Funding Supplemental Services for Economically Disadvantaged Students in Ohio: Analysis and Policy Implications

OHIO EDUCATION POLICY INSTITUTE

INFORMING EDUCATION PUBLIC POLICY

December 2022

The Report Authors

This report was commissioned by the Ohio Education Policy Institute (OEPI). OEPI is a not-for-profit research organization that focuses on issues of education finance and policy. OEPI was formed in 1997 and was originally known as the Education Tax Policy Institute (ETPI). The lead authors, who are both long-term, Ohio-based public policy consultants, are R. Gregory Browning, Ph.D. and Howard Fleeter, Ph.D. The authors were ably assisted by Marsha Lewis, Ph.D.

The authors want to thank the administrative leaders of the three case study school districts (Columbus City, Jackson City and Shaker Heights) for their tremendous contributions to this report. Though the information and analysis contained in the report is entirely the responsibility of the authors, the report could not have been prepared without the assistance of these talented professionals.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

Purpose of Study

The central focus of this analysis is to help Ohio educators and public policymakers gain a deeper understanding of the specific supplemental services being provided to Ohio public primary and secondary school students who come from economically disadvantaged circumstances. The report also includes a *preliminary* analysis of the costs associated with providing these services. The analysis is designed to be both informative and foundational to a separate c*omprehensive* study of these costs. This report also creates context for these issues by providing an overview of federal and state funding for low-income students in Ohio, a comparison of Ohio's formula for funding low-income students with that of other states, and a discussion of issues relating to the identification of low-income students in Ohio.

The context of this analysis includes the fact that Ohio's current school funding policies are rooted in the Ohio Fair School Funding Plan, which is being phased-in over a six-year period beginning in FY 22. The plan is a new, inputs-based approach to funding primary and secondary education. It includes a new methodology for providing supplemental funding for the additional costs of providing needed educational services to economically disadvantaged students. This funding comes through the Disadvantaged Pupil Impact Aid (DPIA) component of the state's school funding formula. Importantly, the phase-in of the new funding formula does not treat all components of the formula uniformly, as DPIA is phased in at a slower rate than the other funding components, nor does it provide a clearly articulated, evidence-based approach to funding DPIA. Lastly, there is no legal requirement that the new state funding formula be phased-in fully in future years.

This situation calls out for an independent *comprehensive* analysis of the true costs of providing supplemental services to economically disadvantaged students. This *preliminary* analysis is a significant step toward addressing this need.

Major Near-Term Policy Implications

The major policy implications that emerged from this report and that are particularly relevant and actionable within the context of the development, introduction, and passage of the state of Ohio's FY 24-25 state operating budget are listed below. These policies are anchored in the analysis and informed by the three school district case studies that are at the heart of the report. They address the central question of funding the specific supplemental services provided to economically disadvantaged public school students in Ohio. Briefly stated, these supplemental services can be categorized as follows: a) early intervention services, including district-provided preschool programming and primary grade reading intervention; b) supplemental educational supports such as after-school programming, summer school, and high school credit recovery; and c) health and wellness supports, including school counselors and nurses, school-based health clinics and in-house behavioral health services.

As will be shown in the report, these services are paid for through a combination of ongoing (Title 1) and one-time pandemic-related federal funds, state DPIA funds and the school district's general funds; however, only Title 1 and DPIA are ongoing funds that are intentionally and exclusively

used to fund supplemental services for economically disadvantaged students. In FY 22, these two funding sources totaled $883.76 million (statewide) with $525.8 million from Title 1 and $357.96 million from DPIA.

The three near-term policy implications included in this preliminary study are:

- The evidence-based need for a comprehensive statewide cost study designed to determine the full cost of providing supplemental services to economically disadvantaged students.

- The rationale for phasing-in DPIA funding at the same pace that the overall (new) school funding formula is being phased-in. This policy approach makes sense whether or not the (proposed) six-year funding formula phase-in is paused in the FY 24-25 state operating budget.

- Bringing greater reason, accuracy and uniformity to the definition and related counting of economically disadvantaged students. This could be accomplished by moving from current policy, which is largely based on free and reduced lunch participation, to one that utilizes either Medicaid enrollment or eligibility, which is 206% of the federal poverty level for children under the age of 18.

Importantly, the report includes two particularly relevant sections: the major policy takeaways from the three school district case studies; and a listing of key policy implications articulated as questions intended to facilitate further thinking and the design of a comprehensive cost study.

Study Scope and Research Methodology

The scope of the analysis and the report's research methodology are both anchored in and informed by case studies of three representative school districts: one rural (Jackson City/Jackson County, Ohio), one suburban (Shaker Heights/Cuyahoga County, Ohio) and one urban (Columbus City/Franklin County, Ohio). The district selection rationale is explained below.

The key components of the study are as follows:

1. **Analysis of Current Ohio Policies:** To understand Ohio's system of funding supplemental services to economically disadvantaged students it is first necessary to identify the state of Ohio's current policies (and their rationale) for the funding of these services. In order to place these policies within a national context, it then makes sense to compare them with relevant best practice policies in other states. The analysis includes a functional definition of best practices and an initial attempt to determine the extent to which this definition includes an understanding of measurable program effectiveness. This section of the analysis relies on pertinent academic research and on the Ohio Department of Education report, "Economically Disadvantaged Students: A Review of Definitions and Methods Across States" (January 2021).

2. **School District Case Studies and Selection Rationale:** In order to gain the professional insights of experienced teachers and administrators, the analysis includes school district case studies. This substantive outreach to three representative Ohio school districts – one rural, one suburban and one urban – was done to gain a robust understanding of the programs, support services and other initiatives directly and indirectly associated with providing educational services and non-educational services to economically disadvantaged students. This exercise was essential to identifying and quantifying (albeit preliminarily) the cost of these supplemental services as they are provided by the case study school districts.

   Each of these school district analyses includes: a) a school district information profile; b) answers to a common set of ten survey questions; c) identification of supplemental services and a preliminary quantification of their costs; and d) perspectives regarding the programmatic efficacy and effectiveness of these services based on available metrics.

The rationale for the selection of Columbus City, Jackson City and Shaker Heights school districts for case studies is as follows:

- The timeframe of the analysis (July-November 2022) limits case studies to the three broad categories of rural, suburban and urban as opposed, for example, to doing a case study for each of the state of Ohio's eight school district "typologies," which are classifications based on Ohio Department of Education statistical analyses of shared demographic and geographic characteristics of school districts. Each of the three districts fits comfortably within one of the three categories of rural, suburban or urban. This includes Jackson City, which, though it is technically a "small town," district leaders consider it to be a rural district because it is located in a predominately rural county in southeastern (Appalachian) Ohio and its student population includes many students who live in relatively rural areas.

- Each of the three school districts is substantively representative of *both* one of the three district categories and of their respective typologies. This means that, overall, none of the school districts is a statistical outlier.

- Each case study school district has variability at the school building level, which helps facilitate identification and understanding of distinct supplemental services provided to students from economically disadvantaged circumstances.

- A significant portion – over 25% - of the student population of each case study school district is economically disadvantaged, which is large enough to require a full range of supplemental services. In the case of Columbus City, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students is currently reported as 100%. This is due to Columbus' participation in the Federal Community Eligibility Program (CEP) school lunches. Typically, students at 130% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) or lower are eligible for free lunches and students up to 185% of the FPL are legible for reduced price lunches. CEP allows all students to qualify for free or reduced

priced meals. The CEP program while effective in its primary goal of expanding access to breakfast and lunch for low-income students, has the side effect of confounding the identification of economically disadvantaged students. ODE has been working for several years to develop an alternate measure of economically disadvantaged students as a result of CEP.

- School district leaders are fully supportive of the project and willing to engage and share relevant data, information and perspective as requested.

- The case study school district typologies, as defined by the Ohio Department of Education, are as follows for FY 22:

    - **Columbus City: Typology 8:** This typology is defined as urban with very high poverty and very large student population.

    - **Jackson City: Typology 3:** This typology is defined as small town with low student poverty and small student population.

    - **Shaker Heights: Typology 6:** This typology is defined as suburban with low student poverty and large student population.

Given the central focus of the case studies, it is important to note that the socio-economically related profiles of each of the districts aligns well with their respective categorical and typological peers. The specifics of these profiles are produced by the Ohio Department of Education (ODE). They reveal the following:

- **Columbus City:**

    - **Economically Disadvantage %:** 100%* which compares to a similar district average of 88.62%. (*This number is driven by federal meal eligibility policy described above. The actual number is likely closer to the Typology 8 mean value of 84%.)

    - **Median (Ohio) Income:** $32,563 which compares with a similar district average of $29,928.50

    - **Black Population %:** 53.1% which compares with a similar district average of 51.55% (2020 figure)

    - **Hispanic Population %:** 16.53% which compares with a similar district average of 16.57%

    - **White Population %:** 24.86% which compares with a similar district average of 33.35%

    - **Total Operating Expenditures Per Pupil:** $13,930 which compares with a similar district average of $15,666.

- **Jackson City:**
    - **Economically Disadvantaged %:** 45.97% which compares with a similar district average of 44.1%
    - **Median (Ohio) Income:** $32,941 which compares with a similar district average of $33,580
    - **Black Population %:** 0.56% which compares with a similar district average of 0.51%
    - **Hispanic Population %:** 1.24% which compares with a similar district average of 1.61%
    - **White Population %:** 96.07% which compares with a similar district average of 95.03%
    - **Total Operating Expenditures Per Pupil:** $11,594 which compares with a similar district average of $12,085.
- **Shaker Heights:**
    - **Economically Disadvantaged %:** 33.66% which compares with a similar district average of 22.64%
    - **Median (Ohio) Income:** $46,639 which compares with a similar district average of $48,562
    - **Black Population %:** 45.31% which compares with a similar district average of 16.05%
    - **Hispanic Population %:** 3.56% which compares with a similar district average of 6.45%
    - **White Population %:** 39.27% which compares with a similar district average of 64.53%
    - **Total Operating Expenditures Per Pupil:** $20,465 which compares with a similar district average of $13,880

A more detailed comparison of the districts and factors related to district operations and economically disadvantaged students across multiple areas is outlined in the chart below.

Case Study School District Profile Comparison Chart (FY 21 FY 22 data)

	Columbus City School District	Jackson City School District	Shaker Heights City School District
District Typology	8; urban – very high student poverty and very large student population	3; small town – low student poverty & small student population	6 – suburban – very low student poverty and large student population
District ADM	71,777.21	2,305	4,545
District Enrollment	45,508.97	2,270.65	4,502.39
Attendance Rate	**79.7%** (79.6% economically disadvantaged)	**91.6%** (89.4% economically disadvantaged)	**90.8%** (87.5% economically disadvantaged)
Graduation Rate	79.7%	92.4%	91.9%
Chronic Absenteeism	**65.0%** (65.3% economically disadvantaged)	**28.1%** (39.9% economically disadvantaged)	**29.2%** (47.1% economically disadvantaged)
Assess Property Valuation Per Pupil	$172,569.12	$151,346.11	$185,659.11
Total Property Tax Per Pupil	$7,020.74	$3,371.18	$16,630.87
Median Income:	$32,563.00	$32,941.00	$41,784
Total Gross Tax Rate:	81.63 mills	29.57 mills	189.18 mills
Class 1 (Residential & Agricultural) rate:	38.25 mills	25.57 mills	91.81 mills
# / % Economically Disadvantaged Students Enrolled:	43,574.37 / 99.99%	1,046.50 / 46.08%	1,370.64 / 33.6%

	Columbus City School District	Jackson City School District	Shaker Heights City School District
# Medicaid Eligible Enrolled Students:	29,715 Medicaid Eligible (6,240 students with IEPs)	1,372 Medicaid Eligible (293 IEP students)	1,429 Medicaid Eligible (334 students with IEPs)
% Medicaid Eligible Students	63.66% Medicaid Eligible (71.23% students with IEPs)	51.50% Medicaid Eligible (67.51% IEP students)	27.81% Medicaid Eligible (47.44% students with IEPs)
# / % Students with Disabilities	8,137 / 17.88%	321.57 / 14.6%	603.83 / 13.41%
DPIA Funding Per Pupil	$617	$171	$53
DPIA as a Percentage of Total State Funding	18.3%	2.5%	1.5%
Federal Revenue Per Pupil	$2,439 (19.4%)	$1,612 (19.2%)	$1,189 (8.3%)
Kindergarten Readiness:	• ***All Students:*** Demonstrating Readiness – 25.9%, Approaching Readiness – 35.2%, Emerging Readiness – 39.0% • ***Economically Disadvantaged Students:*** Demonstrating Readiness – 25.9%, Approaching Readiness – 35.2%, Emerging Readiness – 39.0%	• ***All students:*** demonstrating readiness – 51.8%, approaching readiness – 26.8%, Emerging Readiness – 21.3% • ***Economically Disadvantaged Students:*** Demonstrating Readiness – 44.4%, Approaching Readiness – 26.4%, Emerging Readiness – 29.2%	• ***All Students:*** Demonstrating Readiness – 46.3%, Approaching Readiness – 31.3%, Emerging Readiness – 22.3% • ***Economically Disadvantaged Students:*** Demonstrating Readiness – 16.4%, Approaching Readiness – 35.6%, Emerging Readiness – 47.9%

	Columbus City School District	Jackson City School District	Shaker Heights City School District
'22 Performance Index (107.3 possible)	54.07	88.42	83.90
'22 Achievement Rating:	2 Stars	4 Stars	3 Stars
2022 State Report Card Rankings:	• **Achievement:** 2 Stars • **Early Literacy:** 1 Star • **Closing the Achievement Gap:** 3 Stars • **Progress:** 3 Stars • **Graduation:** 1 Star • **Aggregate Ranking:** 2 Stars	• **Achievement:** 4 Stars • **Early Literacy:** 3 Star • **Closing the Achievement Gap:** 5 Stars • **Progress:** 3 Stars • **Graduation:** 3 Star • **Aggregate Ranking:** 4 Stars	• **Achievement:** 3 Stars • **Early Literacy:** 3 Star • **Closing the Achievement Gap:** 5 Stars • **Progress:** 2 Stars • **Graduation:** 4 Star • **Aggregate Ranking:** 3 Stars

3. **Identification of Supplemental Services and Preliminary Analysis of Associated Costs:** The research methodology employed above led to the identification and preliminary quantification of the range of specific educational services being provided to economically disadvantaged students. Efforts were also made to survey case study school district leaders to determine if they believe that these services are efficacious and if they think that the services are being funded at levels sufficient to meet the educational needs of students; and, if not, the educators were asked to identify areas of outstanding need within their existing educational service delivery model and beyond.

   Additionally, the research methodology includes the creation and use of a common set of survey/interview questions used in each of the case studies. These questions were designed to help: determine the effectiveness of supplemental programming for economically disadvantaged students; and gain insights and identify metrics being used by educators to determine the value of specific supplemental programs as it relates to additional academic achievement and other relevant educational factors. The analysis also attempts to better understand educators' professional experience, judgment, and related perceptions regarding which of these supplemental services matter most in terms of student achievement and why.

