EDUCATION FORMULAS AND FAIRNESS TO THE TAXPAYERS

SUMMARY

The complete paper together with six tables is published at WWW.LWVRI.ORG.

Foundation formulas are used by states for two purposes: to calculate how much the education of children costs and to determine how to share those costs between state and local governments. These formulas can have different calculations for determining the local share. The state supplements the local share to reach the total cost of the foundation program. This paper looks at the local share calculation of the current Rhode Island formula and at the calculations of two other types of foundation formulas. Which formula is easiest to understand? Which one is fairest to the taxpayer?

The effects of changing the local share calculation in the three formulas are demonstrated using RI data for FY 2014. In order to compare these effects, the total cost of the foundation program and the total state and local percentage shares are kept constant.

The effects of the three formulas are demonstrated using RI data for FY 2014. The uniform tax rate (UTR) formula raises the local share with the same tax rate for all property taxpayers, except for 8 of the 39 districts. These 8 raise the entire cost of their foundation programs with tax rates that are lower because they have high property wealth. The UTR formula results in a property tax rate of $5.20 per $1,000 for 31 of the 39 RI cities and towns (see the Summary Table). This rate is 9% higher than the formula's average rate, with the rest of the districts paying less. Its tax rate range is from $0.41 to $5.20.

The wealth per pupil (WPP) formula gives greater state shares to districts that have less property wealth per pupil. The WPP formula has a wider tax rate range, from $0.41 to $5.93. Its highest tax rate is 29% higher than this formula's state average.

The quadratic mean (QM) formula, which RI currently uses, averages the WPP state share percentage and the percentage of poor elementary school children for each district in a quadratic mean calculation. The QM formula has the widest tax rate range, from $0.37 to $8.60. Its highest tax rate is 75% higher than the formula's state average tax rate.

The UTR formula is the most transparent. The process of setting property tax rates is familiar to taxpayers because they deal with property taxes to fund local services. The WPP formula equity concept of giving more state funds to districts that have less wealth per pupil is clear, but the math is more complex. The QM formula idea of providing more funds for schools with high densities of poor children is clear, but most citizens do not understand the math that is used to carry out this idea.

Using the concept of fiscal neutrality, the formula that is the most fair and equitable to the taxpayer of the three formulas considered in this paper is the UTR formula. It comes the closest to funding the foundation formula program with the same property tax rate for all local taxpayers. Its local shares are paid with the same local tax rate for the districts which educate 92% of Rhode Island's children; the remaining districts pay less.

The WPP formula is less fair. Its local shares are paid with a wider range of tax rates; Providence pays the highest rate, 29% higher than the state average.

The QM formula is the least fair. Its local shares are paid with the widest range of tax rates; Woonsocket is paying the highest rate, 75% above the state average. RIDE justifies the adding of a density of poor children factor to calculations based on the capacity to pay by saying that this density requires more support. However, adding the poor density factor only gives more state aid when the district's state share based on capacity to pay is lower than its density of poor children. It gives less state aid when the district's state share based capacity to pay is higher than the density of poor children.

Joanne DeVoe, League of Women Voters of Rhode Island

Fall 2014

SUMMARY TABLE*

Comparison Of Education Formula Tax Rates To Raise Local Share in Rhode Island FY 2014: Uniform Tax Rate (UTR), Wealth Per Pupil (WPP), & Quadratic Mean (QM)

	UTR	WPP	QM
City or Town	Tax Rate	Tax Rate	Tax Rate
A	B	C	D
Barrington	$5.20	$4.49	$5.19
Bristol	$5.20	$4.90	$4.95
Burrillville	$5.20	$5.03	$7.27
Central Falls	$5.20	$5.88	$6.47
Charlestown	$3.32	$3.32	$2.67
Coventry	$5.20	$4.90	$6.66
Cranston	$5.20	$5.15	$6.54
Cumberland	$5.20	$4.79	$6.11
East Greenwich	$5.20	$4.52	$5.07
East Providence	$5.20	$5.25	$6.00
Exeter	$5.20	$4.68	$5.09
Foster	$5.20	$4.69	$6.10
Glocester	$5.20	$4.68	$6.26
Hopkinton	$5.20	$4.86	$6.37
Jamestown	$2.77	$2.77	$2.61
Johnston	$5.20	$5.17	$5.61
Lincoln	$5.20	$4.84	$5.48
Little Compton	$1.45	$1.45	$1.27
Middletown	$5.20	$4.91	$5.28
Narragansett	$2.64	$2.64	$2.19
Newport	$3.85	$3.85	$2.05
New Shoreham	$0.41	$0.41	$0.37
North Kingstown	$5.20	$4.72	$5.09
North Providence	$5.20	$5.16	$6.64
North Smithfield	$5.20	$4.67	$6.06
Pawtucket	$5.20	$5.76	$6.24
Portsmouth	$5.15	$4.63	$4.48
Providence	$5.20	$5.93	$4.66
Richmond	$5.20	$4.69	$6.63
Scituate	$5.20	$4.67	$5.53
Smithfield	$5.20	$4.65	$5.09
South Kingstown	$5.20	$4.70	$4.58
Tiverton	$5.20	$4.87	$5.68
Warren	$5.20	$5.16	$5.97
Warwick	$5.20	$5.00	$5.56
Westerly	$5.05	$5.03	$3.56
West Greenwich	$5.20	$4.58	$5.72
West Warwick	$5.20	$5.26	$6.82
Woonsocket	$5.20	$5.68	$8.60
STATE AVERAGE	**$4.77**	**$4.59**	**$4.91**

*For notes on this table, see Table 5 (available at www.lwvri.org) of which this table is a summary.

EDUCATION FORMULAS AND FAIRNESS TO THE TAXPAYERS

by Joanne DeVoe

League of Women Voters of Rhode Island • www.lwvri.org • Fall 2014

1. INTRODUCTION

The states use foundation formulas to determine two things: how much money to spend on educating the state's children and who pays for that education. Two types of foundation formulas have been developed to determine how the taxpayers share the education foundation program cost, a uniform tax rate (UTR) formula and a wealth per pupil (WPP) formula. These formulas have different ways of calculating the local share of the cost. Rhode Island enacted in 2010 a variant of a wealth per pupil formula called a quadratic mean (QM) formula. This paper explores the effect that the two alternate formula types would have, and the effect that the current Rhode Island formula does have, on RI taxpayers. This paper then asks two questions of each formula. First, can the formula be readily understood by the alert educated citizen? Second, is the formula fair to the taxpayers?

The effects of the three formulas are demonstrated using RI data for FY 2014. In order to compare these effects, the total cost of the foundation program and the total state and local percentage shares are kept constant.

Public education formulas were developed in the twentieth century to deal with several facts. While states have Constitutional responsibility to see that public education is provided for all children, the local school districts were expected to run the schools with property tax revenue that was plentiful in wealthy districts and scarce in poor ones. State revenues come primarily from sales and income taxes while local governments are financed primarily by property taxes. The idea emerged that if the state and the local governments shared the cost of public education using a formula, local districts could each raise their part of the total local share with an equitable tax effort. The state then would supplement that local revenue. In a foundation formula, the local share is determined and then subtracted from the total foundation program cost to find the state share for each district.

What if the local taxable property value of a city or town is so great that its local share is higher than its total foundation cost? When the local share is subtracted from the total foundation cost for those districts, they would not get a state share; rather they would owe the state part of their local share. Most states, including Rhode Island, have chosen instead to allow the local districts to keep the excess funds.

