

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OFFICE OF FISCAL ANALYSIS

**Report on the Modeling of SB 948 and
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System (CTECS)
Funding**

January 14, 2022

Janelle Stevens
Primary Analyst, SB 948 Modeling

Sarah Bourne
Primary Analyst, CTECS Funding

Education and Municipal Unit

Alan Shepard, Chief
Sarah Bourne, Principal Analyst
Daniel Dilworth, Principal Analyst
Anthony Naples, Associate Analyst
Janelle Stevens, Principal Analyst

Neil Ayers, Director

We gratefully acknowledge the Connecticut State Department of Education staff who provided assistance throughout the process. We also appreciate the efforts of colleagues in the Office of Legislative Research and the Legislative Commissioners' Office who reviewed a draft version of this report.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
I. Overview.....	2
Part I: SB 948 Modeling	
II. Net Impacts by Operator.....	8
III. Education Cost Sharing (ECS).....	19
IV. State Charter Schools.....	30
V. RESC Magnets	32
VI. Board of Education-Operated (BOE) Magnets	39
VII. Vocational Agriculture	47
VIII. Open Choice.....	55
Part II: CTECS Funding	
IX. CTECS Analysis	64
Appendices	
A. Detailed Information on Grant Calculations Under Current Law and SB 948, for Programs Affected by the Proposal.....	67
B. Relevant Grant Changes in the FY 22 and FY 23 Budget.....	77
C. Assumptions	78
D. Methodology	80
E. Connecticut State Department of Education Comments	81

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mandated Report

The Office of Fiscal Analysis (OFA) is required by the FY 22 and FY 23 budget implementer to model the impacts of SB 948. The bill, which was considered during the 2021 regular legislative session, proposed substantial changes to several major state education grants. The OFA is also required to examine funding for the Connecticut Technical Education and Career System (CTECS) by the same section of the budget implementer.

SB 948 (Proposal) Overview

The proposal would fully fund – but maintain the general structure – of both the major education grant to towns, Education Cost Sharing (ECS), and state charter schools. The proposal also would change the ways that grants are calculated for several other types of programs: magnet schools (run by two different types of operators), vocational agriculture, and Open Choice. Additionally, the proposal would eliminate sending town tuition for such programs as well as programmatic grant funds for in-district students.

Estimated Impacts

Full implementation and funding of the proposal would add \$376 million in expenses to the FY 23 General Fund budget. Most of these additional funds (\$269.7 million, or 72 percent) would be needed for the ECS account, benefiting towns considered "underfunded" by the ECS formula. However, some towns would receive less at the proposal's ECS full funding level in FY 23 than they would at the full funding level under current law (in either FY 28 or FY 30) because the proposal removes Open Choice students from the ECS calculations.

Districts that receive Open Choice students (i.e., receiving districts) and state charter schools would be the other major beneficiaries of the funding influx, with collective net revenue increases of 180 percent and 20 percent respectively, compared to current law estimates.

For operators of programs that charge tuition – all regional educational service center (RESC) magnets, some board of education-run (BOE) magnets, and all vocational agriculture centers – the proposal's impacts would be somewhat mixed. Some would find that large grant increases are greater than lost tuition revenue and lost in-district student revenue, while others would not. The net impacts are favorable for nearly all RESC magnet operators (slight net increases), some BOE magnet operators, and few vocational agriculture centers.

When net impacts are added across programs, the vast majority of school operators would experience net positive fiscal impacts from the proposal. For a handful of towns, the gains are due to ECS increases that offset net total losses across other programs. The proposal overall is favorable for two types of towns (beyond Open Choice receiving districts): towns that currently pay substantial tuition to magnet and/or Vo Ag program operators, and BOE magnet operators that do not currently charge tuition and have large shares of enrollment from out-of-district students. Section II of the report displays the net impacts of the proposal, by program, for every town, regional district, RESC, and state charter school.

Section I. Overview

Mandated Report

This report fulfills the requirements of Section 373 of Public Act 21-2 (June Special Session), the budget implementer for the FY 22 and FY 23 Budget. The section mandates that the Office of Fiscal Analysis (OFA) execute and report on an independent modeling of the education funding proposal contained in the version of SB 948 that was favorably reported by the Education Committee during the 2021 regular session ("the proposal"). The analysis must include the proposal's anticipated effects on grants and tuition, as well as net fiscal impact, for all school operators affected by the proposal.

Section 373 also requires OFA to examine funding for the Connecticut Technical Education and Career System (CTECS) at the system, school, and per pupil levels, and how that funding arrangement impacts racial equity. The CTECS funding information is provided in Section IX of this report.

SB 948 ANALYSIS

Proposal Overview

The proposal would impact funding for the following grants and programs:

1. Education Cost Sharing (ECS) grants to towns;
2. State charter schools;
3. Interdistrict magnet schools operated by regional educational service centers (RESCs) and an institution of higher education (collectively referred to in this report as RESC magnets, for simplicity);
4. Interdistrict magnet schools operated by boards of education (BOE);
5. Vocational agriculture (i.e., Regional Agricultural Science and Technology Education Centers, or Vo Ag); and
6. Open Choice.

The proposal can be viewed as two general types of reforms:

- Fully funding (a) ECS grants for towns considered "underfunded" by the formula and (b) state charter school grants, while largely retaining the current grant structures of both programs; and
- Replacing the current "flat" per-student state grant method for the other four types of programs with more complex calculations that take ECS-based student need levels into account, and fully funding the new methods.¹

¹ The current ECS formula and the state charter school grant calculations contain student need components, which is unchanged by the proposal.

The proposal would also eliminate sending town tuition where it is currently charged² as well as programmatic grant dollars for in-district students.³ The programmatic costs of educating out-of-district students would be shifted to the General Fund, instead of being shared between the General Fund and sending towns for most programs currently. However, sending towns would continue to receive ECS dollars associated with those students, except for Open Choice.⁴

Detailed information regarding grant calculations for the proposal and current law (including changes made in the FY 22 and FY 23 Budget) is provided in Appendices A and B.

Estimated Impacts to the General Fund

It is anticipated that \$376 million would need to be added to the FY 23 Budget to fully implement the proposal (Table I.1). Under the proposal, funding to the affected programs would rise by 14 percent collectively.

The estimated current law expenditures for the affected programs are approximately \$19.5 million lower than FY 23 appropriations because budgeting methods differ from the analytical methods used for this report.⁵ Consequently, the estimated proposal cost exceeds current law projections for this report by a total of \$395.5 million (Table I.2).

² Tuition is currently charged by all six RESC magnet operators, some BOE magnet operators (five of 11 including Hartford, which only charges for Great Path Academy), and all 20 Vo Ag operators.

³ Grant dollars for in-district students are currently received by some BOE magnets (the eight operators outside the Sheff region along with Hartford for Great Path Academy only) and all 20 Vo Ag operators.

⁴ Towns do not currently receive ECS dollars associated with state charter school students, which would not change under the proposal.

⁵ See Appendix C for more information.

Table I.1 FY 23 Appropriations Compared to Current Law and Proposal Estimates

Account	Appropriation	CURRENT LAW		PROPOSAL		
		Projection for This Analysis	Difference From Appropriation	Projection for This Analysis	Difference From Appropriation	Percent Change from Appropriation
ECS	2,184,789,061	2,191,870,850	7,081,789	2,454,438,748	269,649,687	12%
State Charter Schools	130,579,996	128,423,933	(2,156,063)	154,652,604	24,072,608	18%
Open Choice	30,342,327	16,398,592	(13,943,735)	45,949,596	15,607,269	51%
Vo Ag	18,824,200	18,824,200	0	27,355,672	8,531,472	45%
Magnet Schools						
RESC grants	132,351,422	130,151,932	(2,199,490)	201,592,188	69,240,766	52%
Board of Education grants	147,381,439	138,377,470	(9,003,969)	137,230,395	(10,151,044)	-7%
SDE-paid East Hartford tuition subsidy	915,000	1,658,635	743,635	0	(915,000)	-100%
SDE-paid preschool tuition	3,786,216	3,786,216	0	3,786,216	0	0%
SDE administrative set-aside	150,000	150,000	0	150,000	0	0%
Subtotal	284,584,077	274,124,253	(10,459,824)	342,758,800	58,174,723	20%
TOTAL	2,649,119,661	2,629,641,828	(19,477,833)	3,025,155,420	376,035,759	14%

Notes:

1. The chart above includes only the General Fund costs of the programs listed. For Vo Ag operators and many magnet school operators, the grant increases (from the appropriation level) required under the proposal are offset (partially, wholly, or in excess) by the elimination of tuition.
2. The current law estimates for this analysis differ from the methods typically used by OFA to estimate current year or future expenditures, as described elsewhere in this report. The difference between the FY 23 appropriation and current law is not necessarily representative of other OFA estimates produced for other purposes.
3. All account funds except for Magnet Schools are used entirely on grants. The Magnet Schools account differs. For the estimate above, it is assumed that the SDE-paid preschool tuition amounts and SDE administrative set-aside would remain the same under the proposal. The SDE-paid East Hartford tuition subsidy amount projected under Current Law reflects the uncapped tuition subsidy anticipated in FY 22 and FY 23.

**Table I.2 Estimated General Fund Impact of the Proposal by Program,
FY 23**

Program	Current Law	Proposal	Difference	Percent Change
ECS	2,191,870,850	2,454,438,748	262,567,898	12%
State Charter Schools	128,423,933	154,652,604	26,228,671	20%
RESC Magnets	131,810,567	201,592,188	69,781,621	53%
BOE Magnets	138,377,470	137,230,395	(1,147,075)	-1%
Vo Ag	18,824,200	27,355,672	8,531,472	45%
Open Choice	16,398,592	45,949,596	29,551,004	180%
TOTAL	2,625,705,612	3,021,219,204	395,513,592	15%
TOTAL Excluding ECS	433,834,762	566,780,456	132,945,694	31%

Notes:

1. The Difference reflects the difference in General Fund grant dollars needed for the proposal compared to this report's current law estimate.
2. The Open Choice estimates show the changes associated with the Open Choice grant dollars. The impact of removing Open Choice students from ECS is part of the ECS estimates.
3. The General Fund estimated net impacts are calculated using this report's projection of General Fund spending under current law (see Appendices C and D). These net impacts are not the differences between the proposal estimates and the FY 23 appropriations (which are provided in Table I.1).
4. The RESC magnet General Fund impact under current law includes as revenue a General Fund payment that defrays part of East Hartford's tuition costs. In Table I.1, RESC grants and this tuition subsidy appear as separate expenses within the Magnet Schools account.

Estimated Impacts to School Operators

The largest beneficiaries of the proposal in terms of net revenue changes would be:

- Open Choice receiving districts, which individually are anticipated to experience grant growth of between 90 and 418 percent; and
- State charter schools, with estimated individual grant increases of 12 to 25 percent.

Other notable beneficiaries would be:

- BOE magnet operators that do not currently charge tuition and have a sizeable portion of out-of-district students; and
- Towns that currently pay substantial tuition to magnet and/or Vo Ag program operators.

When the programmatic impacts are summed for each operator, the proposal would have positive fiscal impacts (at different levels) for most towns and RESCs, as well as all state charter schools. The proposal is projected to result in negative fiscal impacts for one town, one RESC, and five regional districts. Five additional towns – including four cities⁶ – would be expected to experience negative fiscal impacts from the proposal, when considering only the non-ECS

⁶ Danbury, New London, Stamford, and Waterbury

changes. For almost all the large cities, the projected net revenue increases are largely due to the ECS changes.⁷ (See Section II for the table displaying net impacts for each school operator.)

Estimated Impacts by Program

The proposal's anticipated net impacts for operators of each affected program (compared to current law estimates) are described below and shown in Table I.3.

Table I.3 Estimated Net Revenue Impact of the Proposal on Program Operators, FY 23

Program Operators	Current Law	Proposal	Difference	% Change
ECS (All Towns)	2,191,870,850	2,454,438,748	262,567,898	12%
State Charter Schools	128,423,933	154,652,604	26,228,671	20%
RESC Magnets	192,679,141	201,592,188	8,913,047	5%
BOE Magnets	143,148,431	137,230,395	(5,918,036)	-4%
Vo Ag	30,854,415	27,355,672	(3,498,743)	-11%
Open Choice (Receiving Districts)	16,398,592	45,949,596	29,551,004	180%
TOTAL	2,703,375,361	3,021,219,204	317,843,843	12%
TOTAL Excluding ECS	511,504,511	566,780,456	55,275,944	11%

Note:

The Open Choice estimates show the changes associated with the Open Choice Grant dollars. The impact of removing Open Choice students from ECS is part of the ECS estimates.

- **ECS.** A substantial increase (12 percent) in General Fund grant dollars would flow to the "underfunded" towns, which would become fully funded. However, across underfunded and overfunded towns, there would be a collective decline of approximately (\$24.7 million, or (1 percent)) in the full funding amount due to removing Open Choice students from the calculations. The full funding impact of the Open Choice removal to affected towns would range from minimal to (7 percent).
- **State charter schools.** Each would experience a large increase in General Fund grant dollars (up 20 percent collectively).
- **RESC magnets.** An anticipated large increase in General Fund grant dollars (53 percent) would mostly offset the loss of tuition revenue. Operators generally would receive small increases in net revenue (two to 11 percent), with one exception (a decline of (5 percent)).
- **BOE magnets.** General Fund grant dollars would likely slightly decrease (1 percent). There would be considerable variation regarding how individual operators would fare. Collectively, a small net revenue loss (4 percent) would be anticipated.
- **Vo Ag.** General Fund grant dollars would increase substantially (45 percent) but for most operators, the gain would be insufficient to make up for the loss of tuition revenue, with net revenues down (11 percent) collectively. Seventeen of 20 operators are projected to experience a net revenue decrease (at least (10 percent) for most).

⁷ Hartford is the exception because of the proposal's elimination of the substantial amount of RESC magnet tuition it currently pays and its current level of ECS funding.

- **Open Choice.** General Fund grant dollars would nearly triple (up 180 percent). All operators (receiving districts) would experience large gains.

Why Impacts Vary

The proposal's anticipated impacts to school operators vary by program, and even within programs, for a few key reasons:

1. **Differing levels of grant increases:** The estimated gap between the current grant amounts and the grant amounts under the proposal differs for each program and operator. This is because the *current* grant amounts vary among the programs, and within some programs (RESC and BOE magnet operators), the amounts differ among the operators based on location. Additionally, for all non-ECS programs, the *proposal* grant amount associated with each student would vary based on student need levels.⁸
2. **Varied shares of in-district versus out-of-district enrollment:** For BOE magnets and Vo Ag operators, the proposal would eliminate all programmatic grant dollars provided for in-district students. For the eight BOE magnet operators, and all Vo Ag operators, that currently receive these funds, the magnitude of the negative impact depends on the number and share of program students who are in-district.
3. **For some, grant increases largely offset tuition elimination:** For operators that charge tuition – all RESC operators, some BOE magnet operators, and all Vo Ag operators – the proposal's anticipated grant increases (for those operators likely to experience them) primarily would serve to offset the elimination of sending town tuition. In some instances, increased state grant revenue to operators is projected to be insufficient to make up the tuition loss.

Analysis Assumptions and Estimates

The modeling in this report assumes that the proposal is fully implemented and funded in FY 23. The version of SB 948 examined here requires full implementation in FY 22 per the bill's language; however, as FY 22 is underway, it is assumed the proposal would take effect in FY 23. (See Appendices C and D for a detailed explanation of assumptions and a description of this analysis's methodology.) The report does not address the proposal's implications for FY 24 and beyond, or provide estimates past FY 23, due to many uncertainties.

The figures in this report are considered estimates. The modeling produced exact figures, which are provided, but the precise calculations for FY 23 would vary due to changes in student populations (regarding the number enrolled and, for the proposal, student need levels), along with any changes in tuition under the current law scenario. It is possible that for many operators, the magnitude or even direction (positive or negative) of the proposal's net fiscal impact would differ in FY 23 from what is presented in this report, if the proposal is adopted.

⁸ For RESC magnets and state charter schools, the proposal calculation uses the student need levels of the school populations. For BOE magnets, Vo Ag, and Open Choice, the student need level of each individual sending town is used.

Section II. Net Impacts by Operator

Table II.1 on the following pages shows the net fiscal impact to each school operator affected by the proposal. The net impact is displayed for each program and in total across programs. Shading indicates the operator receives grant dollars and/or is a program operator (for that program's column). See Section I for an overview of the net impacts by operator.

