



**FREE
TO
LEARN**

A Justice in Education Initiative

Education Savings Accounts: Empowering Kids and Saving Money in Connecticut

**By Dr. Lewis M. Andrews
with fiscal analysis by Dr. Martin F. Lueken**



It sounds almost too good to be true – there is a way both to improve opportunity for our state’s children and save money. Education Savings Accounts (ESAs) are an innovative way to increase options for parents and their children, while ensuring that each child in Connecticut has access to a school that will best fit his or her individual needs.

It is clear that we will have to do more with less for Connecticut’s schoolchildren in the coming years. How do we spend taxpayer dollars in a way that is responsible and still helps children achieve to the best of their abilities? ESAs provide an excellent vehicle to increase parent choice, open access and opportunity for more children, and still maintain funding for local schools.

In an effort to demonstrate how ESAs can improve Connecticut’s education landscape, Nonpartisan Action for Better Redding (NABR) and Yankee Institute have partnered to produce this new study, analyzing how Education Savings Accounts (ESAs) could benefit both municipalities and our state as a whole. Although ESAs are hardly a panacea for all of Connecticut’s problems, they do promise both to improve equity and save millions of dollars – and most importantly, offer the opportunity for children across our state to achieve their full potential.

David Bohn
Founder
Nonpartisan Action
for a Better Redding

Carol Platt Liebau
President
Yankee Institute

Introduction

Few states in America currently confront as many difficult challenges across so many policy fronts as Connecticut.

1. In September of 2016, Superior Court Judge Thomas Moukawsher issued his surprise opinion in the case of *CCJEF v. Rell*, an 11-year-old lawsuit that had sought increased subsidies for the state's worst performing schools. But rather than ruling that public-school funding is inadequate, the judge ordered the Connecticut legislature to completely revamp the state's K-12 system with a special emphasis on helping poor, minority, and learning-disabled children.
2. More recently, Connecticut's legislature found itself grappling with budget deficits made worse by an unexpected 12-14% drop in projected revenues and the nation's second-worst-funded teacher pension plan. With high earners and corporations fleeing ever-steeper taxes and a regulatory environment that discourages entrepreneurship, policy makers are struggling more than ever to manage state finances.
3. Adding to these two problems, many of the remedies proposed to correct them endanger the traditional independence of the state's 169 towns. Threats include Gov. Dannel Malloy's desire to bill municipalities for a third of the state's annual contribution to the teacher pension fund and the perennially-resurrected plan to consolidate local school districts into city-centered regions.

The good news is that a policy innovation known as Education Savings Accounts (ESAs) could help to alleviate all these problems.

By offering families who want more flexibility in educating their K-12 children the financial means that would allow it, the legislature could significantly improve the quality of public education; save hundreds of millions of dollars to meet other state and local fiscal needs; and accomplish all of it without threatening towns' control of their own school districts.

What are education savings accounts?

Education savings accounts are an effective way to expand educational options for all families, particularly those in need. For instance, they can help K-12 students who suffer from learning disabilities, have under-nurtured gifts and talents, or experience frequent bullying to reach their full potential.

For parents who voluntarily elect to custom tailor their child's education, a specified amount is annually deposited to an education savings account (ESA) at a state-selected agency. Families can then draw on this account for a variety of approved instructional expenses, including tuition and fees for independent school placements, textbooks, tutoring, online classes, transportation, and special services.

Under one model, providers chosen by the family may directly bill the agency holding the ESA funds, simplifying paperwork. And parents may carry forward unspent annual allotments to use in the more expensive high school years, or to offset later college tuition.

Currently, six states have legislated ESA programs, some targeted specifically toward special needs students, others with a broader focus. These states are Arizona, Florida, Mississippi, Nevada, North Carolina, and Tennessee.¹

To see how an ESA program would successfully address all three of Connecticut's most difficult policy challenges, let us briefly review them.

CHALLENGE #1:

Connecticut's Deficient K-12 Funding Mechanism

In 2005, the Connecticut Coalition for Justice in Education Funding (CCJEF), a consortium of groups including public sector unions and some cities, filed suit in Superior Court to challenge the constitutionality of the state's system for funding public education. It argued that many K-12 schools, especially in the larger cities, are insufficiently financed.

Eleven years later, in September of 2016, Superior Court Judge Thomas Moukawsher shocked both plaintiffs and policymakers by declining to rule on funding adequacy, but holding instead that the state did fall short of its obligation in the following areas: (1) intervening in struggling school districts when local government falters; (2) distributing education aid; (3) defining elementary and secondary education; (4) setting standards for hiring, firing, evaluating, and paying teachers; and (5) funding special education, identifying eligible students, and delivering services.²

Judge Moukawsher then required the state to submit a plan within 180 days that would remedy each of the identified deficiencies. On September

15, 2016, Connecticut's attorney general filed – and was granted – an appeal of Moukawsher's ruling at the Connecticut Supreme Court. This holding suggests that sometime late in 2017 or 2018, the legislature in Hartford could well be compelled to radically restructure Connecticut's entire system of public education.

CHALLENGE #2:

Connecticut's Fiscal Implosion

Amid growing concern over the shaky financial conditions of California, Illinois, and New Jersey, Connecticut is often overlooked. Its size and population are relatively small, and its proximity to New York and Boston makes its challenges easily dismissed. After all, with some of the nation's wealthiest communities – Darien, New Canaan, and Greenwich – how bad could things really be?

Very bad, according to a 2016 study for the Mercatus Center at George Mason University.³ It calculated the fiscal health of all fifty states according to their short- and long-term debts, unfunded pensions, and other key fiscal obligations. Connecticut came in the sickest of all.

In recent months, all three of Wall Street's big credit rating agencies have further downgraded the state's debt, with Fitch and Moody's ranking Connecticut's fiscal soundness as the third worst in the country.⁴ S&P was only a little more generous, naming the state fourth worst behind Kentucky.

