students passing all sections of the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, 6<sup>th</sup> grade and 12<sup>th</sup> grade proficiency tests, number of advanced placement courses weighted by level and percent of students enrolled in the post-secondary option, and teacher-pupil ratios. Due to scheduling limitations, surveys were conducted in 27 of the highest and 29 of the lowest-ranking school districts.

\*\* When the responses to all 183 items in the survey (the total Basket of Essential Learning Resources) were combined and analyzed, superintendents in high ranking districts were nearly twice as likely as the superintendents in low-ranking districts to report their learning resources as adequate.

## How Were the 127 Districts Selected?

were published in April 2001 in the document titled *Determining the Cost of an Adequate Education: A Failed Attempt*. As stated earlier, the school funding proposal in Am. Sub. HB 94, which made its debut in April, was based on 127 so-called “model” districts. Of the 127, 79 districts were common to both Senate Bill 2 and Am. Sub. HB 94 while 48 were newly selected districts. In order to provide a comprehensive account of the adequacy of learning resources in the group of 127 school districts, the learning resources survey instrument was sent to the superintendents of the 48 new districts. Survey forms were received from 109 of the 127 school districts (85.8 percent). (See Appendix A for a copy of the survey instrument.)

In addition to the data secured through the survey described above, certain relevant information from a concurrent E&A Coalition statewide facilities study is incorporated into the section of this report dealing with the adequacy of facilities.

### How were the 127 districts selected? (See Appendix B for a list of the districts)

As noted in the chart above, multiple “screens” were used by legislators to identify the 127 districts used in Am. Sub. HB 94 to provide a rationale for a base per pupil cost of \$4,814. In the first instance, districts were required to meet 17 of the 18 1996 standards and 20 of the 27 of the 1999 standards. While not acknowledged publicly, it appears that seven of the 127 districts did not actually meet all of these criteria, but were simply “close” to meeting them. Interestingly, these seven districts were below average in expenditures per pupil, which lowered still further the derived base cost. (The 1999 average base expenditure costs per pupil for the seven “close” districts was \$3,758 while that of the other 120 districts was \$4,375, a difference of \$617 or 14 percent.)

Table 1 shows that the group of 127 selected school districts is dominated by local districts, and further analysis reveals that city districts, when compared with the local and exempted villages is somewhat under represented in the total group. Although not reflected in Table 1, it should be noted that none of the large seven urban school districts met the criteria for inclusion in the group of 127 districts.

Table 1  
**Local, Exempted Village and City Districts Selected**

|              | <u># Districts in Ohio</u> | <u># Selected</u> | <u>% Of 127 Selected</u> | <u>% of 611 Selected</u> |
|--------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Local        | 369                        | 82                | 64.6                     | 13.4                     |
| Ex. Vill.    | 49                         | 15                | 11.8                     | 2.5                      |
| <u>City</u>  | <u>193</u>                 | <u>30</u>         | <u>23.6</u>              | <u>4.9</u>               |
| <b>Total</b> | 611                        | 127               | 100.0                    | 20.8                     |

Table 2 compares certain relevant characteristics, or “vital statistics,” for the following groupings of Ohio’s School districts: the 127 school districts reflected in Am. Sub. HB 94, the 122 school districts represented in the earlier Senate Bill 2; the 30 districts determined to be effective by meeting at least 27 of 28 standards as reported in the 1999 Ohio School Report Card; the 45 districts which in 1999 met all 18 of the original standards established in 1996, and which were used by the House Committee to establish its proposed base per pupil cost; and statewide figures.

## How Were the 127 Districts Selected?

Table 2  
**Vital Statistics of the 127 School Districts, the 122 Districts,  
the 30 Effective Districts, the 45 Districts and Statewide Figures**

| Vital<br>Statistic       | 127        | 122        | 30<br>Effective | 45<br>18 of 18 | State<br>Figures |
|--------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Expenditure per pupil    | \$6,175    | \$6,126    | \$7,993         | \$7,737        | \$6,264          |
| Average teacher's salary | \$38,097   | \$38,046   | \$44,911        | \$44,374       | \$37,307         |
| College prep graduates   | 70.7       | 68.0       | 81.9            | 78.1           | 58.2             |
| Pupil/teacher ratio      | 19.0       | 19.0       | 17.8            | 18.1           | 18.6             |
| District stability rate* | 6.3        | 6.3        | 4.07            | 4.12           | 10.6             |
| Median income            | \$33,151   | \$30,346   | \$40,063        | \$41,684       | \$28,162         |
| Effective Districts      | 10(7.9%)   | 7(5.8%)    | 30 (100%)       | 30(67.0%)      | 30(4.9%)         |
| Continuous improv        | 117(92.1%) | 113(92.6%) | 0               | 15(33%)        | 379(62%)         |
| Academic watch           | 0          | 2(1.6)     | 0               | 0              | 132(21.6%)       |
| Academic emergency       | 0          | 0          | 0               | 0              | 70(11.5%)        |

Source: FY 1999 Ohio Department of Education Data.

\*Stability rate refers to the percent of students who are enrolled in the school district for one-half of the school year or less.

Several conclusions from Table 2 literally jump out at the reader. Perhaps the most telling of these is that the 127 Am. Sub. HB 94 districts selected for establishing a statewide base per pupil cost are far from the state's own definition of "effective" on several critical measures. In fact, the 127 districts, like 122 districts of Senate Bill 2, resemble the average school district in Ohio much more than they do the effective ones. Of the 127, only 10 (7.9 percent ) were rated effective whereas 92.1 percent are in the continuous improvement category. Am. Sub. HB 94 does, however, avoid the legislative embarrassment of Senate Bill 2 by eliminating the two school districts which were in academic watch.

A startling statistic not shown in Table 2 relates to the number of students now being educated in the 120 selected continuous improvement districts and the number in the seven effective districts. The continuous improvement schools enroll 228,738 students whereas the effective districts enroll only 16,888. Stated another way, of the 245,626 students enrolled in the 127 Am. Sub. HB 94 "model" schools, less than seven percent are in effective districts.

The data in Table 2 also show convincingly that high performing school districts cost much more to operate (upwards of \$2,000 per pupil) than do lower performing ones. Based on the E&A study published January 2001, one may confidently conclude that the higher expenditures per pupil provide greater learning resources to pupils which, in turn, lead to higher academic performance. In that study, superintendents in high performing school districts were nearly twice as likely as their counterparts in low performing ones to report their learning resources as adequate. Teacher/pupil ratios in both the 127 and 122 district groups are significantly higher than those in the effective groups and even exceed the statewide average of 18.6. Attention is drawn in the statewide figures in Table 2 to the low percentage of college prep graduates and the high district stability rates. Both of these statistics reflect the inclusion of data from the seven large urban districts, none of which were included in the other groupings.

