An evidence-based proposal for improving Connecticut education funding

for greater adequacy, equity, and accountability.

(superintendent edition)

Jonathan Carter and Steven Adamowski

October 30, 2026

App v3.0: https://datadaptive.ai/district-comparison-tools (Datadaptive LLC, 2026)

Latest version and other editions: https://datadaptive.ai/funding-proposal

© 2026 Jonathan Carter and Steven Adamowski. All rights reserved.

DATADAPTIVE® is a registered trademark of Jonathan B. Carter and Beth L. Carter, used under license by Datadaptive LLC.

Connecticut ranks fourth in the nation in educational attainment (U.S. Census Bureau, 2024) and fifth in per-pupil spending (U.S. Census Bureau, 2026). Counting revenue from every source, Connecticut schools received about $28,100 per student in 2023-24, compared with a national average near $21,100 (USAFacts, 2026). The state's own per-pupil expenditure reporting, which leaves out the state's contribution to teacher retirement, results in a lower figure: a median of $22,415 across the 111 town-based K-12 districts in 2024-25 (Connecticut State Department of Education, 2026c). Unless noted otherwise, every per-pupil figure in this proposal uses that state measure. Yet despite this level of spending, Connecticut continues to have one of the nation's largest achievement gaps (National Center for Education Statistics, 2025a). This gap is related, at least in part, to a high level of economic segregation, which also places Connecticut among the most expensive and inequitable state education systems in the country (Farrie & Kim, 2025). The Segregation Tracking Project's (2026) *States of Segregation* confirms Connecticut as the sixth most economically segregated state in the nation, and its school districts largely reflect the economic segregation of its municipalities. That segregation also has a racial cost that runs

through the property tax. One study estimated that in 2018, the average Black student in Connecticut was supported by about $4,300 less in local property tax revenue than the average white student, up from about $3,200 in 2008, and that state formula aid made up roughly two-thirds of that difference (Green et al., 2021).

The Education Cost Sharing (ECS) grant is the primary means by which the state distributes education funding to municipalities and school districts. ECS currently totals $2.65 billion, including $190 million in "supplemental" funding for 2026-27 (School and State Finance Project, 2026). While the establishment of Alliance Districts in 2012 (Connecticut State Department of Education, 2026b) and subsequent legislative adjustments (e.g., phasing out overfunded towns, phasing in underfunded districts, and weighting English language learners) made ECS somewhat more equitable, it is still widely viewed as inadequate, particularly for districts with the highest student needs. Moreover, ECS is not the state's only education grant; the state also pays teacher retirement costs, special education excess costs, and the costs of charter schools and the CTEC system (School and State Finance Project, 2026). Counting every state dollar, Connecticut covers approximately 36% of the total cost of public education, compared to a national average of about 45% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2026; USAFacts, 2026). As a result, Connecticut school districts, regardless of wealth, depend more heavily on local property taxes than districts in almost any other state. In 2022-23, local property taxes supplied 54.8% of all revenue for Connecticut's public schools, compared with 33.2% nationally (National Center for Education Statistics, 2025b). Because what the state does not pay is made up almost entirely by a tax based on the wealth of each town, a shortfall in state funding becomes, in practice, a gap in equity between towns.

The state's full funding of teacher pensions offsets some of that burden; Connecticut is one of 15 states that fully fund teacher pensions with no local contribution (Aubry, 2024). However, pension support itself works against equity: the state's contribution follows the salaries a district pays, so it directs more state money to districts that already pay more. It also never passes through a district's operating budget, which is why the Connecticut State Department of Education excludes it from the per-pupil expenditure figures used throughout this proposal.

In 2022-23, Connecticut's public schools took in $13.81 billion. The state provided $4.99 billion, and local sources provided $7.68 billion, $7.56 billion of it from property taxes. For the state to reach a 50% share while local and federal revenue held steady, the Legislature would need to appropriate approximately $3.83 billion more over time.[1] Appendix 2, Table 5 sets out three schedules for reaching that target. However, how much the state spends is only half of the equation; the other half is how that money is distributed.

In the current system, the wealth of each community - reflected in the value of its taxable property and in its residents' ability to pay more - produces extreme variation in what districts spend. In 2024-25, for example, **Westbrook** spent $35,908 per pupil while serving 52.2% high-needs students, and **Meriden** spent $16,977 while serving 84.8%. Likewise, **Westport** ($28,601, 16.9% high needs) outspent **Bridgeport** ($18,440, 92.6%), and **Branford** ($29,396, 46.5%) outspent **New Haven** ($21,346, 83.8%). Yet the same money does not produce the same results when need differs: **Granby** ($22,065, 30.7%) and **New London** ($23,265, 88.5%) spend within $1,200 of each other, but **Granby** scores 82.8 on the District Accountability Index (DAI), the state's summative rating for each district on a 0-to-100 scale, while **New London** scores 58.6. Across the state, the highest-need quarter of districts (serving 67% high-needs students) spends

[1] This assumes the state appropriates new money while local and federal revenue hold steady, so that the state covers half of a growing total: ($4.99 billion + X) ÷ ($13.81 billion + X) = 50%, so X = $3.83 billion.

8.7% less - $2,034 less per pupil - than the lowest-need quarter (serving 28%). Local property tax revenue accounts for more than the whole of that gap: local contributions run about $3,000 per student higher in the lowest-need districts, and state aid closes part, but not all, of the difference. As such, the ECS formula does not compensate for differences in local wealth, and in many cases in Connecticut, a student's destiny is determined by the school district he or she attends.

To address this multifaceted issue, the Governor's Blue-Ribbon Commission on K-12 Education Funding and Accountability is “tasked with conducting a comprehensive review of all education funding in Connecticut and then providing the governor and the Connecticut General Assembly with recommendations on how this system can be improved” (Lamont, 2026). From a state policy perspective, this charge assumes a significant redesign of the education finance system rather than an inflation adjustment to the current, inherently inequitable ECS formula. Moreover, it requires consideration of both *how much* money is spent and *what* it is spent on.

Research has linked higher spending on schools, particularly schools serving high-needs students, to measurable improvements in student outcomes that persist well into adulthood. One review of school-spending studies from across the United States finds that increasing spending by $1,000 per pupil, sustained over four years, raises college-going by 2.8 percentage points and test scores by 3.2% of a standard deviation, with larger effects for students from low-income families (Jackson & Mackevicius, 2024). What that money is spent on, however, is equally important to a district's effectiveness in raising student outcomes and narrowing achievement gaps.

How a school district spends its resources is fundamentally influenced by two factors:

1. Structural cost differences and constraints created by district size, administrative overhead costs, state special education and labor policy, and regional differences in the cost of living and doing business.
2. Variation in the degree of efficiency and effectiveness resulting from local district decision-making, i.e., district priorities and practices that determine how it expends available state and local revenue in those areas where it has discretion.

Economists C. Kirabo Jackson of Northwestern University, Rucker Johnson of the University of California, Berkeley, and Claudia Persico established the causal link between school spending and long-run student outcomes in their study of court-ordered school finance reforms. Their work and the literature that has followed it support a two-part conclusion: money matters, and what it is spent on matters just as much (Jackson et al., 2016).

Research on how districts spend each additional dollar finds, as we have found in Connecticut, significant variation in how similar districts convert per-pupil expenditure (PPE) into student achievement (Jackson & Mackevicius, 2024), and that this variation tracks what the additional money is spent on. In particular, spending directed toward the *instructional core* (De Bruin et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023) - teacher quality (including salaries, professional learning, and retention), instruction itself, and *targeted interventions* such as summer learning and high-dose tutoring - yields far higher returns than spending on general operations, administration, or transportation. Our analysis of the return on investment (ROI) of comparable Connecticut school districts likewise suggests significant variation in student outcomes, as measured by the DAI, among districts of similar size, need, and spending. Moreover, this variation appears related to both (1) structural cost differences and (2) district spending patterns that often reflect past practice and the priorities of district leadership and local boards of education.

An overhaul and redesign of Connecticut's school finance system to be effective must meet three fundamental criteria:

1. Shift more resources to districts with the greatest student need.
2. Prioritize allocation of additional resources for the instructional core of school districts.
3. Through state policy, address structural issues such as district size and related administrative overhead that divert money from the instructional core.

To that end, we have sought to identify the Connecticut districts currently most successful at converting local and state revenue into student outcomes. We hope that examining the characteristics and spending practices of those districts will inform state policy and guide the distribution and allocation of a much-needed increase in the state share of educational funding to create a state school finance system that is more equitable and effective in meeting the needs of more students and more efficient in the use of state and local tax dollars.

Methodology

This analysis builds on the Achievement Return-on-Investment (A-ROI) methodology used in the UConn Executive Leadership Program (ELP) course on *Data-driven Decision-making for District Improvement and Equity*. A-ROI divides what a district spends per pupil (total PPE) by its score on the DAI, the summative rating in Connecticut's Next Generation Accountability System (Connecticut State Department of Education, 2026a). The result is the number of dollars a district spends for each point it earns on the index, so a lower A-ROI means a district produces more achievement for each dollar. Every district-level figure in this proposal is drawn from the District Comparison Tools app (Datadaptive LLC, 2026) and reflects version 3.0 of that app as of September 2026; because the app is updated as the state publishes new data, later figures may differ slightly.

We also calculate a return on investment for growth (G-ROI), which divides PPE by the Growth Accountability Index (GAI). The GAI is the average of a district's ELA and math growth rates, multiplied by 100 so that it sits on the same 0-to-100 scale as the DAI. Where A-ROI asks what a district spends for each point of achievement, G-ROI asks what it spends for each point of student growth.

