

State of Delaware
Equalization Committee

FISCAL YEAR 2022
RECOMMENDATIONS

Per 14 Del. C. §1707(i)

March 2021

Equalization Committee Membership:

Laura V. Sturgeon, Senator
Kimberly Williams, Representative
Dan Shelton, Superintendent, Christina School District
Kevin Fitzgerald, Superintendent, Caesar Rodney School District
Heath Chasanov, Superintendent, Woodbridge School District
Sara Croce, Business Manager, Milford School District
Jerry Gallagher, Business Manager, Smyrna School District
Wali Rushdan, State Board of Education
Kristin Dwyer, Delaware State Education Association
Jon Sheehan, Office of the Governor
Ruth Ann Jones, Controller General's Office
Mary Nash Wilson, Office of Management and Budget
Arsene Aka, Department of Finance

Staff to Committee (Department of Education)

Kim Klein, Associate Secretary, Operations Support
Jennifer Carlson, Director of Finance
Cathy Wolfe, Education Associate, State Funds

Other Participants

Tammy Croce, Lake Forest School District
Nicole Polite, Office of Management and Budget
Ed Ratledge, University of Delaware
Sean Sokolowski, New Castle County Vo-Tech

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Equalization Committee continues to review issues dealing with the equitable funding of education within the State, specifically the Equalization formula. The purpose of the Equalization formula is to allocate state resources to districts inversely on their ability to raise revenues through their local property tax base. This allocation is an attempt to ensure that each district has substantially the same level of resources with which to educate each student.

The committee continues to find that a major issue in attempting to equalize school finances is the inconsistencies in current assessment practices related to property valuation. As the committee has tried over time to correct misalignment of equalization dollars due to the lack of reassessment, the formula has grown more and more unreliable. The Equalization formula relies on data from property assessments, which must be made current for the formula to adequately serve its purpose.

In 2020, a ruling by the Delaware Chancery Court found that the property taxing systems in each of the State's three counties to be unconstitutional and not in keeping with Delaware law. The committee recognizes the upcoming county reassessments that are a result of the recent ruling will resolve the reassessment issue short-term once implemented. However, the committee recommends that the reassessments be completed every five years to ensure a long-term solution.

After years of discussions on the challenges of this formula and the lack of solid options that do not create hardships for districts, the Committee is recommending holding the Fiscal Year 2022 per unit equalization values consistent with Fiscal Year 2009 values. The Committee does not enter into this recommendation lightly, and recommends the correction of the dated assessment realities that exist in Delaware to include unassessed real property and actual sales value be recorded or made known for public use.

BACKGROUND

The last major revision of the equalization formula occurred in 1984. One of the significant changes made was the establishment of a methodology for establishing a district's wealth that required an assessment-to-sales price study of real estate in each district. This study was necessitated by the fact that each county has a different assessment policy. The first such study in March 1989 would have resulted in a significant decrease in funding among the New Castle County school districts with significant increases to those in Kent and Sussex counties had the formula remained intact. That situation led to the establishment of the Equalization Policy Committee by the Governor in 1989. Subsequent legislation called for a committee to be appointed by the Secretary of Education to review the formula annually and make recommendations as needed. Since that time the Equalization Committee has made numerous modifications and adjustments to the formula to attempt to minimize losses, control gains and ensure equity statewide.

In March 2021, the Equalization Committee was provided with the most recent Assessment-to-Sales Ratio Study prepared by the University of Delaware and data showing the impact of updating the formula. The committee determined that the formula was still not having the desired impact.

This report will review the current equalization formula, including impacts by district, and recommendations for Fiscal Year 2022 Equalization funding.

CONCERNS WITH THE EXISTING FINANCE SYSTEM

Overview

There are many facts and published reports, which indicate that Delaware has a sound education financing system in place. Delaware provides state funding to cover approximately two-thirds of the total cost of public education, one of the highest proportions of state funding in the nation. Since FY 1984, equalization funding has increased from \$7.7 M or 3.1% of the education budget to \$100.8 M or 6.1% of the education budget in FY 2021 (excluding the appropriated amount for the Delaware Advisory Council on Career and Technical Education).

Despite the many positive aspects of Delaware's funding system, several areas need improvement. There is still a sizable difference in the ability of districts to raise funds to enhance their educational programs to address student and school accountability measures and many funding areas still create an inequitable burden on poorer districts. In the past, the Equalization Committee has recommended a series of changes to address some of the deficiencies. However, over time, these adjustments are just not accomplishing their intended goals as the formula continues to produce volatile results in response to the implementation of these changes.

Reassessment

It is apparent to the Committee that a major flaw with the existing Equalization formula is not so much the formula but rather the data that drives it. For many years, the Committee has struggled with the effects of shifts in the relative wealth of districts as determined by the annual revisions to the assessment-to-sales ratios. Given the different assessment policies in each county, these ratios are used to estimate the market value of property in each district in order to determine relative wealth. Refer to Table 1 to see the impact of current year adjustments. More important than the shift in wealth is the fact that this can best be described as a shift in a district's paper wealth. While the market value of property has been changing in the districts, the lack of a uniform statewide rolling reassessment policy means that the district's tax base (i.e. assessed value) has not changed consistent with the change in its market value of real estate.

