



State of Connecticut
Latino and Puerto Rican
Affairs Commission

18-20 Trinity Street
Hartford, CT 06106
Tel. (860) 240-8330
Fax (860) 240-0315
E-Mail: lprac@cga.ct.gov
Web Site: www.cga.ct.gov/lprac

Testimony Regarding Bill SB-816

Orlando J. Rodriguez

Associate Legislative Analyst, Latino and Puerto Rican Affairs Commission

Appropriations Committee

April 2nd, 2015, Hartford, CT

Chairperson

Richard A. Cruz

Vice Chair

Elena Trueworthy, M.S.

Secretary

Emanuela Palmares-Leaf

Treasurer

Yolanda Castillo

Commissioners:

Ramón L. Arroyo

Migdalia Castro

Ana Gonzalez

Jay Gonzalez

George Hernández

Dr. Ruby O'Neill

Dr. Agnes Quiñones

Ruben Rodriguez

Dr. Eugene M. Salorio

Christian Soto

Pablo Soto

Feny Taylor

Danny Torres

Executive Director

Werner Oyanadel

Special Projects Director

Lucia Goicoechea-Hernández

Associate Legislative Analyst

Orlando Rodríguez

Senior Legislative Secretary

Clarisa Cardone

Good morning Senator Bye, Representative Walker, and distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee. My name is Orlando Rodriguez and I am an Associate Legislative Analyst with the Latino and Puerto Rican Affairs Commission (LPRAC). LPRAC supports the spirit of bill **SB-816 AN ACT ESTABLISHING A MINIMUM LEVEL OF FUNDING UNDER THE EDUCATION COST SHARING GRANT FORMULA** but is concerned that it would allow towns to continue to receive more ECS funding than is required based on the "fully funded grant" amount as prescribed in General Statute § 10-262f.

As written, this proposed legislation would allow some towns to continue to be overfunded by requiring funding of at least 50 percent of the *adjusted* fully funded formula. There is no definition for "adjusted fully funded" in General Statute § 10-262f. This bill should be changed to state, "that no town shall receive less than fifty percent of the *fully funded grant* as calculated by the education cost sharing formula using the most current data." LPRAC would like to take this opportunity to point out that this legislation would not be necessary if towns were funded at the level set by the ECS formula.

There is misunderstanding that the ECS grant amount is based on the ECS *formula* calculations. While the ECS *formula* corrects for the state's changing socioeconomics, the ECS grant is determined through a political process such that most towns receive less than their ECS "fully funded grant" and some towns receive more than their ECS "fully funded grant".¹ For example, a town does not have their ECS grant reduced even when their student enrollment has declined and the wealth of town residents has increased.

In both FY 2014 and FY 2015, the legislature overfunded the ECS grants of 50 towns by a total of **\$21 million** yearly (\$42 million total). The governor's proposed budget continues this overfunding in FY 2016 and FY 2017 even when the state is facing a budget deficient of over \$1 billion in the next fiscal year.²

This **extra** ECS money for select towns is inconsistent with the stated goal of the ECS grant, which is to equalize educational opportunities among towns.³ Because most towns receive less than their "fully funded grant," the majority of children in public schools in Connecticut are attending schools that are

¹ Orlando Rodriguez, LPRAC Memorandum Re: Towns Receiving ECS funding above their ECS target amount (overfunding); 27feb2015

² ECS funding proposed for FY 2016 and FY 2017 is the same as in FY 2015

³ Final Report of the Task Force to Study State Education Funding, January 2013

underfunded by the state. Furthermore, the state underfunds ECS grants to towns with large Latino populations by tens of millions of dollars each year. Therefore, we ask for the following changes and amendments to this bill:

- No town shall receive less than 50 percent of their ECS “fully funded grant” and no town shall receive more than 100 percent of their ECS “fully funded grant” as calculated by the ECS formula using current data.
- Overfunded towns will have their ECS grant reduced to no more than 100 percent of their ECS “fully funded grant” as calculated by the ECS formula using current data.
- The ECS formula must be updated yearly with current data and the updated ECS “fully funded grant” amount must be taken into account when appropriating state funding to towns for K-12 education.
- The State Department of Education (SDE) must report yearly for each town the difference between (a) their ECS grant (as appropriated) and (b) their ECS “fully funded grant” (as calculated by the ECS formula using current data).
- The worksheet used by SDE to calculate the ECS grant contains data elements (e.g. Adjusted Fully Funded Formula, Entitlement) that are **not** defined in General Statute § 10-262f. Much of the confusion surrounding ECS has been because of the reporting of this misleading information. The formula calculation should include only components specifically identified in statute.
- The Education Cost Sharing Grant should be renamed the *Town Local Education Grant* to eliminate the misunderstanding that this funding is based on the ECS formula, which it is not.

