# PROFILE OF CHANGES IN COLORADO PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING

## 1988-89 TO 1998-99

**Prepared for**

**THE COLORADO SCHOOL FINANCE PROJECT**
Colorado Association of School Boards
Colorado Association of School Executives
Colorado BOCES Association
Colorado Education Association

**Prepared by**

**John Augenblick and Justin Silverstein**
*Augenblick & Myers, Inc.*
*Denver, CO*

**December 2000**

This is the sixth in a series of annual profile reports designed to examine the status of school funding in Colorado. The first report compared 1993-94 to 1988-89 using statewide average information.[1] Subsequent reports updated the first one by adding data as it became available year by year for 1994-95, 1995-96, 1996-97, and 1997-98.[2] This report examines data for 1998-99, comparing it to data for 1988-89, 1996-97, and 1997-98. The report is designed to fulfill one objective of the Colorado School Finance Project: to monitor school funding using consistent, reliable data by tracking the level of state and local support for public schools and examining how funds are spent.

This report is different from earlier reports in two ways: first, it includes data that spans a ten year period, 1988-89 through 1998-99, which allows a long-term, historical view of how funding has changed over time and second, it is organized somewhat differently in that it provides more analysis of the implications of the data rather than just a description of the data. It should be noted that during the ten year period covered by the information, the Colorado Department of Education has changed the way it manages data — it has redefined certain data elements, such as the way pupils in special education programs are counted, and it has implemented a new fiscal accounting system that is designed to collect more data, more accurately and in a more timely fashion. It is also worth noting that this report is particularly important this year because of several things that

---

1 "A Profile of the Fiscal Status of Public Schools in Colorado: Changes Between 1988-89 and 1993-94 and Comparisons to Other States" (Colorado School Finance Project, January 1996).

2 For example, see "Profile of Changes in Colorado School Funding, 1988-89 to 1997-98" (Colorado School Finance Project, September 1999).

are happening in the state that are connected in one way or another to school funding, including the legislature's study of Colorado's tax system, the impacts of the myriad of tax/spending constraints that exist in the state that affect education, the fact that the state is providing additional support for capital purposes as a result of the settlement of recent litigation, and the implications of some of the referenda that were considered by voters this year.

The attached tables organize the data and readers should examine them carefully to draw their own conclusions about what the data mean. The first group of tables (Tables 1-5) displays statewide averages and provides historical data for 1988-89, 1996-97, 1997-98, and 1998-99 along with annual changes between those years. The second group of tables (Tables 6-8) displays data for 1998-99 disaggregated for school districts based on their size, change in enrollment, and wealth. It should be noted that some data are provided for a school year (such as 1998-99) and other data are provided for a fiscal year (such as FY1999); for our purposes, we use the year 1998-99 as essentially the same as FY1999. Almost all data were collected by the Colorado Department of Education based on the most recent audited information. Some data, particularly those in Table 5, come from the Colorado Legislative Council.

Because the first few tables compare 1998-99 to other years, going back as far as 1988-89, we sometimes adjust the older data so that it is presented in current dollar terms. We do this by using an inflation adjustment, as is common in evaluating economic data over several years. We used the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the Denver-Boulder Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area as the basis of the adjustment (this is the factor

published by the Colorado Legislative Council and used by the legislature to make year to year changes in the allocation of some types of state support). The CPI indicates that inflation grew by 42.1 percent between 1988-89 and 1998-99, suggesting that whatever was purchased with $1.00 in 1988-89 would cost $1.421 in 1998-99 (and that it is appropriate to adjust dollar amounts in 1988-89 by 1.421 to make them comparable to 1998-99 figures). Throughout the report this adjustment is made in order to compare revenues and expenditures today to those of a decade ago.

The statewide average data (Tables 1-5) indicate a variety of important things about the level of support for education and how funds are spent by school districts.

- Enrollment levels in Colorado's public schools continued to grow in 1998-99, as they had in the previous nine years, but at a faster rate than ever before (see Table 1, row [1]). On average, the annual rate of growth in enrollment was 2.24 percent over the last decade. The state serves nearly 133,000 more pupils now than it did a decade ago, which is the equivalent of adding a new Jefferson County school district *and* a new Denver school district during the period — the implications of this growth include the need to have hired about 7,400 more professional staff (assuming about one staff member for every 18 pupils) and the need to have built about 150 new schools (assuming about 900 pupils per school).

- Enrollment of pupils with special education needs has stabilized at about 11 percent of all pupils (see Table 1, row [2]), which is below the national average. Over the last decade, the number of pupils with special education needs has risen by 47 percent, or about 24,000 pupils. Given the average cost of serving such pupils (about 130 percent *more than* the cost of a regular pupil according to the Center for Special Education Finance), from a cost perspective school districts face the added burden of about 31,200 pupils above the actual numbers of new pupils with special education needs.

- The proportion of pupils from economically disadvantaged families, as reflected by eligibility for the federal free lunch program, is about 22 percent of all pupils (see Table 1, row [3]). In the last decade the number of such pupils rose by 50 percent, or about 48,700 pupils. Assuming that these

pupils cost anywhere from 25-50 percent more than regular pupils, school districts face added costs of 12,200 -24,400 pupils over the actual numbers of new pupils from economically disadvantaged families. While the proportion of pupils eligible for free lunches has declined slightly for the second year in a row, there is concern that the proportion of pupils eligible for *reduced* price meals, who may also have needs for added education services, may be growing.[3]

! The rate of increase in the numbers of pupils with special needs far exceeds the rate of growth for pupils without such needs. Assuming that the number of pupils without special needs is the total number of pupils minus those with special education needs and those eligible for free lunch (which certainly is not a precise way to calculate them), then between 1988-89 and 1998-99, the number of pupils with special education needs rose by 47.4 percent, the number of pupils eligible for free lunch grew by 50.3 percent, and the number of pupils without special needs (all others) increased by 15.5 percent.

! Local revenue per pupil rose dramatically in 1998-99, where it had been effectively constant during the previous nine years (see Table 2, row [1]). The increase of $246 per pupil reflects $215 million of additional local revenue in one year. It should be noted, however, that had local revenue kept pace with inflation and enrollment growth, it would have generated $1.08 billion in new revenue in 1998-99 as compared with 1988-89 (the fact is that in 1997-98, there was $334 million more in local revenue than there had been in 1988-89; this plus the $215 million in added local revenue in 1998-99 -- for a total of $549 million -- is about half of the amount that would have been required for local revenue to keep pace with inflation and enrollment growth).

