

Funding High-Need Student Populations: A Look Across the States

This brief addresses student populations that require additional funding, including the following: (1) students with disabilities; (2) English language learners (ELLs); (3) students who are at-risk; and (4) gifted and talented students.

Special Education Funding

Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the federal government provides some funding and guidelines on how states should fund services for students requiring special education. Each state distributes this funding, combined with all other sources of education funding through various funding mechanisms. Based on our categorization of special education funding mechanisms, there are seven distinct categories:

1. Single student weight or dollar amount
2. Multiple student weights
3. Census-based allocation
4. Resource-based allocation
5. Reimbursement
6. Categorical grant
7. State funding for high-cost students

The following information is pulled from state statutes and regulations and, where appropriate, the citation is provided.

Some states have a hybrid system where they fall into more than one category; however, states were sorted into the category with which they most closely align. The following chart shows which states use which mechanism to fund special education students.

<i>Mechanism</i>	<i>States</i>
<i>Single student weight or dollar amount (11)</i>	AK, LA, MD, MO, NV, NH, NY, NC, ND, OR, WA
<i>Multiple student weights (16)</i>	AZ, CO, FL, GA, IN, IA, KY, ME, MN, NM, OH, OK, PA, SC, SD, TX
<i>Census-based allocation (5)</i>	AL, CA, ID, MA, NJ
<i>Resource-based allocation (8)</i>	DE, HI, IL, MS, TN, VT, VA, WV
<i>Reimbursement (5)</i>	MI, NE, RI, WI, WY
<i>Categorical grant (2)</i>	MT, UT
<i>State funding for high-cost students (2)</i>	AR, CT
<i>Other (1)</i>	KS

Appendix A provides a brief description and citation for each state’s special education funding mechanism.

Single student weight or dollar amount

There are 11 states that use a single weight or dollar amount to fund special education students. Under this method, all special education students are treated the same, regardless of the actual cost or resources required. Weights vary between states. For example, in New York, a student who requires special education receives a weight of 2.41 (McKinney’s Education Law § 3602). Similarly, in North Dakota, special education students receive a weight of 1.082 (NDCC, 15.1-27-03.1).

Multiple student weights

Instead of providing a single weight for all special education students, 16 states provide multiple student weights, based on the severity of disability, resources required, or specific disability. For example, New Mexico provides four weights, ranging from 1.7 to 3.0, based on the severity (N. M. S. A. 1978, § 22-8-21). Texas provides weights, ranging from 1.1 to 5.0, based on where the student is educated and the resources required (V.T.C.A., Education Code § 42.151). South Carolina provides ten different weights based on the student’s disability (Code 1976 § 59-20-40).

Census-based allocation

States who used a state-wide, census-based number for special education funding assume that all districts in the state, regardless of their actual student composition, have the same percentage of special education students. For example, Alabama assumes that five percent of students receive special education services and weights that five percent at 2.5 (Ala.Code 1975 § 16-13-232). In Idaho, districts receive special education funding at a rate of six percent of a district’s total K–6 enrollment and 5.5 percent of a district’s total 7–12 enrollment. Idaho then uses a resource-based allocation to distribute resources to districts (I.C. § 33-1002).

Resource-based allocation

There are eight states that primarily use a resource-based allocation to fund students in special education. Under a resource-allocation model, states distribute resources (like teachers, aids, specialists and technology) instead of dollars, based on the number of students identified as special education. For example, Delaware has a higher teacher to student ratio for special education students (8.4) than it does for general education students (20) (14 Del.C. § 1703). Similarly, Illinois distributes teachers, aids, and psychologists based on the number of identified special education students (105 ILCS 5/18-8.15).

Reimbursement

Five states use cost reimbursement methods to support special education. The state generally defines eligible cost-categories and the percentage of these costs that will be reimbursed by the state. Wyoming is the only state that reimburses 100 percent of the cost of educating special education students (W.S.1977 § 21-13-321). The state of Michigan also reimburses districts for qualified special education expenses, but caps the reimbursement at 75 percent of the cost (M.C.L.A. 388.1652).

Categorical grant

Block grant distributions are based on state allocations and can vary based on availability of funds. Utah uses a block grant distribution funding mechanism where the amount allocated is based on averages of the prior five years, with a growth factor (U.C.A. 1953 § 53A-17a-111).

Only funding for high-cost students

Because of the range of the cost of educating students who require special education, the state will often step to lessen the burden on districts by providing additional funding for very high cost students. This funding mechanism is often layered on top of other funding mechanisms (e.g. New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Maine). However, in two states – Connecticut and Arkansas – state funding is exclusively for very high-cost students.

Funding for Low-Income/At-Risk Students

Although there are more than 20 methods that states use to define at-risk status, at-risk students are most often defined as students who qualify for free or reduced priced lunches through the National School Lunch Program, meaning that their family income falls below 130 percent or 185 percent of the federal income poverty line, respectively. Studies have found a connection between providing additional funding for these low-income, at-risk students and increased academic success. The second most common identification method is students who do not maintain satisfactory academic progress.

Three states – Alaska, Delaware, and South Dakota – do not provide additional state funding for at-risk students. The remaining 47 states can be divided into four categories. Descriptions of the categories are below and an explanation of each state’s funding mechanism for at-risk students can be found in Appendix B.

<i>Mechanism</i>	<i>States</i>
<i>Single student weight or dollar amount (31)</i>	AL, AZ, CA, CT, HI, IN, IA, KY, LA, ME, MO, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, NH, NM, NV, NY, ND, OH, OK, OR, RI, SC, TX, VT, WA, WV, WY
<i>Multiple student weights (8)</i>	AR, CO, IL, KS, NE, NJ, PA, VA
<i>Categorical grant (4)</i>	FL, MT, UT, WI
<i>Resource-based allocation (4)</i>	GA, ID, NC, TN

Single Weight or Dollar Amount

There are 31 states who use a flat weight or dollar amount per student to provide additional funding for at-risk students. For example, West Virginia provides an additional \$18 per student for the total number of students enrolled in a district (W. Va. Code, § 18-9A-21). In contrast, Maine identifies students who are eligible for free or reduced price meals as at-risk and provides a weight of 1.15 just for those students (20-A M.R.S.A. § 15675).

Multiple Weights or Dollar Amounts

When states fund at-risk students through multiple weights or dollar amounts, it is usually a sliding scale based on the concentration of at-risk students in a district. There are eight states that use this funding mechanism. Pennsylvania uses two different weights – either 1.3 or 1.6 – based on the concentration of at-risk students in a district (24 P.S. § 25-2502.53). Similarly, Nebraska uses seven different weights, ranging from 1.0 to 1.225, where the weight increases as the percentage of at-risk students increases (Neb.Rev.St. § 79-1007.06).

Categorical Grant

Four states provide funding for at-risk student through a categorical grant based on state appropriations. For example, Florida provided \$712,207,631 for the 2017-18 fiscal year for its Supplemental Academic Instruction program. Districts can submit a plan to the state to receive funding through this program.

Resource-Based Allocation

There are four states who use a resource-based allocation for at-risk students. Under this model, states allocate resources, like teachers and aids, based on the number of at-risk students. For example, Tennessee uses class-size reduction to provide additional resources to at-risk students. The teacher to student ratio increases to 1:15 class size reduction for grades K-12, which is estimated to be the equivalent of \$542.27 per identified at-risk student (T. C. A. § 49-3-361).

