



# FundEd: Poverty Funding

## Policies in Each State



## Poverty

Some states provide increased funding for students in poverty. This funding can be provided in a variety of ways. In some states, funding is provided so that every individual student from a low-income household is funded at a higher level. In other states, the district's concentration of such students will affect the amount distributed. This report describes which states provide funding for students in poverty, and whether they do so on a linear, per-student basis or on the basis of district concentrations of poverty.

---

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

---

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

---

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

---

**Arkansas** Arkansas provides increased funding for students from low-income households at a level that differs depending on the concentration of low-income students in their district. 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 FY2018.

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 are at least 90% eligible are funded at \$1,576 apiece.

FRL eligibility information is based on student counts from the previous school year. School districts moving from one funding level to another are transitioned to the new level over a three-year period. 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 students from low-income households and for districts with high concentrations of low-income students. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.2 to the base per-pupil amount for these students. For districts where at least 55% of students are from low-income backgrounds or are otherwise considered to be at-risk, California also provides a grant in the amount of 50% of the per-student base amount for each disadvantaged student above that threshold.

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.

This same multiplier is applied to the base per-pupil amount for students who are English-language learners (ELLs). Students who are both ELL and low-income generate this supplemental funding allocation only once. The grant for districts with high concentrations of low-income and at-risk students is given in addition to the state's supplemental funding for individual students from low-income households.

---

**Colorado**

Colorado provides increased funding for students from low-income households at a level that differs depending on the concentration of low-income students in their district. It does so by applying a multiplier of at least 1.12 to the base per pupil amount for each low-income student and increasing the multiplier for such students in districts whose populations of low-income students exceed the state average.

Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free lunch (but not reduced-price lunch) under the National School Lunch Program. In districts whose free-lunch eligibility rate exceeds the state average, the multiplier of 1.12 that is applied to the base amount for all low-income students is increased in proportion to the amount by which that district's rate surpasses the state average. The total multiplier for a district's low-income students cannot exceed 1.3.

This same multiplier is applied to the base per-pupil amount for non-free-lunch-eligible students whose dominant language is not English. Students who are both English-language learners and free-lunch-eligible generate this supplemental funding allocation only once.

---

**Connecticut**

Connecticut provides increased funding for students from low-income households and for districts with high concentrations of low-income students. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.3 to the base per-pupil amount for these students. For 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.

Students are eligible for supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program or for free milk under the Special Milk Program.

---

**Delaware**

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

The Delaware Department of Education provides competitive grants to help districts provide 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.

In addition, the state provides one unit of funding, in an amount that varies from district to district, for every 250 students enrolled. This funding is intended for the purpose of promoting academic excellence, and the authorizing statute lists a number of permissible uses, including programs for pupils with limited English proficiency.

---

**Florida**

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

However, the state's Supplemental Academic Instruction allocation is intended to provide additional funds for students who are at risk of falling behind. These funds may be used in any manner identified by the school as being the most effective and efficient way to best help students progress from grade to grade and graduate, though schools receiving the funding must provide an additional hour of intensive reading instruction every day. Florida provided about \$712 million in funding for Supplemental Academic Instruction in FY2018.

---

**Georgia**

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

---

**Hawaii**

Hawaii provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.1 to the base per-pupil amount for these students. The state operates as a single school district and therefore cannot provide increased funding based on the concentration of students from low-income households in a district.

Students are eligible for supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program. Beginning in FY2019, Hawaii will also begin providing increased funding for homeless students, if sufficient funds are appropriated by the state legislature. It will do so by applying a multiplier of 1.2 to the base per-pupil amount for homeless students.

The multipliers have been expressed this way for consistency with other states. The funding is actually provided in an amount equal to 0.1 or 0.2 times the per-pupil base amount, distributed in addition to the student's own base amount funding. The multiplier used is fixed annually by the state's Committee on Weights.

---

**Idaho**

Idaho does not provide increased funding for students for low-income households or for districts with high concentrations of low-income students.

---

---

**Illinois**

Illinois provides funding for students from low-income households. It does so through its resource-based formula by specifying student-to-staff ratios for low-income students and calculating specific funding for dedicated staff positions.

