

Public Instruction

General School Aids and Revenue Limits

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 457)

LFB Summary Items for Which Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
-	Federal Coronavirus Aid (Paper #495)
1, 2, 6, & 7	State Support for K-12 Education (Paper #496)
3	Buyback of Current Law General School Aid Payment Delay (Paper #497)
4	Special Adjustment Aid (Paper #498)
8	Revenue Limit Enrollment for the 2020-21 School Year (Paper #499)

LFB Summary Items Removed From Budget Consideration

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
9	Four Year-Old Kindergarten Membership



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873
Email: fiscal.bureau@legis.wisconsin.gov • Website: <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb>

May, 2021

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #495

Federal Coronavirus Aid

CURRENT LAW

In past years, federal funds have made up approximately seven percent of statewide funding for schools. Funding for the National School Lunch Program and other federal child nutrition programs totaled \$237.2 million in 2019-20. In the same year, funding for special education under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act totaled \$206.8 million, and funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, including Title I funding for schools with a significant number of percentage of children in poverty, totaled \$233.7 million. Other sources of federal aid include the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act; Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP), Talent Search, and Upward Bound programs; federal impact aid; and competitive grants awarded to the DPI and to local school districts.

Table 1 shows school district revenues for 2019-20, the most recent year for which audited data is available from the Department of Public Instruction.

TABLE 1

2019-20 School District Revenue

<u>Source</u>	<u>Amount (in Millions)</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>	<u>Per Member</u>
State Aid	\$6,009.93	47.7%	\$7,033
Property Tax	5,209.44	41.4	6,096
Federal	844.40	6.7	988
Local Non-Property Tax	<u>531.34</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>622</u>
Total	\$12,595.11	100.0%	\$14,740

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. An education stabilization fund was created under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, which was enacted by the federal government on March 27, 2020. Additional funding was provided under the Consolidated Appropriations Act (CAA), which was enacted on December 27, 2020, and the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), which was enacted on March 11, 2021. The fund includes an Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) fund, under which aid is allocated directly to public K-12 local educational agencies (LEAs). Additionally, funds were allocated for a Governor's Emergency Education Relief (GEER) fund, which provided funds to the Governor of each state to allocate to K-12 institutions, institutions of higher education, or other education related entities. A subset of GEER funds provides emergency assistance to nonpublic schools. Table 2 shows the amount for each of these funds under the three federal acts.

TABLE 2

**Wisconsin K-12 Funding Under CARES Act, CAA, and ARPA
(\$ in Millions)**

	<u>CARES Act</u>	<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>
Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief	\$174.8	\$686.1	\$1,540.8	\$2,401.7
Governor's Emergency Education Relief*	46.6	20.8	0.0	67.4
Emergency Assistance for Nonpublic Schools	<u>0.0</u>	<u>77.5</u>	<u>73.9</u>	<u>151.4</u>
	\$221.4	\$784.4	\$1,614.7	\$2,620.5

*Excludes Emergency Assistance for Nonpublic Schools; CARES Act GEER moneys were allocated to K-12 education, but the allocation of the CAA GEER moneys has not yet been determined.

Elementary and Secondary Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund

2. Under ESSER, moneys are allocated to states in the same proportion that each state received under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) in the most recent fiscal year. States are required to allocate at least 90% of their received funds for direct aid to public school districts and independent charter schools, according to the formula used for the most recent distribution of Title I Part A funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), which is based on a census count of the number of low-income pupils residing in each district. All three acts allow the state education agency to set aside 10% of its total allocation, including no more than 0.5% for administration and the remainder to address emergency needs related to coronavirus, as determined by the agency. In addition, under ARPA, at least 7% of the 10% must be allocated as follows: (a) at least 5% must be allocated to carry out activities to address learning loss through the implementation of evidence-based interventions, such as summer learning or enrichment, extended day, comprehensive afterschool programs, or extended school year programs; (b) at least 1% must be allocated to implement evidence-based summer enrichment programs; and (c) at least 1% must be allocated to implement evidence-based comprehensive afterschool programs.

3. Allowable activities for LEAs under ESSER include coordinating with public health departments to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus; professional development for staff on sanitation and minimizing the spread of infectious diseases; purchasing educational technology (including hardware, software, and connectivity); providing mental health services and supports; and planning and implementing activities related to summer learning and supplemental after school programs. Under ARPA, LEAs must use at least 20% of their funds to address learning loss through the implementation of evidence-based interventions, such as summer learning or summer enrichment, extended day, comprehensive afterschool programs, or extended school year programs. A full list of allowable activities under each act is included in Attachment 1. Funds must be obligated no later than September 30, 2022, under the CARES Act, no later than September 30, 2023 under the CAA, and not later than September 30, 2024, under ARPA. (These deadlines include one additional year beyond the date included in the federal legislation. Under the federal Tydings Amendment, LEAs can carry over federal education funds for one additional year beyond the period for which they were appropriated.)

4. As a condition of receiving ESSER funds, states are required to fulfill a maintenance of effort requirement. Under the CARES Act, each state's application for funds was required to include assurances that level of state support for elementary and secondary education and higher education (including state funding to institutions of higher education and state need-based financial aid) would be maintained in 2019-20 and 2020-21 at least at the state's average level of support provided in the three previous fiscal years. Under the CAA and ARPA, the proportion of state spending allocated to K-12 and higher education in 2021-22 must be maintained at the same level as the state's average allocation in the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 fiscal years. ARPA requires that this proportion be maintained in the 2022-23 fiscal year as well.

5. Additionally, ARPA includes two provisions requiring the state to maintain its current level of support for high poverty school districts: (a) per-pupil state funding cannot be reduced for any high-need district by an amount that exceeds the overall per-pupil reduction in state funds across all districts in 2021-22 or 2022-23; and (b) per-pupil state funding cannot be reduced for any highest poverty district in 2021-22 or 2022-23 below the level of funding provided to that district in 2018-19. High-need districts are defined as those that meet the following criteria: (a) in rank order, have the highest percentages of economically disadvantaged pupils in the state; and (b) collectively serve not less than 50 percent of the state's total enrollment of pupils. Highest poverty districts are defined as those that meet the following criteria: (a) in rank order, have the highest percentages of economically disadvantaged pupils in the state, and (b) collectively serve not less than 20 percent of the state's total enrollment of pupils. The school district maintenance of effort requirements do not apply to a district that meets any of the following criteria: (a) total enrollment of less than 1,000 pupils; (b) operates a single school; (c) serves all pupils within each grade span with a single school; and (d) demonstrates an exceptional or uncontrollable circumstance, such as unpredictable changes in pupil enrollment or a precipitous decline in financial resources, as determined by the federal Secretary of Education.

6. Under s. 115.295 of the statutes governing federal appropriation adjustments for DPI, the Department is required to submit a plan to the Joint Committee on Finance if additional federal funding is received that would cause the amount of federal funds to exceed 105% of the amount of federal revenue shown in the Chapter 20 schedule of appropriations for that year. The law specifies

that after receiving the plan, the Co-Chairs of the Committee jointly shall determine whether the plan is complete. Once that determination is made, the Committee has 14 calendar days to: (a) meet and either approve or modify and approve the plan, which the State Superintendent would then implement; or (b) not meet, in which case the State Superintendent can implement the plan as submitted.

7. Table 3 shows the allocation of ESSER funding under the three acts. The ESSER I and ESSER II allocations have been approved by the Joint Committee on Finance; the ESSER III plan is currently awaiting approval, and therefore has not yet been finalized. Additional information about funding under each of ESSER I, ESSER II, and ESSER III follows the table.

TABLE 3
Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Funding
(\$ in Millions)

	ESSER I (CARES Act)	ESSER II (CAA)	ESSER III (ARPA)**
Direct aid to LEAs (90% of total)	\$157.3*	\$617.5	\$1,386.7
In-person incentive	0.0	65.5	0.0
Earmark for specific purposes	0.0	0.0	107.8
Statewide priority areas	15.6	0.0	0.0
Minimum aid to LEAs	1.5	2.4	39.4
Administration	<u>0.4</u>	<u>0.7</u>	<u>6.9***</u>
Total	\$174.8	\$686.1	\$1,540.8

*A portion of these funds must be allocated for equitable services to private schools.

**DPI plan, not yet approved by Joint Committee on Finance.

***Includes funding for administration as well as for a reading program.

ESSER I

8. DPI's plan for the CARES Act funding was submitted to the Co-Chairs on April 24, 2020, and approved through a passive review on May 13, 2020. The plan as approved allocated \$350,000 for administration, or approximately 0.2% of the state's total ESSER I amount. DPI indicated that it would use an additional \$1.5 million to provide aid for school districts or independent charter schools that receive no funds or a small amount under the Title I Part A formula, so that every district or independent charter school received a minimum of \$40,000. The remaining funds were allocated to the following priority areas, under which programs and services would be made available to both public and private schools statewide: (a) supporting the expansion of online learning, including access to existing online or digital courses offered through stakeholders such as the Wisconsin Digital Learning Collaborative, as well as assisting schools and districts in developing their own online course offerings; (b) providing professional development for teachers and other staff related to online instruction; and (c) expanding mental health services for pupils, particularly services that can be provided virtually.

ESSER II

9. Under the plan submitted by DPI to the Co-Chairs for ESSER II funds under the CAA, as modified by the Joint Committee on Finance, \$700,000 was allocated for administration and \$2.4 million was used to establish a minimum grant amount of \$100,000, to be distributed to 33 school districts and six independent charter schools to increase their total funding under the CAA Act to \$100,000, and to provide a \$100,000 grant to the state's residential schools for blind and deaf pupils and two county children with disabilities education boards (Syble Hopp School in Brown County and Lakeland School in Walworth County). The remaining \$65.5 million was used to establish in-person incentive funding, with the 172 school districts and two independent charter schools that would otherwise receive less than \$395 per pupil eligible to compete for aid based on the number of in-person instructional hours provided to pupils in the 2020-21 school year. The amount of aid that will be received by each district will be calculated by dividing the number of in-person instructional hours provided by the district or charter school by the total number of in-person instructional hours provided by all eligible districts, with that proportion multiplied by the total amount of available funding. In-person instructional hours are defined as hours in which pupils are together in the same physical location, being taught by a licensed instructor who is in the same physical location.

10. Under the plan, each school district will calculate its in-person instructional hours during the 2020-21 school year using a workbook provided by DPI. For example, in a district in which 30 kindergarten pupils attended school in person for 437 hours over the course of the school year, but all other pupils in the district attended school virtually, the number of in-person instructional hours for the district would be calculated by multiplying the number of kindergarten pupils by the number of instructional hours for those pupils to total 13,110. If among the other 173 local education entities eligible for a portion of the in-person incentive funding, in-person instructional hours totaled 90,000,000, the district's portion of funding would be calculated by dividing the district's in-person instructional hours by the state total ($13,110 \div 90,000,000 = 0.00015$) and multiplying the result by the total amount of funding available ($\$65,537,642 \times 0.00015$) to find the district's total funding under the in-person incentive (\$9,830).

11. It is not possible to estimate the allocation of funding under the in-person incentive, because the number of in-person instructional hours provided by each eligible school district and independent charter school is not known. The allocation will depend on the number of hours of in-person instruction provided by an eligible district or charter school relative to the number of hours of in-person instruction provided by all other eligible districts or independent charter schools. An estimate is not possible without knowing the total number of hours eligible entities have provided thus far, and will provide before the end of the 2020-21 school year. Data on in-person instructional hours will be collected after the end of the current school year, and allocations will be determined once that information is available.

ESSER III

12. DPI's ESSER III plan was submitted to the Joint Committee on Finance on April 1, 2021. Once the Co-Chairs determine that the plan is complete and forward the plan to Committee members, the Committee will have 14 calendar days to approve or modify and approve the plan.

13. Under DPI's plan, \$1,386.7 million would be distributed to LEAs based on the 2020-21 distribution of Title I, Part A funds under the ESEA, as required by the federal law. An additional \$39.4 million would be used to establish a minimum grant amount for most LEAs of \$600,000. (One school district and two independent charter schools with fewer than 25 pupils would receive a minimum amount of \$200,000, as would the state's residential schools for blind and deaf pupils.)

14. ARPA requires that \$107.8 million be earmarked for specific purposes defined in the federal law, as described above. DPI's plan would allocate the \$77.0 million for activities to address learning loss (5% of the state total) to LEAs, using a formula grant process that would take into account the variance in award amounts under the Title I Part A distribution. The \$15.4 million (or 1%) for summer enrichment programs and the \$15.4 million (or 1%) for afterschool programs would be allocated through a competitive grant process. LEAs receiving funding from these programs would be required to demonstrate how their activities and interventions would be used to respond to the academic, social, and emotional needs of pupils. Grant applications and proposed budgets would be reviewed by DPI staff to ensure that they meet the requirements under ARPA.

15. Of the remaining \$6.9 million, a portion would be used for administrative costs, and the remainder would be used to establish a reading program that would provide direct support to LEAs to improve reading outcomes, including helping LEAs access high-quality reading instructional materials and curriculum. DPI indicates that the reading program is in development, and the details of the plan would be determined taking into account federal guidelines and the requirements included in the state application for ESSER III funds.

16. Two-thirds of ESSER III funding (or approximately \$1.0 billion of Wisconsin's total) was made available in March, 2021, without the submission of an application. The remainder (\$0.5 billion) will be released after submission and approval of a state application describing the plan for the ESSER III funds. By June 7, 2021, each state is required to submit either its application, or a description of the state requirements that preclude on-time submission of the application and a date by which the application can be completed.

17. Any LEA receiving funds under ESSER III is required to develop and make publicly available on its website, no later than 30 days after receiving the allocation of funds, a plan for the safe return to in-person instruction and continuity of services for all schools, including those that have already returned to school in-person. Additionally, each LEA must develop and make available on its website a plan for its use of ESSER III funds.

Governor's Emergency Education Relief Fund (GEER)

18. The CARES Act also created the GEER fund, under which funds were distributed to the governor of each state based on relative population, as follows: (a) 60 percent on the basis of each state's relative population of individuals aged 5 through 24; and (b) 40 percent on the basis of each state's relative number of children counted under section 1124(c) of the ESEA, which includes low-income children ages five to 17. Additional funding was provided under the CAA and ARPA, each of which included funds for emergency assistance for nonpublic schools (EANS), which is further described below.

19. The acts identify the following allowable uses for GEER grant funds: (a) provide emergency support through grants to local educational agencies that the state educational agency deems have been most significantly impacted by coronavirus to support their ability to continue to provide educational services to their pupils and to support their ongoing functionality; (b) provide emergency support through grants to institutions of higher education serving students within the state that the governor determines have been most significantly impacted by coronavirus to support the ability of such institutions to continue to provide educational services and support their ongoing functionality; and (c) provide support to any other institution of higher education, local educational agency, or education related entity within the state that the governor deems essential for carrying out emergency educational services to students, the provision of childcare and early childhood education, social and emotional support, and the protection of education-related jobs. The act allows the governor one year to allocate the funds, after which any unallocated funds will be redistributed to other states.

20. On June 17, 2020, Governor Evers announced that the \$46.6 million in GEER funding under the CARES Act would be distributed to K-12 school districts, prioritizing districts based on their remote learning needs and how much they have been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. A press release issued on July 23, 2020, identified school districts, independent charter schools, and tribal schools that would be eligible for funding. The press release identified the following criteria by which eligible grantees were selected: (a) percentage of pupils scoring below basic on the state English language arts assessment; (b) percentage of pupils from economically disadvantaged families; (c) percentage of households with no computer; and (d) percentage of households with no internet.

