



Elementary & Secondary
Marian Bott

2/14

The League of Women Voters of New York State
62 Grand Street, Albany, New York 12207
Phone: 518-465-4162 Fax: 518-465-0812
www.lwvny.org E-Mail: lwvny@lwvny.org

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS *of New York State*

JOINT LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING ON 2017-2018 EXECUTIVE BUDGET PROPOSAL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

FEBRUARY 14, 2017

Good afternoon. I am Marian Bott, Education Finance Specialist for the New York State League of Women Voters. We thank you for the opportunity to testify at these hearings.

Our testimony comprises a general description, remarks about the proposal's adequacy and distribution, an illustration of the operation of the proposed Foundation Aid "formula" (not really a formula), and some concerns about the proposal to impound funds and the treatment of charter schools.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The 2017-18 Executive Budget increases school aid, including grants, by approximately \$961 million or 3.9 percent to a total of \$25.6 billion. The formula based aids increase by \$768.4 million or 3.17 percent to a total of \$24.97 billion. The Executive Budget also extends the "Millionaire's Tax," due to expire at the end of 2017, thereby preserving \$683 million in revenue in 2017-18 and \$3.7 billion in 2018-19. Notably, the budget does not include a private school tuition tax credit scheme as prior budgets had.

The school aid increase is comprised of a modest \$428 million increase in Foundation Aid or 2.6 percent (including a \$50 million increase in the set-aside for community schools); an increase of \$333 million in expense based aids; and \$150 million allocated for a "Fiscal Stabilization Fund" to be apportioned through school aid by the legislature. The Executive Budget increases the grant for After School Programs by \$35 million.

The Executive Budget appears to repeal the Foundation Formula entitlement in future budgets by deleting the original formula sections dating back to the inception of the program in 2007, and adding language that limits future school aid entitlements to no more than the aid received by school districts in the 2017-18 school year.

The Executive's proposed overall increase in school aid is slightly less than half of the \$2.1 billion proposed by the Regents in their 2017-18 State Aid Request and half of the \$2.0 billion

increase recommended by the Education Conference Board (ECB). According to research by ECB, total school spending would have to increase by \$1.7 billion or 2.6 percent just to maintain current services. Since school districts are limited to a tax levy cap of 1.26%, they can only raise approximately \$200 million next year necessitating a state aid increase of approximately \$1.5 billion to cover current services next year.

The Executive's proposed Foundation Aid increase represents only 10 percent of the approximately \$4.3 billion owed to school districts (per 2006 legislative budget) and less than a quarter of the \$1.8 billion, or 7 percent increase recommended by the Regents for 2017-18.

ADEQUACY AND DISTRIBUTION

Although the Executive budget proposal includes changes to update the calculation of poverty concentration by blending in a recent multi-year census bureau measure of small area income (SAIPE), any improvement in progressivity is overwhelmed by the inadequacy of the amount. In fact, the one year foundation aid calculation is substantially below the total foundation aid increase recommended for the Big Five School Districts which caused the Executive to recommend "Due Minimum" or "Save Harmless" increases of 2.93% for New York City and 2.165% for the Big Four, and 1% for all other school districts. For example, New York City only receives a \$109,000,000 increase through the formula calculation, or less than half of its \$240,000,000 total foundation aid increase. The 1.227 percent phase-in of the foundation amount is just too insignificant and the result is weak responsiveness to large variations in district wealth and a relatively flat distribution of the school aid increase clustered around the mean. For instance, a very wealthy Syosset school district receives the 1 percent minimum save harmless increase and the very poor Roosevelt school district receives an increase of 2.7 percent.

The foundation aid formula used in the Executive Request lacks critical features of a true formula. In fact the Executive proposal is a calculation of a year-to-year dollar amount increment, not a comprehensive formula since it begins with a "frozen" amount from prior years, in which inequitable and inadequate distribution methods jeopardize many school districts. What is needed is a zero-based true formula, freed from years of save harmless carry-overs.