The methodology used in Am. Sub. HB 94, like its earlier counter part, Senate Bill 2, is based on John Augenblick’s inferential approach to deriving a base per pupil cost. This methodology theoretically identifies a pool of so-called “successful” districts based on certain output data from which a base cost could be inferred. (In Am. Sub. HB 94, the districts are referred to as “model” districts.) It can be concluded that the Am. Sub. HB 94 funding plan is grounded in the system of education in Ohio which has been found to be unconstitutional by the state’s highest court. The methodology infers a constitutional funding plan based on “what is” in this case, an unconstitutional system. The inferential methodology contrasts with the cost resource or professional judgment approach which addresses “what ought to be,” the long-held position of the E&A Coalition.

**HOW ADEQUATE ARE THE ESSENTIAL LEARNING RESOURCES IN THE 127 “MODEL” SCHOOL DISTRICTS?**

The survey form sent to the 127 school superintendents categorized the essential learning resources into 14 broad areas with most areas possessing multiple resource elements. The instructions to respondents were to respond “Yes” if they believed that a given resource was adequate; “No” if it was inadequate; and, NA (not applicable) where appropriate. Space was provided for comments in most cases. As noted earlier, 109 of the 127 superintendents (85.8 percent) returned the survey forms.

The percent of yes/no responses of superintendents to each item on the survey is presented in this section of the report. Following each statistical presentation, an attempt has been made to summarize the many comments made by respondents, frequently by using verbatim comments. This is followed by an analysis of the data which has been presented.

**1. Does your school district provide full day kindergarten for all students?**

No                    91.5 percent                    Yes    8.5 percent

**Summary of Comments:** Lack of space and funding were repeatedly cited as the reasons for not offering full-day, every-day kindergarten programs. Half-day or every-other-day programs, where available, were usually funded by grants and most likely to be available to at-risk children. The overwhelming majority of districts want full-day programs; however, a couple of districts reported that it was not needed or desired by parents in their districts. One respondent stated “We’d love to, but do not have adequate space (or funding).” Another wrote, “We are meeting in hallways, basement, converted closet space, etc. If we had space, we would do it.”

**Sample of Comments:**

- Yes, but only as an option in one of our three K-4 buildings.
- We have full days twice per week and a half-day on Fridays. We would not have sufficient classroom space to house an all-day everyday kindergarten program.
- No. We don’t even have space to serve at-risk students with all day kindergarten services.
- Kindergarten classes are held in old locker rooms – cannot afford to add space. Cannot afford hiring of two additional teachers – costs us dearly in open enrollment – loss.
- Much needed program - We are currently running a 1/4 million dollar deficit, can’t afford to add it without state funding and no room even if funding comes.

**Analysis:** School communities throughout the state, as a whole, are convinced of the value of full-day kindergarten for all of their young children, but lack of funding for teachers and facilities blocks the addition of these critical developmental experiences to school programs.



**2. Are your curricula and instructional strategies in the following Ohio Department of Education-defined core areas adequate?**

| Subject            | K-3  |       | 4-8  |      | 9-12 |      |
|--------------------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|
|                    | No % | Yes % | No%  | Yes% | No%  | Yes% |
| Reading            | 15.4 | 84.6  | 20.0 | 80.0 | 20.2 | 79.8 |
| English/Lang. Arts | 8.7  | 91.3  | 10.5 | 89.5 | 17.1 | 82.9 |
| Mathematics        | 18.3 | 81.7  | 18.3 | 81.7 | 19.0 | 81.0 |
| Science            | 23.1 | 76.9  | 24.0 | 76.0 | 27.6 | 72.4 |
| Social Studies     | 13.5 | 86.5  | 13.5 | 86.5 | 18.1 | 81.9 |
| World Languages    | 61.4 | 38.6  | 60.2 | 39.8 | 32.4 | 67.6 |

**Summary of Comments:** Much curriculum work is currently underway in the school districts with a primary focus on alignment with proficiency tests and learning outcomes. The status of state standards is a frustration for some. Lack of space, lack of adequate funding and the need for staff professional development were mentioned by several respondents as impacting negatively upon instructional practices. Poor scores on proficiency tests were associated with an inadequate curriculum by a few superintendents. One superintendent wrote: “We need more intervention/remedial help. We receive no DPIA funds but still need intensive intervention strategies, especially in K-8.” Another stated, “In the last levy we were informed that we have the least number of teachers allowable to operate a district. No advanced placement- 28 kids per section K-6 - lack adequate high school curriculum to meet student needs.”

**Sample of Comments:**

- We get by in all areas but excel in none.
- We offer minimum services in all areas.
- I feel the curriculum is OK. I feel that the legislature is working very hard to see that schools fail.
- We know what needs to be done. We target our resources on the most immediate problem, but there isn't enough money to adequately provide for all areas.
- Adequate space and funding would allow us to do more.

**Analysis:** While just over three-fourths of the respondents felt that their curricula and instructional strategies in the ODE-defined core areas were adequate, disturbingly, nearly 25 percent did not. It is apparent that courses in all these basic areas, with the exception of world languages, are being offered in the schools, but that their effectiveness with regard to either content or instructional methodology is at question in about one-fourth of the districts. Foreign language instruction at all levels of the school system is widely accepted in our diverse and increasingly globally oriented society as an essential element in an effective school program, yet it was reported as absent or inadequate in nearly two-thirds of the primary and middle schools and one-third of the high schools which have been selected as the basis for funding a thorough and efficient system of education.

3. Are your curricula and instructional strategies in the following areas adequate?

| Subject              | K-3  |       | 4-8  |       | 9-12 |       |
|----------------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|
|                      | No % | Yes % | No % | Yes % | No % | Yes % |
| Art                  | 24.0 | 76.0  | 22.1 | 77.9  | 16.2 | 83.8  |
| Music (Vocal/Instru) | 17.5 | 82.5  | 19.0 | 81.0  | 19.2 | 80.8  |
| Health/ Phys. Educ.  | 17.1 | 82.9  | 15.4 | 84.6  | 18.3 | 81.7  |
| Technology           | 35.0 | 65.0  | 38.5 | 61.5  | 39.0 | 61.0  |
| Performing Arts      | 61.8 | 38.2  | 58.1 | 41.9  | 51.5 | 48.5  |
| Work/Family Life     | NA   | NA    | 37.4 | 62.6  | 19.4 | 80.6  |

**Summary of Comments:** Most concerns were addressed toward technology programs and the performing arts. Lack of staffing and space were cited as the basis for absent or inadequate arts programs. The costs for upgrading technology and the need for professional development of staff were frequent comments concerning the inadequate technology programs. “We do not have sufficient funds to keep pace with technology or to offer performing arts to a large extent,” wrote one superintendent. Others stated “We need additional computers, software and training in technology. A performing arts center is needed.” “We have no art specialists K-6.”

**Sample of Comments:**

- Need more performing arts.
- Our district has limited funds and therefore can only hire one technology person for the entire district. More computers are needed in schools.
- Original SchoolNet equipment is out of date.
- We have no actual performing arts classes. Technology is an area we are working on to improve the implementation into all curricular areas.

