WRITTEN TESTIMONY

OF THE

CONNECTICUT COALITION FOR JUSTICE IN EDUCATION FUNDING

TO THE

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

March 10, 2008

The Connecticut Coalition for Justice in Education Funding appreciates this opportunity to submit written comments pertinent to a few of the bills before you today.

As most of you are already aware, CCJEF is a broad-based coalition of parents, education associations, child-focused advocacy organizations, and urban, suburban, and rural communities across the state who are committed to improving the fiscal infrastructure of public education so as to ensure equal educational opportunity for all children, regardless of family or community wealth. To that end, CCJEF also advocates for systemic tax/revenue reform to enable the state to adequately and equitably provide its fair share of funding for the schools, thereby lifting the heavy burden from local property taxes. CCJEF communities are home to some 40 percent of the state's population, and they provide public education for more than 200,000 children, including about two-thirds of the state's poor, minority, and limited-English students.

First, a general comment, aimed primarily at **House Bill No. 5026, An Act Implementing the Governor's Budget Recommendations Regarding Education and Raised Bill No. 614, An Act Concerning the Recommendations by the Legislative Commissioners for Technical Revisions to Education Statutes**:

- CCJEF recognizes that under the current tax structure and the state spending cap, and given the anticipated downturn in state revenues, significant changes to the FY09 budget will be difficult, and that therefore most of the urgently needed school finance improvements cannot be achieved at this particular time.

  Nevertheless, we ask that you make every effort to increase the 2008-09 ECS allocation above the currently budgeted 4.4% increase over last year. Otherwise, it will be unlikely, if not altogether impossible, for the state to meet the promised 5-year phase-in that should result in an additional $1.1 billion in annual ECS funding. Overall, the 2007-08 ECS increase amounted to just 11.2% over the previous (base) year, despite last year's huge budget surplus. Thus the state has already failed to implement an equal-interval phase-in, a fact that does not bode well for the future.

As the attached tables show, on average, municipalities have suffered a 24% decrease in the value of ECS per pupil entitlements over the past dozen years. In Shelton, that decrease in purchasing power has been more than 52%. This year's 4.4% increase, plus the projected 2008-09 increase of another 4.4%, will raise the state's per pupil allocation to Shelton schoolchildren by a total of just $70, a truly insignificant amount toward a school budget that exceeds $100 million. The same insignificant 2-year increase pertains to Newtown, and a similar pattern exists in Stamford and Norwalk, whose 2-year increases amount to less than $125 per pupil, despite their large at-risk student populations. Nor are these the only communities receiving but token increases in ECS aid. Moreover, even where substantial percentage increases have been realized, as in many of the higher-wealth towns, the resulting per pupil entitlement nevertheless remains unconscionably low.

Thus, 30 years after *Horton v Meskill*, nearly one-third of all towns are budgeted to receive FY09 equalization grants worth less than the purchasing power of the $250 per pupil flat grant they received from the state in 1977!

Anything this Committee can do to accelerate the move toward substantially greater state funding of education is both urgently needed and welcome. The state's continued reliance on local communities for the lion's share of funding for their public schools is simply untenable, and, we believe, unconstitutional.

- Directly pertinent to **Bill No. 5026**, we ask that you restore the Governor's proposed $1.8 million decrease in Priority District funding. Inasmuch as these districts have rightly been determined to be the state's neediest, any decrease in their funding will further erode the quality of services these towns and their schools are able to provide schoolchildren.

- At future public hearings during this short session, you will also be hearing CCJEF advocate for lowering the special education excess cost grant threshold to 2.5 times the cost of a regular-program student, as well as for fully funding the pupil transportation and adult education grants.

Second, CCJEF supports, in principle, **Senate Bills 644, An Act Concerning a Study of the Open Choice Program, and 645, An Act Concerning a Study of Issues Concerning the Interdistrict Magnet School Program**.

- However, we point to other task forces, commissions, and studies that have already been conducted or are currently underway, including a magnet cost study that will soon be released by CCJEF that will clearly show that successfully integrated and well-implemented magnet programs require considerably more operating funds than are currently being made available by the state or are otherwise affordable to participating towns.

- Last session, the magnet funding formula was changed to reduce state aid for the magnets by some 50%, beginning with a 25% reduction in "need student" counts in FY09 for both sending and receiving towns. Estimates are that with the 25% ECS need student count reduction, the state will save $25.9 million, and that the 50% cut will save $51.8 million. The brunt of these cuts impacts 18 urban school districts affiliated with the Connecticut Association of Urban Superintendents, most of which are also CCJEF members. These urban districts are expected to lose $16 million in ECS aid in FY09 and $45 million in FY10 unless this statute is immediately amended or repealed.

- CCJEF wishes to emphasize just how devastating this further reduction in need student counts could be to the urban districts, which already had their need student counts reduced this year as a result of dropping the 25% weighting for students performing below proficiency on the state's mastery tests. Yet these cities are key to carrying out the state's voluntary desegregation principles; they both provide and participate in valuable magnet programs and the Open Choice program. New Haven alone stands to lose millions over the coming years, and its exemplary host magnet program, which even predates the *Sheff* decision and serves as a model among cities of its size nationally, could be put at jeopardy unless this unfortunate policy is fixed. We therefore urge that any additional studies that are undertaken include appropriate representation by New Haven and the other CAUS districts.

Third, with reference to **Raised Bill No 647, An Act Concerning Charter Schools**, CCJEF raises the question as to why these few small schools, which enroll only about 0.6% of Connecticut's public school students, continue to garner such policy attention and increased funding, particularly given the urgency of additional state aid to the regular public school districts that serve 95.5% of the state's public school students.

- Every dollar that goes to charter schools represents more than a dollar that is not going to the urban public schools in which these charters are located. Not only do the local public school districts lose those students from their ECS count, but also their taxpayers must pick up the cost of charter school transportation, SPED, and other hidden charter subsidies, all of which get added to the cost of doing business for the public school district rather than to the cost of the charters themselves, to which all related costs clearly ought to revert before the legislature and public view and compare education expenditures.