Eligible grantees may apply for funding for eligible costs incurred between July 1, 2020, and September 30, 2022. Eligible costs include costs in the following areas: (a) health and safety, such as purchasing hygiene supplies, hiring additional nursing or janitorial staff, or conducting COVID-19 testing for staff; (b) infrastructure and schedule modifications, such as purchasing additional materials or equipment to limit sharing, or adding or modifying classroom space to allow for social distancing; and (c) remote and distance learning, such as purchasing mobile devices for pupils. Once an application is approved, school districts and schools must submit claims for reimbursement and documentation after an eligible cost is incurred. DPI is required under federal law to pay claims within 30 days of receiving documentation.

Aid for Private K-12 Schools

21. The CARES Act includes an equitable services requirement for funds received by public school districts from both the ESSER I and GEER I grants. Under this provision, a portion of the funds received by each public school district must be used to provide services to pupils attending private schools. The equitable services calculation is the same as the calculation used for Title I Part A funds under the ESEA, which is based on the proportion of low-income pupils residing in each district who are attending a private school. Each public school district must consult with all private schools located within the district's geographic boundaries to determine if the school will participate, and if so, the district and private school must work together to assess pupil needs and determine what services will be provided using grant funding.

22. The CAA and ARPA do not include an equitable services requirement. The CAA instead

created the EANS fund, and requires that a portion of the funding be allocated to any private school that submits an application to the state educational agency requesting allowable services or assistance, with priority for funding given to schools that enroll low-income pupils and are most impacted by the pandemic. Additional EANS funding was provided under ARPA. The CAA defines the following as allowable services or assistance: (a) supplies to sanitize, disinfect, and clean school facilities; (b) personal protective equipment; (c) improving ventilation systems, including windows or portable air purification systems; (d) training and professional development for staff on sanitation, the use of personal protective equipment, and minimizing the spread of infectious diseases; (e) physical barriers to facilitate social distancing; (f) other materials, supplies, or equipment to implement public health protocols, including guidelines and recommendations from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for the reopening and operation of school facilities to effectively maintain the health and safety of pupils, educators, and other staff during the qualifying emergency; (g) expanding capacity to administer coronavirus testing to effectively monitor and suppress coronavirus, to conduct surveillance and contact tracing activities, and to support other activities related to coronavirus testing for pupils, teachers, and staff; (h) educational technology, including hardware, software, connectivity, assistive technology, and adaptive equipment, to assist pupils, educators, and other staff with remote or hybrid learning; (i) redeveloping instructional plans, including curriculum development, for remote learning, hybrid learning, or to address learning loss; (j) leasing of sites or spaces to ensure safe social distancing to implement public health guidelines; (k) reasonable transportation costs; (l) initiating and maintaining education and support services or assistance for remote learning, hybrid learning, or to address learning loss; or (m) reimbursement for the expenses of any of the previous services or assistance incurred on or after March 13, 2020, except for those under (c), (d), (i), or (l). Under ARPA, schools have until September 30, 2024, to obligate funds.

23. All three acts require that public funds remain under public control. As a result, funding cannot be provided directly to a private school but rather must be paid to vendors directly. In federal guidance posted March 19, 2021, the Department of Education clarified that because of this requirement, EANS funding cannot be used for capital improvements that affect the infrastructure of a private school, such as a ventilation system or new windows. Funds can be used to purchase equipment and supplies that could be removed from the private school without remodeling the school's facility, such as a portable air purification system.

24. DPI indicates that under the CAA, EANS funding will be allocated as follows: (a) \$480 for each pupil enrolled in the private school; and (b) an additional \$480 for each low-income pupil enrolled in the school. To be eligible for funding, a private school must meet the following criteria: (a) be non-profit; (b) have submitted required documentation of its status as a private school for the 2020-21 school year; (c) was in existence prior to March 13, 2020; and (d) did not and will not apply for and receive a Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) loan under the Small Business Administration that is made on or after December 27, 2020. The CAA allows states to retain the greater of \$200,000 or 0.5% of their allotment under this provision, to administer the aid to private schools.

District Allocations

25. Attachment 2 shows the allocations to LEAs under ESSER I, ESSER II, ESSER III, and GEER I. For ESSER III, the attachment includes only the allocation of the 90% of funds that the

federal act requires to be allocated based on the most recent distribution of Title I Part A funds under the ESEA. The attachment does not include the in-person incentive funding under ESSER II. It is not possible to estimate the allocation of funding under this provision, because the number of in-person instructional hours provided by each eligible school district and independent charter school is not known.

26. Attachment 2 also includes the percentage of economically disadvantaged pupils in each LEA, based on 2019 Census Bureau data (the most recent data available). It should be noted that under federal law, Title I allocations are calculated using census poverty data from the Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE). These estimates include all children ages 5-17 residing in a school district who are below the federal poverty level. These percentages appear lower than estimates of economically disadvantaged pupils that are based on the number of pupils eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch, which is calculated using higher poverty thresholds. The SAIPE data uses 100% of the federal poverty line as its measure of poverty, while families qualify for free school meals with an annual income of 130% of the poverty line, or a reduced-price meal with an annual income of 185% of the federal poverty line. As a result, a family of four with two children would be considered low-income in the SAIPE data with an annual income of \$26,246 in 2020. A family of the same size would be eligible for a free lunch with an annual income of \$34,060, or a reduced-price lunch with an annual income of \$48,470.

As a result of this differing definition of poverty, the percentages shown in the attachment are lower than what is typically reported as the percentage of economically disadvantaged pupils in the state. For example, the SAIPE data shows that 30.0% of the pupils residing in the boundaries of Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) are living in poverty, while a measure based on free and reduced-price lunch income eligibility shows that 86.5% of MPS pupils are low-income in 2020-21. The SAIPE data is shown in the attachment because that data is used to calculate Title I eligibility under federal law, and therefore in the basis for the allocation of 90% of funds under the three ESSER programs. (SAIPE data is not available for local educational agencies that do not have traditional geographic boundaries, such as independent charter schools; for such schools, states are required to use other measures of pupils' family income to determine the number of children in poverty who are enrolled in the school, and use that information to calculate grant amounts.)

Prepared by: Christa Pugh
Attachments

ATTACHMENT 1

ESSER Allowable Uses Under the CARES Act, CAA, and ARPA

	<u>Allowable use under...</u>		
	<u>CARES</u>		
	<u>Act</u>	<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>
Any activity authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, including the Native Hawaiian Education Act and the Alaska Native Educational Equity, Support, and Assistance Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, or subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act.	x	x	
Any activity authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, or the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.			x
Coordination of preparedness and response efforts with state, local, tribal, and territorial public health departments, and other relevant agencies, to improve coordinated responses to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus.	x	x	x
Activities to address the unique needs of low-income pupils, pupils with disabilities, English learners, racial and ethnic minorities, pupils experiencing homelessness, and foster care youth, including how outreach and service delivery will meet the needs of each population.	x	x	x
Developing and implementing procedures and systems to improve preparedness and response efforts.	x	x	x
Training and professional development for staff on sanitation and minimizing the spread of infectious diseases.	x	x	x
Purchasing supplies to sanitize and clean school facilities.	x	x	x
Planning for and coordinating during long-term closures, including for how to provide meals to eligible pupils, how to provide technology for online learning to all pupils, how to provide guidance for carrying out requirements under IDEA, and how to ensure other educational services can continue to be provided consistent with all federal, state, and local requirements.	x	x	x
Purchasing educational technology (including hardware, software, and connectivity) for pupils that aids in regular and substantive educational interaction between pupils and their classroom instructors, including low-income pupils and pupils with disabilities, which may include assistive technology or adaptive equipment.	x	x	x
Providing mental health services and supports.	x	x	x

	<u>Allowable use under...</u>		
	<u>CARES Act</u>	<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>
Planning and implementing activities related to summer learning and supplemental after school programs, including providing classroom instruction or online learning during the summer months and addressing the needs of low-income pupils, pupils with disabilities, English learners, migrant pupils, pupils experiencing homelessness, and children in foster care.	x	x	x
Other activities that are necessary to maintain the operation of and continuity of services in local educational agencies and continuing to employ existing staff.	x	x	x
Providing principals and other school leaders with the resources necessary to address the needs of their individual schools.	x	x	
Addressing learning loss among pupils, including low-income pupils, pupils with disabilities, English learners, racial and ethnic minorities, pupils experiencing homelessness, and children and youth in foster care, including by administering and using high-quality assessments to accurately assess pupils' academic progress and assist educators in meeting pupils' academic needs, implementing evidence-based activities to meet the comprehensive needs of pupils, providing information and assistance to parents and families on how they can effectively support pupils, and tracking pupil attendance and improving pupil engagement in distance education.		x	x
Making school facility repairs and improvements to enable operation of schools to reduce risk of virus transmission and exposure to environmental health hazards, and to support pupil health needs.		x	x
Conducting inspection, testing, maintenance, repair, replacement, and upgrade projects to improve the indoor air quality in school facilities, including mechanical and non-mechanical heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems, filtering, purification and other air cleaning, fans, control systems, and window and door repair and replacement.		x	x
Developing strategies and implementing public health protocols, including guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for the reopening and operation of school facilities to effectively maintain the health and safety of pupils, educators, and other staff			x

ATTACHMENT 2

Allocations to Local Educational Agencies Under the CARES Act, CAA, and ARPA and Census Bureau Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) (Excludes Minimum Aid Proposed in DPI ESSER III Plan)

		<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Census</u>
	<u>Fall 2020</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
Abbotsford	762	\$127,568	\$108,261	\$461,352	\$1,036,069	\$1,733,249	\$2,275	22.0%
Adams-Friendship Area	1,306	461,980	207,971	1,828,288	4,105,831	6,604,070	5,057	18.6
Albany	313	40,000	0	154,194	346,277	540,471	1,727	7.6
Algoma	617	97,406	0	384,104	862,593	1,344,103	2,178	11.8
Alma	240	40,000	0	100,000	168,460	308,460	1,285	11.5
Alma Center	598	99,693	86,667	396,525	890,486	1,473,371	2,464	16.1
Almond-Bancroft	369	87,178	54,638	312,466	701,712	1,155,994	3,133	12.1
Altoona	1,767	177,716	0	667,222	1,498,397	2,343,335	1,326	9.5
Amery	1,446	135,117	0	547,813	1,230,237	1,913,167	1,323	9.4
Antigo	1,984	538,682	307,971	2,173,213	4,880,438	7,900,304	3,982	16.7
Appleton Area	15,690	1,710,987	0	6,705,753	15,059,279	23,476,019	1,496	9.7
Arcadia	1,241	110,713	184,638	373,053	837,774	1,506,177	1,214	9.1
Argyle	295	44,860	0	185,311	416,157	646,327	2,191	15.1
Arrowhead Union High	2,086	40,000	0	105,108	236,043	381,150	183	2.3
Ashland	1,929	464,613	303,623	1,899,207	4,265,097	6,932,540	3,594	19.6
Ashwaubenon	3,247	198,656	0	782,372	1,756,992	2,738,020	843	7.5
Athens	393	162,795	58,985	555,533	1,247,574	2,024,886	5,152	16.5
Auburndale	805	106,225	0	431,073	968,071	1,505,369	1,870	12.8
Augusta	612	283,700	90,870	1,154,355	2,592,365	4,121,291	6,734	20.8
Baldwin-Woodville Area	1,677	89,792	0	365,501	820,815	1,276,108	761	7.8
Bangor	595	107,106	0	437,338	982,141	1,526,584	2,566	14.1
Baraboo	2,791	469,793	422,608	1,695,983	3,808,711	6,397,095	2,292	14.5
Barneveld	463	40,000	0	100,000	72,724	212,725	459	3.5
Barron Area	1,167	244,044	175,072	968,962	2,176,023	3,564,102	3,054	12.8
Bayfield	409	167,446	58,406	672,527	1,510,310	2,408,689	5,889	24.1
Beaver Dam	3,388	367,251	0	1,461,021	3,281,053	5,109,325	1,508	9.6
Beecher-Dunbar-Pembine	221	44,751	32,464	172,999	388,507	638,721	2,890	10.7
Belleville	925	40,000	0	142,994	321,125	504,119	545	4.1
Belmont Community	361	91,113	55,072	307,006	689,451	1,142,641	3,165	15.4
Beloit	5,765	2,283,682	919,855	8,411,930	18,890,883	30,506,350	5,292	26.9

		<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Census</u>
	<u>Fall 2020</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
Beloit Turner	1,616	\$182,446	\$0	\$680,035	\$1,527,173	\$2,389,654	\$1,479	14.3%
Benton	204	46,565	0	141,697	318,213	506,475	2,483	11.1
Berlin Area	1,463	258,119	0	1,027,867	2,308,306	3,594,292	2,457	15.7
Big Foot Union High	461	45,637	0	155,359	348,893	549,888	1,193	7.2
Birchwood	282	57,318	43,478	196,349	440,946	738,092	2,617	10.9
Black Hawk	374	61,932	54,348	265,395	596,004	977,679	2,614	20.7
Black River Falls	1,641	313,840	248,406	1,243,027	2,791,497	4,596,771	2,801	14.1
Blair-Taylor	604	118,928	93,333	470,579	1,056,791	1,739,631	2,880	15.0
Bloomer	1,256	124,102	0	493,620	1,108,534	1,726,255	1,374	8.9
Bonduel	689	129,451	0	510,210	1,145,792	1,785,454	2,591	9.3
Boscobel Area	735	162,507	112,029	661,996	1,486,661	2,423,194	3,297	19.4
Bowler	330	95,419	51,014	378,417	849,820	1,374,670	4,166	13.5
Boyceville Community	686	97,723	0	387,281	869,728	1,354,732	1,975	9.8
Brighton No. 1	201	40,000	0	100,000	121,607	261,607	1,302	5.1
Brillion	931	58,531	0	232,622	522,406	813,559	874	6.0
Bristol No. 1	801	43,771	0	161,871	363,518	569,160	711	4.3
Brodhead	973	147,243	0	585,277	1,314,371	2,046,891	2,104	10.5
Brown Deer	1,491	214,470	224,927	862,753	1,937,506	3,239,656	2,173	11.8
Bruce	456	139,501	64,493	497,704	1,117,706	1,819,404	3,990	20.6
Burlington Area	3,010	384,379	0	1,534,075	3,445,112	5,363,566	1,782	8.1
Butternut	169	40,000	0	129,319	290,415	459,735	2,720	14.9
Cadott Community	756	116,141	120,580	483,425	1,085,641	1,805,787	2,389	13.8
Cambria-Friesland	329	97,782	52,609	394,658	886,294	1,431,343	4,351	14.9
Cambridge	915	57,683	0	229,907	516,308	803,898	879	4.9
Cameron	1,134	114,923	0	451,639	1,014,258	1,580,820	1,394	8.9
Campbellsport	1,266	111,353	0	387,813	870,920	1,370,086	1,082	4.3
Cashton	622	278,398	90,145	1,154,699	2,593,136	4,116,377	6,618	25.7
Cassville	196	64,002	29,565	219,449	492,822	805,839	4,111	12.2
Cedar Grove-Belgium Area	917	56,431	0	233,160	523,613	813,204	887	8.6
Cedarburg	3,084	57,431	0	212,003	476,101	745,535	242	2.7
Chequamegon	688	151,730	104,203	606,552	1,362,150	2,224,635	3,233	17.2
Chetek-Weyerhaeuser Area	953	211,901	142,174	832,850	1,870,353	3,057,278	3,208	13.5
Chilton	1,129	79,860	0	324,989	729,836	1,134,685	1,005	7.9
Chippewa Falls Area	4,882	586,136	0	2,348,491	5,274,065	8,208,692	1,681	9.4
Clayton	315	50,126	47,391	192,605	432,537	722,659	2,294	9.1

