

# Working Group 4

## More Resources for At-risk Students

Joy Schaefer (Moderator)

Buzzy Hettleman

Richard Madaleno

Maggie McIntosh

Morgan Showalter

Alonzo Washington

### Policy Area:

**System that Ensures At-risk Students are Successful** that supports these students and their families as soon as they arrive at school with both academic supports and extensive case management to address social, physical, mental, and family needs to enable success at school.

### General Notes:

1. Edits that were suggested by a group are included and the group who made the suggestion is noted
2. Items for the full commission include setting the per pupil base amount, determining the at-risk proxy (including discussion of direct certification or CEP, etc.), and setting the tipping point for concentration of poverty
3. Setting the “tipping point” for the concentration of poverty factor will be determined after the full commission recommends an at-risk proxy. The work of WG4 thus far will be very informative in setting that tipping point. Several organizations have advocated for using direct certification with a multiplier and to include participation in other social services programs which staff are investigating.

<p><b>Element Detail 4a:</b> Add a <b>concentrated poverty weight</b> to the funding formula to support intensive services for students and their families to enable them to succeed in school, that are coordinated and able to meet the additional needs of students in schools located in distressed communities. Add <b>funding amounts</b> for schools with concentrated poverty to establish community schools to provide wrap-around services and provide health and behavioral health services.</p>	
---	--

<p><b>Design Assumptions:</b></p>	
<p>1. Maryland provides substantial funding for at-risk students through its foundation and compensatory education funding formula which many schools utilize to provide wrap-around services to students in need of additional supports. However, top performing systems around the world provide additional funds to provide a greater degree of additional services for those students that are at the highest risk of not succeeding in school.</p>	
<p>2. Additional funding for schools with concentrated poverty will allow Maryland to provide funds to schools with high levels of poverty to enhance or establish programs and services to support the needs of students in those schools. The funding would be comprised of a fixed amount and a per pupil amount.</p>	<p>2. <i>In order to provide adequate wrap-around services and academics, fixed amount and PPA must be higher. Staffing ratios must include add'l counselors, psychologists, transportation, restorative practice coaches, attendance staff, family engagement support, support for families (housing, mental health) [ACLU; BCPS]</i></p> <p><i>Consider a student to staff ratio of 1:20 for a mentoring program (coaching, substance abuse, employment, teen parenting). [ACLU]</i></p>
<p>3. This additional funding would be available to every school in which at least X% of students qualify for free and reduced price meals. <b>[But each school would have to submit an implementation plan based on an assessment of need.]</b></p>	<p>3. ...to every school in which 50% of students qualify for free <del>and reduced-price</del> meals...[ACLU, BCPS] [...] move to Implementation 1a.</p>

