

Background

Providing a safe and healthy learning environment is pivotal to ensuring students can achieve in the classroom and beyond. Research has repeatedly shown a safe learning environment can help improve student learning outcomes. Students' overall health and ability to perform academically can be negatively impacted by environmental exposure to mold, poorly ventilated air, uncomfortable temperatures, and inadequate lighting or noise in school buildings.¹ Research has also shown that socioeconomically disadvantaged students are less likely to attend school in a building that is in "good" or "excellent" condition.²

The COVID-19 pandemic illustrated how vital a safe physical learning space is for students. Districts utilized more than \$6.7 billion (15.4 percent) of the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund to improve physical health and safety in schools in fiscal year 2022.³ Districts in Connecticut are estimated to have spent over \$200 million to improve school safety, some of which went toward heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC); outdoor classrooms; facility repairs; and improvements to help reduce the spread of COVID-19.⁴

This historical infusion of federal aid allowed districts to improve student safety, demonstrating the importance of investing in physical learning spaces. While historic, this investment will need to be continued long after the sunset of ESSER aid to ensure continued access to healthy, safe, and effective learning spaces.

Investing in capital improvements for school districts results in more than just improved facilities for students. Research has shown school facility investments result in both improved student outcomes and increased home values.^{5,6} Additionally, the impact of investments is most significant in communities with higher levels of student need and student diversity.⁷

In Connecticut, eligible public school operators undertaking major infrastructure and new construction projects are reimbursed through the state's school construction grant program. However, this program does not equitably support all public school operators or aid schools in minor capital repairs.

To provide better support to school districts, Connecticut should:

1. Expand school construction grant program eligibility to serve all school types;
2. Revamp the school construction grant reimbursement rates to be more equitable for students with additional learning needs; and
3. Create a grant program that can allocate funding to municipalities to make minor improvements to school facilities.

This document seeks to answer high-level questions about how the State of Connecticut currently aids in school construction, how school construction grant reimbursement can

be improved, and how the State can better support schools in maintaining facilities through minor capital improvement grants.

School Construction Grant Program Eligibility

Recommendation: Expand the eligibility of the current school construction grant program to all types of public school districts to benefit all Connecticut students.

Connecticut's school construction grant program reimburses most public school operators, with exceptions for charter school operators, under specific legislative guidelines. Charter school operators are the only public school type ineligible for reimbursement through this program. Instead, they primarily receive funds through the Charter School Facilities grant.

To ensure equity for all students, regardless of where they attend public school, the school construction grant program should be expanded to include support for charter schools. Similar to how support is calculated for Regional Educational Services Centers (RESCs) and regional school districts, charter schools should qualify for the same reimbursement rates as the communities in which they are located.

Do all public school districts receive funding through the school construction grant program?

Typically, the school construction grant program only allocates funds to certain public school operator types. There have been several instances where charter schools, which are not currently eligible to apply for the school construction grant program, have been awarded aid through the school construction grant program.⁸ This only happens when the legislature permits it by adopting special "notwithstanding" language and modifying specific projects, making these projects eligible for reimbursement.⁹

How do districts that are not eligible for the school construction grant program receive facilities funding from the State for their schools?

Currently, charter schools are the only public school type ineligible for support through the school construction grant program. The legislature has occasionally allowed charter schools to receive facilities funding through the school construction grant, but they primarily receive aid through the Charter School Facilities Grant.

Under Charter School Facilities Grant, the General Assembly authorizes bonds to support capital improvements at charter schools to be administered by the State Department of Education.

Unlike funds provided under the school construction grant program, a charter school must wait for action by the State Bond Commission, chaired by the governor, to approve the release of funds.^{10,A}

How can eligibility for the school construction grant program be improved?

The school construction grant program should be expanded to include charter schools to ensure all students have safe, modern, and appropriate school facilities. The standard reimbursement rate for charter schools should be based on the rate provided to the host community in which they are located.^B This ensures all school construction projects move forward equitably once they receive legislative approval.

School Construction Grant Reimbursement Rates

Recommendation: Connecticut should increase its investment for all districts serving higher-needs students by revising the current reimbursement calculation for the school construction grant program.

Students in Connecticut would benefit from a school construction grant program that is more equitable and accurately accounts for district needs. Currently, the school construction grant program's reimbursement rates are divided into three main categories: standard, bonus, and reduced. Within these categories, eligible schools may receive reimbursement rates between 10 and 85 percent. Schools can also receive bonuses ranging from five to 10 percent without exceeding 95 percent.

The school construction grant program provides eligible school districts with additional support. However, the current reimbursement percentages do not fully represent district need or capacity to fund construction projects. The State should add bonus rates that accurately capture student and district need to improve the relationship between support and municipal need.

How is the state funding percentage determined?¹¹

To calculate standard reimbursement rates for local public school districts, the state ranks municipalities based on the average Adjusted Equalized Grand List per Capita (AEGLC) for two, three, and four years prior. Reimbursement rates are then assigned on a continuous scale, with the lowest wealth community receiving the highest rate and each municipality after receiving a slightly lower rate than the municipality prior. There are two ranges of standard reimbursements for any projects approved on or after July 1, 2024, which are outlined in Table 1.¹²

^A For more detailed information, please see:

Callahan, J. (2024). *Charter Schools and the School Construction Program (2024-R-0046)*. Hartford, CT: Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Legislative Research. Retrieved from <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2024/rpt/pdf/2024-R-0046.pdf>.

^B To see how this change would potentially impact charter schools, please see Appendix A.

Table 1: Reimbursement Rates for Projects Approved on or After July 1, 2024^C

Project Type	Reimbursement Rate Range
New construction or building replacement ^D	10% - 80%
Renovations, extensions, code violations, roof replacements	20% - 80%

Districts may receive bonus reimbursement rates on top of their standard rate for certain eligible projects. These rates range between five and 10 additional percentage points on top of the standard rate. For qualified school-related areas where learning may not typically take place — such as outdoor athletic facilities, auditorium seating, and spectator seating in a gymnasium — the reduced reimbursement rate is 50 percent of the district's regular reimbursement rate for construction, extensions, or major alterations.^E

Is the current reimbursement rate calculation equitable and accurately representing district need?

The current method of calculating reimbursement rates does not fully represent districts' needs or provide equitable support. Currently, reimbursement rates are based entirely on municipal wealth and are provided on a continuous scale based on wealth ranking. This method does not consider the impact of student need on the ability to fund projects. Districts with higher levels of student need experience higher costs associated with providing increased levels of student support. This results in reduced resources available for school construction projects.

How can the school construction grant program reimbursement rates be improved?