		<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Census</u>
	<u>Fall 2020</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
Clear Lake	587	\$80,267	\$0	\$335,681	\$753,847	\$1,169,796	\$1,993	14.8%
Clinton Community	1,088	92,231	0	368,959	828,579	1,289,769	1,185	10.7
Clintonville	1,128	236,191	179,130	971,582	2,181,906	3,568,809	3,164	14.3
Cochrane-Fountain City	578	51,079	0	210,195	472,041	733,315	1,269	9.0
Colby	942	209,616	138,841	830,218	1,864,441	3,043,116	3,230	16.8
Coleman	662	84,312	0	342,127	768,324	1,194,764	1,805	15.0
Colfax	726	84,243	0	347,723	780,889	1,212,855	1,671	10.2
Columbus	1,263	86,079	0	342,701	769,613	1,198,394	949	5.3
Cornell	325	104,528	58,406	424,627	953,595	1,541,155	4,742	17.3
Crandon	841	183,629	0	730,715	1,640,986	2,555,330	3,038	21.3
Crivitz	789	125,749	0	502,082	1,127,537	1,755,368	2,225	15.4
Cuba City	652	58,419	0	223,164	501,165	782,748	1,201	9.0
Cudahy	2,175	526,170	332,753	2,120,708	4,762,528	7,742,159	3,560	16.9
Cumberland	977	176,232	145,797	690,358	1,550,354	2,562,742	2,623	9.2
D.C. Everest Area	6,000	549,040	0	2,058,683	4,623,236	7,230,959	1,205	7.2
Darlington Community	875	143,092	123,478	588,493	1,321,595	2,176,658	2,488	15.6
De Pere Unified	4,481	108,833	0	397,056	891,680	1,397,569	312	4.1
De Soto Area	493	143,188	73,623	590,159	1,325,336	2,132,306	4,325	19.0
Deerfield Community	723	40,000	0	100,000	185,937	325,937	451	4.3
DeForest Area	3,878	125,113	0	561,204	1,260,309	1,946,626	502	4.4
Delavan-Darien	1,908	433,624	286,377	1,465,815	3,291,818	5,477,634	2,871	10.2
Denmark	1,547	92,711	0	374,857	841,826	1,309,395	846	8.0
Dodgeland	711	86,094	0	338,393	759,937	1,184,424	1,666	8.2
Dodgeville	1,111	114,529	0	454,869	1,021,511	1,590,909	1,432	9.3
Dover No. 1	99	40,000	0	100,000	0	140,000	1,414	9.9
Drummond Area	325	85,906	50,580	344,024	772,584	1,253,095	3,856	13.4
Durand	956	182,626	0	686,327	1,541,301	2,410,254	2,521	12.8
East Troy Community	1,487	223,217	0	752,129	1,689,076	2,664,422	1,792	5.2
Eau Claire Area	10,881	1,510,209	0	5,672,908	12,739,793	19,922,910	1,831	10.0
Edgar	571	91,500	0	308,309	692,377	1,092,186	1,913	10.4
Edgerton	1,858	200,597	0	805,610	1,809,179	2,815,386	1,515	8.8
Elcho	279	50,577	39,565	170,495	382,884	643,521	2,307	11.2
Eleva-Strum	647	62,866	0	258,144	579,720	900,729	1,392	9.5
Elk Mound Area	1,194	93,636	0	377,094	846,849	1,317,579	1,104	9.5
Elkhart Lake-Glenbeulah	456	40,000	0	100,000	174,595	314,595	690	5.0

		<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Census</u>
	<u>Fall 2020</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
Elkhorn Area	3,597	\$257,033	\$0	\$947,443	\$2,127,696	\$3,332,172	\$926	6.5%
Ellsworth Community	1,640	98,936	0	400,619	899,681	1,399,237	853	5.3
Elmbrook	7,330	114,220	0	421,502	946,579	1,482,301	202	2.5
Elmwood	320	40,000	0	123,411	277,146	440,557	1,377	8.8
Erin	402	40,000	0	100,000	0	140,000	348	3.8
Evansville Community	1,760	109,070	0	428,731	962,811	1,500,612	853	5.8
Fall Creek	829	66,735	0	268,361	602,665	937,760	1,131	7.3
Fall River	473	40,000	0	159,545	358,294	557,840	1,179	9.0
Fennimore Community	779	204,001	116,812	803,423	1,804,267	2,928,503	3,759	21.7
Flambeau	505	192,256	77,826	804,983	1,807,771	2,882,837	5,709	21.5
Florence	377	88,110	56,812	353,994	794,973	1,293,889	3,432	15.3
Fond du Lac	6,662	1,150,052	1,021,739	4,559,392	10,239,141	16,970,323	2,547	8.7
Fontana Joint No. 8	200	40,000	0	100,000	182,966	322,967	1,615	5.0
Fort Atkinson	2,660	252,703	0	959,375	2,154,493	3,366,572	1,266	7.0
Fox Point Joint No. 2	834	74,186	0	298,778	670,973	1,043,937	1,252	5.5
Franklin Public	4,668	282,456	0	1,009,237	2,266,469	3,558,162	762	5.0
Frederic	429	144,554	63,768	573,598	1,288,144	2,070,064	4,825	20.6
Freedom Area	1,567	44,676	0	172,197	386,707	603,580	385	4.8
Galesville-Ettrick-Trempealeau	1,386	104,400	0	398,752	895,488	1,398,640	1,009	6.8
Geneva Joint No. 4	196	40,000	0	100,000	125,682	265,682	1,356	9.5
Genoa City Joint No. 2	502	61,712	0	245,749	551,885	859,346	1,712	10.7
Germantown	3,742	75,218	0	296,122	665,009	1,036,349	277	2.6
Gibraltar Area	516	65,764	0	221,594	497,638	784,996	1,521	6.8
Gillett	523	118,238	0	480,308	1,078,640	1,677,185	3,207	14.8
Gilman	450	168,546	45,072	689,071	1,547,465	2,450,154	5,445	21.6
Gilmanton	156	40,000	23,043	143,132	321,436	527,611	3,382	18.7
Glendale-River Hills	960	113,916	0	392,144	880,648	1,386,708	1,444	9.0
Glenwood City	646	71,733	0	286,555	643,524	1,001,812	1,551	10.5
Goodman-Armstrong	98	40,000	14,638	150,819	338,698	544,155	5,553	13.0
Grafton	1,995	47,468	0	186,693	419,261	653,422	328	3.8
Granton Area	217	227,285	32,754	894,424	2,008,630	3,163,093	14,576	30.5
Grantsburg	1,777	157,167	223,333	587,029	1,318,305	2,285,834	1,286	15.4
Green Bay Area	19,003	5,046,016	2,934,491	19,903,798	44,698,462	72,582,767	3,820	15.8
Green Lake	316	40,000	0	100,000	209,053	349,053	1,105	9.2
Greendale	2,658	302,139	0	1,085,339	2,437,374	3,824,853	1,439	6.8

	Fall 2020	CARES Act		CAA	ARPA	Total		Census
	<u>Headcount</u>	ESSER I	GEERI	ESSER II	ESSER III	Amount	Per Pupil	Poverty
		<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
Greenfield	3,372	\$440,279	\$0	\$1,758,503	\$3,949,114	\$6,147,896	\$1,823	12.7%
Greenwood	355	198,028	51,884	718,525	1,613,610	2,582,048	7,273	21.6
Gresham	246	65,356	39,130	269,852	606,013	980,351	3,985	12.9
Hamilton	4,921	81,534	0	325,906	731,895	1,139,335	232	3.9
Hartford Joint No. 1	1,591	147,984	0	583,231	1,309,778	2,040,993	1,283	8.2
Hartford Union High	1,300	41,731	0	154,306	346,529	542,567	417	4.1
Hartland-Lakeside Joint No. 3	1,103	40,000	0	137,498	308,782	486,279	441	4.2
Hayward Community	2,002	549,056	299,275	2,215,331	4,975,026	8,038,688	4,015	18.1
Herman-Neosho-Rubicon	291	40,000	0	156,632	351,753	548,385	1,884	10.1
Highland	307	40,000	0	101,809	228,634	370,442	1,207	12.4
Hilbert	496	40,000	0	128,920	289,519	458,439	924	5.7
Hillsboro	537	395,473	81,304	1,565,644	3,516,006	5,558,427	10,351	28.8
Holmen	3,861	209,007	0	400,801	900,089	1,509,897	391	4.5
Holy Hill Area	511	40,000	0	100,000	0	140,000	274	2.0
Horicon	622	68,940	0	272,518	612,000	953,457	1,533	7.4
Hortonville	4,139	84,327	0	334,032	750,143	1,168,502	282	4.1
Howards Grove	921	40,000	0	100,000	200,888	340,888	370	2.6
Howard-Suamico	5,890	296,269	0	1,174,486	2,637,573	4,108,329	698	4.9
Hudson	5,371	121,335	0	456,205	1,024,511	1,602,051	298	4.4
Hurley	513	112,361	0	450,095	1,010,790	1,573,246	3,067	16.2
Hustisford	332	40,000	0	142,129	319,184	501,313	1,510	9.3
Independence	398	103,183	60,870	379,667	852,628	1,396,349	3,508	11.8
Iola-Scandinavia	597	64,696	0	259,292	582,298	906,286	1,518	8.4
Iowa-Grant	712	105,080	106,522	386,909	868,890	1,467,401	2,061	15.4
Ithaca	408	42,445	62,899	167,265	375,631	648,240	1,589	9.5
Janesville	9,440	2,000,119	1,434,637	7,421,098	16,665,748	27,521,602	2,915	16.0
Jefferson	1,794	198,053	0	784,374	1,761,489	2,743,916	1,529	7.5
Johnson Creek	576	48,754	0	173,714	390,115	612,583	1,064	4.5
Juda	269	40,000	42,464	106,952	240,184	429,600	1,597	9.9
Kaukauna Area	3,932	280,153	0	1,100,518	2,471,462	3,852,133	980	5.2
Kenosha	19,159	5,057,396	3,008,549	19,976,130	44,860,899	72,902,974	3,805	11.9
Kettle Moraine	3,620	69,744	0	277,011	622,090	968,845	268	3.5
Kewaskum	1,751	64,781	0	228,103	512,256	805,139	460	3.6
Kewaunee	917	74,059	0	298,372	670,062	1,042,493	1,137	7.4
Kickapoo Area	496	177,149	73,188	725,377	1,628,998	2,604,713	5,251	25.4

		<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Census</u>
	<u>Fall 2020</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
Kiel Area	1,367	\$72,487	\$0	\$295,512	\$663,639	\$1,031,637	\$755	6.1%
Kimberly Area	5,187	87,118	0	352,447	791,499	1,231,064	237	3.4
Kohler	705	40,000	0	100,000	62,063	202,063	287	1.7
La Crosse	6,234	1,156,899	0	3,893,097	8,742,826	13,792,821	2,213	11.9
La Farge	230	139,705	33,478	554,365	1,244,951	1,972,499	8,576	29.7
Lac du Flambeau No. 1	526	298,473	76,377	1,233,338	2,769,738	4,377,926	8,323	34.0
Ladysmith	765	179,049	116,377	708,922	1,592,043	2,596,391	3,394	14.8
Lake Country	503	40,000	0	100,000	172,668	312,668	622	7.0
Lake Geneva Joint No. 1	1,846	257,238	0	874,494	1,963,874	3,095,606	1,677	9.6
Lake Geneva-Genoa City Union High	1,342	127,166	0	509,488	1,144,170	1,780,824	1,327	7.0
Lake Holcombe	280	103,115	44,928	347,445	780,267	1,275,756	4,556	13.9
Lake Mills Area	1,576	78,058	0	318,453	715,159	1,111,670	705	4.6
Lakeland Union High	730	118,545	0	472,654	1,061,451	1,652,650	2,264	9.3
Lancaster Community	962	139,785	142,029	568,980	1,277,772	2,128,565	2,213	12.8
Laona	283	40,000	39,710	156,124	350,612	586,446	2,072	26.4
Lena	415	40,000	0	157,991	354,805	552,796	1,332	14.9
Linn Joint No. 4	105	40,000	15,217	100,000	97,529	252,745	2,407	4.9
Linn Joint No. 6	175	40,000	0	100,000	11,321	151,321	865	7.4
Little Chute Area	1,585	144,497	0	567,696	1,274,890	1,987,083	1,254	9.7
Lodi	1,483	97,376	0	384,718	863,971	1,346,065	908	3.9
Lomira	1,049	84,601	0	345,961	776,933	1,207,495	1,151	8.8
Loyal	492	204,147	71,304	844,707	1,896,980	3,017,138	6,132	25.0
Luck	428	75,229	63,768	304,271	683,309	1,126,577	2,632	14.7
Luxemburg-Casco	1,863	129,475	0	473,766	1,063,948	1,667,189	895	5.9
Madison Metropolitan	25,982	5,264,492	3,890,143	18,949,599	42,555,593	70,659,827	2,720	10.4
Manawa	599	89,177	91,594	361,354	811,502	1,353,628	2,260	14.0
Manitowoc	4,763	834,679	722,753	3,349,292	7,521,590	12,428,314	2,609	13.1
Maple	1,293	126,700	0	512,843	1,151,705	1,791,248	1,385	10.8
Maple Dale-Indian Hill	455	40,000	0	123,873	278,184	442,057	972	12.7
Marathon City	736	40,000	0	100,000	155,687	295,688	402	4.0
Marinette	1,959	398,659	289,275	1,586,860	3,563,652	5,838,446	2,980	16.2
Marion	430	161,743	62,899	671,821	1,508,725	2,405,187	5,593	19.0
Markesan	792	256,093	115,797	1,017,917	2,285,962	3,675,768	4,641	17.7
Marshall	984	211,680	0	831,402	1,867,101	2,910,183	2,958	9.0
Marshfield	3,873	374,599	0	1,479,480	3,322,505	5,176,583	1,337	10.7

