

ESTIMATING COLORADO SCHOOL DISTRICT COSTS TO MEET STATE AND FEDERAL EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS

Report to the Colorado School Finance Project

**Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc.
Denver, CO**

October 2006

I. Introduction to the Analysis Process

This report updates work that Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc. (APA) completed in 2003 for the Colorado School Finance Project (CSFP).¹ The purpose of that work was to estimate the cost that school districts in Colorado face in fulfilling the requirements of the state's education accountability system. There are several reasons why this update is now required. First, in 2003 the state was in the midst of an economic downturn and the education community was reluctant to seek additional education funds even though student performance expectations were beginning to escalate. As a result, the 2003 study results were never shared with the media.

Second, and more importantly, much has changed over the past three years. In 2003 school districts were just beginning to comprehend the cost impacts of meeting student performance expectations associated with the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) act, and the state was still developing an NCLB compliance plan. Beyond NCLB, over the past three years Colorado has continued to expand requirements it places on school districts and overall costs for certain items, such as employee medical insurance benefits, have risen at higher rates than inflation. By conducting an update of the 2003 work, CSFP therefore seeks to not only ensure that estimates are based on the most recent data available, but also that costs more accurately reflect the range of services and programs school districts need to meet escalating state and federal performance expectations.

Third, the CSFP has been interested in exploring new procedures to distribute state aid to school districts. The results of an adequacy study provide some of the important parameters that can be used in a state aid formula – it is important that simulation models of a new approach be as up-to-date as possible based on the availability of the wide range of district data that is needed to implement a simulation model.

¹ When the work was undertaken, APA was known as Augenblick & Myers, Inc., or A&M.

APA agreed to undertake several tasks to complete this update. The CSFP asked APA to update the “successful school district” methodology it used in the earlier work to better understand the expenditure levels of districts that are on track to meet district-wide student performance expectations in the near term. APA also agreed to examine the efficiency with which districts provided certain services. Finally, APA updated its “professional judgment” approach panel work, which is designed to better understand the cost that districts face to meet NCLB’s long term, near-universal student proficiency goals. In updating the professional judgment work, it was not necessary to re-run all of the panels we previously convened. Instead, APA was able to get a good sense of how costs might change by focusing on running a few new panels. We also added new panels to probe more carefully into: 1) the programs and services needed for students with special needs (including students in special education programs, students from low income families, English-language learners, and gifted/talented students); and 2) specific cost areas, such as employee benefits and energy costs.

II. The Concept of Adequacy

The underlying rationale for conducting an adequacy study is to ensure that education funding is in line with current school and district performance expectations. In other words, an adequacy study is designed to help identify whether schools have the necessary resources for students to meet specific state and federal standards. The assumption often made about using the results of an adequacy study is that when every district has adequate resources, based on the individual needs of each district, the funding system fulfills *student equity* objectives; obviously, the way that state and local revenue gets to districts affects *taxpayer equity*. APA subscribes to the theory, which has been supported by litigation in some states, that districts should have some ability, but not unlimited ability, to generate funds beyond those considered to be adequate in order to address unique issues that arise in individual districts.

The push to meet such standards – often referred to as “standards-based reform” – has become the norm in most states. In fact, most states not only now specify expectations of what students are supposed to learn, but they have created accountability systems to measure school and district performance toward meeting those expectations. Student testing and assessment programs feed into such accountability systems that help: inform the public about school and district progress; reward schools that exceed expectations; and provide a justification for state intervention if schools do not meet performance standards.

Colorado has made an enormous effort to create a strong accountability system (for more information about Colorado’s system see Appendix A). The focus of accountability is at the district and school level and each district is required to have an accountability committee that oversees and monitors district-

wide performance. In addition, the state now uses three accountability measures to assess school and student performance:

- **Accreditation** assesses the progress and performance of the entire school district. The state has developed 13 model content standards. Districts must develop their own standards that meet or exceed those of the state. The accreditation process relies on both state assessments and content standards.
- **The School Accountability Report** shows the academic performance of individual schools in meeting state standards, as assessed by the Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP).
- **The No Child Left Behind Act**, with its emphasis on measuring whether specific groups of students make “Adequate Yearly Progress” (AYP) in their academic performance, examines how well the state, districts, and individual schools are doing on closing achievement gaps between students of different socioeconomic status.

Like Colorado, most states have developed and implemented some type of standards-based accountability system. Unlike Colorado, however, many states have not taken the next logical step, which is to determine the types of resources and funds that schools and districts need to meet the demands of these new systems. Instead, most states typically rely on a “foundation program” to allocate basic funding support to school districts. Under this approach, the state sets a revenue target for school districts and pays, as state aid, the difference between those targets and the amount of local revenue districts generate given their relative wealth and state-set tax rates. The driving force in determining district revenue targets is called the foundation level, and is constant across all districts.

The problem is that, in most states, the foundation level is determined politically. In other words, it is not based on the programs and services schools need to reach a specified performance level, but is instead calculated based on whatever funds happen to be available that the state legislature is willing to provide. By contrast, a state funding program based on an adequacy analysis would incorporate a rational basis for setting the foundation level, including a base cost and adjustments, depending on the resources needed to meet state standards and student performance expectations. The use of such figures assures that a state aid system is both adequate and equitable (at least for students).

As of 2006, numerous state adequacy studies have been undertaken, and several states (Arkansas, Maryland, Missouri, Ohio, and Wyoming) have already used the results of the studies as the basis for funding their public schools. In some cases, the adequacy studies were sponsored by education interest groups,

including school board associations, teacher organizations, and civic groups (as in Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New York, South Carolina, and Tennessee). In a couple of states, the state education agency sponsored a study (as in Illinois, New Jersey, and North Dakota). More recently, state legislatures have initiated adequacy studies (as in Arkansas, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming). Some adequacy studies were also associated with litigation. That is, they either were conducted as a result of school finance litigation that focused on the relative spending of school districts, or they stimulated litigation that focused on the state's constitutional responsibility to provide an absolute level of support.

Today it is common that multiple approaches are used in conducting adequacy studies. The most popular approaches are the successful school district and professional judgment methodologies. Each of these two methodologies – which APA used in its 2003 Colorado study – is described in more detail below.

III. Updating the Successful School District Approach

The successful school district (SSD) approach to estimating the cost of adequacy relies on the assumption that an adequate base level of spending can be determined by examining the spending of school districts that successfully meet, or are on track to meet, student performance expectations. Studying the resources provided to students in such districts gives one benchmark of the level of resources needed for all schools and districts to succeed.

Importantly, however, the SSD approach only produces a *base cost figure*. This figure only reflects the cost of serving students with no special needs. In fact, the actual calculation uses school district expenditure data after excluding spending for capital purposes, transportation, and students with special needs (at-risk, special education and English language learner students). Studies have shown that the costs of serving special need students can be significant, and a different methodology (in Colorado's case, the professional judgment approach was used) therefore is needed to determine the added cost of serving such students. These special need student costs can then be added to the SSD base to produce a complete picture of the cost of adequacy.

Selecting Successful Colorado School Districts

For the current study, APA identified "successful" districts as those who were on target to have 100 percent of students score proficient or above on reading and math assessments by 2013-14. This is Colorado's official target according to its NCLB compliance plan. To identify on-target school districts,

APA examined reading and math CSAP test data for grades 3-10 for years 2001-02 to 2005-2006. Next, APA:

1. Analyzed whether districts were on pace to meet the 100% target by projecting the linear trend for the available years onto 2013-2014.
2. Identified districts as “on target” in a subject if present trends projected to 100 percent in 2013-2014.
3. Identified districts as “on target” overall if the combined math and reading projections reached 200 percent or above.
4. Took the list of districts whose combined projections were at 200 percent or above, and excluded any that failed to meet Colorado’s current accreditation standards.
5. Identified 58 total successful districts who both met accreditation standards and were on target to meet 2013-14 performance goals.