The state's fiscal problems are especially aggravated by public pension plans which, in 2016, the American Legislative Exchange Council determined to be the most underfunded

¹ "School Choice in America," EdChoice, accessed September 7, 2017, <https://www.edchoice.org/school-choice/school-choice-in-america/>

² John Moran and Marybeth Sullivan, "CCJEF v. Rell Court Decision." *Connecticut Office of Legislative Research*, 2016. <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2016/rpt/pdf/2016-R-0306.pdf>

³ Eileen Norcross and Olivia Gonzalez, "Ranking the States by Fiscal Condition 2016 Edition." Mercatus Center, June 1, 2016. <https://www.mercatus.org/statefiscalrankings>

⁴ Hilary Russ, "With S&P downgrade, Connecticut Now Cut by All Three Rating Firms." Reuters, May 17, 2017. <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-connecticut-downgrade-idUSKCN18D2N6>

in America.⁵ The teacher’s retirement system alone is only 59 percent funded, with pension debt exceeding \$10.8 billion, or \$19,000 for each student in the state.⁶

The latest push for increasing local autonomy occurred in February of 2017, when Gov. Dannel Malloy (D) proposed billing the state’s towns for one-third the cost of teacher pensions, estimated to be \$407 million in the first fiscal year and then increase over the following two years to \$420 million. He also proposed giving the legislature more financial control over “distressed municipalities.”⁷

CHALLENGE #3:

Connecticut’s Loss of Local Control

These fiscal challenges are crowding out resources that could instead be directly targeted to student learning. Between 2000 and 2013, while per-pupil current education expenditures in CT increased by 31 percent, the state’s actuarially determined contributions per student increased by 145 percent.⁸ There is no indication that the growth of pension obligations will cease anytime soon. The state is tied to past commitments with high price tags.

Connecticut has a proud history of strong local government, so much so that it is one of the few

states with no county government. The map line separating, say, Tolland County from Windham County means little more than the line itself. In theory, the state’s 169 towns either run their own school districts or, in the case of very small communities, share facilities with a neighboring municipality.

Yet ever since the 1990 recession, which led to the adoption of a state income tax in 1991, each new fiscal problem has precipitated either greater state regulation of the towns or growing calls for regional government. Today Connecticut has an enormously constraining statute – the “minimum budget requirement” – that actually prohibits most school districts from reducing their spending even when the student census drops.⁹

An elegant policy solution

No one policy, by itself, could completely resolve three of Connecticut’s most difficult challenges, all of which have been building for years. But it would be equally remiss to ignore an empowering policy that could make a positive impact across multiple fronts. Consider the following:

HOW ESAs WOULD ADDRESS CCJEF V. RELL

Education savings accounts address each of the important points raised by Judge Moukawsher in his September 2016 decision:

First, by giving parents an alternative to keeping their child in the local public school, they offer a quick and efficient method for intervening when a district is unable to meet a student’s needs.

Second, ESAs represent a fundamental structural improvement to public education by giving the

⁵ Bob Williams, Jonathan Williams, Theodore Lafferty, and Sarah Curry, “Unaccountable and Unaffordable 2016: Unfunded Public Pension Liabilities Near \$5.6 Trillion.” American Legislative Exchange Council, October, 2016. <https://www.alec.org/app/uploads/2016/10/2016-10-13-Unaccountable-and-Unaffordable.pdf>

⁶ Doherty, K. M., Jacobs, S. and Lueken, M. F. (2017). “What teachers and taxpayers need to know about the teacher pension crisis,” National Council on Teacher Quality and Education Counsel, February 2017, http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Lifting_the_Pension_Fog

⁷ Marc E. Fitch, “Malloy’s Budget Takes a Beating Over Teacher Pensions, Hospitals and Deficits.” Yankee Institute for Public Policy, March 10, 2017. <http://www.yankeeinstitute.org/2017/03/malloys-budget-takes-a-beating-over-teacher-pensions-hospitals-and-deficits/>

⁸ McGee, J. (2016). “Feeling the Squeeze: Pension Costs Are Crowding Out Education Spending,” Manhattan Institute, October 2016. <https://www.manhattan-institute.org/sites/default/files/R-JM-1016.pdf>

⁹ Connecticut General Statute 10-262j (2015) <http://law.justia.com/codes/connecticut/2015/title-10/chapter-172/section-10-262j>

people who know students best – their parents – the control to shape their children’s education to meet each child’s unique needs. They can provide parents with an ongoing opportunity to individualize and fine-tune the education their children receive to ensure that their needs are met. The value of educational choice has been validated by a large body of research examining many student outcomes including tests of academic achievement, high school graduation rates, college acceptance and persistence, and the development of civic values.¹⁰

Third, ESAs can provide a sustained and equitable funding stream to underserved students and students with special needs. A program can differentiate ESA amounts based on student backgrounds. For example, economically disadvantaged students and students with special needs can receive ESAs worth more than ESAs for general education students.

HOW ESAs WOULD IMPROVE CONNECTICUT FINANCES

Education savings accounts are distinct from other forms of school choice -- like vouchers and tax-credit programs -- because they allow the widest possible range of choice. In contrast to vouchers and tax-credit scholarship programs, which provide financial assistance for school tuition only, ESAs allow parents to take advantage of an expanding range of instructional options, from one-on-one tutoring to online classes, in addition to (or instead of) private school tuition. If the cost of providing an ESA to a student is less than the taxpayer’s cost to educate the student in district schools, then students who switch from district schools will generate savings. Notably,

10 Forster, G. (2016). “A Win-Win solution: The Empirical Evidence on School Choice.” The Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice. <http://www.edchoice.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/A-Win-Win-Solution-The-Empirical-Evidence-on-School-Choice.pdf>

when students leave school districts for any reason, the district usually retains revenue from local property taxes and most federal revenue. As a result, per-pupil spending tends to increase as students leave, a common byproduct of school choice programs.

There have been 30 analyses that have attempted to estimate the fiscal effects of private school choice programs.¹¹ Twenty-seven found that the programs save money for taxpayers, and three found that the programs are revenue neutral. None have found that school choice programs have net costs for taxpayers.

A 2014 report by the Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice (now EdChoice) examined the ten largest school voucher programs in the U.S. that financially assist students to attend schools of their choice.¹² This analysis went beyond just comparing the face value of a private/parochial school scholarship to the per-pupil cost at neighboring public schools. It also considered the fact that students already attending independent institutions would be eligible for assistance and that many students with learning disabilities would have to receive enough to cover special services. Even accounting for these and other variables, the average annual per pupil savings from these programs turned out to be \$3,400.

