

**FINAL REPORT OF THE FOUNDATION AID TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP**

**TO THE**

**JOINT COMMITTEE TO ESTABLISH A PERMANENT FOUNDATION AID  
FORMULA FOR RHODE ISLAND**

**May 30, 2007**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Foundation Aid Technical Advisory Group is pleased to submit its final report to the Joint Committee to Establish a Permanent Foundation Aid Formula for Rhode Island. The Foundation Aid Technical Advisory Group submitted its initial report on May 15, 2007 and indicated that it would come back to the Joint Committee with a final report that includes a more detailed budget analysis of this proposal in order to enable comparisons of expenditures in this funding model with current practice on a statewide basis and for each local district. The submission of this final report concludes the work of the Foundation Aid Technical Advisory Group.

Education is of primary importance for Rhode Island's economic competitiveness. The Foundation Aid Technical Advisory Group believes that the State of Rhode Island needs to establish an education funding formula and urges the Joint Committee to adopt such a funding formula during the 2007 legislative session. As indicated in this report, the funding formula needs to be predictable; it needs to result in an increased state share of funding for education over a period of years; and it must be distributed in a transparent, consistently predictable manner. Lean state and local budgets, pressures from limits to local funding, and the need to keep data analysis fresh are all factors that point to the need for immediate action during this legislative session.

In this final report, the Technical Advisory Group is presenting the elements of a funding formula that incorporates the key policy decisions that were made by the Group, most notably: 1) the funding formula must take into account all state funding for education not just the foundation formula amount, 2) the formula should exclude federal dollars from the state/local share for a truer picture of the state/local education funding burden, and 3) the formula should use pupil counts based on student average daily membership counts not attendance-based counts. The Technical Advisory Group also recognizes that the formula will be operating in a context of shifting some current local costs to the state, such as group homes, out-of-district transportation, and high needs special education costs.

The Technical Advisory Group built upon the work of the R.C. Wood Report and the Funding Our Future Report and is now able to present in this final report a structure for the foundation aid formula and an example of how it can be applied for the state as a whole and for the 36 school districts. The Advisory Group respectfully suggests that the Joint Committee adopt a funding formula and as part of the law, authorize an additional work period of up to six months in order to accomplish the following final tasks, including determining the transition plan for implementing the new funding formula, refining the local wealth indicators used in determining each district's local-aid contribution, and completing additional work

regarding special education costs. The Advisory Group also suggests that regular and systematic reviews of the foundation aid formula are included as part of the law so that it can be monitored on an ongoing basis.

## **BACKGROUND**

The Rhode Island General Assembly took action during the 2006 legislative session to begin work on the development of a bold new system to fund public education. The first step was the creation of the Joint Committee to Establish a Permanent Foundation Aid Formula for Rhode Island (chaired by Senator Hanna Gallo and Representative Edith Ajello). After a lengthy national search, the Joint Committee chose the firm of R.C. Wood & Associates to perform an “adequacy study” in order to move to a student need driven model of distributing state resources to school districts. Wood & Associates used four different research methodologies to determine a research-based funding level for an “adequate” education that includes weights for poverty, English language acquisition, and special needs. Depending on the specific methodology relied upon, the R.C. Wood Report recommends a base funding level ranging from the lower \$9,000’s to the mid \$10,000 range, coupled with weights of 25% for free and reduced lunch eligibility, 25% for English Language Learners, and 100% for special education students.

Even before Wood & Associates released its study, a second group formed to define its own funding formula model for consideration and possible adoption by state leaders. This ad hoc consortium, consisting of the Rhode Island Public Expenditure Council, the Rhode Island Association of School Committees, the Rhode Island Federation of Teachers and Health Professionals, the National Education Association of Rhode Island, The Education Partnership, and the Rhode Island School Superintendents’ Association, was able to build a historic consensus around a formula design. As published in a report entitled, *Funding Our Future: A Proposal to Fund Education in Rhode Island*, the ad hoc group addressed both the question of student need and a system of predictability and fairness for Rhode Island taxpayers.

By speaking to the difficult questions of funding an adequate system, the ad hoc group went far beyond the efforts of R.C. Wood & Associates. *Funding Our Future* contains descriptions of a weight-based Foundation Support Program and what it calls a “District Power Equalizing” model that addresses ways in which state funding can be more adequately and equitably distributed. In other words, both reports deal directly with the issue of student need-based vertical equity, but only the ad hoc group addresses the question of wealth equalization and horizontal equity of distribution of state resources across school districts. The ad hoc group did not address the entire structure of financing for Rhode Island’s educational enterprise, instead focusing primarily on the “Foundation” aspect of the system.