Funding for English Language Learners

All but two states – Mississippi and Montana – provide additional funding for English Language Learners. The following table divides all fifty states into categories based on the funding mechanism used to fund English Language Learners in that state.

<i>Mechanism</i>	<i>States</i>
<i>Single weight or dollar amount (25)</i>	AK, AZ, AR, CA, FL, GA, IA, KS, KY, LA, MD, MO, NE, NH, NJ, NM, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, VT, WY
<i>Multiple student weights (10)</i>	CO, HI, IN, ME, MA, MI, MN, NY, ND, OH
<i>Categorical Grant (6)</i>	AL, CT, ID, NV, UT, WV
<i>Resource-based allocation (5)</i>	DE, NC, TN, VA, WA
<i>Reimbursement (2)</i>	IL, WI

Additional information about how each state provides funding for English Language Learners can be found in Appendix C. Descriptions of the categories and state examples are below.

Single Weight or Dollar Amount

Half of the states use a flat weight or dollar amount to fund English Language Learners. Under this model, districts receive the same amount of funding per student, regardless of the concentration or student's ability. For example, Arkansas provides an additional \$338 per identified English Language Learner (A.C.A. § 6-20-2305) and California provides an additional 20 percent through a student weight of 1.2 (West's Ann.Cal.Educ.Code § 42238.02).

Multiple Student Weights

Of the ten states who use multiple student weights to fund English language learners, some states determine weights based on the amount of time that a student has been classified as an English language learner (e.g. Ohio (R.C. § 3317.016)), based on the proficiency of the students (e.g. North Dakota (NDCC, 15.1-27-03.1)), or based on the concentration of English language learners in a district (e.g. Maine (20-A M.R.S.A. § 15675)). Under this model, additional funding can be provided to student with additional need.

Categorical Grants

There are six states that use categorical grants, based on state appropriations, to fund English language learners. For example, Idaho appropriated \$3.82 million for the 2017 – 2018 school year to serve all English language learners in the state (2017 Idaho House Bill No. 287, Idaho Sixty-Fourth Idaho Legislature, First Regular Session – 2017). In West Virginia, a county board must apply to the state superintendent to receive English language learner funding (W. Va. Code, § 18-9A-22).

Resource-Based Allocation

Five states distribute monies for English language learners through resources instead of through dollars or weights. In North Carolina, there is a minimum threshold that districts must meet in order to receive funding. Eligible LEAs or charter schools must have at least 20 students with limited English proficiency (based on a 3-year weighted average headcount), or at least 2.5 percent of the students classified as limited English proficiency to receive funding. There is also a cap of 10.6 percent. Similarly, the state funding formula in Tennessee provides districts with funding for an additional teaching position for every 20 English language learners and an additional interpreter position for every 200 English language learners (T. C. A. § 49-3-307).

Reimbursement

Two states – Illinois and Wisconsin – provide state reimbursement to districts for the additional cost of educating English language learners. In Illinois, each school district is reimbursed for the amount by which such costs exceed the average per pupil expenditure by a school district for the education of children of comparable age who are not in any special education program (105 ILCS 5/14C-12).

Funding for Gifted and Talented Students

There are thirteen states that have no state-level program for gifted and talented students in statute. Additionally, two states – Illinois and Maryland – have programs in statute, but are only funded if there is money available. The remaining 35 states have funding mechanisms for gifted and talented students that can be sorted into six categories.

<i>Mechanism</i>	<i>States</i>
<i>Categorical Grants (11)</i>	AR, CO, FL, ID, IN, ME, MT, NE, OR, UT, WI
<i>Single weight or dollar amount (10)</i>	AK, GA, IA, LA, MN, NV, OK, SC, TX, WY
<i>Resource-based allocation (5)</i>	DE, MS, OH, TN, VA
<i>Census-based allocation (4)</i>	AZ, HI, NC, WA
<i>Reimbursement (3)</i>	CT, ND, PA
<i>Multiple student weights (2)</i>	KY, NM

A unique challenge that states face is how to identify gifted and talented students. Parental identification generally leads to over-identification; whereas identification from a standardized test is expensive and time-consuming. Similarly, states must decide whether define gifted and talented as high-intelligence or high-ability. More detailed descriptions of each state’s funding mechanism for gifted and talented student can be found in Appendix D.

Categorical Grants

There are 11 states that provide funding for gifted and talented students based on categorical funding and state appropriations. In Indiana, for example, the state appropriated \$12.5 million for the 2016 – 2017 school year. Schools can then apply to the state to receive some of that funding under the High Ability Program (IC 20-36-2-1). In contrast, there is no application process in Utah for the \$5 million under the Enhancement for Accelerated Students (U.C.A. 1953 § 53A-17a-165).

Single Weight or Dollar Amount

Eleven states provide a flat weight or dollar amount per student identified as gifted and talented. South Carolina uses this model and provides an additional 15 percent per student. There is also a district minimum of \$15,000, regardless of the gifted and talented student count (S.C. Code of Regulations R. 43-220). Louisiana only provides funding for gifted and talented students who have an IEP. Louisiana provides a weight of 1.6 (2017 La. Sess. Law Serv. Hs. Conc. Res. 7 (WEST)).

Resource-Based Allocation

When funding gifted and talented students, five states primarily use a resource-based allocation system. Under a resource-allocation model, states distribute resources (like teachers, aids, specialists and technology) instead of dollars, based on the number of students identified. For example, Virginia provides one additional teach for 1,000 students identified as gifted and talented (2016 Virginia House Bill No. 29, Virginia 2017 Regular Session). Similarly, Mississippi provides one teach for 20 identified and participating students, and a second teacher for every 40 students (Miss. Admin. Code 7-96).

Census-Based Allocation

Under this funding model, four states assume a flat percentage of gifted and talented students in a district, regardless of the actual demographics. For example, Arizona provides \$75 per pupil for four percent of the district's student count, or \$2000, whichever is more (A.R.S. § 15-779.03). Hawaii assumed that three percent of each school is gifted and talented and provides a weight of 1.265).

Reimbursement

Three states reimburse the district for part of the expenses incurred from educating gifted and talented students. In Connecticut, for example, the state only reimburses if the cost exceeds 4.5 times the average per-pupil expenditure (C.G.S.A. § 10-76a and C.G.S.A. § 10-76g).

Multiple Student Weights

Two states – Kentucky (KRS § 157.200) and New Mexico (N.M. Admin. Code 6.29.1) – provide funding for gifted and talented education based on the degree of modification that a student needs and the cost of providing those modifications.

