Student Success Factor in the School Funding Formula

Dr. Kenneth Wong Director, Urban Education Policy Program Brown University Presentation at the Senate Finance Committee November 19, 2019

Student Success Factor

- An additional 40 percent of the core instruction amount is allocated to children who are eligible for free and reduced-price school lunch program (FRPL)
- The design of 2010 formula did not include additional weights for ELLs and high-cost special education students to avoid over-identification, a concern raised by the 2007 *Funding Our Future* report:
- "[T]he formula must ensure there are not unintended "incentives" for over-identification of student need. For example, one would not want to design a weighted student count that encouraged school districts to increase student counts in certain higher cost areas in order to receive additional resources."
- Categorical funding for high-cost special education students, English Language Learners, early childhood, career & technical programs, and school construction

SSF as a Key Funding Component

- A. core instruction funding = No. of Resident students x core instruction amount
- B. student success factor funding = No. of Free/reduced lunch eligible students x student success factor (additional 40%) x core instruction amount
- Total foundation = Core instruction funding (A) + student success funding (B)

Core Instruction and SSF Funding Trend

 Core instruction & student success factor dollar amounts have increased over the years



Student Weights in New England and Selected States

State	ELL Weight	Poverty Weight
СТ	15%	33%
ME	50-70% by density	15%
NH	\$684.45	\$1,780 on average
VT	20%	25%
RI	Categorical	40%
NY	50%	12%
NJ	50%	47%-57% by density

Core instruction amount and weights: Considering the Connections

State	Core or Base	Poverty	Special Education	ELL	
RI	Broad base that includes instructional, classroom, school supplies, textbooks and equipment, t eachers, administrative costs, librarians and program supports.	Weight :Student Success Factor of 40% of core instructional amount applied for students eligible for free and reduced lunch	Categorical: State addresses "high-cost" special education students	Some costs are included in base, others in the Student Success Factor	1.
NH	Limited base that includes Staff, instructional materials, technology, teacher development, facilities operations & maintenance, and transportation – roughly \$3,500 per student	Categorical: towns that are in the bottom 8 th of property wealth receive \$2,000 per pupil Towns that are the second lowers 8 th receive \$1,250 per pupil	Categorical: \$1,856 per pupil	Categorica l: receive \$685 per pupil	
ME	Moderate base that Includes 97% of basic classroom and instruction cost, support programs and some benefits	Weight: 15% of base rate	Weight: 27% of base rate	Weight: 50-70% based on density	

- I. Rhode Island has a relatively comprehensive core instruction amount
- 2. Some states have higher weights but a much smaller core instruction amount

Low-income status and other high needs status are correlated

- 2010 Act: All children should have access to an adequate and meaningful education regardless of their residence or economic means
- Students' low-income status is highly correlated with English Language Learner status as well as IEP status, suggesting funding formula's aim to address the education needs of all students

	Correlation (n=60)	Correlation (without urban core, n=56)
Free/Reduced Lunch Students LEP / ELL Students	.961	.826
	Correlation (n=60)	Correlation (without urban core, n=56)
Free/Reduced Lunch Students IEP Students	.935	.916

Charter LEAs and high needs students

• For Charter LEAs, total foundation funding and state aid are correlated to concentration of high needs students, especially those who come from low income background

Group	2017 Correlation Between Status and Total State Aid CHARTER LEAs	2018 Correlation Between Status and Total State Aid CHARTER LEAs	Group	2017 Correlation Between Status and Total Foundational Funding CHARTER LEAS	2018 Correlation Between Status and Total Foundational Funding CHARTER LEAS
# of ELL Students	.721	.691	# of ELL Students	.667	.725
# of FRPL Students	.988	.984	# of FRPL Students	.979	.980
# of IEP Students	.946	.931	# of IEP Students	.953	.931

State Aid Correlated with Low Income Students

- For municipal LEAs, total foundation funding and state aid are highly correlated to concentration of high needs students, especially those who come from low income background
- See correlational plots for all LEAs on the next slide

Group	2017 Correlation Between Status and Total State Aid MUNICIPAL LEAs	2018 Correlation Between Status and Total State Aid MUNICIPAL LEAs		Group	Between Status and Total Foundational Funding	2018 Correlation Between Status and Total Foundational Funding MUNICIPAL LEAs
				ELL Students	.978	.904
ELL Students	.958	.955		FRPL Students	.963	.966
	.550			IEP Students	.973	.981
FRPL Students	.993	.997				
IEP Students	.953	.959				











Four scatter plot examples from 2017/2018 showing R-Squared coefficient of determination (funding correlated to the variation in high needs students for all LEAs)

Growing Support for ELLs and Students with Disabilities (UCOA all funding sources: FY2012-18)

Year	Spending on ELLs	Spending on Students with Disabilities
2012	\$31.7M	\$527.8M
2015	\$41.3M	\$532.8M
2018	\$51.8M	\$562.3M
% Increase	63%	6.5%

Implications

- Consider the connections between core amount and student weights (Student Success Factor)
- Continue to maintain strong correlations between total foundation dollars and student needs
- Strengthen state-local partnership in supporting ELLs and students with disabilities (9% and 15% of the total student population in RI respectively)