

CENTER *for* PUBLIC POLICY PRIORITIES

7020 Easy Wind Drive, Suite 200 •Austin, TX •Phone 512.320.0222 •CPPP.org
Estimated Funding Lost in One Year to School Districts within Senate District 31
Revised SB3 Vouchers¹

School District ²	Total # of enrolled students 2014-15 ⁴	Total # Economically disadvantaged students 2014-15	5%	3%	1%
			Estimated financial loss in one year to school districts if 5% of eligible students opt for vouchers ¹	Estimated financial loss in one year to school districts if 3% of eligible students opt for vouchers ¹	Estimated financial loss in one year to school districts if 1% of eligible students opt for vouchers ¹
TOTAL District 31	168,968	89,726	-\$22,087,893	-\$12,431,889	-\$4,143,963
ADRIAN ISD	117	76	NE	NE	NE
AMARILLO ISD	33,169	22236	-\$9,190,110	-\$5,266,047	-\$1,755,349
ANDREWS ISD	4,006	1463	NE	NE	NE
BIG SPRING ISD	4,232	2579	NE	NE	NE
BOOKER ISD	417	210	NE	NE	NE
BORDEN COUNTY ISD	249	60	NE	NE	NE
BORGER ISD	2,738	1405	NE	NE	NE
BOVINA ISD	485	410	NE	NE	NE
BOYS RANCH ISD	281	226	NE	NE	NE
BROWNFIELD ISD	1,808	1420	NE	NE	NE
BUSHLAND ISD	1,493	315	-\$138,230	-\$74,533	-\$24,844
CANADIAN ISD	1,048	419	NE	NE	NE
CANYON ISD	9,396	2469	-\$1,077,288	-\$584,772	-\$194,924
CHANNING ISD	149	77	NE	NE	NE
CHILDRESS ISD	1,148	592	NE	NE	NE
CLARENDON ISD	481	233	NE	NE	NE
CLAUDE ISD	357	231	NE	NE	NE
COAHOMA ISD	894	330	NE	NE	NE
DALHART ISD	1,760	1026	NE	NE	NE
DARROUZETT ISD	112	69	NE	NE	NE
DENVER CITY ISD	1,754	848	NE	NE	NE
DIMMITT ISD	1,233	1083	NE	NE	NE

NE = Revised SB3 applies only to counties with over 50,000 in population, and these school districts are in such counties.

School District ²	Total # of enrolled students 2014-15 ⁴	Total # Economically disadvantaged students 2014-15	5%	3%	1%
			Estimated financial loss in one year to school districts if 5% of eligible students opt for vouchers ¹	Estimated financial loss in one year to school districts if 3% of eligible students opt for vouchers ¹	Estimated financial loss in one year to school districts if 1% of eligible students opt for vouchers ¹
DUMAS ISD	4,554	3184	NE	NE	NE
ECTOR COUNTY ISD	31,900	15315	-\$6,493,983	-\$3,626,943	-\$1,208,981
FARWELL ISD	551	343	NE	NE	NE
FOLLETT ISD	191	93	NE	NE	NE
FORSAN ISD	738	168	NE	NE	NE
FORT ELLIOTT CISD	167	27	NE	NE	NE
FRIONA ISD	1,141	900	NE	NE	NE
GLASSCOCK ISD	306	116	NE	NE	NE
GRADY ISD	231	69	NE	NE	NE
GRANDVIEW-HOPKINS ISD	42	15	NE	NE	NE
GREENWOOD ISD	2,154	608	-\$264,711	-\$144,055	-\$48,018
GROOM ISD	136	46	NE	NE	NE
GRUVER ISD	446	196	NE	NE	NE
HAPPY ISD	259	120	NE	NE	NE
HART ISD	246	223	NE	NE	NE
HARTLEY ISD	223	169	NE	NE	NE
HEDLEY ISD	112	81	NE	NE	NE
HEREFORD ISD	4,201	3491	NE	NE	NE
HIGGINS ISD	151	89	NE	NE	NE
HIGHLAND PARK ISD	888	486	-\$204,234	-\$115,095	-\$38,365
KELTON ISD	120	52	NE	NE	NE
KERMIT ISD	1,451	943	NE	NE	NE
KLONDIKE ISD	258	90	NE	NE	NE
KRESS ISD	225	177	NE	NE	NE
LAZBUDDIE ISD	193	139	NE	NE	NE
LEFORS ISD	164	100	NE	NE	NE
LOOP ISD	126	54	NE	NE	NE

NE = Revised SB3 applies only to counties with over 50,000 in population, and these school districts are in such counties.