- Moreover, this Committee's attention needs to be drawn to the fact that those charters that are most persistently aggressive in seeking additional seats and site expansion actually serve very few high-needs/high-cost students (English-language learners and special education students), certainly far below the proportion of these children within the local urban populations from which the charters draw their students. This would appear to be in defiance of the state's policies requiring charter schools to contribute toward reducing racial/ethnic and economic isolation. Nor is there sound evidence, in Connecticut or on a national scale, that charter students out-perform their local public school peers once student characteristics, class size, hours of schooling, and other factors are controlled for — factors that urban districts do not have the funding luxury to provide, the legal ability to put into place and enforce, or any desire to ever deny services to children regardless how great their learning needs.

Finally, CCJEF urges that no new education requirements be mandated this year unless the local costs of implementing the new mandates are fully paid for by the state. We also urge you and your fellow General Assembly colleagues to reject proposals for property tax caps, which inevitably impinge upon the ability of municipalities to raise local funds for their schools — unless and until state aid to the public schools is increased to an adequate and equitable level for all 169 communities.

Thank you for your consideration. For further information, please contact Dr. Dianne Kaplan deVries, CCJEF Project Director, at (860) 461-0320, or dianne@ccjef.org.

Attachments: Inflation-Adjusted Change in ECS Entitlements Over Past 12 Years
Projected Changes in ECS Entitlements, FY 06-07 through FY 08-09

Inflation-Adjusted Change in ECS Entitlements Over Past 12 Years

DRG	Municipality / School District	Per Pupil Allocation FY 95-96	Per Pupil Allocation FY 06-07	Nominal Change Last 12 Yrs	Inflation-Adj Change (in $2008)	Inflation-Adj Change %
STATE PER PUPIL		**2,506**	**2,877**	**371**	**-606**	**-24.18%**
C	Andover	2,705	3,032	327	-727	-26.9%
H	Ansonia	3,978	4,593	615	-936	-23.5%
E	Ashford	3,707	4,244	537	-908	-24.5%
B	Avon	61	232	171	147	241.2%
C	Barkhamsted	2,014	1,844	-170	-955	-47.4%
E	Beacon Falls	3,202	3,317	115	-1,133	-35.4%
D	Berlin	1,085	1,368	283	-140	-12.9%
C	Bethany	1,838	1,482	-356	-1,073	-58.4%
D	Bethel	2,471	2,286	-185	-1,149	-46.5%
C	Bethlehem	1,881	2,066	185	-548	-29.1%
G	Bloomfield	903	1,454	551	198	22.0%
C	Bolton	2,274	2,723	449	-438	-19.2%
E	Bozrah	3,132	2,746	-386	-1,607	-51.3%
D	Branford	308	371	63	-57	-18.7%
I	Bridgeport	4,962	6,457	1,495	-439	-8.9%
D	Bridgewater	323	400	77	-49	-15.2%
G	Bristol	3,100	3,882	782	-427	-13.8%
B	Brookfield	542	391	-151	-362	-66.9%
E	Brooklyn	4,182	4,418	236	-1,395	-33.4%
C	Burlington	2,478	1,858	-620	-1,586	-64.0%
E	Canaan	900	1,111	211	-140	-15.6%
F	Canterbury	4,325	5,193	868	-819	-18.9%
C	Canton	1,414	1,504	90	-461	-32.6%
E	Chaplin	4,450	4,640	190	-1,545	-34.7%
B	Cheshire	1,802	1,470	-332	-1,034	-57.4%
E	Chester	1,012	1,149	137	-258	-25.5%
D	Clinton	2,648	2,705	57	-975	-36.8%
D	Colchester	3,249	3,570	321	-946	-29.1%
E	Colebrook	971	1,684	713	335	34.5%
C	Columbia	2,278	2,327	49	-840	-36.9%
C	Cornwall	68	285	217	190	279.6%
E	Coventry	3,370	3,604	234	-1,080	-32.0%
D	Cromwell	1,504	1,685	181	-406	-27.0%
H	Danbury	1,493	1,787	294	-288	-19.3%
A	Darien	39	230	191	175	450.0%
E	Deep River	1,887	2,244	357	-378	-20.0%
H	Derby	2,857	3,876	1,019	-94	-3.3%
C	Durham	2,708	2,335	-373	-1,429	-52.8%
D	East Granby	722	886	164	-118	-16.3%
E	East Haddam	2,007	2,182	175	-607	-30.2%
D	East Hampton	2,883	3,007	124	-1,000	-34.7%

