

# LOW INCOME / AT-RISK

## **Alabama**

Funding for at-risk students are calculated based on the number of free and reduced price applications and the number of students scoring at lower levels of required tests. Funds are also provided for additional education services for high school students failing portions of the high school graduation exam.

## **Alaska**

Does not apply.

## **Arizona**

Does not apply.

## **Arkansas**

The amount of national school lunch state categorical funding under Ark. Code Ann. § 6-20-2305(b)(4)(A) shall be increased or decreased in each year of a three-year transition period by one-third (1/3) of the difference between the amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student for the current year and the amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student for the immediately preceding year, adjusted for changes to the funding rates in Ark. Code Ann. § 6-20-2305(b)(4)(A).

The method of transition for a school district that experiences a decrease in the amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student under Ark. Code Ann. § 6-20-2305(b)(4)(A) is detailed using the following example of a decrease in national school lunch state categorical funding per student from \$1,488 in the immediately preceding year to \$992 in the current year:

For illustrative purposes:

- Year one (current year) of transition (decrease 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$1,322.67 (\$1,488 - \$165.33).
- Year two of transition (decrease 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$1,157.34 (\$1,322.67 - \$165.33).
- Year three (final year) of transition (decrease 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$992 (\$1,157.34 - \$165.34).

The method of transition for a school district that experiences an increase in the amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student under Ark. Code Ann. § 6-20-2305(b)(4)(A) is detailed using the following example of an increase in national school lunch state categorical funding per student from \$992 in the immediately preceding year to \$1,488 in the current year. (604.4)

For FY13, it is basically tiered in three levels:

- 90% or greater free and reduced lunch percentage school districts receive \$1,549 per free and reduced count.
- 70% up to 90% free and reduced lunch percentage school districts receive \$1,033 per free and reduced count.
- Below 70% free and reduced lunch percentage school districts receive \$517 per free and reduced count.

There are other considerations. There is a provision for a “three-year transition” for those districts moving from one funding level to another. The change in funding up or down is divided by three and added to the prior year funding level for each of the next three years until the district reaches the appropriate funding level. So there are districts receiving per student funding of various amounts between the amounts shown above.

### **California**

Economic Impact Aid (EIA) is a state categorical program that provides supplemental funds, kindergarten through grade twelve, to support: 1) additional programs and services for English learners (ELs) and 2) compensatory education services for educationally disadvantaged students. Funding is allocated based on a district per pupil rate times the sum of: 1 Prior year English Learner count, 2 Current year Title I Formula child count, and 3 Weighted Concentration Factor.

### **Colorado**

The following is the list of programs under Colorado Revised Statutes which are classified as Compensatory Education. The Revised Statutes are available at:

<http://www2.michie.com/colorado/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=fs-main.htm&2.0>

[\*Art. 20. Education of Exceptional Children, 22-20-101 to 22-20-117.\*](#)

[\*Art. 23. Education of Migrant Children, 22-23-101 to 22-23-107.\*](#)

[\*Art. 24. English Language Proficiency Act, 22-24-101 to 22-24-106.\*](#)

[\*Art. 25. Colorado Comprehensive Health Education Act, 22-25-101 to 22-25- 110.\*](#)

[\*Art. 26. Gifted and Talented Students, 22-26-101 to 22-26-108.\*](#)

[\*Art. 27.5. Before- and After-School Dropout Prevention Programs, 22-27.5-101 to 22-27.5-106.\*](#)

[\*Art. 28. Colorado Preschool Program Act, 22-28-101 to 22-28-113.\*](#)

[\*Art. 29. Character Education, 22-29-101 to 22-29-106.\*](#)

### **Connecticut**

Does not apply.

### **Delaware**

Academic Excellence instruction units are provided on the basis of one unit per 250 pupils enrolled and funds are also provided for extra time for students at risk of not meeting state standard in core content areas.

### **Florida**

There is no comparable program existing at this time.

### **Georgia**

A weight of 1.3136 is provided for students in remedial education programs; a weight of 1.5938 is provided for students in alternative education programs.

**Hawaii**

Over 50% of Hawaii public school students require more educational resources, including at least 31% economically disadvantaged; 3% with English language difficulties; 5% special education; and 13% with multiple special needs.