		<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Census</u>
	<u>Fall 2020</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
Mauston	1,424	\$269,082	\$212,754	\$1,070,217	\$2,403,412	\$3,955,465	\$2,778	16.7%
Mayville	1,029	107,618	0	362,618	814,340	1,284,576	1,248	5.4
McFarland	6,109	47,599	0	187,112	420,202	654,913	107	3.0
Medford Area	3,003	305,827	0	1,077,818	2,420,482	3,804,127	1,267	8.6
Mellen	265	79,627	41,014	325,144	730,184	1,175,969	4,438	27.9
Melrose-Mindoro	749	108,036	0	457,723	1,027,919	1,593,678	2,128	12.3
Menasha	3,199	672,883	485,362	2,657,469	5,967,946	9,783,660	3,058	15.1
Menominee Indian	974	769,280	133,768	3,045,068	6,838,385	10,786,500	11,074	42.6
Menomonee Falls	3,895	87,776	0	346,990	779,245	1,214,011	312	3.6
Menomonie Area	3,199	482,931	0	1,726,644	3,877,568	6,087,143	1,903	9.9
Mequon-Thiensville	3,527	71,190	0	270,594	607,680	949,465	269	2.9
Mercer	130	40,000	22,899	101,218	227,308	391,425	3,011	18.7
Merrill Area	3,285	321,708	0	1,272,926	2,858,643	4,453,277	1,356	10.4
Merton Community	828	46,616	0	120,428	270,449	437,493	528	2.1
Middleton-Cross Plains	7,378	213,661	0	718,275	1,613,047	2,544,983	345	4.2
Milton	3,477	243,803	0	880,416	1,977,172	3,101,391	892	5.5
Milwaukee Public Schools	70,964	55,995,150	10,823,618	225,213,399	505,767,416	797,799,583	11,242	30.0
Mineral Point	760	70,611	0	257,375	577,993	905,979	1,192	7.8
Minocqua Joint No. 1	580	61,077	0	216,919	487,140	765,136	1,319	9.0
Mishicot	875	69,943	0	290,266	651,859	1,012,068	1,157	7.9
Mondovi	908	147,406	0	572,935	1,286,655	2,006,996	2,210	11.7
Monona Grove	3,442	82,406	0	293,480	659,075	1,034,960	301	3.6
Monroe	2,243	245,085	0	951,213	2,136,164	3,332,463	1,486	8.4
Montello	621	179,260	97,826	691,476	1,552,866	2,521,428	4,060	13.9
Monticello	321	40,000	0	100,000	184,130	324,130	1,010	6.6
Mosinee	1,963	141,703	0	485,101	1,089,404	1,716,209	874	6.3
Mount Horeb Area	2,435	136,371	0	274,570	616,608	1,027,548	422	4.0
Mukwonago	5,000	101,295	0	394,925	886,894	1,383,114	277	3.6
Muskego-Norway	4,855	113,793	0	449,452	1,009,346	1,572,590	324	4.0
Necedah Area	720	211,408	104,203	887,229	1,992,471	3,195,311	4,438	24.7
Neenah	6,565	590,881	0	2,274,078	5,106,953	7,971,912	1,214	7.7
Neillsville	874	170,098	134,638	655,471	1,472,007	2,432,214	2,783	15.3
Nekoosa	1,170	189,390	174,638	750,506	1,685,431	2,799,965	2,393	16.1
New Auburn	311	62,367	44,783	266,583	598,671	972,404	3,127	19.9
New Berlin	4,223	92,994	0	345,275	775,392	1,213,661	287	3.3

		<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Census</u>
	<u>Fall 2020</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
New Glarus	1,020	\$40,000	\$0	\$100,000	\$185,819	\$325,819	\$319	4.0%
New Holstein	1,008	91,899	0	365,712	821,289	1,278,901	1,269	5.7
New Lisbon	639	116,801	93,623	447,743	1,005,508	1,663,675	2,604	14.7
New London	2,134	220,847	0	852,780	1,915,109	2,988,736	1,401	9.0
New Richmond	3,465	172,316	0	685,185	1,538,738	2,396,239	692	8.0
Niagara	434	86,693	0	313,030	702,979	1,102,702	2,541	12.5
Nicolet Union High	1,090	74,832	0	306,795	688,976	1,070,603	982	6.4
Norris	60	40,000	3,623	100,000	0	143,623	2,394	2.9
North Cape	196	40,000	0	100,000	31,339	171,339	874	5.1
North Crawford	414	114,079	63,188	459,514	1,031,942	1,668,723	4,031	19.3
North Fond du Lac	1,488	112,970	0	471,753	1,059,429	1,644,152	1,105	7.4
North Lake	307	40,000	0	100,000	0	140,000	456	4.5
North Lakeland	164	40,000	0	101,970	228,997	370,967	2,262	14.8
Northern Ozaukee	1,201	40,000	0	125,443	281,710	447,153	372	5.1
Northland Pines	1,320	208,889	0	845,644	1,899,084	2,953,617	2,238	16.7
Northwood	322	77,451	46,232	314,792	706,935	1,145,410	3,557	25.3
Norwalk-Ontario-Wilton	603	338,045	91,739	1,360,876	3,056,153	4,846,812	8,038	24.3
Norway Joint No. 7	92	40,000	0	100,000	0	140,000	1,522	9.2
Oak Creek-Franklin	6,383	448,288	0	1,805,663	4,055,022	6,308,973	988	7.7
Oakfield	554	42,802	0	171,953	386,159	600,914	1,085	4.4
Oconomowoc Area	5,114	259,380	0	1,039,974	2,335,496	3,634,851	711	4.5
Oconto	965	168,928	0	688,920	1,547,124	2,404,972	2,492	16.3
Oconto Falls	1,615	141,109	0	572,100	1,284,781	1,997,990	1,237	12.3
Omro	1,072	136,712	0	521,556	1,171,271	1,829,539	1,707	7.9
Onalaska	3,039	210,113	0	755,353	1,696,314	2,661,780	876	6.4
Oostburg	1,026	56,694	0	223,827	502,654	783,175	763	4.9
Oregon	4,124	99,375	0	464,740	1,043,678	1,607,792	390	3.9
Osceola	1,548	95,707	0	385,183	865,016	1,345,906	869	6.2
Oshkosh Area	9,277	1,505,798	0	5,971,967	13,411,396	20,889,161	2,252	13.0
Osseo-Fairchild	785	171,569	118,985	691,951	1,553,933	2,536,438	3,231	14.1
Owen-Withee	485	198,291	73,333	792,437	1,779,596	2,843,657	5,863	23.6
Palmyra-Eagle Area	593	88,291	0	362,146	813,280	1,263,717	2,131	7.3
Pardeeville Area	727	110,083	0	439,970	988,053	1,538,106	2,116	8.8
Paris Joint No. 1	280	40,000	0	102,148	229,397	371,545	1,327	5.1
Parkview	790	85,112	0	287,611	645,895	1,018,617	1,289	8.6

		<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Census</u>
	<u>Fall 2020</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
Pecatonica Area	392	\$40,000	\$0	\$150,027	\$336,920	\$526,948	\$1,344	10.9%
Pepin Area	234	40,000	0	136,119	305,685	481,803	2,059	11.4
Peshtigo	1,111	117,237	0	466,696	1,048,071	1,632,004	1,469	9.9
Pewaukee	2,879	53,903	0	186,370	418,535	658,808	229	3.5
Phelps	103	40,000	16,957	100,000	220,499	377,456	3,665	22.6
Phillips	741	120,526	110,435	502,474	1,128,419	1,861,854	2,513	21.1
Pittsville	553	51,611	0	214,082	480,768	746,461	1,350	10.2
Platteville	1,553	234,388	0	929,628	2,087,689	3,251,705	2,094	15.4
Plum City	258	40,000	36,667	100,000	197,606	374,273	1,451	8.1
Plymouth	2,077	172,588	0	688,966	1,547,228	2,408,782	1,160	7.6
Port Edwards	439	63,595	0	252,380	566,777	882,752	2,011	10.5
Port Washington-Saukville	2,520	152,878	0	580,365	1,303,339	2,036,582	808	5.5
Portage Community	2,168	265,559	0	1,002,804	2,252,022	3,520,385	1,624	8.4
Potosi	320	56,864	0	191,605	430,293	678,762	2,121	9.6
Poynette	1,028	54,189	0	215,071	482,991	752,251	732	5.1
Prairie du Chien Area	1,061	194,009	167,826	775,176	1,740,833	2,877,845	2,712	11.7
Prairie Farm	386	41,217	0	166,133	373,090	580,440	1,504	11.6
Prentice	332	81,277	53,043	312,175	701,060	1,147,556	3,456	18.6
Prescott	1,275	41,015	0	141,127	316,931	499,073	391	4.4
Princeton	315	44,180	47,971	177,914	399,546	669,612	2,126	15.4
Pulaski Community	3,687	219,615	0	865,099	1,942,774	3,027,487	821	5.0
Racine	16,572	5,883,184	2,540,433	23,636,060	53,080,097	85,139,774	5,138	19.4
Randall Joint No. 1	664	72,222	0	243,354	546,506	862,082	1,298	6.1
Randolph	546	65,701	0	262,139	588,692	916,531	1,679	11.0
Random Lake	725	55,081	0	233,196	523,695	811,972	1,120	7.7
Raymond No. 14	408	40,000	0	100,000	125,667	265,668	651	5.1
Reedsburg	2,641	406,485	0	1,443,035	3,240,660	5,090,180	1,927	15.2
Reedsville	527	94,783	0	355,324	797,959	1,248,066	2,368	7.7
Rhineland	2,269	413,132	348,261	1,536,220	3,449,928	5,747,541	2,533	12.3
Rib Lake	498	75,079	0	295,904	664,520	1,035,504	2,079	12.8
Rice Lake Area	2,218	331,973	0	1,391,718	3,125,417	4,849,109	2,186	10.3
Richland	1,213	343,603	189,420	1,379,617	3,098,242	5,010,882	4,131	15.9
Richmond	427	40,000	0	100,000	0	140,000	328	2.3
Rio Community	385	40,498	0	137,524	308,841	486,863	1,265	6.0
Ripon Area	1,952	155,277	0	610,960	1,372,048	2,138,285	1,095	6.0

		<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Census</u>
	<u>Fall 2020</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
River Falls	3,434	\$174,091	\$0	\$684,331	\$1,536,819	\$2,395,240	\$698	5.5%
River Ridge	530	144,061	78,985	575,954	1,293,434	2,092,434	3,948	19.7
River Valley	1,120	159,683	0	570,306	1,280,750	2,010,739	1,795	8.7
Riverdale	669	151,579	106,087	613,319	1,377,345	2,248,330	3,361	15.7
Rosendale-Brandon	976	40,000	0	106,836	239,925	386,761	396	3.2
Rosholt	501	43,304	0	162,267	364,407	569,977	1,138	5.8
Royall	482	221,017	76,087	792,948	1,780,744	2,870,797	5,956	21.7
Salem	942	110,133	0	437,226	981,889	1,529,247	1,623	5.9
Sauk Prairie	2,715	230,370	0	920,638	2,067,500	3,218,508	1,185	8.7
Seneca	230	64,030	39,275	271,251	609,155	983,710	4,277	19.3
Sevastopol	594	54,208	0	198,876	446,622	699,706	1,178	8.2
Seymour Community	2,016	311,633	0	1,050,046	2,358,115	3,719,795	1,845	9.6
Sharon Joint No. 11	212	54,064	35,652	224,932	505,136	819,784	3,867	20.2
Shawano	2,316	400,537	0	1,526,775	3,428,716	5,356,028	2,313	11.2
Sheboygan Area	9,661	1,441,021	1,457,680	5,763,688	12,943,660	21,606,049	2,236	13.3
Sheboygan Falls	1,614	96,349	0	390,148	876,166	1,362,663	844	6.3
Shell Lake	587	104,454	98,985	414,551	930,968	1,548,959	2,639	19.0
Shiocton	719	51,859	0	187,656	421,424	660,940	919	6.8
Shorewood	1,891	138,878	0	588,705	1,322,069	2,049,651	1,084	8.8
Shullsburg	326	66,944	0	227,337	510,537	804,818	2,469	11.6
Silver Lake Joint No. 1	466	54,734	0	164,411	369,222	588,368	1,263	6.4
Siren	420	96,207	64,493	390,072	875,995	1,426,768	3,397	27.9
Slinger	3,302	58,966	0	212,449	477,101	748,516	227	2.8
Solon Springs	302	40,000	0	150,278	337,483	527,761	1,748	16.8
Somerset	1,461	40,167	0	143,122	321,414	504,703	345	5.7
South Milwaukee	2,809	549,909	437,826	2,490,990	5,594,078	9,072,803	3,230	22.3
South Shore	161	40,000	0	150,060	336,994	527,055	3,274	8.3
Southern Door County	1,016	101,964	0	419,770	942,689	1,464,423	1,441	11.5
Southwestern Wisconsin	515	45,457	0	157,922	354,649	558,028	1,084	10.7
Sparta Area	2,907	485,586	428,840	1,982,953	4,453,168	7,350,548	2,529	14.4
Spencer	610	80,138	0	271,290	609,244	960,672	1,575	8.3
Spooner Area	1,020	247,403	161,014	979,902	2,200,591	3,588,910	3,519	18.0
Spring Valley	696	72,371	0	258,467	580,446	911,284	1,309	9.9
St. Croix Central	1,908	40,000	0	136,415	306,352	482,767	253	5.2
St. Croix Falls	1,050	95,850	0	379,100	851,354	1,326,304	1,263	10.1

		<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Census</u>
	<u>Fall 2020</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
St. Francis	1,042	\$130,583	\$0	\$442,491	\$993,713	\$1,566,787	1,504	12.0%
Stanley-Boyd Area	1,092	186,717	160,000	772,983	1,735,907	2,855,606	2,615	14.8
Stevens Point Area	6,910	701,553	0	2,761,937	6,202,551	9,666,041	1,399	9.0
Stockbridge	195	40,000	0	100,000	81,392	221,393	1,135	3.9
Stone Bank	318	46,991	0	158,338	355,583	560,911	1,764	4.5
Stoughton Area	2,765	262,795	0	1,020,084	2,290,829	3,573,708	1,292	5.2
Stratford	833	71,282	0	256,623	576,304	904,209	1,085	8.9
Sturgeon Bay	1,090	149,449	0	598,150	1,343,280	2,090,879	1,918	13.9
Sun Prairie Area	8,391	651,600	0	2,235,287	5,019,841	7,906,729	942	6.1
Superior	4,291	882,058	657,681	3,117,894	7,001,933	11,659,566	2,717	15.9
Suring	365	83,493	55,652	344,325	773,258	1,256,728	3,443	18.0
Swallow	451	40,000	0	100,000	0	140,000	310	1.7
Thorp	551	192,978	88,985	760,153	1,707,094	2,749,210	4,989	21.0
Three Lakes	532	67,211	0	288,996	649,006	1,005,214	1,889	15.2
Tigerton	258	58,468	36,667	225,133	505,588	825,856	3,201	14.8
Tomah Area	3,089	547,040	454,493	2,181,051	4,898,041	8,080,625	2,616	14.4
Tomahawk	1,147	156,171	0	544,953	1,223,814	1,924,938	1,678	10.6
Tomorrow River	1,221	74,063	0	276,364	620,638	971,065	795	9.1
Trevor-Wilmot Consolidated	510	63,330	0	201,453	452,408	717,191	1,406	6.2
Tri-County Area	565	140,863	87,101	573,008	1,286,818	2,087,790	3,695	20.5
Turtle Lake	471	69,306	67,971	296,231	665,254	1,098,762	2,333	13.5
Twin Lakes No. 4	270	82,809	0	328,694	738,156	1,149,658	4,258	12.0
Two Rivers	1,732	243,561	0	1,008,320	2,264,410	3,516,290	2,030	13.9
Union Grove Joint No. 1	828	56,735	0	240,678	540,498	837,911	1,012	10.1
Union Grove Union High	993	40,000	0	109,848	246,689	396,537	399	7.3
Unity	938	152,302	133,333	618,947	1,389,985	2,294,567	2,446	13.2
Valders Area	969	78,400	0	310,496	697,289	1,086,185	1,121	8.3
Verona Area	5,643	415,787	0	1,412,390	3,171,840	5,000,018	886	5.4
Viroqua Area	1,096	362,770	167,391	1,495,193	3,357,792	5,383,146	4,912	17.2
Wabeno Area	353	65,053	55,072	266,266	597,960	984,351	2,789	15.7
Walworth Joint No. 1	432	90,271	61,739	356,379	800,330	1,308,719	3,029	11.7
Washburn	580	117,081	0	473,591	1,063,555	1,654,227	2,852	13.5
Washington	47	40,000	0	100,000	140,818	280,818	5,975	11.5
Washington-Caldwell	173	40,000	0	100,000	0	140,000	809	2.3
Waterford Joint No. 1	1,440	103,067	0	363,221	815,696	1,281,984	890	4.8