The value of foundation aid as general operating aid is watered down by the \$50 million increase in the Community Schools set-aside, which serves to reduce funding for classroom services. Finally, the use of 2012-14 small area census data (SAIPE) appears to negatively impact NYC. NYC's traditional Pupil Wealth Ratio is .990 with 1.0 being average. NYC's new Alternate Pupil Wealth Ratio, which uses SAIPE data, is 1.097. The higher number diminishes aid as the distribution is intended to be inverse to local wealth. The next section covers SAIPE in detail.

ILLUSTRATION OF FIVE HIGH NEEDS DISTRICTS

Today our recommendations will focus on two specific drivers in the PreK-12 budget proposal: poverty estimates and English Language Learner (ELL) estimates. The counts for poverty and ELL drive school districts' aid distribution. Other factors, such as the income estimates (as reported on New York State tax returns) and assessed property value are equally important, but they will not be the focus of these remarks. We will address these factors in a separate submission to the Taxation joint committee. As to STAR, we predicted problems in our testimony last year and were not surprised when "timing differences" caused a public outcry.

Although the League is concerned with the outcomes for students in all of the approximately 680 school districts, we have a particular concern for those in the approximately 204 high needs districts. The districts we have chosen to highlight for detailed analysis this year are also those in which we have adjacent Local Leagues and active membership. They are as follows:

Hempstead
New York City
Poughkeepsie
Schenectady
Utica

The tables prepared for this could be used as a guide by any organization to get a better insight into how the school aid formulas work. We have prepared worksheets for the following aspects of the school aid formula:

1. Aggregate Increases from 2016-17 in Foundation Aid, Total Aid and Building Aid
2. State Sharing Ratios, pointing out how upper limits hurt three of the five districts
3. Skews to Aid Under the Formula (High Tax Aid and Charter School Transitional)
4. Enrollment Counts – note there are NINE sources of such counts
5. English Language Learners
6. Poverty Measures including the new Small Area Income Poverty Estimates (SAIPE)
7. Pupil Needs Index
8. Income Wealth Index (this was revised this year to eliminate the "floor" of .65)
9. Wealth Ratios (including property valuation and average income calculations)
10. Community Schools Calculations. Note that only two districts are "ELL Eligible".

Table 2 illustrates the calculations that go into the State Sharing Ratio. We have indicated that Hempstead, Utica and Schenectady are all hurt by the artificial limit of .9. While advocates succeeded in trimming the .65 "floor" associated with the Income Wealth Index (see Table 8), there are high needs districts which are still having their state aid curtailed by this cap. Prior to the implementation of the property tax cap, the .9 might have made sense, but it is not appropriate now. The formula allows a 5% additional allocation for high needs districts but it would be fairer to eliminate the ceiling. Turning to Table 7, let's look at the "Pupil Need Index." It has been computed in order to see whether it impacts school aid, which we believe it does and

we would share these concerns:

1. **The Pupil Needs Index (PNI)** probably shortchanges students who are not counted by either Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL) or the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE). Students above 6th grade are not counted at all for FRPL due to the perceived unreliability of middle and high school counts. While SAIPE uses the strict definition of poverty (approximately \$24,000 income for a family of four), FRPL allows reduced price lunch for families with up to 185% of poverty, a little less than \$45,000 for a family of four. Therefore it is questionable why each of these measures receive a .65 (identical) weighting in the calculation of “extraordinary needs” and this should be reconsidered to calibrate poverty in New York State more accurately. Poverty measures as provided by the Census Bureau are not adjusted for regional cost differences--\$24,000 of income in New York may purchase far less than the same income in many other states around the nation. Aside from this major problem, the SAIPE is an improvement over outdated 2000 census data, but it has two flaws. First, there are newer data available than those which were used to compute a 3-year average (2012-2014). 2015 data were available in December 2015—see chart on the next page of this testimony. If poverty counts are higher based on these data, school districts should be permitted the option to employ those data. Second, SAIPE discloses that it does not count any student who is not “related” to the household in which the income is being measured for poverty. This could under represent foster and other unrelated children and this problem should be recognized in the funding formula, not patched in as a separate categorical aid. Indeed, since SAIPE is used to distribute federal education aid, we are concerned that “poverty” is underestimated for federal aid as well. As Table 7 shows, in New York City the “FRPL” pupil count for the purposes of the Extraordinary Needs % is 502,011 (Column N(PC0263) from NYSED data tab E, whereas the “Census” Count from SAIPE data is 209,351 (Column X(PC028) from the same data tab. Giving English Language Learners a .5 weighting completes, for these five districts, the calculation of the Pupil Needs Index since, as Table 7 shows, there is no “sparsity” factor for these cities. This PNI appears to have been used for this year’s aid calculations rather than being calculated as a future “place setter” as some analysts had stated. **Legislators should consult with their district superintendents to ensure that this change in poverty measure does not incorrectly jeopardize students’ weightings.**