For foundation formulas, property values have to be comparable. In Rhode Island, the different cities and towns have their properties reassessed at different times by different companies within a nine year cycle, so assessments often vary widely. Rhode Island has dealt with this problem by conducting annual studies that compare local assessment values with actual sales data for each locality to determine true property value. It further adjusts these values by local median family income. The result is shown in the table produced by the Rhode Island Department of Municipal Finance (RIDMF) entitled, "Adjusted Equalized Weighted Assessed Valuations (EWAV) of Rhode Island Municipalities." In this paper, EWAV is defined as property value adjusted by median family income. This paper contains six tables. Numbers from the tables that are referred to in the narrative are rounded for clarity

This paper contains six tables. Numbers from the tables that are referred to in the narrative are rounded for clarity.

Helpful Definitions

EWAV: Adjusted Equalized Weighted Assessed Valuations or property wealth adjusted by median family income

FRPL: Free and Reduced Price Lunch, a federal program

QM: Quadratic Mean

RADM: Resident Average Daily Membership

RIDE: Rhode Island Department of Education

RIDMF: Rhode Island Department of Municipal Finance

R.I.G.L.: Rhode Island General Laws

SSR: State Share Ratio, a percentage in the QM formula

SSRC: State Share Ratio for the Community, a WPP formula percentage used in the QM formula.

UTR: Uniform Tax Rate

WPP: Wealth Per Pupil

2. A UNIFORM TAX RATE (UTR) FORMULA

The first type of formula raises the local share with a uniform local property tax rate throughout the state. This means that all district taxpayers have the same tax rate applied to their taxable property regardless of how much property they own or where they live.

Table 1 shows a Uniform Tax Rate formula calculated for Rhode Island in FY 2014. To find the UTR necessary to raise the total local share of a formula for Rhode Island in FY 2014, the local share of the total education foundation cost for the entire state is divided by the total EWAV for the entire state:

UTR = Total Local Share of Total Foundation cost divided by Total EWAV.

Using Rhode Island's current formula local share of 47.5% of the Total Foundation cost and a 52.5% state share, as well as data for the FY 2014, the UTR would be:

UTR = 47.5% x Total Foundation cost divided by Total EWAV.

UTR = 47.5% x $1,397,859,643 / $127,652,896,356 = $0.00520 or $5.20 per $1,000.

If the tax rate of $5.20 per $1,000 is applied to a district's taxable property, it would raise its local share for

a Rhode Island formula. Then the district's state share is determined by subtracting the local share from the cost of the district's Total Foundation.

District Local Share = $5.20 / $1,000 x District local EWAV.
District State Share = District Total Foundation cost – District Local Share.

Let's apply this tax rate to a typical property taxpayer in Rhode Island. The US Census 2010 reports that the median value of owner-occupied housing units in Rhode Island was $259,400. If the tax rate of $5.20 per $1,000 property value were applied to a Rhode Island house assessed at $250,000, the calculation would be:

Property Tax = $5.20/$1,000 tax rate x $250,000 property value
= $0.00520 x $250,000 = $1,300

When the local share raised by applying the $5.20 uniform tax rate is found, the result for one city and seven towns is that their local share is higher than their total foundation cost. Thus when the state share for these districts is determined by subtracting the local share from the total foundation, the result is a negative number; see column E. In Rhode Island, the total of these negative numbers would be $55 million which represents how much would have to be given to the state by these districts to maintain the same tax rate for all taxpayers and to keep the total state share of the total foundation cost at 52.5% Enacting formulas that require local districts to give funds to the state has proven very difficult to do politically in the states that have tried to do it. In this case, if the districts do not give these funds to the state, the share for the entire state goes up from 52.5% to 56.5% and these eight districts each pay a lower tax rate than the other districts.

3. A WEALTH PER PUPIL (WPP) FORMULA

A WPP formula determines the local share percentage of the Total Foundation cost using a comparison between the value of EWAV per pupil and the state average EWAV per pupil. Table 2 shows property wealth per pupil for the Rhode Island cities and towns in FY 2014. Rhode Island had a WPP formula from the 1960's until 1995 when the formula was suspended or frozen. From 1995 to 2010, local school districts received either flat percentage increases or none at all. The current formula was enacted in 2010.

To find the local share percentage for a district in a WPP formula, the state total local share percentage is multiplied by the local wealth per pupil divided by state average wealth per pupil:

Local Share % = state total Local Share % x
(district EWAV/pupils)/(state average EWAV/pupil).

The state share percentage for each district is then determined by subtracting the local share percentage from 100%:

State Share % = 100% – Local Share %

Table 3 shows a WPP formula for Rhode Island in FY 2014 that uses a 47.5% total local share and 52.5% total state share. The state share ratio or percentage shown in Column E is a negative number for one city and five towns because their local share percentages are greater than 100%. The state share ratios shown in Column F are the same as in Column E for all districts except for those districts that had negative percentages in Column E. A negative percentage in Column E is shown as 0% in Column F. This calculation with no negative state shares is in accordance with R.I.G.L. 16-7-20, where the state share ratio is called the State Ratio for the Community (SSRC). If this WPP formula were in effect in Rhode Island for FY 2014, the share for the entire state would go from 52.5% to 58.1%; it would be a cost increase to the state of $78 million.

4. THE RHODE ISLAND CURRENT FORMULA IS THE RHODE ISLAND WEALTH PER PUPIL FORMULA CHANGED BY A QUADRATIC MEAN CALCULATION.

The current Rhode Island formula approved in 2010 uses the WPP formula SSRC. It averages the SSRC with the district's percentage of poor children in prekindergarten through grade 6 in a quadratic mean calculation. It is the only state that uses a quadratic mean in an education funding formula. The result is called the State Share Ratio (SSR) and is in accordance with R.I.G.L. 16-7.2-4:

> *For each district, the state's share of the foundation education aid … (a) shall use a calculation that considers a district's revenue generating capacity and concentration of high-need students. The calculation is the square root of the sum of the state share ratio for the community calculation (SSRC), pursuant to section 16-7-20, squared plus the district's percentage of students eligible for USDA reimbursable school meals in grades PK-6 (PK6 FRPL) squared, divided by two.*

These school district ratios or percentages for Rhode Island in FY 2014 using RIDE data are shown on Table 4. The quadratic mean calculation squares the SSRC percentage and squares the poor children percentage; then it adds these two squares together; then it divides them by 2; then the square root is taken of the result:

State Share Ratio = the square root of {[(SSRC% x SSRC%) + (prek-6 FRPL x prek-6 FRPL)] divided by 2}

The total cost of the QM formula for Rhode Island's school districts in FY 2014 is 55.2% of the Total Foundation program, which is $37 million more than the 52.5% state share.

5. COMPARISON OF THE TWO TYPES OF FORMULAS AND OF THE RHODE ISLAND FORMULA

Table 5 compares the tax rates that the local taxpayer needs to pay to raise the local shares of the three different formulas. This table assumes that even though in some districts the calculation to raise the local share raises more funds than their total foundation cost, no local district would have to give any local funds to the state.

The UTR formula has a tax rate range from $0.41 to $5.20, a difference of $4.79 per $1,000 EWAV. Thirty-one districts have the highest tax rate of $5.20, which is only 9% above the state average for that formula. Eight districts with only 8% of the state's enrollment altogether have tax rates below $5.20. The WPP formula has a wider tax rate range, from $0.41 to $5.93, a difference of $5.52; its highest rate of $5.93 is 29% above the state average for that formula. The QM formula has the widest range, from $0.37 to $8.60, a difference of $8.23; its highest tax rate of $8.60 is 75% higher than the state average for that formula.