As the market value of property in a district (as determined by the assessment-to-sales price study) increases, it is deemed to be wealthier and is expected to generate more revenues from local taxes thereby entitling it to less equalization funding. However, since there is no consistent reassessment practice in place, the district's tax base is not increasing in proportion to its market value. Refer to Table 2 for information on the changes in assessed value within each district. So while a district loses equalization funding, the funding is not replaced by an increase in its tax base. It can only be replaced by a change in the tax rate through referendum. This is an unintended consequence of the formula and has placed a heavy burden on many local districts. It will likely cause even greater problems if the market value of real estate continues to change at current rates. To further

compound the problem, the effect of these changes is to lower a district's effort which may further reduce what they are eligible to receive in equalization funding.

For many years the recommendation of the Committee has been for the State to move forward with recommendations outlined in the Reassessment Report dated November 26, 2008. New Castle County property has not been reassessed since 1983; Kent County property has not been reassessed since 1986; and Sussex County property has not been reassessed since 1974. The completion of the upcoming county reassessments will provide more reliable data on a district's wealth, ensure equity among taxpayers, and allow for the equalization model to function as intended. **Reassessments must occur on a regular basis to prevent the current volatility in the equalization formula and distribution.**

Support Beyond Full Effort

The equalization formula is intended to provide equity among districts to a point. Beyond that point, districts earn what they can generate from their local tax bases without any additional state support. In the current formula, this point is referred to as the authorized amount and is set at \$29,650. The underlying concept is that if a district levied the appropriate tax rate, it would receive \$29,650 through a combination of property taxes and state equalization funds. The state portion of this amount varies based upon each district's wealth. There are no additional state resources made available to a district if they exceed this required level of taxation. As a result, property wealthy districts have the ability to generate considerably more funds with small tax rate increases than their less wealthy counterparts. This creates significant funding disparities as districts assess higher tax rates. Refer to Table 3 for a comparison of per unit funding by district. The statewide average per unit funding is \$64,199 but the amounts range from \$28,429 to \$96,135. Fourteen districts are below the statewide average, which suggests that they are among the poorest and that those above the average have the greatest property wealth. While no district should be penalized when its tax payers elect to provide additional support for education, the inability for poorer districts to raise this level of revenue without astronomical tax rates will perpetuate this funding disparity. Some form of equalization beyond the required level could help to minimize funding disparities. In addition, the

lack of equalization in the other tax areas further exacerbates the problem of poorer districts that must enact significantly higher tax rates to meet their obligations to students.

EQUALIZATION FORMULA REVISIONS

The implementation of the newest assessment-to-sales ratios this past year continues to result in significant changes in the estimated market value of property within each district. See Table 1. While these changes have an impact as to the relative wealth among districts, they have no bearing on the amount of tax revenues collected by a district. The changes in the actual assessed value of property in each district is a more critical factor in determining the actual tax collections because it is against the assessment value that a district's tax rate is applied to raise local taxes. See Table 2.

Other information that can be useful in comparing the relative financial status of each district is presented in several attached tables. Table 3 shows the estimated total amount of current expense and equalization funding available on a per unit basis for each district. Tables 4 and 5 show the FY 2021 property tax for homes with market values of \$100,000 and \$200,000. Table 4 is the current expense tax, which is for school purposes such as local salary supplements and instructional supplies. Table 5 is the total tax bill, which in addition to the current expense tax rate also includes tuition, match and debt service rates. Table 6 utilizes FY 2019 data and shows the per pupil expenditures from all funding sources, exclusive of adult education programs, construction and debt service.

In a continuing attempt to dampen the effects of the volatile changes in a district's wealth as a result of the changing assessment-to-sales ratios, the Committee is maintaining the "smoothing" of the ratios by averaging the ratios from the past three years analysis. As requested, the Committee did receive an analysis of the assessment-to-sales ratios using a 36-month time-frame. However, as per Table 7, the Committee has opted to continue with the average of the three most recent 18-month analysis because it has a smaller negative impact on the districts.

CONCLUSION

The Committee continues to express concerns about recommending the implementation of artificial strategies that continue to erode the original purpose of the Equalization Formula. The Committee strongly urges the Administration and General Assembly to take actions to address the inherent challenges created by the current system, in order to provide equitable funding statewide. The Committee's recommendations include the following:

1. **Short Term:** Continue to freeze the Equalization formula at Fiscal Year 2009 levels, given the limited amount of time for school districts to prepare for the changes that would result from unfreezing the formula. The impact of continuing to freeze the formula through Fiscal Year 2022 is that some school districts that should be receiving greater levels of Equalization funding via an unfrozen formula will continue to forgo this additional revenue, and school districts that should be receiving less Equalization funding will continue to receive greater levels of State support than they are otherwise entitled to receive. Table 8 is a summary of these impacts to the district formula values.

