

— 1,000 \$
— 500 \$

The Funding Gap

— - 500 \$

By Carmen G. Arroyo



In the increasingly competitive international economy, a good education is the best – and perhaps only – insurance. This is especially true for students who are poor, English language learners, or members of minority groups. “Get a good education,” we say. “It’s the best chance you have.”

Unfortunately, too many states provide no such assurance – or insurance – for the students who need it most. Despite national imagery full of high-flying concepts like “equal opportunity” and “level playing field,” English-learner, low-income and minority students do not get the extra school supports they need to catch up to their more advantaged peers; they all too frequently receive less than do other students.

This report examines one way in which these students are shortchanged: the inequitable distribution of state and local funding. A hard look at the funding data makes it clear that many of the school districts with the greatest needs often receive the least funding, begging the question of whether we’re setting some students up for failure.

But here’s the good news: while some states persist in promoting inequality, others are showing us that, with the right leadership, inequitable funding patterns can be changed. We can unstack the deck. We can ensure that our most vulnerable students get a fair shot at success. Some states have provided extras to their neediest children for years; still others are beginning to acknowledge that their futures hinge on providing quality education to

all and have begun to adjust their funding patterns.

In this report, we’ll provide both the “good news” and the “bad news.” Facts – even the uncomfortable ones – are the best way to help people face up to the need for change. But it also helps to have evidence that change is possible, to see actual models of success.

We hope the data will make people at least pause before they offer platitudes about the “critical importance of closing our achievement gaps.” If closing those gaps is as important as people say, then it’s time – past time – that we acted like it.

This Year’s Report

This is the seventh in a series of annual Education Trust reports analyzing education spending patterns in the states. This year we present changes in funding gaps, state-by-state, from 1999 to 2005. The analysis compares state and local spending in school districts with the highest numbers of low-income students to those that have the lowest concentration of such students. We do the same for districts with the highest and lowest numbers of minority students. This year we also look at a third category: spending in school districts serving high numbers of English language learners (ELLs) compared to those serving few or none of these students.

Table 1 provides a quick overview of per-student funding gaps between high- and low-poverty school districts for the 2004-2005 school year in 49 of the 50 U.S. states. (We do not include calculations for Hawaii because it operates as a single state-wide school district.) Table 2 provides the same funding gaps by race. Table 3 presents a summary of the per-student funding gap among districts serving ELL students. For Table 3, funding gaps were calculated only for the eight states where the percentage of ELL students equaled or exceeded 10 percent of the total student population within the state.

These data challenge Americans' deeply held belief that we provide equal educational opportunity; because they make clear that in too many communities students who are poor, minority, or English learners do not get their fair share of education funds.

The Poverty Funding Gap: Impressive Progress in Some States While Others Backslide

Between 1999 and 2005, 10 states increased funding equity between high-poverty and low-poverty districts by more than \$200 per student.

States in which funding equity increased between high- and low-poverty districts, 1999-2005

- Alaska
- Arkansas
- Connecticut
- Maryland
- Minnesota
- New Jersey
- New Mexico
- New York
- Ohio
- Wyoming

Of these 10, three states – Maryland, Ohio, and Wyoming – not only decreased the funding gap, they went from providing their high-poverty districts with *less* per student to providing them with *more*.

Maryland

In 1999, acting on the recommendations of two blue-ribbon panels, Maryland increased the state share of education funding to districts based on students' needs.² Prior to the change, the state's

Table 1: State and Local Funding in High- and Low-Poverty Districts, 2004-2005

	Number of States
Spent more per student in high poverty districts	18
Spent roughly the same per student ¹	15
Spent less per student in high poverty districts	16

Table 2: State and Local Funding in High- and Low-Minority Districts, 2004-2005

	Number of States
Spent more per student in high minority districts	14
Spent roughly the same per student	14
Spent less per student in high minority districts	21

Table 3: State and Local Funding in High- and Low-ELL Districts, 2004-2005

	Number of States
Spent more per student in high ELL districts	1
Spent roughly the same per student	2
Spent less per student in high ELL districts	5

school districts with the highest concentration of poor children had at least \$900 less to spend per student than the districts with the fewest poor children. By 2005, those "poor" districts had almost \$400 *more* per student. Maryland's achievement is a direct result of the state's efforts to answer the question, "Now that we have adopted common academic standards, what will it cost to get different types of students to those standards?"

