

# WEIGHTED STUDENT FUNDING MODEL

Prepared for Delaware Department of Education

May 2015



In the following report, Hanover Research projects school-level funding for 222 public schools in Delaware based on a weighted student funding formula.



[www.hanoverresearch.com](http://www.hanoverresearch.com)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Introduction .....	3
Contents.....	3
<b>Section I: Data and Methodology</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Data.....	4
Student-Level Data .....	4
Budget for Fiscal Year 2015 .....	5
Methodology .....	5
State-, District-, and School-Level Allocations .....	5
Per-Student Weighting Factors.....	5
<b>Section II: Weighted Student Funding</b> .....	<b>7</b>
School-Level Funding .....	7
District-Level Funding .....	8
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>9</b>

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

School reform literature generally argues that a weighted student funding (WSF) formula provides an equitable method of allocating state funds to the students with the highest need. The WSF model for school funding, also called the “student-based budgeting” model is a school, district, and state education finance system that allocates funds based on enrollment and identified student needs. In fact, as of 2013, 37 states use at least one student-based formula factor that explicitly allocates additional funds on a per pupil basis for students with higher needs such as special education, low income, and English language learner students.

In this report, Hanover Research analyzes student-level data provided by the Delaware Department of Education to estimate district- and school-level funding based on a proposed weighted student funding formula. This research should allow Delaware to evaluate the potential effects of such a formula on funding distribution and to make comparisons to its current unit system as it explores the possible advantages and disadvantages of moving toward a new funding structure for its K-12 public school system.

Overall, the analysis concludes that a WSF in Delaware would result in a baseline per-student funding of \$6,209.92 at the school level and \$7,305.79 at the district level based on a projected budget of \$1,227,493,100.

## CONTENTS

This report comprises two sections:

- **Section I: Data and Methodology** describes the dataset provided by Delaware Department of Education and the methodology Hanover Research uses to project funding for Delaware’s public schools and districts.
- **Section II: Weighted Student Funding** summarizes the results of Hanover’s projections and identifies the highest- and lowest-ranking schools and districts in terms of projected funding.

The **Interactive Data Supplement** that accompanies this report provides additional details on district- and school-level funding for all 222 public schools and 43 districts in the state of Delaware. The simulation tool allows the user to adjust key inputs such as the overall funding level and percentage distribution to the state, districts, and schools. Based on the adjusted inputs entered by the user, the simulation tool automatically updates the funding allocations for each district and school in the state.

## SECTION I: DATA AND METHODOLOGY

In this section, Hanover Research presents the methodological approach to projecting district- and school-level funding based on the available data.

### DATA

#### STUDENT-LEVEL DATA

For the purposes of conducting the present analysis, the Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) provided Hanover Research with data on 134,442 students in 222 schools in 43 districts. The dataset included information on student-level characteristics such as grade level, socioeconomic status, and special education needs, among others. Figure 1.1, below, provides a summary of student characteristics in the state that are relevant to this analysis.

**Figure 1.1: Summary Statistics**

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS	PERCENT	NUMBER
<b>Grade Level</b>		
Pre-Kindergarten <sup>1</sup>	1%	1,672
Kindergarten	8%	10,305
1	8%	10,818
2	8%	10,507
3	8%	10,484
4	8%	10,239
5	8%	10,262
6	8%	10,380
7	8%	10,147
8	7%	10,044
9	9%	11,740
10	8%	10,206
11	7%	8,928
12	6%	8,710
<b>Special Education Status</b>		
Basic	7%	9,383
Intense	3%	4,533
Complex	2%	2,648
<b>Other Factors</b>		
Low Income	35%	47,186
English Language Learner	6%	8,101
Migrant or Homeless	1%	1,153

N=134,442

<sup>1</sup> Of all students listed as pre-kindergarten, 300 are classified as special education (intense severity), 328 are classified as special education (complex severity), and the remaining 1,044 are assumed to have special education (basic severity).

## BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

In addition to student-level data, the DDOE provided Hanover Research with projected statewide funding for K-12 public education in fiscal year 2015, including direction on distribution of the overall budget at the state, district, and school levels. The estimated total state funding available for FY 2015 used in this report is \$1,227,493,100.