To be more in line with peer states, and provide more equitable support, Connecticut should adopt reimbursement bonus rates that would provide additional state support to districts with higher rates of student poverty, students with disabilities, and multilingual learners. Currently, Massachusetts offers a similar bonus for students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunch.¹³

^C Reimbursement rates for RESCs, regional school districts, and endowed academies are calculated by taking a weighted average of the rankings of participating communities. Districts receive the reimbursement rate provided to the local public school district with the next closest ranking. Regional school districts receive up to an additional 10 percentage points on their rate, and endowed academies receive up to an additional five percentage points, with their standard rate not to exceed 85 percent.

^D For projects applied for prior to July 1, 2024, new construction reimbursement rates range between 10 and 70 percent.

^E For more detailed information, please visit:

Sullivan, M. (2023). *School Construction Reimbursement Grants (2023-R-0250)*. Hartford, CT: Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Legislative Research. Retrieved from <https://cga.ct.gov/2023/rpt/pdf/2023-R-0250.pdf>.

Under this proposal, districts would receive bonus points based on the percentage of students identified in each need category and the quartile the district ranks in for each category compared to the state as a whole. Table 2 below outlines proposed reimbursement rates by quartile, with Quartile 1 representing districts with the lowest percentages of student need and Quartile 4 representing those with the highest percentages.^F

Table 2: Proposed Bonus Rates

Student Need Category	Quartile 1	Quartile 2	Quartile 3	Quartile 4
Free or Reduced-Price Lunch	1 percentage point	2 percentage points	3 percentage points	4 percentage points
Multilingual Learners	1 percentage point	2 percentage points	3 percentage points	4 percentage points
Students with Disabilities	1 percentage point	2 percentage points	3 percentage points	4 percentage points

District Repair & Improvement Program (DRIP)

Recommendation: *Connecticut should implement a minor capital improvement program for school buildings to ensure districts have the ability to maintain and improve school facilities over time without educational disruption and the requirement to enter the existing school construction grant program.*

Connecticut students would benefit from safe schools maintained over time, not only when major renovations or a new school building are needed. While Connecticut has a program in place to reimburse districts for school construction, there is no program in place for minor capital repairs to school facilities. This means schools must have a significant need for major construction, repair, or replacement to be eligible for any assistance from the State. This can result in deferred building maintenance or reduced resources for student instruction or support.

Creating a system that mirrors the existing Local Capital Improvement Program (LoCIP), which provides municipalities funds to support minor capital improvements — such as roads, bridges, and public building construction activities — would help prevent school districts from having to decide between facilities maintenance and student support.¹⁴ A program modeled after LoCIP for schools would allow districts to maintain their facilities, ensuring students learn in a safe environment.

^F For how these changes would impact district reimbursement rates, please see Appendix B.

Does the State of Connecticut provide annual funding to assist with minor capital improvement projects for public schools?

No, at this time, state funding is not dedicated to assisting with minor capital improvements in public schools.

Connecticut currently utilizes a school construction grant to reimburse schools for major construction or renovations. Under the school construction grant program, each eligible public school operator type receives aid at varying timeframes and reimbursement percentage amounts. However, these programs are limited to large renovation or construction projects and do not provide assistance for smaller scale capital projects.

Considering the State does not provide financial support for minor capital improvement projects, the cost of such projects is entirely borne by local taxpayers. As a result, critical minor capital improvement projects located in districts without the ability to sustain increases in local property taxes to support such projects, will be left unaddressed. As a result, the learning environment and educational experience of students will be impacted.

What is the Local Capital Improvement Program (LoCIP)?^{15,G}

LoCIP provides municipalities with funds through a statutorily defined formula for local capital improvement projects, including road, bridge, and public building construction activities. Funding may be used for projects approved by the municipality's legislative body and included in the most recent five-year capital improvement plan, or approved through an emergency authorization request. LoCIP-eligible projects are defined through state law and regulation and, notably, they do not usually include costs for school-related projects.¹⁶

How are grants under LoCIP determined?¹⁷

Grants are allocated by a statutorily defined formula based on road miles, population density, Adjusted Equalized Net Grand List per Capita (AENGLC), and population. Unconsolidated cities and boroughs receive a percentage of their associated municipality's allocation based on the share of total taxes levied.¹⁸ Table 3 on the following page outlines the current LoCIP grant formula.

^G More information about LoCIP is available at: State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. (2024). *Local Capital Improvement Program (LoCIP) Grants Fiscal Year 2024 and Forward*. Hartford, CT: Author. Retrieved from <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/opm/igpp/grants/locip/guidelines/locip-grant-guidelines-and-instructions-2024.pdf>.

Table 3: LoCIP Entitlement Calculation

Component	Weight	Calculation
Road Miles	30%	Municipal road miles divided by total state road miles.
Population Density	25%	Town density multiplied by town population divided by the sum of all town density calculations.
Municipal Wealth	25%	Town population multiplied by the inverse of town AENGLC divided by the sum of all town wealth calculations.
Population	20%	Municipal population divided by total state population.

Does the State provide annual funding for LoCIP?

Grant amounts vary annually based on appropriations approved by the State Bond Commission. Allocations average approximately \$30 million per year.

How can the State mirror LoCIP for school districts?

The State can create a separate program to provide annual grants to school districts to help fund minor capital projects that are necessary but not large enough to qualify for other construction aid. Connecticut would not be the first state to create such a model for public schools — South Carolina currently utilizes a similar program to aid public schools.^{19,H}

Modeled after the existing LoCIP grant for municipalities, the new District Repair & Improvement Program (DRIP) would provide grants to districts based on a formula that considers student enrollment, density of student need, and district wealth to allot approximately \$30 million annually.

^H South Carolina has a facilities assistance program that provides districts with grants annually to pay for construction, improvement, enlargement, or renovation of public school facilities. Through this program, grants are calculated based on a statutory formula, and districts are able to retain funds for up to 72 months.

The proposed formula allocates 45 percent of the grant based on statewide total student enrollment, 30 percent based on three student need categories, and 25 percent based on district wealth. Table 4 below outlines each grant component and how it is calculated.

Table 4: Proposed DRIP Grant Components

Component	Weight	Calculation
District Enrollment	45%	District enrollment divided by total public school enrollment statewide.
Percentage of Students Qualifying for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL)	10%	Percent of district students qualifying for FRPL divided by the sum of all district FRPL percentages.
Percentage of Students Identified as Multilingual Learners (MLL)	10%	Percent of district students identified as MLLs divided by the sum of all district MLL percentages.
Percentage of Students Identified as Students with Disabilities (SWD)	10%	Percent of district students identified as SWDs divided by the sum of all district SWD percentages.
Municipal Wealth	25%	Inverse of district AENGLC multiplied by district enrollment divided by the sum of all district products resulting from their inverse AENGLC multiplied by enrollment.

Similar to LoCIP, allowable DRIP expenditures would be statutorily defined, and districts would not lose funds if they were not spent by the end of the fiscal year in which they were awarded.^{1,2} This would enable districts to better plan for long term facilities maintenance, save for unexpected repairs, and ensure students have safe, modern school buildings.

