



**ANALYSIS OF THE NEW JERSEY BUDGET**

**DEPARTMENT  
OF EDUCATION**

**FISCAL YEAR**

**2015 - 2016**

# NEW JERSEY STATE LEGISLATURE

## SENATE BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

**Paul A. Sarlo** (D), 36th District (Parts of Bergen and Passaic), *Chair*  
**Brian P. Stack** (D), 33rd District (Part of Hudson), *Vice-Chair*  
**Peter J. Barnes III** (D), 18th District (Part of Middlesex)  
**Jennifer Beck** (R), 11th District (Part of Monmouth)  
**Anthony R. Bucco** (R), 25th District (Parts of Morris and Somerset)  
**Sandra B. Cunningham** (D), 31st District (Part of Hudson)  
**Linda R. Greenstein** (D), 14th District (Parts of Mercer and Middlesex)  
**Steven V. Oroho** (R), 24th District (All of Sussex, and parts of Morris and Warren)  
**Kevin J. O'Toole** (R), 40th District (Parts of Bergen, Essex, Morris and Passaic)  
**Nellie Pou** (D), 35th District (Parts of Bergen and Passaic)  
**M. Teresa Ruiz** (D), 29th District (Part of Essex)  
**Samuel D. Thompson** (R), 12th District (Parts of Burlington, Middlesex, Monmouth and Ocean)  
**Jeff Van Drew** (D), 1st District (All of Cape May, and parts of Atlantic and Cumberland)

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY BUDGET COMMITTEE

**Gary S. Schaer** (D), 36th District (Parts of Bergen and Passaic), *Chair*  
**John J. Burzichelli** (D), 3rd District (All of Salem, parts of Cumberland and Gloucester), *Vice-Chair*  
**Christopher J. Brown** (R), 8th District (Parts of Atlantic, Burlington and Camden)  
**Anthony M. Bucco** (R), 25th District (Parts of Morris and Somerset)  
**Gordon M. Johnson** (D), 37th District (Part of Bergen)  
**John F. McKeon** (D), 27th District (Parts of Essex and Morris)  
**Raj Mukherji** (D), 33rd District (Part of Hudson)  
**Declan J. O'Scanlon, Jr.** (R), 13th District (Part of Monmouth)  
**Eliana Pintor Marin** (D), 29th District (Part of Essex)  
**Troy Singleton** (D), 7th District (Part of Burlington)  
**Jay Webber** (R), 26th District (Parts of Essex, Morris and Passaic)  
**Benjie E. Wimberly** (D), 35th District (Parts of Bergen and Passaic)

## OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**David J. Rosen**, *Legislative Budget and Finance Officer*  
**Frank W. Haines III**, *Assistant Legislative Budget and Finance Officer*

**Marvin W. Jiggetts**, *Director, Central Staff*  
**Kathleen Fazzari**, *Section Chief, Education Section*

This report was prepared by the Education Section of the Office of Legislative Services under the direction of the Legislative Budget and Finance Officer. The primary author was Allen T. Dupree.

Questions or comments may be directed to the OLS Education Section (609-847-3850) or the Legislative Budget and Finance Office (609-847-3105).

# DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Budget Pages..... C-4, C-10, C-17, C-23, C-25 to C-26,  
D-81 to D-106, H-1, H-3, H-12, H-15,  
H-18 to H-19

## **Fiscal Summary (\$000)**

	Expended FY 2014	Adjusted Appropriation FY 2015	Recommended FY 2016	Percent Change 2015-16
State Budgeted	\$11,695,529	\$12,032,329	\$12,841,698	6.7%
Federal Funds	\$779,737	\$848,799	\$847,576	( .1%)
<u>Other</u>	<u>\$16,552</u>	<u>\$12,608</u>	<u>\$12,463</u>	<u>( 1.2%)</u>
Grand Total	\$12,491,818	\$12,893,736	\$13,701,737	6.3%

## **Personnel Summary - Positions By Funding Source**

	Actual FY 2014	Revised FY 2015	Funded FY 2016	Percent Change 2015-16
State	375	410	441	7.6%
Federal	207	202	219	8.4%
<u>Other</u>	<u>213</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>1.3%</u>
Total Positions	795	764	814	6.5%

FY 2014 (as of December) and revised FY 2015 (as of January) personnel data reflect actual payroll counts. FY 2016 data reflect the number of positions funded.

Link to Website: <http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/legislativepub/finance.asp>

## Highlights

- ***The FY 2016 recommended budget provides little increase in direct K-12 State aid to school districts, with such funding increasing by 0.07 percent (\$5.2 million) Statewide to \$7.96 billion.*** The only school districts that would receive an increase in State aid under the proposal are 83 districts that participate in the interdistrict public school choice program that are projected to serve more students in that program in the 2015-2016 school year than in the 2014-2015 school year. All other school districts will receive the same amount of total State aid in FY 2016 as was received in FY 2015; this includes 26 school choice districts that will receive additional adjustment aid to offset a decrease in school choice aid that resulted from the districts serving fewer students in the program.
- ***The budget recommends an appropriation of \$12.756 billion in State aid, an increase of \$811.2 million over the FY 2015 adjusted appropriation; the vast majority of this increase does not affect school districts' budgets.*** Over 92 percent of the increase is attributable to the proposed increased contribution to the Teachers' Pension and Annuity Fund and increased debt service payment on bonds issued by the Economic Development Authority to support the State's school construction program.
- ***The proposed budget reduces State support for programs and services in nonpublic schools by \$3.6 million.*** The reductions are concentrated in two specific areas: nonpublic nursing services aid and the nonpublic technology initiative. Both reductions negate increased appropriations added by the Legislature while developing the FY 2015 appropriations act.
- ***The budget recommendations include a proposal to establish an opportunity scholarship demonstration program, which includes an appropriation of \$2 million.*** The proposal is identical to one included in the FY 2014 budget recommendations, but excluded from that year's appropriations act. The program would award scholarships to students who attend "chronically failing schools" (a term not defined in the budget recommendations) and who reside in households in which income does not exceed 185 percent of the federal poverty threshold.
- ***The assessment of EDA debt service imposed on school districts will be the same amount as it was in FY 2015.*** The recommendation to maintain the assessment at the same level, rather than link it to the State's required principal and interest payment on bonds issued by the Economic Development Authority, likely averted a substantial increase in districts' assessments, as the proposed appropriation for the line item used to pay these debt service costs is 70 percent higher in the recommended budget than the FY 2015 adjusted appropriation.

### Background Paper

- Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools.....pp. 23-38

**Fiscal and Personnel Summary**

**AGENCY FUNDING BY SOURCE OF FUNDS (\$000)**

	Expended FY 2014	Adj. Approp. FY 2015	Recom. FY 2016	Percent Change	
				2014-16	2015-16
<b>General Fund</b>					
Direct State Services	\$80,048	\$82,497	\$81,135	1.4%	( 1.7%)
Grants-In-Aid	2,650	5,150	4,650	75.5%	( 9.7%)
State Aid	148,055	756,652	148,274	0.1%	(80.4%)
Capital Construction	1,461	0	0	( 100.0%)	0.0%
Debt Service	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$232,214</b>	<b>\$844,299</b>	<b>\$234,059</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>( 72.3%)</b>
<b>Property Tax Relief Fund</b>					
Direct State Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0%	0.0%
Grants-In-Aid	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
State Aid	11,463,315	11,188,030	12,607,639	10.0%	12.7%
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$11,463,315</b>	<b>\$11,188,030</b>	<b>\$12,607,639</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>12.7%</b>
<b>Casino Revenue Fund</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Casino Control Fund</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>State Total</b>	<b>\$11,695,529</b>	<b>\$12,032,329</b>	<b>\$12,841,698</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
<b>Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$779,737</b>	<b>\$848,799</b>	<b>\$847,576</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>( 0.1%)</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	<b>\$16,552</b>	<b>\$12,608</b>	<b>\$12,463</b>	<b>( 24.7%)</b>	<b>( 1.2%)</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$12,491,818</b>	<b>\$12,893,736</b>	<b>\$13,701,737</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>6.3%</b>

**PERSONNEL SUMMARY - POSITIONS BY FUNDING SOURCE**

	Actual FY 2014	Revised FY 2015	Funded FY 2016	Percent Change	
				2014-16	2015-16
State	375	410	441	17.6%	7.6%
Federal	207	202	219	5.8%	8.4%
All Other	213	152	154	( 27.7%)	1.3%
<b>Total Positions</b>	<b>795</b>	<b>764</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>6.5%</b>

FY 2014 (as of December) and revised FY 2015 (as of January) personnel data reflect actual payroll counts. FY 2016 data reflect the number of positions funded.

**AFFIRMATIVE ACTION DATA**

Total Minority Percent	29.4%	30.5%	---	---
------------------------	-------	-------	-----	-----

**Significant Changes/New Programs (\$000)**

<u>Budget Item</u>	<u>Adj. Approp.</u> <u>FY 2015</u>	<u>Recomm.</u> <u>FY 2016</u>	<u>Dollar</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Percent</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>Page</u>
<b>Total State Appropriation</b>	<b>\$12,032,329</b>	<b>\$12,841,698</b>	<b>\$809,369</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	<b>D-81</b>

**State Aid**

<b>Total State Aid</b>	<b>\$11,944,682</b>	<b>\$12,755,913</b>	<b>\$811,231</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>D-81</b>
------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	------------------	-------------	-------------

The proposed FY 2016 budget includes a recommended appropriation for State aid of nearly \$12.8 billion, an increase of \$811.2 million, or 6.8 percent, relative to the FY 2015 adjusted appropriation. As shown in the tables below, 92 percent of this increase is attributable to higher recommended appropriations for the State's contribution to the Teachers' Pension and Annuity Fund and debt service payments on bonds issued by the Economic Development Authority to support the State's school construction program. There is little change in direct State aid to school districts.

<b>School Choice</b>	<b>\$49,246</b>	<b>\$52,468</b>	<b>\$ 3,222</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>D-89</b>
----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------	-------------

The recommended FY 2016 appropriation for school choice aid, \$52.5 million, is a \$3.2 million (6.5 percent) increase over the FY 2015 adjusted appropriation. This line item provides funding to school districts that participate in the interdistrict public school choice program, allowing non-resident students to enroll in the districts' school without paying tuition. The FY 2016 proposed allocations are based on the per pupil funding levels established in FY 2014. Additionally, the aid calculation includes a downwards adjustment for school choice districts where the actual enrollment in the 2014-2015 school year was less than the projected enrollment on which that year's school choice aid was calculated (this adjustment is similar to one made in the FY 2015 appropriations act pursuant to budget resolution number 4).

<b>Nonpublic Nursing Services Aid</b>	<b>\$14,311</b>	<b>\$12,902</b>	<b>(\$1,409)</b>	<b>( 9.8%)</b>	<b>D-89</b>
---------------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------	-------------

<b>Nonpublic Technology Initiative</b>	<b>\$5,441</b>	<b>\$3,000</b>	<b>(\$2,441)</b>	<b>( 44.9%)</b>	<b>D-89</b>
--	----------------	----------------	------------------	-----------------	-------------

The FY 2016 budget recommendations contain two significant reductions in aid categories that support nonpublic schools. First, the budget proposes an FY 2016 appropriation of \$12.9 million, a reduction of \$1.4 million (9.8 percent) relative to FY 2015 nonpublic nursing services aid appropriation. Second, the recommended appropriation for the nonpublic technology initiative for FY 2016 is \$3 million, a reduction of \$2.4 million (44.9 percent) from FY 2015.

In both cases, the recommended appropriation included in the FY 2016 budget is identical to the amounts included in the Governor's recommended FY 2015 budget. The Legislature increased both of these line items while developing the FY 2015 appropriations act.

**Significant Changes/New Programs (\$000) (Cont'd)**

<u>Budget Item</u>	<u>Adj. Approp. FY 2015</u>	<u>Recomm. FY 2016</u>	<u>Dollar Change</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>	<u>Budget Page</u>
<b>Charter School Aid</b>	<b>\$12,000</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>(\$2,000)</b>	<b>( 16.7%)</b>	<b>D-89</b>

The proposed FY 2016 appropriation for charter school aid, \$10 million, is a reduction of \$2 million from the FY 2015 adjusted appropriation. The Office of Legislative Services notes that nearly \$3.7 million of the \$12 million appropriation made in FY 2015 was transferred to another line item in the department’s budget, suggesting that the proposed appropriation is adequate for the current needs.