		<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Census</u>
	<u>Fall 2020</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
Waterford Union High	1,032	\$40,000	\$0	\$100,000	\$190,842	\$330,842	\$321	3.3%
Waterloo	766	70,220	0	279,528	627,743	977,491	1,276	7.1
Watertown	3,279	517,830	0	2,106,351	4,730,285	7,354,466	2,243	9.5
Waukesha	12,304	1,205,884	0	4,807,384	10,796,064	16,809,332	1,366	9.0
Waunakee Community	4,306	63,224	0	248,646	558,390	870,260	202	3.4
Waupaca	2,031	280,937	0	1,070,431	2,403,894	3,755,262	1,849	10.4
Waupun	1,920	164,447	0	672,322	1,509,851	2,346,620	1,222	8.0
Wausau	7,788	1,353,186	0	4,694,771	10,543,166	16,591,123	2,130	11.3
Wausaukee	372	103,114	57,536	421,717	947,060	1,529,427	4,111	17.0
Wautoma Area	1,309	314,954	196,811	1,205,151	2,706,438	4,423,353	3,379	17.4
Wauwatosa	7,014	333,388	0	1,351,305	3,034,660	4,719,353	673	4.1
Wauzeka-Steuben	235	47,418	36,957	179,564	403,251	667,189	2,839	12.3
Webster	630	128,200	100,435	508,927	1,142,910	1,880,473	2,985	18.9
West Allis	7,397	1,666,383	1,162,318	6,618,434	14,863,185	24,310,320	3,287	14.3
West Bend	5,891	498,664	0	1,816,104	4,078,471	6,393,239	1,085	5.3
West De Pere	3,623	202,317	0	761,974	1,711,184	2,675,474	738	6.9
West Salem	1,778	108,625	0	235,212	528,221	872,058	490	4.3
Westby Area	1,025	320,959	153,768	1,288,151	2,892,834	4,655,713	4,542	17.8
Westfield	1,014	240,261	151,884	959,491	2,154,753	3,506,388	3,458	14.0
Weston	287	109,680	42,899	435,302	977,569	1,565,451	5,455	23.7
Westosha Central High	1,136	72,468	0	284,457	638,812	995,737	877	4.6
Weyauwega-Fremont	793	100,357	0	387,813	870,920	1,359,090	1,714	7.7
Wheatland Joint No. 1	570	46,455	0	169,766	381,247	597,467	1,048	7.4
White Lake	158	50,497	21,594	202,185	454,052	728,329	4,610	21.4
Whitefish Bay	2,836	188,294	0	701,618	1,575,641	2,465,552	869	7.0
Whitehall	748	140,043	111,739	495,229	1,112,149	1,859,161	2,486	13.0
Whitewater	1,804	252,248	0	920,882	2,068,048	3,241,178	1,797	9.2
Whitnall	2,401	179,363	0	711,901	1,598,734	2,489,997	1,037	5.7
Wild Rose	555	88,651	0	298,705	670,810	1,058,167	1,907	12.0
Williams Bay	731	60,932	0	209,268	469,959	740,159	1,013	6.6
Wilmot Union High	957	84,367	0	356,115	799,737	1,240,220	1,296	9.4
Winneconne Community	1,759	40,000	0	156,131	350,626	546,757	311	4.3
Winter	245	111,165	36,377	472,971	1,062,162	1,682,675	6,868	28.3
Wisconsin Dells	1,715	260,098	257,536	984,950	2,211,926	3,714,509	2,166	13.9
Wisconsin Heights	738	80,312	0	318,552	715,381	1,114,246	1,510	7.4

		<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Census</u>
	<u>Fall 2020</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
Wisconsin Rapids	4,986	\$795,032	\$0	\$3,155,275	\$7,085,882	\$11,036,189	\$2,213	16.4%
Wittenberg-Birnamwood	1,136	185,133	0	623,803	1,400,890	2,209,827	1,945	9.0
Wonewoc-Union Center	335	85,399	48,406	340,969	765,724	1,240,498	3,703	18.7
Woodruff Joint No. 1	530	72,810	0	262,119	588,647	923,576	1,743	10.1
Wrightstown Community	1,320	42,485	0	156,540	351,545	550,570	417	6.0
Yorkville Joint No. 2	443	40,000	0	100,000	153,354	293,354	662	6.8
Independent Charter Schools								
21st Century Prep	510	\$171,268	\$79,855	\$695,439	\$1,561,764	\$2,508,326	\$4,918	****
Aki Earth	8	0	0	100,000	0	100,000	12,500	****
Bruce Guadalupe	1,382	549,164	197,536	2,188,500	4,914,770	7,849,971	5,680	****
Central City Cyberschool	427	222,933	68,696	928,862	2,085,970	3,306,461	7,743	****
Darrell Lynn Hines Academy	226	150,357	37,101	595,296	1,336,871	2,119,625	9,379	****
Downtown Montessori	277	40,000	0	100,726	226,204	366,930	1,325	****
Dr. Howard Fuller Collegiate Academy	315	169,124	43,478	687,989	1,545,035	2,445,626	7,764	****
Escuela Verde	119	54,790	17,101	229,600	515,619	817,110	6,866	****
Isthmus Montessori Academy Public	244	40,000	0	100,000	107,553	247,553	1,015	****
La Casa de Esperanza	199	40,000	21,739	100,000	226,071	387,810	1,949	****
Milestone Democratic School	21	0	0	100,000	0	100,000	4,762	****
Milwaukee Academy of Science	1,270	564,350	176,812	2,356,933	5,293,024	8,391,119	6,607	****
Milwaukee Math & Science Academy	206	186,042	32,174	716,991	1,610,165	2,545,373	12,356	****
Milwaukee Scholars	742	339,262	102,464	1,393,645	3,129,744	4,965,115	6,692	****
One City Expeditionary Elementary School	131	40,000	0	100,000	48,816	188,816	1,441	****
Pathways High School	135	40,000	16,087	145,851	346,352	548,289	4,061	****
Penfield Montessori Academy	114	40,000	0	100,000	223,796	363,796	3,191	****
Rocketship Education Wisconsin Inc.	711	242,199	96,956	1,041,376	2,338,645	3,719,177	5,231	****
Seeds of Health, Inc.	1,145	509,259	132,174	2,046,341	4,873,000	7,560,774	6,603	****
Stellar Collegiate	236	56,619	27,536	260,126	649,718	993,999	4,212	****
UCC Acosta Middle School	211	57,369	25,797	239,996	538,964	862,126	4,086	****
Woodlands School	346	40,000	50,000	126,795	284,748	501,543	1,450	****
Woodlands School - State Street Campus	282	79,993	0	348,237	782,045	1,210,275	4,292	****

	Fall 2020	<u>CARES Act</u>		<u>CAA</u>	<u>ARPA</u>	<u>Total</u>		Census
	<u>Headcount</u>	<u>ESSER I</u>	<u>GEERI</u>	<u>ESSER II</u>	<u>ESSER III</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Per Pupil</u>	<u>Poverty</u>
		<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation*</u>	<u>Allocation**</u>	<u>Initial Allocation***</u>			<u>Percentage</u>
Other Local Educational Agencies								
Wisconsin School for the Blind and Visually Impaired	34	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000	\$2,941	****
Wisconsin School for the Deaf	93	0	0	100,000	0	100,000	1,075	****
Syble Hopp School (Brown County CDEB)	172	0	0	100,000	0	100,000	581	****
Lakeland School (Walworth County CDEB)	<u>154</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>100,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>100,000</u>	649	****
Total	828,632	\$158,544,317	\$46,413,019	\$619,818,597	\$1,386,706,368	\$2,211,482,301	\$2,669	12.4

* A portion of this funding must be used to provide equitable services to private schools.

** Does not include \$65.5 million that will be distributed to school districts and independent charter schools that would otherwise receive less than \$395 per pupil under ESSER II. This funding will be distributed based on the number of in-person instructional hours provided by each district in the 2020-21 school year, and the distribution will not be known until after the end of the school year.

*** As proposed under DPI's ESSER III plan.

**** SAIPE data does not include institutions that do not have traditional geographic boundaries.



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873
Email: fiscal.bureau@legis.wisconsin.gov • Website: <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb>

May, 2021

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #496

State Support for K-12 Education (DPI -- General School Aids and Revenue Limits and Categorical Aids)

[LFB 2021-23 Budget Summary: Page 457, #1; Page 460, #2; Page 462, #6 and #7; Page 465, #5]

CURRENT LAW

Article X, Section 3, of Wisconsin's Constitution specifies that the Legislature is responsible for the establishment of public school districts which are to be "as nearly uniform as practicable" and "free and without charge for tuition to all children." Under s. 121.01 of Wisconsin Statutes, it is "the policy of this state that education is a state function" and "that some relief should be afforded from the local general property tax as a source of public school revenue where such tax is excessive, and that other sources of revenue should contribute a larger percentage of the total funds needed." That section also states that "in order to provide reasonable equality of educational opportunity for all the children of this state, the state must guarantee that a basic educational opportunity be available to each pupil," with the state contributing to a district's educational program only if it meets state standards.

Revenue Limits. Under revenue limits, the amount of revenue a school district can raise from general school aids, property taxes, and exempt property aid is restricted. A district's base revenue in a given year is equal to the restricted revenues received in the prior school year. Base revenue is divided by the average of the district's enrollments in the prior three years to determine its base revenue per pupil. In 2020-21, a \$179 per pupil adjustment is added to each district's base revenue per pupil to determine its current year revenue per pupil. Current year revenue per pupil is then multiplied by the average of the district's enrollments in the current and prior two years to determine the district's initial revenue limit. Under current law, there is no per pupil adjustment authorized in 2021-22 and each year thereafter.

There are several adjustments that are made to the initial revenue limit, such as the low revenue adjustment, the base revenue hold harmless adjustment, and the declining enrollment

adjustment, that generally increase a district's limit. A district can also exceed its revenue limit by receiving voter approval at a referendum.

Under the low revenue adjustment, if the sum of the base revenue per pupil and the revenue limit per pupil adjustment for a district is below a statutorily-specified amount, a district may increase its revenue to that amount. The low revenue adjustment amount in 2020-21 is \$10,000 per pupil, and it will remain at that amount in future years under current law. Otherwise-eligible districts are generally restricted from any low revenue adjustment increases for three years after a failed operating referendum.

Under the declining enrollment adjustment, if a district's current year three-year rolling average pupil enrollment is less than its prior year three-year rolling average, the district receives a nonrecurring adjustment to its revenue limit in a dollar amount equal to 100% of what the decline in the average enrollments would have generated in revenue limit authority.

Under the prior year base revenue hold harmless adjustment, if a district's initial revenue limit in the current year, after consideration of the per pupil adjustment and low revenue adjustment, but prior to any other adjustments, is less than the district's base revenue from the prior year, the district's initial revenue limit is set equal to its prior year base revenue amount.

General School Aids. The general school aids appropriation funds equalization, integration, and special adjustment aid. (High poverty aid, which is also a form of general aid, is funded from a separate appropriation.) Almost all of the funding in the appropriation is distributed through the equalization aid formula. A major objective of the formula is tax base equalization. The formula operates under the principle of equal tax rate for equal per pupil expenditures. In pure form, this means that a school district's property tax rate does not depend on the property tax base of the district, but rather on the level of expenditures. The provision of state aid through the formula allows a district to support a given level of per pupil expenditures with a similar local property tax rate as other districts with the same level of per pupil expenditures, regardless of property tax wealth. There is an inverse relationship between equalization aid and property valuations. Districts with lower per pupil property values receive a larger share of their costs through the formula than districts with higher per pupil property values.

Per Pupil Aid. Each school district receives a statutorily-specified, flat per pupil aid payment, outside of revenue limits, from a sum sufficient per pupil aid appropriation. Under current law, each district receives a \$742 per pupil payment in 2020-21 and each year thereafter. A district's current three-year rolling average pupil count under revenue limits is used to calculate the aid payment.

State Support. One measure of state support of K-12 education is based on the concept of partial school revenues. The traditional definition of partial school revenues is the sum of state general and categorical aids and the gross school property tax levy, with certain exceptions. The traditional definition of state support is the sum of state general and categorical aids, the school levy and first dollar tax credits, and the general program operations appropriation for the Program for the Deaf and Center for the Blind.

DISCUSSION POINTS

General Considerations

1. While the Supreme Court has not ruled recently on the school finance system, in its most recent decision upholding its constitutionality (Vincent v. Voight in 2000), the Court reaffirmed that "the Legislature is entitled to deference in its legislative policy involving fiscal-educational decisions."

2. The Court also held that "so long as the Legislature is providing sufficient resources so that school districts offer students the equal opportunity for a sound basic education as required by the Constitution, the state school finance system will pass constitutional muster." The decision also noted that this standard must take into account districts with disproportionate numbers of disabled students, economically-disadvantaged students, and students with limited-English proficiency.

3. Subject to this constitutional and statutory framework, the Legislature has the role of balancing the various policy goals for K-12 funding within the context of the overall state budget. The competing priorities for general fund revenues, as well as the overall size and condition of the state's general fund, are also considerations in determining the level of state support provided to K-12 education.

4. A unique consideration for the 2021-23 biennial budget is the relatively large amount of federal revenue that will be received by districts under the various federal coronavirus relief acts. The overall amount, distribution, range of per pupil funding, allowable uses, and one-time nature of the funding are all issues that the Committee can consider in its deliberations. These issues are discussed in a separate issue paper on federal coronavirus relief funding.

Methods of Providing State Support

5. Traditionally, additional financial resources have been provided to school districts under revenue limits, either through the per pupil adjustment or through other adjustments to the revenue limit calculation. School boards have the ability to levy for any additional revenue limit authority, with the state providing support either through general school aids or the school levy tax credit to fund school district operations and reduce the local levy. This method allows for some combination of state and local contribution to K-12 funding. Under Assembly Bill 68/Senate Bill 111, the per pupil adjustment would be increased by \$200 in 2021-22 and \$204 in 2022-23, and then adjusted by CPI in future years. Attachment 1 shows the history of the per pupil adjustment since the imposition of revenue limits in 1993-94.