The 58 successful districts are identified below.

| DISTRICTS IDENTIFIED USING THE SUCCESSFUL SCHOOL DISTRICTS APPROACH | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| District number | District Name |
| 40 | BRIGHTON 27J |
| 220 | ARCHULETA COUNTY 50 JT |
| 230 | WALSH RE-1 |
| 250 | SPRINGFIELD RE-4 |
| 290 | LAS ANIMAS RE-1 |
| 310 | MCCLAVE RE-2 |
| 470 | ST VRAIN VALLEY RE 1J |
| 480 | BOULDER VALLEY RE 2 |
| 540 | CLEAR CREEK RE-1 |
| 740 | SIERRA GRANDE R-30 |
| 770 | CROWLEY COUNTY RE-1-J |
| 870 | DELTA COUNTY 50(J) |
| 920 | ELIZABETH C-1 |
| 940 | BIG SANDY 100J |
| 990 | WIDEFIELD 3 |
| 1000 | FOUNTAIN 8 |
| 1080 | LEWIS-PALMER 38 |
| 1110 | FALCON 49 |
| 1140 | CANON CITY RE-1 |
| 1150 | FLORENCE RE-2 |
| 1160 | COTOPAXI RE-3 |
| 1330 | GILPIN COUNTY RE-1 |
| 1400 | LA VETA RE-2 |

| | |
|------|----------------------------------|
| 1460 | HI PLAINS R-23 |
| 1520 | DURANGO 9-R |
| 1530 | BAYFIELD 10 JT-R |
| 1580 | TRINIDAD 1 |
| 1860 | BUFFALO RE-4 |
| 2000 | MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51 |
| 2020 | MOFFAT COUNTY RE:NO 1 |
| 2395 | BRUSH RE-2(J) |
| 2515 | WIGGINS RE-50(J) |
| 2520 | EAST OTERO R-1 |
| 2530 | ROCKY FORD R-2 |
| 2540 | FOWLER R-4J |
| 2560 | CHERAW 31 |
| 2570 | SWINK 33 |
| 2580 | OURAY R-1 |
| 2590 | RIDGWAY R-2 |
| 2600 | PLATTE CANYON 1 |
| 2620 | HOLYOKE RE-1J |
| 2640 | ASPEN 1 |
| 2660 | LAMAR RE-2 |
| 2680 | WILEY RE-13 JT |
| 2690 | PUEBLO CITY 60 |
| 2710 | MEEKER RE1 |
| 2740 | MONTE VISTA C-8 |
| 2750 | SARGENT RE-33J |
| 2800 | MOFFAT 2 |
| 2810 | CENTER 26 JT |
| 2830 | TELLURIDE R-1 |
| 2862 | JULESBURG RE-1 |
| 3010 | CRIPPLE CREEK-VICTOR RE-1 |
| 3030 | AKRON R-1 |
| 3050 | OTIS R-3 |
| 3090 | KEENESBURG RE-3(J) |
| 3100 | WINDSOR RE-4 |
| 3110 | JOHNSTOWN-MILIKEN RE-5J |

APA understands that there is more than one way to identify successful school districts within any state. Even when test scores are used to make the selection, different approaches can be used. To demonstrate that there could be several methods to identify successful districts, we also identified districts who met either: 1) the NCLB AYP requirements for 2004-05; or 2) the success standard from the 2003 APA adequacy study which focused on whether aggregate district performance currently meets Colorado's 2008-09 NCLB performance goals (the 2008-09 goal is for 88 percent of students to be proficient in reading and 80 percent proficient in math). The lists of districts produced using these two alternate methods are shown in Appendix B. APA did not

examine the spending of the districts on these lists, but simply display them as an example of alternative selection methods.

Identifying Successful District Base Spending

To undertake the SSD approach in Colorado, APA also needed spending data for each school district in the state. The spending data had to be organized in such a manner that APA could look only at the base spending for each school (which does *not* include spending for at-risk students, special education students, ELL students, transportation, food service and capital). APA worked with the Colorado Department of Education to collect this data. We collected some data from the Department's website and received other data directly from staff.

A base cost figure was then identified for each district. To reach this figure, APA started with 2004-05 current district expenditures. We then subtracted out the 2004-05 spending for Special Education, ELPA, Transportation and Food Service. Spending for At-Risk students was not directly available from the Department. To take this spending into account APA weighted the at-risk population by .30 for each district. In other words, we assumed that each at-risk student had 30 percent more spent on them than the average student. This percentage comports with what APA has found in studying the added costs of adequately serving at-risk students in school and districts across the country. By applying this added cost weight, APA could properly remove added at-risk student spending from the district's base cost.

After identifying a base, per-pupil cost for each successful district, APA next looked at the weighted average of this cost across all 58 successful districts. This figure was \$5,821. Again, the figure represents district expenditures for students without special education, at-risk or ELPA needs and without any spending for transportation, food service and capital.

IV. Updating the Professional Judgment Approach

The professional judgment (PJ) approach draws on the expertise of experienced educators (teachers, principals, superintendents, and others) to specify the resources that schools need in order for students to meet state performance and accreditation requirements. Once these resources are identified, their cost can be determined and both a *base cost figure* and a *series of adjustments*, in the form of student weights, can be calculated. In many states across the country, APA has used the PJ approach to effectively analyze the relationship between school and district size, base per-student costs, and the added cost of serving students with special needs.

It is worth discussing student weights at this point. Student weights are figures that relate the cost of serving students with a particular special need to

the cost of students with no special needs and are often expressed in decimal form (such as .40, which means that the added cost of serving students with a special need is 40 percent of the base cost). Such weights can be used in a state aid formula to assure that supplemental funding is consistent with the presence of students with special needs on a district by district basis since the proportion of students with special needs may vary across districts. Student weights could also be used to allocate funds to schools (some people use the words “student weighted system” to mean that funding should go directly from the state to schools); APA does not recommend that state aid be allocated directly to schools although school districts might want to sue a weighted system, which could vary from district to district, as the basis of distributing a portion of all revenues to their schools.

In APA’s 2003 work for CSFP, numerous panels of experienced educators were used to specify the school-level and district-level resource needs of very small, small, moderate, large, and very large hypothetical districts. To update this work, APA met with two school-level panels: one focused on hypothetical schools in very small and small districts; and one focused on hypothetical schools in moderate and large districts. As in 2003, each panel was made up of 6-8 people, including teachers, principals, and superintendents. This time, however, we provided panels with a set of initial resources based on applying the results of the evidence-based approach, as it has been used in a couple of other states, to the hypothetical schools; panelists were free to use the evidence-based resource levels, modify them, or discard them entirely.

In addition to the school-level panels, APA met with two panels of educators that we had not used in the earlier work: one composed entirely of people who provided services to students with special needs; and one composed entirely of school business officials. The special needs panel was important because the number of Colorado students with special needs is increasing and the ways districts serve such students is quickly changing. The school business official panel was important as a way of understanding how certain costs – particularly those associated with employee benefits (retirement contributions and medical plans) and energy – have changed. (To view examples of the types of resources which panelists indicated are required for schools to meet state standards, see Appendix C).

To cost out the resources identified by our panelists, APA updated salary levels based on actual statewide average salaries in 2004-05. We then combined school and district level costs to produce base costs and costs for special need students – which were used to develop separate weights. We then determined the equations necessary to calculate weights for districts of any size, as shown below.

| Enrollment | PJ Base | SSD Base | Mild SpEd Weight | Moderate SpEd Weight | Severe SpEd Weight | At-Risk Weight | ELL Weight |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 50 | \$20,849 | \$16,804 | 0.23 | 0.75 | 3.67 | 0.20 | 0.50 |
| 100 | \$19,666 | \$15,851 | 0.23 | 0.75 | 3.67 | 0.20 | 0.50 |
| 250 | \$16,117 | \$12,991 | 0.30 | 0.88 | 3.95 | 0.23 | 0.50 |
| 500 | \$11,639 | \$9,381 | 0.43 | 1.09 | 4.24 | 0.26 | 0.50 |
| 750 | \$10,851 | \$8,746 | 0.51 | 1.21 | 4.41 | 0.28 | 0.50 |
| 1,000 | \$10,064 | \$8,111 | 0.57 | 1.29 | 4.53 | 0.30 | 0.50 |
| 2,500 | \$8,146 | \$6,566 | 0.75 | 1.56 | 4.91 | 0.35 | 0.50 |
| 5,000 | \$7,292 | \$5,878 | 0.89 | 1.77 | 5.20 | 0.39 | 0.50 |
| 7,500 | \$7,237 | \$5,833 | 0.94 | 1.80 | 5.23 | 0.42 | 0.50 |
| 10,000 | \$7,252 | \$5,845 | 0.94 | 1.80 | 5.23 | 0.44 | 0.50 |
| 20,000 | \$7,310 | \$5,892 | 0.94 | 1.80 | 5.23 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| 50,000 | \$7,484 | \$6,032 | 0.94 | 1.80 | 5.23 | 0.58 | 0.50 |

As shown above, the PJ and SSD base cost figures are at their minimum levels at about 7,500 students. Costs increase significantly as enrollment decreases below 7,500 and rise slightly when enrollment is above 7,500 students. The size adjustment is based on our analysis of PJ base cost figures for districts of different size – we simply applied the results of the analysis to the SSD base cost figure, with the result that the ratio of SSD to PJ base cost figures is constant for all enrollment levels.

As far as student weights are concerned, we divided special education into three levels (mild, moderate, and severe) and developed weights for each level. As shown above, the weights increase as the severity of special education need rises and all three weight levels rise as district size increases (although to different extents – the increase in the weight for severe is much less proportionately than the increase for mild). A similar pattern exists for the at-risk weight (applied to students eligible for free lunch): it rises as district size increases. With regard to ELL students, weights are the same across district sizes.

In the case of both special education and at-risk, the smaller weight for smaller districts reflects the interaction between district size and base cost level (the base cost is much higher in smaller districts so a lower weight may produce a total amount of funding – that is, weight times base – that is similar to the amount produced by the higher weight when it is applied against the lower base cost of a large district).