2. **Long Term:** Reassess property statewide every five years, including unassessed real property, and investigate how to promulgate rules and regulations to require mandatory reporting of actual sales value publicly. The Committee uniformly agrees the impact of a lack of property reassessment and throughout the State, and its impact on Equalization, is as such: as a school district's market value of property increases the Equalization formula recognizes this as an indication that a particular school district is wealthier and is expected to generate additional local property tax revenue thereby decreasing State Equalization funding. However, given a lack of reassessment practices, property assessments are not increasing in proportion to market value and school districts that lose Equalization funding do not have the ability to offset the loss via current expense taxes without sizable property tax increases.

Table 1. Assessment - Sales Ratios

| District | FY 2021 | FY 2021 | Old Full Value | FY 2022 | New Full Value | % Change |
|---------------|------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Assessed Value | Adj Ratio | | Adj Ratio | | |
| Appoquinimink | \$2,418,597,395 | 0.282 | \$8,576,586,507 | 0.274 | \$8,826,997,792 | 2.9% |
| Brandywine | \$3,428,275,964 | 0.284 | \$12,071,394,239 | 0.277 | \$12,376,447,523 | 2.5% |
| Christina | \$5,595,443,653 | 0.300 | \$18,651,478,843 | 0.293 | \$19,097,077,314 | 2.4% |
| Colonial | \$3,030,246,756 | 0.297 | \$10,202,851,030 | 0.290 | \$10,449,126,745 | 2.4% |
| Red Clay | \$5,322,496,264 | 0.289 | \$18,416,942,090 | 0.282 | \$18,874,100,227 | 2.5% |
| NCC Total | \$19,912,101,402 | | \$67,919,252,710 | | \$69,623,749,601 | 2.5% |
| NCCDIST | \$17,376,462,637 | | \$59,342,666,203 | | \$60,796,751,809 | 2.5% |
| | | | | | | |
| Caesar Rodney | \$943,488,200 | 0.205 | \$4,602,381,463 | 0.202 | \$4,670,733,663 | 1.5% |
| Capital | \$1,352,161,200 | 0.208 | \$6,500,775,000 | 0.210 | \$6,438,862,857 | -1.0% |
| Lake Forest | \$530,129,900 | 0.197 | \$2,691,014,721 | 0.193 | \$2,746,787,047 | 2.1% |
| Milford Total | \$447,097,093 | | \$3,408,335,869 | | \$3,476,334,113 | 2.0% |
| KC | \$277,236,000 | 0.200 | \$1,386,180,000 | 0.201 | \$1,379,283,582 | -0.5% |
| SC | \$169,861,093 | 0.084 | \$2,022,155,869 | 0.081 | \$2,097,050,531 | 3.7% |
| Smyrna Total | \$813,695,670 | | \$3,950,343,035 | | \$4,017,610,374 | 1.7% |
| NCC | \$117,041,370 | 0.271 | \$431,886,974 | 0.263 | \$445,024,221 | 3.0% |
| KC | \$696,654,300 | 0.198 | \$3,518,456,061 | 0.195 | \$3,572,586,154 | 1.5% |
| TOTAL | \$3,837,778,400 | | \$21,152,850,088 | | \$21,350,328,054 | 0.9% |
| | | | | | | |
| Cape Henlopen | \$1,341,900,027 | 0.074 | \$18,133,784,149 | 0.072 | \$18,637,500,375 | 2.8% |
| Delmar | \$58,666,299 | 0.080 | \$733,328,738 | 0.080 | \$733,328,738 | 0.0% |
| Indian River | \$1,729,902,326 | 0.083 | \$20,842,196,699 | 0.080 | \$21,623,779,075 | 3.8% |
| Laurel | \$129,106,046 | 0.084 | \$1,536,976,738 | 0.081 | \$1,593,901,802 | 3.7% |
| Seaford | \$216,756,805 | 0.085 | \$2,550,080,059 | 0.085 | \$2,550,080,059 | 0.0% |
| Woodbridge | \$171,117,793 | | \$1,859,049,526 | | \$1,876,126,826 | 0.9% |
| KC | \$38,108,800 | 0.194 | \$196,437,113 | 0.198 | \$192,468,687 | -2.0% |
| SC | \$133,008,993 | 0.080 | \$1,662,612,413 | 0.079 | \$1,683,658,139 | 1.3% |
| TOTAL | \$3,779,201,589 | | \$45,655,415,908 | | \$47,014,716,875 | 3.0% |
| | | | | | | |
| Statewide | \$27,529,081,391 | | \$134,727,518,706 | | \$137,988,794,531 | 2.4% |