The Joint Committee received *Funding Our Future* with appreciation. It then created two multi-constituent Technical Advisory Groups – one to address Tax Policy and one to address Foundation Aid. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (RIDE) offered its resources and technical assistance to the Foundation Aid Technical Advisory Group and has played an essential role in the data analysis necessary to support the work of this Technical Advisory Group.

## **OVERVIEW**

The Foundation Aid Technical Advisory Group has found the reports written by R.C. Wood & Associates and the Ad Hoc Committee to be valuable documents that formed the basis for the Advisory Group's work. This report builds upon the expertise and thoughtful deliberations that went into both previous reports in order to present recommendations that will enable Rhode Island to establish a foundation aid formula that will support education in Rhode Island into the future.

### ***Driving Principles***

The Foundation Aid Technical Advisory Group agrees that Rhode Island needs a funding formula for education that is permanent and predictable and that results in an increased state share of funding for education over a period of years. Education is of primary importance for Rhode Island's economic competitiveness. Rhode Island has an urgent obligation to ensure that education funding is distributed in a responsible and consistently predictable manner. Lean state budgets, pressures from limits to local funding, and the need to keep data analysis fresh are all factors that point to the need for immediate action.

Five major principles serve as the basis for the group's recommendations.

- (1) **Equity:** Any funding formula must balance two competing equity interests. The state education funding system must provide horizontal equity between districts in regards to state funding shares. In addition, it must recognize that some students pose a greater educational challenge than others and therefore must provide vertical equity among students, ensuring that there is sufficient funding for all students to receive a quality education.
- (2) **Adequacy:** Recognizing that all students should receive the funding needed to achieve proficiency in the skills and knowledge necessary to be productive in an increasingly competitive economy, adequacy refers to the importance of ensuring that education funding is based on student need, and the inclusion of some measure of the differential expense of educating certain sub-groups of students, i.e. student "weights."
- (3) **Predictability:** Local school districts must be able to plan for predictable levels of state assistance during the local budget process, which occurs months before state aid numbers are finalized for the ensuing fiscal year.

- (4) **Accountability:** No discussion of funding can take place in the absence of a discussion about anchoring funding streams in a strong accountability framework with resources to implement accountability provisions.
- (5) **Efficiency:** Containing costs in the name of increased efficiency requires more overt linking of control and expenses. Local districts cannot achieve cost efficiencies without the means of controlling those costs.

### ***Essential Elements of a Successful Formula***

The Technical Advisory Group has reached agreements on a number of important elements for the Rhode Island education funding formula, particularly:

- The need for weights for high-need student groups,
- The use of average daily membership for the pupil count,
- The maintenance of current statutory provisions dictating the state and local shares for funding teacher retirement costs, with the potential to implement alternative funding options in the future,
- The need to provide a minimum state funding share for every district,
- The need to create a formula that is annually “self-adjusting” for increasing costs,
- The need to increase the current state share in educational costs,
- The need for a minimum local share, and
- The fact that federal monies should be kept outside of the state/local funding formula due to their supplemental nature.

There are four primary categories of expenditures that must be accounted for in an overall state/local funding strategy: first, the foundation formula, which sets parameters for local/state cost sharing for the vast majority of expenses; second, costs for which there are potential efficiencies only at the state level; third, expenses that are state program responsibilities, but which are not included in the foundation itself; and, finally, costs controlled at the local level which could be treated as purely local responsibilities.

The removal of certain expenditure and funding categories from the formula calculations is discussed in more detail in later sections of this report. However, one excluded category of particular note is federal funding, which the group recommends for removal from the formula and budget calculations in order to maintain the integrity of the supplemental role for which it is intended.

As a matter of principle, Rhode Island must have a funding formula that provides a share of state funding for every community in the state. The ad hoc committee proposed a 25% foundation amount minimum share in the *Funding Our Future* report. The calculations for the projections contained in this final report use this minimum state share of 25% for the funding formula. In addition, the group recommends that there be a “hold harmless” provision so that no school district will receive less state funding than current amounts due to the implementation of a new funding formula.

The advisory group also agrees that Rhode Island should not implement a “Robin Hood” funding mechanism. A “Robin Hood” funding formula takes local tax revenue from high-income districts to fund the education systems in low-income districts within the state. Vermont’s education funding system is a good example of this. Finally, the advisory group recognizes that traditional property-based wealth measures for determining the state’s sharing ratio are not the only measures of district fiscal capacity and that the final formula may use alternative measures of financial capacity such as median income or a combination of measures.