If the current trend continues, yearly overfunding will reach \$38 million in FY 2019. From FY 2009 to FY 2019, there will be a 10-year cumulative total of **\$228 million** in overfunding. ECS overfunding will not go away if we ignore it. It will get much worse.

LPRAC thanks this committee for addressing this politically sensitive issue and encourages its members to eliminate permanently ECS overfunding in FY 2016 and beyond.

Memorandum

To: Werner Oyanadel, Executive Director, Latino and Puerto Rican Affairs Commission
From: Orlando Rodriguez, Associate Legislative Analyst
Re: Towns receiving ECS funding above their ECS target amount (overfunding)
Date: February 27, 2015

Based on the most recently available data for the Education Cost Sharing (ECS) formula, the proposed ECS funding for FY 2016 would result in 50 towns being “overfunded.”¹ This means these select towns will receive more ECS grant monies than calculated for their ECS “target” or “maximum” amount. In total, approximately **\$21 million** in ECS monies were overfunded to select towns in FY 2015.² In the past two fiscal years, there has already been a total of roughly \$40 million dollars in ECS overfunding to select towns. Governor’s bill HB-6824 AN ACT CONCERNING THE STATE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM ENDING JUNE THIRTIETH 2017, AND MAKING APPROPRIATIONS THEREFOR AND OTHER PROVISIONS RELATED TO REVENUE continues this overfunding to select towns for the next two fiscal years.

In the five fiscal years from 2009 to 2014, estimates show the state overfunded select towns by a year-to-year cumulative total of \$72.4 million. If this trend continues, overfunding in FY 2019 will be roughly \$38.2 million with a 10-year annual cumulative total of **\$228.4 million** in overfunding having been given to select towns.

The following list of towns shows the difference in proposed ECS funding for FY 2016 vs. their ECS maximum amount as of FY 2014.³ The degree of overfunding would likely increase with an ECS formula updated for FY 2016.

Overfunded

Town	Funding Status FY 2016	The Most the Town Should Get Based on ECS Formula FY 2014	ECS Funding Proposed in HB-6824 FY 2016	Dollars Overfunded FY 2016	Percentage Overfunded FY 2016
Bethlehem	Overfunded	\$1,307,335	\$1,319,337	\$12,002	1%
Bridgewater	Overfunded	\$64,908	\$137,292	\$72,384	112%
Canaan	Overfunded	\$29,474	\$209,258	\$179,784	610%
Canterbury	Overfunded	\$4,255,176	\$4,754,383	\$499,207	12%
Clinton	Overfunded	\$5,183,598	\$6,502,667	\$1,319,069	25%
Cornwall	Overfunded	\$38,749	\$85,322	\$46,573	120%
Darien	Overfunded	\$1,132,163	\$1,616,006	\$483,843	43%
Eastford	Overfunded	\$1,092,969	\$1,116,844	\$23,875	2%
Easton	Overfunded	\$358,322	\$593,868	\$235,546	66%

¹ 2013-2014 ECS worksheet from Kevin Chambers (July 2014) of the State Department of Education and 2015-2017 ECS appropriated from HB-6824.

² ECS funding for FY 2015 was the same as is proposed for FY 2016 and FY 2017.

³ The ECS formula has not been updated since 2013-2014.