It is interesting to note how the base cost and student weights changed between the earlier study and this analysis. For the SSD base, the 2004-05 figure is about 33 percent higher in smaller districts but only about 21 percent higher in the larger districts as compared to what it was in 2001-02. For the PJ base, the 2004-05 figure is 14-16 percent higher among very small districts but

only six percent higher among moderate and large districts compared to what it was in 2001-02. With regard to special need students:

- Special education: It is difficult to compare special education weights over time since APA moved from analyzing a single weight to three weights. However, based on the distribution of students across mild, moderate, and severe categories, the average special education weight in 2004-05 is about 22 percent higher than it was in 2001-02.
- At-risk: The new weight is about 25 percent higher in larger districts and about 25 percent lower in smaller districts than it was in the earlier study.
- English language learners: The new weight is significantly lower than it was in smaller districts and slightly lower than it was in larger districts.

Overall, APA notes that, while it is more precise to use weights in determining funding needs, the special needs PJ panel indicated that educators are seeing a good deal of overlap across the special education, at-risk, and ELL student populations. Too, the panel felt that the state's definition of "at-risk" (at least for funding purposes), based on students eligible for free lunch, was too restrictive and felt that other students, including highly mobile students, needed added support. As a result of this overlap, educators today often prefer to think of all special need students as a single group whose treatment is based on individual needs even if funding is based on the characteristics of sub-groups of students that can be counted easily.

V. Comparing the Cost of Adequacy to Actual Spending in 2004-05

The base cost and student weight figures shown in the previous section indicate the results of applying sets of equations to districts with hypothetical enrollment levels. Those equations can be applied against the actual demographic data of every school district in Colorado to determine the full cost of adequacy. In this section, APA calculates and compares the full cost of adequacy with the actual expenditures of districts in 2004-05 (in both cases, expenditures for capital purposes, transportation, and food services are excluded).

As shown in Appendix Table D-1 the total cost of adequacy using the SSD base was \$5,990.9 million, or \$8,214 per student, which compares to actual spending of \$5,357.6 million, or \$7,345 per student. Since the statewide figures include districts that have spending above adequacy and districts that have spending below adequacy, the remainder of Appendix Table D-1 separates the two types of districts. In 2004-05, there were 15 districts that had spending above what we estimate to be adequate, all but one of which were of moderate size (801-3,000 students) or larger; those districts spent \$66.4 million above

adequacy, or about \$368 per student. At the same time, there were 163 districts with spending below the adequate level and they would have needed to spend \$699.6 million more, or \$1,275 per student, to reach adequacy.

Appendix Table D-2 shows the cost of adequacy using the PJ base, which would have required spending of \$7,432.8 million, or \$10,191 per student, in 2004-05. This amount was \$2,846 (or 38.8 percent) above actual, comparable spending that year. Only one district had spending above the adequate level while 177 districts fell short; those 177 districts needed to spend an additional \$2,077.6 million, or \$2,855 per student in order to reach adequacy.

These figures assume that all local funding is available to pay for the cost of adequacy. But another way to look at local funding is to assume that all local option taxes, as approved by voters, are raised for purposes that go beyond adequacy and that they should be deducted from actual, comparable spending (with the possibility that some districts might not have actually sought the added funding if adequate revenues had been provided). If all local option funding is thought of as being for purposes above and beyond adequacy, then the conclusion presented above about the number of districts with adequate spending levels would change. In fact, the number of districts with spending above SSD-based adequacy would drop to four and the number of districts with spending above PJ-based adequacy would drop to one.

VI. Additional Issues

In the course of updating our 2003 estimates of the costs school districts face in fulfilling state standards, APA heard about a variety of emerging cost pressures on school districts. In order to find out more about those issues, we convened a PJ panel of school business officials (SBOs). In the case of some issues, such as the rising cost of personnel benefits, we made adjustments to figures we had used earlier to reflect a consensus view of the SBOs. In the case of other issues, such as the cost impact of specific instructional programs (for example, International Baccalaureate programs), we did not feel comfortable adjusting our cost estimates either because the SBOs could not agree on the magnitude of the cost impact or because we did not feel that the issue was related to the cost of meeting standards. However, the fact that we chose not to modify our cost estimates does not mean that districts are not affected in some way by these issues. In fact, it is possible that the cost is associated with fulfilling some state objective other than meeting state standards (as in the case of parental choice). Further, some of these issues might still be included in a new funding system separate from adequacy. Below we discuss the cost issues that came up in our discussions.

Benefit Costs

Many people have talked about the rising cost of employee benefits, including retirement contributions and health insurance. The SBO panel cited a three percent rise in retirement contributions which led us to increase the benefit rate we had used previously to 28 percent. The SBO panel also noted that while health insurance costs had been rising rapidly in the last few years, districts had either cut employee benefits, increased deductible levels, or passed costs on to employees as a way to control the impact on districts.

Cost of Choice

Policy makers have debated for some time whether the objective of promoting parental choice imposes costs on districts that would not otherwise exist. Such choice can be promoted through the creation of charter schools, the elimination of geographic service areas for schools, the expansion of opportunities to take college classes for high school credit, and the promotion of on-line learning opportunities. Some argue that school districts have attempted to organize themselves efficiently and that choice undermines efficiency and raises costs even if only temporarily. Others argue that expanding choice has no cost implications and that districts can plan for and respond at no cost as students make decisions about where to attend school. APA has found that districts may face a marginal increase in cost when students have more choices but we would suggest that such costs should be put into a new state aid system separate from the cost of adequacy.

Special Instructional Programs

School districts may face higher costs when they undertake particular programs that are designed to improve student performance. These can include everything from providing advanced placement classes and International Baccalaureate programs to reducing class sizes, purchasing new textbooks or software, or increasing professional development. APA's professional judgment process addressed some of these issues. However, it is possible that educators will decide to expand some programs dramatically and this could require additional cost changes. At this time, APA does not have the ability to assign costs to individual items, such as advanced placement classes, which have start-up costs and require additional marginal costs each year.

Student Activities

One of the issues that arose in the PJ work is the cost of student activities such as sports or clubs. While panelists have differing opinions on the level of student activity funding needed, virtually all agree that such activities are essential to keeping many students in school and that participation improves student academic performance. Activities costs should therefore be considered a component of adequate education funding and APA includes them in our estimated total. Even though these funds are included, an additional question

could arise about whether participants, or other supporters, should pay for some of the cost of student activities. Our view is that a reasonable level of student activities should be included in the cost of adequacy, which might vary somewhat by district size due to economies of scale.

Efficiency

The SBO panel indicated that districts attempt to organize themselves as efficiently as possible but that such organization may conflict with other goals – such as family choice – that the state has decided to pursue. In effect, the SBOs indicated there are trade-offs between organizing school districts efficiently and a host of other issues, including school choice, school district size, inter-district sharing of academic and support personnel, the use of statewide education specialists, keeping under-utilized schools open, and so on. The SBO panel felt that districts were doing everything they could to engage in bulk purchasing, minimize administration costs, and reduce the costs of non-academic services such as plant operation and maintenance. At the same time, districts are using these cost savings to help expand academic services, particularly for students who needed added support in order to meet state standards.

Transportation

Districts face relatively higher transportation costs each year as the cost of fuel rises faster than inflation. In response to increasing costs, districts have changed student transportation policies to reduce the amount of service they provide (by increasing student walking distances, changing school operating hours, reducing transportation in support of student activities, and so on). Although the state only reimburses districts for a relatively low share of total transportation expenditures, SBOs indicated that districts would appreciate having a state aid formula that is more predictable and easier to understand.

Pay for Performance

Several people we talked to during the cost of this analysis expressed interest in the cost of changing teacher compensation systems. It could be argued that such change is an integral part of adequacy both because a new system might better attract and retain well-qualified teachers and because a new system might be linked in some way to student performance and accountability. There are several costs associated with implementing such a change: (1) development of the system; (2) annual cost of salary changes; (3) annual administrative cost. Based on an examination of the new ProComp system being used in Denver Public Schools, our expectation is that the added cost of ongoing expenditures is on the order of \$250 per student while annual administrative cost would be about \$350,000 in a moderate size district. One time development costs depend on the

size of a district and how it goes about the work but could be over \$1 million in a moderate size district.

Changes in Enrollment

Many people, including the SBO panel, have been concerned about the impact of enrollment change on both the costs school districts face and the state aid they receive. They argue that school districts cannot reduce spending as rapidly as enrollment declines and that, while the state aid system uses an approach to mitigate declining enrollment over three years, the approach is not appropriate once enrollment starts to rise after bottoming out. We have never seen any of the approaches used to estimate the cost of adequacy be used to consider year-to-year enrollment change. Although the use of multi-year enrollment averaging is used in several state aid systems, we have seen more complex approaches used. Our view is that this issue is one that is associated with simulating a new school finance system and not one that can be studied directly in the context of adequacy.

