

"...will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools throughout the state..."

# Basket of Essential Learning Resources for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

October 26, 1999  
Columbus, Ohio



“The general assembly shall make such provisions by taxation or otherwise, as, ... will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools throughout the state.”

Article VI, Section 2 – Ohio Constitution

# STEERING COMMITTEE

Larry Miller, Chairperson	William L. Phillis, Executive Director	Max Maley, Fiscal Agent	Richard Fisher, Recording Secretary
Brian Adams, Budget Director Columbus City Schools	Clark E. Davis, Superintendent Fairfield Union Local Schools	Gary Keller, Ret. Superintendent Sandusky County ESC*	Pamela Nickell, Dir. of Special Programs Greenfield Exempted Village Schools John Thomas, Superintendent Delaware City Schools
Glenn Alexander, Ret. Superintendent Clermont County Schools*	Joseph DeRose, Superintendent EHOVE JVSD*	Michael Kinneer, Superintendent Lima City Schools	Jai Norment, Executive Director HR Services, Toledo City Schools Marlin Thompson, Ret. Superintendent Darke County ESC*
Jerry Argabrite, Asst. Superintendent Erie-Ottawa County ESC	Dale Dickson, Superintendent Perry-Hocking County ESC	Rod Lane, Superintendent Clinton County MRDD Board	Mark North, Superintendent Southwest Licking Local Schools*
Thomas Ash, Superintendent East Liverpool City Schools	Gary Doberstyn, Superintendent Monroeville Local Schools	David Lanning, Superintendent Southern Local Schools	Conrad Ott, Director Center for Urban Ed. – Univ. of Akron* Patricia Tutoki AFL-CIO*
Carol Austin, Superintendent Guernsey-Monroe-Noble County ESC	Bruce Douglas*	Robert Lantz, Superintendent Montgomery County ESC	Brian O'Mara, Superintendent Central Ohio JVSD Donald Urban, Ret. Superintendent Licking Valley Local Schools*
Pamela Barber, Treasurer Maumee City Schools*	Patrick Drouhard, Superintendent Cardington-Lincoln Local Schools	Tom Lavinder, Superintendent Montpelier Exempted Village Schools	Joan Platz, Legislative Liaison League of Women Voters* William Volosin, Dir. of Admin. Serv. Youngstown City Schools
Charles Barr, Superintendent Groveport Madison Local Schools	Max Evans, Executive Director Coal. of Rural & Appalachian Schools*	George Lawson, Superintendent South Central Ohio ESC*	William Platzer, Ret. Superintendent Scioto County ESC Philip Warner, Superintendent Ravenna City Schools
Carl Berg, Superintendent Miamisburg City Schools	Richard Fisher, Ret. Superintendent Perry-Hocking County ESC	Carmen Lorubio, Superintendent Tri-County JVSD*	Albert Porter, Superintendent Ohio Valley Local Schools Donald Washburn, Director Pilasco-Ross SERRC
G. Ronald Bickert, Superintendent Beavercreek City Schools	Paul Folmer, Ret. Superintendent Union-Scioto Local Schools	Robert Ludwig, Asst. Professor of Ed. Bowling Green State University*	Jack Porter, Superintendent Northern Local Schools Linda Watkins, Superintendent Four County JVSD
Michael Billirakis, President Ohio Education Association	Hugh Garside, Treasurer South-Western City Schools	Max Maley, Treasurer Tri-Valley Local Schools	Thomas Reiser, Ret. Superintendent Scioto County JVSD* Stanley Wernz, Superintendent North College Hill City Schools
Fred Blosser, Superintendent Canton City Schools	Rodney Glover, Adult Director Butler County JVSD*	Barbara Marshall, Superintendent Sandusky County ESC	Eugene Robertson, Superintendent Waverly City Schools* Dean Werstler, Assist. Superintendent Olmsted Falls City Schools
Kevin Bockrath, Superintendent Hicksville Exempted Village Schools	John Gray, Board Member West Clermont Local Schools	Carl Martin, Ret. Superintendent Athens City Schools*	Hayward Richardson, Superintendent Mansfield City Schools Randy Weston AFSCME United*
Richard Bongiorno, Superintendent Stow-Munroe Falls City	Donald Green, Superintendent Tri-Valley Local Schools	Richard Maxwell, Deputy Director Buckeye Assoc. of School Admin.	Thomas Richey, Superintendent Winton Woods City Schools Wayne White, Ret. Superintendent Dawson-Bryant Local Schools*
Donna Boylan, Superintendent East Knox Local	Jake Grooms, Superintendent Adena Local Schools*	Virginia May, Ret. Superintendent Athens-Meigs County ESC*	Thomas Robey, Superintendent Claymont City Schools Robert Whitman, Ret. Superintendent Clermont County ESC*
Ann Brennan, Prof. Relations Mgr. Ohio School Psychologists Assoc.*	Walter Hack, Ret. Professor The Ohio State University*	Nelson McCray, Superintendent Licking County ESC	James Rossler, Treasurer Rossford Exempted Village Schools John Wilhelm, Superintendent Northwest Ohio ESC
Patricia Brenneman, Superintendent Oak Hills Local Schools*	James Hall, Superintendent South Range Local Schools	Jane McGee-Rafal, Superintendent Warren City Schools	Joe Rutherford, Ret. Toledo City Schools* Brian Williams, Superintendent Akron City Schools
Brad Burt Fanning & Howey Architects*	R. Kirk Hamilton, Superintendent South-Western City Schools	Sandra McKinley, Superintendent Belpre City Schools	Dean Sarbaugh, Ret. Superintendent Tri-Valley Local Schools* Rudy Yaksich, Ret. Superintendent Chippewa Local Schools*
Margaret Burley, Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities*	Richard Hart, Ret. Superintendent Allen County ESC	Dennis Meade, Superintendent Minford Local Schools	Stanley Searing, Ret. Superintendent Paulding Exempted Village Schools Forest Yocum, Superintendent Pickerington Local Schools
Charles Buroker, Ret. Superintendent Lima City Schools*	James Hayas, Superintendent Brunswick City Schools	Gary Meier, Superintendent Springboro Community Schools	Ann Sheldon, Advocacy Co-Chair Ohio Assoc. for Gifted Children* Carol Young, Superintendent North Union Local Schools
Larry Busdeker, Superintendent Hancock County ESC	Mary Haynes, Ohio Association of Colleges for Teacher Education	Larry Miller, Superintendent Emeritus Muskingum County ESC	Kathy Slaughter Ohio Coal. for Accountable Schools* Herb Young, Superintendent Morgan Local Schools
Bob Caldwell, Superintendent Wolf Creek Local Schools	Ronald Heitmeyer, Superintendent Kalida Local Schools	Lois Miller Cincinnati Federation of Teachers*	Robert Smith, Assistant Superintendent London City Schools <u>Others:</u>
Michael Carlson, Ret. Superintendent Highland Local Schools*	Susan Hersh, Chairperson Dept. of Ed. – Wilmington College*	Jeffrey Mims, Governmental Relations Dayton City Schools	Rosa Smith, Superintendent Columbus City Schools Kern Alexander, Consultant President, Murray State University
Randy Chamberlain, Superintendent Mohawk Local Schools	Mary Lou Holly, Superintendent Shelby County ESC	John Montgomery, Superintendent Darke County ESC	Ernest Strawser, Treasurer Jackson City Schools John Birath, Jr., Legal Counsel Bricker & Eckler LLP
Michael Charney Cleveland Teachers Union*	Alan Hutchinson, Treasurer Lakota Local Schools	Larry Morgan, Superintendent Stark County ESC	Ronald Stebelton, Executive Director Ohio Assoc. of Elem. School Admin.* Susan Greenberger, Legal Counsel Bricker & Eckler LLP
Craig Closser, Superintendent Jefferson County ESC	William Inman, Ret. Executive Director Coal. of Rural & Appalachian Schools*	Stanley Mounts, Superintendent Keystone Local Schools	Steve Stim, Superintendent Blanchester Local Schools * Russ Harris, Consultant Governmental Services, OEA
John Costanzo, Superintendent Athens-Meigs County ESC	Charles Irish, Superintendent Medina City Schools	Richard Murray, Superintendent West Muskingum Local Schools	David Sturgeon, Superintendent Kenton City Schools Nicholas Pittner, Legal Counsel Bricker & Eckler LLP
Robert Crafton, Superintendent Logan County ESC	Charles Jeffords, Superintendent Jefferson Area Local Schools	Edward Myracle, Superintendent Copley-Fairlawn City Schools	Kenneth Taylor, Ret. Superintendent Mercer County ESC Richard Salmon, Consultant Virginia Tech University
Robert Dalton, Superintendent Clinton-Fayette-Highland County ESC	Steve Johnson, Superintendent Triad Local Schools	Gerald Narcisi, Superintendent Shadyside Local Schools	Robert Theide, Superintendent Marion City Schools Sue W. Yount, Legal Counsel Bricker & Eckler LLP

\*Ex-officio

"The responsibility for maintaining a thorough and efficient school system falls upon the state."

## Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary	<i>What must be available to all students</i>	page 4
	A. Accountability		page 4
	B. Programs, Curriculum and Services		page 5
	C. Delivery System		page 7
II.	Prologue	<i>Fundamental philosophy of public common schools</i>	page 11
III.	Introduction		page 12
IV.	The Framework of the Basket		page 15
	A. The Courts	<i>The Ohio Supreme Court decision</i>	page 15
	B. The Curriculum	<i>Ohio's competency based education program</i>	page 18
	C. Citizens/Educator Opinion	<i>What Ohioans want for school children</i>	page 21
	D. Teacher Opinion	<i>What teachers want for school children</i>	page 23
	E. The Project 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	<i>Searching for the consensus of the education needs of students</i>	page 24
	F. Summary and Recommendations		page 27
V.	References		page 34
VI.	Appendices		page 35
	Appendix A – Basket of Essential Learning Resources Grid		page 35
	Appendix B – Principles of Law		page 43
	Appendix C – Ohio's Model Competency Based Programs		page 46
	Appendix D – Survey Findings from the Town Meetings and Education Congress		page 50
	Appendix E – Findings of the Elementary and Secondary School Teacher Survey		page 54
	Appendix F – Recommendations of the Project 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Conference		page 57
	Appendix G – Current Statutes and Administrative Code		page 61

## **Introduction**

The Basket was developed over several months by experts and educators with serious involvement of thousands of members of the general public. It is compatible with the Coalition's remedy proposal published April 1997 and should be applied in concert with that proposal. The Basket has three separate, equally important and interrelated compartments – accountability; programs, curriculum and services; and delivery systems.

The Basket of Essential Learning Resources contains most of the elements of the Coalition's perception of a thorough and efficient system. Not every detail, such as custodial ratios, related to a thorough and efficient system is identified in the Basket herein presented. Any who attempt to cost out the Basket, which is the next step in devising a constitutional school funding system, must take into consideration those additional details in the context of the entire delivery system. It is envisioned that the State must expand supplemental delivery system strategies in order to implement the Basket in a cost effective manner.

Public education is a dynamic and ever-changing enterprise. The items in the Basket will, of necessity, change over time as social and economic systems require. The State must enact a process to revise and update the Basket on an ongoing basis.

The composition of the Basket corresponds favorably to the opportunities already provided by many Ohio school districts. Hence, students in those districts already have access to opportunities that are included in the Basket. This Basket of Essential Learning Resources must be extended to all school children as the State moves forward to secure a thorough and efficient system.

In the aftermath of *DeRolph*, one finding surpasses all others. The State of Ohio has the primary responsibility for providing a state public school system. Public education in this state is not composed of 611 independent school districts, it is a state system. In the years to come, this "new" state system of public education will define roles for the State Board of Education and the Ohio Department of Education. State education officials will secure state resources to offer a number of statewide services such as information and technology systems, low enrollment programs and courses, and educational intervention programs. State-level initiatives to inventory and align existing educational resources, plan for future system resources, and acquire the means to provide a world-class public education to every child in Ohio should complement the academic and cultural diversity of local school districts.

The overall goal of Ohio's public school system is to graduate all students. The graduates must possess the affective, cognitive and psycho-motor proficiencies to enable them to live satisfactory and rewarding personal lives while contributing effectively and positively to our political democracy and free enterprise economic system. This robust goal cannot be accomplished without the availability of appropriate education resources to all school children.

## **Part A – Accountability**

The Basket of Essential Learning Resources begins with accountability directed on a continuum toward the State of Ohio at one end and students on the other. The accountability component of the Basket includes but is not limited to the following:

The State of Ohio is responsible for:

- ◆ defining the elements of a thorough and efficient system and reviewing those elements on a regular cycle,
- ◆ providing the statutory framework for the organization, administration and control of the public school sys-

tem,

- ◆ establishing clear and measurable goals and performance standards expected of students,
- ◆ identifying the conditions and tools that enable schools to provide every student a reasonable opportunity to achieve expected goals and performance standards,
- ◆ providing sufficient funding to secure the conditions, facilities and tools essential to a thorough and efficient system,
- ◆ establishing assessment programs to measure student performance,
- ◆ providing sufficient funding for those activities of the state education agency that are necessary to ensure that appropriate conditions, facilities and tools are in place at the local level,
- ◆ establishing accountability measures and assessment measures for monitoring performance of students, schools and school districts, and
- ◆ monitoring schools to ensure compliance with state statutes and standards.

Local school boards including administrators, teachers and other school personnel are responsible for:

- ◆ communicating state goals to students, parents and other school patrons,
- ◆ selecting and implementing education programs, curriculum and services that afford every student the opportunities that directly relate to the student outcomes expected, with the goal of promoting and monitoring the classroom use of “best practice” research-based planning and lesson designs and instructional strategies
- ◆ overseeing student assessments and essential intervention and monitoring student progress, with the goal of matching or exceeding state goals and standards,
- ◆ directing public funds toward the conditions, facilities and tools inherent in a thorough and efficient system,
- ◆ directing public funds toward maintaining safe, healthful and educationally adequate facilities,
- ◆ reporting to the district patrons and the State,
- ◆ operating schools in accordance with all statutes and regulations in a cost-effective manner, and
- ◆ fulfilling the educational needs of all students in the best way possible.

Students and parents are responsible for:

- ◆ maintaining regular student attendance,
- ◆ cooperating and communicating with school personnel,
- ◆ using school property carefully and appropriately,
- ◆ completing assignments,
- ◆ participating diligently in all school programming in accordance with personal abilities and needs, and
- ◆ achieving state and local expectations to the best of their ability.

Community organizations, institutions of higher education, unions, business and other school patrons are responsible for:

- ◆ providing moral support,
- ◆ volunteering to assist with a variety of activities,
- ◆ seeking information about the performance of their schools,
- ◆ providing support through business advisory councils and other school and community organizations, and
- ◆ providing support through higher education and public school collaboration in the preparation and professional development of teachers, administrators and other school personnel.

## **Part B – Programs, Curriculum and Services**

State statutes, administrative code and other state directives speak to some of the items in the Basket. The

learning elements required by current statutes and administrative code and other state directives will not necessarily be repeated in the Basket presented in this report. The Basket is not intended to limit school districts which wish to go beyond the basic ingredients in the Basket.

The Basket of Essential Learning Resources includes but is not limited to the following components:

### Primary/Elementary School

- ◆ reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies, art, music and health/physical education in appropriate scope and sequence
- ◆ full-day, every day kindergarten for 5-year-olds
- ◆ pre-school for 4-year-olds optional but funded when offered
- ◆ reading intervention programs
- ◆ proficiency/intervention programs
- ◆ exploratory foreign language programs starting in kindergarten (per state model) including French, German, Spanish and a non-western language
- ◆ services for English as a Second Language students where needed
- ◆ courses focusing on acquiring study skills available
- ◆ accelerated or higher level coursework available where appropriate

### Middle School/Jr. High School

- ◆ reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies, art, music and health/physical education in appropriate scope and sequence
- ◆ proficiency/intervention programs
- ◆ foreign languages available to all students including French, German, Spanish and non-western languages
- ◆ industrial technology and work and family life in middle school
- ◆ required conflict resolution training for all students
- ◆ courses focusing on acquiring study skills available
- ◆ business partnerships available
- ◆ accelerated or higher level coursework available where appropriate
- ◆ staff advisor available

### High School

- ◆ minimum of 72 course offerings\* excluding vocational education (career-technical education)
  - minimum of 20 vocational (career-technical education) courses
  - minimum of three foreign languages each with a minimum of three units of credit
  - minimum of seven mathematics courses\*\*
  - minimum of seven English/language arts courses\*\*
  - minimum of seven science courses\*\*
  - minimum of seven social studies courses\*\*
  - minimum of two health/physical education courses
  - minimum of five business/technology courses
  - minimum of four vocal music courses
  - minimum of four instrumental music courses
  - minimum of three arts courses
  - minimum of two industrial technology courses

\* It should be noted that many school districts will have to provide access to some courses via supplemental delivery system strategies in concert with the State.

\*\* Minimum of four courses of at least one unit of credit required plus one unit of advanced placement credit.

- minimum of four work and family life courses
- minimum of 7 elective courses
- minimum of one advanced placement course in each of the following disciplines: mathematics, social studies, science and English.
- ◆ vocational education (career-technical education) and services for vocational students
- ◆ proficiency intervention programs
- ◆ staff advisor available
- ◆ college and career planning available
- ◆ extended time for field studies in a student's specific area of interest
- ◆ business partnerships available

### District-Wide

- ◆ special programming for all students identified as gifted/talented
- ◆ special education programming and services including extended school year programs as appropriate for all students with disabilities
- ◆ career awareness, orientation and exploration at appropriate grade levels
- ◆ extended school year for intervention and enrichment programs available to students
- ◆ comprehensive co-curricular programs
- ◆ provision for the opportunity for students to participate in community service
- ◆ safe, appropriate transportation for students
- ◆ adequate security for all buildings
- ◆ nutritious, adequate and efficient food service with on-site cafeteria facilities for all buildings
- ◆ home/school liaison resources to assist parents with their responsibilities and to engage other human services agencies and resources to assist parents/families who are seriously at risk
- ◆ parent involvement program designed to enhance home enrichment and support for school curriculum for disadvantaged children
- ◆ comprehensive arts education program
- ◆ services of school psychologists, speech and hearing therapists, librarian/media specialists, guidance counselors, nurses, visiting teachers/attendance personnel, social workers, occupational therapists and physical therapists
- ◆ services of classified personnel
- ◆ services of aides and instructional assistants
- ◆ adequate district-wide leadership and supervision in the areas of finance, facilities, personnel, curriculum and instruction.