Table II.1 Estimated Net Fiscal Impact of SB 948 by Operator/Town, FY 23

Operator/Town		NET CHANGE BY PROGRAM (In Dollars)						TOTAL NET CHANGE	TOTAL Excluding ECS
Code	Name	ECS	RESC Magnets	BOE Magnets	Vo Ag	Open Choice	State Charter Schools		
1	Andover	0	46,776	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	79,216	79,216
2	Ansonia	2,667,852	200,863	Less than 6 students	61,407	81,415	Not impacted	3,017,536	349,685
3	Ashford	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	0	Not impacted	29,301	29,301
4	Avon	0	174,276	0	Less than 6 students	1,131,229	Not impacted	1,319,151	1,319,151
5	Barkhamsted	0	Less than 6 students	0	0	0	Not impacted	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students
6	Beacon Falls	530,652	0	0	40,938	0	Not impacted	571,590	40,938
7	Berlin	0	243,966	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	874,531	Not impacted	1,145,646	1,145,646
8	Bethany	0	Less than 6 students	0	47,761	Less than 6 students	Not impacted	116,152	116,152
9	Bethel	0	Less than 6 students	50,000	61,407	0	Not impacted	114,107	114,107
10	Bethlehem	249,155	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	249,155	0
11	Bloomfield	721,420	1,301,313	104,184	(296,392)	0	Not impacted	1,830,525	1,109,105
12	Bolton	0	49,375	0	Less than 6 students	374,799	Not impacted	430,997	430,997
13	Bozrah	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	36,738	36,738
14	Branford	807,547	55,953	0	129,637	629,320	Not impacted	1,622,458	814,910
15	Bridgeport	14,375,524	1,497,217	(2,314,210)	1,305,036	315,024	Not impacted	15,178,591	803,067
16	Bridgewater	112,890	0	0	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	119,713	Less than 6 students
17	Bristol	4,250,275	865,584	0	163,752	0	Not impacted	5,279,611	1,029,336
18	Brookfield	0	0	84,000	81,876	0	Not impacted	165,876	165,876
19	Brooklyn	0	82,950	Less than 6 students	47,761	0	Not impacted	146,155	146,155
20	Burlington	1,084,581	111,240	0	75,053	0	Not impacted	1,270,874	186,293
21	Canaan	0	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	0	0
22	Canterbury	0	Less than 6 students	96,071	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	139,857	139,857
23	Canton	618,592	73,851	0	Less than 6 students	668,759	Not impacted	1,374,848	756,256

Table II.1 Estimated Net Fiscal Impact of SB 948 by Operator/Town, FY 23

Operator/Town		NET CHANGE BY PROGRAM (In Dollars)						TOTAL NET CHANGE	TOTAL Excluding ECS
Code	Name	ECS	RESC Magnets	BOE Magnets	Vo Ag	Open Choice	State Charter Schools		
24	Chaplin	0	40,290	108,108	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	168,867	168,867
25	Cheshire	785,747	122,905	0	75,053	405,078	Not impacted	1,388,783	603,036
26	Chester	334,835	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	361,844	27,009
27	Clinton	0	33,375	0	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	60,667	60,667
28	Colchester	0	304,755	Less than 6 students	88,699	0	Not impacted	401,817	401,817
29	Colebrook	0	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	0	0
30	Columbia	0	33,655	108,108	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	155,409	155,409
31	Cornwall	14,052	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	14,052	0
32	Coventry	0	145,565	Less than 6 students	150,106	0	Not impacted	316,362	316,362
33	Cromwell	529,804	311,234	Less than 6 students	40,938	587,920	Not impacted	1,473,361	943,557
34	Danbury	12,510,786	0	(311,345)	129,637	0	Not impacted	12,329,078	(181,708)
35	Darien	78,595	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	78,595	0
36	Deep River	170,753	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	192,276	21,523
37	Derby	1,738,615	77,726	18,000	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	1,854,810	116,195
38	Durham	0	46,683	0	40,938	0	Not impacted	87,621	87,621
39	Eastford	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	18,846	18,846
40	East Granby	81,983	80,340	Less than 6 students	61,407	348,740	Not impacted	575,935	493,952
41	East Haddam	0	81,804	0	0	0	Not impacted	81,804	81,804
42	East Hampton	0	164,232	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	201,812	201,812
43	East Hartford	11,459,907	2,499,278	250,413	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	14,214,097	2,754,191
44	East Haven	792,015	78,465	0	218,336	209,352	Not impacted	1,298,168	506,153
45	East Lyme	0	322,855	19,866	47,761	0	Not impacted	390,482	390,482
46	Easton	114,653	Less than 6 students	39,000	Less than 6 students	192,454	Not impacted	371,976	257,323
47	East Windsor	0	314,484	Less than 6 students	68,230	470,336	Not impacted	856,515	856,515

Table II.1 Estimated Net Fiscal Impact of SB 948 by Operator/Town, FY 23

Operator/Town		NET CHANGE BY PROGRAM (In Dollars)						TOTAL NET CHANGE	TOTAL Excluding ECS
Code	Name	ECS	RESC Magnets	BOE Magnets	Vo Ag	Open Choice	State Charter Schools		
48	Ellington	423,291	306,489	0	Less than 6 students	832,061	Not impacted	1,595,956	1,172,665
49	Enfield	1,778,198	1,248,640	0	197,867	1,319,848	Not impacted	4,544,553	2,766,355
50	Essex	146,238	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	171,964	25,726
51	Fairfield	43,485	89,100	93,000	416,203	928,161	Not impacted	1,569,949	1,526,464
52	Farmington	0	237,852	0	Less than 6 students	1,234,068	Not impacted	1,478,743	1,478,743
53	Franklin	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	48,430	48,430
54	Glastonbury	0	661,566	Less than 6 students	(62,846)	706,059	Not impacted	1,311,708	1,311,708
55	Goshen	335,700	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	335,700	0
56	Granby	0	106,914	0	88,699	602,618	Not impacted	798,231	798,231
57	Greenwich	512,315	0	0	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	519,138	Less than 6 students
58	Griswold	261,729	92,333	36,709	40,938	0	Not impacted	431,709	169,980
59	Groton	0	1,169,641	436,043	170,575	0	Not impacted	1,776,259	1,776,259
60	Guilford	0	66,177	0	40,938	0	Not impacted	107,115	107,115
61	Haddam	1,353,513	34,878	0	40,938	0	Not impacted	1,429,329	75,816
62	Hamden	7,219,322	1,536,727	0	238,805	0	Not impacted	8,994,854	1,775,532
63	Hampton	0	69,643	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	95,260	95,260
64	Hartford	8,149,993	19,066,864	145,919	334,327	968,194	Not impacted	28,665,298	20,515,305
65	Hartland	0	Less than 6 students	0	68,230	0	Not impacted	72,865	72,865
66	Harwinton	312,741	49,440	0	88,699	0	Not impacted	450,880	138,139
67	Hebron	0	108,124	Less than 6 students	102,345	0	Not impacted	231,061	231,061
68	Kent	18,043	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	18,043	0
69	Killingly	0	264,950	Less than 6 students	(112,591)	0	Not impacted	178,099	178,099
70	Killingworth	597,432	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	648,884	51,452
71	Lebanon	0	79,595	92,664	(122,371)	0	Not impacted	49,888	49,888
72	Ledyard	0	314,128	193,141	(226,343)	0	Not impacted	280,926	280,926

Table II.1 Estimated Net Fiscal Impact of SB 948 by Operator/Town, FY 23

Operator/Town		NET CHANGE BY PROGRAM (In Dollars)						TOTAL NET CHANGE	TOTAL Excluding ECS
Code	Name	ECS	RESC Magnets	BOE Magnets	Vo Ag	Open Choice	State Charter Schools		
73	Lisbon	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	61,407	0	Not impacted	80,301	80,301
74	Litchfield	217,212	Less than 6 students	0	156,929	0	Not impacted	378,776	161,564
75	Lyme	229,778	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	229,778	0
76	Madison	0	65,604	0	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	72,427	72,427
77	Manchester	9,152,974	2,509,242	316,998	163,752	0	Not impacted	12,142,966	2,989,992
78	Mansfield	0	84,813	39,501	0	0	Not impacted	124,314	124,314
79	Marlborough	0	106,901	21,723	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	135,447	135,447
80	Meriden	12,371,977	3,455,991	Less than 6 students	525,371	0	Not impacted	16,356,339	3,984,362
81	Middlebury	1,449,309	Less than 6 students	0	75,053	0	Not impacted	1,531,112	81,803
82	Middlefield	417,022	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	463,541	46,519
83	Middletown	4,619,435	876,132	Less than 6 students	(373,303)	0	Not impacted	5,125,729	506,294
84	Milford	0	177,510	126,000	293,389	335,317	Not impacted	932,216	932,216
85	Monroe	0	59,400	42,000	115,991	0	Not impacted	217,391	217,391
86	Montville	678,461	331,067	301,790	115,991	0	Not impacted	1,427,309	748,848
87	Morris	173,654	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	173,654	0
88	Naugatuck	4,217,108	73,734	16,000	191,044	0	Not impacted	4,497,886	280,778
89	New Britain	21,860,082	2,692,545	34,650	61,407	0	Not impacted	24,648,684	2,788,602
90	New Canaan	81,102	Less than 6 students	0	0	0	Not impacted	83,802	Less than 6 students
91	New Fairfield	0	0	34,000	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	54,469	54,469
92	New Hartford	0	106,257	0	0	0	Not impacted	106,257	106,257
93	New Haven	10,942,161	990,980	820,942	(893,621)	1,766,846	Not impacted	13,627,308	2,685,147
94	Newington	2,037,343	407,724	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	1,101,435	Not impacted	3,563,720	1,526,377
95	New London	6,937,393	1,872,591	(2,207,872)	163,752	0	Not impacted	6,765,865	(171,529)
96	New Milford	0	0	36,000	115,991	0	Not impacted	151,991	151,991
97	Newtown	0	54,603	20,000	95,522	0	Not impacted	170,125	170,125

Table II.1 Estimated Net Fiscal Impact of SB 948 by Operator/Town, FY 23

Operator/Town		NET CHANGE BY PROGRAM (In Dollars)						TOTAL NET CHANGE	TOTAL Excluding ECS
Code	Name	ECS	RESC Magnets	BOE Magnets	Vo Ag	Open Choice	State Charter Schools		
98	Norfolk	32,342	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	32,342	0
99	North Branford	0	38,269	0	197,867	264,929	Not impacted	501,065	501,065
100	North Canaan	0	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	0	0
101	North Haven	132,354	92,963	0	122,814	619,740	Not impacted	967,871	835,517
102	North Stonington	0	43,690	Less than 6 students	68,230	0	Not impacted	121,949	121,949
103	Norwalk	3,370,727	Less than 6 students	320,095	109,168	0	Not impacted	3,802,690	431,963
104	Norwich	8,614,492	426,516	468,906	102,345	0	Not impacted	9,612,259	997,767
105	Old Lyme	979,279	Less than 6 students	0	0	0	Not impacted	1,010,972	Less than 6 students
106	Old Saybrook	14,827	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	45,237	30,410
107	Orange	0	Less than 6 students	0	47,761	Less than 6 students	Not impacted	133,249	133,249
108	Oxford	0	99,689	Less than 6 students	245,628	0	Not impacted	356,317	356,317
109	Plainfield	0	225,370	187,625	156,929	0	Not impacted	569,924	569,924
110	Plainville	949,944	211,047	0	Less than 6 students	896,578	Not impacted	2,084,860	1,134,917
111	Plymouth	0	Less than 6 students	0	143,283	0	Not impacted	147,918	147,918
112	Pomfret	0	38,050	0	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	51,696	51,696
113	Portland	241,167	152,275	0	Less than 6 students	508,461	Not impacted	929,195	688,028
114	Preston	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	54,584	0	Not impacted	73,678	73,678
115	Prospect	1,233,635	Less than 6 students	0	54,584	0	Not impacted	1,293,686	60,051
116	Putnam	0	103,500	0	88,699	0	Not impacted	192,199	192,199
117	Redding	131,490	16,200	21,000	0	0	Not impacted	168,690	37,200
118	Ridgefield	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	0	Not impacted	4,700	4,700
119	Rocky Hill	2,375,588	342,333	0	0	210,120	Not impacted	2,928,041	552,453
120	Roxbury	169,685	0	0	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	183,331	Less than 6 students

Table II.1 Estimated Net Fiscal Impact of SB 948 by Operator/Town, FY 23

Operator/Town		NET CHANGE BY PROGRAM (In Dollars)						TOTAL NET CHANGE	TOTAL Excluding ECS
Code	Name	ECS	RESC Magnets	BOE Magnets	Vo Ag	Open Choice	State Charter Schools		
121	Salem	0	49,145	39,348	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	108,962	108,962
122	Salisbury	38,840	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	38,840	0
123	Scotland	0	Less than 6 students	56,628	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	114,843	114,843
124	Seymour	1,632,649	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	143,283	0	Not impacted	1,804,251	171,602
125	Sharon	21,929	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	21,929	0
126	Shelton	1,226,526	159,769	258,000	293,389	0	Not impacted	1,937,684	711,158
127	Sherman	0	0	0	40,938	0	Not impacted	40,938	40,938
128	Simsbury	1,303,174	229,587	0	Less than 6 students	1,293,424	Not impacted	2,853,476	1,550,303
129	Somers	0	103,089	0	0	223,668	Not impacted	326,757	326,757
130	Southbury	3,652,975	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	143,283	0	Not impacted	3,805,725	152,750
131	Southington	123,654	542,617	0	(311,193)	1,083,672	Not impacted	1,438,750	1,315,096
132	South Windsor	0	499,536	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	1,217,232	Not impacted	1,747,525	1,747,525
133	Sprague	201,574	Less than 6 students	50,946	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	282,176	80,602
134	Stafford	0	123,395	Less than 6 students	47,761	0	Not impacted	178,086	178,086
135	Stamford	6,558,571	Less than 6 students	(672,952)	(609,037)	0	Not impacted	5,279,282	(1,279,289)
136	Sterling	0	58,850	77,220	129,637	0	Not impacted	265,707	265,707
137	Stonington	0	281,306	90,261	40,938	0	Not impacted	412,505	412,505
138	Stratford	6,102,239	558,326	528,000	351,385	0	Not impacted	7,539,950	1,437,711
139	Suffield	0	150,174	0	(200,501)	488,996	Not impacted	438,669	438,669
140	Thomaston	0	Less than 6 students	0	150,106	0	Not impacted	155,359	155,359
141	Thompson	0	85,440	0	170,575	0	Not impacted	256,015	256,015
142	Tolland	0	162,507	0	40,938	100,376	Not impacted	303,821	303,821
143	Torrington	5,692,461	596,425	Less than 6 students	839,229	0	Not impacted	7,131,330	1,438,869
144	Trumbull	0	210,600	192,000	445,236	528,519	Not impacted	1,376,356	1,376,356
145	Union	0	0	0	0	0	Not impacted	0	0

Table II.1 Estimated Net Fiscal Impact of SB 948 by Operator/Town, FY 23

Operator/Town		NET CHANGE BY PROGRAM (In Dollars)						TOTAL NET CHANGE	TOTAL Excluding ECS
Code	Name	ECS	RESC Magnets	BOE Magnets	Vo Ag	Open Choice	State Charter Schools		
146	Vernon	3,058,056	579,496	24,255	(238,093)	Less than 6 students	Not impacted	3,436,261	378,205
147	Voluntown	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	47,761	0	Not impacted	80,336	80,336
148	Wallingford	0	340,917	0	(518,661)	Less than 6 students	Not impacted	(131,221)	(131,221)
149	Warren	134,225	Less than 6 students	0	0	0	Not impacted	139,478	Less than 6 students
150	Washington	257,722	Less than 6 students	0	0	0	Not impacted	262,835	Less than 6 students
151	Waterbury	40,750,532	521,525	(981,368)	252,451	0	Not impacted	40,543,140	(207,392)
152	Waterford	11,098	649,100	155,521	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	822,542	811,444
153	Watertown	1,043,490	Less than 6 students	0	259,274	0	Not impacted	1,313,673	270,183
154	Westbrook	10,899	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	40,032	29,133
155	West Hartford	2,525,727	628,734	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	2,349,864	Not impacted	5,510,290	2,984,563
156	West Haven	7,857,765	171,884	0	327,504	0	Not impacted	8,357,153	499,388
157	Weston	0	Less than 6 students	0	0	318,651	Not impacted	324,118	324,118
158	Westport	77,377	0	0	0	772,984	Not impacted	850,360	772,984
159	Wethersfield	3,415,840	620,696	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	1,216,483	Not impacted	5,276,953	1,861,113
160	Willington	0	41,714	Less than 6 students	0	0	Not impacted	46,862	46,862
161	Wilton	0	Less than 6 students	0	0	0	Not impacted	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students
162	Winchester	0	106,914	0	211,513	0	Not impacted	318,427	318,427
163	Windham	6,133,969	489,354	(1,071,843)	463,964	0	Not impacted	6,015,444	(118,525)
164	Windsor	0	1,436,626	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Not impacted	1,451,414	1,451,414
165	Windsor Locks	(56,086)	317,922	0	218,336	801,368	Not impacted	1,281,539	1,337,626
166	Wolcott	0	Less than 6 students	0	54,584	0	Not impacted	80,231	80,231
167	Woodbridge	0	60,137	0	Less than 6 students	177,355	Not impacted	244,315	244,315
168	Woodbury	1,979,916	0	Less than 6 students	0	0	Not impacted	1,981,916	Less than 6 students