Table 6 compares the current QM formula with the WPP formula on which it is based. It shows that 11 school districts get more with the QM formula, some substantially more; and 28 school districts get more with the WPP formula, some substantially more. The current QM formula uses a special average of the state share percentage of the WPP formula and the younger poor children percentage. See these percentages in columns C and D. Notice that for every district, if the poor children percentage is higher than the WPP state share percentage, the QM state share in column F is higher than the WPP formula state share in column G. Even when a district has a very high percentage of poor children, if its WPP state share percentage is higher still, it loses money with the QM formula. For example, Central Falls has 93% poor children and 96% WPP formula state share because of low property resources. The QM formula drags down the Central Falls state share by nearly $600,000. On the other hand, when a district has a lower percentage of poor children, if its WPP formula state share percentage is even lower than that, it gains with the QM formula. For example, Newport has 66% poor children and 0% WPP formula state share because of high property resources. The QM formula boosts its state share from $0 to over $10 million, nearly half of its total foundation cost of $23 million.

The current QM formula is applied to three regional school districts listed near the bottom of Table 6. Each district consists of two towns which levy the local property taxes independently. Their tax base data, foundation cost data and state share are lumped together, yet these towns have various property tax per pupil measurements; see Table 2. One regional school district, Chariho, has the current formula calculated separately for its towns, Charlestown, Hopkinton, and Richmond; its state funds are sent to the towns.

6. THE TRANSPARENCY AND SIMPLICITY TEST

In a democracy, the citizens need to understand the basis on which their tax dollars are being distributed, especially when vast sums of money are involved. State education foundation program formulas are notorious for being difficult to figure out. Nevertheless, some are clearer than others.

It makes sense to have an education funding formula that shares the costs between state and local governments because the state gains its revenue primarily from income and sales taxes while the local governments depend primarily on the property tax. The taxpayer can usually grasp the logic of raising the local share in a UTR formula with the same tax rate levied in every city and town as long as careful explanations are given. People will see that the state supplements what the local tax does not raise to provide the total foundation program in each local district. If the local share and state shares are determined by the WPP calculation, the math is more complex and harder to follow. If the formula requires adding together the state share ratio for the community determined in the WPP formula with the percentage of poor children in the quadratic mean calculation of a QM formula, most people give up. They don't try to understand any more.

7. THE FAIRNESS TEST

The question that needs to be asked about each foundation formula is this: Is the formula fair and equitable to the taxpayer? In School Finance, A Policy Perspective, Allan R. Odden and Lawrence O. Picus offer the concept of fiscal neutrality: "Fiscal neutrality for taxpayers indicates whether the funding system allowed districts to raise equal dollars (or any object) per pupil for a given tax rate." Let's apply this concept to the raising of funds for the Rhode Island FY 2014 Total Foundation program, which is designed to be fair to the students.

The UTR foundation formula raises its local share with the same property tax for all local tax districts except for eight districts. These districts can raise more than the cost of the total foundation program at that tax rate; their tax rates are less and account for only 8% of the state's pupils.

The WPP foundation formula determines its local share percentage by comparing a district's property wealth per pupil with the state average wealth per pupil. Table 5 shows us that the resulting local share tax rates are similar to the UTR formula rates but not the same. And the range of tax rates required is wider than for the UTR formula.

The QM formula treats the state share percentage of the WPP formula and the poor children percentage equally when it adds them together in a quadratic mean calculation. This formula results in the widest range of tax rates. Woonsocket, one

of Rhode Island's poorest districts, has to pay the highest QM formula tax rate, which is 75% higher than the average rate. Keep in mind that if Woonsocket's tax rate were lower, its local share would be lower and its state share would be higher.

The QM calculation is explained by RIDE in, "Funding Formula State Share Ratio Calculation" (http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Funding-and-Finance-Wise-Investments/Funding-Sources/State-Education-Aid-Funding-Formula/State-Share-Calculation-and-Supporting-Data.pdf), on its website as follows: " – Directs funding to where the greatest student needs are, whether they are a result of a district's capacity to pay or poverty concentration." Indeed, it is generally believed that the percentage of poor children is averaged with the wealth per pupil percentage so that districts with high concentrations of poor children will get more state money than they would with the WPP formula alone. Sometimes that is true but often it is not. Newport with 66% poor children, Providence with 90% and Westerly with 42% get more funds with the QM formula. However, Central Falls with 93% poor children, Pawtucket with 80%, West Warwick with 54%, and Woonsocket with 77% get less funds with the QM formula. And many small towns with low densities of poor children and high state share capacity to pay percentages get much less money with the QM formula.

RIDE also states in "Funding Formula State Share Ratio Calculation" that the QM formula, "...considers the 'concentration effects' of poverty students on local schooling and neighborhood services. The concentration of a substantial number of at-risk students in a community will impose a heavier burden on the local service delivery system." A good case can be made that higher concentrations of poor students require more education services. The place to figure the cost of these education services is either in the development of the Total Foundation program cost or in a separate formula, similar to the school housing aid formula in R.I.G.L. 16-7-39. This matter does not belong in the calculations that determine how taxpayers share the Total Foundation program cost. A question that remains is, do the costs of neighborhood services and local service delivery systems belong in an education funding formula.

The town data for three regional school districts has been lumped together to calculate the current formula, and the funds are sent to the school district. This method of calculation and distribution is not fair to the their taxpayers since they pay their property taxes to the towns, not the school districts. The two towns in each of these regional school districts have different densities of poor children and property wealth per pupil.

8. CONCLUSION

Using the concept of fiscal neutrality, the formula that is the most fair and equitable to the taxpayer of the three formulas considered in this paper is the UTR formula. It comes the closest to funding the foundation formula program with the same property tax rate for all local taxpayers. Its local shares are paid with the same local tax rate for the districts which educate 92% of Rhode Island's children; the remaining districts pay less.

The WPP formula is less fair. Its local shares are paid with a wider range of tax rates; Providence pays the highest rate, 29% higher than the state average.

The QM formula is the least fair. Its local shares are paid with the widest range of tax rates; Woonsocket is paying the highest rate, 75% above the state average. RIDE justifies the adding of a density of poor children factor to calculations based on the capacity to pay by saying that this density requires more support. However, adding the poor density factor only gives more state aid when the district's state share based on capacity to pay is lower than its density of poor children. It gives less state aid when the district's state share based capacity to pay is higher than the density of poor children.

REFERENCES

1. "School Finance, A Policy Perspective," Fourth Edition, by Allan R. Odden and Lawrence O. Picus, 2007.
2. U.S. Census, 2010
3. Rhode Island General Laws in Chapter 16-7 entitled, "Foundation Level School Support."
4. "FY 2014 Final Formula Calculations (March 2013 updates)," Rhode Island Department of Education (www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Funding-and-Finance-Wise-Investments/Funding-Sources/State-Education-Aid-Funding-Formula/FY-2014-Calculations-for-the-Web.pdf).
5. "Funding Formula State Share Ratio Calculation," Rhode Island Department of Education (www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Funding-and-Finance-Wise-Investments/Funding-Sources/State-Education-Aid-Funding-Formula/State-Share-Calculation-and-Supporting-Data.pdf).
6. Email from Kristen Cole, Finance Division, Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) to Joanne DeVoe on November 15, 2013, entitled, "Data for Funding Formula Calculation."
7. "2010 Adjusted Equalized Weighted Assessed Valuations (EWAV) of Rhode Island Municipalities," RI Division of Municipal Finance website (www.muni-info.ri.gov/documents/finances/property%20value%20info/EWAV/2010_EWAV_FINAL.pdf).