Successful education funding must be done with transparency, must be data-driven, and must have the flexibility to allow for mid-course corrections as the nuances of the funding formula begin to play out in the real world. Several factors will allow the new funding formula to accomplish these goals. First, the General Assembly has directed the Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (RIDE) to create a uniform chart of accounts that will be used to track education expenditures by every district in the state. Second, the Technical Advisory Group recommends that part (one half of one percent) of annual foundation aid funding be allocated to RIDE for implementing an accountability framework linked directly with resource allocation. Finally, a realistic funding formula implementation plan must be created that includes allowances for mid-course corrections and that is based on the numbers that arise from the final funding formula decisions.

## **FOUNDATION-BASED FUNDING**

As policy makers work to define an adequate level of foundational support, it is imperative that they consider all current expenses. In FY 2006, approximately \$1.9 billion was spent on public education in Rhode Island when state, federal and local revenues are combined. To build a comprehensive funding strategy, we must reach consensus on the resultant picture of funding that would derive from several years of cost-shifting on a formulaic basis. Therefore, the advisory group proposes to capture and sort all expenditures into four logical categories.

### ***Foundation Formula***

A foundation formula, which represents a recalibration of how municipalities and the state share core expenses, would be the largest category. In order to be effective, the foundational amount must be based on an accurate per pupil cost calculation.

### ***State Efficiencies***

The second category of expenses includes those that logically should be borne by the state based on criteria of efficiency and accountability. Expenses that are

controlled at the state level include out-of-district student transportation and services to non-public schools. Linking control and expenditures more overtly will inevitably lead to greater cost efficiencies. State funding of these new aid categories becomes a direct source of local property tax relief. Thus, the cost shifting from local/state sharing to full state funding becomes an extremely effective tool in achieving horizontal equity. Such shifts in funding would, by definition, occur on a per capita basis, which would favor suburban districts that currently enjoy a lower state share of expenses. An example of this type of funding would be extraordinary costs associated with a small percentage of special needs students.

**State Program**

A third category would be specific program expenses over which the state either desires to exert accountability oversight or avoid unpredictable cost increases. Examples of this could include progressive support and intervention, group homes, and housing aid. The range of expenses in this category could also be expanded or revised over time to support other state priorities. The advisory group recommends at this time that 0.5% of foundation funds be set aside into a restricted fund for the purposes of assuring overall system accountability. Just as capital investments should devote a small percentage of the total budget for maintenance, so should our education investment devote a small amount to fund the oversight and accountability demanded by taxpayers and legislators alike.

**Local Program**

A very small fourth category would consist of those costs over which the local school district has much greater control than does the state. Post-retirement health care costs would meet this test. Again, this would put the responsibility for revenues as close to the control over expenditures as possible.

Table 1 represents a preliminary recommendation for applying these expenditure category criteria to representative current expenditures.

**Table 1. Expenditure Categories**

<b>Foundation Formula</b>	<b>State Efficiencies</b>	<b>State Program</b>	<b>Local Program</b>
General Education	Out-of-District Transportation	Progressive Support & Intervention	Retiree Benefits
Student Weights for SPED, ELL, CTE & Poverty	Extraordinary Cost Special Education	Professional Development	
In-District Transportation		Accountability	
		Group Homes	

Keeping in mind that this table represents a goal to be achieved over time, one can view the many options of shifting funding over a period of years as an additional tool for achieving horizontal equity. One way that this can be done is to shift a portion of these costs to the state (out of district transportation, high cost special education students, group homes), which would assure comparable impacts across districts.

## **WEIGHTING**

The Foundation Aid Technical Advisory Group has reviewed research reports that outline the systems of student weighting used in other states (including R.C. Wood and *Fund the Child*). It is clear that the systems in place in other jurisdictions are one part art, one part science, and one part the economics of available funds. Weighting students by need is the primary mechanism of achieving vertical pupil equity (i.e., the recognition that all pupils do not have equal educational needs, and that certain categories of pupils will require greater levels of investment to achieve acceptable proficiencies). Both R.C. Wood & Associates and the *Funding Our Future* coalition agree on the need for weights, and both focus on the three primary weights of students in poverty, English Language Learners, and students receiving special education services. The recommendations on weights in both the R.C. Wood and *Funding Our Future* reports do not differ significantly. However, there may be additional variables to consider in the creation of reasonably accurate and educationally responsive weights based on student need.