Within the Hawaii statewide school district, the weighted student formula allocates state funding to schools for economically disadvantaged students, based on the Federal free and reduced lunch classifications, that are similarly used for Federal Title I grants. The economically disadvantaged weight is 0.10 per student at this time.

**Idaho**

Does not apply.

**Illinois**

Grants for low-income students have been a part of the GSA formula since FY 1999. Grants are based on a district's concentration ratio of low-income students. This ratio is the three-year average of students in the district who received services through Medicaid or Food Stamps divided by the Average Daily Attendance of the most recent school year. In FY 2011, the district concentration ratio (DCR) is calculated as the average number of students receiving Medicaid or Food Stamps in FYs 2007, 2008 and 2009 divided by the 2009-10 ADA.

Districts with a  $DCR \leq 15\%$  receive a flat grant of \$355 per pupil.

Districts with a  $DCR > 15\%$  receive per pupil grants based on the following curvilinear formula:  
 $[2,700 \times (DCR)^2 + 294.25] \times 3$  year average

**Indiana**

For FY13, National School Lunch Funding is basically tiered in three levels:

- 90% or greater free and reduced lunch percentage school districts receive \$1,549 per free and reduced count.
- 70% up to 90% free and reduced lunch percentage school districts receive \$1,033 per free and reduced count.
- Below 70% free and reduced lunch percentage school districts receive \$517 per free and reduced count.

There are other considerations. There is a provision for a "three-year transition" for those districts moving from one funding level to another. The change in funding up or down is divided by three and added to the prior year funding level for each of the next three years until the district reaches the appropriate funding level. So there are districts receiving per student funding of various amounts between the amounts shown above.

There is also tiered national school lunch growth funding.

6.04.2 The amount of national school lunch state categorical funding under Ark. Code Ann. § 6-20-2305(b)(4)(A) shall be increased or decreased in each year of a three-year transition period by one-third (1/3) of the difference between the amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student for the current year and the amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student for the immediately preceding year, adjusted for changes to the funding rates in Ark. Code Ann. § 6-20-2305(b)(4)(A). See additional information on the website.

## **Iowa**

Formula supplementary weighting is provided for at-risk programs and alternative schools and is determined partially on the percentage of pupils enrolled in grades one through six eligible for free and reduced price meals in a school district and partially on the budget enrollment of the school district. In addition, spending authorization for returning dropout and dropout prevention programs is funded on the basis of 25% or more from the combined district cost of the school district and up to 75% through modified allowable growth approved by the School Budget Review Committee. Modified allowable growth is an increase in budget authority, requested by the district, and is funded with balance on hand or a local property tax levy.

## **Kansas**

### *Funding for At-Risk Students*

Additional funding is provided for at-risk students. The formula is based on the number of students qualifying for free meals with the additional weight set at 0.456 for 2011. In addition, additional funds are available for high density, medium density and non-proficient at-risk students. High Density Weighting: Districts in which their students on free meals exceed 50% of their total enrollment, or a density of 212.1 student per square mile and a free lunch percentage of at least 35.1% and above also use the 0.10 factor per at-risk student. Medium Density: Districts with enrollments of at least 40% but less than 50% use a factor of 0.06 for each at-risk student. A small amount is also given to schools based on the students not on free meals who are non-proficient on state assessment tests. Students not eligible for free meals but who score below proficient in reading or math on the state assessments are weighted 0.0465.

## **Kentucky**

Discontinued for all practical purposes in 1990.

## **Louisiana**

Does not apply. We do have additional funding for At-Risk Students:

Add-on weights - based on student characteristics recognizing the extra cost of instruction for certain categories of students or classes.

At Risk Students (22%) Students who have limited English proficiency who are not contained in the at-risk weight based on the free and reduced lunch criteria, are added to the At-Risk

At-Risk Students are those students receiving free and reduced lunch.

**Maine**

The State provides additional subsidies for all children eligible for free or reduced lunches in each LEA based on a 1.15 pupil weighting.

**Maryland**

A funding level per student who is eligible for free and reduced price meals (FRPM) is calculated by taking 97% of the per pupil amount established in the Foundation Program. The Fiscal Year 2011 funding level is approximately \$1 billion.