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
2			Per Pupil	Per Pupil	Nominal	Inflation-Adj	Inflation-Adj
3		Municipality /	Allocation	Allocation	Change	Change	Change
4	DRG	School District	FY 95-96	FY 06-07	Last 12 Yrs	(in $2008)	%
47	H	East Hartford	2,132	4,203	2,071	1,240	58.2%
48	G	East Haven	3,052	4,179	1,127	-63	-2.1%
49	D	East Lyme	1,941	2,169	228	-529	-27.2%
50	F	East Windsor	2,312	2,804	492	-409	-17.7%
51	E	Eastford	3,876	3,534	-342	-1,853	-47.8%
52	A	Easton	129	252	123	73	56.2%
53	C	Ellington	3,072	3,182	110	-1,088	-35.4%
54	F	Enfield	3,199	3,624	425	-822	-25.7%
55	C	Essex	193	281	88	13	6.8%
56	B	Fairfield	160	260	100	38	23.6%
57	B	Farmington	66	256	190	165	249.5%
58	E	Franklin	2,503	2,591	88	-888	-35.5%
59	B	Glastonbury	480	568	88	-99	-20.6%
60	C	Goshen	264	387	123	20	7.7%
61	B	Granby	1,689	1,892	203	-455	-27.0%
62	B	Greenwich	52	257	205	184	354.5%
63	F	Griswold	4,626	4,724	98	-1,705	-36.9%
64	G	Groton	3,524	4,247	723	-651	-18.5%
65	B	Guilford	868	726	-142	-480	-55.3%
66	C	Haddam	262	875	613	511	195.1%
67	D	Hamden	1,816	2,739	923	215	11.9%
68	E	Hampton	3,460	4,570	1,110	-238	-6.9%
69	I	Hartford	5,904	7,422	1,518	-784	-13.3%
70	E	Hartland	2,829	3,393	564	-539	-19.1%
71	C	Harwinton	2,385	2,534	149	-781	-32.8%
72	C	Hebron	3,147	2,739	-408	-1,635	-52.0%
73	E	Kent	233	317	84	-7	-3.0%
74	G	Killingly	4,535	4,988	453	-1,315	-29.0%
75	C	Killingworth	1,877	1,764	-113	-845	-45.0%
76	E	Lebanon	3,443	3,491	48	-1,294	-37.6%
77	D	Ledyard	3,606	3,746	140	-1,266	-35.1%
78	E	Lisbon	4,153	4,182	29	-1,590	-38.3%
79	E	Litchfield	510	867	357	158	31.0%
80	C	Lyme	128	339	211	161	125.9%
81	B	Madison	238	281	43	-50	-21.0%
82	G	Manchester	2,657	3,428	771	-265	-10.0%
83	C	Mansfield	3,742	4,426	684	-775	-20.7%
84	C	Marlborough	2,502	2,345	-157	-1,132	-45.2%
85	H	Meriden	3,672	4,838	1,166	-266	-7.2%
86	C	Middlebury	258	343	85	-16	-6.0%
87	C	Middlefield	1,985	2,361	376	-398	-20.0%
88	G	Middletown	2,042	2,574	532	-264	-12.9%
89	D	Milford	1,300	1,296	-4	-511	-39.3%
90	B	Monroe	1,821	1,323	-498	-1,208	-66.3%
91	F	Montville	3,249	3,531	282	-985	-30.3%

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
2			Per Pupil	Per Pupil	Nominal	Inflation-Adj	Inflation-Adj
3		Municipality /	Allocation	Allocation	Change	Change	Change
4	DRG	School District	FY 95-96	FY 06-07	Last 12 Yrs	(in $2008)	%
92	C	Morris	1,451	1,496	45	-521	-35.9%
93	G	Naugatuck	3,895	4,828	933	-585	-15.0%
94	I	New Britain	4,544	5,700	1,156	-616	-13.5%
95	A	New Canaan	29	233	204	193	664.6%
96	B	New Fairfield	1,733	1,316	-417	-1,093	-63.1%
97	C	New Hartford	2,114	2,360	246	-578	-27.4%
98	I	New Haven	5,237	6,621	1,384	-657	-12.6%
99	I	New London	5,133	5,853	720	-1,281	-25.0%
100	D	New Milford	2,011	2,124	113	-671	-33.4%
101	D	Newington	1,722	2,264	542	-129	-7.5%
102	B	Newtown	1,094	685	-409	-836	-76.4%
103	E	Norfolk	1,098	1,269	171	-257	-23.4%
104	E	North Branford	2,803	2,711	-92	-1,185	-42.3%
105	F	North Canaan	3,001	3,571	570	-600	-20.0%
106	D	North Haven	582	435	-147	-374	-64.2%
107	E	North Stonington	2,718	3,099	381	-679	-25.0%
108	H	Norwalk	833	789	-44	-369	-44.3%
109	H	Norwich	4,193	4,933	740	-895	-21.3%
110	C	Old Lyme	154	353	199	139	90.4%
111	D	Old Saybrook	204	298	94	14	6.9%
112	B	Orange	170	298	128	62	36.5%
113	C	Oxford	2,436	1,885	-551	-1,501	-61.6%
114	G	Plainfield	4,656	5,384	728	-1,087	-23.4%
115	F	Plainville	2,557	3,281	724	-273	-10.7%
116	F	Plymouth	3,943	4,134	191	-1,347	-34.2%
117	C	Pomfret	3,058	3,411	353	-839	-27.4%
118	E	Portland	2,120	2,463	343	-483	-22.8%
119	E	Preston	3,632	3,426	-206	-1,622	-44.7%
120	E	Prospect	2,785	2,679	-106	-1,191	-42.8%
121	G	Putnam	4,448	5,834	1,386	-348	-7.8%
122	A	Redding	67	260	193	167	249.1%
123	A	Ridgefield	76	247	171	142	186.5%
124	D	Rocky Hill	972	876	-96	-475	-48.9%
125	D	Roxbury	128	349	221	171	133.7%
126	C	Salem	3,201	3,344	143	-1,105	-34.5%
127	E	Salisbury	95	296	201	164	172.4%
128	E	Scotland	4,081	4,584	503	-1,089	-26.7%
129	F	Seymour	2,749	3,296	547	-525	-19.1%
130	E	Sharon	144	313	169	112	78.1%
131	D	Shelton	905	783	-122	-474	-52.4%
132	C	Sherman	40	241	201	185	463.1%
133	B	Simsbury	491	636	145	-47	-9.5%
134	C	Somers	2,746	2,810	64	-1,007	-36.7%
135	B	South Windsor	1,673	1,977	304	-348	-20.8%
136	C	Southbury	255	377	122	22	8.8%