APPENDIX A

COLORADO'S STANDARDS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

Overview

Colorado's uses three accountability measures: Accreditation, School Accountability Reports, and No Child Left Behind. Each uses the CSAP to determine results:

- **Accreditation** assesses the progress and performance of the entire school district. The state has developed 13 model content standards. Districts must develop their own standards that meet or exceed those of the state. The accreditation process relies on the use of the state assessments and content standards.
- **The School Accountability Report** shows the academic performance of individual schools in meeting state standards, as assessed by the CSAP.
- **The No Child Left Behind Act**, with its emphasis on measuring the progress of Adequate Yearly Progress of the sub-groups in school populations, examines how well the state, school districts, and individual schools are doing on closing the achievement gap.

In Colorado, the focus of accountability is at the district and school level, as there are sanctions and requirements that may be different. For example, every school in a district may make AYP, but as a district they don't, so they are on a district improvement plan. Each school district is required to have an accountability committee.

22-7-104. School district accountability committees.

Statute text

(1) The board of education of each school district in the state shall adopt a plan for a local accountability program designed to measure the adequacy and efficiency of educational programs offered by the district. Except as provided in subsection (4) of this section, the board shall appoint or create a process for the election of a school district accountability committee that shall make recommendations to the board relative to the program of accountability, but it shall be the responsibility of the board to implement the provisions of this section. The areas of study by the district accountability committee and other appropriate accountability committees shall be cooperatively determined at least annually by the committee and the board of education. The school district accountability

committee shall consist of at least three parents of students enrolled in a public school in the school district who are not employees or related to employees of the district, one teacher, one school administrator, and one person from the community who is involved in business.

Student Assessment

The Colorado state assessment is the CSAP. All students in grades 3-10 are required to take the CSAP tests in reading, writing, and math. Additionally, students in grades 5, 8, and 10 are required to take the Science CSAP. Students in 11th and 12th grades are not required to take the CSAP; however, those in 11th grade must take the ACT.

Districts must adhere to state and federal assessment requirements (including tests and analysis requirements) for students with special needs, including assessments for English Language Learners, students identified as needing Special Education services, and students who are Gifted and Talented.

State Testing Schedule (Spring 2006)

| Required Tests |
|--|
| Grade 3: CSAP Reading, Writing, Math |
| Grade 4: CSAP Reading, Writing, Math |
| Grade 5: CSAP Reading, Writing, Math, Science |
| Grade 6: CSAP Reading, Writing, Math |
| Grade 7: CSAP Reading, Writing, Math |
| Grade 8: CSAP Reading, Writing, Math, Science |
| Grade 9: CSAP Reading, Writing, Math |
| Grade 10: CSAP Reading, Writing, Math, Science |
| Grade 11: ACT Assessment |

Standards

Colorado has developed model content standards in the following areas:

- Civics
- Dance
- Economics
- Foreign Language
- Geography
- History
- Mathematics
- Music

- Physical Education
- Reading and Writing
- Science
- Theatre
- Visual Arts

School districts are required to develop their own content standards locally which meet or exceed the state model content standards. Following adoption of standards, districts are required to map their curriculum to the standards and assess student progress in meeting the established standards. Standards and assessments must take into consideration the different learning styles and needs of students, including those qualifying for special education and English language instruction. Professional development for district and school-level faculty on standards-based education must also be included.

Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards.

Any individual education program which is developed for a student with disabilities pursuant to section 22-20-108 (4) shall specify whether such student shall achieve the district's adopted standards or whether such student shall achieve individualized standards which would indicate the student has met the requirements of such student's individual education program.

Some requirements for Special Education students may change in the coming year as the new NCLB Consolidated Plan for the State of Colorado has been submitted and is under review.

Accreditation

The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) is responsible for the accreditation of school districts. Each school district board of education must approve an accreditation plan to improve the educational achievement in the school district and to administer the accreditation process for each school in its district. The Colorado Department of Education administers the accreditation process of the district.

CDE regional team managers prepare annual written assessment reviews of school district accomplishments and areas of need. The review includes:

- The progress of the district's educational improvement plan;

- The district's achievements in reading, writing, and math and evidence of a minimum of one year's increase in student achievement for each year;
- The district's achievement data showing reductions in learning gaps in reading, writing and math as measured by disaggregated CSAP data; and
- Compliance with State Board of Education rules and Colorado Revised Statutes.

During the academic year a collaborative, on-going dialogue will take place between the school district and CDE. Strategies for gathering and reviewing information and documentation will include, but are not limited to, ongoing communication and interaction with appropriate district personnel, and review of data the Colorado Department of Education collects.

After completing the preliminary Annual Assessment Review, the regional team manager will discuss with the superintendent prior to July, the results of all information gathered for the final report. A district that shows adequate growth and meets state accreditation indicators will maintain its accreditation status.

The summary judgment about a district's accreditation status shall be made annually by the CDE regional managers, based on evidence of progress submitted by the district and gathered by the regional manager and regional team. CDE regional managers and regional service teams working with the managers will provide assistance to schools and school districts to implement the accreditation rules.

The table on the following page identifies the accreditation criteria and the four indicators for measuring district progress in obtaining and maintaining accreditation. New financial indicators are being developed that effect compliance under section K on the following page.

COLORADO ACCREDITATION INDICATORS

| | Accreditation Report Indicators | ACCREDITATION CATEGORIES | | | |
|----|--|---|---------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | Accredited | Accreditation Watch | Accreditation Probation | Non-Accredited |
| A. | <p><u>Educational Improvement Plan 4.01 (1) (A)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High & attainable student achievement goals • Research-based instructional strategies • Standards-based instruction • State & local assessments of student achievement • Parent & community participation • Other accreditation contract requirements <p>Go to Page 10</p> | Meets 2.01 (4) Accreditation Contract requirements | * | ** | After one year on probation, failure to meet state accreditation indicators or show adequate growth on Colorado Department of Education approved improvement plan. |
| B. | <p><u>CSAP Goals 4.01 (1) (B)</u></p> <p>District established goals of longitudinal growth on district weighted score indices</p> <p>Go to Page 10 & 11</p> | Show progress toward achievement of goals in reading, writing, and math | * | ** | |
| C. | <p><u>Closing Achievement Gaps 4.01 (1) (C)</u></p> <p>District established goals for closing learning gaps and advancing high achieving groups as measured by disaggregated student performance data</p> <p>Go to Page 10 & 11</p> | Show that student groups below grade level have increased <u>more than one year</u> for each year in school | * | ** | |
| D. | <p><u>Value-Added Growth 4.01 (1) (D)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show students' growth in district weighted score indices over time • NWEA, Terra Nova, or other CDE approved assessments, and Sanders and other analyses <p>Go to Page 12</p> | Show <u>one year's growth</u> in a year's time | * | ** | |
| E. | <p><u>Data regarding Achievement in Other Curriculum Standards Areas 4.01 (1) (E)</u></p> <p>Go to Page 13 & 14</p> | Standards are in place and being implemented and that performance is being assessed | * | ** | |
| F. | <p><u>Compliance with School Accountability Report 4.01 (1) (F)</u></p> <p>Go to Page 15</p> | Evidence of Compliance | * | ** | |
| G. | <p><u>Compliance with Educational Accreditation Act 4.01 (1) (G)</u></p> <p>Go to Page 16 & 17</p> | Evidence of compliance | * | ** | |
| H. | <p><u>Compliance with Safe Schools Act 4.01 (1) (H)</u></p> <p>Go to Page 19</p> | Evidence of compliance | * | ** | |
| I. | <p><u>Compliance with Colorado Basic Literacy Act 4.01 (1) (I)</u></p> <p>Implement ILP (Individual Learning Plan) process and increase proficiency in reading, as assessed by CSAP results and other grades 1-3 reading tests</p> <p>Go to Page 20</p> | Evidence of compliance | * | ** | |
| J. | <p><u>The Annual Assessment Review will include CDE written report (2.02) to the district, available to other interested parties.</u></p> <p>Go to Page 21</p> | Show evidence of planning and progress | * | ** | |
| K. | <p><u>Compliance with the Budgeting, Accounting, and Reporting Requirements 4.01 (1) (K)</u></p> <p>Go to Page 21</p> | Evidence of compliance | * | ** | |

*4.01 (2) Accredited: Accreditation Watch = A school or district is placed on Accreditation Watch if it does not meet one of the accreditation indicators described in 4.01 (1) (a) through (i). A district that is placed on accreditation watch shall provide an improvement plan to the Department within 90 days of receiving written notice of its lack of compliance. The Department shall approve or deny the plan within 30 days of receiving it.

**Accreditation Probation = After one year of Accreditation Watch, if progress continues to be insignificant after one year on accreditation watch.