The state's student-to-teacher ratios for different grade spans are decreased for low-income students. (Students are counted as low-income if they are eligible for Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program, TANF, or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.) The state assigns a student-to-teacher ratio of 15 to 1 for low-income students in grades K-3 and 20 to 1 for low-income students in grades 4-12. Low-income students also generate additional staff positions for their districts. The state assigns a low-income-student-to-teacher ratio of 125 to 1 for intervention teachers; 125 to 1 for pupil support teachers; 120 to 1 for extended-day teachers; and 120 to 1 for summer school teachers. Once all staff positions are calculated for a district, with grade-level variation taken into account, the district's formula calculation includes a dollar amount for each position that matches the state average salary for that position. Because the state plans to move toward full formula funding over the span of a number of years, annual increases in funding are distributed to districts with the greatest need for state assistance. Districts are sorted into tiers according to the degree to which their local funding capacity can be expected to cover their local education costs, and a greater percentage of additional state aid is distributed to districts with lesser funding capacity.

If grade-specific counts of low-income students are unavailable, then the state applies the district's general percentage of low-income students to the total count of students in each grade to estimate a grade-specific number of low-income students. Separately, districts 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.

---

**Indiana**

Indiana provides increased funding for some students from low-income households and provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income students they serve. It does so through an increase to a grant program for low-income students and a grant based on the concentration of low-income students in the district.

Districts receive an amount that is calculated through a multi-step formula that takes into account the concentration of students in the district who were receiving benefits from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program (TANF), or from foster care services as of the previous fall; the previous year's grant calculation; the district's entire enrollment count; and the district's percentage of English-language learners (if greater than 25%).

The Honors Grant, which distributes \$1,000 to school districts for each student who receives an academic or technical honors diploma, is increased to \$1,400 for students receiving benefits from SNAP or TANF and for students receiving foster care services. In addition, districts must waive required fees for students who qualify for free or reduced price lunch under the National School Lunch Program and may apply for reimbursement from the state.

---

**Iowa**

Iowa provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.0048 to the base per-pupil amount for certain low-income students. The state also applies a multiplier of 1.00156 to the base amount for all students enrolled in the district in order to generate additional funding for the purposes of supporting at-risk students.

A multiplier of 1.0048 is applied for an estimate of low-income students. The number of low-income students is estimated by multiplying the enrollment by the percentage of students in grades 1-6 who are eligible for free or reduced-priced lunch under the National School Lunch Program. A separate multiplier of 1.00156 is applied for all students enrolled in the district.

The supplemental funding generated through the application of both multipliers is not specifically intended as funding for students in poverty; instead, it is intended to serve at-risk pupils and secondary pupils receiving alternative education. The number of low-income students in elementary grades serves as a proxy for the number of at-risk students in the district.

---

**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 provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.15 to the base per-pupil amount for these students.

Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free lunch (but not reduced-price lunch) under the National School Lunch Program.

---

**Louisiana**

Louisiana provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.22 to the base per-pupil amount for these students.

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

This same multiplier is applied to the base per-pupil amount for students who are English-language learners (ELLs). Students who are both ELLs and low-income students generate this supplemental funding allocation only once.

---

**Maine**

Maine provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.15 to the base per-pupil amount for these students.

The multiplier is applied after the base amount is adjusted for local cost of living. Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program.

---

---

**Maryland**

Maryland provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.97 to the base per-pupil amount for these students and then adjusting the supplemental funding allocation for local wealth levels.

Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) under the National School Lunch Program. The funding generated for these students is calculated by applying the multiplier to the eligible population of students. The state share of this funding is determined by dividing the supplemental funding (0.97 times the number of qualifying students so as to exclude the base amount) by the ratio of local wealth per pupil to statewide wealth per pupil.

The formula for state aid mandates that the state contribute at least 50% statewide for the sum of the supplemental allocations for three different categories of at-risk students: these low-income students, Special Education students, and English-language learners (ELLs). (Supplemental funding for the other categories of at-risk students is calculated similarly, but with different multipliers applied to the base amount.) If the result of the calculation described above, added to the amounts of supplemental funding calculated for the other two at-risk categories, does not sum this intended 50% contribution, the result of the formula is proportionally adjusted to bring the contribution back to the desired level. Additionally, the state must contribute at least 40% of the particular supplemental funding allocation for low-income students regardless of local wealth; if the result of the formula falls below that 40% contribution, the district will receive 40%.

---

**Massachusetts**

Massachusetts provides increased funding for students from low-income households at a level that differs depending on the concentration of low-income students in their district. It does so through a per-student grant for each low-income student that varies depending on the concentration of low-income students in the district compared to other districts in the state.

