

# LOW INCOME / AT-RISK

## **Alabama**

Funding for at-risk students are calculated based on the number of free and reduced price lunch and the number of students scoring at lower levels of required tests

## **Alaska**

Does not apply.

## **Arizona**

Arizona provides compensatory funding.

## **Arkansas**

6-20-2305 School funding: (2)(A) (ii) (ii) For the 2014-2015 school year and each school year thereafter, alternative learning environment funding shall be four thousand three hundred eighty-three dollars (\$4,383) multiplied by the number of identified alternative learning environment students enrolled during the previous school year.

6-20-2305 School funding: (4)(A) National school lunch state categorical funding for each identified national school lunch student shall be as follows:

(i) For a school district in which ninety percent (90%) or greater of the previous school year's enrolled students are national school lunch students, the amount of per-student national school lunch state categorical funding is one thousand five hundred forty-nine dollars (\$1,549);

(ii) For school districts in which at least seventy percent (70%) but less than ninety percent (90%) of the previous school year's enrolled students are national school lunch students, the amount of per-student national school lunch state categorical funding is one thousand thirty-three dollars (\$1,033); and

(iii) For school districts in which less than seventy percent (70%) of the previous school year's enrolled students are national school lunch students, the amount of per-student national school lunch state categorical funding is five hundred seventeen dollars (\$517).

(B) (i) (a) Except as provided under subdivision (b)(4)(B)(i)(c) of this section, national school lunch state categorical funding under this subdivision (b)(4) shall be based on the number of national school lunch students for the immediately preceding school year determined under § 6-20-2303(12)(A).

(b) If the school district is participating under 42 U.S.C. § 1759a, funding under this subdivision (b)(4) is based on the percentage determined in § 6-20-2303(12)(B) multiplied by the number of enrolled students for the immediately preceding school year.

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).

6.04.3 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 \$1,549 in the immediately preceding year to \$1,033 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 \$1,377 ( $\$1,549 - \$172$ ).
- Year two of transition (decrease 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$1,205 ( $\$1,377 - \$172$ ).
- Year three (final year) of transition (decrease 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$1,033 ( $\$1,205 - \$172$ ).

6.04.4 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 \$1,033 in the immediately preceding year to \$1,549 in the current year:

For illustrative purposes:

- Year one (current year) of transition (increase 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$1,205 ( $\$1,033 + \$172$ ).
- Year two of transition (increase 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$1,377 ( $\$1,205 + \$172$ ).
- Year three (final year) of transition (increase 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$1,549 ( $\$1,377 + \$172$ ).
- 

6.04.5 The method of transition for a school district that, within a three-year period, experiences both a decrease and 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 two examples:

6.04.5.1 In the first example, a school district experiences an increase in national school lunch state categorical funding per student from \$1,033 in the immediately preceding year to \$1,549 in the current year, and a decrease to \$1,033 in the following year. In this instance, the transition is completed in two years rather than three.

For illustrative purposes:

- Year one (current year) of transition (increase 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$1,205 (\$1,033 + \$172).
- Year two (final year) of transition (decrease 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$1,033 (\$1,205 - \$172).

6.04.5.2 In the second example, a school district experiences a decrease in national school lunch state categorical funding per student from \$1,033 in the immediately preceding year to \$517 in the current year, no change in the second year, and an increase to \$1,033 in the third year. In this instance, the transition is completed in four years rather than three.

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 \$861 (\$1,033 - \$172).
- Year two of transition (decrease 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$689 (\$861 - \$172).
- Year three of transition (increase 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$861 (\$689 + \$172).
- Year four (final year) of transition (increase 1/3) - the transitioned amount of national school lunch state categorical funding per student is \$1,033 (\$861 + \$172).

### 6.03 National School Lunch State Growth Funding

6.03.1 The ADE shall use the Cycle 2 enrollment data for the previous four years to calculate a three-year trend in district enrollment.

6.03.2 If a district has grown at least one percent for each of the three previous years, it shall qualify for National School Lunch State Growth Funding.

6.03.3 Districts that qualify for funding shall receive National School Lunch State Growth Funding.

6.03.4 The funding shall be calculated as the three year average growth in enrollment multiplied by the district's previous year's percentage of students eligible for the United States Department of Agriculture's National School Lunch Program multiplied by the per student funding amount determined in Section 6.01.

(F) (i) By June 30, 2012, and by June 30 of each year thereafter, a school district shall spend a minimum of eighty-five percent (85%) of the school district's annual national school lunch state categorical funding allocation as provided under subdivision (b)(4)(C) of this section.