## METHODOLOGY

### STATE-, DISTRICT-, AND SCHOOL-LEVEL ALLOCATIONS

Before analyzing student-level characteristics, Hanover Research first estimates the overall budget available at the state, district, and school levels. The funding formula modelled in this report allocates 7 percent of the total budget to the DDOE (\$85,924,517). Of the remaining budget (\$1,141,568,583) for district and school distribution, 15 percent of the total budget for the local education agencies (LEAs) (\$171,235,287) remains at each district office while schools receive the remainder (\$970,333,296) based on the per-student weighted funding formula. For district-level projections, we use the amount of funding prior to the LEA adjustment.

Figure 1.2, below, provides an overview of how this funding model allocates the budget at the state, district, and school levels.

**Figure 1.2: Budget Distribution, FY 2015**

BUDGET CATEGORY	AMOUNT
<b>Overall Budget</b>	<b>\$1,227,493,100</b>
Amount reserved for DDOE	\$85,924,517
Overall amount available for LEA allocation	\$1,141,568,583
<i>Amount reserved for LEA administration</i>	<i>\$171,235,287</i>
<i>Amount reserved for school-level distribution</i>	<i>\$970,333,296</i>

### PER-STUDENT WEIGHTING FACTORS

In a weighted student funding model, students receive a baseline amount of funding which is adjusted (or “weighted”) based on various student-level characteristics. For example, according to this model, districts may receive additional funds on a per-student basis for English language learners (ELLs), special education students, and so on. Students that are classified with multiple eligible funding factors (e.g., ELL and special education classification) receive additional funding beyond the baseline amount for each category. Rather than allocating funds solely by the number of enrolled students, this model multiplies each student’s baseline funding by factors drawn from the weighting classifications listed in Figure 1.3 on the following page.

**Figure 1.3: Weighted Student Funding Factors**

STUDENT CHARACTERISTIC	FACTOR <sup>2</sup>
<b>Grade Level</b>	
Pre-K <sup>3</sup>	1.05
Grades K-5	1.00
Grades 6-8	1.08
Grades 9-12	1.05
<b>Special Education</b>	
Basic	1.05
Intense	1.40
Complex	2.50
<b>Other Factors</b>	
Low Income	1.12
English Language Learner	1.50
Migrant or Homeless <sup>4</sup>	1.20

Students who have multiple classifications receive a weighted funding factor for each classification. Thus, a Grade 1 low-income student *who is also* a migrant would have a weight of 1.34 ( $1 \times 1.12 \times 1.20$ ). After the weighting factor is calculated for each student individually, these per-student total weights are summed statewide to calculate the total weighted number of students, or “weights.”

Following this methodology, the baseline per-student funding (i.e., a student with a weighting factor of 1.0) is \$6,209.92 at the school level and \$7,305.79 at the district level. Following the example above, a Grade 1 low-income student who is also a migrant would receive a school-level, student-based allocation of \$8,321.29.

<sup>2</sup> A factor of 1.00 is equal to the baseline. Weighting factors were provided by DDOE.

<sup>3</sup> Pre-K students who are not classified as intense or complex are classified as basic. See

<sup>4</sup> Because the funding formula stipulates that extra funding is given for students who are homeless or migrants, we consolidate these into a single variable.

## SECTION II: WEIGHTED STUDENT FUNDING

This section presents the results of Hanover’s projections for school- and district-level funding according to the weighted student funding formula described previously. The comprehensive results of Hanover’s projections can be found in the data supplement that accompanies this report.

### SCHOOL-LEVEL FUNDING

Figure 2.1 presents school-level funding projections for the 10 highest- and lowest-ranking schools in terms of projected funding.