<b>Integration Assistance Aid</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,276</b>	<b>\$ 1,276</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>D-89</b>
---------------------------------------	------------	----------------	-----------------	----------	-------------

The recommended FY 2016 budget includes an appropriation of nearly \$1.3 million to assist the Englewood City School District in the implementation of integration programs. Previous budgets have included similar appropriations; most recently, the FY 2009 appropriations act included \$5 million for integration assistance aid, \$4 million of which was dedicated to Englewood, and the balance was divided evenly between the Montclair and Teaneck School Districts.

<b>Family Crisis Transportation Aid</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$100</b>	<b>\$ 100</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>D-89</b>
---	------------	--------------	---------------	----------	-------------

The FY 2016 budget recommendations include an appropriation of \$100,000 for family crisis transportation aid. P.L.2013, c.231 (C.18A:38-1.1 et seq.) allows a student who moves out of a school district as a result of domestic violence, sexual abuse, or another family crisis to remain enrolled in that school district for the remainder of the school year. If a student elects to remain enrolled in the district and now lives remote from the school of attendance (more than two miles away for students enrolled in grades kindergarten through eight, more than 2.5 miles for high school students), then the school district must provide transportation services to the student, the cost of which will be reimbursed by the State.

<b>County Vocational School District Partnership Grant Program</b>	<b>\$3,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$3,000)</b>	<b>( 100.0%)</b>	<b>D-96</b>
--	----------------	------------	------------------	------------------	-------------

The FY 2015 appropriations act included an appropriation and corresponding language establishing a grant program for county vocational school districts to partner with other entities for the development of career and technical education programs in existing facilities owned by those other entities. P.L.2014, c.73 (C.18A:6-132 et seq.) provided for the establishment of a similar four-year program. The department developed a competitive grant program, open to all county vocational school districts, that would award grants of up to \$600,000 to the districts. According to the notice of grant opportunity released by the department, the program will last 39 months.

**Significant Changes/New Programs (\$000) (Cont'd)**

<u>Budget Item</u>	<u>Adj. Approp.</u> <u>FY 2015</u>	<u>Recomm.</u> <u>FY 2016</u>	<u>Dollar</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Percent</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>Page</u>
<b>School Building Aid</b>	<b>\$55,974</b>	<b>\$51,768</b>	<b>(\$4,206)</b>	<b>( 7.5%)</b>	<b>D-89</b>

School building aid provides school districts with assistance in making debt service payments on bonds issued prior to the effective date of the "Educational Facilities Construction and Financing Act," P.L.2000, c.72 (C.18A:7G-1 et al.). The recommended appropriation, \$51.8 million, is a \$4.2 million (7.5 percent) decrease over the prior year, and reflects the fact that school districts are continuing to retire debt issued prior to the enactment of the school construction law.

**School Construction**

<b>Debt Service Aid</b>	<b>\$57,757</b>	<b>\$63,403</b>	<b>\$ 5,646</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>D-89</b>
-------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------	-------------

The recommended appropriation for school construction debt service aid, \$63.4 million, is an increase of \$5.6 million (9.8 percent) over the FY 2015 adjusted appropriation. As noted in discussion point 6 in the Office of Legislative Services' analysis of the department's recommended FY 2014 budget, there were media reports at the time indicating that, "...in most communities with a [school construction bond] referendum, the ballot question states that 'no state support is currently available and the state has not been approving any capital projects for which state support is requested.'" The increased recommended appropriation reflects the department's relaxation of this policy and resuming the approval of capital projects that request State support.

**School Construction**

<b>&amp; Renovation Fund</b>	<b>\$519,802</b>	<b>\$884,167</b>	<b>\$364,365</b>	<b>70.1%</b>	<b>D-90</b>
------------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	--------------	-------------

The recommended FY 2016 appropriation for the school construction and renovation fund, \$884.2 million, is an increase of \$364.4 million (70.1 percent) over the FY 2015 adjusted appropriation. This line item is used to make debt service payments on bonds issued by the Economic Development Authority to support the State's school construction program. While the precise dollar amounts differ, the magnitude of this increase is consistent with the projected debt service payment schedule shown in the State's FY 2014 debt report.

**Teachers' Pension and  
Annuity Fund – Post**

<b>Retirement Medical</b>	<b>\$852,999</b>	<b>\$891,306</b>	<b>\$38,307</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>D-101</b>
---------------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------------	-------------	--------------

The recommended appropriation for Teachers' Pension and Annuity Fund – Post Retirement Medical totals \$891.3 million, and is an increase of \$38.3 million over the FY 2015 adjusted appropriation. This appropriation is used to support the costs of medical benefits provided to retired school district employees who were members of the Teachers' Pension and Annuity Fund. While the proposed appropriation is a modest 4.5 percent increase over the adjusted appropriation, it should be noted that \$40.6 million of the FY 2015 adjusted appropriation is scheduled to lapse at the conclusion of the fiscal year.



**Significant Changes/New Programs (\$000) (Cont'd)**

<u>Budget Item</u>	<u>Adj. Approp.</u> <u>FY 2015</u>	<u>Recomm.</u> <u>FY 2016</u>	<u>Dollar</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Percent</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>Page</u>
<b>Teachers' Pension and Annuity Fund</b>	<b>\$379,214</b>	<b>\$762,960</b>	<b>\$383,746</b>	<b>101.2%</b>	<b>D-101</b>

The FY 2016 proposed budget includes a recommended State contribution to the Teachers' Pension and Annuity Fund (TPAF) of nearly \$763.0 million, more than twice as much as the FY 2015 adjusted appropriation. The increase reflects a change in policy from FY 2015, in which no State contribution was made to the TPAF to cover unfunded accrued liability, to FY 2016, in which the payment equals three-tenths of the actuarially recommended contribution, which includes both the normal liability and unfunded accrued liability. Under the provisions of P.L.2010, c.1, the State's contribution would equal five-sevenths of the actuarially recommended contribution; an appropriation of \$1.827 billion would be necessary to satisfy the statutory requirement.

**Grants-in-Aid**

<b>Education Reform Implementation Grant Program</b>	<b>\$2,500</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$2,500)</b>	<b>( 100.0%)</b>	<b>D-100</b>
--	----------------	------------	------------------	------------------	--------------

The Legislature included a \$2.5 million appropriation in the FY 2015 appropriations act for the establishment of an education reform implementation grant program. Half of the appropriation was to be used for grants to support professional development activities, while the other half was to be used to assist school districts in purchasing technology necessary for administering the assessments developed by the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers. The department issued notices of grant opportunities for both grants, and is not proposing to continue the grant programs in FY 2016.

<b>Opportunity Scholarship Demonstration Program</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,000</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>D-100</b>
--	------------	----------------	-----------------	----------	--------------

The FY 2016 recommended budget includes a \$2 million appropriation for an Opportunity Scholarship Demonstration Program. Under the corresponding language provision included in the budget, the program would award scholarships, not to exceed \$10,000, to students enrolled in selected "chronically failing schools" (the commissioner would determine what constitutes a chronically failing school, and the subset of such schools whose students would be eligible to receive a scholarship). A student must also reside in a household in which the income does not exceed 185 percent of the federal poverty threshold. The commissioner may establish additional eligibility criteria for receipt of a scholarship, and would select one or more public or nonpublic schools that would be authorized to receive scholarship students.

**Significant Changes/New Programs (\$000) (Cont'd)**

<u>Budget Item</u>	<u>Adj. Approp.</u> <u>FY 2015</u>	<u>Recomm.</u> <u>FY 2016</u>	<u>Dollar</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Percent</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>Page</u>
--------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------

**Direct State Services**

<b>Statewide Assessment Program</b>	<b>\$29,912</b>	<b>\$28,550</b>	<b>(\$1,362)</b>	<b>( 4.6%)</b>	<b>D-100</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------	--------------

The recommended FY 2016 appropriation for the Statewide assessment program, nearly \$28.6 million, is \$1.4 million (4.6 percent) less than the amount appropriated in FY 2015. The class of 2015 is the last class for which the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) served as the State graduation proficiency test pursuant to P.L.1979, c.241 (C.18A:7C-1 et seq.). The FY 2015 appropriation included the cost of administering the HSPA to students who did not pass both the language arts and mathematics sections while in the 11th grade, as well as administering the Alternative High School Assessment (AHSA) to students who continue to not demonstrate proficiency on the HSPA. These assessments will not be used in the 2015-2016 school year, accounting for the decrease in the recommended appropriation.

## Significant Language Changes

### Transfer of Nonpublic School Aid Funds

Revision

2015 Handbook: p. B-45  
2016 Budget: p. D-90

Of the amounts hereinabove appropriated for Nonpublic School Aid, such amounts as determined by the commissioner may be transferred between such accounts to address changes in enrollments and services, ~~following notice to the Joint Budget Oversight Committee and~~ subject to the approval of the Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting.

#### Explanation

*While developing the FY 2015 appropriations act, the Legislature added the above language provision (budget resolution number 5425), giving the Commissioner of Education the authority to transfer funds among the various nonpublic school aid accounts after providing notification to the Joint Budget Oversight Committee (JBOC) and subject to the approval of the Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting. The proposed modification would eliminate the requirement that the commissioner first notify JBOC of the transfer. The Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting would still be required to notify the Legislative Budget and Finance Officer of any such transfer on the approved transfer's effective date.*



### Nonpublic Nursing Services Per Pupil Amount

Revision

2015 Handbook: p. B-45  
2016 Budget: p. D-90

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 9 of P.L.1991, c.226 (C.18A:40-31), the amount hereinabove appropriated for Nonpublic Nursing Services Aid shall be made available to local school districts based upon the number of pupils enrolled in each nonpublic school on the last day prior to October 16, ~~2013~~ 2014 and the rate per pupil shall be \$85.

#### Explanation

*The recommended language provision sets the per pupil funding amount for nonpublic nursing services at \$85. This funding level is approximately \$10 per pupil less than the amount included in the FY 2015 appropriations act. The Legislature increased the total funding for nonpublic nursing services aid by \$2.441 million above what was included in the Governor's FY 2015 budget recommendations (budget resolution number 1008). The recommended appropriation for FY 2016 is identical to the FY 2015 proposed appropriation.*



EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough.  
Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.

## Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)

### Nonpublic Technology Initiative Aid Per Pupil Amount

Revision

2015 Handbook: p. B-45  
2016 Budget: p. D-90

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or regulation to the contrary, Nonpublic Technology Initiative Aid shall be paid to school districts and allocated for nonpublic school pupils at the rate of ~~\$32~~ \$20 per pupil in a manner that is consistent with the provisions of the federal and State constitutions.

#### Explanation

*The recommended FY 2016 budget reduces per pupil funding for nonpublic technology initiative aid from \$32 to \$20. The proposed funding level is identical to the amount included in the Governor's recommended FY 2015 budget, which was subsequently increased by the Legislature (budget resolution number 1008).*

### Use of Proceeds from Sale of Surplus Property in SDA District

Revision

2015 Handbook: p. B-45  
2016 Budget: p. D-91

Notwithstanding the provisions of any law or regulation to the contrary, ~~the allocation of the amount hereinabove appropriated for Equalization Aid to an "SDA district" shall be reduced by the amount of proceeds received by the district from the sale of district surplus property, which shall be appropriated by the district for regular education operations~~ in the event that an "SDA district" sells district surplus property, the proceeds from such sale shall be applied as follows, subject to the approval of the Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting: the Commissioner of Education, in his discretion, may direct that the proceeds be used by the SDA district upon a showing of financial need for a capital maintenance project or for a school facilities project if such project is consistent with the district's Long-Range Facilities Plan (LRFP) and the project cost does not exceed \$500,000. If the project cost exceeds \$500,000, the Commissioner may direct all or a portion of the proceeds to the SDA for use in projects identified in that district's LRFP. In the case of capital maintenance projects, the SDA may forward the specified aid amount directly to the district for completion of the projects. If the Commissioner is not satisfied that there is a sufficient showing of financial need for a capital maintenance project or for a school facilities project or if the Commissioner is not satisfied that the proposed project is consistent with the district's LRFP, the proceeds shall be returned to the SDA for use by the SDA for school facilities projects in that SDA district which are consistent with the SDA district's LRFP. Surplus property means that property which is not being replaced by other property under a grant agreement with the New Jersey Schools Development Authority.

EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough. Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.

**Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)**

**Explanation**

*Under the provisions of the “Educational Facilities Construction and Financing Act,” the Economic Development Authority is authorized to issue bonds to finance school facilities projects in SDA (former Abbott) districts. Each appropriations act since FY 2006 has included language specifying that if a district sells surplus property, State aid to that district would be reduced by an amount equal to the proceeds of the sale.*

*The proposed language provisions specifies that rather than having a State aid reduction (which would reduce State expenditures in the General Fund or Property Tax Relief Fund), the proceeds from the sale may be used by the school district or the Schools Development Authority to support the costs of the district’s school facilities projects or capital maintenance projects. Specifically, the language states that the Commissioner of Education may direct the district to use the proceeds to pay for a school facilities project or capital maintenance project if the district has demonstrated financial need and the project costs do not exceed \$500,000. If the costs exceed \$500,000, the commissioner may forward a portion or all of the proceeds to the SDA so that the SDA may complete projects included in the district’s long-range facilities plan (LRFP). In the case of a capital maintenance project, the SDA may send the proceeds back to the school district for the purpose of completing the project (while the language uses the term aid, the Office of Legislative Services believes that the provision refers to the proceeds of the sale). If the commissioner does not find that the school district has a financial need, or does not view a proposed project as consistent with the district’s LRFP, then the proceeds would be forwarded to the SDA for completion of projects that are consistent with the district’s LRFP.*

*The Office of Legislative Services notes the proposed language provision, as currently written, is unrelated to any State appropriation. As such, the appropriateness of its inclusion in the appropriations act is questionable.*

**Per Pupil Growth Aid**

Deletion

2015 Handbook: p. B-46  
2016 Budget: p.

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or regulation to the contrary, the amount hereinabove appropriated for Per Pupil Growth Aid shall be allocated to school districts at the rate of \$10 per pupil multiplied by the district’s projected enrollment as set forth in the February 25, 2014 State Aid notice issued by the Commissioner of Education.~~

EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough.  
Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.

## Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)

### Explanation

*The FY 2015 appropriations act included a new State school aid category known as per pupil growth aid. The corresponding language provision stipulated that the appropriation for per pupil growth aid would be allocated to school districts at a rate of \$10 per pupil in the district's projected resident enrollment for the 2014-2015 school year. The recommended FY 2016 budget removes this language provision, but includes a separate language provision stating that school districts will receive the same amount of funding in FY 2016 as was received in FY 2015 (based on the February 2015 State aid notices released by the department).*

### PARCC Readiness Aid

Deletion

2015 Handbook: p. B-46  
2016 Budget: p.

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or regulation to the contrary, the amount hereinabove appropriated for PARCC Readiness shall be allocated to school districts at the rate of \$10 per pupil multiplied by the district's projected enrollment as set forth in the February 25, 2014 State Aid notice issued by the Commissioner of Education.~~

### Explanation

*The FY 2015 appropriations act included a new State school aid category known as PARCC readiness aid. The stated purpose of this aid category was to assist school districts in purchasing the necessary technology to successfully administer the assessments developed by the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers. The corresponding language provision stipulated that the appropriation for PARCC readiness aid would be allocated to school districts at a rate of \$10 per pupil in the district's projected resident enrollment for the 2014-2015 school year. The recommended FY 2016 budget removes this language provision, but includes a separate language provision stating that school districts will receive the same amount of funding in FY 2016 as was received in FY 2015 (based on the February 2015 State aid notices released by the department).*

EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough.  
Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.

**Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)**

<b>Calculation of Payment to Charter Schools</b>	
Revision	2015 Handbook: p. B-46 2016 Budget: p. D-91

Notwithstanding the provisions of any law or regulation to the contrary, amounts hereinabove appropriated for Charter School Aid shall be used for such sums as are necessary: 1) in the case of a charter school with higher enrollment in the 2014–2015 school year than in the 2007–2008 school year, to provide that in the 2014–2015 school year, the charter school receives no less total support from the State and the resident district than the sum of the total 2007–2008 payments from the resident district and the 2007–2008 payments of Charter School Aid and Charter Schools – Council on Local Mandates Aid and to ensure that such total payments provide a 2014–2015 per pupil amount that is no less than the 2007–2008 per pupil amount based on average daily enrollment; 2) in the case of a charter school with lower enrollment in the 2014–2015 school year than in the 2007–2008 school year, to ensure that such total payments provide a 2014–2015 per pupil amount that is no less than the 2007–2008 per pupil amount based on average daily enrollment; and 3) to provide amounts pursuant to section 12 of P.L.1995, c.426 (C.18A:36A–12), ~~where projected special education enrollment, projected speech enrollment, total projected weighted district enrollment, and the district’s adequacy budget are equal to the fiscal year 2014 values, respectively.~~

**Explanation**

*The proposed language modification deletes language that was added by the Executive during the development of the FY 2015 appropriations act (budget resolution number 22). The statement included in that resolution referred to the language as, “...a technical adjustment that clarifies the calculation of aid for charter schools.” While this language provision refers to State aid provided to charter schools, rather than the amount of funding resident districts must transfer to charter schools, the per pupil amounts that districts were required to transfer to charter schools was calculated using enrollment figures from the 2013-2014, rather than the 2014-2015 school year. The proposed budget deletes that language; however, the proposed budget includes a separate language provision regarding the funding of charter schools.*

*The Office of Legislative Services estimates that the language included in the FY 2015 appropriations act (but omitted in the proposed FY 2016 budget) increased the amount of money transferred from school districts to charter schools by \$70.1 million.*



EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough.  
Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.

**Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)**

**Integration Assistance Aid**

Addition

2015 Handbook: p.  
2016 Budget: p. D-92

From the amount hereinabove appropriated for Integration Assistance Aid, there is appropriated \$1,276,000 for Englewood City School District, to assist with the implementation of integration programs, subject to the approval of the Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting.

**Explanation**

*The above recommended language provides \$1.276 million to the Englewood City School District for the implementation of integration programs. Similar language was last included in the FY 2009 appropriations act, which provided \$4 million to the Englewood City School District, and \$500,000 each to the Montclair and Teaneck School Districts.*



**Family Crisis Transportation Aid**

Addition

2015 Handbook: p.  
2016 Budget: p. D-92

Notwithstanding the provisions of any law or regulation to the contrary, the amount hereinabove appropriated for Family Crisis Transportation Aid shall be paid to districts based on applications approved from the prior year in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of P.L.2013, c.231, subject to the approval of the Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting.

**Explanation**

*P.L.2013, c.231 (C.18A:38-1.1 et seq.) specified that if a child moves out of a school district as a result of domestic violence, sexual abuse, or other family crisis, the child may remain enrolled in the that district's schools for the remainder of the school year. If the student remains enrolled in the district and now resides remote from school (more than two miles away from the school for students in grades kindergarten through eight, and more than 2.5 miles for high school students), then the district would provide transportation services to that student, with the State reimbursing the district for those costs. The proposed language specifies that the recommended appropriation would be used to reimburse school districts that had approved applications in the prior school year.*



EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough.  
Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.



**Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)**

<b>State Facilities for Handicapped Fund</b>	
Deletion	2015 Handbook: p. B-48 2016 Budget: p.

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of any law or regulation to the contrary, accumulated and current year interest earnings in the State Facilities for Handicapped Fund established pursuant to section 12 of P.L.1973, c.149 are appropriated for capital improvements and maintenance of facilities for the ten regional day schools throughout the State and the Marie H. Katzenbach School for the Deaf as authorized in the State Facilities for Handicapped Bond Act, P.L.1973, c.149, subject to the approval of the Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting.~~

**Explanation**

*The above language provision provided that interest earnings in the State Facilities for Handicapped Fund would be used for capital improvements and maintenance at the Marie H. Katzenbach School for the Deaf and the 10 regional day schools. The proposed FY 2016 budget does not anticipate the accrual of interest earnings in the fund.*



<b>County Vocational School District Partnership Program</b>	
Deletion	2015 Handbook: p. B-49 2016 Budget: p.

~~The amount hereinabove appropriated for County Vocational School District Partnership Grant Program shall be allocated for grants to county vocational school districts to partner with urban districts, other school districts, county colleges, and other entities to create high-quality career and technical education programs in existing facilities. The commissioner shall award grants, within the limit of available State appropriations, to selected county vocational school districts to be used to support the development and implementation of a career and technical education program in an existing school or college facility that is not owned or leased by the county vocational school district. The commissioner shall determine the amount of each grant awarded under the program and may award multi-year grants.~~

**Explanation**

*The FY 2015 appropriations act included a \$3 million appropriation, and the above language provision, to establish the County Vocational School District Partnership Grant Program. Under the program, the State would award grants to county vocational school districts to partner with other entities, including other school districts and county colleges, for the county vocational school district to*

EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough. Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.

## Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)

*develop and implement career and technical education programs in the other entities' facilities. Under the program developed by the Department of Education, it is anticipated that between five and 10 county vocational school districts would receive a grant, not to exceed \$600,000. Districts interested in receiving a grant were required to respond to the notice of grant opportunity no later than January 13, 2015. P.L.2014, c.73 (C.18A:6-132 et seq.) provided for the establishment of a similar program, obviating the need for this language provision in the appropriations act.*

---

### State Board of Examiners Carry-Forward Limitation

Revision

2015 Handbook: p. B-51

2016 Budget: p. D-102

Receipts from the State Board of Examiners' fees in excess of those anticipated, ~~not to exceed \$1,200,000,~~ and the unexpended program balances at the end of the preceding fiscal year, are appropriated for the operation of the Professional Development and Licensure programs.

#### Explanation

*The State Board of Examiners receives fees from individuals seeking the certification necessary to be employed in instructional, support, and administrative positions in New Jersey school districts. Prior to the FY 2012 appropriations act, language was included stipulating that any such revenue received that exceeds anticipated receipts would be dedicated to the operation of the department's professional development and licensure program. The FY 2012 appropriations act, and each subsequently enacted appropriations act, limited the amount of excess receipts that would be used for this purpose to \$1.2 million. The proposed budget eliminates that limitation.*

---

### Education Reform Implementation Grant

Deletion

2015 Handbook: p. B-51

2016 Budget: p.

~~The amounts hereinabove appropriated for the Education Reform Implementation Grant Program shall be used by the Commissioner of Education to establish a competitive grant program to award grants to school districts implementing education reform initiatives. No more than \$1,250,000 shall be used to award grants to school districts to provide teaching~~

EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough. Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.

## Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)

~~staff members with professional development opportunities consistent with the provisions of P.L.2012, c.26 (C.18A:6-119 et al.). No more than \$1,250,000 shall be used to award grants to school districts to prepare for the implementation of assessments developed by the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers. No school district shall receive grants totaling more than \$250,000.~~

### Explanation

*Budget resolution number 5417 added an appropriation of \$2.5 million for the creation of the Education Reform Implementation Grant program. Half of the funding was allotted for grants to provide professional development opportunities to school district personnel, while the other half was to be used to provide grants to school districts to help prepare for the implementation of assessments developed by the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC assessments). In a February 2, 2015 press release, the Department of Education announced that it had awarded \$1.25 million to a total of 19 school districts to develop professional development content, and to serve as achievement coaches who will lead professional develop sessions for other educators.*

*The department also released a notice of grant opportunity for the “Bridging the Device Gap” grant program. A school district or charter school would be eligible to apply for the grant if the number of devices available in a school for use during the PARCC assessments was between one and six fewer than the number needed to complete the PARCC assessments within the allotted 20-day testing window (based on two testing sessions per day). The maximum grant awarded to a district equaled the total “device gap” multiplied by \$500, not to exceed \$250,000. Grant recipients were required to purchase additional devices in advance of administering the PARCC assessments.*

---

### **Opportunity Scholarship Demonstration Program**

Addition

2015 Handbook: p.  
2016 Budget: p. D-102

The amount hereinabove appropriated for the Opportunity Scholarship Demonstration Program for the 2015–2016 school year is subject to the following conditions: the Commissioner of Education shall establish, implement, and oversee a pilot program to provide expanded educational opportunities for a limited number of pupils from families with limited financial resources who are enrolled in selected chronically failing schools by providing scholarships not to exceed \$10,000 per student to enable them to enroll in a different school selected by their parents or guardians; provided, however, that in order to be

EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough.  
Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.

## Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)

eligible to receive a scholarship pursuant to this paragraph, a student shall be from a household with an income that does not exceed 1.85 times the official federal poverty level for the school year and be enrolled in a chronically failing school as selected and determined by the Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner of Education shall be responsible for establishing written eligibility criteria for scholarships and for selecting one or more public or nonpublic schools located in this State to provide an approved program of instruction to students receiving scholarships under this program. Such written eligibility criteria and other relevant information concerning the utilization of these scholarship funds shall be publicly available and published on the Department's Internet website.