To make an "apples-to-apples" comparison of how effectively districts convert their funding into student outcomes, we compare districts only with others of the same kind. Connecticut has 199 reporting districts. Of these, 165 are town-based school districts, together covering all 169 municipalities: 111 serve the full K-12 span, 46 are elementary-only (K-6, K-8), and 8 are secondary-only (6-12, 9-12). The remaining 34 have no town boundary: 21 charter districts, the magnet school systems operated by six Regional Educational Service Centers (RESCs), the Connecticut Technical Education and Career System, one college-affiliated district, three endowed academies, and two state agency facilities. For comparisons of efficiency, they are compared among themselves rather than against town-based districts - the six RESCs as one class, and the charter, technical, and college-affiliated districts as another. The three endowed academies and two state agency facilities do not publish both a per-pupil expenditure and an accountability index in any school year, so no efficiency measure exists for them, and they appear in no comparison and no funding table. That leaves 29 districts with no town boundary in this analysis, and 194 districts in all. All but two findings reported below draw on the 111 town-based K-12 districts, so each comparison is made within a single class of district (Findings #1 and #2 use statewide data).[2]

[2] Five of those 34 - the three endowed academies and the two state agency facilities - have never published both a per-pupil expenditure and an accountability index, so no efficiency measure can be calculated for them. They are counted in the 199 but excluded from every comparison, which leaves the 194 districts shown in Appendix 2.

Within the 111, districts are grouped into Reference Groups by enrollment and by their share of high-needs students, meaning students from low-income families (using eligibility for free and reduced-price meals as the measure), multilingual learners, and students with disabilities. Because **Regional School District 20** formed in 2024-25 from the merger of **Litchfield** and **Regional School District 06**, any figure comparing two years is computed on the 110 districts that existed from 2018-19 onward, while figures for 2024-25 alone use all 111.

Within each Reference Group, we identify a district as one of the most efficient only if it meets all three of the following conditions, each measured against its own group's average: (1) its DAI is at or above the average, (2) its PPE is at or below the average, and (3) its A-ROI is at or below the average. As such, a district cannot earn the designation by achieving little at low cost, nor by achieving well at any price; it must be at least as effective as the districts most like it while spending less to get there. Because the three group averages are published beside the districts in the app, a reader can check every condition directly.

Finally, we propose a system for distributing new state funding, which we call benchmark funding, based on ten deciles of student need. A decile is one tenth of the districts, ranked from highest to lowest need, so that Decile 1 holds the highest-need districts and Decile 10 the lowest. This system would distribute up to $3.83 billion in new state funding to reach the 50% target. Benchmark funding, the new state money to be distributed, is distinct from *benchmark achievement*, which is the state's own target of 75 on the DAI, and from benchmark spending, which is what the districts that reached that target spent to get there. Appendix 1 explains how districts are placed by need and by wealth, and Appendix 2 shows the resulting distribution for every district.

For more methodology, visit https://datadaptive.ai/district-comparison-tools and open the Methods & Definitions page.

Findings

Finding #1: Connecticut's inequity will not be addressed by making further adjustments to the current ECS formula

The formula is fully funded and extreme inequity remains. Statewide, actual ECS aid rose from 85.4% of the formula's calculated amount in FY2019 - a shortfall of $345 million - to 97.9% in FY2025. It reached 102.5% in FY2026 and will reach 104.6% in FY2027: no town receives less than its calculated amount, and "overfunded" towns are held harmless at amounts above theirs (School and State Finance Project, 2026). In other words, ECS now delivers everything it promises, and more; what it promises simply does not meet the need. The disparities documented in the rest of this proposal persist under a fully funded formula.

Finding #2: Connecticut funds its schools from local property taxes to a degree almost no other state approaches, and that is the mechanism that turns a funding gap into an equity gap

In school year 2022-23, local property taxes supplied 54.8% of all revenue for Connecticut's public schools, compared with 33.2% nationally. The state's share was 36.1% against a national 45.1%, and the federal share was 8.3% against 12.9% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2025b). Only New Hampshire, which has no state income tax, relies more heavily on the property tax. Because the property tax yields more in a town with a larger grand list, two towns making the same tax effort raise very different amounts for their schools, and no amount of local willingness can close that distance. Every finding in this proposal about town wealth, tax effort, and school spending follows, at least in part, from this arrangement.

An independent national analysis reaches the same conclusion from federal data. Using Census Bureau revenue figures for 2022 to 2024, adjusted for inflation and regional labor costs, EdTrust found that Connecticut's highest-poverty districts, which together enroll about a quarter of the state's students, receive about $3,800 (13.8%) less in state and local revenue per student than its lowest-poverty districts, while nationally the highest-poverty districts receive slightly more, about $200 (0.9%). The difference comes from local revenue, which state aid offsets only in part. Connecticut's districts serving the most English learners also receive $4,800 (16.9%) less, and those serving the most students of color $5,500 (19.1%) less (EdTrust, 2026; Huddleston et al., 2026). These figures measure revenue rather than spending and group districts by child poverty rather than by high needs, so they are not directly comparable with the $2,034 gap given earlier; they point the same way and are larger.

Finding #3: The District Reference Groups are twenty years old and no longer describe the districts they sort

The *District Reference Group* (DRG) method of categorizing Connecticut school districts is an artifact of the past, and it is an invalid and inequitable basis for distributing funds or comparing districts. The Connecticut State Department of Education first released the DRGs in 2006 and has never officially updated them; the only later versions are unofficial re-derivations of the original methodology (School and State Finance Project, n.d.). As such, twenty years separate the classification from the districts it claims to describe. We have found that comparing districts in narrow bands of student need, rebuilt from current data, is a more accurate and more equitable basis for both funding and accountability.

Finding #4: Ten districts convert funding into student outcomes better than their peers, but even the most efficient high-needs district still falls short of benchmark achievement

The Connecticut districts most efficient at translating their available funding into student outcomes, as measured by A-ROI, include the following town-based K-12 districts, drawn from 10 Reference Groups: **Bethel; Coventry; East Granby; Farmington; Granby; Meriden; Shelton; South Windsor; Thomaston; Vernon.**

The standout in this group is **Meriden**, which served an 84.8% high-needs population in 2024-25 on a per-pupil expenditure of $16,977 and achieved a DAI of 69.6 - better than 14 districts spending more than $29,000 per pupil. This suggests that leadership, teacher quality, culture, innovation, prioritization of the instructional core, and high expectations can, to a significant degree, strengthen the relationship between dollars and outcomes. However, **Meriden's** 69.6 remains below the state's own achievement benchmark of 75, even though **Meriden** is doing nearly everything this analysis can identify as the right thing to do. As such, efficiency alone is not enough, and identifying the districts that convert money well is not an alternative to funding the districts that do not have enough money to convert. We name these districts so that the state, and their peers, can learn from what they do, and so that the additional funding proposed below is directed at what works.

Moreover, four additional districts top their Reference Groups on growth return on investment (G-ROI): **Cheshire; Griswold; Newington; Suffield.**

Finding #5: At the same level of student need, districts reach benchmark achievement on budgets that differ widely

In 2024-25, five of the 13 districts serving between 50% and 60% high-needs students met the state's achievement benchmark of 75: **Seymour** (57.7% high needs, $19,784 per pupil), **Plainville** (53.6%, $22,412), **Westbrook** (52.2%, $35,908), **Clinton** (51.5%, $26,336), and **Stafford** (50.2%, $25,044). What they spent to reach the same standard ranges from $19,784 to

$35,908, a spread of 81% among districts serving comparable students. *This variation is the strongest single argument for examining how effectively districts spend, not just how much they spend*.

Finding #6: Among districts with more than 60% student need, benchmark achievement has only been reached twice in five years

Above 60% student need, almost no Connecticut district reaches the state's achievement benchmark of 75. Across the five published years, only two have met it: **Vernon** in 2024-25, at 62.6% high needs, and **Norwalk** in 2018-19, at 65.3%. In 2024-25, 30 districts served populations above 60% high needs, and **Vernon** was the only one to meet the standard. As such, *Connecticut has set a performance standard that its highest-need districts have almost never met, and it has never studied what meeting that standard would cost or how the money to meet it should be spent*.

Finding #7: Vernon is the clearest case in the state of a high-needs district reaching benchmark achievement and sustaining it

Vernon serves 62.6% high-needs students and posted a DAI of 76.3 in 2024-25. It was the only district above 60% high needs to reach benchmark achievement that year, the highest-scoring of all 30 districts in that group, and the highest-scoring Alliance District, and it has held the top position in that group in three of the five published years. Between 2018-19 and 2024-25, the share of its students with high needs rose from 59.0% to 62.6%, while its DAI rose from 74.5 to 76.3. That gain of 1.8 points came over six years in which the median change among the 110 K-12 districts was a loss of 1.9 points and only 29 of them improved at all. Moreover, **Vernon** did this at $19,595 per pupil - $1,664 below the $21,259 median for the 28 districts in the highest-need quarter - while scoring more than nine points above their median of 67.2. **Vernon**

is, therefore, the clearest case in the state of a high-need district successfully converting available funding into student outcomes.

Finding #8: Districts under 1,500 students spend about $2,700 more per pupil for the same results as larger districts

In none of the three most recent published years has a Connecticut district with fewer than 1,500 students ranked in the top quarter of districts on converting spending into student achievement; in 2024-25, the closest of them, **Somers**, missed by two tenths of a point. Districts below 1,500 students do not score worse than districts of 1,500 to 7,000 students - 75 to 77 on the DAI, compared with 77 to 78 - *but they spend roughly $2,700 more per pupil to get there*: $22,826 compared with $20,164, pooled across the five published years. That premium is about 13% of what the larger districts spend; it appears in every published year, and it has grown from 9.0% in 2018-19 to 13.8% in 2024-25. Moreover, the premium is concentrated among small districts serving moderate to high student need, which cannot spread the cost of serving that need across enough students; among the wealthiest districts, size makes almost no difference. Districts above 7,000 students are also less efficient, for the opposite reason: they carry the state's heaviest concentrations of need. This finding establishes that *small size carries a real and growing cost. It does not, by itself, establish what consolidation would save*.