Town	Funding Status FY 2016	The Most the Town Should Get Based on ECS Formula FY 2014	ECS Funding Proposed in HB-6824 FY 2016	Dollars Overfunded FY 2016	Percentage Overfunded FY 2016
Essex	Overfunded	\$251,835	\$389,697	\$137,862	55%
Fairfield	Overfunded	\$2,449,127	\$3,590,008	\$1,140,881	47%
Farmington	Overfunded	\$1,495,248	\$1,611,013	\$115,765	8%
Franklin	Overfunded	\$921,749	\$948,235	\$26,486	3%
Goshen	Overfunded	\$137,417	\$218,188	\$80,771	59%
Greenwich	Overfunded	\$2,097,370	\$3,418,642	\$1,321,272	63%
Groton	Overfunded	\$22,638,780	\$25,625,179	\$2,986,399	13%
Guilford	Overfunded	\$2,055,362	\$3,058,981	\$1,003,619	49%
Hampton	Overfunded	\$1,088,677	\$1,339,928	\$251,251	23%
Hartland	Overfunded	\$1,338,751	\$1,358,660	\$19,909	1%
Kent	Overfunded	\$77,592	\$167,342	\$89,750	116%
Lebanon	Overfunded	\$5,491,277	\$5,524,550	\$33,273	1%
Lisbon	Overfunded	\$2,955,382	\$3,927,193	\$971,811	33%
Lyme	Overfunded	\$104,039	\$145,556	\$41,517	40%
Madison	Overfunded	\$802,004	\$1,576,061	\$774,057	97%
Monroe	Overfunded	\$6,575,405	\$6,613,738	\$38,333	1%
Morris	Overfunded	\$114,215	\$657,975	\$543,760	476%
New Canaan	Overfunded	\$984,034	\$1,495,604	\$511,570	52%
Norfolk	Overfunded	\$57,614	\$381,414	\$323,800	562%
North Canaan	Overfunded	\$1,961,169	\$2,091,790	\$130,621	7%
North Stonington	Overfunded	\$2,411,817	\$2,906,538	\$494,721	21%
Old Lyme	Overfunded	\$390,006	\$605,586	\$215,580	55%
Old Saybrook	Overfunded	\$358,049	\$652,677	\$294,628	82%
Preston	Overfunded	\$2,929,599	\$3,077,693	\$148,094	5%
Redding	Overfunded	\$405,657	\$687,733	\$282,076	70%
Ridgefield	Overfunded	\$1,231,804	\$2,063,814	\$832,010	68%
Roxbury	Overfunded	\$88,124	\$158,114	\$69,990	79%
Salem	Overfunded	\$2,872,625	\$3,114,216	\$241,591	8%
Salisbury	Overfunded	\$95,038	\$187,266	\$92,228	97%
Scotland	Overfunded	\$1,304,997	\$1,450,663	\$145,666	11%
Sharon	Overfunded	\$60,947	\$145,798	\$84,851	139%
Sherman	Overfunded	\$136,502	\$244,327	\$107,825	79%
Stonington	Overfunded	\$589,614	\$2,079,926	\$1,490,312	253%
Voluntown	Overfunded	\$2,401,411	\$2,550,166	\$148,755	6%
Warren	Overfunded	\$58,723	\$99,777	\$41,054	70%
Washington	Overfunded	\$123,953	\$240,147	\$116,194	94%
Waterford	Overfunded	\$732,531	\$1,485,842	\$753,311	103%



Town	Funding Status FY 2016	The Most the Town Should Get Based on ECS Formula FY 2014	ECS Funding Proposed in HB-6824 FY 2016	Dollars Overfunded FY 2016	Percentage Overfunded FY 2016
Westbrook	Overfunded	\$213,003	\$427,677	\$214,674	101%
Weston	Overfunded	\$559,631	\$948,564	\$388,933	69%
Westport	Overfunded	\$1,341,144	\$1,988,255	\$647,111	48%
Wilton	Overfunded	\$995,712	\$1,557,195	\$561,483	56%
Total:		\$86,360,628	\$107,146,705	\$20,786,077	24%