! State revenue per pupil rose more slowly in 1998-99 than it had in the previous nine years (see Table 2, row [2]), reflecting the high growth in local revenues between 1997-98 and 1998-99. At a level of $2,788 per pupil in 1998-99, state aid was about $235 per pupil, or $157 million, higher than it needed to be in order to have kept up with inflation and enrollment growth between 1988-89 and 1998-99. But that amount was still insufficient to make up for the loss of over $500 million in local funds. The problem is that, unlike many other services, public schools are funded by both state and local sources — the fact that one of the two sources, in this case the state, has

---

[3] Last year, the Colorado School Finance Project undertook a study of this issue and found that while the proportion of pupils eligible for free lunches was decreasing, the proportion of pupils eligible for reduced-price lunches was growing.

provided a tremendous amount of new funding over the course of a decade does not alleviate the impact of an anemic rise in the other source, local funds. In 1988-89, state revenue per pupil
was $805 less than local revenue per pupil; in 1998-99, state revenue was $118 less than local revenue.

- Total current operating revenue per pupil rose by 6.1 percent between 1997-98 and 1998-99 (see Table 2, row [4]), a rate that exceeded inflation (the Denver-Boulder Consumer Price Index [CPI] rose by 2.4 percent in that one year period) and was the highest level of the ten year period. Despite this level of growth in the past year, operating revenue has not kept up with inflation and enrollment change over the past decade; given revenue of $4,629 in 1988-89, $6,578 per pupil would have been needed in 1998-99, which exceeded actual revenue in that year by $531 per pupil.
- Per pupil spending for "central" purposes (that is, spending for instruction, instructional support, administration, plant maintenance and operation but excluding transportation, food services, community services, and capital) rose by 2.8 percent between 1997-98 and 1998-99 (see Table 2, row [5]) although, after taking inflation into consideration, per pupil spending in 1998-99 was about 8.2 percent lower than it had been a decade earlier.

- Per pupil spending for other operating purposes (transportation, food services, and community services) rose dramatically in 1998-99 after falling in the previous year (see Table 2, row [6]), although after adjusting for inflation, such spending was 10.2 percent lower than it had been in 1988-89.

- Central spending was about 86.7 percent of total spending for current operations in 1998-99, slightly lower than it had been in 1988-89 (when the figure was 88.3 percent). This means that districts are spending a slightly higher proportion of current spending for transportation, food services, and community services now than was the case a decade ago.

- The major purposes for which districts allocate resources has changed somewhat over ten years (see Table 2, row [7]) -- while about the same proportion of "central" spending is for instruction (nearly two-thirds of central spending) and for administration (just over nine percent of central spending), a lower share is being spent on the operation and maintenance of school buildings (a drop from 11.7 percent to 9.7 percent of central spending, which translates into a decrease of $160 per pupil after taking inflation into consideration) and a higher share is being spent for pupil and staff support (such as professional development, guidance, and psychological services), which rose from 12.7 percent of central spending in 1988-89 to 15.3 percent of central spending in 1998-99, an inflation adjusted increase of $76 per pupil.

- After adjusting for inflation, “central” spending was $471 per pupil, or $315 million, lower than it had been in 1988-89 (see Table 3). The size of the gap between the spending necessary to keep up with inflation and enrollment growth and actual spending continues to decrease slowly, but steadily, over time: in 1995-96, the gap was $543 per pupil, which dropped to $526 per pupil in 1996-97, and decreased to $483 per pupil in 1997-98. The gap can be broken into two pieces, one associated with inflation and the other associated with enrollment growth. Analysis shows that actual spending accounted for about 72 percent of the increase needed to meet inflation and about 92 percent of the amount needed for enrollment growth.

- There are more teachers relative to pupils than ever before (see Table 4). In 1998-99 there were 58.8 teachers for every 1,000 pupils, which is higher than the level in 1988-89 (when there were 58.1 teachers for every 1,000 pupils). These figures indicate that there were about 39,340 teachers (including classroom teachers, special education teachers, and other teachers who provide service but may not be assigned to one classroom) in 1998-99 and that there were about 31,150 teachers in 1988-89. The growth in the number of teachers, about 8,200, is greater than the number, about 7,400, that would have been anticipated based on adding one staff member for every 18 new pupils. The fact is that the number of *classroom* teachers decreased relative to numbers of pupils over the decade, which probably reflects the fact that so many professional personnel other than classroom teachers have been hired in response to the influx of pupils with special needs.

- The average salary paid to teachers was $38,229 in 1998-99 (see Table 4, row [3]). In conjunction with figures for earlier years, this indicates that teacher salaries have increased, on average, by about 2.6 percent each year over the decade. When the figures are adjusted for inflation, the average teacher salary has decreased by $3,852, or 9.2 percent over the decade. What has remained constant over the ten year period is the fact that teacher salaries account for about 42.8 percent of the “central” spending (as discussed above) of school districts. So the combination of a slower than expected increase in total revenues and the hiring of sufficient numbers of staff to raise the number of teachers per 1,000 pupils has led to a slower salary growth in average teacher salary than in central spending.

- The characteristics of teachers have remained constant over the last decade (see Table 4, rows [4] and [5]) with the average teacher having 13 years of experience and about 47 percent of all teachers having earned at least a masters degree. The fact that these characteristics, which are

important determinants of teacher salary levels, have remained similar means that the salary comparison is valid.

- Colorado's population grew by 2.0 percent between 1997-98 and 1998-99 to nearly four million people (see Table 5, row [1]). The average annual increase in population was 1.95 percent over the last ten years, slightly lower than the average annual increase in pupil enrollment.

- The assessed value of property rose dramatically in 1998-99 (see Table 5, row [2]). In 1998-99, property valuation was $38.3 billion, nearly $5 billion higher than it had been in 1997-98 (which was only $150 million higher than it had been in 1988-89). In per pupil terms, property valuation was about $57,250 in 1998-99, which was 7.7 percent *lower* than it was in 1988-89 (when it was about $62,000). In terms of population, assessed property value decreased from $10,160 to $9,650 between 1988-89 and 1998-99. Given the phenomenal growth in population over the decade (almost 700,000 people), with the associated increase in residential, commercial, and other properties, and the well known increase in the market value of property during the same time, it is obvious that property assessment does not reflect the true value of property. This explains, in part, the diminishing reliance on local revenue support for schools, which in turn is associated with school revenue growth that has been slower than inflation.