A 2016 fiscal analysis by EdChoice examined ten tax-credit scholarship programs in seven states and estimated that these programs saved states and school districts between \$1.7 billion and

11 *Ibid.*

Trivitt, J. R. and DeAngelis, C. A. (2016). “The Fiscal Effect of Eliminating the Louisiana Scholarship Program on State Education Expenditures,” (April 19, 2016). EDRE Working Paper No. 2016-06. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2768956>. DeAngelis, C. A. and Trivitt, J. R. (2016). “Squeezing the Public School Districts: The Fiscal Effects of Eliminating the Louisiana Scholarship Program,” (August 11, 2016). EDRE Working Paper 2016-10. <http://www.uaedreform.org/downloads/2016/08/squeezing-the-public-school-districts-the-fiscal-effects-of-eliminating-the-louisiana-scholarship-program.pdf>

12 Jeff Spalding, “The School Voucher Audit.” Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice, September 30, 2014. <https://www.edchoice.org/research/the-school-voucher-audit/>

\$3.4 billion through 2013-14, or up to \$3,000 per scholarship student.¹³

Given the unusually high average per pupil cost of public education in Connecticut, \$16,249 according to the Connecticut School Finance Project's most recent calculations, the cumulative savings from ESAs can be very substantial.¹⁴ Table 1 below shows that having just two percent of the state's children receiving an ESA worth \$5,000 would yield an annual surplus of \$26 million for the state, or about \$2,500 in savings for each scholarship student. Districts would experience even larger savings, exceeding \$50 million, or about \$5,000 per scholarship student. Note that a district's fiscal effect per student will be the same regardless of the reason for leaving the district. The fiscal effect on the state will depend on several

factors, including the value of the ESA awarded and how many scholarships are awarded to students who would enroll in a private school even without financial assistance from the ESA program.

More details about the analytic methods are in the appendix, along with district-specific results (Table A.1).

If ten percent of Connecticut K-12 students were educated with ESAs, the savings to the state would be about \$130 million – equal to almost 10 percent of the state's required \$1.3 billion pension payment to the teacher's retirement system for FY 2018.¹⁵ School districts would experience an even larger fiscal benefit -- more than \$250 million in variable cost savings. Variable costs are costs that vary with enrollment. Examples include classroom supplies, textbooks, software licenses, and salaries and benefits for personnel.

13 Lueken, M. F. (2016). "The Tax-Credit Scholarship Audit: Do Publicly Funded Private School Choice Programs Save Money?" EdChoice. October 2016. <https://www.edchoice.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Tax-Credit-Scholarship-Audit-by-Martin-F.-Lueken-UPDATED.pdf>

14 "Spending Per Student." Connecticut School Finance Project. <http://ctschoolfinance.org/spending/per-student>

15 Connecticut Teachers' Retirement Board (2016). "Connecticut State Teachers' Retirement System Actuarial Valuation as of June 30, 2016." http://www.ct.gov/trb/lib/trb/formsandpubs/actuarial_valuation_rep_2016.pdf

Table 1: Overall fiscal impact on state and school districts

	Savings (cost) to districts		Savings (cost) to state		Savings (cost) combined	
	Total	Per ESA awarded	Total	Per ESA awarded	Total	Per ESA awarded
ESA=\$5,000						
2% students using ESAs	\$51,338,260	\$5,023	\$25,746,440	\$2,519	\$77,084,700	\$7,541
10% students using ESAs	\$256,691,300	\$5,023	\$128,732,200	\$2,519	\$385,423,500	\$7,541
ESA=\$10,000						
2% students using ESAs	\$51,338,260	\$5,023	(\$25,361,760)	(\$2,481)	\$25,976,500	\$2,541
10% students using ESAs	\$256,691,300	\$5,023	(\$126,808,800)	(\$2,481)	\$129,882,500	\$2,541

Data Source: Author's calculations; U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), "Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey Directory Data", 2014-15 v.1a; "School District Finance Survey (F-33)", 2013-14 (FY 2014) v.1a.

Notes: Parentheses denotes negative number. Variable costs were estimated from data reported by the CT SDE to the U.S. Dept. of Education. They include expenditures on instruction, student support services, and instructional staff support services and excludes all other costs including administration, capital and maintenance, debt service, food services, transportation, enterprise operations, and all other categorical expenditures; the analysis assumes all ESA students would be switchers under the program; awarding ESAs to students who would enroll in a private school without an ESA program in place will mitigate fiscal benefits accrued from students who switch from public school into the ESA program.

For an ESA worth \$10,000, the net fiscal effect for the state would be a cost saving worth between \$25 million and \$127 million (about \$2,500 per student).

These estimates are based on data that the Connecticut State Department of Education, (SDE) reports annually to the United States Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). These data allow us to estimate the potential fiscal effects on the state and local school districts. One limitation to using these data is that the fiscal impact of an ESA program on the state will depend on how the ESA amount is determined and interacts with the state’s school funding formulas. In addition, because there is a lag in data reporting (FY 2014 is the most recent year financial data are available), precision of any analysis may be somewhat lower than an analysis based on more recent data.

As such, we also estimate the combined fiscal effects of ESAs by using data from the SDE on the Net Expenditures Per Pupil (NCEP). Using these

data offer at least two advantages. First, they are more current than the NCES data. Second, these data are widely used by policymakers, analysts, and public officials in Connecticut and considered the state’s “official” numbers. On the other hand, these data don’t account for all funds that support K-12 education in Connecticut, whereas state education departments report everything to the U.S. Department of Education. Thus, estimates based on the SDE data may understate the fiscal effect.

To estimate variable cost savings, we used NCES data to estimate the percent of total costs that are variable costs and then applied these rates to each district’s NCEP. Table 2 reports the results.

An ESA worth \$10,000 would yield overall savings worth between \$5 million and \$25 million, assuming ESA take-up rates of between 2 percent and 10 percent. Assuming the same take-up rates, an ESA worth \$5,000 would generate a larger fiscal benefit overall, worth between about \$58 million and \$288 million.

Table 2: Overall net savings (cost) to state and districts combined

	Total combined savings (cost)	Combined savings (cost) per ESA awarded
ESA=\$5,000		
2% students using ESAs	\$57,562,211	\$5,466
10% students using ESAs	\$287,811,055	\$5,466
ESA=\$10,000		
2% students using ESAs	\$4,905,247	\$466
10% students using ESAs	\$24,526,235	\$466

Data Sources: Author’s calculations; U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), “Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey Directory Data”, 2014-15 v.1a; “School District Finance Survey (F-33)”, 2013-14 (FY 2014) v.1a.; Connecticut State Department of Education, Bureau of Grants Management, “2015-16 Net Current Expenditures (NCE) per Pupil (NCEP) and 2016-17 Special Education Excess Cost Grant, Basic Contributions for the May Payment,” January 2017. <http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/PDF/dgm/report1/basiccon.pdf> (accessed 7/18/2017).

Notes: Variable costs were estimated from data reported by the CT SDE to the U.S. Dept. of Education. They include expenditures on instruction, student support services, and instructional staff support services and excludes all other costs including administration, capital and maintenance, debt service, food services, transportation, enterprise operations, and all other categorical expenditures; the analysis assumes all ESA students would be switchers under the program; awarding ESAs to students who would enroll in a private school without an ESA program in place will mitigate fiscal benefits accrued from students who switch from public school into the ESA program

HOW ESAs WOULD PRESERVE TOWN AUTONOMY

Private school choice programs so far have been targeted to certain disadvantaged student populations and funded at levels significantly lower than public schools. Participation has depended on eligibility and funding. As promising as education savings accounts appear to be, the evidence from other states with narrow programs is that they are unlikely to be used by more than ten percent of the student population under similar models that target low-income students or students with special needs. This is because the expansion of educational options for families can motivate school districts to perform at their best, leaving ESAs for the use of students whose needs genuinely require a different academic setting. This also relieves districts of their obligation to educate students who leave. And because districts would receive some portion of funds for students they're no longer obligated to educate, the amount of resources per student remaining in district schools will increase.