Please turn to Appendix A for additional information.

### **Part C – Delivery System**

The current delivery system is comprised of school districts, educational service centers, joint vocational school districts, special education regional resource centers, colleges and universities (post secondary options) and several other state and regional service entities. The programs, curriculum and services that constitute the elements of a thorough and efficient system can be delivered in a variety of ways. Those districts too small to offer the breadth of courses essential to a thorough and efficient system must be provided choices of supplemental delivery system strategies, such as interactive television, electronic resources access via INFOhio, regional curriculum and service offerings, etc.

Competent and appropriately licensed personnel who have access to ongoing professional development oppor-

tunities in sufficient quality and quantity are at the heart of the delivery system. To ensure effectiveness, efficiency and productivity, those personnel must be able to function in educationally adequate buildings with access to appropriate equipment, materials, technology and supplies. The Delivery System component of the Basket of Essential Learning Resources includes but is not limited to the following:

- ◆ 10 days of intensive professional development annually for all professional personnel, appropriate professional development for substitutes and five days of inservice training for classified personnel for the first two years of tenure, with future annual inservice scheduled on an as-needs basis
- ◆ educationally adequate, properly maintained facilities with technology, equipment and laboratories which support the programs, curriculum and services contained in the Basket; the buildings must be designed to promote the concept of the schools as a community center with the capacity to accommodate large gatherings (see page 27)
- ◆ sufficient buses and other vehicles to accommodate the transportation needs of all students,
- ◆ planning times for teacher teams in core classes as well as special areas (such as art, health, PE)
- ◆ instruments for music programs (orchestra/band)
- ◆ provision for one multi-media computer for each five pupils with updating to be done on a five-year cycle
- ◆ provision for appropriate Internet connection (minimum T1) at each school facility including INFOhio connection
- ◆ personnel (**class size and personnel ratios identified below are for regular students and must be modified to accommodate school districts with high rates of poverty and/or student mobility and/or high rates of students with disabilities.**)
  - sufficient regular classroom teachers to allow average class sizes\* of 18-20 in primary grades (preK-3) and average class size of 15 (preK-3) in districts with high poverty rates and/or high student mobility rates, and/or high rates of students with disabilities, 22\*\* in middle/junior high school and 24\*\* in high school
  - sufficient licensed teachers to provide appropriate class time for dance, drama/theater, music and visual arts physical education and technology; in the elementary and middle/junior high schools there should be one specialist teacher in physical education, music and art for every 500 students
  - sufficient special education and vocational education (career-technical education) teachers to meet current state standards and student needs
  - sufficient teachers of gifted and talented to accommodate the needs of all gifted and talented students
  - visiting teacher/attendance personnel for each 2,500 students
  - school psychologist for each 1,250 students
  - speech therapist for each 1,250 students
  - daily library services supervised by a certificated/licensed librarian /media specialist for each school district plus one certificated/licensed specialist for each high school with library/media services, including INFOhio connectivity in all school buildings
  - licensed guidance counselor for each 500 elementary students, for each 400 middle school students and for each 250 high school students
  - licensed nurse for each 1500 students and daily nursing services in every building provided by trained nursing aides
  - aide and instructional assistants as needed
  - at least one technology coordinator per district or building depending on size of district
  - at least one Education Management Information System (EMIS) coordinator for each district
  - sufficient classified personnel to perform required tasks
  - principal/assistant for each 500 students (a principal shall serve no more than two buildings)

\*To compute average class size, only regular teachers and licensed intervention specialists are included. Education service personnel are excluded from the calculation.

\*\*Adjustments must be made for districts with high poverty rates and/or high student mobility rates and/or high rates of students with disabilities.

- social worker for each 2000 students in school districts with high rates of poverty, student mobility or student disability
- ◆ State-funded supplemental delivery system strategies (choices – not mandates)
  - post-secondary options,
  - virtual schools (Internet),
  - distance learning,
  - closed circuit television,
  - independent study and other educational options,
  - cooperative agreements with neighboring districts,
  - state-supported joint centers for special curricular areas, and
  - public television.

Please turn to Appendix A for additional information.

### **Concluding Statement**

Underlying an appropriate program is the identification of the elements which compose a program that is equitable and adequate for every child. There must be a recognition that children differ greatly, and therefore what is appropriate for one child, or a child in a specific situation, is not necessarily appropriate for all children. Differences in circumstances may be equally important to differences in abilities or characteristics. Consequently, an appropriate program must be described in broad terms, and must have enough flexibility to provide for a variety of circumstances and a range of student characteristics.

The program is described in the most comprehensive way. It is an adequate program that consider the needs and interests of a great variety of children. It recognizes that students arrive at school with a wide range of abilities and an equally wide range of experiences which contribute to their readiness and ability to learn. Hence, there is an opportunity for pre-school education for some students as early as age four. This would enable that population to enter kindergarten with the skills in place to benefit from that experience. Full-day kindergarten is the norm for five-year olds. It consists not only of social activities, but developmentally appropriate academic activities to prepare children for development of basic literacy skills.

A primary education (grades preK-3) provides substantial amounts of time for developing skills in reading and language as well as proficiency with quantitative skills. The use of multi-media computers becomes an integral part of the educational experience. Grades 4-5 introduces more specific strategies and materials for science and social studies. Foreign languages are available to children in elementary schools. All students have access to instruction in art, music and physical education provided by specialists licensed in those fields.

Middle schools continue and expand the opportunities provided at the elementary level. In addition to reading and language, mathematics, science, social studies, music, art and physical education, the program is expanded to offer additional foreign languages as well as introduce careers, business and technology. Multi-media computers and related technologies are readily available and integrated into appropriate fields of study.

High schools have a broad range of curricular offerings to accommodate the variety of interests and skills within the student body. This does not imply that every course or offering must be made on site or in traditional classroom settings. For example, the standards for vocational education (career-technical education) adopted thirty years ago required that each student would have access to at least twelve fields. This resulted in the development of joint vocational schools, most of which offered far more than the minimum state require-

ments. The offering of other low-enrollment but essential courses can be accomplished through distance-learning programs or other options based on advances in technology. Students are not prohibited from enrolling in valuable courses simply because there are too few students or inadequate facilities on-site to provide the opportunity. The notion of equity implies that all students have access to appropriate courses regardless of where they attend school.

Each school at every level has provisions for identifying children who have disabilities or handicaps as well as those who are gifted/talented. Special programming and services must be provided to these children.

The goal of the educational program from pre-kindergarten through high school graduation is to enable every child to reach his or her full potential to be a productive and responsible citizen. An appropriate investment at the front end of life is likely to pay huge dividends as well as reduce the number of citizens who require the state's resources in their adult life.

Please turn to Appendix A for additional information.

The single most important function of state government and the local school communities throughout Ohio is the operation of a viable, dynamic, public common school system. Public education must rank as the highest financial priority of government and as the greatest moral commitment of parents and citizens. School Board members and school employees must consider it a privilege to serve and measure up to the public trust inherent in working with the public's funds and children. Political rhetoric extolling the importance and virtue of public education is commonplace, but it is an empty shell without a high priority of financial and moral commitment.

The public common school has been and continues to be our link with political democracy. Thomas Jefferson said that if a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never shall be. Jefferson advocated that an aristocracy of everyone can be achieved through appropriate education. He said that if you deem people insufficiently discrete to govern, do not take away their power, but educate their discretion. America's successful experiment with democracy has been fueled by the public common school system. A fundamental task of public education in a free society is the apprenticeship of liberty and thus the need for a strong public common school system is apparent.

America's public school system has been and continues to be an efficient and effective place where students of diverse racial, ethnic and religious groups from throughout the world can meet on common ground. However, the potential for polarization is ever present. Human association depends on the ability to see others like ourselves, sharing our many similarities and accepting our limited differences. Citizenship in an efficient and effective democracy requires excellence. The democratic faith is rooted in the belief that all humans are capable of excellence. Hence, excellence in public education is imperative to the nurturing of this belief.

Education is the equalizer in our society. Equality is not achieved by restricting the fastest, but by assuring the less advantaged a comparable opportunity. Comparable in this matter does not mean identical. The disadvantaged usually require more assistance to compete. Adequate schooling allows those born disadvantaged to compete with those advantaged. All must be provided excellence in opportunity.

The financial rewards accrued by those in the workforce are directly related to the number of years of formal education attained. The free enterprise economic system tends to benefit the educated more so than those lacking education. Hence, substantive personal benefits accrue from the attainment of appropriate education.

Education is a public good as well as a personal benefit. An appropriate investment in the public common schools is an investment in the public good. The investment, to serve the public good effectively, must be sufficient to offer excellence for all. An inadequate investment in public education thus runs counter to the public good.

Each generation must make a determination of what youth must be taught in order to permit them to successfully matriculate into the social and economic system. It is thus imperative that the accountability measures, resources and delivery systems are in place to accomplish the tasks at hand. The education clause of the Ohio Constitution (Article VI, Section 2), provides the impetus for providing the public education resources and delivery systems that will afford all school children the opportunity for excellence and thus the social climate to accomplish an aristocracy of everyone.

The framers of Ohio's 1851 Constitution were highly displeased with the public education system in place at the time and crafted language designed to compel improvements. Some statements by delegates to the 1850-1851 Constitutional Convention that show their dissatisfaction with schools appear in the proceedings of the Convention as follows:

- ◆ I desire to elevate the scale of common school education to a higher degree than it has ever yet obtained, or is likely to obtain under the present system.
- ◆ Our system of common schools, instead of improving in legislative hands, has been degenerating.
- ◆ It is time that we should take the thing in hand ourselves...let us establish and carry out an efficient system of common school education or abandon the thing entirely to the virtue and intelligence of the people.

The 1850-1851 Constitutional Convention delegates debated the education issue thoughtfully, vigorously and at length. They ultimately agreed upon a rich and powerful education clause that should have quickly moved the legislature to make dramatic improvements. The constitutional language, "The general assembly shall make such provisions, by taxation, or otherwise, as, . . . , will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools throughout the state..." is direct, clear, concise and authoritative. It is clear that public education is a constitutional responsibility of state government. It is likewise clear that the system must be complete, perfect and productive with equal access to all school children.

The 1850-51 Constitutional Convention delegates' vision of a thorough and efficient state system of common schools has not yet been fulfilled. Historically, the State has essentially delegated the funding responsibility to local communities and has never put forth a concerted and sustained effort to delineate and define the elements of a thorough and efficient system. The Supreme Court in *DeRolph* has clarified state responsibility and has ordered the state to completely overhaul the funding system in order to make the public education system whole, i.e. thorough and efficient. It follows then that the State has the responsibility to delineate and define the essential learning resources that comprise a thorough and efficient system of common schools.

The principles of law which have emerged from the court decisions in *DeRolph* will have a substantive impact on the way the State conducts the business of public education in the future. It has been determined that the system is statewide and the State is responsible for securing a high quality education for all school children. A complete listing of the principles of law regarding *DeRolph* are provided in Appendix B.

In the publication – Educational Adequacy: Building an Adequate School Finance System, the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) recommends a five-step process in building an adequate school finance system.

1. State policymakers should provide clear and measurable educational goals or objectives that are expected of students as the basis for the establishment of an adequate school finance system as follows.
2. State policymakers should identify those conditions and tools that enable schools to provide every student a reasonable opportunity to achieve expected educational goals or objectives.
3. State policymakers should ensure that sufficient funding is made available and used to establish and maintain those conditions and tools that have been identified as effective and essential for schools to provide every student a reasonable opportunity to achieve expected educational goals or objectives.
4. State policymakers should identify and provide sufficient funding for those activities of their state education agency that are necessary to support the establishment and maintenance in all schools of the conditions and tools that are identified as effective and essential to student learning.

5. State policymakers should establish a system of accountability measures that will provide them with comprehensive, accurate and timely information concerning the use of all public funds for the public education system, the status in every school of those conditions and tools determined to be effective and essential for student learning, and the performance of students relative to expected educational goals or objectives.

The steps recommended in the NCSL publication are logical. Ohio would be well advised to follow the pattern set forth. However, the State has not thus far approached school funding reform in a sequential and logical manner as recommended by NCSL.

Following the Ohio Supreme Court's decision in *DeRolph v. State*, the Ohio Coalition for Equity & Adequacy of School Funding called upon the State Defendants to identify the elements of a "thorough and efficient system of common schools." The Coalition argued that this was the necessary first step in responding to the Court's order "to create an entirely new school financing system." Unfortunately, the State has not heeded this call. The failure of the State to take this necessary first step prompted the Coalition to undertake a series of actions that involved thousands of Ohio citizens in the effort to identify the resources needed for "thorough and efficient" schools.

An outline of the actions taken by the Coalition follow:

- ◆ In September and October 1998, thousands of Ohioans came together in town meetings to consider the elements of a thorough and efficient system. Discussion leaders equipped with a discussion guide drew meaningful responses from those in attendance.
- ◆ On October 28, 1998, approximately 800 persons came together in an Education Congress to further discuss and refine the elements of a thorough and efficient system.
- ◆ On December 11, 1998, the Coalition held a news conference to unveil the results of the town meetings and Education Congress. The Coalition respectfully challenged state government to accept the elements of a thorough and efficient system as formulated in the town meetings and Education Congress and translate such into a "basket" of specific education resources. State officials were silent on the matter.
- ◆ On January 15, 1999, the Coalition hosted a meeting of education association leaders and Coalition Steering Committee members to formulate a logical procedure for translating the "elements" derived by the Coalition's efforts into a "basket" of specific education resources.
- ◆ The January 15 meeting and several subsequent meetings of various subgroups resulted in the following actions:
  - utilization of opinion poll results from an Ohio University Scripps School of Journalism Poll
  - Teachers' Survey completed by 2,492 elementary and secondary teachers
  - Survey of subject-oriented professional associations
  - May 10 Conference attended by 230 selected educators and other knowledgeable Ohioans
  - Review and analysis of all the results of the survey and meeting by national experts
  - In consultation with various nationally recognized and local experts, the Coalition finalized and adopted the Basket of Essential Learning Resources.

The Basket of Essential Learning Resources was made public during a conference on October 26, 1999 at the

Ohio Theatre in Columbus. The Basket includes sufficient detail to serve as a blueprint for building a school system that meets the thorough and efficient standard.

This report summarizes the results of the Coalition's efforts to date (October 26, 1999). It is divided into six sections. The first section reviews the *DeRolph* decision and highlights the views of the Court with regard to the requirements of the thorough and efficient standard. The second section analyzes the Model Competency-Based Education Programs published by the State Board of Education. Those model programs define the educational outcomes expected of the state's students and schools, while at the same time identifying many of the resources needed to achieve those outcomes. The third section summarizes the results of the survey used during the town meetings and the Education Congress, while the fourth section presents the results of the survey of Ohio's elementary and secondary teachers. Finally, the fifth section summarizes and discusses the recommendations of the participants at the Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference, while the sixth and concluding section presents a series of recommendations regarding the resources needed for a "thorough and efficient system of common schools."

To facilitate comparison, the report groups the various findings and recommendations in each section under a set of eight general resource categories. Any categorization of the educational resources that constitute a "thorough and efficient system" is somewhat arbitrary. However, the resource categories used here were derived from the materials reviewed and do not represent the totality of the Basket of Essential Learning Resources that the Coalition adopted. The general resource categories used throughout this report are:

- ◆ Safe, educationally-appropriate facilities
- ◆ Appropriate, up-to-date materials, equipment and technology
- ◆ Quality instructional programs with well-integrated assessments and interventions
- ◆ Comprehensive support services for all students, including special needs students
- ◆ Comprehensive extra-curricular programs
- ◆ District-wide services, including transportation and food services
- ◆ On-going, meaningful in-service programs for teaching and non-teaching staff
- ◆ Sufficient numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff

This report is intended to help all Ohioans understand what is involved in the constitutional mandate of a thorough and efficient system and to help state government come to grips with perfecting a thorough and efficient system of common schools throughout the state.

## A. The Courts: *DeRolph v. State*

On March 24, 1997 the Ohio Supreme Court ruled that the state's school funding system was unconstitutional. Specifically, the court found that "Ohio's elementary and secondary public school financing system violates Section 2, Article VI of the Ohio Constitution, which mandates a thorough and efficient system of common schools throughout the state."

In reaching this historic decision, the Court was guided by the legal history and meaning of the phrase "thorough and efficient." As part of the preceding trial court decision, Judge Linton Lewis included statements by delegates to the 1851 State Constitutional Convention indicating that "thorough" meant "complete, absolute and exact" while "efficient" meant "effective and working well." Consistent with these meanings, the Ohio Supreme Court in *Miller v. Korns* (1923) had declared: "A thorough system cannot mean one in which part or any number of the school districts of the state were starved for funds. An efficient system could not mean one in which part or any number of the school districts of the state lacked teachers, buildings, or equipment." Later, in *Cincinnati School Dist. Bd. of Edn. v. Walter* (1979) the Court cited *Miller* and added that a school district was not thorough and efficient if it "was receiving so little local and state revenue that the students were effectively being deprived of educational opportunity." Additionally, as part of the *DeRolph* decision the Court cited with approval the testimony of Dr. Samuel Kern Alexander. According to Dr. Alexander, the historical development of the phrase "thorough and efficient" implies that "it is the state's duty to provide a system which allows its citizens to fully develop their human potential." Based upon these prior decisions and testimony, the Court ruled that the constitutional mandate of a "thorough and efficient" system of common schools is not fulfilled by simply making public education available to all students. The quality of the system must also ensure that all students have the opportunity to achieve their potential.

