



# Concentrated Poverty

## Concentrated Poverty

<b>Alabama</b>	Alabama does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. However, Alabama does provide a small amount of funding for individual students from low-income households. For more information, see “Poverty.”
<b>Alaska</b>	Alaska does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve.
<b>Arizona</b>	<p>Arizona provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so through two program-specific allocations.</p> <p>School districts in Arizona receive funding to support K-3 students improve reading skills, literacy, and proficiency, in schools where at least 90% of students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) under the National School Lunch Program. Arizona also provides funding through a competitive grant program that rewards schools based on performance in statewide assessments. Schools that score in the top 13% statewide and serve student populations that are less than 60% FRL eligible receive \$225 per student. The state provides \$400 per student for eligible schools where more than 60% of students are FRL eligible.</p>

---

**Arkansas**

Arkansas provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so by providing an amount for every student eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) under the National School Lunch Program, with the precise award based on the concentration of such students in the district. Per-student awards ranged from \$526 to \$1,576 in FY2021.

For FY2022, eligible students in school districts whose populations were less than 70% FRL eligible were funded at \$532 per pupil, eligible students in school districts whose populations were between 70% and 90% FRL eligible were funded at \$1,063 per pupil, and eligible students in school districts whose populations were at least 90% eligible were funded at \$1,594 per pupil. The funding must be spent on approved programs or purposes, including, but not limited to, classroom teachers and other personnel, before-and after-school programs, and extended learning time.

FRL eligibility information is based on student counts from the previous school year. For districts and schools that do not collect student-level FRL eligibility information because the district or school is considered wholly eligible for free lunch under federal guidelines, the state computes the number of students eligible for increased funding by multiplying the percentage of students who were FRL eligible in the most recent year the information was collected by the district's or school's total enrollment for the previous school year. The state also provides a small amount of additional funding for districts that have seen at least 1% year-over-year growth in enrollment in each of the previous three years; the amount of the funding is based on the district's percentage of students eligible for FRL.

---

**California**

California provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so by providing a grant to districts where at least 55% of students are from low-income households or are otherwise eligible for this supplemental funding, in addition to the state's supplemental funding for individual students from low-income households (see "Poverty" for more information).

California provides a grant in the amount of 65% of the per-student base amount for each eligible student in districts where at least 55% of students are from low-income households or are otherwise eligible. This funding is meant to be used to increase the number of staff members who provide direct services to students in individual schools where at least 55% of students are from low-income households or otherwise eligible, relative to the number of such staff members in schools with fewer students from low-income households or otherwise eligible students.

Students are eligible for supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-priced lunch under the National School Lunch Program, are migrants, are homeless, are in foster care, participate in the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, or are directly certified as eligible for free meals because they appear in state Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (known locally as CalFresh) or county welfare (CalWORKS) records. English-language learners are also eligible for this funding. Students who are both English-language learners and from low-income households are counted only once for the purposes of this supplemental funding allocation.

---

**Colorado**

Colorado provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so by increasing the multiplier that is applied to the base per-pupil amount for each student from a low-income household in districts whose populations of such students exceed the state average.

Colorado applies a multiplier of at least 1.12 to the base per-pupil amount for each low-income student. For districts whose proportion of at-risk students exceeds the state average, the multiplier is increased by an amount that considers total enrollment in the district and the degree to which the district's share of at-risk students exceeds the state average. The multiplier does not increase in districts serving fewer than 459 students. The total multiplier for a district's low-income students may not exceed 1.3.

Low-income students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program.

---

**Connecticut**

Connecticut provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so by providing supplemental funding for districts where at least 60% of students are from low-income households.

Connecticut applies a multiplier of 1.3 to the base per-pupil amount for all students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program or for free milk under the Special Milk Program. In districts where at least 60% of students are from low-income backgrounds, students from low-income households above this threshold generate supplemental funding equal to an additional 0.15 times the base per-pupil amount.

---

**Delaware**

Delaware provides increased funding for some districts with schools that serve high concentrations of students from low-income households. It does so through a competitive grant program.