¹ For estimated grant amounts under this proposal, please see Appendix C.

² The ideal formula would also consider the condition of school buildings within a district. However, publicly available data does not currently allow for this proposed component. Additionally, while the number of school buildings in a district was considered in the formula, similar to the use of road miles in the LoCIP formula, there is concern this could incentivize districts to keep buildings open beyond their necessary life.

How would DRIP impact students?

Connecticut's students deserve to attend school in safe, secure, and well-equipped buildings that meet the needs of 21st-century learning. Without dedicated funding for smaller capital projects that do not qualify for funding under the school construction grant program, districts are forced to fund these facility projects out of their operating budgets. This results in delayed maintenance and reduced funding available for instruction-based expenditures to serve students in the classroom; leading to an inequitable learning experience for students across different school districts depending on district wealth.

Research has shown investments in facilities to improve HVAC, safety and health, building infrastructure, and classroom spaces result in improved student outcomes, particularly in districts with lower municipal wealth and higher student diversity.²⁰ By creating a dedicated funding stream for these smaller capital projects, the State will ensure all students have high-quality schools, help improve student outcomes, and save money in the long run by preventing major renovation or replacement projects.

Appendices

Appendix A: Proposed Charter School Rates

The table below displays proposed reimbursement rates for charter schools based on the most recent rates provided to host districts for renovation projects. Proposed rates are subject to change on a yearly basis due to similar fluctuations in host district rates.

Charter School	Proposed Rate
Achievement First Bridgeport Academy	78.60%
Achievement First Hartford Academy	79.60%
Amistad Academy	77.90%
Booker T. Washington Academy	77.90%
Brass City Charter School	78.90%
Capital Preparatory Harbor School	78.60%
Common Ground High School	77.90%
Elm City College Preparatory School	77.90%
Elm City Montessori School	77.90%
Explorations	72.90%
Great Oaks Charter School	78.60%
Highville Charter School	77.90%
Integrated Day Charter School	77.50%
Interdistrict School for Arts and Comm	78.20%
Jumoke Academy	79.60%
New Beginnings Family Academy	78.60%
Odyssey Community School	67.90%
Park City Prep Charter School	78.60%
Side By Side Charter School	60.00%
Stamford Charter School for Excellence	60.00%
The Bridge Academy	78.60%

Appendix B: School Construction Grant Program Reimbursement Rates

The table below displays: 1) the current law reimbursements to districts under the school construction grant program for projects that qualify for the renovation project rates; 2) the increase districts could receive with a more equitable reimbursement rate; and 3) the percentage change from the old rates to the new ones.

District	Current Law	Proposed Rate with Bonuses	Proposed Percentage Point Change
Achievement First Bridgeport Academy	0.0%	87.6%	9.0%
Achievement First Hartford Academy	0.0%	87.6%	8.0%
Amistad Academy	0.0%	86.9%	9.0%
Andover School District	60.4%	64.4%	4.0%
Ansonia School District	77.1%	88.1%	11.0%
ACES	65.0%	75.0%	10.0%
Ashford School District	67.5%	72.5%	5.0%
Avon School District	27.9%	31.9%	4.0%
Barkhamsted School District	51.4%	58.4%	7.0%
Berlin School District	40.4%	47.4%	7.0%
Bethany School District	37.1%	44.1%	7.0%
Bethel School District	47.9%	55.9%	8.0%
Bloomfield School District	49.6%	60.6%	11.0%
Bolton School District	52.5%	56.5%	4.0%
Booker T. Washington Academy	0.0%	85.9%	8.0%
Bozrah School District	60.7%	67.7%	7.0%
Branford School District	34.6%	42.6%	8.0%
Brass City Charter School	0.0%	88.9%	10.0%
Bridgeport School District	78.6%	90.6%	12.0%
Bristol School District	72.1%	83.1%	11.0%
Brookfield School District	33.9%	40.9%	7.0%
Brooklyn School District	68.9%	77.9%	9.0%
Canaan School District	30.0%	36.0%	6.0%
Canterbury School District	65.7%	70.7%	5.0%
Canton School District	41.8%	46.8%	5.0%
Capital Preparatory Harbor School	0.0%	87.6%	9.0%
CREC	59.3%	71.3%	12.0%
Chaplin School District	64.3%	71.3%	7.0%
Cheshire School District	50.0%	54.0%	4.0%
Chester School District	48.9%	52.9%	4.0%
Clinton School District	42.9%	51.9%	9.0%
Colchester School District	61.1%	68.1%	7.0%
Colebrook School District	42.5%	50.5%	8.0%
Columbia School District	48.6%	52.6%	4.0%
Common Ground High School	0.0%	88.9%	11.0%
C.E.S.	40.0%	50.0%	10.0%

District	Current Law	Proposed Rate with Bonuses	Proposed Percentage Point Change
Cornwall School District	23.6%	28.6%	5.0%
Coventry School District	59.6%	64.6%	5.0%
Cromwell School District	44.6%	50.6%	6.0%
Danbury School District	63.9%	71.9%	8.0%
Darien School District	20.7%	27.7%	7.0%
Deep River School District	42.1%	50.1%	8.0%
Derby School District	75.0%	86.0%	11.0%
East Granby School District	46.4%	50.4%	4.0%
East Haddam School District	52.1%	56.1%	4.0%
East Hampton School District	57.1%	63.1%	6.0%
East Hartford School District	76.4%	88.4%	12.0%
East Haven School District	71.4%	82.4%	11.0%
East Lyme School District	40.7%	48.7%	8.0%
East Windsor School District	63.2%	74.2%	11.0%
EASTCONN	65.7%	74.7%	9.0%
Eastford School District	58.6%	63.6%	5.0%
Easton School District	26.8%	31.8%	5.0%
EdAdvance	52.1%	61.1%	9.0%
Ellington School District	53.6%	60.6%	7.0%
Elm City College Preparatory School	0.0%	86.9%	9.0%
Elm City Montessori School	0.0%	83.9%	6.0%
Enfield School District	71.8%	81.8%	10.0%
Essex School District	28.9%	37.9%	9.0%
Explorations	0.0%	81.9%	9.0%
Fairfield School District	26.1%	33.1%	7.0%
Farmington School District	30.7%	35.7%	5.0%
Franklin School District	43.2%	47.2%	4.0%
Glastonbury School District	32.9%	37.9%	5.0%
Granby School District	45.7%	49.7%	4.0%
Great Oaks Charter School	0.0%	88.6%	10.0%
Greenwich School District	20.0%	26.0%	6.0%
Griswold School District	73.2%	83.2%	10.0%
Groton School District	57.5%	67.5%	10.0%
Guilford School District	30.4%	35.4%	5.0%
Hamden School District	69.6%	80.6%	11.0%
Hampton School District	62.9%	70.9%	8.0%
Hartford School District	79.6%	91.6%	12.0%
Hartland School District	51.8%	57.8%	6.0%
Hebron School District	55.4%	58.4%	3.0%
Highville Charter School	0.0%	83.9%	6.0%
Integrated Day Charter School	0.0%	84.5%	7.0%
Interdistrict School for Arts and Comm	0.0%	89.2%	11.0%