- Aggregate personal income has skyrocketed over the last decade (see Table 5, row [3]), rising by an average annual rate of 8.2 percent. In per capita terms, personal income grew from $16,500 in 1988-89 to about $30,000 in 1998-99, exceeding the rate of inflation by 28 percent.

- One way to evaluate the burden placed on people to pay for services is to examine the proportion of personal income devoted to that service (even though some revenue source other than income taxes, such as property or sales taxes, is actually used to pay for the service). The figures in rows 4 and 5 of Table 5 indicate the proportion of personal income that is effectively devoted to supporting public schools from local and state sources. Clearly, a lower proportion of income is devoted to public schools from both local and state sources. In fact, combining the two, in 1988-89, about 3.89 percent of personal income was used to support K-12 education while in 1998-99 only 2.74 percent of personal income was used for that purpose. Had the same proportion of income been used to support public schools in 1998-99 as had been used in 1988-89, about $1.37 billion more revenue would have been available, which would have been enough to eliminate the spending gap ($315 million, or less than a quarter of the amount that would have been available) and still have provided over $1.0 billion in tax relief.

The disaggregated data indicate a variety of important things about the differences between school districts that are associated with district enrollment level (Table 6), change in enrollment (Table 7), and district wealth (Table 8), which are discussed below.

Districts Grouped by Enrollment Level

For this analysis, districts were organized into five groups based on enrollment level: (1) districts with less than 1,000 pupils; (2) districts with between 1,000 and 9,999 pupils; (3) districts with between 10,000 and 19,999 pupils; (4) districts with between 20,000 and 49,999 pupils; and (5) districts with 50,000 or more pupils.

- Of Colorado's 176 school districts, 158 districts had enrollments below 10,000 pupils (of which 103 districts had enrollments below 1,000 pupils) while 18 districts had enrollments over 10,000 pupils (nine of which had enrollments greater than 20,000 pupils), as shown in Table 6. Those districts with less than 10,000 pupils enrolled 27.7 percent of all pupils in the state while those districts with more than 10,000 pupils enrolled 72.3 percent of all pupils in 1998-99. The 103 smallest districts enrolled 5.5 percent of all pupils while the nine largest districts enrolled 52.4 percent of all pupils.

- Between 1988-89 and 1998-99, the seven districts with enrollments between 20-50,000 grew the fastest, increasing by a total of 54,340 pupils or by 37.0 percent over the decade. In effect, each of the seven district in that group increased by an average of 775 pupils per year.

- While the proportion of pupils with special education needs does not vary much depending on the size of the school district, the smallest districts had a slightly higher proportion of such pupils.

- The smallest district and the largest districts have the highest proportions of pupils eligible for free lunches (with proportions of 27.9 percent and 30.3 percent respectively) although it is the largest districts that had the highest increase in the proportion of such pupils in the last ten years (rising from 19.0 percent to 30.3 percent).

- The number of teachers per 1,000 pupils is inversely related to school district size — the smallest district have 81.4 teachers per 1,000 pupils while the largest districts have 51.2 teachers per 1,000 pupils. Over the last decade those districts with 1000 to 10,000 pupils increased the number of teachers per 1,000 pupils by 3.6 while the two districts with more than 50,000 pupils decreased the number of teachers per 1,000 pupils by 4.9.

- Average teacher salary is directly related to school district size — the average salary was $29,087 in the smallest districts while it was $43,375 in the largest districts. While the increase in average salary over the decade was similar across districts of different size, the smallest and largest districts had slightly higher increases than districts of moderate size.

- Districts with over 10,000 pupils have slightly higher levels of teacher experience than districts with lower enrollments. There is a direct relationship between district size and the proportion of teachers with at least a masters degree: 25.5 percent of the teachers in the smallest districts have at least a masters degree while 55.0 percent of teachers in the largest districts have such qualifications.

- Per pupil “central” spending (that is, spending for instruction, instructional support, administration, plant maintenance and operation but excluding transportation, food services, community services, and capital) matched the “backward J” pattern, with the smallest districts spending at the highest levels (about 20 percent higher than the lowest spending group of districts) and the largest districts spending about seven percent more than the lowest spending group of districts. Over the last ten years, the smallest districts had the highest increase in per pupil spending (39.8 percent) while the largest districts had the smallest increase in per pupil spending (22.2 percent).

- Regardless of their size, districts spent about two thirds of their central spending on instruction. Over the course of the decade, districts reduced the proportion they spent on plant maintenance and operation, regardless of size, and most districts increased the proportion of spending for pupil and staff support.

- Districts with more than 20,000 pupils relied more heavily on local revenue than smaller districts while districts with less than 20,000 pupils relied more heavily on state revenue than larger districts despite the fact that the wealthiest districts were those with fewer than 10,000 pupils (for which assessed property valuation rose over the decade while it decreased significantly in districts with more than 20,000 pupils).

- Over the decade, local support decreased slightly in the largest and smallest districts and increased by 15-20 percent in districts with enrollments between 1,000 and 50,000 pupils. Similarly, state aid increased much more rapidly over the past ten years in the very smallest and the very largest districts — the increase was proportionately about 50 percent higher in districts with less than 1,000 pupils or more than 50,000 pupils than it was in other districts.

- The spending "gap" (the difference between actual spending in a particular year and anticipated spending in light of inflation and enrollment growth since 1988-89) is associated with district size -- the larger the district, the higher the gap in FY1999 (the smallest districts had a gap of $97 per pupil while the largest districts had a gap of $863 per pupil). Over the last few years, the gap decreased in all but the largest districts.

District Grouped by Enrollment Change Between 1988-89 and 1998-99

For this analysis, districts were organized into five groups based on the change in enrollment between 1988-89 and 1998-99: (1) districts that had a decline in enrollment; (2) districts with an increase in enrollment up to 12.9 percent over the period; (3) districts with enrollment growth between 13 and 24.9 percent over the period; (4) districts with enrollment increases between 25 and 44.9 percent; and (5) districts with increases over 45 percent over the decade. These categories reflect natural groupings — that is, break points in the distribution of all districts that indicate that one group is different from another group.