Table 1: A UNIFORM TAX RATE (UTR) EDUCATION FORMULA FOR RHODE ISLAND CITIES & TOWNS, FY 2014

City or Town	Total Foundation	Taxable Property EWAV	Local Share @$5.20/$1,00	State Share with UTR	Local Share No Debt	State Share No Debt	Tax Rate no debt	State Share Per Pupil
A	B	C	D=C x $0.00520	E = B – D	F = D or B	G = B – F	H = F / C	I=F/RADM
Barrington	$29,883,244	$4,539,598,993	$23,605,915	$6,277,329	$23,605,915	$6,277,329	$5.20	$1,916
Bristol	$22,263,986	$3,335,204,882	$17,343,065	$4,920,921	$17,343,065	$4,920,921	$5.20	$2,201
Burrillville	$24,635,793	$1,592,616,509	$8,281,606	$16,354,187	$8,281,606	$16,354,187	$5.20	$6,794
Central Falls	$30,952,663	$263,185,446	$1,368,564	$29,584,099	$1,368,564	$29,584,099	$5.20	$11,552
Charlestown	$9,242,204	$2,779,675,053	$14,454,310	($5,212,106)	$9,242,204	$0	$3.32	$0
Coventry	$47,679,023	$3,757,142,814	$19,537,143	$28,141,880	$19,537,143	$28,141,880	$5.20	$5,874
Cranston	$105,105,599	$7,267,568,127	$37,791,354	$67,314,245	$37,791,354	$67,314,245	$5.20	$6,703
Cumberland	$44,346,207	$4,318,613,963	$22,456,793	$21,889,414	$22,456,793	$21,889,414	$5.20	$4,798
E. Greenwich	$21,342,124	$3,497,620,787	$18,187,628	$3,154,496	$18,187,628	$3,154,496	$5.20	$1,356
E. Providence	$57,145,431	$4,209,035,401	$21,886,984	$35,258,447	$21,886,984	$35,258,447	$5.20	$6,584
Exeter	$7,562,478	$1,201,491,895	$6,247,758	$1,314,720	$6,247,758	$1,314,720	$5.20	$1,656
Foster	$6,398,746	$652,703,867	$3,394,060	$3,004,686	$3,394,060	$3,004,686	$5.20	$4,471
Glocester	$13,260,138	$1,292,324,738	$6,720,089	$6,540,049	$6,720,089	$6,540,049	$5.20	$4,698
Hopkinton	$11,936,215	$1,057,628,291	$5,499,667	$6,436,548	$5,499,667	$6,436,548	$5.20	$5,328
Jamestown	$6,067,754	$2,187,578,764	$11,375,410	($5,307,656)	$6,067,754	$0	$2.77	$0
Johnston	$31,385,057	$2,919,429,152	$15,181,032	$16,204,025	$15,181,032	$16,204,025	$5.20	$5,427
Lincoln	$30,885,046	$3,423,659,167	$17,803,028	$13,082,018	$17,803,028	$13,082,018	$5.20	$4,170
Little Compton	$3,790,122	$2,606,578,282	$13,554,207	($9,764,085)	$3,790,122	$0	$1.45	$0
Middletown	$24,030,797	$3,074,324,564	$15,986,488	$8,044,309	$15,986,488	$8,044,309	$5.20	$3,342
Narragansett	$13,918,467	$5,281,546,372	$27,464,041	($13,545,574)	$13,918,467	$0	$2.64	$0
Newport	$22,852,834	$5,940,632,829	$30,891,291	($8,038,457)	$22,852,834	$0	$3.85	$0
New Shoreham	$1,037,390	$2,539,977,525	$13,207,883	($12,170,493)	$1,037,390	$0	$0.41	$0
No. Kingstown	$37,315,797	$5,182,590,182	$26,949,469	$10,366,328	$26,949,469	$10,366,328	$5.20	$2,668
No. Providence	$35,692,985	$2,573,842,569	$13,383,981	$22,309,004	$13,383,981	$22,309,004	$5.20	$6,560
North Smithfield	$16,795,757	$1,744,614,178	$9,071,994	$7,723,763	$9,071,994	$7,723,763	$5.20	$4,366
Pawtucket	$101,404,447	$2,780,557,955	$14,458,901	$86,945,546	$14,458,901	$86,945,546	$5.20	$10,063
Portsmouth	$23,112,627	$4,484,179,151	$23,317,732	($205,105)	$23,112,627	$0	$5.15	$0
Providence	$270,862,047	$7,038,348,378	$36,599,412	$234,262,635	$36,599,412	$234,262,635	$5.20	$10,403
Richmond	$11,058,971	$952,387,553	$4,952,415	$6,106,556	$4,952,415	$6,106,556	$5.20	$5,260
Scituate	$14,043,025	$1,739,422,685	$9,044,998	$4,998,027	$9,044,998	$4,998,027	$5.20	$3,377
Smithfield	$22,005,840	$3,443,216,742	$17,904,727	$4,101,113	$17,904,727	$4,101,113	$5.20	$1,762
South Kingstown	$32,030,979	$5,769,424,522	$30,001,008	$2,029,971	$30,001,008	$2,029,971	$5.20	$606
Tiverton	$18,283,335	$2,134,450,522	$11,099,143	$7,184,192	$11,099,143	$7,184,192	$5.20	$3,885
Warren	$13,302,908	$1,164,526,872	$6,055,540	$7,247,368	$6,055,540	$7,247,368	$5.20	$5,716
Warwick	$94,393,611	$10,203,911,940	$53,060,342	$41,333,269	$53,060,342	$41,333,269	$5.20	$4,452
Westerly	$31,865,495	$6,315,621,118	$32,841,230	($975,735)	$31,865,495	$0	$5.05	$0
West Greenwich	$9,007,345	$1,072,528,503	$5,577,148	$3,430,197	$5,577,148	$3,430,197	$5.20	$3,544
West Warwick	$36,000,821	$2,000,274,630	$10,401,428	$25,599,393	$10,401,428	$25,599,393	$5.20	$7,596
Woonsocket	$64,962,335	$1,314,861,435	$6,837,279	$58,125,056	$6,837,279	$58,125,056	$5.20	$10,335
TOTAL/ AVERAGE	**$1,397,859,643**	**$127,652,896,356**	**$663,795,061**	**$734,064,582**	**$608,575,851**	**$789,283,792**	**$4.77**	**$5,971**
% of Foundation	**100.0%**		**47.5%**	**52.5%**	**43.5%**	**56.5%**		

Notes:

–Col. B:Total Foundation is cost of program; data is from "FY 2014 Final Formula Calculations"; data for regional school district towns is in an email from Kristen Cole, RIDE, to Joanne DeVoe dated November 15, 2013.

-Col. C: Taxable property data is from, "2010 Adjusted Equalized Weighted Assessed Valuations of RI Municipalities," RIDMF.

-Col. D: Local Share Total is 47.5% of Total Foundation Total: Col. D Total = 47.5% x Col. B Total. Uniform Tax Rate (UTR) is tax rate per $1,000 taxable property (Adj. EWAV) needed to raise Total Local Share: UTR = 47.5% x Col. B Total / Col. C Total = $0.00520 or $5.20 per $1,000. Local Share = $0.00520 x Local EWAV.

-Col. E: State Share equals Total Foundation minus the Local Share: Col. E = Col. B - Col. D.

-Col. F: Local Share is the same as the Total Foundation for towns for which a tax rate of $5.20 raises more than Total Foundation.-

-Col. G: State Share is shown as $0 for the city & towns that otherwise would have a debt to the state for the amount shown in Col. E as a deficit. This State Share formula would cost the state an additional $55 million: State Share Total with no debts to state = Col. F Total minus Col. E Total = $789 million – $734 million = $55 million.-

-Col. H: Tax rate per $1,000 EWAV is the rate needed to raise local share; for districts where local share is higher than the Total Foundation, the tax rate is that needed to raise the Total Foundation.

-Col. I: State Share Per Pupil = State Share / Resident Average Daily Membership (RADM): Col. I = Col. F / RADM.

