



# **Presentation to the Task Force for Special Education Cost Drivers and Innovative Approaches to Services**

October 2017

# General

---

- At the request of the Governor, the Commissioner established a workgroup within the Department of Education to identify and provide recommendations on special education cost drivers.
- The work is on-going.
- Today, we will provide an update on the work of that group and other work at the Department.

# DOE Workgroup on Special Education Costs

---

## Members

Suzan Beaudoin	Deputy Commissioner
Ann Belanger	RSU 54 – Director
Janice Breton	State Director Special Services
Robert Hasson	Commissioner
Amy Johnson	Maine Education Policy Research Institute (MEPRI)
Jason Libby	Office of Policy Management – Management Analyst
David Silvernail	Founder and Former Director of Center for Education Policy, Applied Research and Evaluation
Jennifer Tarr	Director of Special Projects

# What is the problem?

---

- Despite an overall decrease in the number of Maine resident students, there has been an increase in the number of resident special education students.

Between 2011 and 2016, the number of Maine resident students decreased by 6810 (3.6%), but the number of resident special education students increased by 881 (3%).

- Expenditure for special education is increasing by a greater percentage than regular education.

There was a 10.5% increase in regular education from FY2009-2010 to FY 2014-2015, but a 15.5% increase in special education during that same time.

# What has the workgroup looked at – Identification Rates

---

How does Maine's identification rates compare to national identification rates?

Percent Total Student Enrollment Identified  
by Special Education Disabilities: National 2013-14<sup>1</sup> Data and 2015-16 Maine Data<sup>2</sup>

Type of Disability	National %	Maine %
Autism	1.1	1.6
Deafness	NA	NA
Developmentally Delayed	0.8	>0.1
Emotional Disability	0.7	1.2
Intellectual Disability	0.9	>0.1
Multiple Disabilities	0.3	1.7
Orthopedic Impairment	0.1	>0.1
Other Health Impairment	1.6	3.5
Specific Learning Disability	4.5	5.1
Speech/Language Impairment	2.7	2.9
Traumatic Brain Injury	0.1	>0.1
Visual Impairment	0.1	>0.1

<sup>1</sup>U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2016)

<sup>2</sup>Maine Department of Education

# What has the workgroup looked at – State Comparisons

---

As a first step, the workgroup made an initial attempt to identify a set of states that might be used in conducting comparisons and analyses of special education programs. Several factors were used in identifying comparison states.

As may be seen from the data included in the table, identifying comparison states is not as straightforward as one might expect. Different states become candidates as comparison states depending upon the factors used in the comparisons.

Based on the data in the table, and at first blush, possible comparison states might be: (1) Idaho; (2) Montana; (3) Oregon; and (4) South Dakota.

# Potential Comparison of States for Special Education

State	State Population (million)	Pop. Density	% Poverty Household	School Enroll	% Special Education	Spec. Ed Model
Arizona	6.6	56.9	18.2	1,122,600	11.8	Multi. Weights
Arkansas	2.9	58.3	18.7	486,300	13.3	Student Ct
Colorado	5.2	<b>50.8</b>	12.1	880,700	10.4	Student Ct
Idaho	<b>1.6</b>	19.5	<b>14.8</b>	292,500	9.3	Census-based
Iowa	3.0	<b>55.3</b>	12.3	499,400	12.9	Mult. Weights
Kansas	2.9	<b>35.4</b>	<b>13.5</b>	490,200	13.8	Single Weight
Maine	<b>1.3</b>	<b>43.1</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>185,900</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>Multi. Weights</b>
Montana	<b>1.0</b>	7.0	<b>15.2</b>	<b>144,300</b>	11.4	Ave. Enroll Ct
N. Hamp.	<b>1.3</b>	142.8	9.2	<b>182,700</b>	15.6	Single Weight
Oklahoma	3.8	56.1	16.6	1,704,200	15.1	Multi. Weights
Oregon	3.9	<b>40.9</b>	16.4	572,500	13.9	Single Weight
S. Dakota	0.8	11.1	<b>14.1</b>	<b>129,300</b>	14.1	\$ per Student Ct
W. Virginia	<b>1.8</b>	79.1	18.3	275,400	15.8	Student Ct.