- In the last decade, 24 school districts saw enrollment declines (such districts enrolled about 4.4 percent of all pupils in Colorado public schools and their decrease in enrollment over 10 years was 6.0 percent), while 42 districts had increases in enrollments of about 8.0 percent, 36 districts had increases of about 18.6 percent, 39 districts had increases of 31.7 percent, and 35 districts had increases of 74.6 percent (see Table 7).

- While the proportion of pupils in need of special education are similar across districts regardless of rate of enrollment growth, the proportion of pupils eligible for free lunches is inversely related to rate of growth (42.3

percent of the pupils in districts that had a decrease in enrollment over ten years were eligible for free lunches while only 6.6 percent of the pupils in districts where growth exceeded 45 percent over the decade were eligible for free lunches).

- Districts with decreasing enrollment, which are relatively small, had: (1) the highest numbers of teachers per 1,000 pupils, 68.7, and the largest increases over ten years in such numbers, 7.8; (2) the lowest average teacher salaries, $33,606, and the lowest increase in salary level over ten years, 23.9 percent; and (3) the highest levels of teacher experience at 13.9 years. The 36 districts with growth between 13 and 25 percent over ten years (an average of about 1.8 percent per year), which are larger on average than the other districts, had: (1) the lowest number of teachers per 1,000 pupils, 54.5, and decreased that number over time, by 2.7 teachers per 1,000 pupils; (2) the highest average teacher salaries, $40,241, and the largest increase in salary level over the decade, 32.2 percent; and (3) the highest proportion of teachers with at least a masters degree, 48.9 percent.

- Districts were similar in their central spending per pupil regardless of enrollment change (the range in the average central spending per pupil of the five enrollment change groups was from $5,153 to 5,374), although such spending had increased somewhat more rapidly in districts with declining enrollments or very low increases in enrollment compared to districts with higher levels of growth over the decade.

- Regardless of change in enrollment, districts reduced the proportion of central spending on plant maintenance and operation and increased the proportion they spent for pupil and staff support.

- There is a direct relationship between the extent of reliance on local funds and rate of growth over the decade with those districts that had decreasing enrollments obtaining 31.9 percent of their current revenue from local funds and those with growth over 45 percent over ten years receiving 55.5 percent of their current revenue from local funds (which is consistent with the per pupil assessed value of property, which was larger in districts with higher levels of enrollment growth).

- The increase in state support over ten years was also associated with enrollment growth (with the exception of districts with enrollment growth between 25 and 45 percent). State aid per pupil rose by 39.2 percent in districts with decreasing enrollment while it jumped by 92.0 percent in districts with more than a 45 percent increase in enrollment over the decade.

- **!** There is no clear relationship between the spending “gap” (the difference between actual spending in a particular year and anticipated spending in light of inflation and enrollment growth since 1988-89) and change in enrollment.

Districts Grouped by Assessed Property Valuation per Pupil

For this analysis, districts were organized into five groups on the basis of assessed property valuation per pupil, district wealth: (1) districts with wealth less than $34,600; (2) districts with wealth between $34,600 and $48,600; (3) districts with wealth between $48,600 and $50,600; (4) districts with wealth between $50,600 and $73,600; and (5) districts with wealth in excess of $73,600. These categories were created so that each group contained about 20 percent of all pupils in the state. It should be noted that in this analysis we discuss cost-of-living differentials between the groups, which is based on using the inter-district cost-of-living figures used as the basis of allocating state aid as part of the School Finance Act. The weighted average cost-of-living for each group is as follows: lowest wealth group, 1.0296; second lowest wealth group, 1.0585; middle wealth group, 1.0730; second highest wealth group, 1.0620; and highest wealth group, 1.1075. These figures suggest that the cost-of-living is somewhat higher in wealthier districts.

- **!** In 1998-99, 39 districts had property wealth less than $34,600 per pupil, while 53 districts had more than $73,600 in property wealth per pupil (see Table 8). The wealthiest districts had almost four times as much assessed valuation per pupil as the poorest ones. The variation among the 84 districts with property wealth between $34,600 and $73,600 went down over time because, while most districts had a decrease in valuation, the districts with higher valuations saw a larger decrease in valuation than the districts with lower valuations. Districts with average property wealth per pupil tended to be larger than districts with low or high property wealth.

- Districts with the lowest and highest levels of wealth tended to have had slower growth, a slightly higher proportion of pupils in need of special education, and a somewhat higher proportion of pupils eligible for free lunches than districts with more moderate wealth.

- There is no relationship between district wealth and the number of teachers per 1,000 pupils, the change in that number over time, or the average salary of teachers although districts with wealth over $48,600 per pupil had somewhat higher teacher salaries and somewhat slower growth in salaries than districts with wealth below that level. It is worth noting that if average salaries are adjusted for cost-of-living differences, using the factors the state uses in the School Finance Act, the salaries of wealthier districts are not too different from the salaries of less wealthy districts.

- The wealthiest and least wealthy districts have both had a decrease in the average years of experience of their teachers over the last decade and the variation across districts of different wealth in the proportion of teachers with at least a masters degree has decreased as the proportions have risen in lower wealth districts and declined in more wealthy districts.

- The wealthiest districts had per pupil central spending about 11 percent higher than that of the least wealthy districts although, after adjusting for cost-of-living differences between districts (using the factors associated with the School Finance Act), the disparity drops to three percent. In part, this low disparity reflects the fact that per pupil spending did not rise as rapidly in the highest wealth districts in comparison to any other districts.

- There are no significant differences in the way districts spent their funds for major purposes based on their wealth. All districts, regardless of wealth, decreased the proportion of central spending for plant maintenance and operation and increased spending for pupil and staff support.

- There is a direct relationship between reliance on local revenue and district wealth and an inverse relationship between reliance on state aid and district wealth. The poorest districts in terms of property valuation per pupil obtain 30.5 percent of their current revenue from local sources and 62.7 percent from state aid while the wealthiest districts obtained 68.3 percent of their current revenue from local sources and 25.0 percent from state aid. This result is produced despite the fact that state aid grew much more rapidly in the wealthiest districts in the last decade than it did in the poorest districts.