2015 Poverty Estimates for School districts Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Program (SAIPE) Release date: December 2016						
State Postal Code	State FIPS Code	District ID	Name	Estimated Total Population	Estimated Population 5-17	Estimated number of relevant children 5 to 17 years old in poverty who are related to the householder
36	NY	14130	Hempstead Union Free School District	44,987	7,064	1,895
36	NY	20580	New York City Department Of Education	8,550,405	1,233,021	353,949
36	NY	23760	Poughkeepsie City School District	30,724	4,318	1,396
36	NY	26010	Schenectady City School District	66,083	10,490	3,119
36	NY	29370	Utica City School District	61,604	10,195	4,800

<https://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/downloads/sd15/index.html>

2. **English Language Learners (ELL)** are handled with a metric that is a blunt instrument, relying on a single test score instead of a more nuanced view of the resources required to move the student out of ELL status into the mainstream of students who have sufficient mastery of English to learn with other English speaking classmates.

Table 5 makes reference to “Est. UNWTD ELL PUPILS” (no, it does not mean “unwanted” but rather “unweighted”). No classification is used to distinguish which language, or how difficult the language is as compared to English, or any estimate of the degree of effort or technology that might be required to help ELLs. For example, it is undoubtedly easier to recruit language specialists who are bilingual in Spanish or Chinese than to recruit language specialists for many of the over 100 languages that are used in the homes of New York City students, as well as in other recent immigrant communities. Better metrics would help to assess the challenges faced by students, families and classroom teachers.

IMPOUNDMENT

The Executive Budget appropriation bill contains language that authorizes the Director of the Budget to reduce amounts for payment to school districts to offset any shortfall in revenues, including federal revenues, assumed in the Governor’s Financial Plan. This statutory proposal appears to be an attempt to circumvent the *Oneida v Berle* Court of Appeals¹ decision that

¹ 427 NYS 2d 407 (1980)

prohibits the Executive from impounding aid to locality payments to local governments. During the 2009-10 school year Governor Patterson attempted to impound a winter school aid payment but later backed down after litigation was threatened by education groups.

CHARTER SCHOOLS

The League does not oppose charter schools. However, we continue to be concerned about any practices of either traditional public or charter schools which discriminate against certain classes of students including students with disabilities and ELL students. Later in this legislative session we will provide a more detailed analysis of New York's charter schools.

The Executive budget would provide substantial financial increases and support to charter schools by:

- discontinuing the partial freeze on the amount school districts must pay in tuition to charter schools thereby resulting in a substantial one year increase (calculated by multiplying Approved Operating Expense times enrollment),
- increasing the rental aid calculation from 20 percent to thirty percent in New York City
- broadening the definition of rental costs in New York City to include lease payments, maintenance, capital improvement and any other costs associated with such facilities, and
- imposing a new requirement for NYC charter schools that a co-location or alternative space must be sufficient to accommodate entire planned grade spans in a single building, including grades not yet in operation at time of offering.

The Executive budget adds another tier for charter school transition aid to temporarily offset the expense in school district expenses, except for NYC. Furthermore, the Executive budget proposes to eliminate the regional cap on charter school expansion for NYC of 50 charters issued on or after July 1st 2015 (as of November 2016 NYC had only 30 charter slots left). Given that there are 126 charters left to issue statewide, the proposal could result in a dramatic rise in charter school expansion in NYC.