Finding #9: Since 2018-19, funding has been flat in real terms while the share of high-needs students rose and achievement measured by DAI, at the median, fell slightly

Despite recent legislative efforts, Connecticut's school funding has been close to flat in real terms while student need has risen and measured achievement has fallen, at the median. Between 2018-19 and 2024-25, the median per-pupil expenditure, including both state and local revenue, rose 28.5%, while inflation rose 25.5%, measured by the change in the Consumer Price

Index for All Urban Consumers between those two school years (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, n.d.). That is real growth of 2.4% over six years, or less than half a percent a year. Over the same period, the median change across the 110 K-12 districts was a 4.8-percentage-point rise in the share of high-needs students and a 1.9-point fall in DAI, and only 29 of 110 districts improved their DAI at all. This suggests that *flat funding against rising need produces slow decline, and that the work of districts has grown harder since COVID faster than their resources have grown to meet it*. Nevertheless, 16 districts raised their DAI while their share of high-needs students rose and while spending less per pupil in real terms than they had six years earlier. These 16 districts did more with less: **Cheshire; East Haven; East Windsor; Farmington; Killingly; Madison; Manchester; Meriden; New Canaan; North Branford; North Haven; Suffield; Torrington; Trumbull; Vernon; and Wilton.**

Finding #10: The towns with the least property wealth make the greatest tax effort for their schools

Connecticut's poorest towns tax themselves hardest for their schools and still have the least to spend on them. Measured against the value of their property, the poorest quarter of the 111 town-based K-12 districts devote roughly twice the share of their property wealth to education as the wealthiest quarter: a median education equalized mill rate of 20.61, compared with 10.74, against a statewide median of 15.83. The education equalized mill rate is a town's education spending divided by the full market value of its taxable property, in thousands of dollars; in other words, it is the tax rate a town would need, at full market value, to pay for its schools. At the extremes, **Hartford** ranks first of 111 on this measure at 48.02, with a grand list of $57,140 per resident, while **Greenwich** ranks last at 4.96, with a grand list of $800,674 per resident. **Windham** ranks second on this measure at 28.81, with a grand list of $81,670 per

resident, while **Old Saybrook** measures at 6.85, with a grand list of $434,542 per resident. As such, *what separates these towns is not their effort but their capacity to raise money.*

The same towns also devote a smaller share of their municipal budgets to education, but not because they value it less. Across the three highest-need deciles, the median district's towns commit 56.6% of municipal spending to education, compared with 70.5% across the three lowest-need deciles and 66.2% statewide; the lowest is **New Haven**, at 35.0%, followed by **Hamden** at 39.6%, **Waterbury** at 45.8%, and **Bridgeport** at 47.3%. *Municipalities like these carry police, fire, pension, and debt obligations that a wealthy suburb does not, and their schools compete with those obligations for a tax base that is already stretched. In these four municipalities, less than half of the budget goes to schools; municipal functions and debt take the rest.*

This analysis also suggests that the highest-need, urban districts in Connecticut (i.e., those where 70% or more of students have high needs) are experiencing a state of "educational overburden." The term extends the established concept of municipal overburden in cities (Stein, 1978) to describe a condition in which the level of student need outpaces the resources available to reach benchmark achievement. It is unclear how much additional funding would be necessary, but it is clear that current funding relative to need is inadequate. The burden, however, does not take the form one might expect. The highest-need quarter of districts devotes the same share of its budgets to instruction as the lowest-need quarter does - a median of 61.8% compared with 61.0% in 2024-25, and never less in any published year (Connecticut State Department of Education, 2026d). They simply have less to devote: they spend $1,202 less per pupil on instruction, out of a total that is $1,999 lower (a figure computed on the districts that publish a spending breakdown, which is why it differs slightly from the $2,034 gap given earlier). They

also spend 3.0 percentage points more of their budgets on transportation than the lowest-need districts do, and $713 per pupil on the support services around teaching, compared with $930. This is the unrecognized cost of economic segregation, and the state must compensate for it as long as it maintains the status quo of housing policy and local control across 169 towns.

For more findings, visit https://datadaptive.ai/district-comparison-tools and open the Findings page and Conclusions page.

Recommendations

The redesign proposed here is built to meet the three criteria set out at the beginning of this proposal:

1. Shift more resources to districts with the greatest student need (Recommendation #1).
2. Prioritize allocation of additional resources for the instructional core (Recommendation #2).
3. Through state policy, capture economies of scale by addressing structural issues such as district size and related administrative overhead (Recommendation #3).

While Recommendations #4 and #5 do not address the three criteria directly, the first three depend on them, and they build the state's capacity to see what its taxpayers' money buys.

Recommendation #1: Distribute new funding to districts by student need, according to district deciles of need, adjusted for town wealth

The current ECS formula is inadequate to meet the level of student need in Connecticut or to narrow the equity and achievement gaps among its school districts. Current ECS funding, including recent supplemental funding, may serve as a foundation that keeps every district's current aid stable; no district would lose any funding it now receives. However, any new funding - up to the $3.83 billion needed for the state to provide 50% of total education costs - should be

distributed as “benchmark” funding, based on need. Under this model, the lowest-need districts (Deciles 9 and 10) receive no additional funding, and districts in Deciles 1 through 8 receive benchmark funding at a single rate of $14,844 per high-needs student. Within each decile, that total is then shared in proportion to enrollment, so every district in the same decile receives the same amount per pupil. Because the highest-need deciles enroll the most high-needs students, Decile 1 receives both the largest total and the largest amount per pupil. The deciles determine which districts are eligible, not how much each student counts; no district's students are weighted more heavily than another's. Appendix 2, Table 1 shows the distribution by decile, and Table 2 shows it for each of the 111 districts.

The amount each district receives per pupil is a distribution rule, not an estimate of what reaching benchmark achievement would cost. For the three highest-need deciles, that cost cannot yet be calculated, because so few districts in them have ever reached benchmark achievement (see Findings #6 and #7). The largest shares are therefore directed to these deciles on evidence of unmet need rather than on a priced target, and pricing that target remains work the state has never commissioned.

Benchmark funding should reach every district that serves Connecticut's students, not only the 111 town-based K-12 districts on which this analysis rests. Forty-six towns run an elementary district rather than a K-12 district, eight secondary regional districts serve their older students, and 29 further districts - 21 charter districts, six RESCs, the Connecticut Technical Education and Career System, and one college-affiliated district - enroll students that no town district counts. Together, these districts educate 63,773 students, 36,886 of whom have high needs. Placed on the same deciles and held to the same eligibility rule, the 71 of them that fall in Deciles 1 through 8 would receive $510.2 million of the $3.83 billion, leaving $3.32 billion for

the 111. Because the state's wealth data cover only K-12 districts, and because charter schools, RESCs, and the technical high schools have no town boundary or local tax base, these districts are placed on need alone, and each receives its own high-needs count multiplied by the single rate. They are included because this proposal distributes funding by the high-needs student rather than by the town. Appendix 2, Tables 3 and 4 list every one of them.

Although the full cost of reaching benchmark achievement cannot yet be priced for the highest-need deciles, one related figure can be, and it sets a floor beneath their shares. As Finding #10 shows, *the highest-need districts already tax themselves harder for schools than the wealthiest districts do*. Bringing the towns in the highest-need deciles down to the statewide median education equalized mill rate of 15.83, at their current level of school spending, would cost $521 million for Decile 1 and $672 million for Deciles 1, 2, and 3 together, or 13.6% and 17.5% of the $3.83 billion. We propose these figures as a minimum: a distribution that delivers less than this to the highest-need deciles would leave the towns that already tax hardest for schools taxing above the state median just to fund what they fund today. Under this proposal, Deciles 1 through 3 receive $2.05 billion, more than three times that floor. The floor is heavily concentrated - **Hartford** alone accounts for a third of the $672 million - and it applies only until a district in Deciles 1 through 3 reaches benchmark achievement, at which point the model can be re-priced on an observed cost of success.

Distributing by need assumes that every town already contributes what it can from its own tax base. For most Connecticut towns that assumption holds; however, two kinds of towns break it, in opposite directions. First, a small number of communities hold property wealth so far above the rest of the state that they can sustain high school spending at a modest tax rate, so their need decile understates what they can raise. Second, some towns cannot raise what the size of

their community suggests, because much of the property within their borders - state and federal facilities, hospitals, and colleges - is exempt from local taxation. Neither case is common enough to justify rebuilding the distribution around wealth, which would reproduce the central flaw of the current formula, but both are consequential enough to require an exception.

We therefore propose that where a district's wealth decile and its need decile sit two or more deciles apart, its placement moves two deciles toward its wealth decile: down for a town whose property wealth exceeds what its need placement implies, and up for a town whose taxable base is smaller than its grand list suggests. Because the move equals the threshold that triggers it, an adjustment can never carry a district past its own wealth placement. Town wealth is measured the way the state's own funding formula measures it (Connecticut Office of Policy and Management, 2026): equalized net grand list per capita (the full market value of taxable property after exemptions, per resident) and median household income, taken together. The threshold should be set in statute. Appendix 1 explains why both measures are needed and why placements average four years rather than one.

On current placements, the adjustment moves 31 of the 111 districts: 18 move down, toward a smaller share of the new money, and 13 move up, toward a larger share. Four districts - **Brookfield**, **Fairfield**, **Greenwich**, and **Regional School District 12** - move into Decile 9 or 10 and therefore receive no benchmark funding; each already sits in wealth decile 9 or 10 on its own. One district, **Thomaston**, moves up into the top three deciles. No district loses any funding it now receives; what is at stake is a share of new money. The Moved column of Appendix 2, Table 2 shows every district the adjustment moves and in which direction.

Because the adjustment moves some large, high-need districts down, the amount per pupil does not fall evenly from one decile to the next. Five districts - **Stamford**, **Norwalk**,

Danbury, **Bloomfield**, and **East Windsor** - move from Decile 2 to Decile 4 because their wealth placements sit two or more deciles above their need placements, and together they enroll 42,546 students, 64% to 75% of whom have high needs. As a result, Decile 4 receives $9,479 per pupil, slightly more than the $9,249 in Decile 3. This is not an error: the adjustment reflects that these towns can raise more locally, while the per-student rate reflects that their high-needs students are still there.

Distributing by need assumes that serving need also narrows the other gaps that track it. In Connecticut, one of those gaps is large: districts serving the most students of color receive 19.1% less state and local revenue per student than districts serving the fewest (EdTrust, 2026). National research finds that state finance reforms built on income did not always narrow funding gaps by race, particularly in states as segregated as Connecticut (Rauscher & Fiel, 2026). Whether benchmark funding narrows that gap as well as the gap by need should be measured, not assumed.

Recommendation #2: Require 80% of new benchmark funding to reach the instructional core and name the uses it should buy

To ensure that new money reaches students, the legislature should require that 80% of new benchmark funding be spent on the instructional core, which the State Department of Education defines as instruction together with student support services and instructional support services. That spending should be informed by the practices of the districts identified above as most successful at converting spending into achievement. Connecticut districts currently spend a median of 72.5% of total per-pupil expenditure on those three functions, and 60.7% on instruction alone (Connecticut State Department of Education, 2026d). As such, the 80%

requirement sets a rate for new money above current practice rather than simply codifying what districts already do.

