



How Can School Finance Systems Support Students With Additional Learning Needs?

#5 IN THE SERIES • OCTOBER 2021 (updated October 2023)

Students with disabilities, English language learners, and economically disadvantaged students need additional resources and support to succeed in school. State school funding formulas should account for those additional needs so that every school can educate all its students.

Weighted, student-based funding formulas are one of the most effective ways for states to direct funds to districts serving students with additional learning needs.

In a weighted, student-based funding formula, all students generate a base amount of funding that is determined by the state. Then, school districts receive additional funding per enrolled student in a specific category so that the district has the resources to meet those additional learning needs.

Example

Maryland's base funding is \$8,310 per student.¹ English language learners are weighted 2.00. This means that for each English language learner enrolled, a district receives an additional 100% of the base funding amount for a total of \$16,620 per enrolled English language learner student.²

Weighted, student-based formulas most often feature one or more of the following four student groups:³

Weight	Number of States
English language learners	36
Students with disabilities	28
Economically disadvantaged students	40
Gifted and talented students	12

Note: States include Washington, D.C. and Puerto Rico.

There are a few additional considerations for equity in weighted student-based funding formulas:

- Weights, like 2.00, are preferable to a flat per-pupil allocation, like \$500 additional dollars, because they allow for states to easily adjust based on changing needs and additional information about the cost of supporting the educational need the weight addresses.
- Weights should be based on data sources that are reliable and publicly available to ensure greater transparency into and accountability for how funding is allocated.⁴

- Students in multiple categories, such as an English language learner with a disability, should generate full funding for all relevant categories to ensure both kinds of learning needs are fully met.
- Some states create tiers within student groups. For example, students with more severe disabilities or newly identified English language learners might receive a higher funding weight. This can make sense, but states should analyze the impact of a tiered approach against the complexity it adds to a formula.
- States should approach gifted and talented weights with caution. This weight can increase inequity because students in wealthier schools are more likely to participate in gifted and talented programs compared to students in high-poverty schools.⁵ Black and Hispanic students are also less likely to be represented in gifted and talented programs.⁶ If states choose to prioritize this group

in a weighted formula, the formula should assume equal giftedness across schools. As a more general principle, weights based on something a school controls, such as elective program enrollment, could create unintended consequences.

Some formulas may also include adjustments to account for district characteristics, such as geographic sparsity or concentrated poverty, but these adjustments are not as common. The rationales are that far-flung rural districts might have higher fixed costs for transportation or facilities maintenance, and districts with higher levels of concentrated poverty might need to meet additional needs among their student and family communities.

Weighted funding formulas are not the only way to direct funding toward students with additional learning needs. Several states use a combination of policy approaches, but too many funding streams outside the main formula can muddy understanding of how funding is actually allocated and jeopardize equity.

ALTERNATIVE FUNDING MECHANISMS TO WEIGHTED FUNDING FORMULAS⁷

Key Term	Overview
Categorical grant programs	Grants for a specific purpose are distributed either through a formula or a competitive process. For example, Utah funds special education primarily through a block grant, where each school district's grant amount is based on allocations from the previous year. ⁸
Cost reimbursement	The state reimburses districts for actual additional costs associated with providing services to students, such as the actual cost of a paraprofessional salary for a student with a disability. Funding is based on district expenditures rather than a predetermined amount.
Resource-based funding	States allocate resources or inputs such as teacher aides or translators based on the number of students with additional needs, such as English language learners.

