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One of a school district’s responsibilities is transporting children to and from school every day. For the 2014-2015 school year, the Ohio Department of Education estimates that school districts transported over 800,000 students at a total estimated cost of $734 million – a task that involved almost 15,000 school buses traveling about 900,000 miles per day. For that year, the General Assembly appropriated $460 million for transportation of nondisabled students. Rising costs have placed pressure on school districts to make their transportation services more economical and efficient. Some districts have responded by cutting back transportation to students whom they are not required by law to transport, such as most high school students or students who live less than two miles from school.

Generally, a district must provide transportation for students in grades K to 8 who live more than two miles from school, whether they attend district schools, public community or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) schools, or private schools that hold a state charter. There are exceptions, however, such as when transportation to a community or STEM school or private school exceeds 30 minutes, or when the district board determines transportation to be impractical and offers to pay a parent instead. But students in certain circumstances, such as students with disabilities and homeless students, are entitled to transportation regardless of age or distance from school. Moreover, a school district may choose to transport any student it is not legally required to transport.

Required transportation of elementary students (grades K to 8)

State law generally requires each city, exempted village, and local school district to transport to and from school any student in grades K to 8 who resides in the district and is enrolled in a school that is more than two miles from the student’s home.¹ A district is required to transport resident
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students attending the district’s own schools, as well as those attending private schools, community schools, and STEM schools.2 (A “community school,” commonly called a “charter school,” is a public school that operates independent of a school district under a contract with a sponsoring entity. A “STEM school” is a public science, technology, engineering, and mathematics school.) By rule of the State Board of Education, however, the mandate to transport private school students applies only to students enrolled in private schools that have received a charter from the State Board.3

State law also outright prohibits a district from transporting students to or from any school that discriminates in the selection of students, teachers, or other employees or that practices discrimination against any person on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

A district may choose to transport students it is not required to transport. It also may be eligible for subsidies from the state for providing transportation for students who live more than two miles from their schools.4 Furthermore, a district may offer a payment in lieu of providing transportation to the parent of a student it is required to transport, upon a finding that it is impractical to transport that student (see below).

“30-minute rule” for students of private, community, and STEM schools

A district is not obligated to transport any private, community, or STEM school student if the direct travel time exceeds 30 minutes, by school bus, between (1) the district school building to which the student otherwise would be assigned and (2) the student’s school, regardless of distance. The 30-minute rule does not apply to students attending the district’s own schools.

Transporting students on the weekend

A school district also is not required to transport elementary or high school students to or from a nonpublic or community school on Saturday or Sunday, unless the district and the student’s school have an agreement in place to do so before July 1 of the school year in which the agreement takes effect.5

History

The mandate to transport students who live more than two miles from school was enacted in 1914. At that time, the mandate applied only to “rural and village school districts” and did not specify the grade levels to which it applied. In 1921, the law was amended to specify that it applied to “elementary students” of “all city, exempted village, rural, and village school districts,”6 apparently expanding its application to all school districts in the state.7 Although there have been a few amendments to this provision over time, the fundamental requirement that all school districts provide transportation for elementary students who live more than two miles from their assigned district school has not been changed since 1921.
The requirement to transport private school students was enacted in 1965 and first applied to the 1966-1967 school year. Shortly thereafter, it was upheld against a challenge that it violated the constitutional bar on government establishing and promoting religion. The 30-minute travel-time limit became effective in December of 1967. It, too, has been upheld against constitutional challenges.

The requirement that school districts transport community school students began when those schools were first authorized in 1997. At that time, it may have applied to all community school students regardless of grade level. The provision was subsequently changed several times so that service to community school students is now the same as it is for private school students. Community schools may transport their own students and receive a payment for doing so, either through an agreement with the students’ resident school district or by unilaterally assuming the district’s transportation responsibility (see below).

The conditional requirement to transport STEM school students began when those schools were authorized in 2007.

Optional transportation of high school students (grades 9 to 12)

The law specifically permits, but in most circumstances does not require, school districts to provide transportation for resident high school students who are not disabled. If a district opts to transport high school students, it appears that the district must offer that service to private and community school students, as well as those attending its own schools. Still, a district need not transport any private, community, or STEM school student for whom the direct travel time is more than 30 minutes. As in the case of elementary students, a district may be eligible for a subsidy for transporting high school students who live more than one mile from their schools.

Determinations of impracticality

Since 1967, statutory law has allowed school districts to offer a parent payment instead of transportation, if the district determines that transporting a particular student is impractical. A 1982 Ohio Supreme Court decision examining this provision stated that "transportation is the rule and payment is the exception" and held that under the law then in effect, a district could not offer payment instead of transportation "unilaterally," but that the decision required confirmation by the State Board of Education. In 2002, the General Assembly enacted standards and procedures that essentially codified the law contained in the Court's ruling.