- The spending “gap” (the difference between actual spending in a particular year and anticipated spending in light of inflation and enrollment growth since 1988-89) is smaller in less wealthy districts than it is in wealthy districts

(the gap in the least wealthy districts was $348 while it was $924 in the wealthiest districts). The gap has increased in the wealthiest districts and decreased in all others over time.

# TABLE 1

## COMPARISON OF CHANGE IN NUMBER OF PUPILS, PUPILS ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION, AND PUPILS FROM LOW INCOME FAMILIES BETWEEN 1988-89 AND 1998-99

| | | Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **1988-89** | **1996-97** | **1997-98** | **1998-99** |
| **(1)** | **All Pupils (FTE)** | **536,196** | **643,744** | **650,050** | **669,041** |
| | *Change from Earlier Year* | | *2.3%*[1] | *1.0%* | *2.9%* |
| **(2)** | **Pupils in Special Education (Head Count)** | **50,681** | **71,160**[2] | **72,663** | **74,695** |
| | *Percentage of All Pupils* | *9.5%* | *11.1%* | *11.2%* | *11.2%* |
| **(3)** | **Pupils from Low Income Families (Free Lunch Program Head Count)** | **96,812** | **145,952** | **143,249** | **145,494** |
| | *Percentage of All Pupils* | *18.1%* | *22.7%* | *22.0%* | *21.7%* |

[1] This is an average annual figure for the period 1988-89 to 1996-97.

[2] In 1994-95 the approach to counting pupils in special education changed.

# TABLE 2

## COMPARISON OF CHANGE IN PER PUPIL REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES BETWEEN 1988-89 AND 1998-99

| | | Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | CY1989 | FY1997 | FY1998 | FY1999 |
| | **Current Operating Revenues:** | | | | |
| **(1)** | **Local** | **$2,602** | **$2,621** | **$2,660** | **$2,906** |
| | *Change from Earlier Year* | | *- 0.1%[1]* | *1.2%* | *9.2%* |
| **(2)** | **State** | **$1,797** | **$2,559** | **$2,712** | **$2,788** |
| | *Change from Earlier Year* | | *4.5%[1]* | *6.0%* | *2.8%* |
| **(3)** | **Federal** | **$226** | **$306** | **$319** | **$337** |
| **(4)** | **Total** | **$4,629** | **$5,487** | **$5,697** | **$6,047** |
| | *Change from Earlier Year* | | *2.1%[1]* | *3.8%* | *6.1%* |

[1] These figures are average annual percentage changes for the period 1988-89 to 1996-97.

# TABLE 2 (Continued)

| | | Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | CY1989 | FY1997 | FY1998 | FY1999 |
| | **Current Operating Expenditures:** | | | | |
| **(5)** | **"Central" per Pupil[2]** | **$4,020** | **$4,877** | **$5,096** | **$5,241** |
| | *Change from Earlier Year* | | *2.4%[1]* | *4.5%* | *2.8%* |
| | Adjusted by CPI[3] to FY1998 | $5,712 | $5,160 | $5,218 | $5,241 |
| **(6)** | **Other Operating per Pupil** | **$532** | **$626** | **$594** | **$679** |
| | *Change from Earlier Year* | | *2.1%[1]* | *- 5.1%* | *14.3%* |
| | Adjusted by CPI[3] to FY1998 | $756 | $662 | $608 | $679 |
| **(7)** | **Distribution by Function:** | | | | |
| | **Instruction** | **66.2%** | **66.9%** | **65.8%** | **65.9%** |
| | **Plant Operation** | **11.7%** | **9.9%** | **9.9%** | **9.7%** |
| | **Administration** | **9.4%** | **9.3%** | **9.5%** | **9.2%** |
| | **Support** | **12.7%** | **13.9%** | **14.9%** | **15.3%** |

---

2 "Central" *excludes* spending for capital purposes, transportation, food services, and community services.

3 To get to FY1999, multiply: FY1999 by 1.000; FY1998 by 1.024; FY1997 by 1.058; and CY1989 by 1.421.

# TABLE 3

## COMPARISON OF ANTICIPATED AND ACTUAL CHANGE IN CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURES BETWEEN CY1989 AND FY1999

| | Change in Revenue Due to: | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Inflation | Growth | Inflation and Growth |
| **CY1989 to FY1999** | | | |
| **Anticipated Increase in Revenue** | **$907,386,592** | **$758,797,660** | **$1,666,184,252** |
| **Actual Increase in Revenue** | **$655,084,351** | **$696,288,631** | **$1,351,372,983** |
| **Difference (Gap = Actual - Anticipated)** | **- $252,302,241** | **- $62,509,029** | **- $314,811,269** |
| **Per Pupil Gap** | **- $377** | **- $93** | **- $471** |

| **Change in Average Per Pupil Gap by Year** | |
|---|---|
| **FY1996** | **- $543** |
| **FY1997** | **- $526** |
| **FY1998** | **- $483** |
| **FY1999** | **- $471** |

Note: Inflation is calculated using the Denver-Boulder Consumer Price Index (CPI), which grew by the following amounts between CY1989 and: FY1996, 29.9%; FY1997, 34.4%, FY1998, 38.8%, and FY1999, 42.1%.

# TABLE 4

## COMPARISON OF CHANGE IN NUMBERS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS BETWEEN 1988-89 AND 1998-99

| | | Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1988-89 | 1996-97 | 1997-98 | 1998-99 |
| (1) | Classroom Teachers per 1,000 Pupils | 51.7 | 49.5 | 51.0 | 49.6 |
| (2) | Total Teachers per 1,000 Pupils | 58.1 | 56.4 | 58.0 | 58.8 |
| (3) | Average Teacher Salary | $29,614 | $36,293 | $37,232 | $38,229 |
| | Adjusted to CPI[1] to FY1998 | $42,081 | $38,398 | $38,126 | $38,229 |
| (4) | Average Number of Years of Experience | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| (5) | Percentage of Teachers with at Least a Masters Degree | 47.3% | 47.2% | 46.5% | 46.5% |

[1] To get to 1998-1999, multiply: 1998-1999 by 1.000; 1997-1998 by 1.024; 1996-1997 by 1.058; and 1988-89 by 1.421.