Appendix A: Funding Mechanisms for Special Education

State		Description	Amount (Dollar Amt or Weight)	Citation
Alabama	Census-Based System	The adjustment for special education reflects 5% ADM weighted 2.50.	2.5 for 5% of the ADM	Ala.Code 1975 § 16-13-232
Alaska	Single Student Weight or Dollar Amount and high-cost adjustment	Special needs funding factor: 1.20 Intensive Services Funding: intensive student count multiplied by 13	1.2 + (intensive student count) X 13	AS § 14.17.420
Arizona	Multiple Student Weights System	Fourteen different categories based on the student's specific disability	Ranging from 1.003 to 8.947	A.R.S. § 15-943
Arkansas	Only High-cost	Special education-catastrophic occurrences funding: Arkansas only provides funding for very high cost students		A.C.A. § 6-20-2305
California	Census-Based System	Based on the total number of students enrolled, regardless of students' disability status.	Not less than ten percent	West's Ann.Cal.Educ.Code § 56836.145
Colorado	Single Student Weight or Dollar Amount and high-cost adjustment	Districts receive \$1,250 for each student with a disability. An additional \$6,000 for children with certain disabilities may be provided	\$167,017,698 for budget year 2017-18.	C.R.S.A. § 22-20-103
Connecticut	Only High-cost	District is responsible for cost, up to four and one-half times average per-pupil educational costs. Above that threshold, the state provides assistance.		C.G.S.A. § 10-76g
Delaware	Resource-Based System	Resource allocation model using increased teacher-student ratios.	Preschool--12.8 K-3--16.2 4-12 Regular Education--20 4-12 Basic Special Education (Basic)--8.4 Pre K-12 Intensive Special Education (Intensive)--6 Pre K-12 Complex Special Education (Complex)--2.6.	14 Del.C. § 1703
Florida	Multiple Student Weights System and high-cost adjustment	Fixed funding for special education students not receiving level 4 or 5 services is provided through an Exceptional Student Education guaranteed allocation.	Kindergarten and Grades 1, 2 and 3 with ESE Services: 1.107 Grades 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 with ESE Services: 1.000 Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12 with ESE Services: 1.001 Support Level 4: 3.619 Support Level 5: 5.526	West's F.S.A. § 1011.62
Georgia	Multiple Student Weights System	Five categories based on individual disabilities	2.37989 to 5.7509	Ga. Code Ann., § 20-2-161
Hawaii	Resource-Based System	Based on state appropriations for a single school district	\$409,869,091 FY2019	http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/budget/Act49OpBudget.pdf
Idaho	Census-Based System and resource allocation model	Districts receive special education funding at a rate of 6.0% of a district's total K-6 enrollment and 5.5% of a district's total 7-12 enrollment for additional support units. The percentage of a district's total enrollment eligible for exceptional child funding is divided by the exceptional child support unit divisor of 14.5 to determine the number of exceptional child support units generated by the district.	K-6: 6.0% 7-12: 5.5%	I.C. § 33-1002

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Illinois	Resource-Based System and Census-Based System	Resource-based: One FTE teacher position for every 141 special ed students One FTE instructional assistant for every 141 special ed students One FTE psychologist for every 1000 special ed students Census-based: Annually, the State Superintendent shall calculate and report to each Organizational Unit the amount the unit must expend on special education and bilingual education pursuant to the unit's Base Funding Minimum, Special Education Allocation, and Bilingual Education Allocation.		105 ILCS 5/18-8.15
Indiana	Multiple Student Weights System	Dollar amounts based on severity and disability	(1) Severe disabilities: \$9,156 (2) Mild and moderate disabilities: \$2,300 (3) Communication disorders: \$500 (4) Homebound programs: \$500 (5) Special preschool education programs: \$2,750	IC 20-43-7-6
Iowa	Multiple Student Weights System	Three different weight based on where the student is educated	Regular classroom: 1.8 Little integration in regular classroom: 2.2 Severe/multiple disabilities: 4.4	I.C.A. § 256B.9
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	Multiple Student Weights System	Three weights	Each category is given an additional weighting of 2.35, 1.17, and 0.24	KRS § 157.200
Louisiana	Single Student Weight or dollar amount	Flat weight for all students with disabilities	2.5	LSA-R.S. 17:7
Maine	Multiple Student Weights System and high-cost adjustment	Students are assigned to three different categories based on the concentrations of students with disabilities in their districts.	Up to 15%: 2.277 More than 15%: 1.38 Fewer than 20 students: 1.29 Additional funding for very high cost students	20-A M.R.S.A. § 1568 1-A
Maryland	Single Student Weight System	Flat weight for all students with disabilities	1.74	MD Code, Education , § 5-209
Massachusetts	Census-Based System and high-cost adjustment	Census-based system	Assumed in-district special education enrollment: 3.75 percent Vocational enrollment: 4.75. Reimbursement for very high cost students.	M.G.L.A. 71B § 5A
Michigan	Reimbursement System	Not to exceed 75% of the total approved costs of operating special education programs	\$956,246,100 for 2017-2018 from state sources and all available federal funding	M.C.L.A. 388.1652
Minnesota	Reimbursement System and Multiple Student Weights	Minnesota funds special education using a hybrid system incorporating multiple student weights and partial reimbursement.	56% reimbursement of a formula (reimbursement) plus additional funding based on students slotted into three categories.	M.S.A. § 125A.76
Mississippi	Resource-Based Allocation	One teacher unit is provided for each approved class of exceptional students. The funding allocated is based on the teacher's certification and experience		Miss. Code Ann. § 37-23-35

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Missouri	Single Student Weight System	Flat weight for all students with disabilities, if the count exceeds the special education threshold	1.75	V.A.M.S. 163.011
Montana	Block Grant	The superintendent of public instruction shall determine the total special education payment to a school district through a block grant formula.	(i) 52.5% through instructional block grants; (ii) 17.5% through related services block grants; (iii) 25% to reimbursement of local districts; and (iv) 5% to special education cooperatives and joint boards for administration and travel.	MCA 20-9-321
Nebraska	Reimbursement System	For special education and support services provided in each school fiscal year, the State Department of Education shall reimburse each school district in the following school fiscal year a pro rata amount determined by the department.		Neb.Rev.St. § 79-1142
Nevada	Single student weight or dollar amount	It is the intent of the Legislature, commencing with Fiscal Year 2016-2017, to provide additional resources to the Nevada Plan expressed as a multiplier of the basic support guarantee to meet the unique needs of certain categories of pupils, including, without limitation, pupils with disabilities, pupils who are English learners, pupils who are at risk and gifted and talented pupils.		N.R.S. 387.121
New Hampshire	Single Student Weight or Dollar Amount and high-cost adjustment	Additional dollar amount in the formula	Additional \$1,956.09 for a special education student who has an individualized educational plan (FY18 and FY19). Extra funding for very high cost students.	N.H. Rev. Stat. § 186-C:18
New Jersey	Census-Based System	Census-based system	$SE = (RE \times SEACR \times AEC \times \frac{1}{2}) \times GCA$ where RE is the resident enrollment of the school district or county vocational school district; SEACR is the State average classification rate for general special education services pupils; AEC is the excess cost for general special education services pupils; and GCA is the geographic cost adjustment as developed by the commissioner.	N.J.S.A. 18A:7F-55
New Mexico	Multiple Student Weights System	Students are assigned to four different categories based on the services they receive.	Class A and Class B: 1.7 Class C: 2.0 Class D: 3.0	N. M. S. A. 1978, § 22-8-21
New York	Single Student Weight System	Flat weight for all students with disabilities	2.41	McKinney's Education Law § 3602
North Carolina	Single Student Weight System	Flat weight for all students with disabilities, which depends on state allocations	Depends on state allocations with a 12.5% cap	N.C.G.S.A. § 115C-107.1
North Dakota	Single Student Weight System	Flat weight for all students with disabilities	1.082	NDCC, 15.1-27-03.1
Ohio	Multiple Student Weights System	Students are assigned to six different categories based on their specific disabilities.	Category 1: \$1,578 Category 2: \$4,005 Category 3: \$9,622 Category 4: \$12,841 Category 5: \$17,390 Category 6: \$25,637	R.C. § 3317.013