Although the state currently is struggling through a budget shortfall and has held back on implementing further planned increases,³ its long-term progress provides evidence of states' ability to turn around inequities in education funding.

Arkansas

Arkansas is another state that has made enormous progress in funding its poorest school districts. After several court decisions finding the state's education funding inequitable, state leaders increased funding for districts with high percentages of low-income students. By 2005 high-poverty districts had some \$500 more per student than districts serving smaller proportions of poor children. In 2007, the state narrowed the gap further by again increasing state aid to educate low-income students.⁴

Unfortunately, the patterns in other states are much uglier. Between 1999 and 2005, 16 states increased their funding gaps between high-poverty and low-poverty districts by more than \$200 per student.

States in which funding equity decreased between high- and low-poverty districts, 1999-2005

- Florida
- Idaho
- Illinois
- Kansas
- Maine
- Missouri
- Nebraska
- Nevada
- New Hampshire
- North Carolina
- South Dakota
- Tennessee
- Texas
- Vermont
- Virginia
- Wisconsin

Vermont

In Vermont, the funding gap has grown *by more than \$2,000 per student* in recent years, even though the state was under court order to provide equitable funding to poor districts. In 1999, Vermont ensured that high-poverty districts had \$2,193 *more* per student. By 2005, high-poverty districts in Vermont were receiving \$264 *less* per student than low-poverty districts.

Illinois

The Illinois pattern is particularly troubling, given that the state has for years had the second largest per-student gap in the country. But bad apparently wasn't bad enough: the state has slipped from a per-student funding gap of \$1,568 in 1999 to \$2,238 in 2005.

New York's Path to Progress

New York, which has ranked among the most inequitable states since The Education Trust began the funding gap reports, appears to be on a path to shed this odious distinction. After decades of patently unfair funding, New York's political leadership has significantly reformed the system and increased education funding to ensure more fiscal equity between school districts. While the data in this report (from the 2004-05 school year) are the latest available, they do not capture major progress made in the last year—progress that came as the result of vigorous and persistent advocacy on behalf of low-income students and the school districts that serve them.

In 1993 the Campaign for Fiscal Equity (CFE) sued the State of New York for under-funding New York City schools. While New York City educated a disproportionate share of the state's minority and low-income students, it received less state funding per student than districts with fewer poor and minority students.*

Despite court orders in 2003 and 2005 to remedy the problem, a political stalemate stalled action on behalf of high poverty districts until Elliot Spitzer was elected governor in 2006. In the first legislative session of Spitzer's term, the New York legislature approved a historic increase in education funding, rewrote the state's complicated aid distribution formula to take into account the needs of a school district's students, provided an unprecedented \$7 billion increase over four years in school funding, and targeted aid to the state's poorest school districts.† Additionally, the state now holds districts accountable for distributing the additional funds predominately to high need, low performing students and schools. Districts that received significant increases were required to negotiate "Contracts For Excellence" with the state; these "contracts" articulate the ways in which the money will be used and how it will be targeted to the students and schools with the greatest needs.‡

New York's progress proves that states can address longstanding inequities in education funding. Funding equity offenders like Illinois, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and other states with gaps have a blue print on which to base school funding fairness. All that's left for them to do is face the issue and muster the will.

* *Campaign for Fiscal Equity, Inc. v State of New York*, decided November 20, 2006 by the New York State Court of Appeals; full-text of decision available at <http://www.cfequity.org/11.20.06%20Court%20Ruling-NYSLRB.pdf>; see also <http://www.cfequity.org/> for further background on the case.