6. The basic concept of equalizing the fiscal capacities of school districts has been promoted through the equalization formula since 1949. The formula uses equalized property valuations per pupil to measure fiscal capacity. To equalize the tax bases of school districts, districts with lower per pupil property values receive a larger share of their costs through the formula than districts with higher per pupil property values. In the 2020-21 aid year, the district with the highest property value per pupil had 44 times the property value per pupil as that of the lowest district. The district at the 90th percentile had over three times the property value per pupil of the district at the 10th

percentile. In the absence of a significant commitment to tax base equalization, it would be difficult, if not virtually impossible, for districts with the lowest property values per pupil to provide a reasonably equal educational opportunity for students as districts with the highest values could.

7. The school levy tax credit, which is provided to all taxable property, could be characterized as neutral with regard to equalization, given that the levy reduction under the credit generally is proportionate for all districts and produces a similar reduction in tax rates. Relative to general aid, school levy tax credit funding could be viewed as favoring taxpayers in districts with relatively higher spending levels and higher per pupil property values. Because these districts receive relatively less equalization aid, more of the cost of operating these districts is funded from property tax levies. Because the school levy tax credit is allocated based on each district's school levy in proportion to statewide levies, these districts receive relatively more school levy tax credit funding than districts that have more of their costs supported from general aid.

8. The first dollar credit was created in the 2007-09 biennial budget act. The first dollar credit is extended to each taxable parcel of real estate on which improvements are located. As a result, the first dollar credit is more focused on residential property than the school levy tax credit. The credit is calculated for each eligible parcel of property by multiplying the property's gross school tax rate by a credit base value determined by the Department of Revenue or the property's fair market value, whichever is less. The first dollar credit has represented a relatively small proportion of total state support since its creation.

9. Per pupil aid is a more recent approach in providing state support to school districts. Per pupil aid could be viewed as a form of minimum aid, under which each district receives an equal, fully state-supported payment per pupil, regardless of the level of property wealth in the district. This could be viewed as a way to ensure that all pupils in the state receive some amount of state aid for their education and that all taxpayers in the state receive some level of benefit from the state to support the operations of their school districts. Attachment 1 shows the per pupil aid payment in each year since 2012-13 and the change in the payment to the prior year.

10. Other categorical aid programs allow for the provisions of additional resources for particular classes of pupils or districts. Three categorical aid programs are targeted to the classes of pupils recognized in the Vincent decision and are distributed on either a cost-reimbursement basis (special education and bilingual-bicultural aid) or on a per eligible pupil basis (the achievement gap reduction program). Separate categorical aid programs provide additional financial resources to particular classes of districts, such as districts with relatively large areas and small enrollments (sparsity aid and high-cost transportation aid) or districts serving a relative large number of pupils who live in properties for which there is no parental property tax base support (tuition payments).

11. Attachment 2 provides information on the relative allocation of funding between the major categories of state support for selected years since 1992-93. As shown in Attachment 2, when the state had a statutory policy in the late 1990s and early 2000s of funding two-thirds of partial school revenues, the proportion of state support provided through general aid increased, as a result of the mechanism that was established to achieve that goal. In the decade after the repeal of the two-thirds funding commitment, increases in the school levy tax credit, the creation of the first dollar credit, and reductions to general aid funding moved the proportions closer to those prior to two-thirds funding.

The creation of per pupil aid has led to an increase in the categorical aid proportion in recent years.

12. Attachment 3 provides information on the level of state support for K-12 partial school revenues over the last decade, using the traditional definitions of state support and partial school revenues. As shown in Attachment 3, the state's share of partial school revenues has ranged from 61.73% to 65.35% over the last 10 years.

13. On April 19, this office distributed a memorandum to the Legislature on the estimated level of property taxes under the budget bill. In that memorandum, it was estimated that the statewide gross school levy would increase from \$5,379.8 million in 2020-21 to \$5,390.0 million in 2021-22 and \$5,470.0 million in 2022-23. These estimates represent year-over-year changes of \$10.2 million (0.2%) in 2021-22 and \$80.0 million (1.5%) in 2022-23.

14. Under current law, it is estimated that the statewide gross school levy would increase from \$5,379.8 million in 2020-21 to \$5,435.0 million in 2021-22 and \$5,525.0 million in 2022-23. These estimates represent year-over-year changes of \$55.2 million (1.0%) in 2021-22 and \$90.0 million (1.7%) in 2022-23. Even if there is no per pupil adjustment provided under revenue limits, as under current law, the statewide school levy can increase due to changes in the other revenue limit adjustments, passage of additional school referenda, or changes in the levies that are outside of revenue limits.

Alternatives

15. The Committee could choose from a number of options related to school finance, based on the overall level of partial school revenues, state aid, and statewide levy that is judged to be appropriate. The Committee could choose to modify the level of general aid and/or per pupil aid funding, provide financial resources to school districts through the per pupil adjustment and/or the low revenue adjustment under revenue limits, or use a blended approach among the various options.

16. A per pupil adjustment under revenue limits would provide a general increase in the financial resources of school districts. The statewide average base revenue per pupil for 2021-22 (the starting point for the 2021-22 revenue limit calculation) is estimated to be \$10,715. Table 1 lists the changes in statewide revenue limit authority in each year that would result under four options to provide a per pupil adjustment for the 2021-23 biennium. For example, as shown in the second line of Table 1, if a \$100 per pupil adjustment were allowed in both 2021-22 and 2022-23, statewide revenue limit authority would increase by \$46 million in 2021-22 and \$131 million in 2022-23 compared to the base. This additional revenue limit authority under any of the alternatives could be funded from some combination of state general aid and/or the school levy tax credit and the local property tax levy.

TABLE 1
Revenue Limit Authority Under Options to Modify
Per Pupil Adjustment

	Change in Revenue Limit Authority (\$ in Millions)		
	<u>2021-22</u>	<u>2022-23</u>	<u>Biennial</u>
\$50/\$50 per pupil (Alt. A1)	\$18	\$61	\$79
\$100/\$100 per pupil (Alt. A2)	46	131	177
\$150/\$150 per pupil (Alt. A3)	81	208	289
\$200/\$200 per pupil (Alt. A4)	120	290	410

17. The Committee could also consider alternatives to increase the low revenue adjustment in conjunction with a per pupil adjustment. This adjustment is intended to decrease the disparity between low-revenue and high-revenue districts by providing additional revenue limit authority to low-revenue districts.

18. Table 2 shows the changes in statewide revenue limit authority in each year of the biennium that would result under five alternatives that include an increase to the low revenue adjustment. The low revenue adjustment amounts are set relative to the indicated per pupil adjustment to provide approximately \$30 to \$40 million in additional revenue limit authority, in total, to low-revenue districts over the biennium. For example, as shown in the second line of Table 2, if a \$50 per pupil adjustment and a \$10,100 per pupil low revenue adjustment were allowed in 2021-22 and a \$50 per pupil adjustment and a \$10,200 per pupil low revenue adjustment were allowed in 2022-23, statewide revenue limit authority would increase by \$29 million in 2021-22 and \$84 million in 2022-23 compared to the base. As with the examples in Table 1, this additional revenue limit authority could be funded from some combination of state general aid/or the levy credit and the local levy.

TABLE 2
Revenue Limit Authority Under Options to Modify
Per Pupil and Low Revenue Adjustments

	Change in Revenue Limit Authority (\$ in Millions)		
	<u>2021-22</u>	<u>2022-23</u>	<u>Biennial</u>
\$0/\$0 per pupil, \$10,075/\$10,150 low revenue (Alt. B1)	\$11	\$31	\$42
\$50/\$50 per pupil, \$10,100/\$10,200 low revenue (Alt. B2)	29	84	113
\$100/\$100 per pupil, \$10,150/\$10,300 low revenue (Alt. B3)	58	156	214
\$150/\$150 per pupil, \$10,200/\$10,400 low revenue (Alt. B4)	94	234	328
\$200/\$200 per pupil, \$10,250/\$10,500 low revenue (Alt. B5)	134	316	450

19. The alternatives at the end of this paper related to the per pupil adjustment and the low revenue adjustment indicate the estimated amount of revenue limit authority that would be generated

by the respective amounts. In the absence of additional state funding, school boards would have the authority to levy, in total, those amounts. The levy impact could be reduced, in whole or in part, by providing an increase in general school aid or school levy tax credit funding. The fiscal effect of any alternatives involving the levy credit would have to account for the fact that the credit is paid on a delayed basis in the state fiscal year following the property tax year to which the credit applies.

20. For declining enrollment districts, there would be an interaction between the base revenue hold harmless adjustment and any per pupil adjustment or low revenue adjustment. If there is no per pupil adjustment (as under current law beginning in 2021-22) and a district is not eligible for the low revenue adjustment, a district with declining enrollment would receive some additional revenue limit authority from the base revenue hold harmless adjustment, because its initial revenue limit would be lower than its base revenue as a result of the loss of pupils. Providing a per pupil or low revenue adjustment would increase the initial revenue limit for eligible districts, which would result in a partially or fully offsetting reduction in the district's base revenue hold harmless adjustment. The per pupil and low revenue adjustments, however, are recurring adjustments which add to an eligible district's base revenue, while the base revenue hold harmless adjustment is nonrecurring.

21. Under current law, a school board has the ability to propose a referendum if the level of ongoing state and local funding for that district under revenue limits under any of these alternatives is not viewed as sufficient. Using the referendum option would ensure that there is local support of the district's decision to make additional expenditures, before it can spend or tax at higher levels.

22. Table 3 shows the funding changes relative to the adjusted base for four alternatives for per pupil aid payments in the 2021-23 biennium. (In prior action, the Committee approved the sum sufficient reestimate of the per pupil aid appropriation based on the current law \$742 per pupil payment and estimated enrollments in the 2021-23 biennium.) For example, as shown in the first line of Table 3, if the per pupil aid payment were set at \$792 per pupil in 2021-22 and \$842 per pupil in 2022-23 and each year thereafter, estimated general fund expenditures would increase by \$41.0 million in 2021-22 and \$81.9 million in 2022-23.

TABLE 3
Per Pupil Aid Funding Under Options to Modify Payment Amount

	<u>Change to Base (\$ in Millions)</u>		
	<u>2021-22</u>	<u>2022-23</u>	<u>Biennial</u>
\$792/\$842 (Alt. C1)	\$41.0	\$81.9	\$122.9
\$842/\$942 (Alt. C2)	82.0	163.8	245.8
\$892/\$1,042 (Alt. C3)	123.1	245.6	368.7
\$942/\$1,142 (Alt. C4)	164.1	327.5	491.6

23. The fiscal effects shown for the revenue limit and per pupil aid alternatives presented are all based on the current law definition of enrollment under revenue limits. If any changes are made to that definition, those fiscal effects would have to be adjusted accordingly.

24. The per pupil adjustment under revenue limits and the level of per pupil aid funding provided also affect payments under the private school choice programs, the independent charter school program, and the special needs scholarship program, as well as the aid transfer amounts under the open enrollment program. Under current law, the respective per pupil payment under each of these programs in a given year increased by the per pupil revenue limit adjustment for the current year, if positive, plus the change in the amount of statewide categorical aid per pupil between the previous year and the current year, if positive. If the Committee modifies the per pupil adjustment or per pupil aid amount, the respective payments and aid reductions for these programs would need to be adjusted as well.

ALTERNATIVES

A. Per Pupil Adjustments under Revenue Limits

1. Set the per pupil adjustment under revenue limits at \$50 in 2021-22 and an additional \$50 in 2022-23. *[This would generate an estimated \$18 million in 2021-22 and \$61 million in 2022-23 in statewide revenue limit authority, the levy impact of which can be offset in whole or in part by increased funding for general school aids or the school levy tax credit.]*

2. Set the per pupil adjustment under revenue limits at \$100 in 2021-22 and an additional \$100 in 2022-23. *[This would generate an estimated \$46 million in 2021-22 and \$131 million in 2022-23 in statewide revenue limit authority, the levy impact of which can be offset in whole or in part by increased funding for general school aids or the school levy tax credit.]*

3. Set the per pupil adjustment under revenue limits at \$150 in 2021-22 and an additional \$150 in 2022-23. *[This would generate an estimated \$81 million in 2021-22 and \$208 million in 2022-23 in statewide revenue limit authority, the levy impact of which can be offset in whole or in part by increased funding for general school aids or the school levy tax credit.]*

4. Set the per pupil adjustment under revenue limits at \$200 in 2021-22 and an additional \$200 in 2022-23. *[This would generate an estimated \$120 million in 2021-22 and \$290 million in 2022-23 in statewide revenue limit authority, the levy impact of which can be offset in whole or in part by increased funding for general school aids or the school levy tax credit.]*

5. Take no action.

B. Per Pupil and Low Revenue Adjustments under Revenue Limits

1. Set the low revenue adjustment at \$10,075 per pupil in 2021-22 and \$10,150 per pupil in 2022-23 and each year thereafter. *[This would generate an estimated \$11 million in 2021-22 and \$31 million in 2022-23 in statewide revenue limit authority, the levy impact of which can be offset in whole or in part by increased funding for general school aids or the school levy tax credit.]*

2. Set the per pupil adjustment under revenue limits at \$50 in 2021-22 and an additional \$50 in 2022-23, and set the low revenue adjustment at \$10,100 per pupil in 2021-22 and \$10,200 per

pupil in 2022-23 and each year thereafter. *[This would generate an estimated \$29 million in 2021-22 and \$84 million in 2022-23 in statewide revenue limit authority, the levy impact of which can be offset in whole or in part by increased funding for general school aids or the school levy tax credit.]*

3. Set the per pupil adjustment under revenue limits at \$100 in 2021-22 and an additional \$100 in 2022-23, and set the low revenue adjustment at \$10,150 per pupil in 2021-22 and \$10,300 per pupil in 2022-23 and each year thereafter. *[This would generate an estimated \$58 million in 2021-22 and \$156 million in 2022-23 in statewide revenue limit authority, the levy impact of which can be offset in whole or in part by increased funding for general school aids or the school levy tax credit.]*

4. Set the per pupil adjustment under revenue limits at \$150 in 2021-22 and an additional \$150 in 2022-23, and set the low revenue adjustment at \$10,200 per pupil in 2021-22 and \$10,400 per pupil in 2022-23 and each year thereafter. *[This would generate an estimated \$94 million in 2021-22 and \$234 million in 2022-23 in statewide revenue limit authority, the levy impact of which can be offset in whole or in part by increased funding for general school aids or the school levy tax credit.]*

5. Set the per pupil adjustment under revenue limits at \$200 in 2021-22 and an additional \$200 in 2022-23, and set the low revenue adjustment at \$10,250 per pupil in 2021-22 and \$10,500 per pupil in 2022-23 and each year thereafter. *[This would generate an estimated \$134 million in 2021-22 and \$316 million in 2022-23 in statewide revenue limit authority, the levy impact of which can be offset in whole or in part by increased funding for general school aids or the school levy tax credit.]*

6. Take no action.

C. Per Pupil Aid

1. *\$50 Per Pupil Annual Increase.* Provide \$41,021,400 in 2021-22 and \$81,877,000 in 2022-23 in per pupil aid to increase the payment from \$742 per pupil in 2020-21 to \$792 per pupil in 2021-22 and \$842 per pupil in 2022-23 and each year thereafter.

ALT C1	Change to Base
GPR	\$122,898,400

2. *\$100 Per Pupil Annual Increase.* Provide \$82,042,700 in 2021-22 and \$163,754,000 in 2022-23 in per pupil aid to increase the payment from \$742 per pupil in 2020-21 to \$842 per pupil in 2021-22 and \$942 per pupil in 2022-23 and each year thereafter.