# TABLE 5

## COMPARISON OF CHANGE IN STATEWIDE POPULATION, PROPERTY VALUE, AND PERSONAL INCOME BETWEEN 1988-89 AND 1998-99

| | | Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1988-89 | 1996-97 | 1997-98 | 1998-99 |
| (1) | **Population** | **3,271,400** | **3,812,700** | **3,891,300** | **3,969,000** |
| | *Change from Earlier Year* | | *1.9%*[1] | *2.1%* | *2.0%* |
| (2) | **Property Valuation (millions)** | **$33,241** | **$32,287** | **$33,384** | **$38,299** |
| | *Change from Earlier Year* | | *- 0.4%*[1] | *3.4%* | *14.7%* |
| (3) | **Aggregate Personal Income (millions)** | **$53,966** | **$100,012** | **$109,228** | **$119,044** |
| | *Change from Earlier Year* | | *8.0%*[1] | *9.2%* | *9.0%* |
| (4) | **Proportion of Personal Income Consumed by Current Operating Support for K-12 Education:** | | | | |
| | ***Local Property Taxes:*** | | | | |
| | **Total (millions)** | **$1,131** | **$1,267** | **$1,300** | **$1,390** |
| | **Percentage of Aggregate Personal Income** | **2.10%** | **1.27%** | **1.19%** | **1.17%** |

[1] This is an average annual figure for the period 1988-89 to 1996-97.

## TABLE 5 (Continued)

| | Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1988-89 | 1996-97 | 1997-98 | 1998-99 |
| **(5) Proportion of Personal Income Consumed by Current Operating Support for K-12 Education:** | | | | |
| ***State General Fund Aid:*** | | | | |
| **Total (millions)** | **$964** | **$1,647** | **$1,763** | **$1,865** |
| **Percentage of Aggregate Personal Income** | **1.79%** | **1.65%** | **1.61%** | **1.57%** |

Source: "Focus Colorado: Economic & Revenue Forecast, 1999-2005" (Legislative Council, December 1999)

Note: Some figures for 1995-96 and 1996-97 are different from those used in earlier reports due to revisions by the Legislative Council.

# TABLE 6

## PROFILE OF SCHOOL FINANCE CHANGE, 1988-89 TO 1998-99
## *DISTRICTS GROUPED BY ENROLLMENT*

| | Enrollment Category | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Less Than 1,000 | 1,000-9,999 | 10,000-19,999 | 20,000-49,999 | More Than 50,000 |
| Group Characteristics: | | | | | |
| Number of Districts | 103 | 55 | 9 | 7 | 2 |
| 1998-99 Enrollment | 36,891 | 148,631 | 132,616 | 201,118 | 149,786 |
| Change in Pupils 1988-89 to 1998-99: | | | | | |
| Change in Total Enroll. | 6,139 | 31,459 | 18,669 | 54,340 | 22,239 |
| *% Change* | *20.0%* | *26.8%* | *16.4%* | *37.0%* | *17.4%* |
| % Spec. Ed. 1988-89 | 10.4% | 10.0% | 9.3% | 9.2% | 9.0% |
| % Spec. Ed. 1998-99 | 11.9% | 11.5% | 10.7% | 11.2% | 10.9% |
| % Free Lunch 1988-89 | 28.8% | 21.4% | 18.8% | 11.7% | 19.0% |
| % Free Lunch 1998-99 | 27.9% | 21.9% | 23.0% | 13.3% | 30.3% |
| Teachers | | | | | |
| 1998-99 Tchrs./1,000 Pupils | 81.4 | 62.8 | 59.0 | 57.1 | 51.2 |
| *Change in Tchrs./1,000* | *-0.7* | *3.6* | *3.1* | *1.6* | *- 4.9* |
| 1998-99 Average Salary | $29,087 | $34,440 | $37,462 | $40,780 | $43,375 |
| *Change in Salary* | *33.9%* | *28.4%* | *28.6%* | *27.7%* | *31.8%* |
| Years of Experience: | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | 10.8 | 12.6 | 13.2 | 12.8 | 14.5 |
| 1998-99 | 10.8 | 11.8 | 14.3 | 13.4 | 12.4 |
| % with Masters or More: | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | 24.8% | 38.7% | 48.1% | 51.5% | 58.2% |
| 1997-98 | 25.5% | 41.3% | 46.7% | 50.5% | 55.0% |

## TABLE 6 (Continued)

| | Enrollment Category | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Less Than 1,000 | 1,000-9,999 | 10,000-19,999 | 20,000-49,999 | More Than 50,000 |
| **Spending** | | | | | |
| FY1999 Total "Central" Per Pupil | $5,986 | $5,072 | $4,963 | $5,374 | $5,294 |
| *% Change CY1989 to FY1999 (Denver-Boulder CPI = 42.1%)* | *39.8%* | *34.6%* | *35.0%* | *29.2%* | *22.2%* |
| Percentage of Total "Central" by Function: | | | | | |
| Instruction | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 66.4% | 66.4% | 66.4% | 65.5% | 66.4% |
| FY1999 | 64.8% | 66.7% | 66.4% | 66.3% | 64.5% |
| Administration | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 14.3% | 10.9% | 8.5% | 8.8% | 8.5% |
| FY1999 | 13.8% | 9.5% | 8.3% | 8.8% | 8.9% |
| Plant M&O | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 12.4% | 12.1% | 12.0% | 11.4% | 11.3% |
| FY1999 | 11.0% | 10.4% | 9.4% | 9.2% | 9.6% |
| Pupil/Staff/ Other Support | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 6.9% | 10.5% | 13.1% | 14.3% | 13.8% |
| FY1999 | 10.3% | 13.4% | 15.9% | 15.7% | 17.1% |
| **Revenue** | | | | | |
| Total "Central" Spending as a Percent of Total Operating Revenue | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 80.6% | 86.1% | 87.5% | 88.9% | 86.3% |
| FY1999 | 85.7% | 86.0% | 88.6% | 87.2% | 85.4% |