Delaware administers a block grant for K-4 schools with greater than or equal to 30% students from low-income households or greater than or equal to 10% English-language learner enrollment. Starting in FY2023, this grant applies to all grades, and at least 98% of funds generated by a district's eligible schools must be allocated to those schools. Also, at least \$5 million of the annual appropriation for this block grant must be allocated to public schools, including charter schools, identified as having an enrollment of at least 60% low-income students or 20% English-language learners.

Allowable uses of funds include mental health services in the form of school counselors, school social workers or licensed clinical social workers, school psychologists, and additional reading supports for grades K-5. In FY2022, the state appropriated \$5.5 million plus \$7.5 million in one-time supplemental funds, allocated over three years. These funds come from the \$33.5 million in Opportunity Funding appropriation used to support English-language learners and students from low-income backgrounds.

---

**District of Columbia**

The District of Columbia does not provide increased funding for schools based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, the District does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (for more information, see "Poverty").

<b>Florida</b>	Florida does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve.
<b>Georgia</b>	Georgia does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve.
<b>Hawaii</b>	Hawaii does not provide increased funding for schools based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, Hawaii does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (for more information, see “Poverty”).
<b>Idaho</b>	Idaho does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve.
<b>Illinois</b>	<p>Illinois does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, Illinois does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (for more information, see “Poverty”).</p> <p>School districts in Illinois continue to receive funding from the state that is equal to or exceeds the amount they received prior to the state’s last major funding reform, including a portion of a grant that was calculated based on a district’s concentration of students from low-income households.</p>
<b>Indiana</b>	<p>Indiana provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so through a grant program based on the concentration of low-income students in a district.</p> <p>Districts receive an amount that is calculated through a multistep formula that takes into account the concentration of students in a district who, as of the previous fall, were receiving benefits from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program (TANF), or foster care services. A district’s percentage of eligible students is multiplied by a dollar amount (\$3,675 in FY2021), which is then multiplied by the district’s student count to calculate their grant amount. The grant amount may also be affected by the district’s share of English-language learners (if greater than 18%) and a recent change in the district’s percentage of eligible students.</p>
<b>Iowa</b>	Iowa does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, Iowa does provide funding for individual students from low-income households. For more information, see “Poverty.”

---

**Kansas**

Kansas provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so by providing supplemental funding for districts where at least 35% of students are from low-income households, in addition to the state's supplemental funding for individual low-income students (see "Poverty" for more information).

For school districts where between 35% and 50% of students come from low-income households, an additional multiplier is applied to the base amount for these students on a sliding scale, in accordance with a legislated formula. This multiplier has a maximum value of 0.105. For school districts where 50% of students or more come from low-income households, an additional multiplier of 0.105 is automatically applied to the base amount for each such student. The state also allows this multiplier to be calculated based on the proportion of low-income students in each school building rather than in the district as a whole if it would yield more supplemental funding for the district in total.

Students are eligible for supplemental funding if they qualify for free lunch under the National School Lunch Program and are enrolled full time in a district that operates an at-risk assistance program. A free-lunch-eligible preschool student who is enrolled in a district operating an at-risk assistance program is counted as one-half of a student for the purposes of the funding calculation. This funding must be used to fund best practices for the support of at-risk students, as identified by the state board of education. Currently, the state law providing for this supplemental funding is scheduled to expire on July 1, 2024; however, expiration dates for this provision have been extended in the past.

---

**Kentucky**

Kentucky does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, Kentucky does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (see "Poverty" for more information).

---

**Louisiana**

Louisiana does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, Louisiana does provide funding for individual students from low-income households. For more information, see "Poverty."

---

**Maine**

Maine does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, Maine does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (for more information, see "Poverty").

---

---

**Maryland**

Maryland provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so by providing a grant to public schools where at least 80% of students are eligible for free and reduced-price meals, in addition to the state's supplemental funding for individual low-income students (see "Poverty" for more information).