Each district will be 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. In FY2018, the lowest-poverty districts received \$3,817 per low-income student, while the highest-poverty districts received \$4,181 per low-income student.

---

**Michigan**

Michigan provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.115 to the base per-pupil amount for these students. However, the amount can be reduced if the state does not appropriate sufficient funding to cover the allocation.

Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program, receive supplemental nutrition assistance or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), or are homeless, migrant, or in foster care. Districts whose local revenue exceeds their formula amount were not previously eligible for this funding, but will receive 30% of what other districts receive per low-income pupil in FY2018. In total, Michigan appropriated \$499 million for this supplemental funding in FY2018.

The stated purpose of this funding is to ensure that students are proficient in reading by grade 3 and that high school graduates are college- and career-ready. This supplemental funding may only be used for specified purposes, including instructional programs and direct non-instructional services such as health and counseling services. It may not be used for administrative costs.

---

**Minnesota**

Minnesota provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income students 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 is equal to 60% of the difference between that base amount and \$839.

---

**Mississippi**

Mississippi provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.05 to the base per-pupil amount for these students.

Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free lunch (but not reduced-price lunch) under the National School Lunch Program.

---



---

**Missouri**

Missouri provides increased funding to districts with high concentrations of low-income students. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.25 to the base per-pupil amount for low-income students in districts above a certain threshold for the concentration of low-income students they serve.

Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) under the National School Lunch Program. The multiplier of 1.25 is applied to FRL-eligible students above a certain threshold that is recalculated every two years. In 2017-2018 the threshold was 36.12% of district enrollment.

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 students from low-income households and for districts with high concentrations of low-income students.

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. This funding is provided entirely by the state and is not subject to a state-local cost sharing arrangement.

---



---

**Nebraska**

Nebraska provides increased funding to districts with high concentrations of low-income students. 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 precise amount 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 a 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 students from low-income households and increased funding for some schools with high concentrations of low-income students. It does so in the form of a flat allocation in the amount of \$1,200 for low-income students and 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). Separately, appropriations permitting, Nevada provides a flat allocation (\$1,200 in FY2018) for each student who is eligible for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program and who scores at or below the twenty-fifth percentile on one of a list of approved assessments. (If appropriations are insufficient, this funding is distributed first to lower-rated schools in accordance with the state accountability system.) This flat allocation is not provided for low-income students enrolled at Victory schools.

The state 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).

---

**New Hampshire**

New Hampshire provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so in the form of a flat allocation for each low-income student. In FY2018, this allocation was \$1,818.02 per eligible student.

Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) under the National School Lunch Program. Students from households receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits are automatically eligible, while others are eligible if parents or guardians provide income information demonstrating FRL-eligibility.

---

**New Jersey**

New Jersey provides increased funding for students from low-income households at a level that differs depending on the concentration of low-income students in their district. 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.

Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they come from households with an income at or below 185% of the federal poverty level. 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.

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 low-income students they serve. It does so through a program-specific allocation that varies depending on the number of at-risk students (a category that also includes English-language learners (ELLs) and mobile 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 ELLs, 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 to districts based on the concentrations of low-income students they serve. It does so primarily in the form of supplemental per-pupil funding for districts in an amount that corresponds to this concentration.

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 low-income students 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 provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.025 to the base per-pupil amount for these students.

The number of students eligible for the supplemental funding is determined by taking the average percentage of students in grades 3-8 who have qualified for free or reduced priced lunch under the National School Lunch Program over the previous three years and applying that percentage to the total number of students in the district.

---

---

**Ohio**

Ohio provides increased funding to students from low-income households and for districts with high concentrations of low-income students. 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, which 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. 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 meeting federal Title I income guidelines. 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. The formula 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 provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.25 to the base per-pupil amount for these students.

Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program. The funding is actually provided in an amount equal to 0.25 times the per-pupil base amount, distributed in addition to the student's own base amount funding, which is first adjusted for grade level.

---

**Oregon**

Oregon provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.25 to the base per-pupil amount for these students.

The number of students eligible for supplemental funding is determined using the United States Census Bureau's Small Area Income Poverty Estimate, which gives an estimate of the number of school-aged children in families below the federal poverty level for each district in the state. The same level of supplemental funding is also provided for students in foster homes and for students in state-recognized facilities for neglected and delinquent children, based on reporting from the Department of Human Services.