**Analysis:** Instruction relating to technology is perceived as being inadequate at all school levels in over 37 percent of the districts. Not only is the initial cost of equipment a very significant figure, but its maintenance and regular upgrading over time creates recurring expenditures which must become ongoing elements in school budgets. But technology in schools is not an end in itself; its main purpose is to enhance the teaching and learning experiences of students. This requires continuing investments in the training of staff which, in most districts, is woefully underfunded.

One can find a bit of encouragement in the responses concerning the adequacy of the arts programs, once regarded as a frill to be dropped when financial pinches occurred. With the exception of the performing arts, which are viewed as inadequate in over 57 percent of the districts, art and music seem to be solidly entrenched in the curriculum. It is apparent, however, that a sizeable percentage of superintendents (approximately 20 percent) believe still that their programs are inadequate.

**4. Does your high school(s) offer the following minimum number of courses?**

| <u>Subject Area</u>                               | <u>No %</u> | <u>Yes %</u> |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| 7 English/language Arts                           | 14.2        | 85.8         |
| 7 Mathematics                                     | 8.6         | 91.4         |
| 7 Science   | 22.9        | 77.1         |
| 7 Social studies                                  | 30.8        | 69.2         |
| 3 Foreign languages<br>(At least one credit each) | 54.7        | 45.3         |
| 3 Business/technology                             | 2.9         | 97.1         |
| 2 Health/physical Education                       | 5.7         | 94.3         |
| 3 Music (4 Credits)                               | 20.0        | 80.0         |
| 3 Art (visual, drama, dance)                      | 33.7        | 66.3         |
| 2 Industrial technology                           | 14.7        | 85.3         |
| 4 Work and family life                            | 26.5        | 73.5         |

**Note:** No space was provided on the survey form for respondent comments concerning the minimum number of courses to be offered in high schools.

**Analysis:** It is evident from the data above that many secondary school students are denied access to the breadth and depth of educational offerings which are regarded as essential to an adequate educational program. The E&A Coalition recognized that secondary schools with small enrollments are least able, typically, to provide programs of this quality. In order to address this problem, supplementary delivery systems drawing upon already available technology will have to be provided. The use of distance education to provide greater equity of educational opportunity has yet to be seriously addressed by the state.

**5. Does your high school(s) offer advanced placement courses in the following areas?**

| <u>Subject</u>   | <u>No %</u> | <u>Yes %</u> |
|------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Mathematics      | 50.5        | 49.5         |
| Science          | 65.1        | 34.9         |
| Social studies   | 63.3        | 36.7         |
| English          | 46.8        | 53.2         |
| Foreign language | 90.8        | 9.2          |
| Other            | 91.7        | 8.3          |

**Summary of Comments:** The reasons given by respondents for not providing advanced placement courses are primarily related to staffing, costs and space. It is apparent from responses that advanced placement courses, honors courses and post-secondary options are viewed as very important to addressing the needs and interests of able students. Two districts are hoping to offer such courses on-line next year and another respondent indicated that the district offers no AP, but “we offer assistance before school allowing students to take the advanced placement tests but no specific courses.” Another superintendent said, “We don’t have the resources for adequate staffing [for AP courses].”

**Sample of Comments:**

- None in any area.
- To my knowledge, we have never offered AP courses.
- We don't have the staff or numbers at this time. Teachers have not done before or after school courses either.
- We need advanced placement courses in every subject.

**Analysis:** Advanced placement and honors courses are widely accepted as essential elements in an adequate educational program, but one or two such courses in a high school curriculum will serve only a portion of the students who could benefit from such advanced learning opportunities. The Basket of Essential Learning Resources identifies, as a minimum, four advanced placement courses in the high school curriculum: mathematics, science, social studies and English. Regrettably, breadth of opportunity for secondary students to undertake advanced studies was not a significant criterion in the selection of school districts upon which to base a “thorough and efficient” school funding system.

**6. Are all students eligible for gifted education services being served?**

No 80.2 percent      Yes 19.8 percent

If not, what percent is not being sufficiently served? 51 percent

**Summary of Comments:** Costs for teaching personnel and lack of space were the most frequently cited reasons for not meeting the needs of all talented and gifted students. One superintendent wrote: “We are in the process of total identification. We do not have enough funds to serve this group.” Another respondent put it simply: “We have a program for 4-6 only. We would like to offer additional programming.” The severity of the problem is further illustrated by another who wrote: “Our school district does not provide gifted education!” Yet another stated, “Recent changes in guidelines for the identification of talented and gifted students have doubled our number of eligible students. No additional funding for services to these students has been forthcoming.”

**Sample of Comments:**

- At grades 7-12, there are no consistent programs offered for gifted students. We do not have a teacher of gifted students on staff.
- No classroom space to house program; lack of staff.
- We cannot afford to hire a teacher full-time to serve all students.
- The students are provided services, however, the level of service is not adequate to the needs of our students.
- Funding is a major issue.

**Analysis:** One can only conclude from these data that in the 127 selected school districts a great number of the children eligible for gifted services, perhaps 50 percent, are not being adequately served or even served at all. In contrast with special education services which are mandated, State Board of Education policies require only that gifted students be identified; service is not required, nor is it required that the parents/guardians of gifted children even be informed of that fact. It is apparent that a change in policy/law and funding will be necessary to provide adequate service to this group of students.

7. Are all students eligible for special education being served?

No 5.7 percent Yes 94.3 percent

If not, what percent is not being sufficiently served? 3.5 percent

**Summary of Comments:** The very high percentage of eligible students being served in special education programs should come as no surprise for such programs are both federal and state mandates. In most Ohio school districts, they represent unfunded mandates as well. Of the many superintendents who added comments to this survey question, most of them referred to the costs for special education. One superintendent stated, “This is one of our biggest concerns - the personnel and space required to properly meet students’ needs is overwhelming and funds are not available.” Another reported that “Our special education population is growing and the overwhelming majority of the cost is borne by the district.” “Excess costs eat up general fund in excess of state funding.” “Funding is lacking from state to provide the services needed.”

**Sample of Comments:**

- We still have many students not identified that need help and additional intervention services.
- We could use more staff, more and more students are being identified.
- We do not have the facilities to meet the needs of our special needs students.
- Funding doesn’t cover the cost.
- Becoming a burden with new mandates.
- Cost does regulate how much we can do.

**Analysis:** Serving all of Ohio’s students who have special learning problems (236,200 in 1999) is a critical funding issue for the state’s public schools which has never been adequately addressed. The magnitude of this problem, acutely felt in the past by school administrators and boards of education but largely ignored by legislators, finally became an authentic public issue with the publication in November 2000 of the report titled **Special Education Finance in Ohio: Analysis and Recommendations**. After finding that over \$300,000,000 more in state revenue would be needed annually to bring special education funding up to the 1983 special education standards of the State Board of Education, the study analysts proposed eight key policy recommendations with cost estimates for each based on conservative assumptions regarding minimum service requirements. The credibility of the study is enhanced by the fact that it was conducted by Capital Partners, a consulting firm headed by the former director of the Ohio Office of Budget and Management, R. Gregory Browning. The survey of the 127 school districts simply corroborates this long-known failure of Ohio’s school funding system. Any “fix” of the Ohio school funding system must effectively address this problem.