District	Current Law	Proposed Rate with Bonuses	Proposed Percentage Point Change
Jumoke Academy	0.0%	86.6%	7.0%
Kent School District	28.2%	34.2%	6.0%
Killingly School District	70.4%	79.4%	9.0%
LEARN	50.7%	61.7%	11.0%
Lebanon School District	57.9%	63.9%	6.0%
Ledyard School District	61.8%	68.8%	7.0%
Lisbon School District	56.4%	65.4%	9.0%
Madison School District	29.3%	34.3%	5.0%
Manchester School District	67.9%	78.9%	11.0%
Mansfield School District	76.1%	82.1%	6.0%
Marlborough School District	46.1%	50.1%	4.0%
Meriden School District	75.7%	87.7%	12.0%
Middletown School District	66.1%	75.1%	9.0%
Milford School District	36.8%	43.8%	7.0%
Monroe School District	37.9%	42.9%	5.0%
Montville School District	72.5%	82.5%	10.0%
Naugatuck School District	74.6%	86.6%	12.0%
New Beginnings Family Academy	0.0%	87.6%	9.0%
New Britain School District	79.3%	91.3%	12.0%
New Canaan School District	20.4%	23.4%	3.0%
New Fairfield School District	35.4%	42.4%	7.0%
New Hartford School District	50.4%	57.4%	7.0%
New Haven School District	77.9%	87.9%	10.0%
New London School District	78.2%	90.2%	12.0%
New Milford School District	48.2%	57.2%	9.0%
Newington School District	59.3%	68.3%	9.0%
Newtown School District	35.0%	40.0%	5.0%
Norfolk School District	31.4%	38.4%	7.0%
North Branford School District	53.2%	59.2%	6.0%
North Canaan School District	63.6%	71.6%	8.0%
North Haven School District	37.5%	43.5%	6.0%
North Stonington School District	56.1%	60.1%	4.0%
Norwalk School District	60.0%	70.0%	10.0%
Norwich Free Academy	76.1%	85.1%	9.0%
Norwich School District	77.5%	89.5%	12.0%
Odyssey Community School	0.0%	75.9%	8.0%
Old Saybrook School District	27.1%	35.1%	8.0%
Orange School District	31.1%	36.1%	5.0%
Oxford School District	41.4%	46.4%	5.0%
Park City Prep Charter School	0.0%	87.6%	9.0%
Plainfield School District	73.9%	83.9%	10.0%
Plainville School District	65.0%	74.0%	9.0%

District	Current Law	Proposed Rate with Bonuses	Proposed Percentage Point Change
Plymouth School District	68.6%	78.6%	10.0%
Pomfret School District	55.7%	61.7%	6.0%
Portland School District	51.1%	60.1%	9.0%
Preston School District	58.9%	64.9%	6.0%
Putnam School District	70.0%	81.0%	11.0%
Redding School District	26.4%	31.4%	5.0%
Regional School District 1	43.6%	50.6%	7.0%
Regional School District 4	48.6%	55.6%	7.0%
Regional School District 5	42.9%	46.9%	4.0%
Regional School District 7	57.5%	64.5%	7.0%
Regional School District 8	63.2%	67.2%	4.0%
Regional School District 9	36.8%	40.8%	4.0%
Regional School District 10	55.0%	61.0%	6.0%
Regional School District 11	75.4%	83.4%	8.0%
Regional School District 12	32.5%	36.5%	4.0%
Regional School District 13	53.2%	60.2%	7.0%
Regional School District 14	50.7%	58.7%	8.0%
Regional School District 15	48.9%	54.9%	6.0%
Regional School District 16	70.0%	76.0%	6.0%
Regional School District 17	50.4%	55.4%	5.0%
Regional School District 18	35.7%	39.7%	4.0%
Regional School District 19	81.8%	88.8%	7.0%
Regional School District 20	<i>District is new and data is not available to calculate a proposed rate.</i>		
Ridgefield School District	24.3%	30.3%	6.0%
Rocky Hill School District	45.4%	53.4%	8.0%
Salem School District	47.1%	53.1%	6.0%
Salisbury School District	22.5%	27.5%	5.0%
Scotland School District	69.3%	77.3%	8.0%
Seymour School District	66.8%	74.8%	8.0%
Sharon School District	23.2%	30.2%	7.0%
Shelton School District	38.6%	47.6%	9.0%
Sherman School District	25.4%	28.4%	3.0%
Side By Side Charter School	0.0%	69.0%	9.0%
Simsbury School District	36.1%	42.1%	6.0%
Somers School District	60.0%	64.0%	4.0%
South Windsor School District	44.3%	50.3%	6.0%
Southington School District	54.6%	61.6%	7.0%
Sprague School District	73.6%	83.6%	10.0%
Stafford School District	70.7%	78.7%	8.0%
Stamford Charter School for Excellence	0.0%	69.0%	9.0%
Stamford School District	60.0%	69.0%	9.0%

District	Current Law	Proposed Rate with Bonuses	Proposed Percentage Point Change
Sterling School District	74.3%	81.3%	7.0%
Stonington School District	32.1%	37.1%	5.0%
Stratford School District	62.1%	72.1%	10.0%
Suffield School District	50.7%	56.7%	6.0%
The Bridge Academy	0.0%	88.6%	10.0%
The Gilbert School	74.6%	82.6%	8.0%
The Woodstock Academy	66.1%	69.1%	3.0%
Thomaston School District	68.2%	75.2%	7.0%
Thompson School District	67.1%	76.1%	9.0%
Tolland School District	50.0%	55.0%	5.0%
Torrington School District	75.4%	86.4%	11.0%
Trumbull School District	34.3%	40.3%	6.0%
Union School District	43.9%	48.9%	5.0%
Vernon School District	71.1%	81.1%	10.0%
Voluntown School District	65.4%	71.4%	6.0%
Wallingford School District	54.3%	64.3%	10.0%
Waterbury School District	78.9%	90.9%	12.0%
Waterford School District	31.8%	39.8%	8.0%
Watertown School District	61.4%	69.4%	8.0%
West Hartford School District	38.2%	47.2%	9.0%
West Haven School District	76.8%	88.8%	12.0%
Westbrook School District	27.5%	36.5%	9.0%
Weston School District	22.1%	27.1%	5.0%
Westport School District	21.1%	24.1%	3.0%
Wethersfield School District	56.8%	64.8%	8.0%
Willington School District	64.6%	72.6%	8.0%
Wilton School District	22.9%	28.9%	6.0%
Winchester School District	72.9%	82.9%	10.0%
Windham School District	80.0%	92.0%	12.0%
Windsor Locks School District	53.9%	62.9%	9.0%
Windsor School District	52.9%	62.9%	10.0%
Wolcott School District	66.4%	74.4%	8.0%
Woodbridge School District	32.5%	37.5%	5.0%
Woodstock School District	55.0%	61.0%	6.0%

Appendix C: Estimated DRIP Grants by District

The table below displays an example of the potential funding by district that could be allocated through DRIP. Columns 2 – 6 represent the grant amounts attributable to each formula component outlined above.