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
2			Per Pupil	Per Pupil	Nominal	Inflation-Adj	Inflation-Adj
3		Municipality /	Allocation	Allocation	Change	Change	Change
4	DRG	School District	FY 95-96	FY 06-07	Last 12 Yrs	(in $2008)	%
137	D	Southington	2,306	2,406	100	-799	-34.7%
138	F	Sprague	4,379	5,062	683	-1,024	-23.4%
139	F	Stafford	3,793	4,328	535	-943	-24.9%
140	H	Stamford	311	387	76	-45	-14.6%
141	F	Sterling	4,439	4,312	-127	-1,857	-41.8%
142	D	Stonington	815	728	-87	-404	-49.6%
143	G	Stratford	1,277	2,155	878	380	29.8%
144	C	Suffield	1,512	1,864	352	-238	-15.7%
145	E	Thomaston	3,171	3,411	240	-996	-31.4%
146	F	Thompson	3,943	4,410	467	-1,071	-27.2%
147	C	Tolland	2,874	2,774	-100	-1,221	-42.5%
148	G	Torrington	3,145	4,021	876	-350	-11.1%
149	B	Trumbull	412	334	-78	-239	-58.0%
150	E	Union	1,980	1,891	-89	-860	-43.5%
151	G	Vernon	3,339	3,911	572	-729	-21.8%
152	F	Voluntown	4,377	5,394	1,017	-690	-15.8%
153	D	Wallingford	2,350	2,605	255	-661	-28.1%
154	C	Warren	297	356	59	-57	-19.2%
155	D	Washington	182	371	189	118	64.9%
156	I	Waterbury	4,559	5,511	952	-826	-18.1%
157	D	Waterford	59	243	184	161	273.5%
158	D	Watertown	2,752	2,848	96	-977	-35.5%
159	B	West Hartford	404	1,138	734	576	142.6%
160	H	West Haven	3,774	4,797	1,023	-448	-11.9%
161	E	Westbrook	189	305	116	42	22.4%
162	A	Weston	78	241	163	133	170.0%
163	A	Westport	46	233	187	169	368.3%
164	D	Wethersfield	746	1,455	709	418	56.0%
165	E	Willington	3,459	3,646	187	-1,162	-33.6%
166	A	Wilton	20	234	214	206	1031.7%
167	G	Winchester	3,934	4,344	410	-1,124	-28.6%
168	I	Windham	5,264	5,843	579	-1,473	-28.0%
169	D	Windsor	1,561	1,980	419	-190	-12.2%
170	F	Windsor Locks	792	1,581	789	481	60.7%
171	F	Wolcott	3,084	3,420	336	-866	-28.1%
172	B	Woodbridge	169	306	137	71	42.0%
173	C	Woodbury	322	449	127	2	0.5%
174	E	Woodstock	2,800	3,101	301	-790	-28.23%
175	Notes:						
176	(a)	2008 dollars were calculated using Consumer Price Index for all Northeast Urban consumers as per U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics data for Jan 1996/Jan 2008					
177	(b)	Columns C and D data are from CSDE, Bureau of Grants Management webpage, downloaded 2/15/08					

Projected Changes in ECS Entitlements, FY 06-07 through FY 08-09

DRG	Municipality / School District	Resident Pupils FY 06-07	ECS TOTAL ENTITLEMENT Year 0 FY 06-07	ECS TOTAL ENTITLEMENT Year 1 FY 07-08	ECS TOTAL ENTITLEMENT Year 2 FY 08-09	ECS PER PUPIL Year 0 FY 06-07	ECS PER PUPIL Year 1 FY 07-08	ECS PER PUPIL Year 2 FY 08-09	Year 1 - FY 07-08 Incr Over Yr 0 %	Year 1 - FY 07-08 Incr Over Yr 0 Per Pupil	Year 2 - FY 08-09 Incr Over Yr 1 %	Year 2 - FY 08-09 Incr Over Yr 1 Per Pupil
STATE PER PUPIL		**565,539.11**	**1,627,321,377**	**1,809,133,470**	**1,889,264,105**	**2,877**	**3,199**	**3,341**	**11.2%**	**321**	**4.4%**	**142**
C	Andover	650.86	1,973,606	2,232,621	2,330,887	3,032	3,430	3,581	13.1%	398	4.4%	151
H	Ansonia	2,805.17	12,883,369	14,398,149	15,031,843	4,593	5,133	5,359	11.8%	540	4.4%	226
E	Ashford	809.86	3,437,204	3,731,867	3,896,104	4,244	4,608	4,811	8.6%	364	4.4%	203
B	Avon	3,400.09	788,475	1,180,736	1,240,678	232	347	365	49.7%	115	5.1%	18
C	Barkhamsted	667.91	1,231,556	1,547,770	1,615,908	1,844	2,317	2,419	25.7%	473	4.4%	102
E	Beacon Falls	1,036.14	3,437,310	3,874,333	4,044,855	3,317	3,739	3,904	12.7%	422	4.4%	165
D	Berlin	3,409.54	4,665,028	5,909,397	6,169,555	1,368	1,733	1,809	26.7%	365	4.4%	76
C	Bethany	1,070.43	1,586,002	1,945,254	2,030,886	1,482	1,817	1,897	22.7%	336	4.4%	80
D	Bethel	3,225.29	7,372,181	7,814,020	8,157,889	2,286	2,423	2,529	6.0%	137	4.4%	107
C	Bethlehem	585.25	1,209,402	1,262,616	1,318,171	2,066	2,157	2,252	4.4%	91	4.4%	95
G	Bloomfield	2,736.60	3,977,721	5,182,323	5,410,485	1,454	1,894	1,977	30.3%	440	4.4%	83
C	Bolton	941.19	2,562,776	2,888,563	3,015,697	2,723	3,069	3,204	12.7%	346	4.4%	135
E	Bozrah	386.36	1,060,857	1,177,447	1,229,268	2,746	3,048	3,182	11.0%	302	4.4%	134
D	Branford	3,680.12	1,363,897	1,684,957	1,759,133	371	458	478	23.5%	87	4.4%	20
I	Bridgeport	22,781.79	147,107,433	157,275,234	164,196,524	6,457	6,904	7,207	6.9%	446	4.4%	304
D	Bridgewater	266.57	106,575	131,506	137,295	400	493	515	23.4%	94	4.4%	22
G	Bristol	9,117.17	35,390,494	39,901,642	41,657,838	3,882	4,377	4,569	12.7%	495	4.4%	193
B	Brookfield	3,076.22	1,202,507	1,466,181	1,530,723	391	477	498	21.9%	86	4.4%	21
E	Brooklyn	1,361.44	6,014,369	6,684,191	6,978,373	4,418	4,910	5,126	11.1%	492	4.4%	216
C	Burlington	1,861.83	3,458,751	4,114,538	4,295,654	1,858	2,210	2,307	19.0%	352	4.4%	97
E	Canaan	171.10	190,054	198,416	207,146	1,111	1,160	1,211	4.4%	49	4.4%	51
F	Canterbury	836.40	4,343,031	4,534,124	4,733,625	5,193	5,421	5,660	4.4%	228	4.4%	239
C	Canton	1,692.99	2,546,057	3,207,653	3,348,866	1,504	1,895	1,978	26.0%	391	4.4%	83
E	Chaplin	364.89	1,692,996	1,801,617	1,880,901	4,640	4,937	5,155	6.4%	298	4.4%	217
B	Cheshire	5,162.33	7,589,637	8,906,932	9,298,989	1,470	1,725	1,801	17.4%	255	4.4%	76
E	Chester	531.09	610,177	637,025	665,054	1,149	1,199	1,252	4.4%	51	4.4%	53
D	Clinton	2,192.98	5,932,138	6,193,152	6,465,651	2,705	2,824	2,948	4.4%	119	4.4%	124
D	Colchester	3,222.55	11,503,712	12,976,275	13,547,401	3,570	4,027	4,204	12.8%	457	4.4%	177
E	Colebrook	246.63	415,422	469,475	490,138	1,684	1,904	1,987	13.0%	219	4.4%	84
C	Columbia	928.94	2,161,259	2,442,564	2,550,069	2,327	2,629	2,745	13.0%	303	4.4%	116
C	Cornwall	214.05	60,930	81,726	85,324	285	382	399	34.1%	97	4.4%	17
E	Coventry	2,141.69	7,718,634	8,472,884	8,845,779	3,604	3,956	4,130	9.8%	352	4.4%	174