Maryland defines concentration of poverty using the percentage of low-income students in a school's enrollment for the three prior years. A further adjustment will be made in the years 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24 to account for pandemic-related fluctuations in enrollment. For FY2022, the state will provide for each eligible school a grant of \$248,833 to be used for specified staff and wraparound services.

Beginning in FY2022, each eligible school will receive supplementary funding equal to 1.16 times the base per-pupil amount for the first year of eligibility, and the amount will be increased over a span of 11 years to 2.00 times the per-student base in FY2033. Also, the concentration of poverty level for eligible schools to receive this grant will be decreased over the span of seven years to 55% in FY2027.

---

**Massachusetts**

Massachusetts provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so by varying the additional allocation provided for each low-income student based on the school district's share of low-income students as compared with other districts in the state.

Each district is assigned to a decile based on the share of its students who come from families that participate in one or more of the following state-administered programs: Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Transitional Assistance for Families With Dependent Children, the state foster care program, and MassHealth (Medicaid). Each district receives a dollar amount per low-income student that differs depending on the decile to which the district is assigned. In FY2021, the school districts with the smallest share of low-income students received \$3,830.04 per low-income student, while those with the greatest share received \$4,680.83 per low-income student.

The dollar amounts are calculated based on the increased resource costs associated with educating low-income students in different environments. The per-student costs included in the funding calculation for each decile include those for staff salaries and benefits, instructional equipment and technology, pupil services, and professional development, among other resources.

---

**Michigan**

In 2023, Michigan's legislature created an "Opportunity Index" that includes six tiers of funding based on the level of concentrated poverty in the school district. Economically disadvantaged students from communities without much poverty would generate at least 11.5% in additional funds for their school district. In a high-poverty community, the same students would generate up to 15.3% in additional funds.

Within each of the first five tiers, the the funding weight increases incrementally as poverty increases. As the highest tier, every low-income student is funded at the maximum weight. After a phased-in implementation, the maximum weight for the highest-poverty districts should reach 47%.

In FY2024, the new index will drive about \$952 million in funding, \$200 million more than previous at-risk weight investments in the state's funding formula.

---

**Minnesota**

Minnesota provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so in the form of additional funding that must be used for specified purposes related to disadvantaged students' educational needs.

This funding is calculated by first adding the full count of students eligible for free lunch to half the count of students eligible for reduced-price lunch; adjusting that number using a formula that reduces the count of such students in schools with a concentration that is less than 80%; and then multiplying that number by a dollar amount, which was equal to \$3,533 in FY2022. This funding is calculated by first adding the full count of students eligible for free lunch to half the count of students eligible for reduced-price lunch; then adjusting that number using a formula for the concentration of such students in the building in such a way that the state aid amount is limited in the case of very needy districts; and then multiplying that number by a dollar amount, which was equal to \$3,137 in FY2017.

The dollar amount used in the formula varies depending on the per-student base amount in use in the state for the year. It is equal to 60% of the difference between that year's base amount (\$6,728 in FY2022) and \$839.

---

**Mississippi**

Mississippi does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, Mississippi does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (see "Poverty" for more information).

---

**Missouri**

Missouri provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.25 to the base per-pupil amount for low-income students in districts where the concentration of low-income students is above a certain threshold.

The threshold above which the multiplier is applied is recalculated every two years. In 2020-21, the threshold was 29.45% of district enrollment. Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) under the National School Lunch Program.

The threshold for supplemental funding for low-income students is calculated as follows: First, the state identifies "performance districts" (those that have met certain performance standards). Then, the state calculates the average FRL-eligible enrollment percentage across these districts, excluding certain outlier districts. The average FRL-eligible enrollment becomes the enrollment threshold above which low-income students in each district generate supplemental funding.

---



---

**Montana**

Montana provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so through a program-specific allocation, which is prorated among eligible districts.

Montana distributes supplemental allocation to districts in the same manner as federal Title I funds. The formula for Title I funding distribution considers both absolute numbers students from low-income households and districts serving especially high proportions of students from low-income households. In this way, Montana's supplemental funding for these students includes support for both individual students from low-income households and districts whose populations include high concentrations of such students.