Underfunded

Town	Funding Status FY 2016	The Most the Town Should Get Based on ECS Formula FY 2014	ECS Funding Proposed in HB-6824 FY 2016	Dollars Underfunded FY 2016	Percentage Underfunded FY 2016
Andover	Underfunded	\$3,038,742	\$2,379,549	-\$659,193	-22%
Ansonia	Underfunded	\$22,264,940	\$16,548,642	-\$5,716,298	-26%
Ashford	Underfunded	\$4,018,107	\$3,933,350	-\$84,757	-2%
Avon	Underfunded	\$1,266,380	\$1,233,415	-\$32,965	-3%
Barkhamsted	Underfunded	\$2,437,720	\$1,668,460	-\$769,260	-32%
Beacon Falls	Underfunded	\$5,211,406	\$4,128,939	-\$1,082,467	-21%
Berlin	Underfunded	\$8,023,474	\$6,311,635	-\$1,711,839	-21%
Bethany	Underfunded	\$2,560,162	\$2,053,378	-\$506,784	-20%
Bethel	Underfunded	\$9,013,919	\$8,261,688	-\$752,231	-8%
Bloomfield	Underfunded	\$9,333,801	\$6,230,536	-\$3,103,265	-33%
Bolton	Underfunded	\$3,391,740	\$3,046,046	-\$345,694	-10%
Bozrah	Underfunded	\$1,625,289	\$1,249,912	-\$375,377	-23%
Branford	Underfunded	\$6,137,057	\$1,911,260	-\$4,225,797	-69%
Bridgeport	Underfunded	\$211,305,113	\$179,600,148	-\$31,704,965	-15%
Bristol	Underfunded	\$56,870,513	\$45,348,587	-\$11,521,926	-20%
Brookfield	Underfunded	\$1,584,587	\$1,555,658	-\$28,929	-2%
Brooklyn	Underfunded	\$8,657,684	\$7,087,589	-\$1,570,095	-18%
Burlington	Underfunded	\$6,548,536	\$4,394,032	-\$2,154,504	-33%
Canton	Underfunded	\$5,441,158	\$3,457,436	-\$1,983,722	-36%
Chaplin	Underfunded	\$1,902,175	\$1,893,763	-\$8,412	-0.4%
Cheshire	Underfunded	\$16,582,513	\$9,506,203	-\$7,076,310	-43%
Chester	Underfunded	\$1,129,400	\$675,408	-\$453,992	-40%



Town	Funding Status FY 2016	The Most the Town Should Get Based on ECS Formula FY 2014	ECS Funding Proposed in HB-6824 FY 2016	Dollars Underfunded FY 2016	Percentage Underfunded FY 2016
Colchester	Underfunded	\$15,816,597	\$13,761,528	-\$2,055,069	-13%
Colebrook	Underfunded	\$603,586	\$508,008	-\$95,578	-16%
Columbia	Underfunded	\$3,118,332	\$2,573,616	-\$544,716	-17%
Coventry	Underfunded	\$9,868,816	\$8,935,142	-\$933,674	-9%
Cromwell	Underfunded	\$8,347,647	\$4,499,307	-\$3,848,340	-46%
Danbury	Underfunded	\$58,801,145	\$29,554,523	-\$29,246,622	-50%
Deep River	Underfunded	\$2,176,132	\$1,720,239	-\$455,893	-21%
Derby	Underfunded	\$12,008,726	\$7,905,484	-\$4,103,242	-34%
Durham	Underfunded	\$4,362,453	\$3,993,506	-\$368,947	-8%
East Granby	Underfunded	\$2,735,151	\$1,377,206	-\$1,357,945	-50%
East Haddam	Underfunded	\$4,552,303	\$3,779,206	-\$773,097	-17%
East Hampton	Underfunded	\$8,965,454	\$7,690,997	-\$1,274,457	-14%
East Hartford	Underfunded	\$65,408,995	\$48,811,203	-\$16,597,792	-25%
East Haven	Underfunded	\$24,392,630	\$20,004,233	-\$4,388,397	-18%
East Lyme	Underfunded	\$7,203,162	\$7,138,163	-\$64,999	-1%
East Windsor	Underfunded	\$6,287,475	\$5,789,350	-\$498,125	-8%
Ellington	Underfunded	\$13,684,753	\$9,722,237	-\$3,962,516	-29%
Enfield	Underfunded	\$37,874,167	\$28,973,638	-\$8,900,529	-24%
Glastonbury	Underfunded	\$14,048,429	\$6,552,432	-\$7,495,997	-53%
Granby	Underfunded	\$8,746,541	\$5,536,473	-\$3,210,068	-37%
Griswold	Underfunded	\$12,946,310	\$10,922,908	-\$2,023,402	-16%
Haddam	Underfunded	\$4,355,470	\$1,823,044	-\$2,532,426	-58%
Hamden	Underfunded	\$44,779,658	\$27,018,047	-\$17,761,611	-40%
Hartford	Underfunded	\$227,334,478	\$200,830,551	-\$26,503,927	-12%
Harwinton	Underfunded	\$3,525,159	\$2,774,080	-\$751,079	-21%
Hebron	Underfunded	\$9,564,703	\$7,016,070	-\$2,548,633	-27%
Killingly	Underfunded	\$17,307,188	\$15,871,254	-\$1,435,934	-8%
Killingworth	Underfunded	\$2,653,050	\$2,245,206	-\$407,844	-15%
Ledyard	Underfunded	\$14,065,183	\$12,178,128	-\$1,887,055	-13%
Litchfield	Underfunded	\$1,988,389	\$1,517,026	-\$471,363	-24%
Manchester	Underfunded	\$47,574,634	\$34,476,141	-\$13,098,493	-28%
Mansfield	Underfunded	\$11,390,432	\$10,186,654	-\$1,203,778	-11%
Marlborough	Underfunded	\$4,850,409	\$3,201,941	-\$1,648,468	-34%
Meriden	Underfunded	\$75,179,523	\$59,964,898	-\$15,214,625	-20%
Middlebury	Underfunded	\$1,878,757	\$738,899	-\$1,139,858	-61%
Middlefield	Underfunded	\$2,668,032	\$2,142,785	-\$525,247	-20%
Middletown	Underfunded	\$32,050,094	\$19,648,776	-\$12,401,318	-39%