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Oklahoma	Multiple Student Weights System	Students are assigned to ten different categories based on their specific disabilities.	Vision Impaired: 4.8 Learning Disabilities: 1.4 Deaf or Hard-of-Hearing: 3.9 Deaf and Blind: 4.8 Educable Mentally Handicapped: 2.3 Emotionally Disturbed: 3.5 Multiple Handicapped: 3.4 Physically Handicapped: 2.2 Speech Impaired: 1.05 Trainable Mentally Handicapped: 2.3	70 Okl.St. Ann. § 18-201.1
Oregon	Single Student Weight System	Flat weight for all students with disabilities	2.0 with an 11% cap	O.R.S. § 327.013
Pennsylvania	Multiple Student Weights System	Multiple student weights based on cost	Three categories based on student costs • Category 1: < \$25,000/year • Category 2: \$25,000 - \$49,999/year • Category 3: \$50,000 and up/year Weights are assigned to each cost category • Category 1: 2.51% • Category 2: 4.77% • Category 3: 8.46%	24 P.S. § 25-2509.5
Rhode Island	Reimbursement and high-cost adjustment	Reimbursement capped at 110% of the state average Categorical for very high cost students		Gen.Laws 1956, § 16-24-6 Gen.Laws 1956, § 16-7.2-6
South Carolina	Multiple Student Weights System	Different weights based on disability	Ten categories ranging from 1.114 to 3.57	Code 1976 § 59-20-40
South Dakota	Multiple Student Weights System	Six levels of disability based on individual disability	Additional dollar amounts ranging from \$5,527.09 to \$28,161.22	SDCL § 13-37-35.1
Tennessee	Resource-Based System	Resource allocation model where teachers, assistants, and supervisors are allocated based on the number of students with disabilities.	Teachers: 10 options based on disability and severity Supervisors: 750:1 Assessment Personnel: 600:1 Assistants: 60:1 Materials: \$36.50 Equipment: \$17.25 Travel: \$17.25	Tenn. Comp. R. & Regs. 0520-01-09-.02
Texas	Multiple Student Weights System	Different weights based on where the student is educated and the resources provided.	Ranging from 1.1 to 5.0	V.T.C.A., Education Code § 42.151
Utah	Block Grant	Block grant based on prior 5 years' allocations with a growth factor	Capped at 12.18%	U.C.A. 1953 § 53A-17a-111
Vermont	Resource-based allocation and high-cost adjustment		Resource-based allocation: Teacher salary weighted 1.6 for special education. 9.75 special education teaching positions per 1000 students. Reimbursement for very high cost (one child costs over \$50,000)	16 V.S.A. § 2961
Virginia	Resource-Based System	Resource-based system	Based on the cost of staff positions in a district	West's Ann. Cal. Educ. Code § 56836.10
Washington	Single Student Weight System	Flat weight for all students with disabilities	1.9309 with a cap of 13.5%	West's RCWA 28A.150.390
West Virginia	Only High-cost	Hybrid resource-allocation and reimbursement for only high-cost students	FTE calculated for teacher, therapist, aides, and bus drivers	http://wvde.state.wv.us/osp/fiscalmonitoring.html

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Wisconsin	Reimbursement System and high-cost adjustment	Partial reimbursement	Additional funding for students costing over \$30,000	W.S.A. 115.881
Wyoming	Reimbursement System	The amount provided for special education shall be equal to one hundred percent (100%) of the amount actually expended by the district during the previous school year for special education programs and services.		W.S.1977 § 21-13-321

Appendix B: Funding Mechanisms for At-Risk Students

State	Mechanism	Description	Program Name	Amount	Citation
Alabama	Single weight or dollar amount	\$100 per student defined as “at risk.” These funds are required to be spent on tutorial assistance programs for students one or more grade levels below the national norm.	Assistance program for at-risk students	\$100 per student	Ala.Code 1975 § 16-6B-3
Alaska	None				
Arizona	Single weight or dollar amount	Each school district and charter school shall submit to the state board of education a plan for improving the reading proficiency of its pupils in kindergarten programs and grades one, two and three.	K-3 Reading Program	1.040 Weight	A.R.S. § 15-211
Arkansas	Multiple weights or dollar amounts	Sliding scale based on the percentage of students in the national school lunch program.	National school lunch state categorical funding	FY2018: >90%: \$1,576 70%-90%: \$1,051 <70%: \$526	A.C.A. § 6-20-2305
California	Single weight or dollar amount	Supplemental Grant: English learners (EL), eligible for free or reduced-price meal (FRPM), foster youth, or any combination of these factors (unduplicated count).	Supplemental Grant	1.2	West's Ann.Cal.Educ.Code § 42238.02
	Single weight or dollar amount	Concentration Grant: Additional 50 percent of the adjusted base grant multiplied by ADA and the percentage of targeted pupils exceeding 55 percent of a local educational agency's (LEA) enrollment.	Concentration Grant	1.5 for the percentage of at-risk students exceeding 55%	West's Ann.Cal.Educ.Code § 42238.02
Colorado	Multiple Weights	Eligibility for participation in the federal free lunch program is used as a proxy of each school district's at-risk pupil population.	At-Risk Funding	Range: 1.12 to 1.30 depending on at-risk percentage	C.R.S.A. § 22-54-136
Connecticut	Single weight or dollar amount	Eligibility for federal assistance under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as of each October 1 counts an extra 33%.	Poverty Count	1.33	C.G.S.A. § 10-262f
Delaware	None				