Table 2: TAXABLE PROPERTY WEALTH PER PUPIL IN RHODE ISLAND CITIES & TOWNS, FY 2014

City or Town	Property Wealth (EWAV) defined by RI Laws 16-7-21	Resident Average Daily Membership	Property Wealth Per Pupil	Wealth Per Pupil as a % of State Average Wealth Per Pupil
A	B	C	D = B / C	E = D / D Total
Barrington	$4,539,598,993	3,276	$1,385,714	143.5%
Bristol	$3,335,204,882	2,236	$1,491,594	154.5%
Burrillville	$1,592,616,509	2,407	$661,660	68.5%
Central Falls	$263,185,446	2,561	$102,767	10.6%
Charlestown	$2,779,675,053	932	$2,982,484	308.9%
Coventry	$3,757,142,814	4,791	$784,208	81.2%
Cranston	$7,267,568,127	10,042	$723,717	74.9%
Cumberland	$4,318,613,963	4,562	$946,649	98.0%
East Greenwich	$3,497,620,787	2,326	$1,503,706	155.7%
East Providence	$4,209,035,401	5,355	$786,001	81.4%
Exeter	$1,201,491,895	794	$1,513,214	156.7%
Foster	$652,703,867	672	$971,286	100.6%
Glocester	$1,292,324,738	1,392	$928,394	96.1%
Hopkinton	$1,057,628,291	1,208	$875,520	90.7%
Jamestown	$2,187,578,764	656	$3,334,724	345.3%
Johnston	$2,919,429,152	2,986	$977,706	101.3%
Lincoln	$3,423,659,167	3,137	$1,091,380	113.0%
Little Compton	$2,606,578,282	402	$6,484,026	671.5%
Middletown	$3,074,324,564	2,407	$1,277,243	132.3%
Narragansett	$5,281,546,372	1,430	$3,693,389	382.5%
Newport	$5,940,632,829	2,047	$2,902,117	300.5%
New Shoreham	$2,539,977,525	111	$22,882,680	2369.7%
North Kingstown	$5,182,590,182	3,885	$1,334,000	138.1%
North Providence	$2,573,842,569	3,401	$756,790	78.4%
North Smithfield	$1,744,614,178	1,769	$986,215	102.1%
Pawtucket	$2,780,557,955	8,640	$321,824	33.3%
Portsmouth	$4,484,179,151	2,453	$1,828,039	189.3%
Providence	$7,038,348,378	22,519	$312,552	32.4%
Richmond	$952,387,553	1,161	$820,317	85.0%
Scituate	$1,739,422,685	1,480	$1,175,286	121.7%
Smithfield	$3,443,216,742	2,327	$1,479,681	153.2%
South Kingstown	$5,769,424,522	3,349	$1,722,731	178.4%
Tiverton	$2,134,450,522	1,849	$1,154,381	119.5%
Warren	$1,164,526,872	1,268	$918,397	95.1%
Warwick	$10,203,911,940	9,284	$1,099,086	113.8%
West Greenwich	$1,072,528,503	968	$1,107,984	114.7%
West Warwick	$2,000,274,630	3,370	$593,553	61.5%
Westerly	$6,315,621,118	3,120	$2,024,238	209.6%
Woonsocket	$1,314,861,435	5,624	$233,795	24.2%
TOTAL OR AVERAGE	**$127,652,896,356**	**132,197**	**$965,626**	**100.0%**

–Col. B: Taxable property wealth data is from, "2010 Adjusted Equalized Weighted Assessed Valuations(EWAV) of RI Municipalities," RI Department of Municipal Finance (RIDMF).

–Col. C: Resident Average Daily Membership (RADM) data is from, "FY 2014 Final Formula Calculations," RIDE, and an email to Joanne DeVoe from Kristen Cole dated November 15, 2013, RIDE.

–Col. D:Property wealth per pupil is EWAV divided by RADM: Col. D = Col.B / Col. C.

–Col. E: Wealth per pupil as a % of state average wealth per pupil is EWAV per pupil as a % of state average wealth per pupil: Col. E = Col. D divided by Col. D state average.

Table 3: A PROPERTY WEALTH PER PUPIL (WPP) FORMULA FOR RHODE ISLAND CITIES AND TOWNS, FY 2014

City or Town	Total Foundation	Wealth/Pupil as % of Avg. Wealth/Pupil	Local Share % (47.5% W/P as % of Avg W/P)	State Share % (100% – Local Share %)	State Share Ratio for the Community	State Share of Total Foundation	Resident Average Daily Membership	State Share Per Pupil
A	B	C	D = 47.5% x C	E = 100% - D	F = 100% - D*	G = B x F	H	I = G / H
Barrington	$29,883,244	143.5%	68.2%	31.8%	31.8%	$9,514,078	3,276	$2,904
Bristol	$22,263,986	154.5%	73.4%	26.6%	26.6%	$5,925,003	2,236	$2,650
Burrillville	$24,635,793	68.5%	32.5%	67.5%	67.5%	$16,619,922	2,407	$6,905
Central Falls	$30,952,663	10.6%	5.0%	95.0%	95.0%	$29,394,196	2,561	$11,478
Charlestown	$9,242,204	308.9%	146.7%	-46.7%	0.0%	$0	932	$0
Coventry	$47,679,023	81.2%	38.6%	61.4%	61.4%	$29,289,224	4,791	$6,113
Cranston	$105,105,599	74.9%	35.6%	64.4%	64.4%	$67,711,655	10,042	$6,743
Cumberland	$44,346,207	98.0%	46.6%	53.5%	53.5%	$23,703,048	4,562	$5,196
E. Greenwich	$21,342,124	155.7%	74.0%	26.0%	26.0%	$5,558,023	2,326	$2,390
E. Providence	$57,145,431	81.4%	38.7%	61.3%	61.3%	$35,050,150	5,355	$6,545
Exeter	$7,562,478	156.7%	74.4%	25.6%	25.6%	$1,933,537	794	$2,435
Foster	$6,398,746	100.6%	47.8%	52.2%	52.2%	$3,341,105	672	$4,972
Glocester	$13,260,138	96.1%	45.6%	54.4%	54.4%	$7,207,217	1,392	$5,178
Hopkinton	$11,936,215	90.7%	43.1%	56.9%	56.9%	$6,793,795	1,208	$5,624
Jamestown	$6,067,754	345.3%	164.0%	-64.0%	0.0%	$0	656	$0
Johnston	$31,385,057	101.3%	48.1%	51.9%	51.9%	$16,283,352	2,986	$5,453
Lincoln	$30,885,046	113.0%	53.7%	46.3%	46.3%	$14,307,498	3,137	$4,561
Little Compton	$3,790,122	671.5%	319.0%	-219.0%	0.0%	$0	402	$0
Middletown	$24,030,797	132.3%	62.8%	37.2%	37.2%	$8,929,243	2,407	$3,710
Narragansett	$13,918,467	382.5%	181.7%	-81.7%	0.0%	$0	1,430	$0
Newport	$22,852,834	300.5%	142.7%	-42.7%	0.0%	$0	2,047	$0
New Shoreham	$1,037,390	2369.7%	1125.6%	-1025.6%	0.0%	$0	111	$0
N. Kingstown	$37,315,797	138.1%	65.6%	34.4%	34.4%	$12,837,567	3,885	$3,304
N. Providence	$35,692,985	78.4%	37.2%	62.8%	62.8%	$22,400,917	3,401	$6,587
N. Smithfield	$16,795,757	102.1%	48.5%	51.5%	51.5%	$8,650,235	1,769	$4,890
Pawtucket	$101,404,447	33.3%	15.8%	84.2%	84.2%	$85,364,799	8,640	$9,880
Portsmouth	$23,112,627	189.3%	89.9%	10.1%	10.1%	$2,330,331	2,453	$950
Providence	$270,862,047	32.4%	15.4%	84.6%	84.6%	$229,176,378	22,519	$10,177
Richmond	$11,058,971	85.0%	40.4%	59.6%	59.6%	$6,593,911	1,161	$5,680
Scituate	$14,043,025	121.7%	57.8%	42.2%	42.2%	$5,925,103	1,480	$4,003
Smithfield	$22,005,840	153.2%	72.8%	27.2%	27.2%	$5,992,190	2,327	$2,575
S. Kingstown	$32,030,979	178.4%	84.7%	15.3%	15.3%	$4,887,927	3,349	$1,460
Tiverton	$18,283,335	119.5%	56.8%	43.2%	43.2%	$7,905,257	1,849	$4,275
Warren	$13,302,908	95.1%	45.2%	54.8%	54.8%	$7,293,652	1,268	$5,752
Warwick	$94,393,611	113.8%	54.1%	45.9%	45.9%	$43,369,145	9,284	$4,671
W. Greenwich	$9,007,345	114.7%	54.5%	45.5%	45.5%	$4,099,918	968	$4,235
West Warwick	$36,000,821	61.5%	29.2%	70.8%	70.8%	$25,484,081	3,370	$7,562
Westerly	$31,865,495	209.6%	99.6%	0.4%	0.4%	$140,208	3,120	$45
Woonsocket	$64,962,335	24.2%	11.5%	88.5%	88.5%	$57,494,915	5,624	$10,223
TOTAL/AVERAGE	**$1,397,859,643**	**100.0%**	**47.5%**	**52.5%**	**58.1%**	**$811,507,579**	**132,197**	**$6,139**