Since NYC doesn't qualify for charter school transition aid, the result of all these proposed actions, taken together, would be to impose a substantial net financial burden on NYC. NYC is not reimbursed through building aid for the first \$40 million in rental expenses.



**THE LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS**
of New York State

The League of Women Voters of New York State
102 Capitol Mall, Albany, New York 12227
Phone: 518-485-4102 Fax: 518-485-0812
www.lwvny.org E-Mail: lwvny@lwvny.org

Table 1: Aggregate Increases (\$000s)

01/17/17	E(FA0198) 00 2016-17 FOUNDATION AID	E(FA0197) 00 2017-18 FOUNDATION AID	% increase in Foundation Aid	AA(FA0190) 00 2016-17 TOTAL	AA(FA0189) 00 2017-18 TOTAL AID	%increase in Total Aid	J(FA0074) 00 2016-17 BUILDING AID	J(FA0073) 00 2017-18 BUILDING AID	% increase without BUILDING AID AND BUILDING REORGANIZATION AID
POUGHKEEPSIE	\$52,184	\$53,221	1.99%	\$63,792	\$65,692	2.98%	\$3,555	\$3,888	2.60%
HEMPSTEAD	\$79,511	\$82,015	3.15%	\$117,669	\$120,439	2.35%	\$5,259	\$5,185	2.53%
NEW YORK CITY	\$7,116,451	\$7,356,957	3.38%	\$9,786,515	\$10,081,377	3.01%	\$1,151,423	\$1,212,136	2.71%
UTICA	\$86,836	\$89,478	3.04%	\$127,930	\$138,139	7.98%	\$15,826	\$22,239	3.39%
SCHENECTADY	\$86,843	\$88,587	2.01%	\$113,396	\$122,944	8.42%	\$7,591	\$12,898	4.01%



THE LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS
of New York State

The League of Women Voters of New York State
42 Grand Street, Albany, New York 12207
Phone: (518) 485-2107 Fax: (518) 485-0812
www.lwv.org E-Mail: lwv@lwv.org

Table 2: State Sharing Ratios

01/17/17	H(W/M0181) 05 ALTERNATE PUPIL WEALTH RATIO (APWR)	I(W/M0182) 05 COMBINED WEALTH RATIO (CWR) FOR 17-18 AID	J(W/M0184) 05 SSR:1.37-1.23CWR;1- .64CWR;.8- .39CWR;.51-.22CWR	W(W/M0283) 03 TAX EFFORT RATIO	Z(W/M0301) 02 DISTRICT TAX RATE (SMALL CITIES DEF)	I(W/M0131) 00 2014 AV/2015-16 RES PUB+NONPUB ENRLMT
POUGHKEEPSIE	0.441	0.472	0.790	3.101	16.43	339,704
HEMPSTEAD	0.330	0.315	0.900	5.044	41.73	189,342
NEW YORK CITY	1.097	1.043	0.394	1.518	17.85	636,902
UTICA	0.290	0.249	0.900	2.941	21.57	133,736
SCHENECTADY	0.375	0.328	0.900	4.043	29.12	183,309
POUGHKEEPSIE						
HEMPSTEAD						
NEW YORK CITY						
UTICA						
SCHENECTADY						



THE LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS
of New York State

The League of Women Voters of New York State
62 Grand Street, Albany, New York 12207
Phone: 518-485-4182 Fax: 518-485-0812
www.lwv.org E-Mail: lwvny@lwvny.org

Table 3: Skews to Aid Under Formula (\$000s)

01/17/17	G(FA0029) 00	F(FA0013) 00	2017-2017-18 HIGH TAX AID	18 CHARTER SCHOOL	TRANSITIONAL
POUGHKEEPSIE	\$	\$			\$
HEMPSTEAD	\$2,688	\$2,592			
NEW YORK CITY	\$	\$			
UTICA	\$	\$1,201			
SCHENECTADY	\$	\$336			



**THE LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS**
of New York State

The League of Women Voters of New York State
88 Grand Street, Albany, New York 12207
Phone: 518-485-4102 Fax: 518-485-0812
www.lwvny.org E-Mail: lwvny@lwvny.org

