Education Funding 101

Office of Fiscal Analysis Office of Legislative Research Sarah Bourne, John Moran and Marybeth Sullivan

Presentation Overview



EDUCATION COST SHARING GRANT

Education Cost Sharing (ECS) Grant

- Major form of state education aid to towns
- ECS topics:
 - ✓ Legal history✓ Formula components
 - ✓ Additional aspects
 - ✓ Full-funding targets



- *Horton v. Meskill* (1977): Connecticut Supreme Court held that it is unfair for public education to be primarily funded with municipal property taxes, because that meant less wealthy cities and towns had less education dollars
- The court ordered the state to construct a fairer funding formula where the state could act as an equalizer to make up the difference between property-wealthy and property-poor towns
- The Legislature responded by enacting the Guaranteed Tax Base (GTB), the first major education equalization formula in Connecticut, and the precursor to the ECS formula
- First version of ECS enacted in 1988 (effective FY 1989-90)

Education Cost Sharing (ECS) Grant

• Formula's Three Main Factors:

```
Need Student Count

X

Per-Student Foundation

X

State Aid Percentage (a.k.a. Aid Ratio)

= Full Funding (a.k.a. Target Aid)
```

ECS Formula =

Student Need Count X Foundation X State Aid Percentage

- Student Need Count = Resident Students + Weighting for Poverty Students
 - Resident Students (as of each Oct. 1) plus 30% added weight for each student eligible for Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)
 - Example: 100 FRPL students = 130 students in Student Need Count

ECS Formula =

Need Student Count X Foundation X State Aid Percentage

• Foundation:

- The level of weighted per-student spending that ECS grants help towns achieve
- Current foundation: \$11,525
- Foundation is not a promise for \$11,525 per student in state aid as each town must contribute its local share

ECS Formula =

Need Student Count X Foundation X State Aid Percentage

- State Aid Percentage (Aid Ratio):
 - A numerical representation of a town's property wealth with a small adjustment for town income
 - Based primarily on the town's equalized net grand list per capita
 - Property poor towns have higher percentages than property wealthy towns

Examples: Two Hypothetical Towns

| Town | Need Students | Foundation | State Aid Percentage | Fully Funded ECS Aid (Target Aid)* |
|---|------------------|------------|-------------------------|--|
| Property Wealthy Town | 1,000 | \$11,525 | 0.3 | \$3,457,500 |
| Property Poor Town | 1,000 | \$11,525 | 0.9 | \$10,372,500 |
| * Most towns do not receive full funding. | | | | |

Other Aspects of the ECS Formula

- Guaranteed minimum State Aid Percentage:
 - 10% for Alliance Districts
 - 2% for all other districts
- Each town's aid at least flat funded (held harmless)
- Most towns do not receive full funding

Last Year's Budget Act: PA 14-47

- ECS allocations based on formula with a few minor exceptions
- Printed ECS allocations by town
- Removed phase-in language for grant increases

Equalization Effect of ECS

FY 15 ECS Aid Per Student by Wealth Deciles



FY 14-15 ECS Phase-In: Alliance vs. Non-Alliance Districts

% Alliance of Total ECS Funding by FY



FY 14-15 ECS Phase-In: Alliance vs. Non-Alliance Districts



ECS Grant Full-Funding Targets

In FY 14 total target ECS aid was: \$2.67 billion

In FY 14 total ECS aid was: \$1.99 billion

In FY 14 ECS was funded at 74.9% of full funding

SCHOOL CHOICE FUNDING

Education School Choices

Charter School Programs

Inter-district Magnet Schools

CTHSS/Technical High Schools

Regional Agricultural Science Centers (Vo-Ag)

Open Choice Program

Charter Schools CGS § 10-66aa

Characteristics

- Public, non-sectarian, nonprofit
- Established under a charter granted by the State Board of Education (state charters) or a local board of education and the state board (local charters)

Operators

• Any person, association, corporation, college or university, or regional education service center (RESC)

Charter School Funding

- State grant per student basis for state charters
- \$11,000 per student for FY 15
- Charter students not counted in town's ECS calculations

Magnet Schools CGS § 10-264/

Characteristics

- Public, inter-district
- Designed to promote racial, ethnic, and economic diversity
- Special, themed curriculum