Table II.1 Estimated Net Fiscal Impact of SB 948 by Operator/Town, FY 23

Operator/Town		NET CHANGE BY PROGRAM (In Dollars)						TOTAL NET CHANGE	TOTAL Excluding ECS
Code	Name	ECS	RESC Magnets	BOE Magnets	Vo Ag	Open Choice	State Charter Schools		
169	Woodstock	0	Less than 6 students	0	61,407	0	Not impacted	82,207	82,207
201	Region 1	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	(696,588)	0	Not impacted	(696,588)	(696,588)
204	Region 4	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	0	0	Not impacted	0	0
205	Region 5	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	0	172,270	Not impacted	172,270	172,270
206	Region 6	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	(41,565)	0	Not impacted	(41,565)	(41,565)
207	Region 7	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	(163,234)	0	Not impacted	(163,234)	(163,234)
208	Region 8	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	0	0	Not impacted	0	0
209	Region 9	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	0	Less than 6 students	Not impacted	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students
210	Region 10	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	0	0	Not impacted	0	0
211	Region 11	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	0	0	Not impacted	0	0
212	Region 12	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	(69,084)	0	Not impacted	(69,084)	(69,084)
213	Region 13	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	0	0	Not impacted	0	0
214	Region 14	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	(369,308)	0	Not impacted	(369,308)	(369,308)
215	Region 15	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	0	0	Not impacted	0	0
216	Region 16	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	0	0	Not impacted	0	0
217	Region 17	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	0	0	Not impacted	0	0
218	Region 18	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	0	0	Not impacted	0	0
219	Region 19	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	55,717	0	Not impacted	55,717	55,717
241	CREC	Not impacted	5,337,080	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	5,337,080	5,337,080

Table II.1 Estimated Net Fiscal Impact of SB 948 by Operator/Town, FY 23

Operator/Town		NET CHANGE BY PROGRAM (In Dollars)						TOTAL NET CHANGE	TOTAL Excluding ECS
Code	Name	ECS	RESC Magnets	BOE Magnets	Vo Ag	Open Choice	State Charter Schools		
242	EDVANCE	Not impacted	0	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	0	0
243	CES	Not impacted	739,626	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	739,626	739,626
244	ACES	Not impacted	927,988	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	927,988	927,988
245	LEARN	Not impacted	1,780,569	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	1,780,569	1,780,569
253	EASTCONN	Not impacted	(235,632)	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	(235,632)	(235,632)
999	Goodwin	Not impacted	363,416	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	363,416	363,416
261	Jumoke	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	1,357,763	1,357,763	1,357,763
263	Odyssey	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	540,806	540,806	540,806
264	Integrated Day	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	492,669	492,669	492,669
265	ISAAC	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	692,979	692,979	692,979
268	Common Ground	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	453,177	453,177	453,177
269	Bridge	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	713,805	713,805	713,805
270	Side By Side	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	460,250	460,250	460,250
272	Explorations	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	209,544	209,544	209,544
279	Amistad	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	2,931,258	2,931,258	2,931,258
280	New Beginnings	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	1,494,217	1,494,217	1,494,217
283	Park City Prep	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	1,068,940	1,068,940	1,068,940
285	Achievement First Bridgeport	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	2,865,635	2,865,635	2,865,635

Table II.1 Estimated Net Fiscal Impact of SB 948 by Operator/Town, FY 23

Operator/Town		NET CHANGE BY PROGRAM (In Dollars)						TOTAL NET CHANGE	TOTAL Excluding ECS
Code	Name	ECS	RESC Magnets	BOE Magnets	Vo Ag	Open Choice	State Charter Schools		
286	Highville	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	1,088,489	1,088,489	1,088,489
288	Achievement First Hartford	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	3,302,700	3,302,700	3,302,700
289	Elm City College Prep	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	1,901,123	1,901,123	1,901,123
290	Brass City	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	653,388	653,388	653,388
294	Great Oaks	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	1,514,847	1,514,847	1,514,847
295	Booker T. Washington	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	1,597,695	1,597,695	1,597,695
296	Stamford Charter School for Excellence	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	839,136	839,136	839,136
297	Capital Prep	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	Not impacted	2,050,250	2,050,250	2,050,250

Section III. Education Cost Sharing (ECS)

Current law: Underfunded towns gradually increase to full funding, reached in FY 28. Overfunded towns are held harmless from losses in FY 23 (then resume phase-out in FY 24 to reach full funding in FY 30).

Proposal: Fully fund underfunded towns immediately; same as current law for all other towns. Additionally, Open Choice students are removed from the ECS calculations.

Proposal Results (Estimated)

- **General Fund impact**: Cost increase of \$262.6 million (12 percent) because additional grant funding would be needed (see Table III.1)
- **Town impact**:
 - FY 23 revenue (grant) increase of \$262.6 million due to fully funding underfunded towns
 - The increase is to the 86 towns considered underfunded by the formula, which are fully funded in FY 23 under the proposal.⁹ Of these towns, 26 are Alliance Districts, which would be required to use all of the increased funds on the implementation of Alliance District plans.
 - The overfunded towns, and those Alliance Districts that are held harmless from ECS losses, experience no changes.
 - Decrease of **(\$24.7 million)**, or **(1 percent)** in the full funding level (across all towns) due to the removal of Open Choice students from the ECS formula (see Table III.2)

Table III.1 compares the current law and proposal estimates for each town, including the percent change under the proposal. Table III.2 shows projected full funding amounts under current law compared to the proposal. Full funding would occur: (1) under current law, in FY 28 for underfunded towns and FY 30 for overfunded towns; and (2) under the proposal, in FY 23 for underfunded towns and FY 30 for overfunded towns.

Table III.1 ECS Grant Estimates: Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Town	Current Law Est.	Proposal Est.	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law	Percent Change
Andover	2,004,782	2,004,782	0	0%
Ansonia	19,013,419	21,681,271	2,667,852	14%
Ashford	3,459,062	3,459,062	0	0%
Avon	584,016	584,016	0	0%
Barkhamsted	1,494,242	1,494,242	0	0%
Beacon Falls	4,009,839	4,540,491	530,652	13%

⁹ One additional "underfunded" town, Windsor Locks, would experience a decrease (from both the current law estimate and FY 22) in order to reach full funding, due to ECS formula mechanics.

Table III.1 ECS Grant Estimates: Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Town	Current Law Est.	Proposal Est.	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law	Percent Change
Berlin	5,870,600	5,870,600	0	0%
Bethany	1,764,574	1,764,574	0	0%
Bethel	7,880,729	7,880,729	0	0%
Bethlehem	1,160,803	1,409,958	249,155	21%
Bloomfield	7,035,479	7,756,899	721,420	10%
Bolton	2,683,216	2,683,216	0	0%
Bozrah	1,190,095	1,190,095	0	0%
Branford	2,923,529	3,731,076	807,547	28%
Bridgeport	191,769,881	206,145,405	14,375,524	7%
Bridgewater	53,312	166,202	112,890	212%
Bristol	49,043,541	53,293,816	4,250,275	9%
Brookfield	962,317	962,317	0	0%
Brooklyn	6,926,095	6,926,095	0	0%
Burlington	4,081,237	5,165,818	1,084,581	27%
Canaan	125,752	125,752	0	0%
Canterbury	4,004,835	4,004,835	0	0%
Canton	3,599,100	4,217,692	618,592	17%
Chaplin	1,652,147	1,652,147	0	0%
Cheshire	9,517,126	10,302,873	785,747	8%
Chester	890,514	1,225,349	334,835	38%
Clinton	5,192,084	5,192,084	0	0%
Colchester	12,040,218	12,040,218	0	0%
Colebrook	403,912	403,912	0	0%
Columbia	2,316,189	2,316,189	0	0%
Cornwall	13,413	27,465	14,052	105%
Coventry	7,952,911	7,952,911	0	0%
Cromwell	5,235,380	5,765,184	529,804	10%
Danbury	42,841,061	55,351,847	12,510,786	29%
Darien	472,781	551,376	78,595	17%
Deep River	1,691,397	1,862,150	170,753	10%
Derby	9,502,029	11,240,644	1,738,615	18%
Durham	3,165,733	3,165,733	0	0%
Eastford	947,176	947,176	0	0%
East Granby	1,461,225	1,543,208	81,983	6%
East Haddam	3,555,957	3,555,957	0	0%
East Hampton	6,902,775	6,902,775	0	0%
East Hartford	58,834,192	70,294,099	11,459,907	19%
East Haven	20,012,663	20,804,678	792,015	4%
East Lyme	6,076,507	6,076,507	0	0%

Table III.1 ECS Grant Estimates: Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Town	Current Law Est.	Proposal Est.	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law	Percent Change
Easton	201,508	316,161	114,653	57%
East Windsor	5,669,122	5,669,122	0	0%
Ellington	10,142,875	10,566,166	423,291	4%
Enfield	30,220,635	31,998,833	1,778,198	6%
Essex	143,383	289,621	146,238	102%
Fairfield	1,127,109	1,170,594	43,485	4%
Farmington	843,467	843,467	0	0%
Franklin	736,256	736,256	0	0%
Glastonbury	5,379,255	5,379,255	0	0%
Goshen	167,983	503,683	335,700	200%
Granby	5,278,314	5,278,314	0	0%
Greenwich	579,413	1,091,728	512,315	88%
Griswold	10,974,205	11,235,934	261,729	2%
Groton	25,040,045	25,040,045	0	0%
Guilford	1,766,084	1,766,084	0	0%
Haddam	2,367,701	3,721,214	1,353,513	57%
Hamden	32,556,320	39,775,642	7,219,322	22%
Hampton	1,058,408	1,058,408	0	0%
Hartford	216,970,361	225,120,354	8,149,993	4%
Hartland	1,071,722	1,071,722	0	0%
Harwinton	2,434,109	2,746,850	312,741	13%
Hebron	5,997,693	5,997,693	0	0%
Kent	32,531	50,574	18,043	55%
Killingly	15,574,402	15,574,402	0	0%
Killingworth	1,691,951	2,289,383	597,432	35%
Lebanon	4,578,589	4,578,589	0	0%
Ledyard	11,492,516	11,492,516	0	0%
Lisbon	2,899,516	2,899,516	0	0%
Litchfield	1,301,152	1,518,364	217,212	17%
Lyme	120,186	349,964	229,778	191%
Madison	395,466	395,466	0	0%
Manchester	41,483,882	50,636,856	9,152,974	22%
Mansfield	9,459,722	9,459,722	0	0%
Marlborough	2,902,339	2,902,339	0	0%
Meriden	69,214,473	81,586,450	12,371,977	18%
Middlebury	1,220,439	2,669,748	1,449,309	119%
Middlefield	1,865,761	2,282,783	417,022	22%
Middletown	23,157,951	27,777,386	4,619,435	20%
Milford	9,673,235	9,673,235	0	0%

Table III.1 ECS Grant Estimates: Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Town	Current Law Est.	Proposal Est.	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law	Percent Change
Monroe	5,272,935	5,272,935	0	0%
Montville	12,909,262	13,587,723	678,461	5%
Morris	156,444	330,098	173,654	111%
Naugatuck	33,495,068	37,712,176	4,217,108	13%
New Britain	103,923,634	125,783,716	21,860,082	21%
New Canaan	409,331	490,433	81,102	20%
New Fairfield	3,481,120	3,481,120	0	0%
New Hartford	2,913,010	2,913,010	0	0%
New Haven	165,414,583	176,356,744	10,942,161	7%
Newington	14,533,454	16,570,797	2,037,343	14%
New London	31,016,663	37,954,056	6,937,393	22%
New Milford	11,124,188	11,124,188	0	0%
Newtown	4,495,691	4,495,691	0	0%
Norfolk	34,208	66,550	32,342	95%
North Branford	7,331,325	7,331,325	0	0%
North Canaan	1,781,954	1,781,954	0	0%
North Haven	3,882,583	4,014,937	132,354	3%
North Stonington	2,584,204	2,584,204	0	0%
Norwalk	13,811,965	17,182,692	3,370,727	24%
Norwich	42,089,424	50,703,916	8,614,492	20%
Old Lyme	502,063	1,481,342	979,279	195%
Old Saybrook	133,492	148,319	14,827	11%
Orange	1,015,498	1,015,498	0	0%
Oxford	3,677,011	3,677,011	0	0%
Plainfield	14,990,047	14,990,047	0	0%
Plainville	11,240,716	12,190,660	949,944	8%
Plymouth	9,802,121	9,802,121	0	0%
Pomfret	2,670,987	2,670,987	0	0%
Portland	4,608,947	4,850,114	241,167	5%
Preston	2,952,496	2,952,496	0	0%
Prospect	5,057,011	6,290,646	1,233,635	24%
Putnam	8,340,282	8,340,282	0	0%
Redding	210,154	341,644	131,490	63%
Ridgefield	568,700	568,700	0	0%
Rocky Hill	5,838,859	8,214,447	2,375,588	41%
Roxbury	85,181	254,866	169,685	199%
Salem	2,525,078	2,525,078	0	0%
Salisbury	31,882	70,722	38,840	122%
Scotland	1,274,671	1,274,671	0	0%

Table III.1 ECS Grant Estimates: Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Town	Current Law Est.	Proposal Est.	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law	Percent Change
Seymour	10,903,136	12,535,785	1,632,649	15%
Sharon	19,583	41,512	21,929	112%
Shelton	7,112,459	8,338,985	1,226,526	17%
Sherman	46,995	46,995	0	0%
Simsbury	6,758,907	8,062,081	1,303,174	19%
Somers	5,692,630	5,692,630	0	0%
Southbury	4,826,151	8,479,126	3,652,975	76%
Southington	20,520,777	20,644,431	123,654	1%
South Windsor	11,408,078	11,408,078	0	0%
Sprague	2,706,832	2,908,406	201,574	7%
Stafford	9,551,487	9,551,487	0	0%
Stamford	16,037,102	22,595,673	6,558,571	41%
Sterling	3,174,585	3,174,585	0	0%
Stonington	1,073,011	1,073,011	0	0%
Stratford	26,319,906	32,422,145	6,102,239	23%
Suffield	6,148,151	6,148,151	0	0%
Thomaston	5,481,226	5,481,226	0	0%
Thompson	7,534,704	7,534,704	0	0%
Tolland	9,105,528	9,105,528	0	0%
Torrington	28,935,077	34,627,538	5,692,461	20%
Trumbull	2,323,541	2,323,541	0	0%
Union	211,728	211,728	0	0%
Vernon	21,119,379	24,177,435	3,058,056	14%
Voluntown	2,117,243	2,117,243	0	0%
Wallingford	20,855,570	20,855,570	0	0%
Warren	64,561	198,786	134,225	208%
Washington	121,715	379,437	257,722	212%
Waterbury	164,909,805	205,660,337	40,750,532	25%
Waterford	328,385	339,483	11,098	3%
Watertown	12,018,836	13,062,326	1,043,490	9%
Westbrook	78,725	89,624	10,899	14%
West Hartford	22,730,297	25,256,024	2,525,727	11%
West Haven	51,930,679	59,788,444	7,857,765	15%
Weston	263,792	263,792	0	0%
Westport	540,122	617,499	77,377	14%
Wethersfield	12,234,644	15,650,484	3,415,840	28%
Willington	3,456,594	3,456,594	0	0%
Wilton	461,796	461,796	0	0%
Winchester	8,024,957	8,024,957	0	0%

Table III.1 ECS Grant Estimates: Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Town	Current Law Est.	Proposal Est.	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law	Percent Change
Windham	31,072,476	37,206,445	6,133,969	20%
Windsor	12,130,392	12,130,392	0	0%
Windsor Locks	5,244,092	5,188,006	(56,086)	-1%
Wolcott	12,387,171	12,387,171	0	0%
Woodbridge	471,575	471,575	0	0%
Woodbury	2,131,754	4,111,670	1,979,916	93%
Woodstock	4,990,532	4,990,532	0	0%
TOTAL	2,191,870,850	2,454,438,748	262,567,898	12%

**Table III.2 ECS Grant Estimates: Full Funding Under Current Law
Compared to Proposal**

Town Name	Current Law Est.	Proposal Est.	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law	Percent Change
Andover	1,798,915	1,798,915	0	0%
Ansonia	21,777,037	21,681,271	(95,766)	0%
Ashford	3,152,597	3,152,597	0	0%
Avon	378,149	371,176	(6,973)	-2%
Barkhamsted	1,387,491	1,387,491	0	0%
Beacon Falls	4,540,491	4,540,491	0	0%
Berlin	5,753,088	5,638,264	(114,824)	-2%
Bethany	1,675,817	1,669,730	(6,087)	0%
Bethel	7,754,386	7,754,386	0	0%
Bethlehem	1,409,958	1,409,958	0	0%
Bloomfield	7,765,097	7,756,899	(8,198)	0%
Bolton	2,354,347	2,274,961	(79,386)	-3%
Bozrah	1,041,649	1,041,649	0	0%
Branford	3,770,155	3,731,076	(39,079)	-1%
Bridgeport	207,610,456	206,145,405	(1,465,051)	-1%
Bridgewater	166,202	166,202	0	0%
Bristol	53,309,572	53,293,816	(15,756)	0%
Brookfield	330,971	330,971	0	0%
Brooklyn	6,818,686	6,818,686	0	0%
Burlington	5,165,818	5,165,818	0	0%
Canaan	72,838	72,838	0	0%
Canterbury	3,122,972	3,122,972	0	0%
Canton	4,338,747	4,217,692	(121,055)	-3%
Chaplin	1,209,822	1,209,822	0	0%
Cheshire	10,345,709	10,302,873	(42,836)	0%
Chester	1,225,349	1,225,349	0	0%
Clinton	3,485,598	3,485,598	0	0%
Colchester	9,846,017	9,846,017	0	0%
Colebrook	349,892	349,892	0	0%
Columbia	1,816,878	1,816,878	0	0%
Cornwall	27,465	27,465	0	0%
Coventry	7,057,738	7,057,738	0	0%
Cromwell	5,870,699	5,765,184	(105,515)	-2%
Danbury	55,351,847	55,351,847	0	0%
Darien	551,376	551,376	0	0%
Deep River	1,862,150	1,862,150	0	0%
Derby	11,295,907	11,240,644	(55,263)	0%
Durham	3,617,456	3,617,456	0	0%