ALT C2	Change to Base
GPR	\$245,796,700

3. *\$150 Per Pupil Annual Increase.* Provide \$123,064,100 in 2021-22 and \$245,631,000 in 2022-23 in per pupil aid to increase the payment from \$742 per pupil in 2020-21 to \$892 per pupil

in 2021-22 and \$1,042 per pupil in 2022-23 and each year thereafter.

ALT C3	Change to Base
GPR	\$368,695,100

4. *\$200 Per Pupil Annual Increase.* Provide \$164,085,400 in 2021-22 and \$327,508,000 in 2022-23 in per pupil aid to increase the payment from \$742 per pupil in 2020-21 to \$942 per pupil in 2021-22 and \$1,142 per pupil in 2022-23 and each year thereafter.

ALT C4	Change to Base
GPR	\$491,593,400

5. Take no action.

Prepared by: Russ Kava
Attachments

ATTACHMENT 1

Per Pupil Adjustment and Per Pupil Aid

	<u>Per Pupil Adjustment</u>	<u>Per Pupil Aid Payment</u>	<u>Change to Prior Year</u>	<u>Combined Resource Change**</u>
1993-94	\$190.00			
1994-95	194.37			
1995-96	200.00			
1996-97	206.00			
1997-98	206.00			
1998-99	208.88			
1999-00	212.43			
2000-01	220.29			
2001-02	226.68			
2002-03	230.08			
2003-04	236.98			
2004-05	241.01			
2005-06	248.48			
2006-07	256.93			
2007-08	264.12			
2008-09	274.68			
2009-10	200.00			
2010-11	200.00			
2011-12	-5.5%*			
2012-13	\$50.00	\$50		\$100
2013-14	75.00	75	\$25	100
2014-15	75.00	150	75	150
2015-16	0.00	150	0	0
2016-17	0.00	250	100	100
2017-18	0.00	450	200	200
2018-19	0.00	654	204	204
2019-20	175.00	742	88	263
2020-21	179.00	742	0	179

* Average statewide reduction of \$554 per pupil.

** Beginning in 2012-13.

ATTACHMENT 2

K-12 State Support Funding and Proportions for Selected Years (\$ in Millions)

	1992-93 (Year Before Revenue Limits)	1995-96 (Year Before Two-Thirds Funding)	1996-97 (First Year of Two-Thirds Funding)	2002-03 (Last Year of Two-Thirds Funding)	2006-07 (School Levy Credit Increase)	2008-09 (First Dollar Credit Created)	2009-10 (General Aid Reduction)	2011-12 (General Aid Reduction)	2020-21 (Base Year)
General Aids	\$1,696.7	\$2,341.5	\$3,182.2	\$4,201.0	\$4,722.7	\$4,811.5	\$4,671.2	\$4,285.0	\$4,920.4
Categorical Aids	349.3	363.7	383.9	574.2	571.7	650.9	644.2	608.5	1,374.9
School Levy Credit	319.3	319.3	469.3	469.3	593.1	747.7	747.4	747.4	940.0
First Dollar Credit	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>75.0</u>	<u>145.0</u>	<u>150.0</u>	<u>150.0</u>
Total	\$2,365.3	\$3,024.5	\$4,035.4	\$5,244.5	\$5,887.5	\$6,285.1	\$6,207.8	\$5,790.9	\$7,385.3
General Aids	71.7%	77.4%	78.9%	80.1%	80.2%	76.6%	75.2%	74.0%	66.6%
Categorical Aids	14.8	12.0	9.5	10.9	9.7	10.4	10.4	10.5	18.6
School Levy Credit	13.5	10.6	11.6	8.9	10.1	11.9	12.0	12.9	12.7
First Dollar Credit	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ATTACHMENT 3

State Support for K-12 Partial School Revenues (\$ in Millions)

	<u>2011-12</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<u>2013-14</u>	<u>2014-15</u>	<u>2015-16</u>	<u>2016-17</u>	<u>2017-18</u>	<u>2018-19</u>	<u>2019-20</u>	<u>2020-21</u>
State Aid	\$4,893.5	\$4,964.4	\$5,079.2	\$5,241.7	\$5,244.2	\$5,444.6	\$5,730.0	\$5,899.8	\$6,072.7	\$6,295.3
School Levy Credit	747.4	747.4	747.4	747.4	853.0	853.0	940.0	940.0	940.0	940.0
First Dollar Credit	150.0	150.0	150.0	150.0	150.0	150.0	150.0	150.0	150.0	150.0
Program for the Deaf/ Center for the Blind	<u>11.2</u>	<u>11.2</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>11.2</u>	<u>11.2</u>	<u>10.9</u>	<u>10.9</u>	<u>11.9</u>	<u>11.9</u>
Total	\$5,802.1	\$5,873.0	\$5,987.4	\$6,149.9	\$6,258.4	\$6,458.8	\$6,830.9	\$7,000.7	\$7,174.6	\$7,397.2
Partial Revenues	\$9,398.7	\$9,493.2	\$9,658.6	\$9,872.5	\$9,975.5	\$10,158.4	\$10,525.0	\$10,712.3	\$10,993.6	\$11,348.0
State Share	61.73%	61.87%	61.99%	62.29%	62.74%	63.58%	64.90%	65.35%	65.26%	65.19%



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873
Email: fiscal.bureau@legis.wisconsin.gov • Website: <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb>

May, 2021

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #497

Buyback of Current Law General School Aid Payment Delay (DPI -- General School Aids and Revenue Limits)

[LFB 2021-23 Budget Summary: Page 460, #3]

CURRENT LAW

Equalization aid is distributed to districts according to the following payment schedule: 15% on the third Monday in September; 25% on the first Monday in December; 25% on the fourth Monday in March; and 35% on the third Monday in June. The state pays \$75 million of equalization aid on a delayed basis, with districts receiving these monies on the fourth Monday in July of the following school year. Total aid entitlements on each of the four main dates are reduced by the percentage that generates the \$75 million amount for the school year.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The current law equalization aid payment delay was enacted in the 1997-99 budget act, beginning with aid for the 1997-98 school year.
2. The \$75 million in delayed equalization aid payments represents 1.6% of the \$4,746.8 million in net equalization aid that will be paid to school districts in 2020-21.
3. The budget bill would provide \$75 million GPR in 2021-22 for general school aids and, beginning in the 2021-22 school year, delete the current law provisions under which the state annually pays that amount of aid on a delayed basis on the fourth Monday in July of the following school year. The bill does not include necessary provisions to treat the general aid appropriation as if there were no buyback so as to distribute the correct amount of funding for 2021-22 through the general aid formula.
4. The delayed aid payment worsens the state's general fund balance under generally

accepted accounting principles (GAAP). While the state has had a GAAP deficit in recent years, the Comprehensive Annual Fiscal Report reported a \$1.5 million GAAP surplus in 2019-20. However, this GAAP surplus is partly attributable to the general fund having an undesignated fund balance of \$1.172 billion at the end of 2019-20 under the statutory basis of accounting. If this balance is drawn down in the 2021-23 budget, the state could once again have a GAAP deficit.

5. The delayed school aid payment could also contribute to the need for districts to do short-term borrowing for cash flow purposes. General school aids and property taxes typically make up the largest portions of school district budgets. In addition to the aid payment schedule noted above, property tax settlements by municipalities to other taxing jurisdictions, including school districts, are required in January, February, and August. Receiving additional state aid on the four main payment dates could reduce the need for cash flow borrowing, especially by more highly-aided districts.

6. The delayed aid payment, however, has been a part of the school finance system for over two decades. Because the \$75 million is a fixed number, it has represented a smaller percentage of equalization aid funding paid to districts as overall funding has increased over that time. In the first year of the payment delay, the \$75 million represented 2.2% of equalization aid funding paid.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Provide \$75,000,000 in 2021-22 for general school aids and, beginning in the 2021-22 school year, delete the provisions under which the state annually pays that amount of aid on a delayed basis on the fourth Monday in July of the following school year. In addition, specify that, for the purpose of calculating general school aid in the 2021-22 school year, DPI would treat the appropriation as if there were no buyback, so as to distribute the correct amount of funding.

ALT 1	Change to Base
GPR	\$75,000,000

2. Take no action.

Prepared by: Russ Kava



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873
Email: fiscal.bureau@legis.wisconsin.gov • Website: <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb>

May, 2021

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #498

Special Adjustment Aid (DPI -- General School Aids and Revenue Limits)

[LFB 2021-23 Budget Summary: Page 460, #4]

CURRENT LAW

The general school aids appropriation funds equalization, integration, and special adjustment aid. Almost all of the funding in the appropriation is distributed through the equalization aid formula. A major objective of the formula is tax base equalization. The formula operates under the principle of equal tax rate for equal per pupil expenditures. There is an inverse relationship between equalization aid and property valuations. Districts with lower per pupil property values receive a larger share of their costs through the formula than districts with higher per pupil property values.

Special adjustment aid is funded as a first draw from the general aid appropriation, primarily as a form of hold harmless payment. Under the main type of special adjustment aid, an eligible district receives a payment equal to the amount needed to make the district's total general aid eligibility in the current year, prior to other aid adjustments, equal to 85% of its prior year general aid payment. Consolidated districts and districts that enter into a whole grade sharing agreement are also eligible for special adjustment aid under separate statutory provisions.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Special adjustment aid was created in the 1977-79 biennial budget act, although there were hold harmless aid programs prior to that. Since it was first created, special adjustment aid has, at times, been paid from a separate appropriation, been limited to districts below a specified cost per pupil or value per pupil thresholds, or been used to limit the dollar loss in aid for eligible districts. The current law provisions related to the main type of special adjustment aid have been effective since the 1999-00 aid year.

2. One exception to the current 85% provision was that, under the 2011-13 budget act, special adjustment aid was calculated based on 90% of a district's prior year payment for the 2011-12 distribution of general school aids. That year, the general school aids appropriation was reduced by \$390.5 million from the prior year, in conjunction with a 5.5% reduction that year in base revenue for each district under revenue limits and collective bargaining modifications. This provision further limited the year-to-year decline in aid for districts that year.

3. In 2020-21, 48 districts were eligible for \$7.6 million in special adjustment aid, excluding prior year aid adjustments and the separate provisions for consolidated districts. These districts are listed in the attachment.

4. Districts tend to become eligible for special adjustment aid if overall funding in the general school aids appropriation is reduced or if a district's value or cost per pupil increases significantly relative to other districts, such that the district generates an equalization aid entitlement less than 85% of its prior year payment. Once districts become eligible for special adjustment aid, they may remain eligible for a period of years if they cannot compete more favorably in the formula relative to other districts.

5. Special adjustment aid is intended to smooth out what could otherwise be large reductions in aid for a district based on sudden changes in total funding or in the district's aid characteristics. Because special adjustment aid is a general aid subject to revenue limits, it also serves to reduce what could otherwise be large increases in a district's property tax levy.

6. The budget bill would specify that special adjustment aid would be calculated based on 90% of a district's prior year general aid payment for the distribution of general aid in the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years.

7. General school aid is calculated using prior year data on equalized values, aidable costs, and enrollment. To the extent that any one-time cost and enrollment changes specific to the COVID-19 pandemic for the 2020-21 school year could lead to relatively large changes in the factors used to calculate general aid from the 2019-20 to the 2020-21 school year, and then from the 2020-21 school year to the 2021-22 school year, it could be viewed as appropriate to increase the special adjustment aid threshold for the two affected aid years.

8. Any changes in costs and enrollments would not directly affect a district's aid payment, but would work through the calculation of aid under the formula. The impact for most districts would depend on the changes in the equalized value per pupil and the aidable cost per pupil for that district, as well as the changes in equalized value per pupil and aidable cost per pupil relative to the statewide average equalized value per pupil and aidable cost per pupil.

9. Information is not available to estimate the 2021-22 or 2022-23 general aid distributions. However, as an illustration of the potential effects of a change, had the 2020-21 aid distribution been calculated with the 90% threshold for special adjustment aid, 58 districts would have received more aid, 353 districts would have received less aid, and 10 districts would have had their aid unchanged. A total of \$2.8 million in funding would have been redistributed among districts, which is 0.1% of the total net general aid payments. A total of 59 districts would have been eligible for \$10.5 million

in special adjustment aid (compared to 48 districts eligible for \$7.6 million under current law). It is not clear, however, how indicative the 2020-21 simulation would be for the 2021-22 or 2022-23 aid runs, given the unique situation created by the pandemic that was not fully incorporated in the 2020-21 distribution.

10. Instead of changing the special adjustment threshold for two years, the Committee could choose to change the threshold for 2021-22 only. Once complete and audited information for the 2021-22 aid run is available in October and the conditions under which schools are operating for the 2021-22 school year are better known, the Legislature could assess whether a similar change is warranted for 2022-23 and pass separate legislation if needed.

11. The Committee could also choose to maintain the current law 85% threshold, as it has been used as the hold harmless in the formula for nearly two decades, in the absence of a large reduction in general aid funding. Further, because special adjustment aid is funded as a first draw from the general school aids appropriation, the increase in special adjustment aid eligibility under the bill would, in isolation, result in less funding being distributed through the equalization formula. It could be viewed as undesirable to reduce the amount of funding available to equalize the tax base of school districts by providing additional special adjustment aid.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Specify that special adjustment aid would be calculated based on 90% of a district's prior year general school aid payment for the distribution of general aid in the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years.

2. Specify that special adjustment aid would be calculated based on 90% of a district's prior year general school aid payment for the distribution of general aid in the 2021-22 school year only.

3. Take no action.

Prepared by: Russ Kava
Attachment

ATTACHMENT

2020-21 Special Adjustment Aid Eligibility

<u>School District</u>	<u>Aid Eligibility</u>	<u>School District</u>	<u>Aid Eligibility</u>
Beecher-Dunbar-Pembine	\$66,469	Norris	\$3,452
Big Foot UHS	13,417	North Lake	262,997
Birchwood	6,666	Northern Ozaukee	78,145
Brighton #1	39,926	Northland Pines	25,365
Drummond	12,907	Northwood	1,318
Elcho	11,890	Paris J1	47,937
Elkhart Lake-Glenbeulah	116,857	Pewaukee	3,453,630
Florence	103,043	Phelps	3,144
Fontana J8	3,518	Sevastopol	6,573
Fox Point J2	6,281	South Shore	8,451
Gibraltar Area	2,198	Spooner Area	3,714
Glendale-River Hills	2,081	Stone Bank	8,158
Goodman-Armstrong	36,791	Suring	16,801
Hayward Community	7,192	Swallow	148,403
Kohler	36,059	Three Lakes	11,347
Lake Country	29,396	Twin Lakes #4	13,582
Lake Geneva-Genoa UHS	917,227	Wabeno Area	70,034
Lake Holcombe	63,558	Wausaukee	11,341
Lakeland UHS	21,926	Webster	33,529
Linn J4	2,943	White Lake	88,584
Linn J6	685	Williams Bay	22,921
Maple Dale-Indian Hill	2,553	Winter	26,867
Mequon-Thiensville	21,140	Wisconsin Dells	<u>691,776</u>
Middleton-Cross Plains	1,053,897		
Minocqua J1	1,398	TOTAL	\$7,618,087



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873
Email: fiscal.bureau@legis.wisconsin.gov • Website: <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb>

May, 2021

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #499

Revenue Limit and Per Pupil Aid Enrollment for the 2020-21 School Year (DPI -- General School Aids and Revenue Limits)

[LFB 2021-23 Budget Summary: Page 463, #8 and Page 465, #5]

CURRENT LAW

Revenue Limits. Under revenue limits, the amount of revenue a school district can raise from general school aids, property taxes, and exempt property aid is restricted. A district's base revenue in a given year is equal to the restricted revenues received in the prior school year. Base revenue is divided by the average of the district's enrollments in the prior three years to determine its base revenue per pupil. In 2020-21, a \$179 per pupil adjustment is added to each district's base revenue per pupil to determine its current year revenue per pupil. Current year revenue per pupil is then multiplied by the average of the district's enrollments in the current and prior two years to determine the district's initial revenue limit. There are several adjustments that are made to the initial revenue limit, such as the declining enrollment adjustment and the low revenue adjustment. A district can also exceed its revenue limit by receiving voter approval at a referendum.