### ***Poverty***

We know that the prevalence of child poverty and high concentrations of poverty are powerful, negative predictors of student achievement. Therefore, the advisory group believes that a pupil-poverty weighting based on “free and reduced lunch eligible” criteria is not sufficiently specific to capture the true cost of the density of poverty. By assigning a greater weight to free lunch eligible than to reduced lunch eligible, we can achieve a reasonable proxy for poverty density. Instead of using a 1.5 weight for free and reduced, the advisory group proposes a weight of 1.5 for free lunch eligible and 1.25 for reduced lunch eligible.

### ***Special Education***

To the extent that our weights are driven by program costs to the greatest degree possible, special education weighting should reflect the actual costs of educating those students with IEPs whose costs are not partially borne by the state through a method of state share for extraordinary program costs. In other words, the special education weighting, once adjusted for state share outside of the foundation formula, can be driven by actual costs rather than a logical guess. While this analysis will need further refinement based on actual costs, for the purposes of this report, the projected funding calculations have been done with a



1.5 multiplier for “non-extraordinary cost” IEP students. The group also recommends that the state assist locals with high-need children and cover all expenses that exceed \$50,000 per year. Furthermore, the group recommends that the Regents, in their amendment of Special Education regulations, consider whether to include speech and language needs students within the special education case load. This will also have an impact on final implementation decisions regarding Special Education weights.

***English Language Learners***

Weighting for English Language Learners (ELL) is especially problematic. Program costs vary widely and the research suggests that multiple levels of programming are typically required as a student acquires English and is increasingly mainstreamed with supports. Given that ELL students require specialized programming, at least for some period of time, a 1.2 multiplier is probably too low. However, discrete program costs for ELL students are not currently available, and review of the relevant research and weights used in other states suggests that a 1.2 multiplier is a good starting point for further analysis.

***Career and Technical Education***

The advisory group also recommends weighting for Career and Technical Education (CTE) with a multiplier of 1.25, to reflect the state’s current spending protocols. However, further analysis is needed to differentiate between part-time and full-time CTE student participation, as well as changing state shares for state-run academies such as Davies. Table 2 summarizes the recommendations on specific student categorical weights.

**Table 2. Student Need Weighting Ratios**

Special Education	1.5
Free Lunch	1.5
Reduced Lunch	1.25
Career & Technical Education	1.25
English Language Learners	1.20

Regardless of the actual weights adopted by the General Assembly, it will be essential that the weights be “stacked” or aggregated. In other words, one student may be poor, be on an IEP and be an English Language Learner. Every applicable weight would be additively attributed to create the multiplier for that child.

Finally, the Technical Advisory Group supports the idea of full state funding for the weights rather than an application of the state share ratio as a part of the calculation leading to the final funding amount.

## **PROGRAM AND PILOT FUNDING**

This comprehensive funding strategy leads to a series of important policy considerations on program specific funding. For example, career and technical programs, full-day kindergarten, pre-K programs, and after-school programs may be better served if discretely funded outside the foundation formula. As opposed to sharing in a weight-driven formula, programmatic funding is not as dependent upon accurate data systems, nor is it subject to the complexity and constant recalibration weighted systems require.

Additionally, there needs to be dedicated funds to address the creation of innovative pilot programs and model practices such as pre-k and after-school programs that increase student achievement and help to close the achievement gap between low income and higher income students. These programs could become eligible for the more expansive funding needed to bring them to scale. Funding specific programs and initiatives outside a base foundation level creates opportunities for more meaningful oversight and accountability of those programs that are specifically aimed at meeting the needs of our high-need students.

It is possible that at a future date one or more of these programs should be considered as a new student weight and therefore included in the foundation formula. Thus, several states have incorporated pre-K and after-school programs into their funding formulas. The advisory group recommends that the student weights recommended in this report in Table 2 be periodically reassessed to determine if the existing weights are working as intended, and to consider whether additional weights should be added.

Finally, the Technical Assistance Group recommends that the General Assembly consider creating a new category of grants designed to elicit and foster innovations in educational programming and support. These grant opportunities could be used to generate new thinking through small scale and laboratory applications, subject to the highest levels of accountability. In this way, we could ensure that Rhode Island continues to implement proven practices across school districts.