The result is that town-based school districts could remain vital and intact. District-draining property tax increases and the proposals some have made to regionalize schools in the wake of *CCJEF v. Rell* would no longer be a threat to Connecticut's tradition of local independence.

Innovation

Education savings accounts can help address the Nutmeg State's troubled finances with a plan that improves its biggest and most costly service -- public education -- while preserving its unique and time-honored character. Horace Mann, inventor of the idea of publicly-financed education, was a Connecticut native. It is only fitting that this state benefit from the newest and most promising education funding innovation.

Methodology

Private school choice programs generate a variety of outcomes, including academic effects on participants and public schools, high school graduation rates, college attendance and persistence, civic values, crime, and fiscal effects. This report examines just one outcome, the fiscal effects on taxpayers, and ignores any potential benefits from the other outcomes just listed.

Whether a program saves money will be based on a straightforward fiscal alignment: if the cost of providing an ESA to a student is less than the taxpayer's cost to educate the student, then that student will generate savings. A student eligible for an ESA program who would have enrolled in a nonpublic school without financial assistance from the ESA program would generate a cost for taxpayers. Savings are therefore generated by students who would enroll in public schools without the existence of the school choice program.

The fiscal impact on the state will be largely driven by the state's funding formula. School choice policies usually tie awards to a state's portion of education funding. School districts typically keep revenue from local property taxes and some federal revenue. As awards are usually less than the state's total per-student cost to educate student in public schools, choice programs usually generate savings, and a byproduct of these programs is that the amount of resources for each student who remains in a district school increases.

A key factor for a program's net fiscal impact is the portion of program participants that are "switchers" vs. "non-switchers." "Switchers" are students who would enroll in a public school without financial assistance from a school choice program (financial assistance allows them to switch from a public school into a non-public school environment). "Non-switchers" are those who would enroll in

a non-public school environment even without financial assistance. Notably, data on these groups in current school choice programs are very limited and usually non-existent.

The fiscal impact on a school district will depend on that district's cost structure. In the short run, costs are separated among fixed costs, variable costs, and quasi-variable costs. In the long run, all costs are variable, meaning that, over time, districts can adjust their budgets proportionally to any change in enrollment. This is a fundamental economic and accounting principle.

This analysis estimated short-run variable costs using cautious methods by other economists. On a statewide per-pupil basis, short-run variable costs for public schools in Connecticut are \$12,541, which is 64 percent of total per-pupil costs. This estimate is slightly lower than what Scafidi (2012) estimated for Connecticut and within the range of estimates by Bifulco and Reback (2014).

We estimated average variable costs for each school district in Connecticut with financial data that the Connecticut State Department of Education (SDE) reports annually to the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The most recent year these data are available is for school year 2013-14. The analysis used the same accounting method as Spalding (2014) and Lueken (2016). We consider the following expenditure categories as variable in the short-run: instruction, instructional staff support services, and student support services. This approach is more cautious than Scafidi's method, which also includes enterprise operations and food service.

Another reason that estimates are cautious is because we consider administrative costs as fixed costs. Between FY 1992 and FY 2015, however, the number of administrators and other non-teaching

staff nearly doubled in Connecticut while student enrollment increased by just 13 percent (Scafidi, 2017). Even though costs for non-teaching personnel appear variable based on these data, we consider them fixed in the analysis.

The NCES data provide total state costs for each school district, as reported by the SDE. The appendix tables provide a range of fiscal effects estimates for an education savings account (ESA) program that provides an ESA for each student who participates. Different scenarios are based on a \$5,000 ESA and a \$10,000 ESA.

The fiscal impact on school districts is the difference between the state revenue reduction from students who leave to participate in the ESA program and the variable cost burden relief from being relieved of the responsibility of educating them.

The fiscal impact on the state is the difference between the cost to fund the ESA program and the reduction in funding the education for fewer students in public schools.

The analysis examines 166 regular school districts and excludes charter schools and non-regular school districts. There are 11 districts that would incur a net cost from students who transfer into the ESA program. Notably, this is due to the districts' cost structure. When students leave for any reason, whether to transfer to another district, a home school environment, or to move out of the state, the district will incur a net cost because the reduction in state aid outweighs its variable costs. For the remaining 155 districts examined, the estimated variable cost burden relief outweighs the loss of state aid revenue when students leave.

The tables present a range of estimates based on assumptions that number of students who would leave district schools via the ESA program equal 2 percent and 10 percent of a district's enrollment.

Caveats and considerations

If the ESA program allows eligibility for nonpublic school students, then some of the savings will be offset by any students from this group who would participate in the program (“non-switchers”).

Demand for the program will depend on the amount of financial assistance. The higher the ESA amount, the greater the demand for the program. Most private school choice programs that exist today are limited in nature. Participation rates in the initial year average about 1 percent of the eligible population, and about 2 percent in the second year. Nevada enacted the first universal ESA program (the legislature is still deliberating how to fund the program). So far about 7,700 applicants have been filed with the state’s treasurer’s office, or about

2 percent of eligible students. The ESA amount is about \$5,900 for students from low-income families and about \$5,200 for all other students. The program requires prior enrollment in a public school, and all students who are kindergarten age are eligible for the program.

Note that estimates do not account for the potential fiscal effects if students with disabilities use the program. In general, the cost to educate students with special needs is, on average, twice the cost to educate mainstream students.¹⁶ Costs increase with the severity of a child’s disability. If the ESA amount is set at the low-end amount considered in the analysis (\$5,000), then participation in the program by students with special needs will likely be very low.

¹⁶ A comprehensive study known as the Special Education Expenditure Project (SEEP) was conducted by the Center for Special Education Finance. The study was mandated in the 1997 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). For more information about the project, see “The Special Education Expenditure Project,” Center for Special Education Finance, <http://www.csef-air.org>.