The requirement applies only to new money, so it would not by itself turn Connecticut into an 80% system. If existing spending keeps its present makeup and every new dollar meets the requirement, the statewide share spent on the instructional core would rise from 72.5% to about 74.1%. Its real force is that it directs roughly $3.07 billion in new spending toward uses supported by evidence.

A spending category, however, is not a strategy. Money reaches students through teachers, and the difference between one teacher and another is the largest difference schools themselves control: replacing a teacher in the bottom 5% of measured effectiveness with an average one raises the combined lifetime earnings of a single classroom of students by roughly $250,000 (Chetty et al., 2014). The requirement should therefore direct new instructional core funding to uses with evidence behind them, namely (1) compensation and retention sufficient to staff classrooms in districts that cannot currently staff them, (2) instructional coaching and content-specific professional learning, and (3) the Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions with the strongest records, including high-dose tutoring and structured summer learning (De Bruin et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023). The evidence on coaching carries a caution: coaching improves classroom practice substantially and student achievement more modestly, and its effects shrink as programs grow from small trials to system-wide implementation (Kraft et al., 2018). Connecticut should expect the same. As such, the State should fund coaching only at a scale it can staff with instructional coaches who are themselves strong practitioners, beginning with the highest-need, lowest-performing districts (e.g., through a State Coaches-in-Residence program).

Recommendation #3: Capture economies of scale - commission an estimate of the savings, then replace the voluntary regionalization process with a statewide framework for shared services and shared governance

The cost premium of small enrollments is established; the savings from merger are not. The General Assembly should therefore begin by commissioning an estimate of the administrative overhead savings achievable by consolidating districts serving under 1,500 students. On that estimate, and not on the premium alone, the State should then set a statutory enrollment threshold and a timeline, sunset the current voluntary regionalization process, and replace it with a structured framework. The voluntary process does not work, and its failure is structural rather than incidental: it requires two towns to agree, and it fails whenever either town concludes the other gains more. A structured framework should have the State identify the districts that ought to be studied for merger, conduct or commission those studies rather than leaving them to the towns, and set a date by which each study is complete.

The State already has a place to begin. Eight secondary regional school districts receive students from 24 elementary districts in their member towns, so 32 boards of education serve students who, in a K-12 town, would be served by eight. When each regional and its elementary districts are treated as one system and compared with the K-12 districts closest to its combined enrollment and share of high-needs students, general administration - the board of education and the superintendent's office - costs more per pupil than the median of those districts in seven of the eight systems, in each of the five years for which the State publishes spending by function (Connecticut State Department of Education, 2026d). In 2024-25 it cost $1,743 per pupil in the **Regional School District 4** system against a median of $699 among comparable K-12 districts, and $1,439 in the **Regional School District 11** system against $704. The difference is not

explained by wealth: Regional School Districts 8 and 19 serve towns with less property wealth per resident than their comparison districts and still pay more (Connecticut Office of Policy and Management, 2026). These eight systems are the natural first subjects of the studies this recommendation calls for, because their duplication is structural and observable and because their towns already share a secondary district. As with the small-district premium, this comparison describes split and unified systems as they are; it does not estimate what combining them would save, which is the estimate the General Assembly should commission first.

The State should also separate what districts can share from what they cannot, because economies of scale can be reached by two routes - shared services and shared governance - and the two reach different costs. Districts can jointly purchase transportation, building maintenance, security, human resources, information technology, and financial management. Per-student cost qualifications should govern that sharing. That means a district should not spend over a certain financial threshold per student for a particular service. When it does, it should be required to partner or contract with a neighboring district or RESC for that service. However, *the cost differential concentrates in general administration, which Connecticut defines as the board of education and the superintendent's office, and general administration cannot be bought jointly: sharing it means sharing governance, which is what consolidation, or a formal shared-governance agreement that stops short of merger, does*. General administration cost $824 per pupil in districts under 1,500 students and $583 in districts between 1,500 and 3,000, against $431 in districts above 3,000 in 2024-25. Shared services therefore reach the smaller part of the available economies of scale; shared governance reaches the larger part.

Recommendation #4: Commission an independent study of the districts that are currently most successful in converting funding into student outcomes

The districts in the state determined by this analysis to be most efficient at translating available funding into student outcomes - 10 on overall achievement and four on reading and math growth - should be studied to determine their leadership and governance characteristics and how they spend their money (i.e., which aspects of the instructional core these districts prioritize successfully, how that prioritization contributes to their relative cost-effectiveness, etc.). *The General Assembly should commission that study and place it with an independent party*, such as a research university, a national school finance authority, or the School and State Finance Project, *with the State Department of Education responsible for supplying the data rather than for producing the findings for which it has limited capacity*.

A study of how districts spend can be no better than the accounts it reads, and while Connecticut districts currently have a basic common chart of accounts to code their spending, the instructional core is not broken down into any level of detail that would be useful for aligning spending to specific interventions. *Connecticut should develop a comprehensive, equity-based platform with pre-populated data and centralized contracts for coordinating funding across the state's districts.* A good example is MICIP, the Michigan Integrated Continuous Improvement Process (Michigan Department of Education, 2026) - aligned to district- and school-level strategic planning for continuous improvement of the instructional core. The point of such a platform is not added reporting. It could move Connecticut closer to a statewide curriculum in the measured areas - ELA, math, and science. It could also assist district leadership see what a comparable district spends on a particular instructional intervention, its impact on student outcomes, and how it may be implemented locally.

Recommendation #5: Publish Achievement and Growth Return-on-Investment measures alongside the state's existing accountability data

The State Department of Education should develop and publish achievement (A-ROI) and growth return-on-investment (G-ROI) measures that tie each district's total spending to its progress toward meeting state benchmark achievement and growth targets. A-ROI and G-ROI should be published annually alongside DAI and PPE data to create public transparency around the efficiency and effectiveness of local district spending. *While an achievement measure largely reflects students' prior performance, a growth measure reports the impact of a district's quality of instruction on student performance in a given year. It also provides districts a gauge to measure the effectiveness of its instructional core and its efforts to drive continuous improvement of teaching and learning.*

For more recommendations, visit https://datadaptive.ai/district-comparison-tools and open the *A Proposal* page, and the *Open Questions* page for what the analysis leaves unresolved.

What this proposal means for your district

Most superintendents will read this proposal with one question in mind: what would it mean for my district? Answering that question takes three steps in Appendix 2, Table 2. First, find your district's adjusted decile. The decile places your district among the 111 town-based K-12 districts by its share of high-needs students, meaning students from low-income families, multilingual learners, and students with disabilities. For 31 districts, the placement is then adjusted for town wealth. Second, read your benchmark funding per pupil. This is the new state money your district would receive for each student it enrolls, on top of what it receives today. No district loses any funding it currently receives. Third, read your total, which is that per-pupil amount multiplied by your enrollment. Elementary-only and secondary-only districts appear in Table 3, and charter districts, the RESCs, and the technical high school system appear in Table 4.

Vernon and **Middletown** show both what is possible and what lies ahead. Both districts sit in adjusted Decile 3, and in both, roughly three in five students have high needs (62.6% and 60.5%, respectively). **Vernon** was the only district in its decile to reach benchmark achievement (a DAI of 75) in 2024-25. It scored 76.3 while spending $19,595 per pupil (see Finding #7). That same year, **Middletown** spent $25,483 per pupil and scored 63.8, down from 73.1 in 2018-19. Under this proposal, each district would receive $9,249 more per pupil once the new funding is fully phased in: about $29.9 million for **Vernon** and $40.6 million for **Middletown**. At least 80% of it would be required to reach the instructional core (see Recommendation #2). As such, the question for **Middletown** is not only how much new money it receives, but also how it spends that money. **Vernon's** record offers the nearest answer, and Recommendations #2 and #4 are designed to make that answer available to every district in the state.

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Measures and judgments

Connecticut publishes each district's accountability index to six decimal places in its accountability data file and displays it to one decimal place in its public district reports. This proposal follows both. Every comparison is computed on the published value, and every figure shown is displayed to one decimal place so that it matches what a reader will find on the state's own report for that district. A district counts as having improved where its 2024-25 index is at least as high as its 2018-19 index; no district in this frame carries an identical index in both years, so no count here turns on a tie. One consequence should be stated plainly. A district can record a change that is real in the published data and invisible at the displayed precision, and it can record one that displays as larger than it was. **Stafford**'s index rose 0.04 points, from 75.863882 to 75.902395, and reads as 75.9 in both years. **Meriden**'s rose 0.12 points and reads as 69.4 against 69.6, a displayed change of 0.2. Both displayed figures are correctly rounded, and both underlying changes are real; they are answers to slightly different questions, and where the two are shown together this proposal says so.

Towns and districts. Capacity and effort are properties of towns because the property tax is levied by a town and the school budget is appropriated by a town. Of the 111 town-based K-12 districts, 102 are a single town. Nine are regional districts covering two to four member towns, and for those, every town-level figure in Appendix 2 is the unweighted mean of the member towns (named on the District Comparison Tools site). Unweighted rather than enrollment-weighted, because effort is what each town decides to do with its own tax base; weighting by enrollment would let the largest member town speak for the whole district.

Town wealth. Connecticut's own funding formula gauges what a town can afford two ways, and this appendix uses both: equalized net grand list per capita - the taxable value of property after exemptions, restated at full market value so that towns assessing at different ratios can be compared - and median household income. A district's wealth decile is the placement the two measures produce together, and that combined placement is what the adjustment runs on. The choice matters more than it appears. Asked which districts sit two or more deciles from where their wealth would place them, equalized net grand list per capita alone answers 48 districts, median household income alone answers 22, and the two together answer 31. All three are counted on the four-year average of placements described below. The state's formula weights the two measures differently, counting property wealth at 70% and income at 30% (Moran, 2017); this proposal weights them equally, so that a town with a large grand list but modest household incomes is not treated as wealthier than its residents can sustain. Under the state's weighting, 38 districts would be flagged rather than 31, and the online tool shows both. The counts are the smaller part of it: only 15 districts are flagged by both measures, while 55 are flagged by at least one, so the two terms are not a loose and a tight version of one question. They point at different districts and using one alone would invent a definition of town wealth the state does not use. Need decile 1 is the highest need and wealth decile 1 is the lowest wealth, so a district whose wealth matches its need reads the same number in both columns.