# TABLE 6 (Continued)

| | Enrollment Category | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Less Than 1,000 | 1,000-9,999 | 10,000-19,999 | 20,000-49,999 | More Than 50,000 |
| **Revenue (Continued)** | | | | | |
| FY1999 Percent of Total Operating Revenue: | | | | | |
| Local | 41.9% | 46.7% | 37.3% | 53.0% | 53.0% |
| State | 53.3% | 46.2% | 56.4% | 42.6% | 40.4% |
| Federal | 4.3% | 6.8% | 6.1% | 3.9% | 6.5% |
| Change in Operating Revenue per Pupil CY1989 to FY1999: | | | | | |
| Local | - 0.4% | 18.4% | 16.3% | 19.6% | - 1.7% |
| State | 76.7% | 50.8% | 45.7% | 48.7% | 76.9% |
| Federal | 24.0% | 71.7% | 45.8% | 32.5% | 57.1% |
| Revenue Gap per Pupil: | | | | | |
| FY1996 vs. CY1989 | $460 | $402 | $308 | $707 | $705 |
| FY1997 vs. CY1989 | $419 | $366 | $350 | $675 | $683 |
| FY1998 vs. CY1989 | $150 | $278 | $331 | $634 | $720 |
| FY1999 vs. Cy1989 | $97 | $282 | $261 | $539 | $863 |
| **Assessed Valuation** | | | | | |
| 1998-99 per Pupil | $79,816 | $69,831 | $39,897 | $52,204 | $61,322 |
| *% Change* | *8.3%* | *11.3%* | *- 0.1%* | *- 16.2%* | *- 21.3%* |

# TABLE 7

## PROFILE OF SCHOOL FINANCE CHANGE, 1988-89 TO 1998-99
## *DISTRICTS GROUPED BY CHANGE IN ENROLLMENT*

| | Enrollment Change Category | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Decrease | Up to 12.9% | 13.0%-24.9% | 25.0%-44.9% | More Than 45.0% |
| Group Characteristics: | | | | | |
| Number of Districts | 24 | 42 | 36 | 39 | 35 |
| 1998-99 Enrollment | 29,693 | 135,472 | 248,066 | 126,107 | 129,705 |
| Average Enrollment | 1,237 | 3,226 | 6,891 | 3,234 | 3,706 |
| Change in Pupils 1988-89 to 1998-99: | | | | | |
| Change in Total Enroll. | -1,892 | 10,005 | 38,931 | 30,371 | 55,431 |
| *% Change* | *-6.0%* | *8.0%* | *18.6%* | *31.7%* | *74.6%* |
| % Spec. Ed. 1988-89 | 9.5% | 10.3% | 9.3% | 9.5% | 8.4% |
| % Spec. Ed. 1998-99 | 11.4% | 11.6% | 11.3% | 11.5% | 10.1% |
| % Free Lunch 1988-89 | 38.3% | 19.5% | 19.2% | 15.6% | 7.0% |
| % Free Lunch 1998-99 | 42.3% | 26.4% | 27.1% | 16.9% | 6.6% |
| Teachers | | | | | |
| 1998-99 Tchrs./1,000 Pupils | 68.7 | 61.0 | 54.5 | 59.6 | 61.6 |
| *Change in Tchrs./1,000* | *7.8* | *2.9* | *- 2.7* | *1.2* | *2.9* |
| 1998-99 Average Salary | $33,606 | $37,145 | $40,241 | $37,821 | $37,510 |
| *Change in Salary* | *23.9%* | *24.7%* | *32.2%* | *31.2%* | *28.4%* |
| Years of Experience: | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | 14.3 | 13.5 | 13.5 | 12.2 | 11.4 |
| 1998-99 | 13.9 | 13.5 | 13.0 | 12.8 | 11.4 |
| % with Masters or More: | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | 43.9% | 48.2% | 49.5% | 45.7% | 43.7% |
| 1998-99 | 44.4% | 42.5% | 48.9% | 46.8% | 47.0% |

# TABLE 7 (Continued)

| | Enrollment Change Category | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Decrease | Up to 12.9% | 13.0%-24.9% | 25.0%-45.9% | More Than 45.0% |
| **Spending** | | | | | |
| FY1999 Total "Central" Per Pupil | $5,318 | $5,374 | $5,153 | $5,229 | $5,267 |
| *% Change CY1989 to FY1999 (Denver-Boulder CPI = 42.1%)* | *37.8%* | *36.0%* | *26.8%* | *32.4%* | *26.2%* |
| Percentage of Total "Central" by Function: | | | | | |
| Instruction | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 65.4% | 65.7% | 66.6% | 67.3% | 64.8% |
| FY1999 | 65.1% | 64.9% | 65.4% | 66.7% | 67.2% |
| Administration | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 10.3% | 9.4% | 8.9% | 9.9% | 9.9% |
| FY1999 | 10.0% | 9.3% | 8.9% | 9.8% | 9.0% |
| Plant M&O | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 11.8% | 11.2% | 11.6% | 11.3% | 13.2% |
| FY1999 | 10.3% | 9.7% | 9.7% | 9.3% | 9.9% |
| Pupil/Staff/ Other Support | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 12.5% | 13.7% | 12.9% | 11.6% | 12.0% |
| FY1999 | 14.6% | 16.2% | 16.0% | 14.2% | 13.9% |
| **Revenue** | | | | | |
| Total "Central" Spending as a Percent of Total Operating Revenue | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 88.1% | 85.5% | 86.9% | 87.3% | 88.0% |
| FY1999 | 88.6% | 88.5% | 85.5% | 86.7% | 86.7% |

# TABLE 7 (Continued)

| | Enrollment Change Category | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Decrease | Up to 12.9% | 13.0%-24.9% | 25.0%-44.9% | More Than 45.0% |
| **Revenue (Continued)** | | | | | |
| FY1999 Percent of Total Operating Revenue: | | | | | |
| Local | 31.9% | 40.1% | 48.0% | 52.7% | 55.5% |
| State | 59.6% | 52.8% | 45.6% | 41.4% | 41.7% |
| Federal | 8.5% | 6.3% | 6.3% | 5.8% | 2.7% |
| Change in Operating Revenue per Pupil CY1989 to FY1999: | | | | | |
| Local | 28.1% | 8.2% | 3.5% | 27.6% | 3.7% |
| State | 39.2% | 51.5% | 67.1% | 36.3% | 92.0% |
| Federal | 62.3% | 53.8% | 60.4% | 73.9% | 2.1% |
| Revenue Gap per Pupil: | | | | | |
| FY1996 vs. CY1989[1] | | | | | |
| FY1997 vs. CY1989 | $273 | $570 | $423 | $628 | $635 |
| FY1998 vs. CY1989 | $21 | $545 | $413 | $559 | $626 |
| FY1999 vs. CY1989 | $164 | $243 | $620 | $382 | $662 |
| **Assessed Valuation** | | | | | |
| 1998-99 per Pupil | $40,095 | $47,586 | $56,077 | $66,530 | $64,463 |
| *% Change* | *28.1%* | *-8.6%* | *-14.5%* | *8.4%* | *-21.7%* |

[1] Not available because only four groups were used in that year.