In reviewing the facts presented by the plaintiffs, the Court found "exhaustive evidence ... that the appellant school districts were starved for funds, lacked teachers, buildings, and equipment, and had inferior educational programs, and that their pupils were being deprived of educational opportunity." By citing specific examples of inadequate funding, the Court identified many of the essential elements of a thorough and efficient system of common schools. Specifically, the Court stated that:

- ◆ **State funding cannot be considered adequate if school districts lack the funds needed "to provide their students a safe and healthy learning environment."** (p. 208) The Court noted that the 1990 Ohio Public School Facility Survey found that it would take \$10.2 billion in facility repair and construction just to bring all school buildings into compliance with existing codes and regulations. In its decision, the Court also recounted incidents in which the health and safety of students was threatened by the condition of the building in which they were being educated, as well as testimony about the lack of classroom space, the absence of facilities such as lunchrooms, and the failure to make school buildings handicapped accessible. In ordering the General Assembly to remedy these conditions, the Court stated that "[a] thorough and efficient system of common schools includes facilities in good repair and the supplies, materials, and funds necessary to maintain these facilities in a safe manner, in compliance with all local, state, and federal mandates." (p. 213)
- ◆ **"A system without basic instructional materials and supplies can hardly constitute a thorough and efficient system of common schools..."** (p. 208) Yet some appellant districts lacked the funds to purchase textbooks or everyday supplies such as paper, chalk, art supplies, paper clips, and even toilet paper.
- ◆ **"None of the appellant school districts is financially able to keep up with the technological training needs of the students in the districts."** These districts lack sufficient computers, computer labs, hands-on

computer training, software and related supplies to serve students' needs. As a result, "it does not appear likely that children in these districts will be able to compete in the job market against students with sufficient technological training." (p. 209)

- ◆ **"The curricula in the appellant districts are severely limited compared to other districts and compared to what might be expected of a system designed to educate Ohio's youth and to prepare them for a bright and prosperous future."** (p. 208) In one school district the elementary school students have no opportunity to take foreign language, computer, music or art classes (other than band), the junior high students have no science lab, and that there is no honors program or advanced placement courses. Other districts report similarly limited curricula.
- ◆ **"Lack of sufficient funding can also lead to poor academic performance."** Nearly one third of the high school seniors in an appellant district had not passed all parts of the ninth grade proficiency test and could not meet basic graduation requirements, yet the district did not have enough money to pay tutors to assist these students. The inability of the appellant districts to fund the interventions needed to improve student performance provided "further evidence that these schools lack sufficient funds with which to educate their students." (p. 209)
- ◆ **Many school districts "lack sufficient funds to comply with the state law requiring a district-wide average of no more than 25 students for each classroom teacher."** In fact, many schools have more than 30 students per classroom teacher, and one school had a sixth grade class with 39 students. As the Court notes, "it is virtually impossible for students to receive an adequate education with a student-teacher ratio of this magnitude." (p. 208)

Table 1 summarizes the Court's statements about "deteriorating buildings, insufficient supplies, inadequate curricula and technology, and large student-teacher ratios." It shows how these statements correspond to the categories used here to identify the resources schools need to provide educational opportunity.

**Table 1: Elements of a Thorough and Efficient System of Common Schools Identified by the Ohio Supreme Court in *DeRolph v. State***

<u>School Resource Categories:</u>	<u>State Funding Cannot Be Considered Adequate If:</u>
1) Safe, educationally-appropriate facilities	School "districts lack sufficient funds to provide their students a safe and healthy learning environment."
2) Appropriate, up-to-date materials equipment, and technology	School districts are "without basic instructional materials and supplies." Districts are unable "to keep up with the technological training needs of the students..."
3) Quality instructional programs with well-integrated assessments and interventions	"The curricula ... are severely limited compared to other districts and compared to what might be expected of a system to educate Ohio's youth and to prepare them for a bright and prosperous future." "Lack of sufficient funding can also lead to poor academic performance" (due to inability of districts to intervene and assist students who are not acquiring needed skills).

**-Table 1 Continued-**

School Resource Categories:

State Funding Cannot Be Considered Adequate If:

- 4) Comprehensive support services for all students, including special needs students
- 5) Comprehensive extra-curricular programs
- 6) District-wide services, including transportation and food services for all students who need them
- 7) On-going, meaningful in-service programs for teaching and non-teaching staff
- 8) Sufficient numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff

School districts “lack sufficient funds to comply with the state law requiring a district-wide average of no more than 25 students for each classroom teacher.”

The Court based its conclusion that the General Assembly had “failed in its constitutional obligation to ensure a thorough and efficient system of common schools” upon more than the evidence of insufficient resources. It also found that the school finance system itself was the root cause of inadequate funding. According to the testimony of school finance experts, the amount of aid provided through the state's foundation plan is largely determined by political and budgetary considerations and "has no real relation to what it actually costs to educate a pupil." In addition, the separate appropriations for categorical programs such as vocational education, special education, and transportation do not adjust for the relative wealth of the receiving district.

The inadequacy and inequity of the school funding system were made worse by legislative provisions designed to reduce the local tax levy. These provisions prevented the revenues obtained through the local property tax from rising due to reappraisal. By preventing school funding though the local property tax from rising as the assessed value of taxable property rises, these tax reduction measures created the phenomenon of “phantom revenues.” Phantom revenues refer to a situation where schools districts do not receive additional funding as local property values rise, yet they receive a reduced amount of state aid under the foundation formula precisely because the total value of taxable property has increased.

Faced with a state funding system that is inadequate and inequitable and a tax system that prevents the local property tax levy from increasing with inflation in local property values, schools districts that cannot meet their budget are forced to borrow. Through the state’s spending reserve loan program, school districts can borrow against a subsequent year’s revenue. If the amount available under this program proves insufficient, they must seek commercial loans or submit a plan for cutting their budget and reducing school operations. The court found that these loan programs simply "disguise" the failure of the state to provide its schools with sufficient funds.

In conclusion, the *DeRolph* decision rejected the claim that wide disparities in school revenues are caused by

the failure of poorer districts to pass local tax levies. The Court concluded that poor districts simply cannot raise as much money as wealthier districts even with identical tax effort, and that as a consequence of inadequate funding many school districts are unable to ensure educational opportunity to their students. To remedy this situation, several legislative provisions were declared unconstitutional. These provisions authorized the School Foundation Program, the granting of borrowing authority to school districts, the emergency school assistance loan program, and the Classroom Facilities Act to the extent that it provides insufficient funding for the construction and maintenance of public school buildings. In place of these legislative provisions, the Court called upon the General Assembly to "create an entirely new financing system."

The legislative enactments since March 24, 1997, have adjusted the school funding and accountability policies but have not corrected the fundamental systematic problems in the system. Therefore, the flaws the Ohio Supreme Court found with the system continue.

## **B. The Curriculum: Ohio's Model Competency-Based Education Programs**

Ohio has responded to the public demand for higher academic standards and increased accountability by requiring competency-based education programs. In 1983, the State Board of Education required competency-based education (CBE) in English composition, mathematics, and reading, and the 118<sup>th</sup> General Assembly subsequently enacted legislation requiring all school districts to implement CBE programs in those curricula for grades one through twelve. The requirements of competency-based education were later extended to science and social studies (i.e., citizenship). To aid districts in developing these programs, the Ohio Department of Education was required to prepare model programs for each discipline. (CBE models have also been developed for foreign language and the comprehensive arts).

According to the state Department of Education, a major objective of competency-based education is to guarantee a better correspondence between the written curriculum and the curriculum as it is taught and assessed. Each model program therefore includes both instructional and performance objectives at each grade level, a program of periodic assessment of student progress toward achieving the specified performance objectives, and a program of intervention services for those who are not making satisfactory progress in achieving these objectives. CBE programs thus integrate the specific instructional and performance goals of different disciplines with a program of assessments and intervention services designed to ensure every student the opportunity to achieve the prescribed learning objectives. The CBE models have also been used by the Ohio Department of Education to develop competencies that are assessed on Ohio's proficiency tests, which play an important role in accountability.

### **Component Elements of CBE Programs**

Both the instructional and the performance objectives of CBE programs are organized around conceptual dimensions or "strands" that represent the essential competencies developed within each discipline. Performance objectives "represent the essential rather than the minimal knowledge and skills necessary for learners" and are generated from the grade-level instructional objectives in the model. Periodic assessments, including ongoing classroom assessments and annual district-wide grade-level assessments, measure progress toward achieving the specified performance objectives. All districts are required to administer annual district-wide assessments in grades one through eight and to report the results of these assessments, as well as final grades for students in grades nine through twelve, to the State Board of Education. These large-scale assessments are intended to facilitate informed decisions about curricular programs, while decisions about students and the need for intervention services are best made through assessment strategies at the classroom level. Although districts may

adopt different assessment procedures, they are required to develop written guidelines specifying how they use assessment data for instruction, evaluation and intervention purposes.

CBE programs also include intervention services, especially for those who are not progressing satisfactorily toward the performance objectives. These interventions consist of alternative or supplemental actions designed to reinforce, support or extend student learning and are necessarily tied to assessment. Interventions occur at three successive levels – the classroom, the school building, and the district, but the primary responsibility for intervention rests with the teacher. It is the classroom teacher who must determine when intervention is necessary and how appropriate instruction will be carried out. Needless-to-say, CBE programs place heavy demands upon both the skills and the time of teachers. The model program guidelines developed by the Ohio Department of Education specify that teachers “must be able to use content material, instruct for specific skills and knowledge, and group students for special needs... The ability to understand and use various diagnostic instruments, analyze assessment data, and teach prescriptively are essential elements of effective intervention.” Teachers must also have the time to focus upon and attend to individual students when needed.

Interventions can occur at three successive levels -- the classroom, the school building, and the districts. When classroom interventions are not sufficient, alternatives must be provided at the building level. These alternatives may include interclass grouping, the creation of a resource or intervention room, tutorial programs, and a formal intervention assistance team. Recent legislation requires districts to provide summer intervention related to performance on Ohio proficiency tests, which are widely used to fulfill CBE assessment requirements at those grade levels at which they are administered. Finally, at the district level interventions that may be needed include individualized summer school programs, before- and after-school programs, or remedial academic courses at the secondary level. CBE programs thus represent much more than a set of curriculum guidelines. Their successful implementation requires a well-integrated program of instruction, assessment, and intervention and imposes heavy demands upon school districts and their instructional and support staff.

**Table 2: Elements of a Thorough and Efficient System of Common Schools  
As Evidenced by Ohio's Model Competency-Based Education Programs**

School Resource Categories:

- 1) Safe, educationally-appropriate facilities
- 2) Appropriate, up-to-date materials equipment, and technology
- 3) Quality instructional programs with well-integrated assessments and interventions

Competency-Based Education Programs Require:

- Computer and science labs, a library/media center, art studios and music rooms
- Sufficient classroom space for group work
- Storage space for equipment and materials
- Building space for intervention and reading/writing centers
- Sufficient quantities of material and equipment available to be integrated into classroom instruction (Appendix C lists specific resource items needed for each program)
- On-going classroom assessments and annual district-wide assessments of student progress toward performance objectives

**-Table 2 Continued-**

School Resource Categories:

Competency-Based Education Programs Require:

Intervention services at classroom, building (interclass groupings, tutorial programs, formal intervention assistance teams), and district (summer school, before- and after-school programs, remedial academic courses) levels

4) Comprehensive support services for all students, including special needs students

Remedial and special education specialists, guidance counselors, social workers, school psychologists, and tutors to oversee and participate in student assessment and remediation programs.

5) Comprehensive extra-curricular programs

6) District-wide services, including transportation and food services for all students who need them

7) On-going, meaningful in-service programs for teaching and non-teaching staff

Professional development programs that prepare teachers to utilize and introduce students to new educational technologies; to use effective instruction, assessment, and intervention strategies in classroom; and to plan and coordinate these activities with other staff

8) Sufficient numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff

Smaller class sizes, especially at lower grade levels where early assessment and intervention is crucial to later success of many students  
Teaching loads that enable teachers to focus efforts on individual students when necessary

**Summary**

Table 2 summarizes the general resource needs entailed by CBE programs. (A more detailed description of the general resources needed to implement CBE programs as well as a partial listing of the specific equipment and expenditure items included in the model program guidelines is presented in Appendix C.) By requiring the State Board of Education to develop model programs for different disciplines and by requiring each district to implement CBE programs based upon these models, the General Assembly gave its imprimatur to a statewide system of integrated instruction, assessment, and intervention programs. The resources needed to achieve the curricular objectives and to provide the assessment and intervention services required by CBE programs constitute some of the essential elements of a “thorough and efficient system of common schools.” In requiring Ohio’s school districts to implement these programs, the General Assembly has at least acknowledged that it has a constitutional responsibility to ensure that all districts have the resources needed to implement the programs effectively. However, the legislature has not promulgated a comprehensive plan to secure a thorough and efficient system.

**C. Citizens/Educator Opinion: Town Meetings and the Education Congress**

To involve Ohio citizens and educators in the effort to define a “thorough and efficient system of common schools,” the Coalition urged school districts and organizations to conduct town meetings throughout the state. During September and October of 1998, over 100 town meetings were held and specifically reported to the Coalition, and an estimated 200 additional meetings were held and not specifically reported. In addition, on October 28, 1998, the Coalition hosted a statewide Education Congress in which approximately 800 people participated. Through these town meetings and the Education Congress, tens of thousands of Ohio citizens were able to express their views regarding the condition of local schools and what they consider essential to the improvement of those schools.

The participants at the town meetings and Education Congress were asked to complete a survey form developed by the Coalition. These survey forms asked participants in the town meetings to evaluate their school districts by assigning letter grades in eight areas of school operation and financing and then rating the importance of each area as “essential,” “somewhat essential,” or “not essential.” In addition, the survey asked respondents to indicate their agreement or disagreement with statements regarding five other areas of school operation and to respond “yes” or “no” to questions on two remaining school issues. Over 1400 survey forms, most representing the consensus of a group of people, were filled out at the town meetings and returned to the Coalition. The participants at the Education Congress were asked the same questions, but were not asked to assign letter grades on various areas of school operation to individual districts.

**Table 3: Elements of a Thorough and Efficient System of Common Schools Identified by Participants in Town Meetings and the Education Congress**

<u>School Resource Categories:</u>	<u>Participants’ Assessment of Ohio School Districts:</u>
1) Safe, educationally-appropriate facilities	Average grade “C” (9.7% assigned grade of “F”)
2) Appropriate, up-to-date materials equipment, and technology	a) Technology – Average grade “C” (10.2% “F”) b) Textbooks, materials & supplies – Average grade “C” (6.9% “F”)
3) Quality instructional programs with well-integrated assessments and interventions	a) Regular education – Average grade “C” (10.3% “F”) b) Vocational education – Average grade “C+” (3.5% “F”) c) Arts education – Average grade “D” (13% “F”) d) Kindergarten & preschool – Large majority want full-day, everyday kindergarten and public preschool programs for all children e) Expanded days of instruction – Divided opinion regarding need for additional days of instruction, but large majority want summer school programs f) Academic accountability – Large majority feel state-mandated tests do not provide enough accountability or reward good performance
4) Comprehensive support services for all students, including special education	a) Special education – Average grade “C” (8.7% “F”)

**-Table 3 Continued-**

School Resource Categories:

needs students

Participants' Assessment of Ohio School Districts:

- b) Gifted education – Average grade “D” (14.1% “F”)
- c) At-risk students – Large majority support additional programs for students in high poverty areas

5) Comprehensive extra-curricular programs

6) District-wide services, including transportation and food services for all students who need them

7) On-going, meaningful in-service programs for teaching and non-teaching staff

Large majority support additional training and preparation time for teachers (and training for non-teaching staff) if it does not reduce instruction time

8) Sufficient numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff

Table 3 summarizes the survey findings from the town meetings and the Education Congress. (A detailed description of the survey results is presented in Appendix D). It is clear from the survey that Ohio citizens place a high value upon most school resources and programs. At the same time, their assessments indicate that the educational resources available in many Ohio school districts are insufficient and that the programs offered are widely regarded as mediocre. In many areas of school operation, a sizable minority of citizens gave their schools an “F.” The variability of the ratings, as well as the low average assessment is cause for concern. It supports the findings of the Court that many schools have “deteriorating buildings, insufficient supplies, inadequate curricula and technology, and large student-teacher ratios.” More specifically:

- ◆ Ohio’s citizens expect schools to provide students with sufficient and up-to-date materials, equipment and technology, yet a majority of the town meeting participants gave their districts a “C” or worse in rating the availability of these educational resources.
- ◆ A majority of respondents evaluate the quality of the instructional programs in their districts as no more than mediocre (i.e., “C”). Dissatisfaction was most frequently expressed with regard to gifted education and arts education programs, but regular educational programs were also judged negatively by many citizens.
- ◆ The surveys revealed widespread support for expanding several areas of school operation. The vast majority of participants want the public schools to offer full-day kindergarten and preschool programming to all children. Attitudes regarding the desirability of lengthening the school year are mixed, but large majorities want expanded summer school programs.
- ◆ Most of the citizens participating in these forums recognize that the cost of educating students is higher in high poverty areas, and they agree that additional state aid and programming is needed in these areas. Schools should not be expected to overcome the disadvantages of concentrated poverty without additional resources.
- ◆ Most participants want the schools to take a more active role in the on-going training of teachers and other school employees, as long as that training does not reduce the time available for instruction.

Finally, many participants do not understand the complexities of Ohio’s school finance system. However, a

large majority is dissatisfied with the current funding system and supports greater funding through state revenues as opposed to the local property tax.

#### D. Teacher Opinion: The Elementary and Secondary School Teacher Survey

No group has a clearer view of the condition of Ohio’s public schools than its teachers. Teachers are, therefore, in a good position to identify the resources that schools need. The Coalition undertook a survey of Ohio’s public school teachers as part of its effort to identify the essential elements of a “thorough and efficient system of common schools.” Questionnaires were developed for both elementary and secondary teachers and distributed in various geographic regions of the state by superintendents, the Ohio Education Association, and the Ohio Federation of Teachers. A total of 2,492 completed surveys were returned, 1,344 from elementary school teachers and 1,148 from secondary school teachers. Although the survey did not follow a random sampling procedure, the districts surveyed represented a broad and representative cross-section of the state.