**Figure 2.1: Highest- and Lowest-Ranking Schools in Terms of Projected Funding**

RANK (OF 222)	DISTRICT NUMBER	SCHOOL NUMBER	STUDENTS	AVERAGE WEIGHT	TOTAL WEIGHTS	FUNDING
<i>Highest-Ranking 10 Schools in Terms of Funding</i>						
1	34	490	2,173	1.16	2,523.4	<b>\$15,670,332</b>
2	13	648	1,866	1.16	2,167.9	<b>\$13,462,471</b>
3	10	626	1,947	1.11	2,155.2	<b>\$13,383,777</b>
4	89	588	1,948	1.06	2,066.6	<b>\$12,833,554</b>
5	33	394	1,555	1.17	1,825.9	<b>\$11,338,396</b>
6	38	80	1,588	1.15	1,818.7	<b>\$11,293,824</b>
7	40	770	1,545	1.09	1,686.8	<b>\$10,475,166</b>
8	29	24	1,552	1.09	1,686.1	<b>\$10,470,450</b>
9	24	688	1,434	1.12	1,608.9	<b>\$9,991,240</b>
10	17	726	1,352	1.17	1,586.4	<b>\$9,851,412</b>
<i>Lowest-Ranking 10 Schools in Terms of Funding</i>						
213	29	13	118	1.19	141.0	<b>\$875,400</b>
214	10	628	111	1.10	121.7	<b>\$755,552</b>
215	33	354	104	1.12	116.6	<b>\$723,982</b>
216	36	689	49	2.35	115.0	<b>\$714,296</b>
217	33	537	73	1.38	100.5	<b>\$623,959</b>
218	10	615	52	1.81	94.0	<b>\$583,708</b>
219	32	530	22	2.70	59.3	<b>\$368,224</b>
220	36	745	46	1.17	53.7	<b>\$333,473</b>
221	15	663	37	1.15	42.7	<b>\$265,176</b>
222	16	765	6	1.58	9.5	<b>\$59,153</b>

## DISTRICT-LEVEL FUNDING

Figure 2.2 presents district level funding projections for the 10 highest- and lowest-ranking districts in terms of projected funding.

**Figure 2.2: Highest- and Lowest-Ranking Districts in Terms of Projected Funding**

RANK (OF 43)	DISTRICT NUMBER	SCHOOLS (N)	STUDENTS	AVERAGE WEIGHT	TOTAL WEIGHTS	FUNDING
<i>Highest-Ranking 10 Districts in Terms of Funding</i>						
1	33	30	16,255	1.23	20,007.9	<b>\$146,173,414</b>
2	32	27	16,302	1.18	19,211.7	<b>\$140,356,344</b>
3	31	16	10,740	1.12	12,076.8	<b>\$88,230,265</b>
4	36	17	9,842	1.22	11,967.2	<b>\$87,429,507</b>
5	34	15	9,825	1.19	11,678.0	<b>\$85,316,804</b>
6	29	16	9,877	1.08	10,708.1	<b>\$78,230,960</b>
7	10	13	7,249	1.16	8,387.7	<b>\$61,279,036</b>
8	13	12	6,665	1.20	7,985.6	<b>\$58,341,456</b>
9	17	8	5,075	1.19	6,026.8	<b>\$44,030,200</b>
10	24	8	5,279	1.11	5,872.4	<b>\$42,902,315</b>
<i>Lowest-Ranking 10 Districts in Terms of Funding</i>						
34	68	1	363	1.15	416.2	<b>\$3,040,502</b>
35	85	1	290	1.15	332.5	<b>\$2,429,147</b>
36	9,606	1	280	1.04	290.8	<b>\$2,124,241</b>
37	67	1	246	1.18	290.8	<b>\$2,124,240</b>
38	92	1	212	1.23	260.5	<b>\$1,903,129</b>
39	75	1	208	1.23	256.8	<b>\$1,875,812</b>
40	9,605	1	221	1.16	256.5	<b>\$1,874,111</b>
41	66	1	203	1.10	222.5	<b>\$1,625,685</b>
42	71	1	126	1.55	195.7	<b>\$1,430,064</b>
43	9,604	1	129	1.10	141.7	<b>\$1,035,565</b>