(ii) A school district that on June 30, 2012, has a national school lunch state categorical funding balance in excess of fifteen percent (15%) of the school district's current year annual national school lunch state categorical funding allocation shall reduce its total national school lunch state categorical funding balance by at least ten percent (10%) each year so that by June 30, 2022, and by June 30 of each year thereafter, the school district has a balance of no more than fifteen percent (15%) of the school district's current year annual national school lunch state categorical funding allocation.

(2) On June 30, 2012, and on June 30 of each school year thereafter, if the total aggregate balance of all state categorical fund sources (NSL, ALE, ELL, PD) exceeds twenty percent (20%) of the school district's total aggregate annual state categorical fund allocations for the current school year, the school district shall reduce the total balance by ten percent (10%) each year until the school district's June 30 balance of aggregate annual categorical fund sources is twenty percent (20%) or less of the total aggregate annual state categorical fund allocations for the current school year.

(3) A school district may transfer funds received from any categorical fund source to another categorical fund source.

(4) (A) The Department of Education shall monitor on a yearly basis each school district's compliance with the requirements of this subsection.

(B) If a school district fails to comply with the requirements of this subsection during a school year, the Department of Education may in the following school year withhold from that school district's categorical funding allocation an amount equal to the amount required to be spent by the school district in order to be in compliance with the requirements of this subsection.

(C) The Department of Education may redistribute amounts withheld under this subsection to other school districts entitled to receive categorical funding allocations.

### **California**

The LCFF provides supplemental and concentration grants for school districts and charter schools based on the percentage of targeted disadvantaged students, which include those classified as English learners, low income, foster youth, or any combination of these factors. During the LCFF transition, funding from previous categorical programs for low-income and at-risk students is a component of the LCFF transition entitlement.

### **Colorado**

The following is the list of programs under Colorado Revised Statutes which are classified as Low Income / At-Risk. 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 provided for use by the districts to address areas of need.

**Florida**

There is no comparable program existing at this time.

**Georgia**

A weight of 1.3092 is provided for students in remedial education programs; a weight of 1.4717 is provided for students in alternative education programs.

**Hawaii**

Over 59% of Hawaii public school students require more educational resources, including at least 39% economically disadvantaged; 3% with English language difficulties; 5% special education; and 14% 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, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the Children's Health Insurance Program or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) divided by the Average Daily Attendance of the most recent school year. In FY 2015, the district concentration ratio (DCR) is calculated as the average number of students receiving services via the aforementioned programs in FYs 2011, 2012 and 2013 divided by the 2013-14 ADA.

**Indiana****COMPLEXITY GRANT**

The funding associated with the complexity index is computed as a separate Complexity Grant in FY2014 and FY2015. The free and reduced lunch percentage used in the FY2014 formula was updated to the 2012-2013 school year percentage of students eligible for free or reduced lunch. Additionally, it was only used in the FY2014 formula. In the FY2015 complexity formula, it was replaced by the percentage of students receiving free textbooks during the 2013-2014 school year. The foundation grant increased from \$4,569 in FY2014 to \$4,587 for FY2015. The second tier calculation of the complexity index is increased from 1.33 in FY2014 to 1.35 in FY2015.

Both a current September (fall) ADM and current February (spring) ADM were used in the complexity grant formula for FY2014 and FY2015. The Complexity Grant uses two counts for fiscal year funding. For FY2014, the percentage of the school corporations' students eligible for

free or reduced lunch in the 2012-2013 school year divided by two (2) is rounded to four places with the result not being less than zero. If the result of the addition is equal to or greater than .33 in FY2014, it was adjusted by subtracting .33 from the result and adding back the difference in FY2014. This result was then multiplied by the FY2014 foundation amount of \$4569. The grant calculation then multiplied this amount by the current adjusted September (fall) ADM and divides by two (2) to determine the July to December complexity grant. The grant calculation multiplied the foundation amount by the current adjusted February (spring) ADM and divided by two (2) to determine the January to June complexity grant. The sum of these two results was the fiscal year complexity grant.

**Reconciliation:** When the Department finalizes the September ADM count, the remaining complexity grant payment distributions for November and December were adjusted to reflect any overpayment or underpayment in the July through October complexity grant distributions. When the February 2015 ADM count is final, the Department will recalculate and positively or negatively adjust the remaining complexity grant distributions to effect the change in January to June 2015 funding.

### **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. Additional funds are available for high density at-risk percentages. High Density Weighting: Districts in which their students on free meals exceed 35% of their total enrollment.

### **Kentucky**

Funding for the at-risk student population is based on the average daily membership of students in the district who are approved for free meals under the National School Lunch Program. The average daily membership is multiplied by 15% of the base funding amount.