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
2			Resident	ECS TOTAL ENTITLEMENT			ECS PER PUPIL			Year 1 - FY 07-08 Incr Over Yr 0		Year 2 - FY 08-09 Incr Over Yr 1	
3		Municipality /	Pupils	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2				
4	DRG	School District	FY 06-07	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	%	Per Pupil	%	Per Pupil
38	D	Cromwell	1,969.16	3,317,649	4,131,889	4,313,786	1,685	2,098	2,191	24.5%	413	4.4%	92
39	H	Danbury	9,840.24	17,588,819	21,894,594	22,858,455	1,787	2,225	2,323	24.5%	438	4.4%	98
40	A	Darien	4,490.19	1,031,384	1,547,898	1,628,727	230	345	363	50.1%	115	5.2%	18
41	E	Deep River	689.77	1,548,120	1,616,237	1,687,351	2,244	2,343	2,446	4.4%	99	4.4%	103
42	H	Derby	1,565.85	6,070,014	6,576,330	6,865,748	3,876	4,200	4,385	8.3%	323	4.4%	185
43	C	Durham	1,459.26	3,406,854	3,788,134	3,954,857	2,335	2,596	2,710	11.2%	261	4.4%	114
44	D	East Granby	912.72	808,527	1,246,305	1,317,111	886	1,365	1,443	54.1%	480	5.7%	78
45	E	East Haddam	1,424.56	3,108,920	3,561,516	3,718,275	2,182	2,500	2,610	14.6%	318	4.4%	110
46	D	East Hampton	2,141.36	6,439,142	7,275,594	7,594,207	3,007	3,398	3,546	13.0%	391	4.4%	149
47	H	East Hartford	8,362.90	35,150,730	39,952,890	41,714,684	4,203	4,777	4,988	13.7%	574	4.4%	211
48	G	East Haven	4,019.29	16,795,891	17,973,300	18,764,261	4,179	4,472	4,669	7.0%	293	4.4%	197
49	D	East Lyme	3,003.26	6,514,705	6,801,352	7,100,611	2,169	2,265	2,364	4.4%	95	4.4%	100
50	F	East Windsor	1,634.97	4,584,774	5,251,087	5,482,212	2,804	3,212	3,353	14.5%	408	4.4%	141
51	E	Eastford	271.61	959,893	1,063,097	1,109,886	3,534	3,914	4,086	10.8%	380	4.4%	172
52	A	Easton	1,585.47	399,292	568,839	595,275	252	359	375	42.5%	107	4.6%	17
53	C	Ellington	2,521.44	8,023,396	9,104,327	9,505,043	3,182	3,611	3,770	13.5%	429	4.4%	159
54	F	Enfield	6,715.53	24,339,063	27,184,046	28,380,474	3,624	4,048	4,226	11.7%	424	4.4%	178
55	C	Essex	977.84	275,152	373,273	389,715	281	382	399	35.7%	100	4.4%	17
56	B	Fairfield	9,272.59	2,412,530	3,438,705	3,597,604	260	371	388	42.5%	111	4.6%	17
57	B	Farmington	4,259.54	1,092,162	1,543,116	1,612,876	256	362	379	41.3%	106	4.5%	16
58	E	Franklin	312.52	809,778	901,415	941,088	2,591	2,884	3,011	11.3%	293	4.4%	127
59	B	Glastonbury	6,878.57	3,907,727	5,939,801	6,206,096	568	864	902	52.0%	295	4.5%	39
60	C	Goshen	424.35	164,337	208,992	218,193	387	492	514	27.2%	105	4.4%	22
61	B	Granby	2,233.03	4,225,049	5,166,931	5,394,386	1,892	2,314	2,416	22.3%	422	4.4%	102
62	B	Greenwich	8,952.38	2,297,232	3,274,561	3,427,474	257	366	383	42.5%	109	4.7%	17
63	F	Griswold	2,013.06	9,510,451	10,282,590	10,735,113	4,724	5,108	5,333	8.1%	384	4.4%	225
64	G	Groton (Town)	5,482.16	23,281,173	24,305,545	25,374,989	4,247	4,434	4,629	4.4%	187	4.4%	195
65	B	Guilford	3,863.26	2,806,569	2,930,058	3,058,981	726	758	792	4.4%	32	4.4%	33
66	C	Haddam	1,346.42	1,178,623	1,655,757	1,737,389	875	1,230	1,290	40.5%	354	4.9%	61
67	D	Hamden	7,105.83	19,465,692	22,060,116	23,031,063	2,739	3,105	3,241	13.3%	365	4.4%	137
68	E	Hampton	268.51	1,227,212	1,281,209	1,337,582	4,570	4,772	4,981	4.4%	201	4.4%	210
69	I	Hartford	22,921.18	170,113,053	180,052,577	187,970,882	7,422	7,855	8,201	5.8%	434	4.4%	345
70	E	Hartland	361.30	1,225,800	1,293,905	1,350,844	3,393	3,581	3,739	5.6%	188	4.4%	158
71	C	Harwinton	942.35	2,387,469	2,613,411	2,728,427	2,534	2,773	2,895	9.5%	240	4.4%	122
72	C	Hebron	2,076.33	5,687,166	6,583,267	6,873,035	2,739	3,171	3,310	15.8%	432	4.4%	140
73	E	Kent	395.55	125,342	160,289	167,346	317	405	423	27.9%	88	4.4%	18