**Table 4: Elements of a Thorough and Efficient System of Common Schools Identified by Ohio’s Elementary and Secondary School Teachers**

<u>School Resource Categories:</u>	<u>Teachers’ Assessment of School Resource Needs:</u>
1) Safe, educationally-appropriate facilities	Majority report that classroom space is adequate, but comments indicate that many schools are overcrowded and in poor condition
2) Appropriate, up-to-date materials equipment, and technology	Most have access to standard equipment but report that number of computers is insufficient, and many lack basic supplies and equipment
3) Quality instructional programs with well-integrated assessments and interventions	Most have adopted state’s model curriculum, but report that many schools do not provide courses or services and activities essential to CBE programs Most feel that students need additional remediation and contact time with teachers and that system of proficiency tests does not contribute to learning Most feel that length of school day/year is sufficient  Majority of elementary teachers want additional planning time
4) Comprehensive support services for all students, including special needs students	Between a quarter and a half report that their schools do not provide needed support services or offer gifted and speech & hearing programs
5) Comprehensive extra-curricular programs	Elementary teachers feel additional activities are needed, while secondary teachers feel extra-curricular programs are sufficient
6) District-wide services, including transportation and food services for all students who need them	Most report that transportation and food services for students are adequate

**-Table 4 Continued-**

School Resource Categories:

Teachers' Assessment of School Resource Needs:

7) On-going, meaningful in-service programs for teaching and non-teaching staff

Most report that professional development opportunities are adequate, but comments show that many programs are not relevant and do not provide training in instructional use of computers

8) Sufficient numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff

Most feel that class sizes should be considerably smaller to provide a quality education

Table 4 summarizes the resource needs identified in the survey of Ohio's elementary and secondary teachers. (Appendix E presents a detailed summary of the survey results.) The views of Ohio's teachers conform in many respects to the judgment of the Court in the *DeRolph* decision and to the assessment of the citizen participants in the town meetings and Education Congress. Ohio's schools are, on average, average. Most teachers report that they have access to standard classroom supplies and equipment, and a majority feel that classroom space, opportunities for professional development, and the support, transportation, and food services offered to students are adequate. But the fact that a large percentage of teachers report that these basic resources are not adequate highlights the diversity, and inequity, of educational opportunity throughout the state. Many schools lack the resources needed to meet even minimal educational standards.

Apart from the diversity and inequity of educational opportunity throughout the state, the survey points to a number of general failings:

- ◆ Many teachers report that basic supplies and equipment are not available as needed, and some have felt compelled to spend their own money on these items. And most teachers report that the number of computers available for instructional purposes is not sufficient.
- ◆ The vast majority of teachers report that they follow the curricular standards specified in the state's model CBE programs, but a majority also point out that their schools cannot afford many of the services and activities that are essential to those programs. In particular, more than 70 percent of those surveyed feel that students need more remedial assistance and more one-on-one contact time with teachers. And fewer than three out of ten agreed that the system of proficiency tests supports classroom learning.
- ◆ Between a quarter and a half of elementary and secondary teachers report that their students do not have adequate access to school counselors, school psychologists, nurses, and speech and hearing specialists. Approximately half report that students lack access to enrichment programs for the gifted and talented.
- ◆ Four out of five of the elementary school teachers feel that the extra-curricular activities available to their students are not sufficient.
- ◆ Over half of the elementary teachers report that they do not have sufficient planning time during the school day, and many teachers at both levels complain that professional development programs are not relevant and do not provide sufficient technical training.
- ◆ Finally, a majority of teachers feel that the number of students in their classes is too large and exceeds the class sizes required for a quality education.

**E. The Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference**

The Coalition's effort to identify the essential elements of a "thorough and efficient system of common schools" culminated in the Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference held on May 10, 1999. Participants in the conference included prominent school administrators, teachers, and school board members, business leaders, local and state government officials, and representatives from educational and professional associations. Not all par-

ticipants were professional educators, but every effort was made to include community leaders and representatives with well-informed views on the problems facing Ohio’s public schools.

Building upon the foundation of the town meetings, the Education Congress, and the survey of elementary and secondary teachers, the task of the conference was to develop a public school model with the educational resources needed to meet the thorough and efficient standard. Conference participants were provided beforehand with a great deal of background information to aid them in this task. They were also provided beforehand with a draft of the conference agenda and the discussion guide that would guide their deliberations. The discussion guide included specific questions on a wide variety of educational resources. During the conference, the participants were divided into nine groups, each with a facilitator and recorder, and asked to reach consensus on as many of the resource items in the discussion guide as possible.

The discussion groups were not able to reach consensus on all of the educational resources included in the model school program. All of the participants were well-informed about public school issues, and many were professionally involved in educational associations. However, they did not share the same views regarding the resources needed for a model school program. Many participants also felt that they lacked the information or expertise needed to recommend specific staff-student ratios. Nonetheless, there was widespread agreement on most of the resources needed to meet the thorough and efficient standard.

**Table 5: Elements of a Thorough and Efficient System of Common Schools Recommended by Participants at the Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference**

<u>School Resource Categories:</u>	<u>Resources Needed for Model School Program:</u>
1) Safe, educationally-appropriate facilities	
2) Appropriate, up-to-date materials equipment, and technology	
3) Quality instructional programs with well-integrated assessments and interventions	Most groups agree on need for instructional support personnel, including elementary art, physical education, and music teachers, substitutes, visiting teachers, librarians, technology coordinators, and curriculum development personnel, but not on student-personnel ratios. Most groups agree that high schools should offer AP courses and three or more languages, that foreign languages be offered in grades 4-8, that summer school, career education, and pre-school programs be offered, that the length of the school day/year be increased, and that alternatives to proficiency tests be found.
4) Comprehensive support services for all students, including special needs students	Most groups agree on need for guidance counselors at ratio of 300:1, school psychologists at ratio of 1000:1, and full-time principal for buildings

**-Table 5 Continued-**

<u>School Resource Categories:</u>	<u>Resources Needed for Model School Program:</u>
------------------------------------	---

with 15 full-time teachers. Most also agree on need for nurses, social workers, speech and hearing therapists, occupational and physical therapists, and secretaries, but not on ratios. Most agree that compensatory programming be available for districts serving at-risk pupils

5) Comprehensive extra-curricular programs

6) District-wide services, including transportation and food services

7) On-going, meaningful in-service programs for teaching and non-teaching staff

Most agree that professional development be available for all teachers, but do not agree on number of days or need for in-service training for non-teaching staff

8) Sufficient numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff

Most agree on class size of 15 for primary grades and 17 for grades 4-6. Recommendations for higher grades are less consistent but most are below current standard of 25 students per teacher

Table 5 summarizes the recommendations of the participants at the Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference. (Appendix F describes these recommendations in detail). As this summary table shows, the conference produced a series of recommendations for the staff and the instructional and support services essential to a model school program. In most cases, the groups were not able to agree upon the specific number of support staff needed (i.e., the staff-student ratios). Nonetheless, a majority of the groups were able to reach consensus on the need for a number of staff and program resources that may or may not be currently available in many Ohio school districts. In particular:

- ◆ All groups agreed that a thorough and efficient system of schools must have elementary art, physical education, and music teachers, (groups were not asked about the need for drama and dance teachers) and a majority of the groups agreed upon the need for qualified instructional support personnel, including substitute and visiting teachers, librarians, technology coordinators, and curriculum development specialists.
- ◆ There was agreement that a thorough and efficient system of schools must have both diversity and depth in its course offerings. All groups felt that high schools must be able to offer advanced placement courses in core subjects. Most also agreed that high schools should offer classes in three or more languages, that foreign language instruction should be extended to intermediate grades, and that students at all grade levels should be provided with career education.
- ◆ Most groups agreed that the thorough and efficient standard means that schools must offer remediation and enrichment programs during the summer and preschool programs for 4-year olds. Most supported lengthening the school day and year.
- ◆ Most groups felt that Ohio's proficiency tests did not aid the learning process and should not be the main indicator of how well a school district is performing.
- ◆ A majority of the groups agreed that a thorough and efficient system must provide students with the services of guidance counselors, nurses, school psychologists, social workers, speech and hearing specialists, and occupational and physical therapists, as needed.

- ◆ Most of the groups agreed that compensatory programs are needed in districts with high concentrations of at-risk students.
- ◆ All groups agreed that professional development opportunities must be provided teaching staff, and most felt that non-teaching staff should be provided in-service training.
- ◆ Finally, the Conference participants clearly agreed that smaller class sizes, especially during the earlier grades, are essential to a thorough and efficient system of schools. Not all groups agreed upon the exact class size that is appropriate for different grade levels, but there was consistent agreement that the current state standard of 25 students per teacher is not acceptable.

In short, the Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference did not produce specific staff-student ratios or expenditure figures for a model school program, but it did identify many of the services and programs that a "thorough and efficient system" of schools must offer students.

### F. Summary and Recommendations

This concluding section summarizes the views of Ohio's citizens regarding the essential elements of a thorough and efficient system of common schools. It briefly reviews the judgments of the Court and of the citizens and teachers surveyed regarding each of the general resource categories and, in several cases, discusses how those judgments accord with the findings of research studies and the recommendations of professional associations. It also presents some tentative conclusions and recommendations regarding the changes needed to meet the thorough and efficient standard. These conclusions are necessarily general in nature. To illustrate the resources needed for a thorough and efficient system, Appendix A presents a detailed description of adequate school programs at the elementary and secondary levels.

#### 1) Safe, educationally-appropriate facilities.

As the Court noted, the unsafe and unhealthy condition of many Ohio school facilities was officially recognized in the 1990 Ohio Public School Facility Survey. That survey found that it would take \$10.2 billion in facility repair and construction just to bring all school buildings into compliance with existing codes and regulations. This figure was reviewed and updated in 1997 by the Legislative Budget Office that found it would cost \$16.5 billion to bring public school buildings into compliance with existing standards.

The unofficial assessment of the condition of the state's school building that emerged from the town meeting and educator surveys revealed that the unsatisfactory condition of many school buildings involves more than code violations. Many respondents pointed out that their schools lacked sufficient classroom and storage space, as well as facilities such as labs, art studios and music rooms that are essential to the state's competency-based educational programs (groups were not asked about spaces for dance and drama/theater). If the state's school children are to be provided "educationally-adequate" as well as safe facilities, school buildings must have the space and facilities to successfully implement competency-based educational programs and other essential programs and services. Toward that end, the Coalition recommends that the state agency responsible for the administration of the school facilities program shall:

- ◆ Professionally assess the facility needs in each district, taking into consideration the concerns and expectations of the local school community. Allow for appropriate input from the local school system and the general public.
- ◆ Develop a comprehensive plan to modernize all school facilities within 6-8 years. (The plan would include an equalization formula with local school districts participation not to exceed three mills of property taxation).

- ◆ Prioritize school districts on the basis of needs criteria promulgated by the State Board of Education.
- ◆ Certify a total project dollar amount for each district.
- ◆ Amend the Ohio School Design Manual to bring it into conformity with the programs, services and delivery systems inherent in the Basket of Essential Learning Resources and the concept of the school as a community center.

## 2) Appropriate, up-to-date materials, equipment and technology.

The Court found in *DeRolph* that the appellant school districts lack basic instructional materials and supplies and that none of the districts is able to meet the technological training needs of its students. This finding is consistent with the views expressed in the town meetings and Education Congress and with the results of the teacher surveys. Many town meeting participants indicated that the equipment in their local schools is outdated and limited in quantity, and that few students had meaningful opportunities to use computers. Similarly, a substantial minority report that their schools lack basic materials and supplies, and most feel that the number of computers available for instructional purposes is not sufficient.

Many Ohio school districts clearly lack the materials and equipment that are essential components of the state's competency-based education programs. The lack of classroom access to sufficient number of computers is particularly consequential. Educational associations have emphasized the importance of equipping individual classrooms with the technology needed to prepare students for life in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. For example, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP, 1996) recommends that students be provided access not only to computers, but also to the Internet and other technologies that assist instruction and learning. NASSP argues that these technologies extend the curriculum by enabling students to more easily acquire information and pursue in-depth and inquiry-driven study. Studies have shown in over 700 empirical research studies, in the study of the entire state of West Virginia, in a national sample of fourth and eighth grade students, and in an analysis of newer educational technologies that students with access to: (a) computer assisted instruction, or (b) integrated learning systems technology, or (c) simulations and software that teaches higher order thinking, or (d) collaborative networked technologies, or (e) design and programming technologies, show positive gains in achievement on researcher constructed tests, standardized tests and national tests. (*The Impact of Education Technology on Student Achievement*, Milken Exchange, Schacter, 1999). However, technology should be provided in areas that benefit and reduced in areas that do not. Conventional teaching, in some areas, is more conducive to positive educational outcomes and should not be replaced by technology, whereas other areas are certainly enhanced by technology. (*Does it Compute?*, Educational Testing Service, Wenglin-sky, 1998). In short, computer and telecommunications technology can improve both instruction and student performance.

A thorough and efficient system of schools must have budget allocations sufficient 1) to provide the materials and equipment essential to the state's competency-based education programs, and 2) to ensure that all students have access to current technologies, while providing for changing technology needs. More specifically, a thorough and efficient system requires that:

- ◆ Annual budgets include the funds needed to purchase and maintain, on a regular replacement cycle, the supplies, materials, and equipment that are integral to the state's CBE programs as well as the particular instructional goals of the district schools. The average replacement cycle for textbooks and equipment should be no more than five years, and rapidly changing technologies (i.e., software) should be continuously upgraded.
- ◆ Schools develop long-range strategic plans for the instructional use of technology and that all students have regular access to that technology. In particular, individual classrooms must have a sufficient number of

computers, with Internet connections, for students to access the information needed for in-depth and inquiry-driven learning.

- ◆ All schools have available a technology resource person to provide technical assistance and to aid teachers in the instructional use of technology.

### **3) Quality instructional programs with well-integrated assessments and interventions.**

In *DeRolph* the Court also found that many of the appellant districts had severely limited curricula compared to other districts and to what might be expected of a system “to educate Ohio’s youth and to prepare them for a bright and prosperous future.” In addition to the shortcomings of the curriculum, the Court found that many districts lacked sufficient funding to intervene and assist students who are not acquiring needed skills. In essence, the Court found that these districts did not have the resources needed to meet the instructional goals or to provide the intervention services mandated by the state’s competency-based education programs.

This negative assessment was echoed by participants in the town meetings and Education Congress and by many teachers. They also expressed concern that their schools are unable to offer the courses or provide the assessment and intervention services essential to CBE programs. In response to these concerns, the participants at the Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference recommended a number of curriculum and program initiatives to better enable schools and students to achieve their instructional and performance goals.

These recommendations of the Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference and those of educational associations such as the NASSP (1996) point to several essential components of a thorough and efficient system of common schools. These include:

- ◆ Full-day, everyday kindergarten for five-year-olds and optional half-day programs for four-year-olds.
- ◆ Remedial instruction during the school year as well as remedial summer school programs for all students who need them.
- ◆ Diversity and depth of course offerings (see Appendix A for a detailed listing of courses). At the high school level this means that in addition to regular course offerings schools must be able to offer: advanced placement courses in English, math, the sciences, and social studies; as well as courses in three or more foreign languages and courses in the arts that combine instruction with performance and exhibition opportunities. At the primary and intermediate grades, it means providing all students with courses in the arts, physical education, and at least one foreign language. At all levels, it means the ability to provide students with career education programs and the skills they will need to meet the performance standards of entry-level jobs.
- ◆ Assessments and interventions based upon one-on-one student-teacher contact and multiple performance measures. All students should be assigned a staff advisor who will help them develop a personal plan for learning based upon their individual needs. And teachers must have time during the school day to meet with individual students and ensure that they are making progress in meeting performance goals.

### **4) Comprehensive support services for all students, including special needs students.**

The physical and mental health of students is essential to their learning. Health services, including guidance and psychological counseling, should be considered essential, not optional, services. The National Institute of Mental Health estimates that between five and nine percent of all students, or 2.5 to 5 million children, are not achieving in school because of emotional and behavioral problems (Allensworth *et al.*, 1997). The specific health services provided at the school site should be determined locally, but the ratios of counselors, school psychologists, social workers, and nurses to students must be low enough for students to have access to the services they need.

In the case of Ohio, these support services are an essential part of the state's competency-based education programs. Those programs require sufficient numbers of counselors, social workers, and school psychologists, as well as of remedial and special education specialists, to provide and oversee needed intervention services. Yet between a quarter and a half of the elementary and secondary teachers surveyed by the Coalition report that their students do not have adequate access to guidance counselors, psychologists, nurses, or speech and hearing therapists. (The list would have been longer had they been asked about other support personnel and special education specialists.) The participants at the Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference agreed that a thorough and efficient system must provide all students with the services of these and other support personnel. It should ensure that all students have access to health and instructional support services, as needed. Specifically, schools must have the resources and personnel to:

- ◆ Meet the recommendations of the Coalition with regard to student-staff ratios (as indicated in Appendix A).
- ◆ Provide the full range of intervention services required by the state's model CBE programs (see Appendix C).
- ◆ Provide the special education and health services mandated by state and federal law.

Toward this end, the Coalition urges the State to provide the funding required for all school districts to engage the personnel and other resources needed to meet these standards, taking into consideration the concerns and expectations of the local school community.

### **5) Comprehensive extra-curricular programs.**

Local community participation is particularly crucial for determining the extra-curricular activities and programs that schools provide. A quality school program provides students with the opportunity to achieve different educational outcomes. These outcomes include proficiency in core academic subjects and broad exposure to and participation in the arts. But they also include citizenship skills, individual well-being, and a sense of personal efficacy. The latter outcomes are achieved, in large part through student participation in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities. Community judgments inevitably enter into the assessment of educational outcomes, but they are clearly crucial to judging the adequacy of activities designed to promote students' individual well-being and interpersonal skills.

The surveys of Ohio's teachers asked them to assess the activities available to students in their schools. More than four out of five elementary teachers (81 percent), compared to only 12 percent of secondary teachers, reported that the activities available to their students were not sufficient. Clearly, most teachers feel that additional extra-curricular programs and activities are needed at the elementary level. A thorough and efficient system should provide students at all levels the opportunity to participate in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities that:

- ◆ Foster citizenship skills and a sense of individual well-being and efficacy.
- ◆ Reinforce the instructional goals of the classroom.

School districts must be able to evaluate the need for extra-curricular activities and programs, particularly at the elementary level, and must have the resources to provide additional programs as needed.