**Table III.2 ECS Grant Estimates: Full Funding Under Current Law
Compared to Proposal**

Town Name	Current Law Est.	Proposal Est.	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law	Percent Change
Eastford	736,571	736,571	0	0%
East Granby	1,584,631	1,543,208	(41,423)	-3%
East Haddam	3,328,317	3,328,317	0	0%
East Hampton	6,418,212	6,416,607	(1,605)	0%
East Hartford	70,394,897	70,294,099	(100,798)	0%
East Haven	20,941,199	20,804,678	(136,521)	-1%
East Lyme	4,466,835	4,466,835	0	0%
Easton	317,332	316,161	(1,171)	0%
East Windsor	5,669,122	5,669,122	0	0%
Ellington	10,734,942	10,566,166	(168,776)	-2%
Enfield	32,309,116	31,998,833	(310,283)	-1%
Essex	289,621	289,621	0	0%
Fairfield	1,175,147	1,170,594	(4,553)	0%
Farmington	498,961	491,355	(7,606)	-2%
Franklin	314,661	314,661	0	0%
Glastonbury	4,871,926	4,849,581	(22,345)	0%
Goshen	503,683	503,683	0	0%
Granby	4,662,695	4,557,267	(105,428)	-2%
Greenwich	1,091,728	1,091,728	0	0%
Griswold	11,235,934	11,235,934	0	0%
Groton	25,040,045	25,040,045	0	0%
Guilford	395,757	395,699	(58)	0%
Haddam	3,721,214	3,721,214	0	0%
Hamden	39,906,183	39,775,642	(130,541)	0%
Hampton	720,823	720,823	0	0%
Hartford	242,032,569	225,120,354	(16,912,215)	-7%
Hartland	667,510	667,510	0	0%
Harwinton	2,746,850	2,746,850	0	0%
Hebron	5,043,435	5,043,435	0	0%
Kent	50,574	50,574	0	0%
Killingly	15,574,402	15,574,402	0	0%
Killingworth	2,289,383	2,289,383	0	0%
Lebanon	3,392,091	3,392,091	0	0%
Ledyard	10,782,174	10,782,174	0	0%
Lisbon	2,140,620	2,140,620	0	0%
Litchfield	1,518,364	1,518,364	0	0%
Lyme	349,964	349,964	0	0%
Madison	307,074	307,074	0	0%

**Table III.2 ECS Grant Estimates: Full Funding Under Current Law
Compared to Proposal**

Town Name	Current Law Est.	Proposal Est.	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law	Percent Change
Manchester	50,680,631	50,636,856	(43,775)	0%
Mansfield	9,633,225	9,633,225	0	0%
Marlborough	3,119,753	3,119,753	0	0%
Meriden	81,586,450	81,586,450	0	0%
Middlebury	2,669,748	2,669,748	0	0%
Middlefield	2,282,783	2,282,783	0	0%
Middletown	27,805,974	27,777,386	(28,588)	0%
Milford	8,906,811	8,883,179	(23,632)	0%
Monroe	4,325,959	4,324,983	(976)	0%
Montville	13,587,723	13,587,723	0	0%
Morris	330,098	330,098	0	0%
Naugatuck	37,712,176	37,712,176	0	0%
New Britain	125,926,702	125,783,716	(142,986)	0%
New Canaan	490,433	490,433	0	0%
New Fairfield	2,140,207	2,140,207	0	0%
New Hartford	2,899,423	2,899,423	0	0%
New Haven	178,452,716	176,356,744	(2,095,972)	-1%
Newington	16,751,666	16,570,797	(180,869)	-1%
New London	37,954,056	37,954,056	0	0%
New Milford	10,125,341	10,125,341	0	0%
Newtown	4,341,805	4,341,805	0	0%
Norfolk	66,550	66,550	0	0%
North Branford	6,751,165	6,709,928	(41,237)	-1%
North Canaan	1,670,500	1,670,500	0	0%
North Haven	4,048,765	4,014,937	(33,828)	-1%
North Stonington	2,185,070	2,185,070	0	0%
Norwalk	17,182,692	17,182,692	0	0%
Norwich	50,703,916	50,703,916	0	0%
Old Lyme	1,481,342	1,481,342	0	0%
Old Saybrook	148,319	148,319	0	0%
Orange	943,078	942,355	(723)	0%
Oxford	2,165,987	2,164,133	(1,854)	0%
Plainfield	13,742,734	13,742,734	0	0%
Plainville	12,486,188	12,190,660	(295,528)	-2%
Plymouth	9,403,561	9,403,561	0	0%
Pomfret	2,333,823	2,333,823	0	0%
Portland	4,969,664	4,850,114	(119,550)	-2%

**Table III.2 ECS Grant Estimates: Full Funding Under Current Law
Compared to Proposal**

Town Name	Current Law Est.	Proposal Est.	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law	Percent Change
Preston	2,548,727	2,548,727	0	0%
Prospect	6,290,646	6,290,646	0	0%
Putnam	8,340,282	8,340,282	0	0%
Redding	341,798	341,644	(154)	0%
Ridgefield	552,057	552,057	0	0%
Rocky Hill	8,237,356	8,214,447	(22,909)	0%
Roxbury	254,866	254,866	0	0%
Salem	1,789,731	1,789,731	0	0%
Salisbury	70,722	70,722	0	0%
Scotland	1,035,715	1,035,715	0	0%
Seymour	12,538,225	12,535,785	(2,440)	0%
Sharon	41,512	41,512	0	0%
Shelton	8,343,014	8,338,985	(4,029)	0%
Sherman	46,121	46,121	0	0%
Simsbury	8,233,291	8,062,081	(171,210)	-2%
Somers	4,985,747	4,953,325	(32,422)	-1%
Southbury	8,479,126	8,479,126	0	0%
Southington	20,778,000	20,644,431	(133,569)	-1%
South Windsor	9,485,201	9,383,421	(101,780)	-1%
Sprague	2,908,406	2,908,406	0	0%
Stafford	8,910,933	8,910,933	0	0%
Stamford	22,595,673	22,595,673	0	0%
Sterling	3,015,567	3,015,567	0	0%
Stonington	259,092	259,092	0	0%
Stratford	32,455,690	32,422,145	(33,545)	0%
Suffield	5,944,977	5,885,936	(59,041)	-1%
Thomaston	5,542,986	5,542,986	0	0%
Thompson	7,534,704	7,534,704	0	0%
Tolland	7,194,488	7,183,045	(11,443)	0%
Torrington	34,627,538	34,627,538	0	0%
Trumbull	812,597	809,888	(2,709)	0%
Union	229,553	229,553	0	0%
Vernon	24,190,181	24,177,435	(12,746)	0%
Voluntown	1,535,311	1,535,311	0	0%
Wallingford	21,046,516	21,029,976	(16,540)	0%
Warren	198,786	198,786	0	0%
Washington	379,437	379,437	0	0%
Waterbury	205,716,834	205,660,337	(56,497)	0%

**Table III.2 ECS Grant Estimates: Full Funding Under Current Law
Compared to Proposal**

Town Name	Current Law Est.	Proposal Est.	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law	Percent Change
Waterford	339,483	339,483	0	0%
Watertown	13,062,326	13,062,326	0	0%
Westbrook	89,624	89,624	0	0%
West Hartford	25,506,849	25,256,024	(250,825)	-1%
West Haven	60,067,078	59,788,444	(278,634)	0%
Weston	262,457	260,901	(1,556)	-1%
Westport	621,302	617,499	(3,803)	-1%
Wethersfield	15,858,042	15,650,484	(207,558)	-1%
Willington	3,394,968	3,394,968	0	0%
Wilton	450,075	450,075	0	0%
Winchester	8,024,957	8,024,957	0	0%
Windham	37,206,445	37,206,445	0	0%
Windsor	12,130,392	12,130,392	0	0%
Windsor Locks	5,344,104	5,188,006	(156,098)	-3%
Wolcott	11,753,118	11,753,118	0	0%
Woodbridge	601,881	600,570	(1,311)	0%
Woodbury	4,111,670	4,111,670	0	0%
Woodstock	4,221,853	4,221,853	0	0%
TOTAL	2,440,178,968	2,415,509,519	(24,669,449)	-1%

Section IV. State Charter Schools

Current law: State grants that vary depending on the need level of operator's students; partial phase-in of this method

Proposal: Fully implement same (current law) method

Proposal Results (Estimated)

- **General Fund impact**: Cost increase of \$26.2 million (20 percent) because additional grant funding would be needed (see Table III.1)
- **Individual operator net revenue impact**: Increase of 12 percent to 25 percent
- **Collective operator net revenue impact**: Increase of \$26.2 million (20 percent)
- **Town impact**: None

Table IV.1 compares the current law and proposal estimates for each operator, including the percent change under the proposal. (Because there is no tuition, the grant estimates are the only component of a net fiscal impact calculation.)

**Table IV.1 State Charter Schools Grant Estimates (Same as Net Fiscal Impact):
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

School	Current Law	Proposal	Difference	Percent Change
Achievement First Bridgeport	13,288,958	16,154,593	2,865,635	22%
Achievement First Hartford	14,044,614	17,347,315	3,302,700	24%
Amistad	13,219,646	16,150,905	2,931,258	22%
Booker T. Washington	6,892,004	8,489,699	1,597,695	23%
Brass City	3,870,289	4,523,678	653,388	17%
Bridge	3,362,126	4,075,932	713,805	21%
Capital Prep	9,114,017	11,164,268	2,050,250	22%
Common Ground	2,648,546	3,101,723	453,177	17%
Elm City College Prep	9,168,870	11,069,993	1,901,123	21%
Explorations	1,108,109	1,317,653	209,544	19%
Great Oaks	6,658,683	8,173,530	1,514,847	23%
Highville	5,489,981	6,578,470	1,088,489	20%
Integrated Day	4,142,110	4,634,779	492,669	12%
ISAAC	3,335,470	4,028,449	692,979	21%
Jumoke	8,371,758	9,729,520	1,357,763	16%
New Beginnings	6,078,861	7,573,078	1,494,217	25%
Odyssey	3,885,370	4,426,176	540,806	14%
Park City Prep	4,345,621	5,414,560	1,068,940	25%
Side by Side	2,799,596	3,259,846	460,250	16%
Stamford Charter School for Excellence	6,599,303	7,438,439	839,136	13%
TOTAL	128,423,933	154,652,604	26,228,671	20%

Note: Budgeted student increases are reflected in both current law and proposal estimates for Booker T. Washington and Stamford Charter School for Excellence.

Section V. RESC Magnets

Current law: State grants per-student based mainly on region, and sending towns pay tuition

Proposal: State grants that vary with need level of operator's students; no tuition

Proposal Results (Estimated)

- **General Fund impact**: Cost increase of \$69.8 million (53 percent) because additional grant funding would be needed (see Table V.1)
- **Individual operator net revenue impact**: Change of (5 percent) to 11 percent (see Table V.2) due to grant and tuition changes
- **Collective operator net revenue impact**: Increase of \$8.9 million (5 percent)
- **Town impact**: Savings of \$60.9 million across sending towns due to tuition elimination¹⁰

Table V.1 compares the current law and proposal net fiscal impact estimates for each operator, separately displaying estimated grants and (for current law) tuition. Table V.2 shows the net impacts to RESC magnet operators only, including the percent change for each and the totals across operators.

**Table V.1 RESC Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law			Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns and Received by Operators (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All Students)	
CREC	90,356,390	38,608,623	128,965,013	134,302,093	5,337,080
EDVANCE	0	0	0	0	0
CES	4,594,320	3,019,950	7,614,270	8,353,896	739,626
ACES	11,526,224	8,237,773	19,763,997	20,691,985	927,988
LEARN	10,854,126	5,661,819	16,515,945	18,296,514	1,780,569
EASTCONN	2,626,908	1,942,700	4,569,608	4,333,976	(235,632)
Goodwin	10,193,964	5,056,344	15,250,308	15,613,724	363,416
Andover	0	(46,776)	(46,776)	0	46,776
Ansonia	0	(200,863)	(200,863)	0	200,863
Ashford	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Avon	0	(174,276)	(174,276)	0	174,276

¹⁰ The proposal maintains RESC magnet students in the sending town ECS calculations, so there is no ECS reduction associated with the RESC magnet aspect of the proposal.

**Table V.1 RESC Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law			Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns and Received by Operators (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All Students)	
Barkhamsted	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Beacon Falls	0	0	0	0	0
Berlin	0	(243,966)	(243,966)	0	243,966
Bethany	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Bethel	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Bethlehem	0	0	0	0	0
Bloomfield	0	(1,301,313)	(1,301,313)	0	1,301,313
Bolton	0	(49,375)	(49,375)	0	49,375
Bozrah	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Branford	0	(55,953)	(55,953)	0	55,953
Bridgeport	0	(1,497,217)	(1,497,217)	0	1,497,217
Bridgewater	0	0	0	0	0
Bristol	0	(865,584)	(865,584)	0	865,584
Brookfield	0	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn	0	(82,950)	(82,950)	0	82,950
Burlington	0	(111,240)	(111,240)	0	111,240
Canaan	0	0	0	0	0
Canterbury	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Canton	0	(73,851)	(73,851)	0	73,851
Chaplin	0	(40,290)	(40,290)	0	40,290
Cheshire	0	(122,905)	(122,905)	0	122,905
Chester	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Clinton	0	(33,375)	(33,375)	0	33,375
Colchester	0	(304,755)	(304,755)	0	304,755
Colebrook	0	0	0	0	0
Columbia	0	(33,655)	(33,655)	0	33,655
Cornwall	0	0	0	0	0
Coventry	0	(145,565)	(145,565)	0	145,565
Cromwell	0	(311,234)	(311,234)	0	311,234
Danbury	0	0	0	0	0
Darien	0	0	0	0	0
Deep River	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Derby	0	(77,726)	(77,726)	0	77,726

**Table V.1 RESC Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law			Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns and Received by Operators (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All Students)	
Durham	0	(46,683)	(46,683)	0	46,683
Eastford	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
East Granby	0	(80,340)	(80,340)	0	80,340
East Haddam	0	(81,804)	(81,804)	0	81,804
East Hampton	0	(164,232)	(164,232)	0	164,232
East Hartford	0	(2,499,278)	(2,499,278)	0	2,499,278
East Haven	0	(78,465)	(78,465)	0	78,465
East Lyme	0	(322,855)	(322,855)	0	322,855
Easton	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
East Windsor	0	(314,484)	(314,484)	0	314,484
Ellington	0	(306,489)	(306,489)	0	306,489
Enfield	0	(1,248,640)	(1,248,640)	0	1,248,640
Essex	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Fairfield	0	(89,100)	(89,100)	0	89,100
Farmington	0	(237,852)	(237,852)	0	237,852
Franklin	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Glastonbury	0	(661,566)	(661,566)	0	661,566
Goshen	0	0	0	0	0
Granby	0	(106,914)	(106,914)	0	106,914
Greenwich	0	0	0	0	0
Griswold	0	(92,333)	(92,333)	0	92,333
Groton	0	(1,169,641)	(1,169,641)	0	1,169,641
Guilford	0	(66,177)	(66,177)	0	66,177
Haddam	0	(34,878)	(34,878)	0	34,878
Hamden	0	(1,536,727)	(1,536,727)	0	1,536,727
Hampton	0	(69,643)	(69,643)	0	69,643
Hartford	0	(19,066,864)	(19,066,864)	0	19,066,864
Hartland	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Harwinton	0	(49,440)	(49,440)	0	49,440
Hebron	0	(108,124)	(108,124)	0	108,124

**Table V.1 RESC Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law			Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns and Received by Operators (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All Students)	
Kent	0	0	0	0	0
Killingly	0	(264,950)	(264,950)	0	264,950
Killingworth	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Lebanon	0	(79,595)	(79,595)	0	79,595
Ledyard	0	(314,128)	(314,128)	0	314,128
Lisbon	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Litchfield	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Lyme	0	0	0	0	0
Madison	0	(65,604)	(65,604)	0	65,604
Manchester	0	(2,509,242)	(2,509,242)	0	2,509,242
Mansfield	0	(84,813)	(84,813)	0	84,813
Marlborough	0	(106,901)	(106,901)	0	106,901
Meriden	0	(3,455,991)	(3,455,991)	0	3,455,991
Middlebury	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Middlefield	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Middletown	0	(876,132)	(876,132)	0	876,132
Milford	0	(177,510)	(177,510)	0	177,510
Monroe	0	(59,400)	(59,400)	0	59,400
Montville	0	(331,067)	(331,067)	0	331,067
Morris	0	0	0	0	0
Naugatuck	0	(73,734)	(73,734)	0	73,734
New Britain	0	(2,692,545)	(2,692,545)	0	2,692,545
New Canaan	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
New Fairfield	0	0	0	0	0
New Hartford	0	(106,257)	(106,257)	0	106,257
New Haven	0	(990,980)	(990,980)	0	990,980
Newington	0	(407,724)	(407,724)	0	407,724
New London	0	(1,872,591)	(1,872,591)	0	1,872,591
New Milford	0	0	0	0	0
Newtown	0	(54,603)	(54,603)	0	54,603
Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0