Education Savings Accounts: Empowering Kids and Saving Money in Connecticut

Table A.1: Estimated combined fiscal effects of education savings account program on school districts and state general fund, Connecticut

Agency Name	Average Daily Membership, 2015-16	Net current expenditures per pupil (NCEP), 2015-16	Variable cost per pupil	Short-run net fiscal effect when student transfers from district for any reason	ESA = \$5,000		ESA = \$10,000	
					Overall net impact on state and district combined, 2% students using ESAs	Overall net impact on state and district combined, 10% students using ESAs	Overall net impact on state and district combined, 2% students using ESAs	Overall net impact on state and district combined, 10% students using ESAs
ANDOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT	502	\$16,040	\$10,695	\$5,345	\$57,211	\$286,054	\$6,985	\$34,924
ANSONIA SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,524	\$14,002	\$8,291	\$5,711	\$166,179	\$830,894	(\$86,267)	(\$431,336)
ASHFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	563	\$19,089	\$12,558	\$6,531	\$85,081	\$425,407	\$28,799	\$143,997
AVON SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,292	\$15,726	\$10,670	\$5,056	\$373,343	\$1,866,714	\$44,098	\$220,489
BARKHAMSTED SCHOOL DISTRICT	565	\$16,782	\$11,461	\$5,321	\$72,970	\$364,851	\$16,497	\$82,486
BERLIN SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,938	\$15,776	\$8,594	\$7,182	\$211,187	\$1,055,937	(\$82,656)	(\$413,278)
BETHANY SCHOOL DISTRICT	841	\$17,428	\$11,980	\$5,448	\$117,353	\$586,764	\$33,284	\$166,419
BETHEL SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,930	\$15,775	\$11,144	\$4,631	\$360,072	\$1,800,362	\$67,041	\$335,207
BLOOMFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,238	\$21,160	\$12,548	\$8,612	\$337,878	\$1,689,390	\$114,049	\$570,245
BOLTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	759	\$17,492	\$11,589	\$5,903	\$100,048	\$500,241	\$24,130	\$120,651
BOZRAH SCHOOL DISTRICT	308	\$17,519	\$9,211	\$8,308	\$25,917	\$129,585	(\$4,853)	(\$24,265)
BRANFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,122	\$17,233	\$11,597	\$5,636	\$411,858	\$2,059,289	\$99,706	\$498,529
BRIDGEPORT SCHOOL DISTRICT	20,948	\$14,343	\$8,737	\$5,606	\$1,565,757	\$7,828,787	(\$528,996)	(\$2,644,978)
BRISTOL SCHOOL DISTRICT	8,393	\$13,894	\$9,393	\$4,501	\$737,442	\$3,687,211	(\$101,836)	(\$509,179)
BROOKFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,731	\$14,125	\$10,023	\$4,102	\$274,394	\$1,371,970	\$1,258	\$6,290
BROOKLYN SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,225	\$14,483	\$7,442	\$7,041	\$59,845	\$299,226	(\$62,695)	(\$313,474)
CANAAN SCHOOL DISTRICT	111	\$28,947	\$19,799	\$9,148	\$32,987	\$164,935	\$21,842	\$109,210
CANTERBURY SCHOOL DISTRICT	649	\$17,525	\$8,525	\$9,000	\$45,721	\$228,603	(\$19,137)	(\$95,687)
CANTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,638	\$15,494	\$10,396	\$5,098	\$176,796	\$883,980	\$12,975	\$64,875
CHAPLIN SCHOOL DISTRICT	288	\$20,128	\$14,856	\$5,272	\$56,698	\$283,489	\$27,935	\$139,674
CHESHIRE SCHOOL DISTRICT	4,401	\$15,237	\$10,400	\$4,837	\$475,340	\$2,376,702	\$35,201	\$176,007
CHESTER SCHOOL DISTRICT	444	\$18,261	\$12,658	\$5,603	\$68,032	\$340,159	\$23,612	\$118,059
CLINTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,866	\$16,765	\$12,230	\$4,535	\$269,833	\$1,349,166	\$83,239	\$416,196
COLCHESTER SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,705	\$14,716	\$9,815	\$4,901	\$260,520	\$1,302,599	(\$10,009)	(\$50,046)
COLEBROOK SCHOOL DISTRICT	195	\$18,331	\$10,544	\$7,787	\$21,661	\$108,305	\$2,127	\$10,635
COLUMBIA SCHOOL DISTRICT	698	\$17,321	\$8,366	\$8,955	\$46,963	\$234,814	(\$22,801)	(\$114,006)
CORNWALL SCHOOL DISTRICT	128	\$30,193	\$20,373	\$9,820	\$39,481	\$197,405	\$26,640	\$133,200
COVENTRY SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,737	\$15,502	\$10,355	\$5,147	\$186,006	\$930,031	\$12,332	\$61,661
CROMWELL SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,104	\$13,928	\$9,533	\$4,395	\$190,788	\$953,941	(\$19,650)	(\$98,249)
DANBURY SCHOOL DISTRICT	10,871	\$12,794	\$9,048	\$3,746	\$880,062	\$4,400,311	(\$207,020)	(\$1,035,099)
DARIEN SCHOOL DISTRICT	4,859	\$19,318	\$13,601	\$5,717	\$835,847	\$4,179,237	\$349,953	\$1,749,767
DEEP RIVER SCHOOL DISTRICT	624	\$17,669	\$12,197	\$5,472	\$89,874	\$449,372	\$27,434	\$137,172
DERBY SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,547	\$15,352	\$9,839	\$5,513	\$149,734	\$748,672	(\$4,967)	(\$24,833)
EAST GRANBY SCHOOL DISTRICT	179	\$20,643	\$11,670	\$8,973	\$23,813	\$119,065	\$5,963	\$29,815
EAST HADDAM SCHOOL DISTRICT	907	\$18,921	\$12,763	\$6,158	\$140,783	\$703,913	\$50,103	\$250,513
EAST HAMPTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,108	\$17,891	\$11,250	\$6,641	\$138,492	\$692,461	\$27,707	\$138,536
EAST HARTFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,984	\$14,429	\$9,932	\$4,497	\$195,705	\$978,526	(\$2,697)	(\$13,484)
EAST HAVEN SCHOOL DISTRICT	8,092	\$13,437	\$8,997	\$4,440	\$646,943	\$3,234,713	(\$162,266)	(\$811,332)
EAST LYME SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,414	\$15,849	\$9,209	\$6,640	\$287,446	\$1,437,232	(\$53,992)	(\$269,958)
EAST WINDSOR SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,616	\$15,631	\$10,625	\$5,006	\$294,279	\$1,471,393	\$32,684	\$163,418
EASTFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,394	\$19,233	\$13,019	\$6,214	\$223,555	\$1,117,775	\$84,165	\$420,825

Table A.1: Estimated combined fiscal effects of education savings account program on school districts and state general fund, Connecticut