Placements. A placement cut on a single year is not steady enough to carry consequences: cut on 2024-25 alone, 26 districts are flagged; cut on 2022-23 alone, 33; only 20 appear in both. Placements therefore average the four most recent published school years - 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25. The rule is stated in advance rather than chosen after the fact: use the published years whose placements still describe the district and drop a year that diverges

materially from the recent pattern. Measured against each district's own average over the three most recent years, the mean absolute deviation is 0.0374 for 2018-19 and 0.0295 for 2021-22, and 31 districts sit five or more percentile points away in 2018-19 against 21 in 2021-22. On that test 2018-19 is dropped and 2021-22 is kept. A district's percentile is computed within each year by the same convention used elsewhere in this analysis, the four are averaged, and the average is ranked again before the decile is cut.

Two districts do not appear in every year. **Litchfield** and **Regional School District 06** consolidated into **Regional School District 20** in 2024-25, so each year's percentile is computed across every town-based K-12 district that existed in that year, which is 112 through 2023-24 counting the two predecessors, and 111 in 2024-25. **Regional School District 20**'s own placement therefore rests on 2024-25 alone, whereas every other district's placement rests on four years.

Gap, threshold and adjustment are three judgments, and only the first is arithmetic. The gap is the wealth decile minus the need decile: positive means a district is wealthier than its need placement implies, negative means poorer. With 111 districts sorted into ten bins, a difference of one decile is what noise looks like, and most districts differ by one. A threshold of two deciles flags 31 districts; a three-decile threshold would flag 10 and a four-decile threshold would flag four. Two is a judgment and is stated as one: it is the smallest gap that is larger than the noise, and it holds the exception to 31 of 111 districts.

The adjustment is set equal to the threshold, at two deciles, and that equality does the work. Because a move can never be larger than the gap that triggered it, the adjustment always closes part of the distance to a district's own wealth placement and never carries it past. Of the districts adjusted, 10 have a gap larger than two and are therefore only partly corrected.

An adjustment set below the threshold - a single decile, as an earlier version of this proposal used - under-corrects every flagged district by at least one decile and leaves the largest gaps almost untouched. An adjustment set above the threshold would allow a district to finish further from its wealth placement than it began. Equality is the only setting that corrects in the right direction without overcorrecting in any case. Both directions are used. 18 districts move toward wealth and a smaller share of the new money; 13 move toward need and a larger share. A count of the flagged districts that reports only the first is reporting half the rule.

Effort. Wealth says what a town could raise; effort says what it does raise. The education equalized mill rate is a town's education spending divided by its equalized net grand list in thousands - the share of its property wealth it devotes to schools. The education share is education spending as a proportion of total municipal spending. Both are fiscal year 2023, the most recent year Connecticut publishes municipal finance for, and both are drawn from the town's general-fund reporting. That figure is not the same quantity as the per-pupil expenditure used elsewhere in this analysis, and no figure in Appendix 2 divides one by the other.

What is stable and what is not. 16 districts are flagged on every single year and on the four-year average alike: **Brookfield**, **Canton**, **Danbury**, **Ellington**, **Fairfield**, **Greenwich**, **North Branford**, **North Stonington**, **Norwalk**, **Shelton**, **Somers**, **Stamford**, **Thomaston**, **Tolland**, **Waterford** and **Windsor**. If the wealth measure is allowed to vary as well, 10 are flagged under every version: **Brookfield**, **Canton**, **Fairfield**, **Greenwich**, **North Stonington**, **Norwalk**, **Shelton**, **Somers**, **Stamford** and **Thomaston**. A solid core, and a larger set that depends on choices a reasonable person could make differently, is what this appendix contains, and it is described that way rather than presented as a single settled list.

Appendix 2 - Proposed distribution of benchmark funding

Appendix 2 carries five tables. Table 1 distributes benchmark funding by adjusted decile across all 194 funded and unfunded districts. Table 2 lists the 111 town-based K-12 districts. Table 3 lists the 54 town-based elementary-only and secondary-only districts, and Table 4 the 29 districts with no town boundary, both scored against the K-12 deciles framework. Table 5 sets out three phase-in schedules to a 50% state share of total education funding.

Table 1: Distribution of benchmark funding by adjusted decile. Table 1 sets out the whole distribution in one place. The first ten rows are the 111 town-based K-12 districts by adjusted decile; the rows beneath them are the districts outside that frame, grouped by type. Every funded row is funded at the same rate, $14,844 per high-needs student, so a row's share of the $3.83 billion is its share of the 258,161 high-needs students in Deciles 1 through 8. Within a K-12 decile, the decile's total is then shared in proportion to enrollment, so every district in that decile receives the same amount per pupil; each district outside the 111 receives $14,844 for each of its own high-needs students. Decile 1 receives the largest amount because it enrolls the most high-needs students, not because its students are weighted more heavily. The per-pupil premium column shows what that produces for a group's students: it falls from $12,669 in Decile 1 to $4,749 in Decile 8 and stops entirely at Decile 9.

Distribution of benchmark funding by adjusted decile.

Adjusted decile	Districts	Enrollment	High-needs students	Share of the $3.83 billion	Benchmark funding (calculated on high-needs students)	Benchmark funding - additional PPE
1	11	111,684	95,321	36.9%	$1,414,910,628	$12,669
2	6	26,367	18,071	7.0%	$268,239,422	$10,173
3	12	39,354	24,521	9.5%	$363,980,902	$9,249
4	14	61,143	39,046	15.1%	$579,584,776	$9,479
5	11	27,419	11,475	4.4%	$170,330,771	$6,212
6	14	36,883	15,075	5.8%	$223,767,876	$6,067
7	12	32,177	12,507	4.8%	$185,649,408	$5,770
8	9	24,291	7,771	3.0%	$115,349,928	$4,749
9	9	24,368	7,180	none	none	none
10	13	57,096	14,646	none	none	none

Adjusted decile	Districts	Enrollment	High-needs students	Share of the $3.83 billion	Benchmark funding (calculated on high-needs students)	Benchmark funding - additional PPE
All 111 districts	**111**	**440,782**	**245,613**	**86.7%**	**$3,321,813,711**	**$9,245**
Elementary districts, Deciles 1-8	37	14,426	7,676	3.0%	$113,939,782	$7,898
Secondary regionals, Deciles 1-8	5	3,075	1,273	0.5%	$18,895,954	$6,145
Elementary and secondary, Deciles 9-10	12	9,348	2,512	none	none	none
Charter districts	21	10,811	8,412	3.3%	$124,864,701	$11,550
Regional service centers	6	13,594	9,601	3.7%	$142,513,790	$10,484
Technical high school system	1	11,296	6,603	2.6%	$98,012,556	$8,677
College-affiliated district	1	1,223	809	0.3%	$12,008,505	$9,819
All 83 districts outside the 111	**83**	**63,773**	**36,886**	**13.3%**	**$510,235,289**	**$9,375**
All 194 districts	**194**	**504,555**	**282,499**	**100.0%**	**$3,832,049,000**	**$9,262**

Note. Benchmark funding is apportioned in proportion to high-needs students in adjusted Deciles 1 through 8, at $14,844 per high-needs student across every funded district. The pool is 258,161 high-needs students: 223,787 in the 89 funded districts of the 111 and 34,374 in the 71 funded districts outside them. Deciles 9 and 10 receive none, whether town-based or not. Per-pupil premiums on total rows divide by funded students only, 359,318 in the 111, 54,425 outside and 413,743 in all.

Table 2: All 111 town-based K-12 districts by adjusted decile. Table 2 lists the 111 town-based K-12 districts in the order of their adjusted deciles. The Moved column shows the effect of the wealth adjustment on the 31 districts it affects; four of them move far enough to leave the funded range. Total per-pupil expenditure is shown so that benchmark funding can be read against what a district already spends, though the two are not additive: benchmark funding is new state money, while per-pupil expenditure is what districts spend today. Because benchmark funding per pupil is the same within a decile, it repeats down the column.

All 111 town-based K-12 districts by adjusted decile.

District	High-needs students 2024-25	Adjusted decile	Moved	Enrollment 2024-25	Total PPE 2024-25	Share of the $3.83 billion	Benchmark funding (calculated on high-needs students)	Benchmark funding - additional PPE
Ansonia	71.0%	1		2,404	$20,187	0.79%	$30,455,975	$12,669
Bridgeport	92.6%	1		20,022	$18,440	6.62%	$253,656,214	$12,669
East Hartford	75.7%	1		6,504	$18,067	2.15%	$82,398,363	$12,669
Hartford	85.1%	1		16,434	$21,366	5.43%	$208,200,291	$12,669
Meriden	84.8%	1		8,707	$16,977	2.88%	$110,307,894	$12,669
New Britain	85.0%	1		10,038	$18,064	3.32%	$127,170,167	$12,669
New Haven	83.8%	1		18,817	$21,346	6.22%	$238,390,220	$12,669
New London	88.5%	1		2,918	$23,265	0.96%	$36,967,777	$12,669
Torrington	75.7%	1		3,911	$21,772	1.29%	$49,547,970	$12,669
Waterbury	87.1%	1		18,776	$18,654	6.21%	$237,870,796	$12,669
Windham	81.7%	1		3,153	$23,635	1.04%	$39,944,963	$12,669