Town	Funding Status FY 2016	The Most the Town Should Get Based on ECS Formula FY 2014	ECS Funding Proposed in HB-6824 FY 2016	Dollars Underfunded FY 2016	Percentage Underfunded FY 2016
Milford	Underfunded	\$29,577,821	\$11,381,824	-\$18,195,997	-62%
Montville	Underfunded	\$15,635,052	\$12,768,219	-\$2,866,833	-18%
Naugatuck	Underfunded	\$36,415,487	\$30,805,615	-\$5,609,872	-15%
New Britain	Underfunded	\$113,617,376	\$85,008,849	-\$28,608,527	-25%
New Fairfield	Underfunded	\$4,689,652	\$4,468,243	-\$221,409	-5%
New Hartford	Underfunded	\$4,312,545	\$3,187,717	-\$1,124,828	-26%
New Haven	Underfunded	\$180,410,850	\$154,577,620	-\$25,833,230	-14%
New London	Underfunded	\$32,675,268	\$25,677,518	-\$6,997,750	-21%
New Milford	Underfunded	\$14,651,165	\$12,127,127	-\$2,524,038	-17%
Newington	Underfunded	\$20,251,163	\$13,031,837	-\$7,219,326	-36%
Newtown	Underfunded	\$9,099,975	\$4,441,264	-\$4,658,711	-51%
North Branford	Underfunded	\$9,728,824	\$8,252,689	-\$1,476,135	-15%
North Haven	Underfunded	\$7,849,178	\$3,393,016	-\$4,456,162	-57%
Norwalk	Underfunded	\$14,754,985	\$11,275,807	-\$3,479,178	-24%
Norwich	Underfunded	\$44,618,539	\$36,195,392	-\$8,423,147	-19%
Orange	Underfunded	\$5,200,554	\$1,185,863	-\$4,014,691	-77%
Oxford	Underfunded	\$5,233,602	\$4,677,464	-\$556,138	-11%
Plainfield	Underfunded	\$17,522,426	\$15,600,016	-\$1,922,410	-11%
Plainville	Underfunded	\$13,208,098	\$10,405,528	-\$2,802,570	-21%
Plymouth	Underfunded	\$11,928,547	\$9,913,763	-\$2,014,784	-17%
Pomfret	Underfunded	\$3,495,899	\$3,136,587	-\$359,312	-10%
Portland	Underfunded	\$6,930,511	\$4,394,272	-\$2,536,239	-37%
Prospect	Underfunded	\$6,948,602	\$5,405,931	-\$1,542,671	-22%
Putnam	Underfunded	\$9,268,846	\$8,471,318	-\$797,528	-9%
Rocky Hill	Underfunded	\$8,765,021	\$3,587,753	-\$5,177,268	-59%
Seymour	Underfunded	\$13,340,239	\$10,072,953	-\$3,267,286	-24%
Shelton	Underfunded	\$12,121,166	\$5,286,265	-\$6,834,901	-56%
Simsbury	Underfunded	\$12,172,536	\$5,633,072	-\$6,539,464	-54%
Somers	Underfunded	\$8,707,066	\$6,024,473	-\$2,682,593	-31%
South Windsor	Underfunded	\$15,479,727	\$13,071,926	-\$2,407,801	-16%
Southbury	Underfunded	\$7,836,635	\$2,631,384	-\$5,205,251	-66%
Southington	Underfunded	\$28,831,075	\$20,361,334	-\$8,469,741	-29%
Sprague	Underfunded	\$3,119,253	\$2,641,208	-\$478,045	-15%
Stafford	Underfunded	\$11,497,201	\$9,958,369	-\$1,538,832	-13%
Stamford	Underfunded	\$20,585,471	\$10,605,319	-\$9,980,152	-48%
Sterling	Underfunded	\$4,318,760	\$3,231,103	-\$1,087,657	-25%
Stratford	Underfunded	\$37,085,434	\$21,391,105	-\$15,694,329	-42%