Agency Name	Average Daily Membership, 2015-16	Net current expenditures per pupil (NCEP), 2015-16	Variable cost per pupil	Short-run net fiscal effect when student transfers from district for any reason	ESA = \$5,000		ESA = \$10,000	
					Overall net impact on state and district combined, 2% students using ESAs	Overall net impact on state and district combined, 10% students using ESAs	Overall net impact on state and district combined, 2% students using ESAs	Overall net impact on state and district combined, 10% students using ESAs
EASTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,203	\$18,604	\$12,240	\$6,364	\$174,262	\$871,311	\$53,921	\$269,606
ELLINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,733	\$12,984	\$9,108	\$3,876	\$224,507	\$1,122,536	(\$48,764)	(\$243,819)
ENFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT	5,553	\$13,894	\$9,040	\$4,854	\$448,701	\$2,243,506	(\$106,577)	(\$532,884)
ESSEX SCHOOL DISTRICT	815	\$19,031	\$13,350	\$5,681	\$136,169	\$680,847	\$54,627	\$273,137
FAIRFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT	10,126	\$16,561	\$10,963	\$5,598	\$1,207,704	\$6,038,521	\$195,107	\$975,536
FARMINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	4,048	\$16,237	\$12,127	\$4,110	\$577,092	\$2,885,458	\$172,245	\$861,223
FRANKLIN SCHOOL DISTRICT	255	\$15,319	\$6,906	\$8,413	\$9,727	\$48,635	(\$15,787)	(\$78,935)
GLASTONBURY SCHOOL DISTRICT	6,213	\$15,729	\$10,250	\$5,479	\$652,317	\$3,261,586	\$31,066	\$155,331
GRANBY SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,921	\$14,547	\$9,538	\$5,009	\$174,325	\$871,623	(\$17,737)	(\$88,687)
GREENWICH SCHOOL DISTRICT	8,644	\$21,331	\$16,060	\$5,271	\$1,911,963	\$9,559,813	\$1,047,596	\$5,237,978
GRISWOLD SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,787	\$13,898	\$8,356	\$5,542	\$119,944	\$599,718	(\$58,758)	(\$293,792)
GROTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	4,904	\$15,528	\$10,373	\$5,155	\$526,950	\$2,634,750	\$36,576	\$182,880
GUILFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,451	\$16,845	\$10,215	\$6,630	\$359,973	\$1,799,866	\$14,851	\$74,256
HAMDEN SCHOOL DISTRICT	6,434	\$18,366	\$11,874	\$6,492	\$884,557	\$4,422,784	\$241,155	\$1,205,774
HAMPTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	175	\$21,919	\$14,807	\$7,112	\$34,282	\$171,412	\$16,804	\$84,022
HARTFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	21,524	\$19,313	\$10,621	\$8,692	\$2,419,748	\$12,098,741	\$267,353	\$1,336,766
HARTLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT	275	\$18,480	\$8,358	\$10,122	\$18,493	\$92,463	(\$9,042)	(\$45,212)
HEBRON SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,664	\$15,336	\$11,185	\$4,151	\$205,770	\$1,028,852	\$39,413	\$197,067
KENT SCHOOL DISTRICT	292	\$23,589	\$16,024	\$7,565	\$64,353	\$321,766	\$35,165	\$175,826
KILLINGLY SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,412	\$16,732	\$9,956	\$6,776	\$239,093	\$1,195,466	(\$2,142)	(\$10,709)
LEBANON SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,027	\$17,706	\$10,787	\$6,919	\$118,868	\$594,340	\$16,162	\$80,810
LEDYARD SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,366	\$15,146	\$9,973	\$5,173	\$235,312	\$1,176,559	(\$1,272)	(\$6,361)
LISBON SCHOOL DISTRICT	570	\$17,042	\$8,448	\$8,594	\$39,282	\$196,412	(\$17,680)	(\$88,398)
LITCHFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT	977	\$18,526	\$11,846	\$6,680	\$133,779	\$668,894	\$36,079	\$180,394
MADISON SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,029	\$16,955	\$11,307	\$5,649	\$382,092	\$1,910,460	\$79,157	\$395,785
MANCHESTER SCHOOL DISTRICT	7,280	\$16,251	\$10,535	\$5,716	\$805,860	\$4,029,299	\$77,894	\$389,469
MANSFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,863	\$17,513	\$12,140	\$5,373	\$265,992	\$1,329,960	\$79,722	\$398,610
MARLBOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,106	\$13,628	\$9,835	\$3,793	\$106,921	\$534,606	(\$3,658)	(\$18,289)
MERIDEN SCHOOL DISTRICT	8,812	\$13,955	\$6,753	\$7,202	\$308,918	\$1,544,590	(\$572,232)	(\$2,861,160)
MIDDLETOWN SCHOOL DISTRICT	5,019	\$16,446	\$10,158	\$6,288	\$517,753	\$2,588,765	\$15,893	\$79,465
MILFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	6,232	\$18,431	\$12,203	\$6,228	\$897,781	\$4,488,906	\$274,617	\$1,373,086
MONROE SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,249	\$16,371	\$11,343	\$5,028	\$412,224	\$2,061,119	\$87,276	\$436,379
MONTVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,389	\$15,320	\$10,424	\$4,896	\$259,190	\$1,295,949	\$20,272	\$101,359
NAUGATUCK SCHOOL DISTRICT	4,496	\$15,068	\$10,382	\$4,686	\$483,945	\$2,419,723	\$34,387	\$171,933
NEW BRITAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT	11,355	\$13,196	\$8,826	\$4,370	\$868,963	\$4,344,816	(\$266,575)	(\$1,332,874)
NEW CANAAN SCHOOL DISTRICT	4,263	\$19,576	\$13,171	\$6,406	\$696,545	\$3,482,725	\$270,289	\$1,351,445
NEW FAIRFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,426	\$15,085	\$10,640	\$4,445	\$273,630	\$1,368,148	\$31,063	\$155,313
NEW HARTFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,031	\$16,473	\$11,166	\$5,307	\$127,093	\$635,464	\$24,040	\$120,199
NEW HAVEN SCHOOL DISTRICT	19,067	\$18,248	\$11,075	\$7,173	\$2,316,715	\$11,583,576	\$410,032	\$2,050,161
NEW LONDON SCHOOL DISTRICT	4,238	\$16,294	\$10,466	\$5,828	\$463,338	\$2,316,691	\$39,499	\$197,496
NEW MILFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,605	\$16,730	\$8,210	\$8,520	\$231,445	\$1,157,226	(\$129,075)	(\$645,374)
NEWINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	4,153	\$14,045	\$9,121	\$4,924	\$342,340	\$1,711,700	(\$73,002)	(\$365,010)

