



#### Alabama

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

#### Alaska

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

#### Arizona

Arizona provides a small amount of increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. It does so through an early literacy program that provides reading support to K-3 students in districts over 90% free or reduced-price lunch (FRL), and can only be used for literacy support.



#### **Arkansas**

Arkansas provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. It provides additional school funding based on overall poverty in the district on a sliding scale in three tiers: districts whose populations were less than 70% FRL-eligible, districts whose populations were between 70% and 90% FRL-eligible, and districts whose populations were at least 90% FRL-eligible.

### **California**

California provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. It provides a multiplier of 1.65 to the per-student base amount for each eligible student in districts that enroll over 55% of eligible students. An eligible student is defined as a participant in FRL or other social safety net programs, or is an English Language Learner.



#### Colorado

Colorado provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. It does so through a new formula with a five-year phase-in that will be fully implemented in 2030, which provides a small amount of additional funding for districts that are both small and have a high concentration of at-risk students. The new at-risk formula takes the statewide base, multiplies it by 32%, and then multiplies that by the district at-risk pupil enrollment count for districts with fewer than 7,000 students and an at-risk population of 70% or greater. The transtition will include at least a .5% year over year increase for every district. Low income students are identified based on the percentages of students eligible for FRL, and using the socioeconomic status index of neighborhoods.



#### Connecticut

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

In districts where at least 60% of students are from low-income backgrounds, students from low-income households above this threshold generate supplemental funding equal to 1.45 times the base per-pupil amount.

### **Delaware**

Delaware provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. It provides increased funding for some districts with schools that serve high concentrations of students from low-income households through Opportunity Grant funding. The state determines an amount for each low-income or English Language Learner student based on the sum of all low-income and ELL students for each school district. For the 2024-2025 school year, at least \$5 million of the annual appropriation for this block grant must be allocated to public schools, including charter schools, identified as having an enrollment of at least 30% low-income students or 10% English Language Learners.



#### **District of Columbia**

The District of Columbia provides increased funding for students from low-income households. It does so by applying a multiplier of 1.31 to the per-pupil base amount for at-risk students in districts with over 40% concentrated poverty and of 1.38 for districts with over 70% poverty. Students are designated "at risk" if their families receive food or income assistance through Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program (TANF), experience homelessness, are in the foster care system, or exceed the typical age in high school.

The number of students for which a school may receive the per-pupil allocation for schools above 40% concentrated poverty is: the number of at-risk students enrolled in the school – (40% x total school population). For schools above 70% concentrated poverty, the number is: the number of at-risk students enrolled in the school – (70% x total school population).

#### **Florida**

Florida does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.

### Georgia

Georgia does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.



### Hawaii

Hawaii does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households. However, Hawaii does provide some funding for individual students from low-income households.

### **Idaho**

Idaho does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.

### Illinois

Illinois does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.



### **Indiana**

Indiana provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income students they serve. The state does so through a "Basic Grant" program, which adds together a Foundation amount and a Complexity amount.

Districts then receive an amount that is calculated through a multistep formula that takes into account the concentration of students in a district who, as of the previous Fall, were receiving benefits from the SNAP, TANF, or foster care services. A district's percentage of eligible students is multiplied by a dollar amount, which is then multiplied by the district's student count to calculate their grant amount. The grant amount may also be affected by the district's share of English Language Learners (if greater than 18%) and a recent change in the district's percentage of eligible students. Total funding per student is the sum of the foundation and complexity amounts.

#### Iowa

lowa does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.



#### Kansas

Kansas provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. It calculates funding weights from the amount of at-risk students in the district, and provides additional funding to districts where at least 35% to 50% of students are from low-income households, and a further increased amount for districts where above 50% are from low-income households. As of FY2024, the at-risk weighting is scheduled to expire at the end of FY2027.