# APPENDIX

Figure A.1: School-Level Funding

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	TOTAL STUDENTS	AVERAGE WEIGHT PER STUDENT	TOTAL WEIGHTS	SCHOOL-LEVEL FUNDING
10	626	1,947	1.11	2,155.2	\$ 13,383,777
10	621	823	1.15	944.9	\$ 5,867,512
10	625	803	1.17	937.6	\$ 5,822,147
10	610	683	1.06	726.4	\$ 4,510,727
10	611	533	1.11	593.7	\$ 3,687,015
10	620	542	1.06	573.6	\$ 3,561,739
10	630	216	2.54	549.0	\$ 3,409,112
10	618	494	1.07	526.8	\$ 3,271,077
10	622	447	1.15	513.0	\$ 3,185,517
10	616	442	1.12	494.0	\$ 3,067,447
10	612	156	1.01	158.1	\$ 981,851
10	628	111	1.10	121.7	\$ 755,552
10	615	52	1.81	94.0	\$ 583,708
13	648	1,866	1.16	2,167.9	\$ 13,462,471
13	644	987	1.22	1,203.0	\$ 7,470,734
13	646	971	1.20	1,161.9	\$ 7,215,080
13	634	564	1.12	631.7	\$ 3,922,572
13	632	394	1.28	504.3	\$ 3,131,950
13	636	353	1.31	461.1	\$ 2,863,495
13	635	387	1.12	433.0	\$ 2,688,846
13	640	372	1.07	398.9	\$ 2,477,384
13	642	318	1.12	354.9	\$ 2,203,666
13	638	303	1.14	344.7	\$ 2,140,742
13	650	68	2.64	179.4	\$ 1,113,922
13	655	82	1.77	144.8	\$ 899,376
15	664	953	1.18	1,119.9	\$ 6,954,439

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	TOTAL STUDENTS	AVERAGE WEIGHT PER STUDENT	TOTAL WEIGHTS	SCHOOL-LEVEL FUNDING
15	665	934	1.13	1,059.8	\$ 6,581,203
15	669	574	1.10	630.1	\$ 3,912,743
15	660	489	1.08	529.6	\$ 3,288,949
15	662	467	1.10	513.8	\$ 3,190,966
15	658	358	1.13	403.5	\$ 2,505,466
15	663	37	1.15	42.7	\$ 265,176
16	782	635	1.17	743.0	\$ 4,614,059
16	752	596	1.18	701.6	\$ 4,356,894
16	756	502	1.17	585.6	\$ 3,636,292
16	753	438	1.12	492.7	\$ 3,059,592
16	765	6	1.59	9.5	\$ 59,153
17	726	1,352	1.17	1,586.4	\$ 9,851,412
17	712	722	1.09	786.6	\$ 4,884,775
17	720	552	1.25	689.4	\$ 4,281,065
17	722	613	1.10	675.3	\$ 4,193,412
17	724	563	1.19	669.0	\$ 4,154,241
17	710	563	1.18	666.6	\$ 4,139,758
17	721	579	1.15	666.1	\$ 4,136,225
17	728	131	2.19	287.4	\$ 1,784,782
18	675	1,024	1.18	1,206.7	\$ 7,493,338
18	678	1,043	1.14	1,191.3	\$ 7,397,864
18	672	627	1.17	734.9	\$ 4,563,629
18	673	563	1.15	645.6	\$ 4,009,133
18	668	523	1.17	612.1	\$ 3,801,380
18	670	417	1.14	477.3	\$ 2,963,748
23	764	860	1.24	1,065.7	\$ 6,617,700
23	766	719	1.22	880.0	\$ 5,464,907
23	761	575	1.18	679.5	\$ 4,219,668
23	760	461	1.21	555.6	\$ 3,450,355
23	762	437	1.26	551.0	\$ 3,421,543

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	TOTAL STUDENTS	AVERAGE WEIGHT PER STUDENT	TOTAL WEIGHTS	SCHOOL-LEVEL FUNDING
23	759	457	1.20	547.8	\$ 3,402,069
24	688	1,434	1.12	1,608.9	\$ 9,991,240
24	685	883	1.15	1,016.4	\$ 6,311,552
24	681	588	1.05	620.3	\$ 3,852,040
24	684	500	1.16	581.1	\$ 3,608,435
24	682	521	1.08	563.1	\$ 3,497,064
24	696	475	1.09	516.9	\$ 3,210,207
24	680	475	1.05	498.6	\$ 3,096,454
24	686	403	1.16	467.0	\$ 2,899,977
29	24	1,552	1.09	1,686.1	\$ 10,470,450
29	18	1,361	1.09	1,483.0	\$ 9,209,095
29	23	905	1.13	1,020.5	\$ 6,337,257
29	16	825	1.13	934.3	\$ 5,801,786
29	17	770	1.13	869.7	\$ 5,400,557
29	20	640	1.04	665.6	\$ 4,133,598
29	32	625	1.05	656.9	\$ 4,079,149
29	28	569	1.04	593.2	\$ 3,683,913
29	11	544	1.07	584.0	\$ 3,626,757
29	10	503	1.09	546.7	\$ 3,394,686
29	21	490	1.05	516.7	\$ 3,208,928
29	14	320	1.05	335.4	\$ 2,083,067
29	22	268	1.01	270.2	\$ 1,677,673
29	29	231	1.05	243.6	\$ 1,512,464
29	27	156	1.03	161.3	\$ 1,001,536
29	13	118	1.19	141.0	\$ 875,400
31	196	1,120	1.14	1,273.9	\$ 7,910,573
31	194	1,086	1.10	1,191.8	\$ 7,400,693
31	170	952	1.18	1,119.8	\$ 6,954,018
31	190	906	1.13	1,027.2	\$ 6,378,947
31	178	881	1.14	1,003.5	\$ 6,231,774