Table 4: Enrollment Counts

01/17/17	H(WM0126) 00 2015-16 RESIDENT PUB+NONPUB ENROLLMENT	X(K20133) 00 2015-16 PUBLIC ENROLLMENT, ATTN, DUPLICATED	F(FL0001) 00 2016-17 PUBLIC ENROLLMENT W/CHARTER(A TTN)	G(K10170) 00 2016-17 NONPUBLIC ENROLLMT	H(NO0850) 00 SOFTWARE AND LIBRARY PUPILS FOR 2017-18 AID	I(FL0014) 00 17 PUBLIC ENR. W/CHARTER (RESIDENT)	2016-J(K10169) 00 2016-17 NONPUBLIC ENROLLMENT (RESIDENT)	K(NO0856) 00 TEXTBOOK PUPILS FOR 2017-18 AID EST.	J(PC0257) 00 2016-17 PUBLIC ENROLLMENT
POUGHKEEPSIE	4,873	4,347	4,388	121	4,560	4,389	455	4,895	4,388
HEMPSTEAD	9,568	8,787	8,815	1,025	9,894	9,776	690	10,520	8,783
NEW YORK CITY	1,294,184	1,061,703	1,068,864	236,000	1,310,164	1,068,722	227,000	1,301,022	1,068,962
UTICA	10,918	10,298	10,613	725	11,422	10,721	430	11,235	10,600
SCHENECTADY	10,577	9,714	9,705	370	10,241	9,928	645	10,739	9,936



THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS of New York State

The League of Women Voters of New York State
68 Grand Street, Albany, New York 12207
Phone: 518-465-4152 Fax: 518-465-0812
www.lwv.org E-Mail: lwvny@lwvny.org

Table 5: English Language Learners

01/17/17	S(K10130)	T(PC0273)
	00 2016-17	00 ELL
	EST.	COUNT FOR
	UNWTD ELL	EN%
	PUPILS	
POUGHKEEPSIE	430	215
HEMPSTEAD	2,300	1,150
NEW YORK CITY	132,135	66,068
UTICA	1,960	980
SCHENECTADY	488	244



THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS of New York State

The League of Women Voters of New York State
62 Grand Street, Albany, New York 12207
Phone: 518-465-4162 Fax: 518-465-0812
www.lwvny.org E-Mail: lwvny@lwvny.org

Table 6: Poverty Measures

01/17/17	K(PC0261) 00	L(PC0262) 00	M(PC0260)	N(PC0263)	U(CI0020) 00	V(CI0021) 00	W(CF0237)	X(PC0278) 00	Y(PC0294) 00
	# K-6 ELIG	K-6	04 LUNCH %, K-6, 3-YEAR AVG.	00 LUNCH COUNT FOR EN%	3 YR(12,13,14) CENSUS	3 YR(12,13,14) CENSUS	04 3 YR(12,13,14) CENSUS	CENSUS	EXTRAORDIN
	FRPL APPLICANTS (OCT 13,14,15)	ENROLLMEN T (FALL 2013, 2014, 2015)			SAIPE CENSUS	SAIPE PUPIL CENSUS	SAIPE RATE	COUNT FOR EN%	ARY NEEDS COUNT
					POVERTY COUNT (NUM)	SAIPE PUPIL COUNT (DEN)			
POUGHKEEPSIE	5,382	8,055	0.6681	1,906	4,560	13,663	0.3337	952	3,074
HEMPSTEAD	9,297	12,225	0.7604	4,341	5,993	21,647	0.2768	1,580	7,072
NEW YORK CITY	1,123,053	1,554,315	0.7225	502,011	1,115,015	3,699,746	0.3013	209,351	777,431
UTICA	13,696	16,987	0.8062	5,555	13,400	30,808	0.4349	2,996	9,532
SCHENECTADY	13,091	16,184	0.8088	5,224	11,420	32,268	0.3539	2,286	7,755



**THE LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS**
of New York State

The League of Women Voters of New York State
422 Grand Street, Albany, New York 12207
Phone: 518-485-4182 Fax: 518-485-0812
www.lwv.org E-Mail: lwvny@lwv.org