### **6) District-wide services, including transportation and food services for all students who need them.**

Current school reform efforts generally favor a more decentralized, site-managed education system (e.g., see Odden and Busch, 1998). Nonetheless, transportation and food services, as well as certain other support services, are usually most efficiently managed at the district level, and districts must have the resources necessary

to provide these services in a manner that safeguards the safety and health of all students. In particular, the planning and management of these services must be directed by certified or licensed professionals who have the resources to continuously monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of their program. For example, food services are essential to the public health of the community and should serve as a learning laboratory for the development of healthful eating habits (Allensworth *et al.*, 1997). A qualified food service/nutrition specialist should plan and oversee the delivery of all food services.

A thorough and efficient system requires that school districts:

- ◆ Determine which services or functions can be performed on site and which are best managed at the district-level.
- ◆ Have sufficient administrative and professional staff to plan, manage, and evaluate the delivery of district-wide services. Specifically, the ratios of administrative and professional staff to students must conform to professional recommendations.

### **7) On-going, meaningful in-service programs for teaching and non-teaching staff.**

As mentioned above, Ohio’s competency-based education programs place heavy demands upon the skills and the time of individual teachers. Teachers must master the content of their discipline, be able to instruct for specific skills and knowledge, and be able to group students for special needs. They must understand and be able to use various diagnostic instruments, to analyze assessment data, and to teach prescriptively. And they must be able to focus upon and attend to individual students, when needed.

These capabilities require on-going in-service training, and sufficient time to plan and coordinate instruction and intervention services with other teachers and staff. Most of the participants at the town meetings and at the Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference agreed that effective staff development programs are essential to a thorough and efficient system.

A thorough and efficient system of schools encompasses a learning community for the teachers and staff as well as students. Educational associations such as the NASSP (1996) recommend that for schools to become learning communities:

- ◆ All school districts should set aside at least five percent of their annual budgets for professional development -- through good fiscal times and bad.
- ◆ Each school should formulate a comprehensive, long-term strategy for staff development so that training amounts to more than a poorly connected sequence of in-service meetings. This staff development should encompass training in the instructional use of technology, in the development and implementation of new curricula, and in the planning and coordination of instructional activities and intervention services with other staff members.
- ◆ In conjunction with the school long-term strategy, each professional staff member should develop a Personal Learning Plan that identifies the knowledge and skills they most need to improve instruction and student learning.

### **8) Sufficient numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff.**

One of the most significant findings of the Court in the *DeRolph* decision was that the appellant school districts “lack sufficient funds to comply with the state law requiring a district-wide average of no more than 25 students for each classroom teacher.” Even that required average is too high if the state’s competency-based education programs are to be implemented effectively. Those programs are largely based upon continuous classroom assessment and intervention and require that teachers be able to focus their efforts upon individual

students when necessary. The goal of reducing the average class size was supported by the town meeting and Education Congress participants and by the vast majority of the teachers surveyed. In addition, most of the participants at the Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference agreed upon the need for smaller class sizes at the primary and intermediate grades.

The recommendation that average class size be reduced is supported by some of the most compelling research in education. Frequently cited as one of the most credible research studies in education, the Tennessee Star Project (and the follow-up Lasting Benefits Study) established the importance of small class size for building a good learning foundation during the early grades. Smaller classes were especially effective at raising the achievement levels of minority students in inner-city schools. Moreover, the benefits of smaller class size were lasting. Students who had been assigned to smaller classes during the early grades continued to outperform those who had been assigned to the regular class treatments through eighth grade (Mosteller, 1995).

There are no comparable experimental studies showing the positive effects of smaller class size upon student performance at higher grade levels. However, in a well-regarded study of Alabama's public schools, Ferguson and Ladd (1996) found that the math scores of 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> graders showed continuous improvement as class sizes fell from a base level of 29 to 23 students (there were few observations of classes with fewer than 23 students). In another recent study, Wenglinsky (1997) found that reduced class size improved the social environment of classrooms at the 8<sup>th</sup> grade level and thereby contributed indirectly to improved student performance. Educational associations also emphasize the importance of smaller class sizes at higher grade levels and recommend maximum teaching loads for core academic subjects. The National Council of Teachers of English (Council) points out that a teacher who spends 20 minutes reading and responding to each student's paper will spend 42 hours responding to an assignment given to five classes of 25 students. To enable teachers to give students regular feedback on their work, the NASSP (1996) recommends a maximum workload of 90 students for high school teachers in academic subjects. In summary, both research studies and the recommendations of educational associations point to the beneficial effects of smaller class sizes at both the elementary and secondary levels.

Virtually every school staff person contributes directly or indirectly to student learning. To ensure sufficient numbers of non-teaching staff, schools and school districts must be able to conform to the staff-student ratios recommended by professional and educational associations. For example, the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP, 1998) points out that in most school districts the ratio of school psychologists to students is greater than 1:2500 and recommends that the ratio be no more than 1:1000. The NASP argues that a school psychologist serving four or five schools and a student population of 3,000 or more students would be equivalent to a first grade teachers serving a class of 75 students.

To assure sufficient numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff, the Coalition recommends:

- ◆ An average class size of 18-20 for the primary grades (preK-3); average class size of 15 for the primary grades (preK-3) in districts with high poverty rates; 22 for grades 4 through 8, and 24 for grades 9 through 12.
- ◆ That the numbers of administrators, instructional and student support staff, and clerical and maintenance personnel not only meet current state requirements, but also conform to the ratios recommended by their respective educational or professional association.

Again, the summary and recommendations presented in this concluding section are general in nature. Appendix A presents a more detailed assessment of the resources needed for a thorough and efficient system and de-

scribes prototypical elementary, middle and high school models. These prototypes are intended to be illustrative, not prescriptive. That is, they describe the resources that the State must make available so that school districts are able to meet the thorough and efficient standard. Schools and school districts are likely to vary considerably in the resources they find most useful for achieving their instructional goals.

Allensworth, D., Lawson, E., Nicholson, L., and Wyche, J. 1997. *Schools and Health: Our Nation's Investment*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Committee for Economic Development. 1995. *Connecting Students to a Changing World: A Technology Strategy for Improving Mathematics and Science Education*, Executive Summary. New York, NY.

Ferguson, R. F., and Ladd, H. F. 1996. "How and Why Money Matters: An Analysis of Alabama Schools." Pp. 265-298 in *Holding Schools Accountable: Performance-Based Reform in Education*, H. F. Ladd, ed. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Mosteller, F. 1995. "Tennessee study of class size in the early school grades." *The Future of Children* 5, Summer/Fall.

National Association of School Psychologists. 1998. "Position Statement: Mental Health Services in the Schools." Adopted at the NASP Delegates Assembly, July.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. 1996. *Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution*. Reston, VA.

Odden, A., and Busch, C. 1998. *Financing Schools for High Performance: Strategies for Improving the Use of Educational Resources*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schacter, J. 1999. *The Impact of Education Technology on Student Achievement, What the Most Current Research Has to Say*. Milken Exchange on Education Technology: page 9.

Wenglinsky, H. 1997. "How money matters: The effect of school district spending on academic achievement." *Sociology of Education* (July): 221-237.

Wenglinsky, H. 1998. *Does it Compute? The relationship between educational technology and student achievement in mathematics*. Educational Testing Service Policy Information Center.

Grade Level	Grades PreK – 3	Grades 4 – 8	Grades 9 – 12
<b>I. CURRICULUM</b>			
<b>A. Primary and Middle/Jr. High</b>			
1. Full Day Kindergarten			
2. 1/2 day state-supported pre-school option for 4-year-olds			
3. reading			
4. writing			
5. mathematics			
6. social studies			
7. science			
8. English			
9. foreign Language			
10. art			
11. music (vocal and instrumental)			
12. health/physical education			
13. career awareness/orientation/exploration			
14. technology			
15. advanced placement opportunities			
16. performing arts (drama/theater, dance)			
17. work and family life			
18. industrial technology			
<b>B. High School</b>			
1. English/language arts			minimum number of courses 7 courses*
2. mathematics			7 courses*
3. science			7 courses*
4. social studies			7 courses*

essential

essential

\*minimum four courses of at least 1 unit of credit each

Grade Level	Grades PreK – 3	Grades 4 – 8	Grades 9 – 12
<b>B. High School continued</b>			minimum number of courses
5. foreign language			3 courses of at least 1 unit of credit each in 3 languages
6. health/physical education			2 courses
7. business/technology			5 courses
8. music (vocal and instrumental)			8 courses (4 credits)
9. art (visual, drama/theater, dance)			3 courses
10. industrial technology			2 courses
11. work and family life			4 courses
12. vocational (career-technical education)			20 courses
13. advanced placement			**1 course in each of: mathematics, social studies, science and English, in addition to 7 other courses
14. electives			7 courses
<b>C. Flexibility is essential at all grade levels for students with disabilities, gifted and disadvantaged students.</b>			
<b>II. PROGRAMS/SERVICES</b>			
A. Special education			
B. Psychological services			
C. Speech Pathology			
D. Hearing services			
E. Audiology services			
F. Vision services			
G. Occupational therapy			
H. Physical therapy			

essential

essential

essential

\*\*at least 1 additional full credit of advanced placement in each of the four subjects

Grade Level	Grades PreK – 3	Grades 4 – 8	Grades 9 – 12
<b>II. PROGRAMS/SERVICES continued</b>			
I. Gifted pupil education			
J. Compensatory programming for disadvantaged			
K. Guidance and counseling including career planning			
L. Nursing			
M. Social			
N. Conflict resolution training for students			
O. Library/media			
P. Visiting teacher			
Q. Attendance personnel			
R. Food			
S. Transportation			
T. Student testing			
U. Tutoring			
V. Services for English as a Second Language students			
W. Proficiency intervention services			
X. Supervision for education operations			
Y. Security			
Z. Community/facility use			
AA. Communications services			
BB. Parent support services			
CC. Vocational education (career-technical education) services			
DD. Access to business partnerships	essential	essential	
EE. Extra-curricular activities		essential	
FF. Field trips	essential	essential	

essential

essential

essential

Grade Level	Grades PreK – 3	Grades 4 – 8	Grades 9 – 12
<b>III. DELIVERY SYSTEMS</b>			
<b>A. Facilities</b>			
1. Teaching Areas			
a. regular classroom	essential	essential	
b. special education	essential	essential	
c. vocational education (career-technical education)			
d. music (vocal and instrumental)	essential		
e. art	essential		
f. drama/auditorium			
g. science laboratories	essential		
h. gymnasiums	essential		
i. Libraries (including INFOhio connectivity)	essential		
j. multi-media computer laboratories	essential		
1) industrial technology			
2) work & family life			
3) business education			
k. foreign language labs			
l. distance learning			
m. tutoring			
n. small group instruction			
2. Support areas			
a. counseling			
b. clinic			
c. parent conference			
d. clerical			
e. administration			

essential

essential

essential

Grade Level	Grades PreK – 3	Grades 4 – 8	Grades 9 – 12
2. Support areas (continued)			
g. cafeteria/kitchens	essential	essential	essential
h. multi-media computer networks with at least a T1 connection	essential	essential	essential
<b>B. Equipment and Materials</b>			
1. textbooks	replace every 5 years	replace every 5 years	replace every 5 years
2. workbooks	New each year	New each year	New each year
3. multi-media computers	1 per every 5 students	1 per every 5 students	1 per every 5 students
4. multi-media computers software	replace every 5 years	replace every 5 years	replace every 5 years
5. multi-media computer printers	2 per classroom	2 per classroom	2 per classroom
6. multi-media computer scanners	1 per classroom	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
7. multi-media computer systems	budget a per pupil amount annually	budget a per pupil amount annually	budget a per pupil amount annually
8. calculators	As required	As required	As required
9. televisions/VCR	1 per classroom	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
10. overhead projectors	1 per classroom	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
11. science materials	As per model curriculum	As per model curriculum	As per model curriculum
12. library collections	1 per building	1 per building	1 per building
13. videos	replace every 5 years	replace every 5 years	replace every 5 years
14. classroom supplies	essential	essential	essential
15. telephone systems	1 per classroom	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
16. instruments for music education	essential	essential	essential
<b>C. Professional Staff Development</b>			
1. licensed/certified personnel	10 days per year	10 days per year	10 days per year
2. support staff	5 days per year	5 days per year	5 days per year
3. substitutes	2 days per year	2 days per year	2 days per year

Grade Level	Grades PreK – 3	Grades 4 – 8	Grades 9 – 12
<b>D. Evaluation Resources</b>	essential		essential
Provide each student with:			
1. personal plan for progress	essential	essential	essential
2. staff advisor		essential	essential
3. assessment for job			essential
Each teacher should have:			
1. time to advise students	essential	essential	essential
2. peer evaluation	essential	essential	essential
3. peer collaboration	essential	essential	essential
<b>E. Staffing</b>	Class size and personnel ratios must be modified to accommodate school districts with high rates of poverty		
1. Number of Pupils per Teacher *			
a. primary grades (preK-3) regular	18-20:1		
b. primary grades (preK-3) poverty	15:1		
c. intermediate grades (4-5,4-6)		22:1	
d. grades (7-8)		22:1	
e. high school (9-12)			24:1
2. Specialized Teachers			
a. physical education teachers	500:1	500:1	
b. art teachers	500:1	500:1	
c. music teachers	500:1	500:1	
d. performing arts/drama teachers			essential
e. gifted teachers- self-contained classroom	15:1	15:1	15:1
f. gifted teachers- resource and intervention specialist	60:1	60:1	60:1
g. gifted coordinators	3500:1 or minimum .5 per district	3500:1 or minimum .5 per district	3500:1 or minimum .5 per district

\*To compute class size count regular classroom teacher and licensed intervention specialists, but exclude educational service personnel.

Grade Level	Grades PreK – 3	Grades 4 – 8	Grades 9 – 12
<b>E. Staffing (continued)</b>			
3. Special Education Teachers			
a. teacher LD	16 max.	16 max.	22 max.
b. teacher DH	16 max.	16 max.	22 max.
c. MH/SBH/low incidence	8 max. + aide	8 max. + aide	8 max. + aide
d. supervisors	required	required	required
e. aides	As needed	As needed	As needed
f. occupational therapy	required	required	required
g. physical therapy	required	required	required
4. Special Services Personnel			
a. social workers for districts with high rates of poverty	2000:1	2000:1	2000:1
b. visiting teachers/attendance personnel	2500:1, minimum 1 per district	2500:1, minimum 1 per district	2500:1, minimum 1 per district
c. psychologists	1250:1	1250:1	1250:1
d. audiologist	available	available	available
e. speech Pathologists	1250:1	1250:1	1250:1
f. hearing	1250:1	1250:1	1250:1
g. vision	1250:1	1250:1	1250:1
h. librarians/media specialists	Min. 1 licensed librarian/media specialist per district + 1 high school librarian with library/media services	Min. 1 licensed librarian/media specialist per district + 1 high school librarian with library/media services	Min. 1 licensed librarian/media specialist per district + 1 high school librarian with library/media services
i. licensed Guidance Counselors	500:1	400:1	250:1
j. nurses	1500:1 + daily nursing services provided by trained nursing aides in every building	1500:1 + daily nursing services provided by trained nursing aides in every building	1500:1 + daily nursing services provided by trained nursing aides in every building
k. technology coordinator	Min. 1 per district	Min. 1 per district	Min. 1 per district
l. EMIS coordinator	Min. 1 per district	Min. 1 per district	Min. 1 per district
m. substitute teachers	essential	essential	essential

Grade Level	Grades PreK – 3	Grades 4 – 8	Grades 9 – 12
<b>E. Staffing (continued)</b>			
5. Administrative Personnel			
a. Principal/Assistant Principal	500:1, Principal to serve no more than 2 buildings	500:1, Principal to serve no more than 2 buildings	500:1, Principal to serve no more than 2 buildings
6. Other Personnel			
a. Instructional Assistants	available	available	available
b. Clerical Personnel	350:1	350:1	350:1
7. Maintenance Personnel	As appropriate	As appropriate	As appropriate
<b>F. District Leadership/Supervisory Personnel</b>			
1. General administration	essential	essential	essential
2. Instructional and curriculum			
3. Fiscal			
4. Facility maintenance			
5. Transportation			
6. Food services			
7. Extra-curricular			
8. Professional development			
<b>G. State-funded supplemental delivery system strategies</b>			
1. Independent study and other educational options			
2. Post secondary options			
3. Virtual schools (Internet)			
4. Distance learning			
5. Closed circuit TV			
6. Independent study and other education options			
7. Public television			
8. Cooperative agreements with neighboring districts			
9. State-supported joint centers for special curricular areas			

“The general assembly shall make such provisions, by taxation, or otherwise, as... will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools throughout the state.”

(Ohio Constitution, Article VI, Section 2.)

In interpreting Article VI, Section 2 of the Constitution of Ohio, in *DeRolph v. Ohio* 78 Ohio St.3d 193;78 Ohio St.3d 419, the Ohio Supreme Court has set out the following principles of law.

1. One State System

The Ohio Constitution establishes one state system of common schools throughout the state. The system is clearly and explicitly of the state and not of localities within the state.

“It is a state-wide system, expressly created by the state’s highest governing document, the Constitution.” (*DeRolph* at 213)

2. State Responsibility

The Constitution places the full responsibility for securing the system of common schools on the General Assembly and this duty cannot be delegated away to local school districts. The obligation rests solely upon the shoulders of the state government.

“The responsibility for maintaining a thorough and efficient school system falls upon the State.” (*DeRolph* at 210). “Our state constitution makes the state responsible for educating our youth.” (*DeRolph* at 211)

3. Thorough and Efficient

The Constitution mandates that the system of common schools as established by the state be throughout the state. The adjectives, thorough and efficient, prescribe a standard and level of quality to which the General Assembly must adhere in securing the system.

The General Assembly has not fulfilled its obligation to secure a thorough and efficient system when "state funding of school districts cannot be considered adequate if the districts lack sufficient funds to provide their students a safe and healthy learning environment." (*DeRolph* at 208).

Moreover, "a thorough system could not mean one in which part or any number of the districts of the state were starved for funds." (*DeRolph* at 204). Adequacy is comprehensive including all aspects of an educational program.

"A thorough and efficient system of common schools includes facilities in good repair and the supplies, materials, and funds necessary to maintain these facilities in a safe manner, in compliance with all local, state, and federal mandates." (*DeRolph* at 213).