<p>4. A fixed amount would be provided for each school in which at least X% of students are eligible for free or reduced price meals. This fixed funding would be used to hire a community schools coordinator and a health services practitioner. In addition to the fixed amount of funding would be an amount per student enrolled at the school. This per pupil funding (in combination with the compensatory education funding formula) could be used to provide programs and services. This would include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. additional extended learning time including before and after school;</li> <li>b. safe transportation to school;</li> <li>c. vision and dental screening;</li> <li>d. additional social workers;</li> <li>e. physical and behavioral health and wellness including providing food for in-school and out-of-school time and linkages to community providers;</li> <li>f. family and community engagement and supports including informing parents of academic course offerings, opportunities for children and social services</li> <li>g. linkages to Judy Centers that feed into the school;</li> <li>h. student enrichment experiences;</li> <li>i. improving student attendance; <del>and</del></li> <li>j. improving the learning environment at the school; <del>and</del></li> <li>k.</li> </ul>	<p>4. A fixed amount... in which at least 50% of students qualify for free <del>and reduced price</del> meals. [ACLU; BCPS] This fixed funding would be <del>used to hire</del> <b>provided at a level to allow for</b> [BCPS] a community schools coordinator and a health services practitioner. In addition to the fixed amount of funding would be an amount per <b>every</b> student [BCPS] enrolled at the school, <b>provided on a sliding scale beginning with partial funding at 50% students who qualify for Free Lunch, escalating to the full amount of funding at 75% students who qualify for Free Lunch.</b> [ACLU, BCPS]</p> <p><i>Clarification requested: could LEAs/Schools delegate these positions' responsibilities (coordinator and practitioner) to existing staff?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. after school...<b>extended school year, and summer learning;</b> [ACLU]</li> <li>c. vision and dental <del>screenings</del> <b>care services;</b> [ACLU; Let Them See Clearly]</li> <li>f. ...for children, and <b>available</b> social services; [PSSAM] <i>family engagement should include but not be limited to: training families to monitor child's learning, school's academic performance, school spending; training families to use wrap around services; school evaluation of the impact of family engagement on the learning process [Mr. Sabater]</i></li> <li>k. <b>enhanced academic, counseling supports for students and training, support and professional development for teachers and staff.</b> [general comment regarding training and counseling from Decoding Dyslexia and ACLU]</li> </ul>
<p><b>Implementation Considerations:</b></p>	
<p>1. Implementation plans should include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A community based needs assessment process that is conducted in partnership with a local capacity building organization to develop an implementation strategy for addressing the needs of the students and their families and building on and strengthening community resources near the school;</li> <li>b. Ensuring that an experienced and</li> </ul>	<p>1. <del>But</del> <b>For Community Schools, each school/LEA would have to submit, as part of its Master Plan, an implementation plan based on an assessment of need.] School or district level</b> <del>Implementation plans should....</del> [BCPS]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. ...process that <del>is</del> <b>may be</b> conducted in partnership with a local capacity building organization.... [BCPS; define "local capacity building org" PSSAM]</li> <li>b. ... schools coordinator at <b>the appropriate administrative a vice principal level</b> is hired; [PSSAM]</li> </ul>

<p>qualified community schools coordinator at a vice principal level is hired;</p> <p>c. Inclusion of community partners in geographic proximity to the school who can assist in meeting the needs identified;</p> <p>d. Ensuring that time is made available to train staff on the support offered, identifying the need for supports and how to engage with the community school coordinator in engaging with these supports; and</p> <p>e. Development of strategies to maximize external non-State or local education funding.</p>	<p>c. Inclusion, <i>if possible and practicable</i>, of community partners in geographic proximity.... [PSSAM; BCPS]</p>
<p>2. Local school systems must demonstrate that funds provided under the weight are being provided to the schools in which the weight is applicable and are being used for the purpose of implementing the plans.</p>	
<p>3. Local governments would be expected to demonstrate support through meaningful partnership and support that is supplemental to and does not supplant existing efforts.</p>	<p>3. <i>As written, does this imply a mandate for expanded local funding (mandated increase to MoE)?</i> [PSSAM]</p>
<p>4. Partner agencies such as local management boards should participate at the State level and provide necessary funding and support to enable local agencies to participate as partnering organizations.</p>	
<p>5. Accountability should focus on indicators that include, but are not limited to: successful implementation of the plan, number of students served and not served, time to receive services, attendance, enrichment opportunities, reduction in disciplinary Actions, student and principal satisfaction, and meaningful family involvement.</p>	<p>5. Accountability measures should [PSSAM; BCPS] focus on....meaningful family involvement. <i>It is important that accountability measures and data points be clearly defined, and, so as not to be meaningful to school systems, developed locally/ in partnership with LEAs. Further, care should be taken to make "like schools" comparisons in order to take into consideration the many complexities at individual schools and/or LEAs.</i> [BCPS]</p>
<p>6. Every year districts will be required to report on their program including progress on indicators. The full commission should include this element in their discussions of accountability and governance including whether there should be consequences and</p>	<p>6. Reporting requirements is a governance and accountability issue. <del>Every year districts will be required to report on their program including progress on indicators.</del> The full commission should include ... accountability and governance <del>including whether there should be consequences and what those consequences should be if progress is not being made.</del> [PSSAM]</p>