Florida	Categorical	Each school district receiving funds from the Supplemental Academic Instruction Categorical Fund shall submit to the Department of Education a plan which identifies the students to be served and the scope of supplemental academic instruction to be provided.	Supplemental Academic Instruction Funds	\$712,207,631 for the 2017-18 fiscal year	http://www.fdoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7507/urlt/Fefpdist.pdf
Georgia	Resource-Allocation Model	Additional funding for remedial students, defined as students identified as not reaching or not maintaining adequate academic achievement relative to grade level.	Remedial Program	Sufficient funds to pay the beginning salaries for instructors needed to provide 20 additional days of instruction for 10 percent of the full-time equivalent count.	Ga. Code Ann., § 20-2-184.1
Hawaii	Single weight or dollar amount	"Economically disadvantaged", which is defined as qualifying for free and reduced price lunch.	Economically Disadvantaged Count	1.1	https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/Reports/FY18WSFOECweights.pdf
Idaho	Resource-Allocation Model	12 students in grade 6-12 at an alternative school generate an alternative support unit.	Alternative Support Units		I.C. § 33-1002
Illinois	Multiple Weights	Count of children receiving services through the programs of Medicaid, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the Children's Health Insurance Program, or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.	GSA Grant	<15%: \$355 15%-100%: [294.25 + (2,700 (Low-Income Percentage)^2)] X low-income pupils	105 ILCS 5/18-8.05
Indiana	Single weight or dollar amount	Complexity grants are used to help school corporations serving high poverty children.	Complexity Grant	\$4,587 for FY2015	IC 20-43-13-4
Iowa	Single weight or dollar amount	Only for grades 1-6, eligibility for free and reduced price meals	At-Risk Programs	0.048 times the percentage of pupils in a school district, grades 1-6 who are eligible for free and reduced price meals, multiplied by the enrollment in the school district, plus 0.156 times the enrollment of the school district.	I.C.A. § 257.11
Kansas	Multiple Weights	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.	High-Density at-risk student Weighting	If >10%: 1.484 If <10%: assume 10% is at-risk If 35-50%: Subtract 35% and multiply by 1.7 if >50%: 1.105	K.S.A. 72-5151
Kentucky	Single weight or dollar amount	Average daily membership of students approved for free meals the prior fiscal year and the number of state agency children.	At-risk student amount	1.15	702 Ky. Admin. Regs. 3:270
Louisiana	Single weight or dollar amount	Eligibility for free or reduced lunches and students identified as English Language Learners (non-duplicated count).	At-risk students	1.22 times the base amount	LSA-Const. Art. 8, § 13
Maine	Single weight or dollar amount	Eligibility for free or reduced-price meals	economically disadvantaged students	1.15	20-A M.R.S.A. § 15675

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Maryland	Single weight or dollar amount	“Compensatory education enrollment count” means the number of students eligible for free or reduced price meals for the prior fiscal year.	Compensatory education enrollment count	1.97	MD Code, Education, § 5-207
Massachusetts	Single weight or dollar amount	Low-income status is reported on the basis of eligibility for free and reduced lunch programs	Low-income status	FY16: \$2,809	M.G.L.A. 70 § 2
Michigan	Single weight or dollar amount	One of the following criteria: did not achieve proficiency on the English Language Arts, ELA, math, science, or social studies content areas of the state summative assessment; is at risk of not meeting the district's core academic curricular objectives in ELA or math; is a victim of child abuse or neglect; is a pregnant teenager or teenage parent; has a family history of school failure, incarceration, or substance abuse; or is enrolled in a priority or priority successor school. Or two of the following: eligible for free or reduced price breakfast, lunch, or milk; absent more than ten percent of enrolled days or ten school days during the school year; homeless; migrant; an English language learner; an immigrant who has immigrated within the immediately preceding three years; did not complete high school in four years and is continuing in school	At-risk	1.115	M.C.L.A. 388.1631a
Minnesota	Single weight or dollar amount	Eligibility for free or Reduced Price Lunch	Compensatory Pupil Units	Compensatory Revenue = (Basic Formula Allowance – \$415) x .6 x Compensatory Pupil Units	M.S.A. § 126C.05
Mississippi	Single weight or dollar amount	Eligibility for free Lunch	At-risk component	1.05	Miss. Code Ann. § 37-151-7
Missouri	Single weight or dollar amount	Eligibility for free and reduced price lunch if the district meets a minimum threshold	Free and reduced price lunch weighting	1.25	V.A.M.S. 163.011
Montana	Categorical	The At-Risk Student payment is intended to address the needs of at-risk students, and the money is distributed in the same manner as Title I monies are distributed to schools.	At-risk student payment		MCA 20-9-328
Nebraska	Multiple Weights	Poverty students are determined by Free and reduced Lunch status.	Poverty student count	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.0000 for the first 5% • 1.0375 for 5 - 10% • 1.0750 for 10 - 15% • 1.1125 for 15 - 20% • 1.1500 for 20 - 25% • 1.1875 for 25 - 30% • 1.2250 for more than 30% of formula students 	Neb.Rev.St. § 79-1007.06
Nevada	Single weight or dollar amount	It is the intent of the Legislature, commencing with Fiscal Year 2016-2017, to provide additional resources to the Nevada Plan expressed as a multiplier of the basic support guarantee to meet the unique needs of certain categories of pupils, including, without limitation, pupils with disabilities,			N.R.S. 387.121

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

		pupils who are English learners, pupils who are at risk and gifted and talented pupils.			
New Hampshire	Single weight or dollar amount	Eligibility for free and reduced-price meals	Differentiated aid for free and reduced-price meal eligible students	Additional \$1,780.63	N.H. Rev. Stat. § 198:40-a
New Jersey	Multiple Weights	Free and reduced price lunches	At-risk pupil weight	FY2017: <20%: 1.41 >40%: 1.46 Sliding scale in between	N.J.S.A. 18A:7F-51
New Mexico	Single weight or dollar amount	Units calculated based on a factor or index determined by establishing a three-year average of the following: 1) percentage of membership used for Title I allocation; 2) percentage of membership classified as English language learners (using the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), and, 3) percentage of student mobility.	At-risk units	Three-Year Average Total Rate x 0.106 = At-Risk Index	N. M. S. A. 1978, § 22-8-23.3
New York	Single weight or dollar amount	Three-year average percentage of students in grades K-6 who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program and the census count of students in poverty	Extraordinary needs pupil count	(National School Lunch Program and Poverty) X 0.65 + (ELL) X 0.5 + (Sparsity Count)	McKinney's Education Law § 3602
North Carolina	Resource-Allocation Model	Every LEA receives the following: 1. Funding equivalent to an School Safety Officer salary (\$37,838) per high school 2. Remaining funds allocated based 50% on Federal Title I headcount (\$329.77/pupil) and 50% on allotted ADM (\$88.37/pupil) NOTE: Each LEA must receive at least the equivalent of two teachers and two instructional support personnel (\$249,288).	At-risk student services		http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/fbs/allotments/general/2014-15policymanual.pdf
	Resource-Allocation Model	Disadvantaged students supplemental funding: Step 1: Use the average statewide (K-12) teacher-to-student classroom teacher allotment for the Fundable Disadvantaged Population which is 1:21. Step 2: The targeted allotment ratios for the Fundable Disadvantaged Population are: • If low wealth % is > 90%, one teacher per 19.9 students • If low wealth % is >= 80% but <= 90%, one teacher per 19.4 students. • If low wealth % is < 80%, one teacher per 19.1 students. Step 3: Convert the teaching positions to dollars by using the	Disadvantaged students supplemental funding		http://www.ncleg.net/documents/sites/committees/JLSCPSFF/2007-12-13%20Meeting/2007.12.13%20Pt.6_DS_SF.pdf