† "Ambitious Legislative Agendas Move Ahead," Michele McNeil, *Education Week*, April 11, 2007, available at http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2007/04/11/32legislate.h26.html?qs=campaign_for_fiscal_equity.

‡ "Spitzer's Education Agenda Promises Aid Increase," David Herszenhorn and Danny Hakim, *The New York Times*, January 30, 2007, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/01/30/nyregion/30schools.html?pagewanted=1&r=1&sq=spitzer%20school%20funding&scp=2>.

Adding it Up

So, some states are getting better, some worse. Unfortunately, the bottom line for the country as a whole remains the same: our nation consistently spends fewer dollars educating students in its highest-poverty and highest-minority school districts than it does districts with fewer of such students.

- In 2005, districts serving the highest concentration of poor students received, on average, \$938 less per-pupil in state and local money than the lowest poverty districts, a gap that was essentially unchanged (given inflation) from 1999 (see Table 5).
- In 2005, high-minority districts received, on average, approximately \$877 less per student in state and local funds than low-minority districts (see Table 6).

As unjust as these amounts seem they *understate* the real gaps in educational opportunities. Students growing up in poverty do not merely need the same resources as others, they need more from their schools than do students who can fall back on community and family resources to support their achievement.

When we add a widely-used adjustment to account for the additional cost of educating low-income students, the nationwide poverty funding gap increases from \$983 per student to \$1,532 per student and the nationwide minority funding gap increases from \$877 to \$1,275 per student.⁵

Emerging Issues in School Funding Equity: Districts that Serve English Language Learners Do Not Receive Their Fair Share

The demographic profile of American schools has changed significantly in the last decade, with the biggest population growth occurring among English language learners. Students classified as English language learners represented

How We Did These Analyses

This report analyzes annual financial data gathered by the U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Department of Education from each of the nation's approximately 14,000 school districts. The calculations are based on the total amount of state and local revenues received by each district for the school years spanning 1999 through 2005, the latest year for which such financial data are available. Our Funding Gap series focuses on the distribution of state and local resources, and does not include federal funds, in order to answer the question of whether or not *state* funding patterns are equitable.⁶

To calculate the per-student funding gaps for each of the 49 states and the nation as a whole, we compare average state and local revenue spent per student in the highest poverty school districts (the top 25 percent among states with the greatest percent of students living below the federal poverty line) to per-student expenditures in the lowest-poverty school districts (the 25 percent with the fewest students in poverty).⁷ To ensure that we develop comparable quartiles for analyzing funding in high -and low-poverty school districts, each quartile contains approximately the same total number of students. We then conduct a similar analysis based on districts with high and low concentrations of minority students.

These analyses take into account the fact that school districts differ in how much money they need to spend due to regional differences in the cost for goods and services. To account for the fact that some districts have to pay more for teacher salaries, utilities, transportation, and other education-related expenses, we use the most recent formula developed by the U.S. Department of Education to adjust district revenues for the local cost of living. We also adjust district revenues based on the number of special education students they serve to account for the fact that the cost of educating special education students is higher than that of educating other students. (For more information on the calculations and adjustments, see the Technical Appendix, available at www.edtrust.org).

approximately 11 percent of the national public school population in 2003-2004, up from 6 percent in 1999-2000.⁸ The number of students who are English language learners will likely continue to grow because the population of school-age children who have immigrant parents and are likely to need ELL services is projected to increase from 12 million in 2005 to 14 million in 2010.⁹

While there is no consensus on how much more it costs to address the special needs of English learners (or even how *best* to address their needs), there is no question that ELL students need additional resources and support to succeed.¹⁰ Yet, many state education finance policies and practices simply have not caught up with the reality or assumed responsibility for serving these students.