Town	Funding Status FY 2016	The Most the Town Should Get Based on ECS Formula FY 2014	ECS Funding Proposed in HB-6824 FY 2016	Dollars Underfunded FY 2016	Percentage Underfunded FY 2016
Suffield	Underfunded	\$10,797,943	\$6,267,018	-\$4,530,925	-42%
Thomaston	Underfunded	\$7,089,108	\$5,737,258	-\$1,351,850	-19%
Thompson	Underfunded	\$8,108,320	\$7,682,218	-\$426,102	-5%
Tolland	Underfunded	\$12,889,528	\$10,902,485	-\$1,987,043	-15%
Torrington	Underfunded	\$33,478,355	\$24,565,539	-\$8,912,816	-27%
Trumbull	Underfunded	\$8,770,545	\$3,310,992	-\$5,459,553	-62%
Union	Underfunded	\$243,920	\$241,791	-\$2,129	-1%
Vernon	Underfunded	\$27,449,311	\$19,650,126	-\$7,799,185	-28%
Wallingford	Underfunded	\$24,550,209	\$21,769,831	-\$2,780,378	-11%
Waterbury	Underfunded	\$180,175,738	\$132,732,623	-\$47,443,115	-26%
Watertown	Underfunded	\$15,399,382	\$11,951,602	-\$3,447,780	-22%
West Hartford	Underfunded	\$55,057,970	\$18,181,174	-\$36,876,796	-67%
West Haven	Underfunded	\$60,630,882	\$45,496,942	-\$15,133,940	-25%
Wethersfield	Underfunded	\$19,469,164	\$8,518,846	-\$10,950,318	-56%
Willington	Underfunded	\$4,166,031	\$3,718,418	-\$447,613	-11%
Winchester	Underfunded	\$8,279,000	\$8,187,980	-\$91,020	-1%
Windham	Underfunded	\$32,966,208	\$26,753,954	-\$6,212,254	-19%
Windsor	Underfunded	\$16,110,784	\$12,476,044	-\$3,634,740	-23%
Windsor Locks	Underfunded	\$6,932,890	\$5,274,785	-\$1,658,105	-24%
Wolcott	Underfunded	\$14,276,403	\$13,696,541	-\$579,862	-4%
Woodbridge	Underfunded	\$1,361,313	\$732,889	-\$628,424	-46%
Woodbury	Underfunded	\$3,291,559	\$942,926	-\$2,348,633	-71%
Woodstock	Underfunded	\$5,995,275	\$5,463,651	-\$531,624	-9%
Total:		\$2,570,832,766	\$1,932,393,909	-\$638,438,857	-25%