8. Are compensatory programs for disadvantaged students sufficient to meet the needs of those students?

No 43.6 percent Yes 56.4 percent

If not, what percent is not sufficiently served? 33.4 percent

**Summary of Comments:** Several superintendents reported having few students on free/reduced lunches in their districts and, thus, were not eligible for special funding such as Title 1. Where special programs are available, they are focused on the lower grades. Several respondents expressed views similar to the superintendent who wrote: “We do not have enough services to meet the needs of students in 6-12. Our resources are utilized in K-5.” The expanding nature of programs for disadvantaged children is

reflected in the comment of a superintendent who wrote “We are not able to offer programs that we would like for at-risk students (i.e. latchkey or after school programs).”

**Sample of Comments:**

- We have minimum number of at-risk programs and could offer more if money/funds were available.
- Not eligible for DPIA - no programs exist in our district targeted at disadvantaged students.
- We receive Title 1 (no DPIA), but it is not adequate to serve all students.
- We are serving all eligible children (those most in need) but only at the primary grades. Additional funding would make it possible to offer programs for students in grade 5 and beyond.
- Both space and financial resources prevent this from occurring.

**Analysis:** Over 43 percent of the respondents in the 127 school districts indicated that their compensatory programs for disadvantaged students were insufficient to meet their students’ needs. In view of the fact that Ohio’s at-risk students are concentrated to a great extent in urban centers, none of which were included in this funding model, one can only conclude that addressing this problem and the related special education problem represent critical elements in a constitutional school funding plan.

**9. Are intervention services (including proficiency) adequate in the following areas?**

| <u>Subject area</u> | <u>No%</u> | <u>Yes%</u> |
|---------------------|------------|-------------|
| Reading             | 43.8       | 56.2        |
| Mathematics         | 50.5       | 49.5        |
| Writing             | 42.3       | 57.7        |
| Social studies      | 44.2       | 55.8        |
| Science             | 52.9       | 47.1        |

**Summary of Comments:** The theme that runs throughout the superintendents’ comments was that their districts should be doing more. Most of the intervention programs which do exist are grant funded as opposed to being an integral part of the on-going school program and they are limited to one or two subjects. “Intervention at the secondary level is sporadic,” “limited by funding,” “cost is prohibitive,” and “not near what should/could be due to lack of funding” were typical responses to the question. Another wrote: “If they (intervention services) were adequate, we would be an ‘effective’ school system.” Several wrote of the need to extend the school year or school day.

**Sample of Comments:**

- Additional personnel would be required in order to provide a truly effective intervention program.
- We would like to expand our intervention, but finances prohibit.
- We have 1/2 aide in charge of volunteer tutor program, we struggle to find funds for basic summer elementary program.
- All high school areas could use additional intervention.
- The only way we are able to fund after school or summer school interventions are through grant funds.

**Analysis:** The high “failure” rates of many school districts on proficiency tests have focused attention on helping low-performing students to improve their achievement. Intervention requires the identification of pupils having difficulty and establishing special programs to address those problems. The programs take different forms in different districts, but may include summer school, after school, tutors, volunteers and special groupings within regular classrooms. Few, if any, deny the importance of special

programs to help all students learn, but they are significant cost factors in some school districts. Regrettably, nearly one-half of the superintendents believe their efforts at intervention are not adequate.

**10. Are your facilities adequate in number/space/quality in the following areas?**

(Note: Some supplementary data from the concurrent E&A survey of school facilities is added below to superintendents’ responses to this question.)

| <u>Instructional Area</u> | <u>No %</u> | <u>Yes%</u> |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Regular classrooms        | 71.6        | 28.4        |
| Special education         | 66.3        | 33.7        |
| Science                   | 71.3        | 28.7        |
| Libraries                 | 50.5        | 49.5        |
| Computer laboratories     | 54.5        | 45.5        |
| Music                     | 52.5        | 47.5        |
| Art                       | 60.0        | 40.0        |
| Drama/auditorium          | 60.4        | 39.6        |
| Gymnasiums                | 53.0        | 47.0        |
| Industrial technology     | 54.1        | 45.9        |
| Work and family life      | 30.3        | 69.7        |
| Business education        | 39.0        | 61.0        |
| Foreign language          | 33.7        | 66.3        |
| Tutoring                  | 69.6        | 30.4        |
| Small group instruction   | 78.0        | 22.0        |

**Summary of Comments:** A few comments reflected that districts have been recipients of very helpful state building assistance or that such funding is on the way and that facilities will be adequate at some time in the future. But for most of the superintendents, the facilities problems are immediate and they are negatively impacting the educational opportunities available to students. Typical comments were: “our facilities are outdated and overcrowded,” “our biggest need,” “we are still using seven classrooms and office space in a building that opened in 1885,” “we have no room for our children,” “although we will have a new building [soon] there will still be challenges for space.” And wealthy districts are not without facilities problems, as reflected by the superintendent who wrote, “We are considered ‘high wealth’ yet our buildings are 1920’s with a coal fired furnace. 427 on the equity list. Go figure.”

**Sample of Comments:**

- Overall, facilities are good, but we will need a new elementary building and renovations to two others to meet growth.
- K-6 classes include range of 25-30 per section, many high school courses are 25+.
- Our facilities could use expansion and upgrades but we do not anticipate help from the state that we can afford.
- Our facilities are old, but in good shape. They do not meet the needs of a 21<sup>st</sup> century curriculum.
- Our elementary buildings have no space for science labs. Our art and music teachers have to share a single room.

**Analysis:** Most of the 127 school districts have serious facilities problems and the magnitude of the problem statewide is starkly apparent. Over 71 percent of the responding districts report inadequate facilities in terms of number, space and quality in regular classrooms, special education classrooms, science laboratories, and small group instruction areas, and over 61 percent indicate similar problems

in computer laboratories, space for tutoring and in the performing arts. Just as textbooks, computers/software and skilled teachers are essential learning resources, so too are appropriate, safe and healthful spaces for instruction. Taken as a whole, the facilities in the 127 school districts fall far short of the standards of adequacy that would be expected in schools being used to establish a “thorough and efficient” system of education.

**From the Facilities Survey of the 127 School Districts**

77 districts of the 127 responded to a facility survey, of those 77 districts which are not now in the Ohio School Facilities Commission program:

- 52 districts have a total of 95 buildings that do not meet the barrier-free requirements.
- 55 districts have a total of 149 buildings with asbestos.
- 14 districts have a total of 25 buildings that are unsafe and/or hazardous to the health of students.
- 40 districts have a total of 83 buildings that lack the electrical/cabling/space capacity to accommodate appropriate technology.
- 68 districts have insufficient elementary classrooms to accommodate all-day, every day kindergarten.
- 55 districts do not have sufficient elementary classrooms to accommodate their disadvantaged children in 15:1 pupil-teacher ratio settings.
- 24 districts use modular classrooms to teach 99 regular classes and 14 other classes affecting 2,947 students.