This analysis looks only at states whose ELL student population in 2005 exceeded 10 percent of the total student population: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, and Texas. These eight states alone educate over 2.8 million students in need of ELL services.¹¹ To calculate the ELL funding gap, we followed the same procedures used in the analyses of the poverty and minority funding gaps and compared average state and local revenues per student in the highest-ELL districts within these states to per student spending in the lowest-ELL school districts.

Our analysis reveals an alarming pattern of inequity. In most states with large percentages of ELL students, the districts with the highest

concentration of ELL students receive less money than low-ELL districts.¹² Texas and Nevada have the largest ELL funding gaps, each over \$1,000 per student. These gaps are particularly egregious when one considers that, in some states, ELL students represent a large fraction of the total student population within high-ELL districts in these states. For example, in California, ELL students represent over 53% of the total student population in high-ELL school districts. These districts have mostly ELL students, but spend less money per-student than other districts to meet these challenges. It is not fair and it is not good education policy.

State-by-State Numbers: Poverty

Per-student expenditure data for every state are provided in Table 5. Five states – Illinois, Delaware, New Hampshire, New York, and Pennsylvania – shortchange their high-poverty school districts by roughly \$1,000 per student or more. By contrast, in four states – Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey and Alaska – high-poverty school districts get at least \$1,000 more per student.

Among all the states that are providing extra for their highest-poverty districts, only nine states (Alaska, Arkansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon) provide enough extra to meet the minimal 40% encouraged in Federal statute (see Table 7).

Table 4: English Language Learner (ELL) Funding Gaps, 2005

State	Percentage of ELL students in High-ELL districts	Percentage ELL students in Low-ELL Districts	Gap between Highest-ELL and Lowest-ELL Districts
<i>How to read this table: A negative number indicates that fewer dollars were provided to high-ELL districts.</i>			
Alaska	60.02	0.76	\$4,530
Arizona	42.73	1.66	-\$420
California	53.42	4.36	-\$357
Colorado	28.45	1.03	-\$587
New Mexico	42.29	2.72	\$5
Nevada	17.68	4.55	-\$1,025
Texas	40.45	2.58	-\$1,252
Oregon	36.36	0.56	-\$158

Table 5: Poverty Funding Gaps Over Time: 1999 – 2005

State	Gap between Highest- and Lowest-Poverty Districts 1999 (no adjustment for low-income students)	Gap between Highest- and Lowest-Poverty Districts 2005 (no adjustment for low-income students)	Poverty Gap Change in Dollars 1999-2005 (no adjustment for low-income students)
<i>How to read this table: A negative number indicates that fewer dollars were provided to high-poverty districts.</i>			
Alaska	\$684	\$6,523	\$5,839
Alabama	-\$309	-\$328	-\$19
Arkansas	\$18	\$541	\$523
Arizona	-\$198	-\$143	\$55
California	\$11	\$154	\$143
Colorado	-\$133	-\$126	\$7
Connecticut	\$615	\$825	\$210
Delaware	-\$1,052	-\$954	\$98
Florida	\$350	-\$18	-\$368
Georgia	\$245	\$82	-\$162
Iowa	-\$4	\$108	\$112
Idaho	\$457	-\$185	-\$642
Illinois	-\$1,568	-\$2,235	-\$668
Indiana	\$126	\$322	\$197
Kansas	\$388	-\$284	-\$672
Kentucky	\$801	\$878	\$77
Louisiana	-\$421	-\$241	\$180
Massachusetts	\$1,435	\$1,396	-\$39
Maryland	-\$981	\$395	\$1,376
Maine	-\$9	-\$331	-\$321
Michigan	-\$682	-\$759	-\$78
Minnesota	\$1,368	\$1,629	\$261
Missouri	\$480	-\$104	-\$584
Mississippi	\$192	\$151	-\$41
Montana	-\$500	-\$505	-\$5
North Carolina	\$337	-\$603	-\$939
North Dakota	\$183	\$159	-\$23
Nebraska	\$384	\$66	-\$318
New Hampshire	-\$723	-\$1,340	-\$617
New Jersey	\$568	\$2,712	\$2,145
New Mexico	\$495	\$923	\$427
Nevada	-\$189	-\$680	-\$491
New York	-\$3,426	-\$3,068	\$358
Ohio	-\$77	\$833	\$910
Oklahoma	\$312	\$271	-\$42
Oregon	\$659	\$647	-\$13
Pennsylvania	-\$1,218	-\$1,055	\$163
Rhode Island	\$197	\$266	\$68
South Carolina	\$166	\$302	\$136
South Dakota	\$240	-\$228	-\$468
Tennessee	\$729	\$454	-\$275
Texas	\$280	-\$165	-\$445
Utah	\$799	\$739	-\$60
Virginia	\$234	-\$122	-\$356
Vermont	\$2,193	-\$264	-\$2,457
Washington	\$64	\$87	\$23
Wisconsin	-\$28	-\$468	-\$439
West Virginia	\$22	-\$19	-\$40
Wyoming	-\$59	\$468	\$527
USA	-\$848	-\$938	-\$90