District	High-needs students 2024-25	Adjusted decile	Moved	Enrollment 2024-25	Total PPE 2024-25	Share of the $3.83 billion	Benchmark funding (calculated on high-needs students)	Benchmark funding - additional PPE
Bristol	64.1%	2		7,713	$21,445	2.05%	$78,466,669	$10,173
Derby	69.2%	2		1,311	$25,392	0.35%	$13,337,197	$10,173
Manchester	70.7%	2		6,122	$21,171	1.63%	$62,280,948	$10,173
Naugatuck	68.5%	2		4,095	$19,251	1.09%	$41,659,667	$10,173
Putnam	66.0%	2		1,176	$20,671	0.31%	$11,963,802	$10,173
West Haven	72.4%	2		5,950	$18,666	1.58%	$60,531,140	$10,173
East Haven	70.0%	3		2,857	$19,476	0.69%	$26,424,085	$9,249
Enfield	59.5%	3		4,694	$19,405	1.13%	$43,414,300	$9,249
Griswold	60.8%	3		1,823	$19,341	0.44%	$16,860,730	$9,249
Groton	73.6%	3		4,009	$21,725	0.97%	$37,078,809	$9,249
Hamden	58.0%	3		5,464	$24,882	1.32%	$50,535,947	$9,249
Killingly	59.6%	3		2,392	$21,336	0.58%	$22,123,350	$9,249
Middletown	60.5%	3		4,394	$25,483	1.06%	$40,639,632	$9,249
Plainfield	64.0%	3		1,886	$20,864	0.46%	$17,443,411	$9,249
Plymouth	61.0%	3		1,244	$21,484	0.30%	$11,505,622	$9,249
Stratford	61.6%	3		6,578	$22,091	1.59%	$60,839,213	$9,249
Thomaston	47.4%	3	Up 2	777	$22,567	0.19%	$7,186,389	$9,249
Vernon	62.6%	3		3,236	$19,595	0.78%	$29,929,415	$9,249
Bloomfield	63.6%	4	Down 2	1,897	$24,952	0.47%	$17,981,982	$9,479
Danbury	75.3%	4	Down 2	11,956	$17,847	2.96%	$113,332,934	$9,479
East Windsor	65.5%	4	Down 2	1,035	$27,076	0.26%	$9,810,939	$9,479
Ledyard	41.4%	4	Up 2	2,347	$19,458	0.58%	$22,247,608	$9,479
Montville	54.9%	4		2,001	$21,827	0.49%	$18,967,815	$9,479
Newington	48.0%	4		3,855	$23,083	0.95%	$36,542,193	$9,479
Norwalk	67.2%	4	Down 2	11,473	$23,147	2.84%	$108,754,496	$9,479
Plainville	53.6%	4		2,223	$22,412	0.55%	$21,072,191	$9,479
Seymour	57.7%	4		2,103	$19,784	0.52%	$19,934,691	$9,479
Stafford	50.2%	4		1,266	$25,044	0.31%	$12,000,627	$9,479
Stamford	67.3%	4	Down 2	16,185	$24,176	4.00%	$153,420,336	$9,479
Thompson	56.3%	4		826	$27,518	0.20%	$7,829,793	$9,479
Watertown	50.8%	4		2,528	$22,439	0.63%	$23,963,337	$9,479
Windsor Locks	58.5%	4		1,448	$24,793	0.36%	$13,725,835	$9,479
Branford	46.5%	5		2,567	$29,396	0.42%	$15,946,573	$6,212
Coventry	36.6%	5	Up 2	1,612	$19,493	0.26%	$10,013,976	$6,212
East Hampton	35.4%	5	Up 2	1,676	$23,714	0.27%	$10,411,553	$6,212
Ellington	35.7%	5	Up 2	2,526	$20,298	0.41%	$15,691,875	$6,212
New Milford	46.9%	5		3,532	$21,973	0.57%	$21,941,292	$6,212
North Branford	35.3%	5	Up 2	1,546	$22,191	0.25%	$9,603,974	$6,212
Portland	41.8%	5		1,250	$21,870	0.20%	$7,765,180	$6,212
Regional 16	37.7%	5	Up 2	1,898	$21,735	0.31%	$11,790,649	$6,212
Wallingford	46.7%	5		5,241	$24,427	0.85%	$32,557,846	$6,212
Wethersfield	39.5%	5		3,471	$21,197	0.56%	$21,562,351	$6,212
Wolcott	44.7%	5		2,100	$19,433	0.34%	$13,045,502	$6,212
Berlin	36.3%	6		2,634	$23,479	0.42%	$15,980,386	$6,067
Bolton	29.5%	6	Up 2	688	$23,319	0.11%	$4,174,072	$6,067
Canton	33.3%	6	Up 2	1,439	$25,140	0.23%	$8,730,363	$6,067

District	High-needs students 2024-25	Adjusted decile	Moved	Enrollment 2024-25	Total PPE 2024-25	Share of the $3.83 billion	Benchmark funding (calculated on high-needs students)	Benchmark funding - additional PPE
Clinton	51.5%	6	Down 2	1,426	$26,336	0.23%	$8,651,492	$6,067
Colchester	37.4%	6		2,101	$22,601	0.33%	$12,746,694	$6,067
Cromwell	39.1%	6		1,841	$22,362	0.29%	$11,169,283	$6,067
East Lyme	40.4%	6		2,500	$24,278	0.40%	$15,167,413	$6,067
Lebanon	38.3%	6		968	$25,245	0.15%	$5,872,822	$6,067
Regional 14	33.7%	6		1,561	$25,412	0.25%	$9,470,533	$6,067
Rocky Hill	39.3%	6		2,539	$21,151	0.40%	$15,404,025	$6,067
Southington	38.0%	6		6,200	$19,961	0.98%	$37,615,184	$6,067
West Hartford	40.5%	6		9,128	$22,971	1.45%	$55,379,258	$6,067
Westbrook	52.2%	6	Down 2	592	$35,908	0.09%	$3,591,643	$6,067
Windsor	59.2%	6	Down 2	3,266	$24,003	0.52%	$19,814,708	$6,067
Bethel	45.5%	7	Down 2	3,227	$19,093	0.49%	$18,618,598	$5,770
East Haddam	35.7%	7		954	$25,924	0.14%	$5,504,228	$5,770
Granby	30.7%	7	Up 2	1,709	$22,065	0.26%	$9,860,299	$5,770
Milford	42.7%	7	Down 2	5,218	$26,131	0.79%	$30,105,933	$5,770
North Haven	34.8%	7		3,214	$20,718	0.48%	$18,543,593	$5,770
North Stonington	28.4%	7	Up 2	726	$21,126	0.11%	$4,188,752	$5,770
Regional 13	33.2%	7		1,339	$30,387	0.20%	$7,725,536	$5,770
Shelton	48.1%	7	Down 2	4,518	$20,097	0.68%	$26,067,192	$5,770
South Windsor	33.6%	7		5,125	$18,815	0.77%	$29,569,358	$5,770
Stonington	36.5%	7		1,722	$26,407	0.26%	$9,935,304	$5,770
Tolland	30.8%	7	Up 2	2,144	$20,860	0.32%	$12,370,088	$5,770
Waterford	43.8%	7	Down 2	2,281	$26,308	0.34%	$13,160,528	$5,770
East Granby	30.3%	8		880	$23,482	0.11%	$4,178,829	$4,749
Farmington	31.6%	8		4,195	$21,032	0.52%	$19,920,668	$4,749
New Fairfield	33.6%	8		2,123	$23,973	0.26%	$10,081,425	$4,749
Old Saybrook	36.3%	8	Down 2	1,030	$28,583	0.13%	$4,891,129	$4,749
Regional 20	38.7%	8	Down 2	1,619	$26,590	0.20%	$7,688,096	$4,749
Simsbury	30.7%	8		4,127	$22,059	0.51%	$19,597,759	$4,749
Somers	20.8%	8	Up 2	1,347	$21,773	0.17%	$6,396,458	$4,749
Suffield	29.6%	8		2,027	$20,973	0.25%	$9,625,553	$4,749
Trumbull	33.4%	8		6,943	$20,027	0.86%	$32,970,012	$4,749
Brookfield	34.1%	9	Down 2	2,542	$22,197	none	none	none
Cheshire	29.8%	9		4,317	$21,091	none	none	none
Monroe	28.1%	9		3,458	$21,145	none	none	none
Newtown	27.4%	9		3,924	$23,196	none	none	none
Oxford	30.9%	9		1,622	$22,415	none	none	none
Regional 10	29.2%	9		2,140	$21,006	none	none	none
Regional 15	29.0%	9		3,368	$25,887	none	none	none
Regional 17	29.7%	9		1,716	$28,369	none	none	none
Regional 18	28.6%	9		1,281	$26,038	none	none	none
Avon	24.8%	10		3,092	$22,569	none	none	none
Darien	22.9%	10		4,673	$26,817	none	none	none
Fairfield	33.3%	10	Down 2	9,139	$25,369	none	none	none
Glastonbury	26.8%	10		5,696	$22,603	none	none	none
Greenwich	33.0%	10	Down 2	8,465	$29,025	none	none	none
Guilford	27.5%	10		3,080	$23,841	none	none	none

District	High-needs students 2024-25	Adjusted decile	Moved	Enrollment 2024-25	Total PPE 2024-25	Share of the $3.83 billion	Benchmark funding (calculated on high-needs students)	Benchmark funding - additional PPE
Madison	20.5%	10		2,445	$26,293	none	none	none
New Canaan	13.9%	10		4,060	$27,869	none	none	none
Regional 12	29.6%	10	Down 2	798	$32,551	none	none	none
Ridgefield	26.0%	10		4,484	$26,267	none	none	none
Weston	17.3%	10		2,101	$29,348	none	none	none
Westport	16.9%	10		5,281	$28,601	none	none	none
Wilton	23.2%	10		3,782	$25,819	none	none	none
All 111 districts	**55.7%**			**440,782**		**86.7%**	**$3,321,813,711**	**$9,245**

Note. Member towns of the nine regional districts, each district's need decile and wealth decile before adjustment, and the gap between them are on the District Comparison Tools site under Rank Districts and District Geography. A district's high-needs student count is its high-needs share multiplied by its enrollment. Benchmark funding is the adjusted decile's per-pupil premium multiplied by enrollment, so every district in a decile shows the same benchmark funding per pupil; districts in adjusted Deciles 9 and 10 receive none.

Table 3: The 54 town-based elementary and secondary districts, scored against the K-12 deciles framework. Table 3 covers the 54 town-based districts that are not K-12: 46 elementary districts and eight secondary regionals. Their towns levy the same property tax and set the same kind of education mill rate as the 111, and they sit outside the main analysis only because the unit of that analysis is the K-12 district. They are scored against the 111 rather than ranked among themselves, so an elementary district's need decile is its position in the state and not its position among 46 elementary districts. Forty-two of the 54 place in Deciles 1 through 8 and are funded; the twelve that do not are shown with their placements so that the boundary is visible.