Table 2. Assessed Value Comparison

| District | Assessed Value 2019-20 | Assessed Value 2020-21 | % Change |
|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------|
| Appoquinimink | \$2,323,461,920 | \$2,418,597,395 | 4.1% |
| Brandywine | \$3,404,008,712 | \$3,428,275,964 | 0.7% |
| Christina | \$5,574,732,163 | \$5,595,443,653 | 0.4% |
| Colonial | \$2,991,022,806 | \$3,030,246,756 | 1.3% |
| Red Clay | \$5,314,770,206 | \$5,322,496,264 | 0.1% |
| NCC Total | \$19,724,097,527 | \$19,912,101,402 | 1.0% |
| NCCDIST | \$17,284,533,887 | \$17,376,462,637 | 0.5% |
| | | | |
| Caesar Rodney | \$927,711,100 | \$943,488,200 | 1.7% |
| Capital | \$1,339,902,600 | \$1,352,161,200 | 0.9% |
| Lake Forest | \$521,103,600 | \$530,129,900 | 1.7% |
| Milford Total | \$439,968,743 | \$447,097,093 | 1.6% |
| KC | \$273,723,600 | \$277,236,000 | 1.3% |
| SC | \$166,245,143 | \$169,861,093 | 2.2% |
| Smyrna Total | \$795,293,020 | \$813,695,670 | 2.3% |
| NCC | \$116,101,720 | \$117,041,370 | 0.8% |
| KC | \$679,191,300 | \$696,654,300 | 2.6% |
| TOTAL | \$3,779,125,500 | \$3,837,778,400 | 1.6% |
| | | | |
| Cape Henlopen | \$1,299,323,252 | \$1,341,900,027 | 3.3% |
| Delmar | \$55,986,749 | \$58,666,299 | 4.8% |
| Indian River | \$1,680,720,776 | \$1,729,902,326 | 2.9% |
| Laurel | \$127,011,346 | \$129,106,046 | 1.6% |
| Seaford | \$213,787,855 | \$216,756,805 | 1.4% |
| Woodbridge | \$168,877,009 | \$171,117,793 | 1.3% |
| KC | \$37,493,300 | \$38,108,800 | 1.6% |
| SC | \$131,383,709 | \$133,008,993 | 1.2% |
| TOTAL | \$3,674,458,830 | \$3,779,201,589 | 2.9% |
| | | | |
| Statewide | \$27,177,681,857 | \$27,529,081,391 | 1.3% |
| | | | |
| NCC Vo-Tech | \$19,607,995,807 | \$19,795,060,032 | 1.0% |
| Polytech | \$3,895,227,220 | \$3,954,819,770 | 1.5% |
| NCC | \$116,101,720 | \$117,041,370 | 0.8% |
| KC | \$3,779,125,500 | \$3,837,778,400 | 1.6% |
| Sussex Tech | \$3,674,458,830 | \$3,779,201,589 | 2.9% |

Table 3. Estimated Current Expense and Equalization Funding

| District | Estimated Current | | November 2020 | | | |
|--|-------------------|---------|----------------|---------------|------------|----------------|
| | Expense | Revenue | Equalization * | Total Funds | Unit Count | Funds Per Unit |
| Appoquinimink | \$33,086,412 | | \$13,387,297 | \$46,473,709 | 858.05 | \$54,162 |
| NCCDIST | \$81,321,845 | | | \$81,321,845 | 3,920.56 | |
| Brandywine | \$47,001,663 | | \$4,903,832 | \$51,905,495 | 758.52 | \$68,430 |
| Christina | \$89,079,463 | | \$8,132,920 | \$97,212,383 | 1,218.51 | \$79,780 |
| Colonial | \$33,878,159 | | \$5,092,291 | \$38,970,450 | 782.89 | \$49,778 |
| Red Clay | \$58,973,259 | | \$7,550,786 | \$66,524,045 | 1,160.64 | \$57,317 |
| New Castle County Total | \$343,340,801 | | | \$343,340,801 | 4,778.61 | |
| Caesar Rodney | \$9,123,458 | | \$11,365,437 | \$20,488,895 | 574.59 | \$35,658 |
| Capital | \$15,144,205 | | \$8,854,296 | \$23,998,501 | 559.32 | \$42,907 |
| Lake Forest | \$5,120,105 | | \$5,188,170 | \$10,308,275 | 249.96 | \$41,240 |
| Milford | \$8,625,207 | | \$5,318,446 | \$13,943,653 | 304.59 | \$45,778 |
| KC | \$3,157,718 | | | \$3,157,718 | | |
| SC | \$5,467,489 | | | \$5,467,489 | | |
| Smyrna | \$7,872,622 | | \$9,132,422 | \$17,005,044 | 459.84 | \$36,980 |
| NCC | \$928,372 | | | \$928,372 | | |
| KC | \$6,944,250 | | | \$6,944,250 | | |
| Kent County Total | \$45,885,597 | | | \$45,885,597 | 2,148.30 | |
| Cape Henlopen | \$24,798,312 | | \$635,417 | \$25,433,729 | 483.16 | \$52,640 |
| Delmar | \$1,130,336 | | \$1,784,195 | \$2,914,531 | 86.54 | \$33,678 |
| Indian River | \$40,973,620 | | \$1,232,687 | \$42,206,307 | 827.41 | \$51,010 |
| Laurel | \$2,107,614 | | \$2,934,764 | \$5,042,378 | 177.37 | \$28,429 |
| Seaford | \$5,939,136 | | \$4,213,742 | \$10,152,878 | 248.32 | \$40,886 |
| Woodbridge | \$3,603,352 | | \$3,066,496 | \$6,669,848 | 183.14 | \$36,419 |
| KC | \$379,101 | | | \$379,101 | | |
| SC | \$3,224,251 | | | \$3,224,251 | | |
| Sussex County Total | \$78,552,370 | | | \$78,552,370 | 2,005.94 | |
| Regular and Special Total | \$467,778,768 | | | \$467,778,768 | 8,932.85 | |
| NCC Vo-Tech | \$29,692,590 | | \$2,780,864 | \$32,473,454 | 372.67 | \$87,137 |
| Polytech | \$5,346,276 | | \$1,724,377 | \$7,070,653 | 88.89 | \$79,544 |
| NCC | \$130,735 | | | \$130,735 | | |
| KC | \$5,215,541 | | | \$5,215,541 | | |
| Sussex Tech | \$8,881,124 | | \$148,879 | \$9,030,003 | 93.93 | \$96,135 |
| Vo-Tech Total | \$43,919,990 | | | \$43,919,990 | 555.49 | |
| Statewide | \$511,698,758 | | \$97,447,318 | \$609,146,076 | 9,488.34 | \$64,199 |
| * Reflects FY21 actual earned at FROZEN rate | | | | | | |