The case studies close with a listing of the key policy takeaways that emerged from the analysis.

4. **Policy and Funding Implications**

The analysis ends with an articulation of the leading policy and funding implications that emerge from the report's policy analysis and case studies. These policy implications, which are articulated in the form of questions, combined with the other insights and information revealed by this analysis can serve as a foundation that serves to inform a subsequent and comprehensive cost analysis of what resources are needed to provide supplemental services to economically disadvantaged public school students in Ohio.

II. State and Federal Funding for Services to Economically Disadvantaged Students

Disadvantaged Pupils in Ohio: An Overview

The focus of this report is examining the services that Ohio school districts provide in support of economically disadvantaged students. Years of education research has shown that the cost of educating economically disadvantaged students is significantly higher than is the cost of educating non-economically disadvantaged students. Furthermore, research has also shown that this marginal cost increases as the concentration of low-income students increases. Ohio school districts receive on-going funding directed towards services for economically disadvantaged pupils from two primary sources:

1) Federal Title I funds[1]

2) State Disadvantaged Pupil Impact Aid (DPIA)

A. Title I Funding

Federal Title I funds date back to the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and are one of several federal funding streams designed to provide supplemental funding to states. As stated in the July 2017 Ohio Department of Education's *Title I, Part A: Spending Guide*, "the purpose of Title I is to provide all children 'significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable and high-quality education, and to close academic achievement gaps'."[2] The primary rationale for Title I funding is that low-income students face disadvantages in public schools because they do not enjoy the educational benefits often provided to children from higher-income families. With this objective in mind, Title I funds are intended to <u>supplement and not supplant</u> existing state and

[1] The districts participating in this project also indicated that some Federal Title II funds were used to serve low-income students. The overriding purpose of Title II Part A is Supporting Effective Instruction. One of 4 outlined Title II-A spending areas is to "provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals and other school leaders.". Instructional coaches, for example, would be an allowable use of Title II funds. Total Ohio Title II-Part A funding has been roughly $69 million annually over the past 4 years. It is not clear how much of this amount has been directed towards instructional support to low-income students.

[2] ODE drew the quoted passage from the Federal *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA), Section 1001

local education funding already in place. Title I funds are allocated according to an appropriation formula which is based on a per-pupil aid amount and the number of school-age children from low-income families.

According to ODE's July 2017 *Title 1 Part A Spending Guide*, the following uses of funds are permissible in a schoolwide Title I program:

1. High-quality preschool or full-day kindergarten and services to facilitate the transition from early learning to elementary education programs.

2. Recruitment and retention of effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects.

3. Instructional coaches to provide high-quality, school-based professional development.

4. Increased learning time.

5. Evidence-based strategies to accelerate the acquisition of content knowledge for English learners.

6. Activities designed to increase access and prepare students for success in high-quality advanced coursework to earn postsecondary credit while in high school (e.g., Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, early college high schools and dual or concurrent enrollment programs).

7. Career and technical education programs to prepare students for postsecondary education and the workforce.

8. Counseling, school-based mental health programs, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' nonacademic skills.

9. School climate interventions (e.g., anti-bullying strategies, positive behavior interventions and supports).

10. Equipment, materials, and training needed to compile and analyze student achievement data to monitor progress, alert the school to struggling students and drive decision-making.

11. Response-to-intervention strategies intended to allow for early identification of students with learning or behavioral needs and to provide a tiered response based on those needs.

12. Activities that have been shown to be effective at increasing family and community engagement in the school, including family literacy programs.

13. Devices and software for students to access digital learning materials and collaborate with peers and related training for educators (including accessible devices and software needed by students with disabilities).

14. Two-generation approaches that consider the needs of both vulnerable children and parents, together, in the design and delivery of services and programs to support improved economic, educational, health, safety and other outcomes that address the issues of intergenerational poverty.[3]

Table 1 below provides a summary of total Federal Title I-A funding distributed to Ohio from FY19 through FY22. Note that these figures represent the total of Title I-A funding distributed to Ohio's 609 traditional K-12 school districts and do not include Title I funds distributed to Ohio's 300+ community schools.

Table 1: Ohio Federal Title I-A Funding, FY19-FY22

Year	Title I-A Funding
FY19	$487.4 Million
FY20	$510.6 Million
FY21	$518.7 Million
FY22	$525.8 Million

Source: Ohio Department of Education

Table 1 shows Title I-A funding has increased from $487.4 million to $525.8 from FY19 to FY22.

In FY18, immediately prior to the timeframe shown in Table 1, the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimate Program calculated the following Title 1 allocations for the three case study school districts included in this report:

- Columbus City School District: $51,860,883, which amounts to $1,985.87 per low-income child.
- Jackson City School District: $874,344, which amounts to $1,322.76 per low-income child.
- Shaker Heights School District: $759,815, which amounts to $1,158.26 per low-income child.

Title I Eligibility

The Federal Title I program has four main parts: 1) Basic Grants; 2) Concentration Grants; 3) Targeted Grants; and 4) Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG).

[3] ODE cited the 2016 U.S. Department of Education, "Supporting School Reform by Leveraging Federal Funds in a Schoolwide Program" publication as the source of this list.

The primary basis for Title I-A funding is the number of school-age children who are identified in the most recent census as low-income, which is defined as 100% of the Federal Poverty Level or below, along with the Census Bureau estimate of the age 5-17 population in each school district.

Basic grants are allocated on a per pupil basis to all districts that have at least 10 low-income students and their number of low-income students exceeds 2 % of the age 5-17 population in the district.

Concentration grants are for districts with larger concentrations of low-income students. Districts that have more than 6,500 low-income students or their number of low-income students is 15% or more of the age 5-17 population are eligible for concentration grants.

Districts are eligible for Targeted and EFIG Title I-A grants if they have at least 10 low-income students and that number is 5% or more of their age 5-17 population. Eligibility for EFIG grants is also based on state expenditure data.

In addition, Title-A is comprised of two types of programs at the school building level. To be designated a "Schoolwide" Title I building, 40% or more of the students must be identified as low-income. In this instance all students in the building are considered to be Title I eligible and all teachers are considered to be Title I teachers. If a school's poverty level is at least 35% of the district's overall poverty level then a building is eligible for the Title I "Targeted Assistance" program. In these buildings students are served from highest to lowest risk.

Nationally, more than half of American children in over 60% of the country's public schools receive Title I funding. Additionally, an earlier analysis by the National Center for Education Statistics revealed that in 2001-2002 Ohio had 2,536 eligible Title 1 schools serving 60.6% of all Ohio public school students. The number of Title 1 Schoolwide schools totaled 1,204. This group of schools served 27.8% of the total Ohio public school population.

B. State Funding for Low- Income Students (DPIA)

Ohio's state school funding formula has included a component that provides funding directed towards low-income students since at least 1985. Since that time, this funding component has had many names and has taken many forms although one principal has remained consistent over time; *unlike most other components of the state funding formula for which a state/local share calculation is applied, funding for low-income students has been completely funded by the state with no local share assumed.* From 1985-2005 it was known as Disadvantaged Pupil Impact Aid (DPIA) which provided additional per pupil aid on a sliding scale. Districts with the lowest levels of poverty would receive no aid, while districts with modest poverty would receive aid on the order of $100 per pupil. Poverty was measured as the percent of the district's students whose families received Aid for Dependent Children (ADC)). As the percentage of ADC students increased, so would the amount received per pupil, with the highest poverty districts receiving over $1000 per ADC student. As federal poverty programs evolved ADC was replaced by Ohio Works First (OWF) and the DPIA formula was changed from a sliding scale of per pupil funding amounts to a DPIA index formula that compared a district's percentage of poverty with the statewide average poverty percentage.

From FY 06-09 DPIA was discontinued and replaced by Poverty Based Assistance (PBA). PBA was both an expanded and more restrictive funding program than was DPIA. Separate PBA funding was available for all-day kindergarten, class size reduction, services for limited English proficient (LEP) students, professional development, dropout prevention ("Big 8" districts only), community outreach ("Urban 21" districts only), and intervention services. Districts had to qualify for each of the above programs individually and PBA funds could be expended only in these areas. Total state funding under PBA increased from $330.4 million in 2005 (the last year of DPIA) to $470.2 million in FY 09.

PBA was discontinued in FY 10 and FY 11 when the Evidenced Based funding Model (EBM) was implemented. The EBM, however, did include a component called the Educational Challenge Factor (ECF) that provided additional funding based on the income, concentration of poverty, and level of college attainment of residents of each school district. However, the ECF was used as a multiplier in the formula and no separate computation was made for the amount of funding added by the ECF.

In FY 12 and FY 13 Ohio effectively had no school funding formula as Governor John Kasich eliminated the EBM, which was developed by his predecessor Governor Ted Strickland. In place of the EBM was the "Bridge Formula" which essentially functioned by basing funding on FY 11 funding levels for each school district.

When Ohio returned to a foundation formula funding mechanism in FY14, the component that had previously been DPIA and PBA became known as Economically Disadvantaged Aid (EDA). From FY 14 through FY 19 the school funding formula provided additional funding to districts based on the percentage of economically disadvantaged students compared to the statewide average percentage. This ratio is squared (in order to increase the rate at which funding increases for districts with higher percentages of economically disadvantaged students) and is then multiplied by a base per pupil dollar amount. The base amount was set at $269 per pupil in FY14 and then increased to $272 per pupil from FY15 through FY19. No explanation was ever provided for why the $269 base per pupil figure was employed, however, those who follow school funding in Ohio noticed that the 2014 EDA funding level of $332.7 million was very close to the $330.4 million level of 2005 (the last year of DPIA prior to the implementation of Poverty Based Assistance). By 2019, total state funding for Economically Disadvantaged Aid had increased to $417.2 million.

Ohio's funding formula was once again frozen in the FY 20-21 biennium, with the impact of the freeze exacerbated by $277.2 million in state funding reductions in FY 20 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. $125.2 million of these reductions remained in effect during the 2021 school year.

A new state funding formula commonly known as the Fair School Funding Plan was implemented in the FY 22-23 biennium and the Economically Disadvantaged Aid funding component was renamed as Disadvantaged Pupil Impact Aid (DPIA). While the name was changed back to its original incarnation from the mid-1980s, the newly adopted DPIA component is based on the same formula that was used for EDA since FY 14. However, the base per pupil amount was increased from $272 per pupil to $422 per pupil in FY 22 and FY 23, which will increase funding significantly once this component is fully phased-in.

It is important to note that DPIA was not phased-in at the same rate as the other components of the formula. There was zero increase in DPIA funding in FY22 and only a 14% phase-in in FY23. All other components of the formula were phased-in at a 16.67% rate in FY22 and a 33.33% rate in FY23. It is also important to understand that a "16.67% phase-in rate" does not mean a 16.67% increase in funding. Rather it means that in FY22 funding for all components except DPIA were increased 16.67% (1/6th) of the way from the FY20 funding amount to the newly computed Fair School Funding Formula funding amount. Similarly, in FY23 funding for all funding formula components except for DPIA were increased by another 1/6th to a 33% phase-in percentage. In contrast, by FY23 DPIA had been increased only 14% (slightly less than 1/7th) of the way from the FY20 Economically Disadvantaged Aid amount to the newly computed DPIA amount.

Table 2 provides a summary of Ohio's funding for economically disadvantaged students from FY 2001 through FY 2023:

Table 2: Number and Percent of Economically Disadvantaged Students and State Aid for Districts with High Concentrations of Poverty Students, FY01-FY23

Year	Program	Poverty Aid Amount	# of Econ. Disadvantaged Students	Poverty Aid Per Pupil
FY01	DPIA	$333,118,797	494,829	$673.20
FY02	DPIA	$324,640,211	512,624	$633.29
FY03	DPIA	$315,546,197	535,072	$589.73
FY04	DPIA	$322,838,791	544,374	$593.05
FY05	DPIA	$330,423,012	575,202	$574.45
FY06	PBA	$361,350,111	*597,517*	$604.75
FY07	PBA	$408,755,291	619,247	$660.08
FY08	PBA	$452,149,545	616,031	$733.97
FY09	PBA	$470,178,046	661,151	$711.15
FY10	ECF	--	709,928	--
FY11	ECF	--	745,121	--
FY12	Bridge Formula	--	758,106	--
FY13	Bridge Formula	--	795,120	--

Year	Program	Poverty Aid Amount	# of Econ. Disadvantaged Students	Poverty Aid Per Pupil
FY14	EDA	$332,697,675	801,657	$415.01
FY15	EDA	$372,144,220	830,275	$448.22
FY16	EDA	$376,638,982	827,858	$454.96
FY17	EDA	$401,173,389	841,224	$476.89
FY18	EDA	$408,655,728	827,643	$493.76
FY19	EDA	$417,181,285	816,046	$511.22
FY20#	EDA	$402,861,435	799,538	$503.87
FY21#	EDA	$410,714,987	779,216	$527.09
FY22*	DPIA	$357,961,833	648,751	$551.77
FY23*	DPIA	$404,356,853	646,424	$625.24
FY01-21 Change		**23.3%**	**57.5%**	**-$146.11**

Table 2 Source: Poverty Aid amounts for FY99 through FY20 from ODE district payment reports.

Note: FY14 –FY19 Economically Disadvantaged Aid amounts are after the Gain Cap was applied.

*FY20 Economically Disadvantaged Aid amount computed by Howard Fleeter after impact of Governor's $300.5 million May 2020 budget reduction and $23.3 million HB 164 supplemental aid.

*FY21 Economically Disadvantaged Aid amount computed by Howard Fleeter after impact of $272.2 million 2020 budget reduction and Governor's January 2021 restoration of $152.0 million in FY21 funding.

* FY22, and FY23 amounts under new funding formula which no longer includes DPIA funding for community school students.

Number and percent of economically disadvantaged students in FY01-FY12 from NCES Digest of Education Statistics tables showing student eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch. (FY06 figures estimated by NCES.) FY13 figures computed from ODE State Report Card. FY14-FY21 number and percent of economically disadvantaged students from ODE Final school funding payment report for each year.

Note: FY13 was the first year that the Community Eligibility (CEP) program for free and reduced price school meals began. This program has increased Ohio's count of Economically disadvantaged students by roughly 4 percentage points (roughly 69,000 students).

Table 2 shows that from 2001 through 2021 total state aid for economically disadvantaged students has increased by 23.3% (from $33.1 million to $410.7 million) while the number of economically disadvantaged students has increased by 57.5% (from 495,000 to 779,000).

Furthermore, the Ohio Department of Education school finance payment reports estimate that if DPIA were fully funded in 2022 and 2023 total state funding would have been roughly $689 million each year.