### **Louisiana**

Low Income and English Language Learner Weight

22% - based on the prior year February 1 student count

### **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 **Compensatory Education** grant is provided annually based upon the number of students in the local school system eligible for free and reduced price meals. The grant is calculated by taking 97% of the per pupil amount established in the Foundation Program. The program is equalized on the basis of local wealth. The Fiscal Year 2015 funding level is approximately \$1.25 billion.

**Massachusetts**

Each low-income pupil generates an extra increment of between \$ 2,767 to \$3,422 in foundation budget dollars.

**Michigan**

In 2015, the Michigan legislature appropriated approximately \$317 million for Low Income / At-Risk (At-Risk). The Formula is 11.5% of the district’s per pupil foundation allowance times the number of pupils eligible for free school meals. The appropriation is capped at \$317 million.

**Minnesota**

Low Income / At-Risk 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 \$2,995 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 Low Income / At-Risk**

<b>Definition of Category</b>	<b>Weight</b>
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 38.8% 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**

An at-risk student payment is provided to schools for students who are affected by environmental conditions that negatively impact the student's education performance or threaten a student's likelihood of promotion or graduation. The at-risk student payment is distributed to public school districts in the same manner as Title I funding. Payments are prorated to districts based upon the available appropriation. District's deposit the at-risk student payment into the general fund.

### **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**

See Adequacy Aid component above for free or reduced-price meal eligible students.

### **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-price 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 2015, the maximum security aid per pupil was \$428 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. In all other districts, funding is intended for all at-risk resident 3- and 4-year olds.

Due to budgetary constraints resulting from the recession, the plan to expand the preschool program as defined in the SFRA has not been fully realized. 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 is currently 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 Foundation Aid Formula above.

### **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**

The funding formula includes a factor of .025 for at-risk students. The factor is applied to the percentage of free and reduced price lunch students (grades 3-8) in ADM.

### **Ohio**

Funding in support of the economic disadvantaged is provided to address poverty and its effects on educational outcomes. The statutory provision for this aid program is found in ORC Section 3317.022(A)(5). Its calculation is based on a per-pupil amount of \$269 equalized by the poverty index of the district. Poverty index is calculated by obtaining the square of the ratio of the individual district's poverty percentage to the statewide poverty percentage.

### **Oklahoma**

Pupils who qualify and participate in a free and/or 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. These weights are not capped for an individual student. Further, there is no limit to the number of students in a district who can receive these weights.

### **Pennsylvania**

No response

### **Rhode Island**

The formula includes one weight, called the student success factor, that provides forty percent of the core instruction per pupil to all resident children eligible for USDA reimbursable school meals (FY 2015 = \$3,586).

### **South Carolina**

State appropriated \$79,551,723 for 2014-15.

### **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 \$530.19 (FY 2014-15) per identified at-risk ADM. BEP 2.0 provides 100% of this funding per identified at-risk student.

**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 low-income and at-risk services. School districts and charter schools that do not participate in the NSLP may participate in an alternative reporting program to deliver low-income and at-risk funding for income-eligible students.

**Pupil Weights for Low-Income and At-Risk Students**

<b>Definition of Category</b>	<b>Weight</b>
Pupils who qualify and participate in a free and reduced-price lunch program (per ADA)	0.20
Pupils who are pregnant (per FTE)	2.41

**Utah**

The State Board of Education shall appropriate \$1.2 million from the appropriation (FY15: \$24,376,400) for Enhancement for At-Risk Students for a gang prevention and intervention program designed to help students at-risk for gang involvement stay in school.

Money for the gang prevention and intervention program shall be distributed to school districts and charter schools through a request for proposals process.

In establishing a distribution formula, the State Board of Education shall use the following criteria:

- low performance on U-PASS tests;
- poverty;
- mobility; and
- limited English proficiency.

A school district or charter school shall use money distributed under this section to improve the academic achievement of students who are at risk of academic failure. (UCA 53A-17a-166)

**Vermont**

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.

### **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). The number of students qualifying for FRPL at each district drive an allocation of teacher units in the funding formula. The assumed role of these teacher units are to provide additional hours of instruction to students in the program. The allocation per each eligible student in the 2014-15 school year is approximately \$460.

### **West Virginia**

No specific funds are provided for Low Income / At-Risk.

### **Wisconsin**

See SAGE in the categorical aid chart

### **Wyoming**

Additional staffing resources are generated for students identified as at-risk represented by an unduplicated count of students identified as English Language Learners (ELL), Federal free and reduced lunch (FRL) or considered mobile grades 6-12. Students who are identified as ELL, FRL, or mobile are not necessarily the at-risk students to be served. Rather, the count of these students represents a proxy for the number of struggling or at-risk students in a school.

Additional at-risk resources are funded through other programs such as extended day, and Summer School programs. These programs are administered as state restricted grants.