School Accountability: State Report Cards

Using data from the CSAP tests from current and prior years (to measure schoolwide performance now and growth over time), the Colorado Department of Education issues an annual report card for each school that assigns ratings of "excellent", "high", "average", "low", or "unsatisfactory" for the public school's overall academic performance. In addition, the report card provides other information about the schools (e.g., teacher/student ratios, attendance, financial, and other data). In addition, the report cards indicate whether or not the school made Adequate Yearly Progress (under the federal No Child Left Behind Act). The ratings correspond to the following categories:

- (a) "Excellent": Excellent academic performance;
- (b) "High": Above average academic performance;
- (c) "Average": Average academic performance;
- (d) "Low": Below average academic performance; and
- (e) "Unsatisfactory": Failing academic performance.

In addition, the CDE shall annually assign a rating for academic growth of students to each public school of "significant improvement", "improvement", "stable", "decline", or "significant decline". The academic growth of students rating shall be based upon the proportion of students who make CSAP scale score gains.

The state board may exempt from the requirement that an academic performance rating be assigned to any school in which more than ninety-five percent of students enrolled in the school have an individual educational program. Before an exemption is granted, such schools shall establish a public process that will provide for accountability.

According to Colorado School Law (CRS 22-7-609), schools rated "unsatisfactory" develop an improvement plan for Colorado Department of Education approval and assistance. Ultimately, the school has a three-year period to overcome the "unsatisfactory" status. If the school is rated "unsatisfactory" at the end of the third year, the state board shall recommend that the school be converted to a charter school.

High School Graduation/College Admission Requirements

Colorado does not have state level graduation requirements or proficiency tests (beyond the requirements specified above for CSAP and ACT testing). However,

in October 2003, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) revised the Admissions Standards Policy to include the addition of a pre-collegiate course completion requirement. The revised admission standards apply to students who graduate from high school in spring 2008 and later and seek to qualify for admission to Colorado's four-year public institutions. Community colleges will continue to be open admissions; students enrolling in these institutions are not subject to admissions standards.

Summary of the Pre-collegiate Course Requirements (Higher Education Admission Requirement – HEAR)

The updated Admission Requirements identify a combination of courses, primarily in the areas of English, mathematics, natural and physical sciences, and social sciences that students should plan to complete as preparation for entering one of Colorado's four-year public colleges or universities. Many states now have some form of pre-collegiate coursework structure, either as a requirement to qualify for admission to four-year colleges/universities or as a high school graduation requirement. In Colorado, the Admission Requirements are being implemented in two phases: Phase I begins with students who graduate in spring 2008; Phase II applies to graduates in spring 2010 and later. The specifics for each phase are as follows:

Academic Area Number of Units

Spring 2008--Phase I (15 units total):

English, 4 units

Mathematics (Algebra I level and higher), 3 units

Natural/Physical Sciences (two units must be lab-based), 3 units

Social Sciences (at least one unit of U.S. or world history), 3 units

Academic Electives (see note below), 2 units

Spring 2010--Phase II (18 units total):

English, 4 units

Mathematics (Algebra I level and higher), 4 units

Natural/Physical Sciences (two units must be lab-based), 3 units

Social Sciences (at least one unit of U.S. or world history), 3 units

Foreign Language (must be same language), 2 units

Academic Electives (see note below), 2 units

Note 1: An academic unit, often referred to as a Carnegie unit, is equivalent to one full year of credit in a specific subject.

Minimum # of Days of Instruction

Every child who has attained the age of seven years and is under the age of sixteen years shall attend public school for at least one thousand fifty-six hours if a secondary school pupil or nine hundred sixty-eight hours if an elementary school pupil during each school year; except that in no case shall a school or schools be in session for fewer than one hundred sixty days without the specific prior approval of the commissioner of education.

(note: some discussion indicates that these requirements might be changed to require students ages 6-18 to attend school, but until then, the requirements remains for kids ages 7-16).

No Child Left Behind Federal Requirements

In order for a district or school to make AYP, all of the following requirements must be met:

1. Achieve a 95% participation rate in state reading and math assessments.
2. Reach proficiency performance targets for either proficiency or decrease non-proficiency in reading and math (see table below).
3. Reach targets for one other indicator - advanced level of performance for elementary and middle schools in reading and math and graduation rate for high schools.

Adequate Yearly Progress Performance Targets

AYP Proficiency Performance Targets by Grade Level, Content Area, and Year (number are percentages)

| School year | Elementary School | | Middle School | | High School | |
|-------------|-------------------|-------|---------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math |
| 2006 | 82.69 | 81.90 | 80.21 | 69.63 | 84.74 | 60.25 |
| 2007 | 82.69 | 81.90 | 80.21 | 69.63 | 84.74 | 60.25 |
| 2008 | 88.46 | 87.94 | 86.81 | 79.75 | 89.83 | 73.50 |
| 2009 | 88.46 | 87.94 | 86.81 | 79.75 | 89.83 | 73.50 |
| 2010 | 88.46 | 87.94 | 86.81 | 79.75 | 89.83 | 73.50 |
| 2011 | 94.23 | 93.98 | 93.41 | 89.88 | 94.92 | 86.75 |
| 2012 | 94.23 | 93.98 | 93.41 | 89.88 | 94.92 | 86.75 |
| 2013 | 94.23 | 93.98 | 93.41 | 89.88 | 94.92 | 86.75 |
| 2014 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Note: the new plan submitted to the US Department of Education recommends changes to the safe harbor plan for both special ed and regular ed students allowing for student growth/gains over time, but for now, requirements remains as is.

“Other Indicator” Performance Targets

Overall, and within each sub-group, a percentage of students in elementary and middle school must score advanced in reading and math.

| School year | Elementary School | | Middle School | |
|-------------|-------------------|------|---------------|------|
| | Reading | Math | Reading | Math |
| 2006 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.10 |
| 2007 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.10 |
| 2008 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.10 |
| 2009 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 1.21 |
| 2010 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 1.21 |
| 2011 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 1.21 |
| 2012 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 |
| 2013 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 |
| 2014 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 |

Overall, and within each sub-group, a minimum percentage of kids must graduate from high school. The high school graduation rate is the percentage of students from an end of year 8th grade cohort, adjusted for verified transfers in and out with adequate documentation, who leave school as graduates as defined by the school district in four years or less.

| Year | Graduation Rate |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2006 | 57.40 |
| 2007 | 57.40 |
| 2008 | 57.40 |
| 2009 | 59.50 |
| 2010 | 59.50 |
| 2011 | 61.60 |
| 2012 | 61.60 |
| 2013 | 61.60 |
| 2014 | 65.00 |

On-Time Graduation Exceptions

Students will be assigned to an appropriate on-time graduation cohort according to the point at which the students complete 8th grade. Students may be placed in a non-standard on-time graduation cohort only if they meet one of the exceptions below:

- The anticipated year of graduation/completion for each special education student will be provided by districts. Students will be placed in the appropriate on-time graduation cohort according to the expectations stated in their Individualized Education Program (IEP). Graduation expectations for certain special education students could change from one year to the next.

- The Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA) will determine each English Language Learner student's language proficiency and appropriate graduation cohort. The anticipated year of graduation/completion for each English Language Learner will be determined by the department from CELA results. The amount of additional time to graduation granted to a student, if any, is dependent upon the point at which a student enters the 9th grade or when the student enters into the Colorado public education system, language proficiency level, and student date of birth.

Results

2003-2004: Percentage of Schools and Districts that made AYP

Note: The use of the terms public elementary and secondary districts is federal language. In Colorado we don't separate districts by elementary and secondary; our districts are K-12 and these data represent results from all districts K-12.

| School Accountability | Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State | Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP | Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data | 1822 | 1440 | 79.03% |

| District Accountability | Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State | Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP | Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data | 182 | 115 | 63.19% |

2003-2004: Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient or Advanced on CSAP (data from the 2005 NCLB consolidated plan)

| Grade | Math | Reading |
|-------|-------|---------|
| 3 | NA | 93% |
| 4 | NA | 88.7% |
| 5 | 88.7% | 88.7% |
| 6 | 82.6% | 88.7% |
| 7 | 71.1% | 87.1% |
| 8 | 71.1% | 87.1% |
| 9 | 62.9% | 89% |
| 10 | 62.9% | 88.4% |