Notes:
Data for Col. B and Col. H is from, "FY 2014 Final Formula Calculations"; for towns in regional school districts, from Kristen Cole, RIDE

–Col. B: Total Foundation includes Core Instructional Amount for all students and 40% of CIA for Free and Rduced Price Lunch students.

–Col. C: Wealth or EWAV per pupil as a percent of state average wealth per pupil is WPP divided by state average WPP and expressed as a percentage; see Table 2, Column E.

–Col. D: Local Share Ratio or percent equals 47.5% multiplied by WPP divided by state average WPP; Column D = 47.5% x Column C.

–Col. E: State Share Ratio or percent equals 100% minus Local Share Ratio; Column E = 100% - Column D.

–Col. F: State Share Ratio for the Community (SSRC) is the same as the State Share Ratio (Col. E) except that for the 5 towns and 1 city which have 0% instead of the negative state share percentages in Col E since their local share is more than 100%. This provision means that the state share costs 58.1% of the Total Foundation rather than 52.5%, so $78.5 million more.

–Col. G: The State Share amount is the SSRC multiplied by the Total Foundation; Column G = Column F multiplied by Column B.

–Col. H: Resident Average Daily Membership (RADM) is March 2013 enrollment data, RIDE.

–Col. I: State Share Per Pupil is the State Share of the Total Foundation per pupil; Column I = Column G divided by Column H.

Table 4: CURRENT QUADRATIC MEAN (QM) FOUNDATION FORMULA, RHODE ISLAND, FY 2014

School District	Total Foundation	%FRPL PK-6	State Share Ratio for the Community	State Share Ratio QM Formula	State Share $ QM Formula	PK-12 RADM	State Share Per Pupil
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H = F / G
Barrington	$29,883,244	6.7%	29.1%	21.1%	$6,309,895	$3,276	$1,926
Burrillville	$24,635,793	34.7%	66.4%	53.0%	$13,051,217	$2,407	$5,422
Charlestown	$9,242,204	27.9%	0.0%	19.7%	$1,823,328	$932	$1,956
Coventry	$47,679,023	28.4%	60.9%	47.5%	$22,654,737	$4,791	$4,729
Cranston	$105,105,599	44.3%	63.3%	54.6%	$57,421,624	$10,042	$5,718
Cumberland	$44,346,207	22.9%	52.5%	40.5%	$17,960,652	$4,562	$3,937
E. Greenwich	$21,342,124	7.6%	22.6%	16.9%	$3,598,285	$2,326	$1,547
E. Providence	$57,145,431	50.4%	60.7%	55.8%	31,880,416	$5,355	$5,953
Foster	$2,722,482	20.4%	50.5%	38.5%	$1,048,493	$280	$3,745
Glocester	$5,089,084	20.0%	51.0%	38.7%	$1,971,322	$524	$3,762
Hopkinton	$11,936,215	28.2%	54.8%	43.6%	$5,201,698	$1,208	$4,306
Jamestown	$6,067,754	8.5%	0.0%	6.0%	$$364,697	$656	$556
Johnston	$31,385,057	45.1%	50.3%	47.8%	$14,992,895	$2,986	$5,021
Lincoln	$30,885,046	29.0%	47.2%	39.2%	$12,098,189	$3,137	$3,857
Little Compton	$3,790,122	17.6%	0.0%	12.4%	$471,684	$402	$1,173
Middletown	$24,030,797	31.2%	33.8%	32.5%	$7,816,255	$2,407	$3,247
Narragansett	$13,918,467	23.9%	0.0%	16.9%	$2,352,200	$1,430	$1,645
Newport	$22,852,834	66.0%	0.0%	46.7%	$10,665,200	$2,047	$5,210
Nw Shoreham	$1,037,390	13.4%	0.0%	9.5%	$98,295	$111	$886
N. Kingstown	$37,315,797	24.8%	33.2%	29.3%	$10,934,484	$3,885	$2,815
N. Providence	$35,692,985	41.8%	60.6%	52.1%	$18,580,247	$3,401	$5,463
N. Smithfield	$16,795,757	19.7%	48.7%	37.1%	$6,239,098	$1,769	$3,527
Pawtucket	$101,404,447	80.4%	85.3%	82.9%	$84,050,310	$8,640	$9,728
Portsmouth	$23,112,627	16.9%	7.2%	13.0%	$3,002,196	$2,453	$1,224
Providence	$270,862,047	90.2%	85.5%	87.9%	$238,037,429	$22,519	$10,571
Richmond	$11,058,971	18.3%	57.8%	42.9%	$4,741,017	$1,161	$4,084
Scituate	$14,043,025	18.0%	40.8%	31.5%	$4,428,165	$1,480	$2,992
Smithfield	$22,005,840	14.9%	24.5%	20.3%	$4,475,281	$2,327	$1,923
S. Kingstown	$32,030,979	19.6%	15.0%	17.5%	$5,590,117	$3,349	$1,669
Tiverton	$18,283,335	27.9%	38.6%	33.7%	$6,157,400	$1,849	$3,330
Warwick	$94,393,611	34.2%	44.8%	39.9%	$37,619,614	$9,284	$4,052
Westerly	$31,865,495	41.6%	0.0%	29.4%	$9,373,440	$3,120	$3,004
West Warwick	$36,000,821	53.8%	69.5%	62.1%	$22,373,706	$3,370	$6,639
Woonsocket	$64,962,335	76.6%	88.2%	82.6%	$53,661,406	$5,624	$9,542
Bristol Warren	$35,091,547	34.2%	33.0%	33.6%	$11,792,640	$3,429	$3,439
Exeter/ W. Greenwich	$15,913,174	14.7%	32.7%	25.4%	$4,034,202	$1,683	$2,397
Foster-Glocester	$11,416,630	18.5%	50.9%	38.3%	$4,372,033	$1,186	$3,686
Central Falls	$30,952,663	92.7%	96.3%	94.5%	$29,255,572	$2,561	$11,423
TOTAL	**$1,396,296,959**				**$770,499,437**	**$131,969**	**$5,838**

Notes: Data for Col. B and Col. H is from, "FY 2014 Final Formula Calculations"; for towns in regional school districts, from Kristen Cole, RIDE

–Col. B: Total Foundation includes Core Instructional Amount for all students and 40% of CIA for Free and Reduced Price Lunch students.