School District ²	Total # of enrolled students 2014-15 ⁴	Total # Economically disadvantaged students 2014-15	5%	3%	1%
			Estimated financial loss in one year to school districts if 5% of eligible students opt for vouchers ¹	Estimated financial loss in one year to school districts if 3% of eligible students opt for vouchers ¹	Estimated financial loss in one year to school districts if 1% of eligible students opt for vouchers ¹
MCLEAN ISD	206	91	NE	NE	NE
MEMPHIS ISD	538	374	NE	NE	NE
MIAMI ISD	209	38	NE	NE	NE
MIDLAND ISD	24,300	10264	-\$4,385,704	-\$2,430,796	-\$810,265
MORTON ISD	433	403	NE	NE	NE
MULESHOE ISD	1,423	1210	NE	NE	NE
NAZARETH ISD	227	42	NE	NE	NE
PAMPA ISD	3,824	2141	NE	NE	NE
PANHANDLE ISD	643	128	NE	NE	NE
PERRYTON ISD	2,425	1322	NE	NE	NE
PLAINS ISD	454	287	NE	NE	NE
PLEMONS-STINNETT-PHILLIPS (664	254	NE	NE	NE
PRINGLE-MORSE CISD	123	57	NE	NE	NE
RIVER ROAD ISD	1,310	801	-\$333,633	-\$189,646	-\$63,215
SANDS CISD	235	132	NE	NE	NE
SANFORD-FRITCH ISD	829	354	NE	NE	NE
SEAGRAVES ISD	596	372	NE	NE	NE
SEMINOLE ISD	2,824	1343	NE	NE	NE
SHAMROCK ISD	444	214	NE	NE	NE
SILVERTON ISD	185	100	NE	NE	NE
SPEARMAN ISD	879	500	NE	NE	NE
SPRING CREEK ISD	106	48	NE	NE	NE
SPRINGLAKE-EARTH ISD	384	254	NE	NE	NE
STANTON ISD	963	498	NE	NE	NE
STRATFORD ISD	576	345	NE	NE	NE
SUDAN ISD	433	228	NE	NE	NE
SUNRAY ISD	520	249	NE	NE	NE
TEXHOMA ISD	211	101	NE	NE	NE
TEXLINE ISD	180	123	NE	NE	NE

NE = Revised SB3 applies only to counties with over 50,000 in population, and these school districts are in such counties.

School District ²	Total # of enrolled students 2014-15 ⁴	Total # Economically disadvantaged students 2014-15	5%	3%	1%
			Estimated financial loss in one year to school districts if 5% of eligible students opt for vouchers ¹	Estimated financial loss in one year to school districts if 3% of eligible students opt for vouchers ¹	Estimated financial loss in one year to school districts if 1% of eligible students opt for vouchers ¹
TULIA ISD	1,077	831	NE	NE	NE
TURKEY-QUITAQUE ISD	189	91	NE	NE	NE
VEGA ISD	359	108	NE	NE	NE
WALCOTT ISD	132	88	NE	NE	NE
WELLINGTON ISD	602	370	NE	NE	NE
WELLMAN-UNION CISD	248	149	NE	NE	NE
WHEELER ISD	486	219	NE	NE	NE
WHITE DEER ISD	369	161	NE	NE	NE
WHITEFACE CISD	362	177	NE	NE	NE
WILDORADO ISD	92	29	NE	NE	NE
WINK-LOVING ISD	407	159	NE	NE	NE

1. CPPP analysis using Texas Education Agency 2015 enrollment and economically disadvantaged data (2014-15 School Year), with the voucher and payback parameters defined in revised SB 3. We calculated the financial loss to school districts by multiplying the number of economically disadvantaged students by the 2015 TEA statewide average cost per student (\$9022), and then subtracting the one-time payback payment to the district for those students (\$1128). Under SB 3, the one-time payback payments to school districts would be based on 50% of the difference between the state average cost per student and the ESA voucher amount for the student. Because no data is available regarding the percentage of students in each school district with income levels defined in SB 3, we used TEA data for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in each district. (Using the economically disadvantaged percentage for our calculations will yield a conservative estimate of money lost to the district, because the economically disadvantaged group is a smaller group than the lower income group defined by revised SB 3 as eligible for the ESA vouchers.)

2. CPPP analysis using Texas Education Agency 2015 economically disadvantaged and enrollment data (2014-15 School Year). There are a small number of Texas school districts not included in this table because TEA did not have the relevant data available.

3. TEA did not have district-specific data available on the percentage of economically disadvantaged students for this district, so we used the statewide average percentage of economically disadvantaged students, which is 59%.

4. These numbers include K-12 Students. There is some indication that Kindergarteners will be excluded in the revised SB3.

NE = Revised SB3 applies only to counties with over 50,000 in population, and these school districts are in such counties.