Education Savings Accounts: Empowering Kids and Saving Money in Connecticut

Table A.1: Estimated combined fiscal effects of education savings account program on school districts and state general fund, Connecticut

Agency Name	Average Daily Membership, 2015-16	Net current expenditures per pupil (NCEP), 2015-16	Variable cost per pupil	Short-run net fiscal effect when student transfers from district for any reason	ESA = \$5,000		ESA = \$10,000	
					Overall net impact on state and district combined, 2% students using ESAs	Overall net impact on state and district combined, 10% students using ESAs	Overall net impact on state and district combined, 2% students using ESAs	Overall net impact on state and district combined, 10% students using ESAs
NEWTOWN SCHOOL DISTRICT	4,677	\$15,541	\$9,567	\$5,974	\$427,251	\$2,136,255	(\$40,485)	(\$202,425)
NORFOLK SCHOOL DISTRICT	205	\$20,763	\$11,859	\$8,904	\$28,177	\$140,887	\$7,636	\$38,182
NORTH BRANFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,959	\$15,076	\$9,354	\$5,722	\$170,529	\$852,643	(\$25,322)	(\$126,612)
NORTH CANAAN SCHOOL DISTRICT	390	\$22,236	\$15,802	\$6,434	\$84,166	\$420,831	\$45,206	\$226,031
NORTH HAVEN SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,246	\$15,345	\$9,605	\$5,740	\$298,916	\$1,494,580	(\$25,637)	(\$128,185)
NORTH STONINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	752	\$16,027	\$10,464	\$5,563	\$82,170	\$410,851	\$6,978	\$34,891
NORWALK SCHOOL DISTRICT	11,541	\$17,093	\$11,650	\$5,443	\$1,534,924	\$7,674,622	\$380,849	\$1,904,247
NORWICH SCHOOL DISTRICT	5,268	\$16,260	\$8,108	\$8,152	\$327,467	\$1,637,334	(\$199,311)	(\$996,556)
OLD SAYBROOK SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,338	\$19,018	\$12,448	\$6,570	\$199,340	\$996,698	\$65,516	\$327,578
ORANGE SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,304	\$17,266	\$12,098	\$5,168	\$326,999	\$1,634,997	\$96,649	\$483,247
OXFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,037	\$13,883	\$9,064	\$4,819	\$165,581	\$827,903	(\$38,132)	(\$190,662)
PLAINFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,294	\$14,415	\$9,123	\$5,292	\$189,136	\$945,680	(\$40,245)	(\$201,225)
PLAINVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,415	\$14,858	\$10,081	\$4,777	\$245,442	\$1,227,210	\$3,926	\$19,630
PLYMOUTH SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,678	\$14,370	\$9,036	\$5,334	\$135,468	\$677,340	(\$32,369)	(\$161,845)
POMFRET SCHOOL DISTRICT	602	\$16,902	\$8,185	\$8,717	\$38,379	\$191,894	(\$21,868)	(\$109,341)
PORTLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,401	\$14,539	\$9,320	\$5,219	\$120,993	\$604,964	(\$19,058)	(\$95,291)
PRESTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	648	\$16,613	\$7,626	\$8,987	\$34,035	\$170,173	(\$30,774)	(\$153,872)
PUTNAM SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,166	\$16,911	\$10,635	\$6,276	\$131,387	\$656,935	\$14,798	\$73,990
REDDING SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,488	\$21,233	\$15,408	\$5,825	\$309,754	\$1,548,771	\$160,949	\$804,746
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 01	5,015	\$17,013	\$11,827	\$5,186	\$684,738	\$3,423,689	\$183,261	\$916,304
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 04	2,762	\$14,522	\$10,292	\$4,230	\$292,376	\$1,461,881	\$16,144	\$80,721
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 05	630	\$17,215	\$5,288	\$11,927	\$3,633	\$18,163	(\$59,412)	(\$297,062)
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 06	342	\$23,568	\$16,500	\$7,068	\$78,627	\$393,136	\$44,440	\$222,201
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 07	209	\$22,749	\$14,720	\$8,029	\$40,647	\$203,234	\$19,738	\$98,689
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 08	2,323	\$14,385	\$8,811	\$5,574	\$177,092	\$885,458	(\$55,257)	(\$276,287)
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 09	230	\$28,608	\$18,392	\$10,216	\$61,712	\$308,560	\$38,672	\$193,360
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 10	5,179	\$13,401	\$8,869	\$4,532	\$400,695	\$2,003,476	(\$117,175)	(\$585,874)
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 11	502	\$17,224	\$9,464	\$7,760	\$44,837	\$224,184	(\$5,381)	(\$26,906)
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 12	4,253	\$16,036	\$11,441	\$4,595	\$547,924	\$2,739,622	\$122,577	\$612,887
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 13	1,441	\$15,122	\$10,560	\$4,562	\$160,265	\$801,326	\$16,151	\$80,756
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 14	6,648	\$13,811	\$7,835	\$5,976	\$376,894	\$1,884,470	(\$287,910)	(\$1,439,550)
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 15	4,321	\$16,835	\$11,421	\$5,414	\$554,882	\$2,774,411	\$122,794	\$613,971
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 16	462	\$13,555	\$7,641	\$5,914	\$24,399	\$121,993	(\$21,790)	(\$108,952)
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 17	1,596	\$17,213	\$11,166	\$6,047	\$196,870	\$984,349	\$37,221	\$186,104
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 18	15,642	\$18,063	\$12,183	\$5,880	\$2,247,105	\$11,235,525	\$682,883	\$3,414,415
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 19	582	\$13,691	\$6,764	\$6,927	\$20,524	\$102,618	(\$37,651)	(\$188,257)
RIDGEFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,250	\$16,128	\$10,339	\$5,789	\$240,290	\$1,201,451	\$15,246	\$76,231
ROCKY HILL SCHOOL DISTRICT	7,246	\$14,631	\$9,859	\$4,772	\$704,129	\$3,520,643	(\$20,426)	(\$102,132)
SALEM SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,261	\$15,698	\$10,503	\$5,195	\$248,841	\$1,244,206	\$22,729	\$113,646
SALISBURY SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,014	\$14,958	\$8,276	\$6,682	\$66,421	\$332,105	(\$34,958)	(\$174,790)
SCOTLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,043	\$16,657	\$9,834	\$6,823	\$100,847	\$504,233	(\$3,453)	(\$17,267)
SEYMOUR SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,710	\$14,495	\$9,337	\$5,158	\$235,126	\$1,175,630	(\$35,918)	(\$179,590)

Table A.1: Estimated combined fiscal effects of education savings account program on school districts and state general fund, Connecticut