### Explanation

*The recommended FY 2016 budget appropriates \$2 million for an Opportunity Scholarship Demonstration Program. The above language specifies that a student would be eligible to receive a scholarship, not to exceed \$10,000, if the student lives in a household in which income does not exceed 185 percent of the federal poverty threshold, and attends a "chronically failing school," which would be defined and selected by the Commissioner of Education. The commissioner would also develop other eligibility criteria for receipt of a scholarship, and would select one or more public or nonpublic schools that would be able to enroll scholarship students. Substantively identical language was included in the Governor's budget recommendations for FY 2014, but was not included in the appropriations act.*

### Authorizing Supplemental Appropriation – Affordable Care Act Fees

2015 Handbook: p. B-52  
2016 Budget: p. D-102

Such additional sums as may be required for the Teachers' Pension and Annuity Fund -- Non-contributory Insurance ~~and~~ Post Retirement Medical Other Than TPAF and Affordable Care Act fees are appropriated, as the Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting shall determine.

### Explanation

*The appropriations act routinely includes language granting the Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting the authority to make a supplemental appropriation as necessary to make certain payments, such as the costs of retirees' non-contributory insurance and post-retirement medical benefits. The above language provision extends this authority to fees assessed under the federal Affordable Care Act.*

EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough.  
Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.

**Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)**

**Authorizing Supplemental Appropriation – Pension Obligation Bonds**

Addition

2015 Handbook: p.  
2016 Budget: p. D-102

Such additional amounts as may be required for Debt Service on Pension Obligation Bonds are appropriated, as the Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting shall determine.

**Explanation**

*The appropriations act routinely includes language granting the Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting the authority to make a supplemental appropriation as necessary to make certain payments, such as the costs of retirees' non-contributory insurance and post-retirement medical benefits. The above language provision extends this authority to debt service payments on pension obligation bonds.*

**Pension Obligation Bond Carry-Forward**

Addition

2015 Handbook: p.  
2016 Budget: p. D-102

The unexpended balance at the end of the preceding fiscal year in the Debt Service on Pension Obligation Bonds account is appropriated for the same purpose.

**Explanation**

*The proposed language provides that any unexpended amounts appropriated for making principal and interest payments on pension obligation bonds may carry forward to the subsequent fiscal year. As of the time of this analysis, the State's accounting system shows that nearly \$7 million of the current year's appropriation remains unexpended.*

EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough.  
Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.

## Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)

### Services for Students Unable to Use Standard Texts

Deletion

2015 Handbook: p. D-54  
2016 Budget: p.

~~Subject to the availability of federal funds, the Commissioner of Education shall enter into a contract with a nonprofit entity, having the largest library of audio textbooks, for the provision of products and services to public schools to assist students who are unable to use standard text due to a learning disability, visual impairment, or a physical disability. The products and services to be provided may include, but need not be limited to, accessible, human narrated audiobooks that are available through both mainstream and specialized devices, software capable of recording and reporting data for instructional purposes, and professional development opportunities for instructional and support staff. Upon the certification of the Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting of the availability of federal funds for the performance of the terms of such contract for the 2014-2015 school year, there is appropriated an amount of federal funds not to exceed \$1,500,000 subject to the approval of the director.~~

#### Explanation

*The Legislature added language to the FY 2015 appropriations act (budget resolution number 2009) directing the Commissioner of Education to enter into a contract with a nonprofit entity to provide products and services to public schools to assist students who are unable to use standard texts. The provision was subject to the availability of federal funds, and no more than \$1.5 million would be appropriated for this purpose. The proposed FY 2016 budget omits this language.*

*The Department of Education awarded a contract for approximately \$35,000 to Learning Ally. Under the contract, the organization will deliver a professional development workshop, including three webinars and nine days of training, regarding working effectively with students who have language-based reading disabilities.*

### Per Pupil Funding for Charter Schools

Addition

2015 Handbook: p.  
2016 Budget: p. D-106

Notwithstanding the provisions of any law or regulation to the contrary, the school districts receiving Equalization Aid, Special Education Categorical Aid, or Security Categorical Aid shall provide per pupil payments to charter schools for regular education Equalization Aid and general fund levy pursuant to 18A:36A-12 calculated using the greater of: (1) the per pupil amount calculated using weighted enrollment pursuant to 18A:7F-50 et seq., local levy, and Equalization Aid from the 2013-14 fiscal year; or (2) the per pupil amount

EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough. Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.

## Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)

calculated using weighted enrollment pursuant to 18A:7F-50 et seq., local levy, and Equalization Aid from the 2015-16 fiscal year.

### Explanation

*Section 12 of the "Charter School Program Act of 1995" (C.18A:36A-12) details the calculation of the amount of per pupil funding that a resident school district must transfer to a charter school for its students who are enrolled in the charter school. The resident district is to transfer 90 percent of the sum of its equalization aid per pupil for the budget year and the prebudget year general fund tax levy per pupil, inflated by the consumer price index. The language included in the proposed budget stipulates that the per pupil amount used to determine the amount of funding that a district must transfer to a charter school will equal the greater of that calculation using school district revenue and enrollment data from the 2013-2014 school year or using revenue and enrollment data from the 2015-2016 school year.*

*The Office of Legislative Services estimates that this language provision would increase the payments made by 83 school districts to charter schools by \$37.5 million.*

### Adequacy Budget Calculation

2015 Handbook: p.  
2016 Budget: p. D-106

Notwithstanding the provisions of any law or regulation to the contrary, school district adequacy budgets for fiscal year 2016 shall be equal to the school district's adequacy budget for fiscal year 2014.

### Explanation

*A school district's adequacy budget is an estimate of the costs of providing educational opportunities to students that are consistent with the State's curricular standards, and is based on various factors, including the district's overall enrollment, as well as the number of low-income and bilingual students. Generally, a district's adequacy budget is used for a number of purposes, most significantly to determine the amount of equalization aid the school district will receive. Given the method of determining most State school aid that is included in the FY 2016 recommended budget, most uses of the adequacy budget would*

EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough.  
Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.

**Significant Language Changes (Cont'd)**

*not be applicable in the next fiscal year. However, the adequacy budget is used to determine the per pupil funding provided to a school district that participates in the interdistrict public school choice program; it is also a factor when determining the amount of funding that a school district will transfer to a charter school. For both of these purposes, districts' FY 2014 adequacy budgets will be used.*

EXPLANATION: FY 2015 language not recommended for FY 2016 denoted by strikethrough.  
Recommended FY 2016 language that did not appear in FY 2015 denoted by underlining.



## Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools

Budget Pages.... D-91; D-106

Under the provisions of the "Charter School Program Act of 1995," P.L.1995, c.426, a resident school district is required to transfer certain revenues to a charter school that enrolls a student who lives in that school district. Specifically, the district must transfer, "...an amount equal to 90% of the sum of the budget year equalization aid per pupil and the prebudget year general fund tax levy per pupil inflated by the CPI most recent to the calculation." This background paper discusses a language provision included in the FY 2015 appropriations act and a new language provision in the FY 2016 budget recommendations that modify the amount of per pupil funding that resident school districts must transfer to charter schools.

### FY 2015 Language Provision

In recent years, each appropriations act has appropriated funds to a line item called charter school aid, with which there was an associated language provision. The language provision stipulated that the line item would be used, as necessary, to ensure that charter schools' total revenue in that year (or in some instances, per pupil revenue) would be no less than the amount of revenue that a charter school received in the 2007-2008 school year. The language also provided that the appropriation would be used to pay the costs of any student who is enrolled for the first year in the charter school and was not included in the resident school district's enrollment projection, as required pursuant to subsection d. of section 12 of P.L.1995, c.426 (C.18A:36A-12).

Subsequent to the submission of the FY 2015 budget recommendations, the Executive submitted a budget resolution (budget resolution number 22) to amend that language provision as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any law or regulation to the contrary, amounts hereinabove appropriated for Charter School Aid shall be used for such sums as are necessary: 1) in the case of a charter school with higher enrollment in the 2014–2015 school year than in the 2007–2008 school year, to provide that in the 2014–2015 school year, the charter school receives no less total support from the State and the resident district than the sum of the total 2007–2008 payments from the resident district and the 2007–2008 payments of Charter School Aid and Charter Schools – Council on Local Mandates Aid and to ensure that such total payments provide a 2014–2015 per pupil amount that is no less than the 2007–2008 per pupil amount based on average daily enrollment; 2) in the case of a charter school with lower enrollment in the 2014–2015 school year than in the 2007–2008 school year, to ensure that such total payments provide a 2014–2015 per pupil amount that is no less than the 2007–2008 per pupil amount based on average daily enrollment; and 3) to provide amounts pursuant to section 12 of P.L.1995, c.426 (C.18A:36A–12), where projected special

## Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)

education enrollment, projected speech enrollment, total projected weighted district enrollment, and the district's adequacy budget are equal to the fiscal year 2014 values, respectively.

For the purpose of this analysis,<sup>1</sup> the most relevant aspect of the language modification is the use of a school district's projected weighted enrollment<sup>2</sup> from FY 2014, rather than using the more recent data available at the time. The weighted enrollment is used as the denominator to calculate the per pupil funding amount that must be transferred to a charter school. If one calculates a per pupil funding amount that mixes fiscal years (revenue figures included in the numerator are relevant to FY 2015 while the enrollment in the denominator is relevant to FY 2014), then the amount that a school district must transfer to a charter school is no longer directly connected to the resources available to the school district in FY 2015. This practice could lead to a higher or lower amount that would be transferred to a charter school. For example, if the percent change in a district's weighted enrollment from FY 2014 to FY 2015 is greater than the percent change in the sum of the district's equalization aid and tax levy, then the use of this language provision would lead to a lower per pupil amount to be transferred to a charter school than what would be required under the charter school law.

Appendix table 1 provides a listing of school districts that were affected by this language provision in the current school year. The Office of Legislative Services (OLS) estimates that the language provision affected the base charter school payments made by 267 school districts, with a net increase in payments to charter schools totaling \$70.1 million. Of these districts, 198 paid a greater amount to charter schools, totaling \$70.5 million, while the remaining 69 districts experienced slightly lower payments of \$402,000. A review of that table demonstrates that, in the case of most resident school districts, the magnitude of the effect is rather small. Table 1 lists the 13 school districts in which the increase in the required charter school payment exceeded \$500,000; this small number of districts accounts for 94 percent of the previously stated increase; the Newark School District alone accounts for the majority of the change (54.2 percent). This is consistent with the fact that these districts tend to have larger shares of their students enrolled in a charter school.

The corresponding language provision included in the FY 2016 budget recommendations omits the phrase that was added in the FY 2015 appropriations act and reverts back to the language that was used in prior years. A separate new language provision included in the recommended budget would establish a somewhat different mechanism for determining the per pupil funding that would be transferred to a charter school.

---

<sup>1</sup> This analysis focuses on the base funding that is provided to charter schools by the resident school district. While the language provision in question also affects the amount of funding that the charter school receives for special education students and students who received speech services only, these account for a smaller share of the total funding provided to charter schools, and are omitted from this analysis.

<sup>2</sup> A district's projected weighted enrollment is adjusted by the weights included in the "School Funding Reform Act of 2008" to account for the additional costs of educating students in higher grade levels, as well as low-income and bilingual students. For example, a high school student counts as 1.16 students in the weighted enrollment, rather than just 1.00.

## Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)

**Table 1**  
**Resident School Districts with Increased Charter School Payment of More than \$500,000 in**  
**FY 2015 Due to Appropriations Act Language**  
**(in millions)**

County	District	Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	
				\$	%
Bergen	Garfield City	\$4.958	\$4.273	\$0.685	16.0%
Camden	Camden City	\$73.165	\$64.043	\$9.122	14.2%
Essex	East Orange	\$10.357	\$9.153	\$1.204	13.2%
Essex	Irvington Township	\$8.373	\$7.111	\$1.262	17.7%
Essex	Newark City	\$186.862	\$148.628	\$38.234	25.7%
Hudson	Hoboken	\$7.360	\$6.832	\$0.528	7.7%
Hudson	Jersey City	\$46.090	\$41.646	\$4.444	10.7%
Mercer	Trenton City	\$24.163	\$21.606	\$2.557	11.8%
Middlesex	Perth Amboy City	\$5.418	\$4.895	\$0.523	10.7%
Monmouth	Asbury Park City	\$4.581	\$3.926	\$0.655	16.7%
Passaic	Passaic City	\$6.470	\$5.772	\$0.698	12.1%
Passaic	Paterson City	\$29.357	\$25.221	\$4.136	16.4%
Union	Plainfield City	\$15.262	\$13.048	\$2.214	17.0%

### FY 2016 Proposed Language Provision

The language provision included in the proposed FY 2016 budget is somewhat more straightforward. The provision requires calculating the per pupil amount that would be transferred to a charter school in two ways: first using data relevant to FY 2014, and second using data relevant to FY 2016. Whichever calculation yields the higher per pupil amount becomes the final amount that must be transferred to a charter school. This language provision leads to a resident school district being required to transfer either the same amount of per pupil funding required under the charter school law, or some greater amount. The OLS estimates that the provision included in the proposed FY 2016 budget would require 83 school districts to transfer an additional \$37.5 million to charter schools than the amount that would be mandated under the charter school law. Similar to the observation of the effects of the FY 2015 language provision, the vast majority of the increase can be attributed to a small number of resident school districts – in this case – nine districts, in which the additional contribution exceeds \$500,000. The Newark School District accounts for 66.5 percent of the increase funding to charter schools. These districts are listed in Table 2.

## Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)

**Table 2**  
**Resident School Districts with Increased Charter School Payment of More than \$500,000 in**  
**FY 2016 Due to Proposed Budget Language**  
**(in millions)**

County	District	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
				\$	%
Atlantic	Atlantic City	\$9.636	\$8.966	\$0.670	7.5%
Camden	Camden City	\$63.366	\$61.138	\$2.228	3.6%
Essex	East Orange	\$10.837	\$10.107	\$0.730	7.2%
Essex	Irvington Township	\$9.356	\$8.301	\$1.055	12.7%
Essex	Newark City	\$199.679	\$174.730	\$24.949	14.3%
Hudson	Jersey City	\$49.899	\$48.188	\$1.711	3.6%
Mercer	Trenton City	\$29.290	\$28.309	\$0.981	3.5%
Passaic	Paterson City	\$32.681	\$31.892	\$0.789	2.5%
Passaic	Plainfield City	\$17.030	\$14.738	\$2.292	15.6%

**Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools**

**Appendix Table 1**

**Comparison of Required Charter School Payments between Appropriations Act or Proposed Budget (as applicable) and Charter School Law**

LD	County	District	Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2015			Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2016			Two-Year Total
			Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
1	Atlantic	Estell Manor City	\$31,158	\$32,922	(\$1,764)	\$30,436	\$30,436	\$0	(\$1,764)
1	Atlantic	Weymouth Twp	\$127,507	\$127,906	(\$399)	\$107,814	\$107,814	\$0	(\$399)
1	Cape May	Dennis Twp	\$72,030	\$72,120	(\$90)	\$70,201	\$70,201	\$0	(\$90)
1	Cape May	Lower Cape May Regional	\$58,393	\$56,371	\$2,022	\$41,371	\$41,371	\$0	\$2,022
1	Cape May	Lower Twp	\$10,030	\$9,167	\$863				\$863
1	Cape May	Middle Twp	\$87,375	\$87,396	(\$21)	\$49,294	\$49,294	\$0	(\$21)
1	Cape May	Ocean City				\$19,739	\$18,439	\$1,300	\$1,300
1	Cape May	Sea Isle City	\$47,429	\$49,078	(\$1,649)				(\$1,649)
1	Cape May	Upper Twp	\$64,726	\$63,775	\$951	\$74,007	\$73,978	\$29	\$980
1	Cumberland	Commercial Twp	\$92,114	\$81,897	\$10,217	\$69,023	\$69,023	\$0	\$10,217
1	Cumberland	Fairfield Twp	\$21,264	\$19,072	\$2,192	\$41,788	\$38,386	\$3,402	\$5,594
1	Cumberland	Lawrence Twp	\$11,847	\$9,778	\$2,069	\$13,050	\$11,752	\$1,298	\$3,367
1	Cumberland	Maurice River Twp	\$15,934	\$14,526	\$1,408	\$15,200	\$14,848	\$352	\$1,760
1	Cumberland	Millville City	\$1,857,780	\$1,708,304	\$149,476	\$2,187,300	\$2,187,300	\$0	\$149,476
1	Cumberland	Vineland City	\$3,713,434	\$3,318,446	\$394,988	\$4,188,146	\$4,058,555	\$129,591	\$524,579
			<b>\$6,211,021</b>	<b>\$5,650,758</b>	<b>\$560,263</b>	<b>\$6,907,369</b>	<b>\$6,771,397</b>	<b>\$135,972</b>	<b>\$696,235</b>
2	Atlantic	Absecon City	\$348,155	\$340,213	\$7,942	\$332,724	\$332,724	\$0	\$7,942
2	Atlantic	Atlantic City	\$3,452,915	\$3,040,537	\$412,378	\$9,636,354	\$8,965,648	\$670,706	\$1,083,084
2	Atlantic	Brigantine City	\$331,617	\$320,377	\$11,240	\$428,201	\$428,201	\$0	\$11,240
2	Atlantic	Buena Regional	\$9,425	\$9,484	(\$59)	\$70,817	\$70,817	\$0	(\$59)
2	Atlantic	Egg Harbor City	\$13,787	\$12,635	\$1,152				\$1,152
2	Atlantic	Egg Harbor Twp	\$344,875	\$341,596	\$3,279	\$374,847	\$374,847	\$0	\$3,279
2	Atlantic	Greater Egg Harbor Reg	\$494,276	\$481,944	\$12,332	\$509,778	\$509,778	\$0	\$12,332
2	Atlantic	Hamilton Twp	\$8,009	\$7,532	\$477	\$30,136	\$30,072	\$64	\$541
2	Atlantic	Longport	\$38,727	\$40,135	(\$1,408)				(\$1,408)
2	Atlantic	Mainland Regional	\$342,304	\$325,824	\$16,480	\$422,207	\$422,207	\$0	\$16,480
2	Atlantic	Margate City	\$25,339	\$26,114	(\$775)	\$119,325	\$119,325	\$0	(\$775)

**Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)**

LD	County	District	Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2015			Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2016			Two-Year Total
			Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
2	Atlantic	Mullica Twp				\$22,602	\$20,583	\$2,019	\$2,019
2	Atlantic	Pleasantville City	\$2,503,354	\$2,295,828	\$207,526	\$2,319,681	\$2,319,681	\$0	\$207,526
2	Atlantic	Ventnor City	\$291,252	\$289,754	\$1,498	\$305,152	\$305,152	\$0	\$1,498
			<b>\$8,204,035</b>	<b>\$7,531,973</b>	<b>\$672,062</b>	<b>\$14,571,824</b>	<b>\$13,899,035</b>	<b>\$672,789</b>	<b>\$1,344,851</b>
3	Cumberland	Bridgeton City	\$63,920	\$56,649	\$7,271	\$847,109	\$788,076	\$59,033	\$66,304
3	Cumberland	Upper Deerfield Twp	\$25,051	\$22,690	\$2,361	\$14,450	\$13,685	\$765	\$3,126
3	Gloucester	Clayton Boro	\$19,097	\$17,717	\$1,380	\$7,530	\$7,127	\$403	\$1,783
3	Gloucester	Franklin Twp	\$13,177	\$12,999	\$178				\$178
3	Gloucester	Glassboro	\$57,654	\$56,634	\$1,020	\$49,577	\$49,577	\$0	\$1,020
3	Gloucester	Swedesboro-Woolwich	\$8,526	\$7,779	\$747	\$8,744	\$8,744	\$0	\$747
3	Gloucester	West Deptford Twp	\$39,478	\$38,068	\$1,410	\$30,482	\$30,482	\$0	\$1,410
3	Salem	Pittsgrove Twp	\$26,964	\$25,902	\$1,062	\$26,427	\$26,427	\$0	\$1,062
			<b>\$253,867</b>	<b>\$238,438</b>	<b>\$15,429</b>	<b>\$984,319</b>	<b>\$924,118</b>	<b>\$60,201</b>	<b>\$75,630</b>
4	Camden	Chesilhurst	\$13,679	\$14,363	(\$684)	\$36,646	\$36,646	\$0	(\$684)
4	Camden	Clementon Boro	\$19,282	\$18,940	\$342	\$50,408	\$50,408	\$0	\$342
4	Camden	Gloucester Twp	\$1,363,352	\$1,328,699	\$34,653	\$1,857,622	\$1,857,622	\$0	\$34,653
4	Camden	Laurel Springs Boro	\$28,784	\$24,231	\$4,553				\$4,553
4	Camden	Lindenwold Boro	\$191,568	\$176,592	\$14,976	\$208,896	\$193,188	\$15,708	\$30,684
4	Camden	Winslow Twp	\$688,842	\$645,461	\$43,381	\$374,865	\$374,865	\$0	\$43,381
4	Gloucester	Monroe Twp	\$33,632	\$32,912	\$720	\$24,681	\$24,681	\$0	\$720
4	Gloucester	Washington Twp	\$168,476	\$171,943	(\$3,467)	\$246,621	\$246,621	\$0	(\$3,467)
			<b>\$2,507,615</b>	<b>\$2,413,141</b>	<b>\$94,474</b>	<b>\$2,799,739</b>	<b>\$2,784,031</b>	<b>\$15,708</b>	<b>\$110,182</b>
5	Camden	Audubon Boro	\$12,142	\$11,285	\$857				\$857
5	Camden	Barrington Boro	\$18,640	\$18,826	(\$186)				(\$186)
5	Camden	Bellmawr Boro	\$33,515	\$30,758	\$2,757	\$58,320	\$56,391	\$1,929	\$4,686
5	Camden	Camden City	\$73,165,024	\$64,043,344	\$9,121,680	\$63,365,999	\$61,138,352	\$2,227,647	\$11,349,327
5	Camden	Gloucester City	\$84,693	\$74,948	\$9,745	\$193,090	\$182,276	\$10,814	\$20,559

**Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)**

LD	County	District	Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2015			Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2016			Two-Year Total
			Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
5	Camden	Lawnside Boro	\$150,460	\$141,550	\$8,910	\$100,861	\$100,861	\$0	\$8,910
5	Camden	Mount Ephraim Boro	\$27,129	\$25,357	\$1,772	\$28,491	\$28,449	\$42	\$1,814
5	Camden	Runnemede Boro	\$9,055	\$9,216	(\$161)	\$8,999	\$8,999	\$0	(\$161)
5	Camden	Woodlynne Boro	\$396,499	\$382,645	\$13,854	\$342,113	\$342,113	\$0	\$13,854
5	Gloucester	Deptford Twp	\$64,220	\$60,244	\$3,976	\$56,807	\$56,807	\$0	\$3,976
5	Gloucester	Mantua Twp	\$15,350	\$15,509	(\$159)	\$16,970	\$16,970	\$0	(\$159)
5	Gloucester	Westville Boro	\$11,674	\$10,272	\$1,402				\$1,402
5	Gloucester	Woodbury City	\$137,088	\$126,303	\$10,785	\$27,460	\$27,460	\$0	\$10,785
			<b>\$74,125,489</b>	<b>\$64,950,257</b>	<b>\$9,175,232</b>	<b>\$64,199,110</b>	<b>\$61,958,678</b>	<b>\$2,240,432</b>	<b>\$11,415,664</b>
6	Burlington	Maple Shade Twp	\$32,860	\$30,573	\$2,287	\$28,103	\$26,733	\$1,370	\$3,657
6	Camden	Cherry Hill Twp	\$130,611	\$128,356	\$2,255	\$123,864	\$123,864	\$0	\$2,255
6	Camden	Collingswood Boro	\$90,510	\$85,768	\$4,742	\$106,071	\$105,232	\$839	\$5,581
6	Camden	Eastern Camden County Reg	\$12,026	\$11,922	\$104	\$24,380	\$24,380	\$0	\$104
6	Camden	Haddon Twp	\$14,447	\$14,350	\$97	\$32,285	\$32,285	\$0	\$97
6	Camden	Merchantville Boro	\$49,422	\$58,566	(\$9,144)	\$30,781	\$30,781	\$0	(\$9,144)
6	Camden	Oaklyn Boro	\$8,558	\$8,320	\$238	\$23,605	\$23,605	\$0	\$238
6	Camden	Pennsauken Twp	\$1,979,428	\$1,854,370	\$125,058	\$2,395,026	\$2,395,026	\$0	\$125,058
6	Camden	Somerdale Boro	\$11,686	\$10,363	\$1,323				\$1,323
6	Camden	Stratford Boro	\$55,507	\$53,289	\$2,218				\$2,218
6	Camden	Voorhees Twp	\$11,585	\$11,926	(\$341)	\$44,143	\$44,143	\$0	(\$341)
			<b>\$2,396,640</b>	<b>\$2,267,803</b>	<b>\$128,837</b>	<b>\$2,808,258</b>	<b>\$2,806,049</b>	<b>\$2,209</b>	<b>\$131,046</b>
7	Burlington	Beverly City	\$26,406	\$24,276	\$2,130				\$2,130
7	Burlington	Burlington City	\$10,490	\$9,954	\$536	\$16,605	\$16,605	\$0	\$536
7	Burlington	Burlington Twp	\$44,900	\$44,190	\$710	\$18,282	\$18,282	\$0	\$710
7	Burlington	Cinnaminson Twp	\$11,667	\$11,296	\$371	\$11,448	\$11,271	\$177	\$548
7	Burlington	Florence Twp	\$1,251,221	\$1,175,187	\$76,034	\$1,318,351	\$1,318,351	\$0	\$76,034
7	Burlington	Lenape Regional	\$14,524	\$14,352	\$172				\$172
7	Burlington	Moorestown Twp	\$24,576	\$24,859	(\$283)				(\$283)

**Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)**

LD	County	District	Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2015			Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2016			Two-Year Total
			Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
7	Burlington	Mount Laurel Twp	\$10,547	\$10,303	\$244	\$15,558	\$15,393	\$165	\$409
7	Burlington	Willingboro Twp	\$1,948,707	\$1,773,226	\$175,481	\$1,983,496	\$1,983,496	\$0	\$175,481
			<b>\$3,343,038</b>	<b>\$3,087,643</b>	<b>\$255,395</b>	<b>\$3,363,740</b>	<b>\$3,363,398</b>	<b>\$342</b>	<b>\$255,737</b>
8	Atlantic	Hammonton Town	\$15,550	\$14,246	\$1,304	\$6,408	\$6,228	\$180	\$1,484
8	Burlington	Lenape Regional	\$14,524	\$14,352	\$172				\$172
8	Burlington	Lumberton Twp	\$35,785	\$35,032	\$753	\$28,428	\$28,428	\$0	\$753
8	Burlington	Mansfield Twp	\$98,803	\$98,117	\$686	\$69,768	\$69,768	\$0	\$686
8	Burlington	Medford Twp	\$22,202	\$23,184	(\$982)				(\$982)
8	Burlington	Pemberton Twp	\$1,306,067	\$1,209,891	\$96,176				
		Eastern Camden County							
8	Camden	Reg	\$12,026	\$11,922	\$104	\$24,380	\$24,380	\$0	\$104
8	Camden	Pine Hill Boro	\$146,203	\$133,966	\$12,237	\$130,614	\$125,428	\$5,186	\$17,423
			<b>\$1,651,160</b>	<b>\$1,540,710</b>	<b>\$110,450</b>	<b>\$259,598</b>	<b>\$254,232</b>	<b>\$5,366</b>	<b>\$19,640</b>
9	Atlantic	Galloway Twp	\$667,628	\$645,212	\$22,416	\$729,507	\$729,507	\$0	\$22,416
9	Atlantic	Greater Egg Harbor Reg	\$494,276	\$481,944	\$12,332	\$509,778	\$509,778	\$0	\$12,332
9	Burlington	Lenape Regional	\$14,524	\$14,352	\$172				\$172
9	Ocean	Barnegat Twp	\$11,670	\$11,108	\$562	\$20,017	\$20,017	\$0	\$562
9	Ocean	Little Egg Harbor Twp	\$9,490	\$9,770	(\$280)	\$9,973	\$9,973	\$0	(\$280)
9	Ocean	Ocean Twp	\$8,716	\$8,778	(\$62)				(\$62)
9	Ocean	Pinelands Regional	\$16,391	\$14,807	\$1,584	\$12,607	\$12,607	\$0	\$1,584
9	Ocean	Southern Regional	\$13,091	\$12,394	\$697				\$697
			<b>\$1,235,786</b>	<b>\$1,198,365</b>	<b>\$37,421</b>	<b>\$1,281,882</b>	<b>\$1,281,882</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$37,421</b>
11	Monmouth	Asbury Park City	\$4,581,440	\$3,926,360	\$655,080	\$4,467,791	\$4,442,348	\$25,443	\$680,523
11	Monmouth	Freehold Twp	\$11,156	\$11,547	(\$391)				(\$391)
11	Monmouth	Long Branch City	\$40,411	\$35,452	\$4,959	\$18,352	\$17,758	\$594	\$5,553
11	Monmouth	Neptune City	\$32,090	\$29,676	\$2,414	\$28,713	\$28,713	\$0	\$2,414
11	Monmouth	Neptune Twp	\$535,178	\$499,298	\$35,880	\$425,906	\$425,906	\$0	\$35,880
11	Monmouth	Ocean Twp	\$45,305	\$42,951	\$2,354	\$16,325	\$15,939	\$386	\$2,740



**Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)**

LD	County	District	Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2015			Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2016			Two-Year Total
			Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
11	Monmouth	Red Bank Boro	\$1,463,523	\$1,266,711	\$196,812	\$1,382,134	\$1,363,570	\$18,564	\$215,376
			<b>\$6,709,103</b>	<b>\$5,811,995</b>	<b>\$897,108</b>	<b>\$6,339,221</b>	<b>\$6,294,234</b>	<b>\$44,987</b>	<b>\$942,095</b>
12	Burlington	New Hanover Twp	\$74,977	\$62,216	\$12,761				\$12,761
12	Middlesex	Old Bridge Twp	\$98,240	\$97,700	\$540	\$86,103	\$86,103	\$0	\$540
		Manalapan-Englishtown							
12	Monmouth	Reg	\$71,288	\$71,428	(\$140)	\$71,547	\$71,547	\$0	(\$140)
12	Ocean	Jackson Twp	\$13,089	\$13,033	\$56	\$14,532	\$14,532	\$0	\$56
12	Ocean	Plumsted Twp	\$18,272	\$19,160	(\$888)				(\$888)
			<b>\$275,866</b>	<b>\$263,537</b>	<b>\$12,329</b>	<b>\$172,182</b>	<b>\$172,182</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$12,329</b>
13	Monmouth	Marlboro Twp	\$102,880	\$106,370	(\$3,490)	\$102,267	\$102,267	\$0	(\$3,490)
			<b>\$102,880</b>	<b>\$106,370</b>	<b>(\$3,490)</b>	<b>\$102,267</b>	<b>\$102,267</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$3,490)</b>
14	Mercer	East Windsor Regional	\$30,081	\$29,055	\$1,026	\$9,712	\$9,559	\$153	\$1,179
14	Mercer	Hamilton Twp	\$551,679	\$519,992	\$31,687	\$891,090	\$891,090	\$0	\$31,687
14	Mercer	W Windsor-Plainsboro Reg	\$22,602	\$22,632	(\$30)	\$17,543	\$17,543	\$0	(\$30)
14	Middlesex	Cranbury Twp	\$14,177	\$14,534	(\$357)	\$15,232	\$15,232	\$0	(\$357)
14	Middlesex	Monroe Twp	\$55,080	\$53,745	\$1,335	\$64,524	\$64,524	\$0	\$1,335
14	Middlesex	Spotswood	\$12,953	\$12,741	\$212				\$212
			<b>\$686,572</b>	<b>\$652,699</b>	<b>\$33,873</b>	<b>\$998,101</b>	<b>\$997,948</b>	<b>\$153</b>	<b>\$34,026</b>
15	Mercer	Ewing Twp	\$952,915	\$926,181	\$26,734	\$76,762	\$76,762	\$0	\$26,734
15	Mercer	Lawrence Twp	\$20,796	\$20,488	\$308				\$308
15	Mercer	Trenton City	\$24,163,381	\$21,605,581	\$2,557,800	\$29,290,105	\$28,308,838	\$981,267	\$3,539,067
15	Mercer	W Windsor-Plainsboro Reg	\$22,602	\$22,632	(\$30)	\$17,543	\$17,543	\$0	(\$30)
			<b>\$25,159,694</b>	<b>\$22,574,882</b>	<b>\$2,584,812</b>	<b>\$29,384,410</b>	<b>\$28,403,143</b>	<b>\$981,267</b>	<b>\$3,566,079</b>
16	Hunterdon	Flemington-Raritan Reg	\$22,094	\$22,690	(\$596)	\$22,398	\$22,398	\$0	(\$596)
16	Mercer	Princeton	\$4,637,920	\$4,834,113	(\$196,193)	\$4,664,305	\$4,664,305	\$0	(\$196,193)
16	Middlesex	South Brunswick Twp	\$125,800	\$126,535	(\$735)	\$173,322	\$173,322	\$0	(\$735)

**Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)**

LD	County	District	Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2015			Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2016			Two-Year Total
			Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
16	Somerset	Manville Boro	\$8,768	\$7,925	\$843				\$843
			<b>\$4,794,582</b>	<b>\$4,991,263</b>	<b>(\$196,681)</b>	<b>\$4,860,025</b>	<b>\$4,860,025</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$196,681)</b>
17	Middlesex	Milltown Boro	\$51,265	\$50,880	\$385	\$53,395	\$53,395	\$0	\$385
17	Middlesex	New Brunswick City	\$4,181,969	\$3,709,508	\$472,461	\$4,590,893	\$4,196,795	\$394,098	\$866,559
17	Middlesex	North Brunswick Twp	\$816,439	\$766,349	\$50,090	\$1,023,751	\$1,010,771	\$12,980	\$63,070
17	Middlesex	Piscataway Twp	\$190,861	\$188,706	\$2,155	\$194,137	\$194,137	\$0	\$2,155
17	Somerset	Franklin Twp	\$5,469,155	\$5,181,851	\$287,304	\$6,821,355	\$6,821,355	\$0	\$287,304
			<b>\$10,709,689</b>	<b>\$9,897,294</b>	<b>\$812,395</b>	<b>\$12,683,531</b>	<b>\$12,276,453</b>	<b>\$407,078</b>	<b>\$1,219,473</b>
18	Middlesex	East Brunswick Twp	\$2,099,550	\$2,050,233	\$49,317	\$2,090,112	\$2,090,112	\$0	\$49,317
18	Middlesex	Edison Twp	\$479,655	\$463,914	\$15,741	\$506,994	\$495,833	\$11,161	\$26,902
18	Middlesex	Highland Park Boro	\$437,161	\$382,229	\$54,932	\$319,632	\$287,861	\$31,771	\$86,703
18	Middlesex	Metuchen Boro	\$21,838	\$21,614	\$224	\$33,114	\$33,114	\$0	\$224
18	Middlesex	South Plainfield Boro	\$55,353	\$55,974	(\$621)	\$19,970	\$19,970	\$0	(\$621)
18	Middlesex	South River Boro	\$198,208	\$193,314	\$4,894	\$188,024	\$188,024	\$0	\$4,894
			<b>\$3,291,765</b>	<b>\$3,167,278</b>	<b>\$124,487</b>	<b>\$3,157,846</b>	<b>\$3,114,914</b>	<b>\$42,932</b>	<b>\$167,419</b>
19	Middlesex	Carteret Boro	\$16,566	\$15,611	\$955	\$7,255	\$7,255	\$0	\$955
19	Middlesex	Perth Amboy City	\$5,417,920	\$4,894,983	\$522,937	\$5,302,083	\$5,285,049	\$17,034	\$539,971
19	Middlesex	Sayreville Boro	\$92,451	\$88,036	\$4,415	\$60,128	\$60,128	\$0	\$4,415
19	Middlesex	Woodbridge Twp	\$53,517	\$50,837	\$2,680	\$50,707	\$49,175	\$1,532	\$4,212
			<b>\$5,580,454</b>	<b>\$5,049,467</b>	<b>\$530,987</b>	<b>\$5,420,173</b>	<b>\$5,401,607</b>	<b>\$18,566</b>	<b>\$549,553</b>
20	Union	Elizabeth City	\$72,220	\$63,967	\$8,253	\$87,339	\$82,037	\$5,302	\$13,555
20	Union	Hillside Twp	\$423,450	\$391,096	\$32,354	\$511,356	\$511,356	\$0	\$32,354
20	Union	Roselle Boro	\$345,720	\$307,397	\$38,323	\$525,885	\$483,986	\$41,899	\$80,222
20	Union	Union Twp	\$178,938	\$176,758	\$2,180	\$201,154	\$201,154	\$0	\$2,180
			<b>\$1,020,328</b>	<b>\$939,218</b>	<b>\$81,110</b>	<b>\$1,325,734</b>	<b>\$1,278,533</b>	<b>\$47,201</b>	<b>\$128,311</b>

**Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)**

LD	County	District	Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2015			Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2016			Two-Year Total
			Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
21	Morris	Sch Dist Of The Chathams	\$10,421	\$10,412	\$9				\$9
21	Morris	Long Hill Twp	\$70,145	\$67,245	\$2,900	\$55,304	\$55,168	\$136	\$3,036
21	Somerset	Bernards Twp	\$20,558	\$20,262	\$296	\$20,656	\$20,656	\$0	\$296
21	Union	New Providence Boro	\$21,394	\$20,516	\$878				\$878
21	Union	Roselle Park Boro	\$9,627	\$9,131	\$496	\$9,258	\$9,218	\$40	\$536
21	Union	Summit City	\$43,660	\$42,852	\$808	\$86,232	\$86,232	\$0	\$808
			<b>\$175,805</b>	<b>\$170,418</b>	<b>\$5,387</b>	<b>\$171,450</b>	<b>\$171,274</b>	<b>\$176</b>	<b>\$5,563</b>
22	Middlesex	Dunellen Boro	\$18,266	\$17,995	\$271	\$24,173	\$24,173	\$0	\$271
22	Somerset	North Plainfield Boro	\$272,928	\$248,798	\$24,130	\$1,149,666	\$1,119,357	\$30,309	\$54,439
22	Union	Linden City	\$43,205	\$40,368	\$2,837	\$36,544	\$36,544	\$0	\$2,837
22	Union	Plainfield City	\$15,261,793	\$13,048,304	\$2,213,489	\$17,029,928	\$14,737,561	\$2,292,367	\$4,505,856
22	Union	Rahway City	\$52,178	\$50,217	\$1,961	\$102,350	\$102,350	\$0	\$1,961
			<b>\$15,648,370</b>	<b>\$13,405,682</b>	<b>\$2,242,688</b>	<b>\$18,342,661</b>	<b>\$16,019,985</b>	<b>\$2,322,676</b>	<b>\$4,565,364</b>
23	Somerset	Bedminster Twp	\$25,604	\$25,328	\$276	\$53,497	\$53,497	\$0	\$276
23	Somerset	Bound Brook Boro	\$55,137	\$46,458	\$8,679	\$69,540	\$60,222	\$9,318	\$17,997
23	Somerset	Bridgewater-Raritan Reg	\$12,955	\$13,015	(\$60)	\$13,301	\$13,301	\$0	(\$60)
23	Somerset	South Bound Brook	\$27,782	\$26,060	\$1,722	\$20,711	\$20,425	\$286	\$2,008
23	Warren	Hackettstown	\$19,920	\$18,454	\$1,466				\$1,466
23	Warren	Harmony Twp	\$13,270	\$13,092	\$178	\$12,968	\$12,968	\$0	\$178
23	Warren	Mansfield Twp	\$16,418	\$15,728	\$690	\$16,076	\$15,812	\$264	\$954
23	Warren	Phillipsburg Town	\$8,642	\$7,945	\$697				\$697
23	Warren	Pohatcong Twp	\$10,234	\$9,714	\$520	\$10,633	\$10,633	\$0	\$520
23	Warren	Washington Boro	\$19,260	\$17,144	\$2,116				\$2,116
			<b>\$209,222</b>	<b>\$192,938</b>	<b>\$16,284</b>	<b>\$196,726</b>	<b>\$186,858</b>	<b>\$9,868</b>	<b>\$26,152</b>
24	Morris	Mount Olive Twp	\$146,185	\$143,451	\$2,734	\$98,590	\$98,590	\$0	\$2,734
24	Sussex	Byram Twp	\$88,371	\$95,815	(\$7,444)	\$105,660	\$105,660	\$0	(\$7,444)
24	Sussex	Frankford Twp	\$29,444	\$29,444	\$0	\$37,932	\$37,398	\$534	\$534

**Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)**

LD	County	District	Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2015			Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2016			Two-Year Total
			Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
24	Sussex	Franklin Boro	\$82,017	\$85,328	(\$3,311)	\$39,697	\$39,697	\$0	(\$3,311)
24	Sussex	Fredon Twp	\$35,024	\$39,599	(\$4,575)	\$43,893	\$43,893	\$0	(\$4,575)
24	Sussex	Green Twp	\$20,472	\$18,720	\$1,752	\$20,274	\$18,828	\$1,446	\$3,198
24	Sussex	Hamburg Boro	\$47,512	\$45,020	\$2,492	\$116,222	\$116,222	\$0	\$2,492
24	Sussex	Hampton Twp	\$36,975	\$38,886	(\$1,911)	\$70,910	\$70,910	\$0	(\$1,911)
24	Sussex	Hardyston Twp	\$68,076	\$64,433	\$3,643	\$127,852	\$127,546	\$306	\$3,949
24	Sussex	Hopatcong	\$585,014	\$611,567	(\$26,553)	\$826,590	\$826,590	\$0	(\$26,553)
24	Sussex	Kittatinny Regional	\$44,676	\$43,352	\$1,324	\$92,197	\$92,197	\$0	\$1,324
24	Sussex	Lafayette Twp	\$82,634	\$82,634	\$0	\$108,392	\$102,393	\$5,999	\$5,999
24	Sussex	Montague Twp	\$575,374	\$576,386	(\$1,012)	\$348,217	\$348,217	\$0	(\$1,012)
24	Sussex	Newton Town	\$154,113	\$143,874	\$10,239	\$101,556	\$97,546	\$4,010	\$14,249
24	Sussex	Ogdensburg Boro	\$48,490	\$51,374	(\$2,884)	\$73,219	\$73,219	\$0	(\$2,884)
24	Sussex	Sparta Twp	\$168,794	\$173,768	(\$4,974)	\$306,306	\$306,306	\$0	(\$4,974)
24	Sussex	Stanhope Boro	\$10,451	\$10,181	\$270	\$47,572	\$47,572	\$0	\$270
24	Sussex	Stillwater Twp	\$47,948	\$50,964	(\$3,016)	\$24,384	\$24,384	\$0	(\$3,016)
24	Sussex	Sussex-Wantage Regional	\$620,919	\$667,135	(\$46,216)	\$657,170	\$657,170	\$0	(\$46,216)
24	Sussex	Vernon Twp	\$464,115	\$463,307	\$808	\$414,085	\$414,085	\$0	\$808
24	Sussex	Walkill Valley Regional	\$13,730	\$14,394	(\$664)	\$14,843	\$14,843	\$0	(\$664)
24	Warren	Belvidere Town	\$22,158	\$21,864	\$294	\$43,072	\$43,072	\$0	\$294
24	Warren	Blairstown Twp	\$263,112	\$274,878	(\$11,766)	\$299,761	\$296,814	\$2,947	(\$8,819)
24	Warren	Frelinghuysen Twp	\$70,350	\$74,746	(\$4,396)	\$66,660	\$66,660	\$0	(\$4,396)
24	Warren	Great Meadows Regional	\$82,736	\$84,808	(\$2,072)	\$80,450	\$80,450	\$0	(\$2,072)
24	Warren	Hope Twp	\$57,805	\$60,050	(\$2,245)	\$62,322	\$62,322	\$0	(\$2,245)
24	Warren	Knowlton Twp	\$11,960	\$12,253	(\$293)				(\$293)
24	Warren	North Warren Regional	\$152,658	\$154,556	(\$1,898)	\$162,016	\$162,016	\$0	(\$1,898)
24	Warren	White Twp	\$11,010	\$10,927	\$83	\$34,173	\$34,173	\$0	\$83
			<b>\$4,042,123</b>	<b>\$4,143,714</b>	<b>(\$101,591)</b>	<b>\$4,424,015</b>	<b>\$4,408,773</b>	<b>\$15,242</b>	<b>(\$86,349)</b>
25	Morris	Boonton Town	\$36,582	\$32,343	\$4,239	\$34,164	\$33,453	\$711	\$4,950
25	Morris	Chester Twp	\$26,401	\$27,035	(\$634)				(\$634)

**Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)**

LD	County	District	Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2015			Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2016			Two-Year Total
			Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
25	Morris	Denville Twp	\$98,656	\$97,920	\$736	\$119,981	\$119,981	\$0	\$736
25	Morris	Dover Town	\$14,885	\$13,816	\$1,069	\$42,714	\$39,117	\$3,597	\$4,666
25	Morris	Mine Hill Twp	\$9,715	\$9,461	\$254	\$19,214	\$19,214	\$0	\$254
25	Morris	Morris School District	\$927,303	\$890,308	\$36,995	\$1,084,019	\$1,034,494	\$49,525	\$86,520
25	Morris	Mount Arlington Boro	\$38,583	\$43,797	(\$5,214)	\$53,472	\$53,472	\$0	(\$5,214)
25	Morris	Randolph Twp	\$100,839	\$102,872	(\$2,033)	\$85,321	\$85,321	\$0	(\$2,033)
25	Morris	Roxbury Twp	\$24,428	\$25,266	(\$838)	\$63,959	\$63,959	\$0	(\$838)
25	Morris	Washington Twp	\$48,612	\$49,376	(\$764)	\$39,609	\$39,609	\$0	(\$764)
25	Morris	Wharton Boro	\$13,589	\$12,780	\$809	\$13,917	\$13,917	\$0	\$809
			<b>\$1,339,593</b>	<b>\$1,304,974</b>	<b>\$34,619</b>	<b>\$1,556,370</b>	<b>\$1,502,537</b>	<b>\$53,833</b>	<b>\$88,452</b>
26	Essex	North Caldwell Boro	\$18,649	\$18,904	(\$255)	\$20,874	\$20,874	\$0	(\$255)
26	Essex	West Essex Regional	\$19,209	\$18,798	\$411				\$411
26	Morris	Butler Boro	\$12,638	\$11,744	\$894	\$24,312	\$23,296	\$1,016	\$1,910
26	Morris	Jefferson Twp	\$44,424	\$45,072	(\$648)	\$35,460	\$35,460	\$0	(\$648)
26	Morris	Morris Plains Boro	\$87,353	\$87,451	(\$98)	\$66,310	\$66,310	\$0	(\$98)
26	Morris	Parsippany-Troy Hills Twp	\$288,157	\$287,334	\$823	\$319,413	\$319,413	\$0	\$823
26	Morris	Rockaway Twp	\$56,170	\$56,744	(\$574)	\$44,284	\$44,284	\$0	(\$574)
26	Passaic	West Milford Twp	\$20,881	\$20,896	(\$15)	\$21,551	\$21,551	\$0	(\$15)
			<b>\$547,481</b>	<b>\$546,943</b>	<b>\$538</b>	<b>\$532,204</b>	<b>\$531,188</b>	<b>\$1,016</b>	<b>\$1,554</b>
27	Essex	Livingston Twp	\$35,529	\$35,208	\$321	\$35,619	\$35,619	\$0	\$321
27	Essex	South Orange-Maplewood	\$377,554	\$363,368	\$14,186	\$350,859	\$346,775	\$4,084	\$18,270
27	Essex	West Essex Regional	\$19,209	\$18,798	\$411				\$411
27	Essex	West Orange Town	\$182,848	\$171,382	\$11,466	\$261,324	\$261,324	\$0	\$11,466
27	Morris	Sch Dist Of The Chathams	\$10,421	\$10,412	\$9				\$9
27	Morris	Florham Park Boro	\$12,574	\$12,562	\$12	\$13,139	\$13,139	\$0	\$12
27	Morris	Hanover Twp	\$69,319	\$67,614	\$1,705	\$98,958	\$98,958	\$0	\$1,705
			<b>\$707,454</b>	<b>\$679,344</b>	<b>\$28,110</b>	<b>\$759,899</b>	<b>\$755,815</b>	<b>\$4,084</b>	<b>\$32,194</b>

**Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)**

LD	County	District	Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2015			Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2016			Two-Year Total
			Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
28	Essex	Bloomfield Twp	\$249,480	\$257,831	(\$8,351)	\$210,874	\$210,874	\$0	(\$8,351)
28	Essex	Irvington Township	\$8,372,985	\$7,110,886	\$1,262,099	\$9,355,588	\$8,301,128	\$1,054,460	\$2,316,559
28	Essex	Newark City	\$186,862,263	\$148,628,093	\$38,234,170	\$199,679,494	\$174,730,230	\$24,949,264	\$63,183,434
			<b>\$195,484,728</b>	<b>\$155,996,810</b>	<b>\$39,487,918</b>	<b>\$209,245,956</b>	<b>\$183,242,232</b>	<b>\$26,003,724</b>	<b>\$65,491,642</b>
29	Essex	Belleville Town	\$90,158	\$84,325	\$5,833	\$68,181	\$68,181	\$0	\$5,833
29	Essex	Newark City	\$186,862,263	\$148,628,093	\$38,234,170	\$199,679,494	\$174,730,230	\$24,949,264	\$63,183,434
			<b>\$186,952,421</b>	<b>\$148,712,418</b>	<b>\$38,240,003</b>	<b>\$199,747,675</b>	<b>\$174,798,411</b>	<b>\$24,949,264</b>	<b>\$63,189,267</b>
30	Monmouth	Bradley Beach Boro	\$35,484	\$32,588	\$2,896	\$64,342	\$64,342	\$0	\$2,896
			<b>\$35,484</b>	<b>\$32,588</b>	<b>\$2,896</b>	<b>\$64,342</b>	<b>\$64,342</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,896</b>
31	Hudson	Bayonne City	\$107,161	\$98,415	\$8,746	\$169,345	\$167,475	\$1,870	\$10,616
31	Hudson	Jersey City	\$46,090,430	\$41,645,842	\$4,444,588	\$49,899,109	\$48,188,163	\$1,710,946	\$6,155,534
			<b>\$46,197,591</b>	<b>\$41,744,257</b>	<b>\$4,453,334</b>	<b>\$50,068,454</b>	<b>\$48,355,638</b>	<b>\$1,712,816</b>	<b>\$6,166,150</b>
32	Hudson	Guttenberg Town	\$10,209	\$8,766	\$1,443	\$22,882	\$21,056	\$1,826	\$3,269
32	Hudson	Harrison Town	\$26,913	\$25,875	\$1,038	\$24,485	\$24,389	\$96	\$1,134
32	Hudson	Kearny Town	\$20,944	\$19,891	\$1,053	\$504,073	\$504,073	\$0	\$1,053
32	Hudson	North Bergen Twp	\$136,527	\$135,935	\$592	\$174,656	\$174,656	\$0	\$592
32	Hudson	Secaucus Town	\$75,411	\$71,477	\$3,934	\$94,067	\$93,748	\$319	\$4,253
32	Hudson	West New York Town	\$8,046	\$7,092	\$954	\$21,524	\$20,390	\$1,134	\$2,088
			<b>\$278,050</b>	<b>\$269,036</b>	<b>\$9,014</b>	<b>\$841,687</b>	<b>\$838,312</b>	<b>\$3,375</b>	<b>\$12,389</b>
33	Hudson	Hoboken City	\$7,359,589	\$6,831,572	\$528,017	\$7,927,450	\$7,927,450	\$0	\$528,017
33	Hudson	Jersey City	\$46,090,430	\$41,645,842	\$4,444,588	\$49,899,109	\$48,188,163	\$1,710,946	\$6,155,534
33	Hudson	Union City	\$173,052	\$153,965	\$19,087	\$227,264	\$213,305	\$13,959	\$33,046
33	Hudson	Weehawken Twp	\$74,320	\$69,320	\$5,000	\$61,334	\$60,585	\$749	\$5,749
			<b>\$53,697,391</b>	<b>\$48,700,699</b>	<b>\$4,996,692</b>	<b>\$58,115,157</b>	<b>\$56,389,503</b>	<b>\$1,725,654</b>	<b>\$6,722,346</b>

**Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)**

LD	County	District	Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2015			Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2016			Two-Year Total
			Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
34	Essex	East Orange	\$10,356,921	\$9,152,970	\$1,203,951	\$10,837,313	\$10,107,397	\$729,916	\$1,933,867
34	Essex	Montclair Town	\$10,349	\$10,026	\$323	\$10,377	\$10,377	\$0	\$323
34	Essex	City Of Orange Twp	\$1,852,302	\$1,627,772	\$224,530	\$1,998,216	\$1,829,274	\$168,942	\$393,472
34	Passaic	Clifton City	\$2,085,321	\$1,946,030	\$139,291	\$2,349,698	\$2,349,698	\$0	\$139,291
			<b>\$14,304,893</b>	<b>\$12,736,798</b>	<b>\$1,568,095</b>	<b>\$15,195,604</b>	<b>\$14,296,746</b>	<b>\$898,858</b>	<b>\$2,466,953</b>
35	Bergen	Elmwood Park	\$223,056	\$218,224	\$4,832	\$261,502	\$261,502	\$0	\$4,832
35	Bergen	Garfield City	\$4,957,974	\$4,273,158	\$684,816	\$5,581,116	\$5,180,643	\$400,473	\$1,085,289
35	Passaic	Haledon Boro				\$38,011	\$37,697	\$314	\$314
35	Passaic	Paterson City	\$29,357,448	\$25,221,198	\$4,136,250	\$32,680,541	\$31,891,827	\$788,714	\$4,924,964
35	Passaic	Prospect Park Boro	\$65,086	\$59,166	\$5,920	\$109,429	\$109,412	\$17	\$5,937
			<b>\$34,603,564</b>	<b>\$29,771,746</b>	<b>\$4,831,818</b>	<b>\$38,670,599</b>	<b>\$37,481,081</b>	<b>\$1,189,518</b>	<b>\$6,021,336</b>
36	Bergen	Carlstadt Boro	\$98,380	\$92,533	\$5,847	\$65,579	\$65,579	\$0	\$5,847
36	Bergen	Cliffside Park Boro	\$55,545	\$50,183	\$5,362	\$62,645	\$60,197	\$2,448	\$7,810
36	Bergen	East Rutherford Boro	\$34,899	\$34,713	\$186	\$34,542	\$34,542	\$0	\$186
36	Bergen	Little Ferry Boro	\$55,543	\$53,053	\$2,490	\$55,320	\$54,180	\$1,140	\$3,630
36	Bergen	Lyndhurst Twp	\$100,020	\$95,819	\$4,201	\$153,212	\$153,212	\$0	\$4,201
36	Bergen	North Arlington Boro	\$9,701	\$9,020	\$681				\$681
36	Bergen	Ridgefield Park Twp	\$16,874	\$16,362	\$512	\$32,600	\$32,600	\$0	\$512
36	Bergen	South Hackensack Twp	\$23,156	\$21,913	\$1,243	\$38,921	\$37,700	\$1,221	\$2,464
36	Bergen	Wallington Boro	\$150,819	\$147,437	\$3,382	\$156,741	\$150,793	\$5,948	\$9,330
36	Bergen	Wood-Ridge Boro	\$68,327	\$66,678	\$1,649	\$34,594	\$34,594	\$0	\$1,649
36	Passaic	Passaic City	\$6,469,705	\$5,772,110	\$697,595	\$8,070,348	\$7,635,128	\$435,220	\$1,132,815
			<b>\$7,082,969</b>	<b>\$6,359,821</b>	<b>\$723,148</b>	<b>\$8,704,502</b>	<b>\$8,258,525</b>	<b>\$445,977</b>	<b>\$1,169,125</b>
37	Bergen	Bogota Boro	\$20,038	\$21,440	(\$1,402)	\$78,538	\$78,538	\$0	(\$1,402)
37	Bergen	Englewood City	\$1,951,718	\$1,957,292	(\$5,574)	\$1,867,010	\$1,867,010	\$0	(\$5,574)
37	Bergen	Hackensack City	\$2,685,467	\$2,451,972	\$233,495	\$2,606,272	\$2,474,242	\$132,030	\$365,525
37	Bergen	Palisades Park	\$50,264	\$46,488	\$3,776	\$51,656	\$50,928	\$728	\$4,504

**Background Paper: Language Provisions Affecting Resident School Districts' Payments to Charter Schools (Cont'd)**

LD	County	District	Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2015			Base Payment - Fiscal Year 2016			Two-Year Total
			Appropriations Act	Charter Law	Difference	Proposed Budget	Charter Law	Difference	
37	Bergen	Teaneck Twp	\$4,528,722	\$4,550,702	(\$21,980)	\$4,668,560	\$4,668,560	\$0	(\$21,980)
			<b>\$9,236,209</b>	<b>\$9,027,894</b>	<b>\$208,315</b>	<b>\$9,272,036</b>	<b>\$9,139,278</b>	<b>\$132,758</b>	<b>\$341,073</b>
38	Bergen	Bergenfield Boro	\$203,954	\$199,512	\$4,442	\$219,499	\$219,499	\$0	\$4,442
38	Bergen	Fair Lawn Boro	\$61,042	\$60,680	\$362	\$74,009	\$74,009	\$0	\$362
38	Bergen	Hasbrouck Heights Boro	\$52,349	\$51,216	\$1,133	\$30,602	\$30,602	\$0	\$1,133
38	Bergen	Lodi Borough	\$1,689,368	\$1,608,957	\$80,411	\$1,715,102	\$1,715,102	\$0	\$80,411
38	Bergen	Maywood Boro	\$13,436	\$12,218	\$1,218	\$16,123	\$16,007	\$116	\$1,334
38	Bergen	New Milford Boro	\$13,832	\$14,276	(\$444)				(\$444)
38	Bergen	Paramus Boro	\$44,609	\$45,210	(\$601)	\$13,960	\$13,960	\$0	(\$601)
38	Bergen	River Dell Regional	\$19,443	\$19,423	\$20				\$20
38	Bergen	River Edge Boro	\$9,063	\$9,256	(\$193)	\$9,065	\$9,065	\$0	(\$193)
38	Bergen	Rochelle Park Twp	\$73,310	\$66,765	\$6,545	\$100,422	\$94,867	\$5,555	\$12,100
38	Bergen	Saddle Brook Twp	\$374,173	\$370,760	\$3,413	\$327,992	\$327,992	\$0	\$3,413
			<b>\$2,554,579</b>	<b>\$2,458,273</b>	<b>\$96,306</b>	<b>\$2,506,774</b>	<b>\$2,501,103</b>	<b>\$5,671</b>	<b>\$101,977</b>
39	Bergen	Dumont Boro	\$25,666	\$26,052	(\$386)	\$16,712	\$16,712	\$0	(\$386)
39	Bergen	Ramapo-Indian Hill Reg	\$22,931	\$22,739	\$192				\$192
39	Passaic	Bloomington Boro	\$28,244	\$27,302	\$942	\$27,528	\$27,280	\$248	\$1,190
			<b>\$76,841</b>	<b>\$76,093</b>	<b>\$748</b>	<b>\$44,240</b>	<b>\$43,992</b>	<b>\$248</b>	<b>\$996</b>
40	Bergen	Ramapo-Indian Hill Reg	\$22,931	\$22,739	\$192				\$192
40	Morris	Riverdale Boro	\$11,263	\$11,466	(\$203)				(\$203)
40	Passaic	Little Falls Twp	\$10,633	\$10,255	\$378	\$10,978	\$10,978	\$0	\$378
40	Passaic	Totowa Boro	\$10,011	\$9,180	\$831	\$9,713	\$9,111	\$602	\$1,433
40	Passaic	Wayne Twp	\$25,637	\$25,799	(\$162)	\$14,750	\$14,750	\$0	(\$162)
40	Passaic	Woodland Park	\$54,048	\$52,358	\$1,690	\$127,037	\$127,037	\$0	\$1,690
			<b>\$134,523</b>	<b>\$131,797</b>	<b>\$2,726</b>	<b>\$162,478</b>	<b>\$161,876</b>	<b>\$602</b>	<b>\$3,328</b>



## OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

The Office of Legislative Services provides nonpartisan assistance to the State Legislature in the areas of legal, fiscal, research, bill drafting, committee staffing and administrative services. It operates under the jurisdiction of the Legislative Services Commission, a bipartisan body consisting of eight members of each House. The Executive Director supervises and directs the Office of Legislative Services.

The Legislative Budget and Finance Officer is the chief fiscal officer for the Legislature. The Legislative Budget and Finance Officer collects and presents fiscal information for the Legislature; serves as Secretary to the Joint Budget Oversight Committee; attends upon the Appropriations Committees during review of the Governor's Budget recommendations; reports on such matters as the committees or Legislature may direct; administers the fiscal note process and has statutory responsibilities for the review of appropriations transfers and other State fiscal transactions.

The Office of Legislative Services Central Staff provides a variety of legal, fiscal, research and administrative services to individual legislators, legislative officers, legislative committees and commissions, and partisan staff. The central staff is organized under the Central Staff Management Unit into ten subject area sections. Each section, under a section chief, includes legal, fiscal, and research staff for the standing reference committees of the Legislature and, upon request, to special commissions created by the Legislature. The central staff assists the Legislative Budget and Finance Officer in providing services to the Appropriations Committees during the budget review process.

Individuals wishing information and committee schedules on the FY 2016 budget are encouraged to contact:

**Legislative Budget and Finance Office  
State House Annex  
Room 140 PO Box 068  
Trenton, NJ 08625  
(609) 847-3105 • Fax (609) 777-2442**