Questions for Advocates

- *Does your state formula allocate additional funding based on students' needs?*
- *If your state includes weights in its funding formula, how are those weights structured and determined?*
- *If a student is eligible to receive multiple weights, does your state's funding formula provide for that?*

Endnotes

- 1 “Blueprint Funding: Formula and Accountability,” Maryland State Department of Education, <https://blueprint.marylandpublicschools.org/funding-2/#:~:text=Base%20Per%20Pupil%20Amount&text=It%20provides%20each%20school%20with,is%20%248%2C310%20for%20each%20student>.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 “50-State Comparison—K-12 Funding: Funding Mechanism,” <https://reports.ecs.org/comparisons/k-12-funding-all>; Tennessee Department of Education, *Tennessee Investment in Student Achievement (TISA) Guide*, July 2023, https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/tisa-resources/TISA_Guide_7-1-23_Updated.pdf.
- 4 “Transforming School Funding for Equity, Transparency, and Flexibility: A Nuts-and-Bolts Guide to Implementing Student-Based Budgeting,” Education Resource Strategies, August 2018, <https://www.erstrategies.org/cms/files/4007-transforming-school-funding-for-equity-transparency-and-flexibility-a-nuts-and-bolts-guide-to-implementing-student-based-budgeting.pdf>.
- 5 Christopher B. Yaluma and Adam Tyner, “Are U.S. Schools Closing the ‘Gifted Gap’? Analyzing Elementary and Middle Schools’ Gifted Participation and Representation Trends (2012-2016),” *Journal of Advanced Academics* 32, no. 1 (February 1, 2021): 28-53, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1932202X20937633>.
- 6 Jason A. Grissom and Christopher Redding, “Discretion and Disproportionality: Explaining the Underrepresentation of High-Achieving Students of Color in Gifted Programs,” *AERA Open* 2, no. 1 (January 1, 2016), <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2332858415622175>.
- 7 Tammy Kolbe, Drew Atchison, Caitlin Kearns, and Jesse Levin, “Policy Brief: State Funding Formulas—A National Review,” American Institutes for Research, June 2020, https://carsey.unh.edu/sites/default/files/media/2020/06/20-11882_7_primer_policyscan_v3.pdf.
- 8 “FundEd: State Policy Analysis: A Detailed Look at Each State’s Funding Policies—Utah,” EdBuild, accessed September 15, 2021, <http://funded.edbuild.org/state/UT>.

About the Authors



INDIRA DAMMU

Indira Dammu is an associate partner at Bellwether in the Policy and Evaluation practice area. She can be reached at indira.dammu@bellwether.org.



BONNIE O'KEEFE

Bonnie O'Keefe is a senior associate partner at Bellwether in the Policy and Evaluation practice area. She can be reached at bonnie.okeefe@bellwether.org.



JENNIFER O'NEAL SCHIESS

Jennifer O'Neal Schiess is a senior partner at Bellwether and leads the Policy and Evaluation practice area. She can be reached at jennifer.schiess@bellwether.org.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for its financial support of this project, to Super Copy Editors, and to Five Line Creative for graphic design on the original series.

Thank you to our colleague Linea Koehler for supporting reviews and updates to this publication. Thank you to Alyssa Schwenk, Andy Jacob, Zoe Campbell, Julie Nguyen, and Amber Walker for shepherding and disseminating this work.

Any errors in fact or analysis are the responsibility of the authors alone.

ABOUT THE SERIES

Splitting the Bill is a crash course in the essentials of school finance equity for advocates and others interested in reforming state education finance systems. Learn more and read the other briefs in this series [here](#).

About Bellwether

Bellwether is a national nonprofit that exists to transform education to ensure systemically marginalized young people achieve outcomes that lead to fulfilling lives and flourishing communities. Founded in 2010, we work hand in hand with education leaders and organizations to accelerate their impact, inform and influence policy and program design, and share what we learn along the way. For more, visit bellwether.org.

© 2023 Bellwether

- © This report carries a Creative Commons license, which permits noncommercial re-use of content when proper attribution is provided. This means you are free to copy, display and distribute this work, or include content from this report in derivative works, under the following conditions:
- ① **Attribution.** You must clearly attribute the work to Bellwether and provide a link back to the publication at www.bellwether.org.
- ③ **Noncommercial.** You may not use this work for commercial purposes without explicit prior permission from Bellwether.
- ④ **Share Alike.** If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under a license identical to this one.

For the full legal code of this Creative Commons license, please visit www.creativecommons.org. If you have any questions about citing or reusing Bellwether content, please contact us.