For school districts with an at-risk population greater than 35% but less than 50%, 35% is subtracted from the percentage of at-risk students in the district. That difference is then multiplied by a factor of 0.7. That product is then multiplied by the number of at-risk students in the district. The formula is as follows: (% of at-risk students - 35%) x 0.7 x at-risk enrollment = high-density at-risk weighting.

For school districts with an at-risk population of at least 50%, the number of at-risk students is multiplied by a factor of 0.105 to produce an additional high density at-risk weighting.



### Kentucky

Kentucky does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.

### Louisiana

Louisiana does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.

### Maine

Maine does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.



### Maryland

Maryland provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. It does so by providing a grant to public schools where at least 65% of students are FRL-eligible, with additional phase-ins through 2033.

Each eligible school receives funding equal to a multiplier of 1.16 times the base per-pupil amount for the first year of eligibility, with up to 2.00 times the per-student base after seven years for eligible students. The concentration of poverty level for eligible schools to receive this grant will be decreased to 60% in FY2026 and 55% in FY2027.

Maryland decides the count for concentrated poverty per pupil grant funding by taking the sum of the percentage of eligible students of the school's enrollment for the prior four prior school years, minus the 2020-21 school year percentage of eligible students, rounded to the nearest whole percent. It then divides this by three, and rounds to the nearest whole percent.



#### **Massachusetts**

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

Districts are assigned to low-income groups based on the share of lowincome students as a percentage of enrollment, with districts in higher groups receiving more funding. There are twelve total groups. Each district is assigned to a group based on the share of its students who come from families that participate in one or more of the following stateadministered programs: SNAP, Transitional Assistance for Families with Dependent Children (TAFDC), foster care, Medicaid, or students reported by a district as homeless through the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance program application, or through a supplemental data collection process identifying them as at 185% of the federal poverty level. In FY2025, the school districts in low-income group 1 (with the smallest share of low-income students) received \$4,142 additional increments per-student, while the districts in low income group 12 (with the largest share of low-income students) received \$8,514 in incremental increase per-student. These incremental rates are then added to the base student funding amount for the total per-pupil allocation.

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



### Michigan

Michigan provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. In 2023, Michigan's legislature created an "Opportunity Index" that includes six tiers of funding based on the level of concentrated poverty in the school district. Economically disadvantaged students from communities with less poverty will generate a multiplier of 1.115 to the base rate in additional funds for their school district. In a high-poverty community, the same students would generate up to a multiplier of 1.153 in additional funds. This index will phase in over a period of years.

Within each of the first five tiers, the funding weight increases incrementally as poverty increases. At the highest tier, every low-income student is funded at the maximum weight. After a phased-in implementation, the maximum weight for the highest-poverty districts should reach a multiplier of 1.47 to the base student funding rate.



#### **Minnesota**

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

Districts are eligible for this funding, called compensatory pupil funding, based on fall district counts of students eligible for FRL, or through participation in public assistance programs including medical assistance and SNAP.

This funding is calculated by the following formula:

(Number of free lunch students + half the number of reduced lunch students) x .6 x (the lesser of: (1) or (reduced lunch students + half the number of reduced lunch students/the school's average daily membership)). This number is then multiplied by the base rate, minus \$839 to determine the compensatory funding.



### Mississippi

Mississippi provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. It does so in the form of a multiplier of 1.10 applied to each student identified as low income where 35% or more students in that district are low-income. This weight applies in addition to the low-income weight of 30% that already applies to individual low income students.

### Missouri

Missouri does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.



#### Montana

Montana provides increased funding for districts with high concentrations of students from low-income households. It does so through a program-specific allocation, which is prorated among eligible districts.

Montana distributes this supplemental allocation to districts in the same manner as federal Title I funds. The formula for Title 1 funding distribution considers both absolute numbers of students from low-income households and districts serving especially high proportions of such students. In this way, Montana's supplemental funding for these students includes support for both individual students from low-income households and districts whose populations include high concentrations of such students.



#### Nebraska

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

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

The concentration of students from low-income households is calculated using students who are at 185% of the federal poverty line.