**Table V.1 RESC Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law			Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns and Received by Operators (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All Students)	
North Branford	0	(38,269)	(38,269)	0	38,269
North Canaan	0	0	0	0	0
North Haven	0	(92,963)	(92,963)	0	92,963
North Stonington	0	(43,690)	(43,690)	0	43,690
Norwalk	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Norwich	0	(426,516)	(426,516)	0	426,516
Old Lyme	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Old Saybrook	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Orange	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Oxford	0	(99,689)	(99,689)	0	99,689
Plainfield	0	(225,370)	(225,370)	0	225,370
Plainville	0	(211,047)	(211,047)	0	211,047
Plymouth	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Pomfret	0	(38,050)	(38,050)	0	38,050
Portland	0	(152,275)	(152,275)	0	152,275
Preston	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Prospect	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Putnam	0	(103,500)	(103,500)	0	103,500
Redding	0	(16,200)	(16,200)	0	16,200
Ridgefield	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Rocky Hill	0	(342,333)	(342,333)	0	342,333
Roxbury	0	0	0	0	0
Salem	0	(49,145)	(49,145)	0	49,145
Salisbury	0	0	0	0	0
Scotland	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Seymour	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Sharon	0	0	0	0	0
Shelton	0	(159,769)	(159,769)	0	159,769
Sherman	0	0	0	0	0

**Table V.1 RESC Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law			Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns and Received by Operators (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All Students)	
Simsbury	0	(229,587)	(229,587)	0	229,587
Somers	0	(103,089)	(103,089)	0	103,089
Southbury	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Southington	0	(542,617)	(542,617)	0	542,617
South Windsor	0	(499,536)	(499,536)	0	499,536
Sprague	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Stafford	0	(123,395)	(123,395)	0	123,395
Stamford	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Sterling	0	(58,850)	(58,850)	0	58,850
Stonington	0	(281,306)	(281,306)	0	281,306
Stratford	0	(558,326)	(558,326)	0	558,326
Suffield	0	(150,174)	(150,174)	0	150,174
Thomaston	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Thompson	0	(85,440)	(85,440)	0	85,440
Tolland	0	(162,507)	(162,507)	0	162,507
Torrington	0	(596,425)	(596,425)	0	596,425
Trumbull	0	(210,600)	(210,600)	0	210,600
Union	0	0	0	0	0
Vernon	0	(579,496)	(579,496)	0	579,496
Voluntown	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Wallingford	0	(340,917)	(340,917)	0	340,917
Warren	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Washington	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Waterbury	0	(521,525)	(521,525)	0	521,525
Waterford	0	(649,100)	(649,100)	0	649,100
Watertown	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Westbrook	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
West Hartford	0	(628,734)	(628,734)	0	628,734
West Haven	0	(171,884)	(171,884)	0	171,884
Weston	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Westport	0	0	0	0	0

**Table V.1 RESC Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law			Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns and Received by Operators (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All Students)	
Wethersfield	0	(620,696)	(620,696)	0	620,696
Willington	0	(41,714)	(41,714)	0	41,714
Wilton	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Winchester	0	(106,914)	(106,914)	0	106,914
Windham	0	(489,354)	(489,354)	0	489,354
Windsor	0	(1,436,626)	(1,436,626)	0	1,436,626
Windsor Locks	0	(317,922)	(317,922)	0	317,922
Wolcott	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Woodbridge	0	(60,137)	(60,137)	0	60,137
Woodbury	0	0	0	0	0
Woodstock	0	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students

Note: Per student privacy requirements, amounts have been suppressed when a town sends between 1 and 5 (inclusive) students to RESC magnet schools. As the amount of per-student tuition varies among these schools, and is lower for part-time programs, the threshold for suppression differs depending on the schools attended.

**Table V.2 RESC Magnet Operator Net Revenue Estimates: Current Law
Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law	Proposal	Difference	Percent Change
CREC	128,965,013	134,302,093	5,337,080	4%
EDVANCE	0	0	0	Not applic.
CES	7,614,270	8,353,896	739,626	10%
ACES	19,763,997	20,691,985	927,988	5%
LEARN	16,515,945	18,296,514	1,780,569	11%
EASTCONN	4,569,608	4,333,976	(235,632)	-5%
Goodwin	15,250,308	15,613,724	363,416	2%
TOTAL	192,679,141	201,592,188	8,913,047	5%

Section VI. Board of Education-Operated (BOE) Magnets

Current law: State grants per-student based mainly on region (with no grant dollars for in-district students in the Sheff region), and sending towns pay tuition for some schools

Proposal: State grants that vary depending on where students reside (sending towns) and the level of student need in each sending town; no grants for in-district students and no tuition

Proposal Results (Estimated)

- **General Fund impact**: Savings of **(\$1.1 million) (1 percent)** because less grant funding would be needed (see Table VI.1)
- **Individual operator net revenue impact**: Change of **(32 percent)** to 17 percent due to grant and tuition changes (see Table VI.2)
- **Collective operator net revenue impact**: Decrease of **(\$5.9 million) (4 percent)**
- **Town impact**: Net revenue impacts of -
 - Decrease of **(\$5.8 million)** collectively for towns that operate magnets and currently charge tuition
 - Decrease of **(\$158,700)** collectively for towns that operate magnets and do not charge tuition
 - Savings of \$4.8 million across non-operator towns due to the elimination of tuition¹¹

Table VI.1 compares the current law and proposal net fiscal impact estimates for each town, separately displaying estimated grants and (for current law) tuition. Table VI.2 shows the net impacts to BOE magnet operators only, including the percent change for each and the totals across operators.

**Table VI.1 BOE-Operated Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Town	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All students)	
Andover	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Ansonia	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Ashford	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students

¹¹ The proposal maintains BOE magnet students in the sending town ECS calculations, so there is no ECS reduction associated with the BOE magnet aspect of the proposal.

**Table VI.1 BOE-Operated Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Town	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All students)	
Avon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barkhamsted	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beacon Falls	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berlin	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Bethany	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bethel	0	(50,000)	0	(50,000)	0	50,000
Bethlehem	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bloomfield	5,019,755	Less than 6 students	0	5,009,360	5,113,544	104,184
Bolton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bozrah	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Branford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bridgeport	7,158,474	0	1,356,000	8,514,474	6,200,264	(2,314,210)
Bridgewater	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bristol	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brookfield	0	(84,000)	0	(84,000)	0	84,000
Brooklyn	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Burlington	0	0	0	0	0	0
Canaan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Canterbury	0	(96,071)	0	(96,071)	0	96,071
Canton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chaplin	0	(108,108)	0	(108,108)	0	108,108
Cheshire	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chester	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colchester	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Colebrook	0	0	0	0	0	0
Columbia	0	(108,108)	0	(108,108)	0	108,108
Cornwall	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coventry	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Cromwell	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Danbury	1,646,109	Less than 6 students	254,000	1,897,109	1,585,764	(311,345)
Darien	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deep River	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students

**Table VI.1 BOE-Operated Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Town	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All students)	
Derby	0	(18,000)	0	(18,000)	0	18,000
Durham	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eastford	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Granby	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
East Haddam	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Hampton	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
East Hartford	1,691,005	(180,180)	0	1,510,825	1,761,238	250,413
East Haven	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Lyme	0	(19,866)	0	(19,866)	0	19,866
Easton	0	(39,000)	0	(39,000)	0	39,000
East Windsor	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Ellington	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enfield	0	0	0	0	0	0
Essex	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fairfield	0	(93,000)	0	(93,000)	0	93,000
Farmington	0	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Glastonbury	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Goshen	0	0	0	0	0	0
Granby	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greenwich	0	0	0	0	0	0
Griswold	0	(36,709)	0	(36,709)	0	36,709
Groton	0	(436,043)	0	(436,043)	0	436,043
Guilford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haddam	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hamden	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hampton	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Hartford	60,889,495	0	647,955	61,537,450	61,683,369	145,919
Hartland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harwinton	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table VI.1 BOE-Operated Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Town	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All students)	
Hebron	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Kent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Killingly	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Killingworth	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lebanon	0	(92,664)	0	(92,664)	0	92,664
Ledyard	0	(193,141)	0	(193,141)	0	193,141
Lisbon	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Litchfield	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lyme	0	0	0	0	0	0
Madison	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manchester	0	(316,998)	0	(316,998)	0	316,998
Mansfield	0	(39,501)	0	(39,501)	0	39,501
Marlborough	0	(21,723)	0	(21,723)	0	21,723
Meriden	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Middlebury	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middlefield	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middletown	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Milford	0	(126,000)	0	(126,000)	0	126,000
Monroe	0	(42,000)	0	(42,000)	0	42,000
Montville	0	(301,790)	0	(301,790)	0	301,790
Morris	0	0	0	0	0	0
Naugatuck	0	(16,000)	0	(16,000)	0	16,000
New Britain	0	(34,650)	0	(34,650)	0	34,650
New Canaan	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Fairfield	0	(34,000)	0	(34,000)	0	34,000
New Hartford	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Haven	33,368,283	0	0	33,368,283	34,189,225	820,942
Newington	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
New London	7,811,766	0	1,835,442	9,647,208	7,439,336	(2,207,872)
New Milford	0	(36,000)	0	(36,000)	0	36,000
Newtown	0	(20,000)	0	(20,000)	0	20,000

**Table VI.1 BOE-Operated Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Town	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All students)	
Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Branford	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Canaan	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Haven	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Stonington	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Norwalk	1,343,493	Less than 6 students	0	1,331,493	1,651,588	320,095
Norwich	0	(468,906)	0	(468,906)	0	468,906
Old Lyme	0	0	0	0	0	0
Old Saybrook	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oxford	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Plainfield	0	(187,625)	0	(187,625)	0	187,625
Plainville	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plymouth	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pomfret	0	0	0	0	0	0
Portland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Preston	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Prospect	0	0	0	0	0	0
Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0
Redding	0	(21,000)	0	(21,000)	0	21,000
Ridgefield	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Rocky Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roxbury	0	0	0	0	0	0
Salem	0	(39,348)	0	(39,348)	0	39,348
Salisbury	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scotland	0	(56,628)	0	(56,628)	0	56,628
Seymour	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Sharon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shelton	0	(258,000)	0	(258,000)	0	258,000

**Table VI.1 BOE-Operated Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Town	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All students)	
Sherman	0	0	0	0	0	0
Simsbury	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southbury	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Southington	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Windsor	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Sprague	0	(50,946)	0	(50,946)	0	50,946
Stafford	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Stamford	8,408,205	0	0	8,408,205	7,735,253	(672,952)
Sterling	0	(77,220)	0	(77,220)	0	77,220
Stonington	0	(90,261)	0	(90,261)	0	90,261
Stratford	0	(528,000)	0	(528,000)	0	528,000
Suffield	0	0	0	0	0	0
Thomaston	0	0	0	0	0	0
Thompson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tolland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Torrington	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Trumbull	0	(192,000)	0	(192,000)	0	192,000
Union	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vernon	0	(24,255)	0	(24,255)	0	24,255
Voluntown	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Wallingford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Warren	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0
Waterbury	8,624,754	Less than 6 students	0	8,617,289	7,635,921	(981,368)
Waterford	0	(155,521)	0	(155,521)	0	155,521
Watertown	0	0	0	0	0	0
Westbrook	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
West Hartford	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
West Haven	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weston	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table VI.1 BOE-Operated Magnet School Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Town	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue (All students)	Tuition Paid by Towns (No such tuition applies to PreK students)	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue (All students)	
Westport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wethersfield	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Willington	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Wilton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Winchester	0	0	0	0	0	0
Windham	2,416,131	0	890,604	3,306,735	2,234,892	(1,071,843)
Windsor	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Windsor Locks	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wolcott	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woodbridge	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woodbury	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Woodstock	0	0	0	0	0	0

Notes:

1. Towns that have Board of Education-operated magnets are highlighted.
2. Per student privacy requirements, amounts have been suppressed when a town sends between 1 and 5 (inclusive) students to the Board of Education-operated magnet schools. As the amount of per-student tuition varies among these schools, the threshold for suppression differs depending on the schools attended.
3. New London's C.B. Jennings elementary school is currently transitioning to an interdistrict magnet school, but was not in October 2019. Consequently, it is not included in the calculations, consistent with the analysis's use of October 2019 data.

**Table VI.2 Board of Education Magnet Operator Net Revenue
Estimates: Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Town	Current Law	Proposal	Difference	Percent Change
Bloomfield	5,009,360	5,113,544	104,184	2%
Bridgeport	8,514,474	6,200,264	(2,314,210)	-27%
Danbury	1,897,109	1,585,764	(311,345)	-16%
East Hartford	1,510,825	1,761,238	250,413	17%
Hartford	61,537,450	61,683,369	145,919	0%
New Haven	33,368,283	34,189,225	820,942	2%
New London	9,647,208	7,439,336	(2,207,872)	-23%
Norwalk	1,331,493	1,651,588	320,095	24%
Stamford	8,408,205	7,735,253	(672,952)	-8%

**Table VI.2 Board of Education Magnet Operator Net Revenue
Estimates: Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Town	Current Law	Proposal	Difference	Percent Change
Waterbury	8,617,289	7,635,921	(981,368)	-11%
Windham	3,306,735	2,234,892	(1,071,843)	-32%
TOTAL	143,148,431	137,230,395	(5,918,036)	-4%

Section VII. Vocational Agriculture

Current law: State grants per-student and sending towns pay tuition (uniform rates)^{12,13}

Proposal: State grants that vary depending on where students reside (sending towns) and the level of student need in each sending town; no grants for in-district students and no tuition

Proposal Results (Estimated)

- **General Fund impact**: Cost increase of \$8.5 million (45 percent) because additional grant funding would be needed (see Table VII.1)
- **Individual operator net revenue impact**: Change of (-98 percent) to 39 percent due to grant and tuition changes (see Table VII.2)
- **Collective operator net revenue impact**: Decrease of (\$3.5 million) (11 percent)
- **Town impact**: Savings of \$12 million across non-operator towns due to the elimination of tuition¹⁴

Table VII.1 compares the current law and proposal net fiscal impact estimates for each town and regional district, separately displaying estimated grants and (for current law) tuition. Table VII.2 shows the net impacts to Vo Ag operators only, including the percent change for each and the totals across operators.

**Table VII.1 Vocational Agriculture Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue	Tuition Paid by Towns	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue	
Andover	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Ansonia	0	(61,407)	0	(61,407)	0	61,407
Ashford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Avon	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Barkhamsted	0	0	0	0	0	0

¹² The tuition rate for full-time programs is uniform (\$6,823) while the rate for part-time students varies. The grant rate is the same for all students (\$5,200).

¹³ While the current grant rate is \$5,200 per student, any funds remaining after the initial calculation are distributed on a pro-rated basis per statute. The current law estimates include this distribution.

¹⁴ The proposal maintains Vo Ag students in the sending town ECS calculations, so there is no ECS reduction associated with the Vo Ag aspect of the proposal.

**Table VII.1 Vocational Agriculture Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue	Tuition Paid by Towns	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue	
Beacon Falls	0	(40,938)	0	(40,938)	0	40,938
Berlin	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Bethany	0	(47,761)	0	(47,761)	0	47,761
Bethel	0	(61,407)	0	(61,407)	0	61,407
Bethlehem	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bloomfield	583,167	0	220,836	804,003	507,611	(296,392)
Bolton	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Bozrah	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Branford	0	(129,637)	0	(129,637)	0	129,637
Bridgeport	2,390,458	(307,035)	1,282,724	3,366,147	4,671,183	1,305,036
Bridgewater	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Bristol	0	(163,752)	0	(163,752)	0	163,752
Brookfield	0	(81,876)	0	(81,876)	0	81,876
Brooklyn	0	(47,761)	0	(47,761)	0	47,761
Burlington	0	(75,053)	0	(75,053)	0	75,053
Canaan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Canterbury	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Canton	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Chaplin	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Cheshire	0	(75,053)	0	(75,053)	0	75,053
Chester	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Clinton	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Colchester	0	(88,699)	0	(88,699)	0	88,699
Colebrook	0	0	0	0	0	0
Columbia	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Cornwall	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coventry	0	(150,106)	0	(150,106)	0	150,106
Cromwell	0	(40,938)	0	(40,938)	0	40,938
Danbury	0	(129,637)	0	(129,637)	0	129,637
Darien	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deep River	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Derby	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Durham	0	(40,938)	0	(40,938)	0	40,938

**Table VII.1 Vocational Agriculture Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue	Tuition Paid by Towns	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue	
Eastford	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
East Granby	0	(61,407)	0	(61,407)	0	61,407
East Haddam	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Hampton	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
East Hartford	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
East Haven	0	(218,336)	0	(218,336)	0	218,336
East Lyme	0	(47,761)	0	(47,761)	0	47,761
Easton	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
East Windsor	0	(68,230)	0	(68,230)	0	68,230
Ellington	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Enfield	0	(197,867)	0	(197,867)	0	197,867
Essex	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Fairfield	0	(416,203)	0	(416,203)	0	416,203
Farmington	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Franklin	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Glastonbury	373,017	0	261,451	634,468	571,621	(62,846)
Goshen	0	0	0	0	0	0
Granby	0	(88,699)	0	(88,699)	0	88,699
Greenwich	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Griswold	0	(40,938)	0	(40,938)	0	40,938
Groton	0	(170,575)	0	(170,575)	0	170,575
Guilford	0	(40,938)	0	(40,938)	0	40,938
Haddam	0	(40,938)	0	(40,938)	0	40,938
Hamden	0	(238,805)	0	(238,805)	0	238,805
Hampton	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Hartford	0	(334,327)	0	(334,327)	0	334,327
Hartland	0	(68,230)	0	(68,230)	0	68,230
Harwinton	0	(88,699)	0	(88,699)	0	88,699
Hebron	0	(102,345)	0	(102,345)	0	102,345
Kent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Killingly	819,586	0	777,822	1,597,408	1,484,816	(112,591)