## **DATA ANALYSIS**

This final report of the Technical Advisory Group presents detailed data that show how the concepts put forth in this report would look if applied to the annual expenditure of funding for education in the state of Rhode Island. Note that all numbers provide projections for how the fully-implemented formula would look at the end of the transition period. Each document includes state-wide totals and total amounts for each of Rhode Island's 36 school districts and is based on a per pupil foundation cost of \$10,607.

**Chart 1 - COMPARISON OF CURRENT EDUCATION AID TO AID UNDER FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSAL AT THE END OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD**

The foundation aid program increases the state share of the cost of education in two ways: 1) increases in education aid distributed to districts, and 2) district savings through state assumption of certain costs. This chart compares current funding with the proposed funding under the foundation aid program.

In the top square, current district aid under general aid and the investment funds is \$689 million. Under the foundation aid program at full funding, general aid (or aid based on a district's pre K to 12 students and a per pupil of \$10,607) is \$805 million, and aid based on weighted students is \$438 million. Added together, aid under the foundation program is \$1.24 billion, an increase of \$554 million over current funding.

The middle square shows other aid categories not distributed to districts such as progressive support and intervention, and other current programs such as housing aid. Under this proposal, the state assumes increased costs in four categories: non-public school textbooks, high cost special education students, group home aid and out-of-district transportation. State assumption of all costs in these four categories adds \$40 million to the cost of the program.

The bottom square displays the costs of the state operated schools and the overall totals for current funding (\$850 million); proposed funding (\$1.44 billion); and the increase at full funding (\$594 million).

**Chart 2 - COMPARISON OF TOTAL COST OF EDUCATION AND STATE COST UNDER PROPOSED FOUNDATION AID PROGRAM**

This chart shows the total cost of education by district under the proposed foundation aid program (\$2 billion) and the state share of those costs (\$1.24 billion). The foundation model is based on a per pupil foundation cost of \$10,607. The total cost column multiplies this per pupil amount by the total of regular and weighted students in each district, and is displayed both by total dollars and on a per pupil basis. The state share columns show the state share for each district on a total dollar and per pupil basis if the program were fully funded.

**Chart 3 - CALCULATION OF DISTRICT FOUNDATION AID**

This chart provides a breakout of the calculation of the state share (or foundation aid) by district. The state share is the sum of the per pupil (\$10,607) times the pre-k to 12 student count times a state share ratio, and the per pupil times the student weights only. The state share ratio is based on wealth per student in each district as compared to the wealth per student in the state, and provides for an average state share of 44% and a minimum district share of 25%.

(NOTE: These tables are for explanatory purposes only, as further analysis and refinement would be needed to arrive at the accurate figures. Of particular concern is the age and reliability of data relating to local income.)

## **GOING FORWARD**

The Technical Advisory Group is pleased to present this report of policy recommendations for foundation-based school funding to the Joint Committee. This report reflects the work that this group has accomplished during the six week period from April 13, 2007, the date of the first meeting, through May 30, 2007. We recommend that a foundation funding formula be adopted by the Legislature during the 2007 Legislative Session, and that the law provide for an additional six month period to further refine the data analysis and develop a transition plan prior to the implementation of the foundation formula for FY 2009.

The Technical Advisory Group also recognizes the enormous complexity of education financing. It is highly unlikely that even with the best intentions, talent and information, legislation passed at one moment in time will continue to address all the needs of this dynamic system. Therefore, we recommend that the legislation include plans for systematic reviews to be conducted at specific intervals to assure that it continues to satisfy the driving principals of equity, adequacy and accountability. This review should include both legislative, administrative and community leadership. Some individual members of the advisory group and their organizations are willing to offer their continued assistance for any future work in developing the formula or for the ongoing review process after the formula is adopted.

The Technical Advisory Group also acknowledges that there are a number of issues that are not covered in this report but that would need to be addressed in the future (during the additional work period of up to six-months). These issues include:

- Developing a transition plan to show how the new funding formula would be fully phased in over a period of years,
- Determining the number of years the transition period would last,
- Determining how the state would transition to taking over certain local costs (suggestions include fully funding one element at a time or phasing in funding for a portion of all state-funded items each year).
- Refining the wealth indicator(s) to be used in determining the state-aid contribution received by each district,
- Determining the level of minimum local share, and
- Completing additional work to cost out special education expenses, which vary depending on what is included (such as speech and language support).

