



FundEd: Concentrated Poverty

Policies in Each State



Concentrated Poverty

Concentrated Poverty

Alabama

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

Alaska

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

Arizona

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

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 \$1576 in FY2019.

For FY2018, eligible students in school districts whose populations were less than 70% FRL-eligible were funded at \$526 apiece; eligible students in school districts whose populations were between 70% and 90% FRL-eligible were funded at \$1,051 apiece; and eligible students in school districts whose populations were at least 90% eligible were funded at \$1,576 apiece.

The state also provides a small amount of additional funding for districts experiencing at least 1% year-on-year growth in their FRL-eligible population.

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 low-income or otherwise considered to be at-risk, in addition to the state's supplemental funding for individual low-income students (see "Poverty" for more information).

California provides a grant in the amount of 50% of the per-student base amount for each eligible student to districts where at least 55% of students are low-income or otherwise considered to be at-risk. 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 (SNAP, known locally as CalFresh) or county welfare (CalWORKS) records.

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 at-risk 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 more information, see "Poverty.") For districts whose free-lunch eligibility rate 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. For districts with more than 459 students and fewer than 50,000 students, the multiplier increases by 0.003 for each percentage point that the district's at-risk share exceeds the state average. The total multiplier for a district's low-income students may not exceed 1.3.

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 75% 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 75% of students are from low-income backgrounds, low-income students above this threshold generate supplemental funding equal to an additional 0.05 times the base per-pupil amount.

Delaware

Delaware provides increased funding for some districts to support programming for students from low-income households. It does so through a competitive grant program.

The Delaware Department of Education provides competitive grants for school-level initiatives providing services to low-income students, English-language learners, and students chronically exposed to stress and trauma. In FY2018, the state offered grants totaling \$1 million for this purpose.

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.”
Florida	Florida does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve.
Georgia	Georgia does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve.
Hawaii	Hawaii does not provide increased funding for districts 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.”
Idaho	Idaho does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve.
Illinois	<p data-bbox="336 963 1501 1120">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 data-bbox="336 1149 1501 1305">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 the district’s concentration of students from low-income households.</p>
Indiana	<p data-bbox="336 1373 1501 1485">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 the district.</p> <p data-bbox="336 1514 1501 1872">Districts receive an amount that is calculated through a multi-step formula that takes into account the concentration of students in the 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. The districts’ percentage of eligible students is multiplied by a dollar amount (\$3,539 in FY 2017), which is then multiplied by the districts’ student count to calculate their grant amount. The grant amount may also be affected by the districts’ share of English-language learners (if greater than 18%) and recent change in districts’ percentage of eligible students.</p>
Iowa	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	The Kansas Supreme Court ruled the state’s education funding formula unconstitutional on October 2, 2017 and reiterated this finding on June 25, 2018. The Court has set a deadline of June 30, 2019 for the creation of a constitutional funding system.
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. For more information, see “Poverty.”
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	<p>Maryland does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, Maryland does provide funding for individual students from low-income households. For more information, see “Poverty.”</p> <p>Moreover, Maryland does adjust the amount of increased funding provided based on local wealth levels. The state provides a larger share of funding for low-income students if local wealth per pupil in the district is lower than statewide wealth per pupil. See “Poverty” for more information.</p>
Massachusetts	<p>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 per-student grant provided for each low-income student based on the school district’s share of low-income students as compared to other districts in the state.</p> <p>Each district is assigned to a decile based on the share of its students who come from families who participate in one or more of the following state-administered programs: Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Transitional Assistance for Families with Dependent Children, the state foster care program, and MassHealth. Districts receive a dollar amount per low-income student which differs depending on the decile to which it is assigned. In FY2018, the school districts with the smallest share of low-income students received \$3,817 per low-income student, while those with the greatest share received \$4,181 per low-income student.</p>
Michigan	Michigan does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve. However, Michigan does provide funding for individual students from low-income households. For more information, see “Poverty.”

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.

In allocating this funding, Minnesota accounts for concentration of poverty through a calculation that limits how much districts with very high concentrations of low-income students may receive. 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. In FY2017, it was equal to 60% of the difference between that base amount 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. For more information, see "Poverty."

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.

Missouri applies 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 2017-2018 the threshold was 36.12% 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; this 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 provides supplemental allocation distributed to districts in the same manner as federal Title I funding. The formula for Title I funding distribution considers both absolute numbers of low-income students and districts serving especially high proportions of low-income students. In this way, Montana's supplemental funding for these students includes both support for individual low-income students and districts whose populations include high concentrations of such students.

For FY2018, the state legislature appropriated \$5.44 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 low-income students 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 multi-step formula. Low-income students above the 5% enrollment threshold generate supplemental funding equal to a percentage of a statewide average per pupil spending figure, with the percentage increasing as low-income students make up a greater proportion of total district enrollment. Percentages range from 3.75% for low-income students comprising between 5% and 10% of enrollment, to 22.5% for low-income students comprising greater than 30% of enrollment.