13 districts of the 127 responded to a facility survey, of those 13 districts which are currently in the Ohio School Facilities program:

- 7 districts are in the planning stages of new school construction.
- 11 districts have passed their local share millage.
- 2 districts have tried once and failed to pass their local millage share.
- 4 districts passed more than the millage required while 8 districts did not.
- 9 districts are not allowed an auditorium as a part of their OSFC project.

The most problematic areas reported for new construction are:

|   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Physical education (38.4 percent)         | Administration (38.4 percent)      |
| Regular middle/junior high (30.7 percent) | Pre-school programs (23 percent)   |
| Vocal/instrumental music (23 percent)     | Industrial technology (23 percent) |



**11. Do you provide the following instructional materials?**

|   | <u>No%</u> | <u>Yes%</u> |
|---|------------|-------------|
| Replace textbooks every five years?         | 44.4       | 55.6        |
| Provide 1 TV/VCR per classroom?             | 67.9       | 32.1        |
| Provide 1 overhead projector per classroom? | 73.3       | 26.7        |
| Provide model science curriculum material?  | 52.9       | 47.1        |
| Provide adequate classroom supplies?        | 29.8       | 70.2        |

**Summary of Comments:** A few districts reported progress in providing more adequate instructional materials and supplies. For example, one superintendent wrote that “our textbooks were not kept up for many years so the catch up process is slow.” But most comments were of an entirely different nature. Respondents wrote: “There are no funds for consumable science materials. Teachers use their own money for these.” “The PTO gives money to teachers each year so that they can purchase classroom materials.” Another superintendent said, “We have been fortunate to have materials, however, we are in a financial crunch and we have made drastic cuts for next year.”

**Sample of Comments:**

- We probably spend a higher amount per pupil on classroom supplies and equipment than many districts, but more is needed.
- More funds are needed.

**Analysis:** Up-to-date textbooks, related curriculum materials and basic technology for delivering instruction are unquestioned essential learning resources, yet an alarming shortage is reported throughout the 127 school districts. Such findings, once again, raise the question as to why districts unable to provide these basic resource elements were included in the attempted formulation of a constitutional school-funding plan.

**12. Professional development days for Licensed/certificated staff per year?** 2.8 days average

**Support staff professional development Days per year?** 1.3 days average

**Summary of Comments:** Most respondents indicated a set number of days (2 or 3) for staff development for certificated staff with some additional days being available for individual staff members. The central message of the comments were, however, that much more time is needed if the professional staff is to continue the learning and skill development that is essential for a continuously improving school program. The comment of one superintendent expresses this concern succinctly: “Financial resources restricts this activity.” The problem was put in a somewhat darker context by the superintendent who wrote, “Our faculty is talented. But they have heard there is no money for so long that they have lost much enthusiasm.”

**Sample of Comments:**

- Our district has made a commitment toward staff development this year. We will not be able to sustain [this commitment] without additional funds. It has made a difference in academic outcomes in one year.
- Big need for summer professional development.
- Need more - no money for extra time or to pay for programs beyond what we do.

**Analysis:** No less than the private sectors in America which invests very heavily in the continuous development of its workforce, our educational institutions must do the same. This concept seems to be widely now accepted by policymakers, educators and, no doubt, by many in the general public, but what is lacking is the funding which will allow school districts to put into place comprehensive, long-range staff development plans which are consistent with and integral to their system-wide continuous development plans. The fact that the 127 school districts average less than three days per year for staff development purposes shows only meager school district investments in helping professional staff learn and grow in their capacity to teach the state’s school children. The E&A Coalition strongly believes that the continuing development of staff is an essential element in providing adequate educational opportunities to all students and that 10 days set aside annually for that purpose represents the necessary standard. The support staff plays a vital role in the operation of successful schools and their work, in many instances, is becoming increasingly complex and demanding. The Coalition believes that five days per year must be provided for their development.

**13. Do the number of students per teacher exceed the following ratios?**

| <u>Grade levels</u>   | <u>Yes %</u> | <u>No %</u> |
|---|--------------|-------------|
| 20-1 in pre-k regular grades?   | 40.7         | 59.3        |
| 15-1 in poverty pre-k primary?  | 43.2         | 56.8        |
| 22-1 in grades 4-6?   | 63.1         | 36.9        |
| 22-1 in grades 7-8?   | 68.3         | 31.7        |
| 24-1 in grades 9-12?  | 43.3         | 56.7        |
| 15-1 in gifted self-contained classrooms?   | 28.6         | 71.4        |
| 60-1 where provisions for the gifted are through resource/intervention specialists? | 39.4         | 60.6        |

**Note:** No space was provided on the survey form for respondent comments concerning the number of students per teacher.

**Analysis:** Perhaps the most thoroughly discussed and debated element as the Basket of Essential Learning Resources was being formulated through town meetings and statewide forums was that of teacher-student ratios. Evidence based on rigorously designed longitudinal studies continues to accumulate. The studies show that smaller classes, especially for younger children and those at risk, result in greater and more lasting academic gains and increased social growth than occurs in classes where teachers must work with larger numbers of children. Those Ohioans engaged in these debates were convinced that class sizes in Ohio’s schools must be reduced if an effective system of public education were to be established. It is important to note that the cost considerations related to class size reductions were also subjects of significant debate within the groups.

In reviewing the class-size responses from the 127 school districts, it is evident that the teacher-student ratios recommended by the Coalition in the Basket of Essential Learning Resources are realistic ones. Of the seven grade configurations listed in item 13, over half of the superintendents reported meeting the recommended ratios in five of them. The disturbing part of the statistical picture is that such a large percentage of the districts still exceeded the recommended teacher-student ratios, yet they were included in the 127 districts selected to establish a base per pupil cost figure.

14. Based on your responses above, should your district be included in a grouping of districts whose expenditures for regular pupil instruction will be averaged to determine the per pupil cost of an adequate education for regular pupils?

No 55.9 percent      Yes 44.1 percent

**Summary of Comments:** Most of the responding superintendents indicated that their school districts should not be included in the group of 127 districts whose expenditures would be averaged to determine the cost of an adequate education for regular pupils. Many added comments, most of which dealt with reasons that their respective districts should not be used to determine base per pupil costs. One superintendent expressed the views of a few others when he wrote at length:

Establishing the 127 districts as the model districts says that if you can get 20+ on the state report card you are a model for what education should be in Ohio. Shouldn't the goal be to help every child reach his/her full potential? This is just 'residual' funding by another name. If you used this process, the least ill persons in the hospital would define 'health' and the best meal at McDonald's would define gourmet."