**Table VII.1 Vocational Agriculture Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue	Tuition Paid by Towns	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue	
Killingworth	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Lebanon	394,032	0	327,504	721,536	599,164	(122,371)
Ledyard	1,066,512	0	846,052	1,912,564	1,686,221	(226,343)
Lisbon	0	(61,407)	0	(61,407)	0	61,407
Litchfield	0	(156,929)	0	(156,929)	0	156,929
Lyme	0	0	0	0	0	0
Madison	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Manchester	0	(163,752)	0	(163,752)	0	163,752
Mansfield	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marlborough	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Meriden	0	(525,371)	0	(525,371)	0	525,371
Middlebury	0	(75,053)	0	(75,053)	0	75,053
Middlefield	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Middletown	577,913	0	252,451	830,364	457,060	(373,303)
Milford	0	(293,389)	0	(293,389)	0	293,389
Monroe	0	(115,991)	0	(115,991)	0	115,991
Montville	0	(115,991)	0	(115,991)	0	115,991
Morris	0	0	0	0	0	0
Naugatuck	0	(191,044)	0	(191,044)	0	191,044
New Britain	0	(61,407)	0	(61,407)	0	61,407
New Canaan	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Fairfield	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
New Hartford	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Haven	1,760,008	0	927,928	2,687,936	1,794,315	(893,621)
Newington	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
New London	0	(163,752)	0	(163,752)	0	163,752
New Milford	0	(115,991)	0	(115,991)	0	115,991
Newtown	0	(95,522)	0	(95,522)	0	95,522
Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Branford	0	(197,867)	0	(197,867)	0	197,867

**Table VII.1 Vocational Agriculture Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue	Tuition Paid by Towns	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue	
North Canaan	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Haven	0	(122,814)	0	(122,814)	0	122,814
North Stonington	0	(68,230)	0	(68,230)	0	68,230
Norwalk	0	(109,168)	0	(109,168)	0	109,168
Norwich	0	(102,345)	0	(102,345)	0	102,345
Old Lyme	0	0	0	0	0	0
Old Saybrook	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Orange	0	(47,761)	0	(47,761)	0	47,761
Oxford	0	(245,628)	0	(245,628)	0	245,628
Plainfield	0	(156,929)	0	(156,929)	0	156,929
Plainville	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Plymouth	0	(143,283)	0	(143,283)	0	143,283
Pomfret	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Portland	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Preston	0	(54,584)	0	(54,584)	0	54,584
Prospect	0	(54,584)	0	(54,584)	0	54,584
Putnam	0	(88,699)	0	(88,699)	0	88,699
Redding	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ridgefield	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rocky Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roxbury	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Salem	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Salisbury	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scotland	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Seymour	0	(143,283)	0	(143,283)	0	143,283
Sharon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shelton	0	(293,389)	0	(293,389)	0	293,389
Sherman	0	(40,938)	0	(40,938)	0	40,938
Simsbury	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Somers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southbury	0	(143,283)	0	(143,283)	0	143,283

**Table VII.1 Vocational Agriculture Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue	Tuition Paid by Towns	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue	
Southington	950,929	0	593,601	1,544,530	1,233,338	(311,193)
South Windsor	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Sprague	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Stafford	0	(47,761)	0	(47,761)	0	47,761
Stamford	730,272	0	115,991	846,263	237,226	(609,037)
Sterling	0	(129,637)	0	(129,637)	0	129,637
Stonington	0	(40,938)	0	(40,938)	0	40,938
Stratford	0	(351,385)	0	(351,385)	0	351,385
Suffield	866,869	0	736,884	1,603,753	1,403,252	(200,501)
Thomaston	0	(150,106)	0	(150,106)	0	150,106
Thompson	0	(170,575)	0	(170,575)	0	170,575
Tolland	0	(40,938)	0	(40,938)	0	40,938
Torrington	0	(839,229)	0	(839,229)	0	839,229
Trumbull	992,959	(467,376)	1,009,804	1,535,388	1,980,624	445,236
Union	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vernon	415,047	0	197,867	612,914	374,821	(238,093)
Voluntown	0	(47,761)	0	(47,761)	0	47,761
Wallingford	1,707,470	0	1,153,087	2,860,557	2,341,896	(518,661)
Warren	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0
Waterbury	0	(252,451)	0	(252,451)	0	252,451
Waterford	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Watertown	0	(259,274)	0	(259,274)	0	259,274
Westbrook	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
West Hartford	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
West Haven	0	(327,504)	0	(327,504)	0	327,504
Weston	0	0	0	0	0	0
Westport	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wethersfield	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Willington	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wilton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Winchester	0	(211,513)	0	(211,513)	0	211,513

**Table VII.1 Vocational Agriculture Net Fiscal Impact Estimates:
Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23**

Operator	Current Law				Proposal Net	Difference: Proposal Net Less Current Law Net (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
	Grant Revenue	Tuition Paid by Towns	Tuition Received by Operators	Net (Revenue is positive; cost is negative)	Grant Revenue	
Windham	0	(463,964)	0	(463,964)	0	463,964
Windsor	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Windsor Locks	0	(218,336)	0	(218,336)	0	218,336
Wolcott	0	(54,584)	0	(54,584)	0	54,584
Woodbridge	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students	0	Less than 6 students
Woodbury	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woodstock	0	(61,407)	0	(61,407)	0	61,407
Region 1	704,003	0	Less than 6 students	710,826	Less than 6 students	(696,588)
Region 4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region 5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region 6	1,334,453	0	1,330,485	2,664,938	2,623,373	(41,565)
Region 7	541,137	0	382,088	923,225	759,991	(163,234)
Region 8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region 9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region 11	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region 12	236,419	0	191,044	427,463	358,379	(69,084)
Region 13	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region 14	1,707,470	0	1,535,175	3,242,645	2,873,337	(369,308)
Region 15	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region 16	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region 17	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region 18	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region 19	672,480	0	655,008	1,327,488	1,383,205	55,717

Notes:

1. Per student privacy requirements, amounts have been suppressed when a town sends between 1 and 5 (inclusive) students to a Vo Ag program. As the amount of per-student tuition varies among part-time programs (and is lower for part-time than full-time), the threshold for suppression differs depending on the schools attended.
2. In the subsequent fiscal year (FY 21), Region 12 substantially increased its Vocational Agriculture enrollment. This change is not reflected in the calculations, consistent with the analysis's use of October 2019 student data.

Table VII.2 Vocational Agriculture Net Revenue Estimates for Program Operators: Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Operator	Current Law	Proposal	Difference	Percent Change
Bloomfield	804,003	507,611	(296,392)	-37%
Bridgeport	3,366,147	4,671,183	1,305,036	39%
Glastonbury	634,468	571,621	(62,846)	-10%
Killingly	1,597,408	1,484,816	(112,591)	-7%
Lebanon	721,536	599,164	(122,371)	-17%
Ledyard	1,912,564	1,686,221	(226,343)	-12%
Middletown	830,364	457,060	(373,303)	-45%
New Haven	2,687,936	1,794,315	(893,621)	-33%
Southington	1,544,530	1,233,338	(311,193)	-20%
Stamford	846,263	237,226	(609,037)	-72%
Suffield	1,603,753	1,403,252	(200,501)	-13%
Trumbull	1,535,388	1,980,624	445,236	29%
Vernon	612,914	374,821	(238,093)	-39%
Wallingford	2,860,557	2,341,896	(518,661)	-18%
Region 1	710,826	Less than 6 students	(696,588)	-98%
Region 6	2,664,938	2,623,373	(41,565)	-2%
Region 7	923,225	759,991	(163,234)	-18%
Region 12	427,463	358,379	(69,084)	-16%
Region 14	3,242,645	2,873,337	(369,308)	-11%
Region 19	1,327,488	1,383,205	55,717	4%
TOTAL	30,854,415	27,355,672	(3,498,743)	-11%

Section VIII. Open Choice

Current law: State grants to receiving districts that vary depending on the share of a district's enrollment that is Open Choice¹⁵

Proposal: State grants to receiving districts that vary depending on where students reside (sending towns) and the level of student need in each sending town

Proposal Results (Estimated)

- **General Fund impact**: Cost increase of \$29.6 million (180 percent) because additional grant funding would be needed (see Table VIII.1)
- **Individual operator net revenue impact**: Increase of 90 percent to 418 percent due to grant changes (see Table VIII.2)
- **Collective operator net revenue impact**: Increase of \$29.6 million (180 percent)
- **Town impact**: See ECS section

Table VIII.1 compares the current law and proposal net fiscal impact estimates for each town and regional district. (Because there is no tuition, the grant estimates are the only component of a net impact calculation.) Table VIII.2 shows the net impacts to program operators (districts that receive Open Choice students), including the percent change for each and the totals across operators.

Table VIII.1 Open Choice Grant Estimates (Same as Net Fiscal Impact): Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Operator	Current Law	Proposal	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
Andover	0	0	0
Ansonia	21,000	102,415	81,415
Ashford	0	0	0
Avon	749,958	1,881,187	1,131,229
Barkhamsted	0	0	0
Beacon Falls	0	0	0
Berlin	975,562	1,850,093	874,531
Bethany	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students
Bethel	0	0	0
Bethlehem	0	0	0
Bloomfield	0	0	0

¹⁵ There is also a bonus portion of the grant for those towns that have a school enrolling at least ten program students.

Table VIII.1 Open Choice Grant Estimates (Same as Net Fiscal Impact): Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Operator	Current Law	Proposal	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
Bolton	418,098	792,897	374,799
Bozrah	0	0	0
Branford	248,520	877,840	629,320
Bridgeport	99,138	414,162	315,024
Bridgewater	0	0	0
Bristol	0	0	0
Brookfield	0	0	0
Brooklyn	0	0	0
Burlington	0	0	0
Canaan	0	0	0
Canterbury	0	0	0
Canton	746,018	1,414,777	668,759
Chaplin	0	0	0
Cheshire	106,995	512,073	405,078
Chester	0	0	0
Clinton	0	0	0
Colchester	0	0	0
Colebrook	0	0	0
Columbia	0	0	0
Cornwall	0	0	0
Coventry	0	0	0
Cromwell	655,840	1,243,760	587,920
Danbury	0	0	0
Darien	0	0	0
Deep River	0	0	0
Derby	0	0	0
Durham	0	0	0
Eastford	0	0	0
East Granby	381,969	730,709	348,740
East Haddam	0	0	0
East Hampton	0	0	0
East Hartford	0	0	0
East Haven	54,000	263,352	209,352
East Lyme	0	0	0
Easton	73,980	266,434	192,454

Table VIII.1 Open Choice Grant Estimates (Same as Net Fiscal Impact): Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Operator	Current Law	Proposal	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
East Windsor	524,672	995,008	470,336
Ellington	551,622	1,383,683	832,061
Enfield	483,604	1,803,452	1,319,848
Essex	0	0	0
Fairfield	241,187	1,169,348	928,161
Farmington	818,136	2,052,204	1,234,068
Franklin	0	0	0
Glastonbury	180,120	886,179	706,059
Goshen	0	0	0
Granby	672,236	1,274,854	602,618
Greenwich	0	0	0
Griswold	0	0	0
Groton	0	0	0
Guilford	0	0	0
Haddam	0	0	0
Hamden	0	0	0
Hampton	0	0	0
Hartford	285,300	1,253,494	968,194
Hartland	0	0	0
Harwinton	0	0	0
Hebron	0	0	0
Kent	0	0	0
Killingly	0	0	0
Killingworth	0	0	0
Lebanon	0	0	0
Ledyard	0	0	0
Lisbon	0	0	0
Litchfield	0	0	0
Lyme	0	0	0
Madison	0	0	0
Manchester	0	0	0
Mansfield	0	0	0
Marlborough	0	0	0
Meriden	0	0	0
Middlebury	0	0	0

Table VIII.1 Open Choice Grant Estimates (Same as Net Fiscal Impact): Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Operator	Current Law	Proposal	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
Middlefield	0	0	0
Middletown	0	0	0
Milford	88,972	424,289	335,317
Monroe	0	0	0
Montville	0	0	0
Morris	0	0	0
Naugatuck	0	0	0
New Britain	0	0	0
New Canaan	0	0	0
New Fairfield	0	0	0
New Hartford	0	0	0
New Haven	530,040	2,296,886	1,766,846
Newington	406,624	1,508,059	1,101,435
New London	0	0	0
New Milford	0	0	0
Newtown	0	0	0
Norfolk	0	0	0
North Branford	71,576	336,505	264,929
North Canaan	0	0	0
North Haven	170,316	790,056	619,740
North Stonington	0	0	0
Norwalk	0	0	0
Norwich	0	0	0
Old Lyme	0	0	0
Old Saybrook	0	0	0
Orange	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students
Oxford	0	0	0
Plainfield	0	0	0
Plainville	1,000,156	1,896,734	896,578
Plymouth	0	0	0
Pomfret	0	0	0
Portland	564,282	1,072,743	508,461
Preston	0	0	0
Prospect	0	0	0

Table VIII.1 Open Choice Grant Estimates (Same as Net Fiscal Impact): Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Operator	Current Law	Proposal	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
Putnam	0	0	0
Redding	0	0	0
Ridgefield	0	0	0
Rocky Hill	54,179	264,299	210,120
Roxbury	0	0	0
Salem	0	0	0
Salisbury	0	0	0
Scotland	0	0	0
Seymour	0	0	0
Sharon	0	0	0
Shelton	0	0	0
Sherman	0	0	0
Simsbury	1,442,848	2,736,272	1,293,424
Somers	56,178	279,846	223,668
Southbury	0	0	0
Southington	268,917	1,352,589	1,083,672
South Windsor	446,297	1,663,529	1,217,232
Sprague	0	0	0
Stafford	0	0	0
Stamford	0	0	0
Sterling	0	0	0
Stonington	0	0	0
Stratford	0	0	0
Suffield	179,525	668,521	488,996
Thomaston	0	0	0
Thompson	0	0	0
Tolland	24,000	124,376	100,376
Torrington	0	0	0
Trumbull	137,565	666,084	528,519
Union	0	0	0
Vernon	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students
Voluntown	0	0	0
Wallingford	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students
Warren	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0

Table VIII.1 Open Choice Grant Estimates (Same as Net Fiscal Impact): Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Operator	Current Law	Proposal	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
Waterbury	0	0	0
Waterford	0	0	0
Watertown	0	0	0
Westbrook	0	0	0
West Hartford	868,365	3,218,229	2,349,864
West Haven	0	0	0
Weston	81,000	399,651	318,651
Westport	203,940	976,924	772,984
Wethersfield	447,046	1,663,529	1,216,483
Willington	0	0	0
Wilton	0	0	0
Winchester	0	0	0
Windham	0	0	0
Windsor	0	0	0
Windsor Locks	893,255	1,694,623	801,368
Wolcott	0	0	0
Woodbridge	71,366	248,721	177,355
Woodbury	0	0	0
Woodstock	0	0	0
Region 1	0	0	0
Region 4	0	0	0
Region 5	47,190	219,460	172,270
Region 6	0	0	0
Region 7	0	0	0
Region 8	0	0	0
Region 9	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students
Region 10	0	0	0
Region 11	0	0	0
Region 12	0	0	0
Region 13	0	0	0
Region 14	0	0	0
Region 15	0	0	0
Region 16	0	0	0
Region 17	0	0	0
Region 18	0	0	0

Table VIII.1 Open Choice Grant Estimates (Same as Net Fiscal Impact): Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Operator	Current Law	Proposal	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law (Gain is positive; loss is negative)
Region 19	0	0	0

Notes:

1. Per student privacy requirements, amounts have been suppressed when a town sends between 1 and 5 (inclusive) students to a Vo Ag program. As the amount of per-student tuition varies among part-time programs (and is lower for part-time than full-time), the threshold for suppression differs depending on the schools attended.
2. Beginning in FY 23, up to 50 students each from Danbury and Norwalk may attend schools in surrounding towns per the FY 22 and FY 23 Budget. As the level of participation from potential receiving towns is undetermined, the analysis does not reflect the budgeted expansion. The expansion will increase current law and proposal costs, with proposal costs exceeding current law costs due to the structure of the grant under each scenario.
3. The ECS aspect of the proposal's Open Choice component is included in the ECS section of this analysis (not in this section).