Table 6: Minority Funding Gaps Over Time: 1999 - 2005

State	Gap between Highest- and Lowest-Minority Districts 1999 (no adjustment for low-income students)	Gap between Highest- and Lowest-Minority Districts 2005 (no adjustment for low-income students)	Minority Gap Change in Dollars 1999-2005 (no adjustment for low-income students)
<i>How to read this table: A negative number indicates that fewer dollars were provided to high-minority districts.</i>			
Alaska	\$2,746	\$4,442	\$1,696
Alabama	-\$347	-\$280	\$67
Arkansas	\$308	\$707	\$400
Arizona	-\$34	-\$100	-\$65
California	-\$417	-\$216	\$201
Colorado	-\$652	-\$928	-\$276
Connecticut	-\$74	\$367	\$440
Delaware	-\$385	-\$892	-\$507
Florida	\$31	-\$15	-\$46
Georgia	\$957	\$496	-\$461
Iowa	-\$512	-\$474	\$38
Idaho	\$484	-\$814	-\$1,298
Illinois	-\$864	-\$1,623	-\$758
Indiana	\$766	\$721	-\$45
Kansas	-\$1,249	-\$1,417	-\$168
Kentucky	-\$162	\$44	\$206
Louisiana	-\$285	\$293	\$578
Massachusetts	\$1,865	\$1,891	\$26
Maryland	-\$421	-\$578	-\$157
Maine	\$17	-\$757	-\$774
Michigan	-\$64	\$55	\$119
Minnesota	\$1,027	\$1,113	\$86
Missouri	\$1,446	\$788	-\$658
Mississippi	\$215	\$163	-\$52
Montana	-\$958	-\$1,467	-\$509
North Carolina	-\$75	-\$663	-\$587
North Dakota	-\$713	-\$890	-\$176
Nebraska	-\$982	-\$1,656	-\$674
New Hampshire	-\$1,557	-\$2,267	-\$710
New Jersey	\$418	\$2,633	\$2,215
New Mexico	\$50	\$103	\$53
Nevada	-\$496	-\$1,070	-\$574
New York	-\$3,450	-\$2,902	\$549
Ohio	\$720	\$1,520	\$800
Oklahoma	\$17	-\$56	-\$73
Oregon	-\$138	\$377	\$515
Pennsylvania	-\$869	-\$662	\$207
Rhode Island	-\$99	\$129	\$227
South Carolina	-\$148	\$297	\$445
South Dakota	-\$542	-\$883	-\$341
Tennessee	-\$41	\$10	\$51
Texas	-\$586	-\$912	-\$327
Utah	\$50	-\$12	-\$62
Virginia	\$521	-\$57	-\$579
Vermont	\$823	-\$63	-\$887
Washington	\$91	\$81	-\$10
Wisconsin	-\$430	-\$880	-\$450
West Virginia	\$91	\$200	\$109
Wyoming	-\$921	-\$2,015	-\$1,094
USA	-\$950	-\$877	\$73

State-by-State Numbers: Minority

Per student expenditure data for high- and low-minority districts in every state are provided in Table 6. In eight states – New York, New Hampshire, Wyoming, Nebraska, Illinois, Montana, Kansas and Nevada – high-minority districts received at least \$1,000 per student less than low-minority districts. In five states – Alaska, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey and Ohio – high-minority districts received at least that much MORE per student.