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
2			Resident	ECS TOTAL ENTITLEMENT			ECS PER PUPIL			Year 1 - FY 07-08		Year 2 - FY 08-09	
3		Municipality /	Pupils	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Incr Over Yr 0		Incr Over Yr 1	
4	DRG	School District	FY 06-07	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	%	Per Pupil	%	Per Pupil
74	G	Killingly	2,740.79	13,670,489	14,603,097	15,245,742	4,988	5,328	5,563	6.8%	340	4.4%	234
75	C	Killingworth	1,158.58	2,043,668	2,133,589	2,227,467	1,764	1,842	1,923	4.4%	78	4.4%	81
76	E	Lebanon	1,332.06	4,650,179	5,237,197	5,467,702	3,491	3,932	4,105	12.6%	441	4.4%	173
77	D	Ledyard	2,814.62	10,543,923	11,523,434	12,060,183	3,746	4,094	4,285	9.3%	348	4.7%	191
78	E	Lisbon	827.96	3,462,769	3,734,902	3,899,269	4,182	4,511	4,709	7.9%	329	4.4%	199
79	E	Litchfield	1,322.15	1,146,431	1,417,482	1,479,883	867	1,072	1,119	23.6%	205	4.4%	47
80	C	Lyme	310.36	105,211	139,421	145,560	339	449	469	32.5%	110	4.4%	20
81	B	Madison	3,952.20	1,109,520	1,509,637	1,576,107	281	382	399	36.1%	101	4.4%	17
82	G	Manchester	7,666.09	26,278,814	29,328,640	30,619,454	3,428	3,826	3,994	11.6%	398	4.4%	168
83	C	Mansfield	1,989.46	8,804,430	9,646,242	10,070,774	4,426	4,849	5,062	9.6%	423	4.4%	213
84	C	Marlborough	1,168.83	2,741,278	2,992,740	3,124,435	2,345	2,560	2,673	9.2%	215	4.4%	113
85	H	Meriden	9,628.73	46,584,133	51,516,965	53,784,284	4,838	5,350	5,586	10.6%	512	4.4%	235
86	C	Middlebury	1,261.89	432,884	610,587	642,471	343	484	509	41.1%	141	5.2%	25
87	C	Middlefield	747.36	1,764,710	2,011,723	2,100,268	2,361	2,692	2,810	14.0%	331	4.4%	118
88	G	Middletown	5,284.11	13,603,625	15,950,561	16,652,657	2,574	3,019	3,151	17.3%	444	4.4%	133
89	D	Milford	7,593.88	9,843,256	10,276,359	10,728,519	1,296	1,353	1,413	4.4%	57	4.4%	60
90	B	Monroe	4,296.43	5,683,780	6,295,132	6,572,189	1,323	1,465	1,530	10.8%	142	4.4%	64
91	F	Montville	3,051.79	10,774,376	12,020,528	12,549,576	3,531	3,939	4,112	11.6%	408	4.4%	173
92	C	Morris	403.61	603,682	630,244	657,975	1,496	1,562	1,630	4.4%	66	4.4%	69
93	G	Naugatuck	5,364.02	25,898,435	27,980,269	29,211,642	4,828	5,216	5,446	8.0%	388	4.4%	230
94	I	New Britain	11,248.94	64,119,355	70,813,502	73,930,072	5,700	6,295	6,572	10.4%	595	4.4%	277
95	A	New Canaan	4,181.70	974,458	1,432,571	1,504,404	233	343	360	47.0%	110	5.0%	17
96	B	New Fairfield	3,053.72	4,017,911	4,228,049	4,414,108	1,316	1,385	1,445	5.2%	69	4.4%	61
97	C	New Hartford	1,148.68	2,710,710	3,011,400	3,143,936	2,360	2,622	2,737	11.1%	262	4.4%	115
98	I	New Haven	19,405.22	128,491,056	136,503,376	142,510,454	6,621	7,034	7,344	6.2%	413	4.4%	310
99	I	New London	3,530.99	20,667,811	21,973,721	22,923,204	5,853	6,223	6,492	6.3%	370	4.3%	269
100	D	New Milford	5,057.91	10,741,407	11,436,386	11,939,667	2,124	2,261	2,361	6.5%	137	4.4%	100
101	D	Newington	4,586.84	10,386,893	12,100,206	12,632,814	2,264	2,638	2,754	16.5%	374	4.4%	116
102	B	Newtown	5,734.75	3,927,818	4,128,013	4,309,669	685	720	752	5.1%	35	4.4%	32
103	E	Norfolk	275.83	349,942	365,339	381,414	1,269	1,325	1,383	4.4%	56	4.4%	58
104	E	North Branford	2,596.66	7,038,646	7,775,021	8,117,208	2,711	2,994	3,126	10.5%	284	4.4%	132
105	F	North Canaan	511.75	1,827,473	1,977,579	2,064,610	3,571	3,864	4,034	8.2%	293	4.4%	170
106	D	North Haven	3,980.17	1,732,204	2,665,022	2,819,907	435	670	708	53.9%	234	5.8%	39
107	E	North Stonington	856.33	2,653,770	2,770,536	2,892,440	3,099	3,235	3,378	4.4%	136	4.4%	142
108	H	Norwalk	11,045.42	8,712,307	9,669,666	10,099,964	789	875	914	11.0%	87	4.4%	39
109	H	Norwich	5,725.74	28,243,549	30,954,543	32,316,857	4,933	5,406	5,644	9.6%	473	4.4%	238