Table VIII.2 Open Choice Net Revenue (Grant) Estimates for Program Operators (Districts that Receive Open Choice Students): Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Operator	Current Law	Proposal	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law (Gain is positive)	Percent Change
Ansonia	21,000	102,415	81,415	388%
Avon	749,958	1,881,187	1,131,229	151%
Berlin	975,562	1,850,093	874,531	90%
Bethany	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students
Bolton	418,098	792,897	374,799	90%
Branford	248,520	877,840	629,320	253%
Bridgeport	99,138	414,162	315,024	318%
Canton	746,018	1,414,777	668,759	90%
Cheshire	106,995	512,073	405,078	379%
Cromwell	655,840	1,243,760	587,920	90%
East Granby	381,969	730,709	348,740	91%
East Haven	54,000	263,352	209,352	388%
Easton	73,980	266,434	192,454	260%

Table VIII.2 Open Choice Net Revenue (Grant) Estimates for Program Operators (Districts that Receive Open Choice Students): Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Operator	Current Law	Proposal	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law (Gain is positive)	Percent Change
East Windsor	524,672	995,008	470,336	90%
Ellington	551,622	1,383,683	832,061	151%
Enfield	483,604	1,803,452	1,319,848	273%
Fairfield	241,187	1,169,348	928,161	385%
Farmington	818,136	2,052,204	1,234,068	151%
Glastonbury	180,120	886,179	706,059	392%
Granby	672,236	1,274,854	602,618	90%
Hartford	285,300	1,253,494	968,194	339%
Milford	88,972	424,289	335,317	377%
New Haven	530,040	2,296,886	1,766,846	333%
Newington	406,624	1,508,059	1,101,435	271%
North Branford	71,576	336,505	264,929	370%
North Haven	170,316	790,056	619,740	364%
Orange	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students
Plainville	1,000,156	1,896,734	896,578	90%
Portland	564,282	1,072,743	508,461	90%
Rocky Hill	54,179	264,299	210,120	388%
Simsbury	1,442,848	2,736,272	1,293,424	90%
Somers	56,178	279,846	223,668	398%
Southington	268,917	1,352,589	1,083,672	403%
South Windsor	446,297	1,663,529	1,217,232	273%
Suffield	179,525	668,521	488,996	272%
Tolland	24,000	124,376	100,376	418%
Trumbull	137,565	666,084	528,519	384%
Vernon	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students
Wallingford	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students
West Hartford	868,365	3,218,229	2,349,864	271%
Weston	81,000	399,651	318,651	393%
Westport	203,940	976,924	772,984	379%
Wethersfield	447,046	1,663,529	1,216,483	272%
Windsor Locks	893,255	1,694,623	801,368	90%
Woodbridge	71,366	248,721	177,355	249%
Region 5	47,190	219,460	172,270	365%
Region 9	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students	Less than 6 students

Table VIII.2 Open Choice Net Revenue (Grant) Estimates for Program Operators (Districts that Receive Open Choice Students): Current Law Compared to Proposal, FY 23

Operator	Current Law	Proposal	Difference: Proposal Less Current Law <i>(Gain is positive)</i>	Percent Change
TOTAL	16,398,592	45,949,596	29,551,004	180%

Notes:

1. Per student privacy requirements, amounts have been suppressed when a town sends between 1 and 5 (inclusive) students to a Vo Ag program. As the amount of per-student tuition varies among part-time programs (and is lower for part-time than full-time), the threshold for suppression differs depending on the schools attended.
2. The ECS aspect of the proposal's Open Choice component is included in the ECS section of this analysis (not in the Open Choice section).

Section IX. CTECS Analysis

Table IX.1 provides a comprehensive list of CTECS expenditures by school. The system serves approximately 11,200 full-time high school students and is the largest high school system in the state. The CTECS are funded as two line items within the SDE, and are not funded using a per pupil based formula. The total system wide expenditures for the CTECS are approximately \$186.8 million, including all state and federal funds. Both Bullard Havens and A.I. Prince exceed \$12 million annually in expenditures. Also included in the table are the per pupil expenditures by school, which range from \$12,427 at H.H. Ellis to \$19,970 at Vinal, with a system wide average of \$16,477.

Table IX.2 provides a system wide demographic breakdown, based on October 1, 2019 enrollment. The table includes a count, by race, for the entire system, as well as a percentage for the system compared with the overall statewide percentage of enrolled public school children.

The individual school breakdown may be found here:

<https://edsight.ct.gov/SASPortal/main.do>

Table IX.1 CTECS FY 21 Expenditures By School

Dept. ID	Program Description	Total (\$) FY21 Spent	Per Pupil Cost (\$)
SDE64301	CTHSS Superintendent	824,462	
SDE64305	Trade/ Academic Curriculum & Instruction	10,300,997	
SDE64310	Student Services	1,097,379	
SDE64315	Data Management, Nutrition & School Meals	3,908,960	
SDE64320	Adult Education & Systems Support	645,161	
SDE64326	Ella T Grasso Southeastern	8,814,439	15,250
SDE64327	Platt	10,940,303	13,277
SDE64328	Bullard Havens	12,389,258	14,963
SDE64329	Henry Abbott	9,402,545	13,187
SDE64330	H.H. Ellis	8,910,454	12,427
SDE64331	Eli Whitney	9,868,029	15,840
SDE64332	A.I. Prince	12,144,450	15,550
SDE64333	Howell Cheney	9,305,318	13,725
SDE64334	Enfield Satellite	0	0
SDE64335	H.C. Wilcox	11,147,371	14,255
SDE64336	Vinal	8,087,695	19,970
SDE64337	E.C. Goodwin	10,753,865	15,885
SDE64338	Norwich	10,121,088	14,862
SDE64339	J.M. Wright	7,286,365	16,264
SDE64340	Oliver Wolcott	8,944,115	14,130
SDE64341	W.F. Kaynor	11,083,873	13,855
SDE64342	Windham	8,016,526	16,771
SDE64343	Emmett O'Brien	9,004,251	13,012
SDE64344	Bristol Tech Ed Center	2,499,365	
SDE64345	Stratford School for Aviation Maintenance Technicians	588,808	
SDE64346	CT Aero Tech School for Aviation Maintenance Technicians	732,072	
	Total	186,817,149	

Spent per Student
16,477

Table IX.2 October 1, 2019 Enrollment

	Count	District % of Total	State % of Total
Female	*	*	48.4
Male	6,621	60.2	51.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	25	0.2	0.3
Asian	150	1.4	5.2
Black or African American	1,293	11.8	12.7
Hispanic or Latino of any race	4,402	40.0	26.9
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	14	0.1	0.1
Two or More Races	434	3.9	3.8
White	4,677	42.5	51.1

To protect student privacy, gender counts are suppressed (*) when fewer than 6 students enrolled in the district identify as non-binary.

Appendix A. Detailed Information on Grant Calculations under Current Law and SB 948, for Programs Affected by the Proposal

Table A.1. Current Law and SB 948 Descriptions

	Current Law	SB 948
ECS FUNDING OVERVIEW	Statutory formula and phase-in schedule adopted as part of the FY 18 and FY 19 Budget. Most student weight, regional bonus, and phase-in schedule adjusted in the FY 22 and FY 23 Budget.	Fully implement formula in FY 22 for underfunded towns while continuing to phase out decreases to overfunded towns. Use student weights adopted as part of the FY 22 and FY 23 Budget.
Formula structure at full funding	Foundation amount x Weighted student count x Town's state aid percentage, plus the regional bonus	Same
Foundation amount	\$11,525	Same
Student weights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30% for each Free or Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL) student • 25% for each English Language Learner (ELL) student • 15% for each FRPL student that puts a town above 60% eligible for FRPL 	Same
Student count (resident students)	<p>Generally counted in hometown, except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Choice students are counted as half of a student for both the hometown and the receiving town in the total student count, and students qualifying for FRPL/ELL are counted (as a whole student) in the sending town's FRPL and ELL counts • Charter school students are not counted 	Same except that Open Choice students are removed from the ECS counts, for both the hometown and the receiving town
State aid percentage	Takes into account town property and income wealth, and how the town compares to the median among Connecticut towns	Same
Phase-in to underfunded towns	Gradual increase until FY 28 (when formula is fully implemented)	Fully implement formula for these towns beginning FY 22; for this analysis, assumed effective FY 23

	Current Law	SB 948
Phase-out to overfunded towns	For FY 22 and FY 23, towns continue to receive FY 21 entitlement amounts. Resuming in FY 24, grants gradually decrease until FY 30 (when formula is fully implemented).	No change from current law; for this analysis, assumed FY 22 and FY 23 changes incorporated

	Current Law	SB 948
STATE CHARTER FUNDING OVERVIEW	The FY 22 and FY 23 Budget adopted a partial phase-in to weighted student funding, from a base of \$11,525 per student. (In FY 21, the grant was \$11,250 per student.)	Weighted student funding: \$11,525 x operator's average student weight
Charter grant amount per pupil	\$11,525 plus a portion of the difference between that amount and full funding per pupil. (Portion is 4.1% in FY 22 and 14.76% in FY 23.)	Full funding per pupil, which is: (1) \$11,525 x weighted student count, using (a) charter school operator's student demographics and student count, and (b) ECS weights; then (2) Divide by the number of charter school operator's students
Full funding amount per pupil	Same as SB 948's "Charter grant amount per pupil"	Same as above (and same as Current Law)
Full funding, total grant	\$11,525 x weighted student count; not provided in either FY 22 or FY 23	\$11,525 x weighted student count; fully implemented in FY 22
Sending town tuition	None	None - No change
Students counted in hometown's ECS?	No	No - No change

	Current Law	SB 948
INTERDISTRICT MAGNET FUNDING OVERVIEW	Per-student grant and tuition (if required) differs depending on operator, region, and whether in-district or not. Sending towns count the students in ECS.	Weighted student funding: Based on \$11,525 x average student weight, with difference for RESC operator vs. Board of Ed. operator and an additional weight (15%) for Sheff RESC magnets. Tuition from towns is eliminated and sending towns continue to count the students in ECS. Board of Ed. (BOE) operators no longer receive magnet grant dollars for in-district (hometown) magnet students.
Magnet grant amount	<p>Per student: Ranges from \$3,060 for in-district student at Board of Education (BOE) magnet (except Sheff region) to \$13,315 for out-of-district student at Sheff BOE magnet (which receives no magnet grant for in-district students and cannot charge tuition).</p> <p>Sheff RESC schools typically receive \$10,652 per student and non-Sheff, \$8,058.</p> <p>Non-Sheff BOE magnet schools receive \$3,060 for in-district students and \$7,227 for out-of-district students.</p>	<p><u>RESC</u>: Total grant is \$11,525 x weighted student count for RESCs. For Sheff RESC magnets, add to the weighted student count a weight of 15% for every student.</p> <p><u>BOE</u>: For out-of-district students, total funding for each operator is –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) \$11,525 x sending town's average student weight x number of sent students for each sending town (2) Add all sending town-based calculations together <p>No grant dollars for in-district students.</p>
Sending town tuition per student	Varies from \$0 (towns sending students to Sheff city-run magnets) to nearly \$7k (a few RESC magnets). K-12 tuition at RESC schools was \$3,120-\$6,850 in FY 21, and tuition at BOE magnets ranged from \$2,000-\$5,148. For preschool programs that charge tuition, parents pay, with SDE assistance for income-eligible families.	Eliminate tuition from sending towns. (Parents still directly pay tuition for preschoolers.)
Students counted in hometown's ECS?	Yes	Yes – No change

	Current Law	SB 948
VO AG FUNDING OVERVIEW	Per-student grant of \$5,200 and uniform full-time tuition amount. (In FY 21, the grant was \$4,200 per student.) Part-time tuition varies.	Same as SB 948's BOE magnets method: weighted student funding, based on \$11,525 x average student weight for each sending town. Tuition eliminated and sending towns continue to count the students in ECS. Operators no longer receive Vo Ag grant dollars for in-district (hometown) students.
Vo Ag grant amount	\$5,200 per student (whether in-district or out, part-time or full); any funds remaining are distributed proportionately according to the number of Vo Ag students (up to \$100 per student)	Total funding for each operator is - (1) \$11,525 x sending town's average student weight x number of sent students for each sending town (2) Add all sending town-based calculations together No grant dollars for in-district students.
Sending town tuition	\$6,823 for full-time programs and \$2,250-\$3,412 for part-time in FY 21	Eliminate tuition
Students counted in hometown's ECS?	Yes	Yes - No change

	Current Law	SB 948
OPEN CHOICE FUNDING OVERVIEW	Per-student grant of approximately \$3k-\$8k, depending on receiving town's share of enrollment that is Open Choice, and if any schools have at least ten Open Choice students.	Same as SB 948's BOE magnets method: weighted student funding, based on \$11,525 x average student weights for sending towns. Open Choice students are no longer included in ECS counts.
Open Choice grant amount	\$3k-8k to the receiving town, depending on level of participation (higher per-student grant when Open Choice students are a larger share of enrollment). Then \$500,000 is distributed on a per-student basis for every program student attending a school that has at least ten Open Choice students.	Total funding for each operator is - (1) \$11,525 x sending town's average student weight x number of sent students for each sending town (2) Add all sending town-based calculations together
Sending town tuition	None	None - No change
Students counted in hometown's ECS?	Yes: 0.5 (half a student) each for sending (hometown) <u>and</u> receiving towns. Also any Open	Not counted in ECS in either town

	Current Law	SB 948
	Choice student who receives FRPL or is ELL is counted (as a whole student) in those counts for the sending towns.	

Table A.2 Estimated FY 23 Per-Student Grant Amounts (According to Sending Town) That Would Be Received by Program Operators of Board of Education Magnets, Vocational Agriculture, and Open Choice, Under the Proposal

Sending Town	ECS Average Student Weight	Per-Student Grant Amount (\$) Provided to Receiving Districts for Out-of-District Students
Andover	1.07	12,279
Ansonia	1.22	14,033
Ashford	1.12	12,864
Avon	1.03	11,882
Barkhamsted	1.05	12,156
Beacon Falls	1.08	12,487
Berlin	1.07	12,304
Bethany	1.04	11,962
Bethel	1.11	12,801
Bethlehem	1.07	12,326
Bloomfield	1.18	13,551
Bolton	1.06	12,222
Bozrah	1.11	12,768
Branford	1.12	12,906
Bridgeport	1.28	14,802
Bridgewater	1.03	11,874
Bristol	1.17	13,533
Brookfield	1.07	12,360
Brooklyn	1.10	12,707
Burlington	1.04	11,972
Canaan	1.14	13,109
Canterbury	1.09	12,603
Canton	1.04	11,978
Chaplin	1.13	13,067

Table A.2 Estimated FY 23 Per-Student Grant Amounts (According to Sending Town) That Would Be Received by Program Operators of Board of Education Magnets, Vocational Agriculture, and Open Choice, Under the Proposal

Sending Town	ECS Average Student Weight	Per-Student Grant Amount (\$) Provided to Receiving Districts for Out-of-District Students
Cheshire	1.05	12,068
Chester	1.07	12,301
Clinton	1.13	12,969
Colchester	1.07	12,357
Colebrook	1.08	12,412
Columbia	1.08	12,395
Cornwall	1.09	12,558
Coventry	1.08	12,455
Cromwell	1.08	12,458
Danbury	1.23	14,171
Darien	1.01	11,659
Deep River	1.10	12,696
Derby	1.17	13,493
Durham	1.05	12,066
Eastford	1.09	12,593
East Granby	1.04	12,004
East Haddam	1.08	12,420
East Hampton	1.06	12,230
East Hartford	1.23	14,162
East Haven	1.19	13,695
East Lyme	1.08	12,400
Easton	1.04	11,943
East Windsor	1.17	13,541
Ellington	1.05	12,094
Enfield	1.15	13,227
Essex	1.06	12,246
Fairfield	1.05	12,155
Farmington	1.06	12,192
Franklin	1.07	12,283
Glastonbury	1.05	12,059
Goshen	1.08	12,435

Table A.2 Estimated FY 23 Per-Student Grant Amounts (According to Sending Town) That Would Be Received by Program Operators of Board of Education Magnets, Vocational Agriculture, and Open Choice, Under the Proposal

Sending Town	ECS Average Student Weight	Per-Student Grant Amount (\$) Provided to Receiving Districts for Out-of-District Students
Granby	1.03	11,898
Greenwich	1.07	12,381
Griswold	1.15	13,304
Groton	1.16	13,378
Guilford	1.05	12,051
Haddam	1.05	12,082
Hamden	1.16	13,345
Hampton	1.13	12,971
Hartford	1.35	15,547
Hartland	1.07	12,324
Harwinton	1.05	12,154
Hebron	1.04	12,028
Kent	1.08	12,491
Killingly	1.16	13,387
Killingworth	1.03	11,859
Lebanon	1.09	12,601
Ledyard	1.08	12,457
Lisbon	1.11	12,786
Litchfield	1.07	12,389
Lyme	1.05	12,142
Madison	1.01	11,696
Manchester	1.20	13,851
Mansfield	1.09	12,617
Marlborough	1.05	12,090
Meriden	1.29	14,895
Middlebury	1.05	12,095
Middlefield	1.06	12,180
Middletown	1.16	13,360
Milford	1.09	12,608
Monroe	1.04	11,993
Montville	1.15	13,221

Table A.2 Estimated FY 23 Per-Student Grant Amounts (According to Sending Town) That Would Be Received by Program Operators of Board of Education Magnets, Vocational Agriculture, and Open Choice, Under the Proposal

Sending Town	ECS Average Student Weight	Per-Student Grant Amount (\$) Provided to Receiving Districts for Out-of-District Students
Morris	1.08	12,462
Naugatuck	1.21	13,895
New Britain	1.28	14,752
New Canaan	1.00	11,563
New Fairfield	1.05	12,114
New Hartford	1.05	12,124
New Haven	1.27	14,631
Newington	1.11	12,804
New London	1.35	15,548
New Milford	1.12	12,881
Newtown	1.04	12,019
Norfolk	1.11	12,741
North Branford	1.07	12,345
North Canaan	1.15	13,294
North Haven	1.07	12,312
North Stonington	1.06	12,257
Norwalk	1.22	14,053
Norwich	1.25	14,355
Old Lyme	1.06	12,192
Old Saybrook	1.10	12,667
Orange	1.04	12,012
Oxford	1.05	12,068
Plainfield	1.17	13,495
Plainville	1.13	13,034
Plymouth	1.13	13,015
Pomfret	1.06	12,169
Portland	1.08	12,390
Preston	1.10	12,629
Prospect	1.07	12,291
Putnam	1.17	13,507