In making the determination that it is impractical to transport a student, the district board of education must consider all of the following: (1) the time and distance, (2) the number of students to be transported, (3) the
cost of equipment, maintenance, personnel, and administration, (4) whether similar or equivalent service is provided to other students, (5) whether and to what extent the additional service unavoidably disrupts current transportation schedules, and (6) whether other reimbursable types of transportation are available. After considering these factors, the district board may adopt a resolution declaring the impracticality of transportation and then report its determination to the State Board. The district board must inform the student’s parent of the right to either (a) accept the offer of payment or (b) reject the offer and request the Department of Education to mediate.

If the parent accepts the offer, the payment must be at least $250, but cannot exceed the amount determined by the Department as the average cost of student transportation for the previous school year. According to the Department, the maximum amount for the 2015-2016 school year was $925.08.18

If the parent rejects the offer, the district must provide transportation for the student until the matter is resolved either through mediation or by the State Board. If mediation does not resolve the dispute, the State Board must conduct an administrative hearing and may approve the payment in lieu of transportation or may order the district to provide transportation.

If the Department determines that a district has failed to provide transportation after mediation is requested or as ordered by the State Board after the administrative hearing, the Department must order the district to pay the parent an amount equal to the state average daily cost of transportation for the previous year in accordance with a payment schedule ordered by the Department. If the Department subsequently finds that a district is not in compliance with its order and the affected students are enrolled in a private or community school, the Department must deduct the amount the district is required to pay from the district’s state aid account. The Department must pay the deducted money to the private or community school. That school must either disburse the entire amount to the parent or use it to provide acceptable transportation for the student.

The decision of the State Board in an impracticality matter is binding in subsequent years and on future parties, provided the facts remain comparable.

Required transportation in special circumstances

Special education students

School districts have broader responsibilities for the transportation of students with disabilities, regardless of grade level. The law requires each district to transport all of its resident children who are so disabled that they are unable to walk to and from their school or special education classes. In the case of a dispute, the statute specifies that the health commissioner (of the health district) is the judge of the student’s ability to walk.19
School districts and community schools are required under state and federal special education law to identify and provide special education and related services for students enrolled in their schools. Any disabled child between 3 and 22 years old may receive these services. The services must be provided in accordance with the child’s "individualized education program," which is developed by school officials and the student’s parent. Under both state and federal law, "related services" include "transportation and developmental, corrective, other supportive services . . . as may assist a child with a disability to benefit from special education." Accordingly, transportation of a disabled student may entail more than just getting the student to and from school. Depending on the student’s needs, as outlined in the student’s individualized education program, it can include "travel in and around school buildings" and acquiring specialized equipment, such as adapted buses, lifts, and ramps.

Career-technical education students

In accordance with federal law and a plan adopted by the State Board of Education, each city, exempted village, and local school district must provide career-technical education courses for the students enrolled in their schools and for resident private school students. A district might satisfy its obligation by providing the services itself, by contracting with another city, exempted village, or local district to provide the services, or by belonging to a joint vocational school district (JVSD). In compliance with that state plan, each city, exempted village, and local district must transport high school students enrolled in career-technical programs at another district, including a JVSD, from their assigned high school to those programs.

Interdistrict open enrollment students

Each school district must have in place a policy on the open enrollment of another district’s students. The policy must either permit enrollment of students from adjacent districts only, permit enrollment of students from all other districts, or prohibit interdistrict open enrollment altogether. A district enrolling a student under its open enrollment policy, upon request, must provide transportation for the student within the boundaries of the district on the same basis as it transports its own resident students. But the district need pick up and drop off any nondisabled open enrollment student only at a regular school bus stop. Moreover, the district may use state transportation subsidies to reimburse the student’s parent for the reasonable cost of transporting the student to the bus stop, if the student’s family has an income below the federal poverty line.

Homeless students

To promote stability for students who become homeless, state and federal law entitles a "homeless child or youth" to attend school either in
the school district in which the child’s shelter is located or at the child’s ”school of origin,” regardless of where the child’s parent is residing. (A "homeless child or youth" is an individual who lacks "a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence," and the "school of origin" is the school the child attended when permanently housed or the school in which the child was last enrolled.)

Federal law further provides that if the child continues to live in a school district in which the child’s school of origin is located, the district must arrange transportation to and from school for the child. If a homeless child’s living arrangements in the district terminate, and the child begins living in another district but continues to attend the school of origin, the two districts must agree to apportion the responsibility and costs for providing the child with transportation to and from the school of origin. If the two districts cannot reach an agreement, they must share the responsibility and costs equally.

Second, a community school may take over the transportation responsibility unilaterally without entering into an agreement with the students’ resident school district. To do so, an existing community school must notify the district by January 1 of the previous school year, and a newly opening school must notify the district by April 15 prior to its first year of operation.