Chart 1 -- COMPARISON OF CURRENT EDUCATION AID TO AID UNDER FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSAL

<u>CURRENT</u>	<u>PROPOSED</u>	<u>DIFFERENCE</u>	
GENERAL AID (PLUS CENTRAL FALLS)	\$533,068,950	\$804,916,037	\$271,847,087
INVESTMENT FUNDS	\$156,214,153	\$437,900,104	\$281,685,951
<b>TOTAL DISTRICT AID</b>	<b>\$689,283,103</b>	<b>\$1,242,816,141</b>	<b>\$553,533,038</b>
PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT & INTERVENTION/SALT	\$3,338,044	\$6,214,081	\$2,876,037
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OTHER AID (HASBRO, BREAKFAST, ETC.)	\$670,000 \$977,965	\$670,000 \$977,965	\$0 \$0
NON-PUBLIC TEXTBOOKS	\$240,000	\$761,909	\$521,909
		\$8,300,954	\$8,300,954
		\$14,447,420	\$14,447,420
		\$14,704,024	\$14,704,024
CHARTER SCHOOL	\$22,380,984	\$22,380,984	\$0
HOUSING AID	\$47,172,045	\$47,172,045	\$0
TEACHER RETIREMENT	\$58,632,638	\$58,632,638	\$0
<b>TOTAL OTHER AID</b>	<b>\$133,411,676</b>	<b>\$174,262,020</b>	<b>\$40,850,344</b>
DAVIES CAREER AND TECHNICAL RI SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF METROPOLITAN CAREER AND TECHNICAL	\$12,810,692 \$5,981,028 \$8,814,530	\$12,810,692 \$5,981,028 \$8,814,530	\$0 \$0 \$0
TOTAL STATE OPERATED SCHOOLS	\$27,606,250	\$27,606,250	\$0
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$850,301,029</b>	<b>\$1,444,684,411</b>	<b>\$594,383,382</b>

\* BASED ON AVERAGE STATE SHARE OF 44% AND A MINIMUM DISTRICT SHARE OF 25%

\*\* CALCULATED AT 1/2 OF 1% OF THE TOTAL FOUNDATION AND WEIGHTS

**Chart 2 -- COMPARISON OF TOTAL COST OF EDUCATION AND STATE COST  
UNDER PROPOSED FOUNDATION AID PROGRAM**

DISTRICT	TOTAL COST		STATE SHARE	
	COST OF EDUCATION UNDER FOUNDATION PROPOSAL	COST PER STUDENT	TOTAL FOUNDATION AID	AID PER STUDENT
BARRINGTON	\$38,580,841	\$11,656	\$12,248,964	\$3,701
BRISTOL WARREN	\$44,466,639	\$12,683	\$16,575,532	\$4,728
BURRILLVILLE	\$32,243,159	\$12,754	\$20,321,813	\$8,039
CENTRAL FALLS	\$61,349,111	\$16,599	\$59,157,715	\$16,006
CHARIHO	\$43,877,579	\$11,930	\$14,653,245	\$3,984
COVENTRY	\$69,657,760	\$12,401	\$44,752,159	\$7,967
CRANSTON	\$136,299,897	\$12,966	\$82,022,880	\$7,803
CUMBERLAND	\$62,882,539	\$12,398	\$32,211,488	\$6,351
EAST GREENWICH	\$27,576,874	\$11,680	\$8,794,529	\$3,725
EAST PROVIDENCE	\$78,468,518	\$13,443	\$48,701,018	\$8,344
EXETER-W. GREENWICH	\$25,377,168	\$12,136	\$10,357,074	\$4,953
FOSTER	\$3,505,614	\$11,965	\$1,633,631	\$5,576
FOSTER-GLOCESTER	\$18,696,349	\$11,435	\$10,168,245	\$6,219
GLOCESTER	\$8,302,629	\$12,138	\$5,078,614	\$7,425
JAMESTOWN	\$8,880,578	\$11,778	\$2,882,320	\$3,823
JOHNSTON	\$42,822,209	\$13,200	\$20,297,116	\$6,257
LINCOLN	\$39,596,461	\$12,124	\$16,198,119	\$4,960
LITTLE COMPTON	\$5,247,946	\$11,636	\$1,660,128	\$3,681
MIDDLETOWN	\$31,357,342	\$12,695	\$12,042,694	\$4,876
NARRAGANSETT	\$19,111,693	\$12,111	\$6,558,308	\$4,156
NEW SHOREHAM	\$1,585,747	\$12,013	\$535,654	\$4,058
NEWPORT	\$34,669,457	\$14,434	\$15,560,946	\$6,478
NORTH KINGSTOWN	\$52,172,969	\$12,091	\$17,846,065	\$4,136
NORTH PROVIDENCE	\$43,121,406	\$12,945	\$24,836,777	\$7,456
NORTH SMITHFIELD	\$22,547,486	\$11,981	\$10,840,780	\$5,760
PAWTUCKET	\$139,055,410	\$15,090	\$116,488,379	\$12,641
PORTSMOUTH	\$33,031,418	\$11,938	\$11,019,241	\$3,982
PROVIDENCE	\$424,458,887	\$16,220	\$374,671,158	\$14,317
SCITUATE	\$20,518,552	\$11,691	\$6,557,088	\$3,736
SMITHFIELD	\$29,671,810	\$11,645	\$9,401,833	\$3,690
SOUTH KINGSTOWN	\$48,497,776	\$12,272	\$17,058,628	\$4,316
TIVERTON	\$24,277,434	\$11,930	\$9,032,653	\$4,439
WARWICK	\$142,737,444	\$12,739	\$65,447,226	\$5,841
WEST WARWICK	\$48,868,438	\$13,503	\$33,996,756	\$9,394
WESTERLY	\$45,117,193	\$12,792	\$17,059,026	\$4,837
WOONSOCKET	\$97,130,871	\$15,231	\$86,148,339	\$13,509
TOTAL	\$2,005,763,202	\$13,570	\$1,242,816,141	\$8,408