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
2			Resident	ECS TOTAL ENTITLEMENT			ECS PER PUPIL			Year 1 - FY 07-08		Year 2 - FY 08-09	
3		Municipality /	Pupils	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Incr Over Yr 0		Incr Over Yr 1	
4	DRG	School District	FY 06-07	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	%	Per Pupil	%	Per Pupil
110	C	Old Lyme	1,265.23	446,919	580,063	605,601	353	458	479	29.8%	105	4.4%	20
111	D	Old Saybrook	1,562.52	464,998	625,170	652,696	298	400	418	34.4%	103	4.4%	18
112	B	Orange	2,502.55	746,425	1,011,408	1,055,940	298	404	422	35.5%	106	4.4%	18
113	C	Oxford	2,056.92	3,876,807	4,412,702	4,606,922	1,885	2,145	2,240	13.8%	261	4.4%	94
114	G	Plainfield	2,508.95	13,507,998	14,706,134	15,353,343	5,384	5,861	6,119	8.9%	478	4.4%	258
115	F	Plainville	2,637.83	8,654,338	9,733,576	10,161,979	3,281	3,690	3,852	12.5%	409	4.4%	162
116	F	Plymouth	2,040.11	8,433,186	9,332,636	9,743,376	4,134	4,575	4,776	10.7%	441	4.4%	201
117	C	Pomfret	774.97	2,643,742	2,962,468	3,092,854	3,411	3,823	3,991	12.1%	411	4.4%	168
118	E	Portland	1,423.03	3,505,158	4,092,200	4,272,325	2,463	2,876	3,002	16.7%	413	4.4%	127
119	E	Preston	762.10	2,610,591	2,928,185	3,057,063	3,426	3,842	4,011	12.2%	417	4.4%	169
120	E	Prospect	1,658.50	4,443,912	5,095,020	5,319,277	2,679	3,072	3,207	14.7%	393	4.4%	135
121	G	Putnam	1,253.27	7,311,206	7,731,658	8,071,899	5,834	6,169	6,441	5.8%	335	4.4%	271
122	A	Redding	1,794.28	466,523	658,748	688,666	260	367	384	41.2%	107	4.5%	17
123	A	Ridgefield	5,585.45	1,381,767	1,976,833	2,069,951	247	354	371	43.1%	107	4.7%	17
124	D	Rocky Hill	2,563.26	2,245,446	3,213,819	3,364,755	876	1,254	1,313	43.1%	378	4.7%	59
125	D	Roxbury	339.08	118,371	151,450	158,117	349	447	466	27.9%	98	4.4%	20
126	C	Salem	828.13	2,769,446	2,969,056	3,099,717	3,344	3,585	3,743	7.2%	241	4.4%	158
127	E	Salisbury	451.85	133,664	179,374	187,272	296	397	414	34.2%	101	4.4%	17
128	E	Scotland	280.24	1,284,490	1,383,580	1,472,457	4,584	4,937	5,254	7.7%	354	6.4%	317
129	F	Seymour	2,562.21	8,445,682	9,421,943	9,836,622	3,296	3,677	3,839	11.6%	381	4.4%	162
130	E	Sharon	337.60	105,547	139,653	145,802	313	414	432	32.3%	101	4.4%	18
131	D	Shelton	5,827.87	4,565,270	4,766,142	4,975,852	783	818	854	4.4%	34	4.4%	36
132	C	Sherman	672.72	162,023	234,030	245,335	241	348	365	44.4%	107	4.8%	17
133	B	Simsbury	5,062.74	3,218,273	5,141,300	5,451,989	636	1,016	1,077	59.8%	380	6.0%	61
134	C	Somers	1,723.56	4,842,462	5,669,192	5,918,732	2,810	3,289	3,434	17.1%	480	4.4%	145
135	B	South Windsor	5,181.29	10,243,540	12,316,883	12,859,066	1,977	2,377	2,482	20.2%	400	4.4%	105
136	C	Southbury	3,326.69	1,253,501	2,320,147	2,494,732	377	697	750	85.1%	321	7.5%	52
137	D	Southington	6,801.68	16,363,579	19,002,977	19,839,414	2,406	2,794	2,917	16.1%	388	4.4%	123
138	F	Sprague	467.10	2,364,382	2,491,045	2,600,666	5,062	5,333	5,568	5.4%	271	4.4%	235
139	F	Stafford	1,991.59	8,620,168	9,396,000	9,809,514	4,328	4,718	4,925	9.0%	390	4.4%	208
140	H	Stamford	15,216.31	5,885,766	7,233,820	7,735,440	387	475	508	22.9%	89	6.9%	33
141	F	Sterling	622.91	2,686,246	3,032,944	3,166,434	4,312	4,869	5,083	12.9%	557	4.4%	214
142	D	Stonington	2,596.07	1,891,124	1,974,333	2,061,204	728	761	794	4.4%	32	4.4%	33
143	G	Stratford	7,708.76	16,614,626	19,631,803	20,495,952	2,155	2,547	2,659	18.2%	391	4.4%	112
144	C	Suffield	2,429.97	4,529,296	5,826,144	6,082,645	1,864	2,398	2,503	28.6%	534	4.4%	106
145	E	Thomaston	1,400.47	4,777,023	5,393,014	5,630,378	3,411	3,851	4,020	12.9%	440	4.4%	169

