

Texas Commission on Special Education Funding

WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

DRAFT – AUGUST 10, 2022

Non-Formula Based Funding Recommendations

Evaluation Cost Offset: Costs vary significantly for evaluations based on the individual student.

Fund LEAs to recover some costs by reimbursing at some fixed amount per evaluation:

\$250 per Evaluation = \$25M Annual Statewide Cost; \$500 per Evaluation = \$50M Annual Statewide Cost; \$1,000 per Evaluation = \$100M Annual Statewide Cost

Stipends/increased funding for SPED Educators (*Cost TBD*)

Stipend per sped teacher role type; could be one-time or recurring, could be based on career stage (prep, years of service)

Subsidy for SpEd Certification (*Cost TBD*)

Subsidy for candidates become sped certified

Non-Formula Based Funding Recommendations

SSES Funding Increase Option (Cost = \$100M to cover current waitlist and \$45M annual cost for continued one-time funding)

Provide increased funding support to cover growth of the Texas SSES program

Grants to Non-Profits (could be parent directed or state-directed) (*Cost TBD*)

Provide grant opportunity for Non-Profit organizations that are serving SPED s AMCIntedertisDi

Non-Formula Based Funding Recommendations – Non-Publics, Residential, and Day Placements

Capacity improvements for In-District Programming for Day Placements (*Cost TBD – Possible amounts range from \$2M to \$10M annually*)

TEA would provide seed funding to create permanent capacity increases in day treatment program placements across the state of Texas. A \$4M grant would seed approximately 8-10 program start-up grants.

Use funding to incentivize capacity increases for locally based programs that keep students in their communities.

Cost Regulation for Residential Facility (*Cost TBD - \$150K - \$300K (???) for Agency Admin to monitor costs*)

Require rate reviews/approval by TEA (or HHSC)

Per-diem rates for nonpublic facilities (Similar to Illinois), HHSC set a flat rate of \$179.50 for room and board

Cost Transparency (*\$0 Cost*)

Require facilities to publish tuition rates annually in order to decrease inconsistencies in pricing

TEA only has monitoring authority. Statutory change would be needed in order to implement this recommendation.

Build Statewide Capacity (*\$0 Cost*)

Change current statute requiring that LEAs have an executed contract prior starting approval process.

Work with existing HHSC facilities that could possibly do this work (SSLCs for example)

Formula Based Funding Recommendations

Transportation *(See below for options)*

Increase the Transportation Mileage Rate Increase from \$1.08 to \$1.29 = \$5M; \$1.08 to \$1.35 = \$10M; \$1.08 to \$1.42 = \$15M

Intensity Based Service Formula *(Cost – TBD)*

See following pages for detailed options

Weighted Funding Tier Descriptors

Weighted Funding Tier One. Students in this tier receive resource room type services in one or two of the four main content areas.

Additional Service Funding Groups Descriptors

Weighted Funding Tiers Example

Seven weighted tiers using *weights applied to the adjusted basic allotment* and *special education student average daily attendance*.

	<u>Regular Program ADA Offset Ratio</u>
Tier 1 – Weight TBD (est. 26% of special education ADA in tier)	2/6
Tier 2 – Weight TBD (est. 30% of special education ADA in tier)	0
Tier 3 – Weight TBD (est. 12% of special education ADA in tier)	4/6
Tier 4 – Weight TBD (est. 18% of special education ADA in tier)	0
Tier 5 – Weight TBD (est. 9.0% of special education ADA in tier)	5/6
Tier 6 – Weight TBD (est. 4.5% of special education ADA in tier)	6/6
Tier 7 – Weight TBD (est. 0.5% of special education ADA in tier)	6/6

Estimated **\$100M increase per year**

(Regular Program ADA Offset Ratio) SPED FTE formulas would no longer be used. But given MFS constraints, a similar mechanism would be retained. To facilitate simplicity, a common ADA reduction factor will be applied per student given the students tier – eliminating the need to report contact hours (and eliminating the FTE system), while avoiding MFS issues

All of the above recommendations have additional downstream impacts to tier two, recapture, and formula transition grant, etc.

Transition Timeline – To Begin SY 23-24

TEA does not currently collect the data that would be necessary in order to implement a model such as this. Therefore, it would be necessary to enact legislation establishing a transition plan, to allow for initial data collection, then to transition to funding based on the new tiering model after data has begun to be received.

Year One – TEA stands up the necessary data collection system and LEAs submit the data points necessary for the new funding model. Funding based on the existing system.

Year Two – LEAs continue to submit all required data points and are funded on a combination of the existing system and the proposed system. TEA adjusts weights and dollar amounts to constrain spending to \$100M* above spending associated with prior law².

Year Three - LEAs continue to submit all required data points and are funded on a combination of the existing system and the proposed system. TEA adjusts weights and dollar amounts to constrain spending to \$100M* above spending associated with prior law². **Legislature has the opportunity to evaluate and adjust.**

Year Four - LEAs submit only data required for the new system and are funded on only the new system. TEA adjusts weights and dollar amounts to constrain spending to \$100M above spending associated with prior law² **unless legislature has taken action to increase/decrease the weights.**

² Baseline would be adjusted for population growth.

* Target amount dependent on desired increase total statewide spending in sped, to be considered alongside other commission recommendations.

Appendix

CCMR Outcomes Bonus

For the purposes of

CCMR Outcomes Bonus Funding

Funding Amounts			
	School Year 2019-2020	School Year 2020-2021	School Year 2021-22 (Preliminary)
Economically Disadvantaged	\$107,015,000	\$108,715,000	\$114,355,000
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	\$131,469,000	\$105,885,000	\$137,493,000
Special Education	\$1,738,000	\$1,762,000	\$1,730,000
Statewide	\$240,222,000	\$216,362,000	\$253,578,000

The background of the slide is an aerial photograph of a city. In the foreground, a wide river flows through a lush green area with many trees. In the middle ground, a city skyline is visible, featuring several tall buildings and a bridge. The sky is a clear, bright blue. A large, semi-transparent blue banner is overlaid on the middle of the image, containing the title text in white.

Examples of Full Individual and Initial Evaluations (FIEs) Based on Different Student Needs

Evaluations must be sufficiently comprehensive to identify all the child's special education and related service needs

The child is assessed in all areas of suspected disability, including, if appropriate,



Assessment includes gathering and reporting data from a variety of sources

Criterion-Referenced

- STAAR/STAAR Alt 2
- TELPAS/TELPAS-Alt/IPT
- SAT/ACT
- Brigance
- Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)
- Advanced Placement Tests
- Universal Screener (e.g., TPRI, i-Station/ISIP, AIMSWeb, MAP)





Areas of Assessment	Evaluator(s) with Expertise in Area of Disability	Suspected Disability	Areas of Concern

Areas of Assessment	Evaluator(s) with Expertise in Area of Disability	Suspected Disability	Areas of Concern	Additional Components
Communication	Speech Language Pathologist (SLP)	Speech or language impairment (SI)	Language/swallowing	Medical swallow study
Health, including hearing, vision, motor abilities	Licensed Medical Practitioner Licensed ophthalmologist or optometrist Occupational Therapist (OT) Physical Therapist (PT) Certified orientation & mobility specialist (COMS)	Other Health Impairment (OHI) for cerebral palsy Visual impairment (VI) Related service for occupational therapy Physical therapy	Medical Vision Fine motor/feeding Gross motor/walking Orientation & mobility Gmime ay	
				G5isuetdmrie for