Most respondents, however, spoke of the unmet needs of groups of students in their systems and the lack of basic services: "We are far from a model school. We are, for the most part, meeting the needs of our college prep students, but we need to offer more programs for our at-risk population." Others made reference to their financial situation, "We are not providing an adequate education for regular pupils. If we had the resources I honestly believe we would be considered an effective school by the State of Ohio standards." A superintendent who believed that his district should be included wrote, "Yes, we deliver an adequate no-frills education."

**Analysis:** Of the superintendents in the 127 selected school districts, only 44.1 percent believe that their districts invest sufficiently in public education to warrant inclusion in the group whose average per pupil expenditures would set spending levels for all of Ohio's school districts. It is interesting that, on average, superintendents from higher expenditure districts were more inclined to believe that their district should be included in the 127 group.

Why do over one-half of the respondents believe their districts should not be included? A review of all responses to the 13 survey questions perhaps provides the best answer to that question. The survey asked about the adequacy of educational resources in the following broad areas: the curriculum offered; the availability of services to children with unusual abilities, those with special needs and the so-called regular students; the spaces available for instruction; materials for teaching and related technology; class sizes; and the opportunities for those who teach and those who play supporting roles to continue learning how to do their jobs better throughout their working lives. The survey recognizes especially the diversity of Ohio's school population and that an effective school provides programs and services designed to help each student approach his or her developmental potential.

The survey responses reveal areas where superintendents believe some elements of their resources are adequate, and 44 percent of the respondents felt that they were sufficiently available overall and that their districts should be included in the group used to establish an average per pupil cost figure for the state. The distressing finding of the study, however, is that a majority of the 127 school superintendents believe that the programs and services available in their districts do not meet the standards of adequacy upon which a "complete and systematic overhaul" of Ohio's school funding program should be based.

### *The Superintendents Speak Out*

Many school superintendents responded to the opportunity to comment upon the adequacy of the learning resources available to students in their districts. Over 500 such comments were received and a few have been quoted in the earlier data presentations. An invitation was also extended to the superintendents to “add any additional comments which would further explain the adequacy or inadequacy of resources in your school district which you consider essential for student learning.” Over 70 superintendents who participated in both surveys (Senate Bill 2 and Am. Sub. HB 94) did so. Their shared observations, presented unedited and in their entirety below, provide instructive insights into the problems, concerns and frustrations of these educational leaders as they strive to address the needs of all school children in their charge.

- It is frustrating as hell to work with communities, pass levies, work with teachers and see what needs to be done... only to have inadequate resources (facilities, staffing, funding). My background is in business and not education. Any CEO would go crazy if he spent 1 year in this business with the funding/support/rules we live with.
- Despite the financial resources to offer our students much beyond a basic program, we have done a decent job of educating the children. We have met as many as 19 standards of the State's Report Card. If we are to meet the standards for excellence, we need additional funding to restore and add to current staff, provide intervention, have sufficient funds to purchase curriculum, be able to attract and retain teachers, etc. Thorough and efficient? Not here!
- Our students are on the bottom of an uneven playing field! Our good test scores mask our problems well.
- We need space! We have done everything possible to attain the financial resources to acquire this space.
- I believe we make do with less to maintain positive cash balances. The only reason our per pupil costs are as high as they are due to having three administrators for small student numbers. We have consistently performed well in the state yet we are penalized for this. \$6.5 million was given to 217 schools for improving proficiency scores. We have always performed well and get nothing. Every school is expected to perform at our level and they didn't yet were awarded for improving (inadequacy).
- I don't believe we are operating at the level we need to represent a thorough and efficient, high performing district. With additional resources to handle some critical areas we might become such a district.
- Not for adequate programming for kids, we do not offer the programs that the wealthier districts offer. We also do not have the space nor the personnel to support the programs that should be offered.
- While all districts have and will continue to have needs in an imperfect world, I believe the reality is that you attempt to optimize what you do have. I certainly believe we are a better than average district that could be even better with improved facilities and resources.
- Current funding levels make it necessary to provide the minimum in services.

- The State of Ohio inadequately funds its public schools, violates its Constitution, yet leads the nation in auxillary service funds, promotes vouchers in Cleveland, etc., a state where priorities are not as they should be.
- All of our facilities are inadequate for our program and our students.
- There aren't enough funds to maintain the fine programs presently in our district. Our district is facing "fiscal emergency." We have many great opportunities for our students and staff but these opportunities may disappear due to inadequate funding.
- Facility limits educational opportunities for students K-12.
- Although we offer great "bang for the buck," I think this survey still shows areas of great weakness. At best, we are the bottom side of adequate and our taxpayers are making an above average local effort.

### Conclusions

The findings of this survey can lead to only one conclusion: that Am. Sub. HB 94, like its forerunner Senate Bill 2 plan for funding Ohio's public schools, is based upon a large, deliberately selected sample of school districts that, when considered collectively, does not meet the "thorough and efficient" standard of adequacy demanded by Ohio's Constitution. The reason for this conclusion is obvious. Within the group of 127 districts, large percentages of students are not being adequately served and, in too many cases, not being served at all. These school districts, cited as "models" for purposes of constructing a statewide-school funding model, are simply leaving many children behind.

A review of the survey findings shows clearly where and why this is occurring. Less than one-tenth of the districts provide full day kindergarten for all students; some aspect of the curriculum is judged inadequate in a significant percentage of the schools; able students are being left behind in districts unable to provide challenging programs for them; special education, a largely unfunded mandate, draws heavily upon general operating revenues, especially in districts of low wealth; compensatory (catch-up) programs are lacking for at-risk children who begin school already far behind; intervention services for students who are not succeeding or who may have failed high-stakes proficiency tests are not sufficiently available; class sizes exceed recommended levels by high percentages at all levels in the districts; only 56 percent of the districts are able to replace textbooks every five years; the teaching staff has less than three days set aside per year for district-supported professional growth opportunities; and serious facilities problems affect almost all of the schools' programs.

One has to look no further than the 30 Ohio Effective Districts or the 45 Districts which met 18 of 18 standards in 1999 or the comparison between Ohio's 30 highest and 30 lowest performing school districts to see the relationship between student achievement, the availability of learning resources and expenditures per pupil. The funding available to schools determines in large measure the learning opportunities which will be offered to public school students.

The data are convincing that the 127 school districts, when viewed as whole, set an unacceptable standard of educational opportunity for Ohio's school children and do not provide the basis for remedying the state's unconstitutional funding system.