The 54 town-based elementary and secondary districts, scored against the K-12 deciles framework.

District	Grade span	High-needs students 2024-25	Need decile scored vs the K-12 deciles framework	Total PPE 2024-25	Enrollment 2024-25	Share of the $3.83 billion	Benchmark funding (calculated on high-needs students, distributed by enrollment)	Benchmark funding - additional PPE
Andover	Elementary	36.4%	7	$19,009	239	0.03%	$1,291,397	$5,403
Ashford	Elementary	47.0%	5	$26,551	351	0.06%	$2,449,201	$6,978
Barkhamsted	Elementary	43.2%	5	$21,860	227	0.04%	$1,454,677	$6,408
Bethany	Elementary	33.3%	8	$19,937	430	0.06%	$2,122,641	$4,936

District	Grade span	High-needs students 2024-25	Need decile scored vs the K-12 deciles framework	Total PPE 2024-25	Enrollment 2024-25	Share of the $3.83 billion	Benchmark funding (calculated on high-needs students, distributed by enrollment)	Benchmark funding - additional PPE
Bozrah	Elementary	45.6%	4	$25,699	180	0.03%	$1,217,178	$6,762
Brooklyn	Elementary	50.2%	4	$20,250	852	0.17%	$6,353,078	$7,457
Canaan	Elementary	44.3%	5	$39,520	70	0.01%	$460,153	$6,574
Canterbury	Elementary	43.6%	5	$19,867	512	0.09%	$3,310,132	$6,465
Chaplin	Elementary	46.0%	4	$26,109	150	0.03%	$1,024,211	$6,828
Chester	Elementary	35.4%	7	$28,172	198	0.03%	$1,039,055	$5,248
Colebrook	Elementary	44.3%	4	$33,373	61	0.01%	$400,778	$6,570
Columbia	Elementary	31.3%	8	$22,557	444	0.05%	$2,063,266	$4,647
Cornwall	Elementary	44.2%	5	$40,205	86	0.01%	$564,058	$6,559
Deep River	Elementary	43.4%	5	$28,818	189	0.03%	$1,217,178	$6,440
Eastford	Elementary	39.3%	6	$22,476	173	0.03%	$1,009,368	$5,834
Easton	Elementary	26.3%	10	$23,151	894	none	none	none
Essex	Elementary	40.6%	6	$28,206	308	0.05%	$1,855,455	$6,024
Franklin	Elementary	33.5%	9	$23,258	188	none	none	none
Hampton	Elementary	63.5%	3	$27,773	74	0.02%	$697,651	$9,428
Hartland	Elementary	31.7%	8	$30,256	123	0.02%	$578,902	$4,707
Hebron	Elementary	28.2%	9	$21,439	681	none	none	none
Kent	Elementary	38.9%	6	$35,130	180	0.03%	$1,039,055	$5,773
Lisbon	Elementary	50.2%	4	$20,397	422	0.08%	$3,146,852	$7,457
Mansfield	Elementary	42.2%	5	$27,651	966	0.16%	$6,056,205	$6,269
Marlborough	Elementary	27.3%	9	$19,368	458	none	none	none
New Hartford	Elementary	35.6%	7	$24,538	433	0.06%	$2,285,921	$5,279
Norfolk	Elementary	39.3%	5	$46,016	61	0.01%	$356,247	$5,840
North Canaan	Elementary	53.9%	4	$25,810	245	0.05%	$1,959,361	$7,997
Norwich	Elementary	85.4%	1	$23,658	3,291	1.09%	$41,740,316	$12,683
Orange	Elementary	27.4%	10	$20,523	1,254	none	none	none
Pomfret	Elementary	35.4%	7	$23,489	333	0.05%	$1,751,550	$5,260
Preston	Elementary	40.0%	6	$25,820	432	0.07%	$2,567,950	$5,944
Redding	Elementary	24.7%	10	$30,448	855	none	none	none
Salem	Elementary	33.4%	7	$21,747	392	0.05%	$1,944,517	$4,961
Salisbury	Elementary	32.6%	8	$30,989	288	0.04%	$1,395,302	$4,845
Scotland	Elementary	54.2%	4	$26,826	96	0.02%	$771,869	$8,040
Sharon	Elementary	46.4%	4	$48,747	97	0.02%	$667,964	$6,886
Sherman	Elementary	14.7%	10	$29,686	231	none	none	none
Sprague	Elementary	63.4%	2	$21,209	265	0.07%	$2,493,732	$9,410
Sterling	Elementary	54.8%	4	$21,100	310	0.07%	$2,523,419	$8,140
Union	Elementary		9	$26,736		none	none	none
Voluntown	Elementary	46.1%	5	$25,110	217	0.04%	$1,484,364	$6,840
Willington	Elementary	45.7%	4	$28,966	376	0.07%	$2,553,106	$6,790
Winchester	Elementary	67.3%	2	$23,264	599	0.16%	$5,981,987	$9,987
Woodbridge	Elementary	26.5%	9	$20,768	862	none	none	none
Woodstock	Elementary	36.6%	7	$20,916	756	0.11%	$4,111,688	$5,439
All 46 elementary districts	**Elementary**	**46.0%**			**19,849**	**2.97%**	**$113,939,782**	**$7,898**
Regional 01	Secondary	40.4%	5	$33,860	356	0.06%	$2,137,484	$6,004
Regional 04	Secondary	38.4%	6	$34,045	646	0.10%	$3,681,223	$5,698
Regional 05	Secondary	27.6%	9	$23,694	2,138	none	none	none
Regional 07	Secondary	40.2%	5	$29,305	818	0.13%	$4,883,558	$5,970
Regional 08	Secondary	28.3%	9	$28,330	1,075	none	none	none
Regional 09	Secondary	23.3%	10	$33,549	712	none	none	none
Regional 11	Secondary	63.4%	3	$33,152	194	0.05%	$1,825,768	$9,411
Regional 19	Secondary	40.4%	6	$24,196	1,061	0.17%	$6,367,922	$6,002
All 8 secondary regionals	**Secondary**	**33.3%**			**7,000**	**0.49%**	**$18,895,954**	**$6,145**
All 54 districts		**42.7%**			**26,849**	**3.47%**	**$132,835,736**	**$7,590**

Note. Member towns of these districts are on the District Comparison Tools site under Elementary and Secondary Districts, which also carries their tax effort, grand list per capita and education share of municipal spending. A district's high-needs student count is its high-

needs share multiplied by its enrollment. These 54 are scored against the 111 town-based K-12 districts and are never added to them. No wealth placement is shown: the state education cost sharing wealth file does not cover them, and the only grand list available is a single municipal fiscal year where every K-12 placement averages four. Benchmark funding is the district's own high-needs count multiplied by $14,844; the 12 districts in Deciles 9 and 10 receive none. Per-pupil figures on total rows divide by funded students only.

Table 4: The 29 reporting districts with no town boundary, scored against the K-12 deciles framework. Table 4 covers the 29 districts with no town boundary that publish both a per-pupil expenditure and an accountability index; the three endowed academies and two state agency facilities do not and are excluded. The 29 enroll 36,924 students, 25,425 of them high needs - a 68.9% high-needs share against 55.7% among the 111 - and not one of them places below Decile 4 on need. Fifteen of the 21 charter districts place in Decile 1. Because these districts have no grand list and no education mill rate, the wealth adjustment cannot be applied to them at all, and their placement rests on need alone. Their per-pupil figures vary within the table because each draws on its own high-needs count rather than on a decile premium.

The 29 reporting districts with no town boundary, scored against the K-12 deciles framework.

District	Type	High-needs students 2024-25	Need decile scored vs the K-12 deciles framework	Total PPE 2024-25	Enrollment 2024-25	Share of the $3.83 billion	Benchmark funding (calculated on high-needs students, distributed by enrollment)	Benchmark funding - additional PPE
Achievement First Bridgeport Academy	Charter	81.4%	1	$15,289	1,090	0.34%	$13,166,309	$12,079
Achievement First Hartford Academy	Charter	81.5%	1	$18,195	907	0.29%	$10,969,450	$12,094
Amistad Academy	Charter	82.4%	1	$15,236	1,105	0.35%	$13,522,556	$12,238
Booker T. Washington Academy	Charter	93.1%	1	$17,553	404	0.15%	$5,581,209	$13,815
Brass City Charter School	Charter	74.8%	2	$16,205	401	0.12%	$4,453,092	$11,105
Capital Preparatory Harbor School	Charter	72.8%	1	$14,147	775	0.22%	$8,371,813	$10,802
Common Ground High School	Charter	75.1%	1	$20,127	221	0.06%	$2,464,044	$11,150
Elm City College Preparatory School	Charter	83.0%	1	$17,239	760	0.24%	$9,366,337	$12,324
Elm City Montessori School	Charter	49.7%	4	$18,508	312	0.06%	$2,300,764	$7,374
Explorations	Charter	72.7%	1	$22,438	77	0.02%	$831,244	$10,795
Great Oaks Charter School	Charter	87.5%	1	$19,046	662	0.22%	$8,594,468	$12,983
Highville Charter School	Charter	72.9%	1	$13,457	499	0.14%	$5,403,085	$10,828
Integrated Day Charter School	Charter	57.4%	3	$16,190	364	0.08%	$3,102,321	$8,523
Interdistrict School for Arts and Comm	Charter	75.6%	1	$18,268	328	0.10%	$3,681,223	$11,223