–Col. C: Wealth or EWAV per pupil as a percent of state average wealth per pupil is WPP divided by state average WPP and expressed as a percentage; see Table 2, Column E.

–Col. D: Local Share Ratio or percent equals 47.5% multiplied by WPP divided by state average WPP; Column D = 47.5% x Column C.

–Col. E: State Share Ratio or percent equals 100% minus Local Share Ratio; Column E = 100% - Column D.

–Col. F: State Share Ratio for the Community (SSRC) is the same as the State Share Ratio (Col. E) except that for the 5 towns and 1 city which have 0% instead of the negative state share percentages in Col E since their local share is more than 100%. This provision means that the state share costs 58.1% of the Total Foundation rather than 52.5%, so $78.5 million more.

–Col. G: The State Share amount is the SSRC multiplied by the Total Foundation; Column G = Column F multiplied by Column B.

–Col. H: Resident Average Daily Membership (RADM) is March 2013 enrollment data, RIDE.

–Col. I: State Share Per Pupil is the State Share of the Total Foundation per pupil; Column I = Column G divided by Column H.

Table 5: COMPARISON OF TAX RATES NEEDED TO RAISE LOCAL SHARE OF THREE FORMULAS IN RHODE ISLAND, FY 2014
UNIFORM TAX RATE (UTR), WEALTH PER PUPIL (WPP), & QUADRATIC MEAN (QM) FORMULAS

CITY OR TOWN	UTR Formula Local Share	UTR Tax Rate	UTR % of Avg. Rate	WPP Formula Local Share	WPP Tax Rate	WPP % of Avg. Rate	QM Formula Local Share	QM Tax Rate	QM % of Avg. Rate
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Barrington	$23,605,915	$5.20	109%	$20,380,372	$4.49	98%	$23,577,880	$5.19	106%
Bristol	$17,343,065	$5.20	109%	$16,341,766	$4.90	107%	$16,497,614	$4.95	101%
Burrillville	$8,281,606	$5.20	109%	$8,006,633	$5.03	110%	$11,578,823	$7.27	148%
Central Falls	$1,368,564	$5.20	109%	$1,547,633	$5.88	128%	$1,702,396	$6.47	132%
Charlestown	$9,242,204	$3.32	70%	$9,242,204	$3.32	72%	$7,421,490	$2.67	54%
Coventry	$19,537,143	$5.20	109%	$18,404,103	$4.90	107%	$25,031,487	$6.66	136%
Cranston	$37,791,354	$5.20	109%	$37,417,593	$5.15	112%	$47,507,731	$6.54	133%
Cumberland	$22,456,793	$5.20	109%	$20,665,332	$4.79	104%	$26,385,993	$6.11	124%
East Greenwich	$18,187,628	$5.20	109%	$15,793,172	$4.52	98%	$17,735,305	$5.07	103%
East Providence	$21,886,984	$5.20	109%	$22,115,282	$5.25	114%	$25,258,281	$6.00	122%
Exeter	$6,247,758	$5.20	109%	$5,626,484	$4.68	102%	$6,110,482	$5.09	104%
Foster	$3,394,060	$5.20	109%	$3,058,601	$4.69	102%	$3,980,020	$6.10	124%
Glocester	$6,720,089	$5.20	109%	$6,046,623	$4.68	102%	$8,088,684	$6.26	127%
Hopkinton	$5,499,667	$5.20	109%	$5,144,509	$4.86	106%	$6,732,025	$6.37	130%
Jamestown	$6,067,754	$2.77	58%	$6,067,754	$2.77	60%	$5,703,689	$2.61	53%
Johnston	$15,181,032	$5.20	109%	$15,096,212	$5.17	113%	$16,383,000	$5.61	114%
Lincoln	$17,803,028	$5.20	109%	$16,585,270	$4.84	106%	$18,778,108	$5.48	112%
Little Compton	$3,790,122	$1.45	30%	$3,790,122	$1.45	32%	$3,320,147	$1.27	26%
Middletown	$15,986,488	$5.20	109%	$15,091,341	$4.91	107%	$16,220,788	$5.28	107%
Narragansett	$13,918,467	$2.64	55%	$13,918,467	$2.64	57%	$11,566,246	$2.19	45%
Newport	$22,852,834	$3.85	81%	$22,852,834	$3.85	84%	$12,180,561	$2.05	42%
New Shoreham	$1,037,390	$0.41	9%	$1,037,390	$0.41	9%	$938,838	$0.37	8%
North Kingstown	$26,949,469	$5.20	109%	$24,479,163	$4.72	103%	$26,382,268	$5.09	104%
North Providence	$13,383,981	$5.20	109%	$13,277,790	$5.16	112%	$17,096,940	$6.64	135%
North Smithfield	$9,071,994	$5.20	109%	$8,145,942	$4.67	102%	$10,564,531	$6.06	123%
Pawtucket	$14,458,901	$5.20	109%	$16,021,903	$5.76	126%	$17,340,160	$6.24	127%
Portsmouth	$23,112,627	$5.15	108%	$20,778,252	$4.63	101%	$20,107,985	$4.48	91%
Providence	$36,599,412	$5.20	109%	$41,712,755	$5.93	129%	$32,774,308	$4.66	95%
Richmond	$4,952,415	$5.20	109%	$4,456,765	$4.68	102%	$6,314,672	$6.63	135%
Scituate	$9,044,998	$5.20	109%	$8,116,868	$4.67	102%	$9,619,472	$5.53	113%
Smithfield	$17,904,727	$5.20	109%	$16,020,252	$4.65	101%	$17,538,654	$5.09	104%
South Kingstown	$30,001,008	$5.20	109%	$27,130,239	$4.70	102%	$26,425,558	$4.58	93%
Tiverton	$11,099,143	$5.20	109%	$10,384,934	$4.87	106%	$12,121,851	$5.68	116%
Warren	$6,055,540	$5.20	109%	$6,012,914	$5.16	112%	$6,957,421	$5.97	122%
Warwick	$53,060,342	$5.20	109%	$51,066,944	$5.00	109%	$56,730,560	$5.56	113%
Westerly	$31,865,495	$5.05	106%	$31,738,033	$5.03	109%	$22,497,039	$3.56	73%
West Greenwich	$5,577,148	$5.20	109%	$4,909,003	$4.58	100%	$6,134,002	$5.72	116%
West Warwick	$10,401,428	$5.20	109%	$10,512,240	$5.26	114%	$13,644,311	$6.82	139%
Woonsocket	$6,837,279	$5.20	109%	$7,470,669	$5.68	124%	$11,303,446	$8.60	175%
TOTAL/AVERAGE	**$608,575,851**	**$4.77**	**100%**	**$586,464,362**	**$4.59**	**100%**	**$626,252,767**	**$4.91**	**100%**
% of FOUNDATION	**43.5%**			**42.0%**			**44.8%**		

Notes: – % of Foundation is percentage that Total Local Share is of the Total Foundation program, for each formula; see Table 1, Col. B • No district has a larger local share than their Total Foundation program; see Tables 1, 3, and 4. • EWAV is from, "2010 Adjusted Equalized Weighted Assessed Valuations of RI Municipalities," RIDMF

Col. B is Local Share for the Uniform Tax Rate(UTR) Formula; see Table 1.

Col. C is Tax Rate required to raise UTR formula Local Share (Col. B). Tax Rate = Local Share/EWAV x $1,000.

Col. D is UTR formula tax rate as a % of the AVERAGE tax rate and equals District UTR Formula Tax Rate divided by $4.77.

Col. E is Local Share for Wealth Per Pupil (WPP) Formula; see Table 3.

Col. F is Tax Rate required to raise WPP Formula Local Share (Col. E). Tax Rate = Local Share/EWAV x $1,000.

Col. G is WPP Formula Tax Rate as a % of the AVERAGE Tax Rate and equals district WPP Formula Tax Rate divided by $4.59.