FY22-23 DPIA Funding Calculation

Under current law, formula for computing the amount of DPIA each school district will receive when the foundation formula is fully funded is based on the following 5 steps:

1) ***District's Economically Disadvantaged Percentage =***

   (District's Economically Disadvantaged Enrolled ADM) / (District's Total Enrolled ADM)

2) ***District's Economically Disadvantaged Ratio =***

   (District's Economically Disadvantaged Percentage) / (Statewide Economically Disadvantaged Percentage)

3) ***District's Economically Disadvantaged Index =*** `

   (District's Economically Disadvantaged Ratio)^2

4) ***District's Per Pupil DPIA Amount =***

   (District's Economically Disadvantaged Index) x $422

5) ***District's Total DPIA Funding =***

   (District's Economically Disadvantaged ADM) x District's Per Pupil DPIA Amount)

DPIA Example:

Below is an example DPIA calculation for a district with 2,000 students, 1,440 of whom are economically disadvantaged while the statewide percentage of economically disadvantaged students is 48.0%

District Total Enrolled ADM = 2,000 Students

District Economically Disadvantaged Enrolled ADM = 1,440 students

1) District Economically Disadvantaged Student Percentage = (1,440/2,000) = **72.0%**

Statewide Economically Disadvantaged Student Percentage = 48.0%

2) District Economically Disadvantaged Ratio = (72.0%/48%) =**1.50**

3) District Economically Disadvantaged Index = $(1.50)^2$ = (1.50*1.50) = **2.25**

4) District Per Pupil DPIA Amount = $422 per pupil * 2.25 = **$949.50**

5) District Total DPIA Funding = $949.50 * 1,440 Students = **$1,367,280**

If the same district had **96%** economically disadvantaged students, the economically disadvantaged ratio would be 2.0 and the economically disadvantaged index would be 4.0. This would result in a DPIA per pupil amount of **$1,688.00** and total DPIA funding amount of **$3,240,960**.

If the same district had **24%** economically disadvantaged students, the economically disadvantaged ratio would be 0.50 and the economically disadvantaged index would be 0.25. This would result in a DPIA per pupil amount of **$105.50** and total DPIA funding amount of **$50,640**.

When comparing the three districts in the example above, the district with 96% low-income students has four times the concentration as the district with only 24% low-income students but receives per pupil DPIA find that is 16 times as large ($1,688 vs $105.50). Similarly, the district that has 72% low-income students has three times the concentration of economically disadvantaged students as the district with 24% but receives a per pupil DPIA amount of nine times as much ($949.50 vs $105.50).

Brief Overview of Research Regarding the Marginal Cost of Educating Low-Income Students

The $422 per pupil base amount for DPIA was selected by the architects of the Fair School Funding Plan because this figure would result in a district with 100% economically disadvantaged students receiving additional funding that is roughly 30% of the prior (FY17-FY19) base cost per pupil amount of $6,020 per pupil. The 30% additional cost is based on national research indicating that figure to be a conservative estimate of the additional costs imposed on districts with *average concentrations* of economically disadvantaged students.

The Education Trust references this research on page 7 of their 2018 report, Funding Gaps: An Analysis of School Funding Equity Across the U.S. and Within Each State". Discussing their cost adjustment for low-income students they state, *"To account for these additional needs, we repeated our analysis with the assumption that it costs a district 40 percent more to educate a student in poverty than not in poverty. This figure is based on the federal Title I formula, and, in all likelihood, is an underestimate. Research shows that it could cost twice as much, or more, to educate a student from a low-income background to the same standards as a student from a more affluent background.[16]"*

The study that the Education Trust cites in footnote 16 from the above quote is, "How Much More Does a Disadvantaged Student Cost?" by William D. Duncombe and John Yinger, published by the Center for Policy Research at Syracuse University in July 2004. The study is one of the seminal works in this field conducted by two well respected economists. Summarizing a review of research examining the marginal cost of educating low-income students, the report states on page 19: *"Overall, this poverty weight ranges from 1.22 to 1.67"*

Finally, a third resource is "School Funding Formulas: What Works and What Doesn't? Lessons for California," by Jennifer Imazeki for the Sacramento State Center for the California Studies published in October 2007. This report synthesized information from a very comprehensive study of California's school funding and educational systems. On page 39, the following conclusions are made: *"Imazeki (2007) synthesizes the estimates of marginal cost for poverty and English learners from 16 costing out studies. In pupil weight terms, the estimates for poverty range from 0.30 to 1.22 (i.e., each student in poverty requires the resources of 1.3 to 2.22 regular students).* The report continues *"The cost studies done specifically for California (Chambers et al, Sonstelie, and Imazeki) all establish pupil weights for poverty of at least 30%."*

These sources, along with many others, demonstrate that a 30% multiplier for districts with high concentrations of students in poverty is on the low end of the marginal cost shown by educational research.

<u>Basis for the $422 Base DPIA Per Pupil Amount in Ohio's Current School Funding Formula:</u>

The calculations that led to the $422 per pupil base DPIA amount currently used in Ohio's funding formula are as follows:

FY19 Statewide percentage of economically disadvantaged students = 48.20%

For a district with 100% low-income students the economically disadvantaged ratio = 100%/48.2% = 2.075

Economically disadvantaged index = (2.075 x 2.075) = 4.3043

30% target = 30% of $6,020 = $1,806 per pupil

DPIA Base Per Pupil Amount = ($1,806 per pupil /4.3043) = $420 per pupil

In this manner a DPIA base amount of $420 per pupil would result in a DPIA per pupil amount of $1,806 in a district with 100% low-income students. (Note that at the time this calculation was made the statewide percentage of economically disadvantaged students was slightly higher and thus resulted in the per pupil amount of $422 which was actually employed in the formula.)

Three points should be understood about the $422 per pupil DPIA base amount utilized in Ohio's current school funding formula. First, as the research referenced above makes clear, **a 30% multiplier for districts with high concentrations of students in poverty is on the low end of the marginal cost shown by educational research**. Secondly, this research typically estimates the marginal cost for a district with the *average concentration of low-income students*, not for a district with 100% low-income students. It is well established that the marginal cost increases as

the concentration of poverty goes up, a pattern that has been reflected in Ohio's poverty adjustment since DPIA was first introduced to the school funding formula in 1985. Thirdly, the mathematics behind the $422 per pupil figure are based on a **30% increase over the prior $6,020 per pupil base cost amount for non-disadvantaged students.** Under Ohio's new state aid formula, the state average base cost – which is intended to reflect the cost of educating the "typical student in the typical school district" is **$7,349**. 30% of this figure is $2,205, a nearly $400 increase over the $1,806 per pupil from which the $422 per pupil base DPIA figure is derived.

With the above three points in mind, the increase in the DPIA base cost from $272 to $422 per pupil should be considered to be a first step in increasing funding for DPIA which has lagged well behind the rate of increase of low-income students in Ohio over the past 20 years (as shown in Table 2 above). Ultimately, Ohio needs to conduct a thorough and objective analysis of the cost of educating economically disadvantaged students, however, state funding for such a study was eliminated from the final version of the FY 22-23 state budget. **In this regard, the increase from $272 per pupil to $422 per pupil is best thought of as a "placeholder" until the economically disadvantaged cost study is undertaken and completed.**

Uses of DPIA Funding

Each year the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) produces an Annual Report on Economically Disadvantaged Funds. The most recent report was released in December 2021 and reflects the FY20 and FY21 school years. The ODE annual report provides an overview of how districts are spending their state funding for economically disadvantaged students. The Ohio Revised Code delineates nine general areas upon which Ohio school districts can spend their economically disadvantaged funding. These areas are:

1. Extended school day and year
2. Reading improvement and intervention
3. Instructional technology or blended learning
4. Professional development in reading instruction for teachers or students in kindergarten through third grade
5. Dropout prevention
6. School safety and security measures
7. Community learning centers that address barriers to learning
8. Academic interventions for students in grades 6 through 12
9. Employment of an individual who has successfully completed the bright new leaders for Ohio school program as principal or assistant principal.

(Note that the above list does not include 16 additional uses of DPIA that were added in FY22 when Governor DeWine's Student Wellness and Success funding was moved from outside the school funding formula to become part of DPIA.)

The data submitted to ODE by Ohio's school districts revealed that the three initiatives most frequently utilized were: 1) Reading improvement and intervention (24% of districts in FY21); 2) Instructional technology or blended learning (20% of districts in FY21); and 3) school safety and security measures (14.5% of districts in FY21).

Ohio's Method for Identifying Economically Disadvantaged Students

The number of economically disadvantaged students in each district which is the basis for DPIA is based upon the number of students eligible for federal free and reduced lunch programs. Eligibility for these programs is a function of family size and income, and the identification of students who are economically disadvantaged in Ohio is distinct from the criteria for federal Title I eligibility outlined above (as explained above, Title I eligibility is based on Census poverty data reflecting all students within a district's geographic area). ODE counts as economically disadvantaged any students who meet one of the following criteria:[4]

1. Students who are known to be eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches; a program through the United States Department of Agriculture (U.S.D.A) National School Lunch Program. Eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch can be determined through a variety of methods including electronic direct certification process or completion by a parent or guardian of a free and reduced-price lunch application. A student with an approved application on file for a free or reduced-price lunch is qualified to be reported to ODE as economically disadvantaged.

2. Students who have not applied for free or reduced-price lunch or who have not been directly certified as eligible if they reside in a household in which a member (e.g., sibling) is known to be eligible for free or reduced-price lunch via an approved application or through direct certification.

3. Students who are known to be recipients of or whose guardians are known to be recipients of public assistance, which typically refers to the TANF and/or SNAP federal program and may in the future include Medicaid.

4. Students whose parents or guardians have completed a Title I student income form and meet the income guidelines specified.

Also, many Ohio school districts have opted for the federal Community Eligibility Program (CEP) that enables eligible school districts to identify all students in a CEP-eligible school as disadvantaged, in part, in order to remove the stigma associated with identifying a need for school lunch and breakfast.

[4] The source of this information is the ODE District Profile report (aka "Cupp Report") webpage which can be found at: https://education.ohio.gov/Topics-Finance-and-Funding/School-Payment-Reports/FY-2021-District-Profile

As a practical matter, Ohio school districts use the following process for identifying students as economically disadvantaged:

First, districts receive their Direct Certification count (referred to in item 1 on the list above) from the Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services (ODJFS) via the state's designated Information Technology Center (ITC). This is based on eligibility for the SNAP food assistance program and the TANF cash assistance program. The SNAP eligibility cutoff is 130% of the FPL while the TANF eligibility cutoff is 150% of the FPL. However, ODJFS only certifies those students whose families receive TANF and are at 130% or below the FPL. *Thus, Ohio's direct certification process, which is mandated by federal law in order to participate in the National Lunch Program, effectively serves to only identify students who are eligible for free lunch.*

The second step is that districts then rely on parents and guardians submitting the lunch program application form. This process is typically referred to as "income verification." This will capture students between 130% and 185% of FPL who are eligible for reduced-price lunch as well as students who are eligible for free lunch but whose families do not participate in SNAP or TANF.

The third step is that the school district identifies cases where there are siblings or other students living in the household who are eligible to receive free and reduced price lunch even if these students do not participate in the lunch program. In this manner, Ohio's definition of economically disadvantaged students includes not just students who participate in the school lunch program but those who are *eligible to participate even if they choose not to do so* (this is not uncommon for older students who may feel that participation is stigmatizing.) Many other states do not take this step and count only students who actually *participate* in the school lunch program.

These three steps are the primary methods for identifying economically disadvantaged students in Ohio. However, the widespread adoption since FY 13 of the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) option for federal free breakfasts and lunches raises important issues for Ohio's DPIA funding calculation.

Community eligibility allows schools with more than 40% of its students eligible for free meals to provide no-cost breakfasts and lunches to all students in the building[5]. All students in CEP buildings are then reported as economically disadvantaged. Community eligibility offers an important tool and incentive for high poverty districts to provide nutritional meals to all students who may need them. However, districts utilizing the community eligibility option will typically show a much higher percentage of free and reduced lunch eligible students than previously. *ODE reports that roughly one-fifth of Ohio districts are currently taking advantage of the Community Eligibility option as well as an even greater share of community schools.*

Because economically disadvantaged aid is based on each district's percent of free and reduced price students compared to the statewide average, the federal community eligibility program will impact the state's formula by raising the statewide percentage of economically disadvantaged students. This in turn will impact each district's economically disadvantaged ratio, which is the

[5] CEP eligibility is based on students eligible through direct certification – either by SNAP or OWF participation, homeless and runaway students, migrant students, Head Start program participants or foster children.

key element in determining funding. The increase in the statewide average percentage lowers state aid in non-CEP districts by reducing their economically disadvantaged ratio.

In addition, the identification of economically disadvantaged students also has important ramifications for Ohio's report card system. The report card provides a comparison between the performance of economically disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students. However, in both FY21 and FY22 more than 70 school districts have identified more than 97.5% of their students as economically disadvantaged. This is primarily due to the utilization of the Community Eligibility Provision of the school lunch program. In this circumstance it is not possible to make meaningful comparisons between the academic performance of disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students as there are so few non-disadvantaged students in these districts. This also means that the academic results of economically disadvantaged students are not reliable because they also include the performance of students who are not actually low-income but are identified as such because of CEP.

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) has been examining how best to measure the number of economically disadvantaged students in each district. This issue is discussed in the January 2021 ODE report, "Economically Disadvantaged Students: A Review of Definitions and Methods Across States." One option that appears to be viable is to add Medicaid eligibility as a criterion.

ODE has been collecting Medicaid enrollment data by school district for the past several years. This data can be found on the ODE Ohio Healthy Students Profiles webpage at: https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Student-Supports/Healthy-Students-Profiles. The Medicaid enrollment data on the Healthy Students webpage includes ALL students who are enrolled in any (or all) Medicaid programs for at least three months during the fiscal year. Ohio has established that any child in a household that is at or below 206% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) is eligible for Medicaid

Table 3 provides a comparison in Ohio's 609 traditional school districts of FY21 Medicaid enrollment to Ohio's current definition of economically disadvantaged students, which, as discussed above, is primarily based on free and reduced price lunch eligibility.

(Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank)

Table 3: FY21 Percent Economically Disadvantaged & Percent Medicaid Students

Percentage of Students	Medicaid Enrolled Students (206% FPL) # of Districts	Econ. Disadvantaged Students (185% FPL) # of Districts
0-10%	24	37
10%-20%	52	73
20%-30%	97	109
30%-40%	152	121
40%-50%	130	103
50%-60%	93	50
60%-70%	41	16
70%-80%	18	11
80%-90%	0	10
90%-99.99%	0	47
100%	0	30
Statewide %	**40.3%**	**46.7%**

In FY21, Warren City school district had the largest percentage of students enrolled in Medicaid at 77.3%. In contrast, in FY21 there were 88 districts with a percentage of economically disadvantaged students greater than Warren's 77.3% Medicaid figure. Furthermore, Table 3 indicates that there are 77 districts above 90% economically disadvantaged students, and 76 of these districts have an economically disadvantaged student percentage above 96.7%. This large concentration of school districts with very high percentages of economically disadvantaged students is almost certainly primarily due to the advent of the Community Eligibility Program (discussed above) which inflates the number of economically disadvantaged students in districts that participate in CEP. Overall, the statewide percentage of students in Ohio's 609 traditional school districts enrolled in Medicaid in FY21 was 40.3% which is 6.4 percentage points lower than the FY21 statewide percentage of economically disadvantaged students arrived at using Ohio's current method of identifying low-income students.