#### Nevada

Nevada does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.

### **New Hampshire**

New Hampshire does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.



### **New Jersey**

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

A multiplier of 1.47 is applied for districts where fewer than 20% of students are eligible for this funding; between 1.47 and 1.57 for districts where between 20% and 60% of students are eligible, on a sliding scale; and 1.57 for districts where more than 60% of students are eligible. Students are eligible for this supplemental funding if they come from households with an income at or below 185% of the federal poverty level.



#### **New Mexico**

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

The formula uses factors to determine the specific needs of each school in comparison with other schools. The formula starts with basic school enrollment, then uses multipliers for the number of students in different grades, number of students receiving special education, education and experience of teachers, size of the district, rural population units, and at-risk or low-income students. These factors are added together, and the sum is multiplied by a factor to produce an atrisk index. In FY2025, this index was 0.33. This index is multiplied by the district's entire student enrollment to produce a number of students to be added to that district's enrollment count. The state then provides the district's regular per-student funding on the basis of its inflated enrollment count rather than its true student population.



#### **New York**

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

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



#### **North Carolina**

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

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

### **North Dakota**

North Dakota does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.



### Ohio

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

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

For the purposes of Economically Disadvantaged funding, economically disadvantaged students are those who are FRL-eligible, those who are known to be recipients of public assistance, and those who meet federal Title I income guidelines. For Targeted Assistance, the calculation first considers a per-student local wealth measure based on local property valuation and local household income. This figure is then compared to a parallel statewide measure to produce a wealth index. The formula uses this information to provide supplemental funding to those districts where the wealth index falls below a threshold.



### Oklahoma

Oklahoma does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.

### **Oregon**

Oregon does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.



### Pennsylvania

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

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

For FY2025, Pennsylvania introduced an Adequacy Supplement and Tax Equity supplement. The bill calculates a total adequacy gap (\$5.1 billion) and tax equity gap (\$955 million) and allocates 1/7th of that amount each year for the next seven years. These supplement amounts become part of the base amount in subsequent years. The adequacy gap is calculated by subtracting the district's current expenditures from the product of \$13,704 and the district's weighted student count. The adequacy gap is then adjusted downward for districts that have a low local tax effort or are growing and have a strong tax base.



#### **Rhode Island**

Rhode Island does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.

### **South Carolina**

South Carolina does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.

### **South Dakota**

South Dakota does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.

#### **Tennessee**

Tennessee provides increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. The Concentrated Poverty weight in the Tennessee Investment in Student Achievement (TISA) funding formula provides additional funding for students who attend a Title I eligible school. The school does not have to be served by Title I; it only needs to be eligible to be served. This funding is a multiplier of 1.05 of the base amount.



#### **Texas**

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

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

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



#### Utah

Utah does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households. Utah does have two program-specific allocations that are limited in scope to staffing purposes.

#### Vermont

Vermont does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of low-income households.

### Virginia

Virginia provides increased funding for students from low-income households based on concentrations of students from low-income households through its at-risk add-on funding. At-risk student funding provides each school division the state share of a payment up to a multiplier of 1.37 of basic-aid add-on per estimated at-risk student, with each school division's add-on percentage determined based upon the school division's concentration of at-risk students relative to all other school divisions. Forty percent of the allocated at-risk add-on funding is distributed using a variable rate based on the concentration of poverty in each school division.



### Washington

Washington provides a small amount of increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households that they serve by adding additional teacher hours through their resource-based funding formula.

### **West Virginia**

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

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

### Wisconsin

While Wisconsin continues to have statutory language for Concentrated Poverty, the Legislature provided \$0 for the appropriation for High Poverty Aid under 2019 Act 23, covering the 2023-25 biennial budget.

### **Wyoming**

Wyoming does not provide increased funding for districts based on the concentrations of students from low-income households.

Learn more about Concentrated Poverty Funding at https://ed-fund.org/concentrated-poverty/