APPENDIX B

LIST OF SUCCESSFUL SCHOOL DISTRICTS USING ALTERNATE IDENTIFICATION APPROACHES

| TABLE B-1 | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| DISTRICTS MEETING 2004-05 AYP | |
| District Number | District Name |
| 50 | BENNETT 29J |
| 110 | SANGRE DE CRISTO RE-22J |
| 170 | DEER TRAIL 26J |
| 190 | BYERS 32J |
| 220 | ARCHULETA COUNTY 50 JT |
| 230 | WALSH RE-1 |
| 240 | PRITCHETT RE-3 |
| 250 | SPRINGFIELD RE-4 |
| 270 | CAMPO RE-6 |
| 290 | LAS ANIMAS RE-1 |
| 310 | MC CLAVE RE-2 |
| 490 | BUENA VISTA R-31 |
| 500 | SALIDA R-32 |
| 510 | KIT CARSON R-1 |
| 520 | CHEYENNE COUNTY RE-5 |
| 540 | CLEAR CREEK RE-1 |
| 550 | NORTH CONEJOS RE-1J |
| 560 | SANFORD 6J |
| 740 | SIERRA GRANDE R-30 |
| 770 | CROWLEY COUNTY RE-1-J |
| 860 | CUSTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT C-1 |
| 890 | DOLORES COUNTY RE NO.2 |
| 920 | ELIZABETH C-1 |
| 930 | KIOWA C-2 |
| 940 | BIG SANDY 100J |
| 950 | ELBERT 200 |
| 960 | AGATE 300 |
| 970 | CALHAN RJ-1 |
| 990 | WIDEFIELD 3 |
| 1030 | MANITOU SPRINGS 14 |
| 1050 | ELLCOTT 22 |
| 1060 | PEYTON 23 JT |
| 1070 | HANOVER 28 |
| 1120 | EDISON 54 JT |
| 1130 | MIAMI/YODER 60 JT |
| 1160 | COTOPAXI RE-3 |

| | |
|------|-------------------------|
| 1220 | GARFIELD 16 |
| 1330 | GILPIN COUNTY RE-1 |
| 1340 | WEST GRAND 1-JT. |
| 1350 | EAST GRAND 2 |
| 1360 | GUNNISON WATERSHED RE1J |
| 1380 | HINSDALE COUNTY RE 1 |
| 1400 | LA VETA RE-2 |
| 1410 | NORTH PARK R-1 |
| 1430 | EADS RE-1 |
| 1440 | PLAINVIEW RE-2 |
| 1450 | ARRIBA-FLAGLER C-20 |
| 1460 | HI-PLAINS R-23 |
| 1480 | STRATTON R-4 |
| 1490 | BETHUNE R-5 |
| 1520 | DURANGO 9-R |
| 1530 | BAYFIELD 10 JT-R |
| 1600 | HOEHNE REORGANIZED 3 |
| 1760 | KIM REORGANIZED 88 |
| 1780 | GENOA-HUGO C113 |
| 1790 | LIMON RE-4J |
| 1810 | KARVAL RE-23 |
| 1850 | FRENCHMAN RE-3 |
| 1860 | BUFFALO RE-4 |
| 1870 | PLATEAU RE-5 |
| 1980 | DE BEQUE 49JT |
| 2010 | CREEDE CONSOLIDATED 1 |
| 2055 | DOLORES RE-4A |
| 2070 | MANCOS RE-6 |
| 2190 | WEST END RE-2 |
| 2505 | WELDON VALLEY RE-20(J) |
| 2515 | WIGGINS RE-50(J) |
| 2535 | MANZANOLA 3J |
| 2540 | FOWLER R-4J |
| 2560 | CHERAW 31 |
| 2570 | SWINK 33 |
| 2580 | OURAY R-1 |
| 2590 | RIDGWAY R-2 |
| 2600 | PLATTE CANYON 1 |
| 2610 | PARK COUNTY RE-2 |
| 2620 | HOLYOKE RE-1J |
| 2630 | HAXTUN RE-2J |
| 2640 | ASPEN 1 |
| 2650 | GRANADA RE-1 |
| 2670 | HOLLY RE-3 |
| 2680 | WILEY RE-13 JT |
| 2710 | MEEKER RE1 |

| | |
|------|---------------------------|
| 2720 | RANGELY RE-4 |
| 2750 | SARGENT RE-33J |
| 2760 | HAYDEN RE-1 |
| 2780 | SOUTH ROUTT RE 3 |
| 2790 | MOUNTAIN VALLEY RE 1 |
| 2800 | MOFFAT 2 |
| 2820 | SILVERTON 1 |
| 2830 | TELLURIDE R-1 |
| 2840 | NORWOOD R-2J |
| 2862 | JULESBURG RE-1 |
| 2865 | PLATTE VALLEY RE-3 |
| 3010 | CRIPPLE CREEK-VICTOR RE-1 |
| 3020 | WOODLAND PARK RE-2 |
| 3030 | AKRON R-1 |
| 3040 | ARICKAREE R-2 |
| 3050 | OTIS R-3 |
| 3060 | LONE STAR 101 |
| 3070 | WOODLIN R-104 |
| 3100 | WINDSOR RE-4 |
| 3145 | AULT-HIGHLAND RE-9 |
| 3146 | BRIGGSDALE RE-10 |
| 3147 | PRAIRIE RE-11 |
| 3148 | PAWNEE RE-12 |
| 3210 | WRAY RD-2 |
| 3220 | IDALIA RJ-3 |

| TABLE B-2 |
|---|
| DISTRICTS CURRENTLY MEETING THE 2008-09 NCLB STANDARD IN AGGREGATE |
| ACADEMY 20 |
| AGATE 300 |
| AGUILAR REORGANIZED 6 |
| AKRON R-1 |
| ARCHULETA COUNTY 50 JT |
| ARICKAREE R-2 |
| ARRIBA-FLAGLER C-20 |
| ASPEN 1 |
| BAYFIELD 10 JT-R |
| BETHUNE R-5 |
| BIG SANDY 100J |
| BOULDER VALLEY RE 2 |
| BRIGGSDALE RE-10 |
| BUENA VISTA R-31 |
| BUFFALO RE-4 |
| BYERS 32J |
| CALHAN RJ-1 |
| CAMPO RE-6 |
| CHERAW 31 |
| CHERRY CREEK 5 |
| CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN 12 |
| CLEAR CREEK RE-1 |
| COLORADO SPRINGS 11 |
| COTOPAXI RE-3 |
| CREEDE CONSOLIDATED 1 |
| CROWLEY COUNTY RE-1-J |
| CUSTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT C-1 |
| DEER TRAIL 26J |
| DELTA COUNTY 50(J) |
| DOLORES RE-4A |
| DOUGLAS COUNTY RE 1 |
| DURANGO 9-R |
| EADS RE-1 |
| EAST GRAND 2 |
| EATON RE-2 |
| EDISON 54 JT |
| ELBERT 200 |
| ELIZABETH C-1 |
| FALCON 49 |

| |
|--------------------------|
| FOUNTAIN 8 |
| FOWLER R-4J |
| FRENCHMAN RE-3 |
| GENOA-HUGO C113 |
| GILPIN COUNTY RE-1 |
| GUNNISON WATERSHED RE1J |
| HAXTUN RE-2J |
| HINSDALE COUNTY RE 1 |
| HI-PLAINS R-23 |
| HOEHNE REORGANIZED 3 |
| HOLYOKE RE-1J |
| IDALIA RJ-3 |
| JEFFERSON COUNTY R-1 |
| JOHNSTOWN-MILLIKEN RE-5J |
| JULESBURG RE-1 |
| KIM REORGANIZED 88 |
| KIOWA C-2 |
| KIT CARSON R-1 |
| LA VETA RE-2 |
| LEWIS-PALMER 38 |
| LIBERTY J-4 |
| LIMON RE-4J |
| LITTLETON 6 |
| LONE STAR 101 |
| MANCOS RE-6 |
| MANITOU SPRINGS 14 |
| MANZANOLA 3J |
| MC CLAVE RE-2 |
| MEEKER RE1 |
| MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51 |
| MOFFAT 2 |
| MOFFAT COUNTY RE:NO 1 |
| MOUNTAIN VALLEY RE 1 |
| NORTH PARK R-1 |
| NORWOOD R-2J |
| OTIS R-3 |
| OURAY R-1 |
| PARK (ESTES PARK) R-3 |
| PARK COUNTY RE-2 |
| PAWNEE RE-12 |
| PLAINVIEW RE-2 |
| PLATEAU RE-5 |
| PLATTE CANYON 1 |
| PLATTE VALLEY RE-3 |
| PLATTE VALLEY RE-7 |
| POUDRE R-1 |

| |
|-------------------------|
| PRAIRIE RE-11 |
| PRITCHETT RE-3 |
| PUEBLO COUNTY RURAL 70 |
| RIDGWAY R-2 |
| SALIDA R-32 |
| SANFORD 6J |
| SANGRE DE CRISTO RE-22J |
| SARGENT RE-33J |
| SILVERTON 1 |
| SPRINGFIELD RE-4 |
| ST VRAIN VALLEY RE 1J |
| STEAMBOAT SPRINGS RE-2 |
| STRASBURG 31J |
| STRATTON R-4 |
| SUMMIT RE-1 |
| SWINK 33 |
| TELLURIDE R-1 |
| THOMPSON R-2J |
| TRINIDAD 1 |
| VALLEY RE-1 |
| WALSH RE-1 |
| WELDON VALLEY RE-20(J) |
| WEST END RE-2 |
| WIDEFIELD 3 |
| WILEY RE-13 JT |
| WINDSOR RE-4 |
| WOODLAND PARK RE-2 |
| WOODLIN R-104 |
| WRAY RD-2 |

APPENDIX C

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES SUGGESTED BY THE PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT APPROACH