For the purposes of this allocation, the concentration of low-income students is calculated as the proportion of students who would have been eligible for free lunch under the National School Lunch Program during the 2015-16 school year or the proportion of school system enrollment matching the proportion of local children under nineteen from families whose income is such that, if they were a family of four, their children would be free-lunch-eligible, whichever is greater. However, if actual 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), the state adjusts its distribution.

Nevada

Nevada 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 a program-specific allocation for some schools serving high-concentrations of low-income students.

The Victory program supplies program-specific grant funding to support instruction and services for low-income students. Grants are awarded to schools that are designated as Victory schools by the Department of Education because they both are low-performing and serve a high proportion of students from homes below the federal poverty level. In total, the state appropriated \$25 million for the Victory program in FY2018, yielding \$1123.29 per student enrolled in a Victory school (including low-income and non-low-income students). Nevada also offers limited grants to districts to provide hiring incentives of up to \$5,000 per year to certain new teachers, including those who come to work in Title I (high-poverty) schools. Separately, a district serving a higher proportion of students in poverty is more likely to be selected to receive a competitive grant through the Read by Grade 3 program (see “Grade Level” for a description of this program).

With limited exceptions, no school may receive funding from more than one program: Victory, Read by Grade 3, or Zoom (see “English-Language Learner” for a description of this program). The state also provides program-specific grant funding to support instruction and services for individual low-income students in non-Victory schools. 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 1.41 to 1.46 depending on the concentration of low-income students in the district.

A multiplier of 1.41 is applied for districts where less than 20% of students are eligible for this funding; between 1.41 and 1.46 for districts where between 20% and 40% of students are eligible, on a sliding scale; and 1.46 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 \$77 per student generally, this amount is increased on a sliding scale up to \$452 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). Students who fit multiple at-risk criteria are counted only once. These averages are added together, and the sum is multiplied by 0.106 to produce an At-Risk Index. 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 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 one 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 taken into account in the calculation of several program-specific allocations. The Combined Wealth Ratio, an adjustment that takes into account both the value of the district's property and the income of residents of the district, is considered in the calculation of program-specific allocations, including aid for career and technical education programs, computer administration expenses, academic improvement initiatives, 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, its tax base per square mile, and its 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 of these 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 which provides funding for low-income students, adjusted for the concentration of low-income students in their district, and another that provides increased funding for districts with high concentrations of low-income students and low levels of property wealth.

Ohio provides increased funding for low-income students through Economically Disadvantaged funding, which provides an amount to each district equal to \$272 for each economically disadvantaged student, multiplied by a poverty index. The poverty index is the square of the ratio of the individual district's poverty percentage to the statewide poverty percentage. Ohio also provides increased funding for districts with high concentrations of low-income students through Targeted Assistance, which is calculated using a multi-step formula.

For the purposes of Economically Disadvantaged funding, qualifying 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 meeting federal Title I income guidelines. For Targeted Assistance, the calculation first considers a per-student local wealth measure based equally on local property valuation and local household income. This figure is divided by a parallel statewide measure to produce a wealth index. The formula uses this information, along with information about general district enrollment and about the proportion of property in the district classified as agricultural real property, to provide supplementary funding to those districts with local wealth levels below a threshold level.

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 that they serve. However, Oregon does provide funding for individual students from low-income households. For more information, see “Poverty.”

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 each student from a low-income household in districts where 30% or more of students are low-income, 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 to 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 only applies to state education funds appropriated over and above FY2015 nominal funding levels. For FY2018, less than 8% of the state’s total education funding (or \$453 million out of \$6 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 that they serve. However, Tennessee does provide funding for individual students from low-income households. For more information, see “Poverty.”

Texas

Texas provides increased funding for districts based on the level of economic disadvantage in the student communities that 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 0.225 to 0.275. For each low-income student, the multiplier for the census block group where they reside 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.

The level of economic disadvantage in a census block group is assessed based on several data points drawn from the United States 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 insufficient data is available to assign a block group to a tier, eligible students from that block group receive funding through the lowest multiplier, 0.225. The multipliers have been expressed this way for consistency with other states. The funding is actually provided in an amount that ranges 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 through a program-specific allocation, a part of which is distributed to schools with high concentrations of low-income students.

The Utah State Board of Education is required to distribute funding for at-risk students in a way that takes into account the share of a school's enrollment is eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) under the National School Lunch Program. In particular, 20% of the state appropriation for this program is directed to schools where at least 75% of students are FRL-eligible. In FY2018, about \$28 million, in total, was appropriated for at-risk students.

Vermont

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

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 which 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 1.13 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.

The Learning Assistance Program, which provides funds to support students performing below grade level in core academic subjects, allocates funding primarily on the basis of student enrollment. School districts receive a greater level of 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. 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, and elementary schools where at least 70% are.

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 a prorated 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 are FRL-eligible. However, this aid counts towards 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 FY2018 and FY2019. This was equal to about \$80.12 per pupil attending a high-poverty district for each of FY2018 and FY2019.

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