<p>what those consequences should be if progress is not being made.</p>	<p><i>Additional staffing, and therefore funding, may be required to meet reporting requirements. [BCPS; PSSAM]</i></p>
<p>7. Schools with a lower poverty threshold could still provide wrap-around services, organize a community school, and/or provide health and behavioral health services using their compensatory education funding</p>	
	<p><i>Categorical funding is extremely limited and does not allow for the diversity of students and student needs across the State; it prohibits LEAs from using funds as necessary to meet legal obligations or to meet the needs of students. [BCPS]</i></p> <p><i>Consider explicit recommendations for policies, staffing, accountability to address racial disparities. [ACLU, Strong Schools]</i></p> <p><b><u>For School-Based Health Centers:</u></b></p> <p><i>Consider addition of a stand-alone assumption and/or consideration re: SBHCs as providers of access to health care in low income communities, as partners with school health staff and provides access to Medicaid and private insurance health reimbursement. [MoCo DHHS]</i></p> <p><i>Stand alone recommendation supporting SBHCs for all schools/funding availability for SBHCs for meeting concentration of poverty criteria, not limited for placement within a Community School. [Del. Cullison, MoCo DHHS]</i></p> <p><i>Consider funding alignment to/based on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>elements of need/successful programming which will be identified by Council of Advancement of SBHCs; [Del. Cullison; MoCo DHHS]</i></li> <li>• <i>(solely on) meeting MSDE eligibility criteria/standards. [MoCo DHHS, Del. Cullison; Choptank Community Health]</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Ensure it is clear that SBHCs can be established regardless "Community School" status. [MASBHC, JHU, MoCo DHHS]</i></p>
<p><b>Element Detail 4b (referred to full commission):</b> Train school staff in all schools to recognize mental health issues as well as other issues related to trauma and coordinate access to needed mental health and other services for students, as part of effort to increase school safety (see SB 1265 – signed into law as Chapter 30)</p>	<p><i>ACES an important focus/training need to meet student needs. [MSEA]</i></p> <p><i>Concerned with reliance on using teachers/staff in providing mental health related services. [PSSAM]</i></p>
<p><b>Element Detail 4c: Revise funding formula weight for special education students.</b></p>	<p><i>With regards to the recommended 2.18 weight, consideration for a weight to provide the equivalent of \$28K PPA for each student with a disability. [Parent Advocacy Consortia (PAC)]</i></p>
<p><b>Design Assumptions:</b></p>	
<p>1. State and federal law require school systems to identify, locate, and evaluate all students who</p>	

<p>have or are suspected of having disabilities and in need of special education and related services.</p>	
<p>2. To ensure students are not misidentified as being disabled, the law defines a list of eligible disabilities and students must meet one of those criteria.</p>	<p>2. ...eligible disabilities, and students <del>must</del> are supposed to meet one of those criteria. [Hettleman]</p>
<p>3. The timeline for identifying, locating, and evaluating students for special education and related services is established in State and federal law and regulation. Parental consent is required for students to be evaluated. An Individualized Education Plan (IEP) must be developed within 30 days of the date a student is identified as a student with a disability.</p>	<p>3. ...with a disability that will enable them to achieve at certain performance levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. For students on a diploma program, adequate special education provides IEP services that enable achievement of grade-level standards in foundation skills (reading, writing, math) and core content courses; if students are below grade level in foundational skills, to narrow the gap between their enrolled grade level and their performance level in the foundational skills.</li> <li>b. For students on an Alternate Assessment (Certificate) program, adequate special education provides IEP services that enable them to achieve, taking into account the severity of individual disabilities, "the highest achievement possible."</li> </ul> <p>[Hettleman]</p>
<p>4. HB1415 was enacted in the 2018 session and it required MSDE, in consultation with DBM and DLS, to contract for an independent study to evaluate funding methodologies used nationally and internationally and make recommendations regarding the appropriate level of funding for special education students in Maryland.</p>	
<p>5. Differentiated weights are preferred in principle, but APA proposed a blended weight. It is anticipated that the special education study required by HB 1415 will propose differentiated weights. In the meantime, the Commission will propose a single placeholder weight.</p>	
<p>6. To provide special education resources, local school systems spend more than the current funding formula provides.</p>	
<p>7. Total State and local expenditures on special education equaled \$1.567 billion in fiscal 2015. Of this, the State provided \$272 million, or 17.3% of the total. Thus the local funding accounted for the remaining \$1.296 billion.</p>	
<p>8. A weight of 2.18 is recommended as the "stop-gap" weight until the completion of the special education study required by HB1415 and until any recommendations of the study are implemented in law. This weight is calculated based on the fiscal 2015 foundation per pupil</p>	<p>8. <i>Concern the increase of 195% funding is unrealistic and will affect LEA's MoE requirement.</i> [PSSAM]</p>

