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• Periodic review of special education funding model for MDoE
• Model goals: Adequacy and equity
• What are the challenges with the current model?
• What are other options for a revised model?
• Feedback / practitioner wisdom on potential modifications.

Purpose of Funding Model

The Goal of the Essential Programs and Services school funding approach is “to ensure that all schools have the programs and services that are essential for all students to have equitable opportunities to achieve Maine’s Learning Results.”
Horizontal equity:
• Equal treatment of equals.
• Students with similar needs should receive similar levels of service, regardless of zip code or poverty level or race

Vertical equity:
• Unequal treatment of unequal circumstances.
• Students with more intense needs should receive more services than others

Special Education Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Components:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Weight</td>
<td>$212.4</td>
<td>$215.4</td>
<td>$228.6</td>
<td>$216.7</td>
<td>$271.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>$28.6</td>
<td>$29.8</td>
<td>$33.5</td>
<td>$36.6</td>
<td>$41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Effort</td>
<td>$43.6</td>
<td>$73.5</td>
<td>$91.7</td>
<td>$134.9</td>
<td>$83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocation*</td>
<td>$247.6</td>
<td>$278.7</td>
<td>$313.1</td>
<td>$342.2</td>
<td>$396.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Expense**</td>
<td>$281.7</td>
<td>$314.7</td>
<td>$346.5</td>
<td>$391.4</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total allocation is net of federal revenue
** Allowable expense is shown net of Medicaid reimbursement.
Challenge #1:

Growth of the Maintenance of Effort Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total MOE Component ($millions)</th>
<th># SAUs with Sp. Ed. Allocat.</th>
<th>% SAUs receiving MOE Adjust.</th>
<th>% Change in MOE from prior year</th>
<th>Total EPS Special Education Allocation</th>
<th>MOE as % of Special Education Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$29.8</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>$217.7</td>
<td>13.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$39.9</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>$232.0</td>
<td>17.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$61.7</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>41.42</td>
<td>$260.1</td>
<td>23.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>$91.7</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>$313.5</td>
<td>29.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$110.7</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>$322.7</td>
<td>34.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$134.9</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>$343.3</td>
<td>39.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19*</td>
<td>$68.3</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>-49.35</td>
<td>$366.0</td>
<td>18.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>$83.0</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>$389.3</td>
<td>21.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base weight increase to 1.5

Maintenance of Effort FY20: Horizontal Inequity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District poverty level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pupils w IEPs</th>
<th>Total MOE ($Millions)</th>
<th>Avg. MOE adj. per pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest 33%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11,121</td>
<td>$36.7</td>
<td>$3,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 33%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10,894</td>
<td>$26.2</td>
<td>$2,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest 33%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8,998</td>
<td>$19.9</td>
<td>$1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>31,013</td>
<td>$83.0</td>
<td>$2,522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenge #2: Vertical inequity

**High-Cost In-District adjustment:**
- Students with more intense needs should receive more support
- Adjustment based on disability and placement setting
- Estimates based on individual student cost data from 2005; data no longer collected
- Intent is no longer being met.

---

**Other Allocation Methods**
- Census estimate & Single Weight Models
  - Inexact fit for districts with atypical patterns
  - Resource-based (e.g. staff ratios)
  - Potential year-to-year inconsistencies
  - Don’t have the data to develop
  - DE, HI, MS, TN, VA
  - Multiple student weights
    - AZ, CO, GA, IN, IA, KY, NM, OH, OK, SC, TX
• What data are available and accurate?
  • E.g. disability and placement setting
  • Services provided?
  • Others?
• What new data would need to be collected?
  • How much work would that take?

5 Student weights:
1. Regular classroom
2. Resource room
3. Self-contained
4. In-district, additional adult support
5. Out of district / private

Need to capture costs within those categories!
I support the concept of five weights - regular ed, resource, self-contained, students with adult support (regardless of placement setting), out of district/private placement.

- yes
- no
- not sure

I feel there should be a different weight for elementary vs secondary

- yes
- no
Special education teacher salaries and benefits

yes, we already categorize these expenditures by student placement

this would require changing how we track things, but it seems feasible

this would be difficult or impossible to categorize by student placement

I don't know

Ed tech salaries and benefits

yes, we already categorize these expenditures by student placement

this would require changing how we track things, but it seems feasible

this would be difficult or impossible to categorize by student placement

I don't know
Related services personnel (OT, PT, SLP, etc.)

yes, we already categorize these expenditures by student placement

this would require changing how we track things, but it seems feasible

this would be difficult or impossible to categorize by student placement

I don’t know

Consultation (psych, BCBA, TVI, TOD, etc.)

yes, we already categorize these expenditures by student placement

this would require changing how we track things, but it seems feasible

this would be difficult or impossible to categorize by student placement

I don’t know
Instructional supplies

yes, we already categorize these expenditures by student placement

this would require changing how we track things, but it seems feasible

this would be difficult or impossible to categorize by student placement

I don’t know

Professional development

yes, we already categorize these expenditures by student placement

this would require changing how we track things, but it seems feasible

this would be difficult or impossible to categorize by student placement

I don’t know
Employee travel costs

yes, we already categorize these expenditures by student placement
this would require changing how we track things, but it seems feasible
this would be difficult or impossible to categorize by student placement

I don't know

Assistive technology / equipment

yes, we already categorize these expenditures by student placement
this would require changing how we track things, but it seems feasible
this would be difficult or impossible to categorize by student placement

I don't know
Thoughts?
Questions?

• Amy Johnson
  amyj@maine.edu

• Katie Hawes
  kathryn.hawes@maine.edu

• Jim Sloan
  james.sloan@maine.edu

I found this information to be