If Medicaid is incorporated into the economically disadvantaged standard, then ODE would have to decide whether to set the income cap for the definition of an economically disadvantaged student at Ohio's Medicaid eligibility income cap for children (0-18 years of age), which is 206% of the federal poverty level. This level is higher than the current economically disadvantaged student standard of 185% used by the school lunch program which is set at the federal level. The policy logic for moving in this direction is twofold:

a) it is reasonable to have the same income eligibility standard for Ohio's major children's health and education programs; and

b) a uniform eligibility standard would allow all students who currently qualify for the economically disadvantaged category due to their eligibility for free or reduced-price lunches to automatically meet the new (higher) income threshold.

At the same time, a fact-based standard would be created that would replace the direct certification standard that makes sense in terms of access to the federal food program, but that does not make sense in terms of over-allocating limited DPIA dollars to districts that report 100% economically disadvantaged students even though as a factual matter the numbers are less than this amount.

This situation, in a zero-sum universe of limited DPIA funds, has the unintended and illogical effect of reducing DPIA funding directed towards economically disadvantaged students in other districts that do not qualify for or utilize the community eligibility provision and are therefore not deemed to have 100% of their students labelled as economically disadvantaged.

Importantly, Ohio is currently scheduled to be included in a cohort of states for which Medicaid would be incorporated in the direct certification process for the school lunch program effective in the 23-24 school year.

If Medicaid enrollment is included in Ohio's economically disadvantaged student identification process, a decision would need to be made as to whether or not income verification would continue for purposes of DPIA. Its elimination would save both parents and districts the work of filling out and reviewing the income verification forms. In addition, an advantage of eliminating income verification is that districts could use the time and resources that they currently spend processing income verification forms to encourage eligible families to enroll in SNAP, TANF and Medicaid. This would benefit both the district and the families themselves.

However, the downside would be that families who, for one reason or another, choose not to participate in federal assistance programs would not be eligible for the school lunch program, and these students would no longer be counted as economically disadvantaged. Furthermore, income verification may be federally required in districts that do not participate in CEP. If a phase-out of income verification is allowable, students who are currently eligible through income verification should be grandfathered and retain their free lunch eligibility.

Additionally, consideration could be given to allowing students to be counted as economically disadvantaged if they could prove that they were Medicaid eligible even if they chose not to enroll in the program. In any case, a shift to a Medicaid standard would, over time, entail the elimination of the current community eligibility program for the purposes of identifying students as economically disadvantaged while still using it for meal eligibility purposes.

C. Comparison of Ohio's Funding of Low-Income Students to Other States

The preceding section of this report described the formula by which Ohio provides additional funding to the state's 609 school districts to support the education of economically disadvantaged students. This section of the report provides an overview of how Ohio's funding mechanism compares with those of other states.

Education Commission of the States 50-State Comparison

In October 2021, the non-partisan Education Commission of the States (ECS) compiled information on how each of the 50 states provide funding for K-12 education. ECS provides information and comparisons across eight areas of funding, including the base funding amount, special education funding, English learner funding and funding for low-income students. This resource can be found at: https://www.ecs.org/50-state-comparison-k-12-and-special-education-funding/

ECS's research shows that 44 states provide supplemental funding for low-income students in one form or another, while six states (Alaska, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Idaho and South Dakota) provide no supplemental funding for this purpose.

Among the 44 states that do provide supplemental funding in support of low-income students, ECS has grouped them according to the methodology that they employ. Four states (Alabama, Delaware, Montana, and Wisconsin) employ what ESC describes as a "categorical grant" while three states (Illinois, Washington, and Wyoming) utilize a "resource-based funding" system. The categorical grant method appears to be a flat dollar amount available to each school district while the resource-based approach provides funding for specific supports (additional FTE units in Illinois, additional hours of instruction in Wisconsin and additional teachers and support staff in Wyoming). North Carolina uses a hybrid approach which combines the resource-based approach (two additional teachers and instructional aids) with an unspecified formula based on the number of low income students.

While three states (Iowa, Maryland along with North Carolina) provide a "hybrid" approach which combines different methods, the two most common funding models in the ECS taxonomy are a "flat weight" methodology (21 states) and a "multiple student weight" methodology (13 states).

States With Flat Weight Funding Models

ECS defines a flat weight formula as one where "a single weight or dollar amount [is] allocated by the state for students for districts that qualify based on certain factors or student needs." In the context of providing additional funds to serve low-income students this will typically mean that a state uses a flat per pupil amount or single weight. Table 4 below provides a summary of 18 of the 21 states identified as "flat weight" by ECS along with Iowa's hybrid approach.

Table 4 shows that there are four states that employ a low-income student weight that is less than 0.10, four states that employ a weight that ranges from 0.10 to 0.199, five states that employ a weight that ranges from 0.20 to 0.299, and two states that have a weight of 0.30 or greater[6]. Additionally, there are three states that utilize flat per pupil amounts to provide funding for low-income students. Iowa also uses a hybrid approach with a flat per pupil weight for low-income students.

Table 4: States with Flat Rate Low-Income Student Funding Models (ECS)

Weight Range	State(s)
Weight less than 0.10	N. Dakota (.025), Nevada (.03), Mississippi (.05), Utah (.05 possibly increasing to 0.30 in FY23)
Weight >= 0.10 and less than 0.20	Hawaii (0.10), Michigan (0.115), Kentucky (0.15), Maine (0.15)
Weight >= 0.20 and less than 0.30	South Carolina, (0.20), Louisiana (0.22), Oklahoma (0.25), Oregon (0.25), Missouri (0.25 for all pupils above a threshold poverty %)
Weight 0.30 or greater	New Mexico (0.30), Rhode Island (0.40)
Per Pupil Amount	W. Virginia ($18/pupil), Tennessee ($940/pupil), New Hampshire ($,1893/pupil)
Hybrid with Flat Weight	Iowa employs a weight of .00156 for all students plus an additional weight of .0048 for each low-income student

Source: Education Commission of the States 50-Stste Comparison, October 2021.

It is important to note that the ECS report includes three states in the "flat weight" category that should more appropriately be included in the "multiple weight" category, including Ohio.

Indiana is described as offering a $3,775 per pupil amount which is multiplied by each district's percentage of low-income students. If a district has 100% low-income students, they will receive $3,775 for each pupil; however, if they only have 50% low-income students, they will receive $1,887.50 per pupil.

[6] Note that Utah, listed as one of the states in the "<0.10" category is scheduled to increase the weight to 0.30 in FY23 "pending approval". It is not clear if this approval (presumably by the legislature) has been provided.

Similarly, Vermont utilizes a 0.25 weight but multiplies this by the poverty ratio in each district. Thus, if a district in Vermont has a poverty ratio of 0.8 the weight would become 0.20 and if the district had a poverty ratio of 40% the weight would become 0.10.

Finally, Ohio is (erroneously) included in the ECS grouping of states with a flat weight formula for providing funding for low-income students as the ECS report identifies Ohio as providing $422 per pupil. The discussion above clearly explains that Ohio's low-income student funding formula works similarly to that of Vermont where the $422 base per pupil amount is multiplied by the district's ratio of low -income students (which in Ohio's case is also squared). This results in school districts with different ratios receiving different per pupil funding amounts as described above.

Ohio's mis-categorization by ECS is concerning as only a reader with specific knowledge of Ohio (such as the authors of this report) would be aware that Ohio's low-income student funding formula is described inaccurately. Short of verifying with each state's department of education, there is no way of knowing if any other states are also mis-categorized. However, ODE's January 2021 report on economically disadvantaged students (discussed below) appears to verify the accuracy of the ECS categorizations, apart from Ohio.

States With Multiple Weight Funding Models

ECS identifies 11 states as utilizing multiple weight formulas for providing funds to serve low-income students. Some of the states categorized as "multiple have tiered weight systems with different weights for different percentages of low-income students, whereas other states categorized as "multiple weight" use a formula with a sliding scale where the per pupil amount increases as the percentage of low-income students increases. In addition, Maryland employs a hybrid model which uses a sliding scale per pupil amount in addition to a flat personnel grant.

Table 5 provides a summary of 17 states employing a multiple weight low-income student funding formula (note that Indiana, Vermont and Ohio are categorized by ECS as "flat weight").

Table 5: States with Multiple Weight Low-Income Student Funding Models (ECS)

State	Description of Low-income Students Funding Formula
Arkansas	3 Tier per pupil amount. **$532**/pupil (<70% low-income students), **$1,063**/pupil (70-90%), **$1,594**/pupil (>90%)
Massachusetts	Sliding scale per pupil amount. **$3,843**/pupil (0-6% low-income students) increasing up to **$5,472**/pupil (>80%)
Maryland	Hybrid formula with sliding scale per pupil amount up to maximum of **$3,374**/pupil
Indiana	Sliding scale **$3,775**/pupil multiplied by each district's percentage of low-income students

State	Description of Low-income Students Funding Formula
Ohio	Base weight of **$422**/pupil multiplied by ratio of district % low-income students to state average %, which is then squared.
Virginia	Sliding scale weight ranging from **0.01-0.199** based on % low-income students
Colorado	Sliding scale weight ranging from **0.03-0.30** based on % low-income students above the state average
Nebraska	6 Tier weight system. **0.0375** (5-10% low -income students) increased by 0.0375 each 5% increment up to **0.225** (>30% low-income students
California	2 Tier weight. Tier 1 weight is **0.20**. Tier 2 weight is **0.65** applied to district's low-income and ELL pupils above 55%
Texas	5 Tier weight system ranging from **0.225 to 0.275**.
Vermont	Sliding scale weight of **0.25** multiplied by district poverty ratio
Connecticut	2 Tier weight. Tier 1 weight is **0.30**. Tier 2 weight is **0.45** applied to district's low-income pupils above 60%
Pennsylvania	3 Tier weight. **0.30** for pupils of average poverty**, 0.60** for pupils of acute poverty, and an additional **0.30** if the districts poverty rate exceeds 30%
New Jersey	Sliding scale weight ranging from **0.47-0.57** based on % low-income students in the district
Kansas	Sliding scale weight beginning at **0.484** and increasing based on % of low-income students in the district
Minnesota	Compensatory pupil units weight of **0.6** adjusted for reduced lunch students (weighted at 0.5) vs. free lunch students (weighted at 1.0)
New York	Sliding scale weight ranging from **1.0-2.0** based on % of low-income & ELL students in the district, and sparsity adjustment

Source: Education Commission of the States 50-Stste Comparison, October 2021.

It interesting to note that according to the ECS report, the states that employ a multiple weight formula appear to be more generous in their support of low-income students than are the states which utilize a flat weight formula. 15 states shown in Table 4 use a flat rate weight approach. Seven of these states employ weights that are less than 0.20 and seven have weights that are more than 0.20 (Utah either has a weight of 0.05 or 0.30 – it is unclear which is currently in effect).

In contrast, 12 states shown in Table 5 use a multiple weight system (the other 5 use multiple per pupil amounts). Of these 12 states, only Virginia has a low-income student weight whose maximum value is below 0.2. And only 4 of these 12 states have minimum weights that are less than 0.20.

Additionally, it is worth noting that both California and Connecticut apply their higher weights to only the students above their selected low-income student percentage thresholds (55% in California and 60% in Connecticut). Other states with multiple weights apply the higher weight (or per pupil amount) to all students in each district that qualifies for a higher weight.

ODE "Economically Disadvantaged Students: A Review of Definitions and Methods Across States"

In January 2021, the Ohio Department of Education released a report which examined practices used by other states to both identify economically disadvantaged students and to provide additional funding.

ODE's overview of how other states fund economically disadvantaged students is largely, but not exactly, congruent with the ECS overview. ODE identifies 16 states that provide a flat weight or per pupil amount to provide funding to low-income students. ODE's list includes Indiana and Vermont in this category, as did ECS, although the authors of this report interpreted these models to be more consistent with a variable weight approach. ODE, however, did not include Michigan, New Mexico, Ohio Utah, and West Virginia in this grouping.

As for the weights themselves, ODE's overview is in exact agreement with ECS on 11 of the states; it has minor differences on Hawaii, Indiana, Nevada, and Tennessee, and shows New Hampshire with a weight of 0.50; for its part, ECS describes New Hampshire as using a per pupil amount of $1,893. Because the ODE summary was released in the 2021 school year while the ECS report was released in the 2022 school year, it is possible that New Hampshire's system changed from one year to the next.

The ODE report also discusses the states that use a variable weight or per pupil model for funding low-income students. ODE identifies 14 states that use this approach. Apart from some minor differences most likely related to examining the year prior to that studied by ECS, ODE's list corresponds to ESC's for Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Kansas, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Texas and Virginia. ODE shows Maryland as using a 0.97 weight whereas ECS shows them with $3,374 per pupil amount and ODE shows the same weights for Michigan and Missouri but provides additional detail to demonstrate the weights are variable not fixed as ECS classifies them. Minnesota, Nebraska, and New York were omitted from ODE's review.

Overall, there is a high degree of correlation between ODE's state-by-state taxonomy of funding for economically disadvantaged students and ECS's. Within this picture, Ohio's funding model for low-income students aligns well with accepted, mainstream funding policies. In fact, as has been previously mentioned, Ohio's reliance on a multi-weighted system of funding means that it is using a model that has been shown to provide greater financial allocations to school districts than would be provided by the other low-income student funding models.

III. Best Practice Considerations

Functional Definition of Best Practices

In the public policy arena, best practices, as is the case in other domains, can be an unclear, even subjective, term that is difficult to describe with precision. It usually suggests that a policy is superior to other related policy options because there is relatively greater quantifiable evidence that it works in terms of reaching intended results and that it's use is thus generalizable to other related applications. Many argue that since the term is rooted in performance realities and metrics, it is interchangeable with effective, evidence-based policies and practices.

It is this commonsense conceptualization of best practices that is used in this report.

In K-12 education, effective practices are most often identified and catalogued based on evidence from research ranging from local program evaluations to rigorous, large-scale studies. The U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse, developed under federal education law (No Child Left Behind), was the first large-scale effort to catalogue educational programs with evidence of their effectiveness based on common, rigorous research standards. The current federal law governing education, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), signed into law in 2015, broadened what can be considered evidence-based by defining "levels of evidence" for educational programs as strong, moderate, or promising. The criteria also allow for local innovation at a "Tier 4" promising practice level. ESSA requires federal money to be spent on programs for disadvantaged subgroups where evidence of effectiveness includes impact on those subgroups, including students in poverty. Arguably, because of federal law governing the use of federal education money and states' efforts to comply, K-12 education has operationalized the term "best practices" more fully than is the case in many other public policy areas.

The primary reason to introduce the notion of best practices is to utilize it as an organizing principle that enhances understanding of how Ohio's approach to funding supplemental services for economically disadvantaged students compares to the policy approaches utilized by other states. This policy discussion is also designed to help facilitate future cost-benefit analyses regarding the quantifiable public value – and associated costs – produced by providing these services.