4. Deprivation Due to Wealth

As *DeRolph* repeatedly underscored, it is the State’s obligation to fund education, and thus, a child may not be deprived of a high quality education due to the wealth of the local community.

"Vast wealth-based disparities among Ohio's schools deprive many of Ohio's public school students of high quality educational opportunities." (*DeRolph* at 198). Fiscal inequities due to wealth disparities produce

“inadequate educational opportunities.” (*DeRolph* at 205).

##### 5. Decrease Emphasis upon Property Taxes

The state's school funding system must not place dominant emphasis on the local property tax.

The consequences of over reliance on the local tax bases are great disparities in school revenues among local school districts. The Supreme Court in *DeRolph* observed that:

"The evidence reveals that the wide disparities (in educational opportunity) are caused by the funding systems' over reliance on the tax base of individual school districts." (*DeRolph* at 210).

##### 6. Adequate Education

The Constitution obligates the General Assembly to provide sufficient tax resources to "ensure an adequate" education for all children. The Supreme Court has said that an adequate education requires a funding level sufficient to "provide each district enough money to ensure an adequate program." (*DeRolph* at 210).

Adequacy requires a funding framework for a full, complete and efficient system of public education. The education provided to the youth must not be mediocre but "as perfect as could humanly be devised." (*DeRolph* at 203). A thorough and efficient system includes but is not limited to:

- ◆ School buildings that are safe and conducive to learning,
- ◆ Sufficient technology, equipment, materials and supplies,
- ◆ Sufficient curricula, teachers and other personnel, and
- ◆ Sufficient services and programs to meet the intended needs of all pupils.

##### 7. Fully Develop Human Potential

By the phrase 'thorough and efficient' the Constitution places upon the state the "duty to provide a system which allows its citizens to fully develop their human potential." (*DeRolph* at 203). The state must "provide for the full education of all children within the state." (*DeRolph* at 203).

The Constitution requires a system in which "rich and poor people alike are given the opportunity to become educated so they may flourish and our society may progress." (*DeRolph* at 203). To achieve this end a full and complete education in which all children will have the opportunity to flourish with equal prospects in life the common school must provide the following (*DeRolph* Trial Court Decision, July 1, 1994, pp. 460-61):

- ◆ Sufficient oral and written communications skills to function socially and economically in Ohio and globally;
- ◆ Sufficient mathematics and scientific skills to function as a contributing citizen to the economy of Ohio and globally;
- ◆ Sufficient knowledge of economic, social and political systems, generally, and of the history, policies, and social structure of Ohio and the nation and enable the student to make informed decisions;
- ◆ Sufficient understanding of governmental processes and of basic civic institutions to enable the student to understand and contribute to the issues that affect his or her community, state, and nation;
- ◆ Sufficient self-knowledge and knowledge of principles of health and mental hygiene to enable the stu-

dent to monitor and contribute to his or her own physical and mental well-being;

- ◆ Sufficient understanding of the arts to enable each student to appreciate his or her cultural heritage and the cultural heritages of others;
- ◆ Sufficient training, or preparation for advanced training, in academic or vocational skills, and sufficient guidance, to enable each child to choose and pursue life intelligently;
- ◆ Sufficient levels of academic or vocational skills to enable public school students to compete favorably with their counterparts in Ohio, in surrounding states, across the nation, and throughout the world, in academics or in the job market;
- ◆ Sufficient support and guidance so that every student feels a sense of self-worth and ability to achieve, and so that every student is encouraged to live up to his or her full potential;
- ◆ Sufficient facilities, equipment, supplies and instruction to enable both female and male students to compete equally within their own schools as well as schools across the State of Ohio and worldwide in both academic and extracurricular activities;
- ◆ Sufficient monitoring by the General Assembly to assure that this State's common schools are being operated without there being mismanagement, waste or misuse of funds; and
- ◆ Sufficient facilities for each school district across the State that are adequate for instruction, safe, sanitary and conducive to providing a proper education as outlined by the above-related criteria.

(*DeRolph* Trial Court Decision, July 1, 1994, pp. 460-61).

## Appendix C: Educational Resources Inferred from Ohio's Model Competency-Based Programs

The model CBE programs developed by the Ohio Department of Education provide a detailed description of the instructional and performance outcomes expected of the state's school and students. At the same time they identify, explicitly or implicitly, many of the human and material resources needed to achieve those outcomes. This Appendix includes two sections. The first section describes the requirements of Ohio's CBE programs in terms of the general resource categories used throughout this report. The second section presents a detailed listing of the materials and equipment needs of specific CBE programs.

### General Requirements of Ohio's CBE Programs

**Safe, educationally-appropriate facilities.** The instructional and performance objectives of all the CBE programs require adequate facilities such as computer and science labs, a library/media center, art and dance studios, theaters and music performance areas, and sufficient classroom space to accommodate group work and enough storage space for materials and equipment. In addition, a program of effective building-level interventions require sufficient space for resource/intervention centers and reading/writing centers.

**Up-to-date materials, equipment, and technology.** Many instructional and performance objectives require more than basic classroom supplies such as paper, pencils, textbooks, and desks. They require resources such as computers, calculators, maps, periodicals, videos, musical recordings, foreign language materials, as well as student access to the internet and to performances and presentations outside the classroom. This equipment and technology must not only be available, it must be up-to-date and available in sufficient quantities to be integrated into regular classroom instruction. One of the assumptions that guided the development of the competency-based programs in science, mathematics, and other disciplines was that natural uses of technology would be incorporated into the classroom and learned by all. The use of technology in the form of calculators and computers can produce more effective learning. However, to produce that learning "students must acquire a comfortable familiarity with technology that is used in the workplace and in the further study of mathematics, science, and business" (Model Competency-Based Mathematics Program, p. 11) "Comfortable familiarity" cannot be achieved when equipment is out-of-date or in scarce supply.

**Quality instructional programs, with well-integrated assessments and interventions.** The basic thesis of competency-based education is that even the most specific and detailed listing of desired skills and competencies is not sufficient to produce effective learning. Instructional activities must be closely integrated with assessment and intervention programs. The successful integration of these activities at the classroom level requires smaller class sizes and teaching loads and on-going staff development programs, as is discussed below. CBE programs also require that districts have the resources to carry out, analyze, and utilize the information derived from annual district-wide assessments. Finally, CBE programs require the human and material resources needed for effective intervention programs at the building and districts levels. The resources required for these interventions overlap with the support services needed for all students and are also discussed below.

**Comprehensive support services for all students, including special needs students.** When classroom interventions are not sufficient, Ohio's CBE programs require that schools seek to improve student performance through interclass groupings, tutorial programs, or formal intervention teams and that districts provide summer school, before- and after-school programs, or remedial courses. Interclass groupings may need additional classroom space, tutorial programs need tutors and instructional materials, and formal intervention teams require professional support staff such as social workers, school psychologists, and special and remedial educa-

tion specialists. Summer school programs must be staffed and remedial programs at all levels require oversight and participation by remedial reading and math specialists.

**On-going, meaningful professional development for teaching and non-teaching staff.** CBE programs require that teachers be able to utilize and introduce students to new educational technologies; that they be capable of effective instruction, assessment and intervention strategies within the classroom; and that they be able to plan and coordinate these activities with other staff. On-going professional development programs are essential to develop and maintain each of these capabilities.

**Sufficient numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff.** CBE programs require smaller class sizes, especially at the lower grade levels. Early assessment and intervention is crucial to the later success of students with special learning needs, and effective assessment and intervention requires that teachers be able to focus upon and interact one-on-one with individual students. Class sizes and teaching loads must be such that teachers are able to focus their efforts upon individual students when necessary.

### **Resources Required for Specific CBE Programs**

**Mathematics** – the instructional and performance objectives in mathematics require a variety of materials and supplies at every grade level. For primary and intermediate grades the curriculum specifically calls for large sheets/rolls of paper; objects for counting and sorting; materials for creating and coloring geometric shapes; attribute blocks; tangram puzzles; geoboards; and drawing materials. For high classes, electric, sound, and light measuring devices are needed. At all grade levels students need text books; access to calculators and to computer labs with mathematics based software such as Logo, a graphing program, and a statistics and spreadsheet program; projection units for computers and calculators; and compasses, protractors, and straight edges; and standard measuring devices such as rulers, measuring cups, timers, and clocks.

**Social Studies** – Materials needed to meet the instructional and performance objectives in the social sciences include maps; a globe; materials for celebrating holidays from various cultures and historical periods; art, literature, and music from different cultures and periods (and equipment to play it); pictures of various peoples and locations around the world; and sources of local and national news. Additional materials and resources used at higher grade levels include computers with research databases, biographies and autobiographies of well-known individuals. Specific instructional objectives also call for guest presentations and community service field experiences.

**Foreign Languages** – Materials needed to meet the instructional and performance objectives in foreign language include many of those required for the social science program (e.g., maps; a globe; art, literature and music from the target culture; videos and photographs from the target culture). But there is also a need in the primary grades for things such as puppets; tapes and tape player for songs; story books in the target language; flannel story boards; kitchen ingredients to prepare target culture foods; target culture games and toys; newspapers, currency, and measuring devices from the target culture; class guests and trips to festivals and performances celebrating the target culture. At higher grade levels, authentic foreign language study requires texts on target language and culture; computers with e-mail and internet access; student exchange programs; and an extensive library of foreign language resources including both fiction and nonfiction.

**Arts Education** -- A comprehensive arts program includes field trips to view exhibitions and performances; visits by guest artists; and library resources on the arts.

A partial list of specific materials and facilities needed includes:

**Dance** -- A quality sound system, specially constructed dance floors with adequate space (100-125 square feet per dancer), costumes and space to design, produce and repair them, and facilities to share with drama for set construction.

**Drama/theater** – Elementary: props, CDs, records, tapes, VCR, costumes, CD-Rom, musical and sound-effect instruments, slide projector, video camera, play scripts, films, books, video tapes; Secondary: same for elementary grades plus flexible staging, modular scenic units, rehearsal props and costumes, mood lighting, literature collections.

**General Music** – Textbooks, CDs and tapes, audio equipment, video/CD-Rom, secure storage facilities, appropriate seating, piano and maintenance, scanner and printer.

**Choir** – Literature, piano and maintenance, risers, or adequate posture seating, recording equipment, CDs and tapes, scanner, printer, costumes (robes, etc.), dressing rooms, well equipped concert or production facilities.

**Show Choir** – Rehearsal stage and all listed above under choir.

**Orchestra** – Instructional literature, music stands, posture chairs, school-owned instruments, instruments to fill out orchestration and provide for students who cannot afford to purchase instruments, piano and instrument maintenance, CDs and tapes, recording equipment, secure instrument storage, scanner and printer, library, individual and small ensemble rehearsal rooms.

**Band** – Instructional literature, music stands, posture chairs, school-owned instruments, instruments to fill out orchestration and provide for students who cannot afford to purchase instruments, piano and instrument maintenance, CDs and tapes, recording equipment, secure instrument storage, scanner and printer, library, individual and small ensemble rehearsal rooms.

**Visual art** – Facilities for K-12 visual art education should provide space for students to create, read about, examine and exhibit fine works of art. They also should be adequately supplied and equipped for students to work in the following content areas:

*Grades K-7: Drawing and Painting:* newsprint paper, cream manilla paper, white drawing paper, water color paper, colored tissue paper, brown wrapping paper, railroad board, tag board, colored chalk, fixitive spray, tempera paint, crayons, water color paint, brushes, erasers, lettering pens, water based markers, masking tape, scotch tape, scissors, staplers, paper cutter, portfolios.

*Print Making:* battleship linoleum, linoleum block cutters, brayers, colored pipe cleaners, stove pipe wire, airplane glue, toothpicks, modeling clay, styrofoam blocks, wheat paste, papier mache mix, string, rubber bands, mixing bowls.

*Pottery:* white firing clay, glazes, ceramic tools, ceramic kiln.

*Fabric Design:* yarns, carpet warp, cold water dyes, mixing bowls, weaving frame, cardboard looms, unbleached muslin.

*Photography, Film Making, Video, Computer Graphics:* still camera, 16 mm film camera, video camera, computer, digital camera.

*Art History, Criticism, Aesthetics:* books, magazines, slides, reproductions, CD-roms, films, videos and games.

*Grades 8-12: Drawing and Painting:* same as for grades K-7 plus illustration board, chipboard, mattboard, charcoal paper, charcoal pencils, drawing pencils and pens, pastels, oil paint, acrylic paint, canvas rolls, canvas stretchers, permanent markers, table and floor easels, tracing paper, airbrush, inks, poster board, matt cutters, palettes, palette knives, gesso, paint keepers, paint thinner, oil paint sticks, taborets, drawing boards, staple guns, stumps, scratch board, sketch books and shrink wrapper.

*Sculpture:* same as for grades K-7 plus stone cutting tools, wood chisels, limestone blocks, mahogany blocks, riffler files, pliers, sculpture wire, soapstone blocks, plastic coated wire, colored plastic sheets, wire cutters, aluminum sheets, copper sheets, copper foil, soldering gun, glue gun, utility knives, x-acto

knives, glass enamels, enameling kiln, copper wire and plaster cloth strips.

*Pottery:* same as for K-7 plus red clay, potters wheels, decorating wheels, pugmill and plaster of paris.

*Fabric Design:* same as for grades K-7 plus floor harness loom, hooked rug needles, raffia, fabric markers and hemp.

*Photography, Film Making, Video, Computer:* same as for grades K-7 plus electronic color copying machine.

*Art History, Criticism, Aesthetics:* same as for grades K-7 plus three-dimensional replicas.

**Health and Physical Education** – These programs call for kitchen, utensils and food; models of human body; measuring devices for physical activity (stop watches, etc.); health monitoring devices; first-aid resources; models of personal hygiene practices; rule books for sports; CPR models; field trips to community health service providers; models of traffic and fire safety scenarios; and audio equipment. Physical education resources: insurance; ropes course; dance floor; gymnastics equipment; swimming pool; sports equipment and playing fields or courts; weight training equipment; outdoor recreation equipment.

**Language arts** – Instructional activities need picture books; puppets, video and audio recordings; letter/number learning toys; stage props; writing materials; appropriate reading materials for each grade level; field trips to performances; and opportunities to give presentations outside the classroom.

**Sciences** – An extensive listing of the materials and equipment needed to meet the instructional objectives and the safety concerns of Ohio's competency-based science program is provided in Appendix B of Science: Ohio's Model Competency-Based Program. The following is a partial listing of materials and equipment needed for instructional activities:

Grades K-8 -- kitchen/utensils; toys; pets and animal cage; attribute blocks; balance and primer; assortment of nuts, bolts, washers, and rivets; bar magnet; bulb holders, clock; magnetic compass; measuring cups; thermometer; prisms; rock samples and sea shells; steel mirrors; incubator; rubber stoppers; medicine cups; terrariums; trundle wheel; hand lenses; measuring tape and spoons; bow caliper; plastic tubing; aquariums, fish and fish food; seeds; rulers; masking tape; colored pencils; pipe cleaners; fertilizer; food straws; glycerin; hydrogen peroxide; baking soda; string; modeling clay; fasteners; batteries; wire; plastic bags; alcohol; clorox; plastic cups and spoons; ammeters and voltmeters; aneroid barometer; weight sets; beakers; brushes; charts; funnels; graduated cylinders; hot plate; microscopes; models of body and earth; petri dishes; radiometer; anemometer; cloud chamber; conductivity indicators; cork borer set and sharpeners; Geiger counter; rock hammer; magnifying glasses; power supply; spectrum tubes; test tubes and holders; ring stands; science trade and textbooks; and science electronic media.

Grades 9-12 -- Use many of the same materials and equipment, including textbooks, but also need battery chargers; generators; motors; rectifiers; rheostats; solar cells; transformers; electrical circuit and electronic kits; transistor kits; Boyle's Law apparatus; calipers; various meters and gauges; anatomical, atomic, and biological models; skeletal and specimen mounts; telescopes; demonstration radio transmitters and receivers; fire extinguishers; germinating beds; growing frames; gyroscopes; laser and holographic equipment; linear expansion apparatuses; oscilloscopes; photoelectric cells; photometers; planetaria; probeware; pulleys; pumps; radiometers; spectrosopes; sterilizers; Van de Graff generators; transector apparatuses; vivariums and water baths; materials for working with DNA. Safety equipment needed includes goggles and gloves, foot protection; face shields; lab coats; safety shower; fume hood; fire blanket; first aid supplies; spill kits; chemical storage cabinets and handling containers; waste disposal containers and library resources on safety and chemical hygiene.

## Appendix D: Survey Findings from the Town Meetings and Education Congress

The survey of the participants in the Town Meetings and Education Congress did not ask them to identify the specific resource needs of effective schools. Rather, participants were asked to evaluate the current condition of their schools in a variety of areas and to indicate how essential those areas of operation are. Questions dealing with specific areas of school operation are summarized below under the general resource headings used throughout this report. The collective judgment of the participants in the town meetings is reflected in the average grade assigned to different areas of operation. However, the intensity of the dissatisfaction with many school conditions is perhaps more accurately reflected in the percentage of respondents who assigned their districts a grade of “F,” and these percentages are also reported below. In addition, several survey questions asked about how schools should be financed, and the responses to those questions are discussed at the end of the summary.

**Safe, educationally-appropriate facilities.** Participants at the town meetings were asked to grade the school buildings in their districts on nine separate categories that covered a wide range of building conditions: safety; exterior; interior; educationally functional; electrical system; plumbing system; handicapped accessible; whether the facilities meet Ohio’s Building Code, and cleanliness. The overall grade given to Ohio school facilities was a “C,” with 9.7% of the respondents assigning their districts a grade of “F.” The individual category receiving the lowest average grade was “handicapped accessible,” an assessment that reflected the high cost and consequent failure of many districts to renovate antiquated school buildings. The condition of many school buildings was a matter of grave concern to most participants. Nearly 81% of the survey responses from the town meetings indicated that school facilities in good condition are “essential” (an additional 16.9% rated them “somewhat essential”), while 96.7% of participants in the Education Congress rated them as “essential.” Yet the comments of many of the participants indicate that they regard the schools in their district to be old, unsafe, and overcrowded.