District	Enrollment Portion of Proposed Grant	FRPL Portion of Proposed Grant	MLL Portion of Proposed Grant	SWD Portion of Proposed Grant	District Wealth Portion of Proposed Grant	Total Proposed Grant
Achievement First Bridgeport Academy	\$29,695	\$29,217	\$41,634	\$10,860	\$30,984	\$142,390
Achievement First Hartford Academy	\$25,990	\$32,438	\$15,659	\$9,853	\$58,322	\$142,263
Amistad Academy	\$30,425	\$32,071	\$35,839	\$8,261	\$28,530	\$135,126
Andover School District	\$5,544	\$11,666	\$-	\$8,982	\$2,332	\$28,524
Ansonia School District	\$64,825	\$25,701	\$21,440	\$15,509	\$44,777	\$172,253
ACES	\$46,489	\$18,902	\$15,031	\$39,477	\$21,759	\$141,659
Ashford School District	\$9,601	\$13,590	\$-	\$13,584	\$4,855	\$41,629
Avon School District	\$84,514	\$5,238	\$8,813	\$10,830	\$12,187	\$121,582
Barkhamsted School District	\$5,896	\$8,701	\$-	\$24,533	\$1,735	\$40,864
Berlin School District	\$71,965	\$10,770	\$12,164	\$14,102	\$19,848	\$128,848
Bethany School District	\$12,035	\$6,116	\$19,142	\$16,747	\$2,636	\$56,675
Bethel School District	\$87,867	\$13,199	\$20,362	\$14,383	\$25,480	\$161,292
Bloomfield School District	\$53,602	\$23,114	\$14,326	\$17,739	\$17,650	\$126,430
Bolton School District	\$18,904	\$10,087	\$2,437	\$10,913	\$6,655	\$48,996
Booker T. Washington Academy	\$10,385	\$36,725	\$14,049	\$7,535	\$9,738	\$78,431
Bozrah School District	\$4,598	\$15,524	\$-	\$14,957	\$1,456	\$36,534
Branford School District	\$70,991	\$15,190	\$21,092	\$12,225	\$13,617	\$133,116

District	Enrollment Portion of Proposed Grant	FRPL Portion of Proposed Grant	MLL Portion of Proposed Grant	SWD Portion of Proposed Grant	District Wealth Portion of Proposed Grant	Total Proposed Grant
Brass City Charter School	\$9,817	\$27,717	\$11,733	\$15,217	\$12,387	\$76,870
Bridgeport School District	\$529,826	\$35,543	\$80,249	\$17,843	\$552,838	\$1,216,300
Bristol School District	\$210,243	\$23,513	\$19,796	\$19,331	\$121,658	\$394,541
Brookfield School District	\$69,829	\$10,157	\$12,646	\$12,904	\$15,537	\$121,072
Brooklyn School District	\$23,934	\$15,189	\$4,492	\$18,328	\$13,067	\$75,010
Canaan School District	\$2,164	\$14,948	\$-	\$13,151	\$373	\$30,635
Canterbury School District	\$13,144	\$13,066	\$-	\$14,252	\$5,783	\$46,244
Canton School District	\$40,729	\$7,530	\$2,640	\$15,777	\$10,752	\$77,427
Capital Preparatory Harbor School	\$21,122	\$28,405	\$29,448	\$7,858	\$22,039	\$108,872
CREC	\$241,127	\$23,808	\$26,941	\$18,704	\$93,527	\$404,108
Chaplin School District	\$4,165	\$15,798	\$-	\$17,080	\$1,937	\$38,979
Cheshire School District	\$114,235	\$6,941	\$8,537	\$12,765	\$29,205	\$171,683
Chester School District	\$5,598	\$11,155	\$-	\$11,013	\$1,622	\$29,388
Clinton School District	\$39,404	\$16,160	\$28,647	\$14,202	\$10,041	\$108,453
Colchester School District	\$58,443	\$10,685	\$5,387	\$16,432	\$25,310	\$116,257
Colebrook School District	\$1,785	\$14,370	\$-	\$23,912	\$404	\$40,471
Columbia School District	\$12,900	\$9,768	\$-	\$11,029	\$4,866	\$38,563
Common Ground High School	\$6,031	\$26,997	\$17,826	\$26,342	\$5,655	\$82,851
C.E.S.	\$21,852	\$20,260	\$13,002	\$37,111	\$5,587	\$97,811
Cornwall School District	\$2,623	\$13,603	\$-	\$9,943	\$256	\$26,425
Coventry School District	\$44,163	\$10,908	\$3,130	\$12,939	\$16,493	\$87,634

District	Enrollment Portion of Proposed Grant	FRPL Portion of Proposed Grant	MLL Portion of Proposed Grant	SWD Portion of Proposed Grant	District Wealth Portion of Proposed Grant	Total Proposed Grant
Cromwell School District	\$51,492	\$12,214	\$16,553	\$11,927	\$14,637	\$106,823
Danbury School District	\$327,940	\$21,593	\$102,185	\$12,747	\$138,652	\$603,117
Darien School District	\$126,595	\$581	\$4,307	\$18,093	\$3,680	\$153,256
Deep River School District	\$5,274	\$13,956	\$13,105	\$14,838	\$1,468	\$48,640
Derby School District	\$36,375	\$23,514	\$12,455	\$20,208	\$22,838	\$115,391
East Granby School District	\$22,312	\$6,298	\$5,507	\$12,328	\$6,728	\$53,172
East Haddam School District	\$27,017	\$11,268	\$3,411	\$12,638	\$7,364	\$61,699
East Hampton School District	\$47,111	\$8,474	\$1,630	\$15,653	\$17,055	\$89,923
East Hartford School District	\$173,354	\$25,107	\$52,048	\$20,640	\$173,706	\$444,856
East Haven School District	\$78,510	\$21,690	\$34,722	\$16,400	\$49,093	\$200,414
East Lyme School District	\$67,773	\$10,103	\$11,897	\$17,248	\$18,561	\$125,582
East Windsor School District	\$28,451	\$23,322	\$19,703	\$17,919	\$10,390	\$99,784
EASTCONN	\$9,952	\$21,514	\$6,173	\$33,355	\$5,032	\$76,026
Eastford School District	\$4,706	\$11,138	\$-	\$13,605	\$1,756	\$31,205
Easton School District	\$24,448	\$3,147	\$8,480	\$14,839	\$3,400	\$54,315
EdAdvance	\$7,789	\$28,492	\$-	\$33,183	\$2,474	\$71,938
Ellington School District	\$68,882	\$8,742	\$5,462	\$14,940	\$23,402	\$121,428
Elm City College Preparatory School	\$20,959	\$32,136	\$28,577	\$8,711	\$19,654	\$110,037
Elm City Montessori School	\$8,249	\$15,818	\$7,447	\$11,211	\$7,735	\$50,460
Enfield School District	\$130,516	\$20,233	\$10,531	\$17,804	\$77,998	\$257,082
Essex School District	\$8,113	\$8,797	\$9,465	\$23,380	\$1,199	\$50,954