Table 4. Current Expense School Property Taxes

| District | County | FY 2022 Assessment Ratio | Current Expense Tax Rate Per \$100 Assessed Value | Current Expense Taxes On Home Valued at | |
|---------------|--------|--------------------------------|--|---|-----------|
| | | | | \$100,000 | \$200,000 |
| Appoquinimink | N | 0.267 | 1.3680 | \$365.26 | \$730.51 |
| Brandywine* | N | 0.274 | 1.3710 | \$375.65 | \$751.31 |
| Christina* | N | 0.293 | 1.5920 | \$466.46 | \$932.91 |
| Colonial* | N | 0.292 | 1.1180 | \$326.46 | \$652.91 |
| Red Clay* | N | 0.279 | 1.1080 | \$309.13 | \$618.26 |
| Caesar Rodney | K | 0.201 | 0.9500 | \$190.95 | \$381.90 |
| Capital | K | 0.220 | 1.1200 | \$246.40 | \$492.80 |
| Lake Forest | K | 0.194 | 0.9508 | \$184.46 | \$368.91 |
| Milford | K | 0.211 | 1.1390 | \$240.33 | \$480.66 |
| | S | 0.078 | 3.2188 | \$251.07 | \$502.13 |
| Smyrna | N | 0.260 | 0.7932 | \$206.23 | \$412.46 |
| | K | 0.195 | 0.9968 | \$194.38 | \$388.75 |
| Cape Henlopen | S | 0.070 | 1.8480 | \$129.36 | \$258.72 |
| Delmar | S | 0.078 | 1.8710 | \$145.94 | \$291.88 |
| Indian River | S | 0.075 | 2.3500 | \$176.25 | \$352.50 |
| Laurel | S | 0.077 | 1.5000 | \$115.50 | \$231.00 |
| Seaford | S | 0.085 | 2.7400 | \$232.90 | \$465.80 |
| Woodbridge | K | 0.207 | 0.9840 | \$203.69 | \$407.38 |
| | S | 0.077 | 2.3790 | \$183.18 | \$366.37 |
| NCC Vo-Tech | N | 0.268 | 0.1500 | \$40.20 | \$80.40 |
| Polytech | N | 0.253 | 0.1117 | \$28.26 | \$56.52 |
| | K | 0.197 | 0.1359 | \$26.77 | \$53.54 |
| Sussex Tech | S | 0.080 | 0.2350 | \$18.80 | \$37.60 |

*Current Expense rate does not include the New Castle County Tax Rate.