**Appropriate, up-to-date materials, equipment, and technology.** The survey included separate questions on technology and on textbooks, materials, and supplies.

- ◆ Instructional technology was graded under six separate categories: whether the district participated in the School Net programs for kindergarten through grade 4, number of computers per classroom, updated computers and software, computer curriculum, interactive TV, and video programming. The total average grade in these categories was a “C,” and 10.2% of the grades were “F.” Comments indicated that the major areas of concern were that the equipment and software is outdated and very limited in quantity. In many districts few children have meaningful opportunities to use computers. The importance accorded to these classroom technologies would have been much greater had the questions been limited to computers and software. Many respondents were uncertain about the importance of interactive TV and video programming. Nonetheless, more than 50% of the survey responses from the town meetings rated classroom technology as “essential” (an additional 38% rated it “somewhat essential”), and over 96% of the participants in the Education Congress judged technology to be “essential” or “somewhat essential.”
- ◆ The questions about textbooks, materials and supplies asked whether the districts had appropriate and up-to-date textbooks, a sufficient number of textbooks, adequate materials and supplies, and adequate equipment. Although the overall grade received in this area was again a “C,” the accompanying comments indicated that many districts lack basic instructional materials and supplies and 6.9% of the grades assigned were “F.” Over 80% of the respondents at the town meetings and over 97% of the participants in the Education Congress indicated that these resources are “essential.” The importance accorded to these basic in-

structional materials helps to explain why there is widespread dissatisfaction with the quantity and quality available in many districts.

**Quality instructional programs, with well-integrated assessments and interventions.** The survey included questions about the quality of several instructional programs, as well as the need for expanded instruction and improved academic accountability. Respondents were asked to evaluate regular education, vocational education, and arts education programs on the basis of whether or not there were adequate desks, chairs, and tables; whether there was adequate instructional space; whether there were appropriate student/teacher ratios; whether curriculum offerings were appropriate; whether support services were adequate; and – in the case of regular and vocational education – whether the labs and equipment were adequate. In addition, they were asked to agree or disagree with statements about the need for kindergarten and preschool programming and for expanded days of instruction and to respond “yes” or “no” to questions about the measures used to assess academic performance (i.e., proficiency exams).

- ◆ Regular education – The overall grade for regular education was again a “C” with 10.3% of the grades being “F.” In addition, several specific measures received an average grade of “D,” including lack of instructional space, large student-teacher ratios, and insufficient labs and equipment, and the appropriateness of the curriculum received a low “C.” At the same time, over 80% of the town meeting participants and 99% of the participants in the Education Congress judged these instructional resources to be “essential.”
- ◆ Vocational education – The overall grade from the town meetings was a “C+,” the highest of the eight areas that were graded. Only 3.5% of the grades were “F.” This relatively favorable assessment undoubtedly reflects the considerable amount of state support received by vocational education programs after they were mandated in 1969. Although many participants indicated that they were not familiar enough with the vocational programs in their district to assign grades, 69% of the town meeting participants and 100% of those at the Education Congress regard these programs as “essential.”
- ◆ Arts education – In contrast to the relatively high grades assigned to vocational programs, arts education received “D’s” in all five resource areas, for the lowest overall grade given to any of the eight areas of school operation that were assigned letter grades (13% of the average grades were “F”). Yet nearly 64% of the town meeting participants and 100% of those at the Education Congress rated arts education as “essential.” They evidently agreed with the opinion of Judge Linton Lewis, Jr., who declared in the initial trial court decision in *DeRolph* that students should have “sufficient understanding of the arts to enable (them) to appreciate his or her cultural heritage and the cultural heritage of others.”
- ◆ Kindergarten and preschool -- Over 81% of the survey responses from the town meetings and 100% of those at the Education Congress either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that all children should have the right to all-day everyday kindergarten. Similarly, over 76% of those at the town meetings and 100% of those at the Education Congress agreed that all preschool children (ages 3 to 5) should have the opportunity for public preschool programming. Many of the comments from those expressing agreement indicated that preschool programs help ensure that children begin school ready to learn. Currently, Ohio does not fund all-day kindergarten for all students. Only those districts where the proportion of children receiving public assistance equals or exceeds the statewide average or where the three-year average daily membership (enrollment) exceeds 17,500 students receive additional funding for all-day kindergarten.
- ◆ Expanded days of instruction -- Participants were also asked whether the days of instruction should be increased and whether schools should offer summer intervention and enrichment programs. Over 53% of the town meeting participants but only 33.4% of those at the Education Congress agreed that the “explosion of information and technology” has created a need for additional days of instruction. There was stronger agreement on the need for summer intervention and enrichment programs – 87% of those participating in the town meetings and 100% at the Education Congress agreed that schools should offer extended summer

programs.

- ◆ Academic accountability -- Large majorities at both the town meetings and the Education Congress indicated dissatisfaction with the current system of proficiency exams. When asked whether the program of proficiency tests is effective, especially the requirement that students pass the 9<sup>th</sup> grade proficiency exam to graduate high school, less than 32% of the town meeting participants and less than 17% of those at the Education Congress answered “yes.” Asked whether the combination of “proficiency, standardized and teacher tests provide enough academic accountability and information,” less than 35% of the town meeting respondents and fewer than 17% of those at the Education Congress answered “yes.” However, when asked whether (assessment) “measures should identify and reward students, teachers, school building, and school districts,” over 60% of the responses from the town meetings and over 44% from the Education Congress were affirmative. Evidently, most participants did not feel that the system of proficiency exams accurately assesses or adequately rewards good performance on the part of students, schools and districts.

### **Comprehensive support services for all students, including special needs students.**

To assess the quality of the services provided to special needs students, the survey included questions on special education, gifted programming, and programs for “at-risk” students. Like other instructional programs, the special education and gifted programs were graded in a number of specific areas, including instructional space, student/teacher ratios, curriculum offerings, and support services. In addition, the survey asked participants to agree or disagree with statements gauging support for programs for at-risk students.

- ◆ Special education – The average overall grade was again a “C,” with 8.7% of the respondents assigning a grade of “F.” Although many respondents indicated that they were not familiar with the special education programs in their districts, those who were familiar with the programs felt there should be more inclusion of special education students in regular classes. Most participants feel that special education is very important. Nearly 75% of the responses from the town meetings and 100% from the Education Congress rated special education as “essential.”
- ◆ Gifted education – The overall grade given to gifted programming was a “D” and 14.1% of the grades were “F.” This particularly negative assessment no doubt reflects the fact that many districts either have no programs or very limited ones. Some participants expressed the view that gifted education is just as important as special education, yet it is not given the same priority in allocating resources. Over 67% of those at the town meetings and 99% at the Education Congress felt that gifted programming was “essential.” Nonetheless, the state does not require that additional services be provided for gifted and talented students. According to Mary Deem, the former president of the Ohio Association for Gifted Children, the state funds services for less than 15% of all identified gifted children, while local funding for these services decreased by a third between 1990 and 1996. In the absence of any state requirement that they provide services for gifted students, districts under budget pressures have chosen to reduce their funding.
- ◆ At-risk students – Between 70% and 90% of the town meeting participants and virtually all of those at the Education Congress agreed with statements designed to measure support for at-risk programming. Participants were asked whether the program needs of students in poverty areas should be addressed regardless of cost; whether parental involvement programs should be developed; whether family resource centers with licensed social workers, nurses, and guidance counselors should be located in or near school buildings; whether student –teacher ratios in grades K-4 should be no greater than 15:1; and whether schools should coordinate services (for at-risk students) with other agencies. Writing for the majority in the *DeRolph* decision, Justice Francis Sweeney declared that “districts with higher concentrations of ADC pupils are forced to carry more of the extra cost.” Most of the participants in the town meeting and Education Congress evidently recognized that educational costs are higher in high poverty areas and agreed that schools should have the resources they need to meet those costs.

**On-going, meaningful professional development and in-service programs for teaching and non-teaching staff.** To gauge support for these programs the survey asked participants whether teachers need continuous training, whether teachers need more preparation time during the school day, whether teachers should have 10 days of state-subsidized in-service training annually, and whether other school employees should be provided in-service training annually. Over 95% of the town meeting participants agreed that teachers need continuous training and nearly 85% agreed that other school employees should be provided in-service training, while agreement with both statements was unanimous at the Education Congress. There was greater uncertainty regarding the second and third statements. Although large majorities agreed with both of these statements, many were not sure if more preparation time would increase the length of the school day or cut instructional time. Similarly, they were uncertain whether ten additional days of training would increase the length of the school year or result in fewer days of instruction. The additional comments made in response to these statements show the respondents want teachers to receive on-going training, but they do not want instructional time reduced.

**Ohio's School Finance System.** In addition to questions about school resources and programs, the survey included several technical questions about the property tax and several statements regarding the need for better fiscal accountability standards. Respondents were asked whether House Bill 920 (that provided for a tax reduction factor to prevent inflationary growth in property values) should be repealed, whether it should be modified, and whether school boards should be allowed to claim a larger share of the property tax levy by gradually replacing voted millage with inside millage. Many respondents did not understand the questions, and between a third and two-fifths responded "no opinion." Nonetheless, a substantial minority agreed that House Bill 920 should be repealed (44%) or modified (nearly 40%); and that there should be a phase-in exchange of voted millage with inside millage (35%). There was less confusion, but considerable disagreement, about the need for greater fiscal accountability. A majority of those surveyed at the town meetings agreed that school districts do a good job informing citizens about local district fiscal matters (over 59%), and that school districts spend their money wisely (over 64%). Fewer participants at the Education Congress expressed agreement with these statements (20% and a little over 53%, respectively). At the same time, there was limited support for new or additional measures of fiscal accountability. There was stronger support for funding schools through state revenues as opposed to the local property tax. Over 68% of the town meeting participants and nearly 94% of those at the Education Congress agreed with this statement.

## Appendix E: Findings of the Elementary and Secondary School Teacher Survey

The findings of the Coalition's survey of Ohio's public school teachers are summarized below under the same general categories used throughout this report. Most of the questions in the teacher survey asked about the availability of and need for a wide range of specific resources. The survey responses thus help to identify not only the resources schools need to be effective, but also where those resource needs are not being met.

**Safe, educationally-appropriate facilities** – The survey did not ask teachers about the condition of the buildings in which they work. However, it did ask them about the adequacy of the available classroom space.

- ◆ Only 51% of elementary teachers and 70% of the secondary teachers responded that classroom space is adequate. The comments of those who feel that there is not adequate space point to a number of problems. Many classrooms lack space to store equipment and materials or to allow students to move about, and the need for additional classroom space has forced some schools to use rooms without windows or proper ventilation. These comments confirm that many Ohio schools are overcrowded and in poor condition.

**Appropriate, up-to-date material, equipment and technology** – The survey included a number of detailed questions regarding the availability of and need for various materials and equipment. One of the areas of greatest need is basic classroom materials and supplies. The survey asked respondents to estimate the annual classroom budget needed for consumable supplies (paper, pencils, etc.), for instructional materials (maps, charts), for equipment (microscopes, TVs, overhead projectors), and for textbooks and/or tradebooks. The survey did not ask what was actually spent on these classroom resources, but it did ask about the availability of various types of equipment.

- ◆ Judging from the median responses, elementary classrooms require annual budgets of \$150 or more both for consumable supplies and for instructional materials, \$300 for equipment, and \$1500 for textbooks. The median budget figures reported by the secondary teachers were somewhat lower, ranging from \$100 per classroom for consumable supplies and instructional materials, to \$200 for equipment, to \$1000 for textbooks.
- ◆ Over 80% of the respondents at both the elementary and secondary level reported that they have access to TVs, VCRs, copiers, and computers and over 50% had ready access to a telephone. Nonetheless, a substantial percentage of classrooms lack access to these standard equipment items. Most troubling is the insufficient number of computers available. No more than 20% of elementary and secondary school teachers have access to 10 or more computers, yet 43% and 44%, respectively, feel that 10 or more computers are needed.
- ◆ Again, the comments of the teachers emphasized that many classrooms lack basic supplies, equipment, and textbooks, while many others are forced to use equipment and texts badly in need of replacement. A number of teachers reported that they spend their own money on basic classroom supplies.

**Quality instructional programs, with well-integrated assessments and interventions.** Several questions asked about the curriculum, the system of proficiency tests, and the remedial and educational support services available to students. The survey also asked whether the school day or school year should be lengthened and whether they had sufficient time for class preparation and planning.

- ◆ Most of the courses in Ohio's public schools conform, at least in the view of teachers, to the state's curriculum standards. Over 80% of elementary teachers and over 70% of secondary teachers report both that they have incorporated some or all of the of the state's model curriculum into their teaching and that these state standards affect their lesson plans.
- ◆ However, the responses to a number of questions indicate that many school curricula do not meet the stan-

dards of the state's CBE programs. When asked an open-ended question about additional courses that should be offered, many teachers indicated a need for foreign language instruction at the elementary level and for remedial and gifted programs. A substantial percentage of elementary and secondary teachers also reported that their students do not have access to adequate library/media services (23% and 25%, respectively), field trips (36% and 45%, respectively), and lab experiences (81% and 35%, respectively), all of which are part of the model curriculum in many subject areas.

- ◆ Between 71% and 93% of the teachers surveyed indicated that their students need more remediation, more individual tutoring, more one-on-one contact time with teachers, and more time spent on task. They also expressed a great deal of dissatisfaction with the state's proficiency tests. Only 24% of the elementary teachers and 30% of the secondary teachers felt that these tests contributed to the learning process. In their comments, many teachers complained that they were forced to "teach to the tests" and that this often hindered rather than helped them to achieve the goals expressed in the curriculum standards.
- ◆ Most of the teachers surveyed did not feel that lengthening the school day or the school year was necessary. More than 80% responded that the length of the school day was adequate, and more than 90% felt that the length of the school year was sufficient. While these responses are perhaps to be expected, the individual comments of many respondents point out that any increase in the length of the school year will entail substantial costs and that these costs need to be weighed against any instructional benefits. Unfortunately, the survey did not ask about summer remediation and enrichment programs, for which there is likely to be much greater support.
- ◆ A majority of elementary teachers reported needing more planning time. The average daily preparation/planning time reported by secondary school teachers is 62 minutes and 56% felt that this was adequate. Among elementary teachers the average planning time was 42 minutes and only 44% felt that this was adequate. Many teachers, especially at the elementary level, noted that there were no blocks of time for class preparation during the school day. Many also commented that they had few opportunities to plan or coordinate their lessons and instructional activities with other teachers.

**Comprehensive support services for all students, including special needs students.** Several questions asked about student access to support services and about services for special needs students.

- ◆ Many schools are not able to provide students with necessary support services. A large percentage of both elementary and secondary teachers report that their students do not have access to adequate counseling (54% and 24%), psychological (58% and 45%), and nursing (51% and 50%) services.
- ◆ Many schools are also unable to provide necessary services to special needs students. Approximately half of elementary and secondary teachers (46% and 50%, respectively) reported that their students do not have ready access to (enrichment) programs for gifted students, and a nearly a quarter (22% and 26%, respectively) reported that many students lack access to speech and hearing programs.

**Comprehensive extra-curricular programs.** The greatest divergence in elementary and secondary teachers' assessments of school resource needs involved extra-curricular activities.

- ◆ Fully 81% of elementary teachers feel that their students do not have sufficient access to extracurricular activities, compared to 12% of secondary teachers. This discrepancy clearly indicates the need for additional extra-curricular programs and activities at the elementary level.

**District-wide services, including transportation and food services for all students who need them.**

- ◆ The vast majority of both elementary and secondary teachers feel that Ohio's schools provide adequate food (93% and 92%) and transportation (88% and 84%) services.

**On-going, meaningful in-service programs for teaching and non-teaching staff.** Teachers were asked whether their professional development and training opportunities were adequate and the number of days needed each year for professional development.

- ◆ A majority of elementary and secondary teachers (66% and 65%) reported that the professional development available was adequate, and both groups recommended, on average, four days a year for professional development. However, the comments of those who felt that professional development opportunities are inadequate reveal that many districts have little or no opportunity for professional development or that the programs offered provide little help to them in their role as teachers. A number of respondents urged that there be more opportunities for computer training, particularly in the instructional use of computers.

**Sufficient numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff.** Teachers were asked the number of students in their classrooms, and the class size needed to provide a quality education.

- ◆ The median class size reported by elementary teachers was 23 students, while the average among secondary teachers was 25 students per class. The median class size recommended by both elementary and secondary teachers was 20 students. Both groups obviously feel that student outcomes would be improved if class sizes were considerably smaller.

## Appendix F: Recommendations of the Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference

Building upon the previous work of the Coalition, the task of the Project 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference was to develop a public school model that included the educational resources needed to meet the thorough and efficient standard. Before the conference all participants were sent a number of materials, including: 1) the summary results of the town meetings and Education Congress; 2) the current elementary and secondary education standards promulgated by the State Board of Education in 1983; 3) a Legislative Service Commission analysis of the academic accountability measures passed by the 122<sup>nd</sup> General Assembly; 4) a description of the status of gifted pupil education programming; 5) statements by the Ohio Education Audiology Network and the Ohio Speech and Hearing Association; and 6) a listing of the components used to cost out a basic education program in Tennessee. These preparatory materials notwithstanding, many participants felt that they did not have the information or expertise needed to make specific staffing recommendations. However, they did agree upon the need for a variety of curricular and staff resources. The following summary describes the extent of the group agreement and disagreement on the “basket” of educational resources necessary for a model school program and indicates how many of the conference recommendations do or do not conform to existing state or professional standards. The summary is organized around the general resource categories used in previous sections of this report.

**Quality instructional programs with well-integrated assessments and interventions.** Most of the discussion items concerned the need for various instructional and student support staff. The recommendations regarding instructional support staff largely determine the quality of an educational program and are summarized here along with the recommendations concerning curriculum, the length of the school day/year, the state’s system of proficiency tests, and remediation programs.