Table A.2 Estimated FY 23 Per-Student Grant Amounts (According to Sending Town) That Would Be Received by Program Operators of Board of Education Magnets, Vocational Agriculture, and Open Choice, Under the Proposal

Sending Town	ECS Average Student Weight	Per-Student Grant Amount (\$) Provided to Receiving Districts for Out-of-District Students
Redding	1.03	11,855
Ridgefield	1.02	11,742
Rocky Hill	1.09	12,513
Roxbury	1.06	12,204
Salem	1.06	12,164
Salisbury	1.09	12,586
Scotland	1.12	12,888
Seymour	1.13	13,006
Sharon	1.12	12,962
Shelton	1.11	12,750
Sherman	1.02	11,774
Simsbury	1.04	11,996
Somers	1.03	11,884
Southbury	1.04	11,969
Southington	1.07	12,368
South Windsor	1.07	12,275
Sprague	1.17	13,513
Stafford	1.12	12,934
Stamford	1.22	14,022
Sterling	1.12	12,883
Stonington	1.08	12,477
Stratford	1.17	13,457
Suffield	1.05	12,141
Thomaston	1.11	12,744
Thompson	1.14	13,145
Tolland	1.04	12,011
Torrington	1.24	14,238
Trumbull	1.06	12,226
Union	1.02	11,777
Vernon	1.17	13,482
Voluntown	1.08	12,430

Table A.2 Estimated FY 23 Per-Student Grant Amounts (According to Sending Town) That Would Be Received by Program Operators of Board of Education Magnets, Vocational Agriculture, and Open Choice, Under the Proposal

Sending Town	ECS Average Student Weight	Per-Student Grant Amount (\$) Provided to Receiving Districts for Out-of-District Students
Wallingford	1.11	12,812
Warren	1.07	12,365
Washington	1.08	12,465
Waterbury	1.32	15,173
Waterford	1.10	12,715
Watertown	1.12	12,942
Westbrook	1.14	13,155
West Hartford	1.09	12,608
West Haven	1.23	14,182
Weston	1.01	11,621
Westport	1.01	11,671
Wethersfield	1.10	12,632
Willington	1.10	12,728
Wilton	1.02	11,720
Winchester	1.17	13,527
Windham	1.32	15,226
Windsor	1.13	13,046
Windsor Locks	1.15	13,210
Wolcott	1.10	12,630
Woodbridge	1.04	11,994
Woodbury	1.05	12,123
Woodstock	1.04	12,025

Note: The information above is specific to the October 2019 student dataset used for this analysis. Each year, the average ECS student weight by town would change as the ECS student data are updated. Therefore, table above provides estimates. The amount per sending town in any year will be: the ECS foundation amount of \$11,525 x the average ECS student weight.

Appendix B. Relevant Grant Changes in the FY 22 and FY 23 Budget

The FY 22 and FY 23 Budget made changes to a few of the grant programs addressed in SB 948: Education Cost Sharing, state charter schools, and Vo Ag. This report's current law estimates for FY 23 reflect the changes, which all began in FY 22.

EDUCATION COST SHARING (ECS)

Some of the budget's changes to the ECS formula and schedule aligned with changes proposed by SB 948, specifically the changes involving student weights:

1. Increase the ELL weight from 15% to 25%
2. Increase the low-income concentration weight from 5% to 15%
3. Lower the threshold for qualifying for the low-income concentration weight from 75% to 60%

Other budget changes to ECS – which differed from SB 948 – were:

1. Increase the value of the regional bonus and extend it to towns that pay tuition to send students to the endowed academies
2. Towns considered overfunded by the formula, and which therefore would have otherwise experienced ECS decreases in FY 22 and beyond, instead receive the FY 21 grant amounts in FY 22 and FY 23. These towns will re-start the phase-out decreases in FY 24, and reach full funding in FY 30 (instead of FY 28 as under prior law and SB 948).

STATE CHARTER SCHOOLS

The FY 22 and FY 23 Budget replaced the prior per-pupil state charter school grant of \$11,250 with a partial phase-in to a weighted student funding-based calculation. The weighted student funding-based calculation is the same as proposed by SB 948.

To determine each state charter operator's grant under the FY 22 and FY 23 Budget:

1. Calculate the weighted student funding-based grant, if the grant were fully funded, as under SB 948's proposed reform of state charter school funding.
2. For each fiscal year in the new biennium –
 - a. FY 22: The grant for each operator is equal to \$11,525 per student plus 4.1% of the difference between the fully funded per-student amount and \$11,525 per student
 - b. FY 23: The grant for each operator is equal to \$11,525 per student plus 14.76% of the difference between the fully funded per-student amount and \$11,525 per student

The FY 22 and FY 23 Budget has no grant mechanism in place for state charter schools in the out years.

VO AG PROGRAMS

The FY 22 and FY 23 Budget increased the per-pupil grant for operators of Vo Ag programs from \$4,200 to \$5,200.

Appendix C. Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in executing this analysis:

- 1. Effective FY 23:** The changes proposed by SB 948 would be implemented (in full) in FY 23. SB 948 required the changes to take effect in FY 22; however, as FY 22 is underway, it was determined that this analysis would assume implementation, in full, in FY 23.
- 2. Enrollment Rebound:** Student enrollment will rebound in the 2021-2022 and 2022-23 school years to pre-pandemic levels. Public school enrollment dipped in the 2020-21 academic year. As COVID-19 begins to ease in Connecticut, it is likely that enrollment may increase in subsequent years. Consequently, the analysis uses 2019-20 school year (October 2019) student data, which included more students than the 2020-21 data. For this analysis, it is assumed that the October 2019 student data is a reasonable approximation for future enrollment levels and demographic characteristics. If this assumption is incorrect, the fiscal implications of both the system under current law and the proposal in SB 948 will vary from the report's analysis.
- 3. No Enrollment Growth Due to Proposal:** The programs and schools funded through the methods described in SB 948 would not significantly increase enrollment (beyond pre-pandemic levels). Typically magnet schools and, to a lesser extent, state charter schools have enrolled students up to the state's funding levels. SB 948 does not include any mechanisms to limit enrollment growth, although a planned state charter school enrollment increase of at least 20 percent must first be approved by the State Department of Education.¹⁶ If these schools' operators decide to increase enrollment, the cost of the state grants under the proposal could rise substantially.
- 4. No Special Tuition Arrangements:** There are no arrangements between towns that limit tuition paid for any program or across programs, and tuition will not change substantially in FY 23 (under current law). There may be such arrangements. However, as there is no existing catalog, it is assumed that tuition is charged for every student as required or allowed by law, at the FY 21 amounts. If there are arrangements to reduce tuition, then: (1) under current law, the revenue benefit of tuition is overstated to participating operators; (2) under the proposal, the loss of revenue is equally overstated to the operators; and (3) the cost of tuition to sending towns is overstated under current law, and the savings from elimination under the proposal is also overstated.
- 5. ECS FY 22 Student Count Changes Not Used:** SB 948's ECS student count changes specific to FY 22 can be disregarded. SB 948 required, for FY 22, the ECS calculations to use the higher of the student counts (October 2019 or October 2020) for total (resident) students, Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL) students, and English Language Learner (ELL) students. However, this analysis does not consider that aspect of SB 948 because: (a) implementation for this analysis is assumed for FY 23, when student counts may have rebounded anyway; and (b) the analysis uses the October 2019 student data as described above.

¹⁶ Effective July 1, 2021. Included in Section 353 of Public Act 21-2 (June Special Session).

6. **ECS Hold-Harmless as in Statute:** The ECS statute's FY 22 and FY 23 hold-harmless of towns that are overfunded according to the ECS formula would not change with SB 948. SB 948 proposed no changes to then-current law regarding these towns. This analysis assumes that the bill would similarly make no changes to the now-revised applicable statute – specifically, SB 948 would hold harmless these towns for FY 22 and FY 23, and then resume the phase-out (decreases) in FY 24.
7. **ECS Regional Bonus Changes Maintained:** The changes made to the regional bonus component of ECS would be maintained with SB 948. It is assumed that an adoption of SB 948 would incorporate (not reverse) the regional bonus changes that took effect in FY 22.

Appendix D. Methodology

To carry out this analysis, OFA used a protected Excel file from the Connecticut State Department of Education (SDE) containing the Public School Information System (PSIS) data for October 2019. The PSIS data included demographic, town of residence, school/program of attendance, and other necessary information on every student who attended a Connecticut public school at that time. (See Appendix C for an explanation of why October 2019 data were used.) The education department also provided updated FY 22 and FY 23 per-student grant amounts where applicable, FY 21 tuition information (as FY 22 was not available when the project began), and notes on programmatic openings, closures, and transfers.

OFA is bound by a July 2021 Memorandum of Understanding between SDE and the Office of Legislative Management (OLM) regarding student data storage, access, and use. Consequently OFA may not share student-level data beyond the OFA staff authorized to participate in this project and SDE personnel. Additionally, OFA must suppress in the report all values associated with fewer than six students.

Each program addressed in SB 948 – ECS, state charter schools, Open Choice, Vo Ag, and RESC and Board of Education magnets – was approached individually with an analysis under current law and then under the proposal, using October 2019 student data for all aspects. The calculations were documented in numerous Excel workbooks and step-by-step guides.

Every aspect of the analysis was reviewed by OFA staff and the SDE personnel who manage the grant programs addressed in SB 948, from July 2021 through December 2021. State education department staff provided valuable and timely feedback for each component. Other OFA personnel as well as nonpartisan education staff from the Office of Legislative Research and the Legislative Commissioners' Office reviewed the draft report.

Appendix E. Connecticut State Department of Education Comments

Connecticut State Department of Education

Comments on “Report on the Modeling of SB 948 and Connecticut Technical Education and Career System (CTECS) Funding”

Background:

Section 373 of Public Act 21-2 (June Special Session) requires the Legislative Office of Fiscal Analysis (OFA) to:

- (a) The Office of Fiscal Analysis shall conduct an independent modeling of the education funding proposal described in the version of senate bill 948 of the 2021 regular session that was favorably reported by the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to education on March 22, 2021. (b) Such modeling shall include, but need not be limited to, (1) an analysis of the estimated fiscal impact of such proposal on (A) local and regional boards of education and operators of interdistrict magnet school programs, state and local charter schools and agricultural science and technology education centers, including the (i) receipt of grants, (ii) receipt and payment of tuition, and (iii) estimated net impact to each local and regional board of education specific to each grant described in Senate Bill No. 1202 June Sp. Sess., Public Act No. 21-2 591 of 790 subparagraph (B) of this subdivision, and (B) the equalization aid grant, described in section 10-262h of the general statutes, and grants for (i) interdistrict magnet school programs pursuant to section 10-264l of the general statutes, (ii) state and local charter schools pursuant to section 10-66ee of the general statutes, (iii) regional agricultural science and technology centers pursuant to section 10-65 of the general statutes, and (iv) the interdistrict public school attendance program pursuant to section 10-266aa of the general statutes, and (2) funding for the Technical Education and Career System, including such funding at a system-wide level, a school level and a per pupil level, and the effects of racial equity within the system based on such funding. (c) (1) Not later than December 15, 2021, the Office of Fiscal Analysis shall submit such modeling and a draft report to the Commissioner of Education for review and comment. (2) Not later than January 3, 2022, the commissioner, or the commissioner's designee, shall submit his or her comments and recommendations, if any, concerning such draft report to the Office of Fiscal Analysis. (d) Not later than January 15, 2022, the Office of Fiscal Analysis shall submit a report of such modeling to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to education and appropriations. Such report shall include the modeling and any comments and recommendations submitted to the office by the Commissioner of Education.*

The department provided the necessary data to OFA to conduct the analysis of SB 948 pursuant to a Memorandum of Agreement, which met FERPA requirements to ensure the confidentiality of student data. In addition, department staff reviewed and provided feedback on various iterations of the proposed calculation. Therefore, our comments are not related to the actual calculation but rather the potential implications of the proposal itself.

Overview and Considerations:

State Funding:

SB 948 proposes changes in the funding models for the Education Cost Sharing (ECS) grant, state charter schools, Interdistrict magnet schools, Regional Agricultural Science and Technology Education (ASTE) Centers and the Open Choice program. It is important to note certain pieces of the proposal have already been legislatively enacted. They include adjustments to weighting for students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch and English Language learners, a change in the threshold for concentrated poverty, and an increase in the bonus for regional school districts. To implement the proposed funding model, it is estimated that an **additional \$395.5 million** would be needed above current year estimated expenditures (under current law).

Enrollment Counts:

ECS is the state's main education funding mechanism. Student count is a central component in determining a district's ECS entitlement. Counting a student as a resident of the district acknowledges the home districts financial responsibility for educating the student, hence a district's ability to claim that student for purposes of the ECS calculation.

The proposal modifies which students attending choice programs are counted in the determination of their home district's ECS entitlement. Students will be counted as follows:

- a. Charter school students would ***continue not being counted*** in their home district's ECS resident student count.
- b. Open Choice students ***would no longer contribute 0.5 credit*** to the home district and receiving district's ECS resident student count. They would be removed from the resident student count completely.
- c. Students attending Magnet schools and ASTE programs ***would continue*** to remain in their home district's ECS resident student count.

Keeping students attending magnet schools and ASTE programs in a home districts' ECS count continues a longstanding argument that the formula is inequitable, i.e. the state is paying for some students twice. The proposal not only eliminates tuition payments between districts and choice programs, but it also provides significant additional funding to the choice programs to make up for this loss of revenue. The concept being the state pays the district/program where the student is being educated. This would eliminate the home district's financial responsibility for educating students in choice programs, which as mentioned previously is the basis for inclusion in ECS student counts.

Tuition:

Currently ASTE programs, RESC operated magnet programs, and certain district operated magnet programs charge tuition to a student's home district to assist with education costs not covered by the current state grant. The proposed formula would eliminate the current system of tuition payments between a student's home district and the choice program they are attending for regular education related costs. To address the critical impact of losing that revenue source on the continued financial viability of the impacted choice programs it proposes shifting those costs to the state through a significant increase in their per pupil grant amounts.

The increased state subsidy covers the tuition loss for many of the choice programs and importantly offers financial relief to the home districts that send students to these programs. However, 6 of the BOE operated magnet schools, 1 RESC operated magnet school, and all but 3 ASTE programs would

experience an immediate loss in revenue. For the programs operated by a local Board of Education the district will have to seek additional funding from local taxpayers while the RESC operated magnet will be forced to reduce their programming as they do not have taxing authority.

With exception of the Open Choice program, it is anticipated that all choice programs those that charged tuition and those that did not will over time receive insufficient revenue through the new funding mechanism impacting their sustainability. Under the new funding mechanism, the estimated per pupil grant a choice program will receive for a student would be a range between \$11,563 for a New Canaan student to \$15,547 for a student from Hartford. That amount is calculated on an annual basis and will fluctuate based on current data. By comparison the state average for Net Current Expenditures per pupil was \$17,702 in FY 2020 and \$18,967 in FY 2021. The addition of federal funding to the state per pupil grant, for an apples-to-apples comparison with Net Current Expenditures per Pupil (NCEP), does not fully mitigate the funding differential. In order for these programs to remain financially and programmatically viable the legislature would need to adjust the foundation amount on a regular basis to keep pace with annual increases in costs. Such an adjustment is not anticipated in the current formula.

Special Education Billing:

The proposal does not address or change the existing system of choice programs billing the student's home district for special education costs in excess of regular education related costs and revenue streams. In the past a case has been made for leaving choice students in their home district ECS count because they still had financial responsibility for excess special education costs. However, the formula continues the practice of Charter School students not counting in their home district's ECS count and removes Open Choice students from the count also. Whereas students enrolled in magnet schools and ASTE programs still count in their home district's ECS count. This creates an inequity that should be addressed if this proposal is to be moved forward.

Enrollment Data Used in Simulation:

For purposes of the simulation OFA needed to rely on October 2019 enrollment data due to the impact the pandemic had on the October 2020 enrollment data. The October 2020 data showed a loss of (14,553) resident students (PK-12) statewide and a reduction of (15,978) students in the statewide "need student" counts from October 2019. At the time OFA was developing the simulation we were anticipating a rebound in those numbers in the October 2021 collection. That has not happened. Preliminary October 2021 statewide enrollment numbers only increased by 352 students and "need student" counts continued to decline by (2,207) students. When final October 2021 data is available the formula simulation will need to be rerun.

Other Considerations:

There are other considerations that will need to be addressed if this proposal moves forward. While not all inclusive below are some additional considerations.

1. If passed this would be a significant commitment of additional state funds for education. A corresponding tie into our Accountability System is needed to ensure these resources enable increasing student outcomes for all students.

2. This proposal hastens what was a 10-year phase-in to the concept of “full funding.” Only the districts that were considered “overfunded” and losing funding over that time period will continue with the phase-out for the 10-year period. The concept of “full-funding” was based on a foundation level that was held static for the whole time of the phase in. The proposal does not address how the foundation should be adjusted over time to better reflect the actual cost of educating students which is arguably the most critical component from a district standpoint.
3. We have a general concern with the impact of shifting demographics on the calculation as it relates to districts/programs ability to budget and the department’s ability to regularly update the calculation based on those shifts. If the proposal were to move forward the department would be willing to work with the legislature on potential modifications to language.