**Massachusetts**

Each low-income pupil generates an extra increment of between \$ 2,561 to \$3,167 in foundation budget dollars.

**Michigan**

In 2011, the Michigan legislature appropriated approximately \$309 million for compensatory education (At-Risk). The Formula is 11.5% of the district's per pupil foundation allowance times the number of free school meals claimed by the district. The appropriation is capped at \$309 million.

**Minnesota**

Compensatory education revenue is included in the general education revenue program. Funding is based on building-level concentration of students eligible for free and reduced priced lunches as of October 1 of the previous fiscal year. Students eligible for reduced price lunches are weighted at 0.5 and students eligible for free lunches are weighted at 1.0. If the adjusted free & reduced price lunch count is at least 80% of the building's enrollment, the compensatory revenue equals \$2,825 times the adjusted free & reduced price lunch count. The rate per adjusted count decreases proportionately as the concentration of eligible students decreases (e.g., ½ of this amount for a school with an adjusted eligible count equal to 40% of building enrollment).

**Pupil Weights for Compensatory Education**

Definition of Category	Weight
Free & Reduced Price Lunch	Variable weighting 0.0 to 0.6, depending on concentration of free & reduced lunch-eligible pupils in the building. Applies only to compensatory revenue calculation

**Mississippi**

MAEP has an at-risk component that is based on 5% of the Base Student Cost times the number free lunch participants on October 31 of the previous year.

**Missouri**

State aid for students at-risk of completing their K-12 education is included in the Basic State Aid to districts. When a district's count of students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch exceeds the state threshold, currently at 32% of the district's ADA, the excess is weighted at .25 and added to the district's ADA calculation in the overall weighted average daily attendance.

**Montana**

Does not apply.

**Nebraska**

Poverty Allowance is calculated by taking the lesser of the maximum poverty allowance designated by the district or by the calculated amount based on the number of low income students (progressive percentages between .05 and .30 multiplied by students qualified for free lunches/milk or low income children under 19 years of age living in a household having an annual adjusted gross income equal to or less than the maximum household income that would allow a student from a family of four people to be a free lunch or free mild student, whichever is greater).

**Nevada**

Does not apply.

**New Hampshire**

No response provided.

**New Jersey**

The following 3 categories of aid are based on measures of district and student wealth. For aid purposes, low-income (“at-risk”) counts are based on the number of students eligible for the federal free and reduced priced lunch programs.

*At-Risk Equalization Aid*

Aid for low-income students is primarily provided through equalization aid. As noted above, low-income students generate an additional weight (ranging from 0.47 to 0.57) when determining the adequacy budget. In districts with a low-income concentration lower than 20%, each at-risk student receives a weight of 0.47. This weight gradually increases as the at-risk concentration increases to a maximum weight of 0.57 for districts with an at-risk concentration greater than or equal to 60%.

*At-Risk Security Aid*

As described in the security aid section above, each at-risk student generates an additional categorical allocation for a district, where the per pupil amount received increases with the district’s at-risk concentration. In FY 2011, the maximum security aid per pupil was \$412 per at-risk student in a district with an at-risk concentration of at least 40%.

*Preschool*

The SFRA includes full State funding for all at-risk 3- and 4-year olds to attend full-day preschool programs in every district. In districts with the DFG designations “A” or “B” or those in “CD” districts that also have an at-risk concentration of at least 40%, funding is intended for all resident 3- and 4-year olds, regardless of income.<sup>[1]</sup> In all other districts, funding is intended for all at-risk resident 3- and 4-year olds.

---

<sup>[1]</sup> District Factor Groups (DFGs) are based on a socio-economic index of each school district’s community characteristics. The index is grouped into the following 8 categories, listed from lowest to highest: A, B, CD, DE,

Due to recent budgetary constraints, the State's plan to expand the preschool program as defined in the SFRA was not realized in FY 2011. While some amount of Preschool Education Aid (PEA) was provided to each district that received early childhood aid under the previous funding law, the SFRA calculation was only applied to about 20% of those receiving aid. Other districts' aid allocations were based on prior year aid allocations, with some adjustments.

### **New Mexico**

Does not apply.

### **New York**

See pupil need index in Description of Formula.