Best Practices for Economically Disadvantaged Students

ESSA gives some flexibility to states to develop their own plans, while still holding states accountable for the achievement of historically disadvantaged subgroups, including students in poverty. To support their ESSA plans, many states are building their own clearinghouses of evidence-based practices using ESSA's definition of levels of evidence. Ohio's Evidence-Based Clearinghouse and the Pennsylvania Evidence Resource Center are examples of state-level clearinghouses. Johns Hopkins University's Center for Research and Reform in Education (CRRE) has developed *Evidence for ESSA*, a national clearinghouse that catalogues evidence-based PreK-12 programming based on the ESSA levels of evidence. All of these clearinghouses include ways to identify interventions with specific evidence of effectiveness for economically disadvantaged students.

One component of this study is the identification of the best practice models currently used in Ohio. The case study research conducted as part of this overall study identified a common set of

supplemental services being implemented by all three districts to support economically disadvantaged students. It is important to note, although perhaps not surprising, that the three very different districts (large urban, suburban, and rural Appalachian) identified essentially the same list of specific services when asked to describe their programming for economically disadvantaged students (see case study section of this report). This set of services can be categorized as: (A) early intervention services, including district-provided preschool programming and primary grade reading intervention; (B) supplemental educational supports such as after-school programming, summer school, and high school credit recovery; and (C) health and wellness supports, including counselors, school-based health clinics and in-house behavioral health services.

While the objectives of this study did not include identification of the specific types of interventions being utilized by school districts in Ohio (e.g., what specific third grade classroom interventions are being implemented), the state-and national-level clearinghouses include evidence for the effectiveness of programs in all categories of interventions listed by the case study districts. For example, the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse has reviewed and accepted 58 individual studies that found strong, moderate, or promising evidence of the effectiveness of various types of preschool programming.[7]

In addition to specific studies cited in the clearinghouses, there is a large body of research supporting the program areas the three case study districts are prioritizing for economically disadvantaged students. For example, the positive academic impact of early intervention and quality pre-school programming is well documented in the literature, indicating persistent, positive effects for students living in poverty.[8] In its ESSA guidance document for early learning programs, the U.S. Department of Education reviewed multiple studies of the effects of quality early learning programming and concluded, "while all children benefit by participating in high-quality early learning programs, the achievement gains are largest for children from low-income families and others who have been traditionally underserved."[9] A similar evidence base exists for the other categories of services the case study districts are deploying for economically disadvantaged students.

IV. School District Case Studies

Introduction

This section of the analysis is devoted to three school district case studies. The three districts – one rural (Jackson City), one suburban (Shaker Heights) and one urban (Columbus City) – have all

[7] https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Search/Products?searchTerm=&gradeLevel=PK

[8] Barnett, S.W. (1998). Long-Term Cognitive and Academic Effects of Early Childhood Education on Children in Poverty, *Preventive Medicine*, 27(2), 204-207; Thompson, R. A. (2016). What more has been learned? The science of early childhood development 15 years after neurons to neighborhoods. *Zero to Three Journal*, *36*(3), 18-24.

[9] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, *Non-Regulatory Guidance Early Learning in the Every Student Succeeds Act: Expanding Opportunities to Support our Youngest Learners*, Washington, D.C., 2016.

been fully engaged and responsive with regard to responding to a common set of interview questions.

Listed below, these questions were designed to reveal what supplemental services are provided to economically disadvantaged students and, at least in a preliminary manner, what it cost the school district to provide these services.

Case Study Interview Questions and Supplemental Services Provided

1. For program/service purposes, how does the district define economically disadvantaged students?

2. What are the specific supplemental services provided to economically disadvantaged students by your district? Additionally, how do you determine what these services are and how they respond to the needs of economically disadvantaged students?

3. In your experience, what, if any, additional services are needed to adequately serve this population of students?

4. On a service-by-service basis, what is the annual state and local cost of providing these services? Use the most recent fiscal year for which data is available. Additionally, how are the expenditure of funds accounted for and reported to the state?

5. What are the sources and amounts of federal funds used to help finance supplemental services to students from economically disadvantaged circumstances?

6. What percentage does this supplemental spending represent in terms of your school district's total annual budget (exclusive of federal funds)?

7. From an educational perspective, what is the primary impact of these supplemental services generally; and, more specifically, which services are the most impactful educationally and how do you measure this impact?

8. What impact do non-academic wraparound services, such as mental health services, have on improving outcomes for economically disadvantaged students? More specifically, to what extent did the state-provided Student Wellness and Success Funds (SWSF) translate into more services to economically disadvantaged students in your district. To what degree did the district use these funds to supplement and/or supplant existing funding for existing services?

9. Whom within the district is most directly responsible for monitoring the provision of services to economically disadvantaged students and understanding and evaluating related outcomes? Is there a specific individual or department responsible for this?

10. How do the demographic and geographic dimensions of your specific school district typology shape district decisions regarding: a) which supplemental services your district provides to economically disadvantaged students; and b) what service delivery models are used to provide these services?

Additionally, are these decisions adjusted in any way as it relates to providing supplemental services to students at district school buildings with relatively high proportions of students who are economically disadvantaged versus providing these same services to economically disadvantaged students who are attending school buildings that, relatively speaking, have significantly lower proportions of economically disadvantaged students?

Additionally, the interview questions and answers process, which are provided for each case study school district in the following text, revealed that the following building level supplemental services (and related professional staff positions, which may be part-time or full-time) were provided by all three case study school districts to economically disadvantaged students. In aggregate, these services are being funded through a combination of state (DPIA), federal (Title 1 and one-time pandemic-related stimulus) and local funds.

1. Academic Intervention Specialist (Elementary Reading)
2. Academic Intervention Specialist (Elementary/Middle School Math)
3. Supplemental Professional Development for Teachers
4. Supplemental Classroom Supplies
5. Instructional Coaches
6. High-Dose Tutoring
7. Classroom Aides
8. School Counselors
9. School Social Worker/Psychologist
10. Summer School (Building Focused)
11. After School Academic Intervention/Tutoring
12. Pre-school (3 and 4 year olds)
13. School Nurses and Pediatric Health Services
14. Credit and Dropout Recovery
15. Transportation for Summer School/After School
16. Technology (1-to-1 Devices, Hotspots, Online Learning Centers, etc..)

17. Instructional Materials/On-line Learning Platforms

18. Parent and Community Outreach/Engagement

19. Other: Hire and Retain Teachers

20. Other: Assistant Principal

21. Other: Career Tech

22. Other: Miscellaneous

Columbus City School District Case Study

Overview

Columbus City Schools in Columbus, Ohio (Franklin County) was selected for the urban case study. As the largest school district in Ohio, Columbus City enrolls over 45,000 students and operates 112 school buildings. Students who are classified as economically disadvantaged comprise 99.99% of enrollment in FY 22.[10] The research team worked with four district-level administrators (treasurer/CFO, executive director of leadership & school programs, executive director of finance, and executive director of financial affairs) to develop this case study.

Columbus City Schools' programs and supplemental services to economically disadvantaged students focus on targeted supports for academic, social and health-related needs. For example, the district employs a full-time instructional coach in every school, along with fully licensed literacy specialists. Federal ESSER funds are used to fund these coaches. Prior to ESSER, only certain Title I schools (those with allocations > $120,000) had instructional coaches and these coaches also had to spend 50% of their time providing literacy intervention. The other Title I schools (those receiving allocations < $120,000) had no instructional coaches and had only part-time literacy intervention specialists who were not uniformly licensed to teach reading. In FY22, 97 of the district's 112 school buildings had Title 1 allocations greater than $120,000. Currently, all schools get a fulltime instructional coach (funded through ESSER) and the schools with > $120,000 Title I have a separate full time fully licensed teacher to work with the lowest performing students on: K-2 literacy in elementary schools; math for middle school; and off-track students in high school. Schools at < $120,000 have a part-time fully licensed specialist.

Columbus City offers high dose tutoring both after school and in the summer with tutoring provided by fully licensed teachers. Title I funds this by paying for extended time for teachers. Title I funding also allows for Saturday intervention programs.

All schools in the district now have a full-time counselor (ESSER funded) to address both instructional and social/emotional needs of students. Prior to ESSER, counselors were split across multiple buildings each week. Title I funding is also used for supplemental nurses and social workers in the most economically disadvantaged schools. ESSER is allowing for funding of 20

[10] Columbus City Schools utilizes the Community Eligibility Provision for the free and reduced lunch program, counting all students in a building as eligible if 40% or more meet specific income-related criteria.

additional social workers. Prior to ESSER, most elementary and middle schools had a social worker only 1-2 days per week, which is insufficient to meet the needs of students.

Title I funds are used for supplemental instructional materials and technology. These federal funds also support: a) ESL parent engagement; Pre-K parent engagement; family ambassador coordinators; and "Communities in Schools" staff to provide students with food, supplies and health care. Communities in Schools and City Year provide support for non-academic interventions meant to improve behavior and attendance. Title I also pays for class size reduction in primary grades and professional development for teachers.

If Columbus City had more resources to spend on supplemental services for economically disadvantaged students, the top priorities would be: a) additional class size reduction in all grades in which students are significantly off-track and where there are high numbers of English learners and students with IEPs; b) additional social/emotional learning (SEL) support, including more counselors and social workers; and c) additional wraparound supports to mitigate barriers to attendance.

Columbus City Schools – Responses to Case Study Questions

Outlined below is a distillation of oral and written communication with senior administrators, including the school treasurer, regarding supplemental services – and their associated costs – provided to economically disadvantaged students in the Columbus City School District.

The questions are queries being posed to each of the three case study school districts.

1. **For program/service eligibility purposes, how does the district define economically disadvantaged students?**

   Answer: The district provides breakfast and lunch to all students through Community Eligibility. Title 1 federal funds are allocated based on the direct certification percentage in the school and on enrollment.

2. **What are the specific supplemental services provided to economically disadvantaged students in your district? Additionally, how do you determine what these services are and how they respond to the needs of economically disadvantaged students?**

   Answer:

   - All schools in the district have an instructional coach and a full-time school counselor (funded through one-time federal ESSER funds) to address instructional and social-emotional needs of students and staff.

   - All elementary schools have a full-time literacy specialist to provide intervention for struggling students. This position is Title 1 funded.

- All middle schools have a full-time math specialist to provide intervention for students struggling in math. This position is Title 1 funded. The math intervention strategy was put in place this year due to a drastic decline in math proficiency in middle school. The primary goal is to have students prepared to be successful in Algebra 1 in ninth grade as passing Algebra 1 is a strong determinant of on-time graduation.

- All high schools have a full-time matriculation specialist (Title 1 funded) to provide intervention for students who are off-track moving from 9 to 10, 10 to 11 and to graduation.

- In addition to these academic intervention positions, we use Title 1 to supplement funding for supplemental nurse and/or school social worker support in the most economically disadvantaged schools. Title 1 funds are used to supplement student materials, instructional materials, and technology, as well as extended time for teachers to provide intervention services for students and professional development.

- Additional Title 1 funded supports include: ESL parent engagement; academic advocates; transportation for homeless students and students in foster care; early childhood literacy coaches; early childhood math coaches; pre-K parent engagement staff; family ambassador coordinators; supplemental translation services for deaf and/or bi-lingual families; Communities in Schools staff in selected schools to provide students with food, supplies, health care, counseling, academic assistance to remove barriers to students getting to school; turnaround principal coaches to support first and second year school leaders; Saturday intervention programs; PBIS specialists in schools; class size reduction teachers in primary grades; and professional development for teachers.

- Columbus City uses district and school One Plan Needs Assessments aligned with the Ohio Department of Education's One Plan requirements to determine the needs of economically disadvantaged students.

- (Note: Refer to the district's ESSER webpage for additional detail on funding and services at: https://www.ccsoh.us/domain/4441.

3. In your experience, what, if any, additional services are needed to adequately serve this population of students?

Answer: Additional class size reduction teachers in all grades where students are off-track and/or where there are high numbers of students with IEPs and/or English learners. Additionally, it would be helpful to have more social-emotional supports such as school counselors and social workers; it would also be useful to have more wraparound supports to mitigate barriers to attendance.

4. **On a service-by-service basis, what is the annual state and local cost of providing these services? Use the most recent fiscal year for which data is available. Additionally, how is the expenditure of funds accounted for and reported to the state?**

   Answer: These figures are shown in Tables 8-10 in Section V. (pages 55-58)

5. **What percentage does this supplemental spending represent in terms of your school district's total annual budget (exclusive of federal funds)?**

   Answer:

   - Columbus City's over operating budget (exclusive of grants) is approximately $840 million.

6. **What are the sources and amounts of funds used to help finance supplemental services to students from economically disadvantaged circumstances?**

   Answer:

   - General Revenue Fund (GRF)
   - DPIA
   - Title I
   - Title IIa
   - Title III
   - Title IV
   - Title VI B (IDEA)
   - ESSER

7. **From an educational outcomes perspective, what is the primary impact of these supplemental services generally; and, more specifically, which services are the most impactful educationally and how do you measure this impact?**

   Answer: Without the additional state and federal funds, the district would not be able to meet the needs of its students. The supplemental services that have the greatest impact include: reading and math intervention teachers; high dose tutoring after school and summers; and school counselors and instructional coaching. The district measures impact through progress on its board "goals and guardrails," as well as on the state report card growth measures.

8. **What impact do non-academic wraparound services, such as mental health services, have on improving outcomes for economically disadvantaged students? More specifically, to what extent did the state-provided Student Wellness and Success Funds (SWSF) translate into more services to economically disadvantaged students in your district? To what degree did the district use these funds to supplement and/or supplant existing funding for existing services?**

Answer: See funding tables 6-11 at the end of this section of the report.

9. **Whom within the district is most directly responsible for monitoring the provision of services to economically disadvantaged students and understanding and evaluating the related outcomes? Is there a specific individual or department responsible for this?**

Answer: This is a shared responsibility between the Office of the Superintendent, Office of Transformation and Leadership, Office of Teaching and Learning, Office of Student Services and Office of Performance.

10. **How do the demographic and geographic dimensions of your specific school district typology shape district decisions regarding: a) which supplemental services your district provides to economically disadvantaged students; and b) what service delivery models are used to provide these services?**

Answer: This is not a major determining factor for CCS as the district is geographically large. The district offers school choice and buses students within the district boundaries. All students qualify for breakfast and lunch through community eligibility.

11. **Additionally, are decisions adjusted in any way as it relates to providing supplemental services to students at district school buildings with relatively high proportions of students who are economically disadvantaged versus providing these services to economically disadvantaged students who are attending buildings that, relatively speaking, have significantly lower proportions of economically disadvantage students?**

Answer: See above with the additional comment that student needs as a result of the pandemic have increased exponentially. The cost to address these expanded needs continue to grow.

Jackson City School District Case Study

Overview

The school district selected for the rural case study is Jackson City Schools (JCS), located in Jackson, Ohio (Jackson County). The district spans 181 square miles and serves a largely rural population in this Appalachian county in Southern Ohio. JCS enrolls 2,305 students and operates five school buildings, including three elementaries, one middle school, and one high school. Overall, students who are economically disadvantaged[11] comprised 46.9 percent of Jackson's enrollment in FY21-22 and ranged by building from 39.8% at the high school to 56.3% at Northview Elementary (see District Profile for additional data). The research team worked with four senior district-level administrators (superintendent, treasurer, director of special services, and director of special projects) to develop this case study.