### Recommendations

The National Conference of State Legislatures has recommended a five-step procedure in building an adequate school finance system that Ohio, a member, has essentially ignored. Step 2 of the procedure calls for identifying those conditions and tools (capacity) that enable schools to provide every student a reasonable opportunity to achieve expected educational goals. The Ohio Coalition for Equity & Adequacy of School Funding has, itself, carried out that step with the involvement of thousands of Ohioans. Based on that work, the Coalition holds that the following are the requirements for establishing a constitutional system of education and funding for all of Ohio's school children:

1. The development and implementation of **Standards of Opportunity**, including but not limited to:
  - a. Class size averages and maximum limits at all grade levels.
  - b. Curriculum opportunities at all grade levels, including foreign language in the elementary schools and advanced placement courses in the high schools.
  - c. Textbook replacement cycles.
  - d. Classroom equipment and materials required including, but not limited to, computers, multi-media computer systems, televisions/VCRs and telephones.
  - e. Number of days of professional development for licensed/certificated personnel and support staff.
  - f. Teacher/pupil ratios for elementary art, music, physical education, gifted education, and ratios for nursing, technology, and library services.
  - g. District-wide leadership personnel ratios for administrators, gifted programs, nursing services, library, technology, and other related services.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

- h. Provision for all day, every day kindergarten.
  - i. Provision for pre-school programming.
  - j. Provision for programming and services to meet the unique needs of special pupil populations.
  - k. Provision for the state to deliver programs and services that cannot be efficiently delivered at the local level.
  - l. All other areas to ensure adequate educational opportunities consistent with the constitutional requirement of a "thorough and efficient" system of common schools.
2. Until the cost determination methodology for funding the Standards of Opportunity set forth above is perfected, the per pupil base would be determined by using the median cost of the districts which met all 18 of the original (1999) school district report card criteria. (The FY 2002 per pupil base cost, using this methodology applied to FY 1999 data and inflated 2.8 percent per year, would be \$5,560. It should be noted that the argument can be made for applying the mean rather than median costs of the districts which, if used in this case, would result in a base cost figure for FY 2002 of \$5,931.)
  3. Special education funding should be based on the recommendations of the study commissioned by the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities which shows a \$300 million annual shortfall in special education student funding and supports the efficacy of using a formula with six pupil weights rather than the current two-weights system.
  4. All gifted students should be accommodated with state-supported programs. (The best estimate available today is that full service to all gifted students can be accomplished by an additional appropriation of \$142 million annually.)
  5. The technology program of providing one computer for each five students, initiated a few years ago, should be completed. (\$70 million per year will be required.)
  6. The phantom revenue problem should be eliminated as proposed in the House of Representatives' plan.
  7. The school facilities problems should be revisited by:
    - a. Requiring a complete assessment of all school district facilities and the report being made public.
    - b. Developing a new priority list of school districts based on facility needs (particularly health and safety factors) and property valuation.
    - c. Revising the local share millage requirement to ensure that no students are deprived of adequate facilities due to an unreasonable local share requirement or the inability of a district to pass the local issue.
    - d. Revising the Ohio School Facilities Commission policies and its Ohio School Design Manual to ensure that new facilities are durable and educationally adequate.
  8. Provide funding for all day, every day kindergarten in those districts which choose to offer this program.
  9. Provide funding for pre-school programs in those districts which choose to offer this program.
  10. Conduct a major study to determine the actual cost of providing compensatory programs for disadvantaged children in inner cities and poor rural areas.
  11. Provide adequate programs of professional development for all certificated/licensed and support staff.
  12. Accommodate unfunded mandates to the extent that these are not addressed by the funding system.

## References

DeRolph v. State (1997), 78 Ohio St.3d 193.

DeRolph v. State (2000), 89 Ohio St.3d 1.

Education Tax Policy Institute (February 2001). *Part II Reforming Education Funding In Ohio: An Analysis of Proposals for Funding an Adequate Education and Reducing Overreliance on the Local Property Tax* (Prepared by William Driscoll and Howard Fleeter).

Joint Committee to Re-Examine the Cost of an Adequate Education (December 31, 2000). *Final Report of the Joint Committee to Re-Examine the Cost of an Adequate Education*.

National Conference of State Legislatures (July 1998). *Educational Adequacy: Building an Adequate School Finance System*.

Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities (November 2000). *Special Education Finance in Ohio: Analysis and Recommendations*. (Prepared by Capital Partners)

Ohio Coalition for Equity and Adequacy of School Funding (October 1999). *Basket of Essential Learning Resources for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*.

Ohio Coalition for Equity and Adequacy of School Funding (January 2001). *The Urgent Necessity for Developing and Adopting Standards of opportunities for Ohio's School Children*.

Ohio Coalition for Equity and Adequacy of School Funding (April 2001). *Determining the Cost of an Adequate Education: A Failed Attempt*.

124<sup>th</sup> General Assembly (March 2001). *Senate Bill 2*.

124<sup>th</sup> General Assembly (April 2001). *Amended Substitute House Bill 94*.

State Board of Education. *Budget and Policy Recommendations of the State Board of Education to the Governor and Members of the 124<sup>th</sup> Ohio General Assembly*.



# APPENDIX A

## Survey Form

**Instructions:** If you believe the learning resources listed in the survey are adequate in your school district at this point in time, respond "yes." If you believe the resources are inadequate, respond "no." Not applicable (NA) may be appropriate for a few items. In a few cases a response other than yes or no is required. Space is provided for your comments for each item and at the end of the survey.

1. Does your district provide full day kindergarten for all students? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Using your professional judgment, are your curricula in the following ODE-defined core areas adequate?

|                        |           |           |            |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Reading                | K-3 _____ | 4-8 _____ | 9-12 _____ |
| English language arts: | K-3 _____ | 4-8 _____ | 9-12 _____ |
| Mathematics:           | K-3 _____ | 4-8 _____ | 9-12 _____ |
| Science:               | K-3 _____ | 4-8 _____ | 9-12 _____ |
| Social studies         | K-3 _____ | 4-8 _____ | 9-12 _____ |
| World languages        | K-3 _____ | 4-8 _____ | 9-12 _____ |

Comments \_\_\_\_\_

3. Are your curricula in the following areas adequate?

|                             |               |           |            |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Art                         | K-3 _____     | 4-8 _____ | 9-12 _____ |
| Music (vocal/ instrumental) | K-3 _____     | 4-8 _____ | 9-12 _____ |
| Health/physical education   | K-3 _____     | 4-8 _____ | 9-12 _____ |
| Technology                  | K-3 _____     | 4-8 _____ | 9-12 _____ |
| Performing arts             | K-3 _____     | 4-8 _____ | 9-12 _____ |
| Work and family life        | K-3 <u>NA</u> | 4-8 _____ | 9-12 _____ |

Comments \_\_\_\_\_

4. Does your high school(s) offer the following minimum number of courses?

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 7 English/language arts _____                                  | 7 mathematics _____                        |
| 7 science _____  | 7 social studies _____                     |
| 3 different foreign languages (at least one credit each) _____ |  |
| 2 health/physical education _____                              | 3 business/technology _____                |
| 3 music (4 credits) _____                                      | 3 Art (visual, drama/theater, dance) _____ |
| 2 industrial technology courses _____                          | 4 work and family life _____               |

5. Indicate the number of advanced placement courses your high school offers in each of the following curriculum areas:

mathematics \_\_\_\_\_ science \_\_\_\_\_ social studies \_\_\_\_\_ English \_\_\_\_\_  
foreign language \_\_\_\_\_ other courses and number \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_

6. Are all students eligible for gifted education services being served? \_\_\_\_\_  
If not, what is the percentage of eligible students not sufficiently served? \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_