Agency Name	Average Daily Membership, 2015-16	Net current expenditures per pupil (NCEP), 2015-16	Variable cost per pupil	Short-run net fiscal effect when student transfers from district for any reason	ESA = \$5,000		ESA = \$10,000	
					Overall net impact on state and district combined, 2% students using ESAs	Overall net impact on state and district combined, 10% students using ESAs	Overall net impact on state and district combined, 2% students using ESAs	Overall net impact on state and district combined, 10% students using ESAs
SHARON SCHOOL DISTRICT	4,466	\$16,361	\$10,588	\$5,773	\$499,071	\$2,495,354	\$52,508	\$262,539
SHELTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	6,616	\$15,417	\$10,504	\$4,913	\$728,297	\$3,641,486	\$66,733	\$333,666
SHERMAN SCHOOL DISTRICT	113	\$17,216	\$7,571	\$9,645	\$5,810	\$29,052	(\$5,490)	(\$27,448)
SIMSBURY SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,512	\$15,544	\$10,551	\$4,993	\$389,936	\$1,949,682	\$38,692	\$193,462
SOMERS SCHOOL DISTRICT	388	\$19,440	\$10,365	\$9,075	\$41,678	\$208,391	\$2,837	\$14,186
SOUTH WINDSOR SCHOOL DISTRICT	6,135	\$16,831	\$10,043	\$6,788	\$618,750	\$3,093,751	\$5,249	\$26,246
SOUTHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	18,383	\$15,219	\$10,269	\$4,950	\$1,937,293	\$9,686,465	\$99,010	\$495,050
SPRAGUE SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,904	\$15,860	\$9,325	\$6,535	\$251,138	\$1,255,691	(\$39,216)	(\$196,079)
STAFFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,830	\$14,250	\$8,536	\$5,714	\$200,171	\$1,000,856	(\$82,855)	(\$414,274)
STAMFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	783	\$22,590	\$14,899	\$7,691	\$155,022	\$775,110	\$76,724	\$383,620
STERLING SCHOOL DISTRICT	10,132	\$15,022	\$10,133	\$4,889	\$1,040,252	\$5,201,260	\$27,005	\$135,025
STONINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	7,017	\$13,825	\$8,273	\$5,552	\$459,343	\$2,296,715	(\$242,400)	(\$1,212,000)
STRATFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,383	\$20,759	\$13,683	\$7,076	\$413,870	\$2,069,348	\$175,543	\$877,713
SUFFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT	5,717	\$19,800	\$13,709	\$6,091	\$995,828	\$4,979,142	\$424,120	\$2,120,602
THOMASTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,971	\$15,097	\$10,290	\$4,807	\$420,132	\$2,100,658	\$23,027	\$115,133
THOMPSON SCHOOL DISTRICT	673	\$18,017	\$12,556	\$5,461	\$101,693	\$508,463	\$34,400	\$171,998
TOLLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT	4,155	\$19,337	\$13,786	\$5,551	\$730,144	\$3,650,718	\$314,614	\$1,573,068
TORRINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,186	\$18,343	\$7,660	\$10,683	\$63,068	\$315,342	(\$55,483)	(\$277,413)
TRUMBULL SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,207	\$18,977	\$11,320	\$7,657	\$405,352	\$2,026,759	\$84,642	\$423,209
UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,937	\$17,286	\$11,226	\$6,060	\$490,237	\$2,451,187	\$96,565	\$482,827
VERNON SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,703	\$19,013	\$12,232	\$6,781	\$246,353	\$1,231,763	\$76,025	\$380,123
VOLUNTOWN SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,547	\$13,377	\$8,907	\$4,470	\$198,997	\$994,984	(\$55,665)	(\$278,326)
WALLINGFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,488	\$17,736	\$11,851	\$5,885	\$203,833	\$1,019,166	\$55,061	\$275,306
WATERBURY SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,265	\$13,677	\$6,720	\$6,957	\$43,510	\$217,549	(\$82,943)	(\$414,716)
WATERFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	420	\$25,143	\$15,837	\$9,306	\$91,032	\$455,160	\$49,032	\$245,160
WATERTOWN SCHOOL DISTRICT	953	\$17,481	\$10,451	\$7,030	\$103,899	\$519,494	\$8,599	\$42,994
WEST HARTFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,284	\$17,440	\$10,303	\$7,137	\$242,274	\$1,211,372	\$13,836	\$69,182
WEST HAVEN SCHOOL DISTRICT	829	\$19,685	\$13,217	\$6,468	\$136,231	\$681,154	\$53,339	\$266,694
WESTBROOK SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,021	\$16,971	\$10,159	\$6,812	\$105,300	\$526,500	\$3,236	\$16,180
WESTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,703	\$14,601	\$9,327	\$5,274	\$147,363	\$736,817	(\$22,937)	(\$114,683)
WESTPORT SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,051	\$19,754	\$12,365	\$7,389	\$154,767	\$773,833	\$49,693	\$248,463
WETHERSFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,464	\$14,440	\$9,675	\$4,765	\$230,400	\$1,151,999	(\$15,992)	(\$79,961)
WILLINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	286	\$21,716	\$10,937	\$10,779	\$33,969	\$169,843	\$5,362	\$26,808
WILTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	677	\$29,202	\$18,466	\$10,736	\$182,360	\$911,802	\$114,648	\$573,242
WINCHESTER SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,771	\$19,463	\$12,949	\$6,514	\$281,595	\$1,407,973	\$104,460	\$522,298
WINDHAM SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,501	\$19,603	\$12,650	\$6,953	\$229,698	\$1,148,491	\$79,574	\$397,871
WINDSOR LOCKS SCHOOL DISTRICT	3,804	\$16,619	\$11,298	\$5,321	\$479,140	\$2,395,698	\$98,731	\$493,653
WINDSOR SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,291	\$15,391	\$8,853	\$6,538	\$176,547	\$882,735	(\$52,542)	(\$262,710)
WOLCOTT SCHOOL DISTRICT	2,165	\$17,165	\$10,480	\$6,685	\$237,254	\$1,186,271	\$20,797	\$103,986
WOODBRIIDGE SCHOOL DISTRICT	1,374	\$19,619	\$12,040	\$7,579	\$193,457	\$967,286	\$56,051	\$280,256
WOODSTOCK SCHOOL DISTRICT	974	\$18,028	\$11,486	\$6,542	\$126,348	\$631,738	\$28,948	\$144,738

Notes: Parentheses denotes negative number.



About the Authors

Dr. Martin F. Lueken is the Director of Fiscal Policy and Analysis at EdChoice.

Dr. Lewis M. Andrews is president of the Children's Educational Opportunity Foundation of Connecticut and a contributor to *The Federalist*, *Real Clear Policy*, and *The Wall Street Journal*.