States Can Close Funding Gaps

The goal of standards-based education reform is to ensure a high-quality education for all students, regardless of gender, race, poverty, disability status, or cultural and ethnic background. The core idea is to set consistently high standards for all students, and then do what it takes to get them there, even if they arrived at school behind.

In recent years, policymakers have been quick to blame educators for not making enough progress in getting students to these new standards and closing gaps between groups. Some of that blame is well-deserved, for even when they have equitable resources educators don't always use those resources on things that really matter, such as attracting highly-effective teachers to work in hard-to-staff schools and supporting them once they get there.

But policymakers have not always lived up to their part of the bargain, either. Funding gaps undermine equity in hundreds of different ways. Inequitable

funding policies undercut the effectiveness of standards and accountability practices. Worse, they breed deep cynicism about whether we have anything but a superficial, rhetorical commitment to the education of all students.

These inequities have deep roots in our decision as a country to fund schools with property taxes. These patterns are not the fault of state policymakers alone. Nevertheless, education remains a state responsibility, and even where there are large differences in locally generated revenue, determined state leaders have found ways to do what it takes to compensate for local inequities.

States successful in these efforts have generally taken steps that are straightforward and well known:

1. Take more responsibility for education funding at the state level; and,
2. Use state dollars to target student needs and compensate for differences in local abilities to pay for education.

In other words, the persistence of funding gaps is more a problem of political will than technical know-how.

Some of the issues involved in ensuring that every single child in this nation has an equal shot at a good education are complex, but making sure that school districts are funded fairly isn't one of them. The successful efforts in states like Arkansas, Maryland and New York prove that where there's a will, there's a way. It's time for state leaders to put aside tired excuses and platitudes and summon political courage. It really is just that simple.

Table 7: Funding Gaps by State, 2005 (Adjusted for Low-Income Students)

	Gap between Highest- and Lowest-Poverty Districts 2005 (40% adjustment for low-income students)	Gap between Highest- and Lowest-Minority Districts 2005 (40% adjustment for low-income students)
<i>How to read this table: A negative number indicates that fewer dollars were provided to high-poverty or high-minority districts.</i>		
Alaska	\$5,720	\$3,952
Alabama	-\$692	-\$500
Arkansas	\$230	\$547
Arizona	-\$653	-\$539
California	-\$436	-\$661
Colorado	-\$518	-\$1,206
Connecticut	-\$162	-\$563
Delaware	-\$1,126	-\$933
Florida	-\$199	-\$133
Georgia	-\$436	\$134
Iowa	-\$157	-\$574
Idaho	-\$371	-\$824
Illinois	-\$2,827	-\$2,021
Indiana	-\$238	\$428
Kansas	-\$632	-\$1,594
Kentucky	\$462	\$152
Louisiana	-\$560	\$229
Massachusetts	\$513	\$1,116
Maryland	-\$23	-\$803
Maine	-\$718	-\$864
Michigan	-\$1,388	-\$358
Minnesota	\$1,134	\$833
Missouri	-\$803	\$535
Mississippi	-\$267	-\$166
Montana	-\$810	-\$1,540
North Carolina	-\$825	-\$738
North Dakota	-\$40	-\$951
Nebraska	-\$237	-\$1,763
New Hampshire	-\$1,662	-\$2,332
New Jersey	\$1,918	\$1,840
New Mexico	\$491	-\$126
Nevada	-\$737	-\$1,094
New York	-\$3,972	-\$3,544
Ohio	\$73	\$1,032
Oklahoma	-\$72	-\$294
Oregon	\$381	\$277
Pennsylvania	-\$1,708	-\$1,030
Rhode Island	-\$653	-\$716
South Carolina	-\$19	\$81
South Dakota	-\$228	-\$939
Tennessee	\$155	-\$81
Texas	-\$796	-\$1,385
Utah	\$523	-\$122
Virginia	-\$526	-\$250
Vermont	-\$798	-\$135
Washington	-\$292	-\$167
Wisconsin	-\$990	-\$1,221
West Virginia	-\$383	\$238
Wyoming	\$174	-\$2,034
National	-\$1,532	-\$1,275