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
2			Resident	ECS TOTAL ENTITLEMENT			ECS PER PUPIL			Year 1 - FY 07-08		Year 2 - FY 08-09	
3		Municipality /	Pupils	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Incr Over Yr 0		Incr Over Yr 1	
4	DRG	School District	FY 06-07	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	%	Per Pupil	%	Per Pupil
146	F	Thompson	1,520.68	6,705,681	7,287,825	7,608,556	4,410	4,792	5,003	8.7%	383	4.4%	211
147	C	Tolland	3,202.25	8,881,453	10,305,827	10,759,448	2,774	3,218	3,360	16.0%	445	4.4%	142
148	G	Torrington	5,048.04	20,296,473	22,924,658	23,933,648	4,021	4,541	4,741	12.9%	521	4.4%	200
149	B	Trumbull	6,774.83	2,260,482	2,904,203	3,032,063	334	429	448	28.5%	95	4.4%	19
150	E	Union	107.00	202,390	229,479	239,579	1,891	2,145	2,239	13.4%	253	4.4%	94
151	G	Vernon	3,948.71	15,445,222	16,901,499	17,645,334	3,911	4,280	4,469	9.4%	369	4.4%	188
152	F	Voluntown	431.42	2,326,904	2,429,288	2,536,177	5,394	5,631	5,879	4.4%	237	4.4%	248
153	D	Wallingford	7,147.95	18,620,420	20,536,622	21,440,456	2,605	2,873	3,000	10.3%	268	4.4%	126
154	C	Warren	211.00	75,048	95,572	99,779	356	453	473	27.3%	97	4.4%	20
155	D	Washington	488.22	181,154	230,026	240,152	371	471	492	27.0%	100	4.4%	21
156	I	Waterbury	17,748.66	97,808,233	108,828,718	113,618,460	5,511	6,132	6,402	11.3%	621	4.4%	270
157	D	Waterford	3,283.97	799,224	1,384,487	1,445,472	243	422	440	73.2%	178	4.4%	19
158	D	Watertown	3,549.90	10,108,359	11,254,198	11,749,515	2,848	3,170	3,310	11.3%	323	4.4%	140
159	B	West Hartford	9,995.26	11,372,329	15,398,582	16,076,586	1,138	1,541	1,608	35.4%	403	4.4%	68
160	H	West Haven	7,603.39	36,473,924	39,654,505	41,320,474	4,797	5,215	5,434	8.7%	418	4.2%	219
161	E	Westbrook	1,022.30	311,769	409,652	427,688	305	401	418	31.4%	96	4.4%	18
162	A	Weston	2,577.55	621,222	908,586	953,527	241	352	370	46.3%	111	4.9%	17
163	A	Westport	5,473.06	1,277,247	1,904,459	2,002,752	233	348	366	49.1%	115	5.2%	18
164	D	Wethersfield	3,855.17	5,608,130	7,680,481	8,018,662	1,455	1,992	2,080	37.0%	538	4.4%	88
165	E	Willington	893.07	3,256,074	3,521,683	3,676,667	3,646	3,943	4,117	8.2%	297	4.4%	174
166	A	Wilton	4,291.00	1,004,671	1,491,566	1,567,874	234	348	365	48.5%	113	5.1%	18
167	G	Winchester	1,580.26	6,864,678	7,494,244	7,824,063	4,344	4,742	4,951	9.2%	398	4.4%	209
168	I	Windham	3,634.68	21,238,624	23,151,070	24,169,939	5,843	6,369	6,650	9.0%	526	4.4%	280
169	D	Windsor	4,655.22	9,215,635	11,060,980	11,547,877	1,980	2,376	2,481	20.0%	396	4.4%	105
170	F	Windsor Locks	2,071.77	3,276,272	4,456,291	4,652,505	1,581	2,151	2,246	36.0%	570	4.4%	95
171	F	Wolcott	3,345.58	11,443,209	12,968,746	13,577,680	3,420	3,876	4,058	13.3%	456	4.7%	182
172	B	Woodbridge	1,692.42	517,800	690,967	721,390	306	408	426	33.4%	102	4.4%	18
173	C	Woodbury	1,558.79	700,133	839,098	876,035	449	538	562	19.8%	89	4.4%	24
174	E	Woodstock	1,483.63	4,600,969	5,162,888	5,390,120	3,101	3,480	3,633	12.2%	379	4.4%	153
175	**Notes:**												
176	(a)	Year 1 and 2 per pupil figures shown here assume that 100% of the ECS entitlement is passed on by each municipality to its BOE, which is no longer required by statute.											
177	(b)	Per pupil increases for FY 08-09 are based on FY 06-07 (Column C) resident pupil counts, inasmuch as SDE has not yet released the Oct 1, 2007 resident student counts used in the FY 08-09 calculations; because resident student counts vary each year and the Year 2 counts for towns with students attending interdistrict magnet schools will be lowered, the projected ECS per pupil figures for 2008-09 must be viewed with caution.											
178	(c)	Data in Columns D and E are from CSDE, Bureau of Grants Management publication, "Education Cost Sharing (ECS) Entitlements," dated 1/11/2008, downloaded 2/24/08.											
179	(d)	Data for Column F are from latest available OPM document, "Statutory Formula Grants," undated, received from CCM 7/15/07; total is approx. $80K more than is budgeted.											