



## Special Needs Subcommittee

### Meeting Minutes for May 13, 2010

12:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Ohio School Boards Association

8050 North High Street Columbus, OH 43235

#### Members in Attendance

Robyn Essman, Chair

Thomas Babb

State Rep. Randy Gardner

David Huelsman

Jan Kennedy

James McClure

Dr. Jan Osborn

Dr. Roger Saurer

Ann Sheldon

#### Members Not in Attendance

Dayvenia Chesney

#### Staff

Daria Shams

Carey McDonald

Emily Nemeth

#### Opening

Chair Essman called the meeting to order at 12:42 p.m. and asked for approval of the minutes. A motion to accept meeting minutes from April 27<sup>th</sup> 2010 was made by Ms. Kennedy, seconded by Representative Gardner, and then unanimously accepted by all subcommittee members.

#### Presentations

**Daria Shams**, Educational Employee Consultant in School Options and Finance at ODE, presented *HB1 Calculations for Special Education* (handouts are available on the Council's website at <http://sfac.education.ohio.gov>).

- A clarification question was asked about whether or not the numbers in Mr. Shams' presentation reflected the money ESCs received. He explained the numbers only reflected the 614 school districts.
- The subcommittee discussed how Ohio's evidence-based model (EBM) accounts for the necessary funds required for special education.

**Dr. Jan Osborn**, Superintendent Putnam County ESC, and **Margaret Burley**, Executive Director of Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, presented concerns regarding how the EBM addresses the special education population in Ohio schools (handouts are available on the Council's document sharing site).

**Ann Sheldon**, Executive Director of Ohio Association for Gifted Children, presented concerns regarding how the EBM addresses the gifted population in Ohio schools (handouts are available on the Council's document sharing site).

**Dr. Roger Saurer**, Superintendent of Copley-Fairlawn City Schools, presented concerns regarding how the EBM addresses the ELL population in Ohio schools (handouts are available on the Council's document sharing site).

Members discussed all three issues areas following the presentations, and identified goals, concerns and possible solutions for each (see Attachment 1).

**Future Agendas**

The subcommittee members plan to devote the May 25<sup>th</sup> meeting to the discussion of special education funding recommendations; the June 4<sup>th</sup> meeting will be devoted to the gifted funding recommendations; the June 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting will be devoted to the ELL recommendations. At the July 14<sup>th</sup> meeting subcommittee members would like to combine recommendations into presentation format.

**Adjourn**

Chair Essman moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:06p.m. Her motion was seconded by Dr. Osborn and approved without objection.

## Attachment 1

*The Special Needs Subcommittee brainstormed goals, concerns and possible solutions regarding how the EBM addresses special education and gifted students, as well as English language learners (ELL) in Ohio schools.*

### Special Education

---

#### Goals and Concerns

- 1) How do related services calculate into the model?
- 2) Do weights adequately account for student costs if used for class size?
  - a. Are weights still accurate? Are they related to cost?
- 3) How was the 1:20 ratio calculated? Is it based in research?
- 4) The 90% funding phase-in for special education should be moved to 100%.
- 5) How are special education populations in ESCs, non-publics, community schools, MRDDs (DDs), and JVSs funded?
- 6) How do we account for kindergartners with special needs in the EBM?
- 7) How will the state hold schools accountable?

#### Possible Solutions

- 1) The subcommittee would like to recommend a related services weight based on inflationary costs and the costs associated with professional staff required to serve the special education population.

### Gifted Education

---

#### Goals and Concerns

- 1) How will schools be held accountable during the transitional period?
- 2) There should be an increase in identification funds for gifted education.
- 3) The maintenance of effort requirement is concerning for those schools that are receiving zero dollars worth of state aid.
- 4) Where is the money for wealthier districts who have traditionally sought services from ESCs?
- 5) What are the flexibility parameters?
- 6) How might the subcommittee consider ADM in relation to the licensed gifted coordinator?
- 7) Is there an expectation to serve students at schools that are not receiving state funding?
- 8) How can we address the language which mandates schools to serve gifted students?
- 9) What should the minimum level of funding be for coordinators?
- 10) How will the subcommittee address current lack of funding for community schools?
- 11) Is there a way to play a role in identification of gifted students in non-public schools?

#### Possible Solutions

- 1) The subcommittee would like to consider a component guarantee.

## ELL Education

---

### Goals and Concerns

- 1) The 1:100 ratio is not sufficient. It needs to account for:
  - a. Identifying and assessing students
  - b. Theoretically sound services
  - c. Qualified staff and resources:
    - i. specialized dictionaries
    - ii. specialized computer programs
    - iii. specialized technology
  - d. Monitoring and evaluation of program
  - e. Collaboration and transition services
  - f. Salaries
  - g. Professional development
  - h. Translation services
  - i. Space of instruction
- 2) The subcommittee would like to recommend a certain level of support for general population and then specific funding for identified ELL students.
- 3) How can schools respect students' cultures and native languages while also allowing for development of English language skills?

### Possible Solutions

- 1) Could the subcommittee come up with a catastrophic aid calculation?

## Parking Lot

---

*Beyond goals, concerns and possible solutions for special education, gifted education and ELL, the subcommittee thought of additional issues they would like to address after they address the specific requirements within their charge:*

### Goals and Concerns

- 1) The Cliff—What happens when stimulus money is gone?
- 2) How can the subcommittee address lack of funding for special needs populations in pre-schools?
- 3) There is a shortage of special education and gifted teachers. What role can the subcommittee play in addressing this issue?
- 4) How can the subcommittee support the return of Project MORE?