Table 5. Total School Property Taxes

| District | County | FY 2022 Assessment Ratio | Total School Property Tax Rate Per \$100 Assessed Value | Total Taxes On Home Valued at | |
|---------------|--------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------|
| | | | | \$100,000 | \$200,000 |
| Appoquinimink | N | 0.267 | 2.5001 | \$667.53 | \$1,335.05 |
| Brandywine* | N | 0.274 | 2.0705 | \$567.32 | \$1,134.63 |
| Christina* | N | 0.293 | 2.4702 | \$723.77 | \$1,447.54 |
| Colonial* | N | 0.292 | 1.7250 | \$503.70 | \$1,007.40 |
| Red Clay* | N | 0.279 | 1.8400 | \$513.36 | \$1,026.72 |
| Caesar Rodney | K | 0.201 | 1.8350 | \$368.84 | \$737.67 |
| Capital | K | 0.220 | 2.1897 | \$481.74 | \$963.48 |
| Lake Forest | K | 0.194 | 1.5833 | \$307.16 | \$614.32 |
| Milford | K | 0.211 | 1.7164 | \$362.16 | \$724.32 |
| | S | 0.078 | 4.8506 | \$378.35 | \$756.69 |
| Smyrna | N | 0.260 | 1.3621 | \$354.15 | \$708.29 |
| | K | 0.195 | 1.7118 | \$333.80 | \$667.60 |
| Cape Henlopen | S | 0.070 | 3.9876 | \$279.13 | \$558.26 |
| Delmar | S | 0.078 | 4.2367 | \$330.46 | \$660.93 |
| Indian River | S | 0.075 | 3.0541 | \$229.06 | \$458.12 |
| Laurel | S | 0.077 | 4.4030 | \$339.03 | \$678.06 |
| Seaford | S | 0.085 | 4.5955 | \$390.62 | \$781.24 |
| Woodbridge | K | 0.207 | 1.6800 | \$347.76 | \$695.52 |
| | S | 0.077 | 4.5560 | \$350.81 | \$701.62 |
| NCC Vo-Tech | N | 0.268 | 0.1710 | \$45.83 | \$91.66 |
| Polytech | N | 0.253 | 0.1578 | \$39.92 | \$79.85 |
| | K | 0.197 | 0.1298 | \$25.57 | \$51.14 |
| Sussex Tech | S | 0.080 | 0.2623 | \$20.98 | \$41.97 |

*Total School Property Tax rate does not include the New Castle County Tax Rate.

Table 6. Expenditures Per Pupil - FY 2019 *

| District | |
|-----------------|----------|
| Appoquinimink | \$13,472 |
| Brandywine | \$17,469 |
| Christina | \$16,568 |
| Colonial | \$15,320 |
| Red Clay | \$16,164 |
| Caesar Rodney | \$12,221 |
| Capital | \$16,418 |
| Lake Forest | \$12,709 |
| Milford | \$12,775 |
| Smyrna | \$12,775 |
| Cape Henlopen | \$14,394 |
| Delmar | \$10,559 |
| Indian River | \$14,308 |
| Laurel | \$11,968 |
| Seaford | \$14,456 |
| Woodbridge | \$15,114 |
| NCC Vo-Tech | \$18,637 |
| Polytech | \$16,741 |
| Sussex Tech | \$18,806 |

* Excludes Adult and Non-Public Education, Facilities Construction and Debt Service

Source: 2018-19 Educational Statistics Report, Table 48 - Summary of Expenditures per Pupil by District

