

**From:** [Jordan Frank](#)  
**To:** [S Legislation](#)  
**Subject:** Testimony S-2934 / Section 16-7.1-5.3 (3)  
**Date:** Sunday, May 17, 2026 6:30:05 PM

---

You don't often get email from jordanfrank@me.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To: State Senate Education Committee.

From: Jordan Frank / Providence RI

I am writing testimony for your 20 May 2026 meeting, in regards to [S-2934 / Section 16-7.1-5.3 Part \(3\)](#) about the Contribution amount.

As a citizen of Providence and one who spent 7 Years on a Private School Board (Gordon), including years participating and leading the Finance Committee and the Investment Committee, generally applaud the bill as written, but for the part about the contribution levels.

There are several issues:

**- It demands an increased average contribution, rather than marginal contribution, per student:** This sounds good but the *\*marginal\** cost per new student is not the same as the *\*average\** cost for all students. The increase should be based on the marginal cost, not the average. Marginal costs can vary significantly based on the size of the school, whether you have to add classrooms or teachers... but in the best case scenario, there is a seat available and the marginal cost might be school lunch and nominal administrative time. In the worst case scenario, the added student tips the balance (e.g. a 26th student in a classroom) and requires a new teacher... but it would be rare that an added student, say, requires a new principal, middle school head, gym teacher, and so on. A school CFO may have a better idea about how to define marginal increase (decrease) per student in the population.

**- It requires increase per student based on inflation, irrespective of context:** Are you talking about inflation of school costs (salaries, chalk, food, snowplowing...) or are you talking about CPI? "Inflation is a blunt hammer here. A school CFO may have a better idea about how to define keeping up with costs.

**- It requires increases which may blow the city's budget altogether:** If PVD adds students **OR** faces inflation **OR** faces state aid increases at a rate faster than 4% maximum city tax levy increase *\*in any given year\**, then the mandated increase will blow the City budget. You can't put something into law that conflicts with another law. This very well might.

**- It looks at Per Year increases on a Per Year instead of Rolling basis:** If inflation or State Aid increase is 8% one year and 2% the next, the average is a 5% increase. The 8% increase in one year may be untenable for the City budget, but over 2 years, the 5% average might be doable, even though its a stretch over the 4% maximum increase. So, budget changes might look at annual variables but shouldn't be subject to annual spending shocks.

**- Efficiencies are not Allowed:** If the school system figures out how to digitize math learning or cuts the MLL program (altogether or with, say, a one semester or year immersion program with a lower cost structure) or consolidates leadership for multiple schools into a central administration, cost savings could be achieved but the City would be mandated to spend the

money anyway. That's problematic.

**- Increase per Student + Inflation OR by State Aid Increase? Which one?** Does the city choose the lower of the two? or is it compelled to use the higher of the two?

Thanks for your consideration.

Jordan Frank  
Providence, RI