

At-Risk Funding

Colorado Legislative Interim Committee on School Finance

Michael Griffith
Senior Researcher & Policy Analyst
Learning Policy Institute

August 2021



Overview JW1

- How states identify at-risk students
- Why free/reduced price lunch (F/R L) can't be used in state formulas moving forward
- State options for moving forward

Slide 2

JW1

Modified language on this slide

Julie Woods, 8/24/2021

Identifying At-Risk Students

- A 2019 study found that **42 states and D.C.** provide their districts with some form of at-risk funding
- The majority of states (31) use free/reduced price lunch eligibility to identify at-risk students

Source: Education Commission of the States

Other Methods to Identify At-Risk Students

- English language learners (6 states) JW2
- Foster Care (6 states)
- SNAP, TANF, or state level assistance programs (6 states)
- Census data/federal poverty rate (3 states)
- Students experiencing homelessness (3 states)
- Student performance (2 states)

Source: Education Commission of the States

Slide 4

JW2

Seems weird that these are all underlined

Julie Woods, 8/24/2021

Why Do So Many States Use F/R Lunch?

JW3

- Districts are limited in what kind of information they can ask students and their families
- Students are not required to apply for F/R L – however – they can not qualify for the program without applying
- The F/R L numbers capture low-income families as well as students from working poor families.
 - Free – 130% of poverty
 - Reduced – 185% of poverty

Slide 5

JW3

I might slim these down to something more like: -Privacy/capacity limitations, - Qualification for the program, - Wide net for capturing poverty (or something so that folks aren't trying to read the sentences while you talk)

Julie Woods, 8/24/2021

Community Eligibility and the Need for a New Set of Measures

JW4

- **Community Eligibility:**
 - Began in 2010
 - All students in a school are eligible for free lunch
 - Families no longer need to apply for the F/R Lunch program
- **Eligibility Criteria:**
 - At least 40% of the students' families are identified as low-income
 - Based on their enrollment in other public service programs

Slide 6

JW4

Monkeyed with the language and structure of this slide

Julie Woods, 8/24/2021

Possible Issues With Other Measures

- Federal poverty rate
 - Income level is lower than F/R Lunch number
 - Census numbers may not perfectly reflect actual enrollment
- Federal/state aid programs
 - Some programs have lower income qualifications than F/R Lunch (TANF)
 - Families must apply for these programs
- Student performance
 - Some policymakers believe that student performance could be manipulated to increase funding

Measures of Poverty

Annual Household Income

2021-22

Family Size	Colorado TANF	Federal Poverty Rate	Free Lunch (130%)	Colorado SNAP
2	\$3,972	\$17,420	\$22,646	\$34,488
3	\$5,052	\$21,960	\$28,548	\$43,440
4	\$6,120	\$26,500	\$34,450	\$52,416

Sources: US Department of Agriculture & CO Dept. of Human Services

State Example Massachusetts

JW6

In 2014-15, the state started to move from using F/R L to other measures that included:

- Medicaid
- Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
- Foster care
- Living in a facility run by the Dept. of Youth Services
- Receiving Supplemental Security Income

Slide 9

JW6

Made minor edits to this slide

Julie Woods, 8/24/2021

State Example Massachusetts

- In the first year of the new program:
 - MA identified **251,026 students**
 - F/R L would have identified 366,000 students
- After working on identification methods:
 - MA identified **314,776 students** by FY 2018.
- To make up for the difference in identified students:
 - Beginning in FY 2016, MA increased the per pupil funding amount

Slide 10

JW7

I'm not wild about how I broke this out, but it's easier visually to grasp the info quickly

Julie Woods, 8/24/2021

State Examples Texas

To qualify as at-risk, a student must meet one of the following criteria:

- Did not advance from one grade to the next
- Received a score of less than 70 in two or more JW8 foundation curriculum classes (Grades 7-12)
- Did not perform satisfactorily on a state assessment
- Did not perform satisfactorily on a readiness test (Grades K-3)
- Dropped out of school
- Expelled

Slide 11

JW8

Check my edits here

Julie Woods, 8/24/2021

State Example Texas

Other at-risk identifiers:

- English language learner
- Student experiencing homelessness
- Pregnant or is a parent
- Placed in an alternative school program
- Currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release
- Resides in a residential placement facility
- Has been incarcerated or has a parent/guardian who has

Issues to Think About

JW10

- States need to move away from the use of F/R Lunch as a measure of at-risk JW9
- If the set of programs used for eligibility is too **narrow**, students in poverty may be undercounted
- State and district staff must have appropriate **capacity** to collect data

Slide 13

JW9

Can we reiterate why on the slide? I made something up here, but I think it's important to hammer it home in case people zoned out in the middle of the presentation

Julie Woods, 8/24/2021

JW10

Monkeyed with the language on this slide

Julie Woods, 8/24/2021

Issues to Think About

A New Generation of At-Risk Funding

- Not all at-risk students are the same
- Different student groups may need different levels of funding
- Students experiencing homelessness or foster youth generally require a higher level of resources
- States need to start thinking of at-risk funding like they think of special education funding with different levels based on student needs JW11

Slide 14

JW11

I think this one is repetitive of the info above and you can just say it

Julie Woods, 8/24/2021

Q & A

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact:

Michael Griffith
Senior Policy Analyst & Researcher
Learning Policy Institute
mgriffith@learningpolicyinstitute.org