Operators

 Local or regional boards of education, RESCs, or other entities

Magnet Student Funding

Hartford Region: Per-Student Grants Show by Sample Towns

Chart 1: RESC-Operated Sheff Magnet: > 60% of Total Enrollment from Hartford

| | <u>State</u> | | |
|--------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| | Magnet ¹ | Magnet ¹ To | |
| Sending Town | <u>Grant \$</u> | <u>ECS \$1</u> | <u>Aid \$</u> |
| Hartford | 3,000 | 9,217 | 12,217 |
| W. Hartford | 7,085 | 1,777 | 8,507 |
| Granby | 7,085 | 2,739 | 9,469 |

Chart 2: RESC-Operated Sheff Magnet: < 60% of Total Enrollment from Hartford

| | <u>State</u> | | |
|--------------|------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| | Magnet ¹ <u>T</u> | | Total State |
| Sending Town | <u>Grant \$</u> | <u>ECS \$1</u> | <u>Aid \$</u> |
| Hartford | 10,443 | 9,217 | 19,660 |
| W. Hartford | 10,443 | 1,777 | 12,220 |
| Granby | 10,443 | 2,739 | 13,182 |

Chart 3: Hartford Host Magnet

| | <u>State</u> | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | | Total State |
| <u>Sending Town</u> | <u>Grant \$</u> | <u>ECS \$2</u> | <u>Aid \$</u> |
| Hartford | 3,000 | 9,217 | 12,217 |
| W. Hartford | 13,054 | 1,777 | 14,831 |
| Granby | 13,054 | 2,739 | 15,793 |

¹The magnet operating grant is payable to the RESC, while the ECS grant is payable to the sending town. The sum of the two represents the state aid for each student attending an interdistrict magnet school, but does not represent the total state aid that goes to the school. ²Hartford receives a magnet operating and an ECS grant for each student from Hartford, plus a magnet grant for each student from outside Hartford who attends a Hartford host magnet. Sending towns receive ECS grants for their students attending Hartford host magnets. *Starting with FY 11, RESCs must charge tuition equal to the difference between the school's average per pupil expenditure for the prior fiscal year and the sum of (1) the state magnet school operating grant and (2) any revenue the school receives from other sources, calculated on a per-pupil basis. Because per-pupil expenditures vary from school-to-school, tuition charged to sending districts also varies. *State law prohibits Hartford from charging tuition for students enrolled in interdistrict magnet schools it operates.

Magnet Student Funding

New Haven/New London Region: Per-Student Grants Show by Sample Towns

Chart 4: RESC-Operated Non-Sheff Magnet: > 55% of Total Enrollment from New Haven/New London¹

| | <u>State</u> | | |
|--------------|--|----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Sending Town | <u>Magnet² Grant \$</u> | <u>ECS \$2</u> | <u>Total State</u> <u>Aid \$</u> |
| New Haven | 3,000 | 8,209 | 11,209 |
| Waterford | 7,085 | 500 | 7,585 |
| Oxford | 7,085 | 2,232 | 9,317 |

Chart 5: RESC-Operated Non-Sheff Magnet: < 55% of Total Enrollment from New Haven/New London

| | <u>State</u> | | |
|--------------|--|---------|-------------------------------------|
| Sending Town | <u>Magnet²</u> <u>Grant \$</u> | ECS \$2 | <u>Total State</u> <u>Aid \$</u> |
| New Haven | 7,900 | 8,209 | 16,109 |
| Waterford | 7,900 | 500 | 11,912 |
| Oxford | 7,900 | 2,232 | 10,132 |

Chart 6: New Haven/New London Host Magnet

| | <u>State</u> | | |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| <u>Sending Town</u> | <u>Magnet³ Grant \$</u> | <u>ECS \$</u> 3 | <u>Total State</u> <u>Aid \$³</u> |
| New Haven | 3,000 | 8,209 | 11,209 |
| Waterford | 7,085 | 500 | 7,585 |
| Oxford | 7,085 | 2,232 | 9,317 |

¹To simplify the table, we assumed that the town with more than 55% enrollment in the magnet school is New Haven, but by law any non-Sheff RESC magnet school that has more than 55% of its enrollment from one town gets \$3,000 for each of those students. One exception is the Wintergreen Magnet School in Hamden.