Additional School-level Personnel

- Additional classroom teachers to reduce class sizes
- Additional “other” teachers, including Reading and Math specialists
- Counselors
- Librarians
- Technology specialists
- Teacher tutors
- Social workers
- School-parent liaisons
- Clerical Staff
- Aides (Instructional, Clinical)

Supplies/Materials

- Computer hardware and software (instructional, data analysis, or other)
- Materials for students with special needs
- Assessment materials

Student Programs

- Pre-school
- Full-day kindergarten
- Before/after school programs
- Summer school programs

Teacher Services

- Increased professional development for teachers

APPENDIX D

TABLES COMPARING SSD AND PJ ADEQUACY COST WITH CURRENT COLORADO SPENDING

TABLE D-1

**ESTIMATING THE COST OF ADEQUACY FOR COLORADO SCHOOL DISTRICTS
USING THE SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS BASE IN 2004-05**

| | Very Small | Small | Moderate | Large | Very Large | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| I. <u>School District Characteristics</u> | | | | | | |
| Range in Size of District (Students) | < 200 | 200- 800 | 801- 3,000 | 3,001- 12,500 | > 12,500 | |
| Number of Districts | 31 | 67 | 43 | 21 | 16 | 178 |
| Number of Students | 3,896 | 27,295 | 67,899 | 124,039 | 506,248 | 729,377 |
| II. <u>Estimated Aggregate Cost of Adequacy (millions)*</u> | | | | | | |
| Base Cost | \$58.8 | \$282.3 | \$478.9 | \$734.3 | \$3,037.0 | \$4,591.3 |
| Special Education | \$4.1 | \$24.2 | \$60.3 | \$115.8 | \$482.2 | \$686.6 |
| At-Risk | \$4.2 | \$22.9 | \$44.9 | \$87.9 | \$439.4 | \$599.3 |
| ELPA | \$0.5 | \$3.5 | \$12.9 | \$21.7 | \$75.1 | \$113.7 |
| Grand Total | \$67.6 | \$332.9 | \$597.0 | \$959.7 | \$4,033.7 | \$5,990.9 |
| III. <u>Estimated Cost of Adequacy Per Student*</u> | | | | | | |
| <i>Grand Total</i> | <i>\$17,352</i> | <i>\$12,196</i> | <i>\$8,792</i> | <i>\$7,737</i> | <i>\$7,968</i> | <i>\$8,214</i> |
| IV. <u>Actual Comparable Spending*</u> | | | | | | |
| Aggregate Total (millions) | \$45.0 | \$220.0 | \$489.1 | \$858.3 | \$3,745.3 | \$5,357.6 |
| <i>Per Student Total</i> | <i>\$11,544</i> | <i>\$8,060</i> | <i>\$7,203</i> | <i>\$6,920</i> | <i>\$7,398</i> | <i>\$7,345</i> |

TABLE D-1 (Continued)

| | Very Small | Small | Moderate | Large | Very Large | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|--|---------------|----------|---------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | < 200 | 200- 800 | 801- 3,000 | 3,001- 12,500 | > 12,500 | |
| V. <u>Districts with Higher</u> <u>Spending than the Amount</u> <u>Estimated to be Adequate</u> | | | | | | |
| Number of Districts | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 15 |
| Number of Students | -- | 548 | 7,398 | 24,564 | 148,273 | 180,783 |
| Estimated 2004-05 Adequate Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | -- | \$5.7 | \$58.9 | \$188.3 | \$1,061.0 | \$1,313.9 |
| Actual 2004-05 Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | -- | \$6.4 | \$69.7 | \$196.9 | \$1,107.3 | \$1,380.3 |
| Actual Spending Over Adequacy (Aggregate in millions)* | -- | \$0.7 | \$10.8 | \$8.6 | \$46.3 | \$66.4 |
| Per Student Spending Over Adequacy | -- | \$1,333 | \$1,455 | \$352 | \$312 | \$368 |

TABLE D-1 (Continued)

| | Very Small | Small | Moderate | Large | Very Large | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| | < 200 | 200- 800 | 801- 3,000 | 3,001- 12,500 | > 12,500 | |
| VI. <u>Districts with Lower Spending than the Amount Calculated to be Adequate</u> | | | | | | |
| Number of Districts | 31 | 66 | 39 | 16 | 11 | 163 |
| Number of Students | 3,896 | 26,747 | 60,501 | 99,475 | 357,975 | 548,594 |
| Estimated 2004-05 Adequate Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | \$67.6 | \$327.2 | \$538.0 | \$771.4 | \$2,972.7 | \$4,676.9 |
| Actual 2004-05 Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | \$45.0 | \$213.6 | \$419.4 | \$661.4 | \$2,637.9 | \$3,977.3 |
| Actual Spending <i>Under Adequacy</i> (Aggregate in millions)* | \$22.6 | \$113.6 | \$118.6 | \$110.0 | \$334.8 | \$699.6 |
| Per Student Spending <i>Under Adequacy</i> | <i>\$5,808</i> | <i>\$4,248</i> | <i>\$1,961</i> | <i>\$1,106</i> | <i>\$935</i> | <i>\$1,275</i> |

* Figures exclude spending for capital, transportation, and food service

TABLE D-2

ESTIMATING THE COST OF ADEQUACY FOR COLORADO SCHOOL DISTRICTS
USING THE PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT BASE IN 2004-05

| | Very Small | Small | Moderate | Large | Very Large | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| I. <u>School District Characteristics</u> | | | | | | |
| Range in Size of District (Students) | < 200 | 200- 800 | 801- 3,000 | 3,001- 12,500 | > 12,500 | |
| Number of Districts | 31 | 67 | 43 | 21 | 16 | 178 |
| Number of Students | 3,896 | 27,295 | 67,899 | 124,039 | 506,248 | 729,377 |
| II. <u>Estimated Aggregate Cost of Adequacy (millions)*</u> | | | | | | |
| Base Cost | \$72.9 | \$350.2 | \$594.1 | \$911.0 | \$3,768.0 | \$5,696.2 |
| Special Education | \$5.1 | \$30.0 | \$74.8 | \$143.7 | \$598.3 | \$851.9 |
| At-Risk | \$5.3 | \$28.4 | \$55.7 | \$109.0 | \$545.2 | \$743.6 |
| ELPA | \$0.6 | \$4.3 | \$16.1 | \$26.9 | \$93.2 | \$141.1 |
| Grand Total | \$83.9 | \$412.9 | \$740.7 | \$1,190.6 | \$5,004.7 | \$7,432.8 |
| III. <u>Estimated Cost of Adequacy Per Student*</u> | | | | | | |
| <i>Grand Total</i> | <i>\$21,529</i> | <i>\$15,131</i> | <i>\$10,908</i> | <i>\$9,599</i> | <i>\$9,886</i> | <i>\$10,191</i> |
| IV. <u>Actual Comparable Spending*</u> | | | | | | |
| Aggregate Total (millions) | \$45.0 | \$220.0 | \$489.1 | \$858.3 | \$3,745.3 | \$5,357.6 |
| <i>Per Student Total</i> | <i>\$11,544</i> | <i>\$8,060</i> | <i>\$7,203</i> | <i>\$6,920</i> | <i>\$7,398</i> | <i>\$7,345</i> |

TABLE D-2 (Continued)

| | Very Small | Small | Moderate | Large | Very Large | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|--|---------------|----------|---------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | < 200 | 200- 800 | 801- 3,000 | 3,001- 12,500 | > 12,500 | |
| V. <u>Districts with Higher</u> <u>Spending than the Amount</u> <u>Estimated to be Adequate</u> | | | | | | |
| Number of Districts | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Number of Students | -- | -- | 1,523 | -- | -- | 1,523 |
| Estimated 2004-05 Adequate Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | -- | -- | \$14.1 | -- | -- | \$14.1 |
| Actual 2004-05 Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | -- | -- | \$16.6 | -- | -- | \$16.6 |
| Actual Spending Over Adequacy (Aggregate in millions)* | -- | -- | \$2.5 | -- | -- | \$2.5 |
| Per Student Spending Over Adequacy | -- | -- | \$1,668 | -- | -- | \$1,185 |

TABLE D-2 (Continued)

| | Very Small | Small | Moderate | Large | Very Large | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | < 200 | 200- 800 | 801- 3,000 | 3,001- 12,500 | > 12,500 | |
| VI. <u>Districts with Lower</u> <u>Spending than the Amount</u> <u>Calculated to be Adequate</u> | | | | | | |
| Number of Districts | 31 | 67 | 42 | 21 | 16 | 177 |
| Number of Students | 3,896 | 27,295 | 66,376 | 124,039 | 506,248 | 727,854 |
| Estimated 2004-05 Adequate Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | \$83.9 | \$413.0 | \$726.5 | \$1,190.6 | \$5,004.7 | \$7,418.7 |
| Actual 2004-05 Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | \$45.0 | \$220.0 | \$472.5 | \$858.3 | \$3,745.3 | \$5,341.1 |
| Actual Spending <i>Under Adequacy</i> (Aggregate in millions)* | \$38.9 | \$193.0 | \$254.1 | \$332.4 | \$1,259.2 | \$2,077.6 |
| Per Student Spending <i>Under Adequacy</i> | \$9,985 | \$7,071 | \$3,828 | \$2,679 | \$2,488 | \$2,855 |