<p>base of \$6,860. For context, the weight in current law is 0.74. The weight will be recalculated once the Commission determines a new foundation base such that an equivalent amount of State funds are generated as the weight of 2.18 would generate.</p>	
<p>9. The result of this stop gap weight is that State funding, in fiscal 2015 dollars, increases by 195% from \$272 million to \$800 million. This increases the State proportion of expenditures from 17% to 51%.</p>	<p>9. Consider whether the additional funding allows for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced training for instruction/instructors</li> <li>• Additional personnel (SPED teachers, psychologists, SLPs, etc.</li> <li>• Parent/family engagement</li> </ul> <p>[Decoding Dyslexia]</p>
<p><b>Implementation Considerations:</b></p>	
<p>1. Because a special education study required by HB 1415 is due by December 2019, the new weight may be revised again in response to the study recommendations. It is anticipated that the placeholder weight recommended by the Commission may be in place for up to 3 years while the completed study is being reviewed and incorporated into State law.</p>	
<p>2. Although school districts will have discretion in repurposing approximately \$529 million in local funds, they are encouraged to reinvest a portion back into special education as appropriate to provide a robust level of services to meet the needs of the special education students.</p>	
	<p>Consider adding an Implementation Consideration reflecting the connection between a substantial number of students identified that have difficulties in reading and the connection to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs for resources and funding for additional screening;</li> <li>• Improved teacher preparation, training and PD;</li> <li>• Additional training in specific disability identification, awareness and response.</li> </ul> <p>[Decoding Dyslexia]</p> <p>Consider what effect recommendations and expanded funding will have on MoE requirements. [PSSAM]</p>
<p><b>Element Detail 4d:</b> Revise funding formula weight for <b>English Learner</b> students.</p>	
<p><b>Design Assumptions:</b></p>	
<p>1. The Commission’s preliminary report recommends increasing support for at-risk students, including special education, low-income, and EL</p>	

<p>2. Because most of EL students also qualify for compensatory education funding, the compensatory education weight will provide for academic and social/emotional supports. Therefore, the EL weight as recommended by APA is only reflective of resources needed to specifically support language acquisition.</p>	<p>2. ...the EL weight should be increased to allow for the provision of <del>provide</del> a family liaison or services specific to supporting families and connecting home to school. [PSSAM]</p>
<p>3. In addition to what APA recommended, the EL weight should be increased to provide a family liaison. The services that a family liaison would provide or coordinate could include: translation services for communication between school personnel and parents through a bilingual liaison, cultural competency training for school personnel, other family support and family engagement, and referrals to outside resources that a school may not be able to directly provide. A school can determine what services would best meet the needs of their students.</p>	
<p>4. EL teachers must have specialized training, proficiency in the other language(s), and cultural competency.</p>	
<p><b>Implementation considerations:</b></p>	
<p>1. The workgroup is concerned that changes at the federal level relating to immigration status of documented and undocumented students will result in an undercounting of students for compensatory education purposes. It may be necessary to adjust the EL weight to ensure that students who would otherwise qualify for compensatory education would receive the resources they need to be successful.</p>	<p>1. ...need to be successful. It will be important to establish methods to identify low income immigrant students. [PSSAM]</p>