### Instructional Support Staff:

- ◆ Elementary art, physical education, and music teachers -- The groups were virtually unanimous that all pre-high school students should have elementary art, physical education, and music teachers available to them. This recommendation is consistent with the 1983 state education standards promulgated that require a minimum of 200 minutes a week of planned instruction in art, music, and physical education in grades one through six. However, the groups were less certain about the teacher-student ratios appropriate for each of these subject areas. The recommended ratios ranged from 125 students per specialty teacher to 300 per teacher, and several groups were unable to agree upon specific ratios.
- ◆ Substitute teachers -- Six of the groups were unable to agree upon an annual dollar amount per pupil that should be available for the payment of substitute teachers, and the figures provided by the remaining three groups ranged from \$60 to \$100 per pupil. All of these figures were higher than the \$54 per pupil spent on substitutes by Ohio’s public schools in FY 1998.
- ◆ Teacher aides -- Eight groups agreed that all students should have access to instructional assistants, but only two provided teacher aide-to-student ratios of 80:1 and 100:1.
- ◆ Visiting teachers -- Five groups felt that visiting teachers should be available to all students, but only one group specified that the ratio should be one visiting teacher for every 150 students. None of the groups agreed that visiting teachers should be available only in districts with average to high poverty rates.
- ◆ Curriculum development and instructional leadership personnel -- Six groups agreed that professional personnel should be available for curriculum development, and three groups agreed that a ratio of one such person for every 2,000 students was appropriate (the remaining groups made other comments or did not answer). Four groups felt that professional personnel were needed to provide instructional leadership, with one providing a ratio of one such person for every 2,000 students. Currently, the state requires only that each district provide curriculum supervision to assist in the improvement of the instructional program.

There are no specific personnel requirements.

- ◆ Librarian -- Eight groups agreed that all students should have access to a certified librarian. Seven of these groups agreed that a ratio of one librarian for every 500 students was appropriate, while one group felt that one librarian per district was appropriate. The current state standard requires only that each school library be staffed by a certified librarian or by an aide or volunteer supervised by a certified librarian.
- ◆ Technology coordinator -- Five groups agreed that every district should have a technology coordinator.

#### Curriculum & Programs:

- ◆ Advanced placement (AP) courses -- All nine groups agreed that high school students should have access to AP courses in language arts, science, mathematics, and arts, and five groups felt that AP courses should be available in social studies.
- ◆ Foreign languages -- Five of the groups felt that high schools should offer courses in three foreign languages; two groups felt that courses in two languages are appropriate; and one group felt that classes in four languages should be offered. In addition, eight groups felt that foreign language courses should be offered to students in grades 4-8. There was no consensus on whether foreign languages should be available to primary students in grades K-3. The 1983 state standards currently require high schools to offer three units of one foreign language, or two units each if two foreign languages are scheduled.
- ◆ Summer school -- All nine groups felt that summer school should be available both for students achieving below grade level and for those who want accelerated programming. Ohio has not previously required school districts to offer summer school programs. But the academic accountability measures recently passed by the 122<sup>ND</sup> General Assembly require school districts to offer intervention services students in grades one through three who are identified as reading below grade level, including intense summer remediation after third grade.
- ◆ Career education -- All nine groups agreed that career education should be part of the curriculum. This education should take the form of career awareness programs during the primary grades, career orientation programs at the intermediate level, and career exploration programs for middle and junior high school students.
- ◆ Pre-school programs -- Six groups agreed that pre-school programs should be available to 4-year-old children at public expense, while two groups disagreed and one was unable to make a recommendation. When asked if pre-school programs should be limited to low-income children, five groups disagreed and two agreed.
- ◆ Length of school day/year -- Five of the groups agreed that the length of the school day and the school year should be increased, while the remaining groups either disagreed or could not answer.
- ◆ Proficiency tests -- Seven groups agreed that Ohio's proficiency tests did not improve the learning process (two groups did not answer). When asked what role these tests should play, the groups indicated that these statewide tests should be part of the "curriculum alignment process," pointing up the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum. Six of the groups also agreed that proficiency tests should not be the main indicator of how well a school district is doing, although they did not say what measures should be used.

**Comprehensive services for all students, including special needs students.** The conference participants made a number of recommendations concerning student support personnel such as guidance counselors, nurses, and social workers, as well as administrators and clerical staff. In addition, they were asked about the need for programs for at-risk students.

- ◆ Guidance counselors -- Nine groups felt that guidance counselors should be available to all students, and five of these groups felt that a ratio of one guidance counselor for every 300 students was appropriate. One

group recommended 400:1, and three had other comments. The state standards require only that school guidance services shall be provided for all pupils.

- ◆ Nurses -- Nine groups agreed that nurses should be available to all students, but there was obvious uncertainty about the appropriate ratio. One group said a ratio of 300:1 was appropriate, two said 500:1, and six had other comments.
- ◆ Social workers -- Seven groups agreed that social workers should be available to all students, but again there was little agreement about the appropriate ratio. Recommended ratios ranged from 500:1 to 3000:1, and five groups did not answer. None of the groups agreed that social workers should be limited to districts with average to high poverty rates.
- ◆ Psychologists -- All nine groups agreed that psychologists should be available to all students, with six groups agreeing that a ratio of 1000:1 was appropriate and three recommending a ratio of less than 1000:1.
- ◆ Speech and hearing therapists -- Eight groups said that speech and hearing therapists should be available to all students (one group did not answer). Recommended ratios ranged from less than 1000:1 to 1500:1, with five groups declining to answer. The current state guidelines require audiologists to identify hearing handicapped children but provide funding only on the basis of identified students. Although the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association recommends one audiologist for every 12,000 students, the Ohio Division of Special Education states that one audiologist for every 30,000 students, and one for every 75 identified hearing handicapped students, is appropriate. Finally, the Ohio Speech and Hearing Association recommends a maximum caseload of 40 students, or 25 preschool students.
- ◆ Occupational and physical therapists -- All nine groups felt that occupational and physical therapists and aides should be available for special education students.
- ◆ Principals -- Five groups recommended that there be a full-time principal in all school buildings with at least 15 full-time teachers, and that buildings with enrollment exceeding 500 students should have an additional administrator for every additional 500 students. (Four groups did not answer.) The state standards require only that each school have a principal, and that schools with 15 or more full-time teachers have a full-time principal.
- ◆ Secretarial personnel -- Seven of the groups did not answer the questions dealing with the need for secretarial personnel, both system-wide and within schools. The two groups that answered felt that one secretary is needed for every 400 or 500 students.
- ◆ Programs for at-risk students -- Six groups agreed that personnel to provide compensatory programming should be available to school districts serving at-risk pupils (three groups did not answer), and four of these groups recommended that home visitation, parent involvement, smaller class size, tutors, and summer remediation should be available. The additional comments qualified these recommendations by noting that if class sizes and counselor-student ratios were reduced, additional staffing to provide this programming should not be necessary.

**On-going, meaningful in-service programs for teaching and non-teaching staff.** Conference participants were asked whether professional development and in-service training opportunities should be available for teachers and non-teaching staff. If so, how many days a year should be devoted to this training?

- ◆ Professional development -- Nine groups agreed that annual professional development should be available for all teachers at public expense. One group recommended that 10 days a year be devoted to professional development activities, while the other eight groups were not able to agree on the number of days needed.
- ◆ In-service training -- Only two groups agreed that annual in-service education should be available to all non-teaching employees at public expense, and recommended that two to five days a year be reserved for this training. The 1983 state standards require that certificated and classified staff shall have opportunities to participate in in-service education, including: cooperative planning, implementation and evaluation; job-

related training in areas of need identified in personnel evaluations; and orientation activities for new employees. The standards also call for annual in-service education for certificated staff that includes instructional methods, subject matter updates, and strategies for preventing and correcting disruptive behavior. Although the standards do not specify the number of days a year needed for training, they require that the schedule of each full-time equivalent teacher shall include at least 200 minutes a week for instructional planning and evaluation and conferences.

**Sufficient numbers of teaching and non-teaching staff.** The first resource issue discussed at the conference was what the pupil/teacher ratios should be at the primary (grades K-3), intermediate (grades 4-6), middle/junior high (grades 7-8), and high school (grades 9-12) levels. Although the question asked about pupil/teacher ratios, the comments of the groups indicate that class size, rather than pupil-teacher ratios (which are affected by the assignment of teachers to non-teaching positions), was the focus of the discussion and their recommendations.

- ◆ Primary grades -- Six groups felt that a class size of 15 students was appropriate, one group felt that 17 students was appropriate, and one group recommended a class size of 19 (one group did not answer).
- ◆ Intermediate grades -- One group recommended a class of 15, five groups agreed on a class size of 17, and two groups felt that 19 students per class should be the standard (one group did not answer).
- ◆ Middle/junior high school -- One group recommended a ratio of 15:1, three groups recommended 17:1, and the ratios of 19:1, 21:1, and 23:1 were each recommended by one group (two groups did not answer).
- ◆ High school -- One group again recommended a ratio of 15:1, four groups said 19:1 was appropriate, two groups recommended 21:1, and one group said 25:1 (one group did not answer).

As we can see, most of the groups recommended class sizes of 15 and 17 for the primary and intermediate grades, respectively, but here was much less certainty about the class sizes appropriate for older students. However, the recommended class sizes, even for high school students, are generally below the current state standard that there should be one full-time equivalent teacher for every 25 students in the school district.

**Organizational Reforms.** In addition to discussing the educational resources needed to meet the thorough and efficient standard, the conference participants were asked to evaluate several proposed organizational reforms at the district and state level. Most of the groups felt that school district consolidation was not part of educational reform, but agreed that financial incentives should be offered to small districts to consolidate. There was little agreement about a proposal to reorganize education service agencies into comprehensive regional agencies or about the proposal that Ohio Department of Education personnel and services be included in the regional centers. Most groups agreed that the members of the State Board of Education should all be elected and that the state should establish a statewide purchasing agency. There was less support for reassigning the duties of the Ohio School Facilities Commission and the Office of Information Learning and Technology to the State Board of Education, or for establishing a statewide teachers' salary schedule.

# **CURRENT STATUTES AND ADMINISTRATIVE CODE**

Staffing	Elementary School	Middle School/ Junior High	High School	References
<b>Pupil Teacher Ratio</b>	25:1			ORC 3317.02.03 (C) (1)
<b>Pupil Teacher Ratio</b>	K-4 15:1			DPIA Funding Priority ORC 3317.023
<b>Pupil Teacher Ratio</b>	K-4 25:1			OAC 3301-35-03
<b>All Day Kindergarten</b>	15:1			DPIA Funding Priority ORC 3317.02 ORC 3317.023
<b>Specialized Teachers</b>	Required	Required	Required	OAC 3301-35-03 (H)
1. Counselor				
2. Librarian	Required	Required	Required	Librarian or aide supervised by librarian—OAC 3301-35-03 (B)(2)(b)
3. Nurse				
4. Visiting Teacher				
5. Art				
6. Music				OAC 3301-35-03 (A)(4) requires every district to have teachers in 5 of the 7 categories at a ratio of 1000:5 with art, music and phys. ed. being elementary
7. Physical Education				
<b>Gifted Coordinator</b>	Optional	Optional	Optional	OAC 3301-51-15(5)(1) says if the district has a coordinator they must be fulltime.
<b>Gifted Teachers</b>	Optional	Optional	Optional	Note: 3313.21 ORC requires school districts to identify gifted students but not to serve them.
<b>Special Education</b>				
LD Teacher	16 max. 16 max.	16 max. 16 max.	24 max. 24 max.	ORC 3323 and OAC 3301-51 detail the requirements for special education.
DH Teacher	8 max. + aide As required	8 max. + aide As required	8 max. + aide As required	
MH/SBH/Low Incidence Aides	As required	As required	As required	
School Psychologists	As required	As required	As required	
Occupational Therapy	As required	As required	As required	
Physical Therapy	As required	As required	As required	
Speech Therapists	As required	As required	As required	
Related Services	As required	As required	As required	

	Elementary	Middle School/ Junior High	High School	References
<b>Principals</b>	Required	Required	Required	OAC 3301-35-03(A)(5) Fulltime principal for 15 teachers No principal covers more than 2 buildings
<b>Clerical</b>	Required	Required	Required	OAC 3301-35-03(A)(7) Clerical services shall be provided
<b>Custodians</b>	Required	Required	Required	OAC 3301-35-03(A)(7) custodial services shall be provided
<b>Curriculum Supervision Lesson Plans</b>	Required	Required	Required	OAC 3301-35-03(A)(6)
	Required	Required	Required	OAC 330-35-02 (B) (3) Daily lesson plans shall give direction for instruction and implementation of courses of study
<b>Each of the school districts in the state are required to develop model courses of study for curriculum.</b>	See appendix C	See appendix C	See appendix C	ORC 330.0715 3301.0716 3301.0720
<b>Preschool for children with disabilities</b>	Required	N/A	N/A	Special Education ORC 3323 ORC 3301-51
<b>Kindergarten</b>	2.5 hours per day required	N/A	N/A	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(10)
<b>Readiness activities For handwriting, math and reading</b>	200 minutes per week required	N/A	N/A	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(10)(a)

	Elementary	Middle School/ Junior High	High School	References
<b>Grades 1 through 6</b>	5 hours per day required	N/A	N/A	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(11)
<b>English language arts, health, math, reading, science and social studies</b>	1100 minutes per week required	N/A	N/A	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(11)(a)
<b>Foreign language may be part of 1100 minutes/week</b>	Optional	N/A	N/A	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(11)(a)
<b>Art, music including drama and phys. ed.</b>	200 minutes per week required	N/A	N/A	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(11)(b)
<b>Grades 7 - 8</b>	N/A	5.5 hours per day required	N/A	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(12)
<b>English language arts, math, reading or foreign language, science, social studies</b>	N/A	1000 minutes per week Required	N/A	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(12)(a)(i-v)
<b>Physical Education</b>	N/A		N/A	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(12)(b)
<b>Art, Music, Health</b>	N/A	80 minutes per week required	N/A	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(12)(c)(i-ii)
<b>Business education, typewriting, key-boarding, computer science, industrial arts</b>	N/A	80 minutes per week required for each optional	N/A	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(12)(d)(i-iv)

	Elementary	Middle School/ Junior High	High School	References
<b>Grades 9 - 12</b>	N/A	N/A	5.5 hours per day required	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(13)
<b>A minimum of 45 unites shall be available each year</b>	N/A	N/A	Required	OAC 3301-35-02 (B)(13)(a)
<b>Business or vocational business</b>	N/A	N/A	2 units required .5 unit shall be typewriting or keyboarding	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(13)(b)(i)
<b>Economics</b>	N/A	N/A	.5 unit required	OAC 3301-35-02 (B)(13)(b)(ii)
<b>English language arts</b>	N/A	N/A	4.5 units required	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(13)(b)(iii)
<b>Fine arts</b>	N/A	N/A	4 units required 1 unit art and 1 unit music	OAC 3301-35-02 (B)(13)(b)(iv)
<b>Foreign Language</b>	N/A	N/A	3 units if one language, 2 units if two languages	OAC 3301-35-02 (B)(13)(b)(v)
<b>Health</b>	N/A	N/A	.5 unit required	OAC 3301-35-02 (B)(13)(b)(vi)
<b>Home economics for vocational home economics</b>	N/A	N/A	2 units required	OAC 3301-35-02 (B)(13)(b)(vii)
<b>Industrial Arts</b>	N/A	N/A	2 units required	OAC 3301-35-02 (B)(13)(b)(viii)
<b>Mathematics</b>	N/A	N/A	4 units required	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(13)(b)(x)
<b>Physical Education</b>	N/A	N/A	.5 unit required	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(13)(b)(x)
<b>Reading</b>	N/A	N/A	.5 unit required	OAC 3301-35-02(B)(13)(b)(xi)

	Elementary	Middle School/ Junior High	High School	References
<b>Grades 9 - 12</b>				
<b>Science</b>	N/A	N/A	4 units required of which 2 must be laboratory	OAC 3301-35-02 (B)(13)(b)(xii)
<b>Social Studies</b>	N/A	N/A	2.5 units required of which .5 is American History and .5 is American Government	OAC 3301-35-02 (B)(13)(b)(xiv)
<b>Special Curriculum Requirements Energy and resource conservation K-12</b>	required	required	required	ORC 3301.07(L)
<b>Graduation Requirements</b>	N/A	N/A	required	Amended Senate Bill 55 increased graduation requirements. Schools must adjust course offerings to allow students to meet the new requirements.  Attached are the new requirements.
	<b>District</b>	<b>References</b>		
<b>Teacher evaluation</b>	required	ORC 3319.11.1 evaluation of teachers required  OAC 3301-35-03(A)(8)		
<b>Teacher Inservice</b>	optional	ORC 3313.48 up to two days for professional meetings as part of the school year		
<b>Child abuse training</b>	required	ORC 3319.07.03 requires training		

**Minimum Graduation Requirements**

Subject Area	1983 Standard effective until September 15, 2001	SB 55 Effective September 15, 2001	Graduating Class	Change
English Language Arts	3 units	4 units	2002	+1
Health	1/2 unit	1/2 unit	2002	same
Mathematics	2 units	3 units	2002	+1
Physical Education	1/2 unit	1/2 unit	2002	same
Science	1 unit	2 units until 9/15/03 must include: 1 unit biological science and 1 unit physical science	2002 & 2003	+1
		3 units after 9/15/03 must include: 1 unit biological science and 1 unit physical science	2004	+1
Social Studies	2 units	3 units	2002	+1
Electives	9 units	8 units until 9/15/03	2002 & 2003	-1
		7 units until 9/15/03	2004	-1
		After 9/15/01 one unit or two half-units must include: business/technology, fine arts or foreign language		
<b>Total</b>	<b>18 units</b>	<b>21 units</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>+3</b>

Graduation credit for courses below the ninth grade with criteria.

Post-secondary enrollment options (HB 215) adds non-chartered nonpublic and 9th and 10th grade students after 7/1/98.

"...will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools throughout the state..."

*"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."*

- Thomas Jefferson



*"If there ever was a cause, if ever there can be a cause, worthy to be upheld by all of toil and sacrifice that the human hand or heart can endure, it is the cause of education."*

- Horace Mann

Ohio Coalition for Equity & Adequacy of School Funding

Larry Miller, Chairperson ■ William L. Phillis, Executive Director

137 E. State Street ■ Columbus, Ohio 43215 ■ 614-228-6540 phone ■ 614-228-6542 fax ■ [www.ohiocoalition.org](http://www.ohiocoalition.org)

All children are entitled to the Basket of Essential Learning Resources