# District Comparisons

SAUs with Similar Size and FRL %, but Different % Special Education Identification Rates:

	Pupils	FRL %	Spec. Ct	Spec %	County
SAU 1	2468	57.21	397	16.09	Cumberland
SAU 2	2439	65.35	586	24.03	Oxford
SAU 3	1960	34.64	316	16.12	Kennebec
SAU 4	1912	33.37	395	20.66	Cumberland
SAU 5	1227	51.34	253	20.62	Penobscot
SAU 6	1227	54.69	202	16.46	Androscoggin
SAU 7	1040	52.21	110	10.58	Penobscot
SAU 8	1039	51.97	217	20.89	Hancock
SAU 9	909	68.21	171	18.81	Penobscot
SAU 10	906	61.59	121	13.36	Penobscot



# District Comparisons

SAUs with Similar Size and FRL %, but Different % Special Education Identification Rates continued:

	Pupils	FRL %	Spec. Ct	Spec %	County
SAU 11	571	61.12	140	24.52	Washington
SAU 12	565	55.75	73	12.92	Oxford
SAU 13	389	47.81	71	18.25	Penobscot
SAU 14	349	49.57	94	26.93	Aroostook
SAU 15	172	46.51	35	20.35	Hancock
SAU 16	171	46.20	26	15.20	Piscataquis
SAU 17	148	58.78	19	12.84	Somerset
SAU 18	147	56.46	26	17.69	Washington
SAU 19	91	31.87	14	15.38	Lincoln
SAU 20	90	33.33	8	8.89	Washington

# District Comparisons

SAUs with Similar Size and Special Education % but Different Expenditure Levels

Name	Pupils	FRL %	Sped Ct	Sped %	Expenditures	County
SAU A	3053	38.45	545	17.85	\$8,393,816	Cumberland
SAU B	2998	32.89	536	17.88	\$6,222,664	York
SAU C	2416	52.57	474	19.62	\$5,382,196	York
SAU D	2408	37.62	421	17.48	\$6,800,917	Sagadahoc
SAU E	2098	60.20	386	18.40	\$4,270,349	Kennebec
SAU F	2097	58.18	392	18.69	\$3,734,088	Somerset
SAU G	1087	48.94	172	15.82	\$1,914,038	Kennebec
SAU H	1063	28.88	149	14.02	\$2,790,788	York

# District Comparisons

SAUs with Similar Size and Special Education % but Different Expenditure Levels continued

Name	Pupils	FRL%	Sped Ct	Sped%	Expenditures	County
SAU I	612	24.51	129	21.08	\$2,295,985	Penobscot
SAU J	608	66.78	121	19.90	\$1,467,289	Aroostook
SAU K	475	46.11	100	21.05	\$1,352,336	Lincoln
SAU L	462	64.50	93	20.13	\$668,142	Penobscot
SAU M	392	61.73	76	19.39	\$2,356,350	Washington
SAU N	394	40.86	78	19.80	\$796,206	Aroostook
SAU O	234	28.21	37	15.81	\$689,223	Penobscot
SAU P	232	55.17	39	16.81	\$312,779	Washington
SAU Q	166	34.94	22	13.25	\$390,289	Knox
SAU R	151	59.60	23	15.23	\$111,159	Washington
SAU S	143	28.67	26	18.18	\$679,996	Hancock
SAU T	147	56.46	26	17.69	\$256,481	Washington