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

		state average teacher salary (including benefits).			
North Dakota	Single weight or dollar amount	The three-year average percentage of students in grades three through eight who are eligible for free or reduced lunches.	Weighted ADM for students eligible for free or reduced lunches	1.025	NDCC, 15.1-27-03.1
Ohio	Single weight or dollar amount	The square of the quotient of that district's percentage of students in its total ADM who are identified as economically disadvantaged as defined by the department of education, divided by the percentage of students in the statewide total ADM identified as economically disadvantaged. Eligibility for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch, recipient of public assistance, or title 1 application	Economically disadvantaged index for a school district	$\$272 \times ((\# \text{ at-risk students in district} / \# \text{ at-risk students in state})^2 \times \# \text{ at-risk in district})$	R.C. § 3317.022
Oklahoma	Single weight or dollar amount	Eligibility for free/reduced meal status. Note: starting in 2015, free and reduced meals were no longer used as the proxy for economic disadvantage for some types of schools (http://sde.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/Econ.%20Disadv.%20Mem o%20Final.pdf).	Economically disadvantaged weight	1.25	70 Okl.St. Ann. § 18-201.1
Oregon	Single weight or dollar amount	The number of children in poverty families, as determined by the Department of Education based on rules adopted by the State Board of Education; and the number of children in foster homes in the district; and the number of children in the district in state-recognized facilities for neglected and delinquent children.	Poverty weight	1.25	O.R.S. § 327.013
Pennsylvania	Multiple Weights	Various weights based on concentration	Poverty average daily membership	1.3 or 1.6	24 P.S. § 25-2502.53
Rhode Island	Single weight or dollar amount	PK-12 students eligible for free and reduced lunch	Student success factor	1.4	Gen.Laws 1956, § 16-7.2-3
South Carolina	Single weight or dollar amount	(1) the poverty index of the district as documented on the most recent district report card, which measures student eligibility for the free or reduced price lunch program and Medicaid; and (2) the number of students not in poverty or eligible for Medicaid but who fail to meet state standards in either reading or mathematics.	Students at risk of school failure	1.2	http://ed.sc.gov/finance/financial-services/manual-handbooks-and-guidelines/funding-manuals/fy-2014-2015-funding-manual/
South Dakota	None	None			
Tennessee	Resource-Allocation Model	Based on 1:15 class size reduction for grades K-12, estimated at \$542.27 per identified at-risk ADM by eligibility for free and reduced price lunch	K-12 At-risk class size reduction		T. C. A. § 49-3-361

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Texas	Single weight or dollar amount	Educationally disadvantaged student, determined by averaging the highest six months of student enrollment in the National School Lunch Program for free or reduced-price lunches for the prior federal fiscal year.	State compensatory education	1.2	V.T.C.A., Education Code § 42.152
Utah	Categorical	One or more of the following risk factors: (1) Low performance on U-PASS tests; (2) Poverty; (3) Limited English Proficiency; and (4) Mobility. "Mobility" means the number of students enrolled less than 160 days or its equivalent in one school within one school year. "Poverty" means the total number of students eligible for free or reduced-priced lunch.	Enhancement for At-Risk Students Program	Annual appropriation	U.A.C. R277-708
Vermont	Single weight or dollar amount	Additional 25% for students, ages 6-17, from families receiving food stamps.	Poverty ratio	1.25	16 V.S.A. § 4010
Virginia	Multiple Weights	1) A minimum 1.0 percent add-on for each child who qualifies for the federal Free Lunch Program; and 2) An addition to the add-on, based on the concentration of children qualifying for the federal Free Lunch Program. Based on its percentage of Free Lunch participants, each school division will receive between 1.0 and 13.0 percent in additional basic aid per Free Lunch participant.	Remedial Education Payments for federal free lunch participants	Rage: 1.01 to 1.13 based on the percentage of at-risk students	https://budget.lis.virginia.gov/get/budget/3279/
Washington	Single Student weight or dollar amount	Districts receive LAP allocations based on the number of students in poverty, as measured by eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch.	Learning Assistance Program	2014-2015: Additional \$463	http://leg.wa.gov/Senate/Committees/WM/Documents/K-12%20Booklet_2015%202-10-15.pdf
West Virginia	Single weight or dollar amount	The total funds are distributed proportionally to each district on the basis of net enrollment, regardless of at-risk status.	Allowance for Alternative Education Programs	\$18 per student	W. Va. Code, § 18-9A-21
Wisconsin	Categorical	A school district is eligible for aid if at least 50 percent of the district's student enrollment is eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.	Aid to High Poverty Districts	\$16,830,000 in 2017-18 and 2018-19	W.S.A. 121.136
Wyoming	Single weight or dollar amount	Eligibility for the federal free and reduced lunch program. A district receives an EDY adjustment if the percentage of eligible children within any of its schools exceeds 150% of the statewide average concentration level for each school type.	Economically disadvantaged youth	If >150% of state average, additional \$500 per at-risk student	W.S.1977 § 21-13-309

Appendix C: Funding Mechanisms for English Language Learners

State	Mechanism	Description	Amount (Dollar Amt or Weight)	Citation
-------	-----------	-------------	-------------------------------	----------

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Alabama	Categorical Grant	The amount is appropriated on a per student basis based on total state appropriations	\$2,755,334 for FY 18	2017 Alabama House Bill No. 171, Alabama 2017 Regular Session
Alaska	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount	Special needs funding is available to a district to assist the district in providing special education, gifted and talented education, vocational education, and bilingual education services to its students	1.2	AS § 14.17.420
Arizona	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount	English Learner Classroom Personnel Bonus Fund	1.115	A.R.S. § 15-943
Arkansas	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		\$338 per identified student in FY2018	A.C.A. § 6-20-2305
California	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.2	West's Ann.Cal.Educ.Code § 42238.02
Colorado	Multiple Weights and categorical	Formula: 1.2 weight in the formula, plus a bonus for districts with a high concentration of ELLs.	If ELL < state average: 1.2 If ELL > state average, then districts get additional funding	C.R.S.A. § 22-54.5-201 C.R.S.A. § 22-24-104
Connecticut	Categorical Grant	Districts shall annually receive, within available appropriations, a grant in an amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying one million nine hundred sixteen thousand one hundred thirty by the ratio which the number of eligible children in the school district bears to the total number of such eligible children state-wide.	1,916,130 X Ratio of ELL students to statewide average	2017 Connecticut Senate Bill No. 1502, Connecticut General Assembly - June Special Session, 2017
Delaware	Resource-Allocation Model	The unit for academic excellence may be used to provide educational services for limited English proficient pupils...		14 Del.C. § 1716
Florida	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.212	West's F.S.A. § 1011.62
Georgia	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount	English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) program	2.5558	Ga. Code Ann., § 20-2-161
Hawaii	Multiple Weights	Different weights depending on English language proficiency	Fully English Proficient: 1.0648 Limited English Proficient: 1.1944 Non-English Proficient: 1.3888 Aggregate: 1.2341	https://www.hawaii publicschoools.org/Reports/FY18WSFOECw eights.pdf
Idaho	Categorical Grant	Based on total state appropriations	\$3,820,000 in 2017-2018	2017 Idaho House Bill No. 287, Idaho Sixty-Fourth Idaho Legislature, First Regular Session - 2017
Illinois	Reimbursement	Each school district shall be reimbursed for the amount by which such costs exceed the average per pupil expenditure by such school district for the education of children of comparable age who are not in any special education program.	Reimbursement	105 ILCS 5/14C-12
Indiana	Multiple Weights	Non English-Speaking Program (NESP)	For 2017-2018: -\$250 base per-pupil allocation -\$131.50 additional per-pupil allocation for LEAs with an EL population in excess of 5% but less than 18% -\$165.16 additional per-pupil for LEAs with an EL population greater than 18%	IC 20-30-9-5