For FY2022, the state legislature appropriated \$5.73 million for this purpose, which is prorated among districts. This funding is provided entirely by the state and is not subject to a state-local cost-sharing arrangement.

---

**Nebraska**

Nebraska provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so by providing supplemental funding to all districts where students from low-income households exceed 5% of the district's enrollment, in an amount that depends on the concentration of such students within the district.

The amount of supplemental funding is calculated based on a multistep formula. Students from low-income households above the 5% enrollment threshold generate supplemental funding equal to a percentage of the statewide average per-pupil spending figure, with the percentage increasing as the share of students from low-income households in the district increases. Percentages range from 3.75% for students from low-income households composing between 5% and 10% of enrollment to 22.5% for students from low-income households composing greater than 30% of enrollment.

For the purposes of this allocation, the concentration of students from low-income households is calculated as the greater of: the proportion of students who would have been eligible for free lunch under the National School Lunch Program during the school year that is two years prior to the current year (2019-20 for FY2022) or the proportion of local children under age 19 from families whose income is such that, if they were a family of four, their children would be free-lunch eligible. This low-income student count is adjusted to account for shifts in enrollment over the previous three years. If expenditures are less than 117.65% of the allowance the district received for the most recently available complete data year (two years prior to the current year), then the state reduces its distribution.

---

**Nevada**

Nevada does not provide increased funding based on the concentration of students from low-income households in a particular district. However, Nevada does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (for more information, see "Poverty").

---

**New  
Hampshire**

New Hampshire does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, New Hampshire does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (for more information, see "Poverty").

---



---

**New Jersey**

New Jersey provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so by applying a multiplier to the base per-pupil amount for low-income students, which ranges from 1.47 to 1.57 depending on the concentration of low-income students in the district.

A multiplier of 1.47 is applied for districts where fewer than 20% of students are eligible for this funding; between 1.47 and 1.52 for districts where between 20% and 40% of students are eligible, on a sliding scale; and 1.57 for districts where more than 40% of students are eligible. Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they come from households with an income at or below 185% of the federal poverty level.

In addition, the state provides a larger amount of per-pupil funding for school security for low-income students than for non-low-income students, in amounts that vary depending on the concentrations of such students in the district. While the state provides \$83 per student generally, this amount is increased on a sliding scale up to \$495 for students in districts where 40% or more of the student body is low income.

---

**New Mexico**

New Mexico provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so through a program-specific allocation that varies depending on the number of “at-risk” students served in the district.

“At-risk” student funding is allocated in accordance with the following formula: Three-year-average enrollment counts are calculated for each of the three “at-risk” student categories (low-income students, as defined for the purposes of federal Title I funding; mobile students; and English-language learners, as classified according to the criteria established by the federal Office for Civil Rights). These averages are added together, and the sum is multiplied by a factor to produce an At-Risk Index. In FY2021 this factor was 0.3. This index is multiplied by the district’s entire student enrollment to produce a number of students to be added to the district’s enrollment count. The state then provides the district’s regular per-student funding on the basis of its inflated count rather than its true student population.

---

---

**New York**

New York provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so primarily in the form of supplemental per-pupil funding for districts in an amount that corresponds to the concentration of low-income students in the district.

In New York, the student-based funding calculated for each district is first multiplied by an index that adjusts for regional cost of living and then by the Pupil Need Index, which is a compound adjustment that considers concentrations of students from low-income households along with concentrations of English-language learners and the sparsity of the school district. The portion of this index related to poverty adds together 65% of the students in grades K-6 who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program and 65% of the students from households below the federal poverty level, and then divides the result by the total K-12 enrollment of the district. This percentage plus 1 becomes the effective multiplier that is applied to the district's cost-adjusted formula funding to provide for students from low-income households.

In addition, a district's wealth is accounted for in the calculation of several program-specific allocations. The Combined Wealth Ratio, an adjustment that considers both the value of the district's property and the income of residents of the district, is factored into the calculation of program-specific allocations, including aid for career and technical education programs, computer administration expenses, academic improvement initiatives, transportation aid, and high-cost special education services.