The supplemental services JCS provides to economically disadvantaged students are directed at both academic achievement and physical/mental health. Jackson provides all of the supplemental services identified by the other two case study districts as part of this study. With a high percentage of students starting kindergarten who do not meet Ohio's Early Learning and Development Standards, the district places an emphasis on early intervention programming for economically disadvantaged students. In recent years, the district re-established preschool programming for three- and four-year-olds. In response to increasing numbers of kindergarten students starting school with significant social and academic deficits, in FY21-22, the district hired nine additional kindergarten classroom aides. All three elementary buildings well exceed the 40 percent economically disadvantaged threshold, so are able to provide schoolwide Title I programming. The district developed after school programming through federal 21st Century Community Learning Center grant funds. Although only two buildings still qualify for grant-funded after school services, the JCS funds the other after school programming with district funds, as it is seen as a critical intervention.

Physical/mental health supports directed largely at economically disadvantaged students include a doubling of the number of school counselors (from three to six), including the addition of elementary counselors in each building, and increasing the number of school psychologists from one to three. JCS is now leading a Community Partners group with Nationwide Children's Hospital and various local agencies with the goal of coordinating services to meet children and families' physical and behavioral health needs. In FY20-21, the district launched a school-based health clinic and is currently in the process of expanding the facility.

The district measures the impact of the academic supports using both diagnostic and accountability-based assessment results. For example, JCS received five stars for Gap Closing on the most recent (state issued) district report card. Of the students entering kindergarten in the fall of 2018, 48% scored "on track" in Language & Literacy. Of the same cohort, 74.5% scored proficient or above on the reading portion of the state's third grade English language arts test. Measures of the impact of the physical/mental health services include relatively low chronic

[11] Defined by the district as students who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

absenteeism. The district's attendance rate in FY21-22 was 91.6%, and the chronic absenteeism rate was 28.2% - below the state average and a number that includes excused absences.

When asked about additional services needed to adequately serve economically disadvantaged students, JCS administrators stressed wraparound services to support students and families, including counselors, social workers, and health care providers. Families living in poverty in rural areas struggle to access services for basic needs including food, housing, transportation, and basic health care. Endemic rural poverty and the opioid epidemic have led to more and more families in crisis in Jackson and other Appalachian counties. JCS administrators described the impact of these conditions as increasing the number of children who come to school with myriad needs that must be met before any academic progress can be made.

Additionally, early intervention (birth to five) is seen by the district as increasingly important. JCS would like to continue to expand preschool programming for three- and four-year-olds, but challenges include space and transportation. Preschool transportation is only available for students who have been identified with specific developmental delays. Similarly, transportation for after school programming is currently only available for two elementaries who have grant-funded after school programs. The district funds the other buildings' after school programs but does not have funding to transport students home. This lack of transportation funding means that many of the poorest students who could benefit most from high-quality preschool programming or after school programming cannot access the service because household poverty-related challenges prevent them from getting there. The district would like to have a school nurse in every building, but currently has only one school nurse serving all three elementary buildings.

One-time, pandemic-related federal (ESSER) funds enabled JCS to implement some of the needed additional interventions such as increasing the number of school counselors. These additional supports are now seen as critical; JCS will look for ways to continue to fund as many as possible once ESSER funding is no longer available.

Jackson City Schools – Responses to Case Study Questions

Outlined below is a distillation of oral and written communication with senior administrators regarding supplemental services – and their associated costs – provided to economically disadvantaged students in the Jackson City School District.

1. **For program/service eligibility purposes, how does the district define economically disadvantaged students?**

   Answer: Economically disadvantaged students are those who are eligible for free or reduced price lunch. This is the same definition that the state of Ohio uses. From a service perspective we do exceed this definition by providing needed federal Title 1 academic services to all students in our three elementary schools whether the student is (formally deemed) economically disadvantaged or not. The three buildings allow this by being designated "schoolwide" for Title 1 funding purposes.

2. **What are the specific supplemental services provided to economically disadvantaged students by your district? Additionally, how do you determine**

what these services are and how they respond to the needs of economically disadvantaged students?

Answer: The specific supplemental services provided to economically disadvantaged students in our district include: academic support, counseling services, preschool, extended day services, health care, and any of the special education programs if the student has an IEP (Individual Education Plan). These services are provided as determined by student academic performance, teacher referral, parent referral, observation by appropriate personnel in the school setting, and multi-factored evaluation by licensed psychologists and educational specialists. Determining how the services address the needs of the economically disadvantaged students is based on the same criteria and determined by the service providers and other educational personnel.

Last year, the district hired nine additional kindergarten classroom aides to help with all of the behavioral/socialization/academic deficits that kindergarteners are exhibiting. These aides work with a classroom approach, which means that services are provided to both economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged students. It was noted that this relates, in part, to the reality that all students are being affected by the deficits of the economically disadvantaged kids and particularly as it relates to those with intensive academic and behavioral needs. Also, at the elementary level, half of the students are economically disadvantaged (and many others are close).

Additionally, the district has doubled the number of school counselors to six (from three) and more could be used effectively. The district never had elementary counselors until two years ago. Now there is one in each of the three elementary buildings and each of these buildings could use additional counselor. Three counselors are being paid from one-time federal ESSER funds. Administrators noted that the needs are so great that it will be impossible to cut these counselors once these temporary funds are gone, which suggests that other school costs will need to be reduced. Importantly, professional standards indicate that Jackson City should have a minimum of ten counselors (1:250).

In response to a query about specific initiatives, positive mention was made of Ohio Governor Mike DeWine's policy and funding focus on child and family mental health. Specifically, OhioRISE, a Medicaid reform to enhance support for multi-system youth with high cost and complex health needs, was noted as were ongoing efforts to focus on prevention and early intervention, including the work of Family and Children First Councils. Additionally, Jackson City convenes a Community Partners group monthly (since 2020) through an initiative with Nationwide Children's Hospital (funded by Cardinal Health). This funding sponsored Tier 1 PBIS intervention, Signs of Suicide programming, the school-based health clinic launch. The group has grown to 30+ participants monthly, including all school counselors, building principals, juvenile court, and the behavioral health provider organizations.

In response to a question about chronic absenteeism, DC described why Jackson's attendance rate is consistently high. "School is a good place to be" when you are a child living in poverty in a rural area. If a child can get to school, they will. DC described buying a second grader an alarm clock because she kept missing the bus because her parents stayed up all night partying and didn't get up. She stopped missing school and graduated as a valedictorian a few years ago. PH described a kindergartener who came to school recently with a raw egg and an egg cooker because he said his mom didn't get up. Kids know people care about them at school.

They are seeing kids who are 7 or 8 years old enrolling who have never been in school. Just recently, they placed an 8-year-old in a kindergarten class who had never been to school. He has now moved to his grade level. It was stated that they would not have been able to close the gap without the after school program.

Finally, SH and DC stressed that the after school programming is a critical intervention that helps overcome the academic gaps for economically disadvantaged students.

3. In your experience, what, if any, additional services are needed to adequately serve this population of students?

Answer: More services needed to adequately support these students would include: counselors, therapists and nurses who could provide wrap-around services for families. Case managers who could monitor and coordinate the student's families' needs and services would also be beneficial. Licensed social workers who could conduct home visits and provide support services for students and their families to make sure they have basics like food, water, shelter, heat, air, electricity, and transportation--essential services that many do not have—would greatly enhance the districts efforts to support these students while they are in school.

In response to a query about additional service needed being OUTSIDE the school building, PH response described the small amount of time (11-12%) that schools interact with students, so "fixing" issues is very difficult, especially when the other 85%+ of the child's life is in an environment of trauma, poverty…

DC described that most of what they are doing for intervention is "after the fact." Birth-to-5 investment is critical. The behavioral health interventions they are doing is mostly treatment, not prevention. Prevention is so much better and cheaper and more effective.

Specific early intervention needs include preschool for 3 and 4 year olds (approximately 400 total). Would need teachers, six additional classrooms, and transportation.

Currently, the district cannot provide transportation for all of the after school programs. The two buildings with grant-funded after school programs and provide transportation. Additional funding is needed to provide transportation for all buildings for after school programs, as economically disadvantaged kids cannot

attend. Parents do not have transportation, gas money, etc. These kids need after school programming the most but can't attend.

4. **On a service-by-service basis, what is the annual state and local cost of providing these services? Use the most recent fiscal year for which data is available. Additionally, how are the expenditure of funds accounted for and reported to the state?**

Answer: From a staffing perspective, which is the vast majority of these costs, the positions paid for, at least in part, by DPIA funding includes the following:

- Title 1 Teachers
- School Counselors
- Librarians
- Special Education Teachers
- School Nurses
- Health Clinic
- Therapists
- Psychologists
- School Resource Officers
- Classroom Aides
- Food Service Personnel
- Other

The expenditure of funds is accounted for through the School Treasurer's financial reports (see attached).

Additionally, in response to a query about using DPIA funds for non-academic wraparound services, JB response was yes because these funds are "baked in" to the formula.

5. **What are the sources and amounts of federal funds used to help finance supplemental services to students from economically disadvantaged circumstances?**

Answer: These figures are shown in Tables 7, 9 and 10 in Section V. (pages 54-58)

6. **What percentage does this supplemental spending represent in terms of your school district's total annual budget (exclusive of federal funds)?**

Answer: See funding tables 7 and 9--11 in Section V. of the report.

7. **From an educational outcomes perspective, what is the primary impact of these supplemental services generally; and, more specifically, which services are the most impactful educationally and how do you measure this impact?**

Answer: The primary impact of supplemental services is the support provided to students so that they can attend, learn, and succeed in school. The greatest impact educationally is the presence of additional teachers, tutors, counselors, and health personnel who provide hands-on support for students who can attend regularly, remain healthy and learn what they are supposed to learn. Additionally, the supplemental services that are targeted to specific individual needs make it possible for students to overcome difficulties they may have and progress at the expected rate in their development and education. The Adena Ironmen Clinic provides an opportunity for healthcare on site at the middle school for those students who might not otherwise have access to medical professionals to identify and treat illnesses and conditions ranging from minor to more significant issues.

8. **What impact do non-academic wraparound services, such as mental health services, have on improving outcomes for economically disadvantaged students? More specifically, to what extent did the state-provided Student Wellness and Success Funds (SWSF) translate into more services to economically disadvantaged students in your district? To what degree did the district use these funds to supplement and/or supplant existing funding for existing services?**

Answer: Non-academic wraparound services, such as those for mental health, are extremely important for improving outcomes for economically disadvantaged students. Of primary impact is the fact that many of these services make it possible for the students to actually be in school and to be healthy and happy. One of the greatest needs is for those services, such as school nurses, librarians, counselors, and school resource offices, to be available in each school building every day. Jackson City currently shares one elementary librarian and one school nurse among three elementary schools. So, most of the time there is not a librarian or nurse at an elementary school because she is at one of the other buildings. One school resource officer is shared among the three elementary schools and the middle school. So much of the time an SRO is not on site because he is at another building. The high school, however, does have an SRO on site full-time. The district has increased the amount of mental health services and social emotional learning opportunities for their students with monthly staff meetings for principals and counselors to work with representatives from Nationwide Children's Hospital, Integrated Services, Hopewell Health Centers, Jackson County Juvenile Court and Family And Children First Council to consider the impact of services as well as any new concerns. Student behavior, student and family needs and communication among agencies

are all topics for discussion during this monthly meeting. The PAX Good Behavior game, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), lessons in Zones of Regulation, as well as Threat Assessments being conducted by school psychologists and crisis responders are all part of the wraparound services provided by the district for improving outcomes for disadvantaged students.

9. **Whom within the district is most directly responsible for monitoring the provision of services to economically-disadvantaged students and understanding and evaluating the related outcomes? Is there a specific individual or department responsible for this?**

   Answer: Building administrators are most directly responsible for monitoring and provision of services to economically disadvantaged students as well as understanding and evaluating their outcomes. The building principal is the person most likely to know that services are being provided as planned and that the students are showing improvement in attendance, behavior, and academic performance as a result of the supplemental services. In addition, district central office administrators are in place to provide oversight of programs and funds to remain in compliance with funding and program requirements.

10. **How do the demographic and geographic dimensions of your specific school district typology shape district decisions regarding: a) which supplemental services your district provides to economically disadvantaged students; and b) what service delivery models are used to provide these services?**

    Additionally, are these decisions adjusted in any way as it relates to providing supplemental services to students at district school buildings with relatively high proportions of students who are economically disadvantaged versus providing these services to economically disadvantaged students who are attending school buildings that, relatively speaking, have significantly lower proportions of economically disadvantaged students?

    Answer: The Jackson City School district serves students across 181 square miles. Transportation is a barrier for some of the critical supplemental services we target to economically disadvantaged students, such as preschool and after-school programming. We do not have the funding to provide transportation for preschool unless the student has a disability, and we can only provide transportation for two of our buildings' after school programs because they are currently grant funded. In large part, the students who could benefit the most from these two services cannot attend because of rural transportation barriers.

Supplemental Services for Economically Disadvantaged Students List (Jackson City Schools):

1. Nine kindergarten aides

2. Doubled number of school counselors (from three to six)

3. Community Partners Group focused on Mental health with Nationwide Children's Hospital and multiple community agencies (Cardinal Health Grant) (Also Tier 1 PBIS, Signs of Suicide paid for through this grant)

4. After school programming—all buildings

5. Transportation for after school programming (two buildings)

6. High school credit recovery

7. School-based health clinic

8. Preschool programming

9. Additional school psychologists

10. School-wide Title 1 programming in all three elementary schools

11. Supplemental professional development for teachers

12. Summer school

Shaker Heights School District Case Study

Overview

The school district selected for the suburban case study is Shaker Heights Schools (SHS), located in Shaker Heights, Ohio (Cuyahoga County). Shaker Heights is an eastern suburb of Cleveland. Shaker Heights enrolls 4,545 students and operates eight buildings, including six elementaries, one middle school and one high school. The district also operates a hybrid Innovative Center for Personalized Learning (IC). Overall, students who are economically disadvantaged comprise 31.6% percent of Shaker Heights' enrollment in FY22 and ranged by building from 25.8% at Onaway Elementary to 43.7% at Lomond Elementary (see District Profile for additional data). The research team worked with senior-level administrators (treasurer, accounting supervisor, director of student data systems & accountability, director of curriculum & instruction) to develop this case study.

A broad range of supports targeting economically disadvantaged students are provided through in-school and out-of-school programming. In-school programming includes ten instructional coaches who work one-on-one with teachers on effective instructional practices. These coaches monitor student data to focus on supporting specific instructional practices. Additionally, twelve literacy specialists in the elementary schools provide the capacity to intervene with students who are not on track to meet third grade reading benchmarks. Tutoring services are offered through an Academic Resource Center at Woodbury Elementary (available to all elementary students), as well as middle and high school after-school intervention programming. Supplemental summer literacy and math intervention services are provided for the lowest 20th percentile students in grades K-8 (the majority are economically disadvantaged). Transportation is provided for this summer intervention program. Lomond Elementary is a schoolwide Title 1 building, meaning federal Title

1 funds can be used to provide intervention services to all students in buildings where 40% or more of the students are in poverty. Two other elementaries and the middle school are targeted Title 1 buildings, where Title 1-funded intervention services are targeted specifically to economically disadvantaged students.