For revenue limit purposes, a district's enrollment is the sum of its pupil count taken on the third Friday in September plus 40% of its full-time equivalent summer enrollment. A three-year rolling average of these enrollments is used to calculate the limit. For example, for the 2020-21 revenue limit, the average of the 2017, 2018, and 2019 enrollments is used to calculate the 2019-20 base year revenue per pupil. Then, the average of the 2018, 2019, and 2020 enrollments is used to calculate the 2020-21 current year revenue per pupil.

Under the declining enrollment adjustment, if a district's current year three-year rolling average pupil enrollment is less than its prior year three-year rolling average, the district receives a nonrecurring adjustment to its revenue limit in a dollar amount equal to 100% of what the decline in the average enrollments would have generated in revenue limit authority.

Under the prior year base revenue hold harmless adjustment, which is also nonrecurring, if a district's initial revenue limit in the current year, after consideration of the per pupil adjustment and low revenue adjustment, but prior to any other adjustments, is less than the district's base revenue from the prior year, the district's initial revenue limit is set equal to its prior year base revenue amount.

Under the low revenue adjustment, if the sum of the base revenue per pupil and the revenue limit per pupil adjustment for a district is below a statutorily-specified amount, a district may increase its revenue to that amount. The low revenue adjustment amount in 2020-21 and each year thereafter is \$10,000 per pupil, with a three-year exception for districts with failed referenda.

Per Pupil Aid. Each school district receives a statutorily-specified, flat per pupil aid payment, outside of revenue limits, from a sum sufficient per pupil aid appropriation. Under current law, each district receives a \$742 per pupil payment in 2020-21 and each year thereafter. A district's current three-year rolling average pupil count under revenue limits is used to calculate the aid payment.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. There are three features of revenue limits that address declining enrollment: the three-year rolling average, the declining enrollment adjustment, and the prior year base revenue hold harmless adjustment.

2. Under current law, a district with otherwise steady enrollment and a relatively small enrollment decline in one year would receive the declining enrollment adjustment to replace the loss of revenue limit authority in the first year of the decline. This adjustment is nonrecurring, so the district would lose that revenue limit authority in the two years following the enrollment decline as that decline works through the three-year rolling average. If the enrollment decline is relatively large, the district would also receive the prior year base revenue hold harmless adjustment in the first year of the decline, resulting temporarily in an increase in revenue limit authority compared to the authority the district would have had if the decline had not happened. Once the one-year enrollment decline drops out of the three-year rolling averages, the district's revenue limit would be restored to its original amount. The attachment provides hypothetical examples that illustrate the current law effects of a relatively small and large enrollment decline.

3. The examples shown all assume constant enrollment for the hypothetical districts, so as to show, in isolation, the effect of a decline in enrollment. While the short-term enrollment changes work through the revenue limit calculation, district eligibility for other adjustments could change and districts would still be subject to the revenue limit effects of long-term enrollment demographics.

4. Table 1 below shows the current year three-year average enrollment used for the calculation of revenue limits and per pupil aid each year for the last decade.

TABLE 1**Revenue Limit Enrollment Averages**

	<u>Enrollment Average</u>	<u>Change to Prior Year</u>	
		<u>Amount</u>	<u>Percent</u>
2011-12	847,515		
2012-13	846,490	-1,025	-0.1%
2013-14	846,148	-342	0.0
2014-15	845,600	-548	-0.1
2015-16	843,944	-1,656	-0.2
2016-17	841,906	-2,038	-0.2
2017-18	839,885	-2,021	-0.2
2018-19	837,642	-2,243	-0.3
2019-20	834,198	-3,444	-0.4
2020-21	822,968	-11,230	-1.3

5. The large drop in the average for 2020-21 was primarily due to the one-year enrollment drop from 2019 to 2020. The revenue limit enrollment count dropped from 830,200 in 2019 to 804,400 in 2020, with the largest reductions occurring in the prekindergarten and kindergarten grades. Information from DPI suggests that nearly 90% of the enrollment decline was due to the pandemic rather than long-term enrollment trends.

6. Based on the three-year rolling averages, 329 districts were eligible for the declining enrollment adjustment in 2020-21, an increase from 249 eligible districts in 2019-20. The 2019-20 eligibility is more consistent with recent eligibility for that adjustment.

7. Given the relatively large, unplanned declines in enrollment, it could be viewed as appropriate to attempt to mitigate what could be a temporary reduction in revenue limit authority and per pupil aid for districts.

8. The current features in revenue limits for declining enrollment could also be viewed as sufficient for addressing the changes in enrollment, which were already in effect for districts for the first year of the enrollment decline. Districts would also have the option to use other fund sources to address any revenue shortfalls. School boards could also propose a referendum for additional revenue limit authority for 2022-23, which would ensure that there is local support of the district's decision to make additional expenditures, before it can spend or tax at higher levels.

9. The budget bill would specify that for calculating a school district's revenue limit for the 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24 school years, the number of pupils enrolled in the district in the 2020-21 school year is the sum of the following: (a) the greater of the number of pupils enrolled in the district's September enrollment count in the 2019-20 school year or in the 2020-21 school year; and (b) the greater of 40% of the district's summer enrollment in the 2019-20 school year or in the 2020-21 school year. These provisions would also apply to the calculation of per pupil aid.

10. The budget bill provision would fill in the two-year revenue limit reduction for districts that would become eligible for the low revenue adjustment (\$10,000 under current law). For districts that would not become eligible for that adjustment, the bill would not fill in the two-year reduction and also reduce the revenue limit authority for those districts on an ongoing basis.

11. The budget bill provision could be modified to treat all districts similarly with respect to filling in the loss of revenue limit authority in 2021-22 and 2022-23 without reducing a district's ongoing revenue limit authority beginning in 2023-24. Under this alternative, in addition to the bill provisions, the declining enrollment adjustment from 2020-21 would be made recurring, rather than nonrecurring, for the calculation of base revenues for the 2021-22 school year.

12. The alternatives at the end of this paper related to the revenue limit enrollment count indicate the estimated amount of revenue limit authority that would be generated under each. In the absence of additional state funding, school boards would have the authority to levy, in total, those amounts. The levy impact could be reduced, in whole or in part, by providing an increase in general school aid or school levy tax credit funding. The fiscal effect of any alternatives involving the levy credit would have to account for the fact that the credit is paid on a delayed basis in the state fiscal year following the property tax year to which the credit applies.

13. The fiscal effects shown for the revenue limit alternatives assume no other changes are made to current law revenue limits. If any changes are made to revenue limits, those fiscal effects may need to be adjusted accordingly.

14. The bill provision could also be applied to the calculation of per pupil aid. The Committee could chose to address both the revenue limit and per pupil aid calculations, only one of the calculations, or neither of them.

15. Per pupil aid is calculated using the same three-year enrollment average as under revenue limits. Because per pupil aid does not have any hold harmless provisions for declining enrollment (other than the smoothing effect of using a three-year average), it would be more straightforward to use the higher of 2019 or 2020 enrollments as the 2020 count used for the calculation of per pupil aid. If this change to enrollment were made for per pupil aid, estimated payments from the appropriation would increase by \$6.7 million in 2021-22 and \$6.6 million in 2022-23 compared to base, as adjusted by prior Committee action to reestimate current law payments from the appropriation.

16. The fiscal effect assumes the current law \$742 per pupil aid payment is maintained in each year of the 2021-23 biennium. If the Committee modifies the current law per pupil aid payment amount, the fiscal effect of the enrollment alternative would need to be adjusted as well. The per pupil aid payment amount is addressed in a separate issue paper.

ALTERNATIVES

A. Revenue Limits

1. Specify that for calculating a school district's revenue limit for the 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24 school years, the number of pupils enrolled in the district in the 2020-21 school year is the sum of the following: (a) the greater of the number of pupils enrolled in the district's September enrollment count in the 2019-20 school year or in the 2020-21 school year; and (b) the greater of 40% of the district's summer enrollment in the 2019-20 school year or in the 2020-21 school year. *[This would generate an estimated \$24.3 million in 2021-22 and \$36.7 million in 2022-23 in statewide revenue limit authority, the levy impact of which can be offset in whole or in part by increased funding for general school aids or the school levy tax credit.]*

2. In addition to Alternative A1, specify that the declining enrollment adjustment from 2020-21 would be recurring for the calculation of base revenues for the 2021-22 school year. *[This would generate an estimated \$135.2 million in 2021-22 and \$134.3 million in 2022-23 in statewide revenue limit authority, the levy impact of which can be offset in whole or in part by increased funding for general school aids or the school levy tax credit.]*

3. Take no action.

B. Per Pupil Aid

1. Provide \$6,675,100 in 2021-22 and \$6,640,200 in 2022-23 and specify that for the calculation of per pupil aid for the 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24 school years, the number of pupils enrolled in the district in the 2020-21 school year is the sum of the following: (a) the greater of the number of pupils enrolled in the district's September enrollment count in the 2019-20 school year or in the 2020-21 school year; and (b) the greater of 40% of the district's summer enrollment in the 2019-20 school year or in the 2020-21 school year.

ALT B1	Change to Base
GPR	\$13,315,300

2. Take no action.

Prepared by: Russ Kava
Attachment

ATTACHMENT

Effects of Declining Enrollment Under Current Law

This attachment presents information on a hypothetical district to illustrate the effect that a small and a large decline in enrollment has on a district's revenue limit under current law. The district started 2020-21 with a base revenue of \$24,000,000 and a prior year three-rolling average of 2,000 pupils, with that number of pupils enrolled in each of the three years used to calculate the average. The district's base revenue would then be \$12,000 per pupil.

Table 2 shows the revenue limit for that hypothetical district for the next three years under two scenarios: (a) if there was no change in enrollment beginning in 2020-21, meaning 2,000 pupils continued to be enrolled in the district each year from 2020-21 through 2023-24; and (b) if there was a 2.5% reduction in enrollment in 2020-21 only, meaning 1,950 pupils were enrolled in 2020-21, but 2,000 pupils were enrolled from 2021-22 through 2023-24. Only the per pupil adjustment and the two declining enrollment adjustments are considered in the examples.

TABLE 2

Current Law Revenue Limit for District With and Without 2.5% Enrollment Decline

	<u>No Enrollment Decline</u>	<u>2.5% Decline in 2020-21</u>	<u>Difference</u>
2020-21	\$24,358,000	\$24,358,000	\$0
2021-22	24,358,000	24,151,000	-207,000
2022-23	24,358,000	24,151,000	-207,000
2023-24	24,358,000	24,358,000	0

With the \$179 per pupil adjustment in 2020-21, if there were no change in enrollment, the district's revenue limit would have increased to \$24,358,000 in that year, and would stay at that amount in each year through 2023-24.

If there were a 2.5% enrollment decline in 2020-21, the district's initial revenue limit would have declined to \$24,151,000. The declining enrollment adjustment would be \$207,000, which is amount of revenue limit authority the 50 pupils would have generated. The district's initial revenue limit would have been higher than its prior year base revenue, so the district would not have been eligible for the prior year base revenue hold harmless adjustment. Thus, under this scenario, the district's revenue limit would have been \$24,358,000, which is the same as in the scenario in which there was no decline.

The declining enrollment adjustment is nonrecurring, meaning it would not carry over into 2021-22. Thus, the district's total revenue limit in both 2021-22 and 2022-23 would be \$24,151,000, its initial revenue limit in 2020-21 prior to the adjustment. In both of those years, the 2.5% enrollment decline in 2020-21 would have been included in both the prior year and current year enrollment

averages in the district's revenue limit count.

In 2023-24, the 2.5% enrollment decline in 2020-21 would still be part of the prior year enrollment average, but it would fall out of the current year enrollment average. Thus, from a revenue limit standpoint, the district would be an increasing enrollment district for the first time. As a result, the district would gain back the revenue limit authority it lost from the enrollment decline, with a revenue limit of \$24,358,000, which is equal to the amount it would have been in that year without the enrollment decline.

Table 3 shows the revenue limit for that hypothetical district for the next three years with one change to the scenario shown above. Instead of a 2.5% reduction, Table 3 shows the revenue limit comparison for a 10% reduction in enrollment in 2020-21 only, meaning 1,800 pupils were enrolled in 2020-21. As with Table 2, only the per pupil adjustment and the two declining enrollment adjustments are considered in the examples.

TABLE 3

Current Law Revenue Limit for District With and Without 10% Enrollment Decline

	<u>No Enrollment Decline</u>	<u>10% Decline in 2020-21</u>	<u>Difference</u>
2020-21	\$24,358,000	\$24,816,000	\$458,000
2021-22	24,358,000	23,542,000	-816,000
2022-23	24,358,000	23,542,000	-816,000
2023-24	24,358,000	24,358,000	0

As with the scenario shown in Table 2, with the \$179 per pupil adjustment in 2020-21, if there were no change in enrollment, the district's revenue limit would have increased to \$24,358,000 in that year, and would stay at that amount in each year through 2023-24.

If there were a 10% enrollment decline in 2020-21, the district's initial revenue limit would have declined to \$23,542,000. The declining enrollment adjustment would be \$816,000, which is amount of revenue limit authority the 200 pupils would have generated. The prior year base revenue hold harmless would have been \$458,000, which is the amount needed to get the district back to its base revenue of \$24,000,000. Thus, under this scenario, the district's revenue limit would have been \$24,816,000, an increase of \$458,000 (equal to the amount of the prior year base revenue hold harmless adjustment) compared to the scenario in which there was no decline.

Both of those adjustments are nonrecurring, meaning they would not carry over into 2021-22. Thus, the district's total revenue limit in both 2021-22 and 2022-23 would be \$23,542,000, its initial revenue limit in 2020-21 prior to the adjustments. In both of those years, the 10% enrollment decline in 2020-21 would have been included in both the prior year and current year enrollment averages in the district's revenue limit count.

In 2023-24, the 10% enrollment decline in 2020-21 would still be part of the prior year enrollment average, but it would fall out of the current year enrollment average. Thus, from a revenue limit standpoint, the district would be considered an increasing enrollment district. As a result, the district would gain back the revenue limit authority it lost from the enrollment decline, with a revenue limit of \$24,358,000, which is equal to the amount it would have been in that year without the enrollment decline.

Public Instruction -- General School Aids and Revenue Limits

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
5	Two-Thirds Funding of Partial School Revenues