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Iowa	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount	0.22, may be weighted for up to five years, beginning with the budget year for which the student was first determined to be limited English proficient.	1.22	I.C.A. § 280.4
Kansas	Multiple Weights	Included in at-risk definition	Multiple weights based on concentration	K.S.A. 72-5151
Kentucky	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.096	KRS § 157.200
Louisiana	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.22	LSA-Const. Art. 8, § 13
Maine	Multiple Weights	Additional weight in formula depends on density of ELL students	A. Fewer than 15 ELL students: weight of 1.7 B. More than 15 ELL students and fewer than 251: weight of 1.5 C. 251 or more ELL students: weight of 1.525	20-A M.R.S.A. § 15675
Maryland	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.99	MD Code, Education, § 5-208
Massachusetts	Multiple Weights	Additional weight in formula varies depending on grade level.		I MA ST T. XII, Ch. 71A
Michigan	Multiple Weights		\$6,000,000 total: \$620 or \$410 per FTE depending on proficiency	M.C.L.A. 388.1641
Minnesota	Multiple Weights	There are two parts to the EL portion of basic skills revenue: the first part or basic formula is a set amount per EL pupil; the second part of the EL formula is a concentration formula.	Flat allocation: \$704 for each ELL Second allocation: varies based on concentration (FY18)	M.S.A. § 124D.65
Mississippi	None			
Missouri	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		If ELL > 1.94% of ADA, then weighted at 1.60 (FY18)	V.A.M.S. 163.031
Montana	None			
Nebraska	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount	Must be less than a district maximum and adjustments are made after the calculation.	LEP allowance: 25% of the statewide average general fund operating expenditures per formula student X ELL	Neb.Rev.St. § 79-1007.08
Nevada	Categorical Grant	Zoom Schools Program in Clark and Washoe counties (plus 1500 students in other counties) extended through 2019		2017 Nevada Senate Bill No. 504, Nevada Seventy-Ninth Regular Session
New Hampshire	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		\$711.40 (FY18 and FY19)	N.H. Rev. Stat. § 198:40-a
New Jersey	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount	For the 2008-2009 through 2010-2011 school years the LEP weight shall be 0.5. For subsequent school years, the LEP weight shall be established in the Educational Adequacy Report.	0.47 (FY17)	N.J.S.A. 18A:7F-51
New Mexico	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.35	N. M. S. A. 1978, § 22-8-22
New York	Multiple Weights	Included in Extraordinary Needs (EN) count.	EN = Poverty Count + (English Language Learner Count × 0.5) + Sparsity Count	McKinney's Education Law § 3602

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

North Carolina	Resource-Allocation Model	Eligible LEAs/charter schools must have at least 20 students with limited English proficiency (based on a 3-year weighted average headcount), or at least 2.5% of the ADM of the LEA/charter school. Funding is provided for up to 10.6% of ADM.	Each school receives the minimum of 1 teacher assistant position. 1. 50% of the funds (after calculating the base) will be distributed based on the concentration of limited English proficient students within the LEA. 2. 50% of the funds (after calculating the base) will be distributed based on the weighted 3-year average headcount.	http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/fbs/allotments/general/newpolicies17-18.pdf
North Dakota	Multiple Weights	Weight varies based on level of proficiency	1.40 categories 1-6 1.28 categories 7-12 1.07 categories 13-18	NDCC, 15.1-27-03.1
Ohio	Multiple Weights	Funding depends on duration of enrollment:	(A) \$1,515 per student enrolled for 180 school days or less (B) \$1,136 per student enrolled for more than 180 school days (C) \$758 per student who does not qualify for inclusion under division (A) or (B) and is in a trial-mainstream period.	R.C. § 3317.016
Oklahoma	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.25	70 Okl.St. Ann. § 18-201.1
Oregon	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.5	O.R.S. § 327.013
Pennsylvania	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.6	24 P.S. § 25-2502.53
Rhode Island	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.1	Gen.Laws 1956, § 16-7.2-6
South Carolina	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.2	2017 South Carolina House Bill No. 3720, South Carolina One Hundred Twenty-Second Session General Assembly - First Regular Session
South Dakota	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.25	SDCL § 13-13-10.1
Tennessee	Resource-Allocation Model	The state's funding formula provides districts with funding for an additional teaching position for every 20 ELL students and an additional interpreter position for every 200 students.		T. C. A. § 49-3-307
Texas	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.1	V.T.C.A., Education Code § 42.153
Utah	Categorical Grant	ELLs are included in At-Risk Students Program	20% of at-risk funding goes to high-poverty districts 76% distributed based on districts' at-risk student enrollment. 4% to all districts.	U.A.C. R277-708
Vermont	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount		1.2	16 V.S.A. § 4010

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Virginia	Resource-Allocation Model	State funding shall be provided to support 17 full-time equivalent instructional positions for each 1,000 students identified as having limited English proficiency.	17 teachers per 1000 ELLs	VA Code Ann. § 22.1-253.13:2
Washington	Resource-Allocation Model	The formula provides 4.7780 hours of bilingual instruction per week. The formula translates to additional 11 funding of approximately \$923 per eligible student in the 2014-15 school year.		West's RCWA 28A.180.080
West Virginia	Categorical Grant	In order to receive the funding, a county board must apply to the state superintendent.	Any appropriation made pursuant to this section shall be distributed to the county boards in a manner that takes into account the varying proficiency levels of the students and the capacity of the county board to deliver the needed programs	W. Va. Code, § 18-9A-22
Wisconsin	Reimbursement	It is the policy of this state to reimburse school districts for the added costs of providing special programs.		W.S.A. 115.95
Wyoming	Flat Student Weight/Dollar Amount	A district receives an EDY adjustment if the percentage of eligible children within any of its schools exceeds 150% of the statewide average concentration level for each school type.	If >150% of state average, additional \$500 per at-risk student	W.S.1977 § 21-13-309

Appendix D: Funding Mechanisms for Gifted/Talented Students

State	Mechanism	Description	Amount (Dollar Amt or Weight)	Citation
Alabama	None			
Alaska	Flat Weight		1.2	AS § 14.17.420
Arizona	Census-Based and Flat Weight	4.0 percent assumed for all districts	\$75 per pupil for four per cent of the district's student count, or two thousand dollars, whichever is more	A.R.S. § 15-779.03
Arkansas	Categorical	Funds are appropriated to provide financial assistance to school districts operating programs for gifted and talented students.		A.C.A. § 6-42-106
California	None			
Colorado	Categorical		\$12.1 million plus an additional \$33 million from local and other resources.	C.R.S.A. § 22-20-205
Connecticut	Reimbursement	"Extraordinary learning ability" and "outstanding creative talent" shall be defined by the commissioner.	LEA is responsible for costs up to 4.5 times the average per-pupil educational costs. State reimburses the rest.	C.G.S.A. § 10-76a C.G.S.A. § 10-76g
Delaware	Resource Allocation Model	The unit for academic excellence may be used to provide educational services for gifted and talented pupils.		14 Del.C. § 1716
Florida	Categorical	The Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Guaranteed Allocation provides supplemental funding for students who have low to moderate handicapping conditions and/or are gifted students.	The guaranteed allocation is a fixed amount provided each district.	West's F.S.A. § 1003.57
Georgia	Flat Weight	Category VI of Special Education Funding - intellectually gifted	1.6589 for FY 2018 (adjusted annually)	Ga. Code Ann., § 20-2-161
Hawaii	Census-Based	The count used to determine the G/T enrollment at a school is based on a flat 3% assumption for each school.	1.265	https://www.hawaii publicschoools.org/DOE%20Forms/WSF/C