---

**North Carolina**

North Carolina provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so in the form of two allocations: one that is intended to improve districts' capacity to serve low-income students and one intended to support districts with lower than average ability to raise local revenues for education.

For both allocations, the state uses a measure of wealth based on the district's anticipated property tax revenue, tax base per square mile, and average per capita income. The first allocation is designed to allow school districts to reduce class size in low-wealth districts. The second provides revenue to supplement districts' local receipts with the amount required to bring that district up to the statewide average level of local revenue per student. Both allocations must supplement, rather than supplant, local funds and are limited to particular uses.

---

**North Dakota**

North Dakota does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, North Dakota does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (for more information, see "Poverty").

---

---

**Ohio**

Ohio provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so in the form of two allocations: one that provides funding for students from low-income households, adjusted for the concentration of students from low-income households in the district, and another that provides increased funding for districts with low levels of property wealth and income.

Ohio provides increased funding for students from low-income households through Economically Disadvantaged funding, which provides an amount to each district equal to \$422 for each economically disadvantaged student, multiplied by an index, which reflects the district's share of economically disadvantaged students compared to the statewide share. Ohio also provides increased funding for districts with high concentrations of students from low-income households through Targeted Assistance, which is calculated using a multistep formula.

For the purposes of Economically Disadvantaged funding, economically disadvantaged students are those who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program, those who are known to be recipients of public assistance, and those who meet federal Title I income guidelines. For Targeted Assistance, the calculation first considers a per-student local wealth measure based on local property valuation and local household income. This figure is then compared to a parallel statewide measure to produce a wealth index. The formula uses this information to provide supplemental funding to those districts where the wealth index falls below a threshold. The state additionally provides additional supplemental funding to districts where wealth levels are below an even lower threshold and where less than 88% of the total student count was enrolled in 2019.

---

**Oklahoma**

Oklahoma does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, Oklahoma does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (for more information, see "Poverty").

---

**Oregon**

Oregon does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. However, Oregon does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (see "Poverty" For more information).

---

---

**Pennsylvania**

Pennsylvania provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so by increasing the multiplier that is applied to the student count for students from low-income households in districts where 30% or more of students are from low-income households, as well as by providing increased funding to districts where the median household income falls below the state median household income.

Pennsylvania applies a multiplier of 1.9 to the count of students who live below the federal poverty line in districts where more than 30% of students live in poverty, compared with a multiplier of 1.6 for such students in districts with lower rates of student poverty. In addition, Pennsylvania provides increased funding to districts with low median household incomes. It does so by calculating an index that compares each district's median household income to the state median income, and applying that index to the weighted student count that is used to determine the district's share of state formula aid.

However, Pennsylvania's funding formula applies only to state education funds appropriated over and above FY2015 nominal funding levels. For FY2022, less than 13% of the state's total education funding (or \$899 million out of \$7 billion) was distributed through this formula. The bulk of state education aid is distributed based on historical allocation levels and is not adjusted for student need.

---

**Rhode Island**

Rhode Island does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, Rhode Island does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (for more information, see "Poverty").

---

**South Carolina**

South Carolina does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, South Carolina does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (for more information, see "Poverty").

---

**South Dakota**

South Dakota does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve.

---

**Tennessee**

Tennessee does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. However, Tennessee does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (see "Poverty" for more information).

---

---

**Texas**

Texas provides increased funding for districts based on the level of economic disadvantage in the student communities they serve. It does so by applying a multiplier to the base per-pupil amount for each student from a low-income household and varying that multiplier based on the level of economic disadvantage in the census block group where that student resides.

Each census block group in the state is placed in one of five tiers by the commissioner of education based on its level of economic disadvantage. The five tiers are assigned different multipliers, ranging from 1.225 to 1.275. For each low-income student, the multiplier for the census block group where the student resides is applied to the base per-pupil amount to generate supplemental funding for their district. Eligible low-income students are those eligible for free or reduced-priced lunch under the National School Lunch Program. Homeless students are automatically eligible for the highest tier multiplier for supplemental funding.