# What has the workgroup looked at - District Comparisons

## Pairs of SAUs with Different Expenditure Levels: Percents By Category

Name	Regular Classrm	Resource Room	Self-Contain	Home/Hospital	Admin	Extend School	Other
SAU A*	10.1%^	28.9%	27.6%	0.0%	9.0%	0.0%	24.4%
SAU B	8.0%	24.9%	27.5%	0.0%	14.6%	1.7%	23.2%
SAU C*	3.6%	10.4%	48.9%^	0.9%	13.9%	0.2%	22.1%
SAU D	0.4%	38.8%	21.2%	0.1%	19.3%	0.5%	19.7%
SAU E*	1.7%	19.1%	51.5%^	0.1%	13.6%	0.0%	14.0%
SAU F	1.3%	30.6%	39.5%	0.1%	15.1%	0.8%	12.6%
SAU G*	2.0%	67.6%^	0.0%	0.3%	16.1%	1.7%	12.3%
SAU H	0.1%	50.6%	23.7%	0.0%	6.7%	0.3%	18.6%
SAU I*	5.2%	31.3%	41.3%^	0.1%	9.4%	1.5%	11.2%
SAU J	18.8%	56.9%	1.9%	0.8%	10.0%	0.5%	11.1%

\*=Higher spending SAU

^=Higher spending Category

# District Comparisons

## Pairs of SAUs with Different Expenditure Levels: Percents By Category - continued

Name	Regular Classrm	Resource Room	Self- Contain	Home/ Hospital	Admin	Extend School	Other
SAU K*	47.9%^	23.6%	5.4%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	16.0%
SAU L	9.8%	38.8%	20.9%	0.0%	8.7%	0.0%	21.5%
SAU M*	48.5%	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	32.4%^	0.5%	5.8%
SAU N	69.2%	40.86	0.0%	0.0%	9.3%	0.0%	21.5%
SAU O*	25.0%^	47.8%	0.0%	0.2%	8.4%	1.2%	17.4%
SAU P	0.0%	55.8%	0.0%	0.2%	18.2%	0.0%	25.8%
SAU Q*	13.0%	76.5%^	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%
SAU R	0.0%	53.0%	28.8%	0.0%	8.5%	0.0%	9.7%
SAU S*	0.0%	63.6%^	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	1.2%	27.5%
SAU T	60.0%	16.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	16.3%

\*=Higher spending SAU

^=Higher spending Category

# What has the workgroup looked at – Maine Maintenance of Effort

---

- The cost of the Maine Maintenance of Effort (MMOE) adjustment has increased by 52% in just the last three years (2016-18).
- The number of SAUs receiving the MMOE adjustment has increased from 52.9% in 2006-2007 to 72.7% in 2015-2016.
- The MMOE adjustment as a percentage of Special Education Allocation has increased from 13.67 in 2006-2007 to 29.25 in 2015-2016.
- The average per pupil special education costs are higher in wealthier communities;
- Average per pupil special education MMOE spending in **more wealthy** communities (State subsidy 20% or less) is **30% higher** than the state average MMOE...while the per pupil MMOE spending in **less wealthy** communities (State subsidy between 61-80%) is **30% lower** than the state average MMOE.
- Consequently, in terms of MMOE, wealthier communities are spending approximately twice as much per pupil special education as less wealthy communities.

# What has the workgroup looked at – Maine Maintenance of Effort

State Subsidy Share	No. of SAUs	Average Per Spec. Ed Pupil MMOE	Total Amount of MMOE
Less than 20%	50	\$6051	\$29,118,642
21-40%	23	\$5012	\$22,890,844
41-60%	48	\$4317	\$53,635,501
61-80%	42	\$3202	\$33,055,029
81-100%	1	\$2906	\$139,474
<b>State Average</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>\$4653</b>	<b>\$138,839,490</b>

# Maintenance of Effort

---

- Federal maintenance of effort requirements
  - Hinders the adoption of efficiencies.
- Origins of Maine maintenance of effort in state subsidy formula
- It is a cost driven adjustment



# Other Possible Contributors

---

- Higher incidence of autism
- Socioeconomics
- Newborns-higher rates of survival
- Due process policies (e.g. mediation less costly)
- Related Services
- Substance abuse
- Transportation
- Societal Expectations
- Litigious society - \$30,000
- Least restrictive environment can be costly
- Inexperienced special education director/no director

# MDOE

## Steps Towards Cost Reductions

---

- Enhanced Technical Assistance to SAUs
- Establishing teams with experts to work with SAUs
- Autism
- Early intervention (ESDM)
- MAIER (Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research)
- Efforts to reduce costly out of state placements
- Maine Educational Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing
- Action Plans
- Annual IDEA Part B applications
- Encourage regionalization