Table 7: Pupil Need Index PNI

01/17/17	O(PC0409) 05 PNI	EN%=Col D EN	EN Count	Lunch Count*	.65 Lunch Count	Census Count#	.65 Census Count	Poverty Count	ELL Count	.5 ELL Count	Sparsity Count
	= 1 + EN%, MIN 1; Count/Base										
	MAX 2	Year K-12 Pub									
		Schl Enrl x 100									
POUGHKEEPSIE	1.700	0.700	3,074	1,906	1,239	952	619	1,858	430	215	0
HEMPSTEAD	1.805	0.805	7,072	4,341	2,822	1,580	1,027	3,849	2,300	1,150	0
NEW YORK CITY	1.727	0.727	777,431	502,011	326,307	209,351	136,078	462,385	132,135	66,068	0
UTICA	1.899	0.899	9,532	5,555	3,611	296	1,947	5,558	1,960	980	0
SCHENECTADY	1.780	0.780	7,755	5,224	3,396	2,286	1,486	4,881	488	244	0

* Lunch Count for Students K-6 only, trailing 3-year average of applicants for Free and Reduced Price Lunch divided by Public School Enrollment
SUBJECT TO FLAWED COUNTS AFTER NEW LAW 2014

Changed in 2017-18 to use 3-year average SAPE data.

Definition: pupils scoring at or below 40th percentile on standardize English proficiency AND receiving LEP services



**THE LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS**
of New York State

The League of Women Voters of New York State
44 Gould Street Albany, New York 12207
Phone: 518-485-4192 Fax: 518-485-5812
www.lwv.org E-Mail: lwv@lwv.org

Table 8: Income Wealth Index (\$000s)

01/17/17	G(WE0019) 00 2013 ADJ GROSS INCOME	H(WE0018) 00 2014 ADJ GROSS INCOME	F(WM014 6) 00 2015-16 TWFPU	Statewide Average of Income Wealth of \$261,100 in 2014	J(WM016 3) 05 average of 2014 and 2013 ADJ GROSS INCOME	I(WM0086) 00 2015-16 TWPU	Numerator for Alternate Pupil Wealth Ratio for Foundation Aid	Statewide Average of \$193,000 (over two years 2013 and 2014)	ALTERNATIVE E PUPIL WEALTH RATIO FOR FOUNDATIO N AID		
POUGHKEEPSIE	\$498,457	\$513,257	\$4	\$120	\$261	0.459	\$505,857	\$6	\$88	\$193	0.454
HEMPSTEAD	\$662,775	\$703,208	\$9	\$79	\$261	0.303	\$682,991	\$11	\$64	\$193	0.334
NEW YORK CITY	\$290,891,688	\$323,652,402	\$1,046	\$310	\$261	1.185	\$307,272,045	\$1,467	\$209	\$193	1.085
UTICA	\$706,558	\$721,203	\$10	\$71	\$261	0.271	\$713,880	\$12	\$58	\$193	0.299
SCHENECTADY	\$893,777	\$915,109	\$10	\$95	\$261	0.364	\$904,443	\$12	\$75	\$193	0.387

The Income Wealth Index is used to calculate "Selected Local Share". Districts select the lesser of the Ratio Local Share (1 minus Foundation State Sharing Ratio) times the Per Pupil Foundation Increase OR the Tax Rate Local Share, which is the Selected Actual Valuation/15-16 Total Weighted Foundation Pupil Units (Col. D above) multiplied by an increase factor of .01227) multiplied by an "Adjusted Tax Rate". The Adjusted Tax Rate is the 3-year adjusted statewide average tax rate of .0161 times the district's Income Wealth Index.



THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS of New York State

The League of Women Voters of New York State
62 Grand Street, Albany, New York 12207
Phone: 518-465-4162 Fax: 518-465-0812
www.lwv.org E-Mail: lwvny@lwv.org

Table 9: Wealth Ratios Financial Aid

01/17/17	AA(WM0081) 00 SEL. ACTUAL VALUATION/ 2015-16 TWP/PU FOR FND	State Average Property Valuation for Foundation Aid	AB(WM0121) 00 SEL. INCOME / 2015-16 TWP/PU FOR FND SSR	Statewide Average Income (averaging 2013 and 2014)	AC(WM0195) 05 PUPIL WEALTH RATIO (PWR) FOR FND SSR	AD(WM0196) 05 ALTERNATE PUPIL WEALTH RATIO (APWR), FND	AE(WM0197) 05 COMBINED WEALTH RATIO FOR 17 FND SSR		
POUGHKEEPSIE	286,497	558,500	0.513	87,548	193,000	0.454	0.512	0.453	0.482
HEMPSTEAD	171,005	558,500	0.306	64,469	193,000	0.334	0.306	0.334	0.320
NEW YORK CITY	547,370	558,500	0.980	209,475	193,000	1.085	0.980	1.085	1.032
UTICA	118,048	558,500	0.211	57,715	193,000	0.299	0.211	0.299	0.254
SCHENECTADY	160,091	558,500	0.287	74,679	193,000	0.387	0.286	0.386	0.336

See page 46 of Description of 2017-18 New York State Executive Budget Recommendations for Elementary and Secondary Education "Description 2017"

Education Unit, New York State Division of the Budget, January 17, 2017

"FND" refers to Foundation Aid. "SSR" refers to State Sharing Ratio. It is capped at 90% but High Needs Districts may compute an additional amount of .05 times their ratio.

"TWP/PU" refers to Total Wealth Pupil Units as described in Appendix III-C of "Description 2017"

TWP/PU is based on 100% of Average Daily Attendance (NOT Average Daily Membership). It weights half-day Kindergarten students at .5, K-6 and 7-12 grades at 1.0.

Additional weightings are applied for Secondary school students at .25, as well as ALL pupils K-12 in the classification known as Pupils with Special Educational Needs (PSEN).

They are classified PSEN by falling below a State reference point on 3rd and 6th grade reading and math Pupil Evaluation Program tests.

Students with Disabilities are weighted 1.7 if they spend 60% of their school day in a special class.

Students with Disabilities are weighted .9 if they spend 20% of their school WEEK or five periods (at least 180 minutes) in a resource room

Students with Disabilities are weighted .9 if they have Directly or Indirectly a Consultant Teacher



**THE LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS**
of New York State

The League of Women Voters of New York State
42 Grand Street, Albany, New York 12207
Phone: 518-485-4102 Fax: 518-485-0812
www.lwv.org E-Mail: lwvny@lwv.org

Table 10: Community Schools

01/17/17	AD(CF0174) 00 2011-12 ELL PUPILS	S(K10130) 00 2016-17 EST. UNWTD ELL PUPILS	AE(CLO024) 00 ELL ELIGIBLE (1=YES)	AF(CF0238) 00 FAILING SCHOOL(S) (1=YES)	AG(FLO030) 03 COMMUNITY SCHL RATIO	AH(FLO031) 00 COMMUNITY SCHL INCR	AE(WM0197) 05 COMBINED WEALTH RATIO FOR 17- 18 FND SSR	CWR 17-18*	1-Prior Column
POUGHKEEPSIE	471	430	0	1	0.692	267,273	0.482	0.3085	0.6915
HEMPSTEAD	1,680	2,300	1	1	0.796	615,424	0.320	0.2048	0.7952
NEW YORK CITY	127,240	132,135	0	1	0.340	31,994,032	1.032	0.6605	0.3395
UTICA	1,457	1,960	1	0	0.838	781,856	0.254	0.1626	0.8374
SCHENECTADY	308	488	0	0	0.000	0	0.336	0.2150	0.7850

Criteria: low wealth, must have over 5% of public enrollment, including charter school enrollment, designated as ELL in 16-17, must have experienced greater than 10% growth in ELLs since 2011-12 (100 pupil minimum).

Community Schools Increase: \$88.03 times Community Schools Ratio

Community Schools Ratio = 1 minus [.64 times the Foundation Aid Combined Wealth Ratio]