



FUND OUR FUTURE



Promise Act Compared to Baker & Tucker School Funding Bills¹

FOUNDATION BUDGET BILLS	INCREASE OVER BASELINE IN CHAPTER 70 AID IN FY20 ²	INCREASE OVER BASELINE IN CHAPTER 70 AID IN FY26 ³	INCREASE OVER BASELINE IN FOUNDATION BUDGET IN FY26 ⁴	NEW STATE AUTHORITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES
<u>PROMISE ACT</u>⁵ <i>S.238/H.586</i>	\$181 million	\$1.5 billion	\$2.4 billion	NONE
BAKER BILL <i>H.70</i>	\$43 million	\$510 million	\$1.1 billion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives commissioner of education power to withhold funds from low-scoring districts — a means to force schools to adopt DESE “reforms.” • Applies the bargaining limitations already in effect for “chronically underperforming” districts to “underperforming” schools, restricting educators’ rights to negotiate over student learning conditions.
TUCKER BILL <i>H.576</i>	Can’t be calculated ⁶	Can’t be calculated	Can’t be calculated	NONE

See reverse for a comparison of higher education funding plans

1 All three bills would implement the four major recommendations of the Foundation Budget Review Commission (FBRC) in whole or in part, though their approaches differ. The *Promise Act* would also provide relief to certain districts that have high charter school costs, and it would guarantee minimum aid — \$50 per student when fully implemented. Three-quarters of the new funding would go to the 20 percent of districts with the largest percentages of low-income enrollment.

2 The governor’s foundation budget changes would be phased in over seven years, the *Promise Act* over an indeterminate period. This analysis presumes both are phased in over seven years. This figure is the projected first-year increase in Chapter 70, the main source of state funding for local public schools. The increase is calculated as an amount over baseline (meaning what Chapter 70 aid would be if the FBRC recommendations were not implemented).

3 This figure represents the increase in Chapter 70 aid over baseline in the last year of a seven-year phase-in.

4 By changing the foundation budget, the proposals would increase both Chapter 70 aid and required municipal contributions. Many municipalities already spend more than required from local resources. How much additional money municipalities would have to allocate under any of the proposals would be calculated by subtracting how much they already spend from the new minimum contribution.

5 The *Promise Act* seeks to add students with family incomes between 133 percent and 185 percent of the federal poverty level to the low-income component of the foundation budget. It was not possible to generate reliable estimates of the impact of doing so on the foundation budget and Chapter 70 aid.

6 The House foundation budget bill filed by Rep. Paul Tucker does not fully specify the increase in funding needed to educate low-income students, one of the most pivotal components of the foundation budget. Thus, it is impossible to calculate what the total increases would be.

Read more about the *Promise Act* and the *Cherish Act* [HERE](#)



FUND OUR FUTURE



Cherish Act Compared to Baker Higher Education Funding Plan¹

HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING PROPOSALS	FUNDING IN FY20 OVER FY19 ² BASED ON FIVE-YEAR PHASE-IN	FUNDING IF FULLY IMPLEMENTED IN FY20	IMPACT ON TUITION AND FEES
<u>CHERISH ACT</u> HIGHER ED FUNDING BILL: CAMPUS ACCTS. AND NEED-BASED SCHOLARSHIPS <u>S.741/H.1214</u>	\$116 million	\$580 million	Freezes tuition and fees at current levels if state maintains funding commitments each year for five years.
BAKER'S PLAN CAMPUS ACCTS. AND NEED-BASED SCHOLARSHIPS	\$59 million Also establishes a trust fund of up to \$100 million, depending on revenues	N/A	No freeze

See reverse for a comparison of preK-12 funding bills

¹ The *Cherish Act* would require the state to increase public higher education funding to the per-student level achieved in FY2001, when adjusted for inflation. This is in line with the recommendations of the Higher Education Finance Commission in 2014. The increases would be phased in over five years. The governor has not proposed long-term funding increases for public higher education, so there is no phase-in analysis. The governor's budget would instead establish a one-time trust fund to finance certain programs and scholarships. The amount allocated to that fund depends on revenue levels.

² FY19 General Appropriations Act (FY19 state budget prior to any supplemental appropriations).

Read more about the *Promise Act* and the *Cherish Act* [HERE](#)