**Chart 3 -- CALCULATION OF DISTRICT FOUNDATION AID**

DISTRICT	PK-12 RADM	TOTAL WEIGHTED STUDENTS	FOUNDATION AID BASED ON PK-12 RADM	FOUNDATION PER PUPIL	FOUNDATION AID BASED ON WEIGHTED STUDENTS	WEIGHTS PER PUPIL
BARRINGTON	3,310	3,637	\$8,777,293	\$2,652	\$3,471,671	\$1,049
BRISTOL WARREN	3,506	4,192	\$9,297,036	\$2,652	\$7,278,497	\$2,076
BURRILLVILLE	2,528	3,040	\$14,893,150	\$5,891	\$5,428,663	\$2,147
CENTRAL FALLS	3,696	5,784	\$37,012,076	\$10,014	\$22,145,639	\$5,992
CHARIHO	3,678	4,137	\$9,788,212	\$2,661	\$4,865,033	\$1,323
COVENTRY	5,617	6,567	\$34,673,918	\$6,173	\$10,078,241	\$1,794
CRANSTON	10,512	12,850	\$57,223,767	\$5,444	\$24,799,113	\$2,359
CUMBERLAND	5,072	5,928	\$23,127,653	\$4,560	\$9,083,835	\$1,791
EAST GREENWICH	2,361	2,600	\$6,260,782	\$2,652	\$2,533,747	\$1,073
EAST PROVIDENCE	5,837	7,398	\$32,145,560	\$5,507	\$16,555,459	\$2,836
EXETER-W. GREENWICH	2,091	2,392	\$7,159,143	\$3,424	\$3,197,931	\$1,529
FOSTER	293	331	\$1,235,868	\$4,218	\$397,763	\$1,358
FOSTER-GLOCESTER	1,635	1,763	\$8,814,341	\$5,391	\$1,353,904	\$828
GLOCESTER	684	783	\$4,031,173	\$5,894	\$1,047,441	\$1,531
JAMESTOWN	754	837	\$1,999,420	\$2,652	\$882,900	\$1,171
JOHNSTON	3,244	4,037	\$11,884,015	\$3,663	\$8,413,101	\$2,593
LINCOLN	3,266	3,733	\$11,244,119	\$3,443	\$4,953,999	\$1,517
LITTLE COMPTON	451	495	\$1,195,939	\$2,652	\$464,189	\$1,029
MIDDLETOWN	2,470	2,956	\$6,884,643	\$2,787	\$5,158,052	\$2,088
NARRAGANSETT	1,578	1,802	\$4,184,462	\$2,652	\$2,373,847	\$1,504
NEW SHOREHAM	132	150	\$350,031	\$2,652	\$185,623	\$1,406
NEWPORT	2,402	3,269	\$6,369,504	\$2,652	\$9,191,443	\$3,827
NORTH KINGSTOWN	4,315	4,919	\$11,442,301	\$2,652	\$6,403,764	\$1,484
NORTH PROVIDENCE	3,331	4,065	\$17,047,288	\$5,118	\$7,789,489	\$2,338
NORTH SMITHFIELD	1,882	2,126	\$8,255,669	\$4,387	\$2,585,112	\$1,374
PAWTUCKET	9,215	13,110	\$75,176,474	\$8,158	\$41,311,905	\$4,483
PORTSMOUTH	2,767	3,114	\$7,337,392	\$2,652	\$3,681,849	\$1,331
PROVIDENCE	26,169	40,017	\$227,786,852	\$8,704	\$146,884,302	\$5,613
SCITUATE	1,755	1,934	\$4,653,821	\$2,652	\$1,903,267	\$1,084
SMITHFIELD	2,548	2,797	\$6,756,659	\$2,652	\$2,645,174	\$1,038
SOUTH KINGSTOWN	3,952	4,572	\$10,479,716	\$2,652	\$6,578,912	\$1,665
TIVERTON	2,035	2,289	\$6,340,464	\$3,116	\$2,692,189	\$1,323
WARWICK	11,205	13,457	\$41,561,217	\$3,709	\$23,886,009	\$2,132
WEST WARWICK	3,619	4,607	\$23,515,051	\$6,498	\$10,481,705	\$2,896
WESTERLY	3,527	4,254	\$9,352,722	\$2,652	\$7,706,304	\$2,185
WOONSOCKET	6,377	9,157	\$56,658,306	\$8,885	\$29,490,032	\$4,624
TOTAL	147,814	189,098	\$804,916,037	\$5,445	\$437,900,104	\$2,963