Col.H is Local Share for current Quadratic Mean (QM) Formula; see Table 4.

Col. I is Tax Rate required to raise the current QM Formula Local Share (Col. H). Tax Rate = Local Share/EWAV x $1,000.

Col. J is QM Formula Tax Rate as a % of the AVERAGE Tax Rate and equals district QM Formula Tax Rate divided by $4.91.

Table 6: RHODE ISLAND QUADRATIC MEAN (QM) & WEALTH PER PUPIL (WPP) FORMULAS COMPARED, FY 2014

School District	Total Foundation	Poor % PK-6	WPP % (SSRC)	QM % (SSR)	State Share QM Formula	State Share WPP Formula	State Share Difference	Pupils (RADM)	Difference Per Pupil
A	B	C	D	E	F = B x E	G = B x D	H = F – G	I	J = H / I
Barrington	$29,883,244	6.7%	29.1%	21.1%	$6,305,364	$8,696,024	($2,390,660)	3,276	($730)
Burrillville	$24,635,793	34.7%	66.4%	53.0%	$13,056,970	$16,358,167	($3,301,196)	2,407	($1,371)
Charlestown	$9,242,204	27.9%	0.0%	19.7%	$1,820,714	$0	$1,820,714	932	$1,954
Coventry	$47,679,023	28.4%	60.9%	47.5%	$22,647,536	$29,036,525	($6,388,989)	4,791	($1,334)
Cranston	$105,105,599	44.3%	63.3%	54.6%	$57,387,657	$66,531,844	($9,144,187)	10,042	($911)
Cumberland	$44,346,207	22.9%	52.5%	40.5%	$17,960,214	$23,281,759	($5,321,545)	4,562	($1,166)
East Greenwich	$21,342,124	7.6%	22.6%	16.9%	$3,606,819	$4,823,320	($1,216,501)	2,326	($523)
East Providence	$57,145,431	50.4%	60.7%	55.8%	$31,887,150	$34,687,277	($2,800,126)	5,355	($523)
Foster	$2,722,482	20.4%	50.5%	38.5%	$1,048,156	$1,374,853	($326,698)	280	($1,167)
Glocester	$5,089,084	20.0%	51.0%	38.7%	$1,969,476	$2,595,433	($625,957)	524	($1,195)
Hopkinton	$11,936,215	28.2%	54.8%	43.6%	$5,204,190	$6,541,046	($1,336,856)	1,208	($1,107)
Jamestown	$6,067,754	8.5%	0.0%	6.0%	$364,065	$0	$364,065	656	$555
Johnston	$31,385,057	45.1%	50.3%	47.8%	$15,002,057	$15,786,684	($784,626)	2,986	($263)
Lincoln	$30,885,046	29.0%	47.2%	39.2%	$12,106,938	$14,577,742	($2,470,804)	3,137	($788)
Little Compton	$3,790,122	17.6%	0.0%	12.4%	$469,975	$0	$469,975	402	$1,169
Middletown	$24,030,797	31.2%	33.8%	32.5%	$7,810,009	$8,122,409	($312,400)	2,407	($130)
Narragansett	$13,918,467	23.9%	0.0%	16.9%	$2,352,221	$0	$2,352,221	1,430	$1,645
Newport	$22,852,834	66.0%	0.0%	46.7%	$10,672,273	$0	$10,672,273	2,047	$5,214
North Shoreham	$1,037,390	13.4%	0.0%	9.5%	$98,552	$0	$98,552	111	$888
North Kingstown	$37,315,797	24.8%	33.2%	29.3%	$10,933,529	$12,388,845	($1,455,316)	3,885	($375)
North Providence	$35,692,985	41.8%	60.6%	52.1%	$18,596,045	$21,629,949	($3,033,904)	3,401	($892)
North Smithfield	$16,795,757	19.7%	48.7%	37.1%	$6,231,226	$8,179,534	($1,948,308)	1,769	($1,101)
Pawtucket	$101,404,447	80.4%	85.3%	82.9%	$84,064,287	$86,497,993	($2,433,707)	8,640	($282)
Portsmouth	$23,112,627	16.9%	7.2%	13.0%	$3,004,642	$1,664,109	$1,340,532	2,453	$546
Providence	$270,862,047	90.2%	85.5%	87.9%	$238,087,739	$231,587,050	$6,500,689	22,519	$289
Richmond	$11,058,971	18.3%	57.8%	42.9%	$4,744,299	$6,392,085	($1,647,787)	1,161	($1,419)
Scituate	$14,043,025	18.0%	40.8%	31.5%	$4,423,553	$5,729,554	($1,306,001)	1,480	($882)
Smithfield	$22,005,840	14.9%	24.5%	20.3%	$4,467,186	$5,391,431	($924,245)	2,327	($397)
South Kingstown	$32,030,979	19.6%	15.0%	17.5%	$5,605,421	$4,804,647	$800,774	3,349	$239
Tiverton	$18,283,335	27.9%	38.6%	33.7%	$6,161,484	$7,057,367	($895,883)	1,849	($485)
Warwick	$94,393,611	34.2%	44.8%	39.9%	$37,663,051	$42,288,338	($4,625,287)	9,284	($498)
Westerly	$31,865,495	41.6%	0.0%	29.4%	$9,368,456	$0	$9,368,456	3,120	$3,003
West Warwick	$36,000,821	53.8%	69.5%	62.1%	$22,356,510	$25,020,571	($2,664,061)	3,370	($791)
Woonsocket	$64,962,335	76.6%	88.2%	82.6%	$53,658,889	$57,296,779	($3,637,891)	5,624	($647)
Bristol Warren	$35,091,547	34.2%	33.0%	33.6%	$11,790,760	$11,580,211	$210,549	3,429	$61
Exeter /W. Greenwish	$15,913,174	14.7%	32.7%	25.4%	$4,041,946	$5,203,608	($1,161,662)	1,683	($690)
Foster-Glocester	$11,416,630	18.5%	50.9%	38.3%	$4,372,569	$5,811,065	($1,438,495)	1,186	($1,213)
Central Falls	$30,952,663	92.7%	96.3%	94.5%	$29,250,267	$29,807,414	($557,148)	2,561	($218)
TOTAL	**$1,396,296,959**				**$770,592,193**	**$800,743,631**	**($30,151,438)**	**131,969**	**($228)**

Notes: Data in Columns B through E and I are from, "FY 2014 Final Formula Calculations," March 2013, RIDE

– If poor pupils % (Col. C) is higher than wealth per pupil formula state share % (SSRC, Col. D), then the QM formula state share (Col. F) is higher than WPP formula state share (Col. G). The reverse is also true.

–Column B: Total Foundation is costs of instruction for all students with additional funds for poor children in federal lunch program.

–Column C: Poor PK-6 is the percentage of students PK-6 who are in federal free and reduced price lunch program (FRPL).

–Column D:The State Share Ratio for the Community (SSRC) is in inverse relationship to property value & mean family income. It is calculated according to R.I.G.L. 16-7-20 and 16-7-21. See Table 3 Column F

–Column E: The State Share Ratio (SSR) results from the quadratic mean calculation using SSRC and PK-6 poor pupils (FRPL).

–Column F: State Share for current QM formula equals State Share Ratio (SSR) multiplied by Total Foundation (Col. E x Col. B).

–Column G: State Share for WPP formula equals SSRC multiplied by Total Foundation (Column D x Column B).

–Column H: State Share Difference is amount gained (or lost) by using QM formula rather than WPP formula.

–Column I: Pupils (RADM) is the Resident Average Daily Membership as defined in R.I G.L. 16-7-22

–Column J: Difference Per Pupil is amount gained (or lost) by using current QM formula rather than WPP formula, Col. H / Col.I