The state payment to the community school for each student the school transports will be the amount that would have been calculated for the district for the transportation mode the district would have used. Nevertheless, the community school is not required to use that same mode of transportation. If a community school takes over this responsibility unilaterally and subsequently relinquishes the responsibility, it may not take over the responsibility again without the district’s consent.

In the case of either a bilateral agreement or a unilateral assumption of the transportation responsibility, a community school may provide or arrange transportation for other enrolled students who are not eligible for transportation and may charge a fee for those students up to the cost of the transportation service.

Like a school district, a community school that takes over the responsibility to transport students unilaterally may determine that transportation for a particular student is impractical and instead offer a payment in lieu of transportation.
Transportation by STEM schools

Unless the proposal for the establishment of a STEM school, as it was approved by the STEM Committee of the Department of Education, provides for the transportation of students to and from the STEM school, the students’ resident school districts must provide transportation for them to and from the school in the same manner as it provides for transportation of resident students enrolled in nonpublic schools.35

Reimbursement for transportation of College Credit Plus students

The College Credit Plus Program (CCP) allows high school students to enroll in college courses on a full- or part-time basis and to receive either college credit only or both high school and college credit. Students in public high schools and private high schools (chartered and nonchartered) are eligible to participate.

If a school district provides transportation for students in grades 11 and 12, the law permits the parent of a CCP student opting for both college and high school credit to apply to the district board for full or partial reimbursement for the necessary costs of transporting the student between the high school and the college. Similarly, if a community school provides or arranges transportation for its students in grades 9 through 12, the parent of a CCP student enrolled in the community school also opting for both college and high school credit may apply to the community school’s governing authority for full or partial reimbursement. These reimbursements, however, appear to be limited to students with financial need.36

Fee for transportation charged by chartered nonpublic (private) schools

State law expressly permits a private school to charge a fee for transportation, regardless of whether the student is eligible for transportation by a school district, if the school’s governing authority purchased the vehicle transporting the student without using state or federal funds. This includes permission to charge a fee to a parent or guardian who chooses to decline transportation services from their child’s resident school district and use transportation provided by the private school instead. A private school may not charge a parent or guardian a fee that exceeds the per student cost of the transportation, as determined by the school’s governing authority. However, the provision also states that it does not relieve school districts from any statutory duty to provide transportation to students enrolled in a chartered nonpublic school.37

Lower income students enrolled in college courses through the College Credit Plus Program may be eligible for reimbursements for transportation to their college courses.
Transporting nonresident students to a private school

State law specifically permits a district to transport another district’s resident student to a private school if the student’s resident district is not required to transport that student because either (1) the student is in a grade for which the district does not provide transportation or (2) the travel time exceeds 30 minutes. In either case, a nonresident district may agree to transport the student and receive a state transportation subsidy for doing so. The student’s parent must agree to pay any excess costs for transporting the student. If the nonresident district declines a parent’s request for transportation, the district must state in writing its reasons for declining the request.38

Nonroutine transportation

School buses may be used for "non-routine student transportation," which means transportation of passengers for purposes other than regularly scheduled routes to and from school. However, school buses only may be used for non-routine transportation when the trips will not interfere with routine transportation services. Any such use of school buses may require the school bus owner to receive approval of the vehicle and operator as a commercial motor carrier pursuant to state and federal law. A trip permit, issued by the school bus owner or district superintendent, or the superintendent’s designee, is required on any non-routine student transportation trip.39

Districts may authorize out-of-state travel with district-owned or leased vehicles as long as the total round-trip number of miles outside the state’s boundaries does not exceed 1,000 miles.40 Finally, districts may lease their vehicles to private schools for non-routine transportation of nonpublic students to and from “school related” activities that would be approved uses if they were offered by the public schools to public school students.41

Restrictions on vehicles

School districts may use a vehicle with capacities of nine or fewer passengers when school bus transportation cannot be "reasonably" provided. However, such vehicles may not be used to routinely transport students to and from school during regular hours unless the students are in preschool, have special needs, are homeless, are inaccessible to school buses, or placed in alternative schools. These vehicles must be equipped with safety equipment, have a rooftop sign marked “School Transportation,” and have the name of the school district, or name of the contractor, if applicable, on the side of the vehicle. Vehicles must be inspected at least twice a year.

Other vehicles that may be used, other than school buses and vehicles described above, for transporting students to and from school and school-related events under certain conditions are public transit vehicles, commercial carriers, and taxi cabs.42
Transportation by parents

Occasionally, questions arise over whether the rules regarding authorized vehicles and drivers apply to parents transporting their own or others’ children. By their own terms, they do not. Specifically, the rules’ scope of application expressly states that the rules do not apply to "parental transportation that is provided outside the authority of a school or education program, or by any parent for [the parent’s] own children."43 It appears, therefore, that parents are free to arrange car pools or transport their own children individually, as long as the district or school does not play a role in arranging the transportation.
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