**FOUNDATION AID TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP  
MEMBERS**

updated 5/31/07

Elizabeth Burke Bryant  
Rhode Island KIDS COUNT  
One Union Station  
Providence, RI 02903  
401-351-9400  
[ebb@rikidscount.org](mailto:ebb@rikidscount.org)

Peter McWalters  
Commissioner  
Department of Education  
255 Westminster Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
401-222-8706  
[Peter.McWalters@ride.ri.gov](mailto:Peter.McWalters@ride.ri.gov)

Patrick A. Guida  
Vice Chairman, Board of Regents  
Tillinghast Licht, LLP  
10 Weybosset Street  
Providence, RI 02903-2818  
401-456-1223  
[pguida@tlslaw.com](mailto:pguida@tlslaw.com)

Timothy C. Duffy  
President  
RI Association of School Committees  
RI College Campus, Building 6  
600 Mt. Pleasant Avenue  
Providence, RI 02908  
401-272-9811 x 10  
[tduffy@ri-asc.org](mailto:tduffy@ri-asc.org)

Steve Nardelli  
Executive Director  
RI League of Charter Schools  
4 Richmond Square, Suite 300  
Providence, RI 02906  
401-831-3700 x 102  
[stevenardelli@richarterschools.com](mailto:stevenardelli@richarterschools.com)

Marcia Reback  
President  
RI Federation of Teachers  
356 Smith Street  
Providence, RI 02908  
401-273-9800  
[marciarift@aol.com](mailto:marciarift@aol.com)



Will Van Horn  
Education Partnership  
345 South Main Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
401-331-5222  
[wvanhorne@edpartnership.org](mailto:wvanhorne@edpartnership.org)

Stacey Jordan  
Director of Education Policy  
25 Dorrance Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
401-421-7740 x 745  
[sjordan@providenceri.com](mailto:sjordan@providenceri.com)

M. Richard Scherza  
Cranston School Superintendent  
869 Park Avenue  
Cranston, RI 02910  
401-270-8000  
[superintendent@cpsed.net](mailto:superintendent@cpsed.net)

Linda Filameno  
Head of Library  
108 High Street  
Woonsocket, RI 02895  
[rid27311@ride.ri.net](mailto:rid27311@ride.ri.net)

Ella Whaley  
518 A Shannock Road  
Wakefield, RI 02879  
401-789-2996 or 401-932-7539  
[ellawhaley@cox.net](mailto:ellawhaley@cox.net)

Jennifer Wood  
Office of Lt. Governor Elizabeth Roberts  
State House, Room 116  
Providence, RI 02903  
401-222-2371  
[jwood@ltgov.state.ri.us](mailto:jwood@ltgov.state.ri.us)

Jo Eva Gaines  
227 Eustis Avenue  
Newport, RI 02840  
401-846-7222  
[jeg227@aol.com](mailto:jeg227@aol.com)

Catherine Kaiser  
35 Knowles Court  
Jamestown, RI 02835  
401-423-3589 (home)  
401-749-6850 (cell)  
[cathkais@cox.net](mailto:cathkais@cox.net)