District	Enrollment Portion of Proposed Grant	FRPL Portion of Proposed Grant	MLL Portion of Proposed Grant	SWD Portion of Proposed Grant	District Wealth Portion of Proposed Grant	Total Proposed Grant
Explorations	\$2,380	\$26,240	\$-	\$28,893	\$1,290	\$58,803
Fairfield School District	\$253,000	\$6,938	\$10,471	\$16,626	\$31,076	\$318,111
Farmington School District	\$113,424	\$7,983	\$16,113	\$11,728	\$22,106	\$171,354
Franklin School District	\$5,193	\$10,738	\$-	\$8,676	\$1,571	\$26,178
Glastonbury School District	\$153,450	\$5,429	\$10,108	\$11,126	\$30,380	\$210,493
Granby School District	\$47,111	\$7,243	\$1,793	\$13,489	\$13,528	\$83,165
Great Oaks Charter School	\$17,822	\$21,274	\$44,809	\$16,098	\$18,596	\$118,601
Greenwich School District	\$232,284	\$8,046	\$15,636	\$13,464	\$7,592	\$277,023
Griswold School District	\$48,004	\$22,092	\$4,959	\$17,881	\$34,497	\$127,433
Groton School District	\$110,855	\$22,322	\$12,676	\$17,240	\$42,998	\$206,091
Guilford School District	\$84,649	\$5,480	\$4,536	\$13,278	\$13,875	\$121,818
Hamden School District	\$147,527	\$19,903	\$20,456	\$17,503	\$81,785	\$287,174
Hampton School District	\$2,001	\$16,717	\$-	\$23,696	\$639	\$43,053
Hartford School District	\$455,400	\$32,377	\$70,668	\$18,031	\$1,021,945	\$1,598,421
Hartland School District	\$2,948	\$5,674	\$-	\$17,696	\$790	\$27,109
Hebron School District	\$18,958	\$7,529	\$-	\$12,382	\$6,375	\$45,245
Highville Charter School	\$13,630	\$29,781	\$-	\$7,654	\$12,781	\$63,846
Integrated Day Charter School	\$9,790	\$18,225	\$19,609	\$9,688	\$9,081	\$66,393
Interdistrict School for Arts and Comm	\$7,545	\$29,263	\$48,849	\$15,713	\$6,716	\$108,087
Jumoke Academy	\$16,740	\$39,836	\$5,046	\$6,799	\$37,567	\$105,987
Kent School District	\$5,165	\$10,147	\$-	\$15,607	\$602	\$31,521

District	Enrollment Portion of Proposed Grant	FRPL Portion of Proposed Grant	MLL Portion of Proposed Grant	SWD Portion of Proposed Grant	District Wealth Portion of Proposed Grant	Total Proposed Grant
Killingly School District	\$65,528	\$20,507	\$6,328	\$18,274	\$38,359	\$148,996
LEARN	\$37,754	\$24,073	\$22,780	\$16,141	\$11,682	\$112,430
Lebanon School District	\$26,639	\$12,726	\$2,883	\$17,001	\$8,463	\$67,712
Ledyard School District	\$66,123	\$13,306	\$4,994	\$16,962	\$33,120	\$134,505
Lisbon School District	\$11,954	\$15,486	\$4,497	\$18,646	\$6,080	\$56,662
Madison School District	\$65,826	\$1,542	\$3,733	\$14,048	\$7,731	\$92,880
Manchester School District	\$166,783	\$24,385	\$26,336	\$16,790	\$105,732	\$340,025
Mansfield School District	\$27,098	\$13,045	\$19,269	\$12,250	\$48,335	\$119,998
Marlborough School District	\$12,035	\$7,784	\$3,828	\$11,625	\$3,467	\$38,738
Meriden School District	\$237,693	\$32,245	\$53,078	\$18,774	\$222,950	\$564,741
Middletown School District	\$118,400	\$19,920	\$15,371	\$15,380	\$60,205	\$229,277
Milford School District	\$144,065	\$12,385	\$8,262	\$15,768	\$35,856	\$216,336
Monroe School District	\$93,844	\$5,336	\$7,364	\$14,048	\$21,407	\$141,999
Montville School District	\$54,657	\$18,689	\$13,909	\$18,655	\$34,496	\$140,406
Naugatuck School District	\$114,425	\$24,374	\$34,024	\$17,490	\$75,207	\$265,519
New Beginnings Family Academy	\$10,601	\$33,556	\$32,595	\$8,052	\$11,062	\$95,866
New Britain School District	\$267,739	\$31,105	\$54,206	\$20,732	\$374,194	\$747,977
New Canaan School District	\$111,125	\$-	\$2,211	\$11,928	\$3,817	\$129,081
New Fairfield School District	\$58,254	\$6,662	\$10,677	\$15,997	\$13,417	\$105,006
New Hartford School District	\$12,305	\$8,156	\$4,368	\$18,113	\$3,158	\$46,101
New Haven School District	\$512,923	\$31,499	\$63,656	\$13,947	\$480,973	\$1,102,998