District	Type	High-needs students 2024-25	Need decile scored vs the K-12 deciles framework	Total PPE 2024-25	Enrollment 2024-25	Share of the $3.83 billion	Benchmark funding (calculated on high-needs students, distributed by enrollment)	Benchmark funding - additional PPE
Jumoke Academy	Charter	97.0%	1	$20,204	571	0.21%	$8,223,377	$14,402
New Beginnings Inc Family Academy	Charter	91.4%	1	$16,926	431	0.15%	$5,848,394	$13,569
Odyssey Community School	Charter	51.7%	4	$14,822	410	0.08%	$3,146,852	$7,675
Park City Prep Charter School	Charter	77.6%	1	$15,541	434	0.13%	$5,002,307	$11,526
Side By Side Charter School	Charter	64.8%	3	$15,744	236	0.06%	$2,271,077	$9,623
Stamford Charter School for Excellence	Charter	60.4%	3	$11,837	543	0.13%	$4,868,714	$8,966
The Bridge Academy	Charter	88.6%	1	$16,955	281	0.10%	$3,696,066	$13,153
All 21 charter districts	**Charter**	**77.8%**			**10,811**	**3.26%**	**$124,864,701**	**$11,550**
Area Cooperative Educational Services	RESC	73.4%	2	$57,640	1,726	0.49%	$18,806,892	$10,896
Capitol Region Education Council	RESC	70.9%	2	$31,514	9,091	2.50%	$95,726,636	$10,530
Cooperative Educational Services	RESC	66.4%	2	$42,902	757	0.19%	$7,466,351	$9,863
Eastern Connecticut Regional Educational Service Center (EASTCONN)	RESC	61.9%	2	$65,316	367	0.09%	$3,369,506	$9,181
EdAdvance	RESC	90.1%	1	$66,937	263	0.09%	$3,517,943	$13,376
Learn	RESC	66.0%	3	$27,758	1,390	0.36%	$13,626,462	$9,803
All 6 regional service centers	**RESC**	**70.6%**			**13,594**	**3.72%**	**$142,513,790**	**$10,484**
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System	**Technical**	**58.5%**	**3**	**$30,953**	**11,296**	**2.56%**	**$98,012,556**	**$8,677**
Goodwin University Educational Services (GUES)	**College-affiliated**	**66.1%**	**2**	**$22,900**	**1,223**	**0.31%**	**$12,008,505**	**$9,819**
All 29 districts		**68.9%**			**36,924**	**9.85%**	**$377,399,552**	**$10,221**

Note. A high-needs student count is the high-needs share multiplied by enrollment. These 29 districts have no town boundary, no grand list, and no education mill rate, so no wealth placement exists for them, and none is shown; need placement scores their high-needs share against the same 111 town-based K-12 districts. Benchmark funding is the district's own high-needs count multiplied by $14,844. Three endowed academies and two state agency facilities are excluded: neither publishes both a per-pupil expenditure and an accountability index in any school year, which is the test the tool already applies.

Table 5: Phasing benchmark funding to a 50% state share. Table 5 sets out three phase-in schedules. Each reaches a 50% state share, and they differ only in pace. The choice among them is a budget question rather than a distribution question: the rule that allocates the money is identical in all three, and a district's share of whatever has been appropriated by a given year does not depend on which schedule is chosen. What does depend on the schedule is how

long the system runs below the target. A ten-year phase-in leaves the state at 43.9% in year five, the point at which the five-year schedule has finished.

Phasing benchmark funding to a 50% state share.

Year	5-year: cumulative	5-year: state share	7-year: cumulative	7-year: state share	10-year: cumulative	10-year: state share
1	$766,409,800	39.48%	$547,435,571	38.56%	$383,204,900	37.85%
2	$1,532,819,600	42.51%	$1,094,871,143	40.82%	$766,409,800	39.48%
3	$2,299,229,400	45.24%	$1,642,306,714	42.91%	$1,149,614,700	41.03%
4	$3,065,639,200	47.73%	$2,189,742,286	44.87%	$1,532,819,600	42.51%
5	$3,832,049,000	50.00%	$2,737,177,857	46.69%	$1,916,024,500	43.91%
6	complete	50.00%	$3,284,613,429	48.40%	$2,299,229,400	45.24%
7	complete	50.00%	$3,832,049,000	50.00%	$2,682,434,300	46.51%
8	complete	50.00%	complete	50.00%	$3,065,639,200	47.73%
9	complete	50.00%	complete	50.00%	$3,448,844,100	48.89%
10	complete	50.00%	complete	50.00%	$3,832,049,000	50.00%

Note. Each schedule adds an equal increment each year and assumes local and federal revenue hold at their 2022-23 levels: $766,409,800 a year over five years, $547,435,571 over seven, $383,204,900 over ten. State share is the state's revenue plus the cumulative increment, divided by total revenue plus the same increment. The schedules are illustrative of pace only; the distribution rule is unchanged in every one of them. ***A phase-in must be recalculated every year. Enrollment, high-needs counts, grand lists, and mill rates all move, so each year's placements and each district's share must be recomputed from that year's published data rather than fixed at the schedule's start. A schedule set once and left alone would distribute the last year's money on the first year's facts.***

References

Aubry, J. P. (2024). *What role does state government play in funding teacher pensions?* (No. 24-20). Center for Retirement Research at Boston College. https://crr.bc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/IB_24-20_.pdf

Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., & Rockoff, J. E. (2014). Measuring the impacts of teachers II: Teacher value-added and student outcomes in adulthood. *American Economic Review, 104*(9), 2633–2679. https://doi.org/10.3386/w19424

Connecticut Office of Policy and Management. (2026). *Municipal fiscal indicators: Fiscal years ended 2019–2023.* Connecticut Office of Policy and Management. https://portal.ct.gov/opm/-/media/opm/finance/mfs-unit/municipal-fiscal-indicators/municipal-fiscal-indicators-2019-23---final---revised-asof-1-14-2026.pdf

Connecticut State Department of Education. (2026a). *Accountability.* Connecticut State Department of Education. https://public-edsight.ct.gov/accountability

Connecticut State Department of Education. (2026b). *Alliance Districts.* Connecticut State Department of Education. https://portal.ct.gov/sde/alliance-districts/alliance-and-opportunity-districts

Connecticut State Department of Education. (2026c). *EdSight [Data set].* Connecticut State Department of Education. https://public-edsight.ct.gov/

Connecticut State Department of Education. (2026d). *Per pupil expenditures by function (district) [Data set].* Connecticut State Department of Education. https://public-edsight.ct.gov/overview/per-pupil-expenditures-by-function---district

Datadaptive LLC. (2026). District comparison tools, v3.0 [Computer software]. https://datadaptive.ai/district-comparison-tools

De Bruin, K., Kestel, E., Francis, M., Forgasz, H., & Fries, R. (2023). *Supporting students significantly behind in literacy and numeracy: A review of evidence-based approaches*. Australian Education Research Organisation.

EdTrust. (2026). *Funding for fairness: Revenue inequities for states' highest need districts - Funding gaps in Connecticut, 2022–24 [Fact sheet]*. https://national.edtruststag.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/09/Funding-Gaps-State-Download_CT.pdf

Farrie, D., & Kim, R. (2025). *Making the grade: How fair is school funding in your state?* Education Law Center. https://edlawcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/Making-the-Grade-2025.pdf

Green, P. C., III, Baker, B. D., & Oluwole, J. O. (2021). School finance, race, and reparations. *Washington and Lee Journal of Civil Rights and Social Justice, 27*(2), 483–558. https://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/crsj/vol27/iss2/7

Huddleston, Q., Biaggi, H., & Morgan, I. (2026, October 28). *Funding for fairness: Revenue inequities for states' highest-need districts.* EdTrust. https://edtrust.org/rti/funding-gaps/

Jackson, C. K., Johnson, R. C., & Persico, C. (2016). The effects of school spending on educational and economic outcomes: Evidence from school finance reforms. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 131*(1), 157–218. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjv036

Jackson, C. K., & Mackevicius, C. L. (2024). What impacts can we expect from school spending policy? Evidence from evaluations in the United States. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 16*(1), 412–446. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20220279

Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 88*(4), 547–588. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268

Lamont, N. (2026). *Governor Lamont establishes commission to reevaluate Connecticut's education funding systems, improve student outcomes.* Governor Ned Lamont. Retrieved September 9, 2026, from https://portal.ct.gov/governor/news/press-releases/2026/04-2026/governor-lamont-establishes-commission-to-reevaluate-education-funding-improve-student-outcomes?language=en_US

Michigan Department of Education. (2026). *Michigan Integrated Continuous Improvement Process (MICIP).* MI.gov. Retrieved September 9, 2026, from https://www.michigan.gov/mde/services/school-performance-supports/micip

Moran, J. D. (2017). *2017 changes to the Education Cost Sharing (ECS) formula.* (OLR Research Report No. 2017-R-0319). Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Legislative Research. https://www.cga.ct.gov/2017/rpt/pdf/2017-R-0319.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2025a). *National assessment of educational progress (NAEP), The nation's report card, State results for Connecticut.* U.S. Department of Education and the Institute of Education Sciences. https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/

National Center for Education Statistics. (2025b). *Revenues for public elementary and secondary schools, by source of funds and state or jurisdiction: School year 2022-23 (Digest of Education Statistics 2025, Table 235.20).* U.S. Department of Education and the Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d25/tables/dt25_235.20.asp

Rauscher, E., & Fiel, J. E. (2026). Slow progress: School finance reforms and racial disparities in funding. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 48*(2), 677–702. https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737251362855

School and State Finance Project. (n.d.). *District reference groups (DRGs).* School and State Finance Project. Retrieved September 13, 2026, from https://schoolstatefinance.org/drgs

School and State Finance Project. (2026). *How Connecticut funds education.* School and State Finance Project. Retrieved September 8, 2026, from https://schoolstatefinance.org/issues/how-ct-funds-education

Segregation Tracking Project. (2026). *States of segregation.* Brown's Promise. Retrieved September 8, 2026, from https://www.brownspromise.org/statesofsegregation

Stein, J. M. (1978). "Municipal overburden" as state educational aid: Is it equitable? *Urban Education, 12*(4), 423–450.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (n.d.). *Consumer price index historical tables for U.S. city average [Data set].* U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved September 13, 2026, from https://www.bls.gov/regions/mid-atlantic/data/consumerpriceindexhistorical_us_table.htm

U.S. Census Bureau. (2024). *Educational attainment (American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Subject Table S1501) [Data table].* U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved September 8, 2026, from https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST1Y2024.S1501

U.S. Census Bureau. (2026). *Public school spending per pupil reaches historic high in 2024 [Press release].* U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved September 8, 2026, from https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2026/school-system-finances.html

USAFacts. (2026). *How are public schools in Connecticut funded?* USAFacts. Retrieved September 8, 2026, from https://usafacts.org/answers/how-are-public-schools-in-the-us-funded/state/connecticut/

Zhang, J., Martella, R. C., Kang, S., & Yenioglu, B. Y. (2023). Response to intervention (RTI)/multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS): A nationwide analysis. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, 7*(1)