The state also mandates that all students eligible for reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program be given free lunch, and it allocates funds to districts to cover this cost.

---

**Pennsylvania**

Pennsylvania provides increased funding for students from low-income households and for districts with high concentrations of low-income students. It does so by applying multipliers to the counts of students meeting two different definitions of poverty and then funding the district in accordance with the inflated student count. Pennsylvania also provides increased funding for districts below a certain threshold for median household income.

Pennsylvania applies a multiplier of 1.6 to the count of students who live below 100% of the federal poverty level, as determined by the most recent American Community Survey, and a multiplier of 1.3 to the count of students who live between 100% and 184% of the federal poverty line. In districts where 30% or more of students fall below 100% of the federal poverty level, a multiplier of 1.9, instead of 1.6, is applied to the count of students who live below 100% of the federal poverty line. In addition, Pennsylvania provides increased funding to districts where the median household income falls below the state median household income. It does so by calculating a median household income index that compares each district's median household income to the state median income and applying the 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 provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.4 to the base per-pupil amount for these students.

Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) under the National School Lunch Program.

In addition, the percentage of FRL-eligible students in grades pre-K-6 is considered in the calculation of the state's share of the district's overall funding formula. Districts serving more FRL-eligible students in these grades see the state shoulder a greater share of the funding burden.

---

**South Carolina**

South Carolina provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.2 to the base per-pupil amount for these students.

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

---

**South Dakota**

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

---

---

**Tennessee**

Tennessee provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so in the form of a flat allocation for each low-income student, which was \$863.25 in FY2018. This figure is adjusted for inflation annually.

Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program. This funding is intended to allow for reduced class sizes.

---

**Texas**

Texas provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.2 to the base per-pupil amount for these students.

Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced priced lunch under the National School Lunch Program.

The funding is actually provided in an amount equal to 0.2 times the adjusted per-pupil base amount, which has already been adjusted for sparsity, small size, and local cost of living. (See “Base Amount” for more information.) It is distributed in addition to the student’s own base amount funding.

---

**Utah**

Utah provides increased funding for schools with high concentrations of low-income students. 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 free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) eligible. 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 provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.25 to the student count for these students to generate additional funding for low-income students.

Students aged 6-17 are eligible for this supplemental funding if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) under the National School Lunch Program.

The state also applies this multiplier to the student count for non-FRL-eligible students whose primary language is not English. This supplemental funding is therefore provided for all FRL-eligible students, as well non-FRL-eligible students whose primary language is not English. Because Vermont also has a separate supplemental funding allocation for students who are English-language learners (ELLs), all ELL students in Vermont are automatically weighted for both FRL eligibility and ELL status.

---

---

**Virginia**

Virginia provides increased funding for students from low-income households at a level that differs depending on the concentration of low-income students in their district. It does so by applying a multiplier of between 1.01 and 1.13, for each low-income student, with the specific multiplier depending on the concentration of low-income students in the district.

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 to districts with high concentrations of low-income students. 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 will 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) through 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 students from low-income households or increased funding for districts with high concentration of low-income students.

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

---



---

## Wisconsin

Wisconsin provides increased funding for students from low-income households and for districts with high concentrations of low-income students. It does so in the form of a prorated allocation for low-income students in grades K-3 and a further prorated allocation for districts where at least half the students come from low-income households.

Wisconsin provides additional funding for low-income students through a program encouraging schools to implement one of several strategies to reduce achievement gaps between low-income students and their peers. Funding is distributed to districts based on the number of low-income students they serve in grades K-3. Students are considered low-income if they qualify for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) under the National School Lunch Program. Over \$109 million was appropriated for this program for each of FY2018 and FY 2019. This was equal to about \$2,381 per low-income student FY2018.

In addition, Wisconsin provides per-pupil funding to districts where at least 50% of students were 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 FY 2019. This was equal to about \$80.12 per pupil attending a high-poverty district for each of FY2018 and FY2019.

---

## Wyoming

Wyoming provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so through a block grant that provides funding for additional pupil support staff to serve at-risk students.

At-risk students include those who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Program. The program also counts students in other categories, including those with limited English proficiency and mobile secondary students. A student is only counted once for the purposes of this funding even if he or she meets multiple qualifying criteria.

In FY2018, the state provided an additional 0.15 of a staff unit for every thirty at-risk students.

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