District	Enrollment Portion of Proposed Grant	FRPL Portion of Proposed Grant	MLL Portion of Proposed Grant	SWD Portion of Proposed Grant	District Wealth Portion of Proposed Grant	Total Proposed Grant
New London School District	\$79,024	\$35,223	\$90,175	\$18,213	\$70,340	\$292,976
New Milford School District	\$97,414	\$13,646	\$23,806	\$14,848	\$32,626	\$182,339
Newington School District	\$105,284	\$15,242	\$26,986	\$13,963	\$40,651	\$202,126
Newtown School District	\$106,852	\$5,469	\$4,743	\$13,758	\$22,164	\$152,986
Norfolk School District	\$1,514	\$12,518	\$-	\$21,919	\$248	\$36,199
North Branford School District	\$41,675	\$10,141	\$4,238	\$13,883	\$12,895	\$82,832
North Canaan School District	\$6,599	\$17,575	\$15,128	\$12,936	\$2,998	\$55,236
North Haven School District	\$87,516	\$10,385	\$16,847	\$12,734	\$19,880	\$147,361
North Stonington School District	\$20,040	\$8,458	\$-	\$12,542	\$5,875	\$46,916
Norwalk School District	\$311,551	\$21,136	\$61,224	\$14,910	\$61,815	\$470,636
Norwich Free Academy	\$56,009	\$23,076	\$37,840	\$10,499	\$34,225	\$161,649
Norwich School District	\$90,220	\$31,062	\$65,281	\$19,449	\$83,686	\$289,698
Odyssey Community School	\$10,006	\$18,611	\$36,068	\$8,057	\$6,344	\$79,086
Old Saybrook School District	\$27,856	\$9,888	\$21,226	\$13,705	\$3,063	\$75,739
Orange School District	\$34,644	\$5,601	\$15,294	\$9,856	\$6,192	\$71,587
Oxford School District	\$45,083	\$6,728	\$4,769	\$13,990	\$10,627	\$81,197
Park City Prep Charter School	\$10,899	\$31,207	\$43,682	\$8,267	\$11,372	\$105,428
Plainfield School District	\$51,249	\$24,262	\$3,746	\$17,582	\$34,283	\$131,121
Plainville School District	\$60,985	\$17,426	\$21,657	\$13,181	\$32,812	\$146,061
Plymouth School District	\$34,590	\$20,408	\$9,324	\$21,662	\$24,153	\$110,137

District	Enrollment Portion of Proposed Grant	FRPL Portion of Proposed Grant	MLL Portion of Proposed Grant	SWD Portion of Proposed Grant	District Wealth Portion of Proposed Grant	Total Proposed Grant
Pomfret School District	\$9,438	\$8,625	\$4,881	\$13,566	\$3,380	\$39,891
Portland School District	\$33,616	\$12,341	\$10,051	\$18,904	\$15,127	\$90,038
Preston School District	\$12,170	\$13,287	\$6,941	\$13,444	\$4,700	\$50,542
Putnam School District	\$31,939	\$23,847	\$13,704	\$17,595	\$20,132	\$107,217
Redding School District	\$23,393	\$3,623	\$4,924	\$14,393	\$2,499	\$48,832
Regional School District 1	\$8,492	\$12,607	\$6,330	\$15,637	\$1,681	\$44,746
Regional School District 4	\$19,553	\$12,091	\$7,069	\$17,099	\$4,736	\$60,548
Regional School District 5	\$57,118	\$5,896	\$4,033	\$11,582	\$10,331	\$88,960
Regional School District 7	\$22,474	\$11,413	\$-	\$20,468	\$5,933	\$60,288
Regional School District 8	\$31,426	\$6,849	\$-	\$13,959	\$10,348	\$62,581
Regional School District 9	\$20,256	\$5,285	\$-	\$13,813	\$2,379	\$41,733
Regional School District 10	\$57,361	\$6,221	\$4,819	\$14,964	\$16,523	\$99,888
Regional School District 11	\$5,733	\$17,700	\$-	\$19,851	\$2,411	\$45,696
Regional School District 12	\$21,554	\$7,916	\$3,563	\$12,871	\$1,503	\$47,407
Regional School District 13	\$36,510	\$6,811	\$4,417	\$19,873	\$10,576	\$78,187
Regional School District 14	\$42,757	\$9,415	\$4,310	\$17,469	\$9,513	\$83,465
Regional School District 15	\$92,897	\$6,518	\$6,117	\$16,208	\$21,897	\$143,638
Regional School District 16	\$52,223	\$10,720	\$6,617	\$14,075	\$19,698	\$103,333
Regional School District 17	\$47,869	\$5,894	\$2,406	\$15,207	\$11,914	\$83,290
Regional School District 18	\$34,941	\$5,234	\$7,692	\$12,554	\$3,629	\$64,051
Regional School District 19	\$29,316	\$11,868	\$5,239	\$15,853	\$27,193	\$89,469

District	Enrollment Portion of Proposed Grant	FRPL Portion of Proposed Grant	MLL Portion of Proposed Grant	SWD Portion of Proposed Grant	District Wealth Portion of Proposed Grant	Total Proposed Grant
Regional School District 20	<i>District is new and data is not available to estimate a proposed grant.</i>					
Ridgefield School District	\$120,996	\$2,931	\$5,585	\$15,599	\$11,858	\$156,969
Rocky Hill School District	\$68,422	\$9,486	\$28,730	\$12,892	\$19,817	\$139,347
Salem School District	\$10,439	\$9,828	\$-	\$16,127	\$4,056	\$40,450
Salisbury School District	\$8,194	\$8,982	\$5,622	\$12,732	\$656	\$36,187
Scotland School District	\$2,786	\$17,615	\$-	\$23,834	\$1,511	\$45,746
Seymour School District	\$56,820	\$19,253	\$20,001	\$14,856	\$26,558	\$137,489
Sharon School District	\$2,867	\$17,116	\$-	\$16,543	\$200	\$36,726
Shelton School District	\$122,051	\$14,701	\$21,957	\$14,648	\$35,180	\$208,538
Sherman School District	\$6,653	\$2,011	\$-	\$10,336	\$587	\$19,588
Side By Side Charter School	\$6,382	\$23,588	\$52,937	\$8,173	\$1,266	\$92,347
Simsbury School District	\$112,640	\$6,643	\$5,045	\$15,914	\$24,091	\$164,333
Somers School District	\$36,699	\$2,583	\$2,929	\$14,021	\$14,337	\$70,569
South Windsor School District	\$135,817	\$7,357	\$27,138	\$11,627	\$34,516	\$216,455
Southington School District	\$168,811	\$10,940	\$9,825	\$14,538	\$50,769	\$254,883
Sprague School District	\$7,870	\$22,955	\$10,733	\$15,667	\$4,809	\$62,034
Stafford School District	\$35,644	\$16,800	\$2,585	\$17,695	\$19,296	\$92,021
Stamford Charter School for Excellence	\$14,604	\$23,443	\$24,713	\$4,059	\$2,641	\$69,460
Stamford School District	\$441,878	\$21,035	\$48,936	\$14,746	\$79,921	\$606,516
Sterling School District	\$8,871	\$14,709	\$-	\$16,840	\$5,396	\$45,816