Non-academic supports serving economically disadvantaged students include a Family and Community Engagement Coordinator whose role is to liaison with families to improve communications, as well as address issues such as attendance. The district partners with community providers for mental health treatment services based on referrals from school personnel. State Student Wellness and Success funds are utilized to hire behavioral health professionals who can intervene with students and provide necessary supports and referrals. ESSER federal funding currently enables the district to employ social workers to focus on student and family needs that impact academic achievement, attendance, and health. These non-academic supports are seen by the district as increasingly critical and cannot "go away" entirely when the external funding is no longer available.

Shaker Heights assesses the impact of services to economically disadvantaged students using ongoing local diagnostic assessments, as well as Ohio School Report Card metrics. District-monitored diagnostic data indicate that literacy specialists and instructional coaches are among the interventions with the greatest impact on student learning. Behavioral health interventions are monitored through tracking attendance data, discipline referrals, and by administering the Panorama student feedback survey.

When asked about additional services needed to adequately serve economically disadvantaged students, administrators outlined the need for increased access to services. For example, the district would like to implement virtual tutoring to provide additional support to students who lack transportation, as well as transportation services for after school programs and in-person tutoring supports. Shaker Heights administrators also stressed the need for wraparound services to support students and families. Until this academic year, only one elementary building had a full-time school counselor. Chronic absenteeism is an increasing problem for the district, with close to 30% of students chronically absent in FY22—a rate triple the pre-pandemic yearly rates, and it is higher for economically disadvantaged students (47.1%) and minority students (e.g., Black students at 41.5% chronic absenteeism). Additional student family support services are also needed to address issues that impact attendance for economically disadvantaged students.

Shaker Hts. City Schools – Responses to Case Study Questions

Outlined below is a distillation of oral and written communication with senior administrators, including the school superintendent and treasurer, regarding supplemental services – and their associated costs – provided to economically disadvantaged students in the Shaker Heights School District.

1. **For program/service eligibility purposes, how does the district define economically disadvantaged students?**

   Answer: a) Free and reduced lunch enrollment. This is currently very low and presumably inaccurate. Families have not been completing the required forms for

a few years since breakfast and lunch are being provided to everyone. This spells trouble; and b) McKinney-Vento (federal funds) eligible students.

2. What are the specific supplemental services provided to economically disadvantaged students by your district? Additionally, how do you determine what these services are and how they respond to the needs of economically disadvantaged students?

Answer: The list of supplemental services is as follows:

A. Tutoring services/center: Academic Resource Center at Woodbury Elementary and Middle School and the High School After School Intervention Services.

- After school intervention for all core subject areas (math, reading, science, social studies). Student participation is voluntary.
- Transportation provided with a "late bus."
- School teachers are paid to do this.

B. Bellefaire (nonprofit) mental health counseling services beyond what is provided by the county.

- Students recommended by "student support care specialist" or counselor: Private mental health/therapy services.

C. Ten Instructional Coaches: Work with teachers on effective instructional practices. High school services paid for with federal Title 1 funds.

- Coaches role is to provide 1-1 coaching, facilitate teacher teams and ultimately improve student outcomes.
- Monitor school and teacher data to tailor teacher interventions.

D. FACE: Family and Community Engagement coordinator and liaisons; home visits and parent contact.

- Address attendance concerns, family concerns and improve communication with families.

E. Push-in literacy services in PK-4 by certified reading teachers (12 literacy specialists).

- Literacy specialists assess and provide interventions for students who are on reading improvement and monitoring plans due to concern in not passing Ohio's third grade reading guarantee

assessment test. The group of students are not "on track" for reading on grade level.

F. JumpStart+ Summer Services: Focus on literacy and math development.

- Targeted invitations to students performing in the lowest 20th percentile in reading and math; attend "summer school" for five weeks, 9 am to 2 pm Monday-Thursday. Qualified teachers with some enrichment activities included (so it is not purely academic).
- K-8 services.
- Transportation provided.
- https://www.shaker.org/protected/ArticleView.aspx?iid=6Y32G20&dasi=23B

G. AP/IB Testing Fees Waived for free and reduced meal eligible students as well as free ACT test preparation services.

- For students on free and reduced lunch Shaker Heights pays for their testing fees; this is problematic for "middle of the road" families who are required to pay approximately $120 per test.

H. Career-Technical Education: Shaker Heights Curriculum

- Shaker Heights belongs to a consortium where students can earn career certifications in 11th and 12th grade. See https://www.heightscareertech.com/

I. Providing musical instruments to disadvantaged students; some beginning in elementary school (el Sistema).

- The point is to provide learning opportunities (e.g., music) to learners who would not otherwise have access. Some families can afford instruments and lessons at elementary and more cannot. This is an elective opportunity that represents a district commitment to providing equitable opportunities.

J. Remedial math and reading intervention classes at Woodbury Elementary and at the middle school and the high school (Title 1 Positions).

- Students are placed in an additional reading or math "intervention period" so that they are getting supplemental learning. They are also in their grade level course.
- It is worth noting that Shaker Heights adopted the "Algebra 1 for all in 8th grade" model. This has created additional pressure to provide

intervention supports so that students can be successful in this model. These are additional courses, not "instead of" options.

K. School counselors at K-4 buildings to run groups and coordinate academic interventions.

- Title 1: Lomond has a full-time counselor.
- Other schools share a counselor.

L. Innovative Center (IC) for Personalized Learning: Five teachers and APEX curriculum for blended learning.

- Students who are seeking an alternative to "traditional" school can opt for the IC. They come for a portion of the day to work with teachers and complete credits in APEX online learning.
- Original design was to help students reach graduation even if they were significantly struggling in the typical high school.
- This is an entirely separate location off campus; their entire schedule is at the IC.

M. APEX learning for credit recovery (high school).

- This option is for students who have to make-up just a credit or two for graduation. The rest of their day in "regular" classes.

N. Mobile hotspots to provide high speed internet access for families.

O. Education Support Specialists.

- Specialists address significant student behaviors at the elementary schools. Some other districts may have deans or assistant principals, but Shaker Heights does not. The district ONLY has an assistant principal at Lomond Elementary, which is the Title 1 school.

3. In your experience, what, if any, additional services are needed to adequately service this population of students?

Answer: The list of additional supplemental services includes:

- Virtual tutoring services.
- Wraparound family services
- Learning around trauma-informed care.

- Ways to address chronic absenteeism.

- Transportation services for afterschool and tutoring.

4. **On a service-by-service basis, what is the annual state and local cost of providing these services? Additionally, how are the expenditure of funds accounted for and reported to the state?**

   Answer: See Tables 6 and 9-11 in Section V. (pages 53-58)

5. **What percentage does this supplemental spending represent in terms of your school's total annual budget (exclusive of federal funds)?**

   Answer: See Tables 6 and 9-11 in Section V. (pages 53-58)

6. **What are the sources and amounts of federal funds used to help financial supplemental services to students from economically disadvantaged circumstances?**

   Answer: See funding chart at end of this section of the report.

7. **From an educational outcomes perspective, what is the primary impact of these supplemental services generally; and, more specifically, which services are the most impactful educationally and how do you measure this impact?**

   Answer:

   - Increase to academic achievement as measured by the Ohio state tests and the state report card.

   - Benchmark/internal assessments: Math and reading: NWEA, AIMSWEB+. Shaker Heights disaggregates this based on economically disadvantaged learners.

   - Decreases to discipline referrals.

   - Increases to attendance.

   - Panorama: Social emotional learning feedback.

   - Literacy specialists and instructional coaches seem to have the greatest impact on student achievement.

8. **What impact do non-academic wraparound services, such as mental health services, have on improving outcomes for economically disadvantaged students? More specifically, to what extent did the state provided Student Wellness and Success Funds (SWSF) translate into more services to economically disadvantaged students in your district? To what degree did this**

district use these funds to supplement and/or supplant existing funding for existing services?

Answer: These funds were used to add personnel to address student wellness and success, including: temporary position for a supervisor of student wellness and success; positive behavior coordinators; and student care specialists (mental health professionals. Additionally, some funds were used to purchase and implement wellness screening assessments, including:

- Behavior Intervention Monitoring Assessment System (BIMAS), which is a screening for social-emotional learning.
- Panorama Student and Staff Survey (social-emotional learning).

The district does not yet know the impact of these interventions since they were just started in the 2021-2022 school year.

9. **Whom within the district is most directly responsible for monitoring the provision of services to economically disadvantaged students and understanding and evaluating the related outcomes? Is there a specific individual or department responsible for this?**

Answer:

- Department of Data and Assessment.
- Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. (Family and Community Engagement is located within this department.)
- Department of Learning and Teaching.

10. **How do the demographic and geographic dimensions of your specific school district typology shape district decisions regarding: a) which supplemental services your district provides to economically disadvantaged students; and b) what service models are used to provide these services?**

Answer:

- Lomond: Schoolwide Title 1
- Boulevard, Middle School, and Woodbury are targeted Title 1
- Mercer, Onaway, Fernway and the High School are not Title 1 schools.
- For elementary schools: Attendance zones were created to diversify elementary schools, which means that students may go to a school that is not the closest geographically.

11. Additionally, are these decisions adjusted in any way as it relates to providing supplemental services to students as district school buildings with relatively high proportions of students who are economically disadvantaged versus providing these services to economically disadvantaged students who are attending school buildings that, relatively speaking, have significantly lower proportions of economically disadvantaged students?

Answer:

More resources are provided to schoolwide Title 1 and targeted Title 1 schools. For example, the schoolwide Title 1 elementary school is the only one with an assistant principal. It is significant to note that geographic, demographic, and economic factors strongly correlate within the district.

Additionally, tables 6-11 below provide a detailed overview of the supplemental services and related expenditures for FY22. It also includes students served and related per pupil expenditures.

V. Case Study School Districts' Expenditure Data

Outlined below are six tables that provide financial details regarding the specific supplemental services and related expenditures being provided to economically disadvantaged students in the three case study school districts. Tables 6-8 provide data for each of the individual school districts. Tables 9-11 provide comparative data for these districts. All data are for FY22.

Summary of District FY22 Spending Reports

Table 6: Shaker Hts. Schools Programs to Support Education of Low-Income Students

Category of Support for Low-Income Students	FY22 Expenditure	# of Students Served	Cost Per Pupil
Push-in Literacy/Reading Services	$1,026,831	120	$8,557
Instructional Coaches (10)	$836,923	N.A.	
Title I teachers for math intervention	$265,000	120	$2,208
Title I teachers for reading intervention	$509,251	120	$4,244
Blended Learning Curriculum & Teachers	$631,482	65	$9,715
JUMPStart + Summer Program	$408,266	100	$4,083
Family & Community Engagement	$164,299	N.A.	
Asst. Principal in Title I Building	$152,615	350	$436

Category of Support for Low-Income Students	FY22 Expenditure	# of Students Served	Cost Per Pupil
Late Buses for After School Programs	$150,000	200	$750
Additional School Counselors K-4	$130,300	170	$766
Education Support Specialists	$120,000	700	$171
Tutoring Services Center	$89,493	150	$597
Various Fee Waiver Programs	$42,630	N.A.	
Mobile Hotspots	$19,323	120	$161
APEX Learning for HS Credit Recovery	$15,000	110	$136
Career Technical Education	$405,763	80	$5,072
Total	**$4,967,176**	**1,375***	**$3,612****

* The 1,375 students shown in the bottom row of Table 6 is the total number of economically disadvantaged students in Shaker Hts. in FY22.

** Cost per pupil is $3,317 without Career technical education

Table 7: Jackson City Schools Programs to Support Education of Low-Income Students

Category of Support for Low-Income Students	FY22 Expenditure	# of Students Served	Cost Per Pupil
Teachers for Remediation	$1,809,926	1,200	$1,508
Summer School/After School Remediation	$870,064	450	$1,933
Preschool	$585,376	57	$10,270
Additional Teaching Staff	$582,689	450	$1,295
OT/PT, Speech & Other Health Services	$480,731	115 & 210	$1,479
Psychological Services	$292,500	134	$2,183
Family Literacy program	$162,180	450	$1,416
Three Additional Counselors	$146,707	1,200	$122

Electronic Instructional Materials	$132,143	200	$661
Additional Support Staff (Kindergarten Aides)	$121,313	250	$485
Nursing Service	$69,809	1,200	$58
Remediation Supplies	$18,323	25	$733
Total	**$5,271,759**	**1,093**	**$4,823**

* 1,093 is the total number of economically disadvantaged students in Jackson in FY22

Table 8: Columbus City Schools Programs to Support Education of Low-Income Students

Category of Support for Low-Income Students	FY22 Expenditure	# of Students Served*	Cost Per Pupil
Elementary Reading Specialists (*Estimated*)	*$15,600,000*	NA	
MS Math Intervention Specialists (*Estimated*)	*$2,000,000*	NA	
Suppl. Prof. Development for Teachers	$31,201,369	NA	
Supplemental Classroom Supplies	$11,299,920	NA	
Full-time Instructional Coaches	$14,300,906	NA	
Full-time Counselors	$15,428,349	NA	
Social Workers	$5,800,055	NA	
Summer School	$4,947,971	NA	
Expanded School Day (ELO)	$33,250	NA	
High Dose Tutoring (*Estimated*)	*$2,600,000*	NA	
Pre-K (not including special ed pre-k)	$13,883,393	NA	
Credit recovery – APEX Learning	$447,122	NA	
Instructional Assistants (Classroom Aides)	$34,234,098	NA	
Parent & Community Engagement	$1,872,100	NA	
Technology: Chromebooks, hotspots, online learning academy (*Estimated*)	*$5,000,000*	NA	

Category of Support for Low-Income Students	FY22 Expenditure	# of Students Served*	Cost Per Pupil
Transp. for after school/summer programs	$4,160,721	NA	
Instruct. Materials/Learning Platforms (*Est.*)	*$4,700,000*	NA	
Total	**$167,509,252**	***31,850****	***$5,259***

* 31,850 is estimated number of low-income students based on 70% of 45,500 students.

Notes: Due to the size of Columbus and the compressed timeframe of this study, the number of students served for each initiative was not available.

Figures in *italics* are estimated.