²The magnet operating grant is payable to the RESC, while the ECS grant is payable to the sending town. The sum of the two represents the total state aid for each student attending an interdistrict magnet school, but does not represent the total state aid that goes to the school.

³A host town receives both a magnet operating and an ECS grant for each of its students, plus a magnet grant for each student from outside the host town who attends the host magnet. Sending towns receive ECS grants for their students attending host magnets. To simplify the table, we assumed that the host magnet is operated by the New Haven school district.

*Starting with FY 11, RESCs must charge tuition equal to the difference between the school's average per pupil expenditure for the prior fiscal year and the sum of (1) the state magnet school operating grant and (2) any revenue the school receives from other sources, calculated on a per-pupil basis. Because per-pupil expenditures vary from school-to-school, tuition charged to sending districts also varies.

**Although, unlike Hartford, New Haven is not prohibited by law from charging sending towns tuition to attend a New Haven host magnet, it has traditionally not done so.

Technical High Schools CGS § 10-95 to -99g

Characteristics

- Serve regions of multiple districts
- Provide vocational education for specific careers as well as standard curriculum

Operators

• Exclusively state-operated

CTHSS/Technical Schools Funding

- Appropriated from state \$156.7 million
- CTHSS students are not counted in their town's ECS calculation

Regional Agriscience Centers CGS § 10-64 to -66

Characteristics

- Typically embedded in existing public school
- Vocational agricultural or aquaculture science as well as standard curriculum
- Serve regions of multiple districts

Operators

• Host public school districts

Regional Vo-Ag Center Funding

- Center receives \$3,200 per student
- Centers charge sending districts tuition of \$6,822 per student
- Students are counted within the ECS formula

Open Choice Program CGS § 10-266aa

Characteristics

- Voluntary, statewide, inter-district
- Allows students from large urban districts to attend suburban schools and vice versa, on a space-available basis
- Purpose is to reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation and improve academic achievement

Operator

• Public school districts

Open Choice Funding

• Open Choice Grant:

| % of Open Choice students out of total population of the receiving district | Reimbursement Amount per Student to Receiving District |
|---|--|
| < 2% | \$3,000 |
| 2% to <3% | \$4,000 |
| 3% to <4% | \$6,000 |
| > 4% | \$8,000 |

 In addition, both the sending and receiving districts may count ½ of each student participating, in their ECS calculation.

Number of Students and Schools Participating in Choice Programs



| School Choices | # of schools | # of students |
|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Magnet | 87 | 26,151 |
| Charter | 31 | 7,132 |
| Open Choice | 139 | 2,800 |
| CTHSS | 18 | 10,900 |
| Vo-Ag | 19 | 3,100 |

School Funding Comparing: ECS, Magnet and Charter Schools



AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMMING

After School Program

After School Programs

Inter-district Cooperative Programs

Priority School District Extended Hours

After School Programs CGS § 10-16X

- Eligible grant recipients:
 - Local and regional boards of education
 - Municipalities
 - Nonprofit organizations (501(c)(3))
- Characteristics:
 - Provides educational, enrichment, recreational activities
 - Serves grade K-12 students
 - Has parent involvement component

| Fiscal Year | # of Students | Grant Amount |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| 2013-2014 | 5894 | \$6,513,147 |
| 2014-2015 | 4173 | \$6,200,086 |

Inter-district Cooperative Programs CGS § 10-74d

• Eligible grant recipients:

Assisting local and regional boards of education; regional educational service centers (RESCs); and nonsectarian nonprofit organizations.

• Characteristics:

Academically sound enrichment activities, observable and measureable academic achievement, focus on academic tutoring, personal and academic counseling, an understanding of how culture affects teaching and learning.

| 2014-2015 Profile | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|--|--|
| State Appropriated Grant | \$9,112,199 | | |
| Students Served | 41,488 | | |
| Hartford Minority Students | 5,591 | | |

Priority School District (PSD) Extended Hours CGS § 10-266q

- Eligible grant recipients:
 - Local boards of education in districts designated as "priority school districts"
- Characteristics:
 - Offers academic enrichment, tutorial, and recreational programs or activities
 - Activities may take place before school, after school, weekends, or school vacations
- 14 Priority School Districts
- \$2,994,752 appropriated for FY14
- Benefits approximately 23,868 students

Questions?