District	Enrollment Portion of Proposed Grant	FRPL Portion of Proposed Grant	MLL Portion of Proposed Grant	SWD Portion of Proposed Grant	District Wealth Portion of Proposed Grant	Total Proposed Grant
Stonington School District	\$47,652	\$10,648	\$1,611	\$13,833	\$7,530	\$81,275
Stratford School District	\$182,360	\$19,098	\$28,255	\$15,772	\$67,428	\$312,913
Suffield School District	\$55,116	\$6,657	\$9,056	\$13,767	\$16,255	\$100,851
The Bridge Academy	\$7,599	\$35,512	\$11,115	\$15,913	\$7,930	\$78,068
The Gilbert School	\$12,089	\$23,984	\$9,528	\$12,749	\$5,650	\$64,001
The Woodstock Academy	\$26,341	\$1,905	\$-	\$7,651	\$10,993	\$46,891
Thomaston School District	\$20,986	\$15,782	\$5,123	\$12,880	\$9,865	\$64,637
Thompson School District	\$23,934	\$18,031	\$5,133	\$18,229	\$11,202	\$76,530
Tolland School District	\$59,768	\$5,859	\$4,111	\$14,719	\$17,790	\$102,246
Torrington School District	\$106,690	\$27,615	\$42,105	\$16,802	\$84,645	\$277,857
Trumbull School District	\$187,688	\$7,189	\$11,415	\$13,303	\$49,934	\$269,529
Union School District	\$1,379	\$4,851	\$-	\$17,191	\$372	\$23,794
Vernon School District	\$87,245	\$22,432	\$10,650	\$16,878	\$63,882	\$201,087
Voluntown School District	\$6,382	\$14,502	\$-	\$14,117	\$2,664	\$37,666
Wallingford School District	\$143,119	\$14,547	\$21,301	\$16,535	\$50,660	\$246,161
Waterbury School District	\$512,653	\$33,286	\$56,095	\$17,266	\$646,853	\$1,266,153
Waterford School District	\$63,311	\$11,942	\$15,282	\$15,693	\$13,184	\$119,412
Watertown School District	\$69,720	\$16,571	\$13,877	\$14,726	\$29,351	\$144,245
West Hartford School District	\$250,458	\$11,456	\$24,221	\$15,602	\$63,619	\$365,356
West Haven School District	\$162,212	\$23,415	\$59,362	\$17,249	\$140,121	\$402,360
Westbrook School District	\$16,145	\$14,366	\$43,280	\$13,218	\$2,946	\$89,956

District	Enrollment Portion of Proposed Grant	FRPL Portion of Proposed Grant	MLL Portion of Proposed Grant	SWD Portion of Proposed Grant	District Wealth Portion of Proposed Grant	Total Proposed Grant
Weston School District	\$58,632	\$475	\$3,798	\$13,710	\$3,841	\$80,456
Westport School District	\$144,228	\$1,168	\$3,088	\$12,626	\$4,688	\$165,798
Wethersfield School District	\$96,927	\$11,977	\$29,629	\$13,553	\$35,840	\$187,926
Wilmington School District	\$10,655	\$14,966	\$4,324	\$15,800	\$5,077	\$50,822
Wilton School District	\$103,012	\$2,468	\$5,293	\$15,238	\$7,248	\$133,259
Winchester School District	\$16,740	\$24,314	\$13,761	\$15,864	\$9,072	\$79,752
Windham School District	\$87,245	\$30,498	\$90,567	\$18,671	\$127,582	\$354,563
Windsor Locks School District	\$40,215	\$17,803	\$20,240	\$16,686	\$14,241	\$109,185
Windsor School District	\$90,382	\$19,433	\$8,921	\$18,968	\$30,916	\$168,619
Wolcott School District	\$57,659	\$14,564	\$15,182	\$14,722	\$29,066	\$131,193
Woodbridge School District	\$23,853	\$5,330	\$15,130	\$11,233	\$3,714	\$59,260
Woodstock School District	\$20,959	\$9,843	\$4,030	\$14,255	\$7,318	\$56,405

Endnotes

¹ Eitland, E., Klingensmith, L., MacNaughton, P., Cedeno Laurent, J., Spengler, J., Bernstein, A., & Allen, J.G. (2017). *Foundations for Student Success: How School Buildings Influence Student Health, Thinking and Performance*. Boston, MA: Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Center for Health and the Global Environment. Retrieved from https://forhealth.org/Harvard.Schools_For_Health.Foundations_for_Student_Success.pdf.

² Blagg, K, Terrones, F., & Nelson, V. (2023). *Assessing the National Landscape of Capital Expenditures for Public School Districts*. Washington, DC.: Urban Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/2023-01/Assessing%20the%20National%20Landscape%20of%20Capital%20Expenditures%20for%20Public%20School%20Districts.pdf>.

³ U.S. Department of Education. (2024). *Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund: Fiscal Year 2022 Annual Performance Report*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://api.covid-relief-data.ed.gov/collection/api/v1/public/docs/ESSERFiscalYear2022AnnualPerformanceReport.pdf>.

⁴ School and State Finance Project. (n.d.). COVID-19 Relief Funding for Education. Retrieved from <https://schoolstatefinance.org/issues/esser-funding>.

⁵ Lafortune, J., & Schönholzer, D. (2022). The Impact of School Facility Investments on Students and Homeowners: Evidence from Los Angeles. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 14(3), 254-289. Retrieved from <https://www.aeaweb.org/content/file?id=14772>.

⁶ Biasi, B., Lafortune, J., & Schönholzer, D. (2024). *What Works and For Whom? Effectiveness and Efficiency of School Capital Investments Across the U.S.* (Working Paper 32040). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w32040/w32040.pdf.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Callahan, J. (2024). *Charter Schools and the School Construction Program (2024-R-0046)*. Hartford, CT: Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Legislative Research. Retrieved from <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2024/rpt/pdf/2024-R-0046.pdf>.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Sullivan, M. (2023). *School Construction Reimbursement Grants (2023-R-0250)*. Hartford, CT: Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Legislative Research. Retrieved from <https://cga.ct.gov/2023/rpt/pdf/2023-R-0250.pdf>.

¹² Conn. Gen. Statutes ch. 173, § 10-285a(a)(3), as amended by Conn. Acts 23-205.

¹³ Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 70B, § 10.

¹⁴ State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. (n.d.). LoCIP. Retrieved from <https://portal.ct.gov/opm/igpp/grants/locip/locip-entitlement>.

¹⁵ State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. (2024). *Local Capital Improvement Program (LoCIP) Grants Fiscal Year 2024 and Forward*. Hartford, CT: Author. Retrieved from <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/opm/igpp/grants/locip/guidelines/locip-grant-guidelines-and-instructions-22024.pdf>.

¹⁶ State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. (n.d.). LoCIP. Retrieved from <https://portal.ct.gov/opm/igpp/grants/locip/locip-entitlement>.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Conn. Gen. Statutes ch. 116b, §§ 7-535-538.

¹⁹ S.C. Code Ann. §§ 59-144-30, 59-144-40 (1996).

²⁰ Biasi, B., Lafortune, J., & Schönholzer, D. (2024). *What Works and For Whom? Effectiveness and Efficiency of School Capital Investments Across the U.S.* (Working Paper 32040). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w32040/w32040.pdf.