# TABLE 8

## PROFILE OF SCHOOL FINANCE CHANGE, 1988-89 TO 1998-99
## *DISTRICTS GROUPED BY PROPERTY WEALTH PER PUPIL*

| | Property Wealth Category | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Less Than $34,599 | $34,600-$48,599 | $48,600-$50,599 | $50,600-$73,599 | More Than $73,600 |
| Group Characteristics | | | | | |
| Number of Districts: | 39 | 42 | 5 | 37 | 53 |
| 1998-99 Enrollment: | 152,971 | 110,158 | 146,934 | 125,071 | 133,908 |
| Average Enrollment | 3,922 | 2,623 | 29,387 | 3,380 | 2,527 |
| Change in Pupils 1988-89 to 1998-99: | | | | | |
| Change in Total Enroll. | 23,883 | 23,132 | 34,638 | 26,451 | 24,742 |
| *% Change* | *18.5%* | *26.6%* | *30.8%* | *26.8%* | *22.7%* |
| % Spec. Ed. 1988-89 | 9.9% | 10.1% | 8.4% | 9.2% | 9.7% |
| % Spec. Ed. 1998-99 | 12.0% | 11.2% | 9.5% | 11.0% | 12.1% |
| % Free Lunch 1988-89 | 23.4% | 21.5% | 6.6% | 13.8% | 24.6% |
| % Free Lunch 1998-99 | 26.5% | 23.7% | 8.8% | 15.7% | 34.5% |
| Teachers | | | | | |
| 1998-99 Tchrs./1,000 Pupils | 59.6 | 62.4 | 53.4 | 59.2 | 60.3 |
| *Change in Tchrs./1,000* | *2.4* | *2.7* | *0.8* | *2.1* | *- 3.8* |
| 1998-99 Average Salary | $36,772 | $34,499 | $41,489 | $38,497 | $39,630 |
| *Change in Salary* | *29.2%* | *31.8%* | *26.1%* | *24.3%* | *34.3%* |
| Years of Experience | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | 13.3 | 11.7 | 13.3 | 13.1 | 13.5 |
| 1998-99 | 12.8 | 11.8 | 13.2 | 13.8 | 12.4 |
| % with Masters or More | | | | | |
| 1988-89 | 41.7% | 40.9% | 53.2% | 51.4% | 49.9% |
| 1998-99 | 42.5% | 41.2% | 53.1% | 48.3% | 47.7% |

# TABLE 8 (Continued)

| | Property Wealth Category | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Less Than $34,599 | $34,600-$48,599 | $48,600-$50,599 | $50,600-$73,599 | More Than $73,600 |
| **Spending** | | | | | |
| FY1999 Total "Central" Per Pupil | $5,031 | $5,031 | $5,156 | $5,412 | $5,590 |
| *% Change CY1989 to FY1999 (Denver-Boulder CPI = 42.1%)* | *32.9%* | *37.6%* | *31.3%* | *31.2%* | *21.9%* |
| Percentage of Total "Central" by Function: | | | | | |
| Instruction | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 65.7% | 67.1% | 65.2% | 66.0% | 66.9% |
| FY1999 | 64.9% | 67.5% | 64.4% | 66.5% | 66.6% |
| Administration | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 9.6% | 9.8% | 8.5% | 9.1% | 10.1% |
| FY1999 | 9.7% | 8.8% | 9.4% | 8.5% | 9.4% |
| Plant M&O | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 11.6% | 12.1% | 12.3% | 11.8% | 11.0% |
| FY1999 | 10.0% | 9.8% | 9.6% | 9.6% | 9.5% |
| Pupil/Staff/ Other Support | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 13.0% | 11.0% | 14.0% | 13.1% | 12.0% |
| FY1999 | 15.4% | 14.0% | 16.7% | 15.3% | 14.5% |
| **Revenue** | | | | | |
| Total "Central" Spending as a Percent of Total Operating Revenue | | | | | |
| CY1989 | 88.5% | 85.9% | 89.1% | 87.4% | 83.6% |
| FY1999 | 87.0% | 88.0% | 89.4% | 88.4% | 81.5% |

# TABLE 8 (Continued)

| | Property Wealth Category | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Less Than $34,599 | $34,600-$48,599 | $48,600-$50,599 | $50,600-$73,599 | More Than $73,600 |
| **Revenue (Continued)** | | | | | |
| FY1999 Percent of Total Operating Revenue: | | | | | |
| Local | 30.5% | 35.7% | 49.7% | 52.2% | 68.3% |
| State | 62.7% | 56.8% | 47.0% | 42.5% | 25.0% |
| Federal | 6.7% | 7.3% | 3.2% | 4.5% | 6.4% |
| Change in Operating Revenue per Pupil CY1989 to FY1999: | | | | | |
| Local | 12.8% | 9.3% | 20.6% | 7.2% | 9.0% |
| State | 46.8% | 54.3% | 40.9% | 68.2% | 100.7% |
| Federal | 58.7% | 49.1% | 72.3% | 45.2% | 37.9% |
| Revenue Gap per Pupil | | | | | |
| FY1996 vs. CY1989 | $337 | $416 | $690 | $586 | $728 |
| FY1997 vs. CY1989 | $387 | $302 | $547 | $658 | $757 |
| FY1998 vs. CY1989 | $330 | $171 | $516 | $555 | $833 |
| FY1999 vs. CY1989 | $348 | $166 | $426 | $451 | $924 |
| **Assessed Valuation** | | | | | |
| 1998-99 per Pupil | $29,403 | $40,076 | $49,311 | $56,587 | $112,490 |
| *% Change* | *-12.1%* | *-3.3%* | *-8.6%* | *-17.0%* | *-2.0%* |