The level of economic disadvantage in a census block group is assessed based on several data points drawn from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey. These include the block group's median household income, its percentage of single-parent households, its rate of homeownership, and the average educational attainment of its population. If data are insufficient to assign a block group to a tier, eligible students from that block group receive funding through the lowest multiplier, 1.225. The multipliers have been expressed this way for consistency with other states. The funding is actually provided in an amount ranging from 0.225 to 0.275 times the per-pupil base amount, distributed in addition to the student's own base funding.

---

**Utah**

Utah provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so in the form of program-specific allocations for some schools serving high concentrations of students from low-income households. This is in addition to the state's supplemental funding for individual low-income students (see "Poverty" for more information).

The state provides program-based funding for Title I schools that are not making sufficient academic progress (as defined in federal law) to hire paraeducators. The state also provides program-based funding for salary bonuses for effective teachers in high-poverty schools (those where at least 70% of enrolled students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program or where more than 20% of students are classified by the state as children affected by intergenerational poverty). In FY2022, the state appropriated \$300,000 and \$688,000 for these purposes, respectively.

---

**Vermont**

Vermont provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households they serve. It does so by applying a multiplier to the count of students from low-income households that varies based on the district's share of such students, and then funding the district in accordance with the inflated student count.

The poverty ratio is calculated by dividing the average number of children aged 6-17 who qualify for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program or who are English-language learners by the district's student count. This ratio is then applied to the district's student count in calculating funding.

---

**Virginia**

Virginia provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so by applying a multiplier to a base amount for each low-income student that varies depending on the concentration of low-income students in the district and by providing program-specific allocation for districts with high concentrations of low-income students.

Virginia applies a multiplier of between 1.01 and 1.26 to the base amount for each low-income student. Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free lunch (but not reduced-price lunch) under the National School Lunch Program. The specific multiplier applied to generate increased funding depends on the concentration of free-lunch-eligible students in the district. Local governments are expected to match these funds. The funding must be spent on approved programs for students who are educationally “at risk,” including dropout prevention programs, truancy officers, reading recovery, programs for students who speak English as a second language, and other programs.

The state also provides program-specific allocations for K-3 class size reduction and 6-9 algebra readiness math intervention. The amount allocated to each school or district for these purposes is dependent on the percentage of its students eligible for free lunch.

---

**Washington**

Washington provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so through two program-specific allocations for schools serving high concentrations of students from low-income backgrounds.

The Learning Assistance Program provides funding for students in schools where at least 50% of students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) under the National School Lunch Program. Funds generated by students in high-poverty schools must be expended by the district for those high-poverty schools to support students performing below grade level in core academic subjects. Washington also provides an annual \$5,000 bonus to teachers in high schools where at least 50% of students are FRL eligible, middle schools where at least 60% are eligible, and elementary schools where at least 70% are eligible.

---

**West Virginia**

West Virginia does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve.

However, many of the state’s program-specific allocations consider poverty levels in the allocation of funding.

---

---

**Wisconsin**

Wisconsin provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. It does so through an allocation for districts where at least half the students come from low-income households.

In addition to a separate prorated allocation for low-income students in grades K-3 (see “Poverty” for more information), Wisconsin provides per-pupil funding to districts where at least 50% of students meet the income criteria for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) eligibility. The per-pupil funding is allocated based on all pupils in the district, not just those who meet the FRL eligibility criteria. However, this aid counts toward the limit on what districts may raise in local property taxes, acting to reduce districts’ tax burden rather than adding to overall funding (see “Property Tax Floors and Ceilings” for a description of revenue limits).

Over \$16.8 million was appropriated for this program for each of FY2021, FY2022, and FY2023. This was equal to \$53.54 per pupil attending a high-poverty district for each of FY2022 and FY2023.

---

**Wyoming**

Wyoming does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, Wyoming does provide funding for individual students from low-income households (for more information, see “Poverty”).

For a complete list of primary sources, please see the appropriate state page at [funded.edbuild.org](https://funded.edbuild.org)