7. Are all students eligible for special education services being served? \_\_\_\_\_  
If not, what is the percentage of eligible students not sufficiently served? \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX A

8. Are compensatory programs for disadvantaged students sufficient to meet the needs of those students? \_\_\_\_\_  
If not, what is the percentage of eligible students not sufficiently served? \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9. Are your intervention services (including proficiency) adequate in the following areas?  
reading \_\_\_\_\_ mathematics \_\_\_\_\_ writing \_\_\_\_\_  
social studies \_\_\_\_\_ science \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. Are your facilities adequate in number/space/quality in the following areas?  
Regular classrooms \_\_\_\_\_ special education \_\_\_\_\_ science \_\_\_\_\_  
libraries \_\_\_\_\_ computer labs \_\_\_\_\_ music \_\_\_\_\_  
art \_\_\_\_\_ drama/auditorium \_\_\_\_\_ gymnasiums \_\_\_\_\_  
industrial technology \_\_\_\_\_ work and family life \_\_\_\_\_ business education \_\_\_\_\_  
foreign language \_\_\_\_\_ tutoring \_\_\_\_\_ small group instruction \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

11. Do you replace textbooks every 5 years? \_\_\_\_\_  
Do you have 1 TV/VCR per classroom? \_\_\_\_\_  
1 overhead projector per classroom? \_\_\_\_\_  
science materials (as per the model curriculum)? \_\_\_\_\_  
adequate classroom supplies? \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

12. How many days does your licensed/certificated staff receive for professional development per year? \_\_\_\_\_  
How many days does your support staff receive for professional development per year? \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

13. Do the numbers of students per teacher exceed:  
20:1 in pre-k regular grades? \_\_\_\_\_  
15:1 in poverty pre-k primary? \_\_\_\_\_  
22:1 in grades 4-6? \_\_\_\_\_  
22:1 in grades 7-8? \_\_\_\_\_  
24:1 in grades 9-12? \_\_\_\_\_  
15:1 in gifted self-contained classrooms? \_\_\_\_\_  
60:1 where provisions for gifted is through resource/intervention specialists? \_\_\_\_\_

14. Please add any additional comments which would further explain the adequacy or inadequacy of resources in your school district which you consider essential for student learning. Include additional pages, if needed. YOUR NAME AND DISTRICT WILL NOT BE IDENTIFIED WITH THESE COMMENTS.

\_\_\_\_\_

15. Based on your responses above, should your district be included in a grouping of districts whose expenditures for regular pupil instruction will be averaged to determine the per pupil cost of an adequate education for regular pupils? \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Name of School District \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B

### 127 "MODEL" DISTRICTS

|                            |                                 |                             |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Amherst Ex Village         | Kings Local                     | Southeastern Local          |
| Anna Local                 | Lake Local(Stark)               | Spencerville Local          |
| Anthony Wayne Local        | Lakeview Local                  | St Henry Consolidated Local |
| Arcanum Butler Local       | Lexington Local                 | Sylvania City               |
| Archbold-Area Local        | Liberty Union-Thurston Local    | Tallmadge City              |
| Arlington Local            | Liberty-Benton Local            | Three Rivers Local          |
| Avon Local                 | Lincolnview Local               | Tipp City Ex Village        |
| Ayersville Local           | Lisbon Ex Village               | Tuscarawas Valley Local     |
| Berlin-Milan Local         | Louisville City                 | Tuslaw Local                |
| Bethel Local               | Madeira City                    | Twinsburg City              |
| Bexley City                | Manchester Local                | Van Buren Local             |
| Bluffton Ex Village        | Mariemont City                  | Versailles Ex Village       |
| Boardman Local             | Marion Local                    | Wadsworth City              |
| Botkins Local              | Maumee City                     | Wauseon Ex Village          |
| Bowling Green City         | McDonald Local                  | Wayne Trace Local           |
| Brunswick City             | Medina City                     | West Geauga Local           |
| Buckeye Local              | Mentor Ex Village               | Westerville City            |
| Canal Winchester Local     | Miamisburg City                 | Woodmore Local              |
| Canfield Local             | Milford Ex Village              | Yellow Springs Ex Village   |
| Cedar Cliff Local          | Miller City-New Cleveland Local |                             |
| Celina City                | Milton-Union Ex Village         |                             |
| Centerburg Local           | Minster Local                   |                             |
| Champion Local             | Napoleon Area City              |                             |
| Chardon Local              | New Bremen Local                |                             |
| Chippewa Local             | New Knoxville Local             |                             |
| Coldwater Ex Village       | New Philadelphia City           |                             |
| Colonel Crawford Local     | New Riegel Local                |                             |
| Columbiana Ex Village      | Newbury Local                   |                             |
| Columbus Grove Local       | Newton Local                    |                             |
| Cory-Rawson Local          | North Canton City               |                             |
| Covington Ex Village       | North Olmsted City              |                             |
| Crestview Local (Van Wert) | North Royalton City             |                             |
| East Knox Local            | Northridge Local(Licking)       |                             |
| Eastwood Local             | Norton City                     |                             |
| Fairland Local             | Oak Hills Local                 |                             |
| Fairview Park City         | Old Fort Local                  |                             |
| Forest Hills Local         | Olmsted Falls City              |                             |
| Fort Loramie Local         | Ontario Local                   |                             |
| Fort Recovery Local        | Oregon City                     |                             |
| Franklin-Monroe Local      | Ottawa-Glandorf Local           |                             |
| Garaway Local              | Ottoville Local                 |                             |
| Gibsonburg Ex Village      | Pandora-Gilboa Local            |                             |
| Grandview Heights City     | Patrick Henry Local             |                             |
| Green Local(Summit)        | Perkins Local                   |                             |
| Green Local(Wayne)         | Perrysburg Ex Village           |                             |
| Highland Local(Medina)     | Pettisville Local               |                             |
| Holgate Local              | Poland Local                    |                             |
| Howland Local              | Reynoldsburg City               |                             |
| Huron City                 | Ross Local                      |                             |
| Jackson Local              | Russia Local                    |                             |
| Jennings Local             | Seneca East Local               |                             |
| Kalida Local               | Shawnee Local                   |                             |
| Kent City                  | South Range Local               |                             |
| Kettering City             | Southeast Local(Wayne)          |                             |

**"The definition of 'thorough and efficient' is not static..."**

# **Cost of Adequate Education = Actual Cost of Essential Learning Resources**



**"If there ever was a cause, if ever there can be a cause, worthy to be upheld by all of toil or sacrifice that the human hand or heart can endure, it is the cause of education."**

**Horace Mann**

**Ohio Coalition for Equity & Adequacy of School Funding**

100 S. Third St. Columbus, Ohio 43215 ☎614-228-6540 ☎614-228-6542 fax ✉ohioeanda@aol.com ✉www.ohiocoalition.org

Larry Miller, Chairperson

William L. Phillis, Executive Director

**"...will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools throughout the state."**