* Figures exclude spending for capital, transportation, and food service

TABLE D-3

ESTIMATING THE COST OF ADEQUACY FOR COLORADO SCHOOL DISTRICTS
USING THE SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS BASE IN 2004-05

| | <i>Without Mills</i> | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------------|
| | Very Small | Small | Moderate | Large | Very Large | <u>TOTAL</u> |
| I. <u>School District Characteristics</u> | | | | | | |
| Range in Size of District (Students) | < 200 | 200- 800 | 801- 3,000 | 3,001- 12,500 | > 12,500 | |
| Number of Districts | 31 | 67 | 43 | 21 | 16 | 178 |
| Number of Students | 3,896 | 27,295 | 67,899 | 124,039 | 506,248 | 729,377 |
| II. <u>Estimated Aggregate Cost of Adequacy (millions)*</u> | | | | | | |
| Base Cost | \$58.8 | \$282.3 | \$478.9 | \$734.3 | \$3,037.0 | \$4,591.3 |
| Special Education | \$4.1 | \$24.2 | \$60.3 | \$115.8 | \$482.2 | \$686.6 |
| At-Risk | \$4.2 | \$22.9 | \$44.9 | \$87.9 | \$439.4 | \$599.3 |
| ELPA | \$0.5 | \$3.5 | \$12.9 | \$21.7 | \$75.1 | \$113.7 |
| Grand Total | \$67.6 | \$332.9 | \$597.0 | \$959.7 | \$4,033.7 | \$5,990.9 |
| III. <u>Estimated Cost of Adequacy Per Student*</u> | | | | | | |
| <i>Grand Total</i> | \$17,352 | \$12,196 | \$8,792 | \$7,737 | \$7,968 | \$8,214 |
| IV. <u>Actual Comparable Spending*</u> | | | | | | |
| Aggregate Total (millions) | \$44.6 | \$215.6 | \$466.7 | \$809.0 | \$3,414.9 | \$4,950.8 |
| <i>Per Student Total</i> | \$11,455 | \$7,900 | \$6,873 | \$6,522 | \$6,746 | \$6,788 |

TABLE D-3 (Continued)

| | Very Small | Small | Moderate | Large | Very Large | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|--|---------------|----------|---------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | < 200 | 200- 800 | 801- 3,000 | 3,001- 12,500 | > 12,500 | |
| V. <u>Districts with Higher</u> <u>Spending than the Amount</u> <u>Estimated to be Adequate</u> | | | | | | |
| Number of Districts | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Number of Students | -- | 548 | 6,097 | -- | -- | 6,645 |
| Estimated 2004-05 Adequate Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | -- | \$5.7 | \$48.0 | -- | -- | \$53.7 |
| Actual 2004-05 Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | -- | \$5.9 | \$54.3 | -- | -- | \$60.2 |
| Actual Spending Over Adequacy (Aggregate in millions)* | -- | \$0.2 | \$6.3 | -- | -- | \$6.5 |
| Per Student Spending Over Adequacy | -- | \$347 | \$1,027 | -- | -- | \$971 |

TABLE D-3 (Continued)

| | Very Small | Small | Moderate | Large | Very Large | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| | < 200 | 200- 800 | 801- 3,000 | 3,001- 12,500 | > 12,500 | |
| VI. <u>Districts with Lower</u> <u>Spending than the Amount</u> <u>Calculated to be Adequate</u> | | | | | | |
| Number of Districts | 31 | 66 | 40 | 21 | 16 | 174 |
| Number of Students | 3,896 | 26,747 | 61,803 | 124,039 | 506,248 | 722,733 |
| Estimated 2004-05 Adequate Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | \$67.6 | \$327.2 | \$548.9 | \$959.7 | \$4,033.8 | \$5,937.2 |
| Actual 2004-05 Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | \$44.6 | \$209.7 | \$412.4 | \$809.0 | \$3,414.9 | \$4,890.6 |
| Actual Spending <i>Under Adequacy</i> (Aggregate in millions)* | \$23.0 | \$117.5 | \$136.5 | \$150.7 | \$618.9 | \$1,046.6 |
| Per Student Spending <i>Under Adequacy</i> | <i>\$5,897</i> | <i>\$4,391</i> | <i>\$2,209</i> | <i>\$1,215</i> | <i>\$1,222</i> | <i>\$1,448</i> |

* Figures exclude spending for capital, transportation, and food service

TABLE D-4

ESTIMATING THE COST OF ADEQUACY FOR COLORADO SCHOOL DISTRICTS
USING THE PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT BASE IN 2004-05

| | <i>Without Mills</i> | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | Very Small | Small | Moderate | Large | Very Large | <u>TOTAL</u> |
| I. <u>School District Characteristics</u> | | | | | | |
| Range in Size of District (Students) | < 200 | 200- 800 | 801- 3,000 | 3,001- 12,500 | > 12,500 | |
| Number of Districts | 31 | 67 | 43 | 21 | 16 | 178 |
| Number of Students | 3,896 | 27,295 | 67,899 | 124,039 | 506,248 | 729,377 |
| II. <u>Estimated Aggregate Cost of Adequacy (millions)*</u> | | | | | | |
| Base Cost | \$72.9 | \$350.2 | \$594.1 | \$911.0 | \$3,768.0 | \$5,696.2 |
| Special Education | \$5.1 | \$30.0 | \$74.8 | \$143.7 | \$598.3 | \$851.9 |
| At-Risk | \$5.3 | \$28.4 | \$55.7 | \$109.0 | \$545.2 | \$743.6 |
| ELPA | \$0.6 | \$4.3 | \$16.1 | \$26.9 | \$93.2 | \$141.1 |
| Grand Total | \$83.9 | \$412.9 | \$740.7 | \$1,190.6 | \$5,004.7 | \$7,432.8 |
| III. <u>Estimated Cost of Adequacy Per Student*</u> | | | | | | |
| <i>Grand Total</i> | <i>\$21,529</i> | <i>\$15,131</i> | <i>\$10,908</i> | <i>\$9,599</i> | <i>\$9,886</i> | <i>\$10,191</i> |
| IV. <u>Actual Comparable Spending*</u> | | | | | | |
| Aggregate Total (millions) | \$44.6 | \$215.6 | \$466.7 | \$809.0 | \$3,414.9 | \$4,950.8 |
| <i>Per Student Total</i> | <i>\$11,455</i> | <i>\$7,900</i> | <i>\$6,873</i> | <i>\$6,522</i> | <i>\$6,746</i> | <i>\$6,788</i> |

TABLE D-4 (Continued)

| | Very Small | Small | Moderate | Large | Very Large | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|---|------------|----------|---------------|------------------|------------|---------------------|
| | < 200 | 200- 800 | 801- 3,000 | 3,001- 12,500 | > 12,500 | |
| V. <u>Districts with <i>Higher</i> Spending than the Amount Estimated to be Adequate</u> | | | | | | |
| Number of Districts | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Number of Students | -- | -- | 1,523 | -- | -- | 1,523 |
| Estimated 2004-05 Adequate Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | -- | -- | \$14.1 | -- | -- | \$14.1 |
| Actual 2004-05 Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | -- | -- | \$14.8 | -- | -- | \$14.8 |
| Actual Spending Over Adequacy (Aggregate in millions)* | -- | -- | \$0.7 | -- | -- | \$0.7 |
| Per Student Spending Over Adequacy | -- | -- | \$449 | -- | -- | \$1,185 |

TABLE D-4 (Continued)

| | Very Small | Small | Moderate | Large | Very Large | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | < 200 | 200- 800 | 801- 3,000 | 3,001- 12,500 | > 12,500 | |
| VI. <u>Districts with Lower</u> <u>Spending than the Amount</u> <u>Calculated to be Adequate</u> | | | | | | |
| Number of Districts | 31 | 67 | 42 | 21 | 16 | 177 |
| Number of Students | 3,896 | 27,295 | 66,376 | 124,039 | 506,248 | 727,854 |
| Estimated 2004-05 Adequate Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | \$83.9 | \$413.0 | \$726.5 | \$1,190.6 | \$5,004.7 | \$7,418.7 |
| Actual 2004-05 Spending (Aggregate in millions)* | \$44.6 | \$215.6 | \$451.9 | \$809.0 | \$3,414.9 | \$4,936.0 |
| Actual Spending <i>Under Adequacy</i> (Aggregate in millions)* | \$39.2 | \$197.4 | \$274.6 | \$381.7 | \$1,589.8 | \$2,482.7 |
| Per Student Spending <i>Under Adequacy</i> | \$10,073 | \$7,232 | \$4,137 | \$3,077 | \$3,140 | \$3,411 |

* Figures exclude spending for capital, transportation, and food service