Table 7. Three Year Sales Ratio Calculation

| | FY 2021 | FY 2020 | FY 2020 | FY 2020 Adjusted | FY 2020 Adjusted | FY 2021 | FY 2021 | FY 2021 Adjusted | FY 2021 Adjusted | FY 2022 | FY 2022 | FY 2022 Adjusted | FY 2022 Adjusted | Adj Full Value | Adj Full Value | Actual Full Value |
|------------------|----------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| District | Using Assessed Value | Ratio | Full Value | Ratio | Full Value | Ratio | Full Value | Ratio | Full Value | Ratio | Full Value | Ratio | Full Value | % Change | % Change | % Change |
| Appoquinimink | \$2,418,597,395 | 0.288 | \$8,397,907,622 | 0.286 | \$8,456,634,248 | 0.268 | \$9,024,617,146 | 0.282 | \$8,576,586,507 | 0.267 | \$9,058,417,210 | 0.274 | \$8,826,997,792 | 2.9% | | 7.5% |
| Brandywine | \$3,428,275,964 | 0.295 | \$11,621,274,454 | 0.289 | \$11,862,546,588 | 0.262 | \$13,085,022,763 | 0.284 | \$12,071,394,239 | 0.274 | \$12,511,956,073 | 0.277 | \$12,376,447,523 | 2.5% | | 12.6% |
| Christina | \$5,595,443,653 | 0.314 | \$17,819,884,245 | 0.306 | \$18,285,763,572 | 0.272 | \$20,571,484,018 | 0.300 | \$18,651,478,843 | 0.293 | \$19,097,077,314 | 0.293 | \$19,097,077,314 | 2.4% | | 15.4% |
| Colonial | \$3,030,246,756 | 0.313 | \$9,681,299,540 | 0.303 | \$10,000,814,376 | 0.266 | \$11,391,905,098 | 0.297 | \$10,202,851,030 | 0.292 | \$10,377,557,384 | 0.290 | \$10,449,126,745 | 2.4% | | 17.7% |
| Red Clay | \$5,322,496,264 | 0.299 | \$17,800,990,849 | 0.295 | \$18,042,360,217 | 0.269 | \$19,786,231,465 | 0.289 | \$18,416,942,090 | 0.279 | \$19,077,047,541 | 0.282 | \$18,874,100,227 | 2.5% | | 11.2% |
| NCC Total | \$19,912,101,402 | | \$65,321,356,710 | | \$66,648,119,002 | | \$73,859,260,490 | | \$67,919,252,710 | | \$70,122,055,522 | | \$69,623,749,601 | | 2.5% | |
| NCCDIST | \$17,376,462,637 | | \$56,923,449,089 | | \$58,191,484,753 | | \$64,834,643,344 | | \$59,342,666,203 | | | | \$60,796,751,809 | | 2.5% | |
| Caesar Rodney | \$943,488,200 | 0.205 | \$4,602,381,463 | 0.210 | \$4,492,800,952 | 0.199 | \$4,741,146,734 | 0.205 | \$4,602,381,463 | 0.201 | \$4,693,971,144 | 0.202 | \$4,670,733,663 | 1.5% | | 3.0% |
| Capital | \$1,352,161,200 | 0.208 | \$6,500,775,000 | 0.213 | \$6,348,174,648 | 0.202 | \$6,693,867,327 | 0.208 | \$6,500,775,000 | 0.220 | \$6,146,187,273 | 0.210 | \$6,438,862,857 | -1.0% | | 3.0% |
| Lake Forest | \$530,129,900 | 0.197 | \$2,691,014,721 | 0.202 | \$2,624,405,446 | 0.189 | \$2,804,920,106 | 0.197 | \$2,691,014,721 | 0.194 | \$2,732,628,351 | 0.193 | \$2,746,787,047 | 2.1% | | 4.2% |
| Milford Total | \$447,097,093 | | \$3,464,622,473 | | \$3,357,365,800 | | \$3,458,611,828 | | \$3,408,335,869 | | \$3,491,621,012 | | \$3,476,334,113 | 2.0% | 2.0% | |
| KC | \$277,236,000 | 0.199 | \$1,393,145,729 | 0.204 | \$1,359,000,000 | 0.193 | \$1,436,455,959 | 0.200 | \$1,386,180,000 | 0.211 | \$1,313,914,692 | 0.201 | \$1,379,283,582 | -0.5% | | -8.5% |
| SC | \$169,861,093 | 0.082 | \$2,071,476,744 | 0.085 | \$1,998,365,800 | 0.084 | \$2,022,155,869 | 0.084 | \$2,022,155,869 | 0.078 | \$2,177,706,321 | 0.081 | \$2,097,050,531 | 3.7% | | 7.7% |
| Smyrna Total | \$813,695,670 | | \$3,926,380,359 | | \$3,871,315,685 | | \$4,110,018,823 | | \$3,950,343,035 | | \$4,022,745,269 | | \$4,017,610,374 | 1.7% | 1.7% | |
| NCC | \$117,041,370 | 0.275 | \$425,604,982 | 0.277 | \$422,532,022 | 0.253 | \$462,614,111 | 0.271 | \$431,886,974 | 0.260 | \$450,159,115 | 0.263 | \$445,024,221 | 3.0% | | -2.7% |
| KC | \$696,654,300 | 0.199 | \$3,500,775,377 | 0.202 | \$3,448,783,663 | 0.191 | \$3,647,404,712 | 0.198 | \$3,518,456,061 | 0.195 | \$3,572,586,154 | 0.195 | \$3,572,586,154 | 1.5% | | -2.1% |
| KC TOTAL | \$3,837,778,400 | | \$21,185,174,015 | | \$20,694,062,531 | | \$21,808,564,817 | | \$21,152,850,088 | 0.206 | \$21,087,153,049 | | \$21,350,328,054 | | 0.9% | |
| Cape Henlopen | \$1,341,900,027 | 0.073 | \$18,382,192,151 | 0.076 | \$17,656,579,303 | 0.074 | \$18,133,784,149 | 0.074 | \$18,133,784,149 | 0.070 | \$19,170,000,386 | 0.072 | \$18,637,500,375 | 2.8% | | 5.7% |
| Delmar | \$58,666,299 | 0.077 | \$761,899,987 | 0.081 | \$724,275,296 | 0.085 | \$690,191,753 | 0.080 | \$733,328,738 | 0.078 | \$752,132,038 | 0.080 | \$733,328,738 | 0.0% | | 9.0% |
| Indian River | \$1,729,902,326 | 0.081 | \$21,356,818,840 | 0.083 | \$20,842,196,699 | 0.083 | \$20,842,196,699 | 0.083 | \$20,842,196,699 | 0.075 | \$23,065,364,347 | 0.080 | \$21,623,779,075 | 3.7% | | 10.7% |
| Laurel | \$129,106,046 | 0.080 | \$1,613,825,575 | 0.084 | \$1,536,976,738 | 0.087 | \$1,483,977,540 | 0.084 | \$1,536,976,738 | 0.077 | \$1,676,701,896 | 0.081 | \$1,593,901,802 | 3.7% | | 13.0% |
| Seaford | \$216,756,805 | 0.083 | \$2,611,527,771 | 0.086 | \$2,520,427,965 | 0.087 | \$2,491,457,529 | 0.085 | \$2,550,080,059 | 0.085 | \$2,550,080,059 | 0.085 | \$2,550,080,059 | 0.0% | | 2.4% |
| Woodbridge Total | \$171,117,793 | | \$1,918,891,027 | | \$1,879,087,883 | | \$1,806,308,362 | | \$1,859,049,526 | | \$1,911,490,003 | | \$1,876,126,826 | | 0.9% | |
| KC | \$38,108,800 | 0.199 | \$191,501,508 | 0.195 | \$195,429,744 | 0.187 | \$203,790,374 | 0.194 | \$196,437,113 | 0.207 | \$184,100,483 | 0.198 | \$192,468,687 | -2.0% | | -9.7% |
| SC | \$133,008,993 | 0.077 | \$1,727,389,519 | 0.079 | \$1,683,658,139 | 0.083 | \$1,602,517,988 | 0.080 | \$1,662,612,413 | 0.077 | \$1,727,389,519 | 0.079 | \$1,683,658,139 | 1.3% | | 7.8% |
| SC TOTAL | \$3,779,201,589 | | \$46,645,155,350 | | \$45,159,543,884 | | \$45,447,916,032 | | \$45,655,415,908 | | \$49,125,768,728 | | \$47,014,716,875 | | 3.0% | |
| Statewide | \$27,529,081,391 | | \$133,151,686,076 | | \$132,501,725,416 | | \$141,115,741,338 | | \$134,727,518,706 | | \$140,334,977,299 | | \$137,988,794,531 | 2.4% | 2.4% | -0.6% |