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

				OWFICreport081815.pdf
Idaho	Categorical	"Gifted/talented children" means those students who are identified as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performing capabilities in intellectual, creative, specific academic or leadership areas, or ability in the performing or visual arts and who require services or activities not ordinarily provided by the school in order to fully develop such capabilities.	\$1,000,000 in 2017-2018	2017 Idaho House Bill No. 287, Idaho Sixty-Fourth Idaho Legislature, First Regular Session - 2017
Illinois	Only if funding is available	When sufficient State funding is expected to be available to support local programs of gifted education, the State Superintendent of Education shall issue a Request for Proposals (RFP). To be considered for funding, an eligible entity shall submit for approval by the State Superintendent a plan for its program.		105 ILCS 5/14A-30
Indiana	Categorical	A school corporation may submit a grant proposal for planning or continuation of services. Proposals are reviewed to verify compliance with the High Ability Program Rule.	2016-2017: \$12,548,096	IC 20-36-2-1
Iowa	Flat Weight		\$82.67 per-pupil for 2017-2018	I.C.A. § 257.46
Kansas	None			
Kentucky	Multiple Weights	Funded under "Special Education Programs"		KRS § 157.200
Louisiana	Flat Weight	Funding for gifted and talented students that have an IEP.	1.6	2017 La. Sess. Law Serv. Hs. Conc. Res. 7 (WEST)
Maine	Categorical	The Gifted and Talented Allocation uses the most recent financial data for approved programs, or the approved budget amount, whichever is less, and multiplies that amount by an inflation adjustment.		20-A M.R.S.A. § 15672
Maryland	Only if funding is available	To the extent funds are provided in the State budget or are available from other sources, the State Board shall provide guidance, consultative and technical assistance, and fiscal support for programs that include.		MD Code, Education, § 8-204
Massachusetts	None			
Michigan	None			
Minnesota	Flat Weight	For fiscal year 2015 and later, the formula allowance is \$13 per pupil. The revenue must be reserved and spent only to: (1) identify gifted and talented students; (2) provide education programs for gifted and talented students; or (3) provide staff development	\$13 per pupil \$12,235,000 for 2018	M.S.A. § 126C.10
Mississippi	Resource Allocation Model	The gifted education program is an add-on program funded by the state legislature through the Mississippi Adequate Education Program.	1. The first teacher unit shall be funded on the basis of a minimum of 20 identified and participating students. 2. The second gifted teacher unit shall be funded when there are 41 identified and participating students. 3. Additional gifted teacher units shall be funded based on the 40 + 1 formula.	Miss. Admin. Code 7-96
Missouri	None			

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Montana	Categorical	District must apply to the state for funding. State funds must be matched with local funds.		MCA 20-7-903 Mont.Admin.R. 10.55.804
Nebraska	Categorical	Local systems may apply to the department for base funds and matching funds	Each eligible local system shall receive one-tenth of one percent of the appropriation as base funds plus a pro rata share of the remainder of the appropriation based on identified students, up to ten percent of the prior year's fall membership	Neb. Admin. R. & Regs. Tit. 92, Ch. 3, § 007
Nevada	Flat Weight	Funds will be distributed on a per pupil basis based on a count day(s) reporting mechanism to be established by the Department.		N.R.S. 388.5267
New Hampshire	None			
New Jersey	None			
New Mexico	Multiple Weights	Apply multipliers to the base per-pupil amount for gifted students; these multipliers vary depending on the degree of modification the students require to the general education program.	Varies by need	N.M. Admin. Code 6.29.1
New York	None			
North Carolina	Census-Based	All LEAs receive these funds regardless of the number of identified AIG students.	4% of ADM at \$1310.82 per pupil	N.C.G.S.A. § 115C-150.5
North Dakota	Reimbursement	Funds must be distributed to reimburse school districts or special education units for gifted and talented programs upon the submission of an application that is approved in accordance with guidelines adopted by the superintendent of public instruction.	\$800,000 in 2017	2017 North Dakota House Bill No. 1013, North Dakota Sixty-Fifth Legislative Assembly
Ohio	Flat Weight and Resource Allocation	The funding is distributed through 3 streams.	Identification Funding = (Formula ADM) X \$5.05 Coordinator Funding = [(Formula ADM – Community School ADM) / 3,300] x \$37,370 Specialist Funding = [(Formula ADM – Community School ADM) / 1,100] x \$37,370	OAC 3301-51-15
Oklahoma	Flat Weight		1.34	70 Okl.St. Ann. § 18-201.1
Oregon	Categorical	Any school district may apply for state funds for services for talented and gifted children identified in the district.		O.R.S. § 343.399
Pennsylvania	Reimbursement	The term "children with exceptionalities" shall mean children of school age who have a disability or who are gifted and who, by reason thereof, need specially designed instruction. The state reimburses at different rates based on total cost.	Category 1: <\$25k Category 2: \$25k-\$50k Category 3a: \$50k-\$75k Category 3b: >\$75k	24 P.S. § 13-1373
Rhode Island	None			
South Carolina	Flat Weight	The SCDE will annually calculate each district's allocation based on the number of gifted and talented students projected to be served in each district as it relates to the total of all such students in the state.	1.15 District minimum: \$15,000	S.C. Code of Regulations R. 43-220
South Dakota	None			
Tennessee	Resource Allocation Model	Part of special education funding. "Child with disabilities" means the intellectually gifted."	Tiered teacher allocation system based on location of instruction and amount of specialized contact.	T. C. A. § 49-10-102 and T. C. A. § 49-10-113

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Texas	Flat weight		1.12 with a 5% cap	V.T.C.A., Education Code § 42.156
Utah	Categorical	Enhancement for Accelerated Students	\$5,032,400 in FY 18	U.C.A. 1953 § 53A-17a-165
Vermont	None			
Virginia	Resource Allocation Model	An additional payment shall be disbursed by the Department of Education to local school divisions to support the state share of one full-time equivalent instructional position per 1,000 students	\$34,425,282 for FY 18	2016 Virginia House Bill No. 29, Virginia 2017 Regular Session
Washington	Census-based and Resource Allocation	5.0 percent of each school district's population	Provides 2.1590 hours per week in extra instruction with fifteen highly capable program students per teacher.	West's RCWA 28A.185.020
West Virginia	None			
Wisconsin	Categorical	The department shall award grants to nonprofit organizations, cooperative educational service agencies, institutions within the University of Wisconsin System, and school districts for the purpose of providing to gifted and talented pupils those services and activities not ordinarily provided in a regular school.	Maximum is \$30,000 per grant. Total is \$237,200 for FY18	W.S.A. 118.35
Wyoming	Flat Weight		\$40.29/ADM	2017 Wyoming House Bill No. 236, Wyoming Sixty-Fourth Legislature - 2017 General Session

DRAFT

Our staff is available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.