### **North Carolina**

North Carolina has two categories of funding specifically for remediation and students at risk of failing. These categories are as follow:

1. At-risk Student Services/Alternative Schools – This funding allocates 1 School Safety Officer per High School and the remaining funds are allocated 50% based on ADM and 50% based on poverty with a minimum of 2 teachers and 2 instructional support positions.
2. Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Funding

Distribute resources based on a prescribed delivery option ... reduction of class size.

Step 1: Use the average statewide (K-12) teacher-to-student classroom teacher allotment for the Fundable Disadvantaged Population which is 1:21.

Step 2: The targeted allotment ratios for the Fundable Disadvantaged Population are:

If low wealth % (per low wealth supplemental funding formula) is > or equal to 90%, one teacher per 20.5 students

- If low wealth % is > 80% but < 90%, one teacher per 20 students.
- If low wealth % is < 80%, one teacher per 19.5 students.
- If an LEA received DSSF funds in FY 2005-06, one teacher per 16 students. These 16 LEAs will not receive less funding than they received in FY 2005-06.

Step 3: Convert the teaching positions to dollars by using the state average teacher salary (including benefits).

### **North Dakota**

Does not apply.

**Ohio**

An index is applied to several components to adjust the district amount based on demographic characteristics of resident population.

**Oklahoma**

Pupils who qualify and participate in a free and reduced lunch program: 0.25

**Oregon**

Oregon funds students in Pregnant and Parenting Programs at a weight of 1.0, students in poverty at .25, neglected and delinquent students at .25 and students in foster care at .25 in addition to the students' general education ADM.

**Pennsylvania**

There is a Poverty Supplement in the Basic Education Funding formula. It is described above.

**Rhode Island**

Does not apply.

**South Carolina**

State appropriated \$136,163,204 for 2010-11.

**Pupil Weights for Compensatory Education**

Definition of Category	Weight
Grade 1-12 pupils who fail to meet statewide standards in reading, writing and math or who do not meet first grade readiness test standards.	0.26 Compensatory 0.114 Remediation

**South Dakota**

Does not apply.

**Tennessee**

Funding is generated in the Classroom Component of the BEP with a state share of 75%. Based on 1:15 class size reduction for grades K-12, estimated at \$509.46 per identified at-risk ADM. Funded at 100% at-risk.

**Texas**

Funding is provided for 20% of the adjusted allotment per pupil eligible to receive free or reduced price lunches under the National School Lunch Program (NSLP). A funding weight of 2.41 is applied to each full-time equivalent student who is pregnant and is receiving compensatory education services. School districts and charter schools that do not participate in the NSLP may participate in an alternative reporting program to deliver compensatory education funding for income eligible students.

**Pupil Weights for Compensatory Education**

<b>Definition of Category</b>	<b>Weight</b>
Pupils who qualify and participate in a free and reduced-price lunch program (per ADA)	0.25
Pupils who are pregnant (per FTE)	2.41

### **Utah**

Does not apply.

### **Vermont**

Part of the student count weighting system provides an additional 25% for students from families receiving food stamps. Also, certain costs for students who need support services but are not eligible for special education are covered by the special education reimbursement system.

### **Pupil Weights for Compensatory Education**

Students age 6 – 17 from families receiving food stamps are given an additional weight of 25%

Students for whom English is not the pupil’s primary language are given an additional 20% weight.

### **Virginia**

#### *At-Risk Program*

State payments for at-risk students are disbursed to school divisions based on the estimated number of federal free lunch participants in each division to support programs for students who are educationally at-risk. Funding is provided as a percentage add-on to Basic Aid to support the additional costs of educating at-risk students.. A local match based on the district’s Composite Index of local ability to pay is required.

### **Washington**

A learning assistance program is available to students identified as deficient in basic skills. Allocations are based on the number of students in grades K-12 qualifying for free and reduced price lunch (FRPL). Districts with a percentage over 40% FRPL or over 20% qualifying for English language services receive an additional amount based upon their percentage over 40%. The funding rate is \$282.13 per FRPL student.

### **West Virginia**

No specific funds are provided for compensatory education.

### **Wisconsin**

Does not apply.

### **Wyoming**

Compensatory Education now falls under other programs such as extended day, tutorial system for Saturday school and a Summer School program which are grant programs outside of the block grant.