Table 8. FY 2022 Summary

| District | FY21 Units | Formula Frozen | | No Ceilings or Floors | | 5% Ceiling/Floor from Previous Fiscal Year | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | FY21 Unit Value | Total Cost | "True" Formula Amount | Total Cost | FY21 Formula Unfrozen | Total Cost |
| APPOQUINIMINK | 858.05 | \$15,602 | \$13,387,296 | \$16,616 | \$14,257,359 | \$16,382 | \$14,056,575 |
| BRANDYWINE | 758.52 | \$6,465 | \$4,903,832 | \$6,247 | \$4,738,474 | \$6,247 | \$4,738,474 |
| CHRISTINA | 1,218.51 | \$6,465 | \$8,132,919 | \$6,247 | \$8,161,195 | \$6,247 | \$8,018,592 |
| COLONIAL | 782.89 | \$6,465 | \$5,092,291 | \$6,247 | \$4,957,209 | \$6,247 | \$4,939,942 |
| RED CLAY | 1,160.64 | \$6,465 | \$7,607,824 | \$6,247 | \$7,474,885 | \$6,247 | \$7,416,623 |
| TOTAL NEW CASTLE | 4,778.61 | | | | | | |
| CAESAR RODNEY | 574.59 | \$19,861 | \$11,365,436 | \$18,180 | \$10,307,264 | \$18,868 | \$10,797,183 |
| CAPITAL | 559.32 | \$14,796 | \$8,854,296 | \$10,717 | \$6,758,991 | \$14,056 | \$8,466,545 |
| LAKE FOREST | 249.96 | \$20,756 | \$5,188,170 | \$16,205 | \$4,050,602 | \$19,718 | \$4,928,711 |
| MILFORD | 304.59 | \$17,461 | \$5,318,446 | \$15,336 | \$4,671,192 | \$16,588 | \$5,052,539 |
| SMYRNA | 459.84 | \$19,860 | \$9,132,422 | \$17,055 | \$7,842,571 | \$18,867 | \$8,675,801 |
| TOTAL KENT | 2,148.30 | | | | | | |
| CAPE HENLOPEN | 483.16 | \$1,225 | \$635,417 | (\$28,483) | (\$10,906,948) | \$1,286 | \$647,955 |
| DELMAR | 86.54 | \$20,617 | \$1,784,195 | \$20,068 | \$1,736,685 | \$20,068 | \$1,736,685 |
| INDIAN RIVER | 827.41 | \$1,483 | \$1,232,687 | (\$9,590) | (\$7,674,595) | \$1,483 | \$1,228,320 |
| LAUREL | 177.37 | \$16,546 | \$2,934,764 | \$18,856 | \$3,344,489 | \$17,373 | \$3,081,449 |
| SEAFORD | 248.32 | \$16,969 | \$4,213,742 | \$15,769 | \$3,915,758 | \$16,121 | \$4,003,167 |
| WOODBIDGE | 183.14 | \$16,744 | \$3,066,496 | \$15,967 | \$2,924,196 | \$15,967 | \$2,924,196 |
| TOTAL SUSSEX | 2,005.94 | | | | | | |
| NCC VOTECH | 372.67 | \$7,462 | \$2,780,864 | \$8,392 | \$3,127,447 | \$7,835 | \$2,919,869 |
| POLYTECH | 88.89 | \$19,399 | \$1,724,377 | \$16,801 | \$1,493,441 | \$18,429 | \$1,638,154 |
| SUSSEX VOTECH | 93.93 | \$1,585 | \$148,879 | (\$4,881) | (\$458,472) | \$1,506 | \$141,459 |
| TOTAL VOTECH | 555.49 | | | | | | |
| TOTAL STATE | 9,488.34 | | \$97,504,352 | | \$70,721,741 | | \$95,412,239 |