Footnotes

- ¹ We view as “equitable” those states where the gap in per student funding between high- and low-poverty, high- or low-minority districts, or high- or low-ELL districts differ by no more than \$200.
- ² Commission on Education – Finance, Equity, and Excellence. (2002). *Final Report*. Annapolis, Maryland: Office of Policy Analysis, Department of Legislative Services
- ³ Hernandez, N. *Schools Scramble to Make Grade Despite Lost Funding*. Washington Post, November 24, 2007.
- ⁴ The National Access Network has prepared a brief summary of the litigation and political history of education funding in Arkansas, available online at http://www.schoolfunding.info/states/ar/lit_ar.php3.
- ⁵ School finance scholars, the U.S. Department of Education, and the U.S. General Accounting Office use a 40 percent cost adjustment for low-income students. See for example, *Inequalities in Public School District Revenues*, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1998; *School Finance: Per Pupil Differences between Selected Inner City and Suburban Schools Varied by Metropolitan Area*, U.S. General Accounting Office, 2002.
- ⁶ In some cases federal dollars help fill state-created funding gaps, but when that happens those funds aren’t being used for their intend purpose – to buy extras for the students who need them – but instead to make up for state-created in equities.
- ⁷ We do not include calculations for Hawaii because it operates as a single state-wide school district.
- ⁸ We cite national figures for the 2003-2004 school year because national numbers were not available for 2004-2005, due to lack of reporting by several states. Hoffman, L., and Sable, J. (2006). *Public Elementary and Secondary Students, Staff, Schools, and School Districts: School Year 2003–04* (NCES 2006-307). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics; Meyer, D., Madden, D., and McGrath, DJ. (2004). *English Language Learner Students in US Public Schools: 1994-2000*. U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences, (NCES 2004-035). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- ⁹ Unpublished estimates developed by Passel, J. (2007). *Projections of the U.S. Population to 2050 by Age, Race, Hispanic Origin, and Nativity*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- ¹⁰ August, D. and Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- ¹¹ Information on number of ELL students reported by 45 of 50 states are presented in Sable, J., and Hill, J. (2006). *Overview of Public Elementary and Secondary Students, Staff, Schools, School Districts, Revenues, and Expenditures: School Year 2004–05 and Fiscal Year 2004* (NCES 2007-309). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- ¹² An analysis of ELL funding gaps may be inappropriate in Alaska because the majority of ELL students in that state reside in rural areas. Thus, the funding differences may reflect differences in cost associated with educating rural students rather than differences due to ELL status.

© The Education Trust, 2008



About The Education Trust

The Education Trust, Inc. was created to promote high academic achievement for all students, at all levels – pre-kindergarten through college. While we know that all schools and colleges could better serve their students, our work focuses on the schools and colleges most often left behind in plans to improve education: those serving African-American, Latino, Native American and low-income students.

The Education Trust works side-by-side with policymakers, parents, education professionals, community and business leaders—in cities and towns across the country—who are trying to transform their schools and colleges into institutions that genuinely serve all students. We also bring lessons learned in local communities back to Washington to help inform national policy debates.