Table 9: Columbus, Jackson & Shaker Programs to Support Education of Low-Income Students (FY22)

Category of Support for Low-Income Students	Columbus	Jackson	Shaker
Academic Intervention Specialist Elem Reading	*$15,600,000*	$1,809,926	$1,536,082
Academic Intervention Specialist Elem/MS Math	*$2,000,000*		$265,000
Supp. Prof. Development for Teachers	$31,201,369		
Supplemental Classroom Supplies	$11,299,920	$18,323	
Instructional Coaches	$14,300,906		$836,923
High Dose Tutoring	*$2,600,000*		
Instructional Assistants (Classroom Aides)	$34,234,098	$121,313	$120,000
School Counselors	$15,428,349	$146,707	$130,300
School Social Worker/Psychologist	$5,800,055	$292,500	
Summer School (Building Focused)	$4,947,971	$870,064	$408,266
After School Academic Intervention/Tutoring	$33,250		$89,493
Pre-school (3 & 4 year olds)	$13,883,393	$583,376	
School Nurses & Pediatric Health Services		$550,540	

Category of Support for Low-Income Students	Columbus	Jackson	Shaker
Credit & Dropout Recovery	$447,122		$15,000
Transportation for Summer school/After School	$4,160,721		$150,000
Technology (1-to-1 devices, hotspots, etc..)	*$5,000,000*		$19,323
Instructional Materials/On-line learning platforms	*$4,700,000*	$132,143	$631,482
Parent & Community Outreach/engagement	$1,872,100	$162,180	$164,299
Other-Hire & retain teachers		$582,689	
Other- Asst Principal			$152,615
Other - Career Tech			$405,763
Other – Misc.			$42,630
Total	**$167,509,252**	**$5,271,759**	**$4,967,176**

* Figures in *italics* for Columbus are estimates

Table 10: Columbus, Jackson, and Shaker Sources of Funding for Low-Income Student Services (FY22)

Funding Source for Support for Low-Income Students	Columbus	Jackson	Shaker
General Fund (Non-DPIA)	$17,563,970	$2,097,131	$2,034,852
DPIA	$28,093,371	$388,744	$240,087
Other Local	$1,659,107	$0	$43,065
Title I	$37,979,703	$825,425	$1,056,328
Title II	$2,391,509	$0	$132,746
ESSER I	$6,295,545	$139,769	$0
ESSER II	$25,688,382	$755,317	$423,266
ESSER III (ARPA)	$20,063,869	$694,127	$1,036,831

Funding Source for Support for Low-Income Students	Columbus	Jackson	Shaker
SWS Funds	$0	$127,808	$0
Public Preschool	$6,511,948		
Federal 21st Century	$0	$243,438	$0
Carl Perkins Grant Voc Ed)	$150,802		
IDEA B (Instructional Aides)	$12,658,756		
School Improvement Grant	$6,678,512		
Other Federal	$1,773,779		
Total Funding	**$167,509,252**	**$5,271,759**	**$4,967,176**
Funding Per Pupil	**$5,259**	**$4,823**	**$3,612**

Table 11: Columbus, Jackson, and Shaker Share of Funding for Low-Income Students by Source (FY22)

Funding Source for Support for Low-Income Students	Columbus	Jackson	Shaker
General Fund (Non-DPIA)	10.5%	39.8%	41.0%
DPIA	16.8%	7.4%	4.8%
Title I	22.7%	15.7%	21.3%
Title II	1.4%	--	2.7%
ESSER I, II and II	31.1%	30.1%	29.4%
Other Local $	1.0%	--	0.8%
Other State $	4.0%	2.4%	--
Other Federal $	12.5%	4.6%	--
Total	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Key Takeaways from Tables 6-11

Listed below are key takeaways that have emerged from a review of the case study school district expenditure data.

1. Though there were varying degrees of scope and intensity in terms of the supplemental services provided, the districts, in large part, provided the same array of supplemental services to their respective populations of economically disadvantaged students.

2. There was significant overlap in terms of the sources of funding that were utilized to pay for supplemental services. These state and federal sources were expanded substantially by the availability of one-time, COVID-19 pandemic-related federal funds. Interestingly, there was significant commonality in the use of these one-time funds among the three school districts. For example, all three used the funds to provide additional instructional support and intervention.

3. In terms of how services are paid for, each district uses a significant (approximately 30%) amount of federal ESSER funds.

4. In both Jackson City and Shaker Heights, general fund revenues are the single largest source of funding for supplemental support services for low-income students.

5. Title 1 is the third largest source of funding for interventions in Shaker Heights and Jackson City (behind ESSER and general fund sources). DPIA is the fourth largest source of funding in these two districts.

6. Ohio's DPIA program and the federal Title 1 program remain the pillars of funding for supplemental services for economically disadvantaged students. These sources have been in place for many years and are the only funding sources that are specifically and exclusively intended to finance these services on an ongoing basis. Importantly, in both cases, there is reasonable and workable local flexibility in the use of the funds.

7. Though DPIA and Title 1 are central, ongoing sources of funding for low-income student services, their combined share of funding is well less than half of all spending on low-income students in each district:

    - Columbus City: $66.073 million, which is 39.4% of current service expenditures of $167.509 million.
    - Jackson City: $1.214 million, which is 23.0% of current service expenditures of $5.272 million.
    - Shaker Heights: $1.296 million, which is 26.1% of current service expenditures of $4.967 million.

Clearly, for each district, DPIA and/or Title 1 funding would have to be dramatically increased to replace one-time ESSER federal stimulus related funding that is currently being used to help pay for roughly 30% of supplemental service in each of the three districts. Additionally, according to leaders from each of the districts, the enhanced financial ability accorded by ESSER to provide a more robust array of supplemental services has allowed each district to address more fully the needs of low-income students. **And in each case, these leaders also believe that the identified low-income students needs were largely, if not entirely, in existence *prior* to the 2020 beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic and that they are needs that will be continuing past the pandemic and into the foreseeable future.**

8. In each of the three school districts, the expenditures specifically directed towards low-income students comprises a small fraction of the district's overall expenditures. These figures are as follows:

   - Columbus City: $167.5 million is 17.6% of the district's FY22 operating budget of $950.7 million.
   - Jackson City: $5.3 million is 17.0% of the district's FY22 operating budget of $31.1 million.
   - Shaker Heights: $5.0 million is 4.9% of the district's FY22 operating budget of $101.8 million.

VI. Policy Implications

Listed below, in the form of questions, are the primary policy implications that have emerged from the report's case studies and related policy analysis. The importance of asking the right questions is key to advancing any policy inquiry and it is certainly true with regard to addressing the complex needs of economically disadvantaged students. With this in mind, the following questions serve as a directional guide that can help shape an independent, comprehensive study of the costs associated with providing supplemental services to economically disadvantaged students in Ohio. Importantly, most of the questions are directed at the fundamental policy and program assumptions upon which Ohio's system of providing these services is built.

Policy Implications Questions

1. **Question Context:** Analysis, research and experience suggest strongly that K-12 students who are economically disadvantaged are also educationally disadvantaged in the sense that they have barriers to educational access and success that are not in place for their relatively advantaged peers. This situation has encouraged both the federal government, primarily through Title 1, and states, including Ohio, to provide resources to fund supplemental educational services for economically disadvantaged students. Within this context, education experts have conservatively estimated that the additional cost of providing these essential services to the average

(poverty) impacted school district is approximately 30% greater than what it costs to educate students without these disadvantages.

Question Set #1: Using the 30% cost figure as a reasonable placeholder for analytical purposes, between federal Title 1 funds and Ohio's DPIA funding is Ohio fully paying for this cost? If not, how much would DPIA funding need to increase to meet this financial threshold? Additionally, are there other, perhaps more effective, ways forward financially to meet this goal? If so, what are they? Additionally, how should these questions be integrated into a comprehensive study of the cost of providing supplemental services to economically disadvantaged students?

2. **Question Context:** In Ohio, the functional definition of an economically disadvantaged student is a student who is eligible for the free and reduced lunch program. To be eligible for a free lunch a student must come from a family whose income is less than 130% of the federal poverty level. The eligibility standard moves to 185% of the federal poverty level for a student who qualifies for a reduced price lunch. Significantly, if a school building's student population includes over 40% who are eligible for the free lunch program, 100% of the building's students can be deemed economically disadvantaged (via Community Eligibility) thereby reducing the burdensome paperwork for schools and families that is otherwise required to qualify – and that often works as a barrier to program participation.

   Question Set #2: Though the commonsense logic of Community Eligibility makes sense procedurally and has been unambiguously beneficial in terms of expanding access to meals for students who need them, is it fair and equitable when it means that in a zero sum universe of limited DPIA resources that this process moves these resources toward towards school districts who report nearly 100% economically disadvantaged students and away from other districts with a lower (and uninflated) number of economically disadvantaged students? From a financial perspective, how large a problem is this? If it is deemed a significant problem, is there a better way forward?

3. **Question Context:** At the state level, other than primary and secondary education, the most significant program for children is the Ohio Medicaid program. In fact, most Ohio children qualify for this health care program because the income eligibility cap is 206% of the federal poverty level. Importantly, many professionals in both pediatric health care and in primary and secondary education have shown that there are strong correlations between pediatric health and educational success.

   Question Set #3: Given the fact that it is, and has been for many years, Ohio Medicaid policy that children living in families below 206% of the federal poverty level are, in effect, deemed low-income and thus economically disadvantaged, does it make sense to use the same family income threshold for Ohio's educational definition of economically disadvantagement? If so, would it be possible to implement this new standard while allowing all students who are currently counted as economically disadvantaged to continue to be counted since the Medicaid family

income standard for children is higher than the free and reduced lunch standard? Additionally, should this be a Medicaid enrolled standard or a Medicaid eligible standard? Finally, would it be advantageous to separate free and reduced-price lunch eligibility from the identification of economically disadvantaged students for the purposes of DPIA and the Ohio School Report Card?

4. **Question Context:** Ohio's DPIA funding is used to provide a relatively short list of supplemental educational services. These funds are shaped by state policy intent, but there is significant local discretion as to how the funds are allocated. In fact, this discretion exceeds the flexibility allowed by the federal Title 1 program and, in so doing, allows local school districts to provide supplemental services as part of their broader educational model. At a practical level, this often means that the services (such as counselors, tutors, extended learning time, etc..) are made available to all students who need them and not just those who are economically disadvantaged.

   Question Set #4: Should some or all of Ohio's DPIA resources be earmarked exclusively for supplemental services provided to economically disadvantaged students or a sub-set thereof? If so, why? If not, why not and does a significant part of the answer relate to the likely fact that what is good educationally and programmatically for economically disadvantaged students is good for all students with additional needs because there is growing evidence that these services help all students succeed both personally and academically? Also, is serving students in a socio-economically integrated educational setting the most equitable and effective model for educational success? If so, is this a legitimate argument in favor of the current DPIA allocation model?

   Additionally, to what extent do individual school districts receive sufficient state funds to meet the state's staffing standards, such as for school nurses or counselors, as they relate to both meeting relevant state regulatory standards and to the provision of supplemental services for economically disadvantaged students?

5. **Question Context:** Accurate and effective evaluations of student achievement (and related costs) can do much to inform academic and related budgetary judgments. This work involves identifying and measuring the right set of educational and financial metrics and using them to help answer complex questions regarding program impact and cost.

   Question Set #5: How should the state and school districts improve the efficacy of the DPIA program through a better, clearer understanding of the program's educational results and associated costs? What educational and budgetary metrics would help advance this work and how can these metrics better reveal progress gaps and measure current results, including the benefits that accrue to students who are not economically disadvantaged, but are in classrooms with students who are?

6. **Question Context:** Ohio has a new school funding system that is being phased-in over a six-year period. However, the DPIA component of the formula was not an

equal part of the initial phase-in in the current FY 22-23 biennium. This is primarily because state policymakers observed that there is a historically large amount of *one-time* federal stimulus funding being allocated to Ohio school districts to help them address the economic, health and educational challenges associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. A significant portion of these funds is being used by school district to help provide supplemental services to economically disadvantaged students. In fact, without these funds school districts would very likely not be able to provide all of the supplemental services they are currently providing. This was made plainly visible in each of the three case studies. *The studies revealed that each district is spending substantially more on supplemental services for economically disadvantaged students than it is receiving in combined federal Title 1 and DPIA funding.*

Question Set #6: With referenced one-time federal funds substantially coming to an end before the close of the FY 24-25 state biennium, does it make sense for Ohio to bring DPIA funding in line with the phase-in of the remainder of the state funding formula during this biennium? Does this make sense even if the formula phase-in is paused for the FY 2024-2025 biennium? If the answer is yes, is an important part of the rationale related to the reality that most school districts are not receiving in combined Title 1 and DPIA funds sufficient to pay for the costs directly associated with providing supplemental services to economically disadvantaged students?

Additionally, how and when should other potential changes in funding for supplemental services for economically disadvantaged be phased-in? For instance, what type of transition should take place relative to the possibility of basing economic disadvantage on Medicaid eligibility or enrollment?

VII. Conclusion

This analysis serves as the foundation and essential first stage of a comprehensive study of the costs of providing supplemental services to economically disadvantaged primary and secondary education students in Ohio.

This population of students, which includes nearly one out of every two public school students, needs supplemental services in order to succeed educationally. These complimentary and additive services, which include both educational and health-related support services, have been identified in detail. Importantly, they are well-aligned with mainstream standards used in the vast majority of states; and they are grounded in evaluative research and educational experience and are thus consistent with best practice standards. The clarity of this picture has been improved considerably by the three case studies (one rural, one suburban and one urban) provided in this report. However, this work needs to be completed through a comprehensive cost study that includes case studies involving representative examples of all eight typologies of Ohio school districts, as well as by other outreach efforts to school districts. Clearly, without a full understanding of what is entailed in providing supplemental services at the school building level, and in the complete array of school district typologies, it is not possible to determine with accuracy all instructional and related operational costs.

The contours of a comprehensive cost study can be informed by the report's factual and analytical insights and by the policy implications questions. These questions will be especially helpful with regard to the complex task of further quantifying the cost of distinct yet often interrelated supplemental services. They will also be helpful in better understanding the reality that while supplemental services are designed to assist low-income students, the information that emerged from the case studies suggests that the benefits of this approach accrue to both economically disadvantaged students and, importantly, to their non-economically disadvantaged peers. Districts appropriately provide services to students based on needs not on labels. Just because you are a low-income student does not automatically mean that you need additional services, and just because you are a higher income student does not mean that you do not need additional support.

Focusing on fundamentals, the analysis also sheds penetrating light on a critical question regarding how economic disadvantagement is defined and whether the current approach could be strengthened in both its policy rationale and implementation by uniformly using the Ohio Medicaid income eligibility standard for children (0-18), which is 206% of the federal poverty level. If this shift took place, no student who is currently eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch would be made ineligible for this important benefit.

Finally, the data presented in Tables 6-11 above provides each school district's best attempt to detail the cost of providing supplemental services to economically disadvantaged students in the three case study school districts. This data also identifies total state funds allocated to Disadvantaged Pupil Impact Aid (DPIA) and total Title 1 federal funds allocated to Ohio. The latter is important to understand because supplemental services for economically disadvantaged students are paid for in significant, albeit insufficient, part by this major federal program. This insufficiency helps explain why DPIA is an essential state companion program. This reality is made more tangible by the case studies, which identify the essential elements of how Ohio funds specific supplemental services for economically disadvantaged students and how these funds are allocated at the school district level.

What is left to be done is to fill-out fully this initial fiscal picture. In part, this can be accomplished with a comprehensive cost study which will provide more detailed analysis regarding both the programmatic and related cost side of this complex educational equation – a process that will lead to answering key questions related to the full cost of providing supplemental services to economically disadvantaged students in Ohio.