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	TOTAL STUDENTS	AVERAGE WEIGHT PER STUDENT	TOTAL WEIGHTS	SCHOOL-LEVEL FUNDING
31	151	803	1.15	925.2	\$ 5,745,266
31	176	764	1.10	839.6	\$ 5,214,092
31	180	666	1.16	774.9	\$ 4,812,157
31	110	562	1.08	607.3	\$ 3,771,569
31	128	559	1.08	601.6	\$ 3,736,182
31	130	540	1.08	581.6	\$ 3,611,511
31	112	501	1.07	537.5	\$ 3,338,045
31	132	448	1.13	505.8	\$ 3,141,122
31	156	393	1.18	462.1	\$ 2,869,357
31	124	411	1.09	447.7	\$ 2,780,083
31	510	148	1.20	177.2	\$ 1,100,336
32	284	1,215	1.13	1,377.6	\$ 8,554,983
32	292	1,108	1.14	1,268.2	\$ 7,875,233
32	261	1,105	1.05	1,162.4	\$ 7,218,433
32	286	935	1.08	1,008.4	\$ 6,261,791
32	280	874	1.14	999.9	\$ 6,209,159
32	276	841	1.17	986.3	\$ 6,124,603
32	294	796	1.16	923.6	\$ 5,735,264
32	250	837	1.08	906.7	\$ 5,630,537
32	290	702	1.17	819.2	\$ 5,087,107
32	252	633	1.24	781.8	\$ 4,854,713
32	264	577	1.31	754.9	\$ 4,688,095
32	282	616	1.20	742.2	\$ 4,609,099
32	270	702	1.04	733.1	\$ 4,552,482
32	256	539	1.33	717.5	\$ 4,455,620
32	274	533	1.27	677.2	\$ 4,205,146
32	246	471	1.42	668.9	\$ 4,153,830
32	242	605	1.04	631.5	\$ 3,921,417
32	266	529	1.16	612.2	\$ 3,801,556
32	240	529	1.10	582.5	\$ 3,617,206

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	TOTAL STUDENTS	AVERAGE WEIGHT PER STUDENT	TOTAL WEIGHTS	SCHOOL-LEVEL FUNDING
32	254	479	1.16	555.4	\$ 3,448,799
32	260	405	1.09	440.5	\$ 2,735,322
32	526	303	1.44	435.0	\$ 2,701,182
32	244	368	1.15	424.0	\$ 2,632,771
32	516	155	2.48	385.1	\$ 2,391,220
32	248	315	1.12	352.6	\$ 2,189,855
32	527	108	1.91	206.0	\$ 1,279,244
32	530	22	2.70	59.3	\$ 368,224
33	394	1,555	1.17	1,825.9	\$ 11,338,396
33	372	1,210	1.23	1,493.3	\$ 9,273,478
33	392	992	1.23	1,223.2	\$ 7,595,936
33	376	995	1.20	1,197.3	\$ 7,435,011
33	390	843	1.26	1,060.4	\$ 6,585,282
33	374	823	1.24	1,016.5	\$ 6,312,469
33	327	725	1.27	919.8	\$ 5,712,075
33	312	681	1.09	740.6	\$ 4,599,348
33	321	673	1.09	730.6	\$ 4,537,243
33	339	590	1.21	715.7	\$ 4,444,156
33	322	584	1.15	671.1	\$ 4,167,666
33	330	564	1.13	638.1	\$ 3,962,614
33	352	467	1.35	628.2	\$ 3,900,843
33	320	517	1.12	579.5	\$ 3,598,872
33	324	446	1.25	558.9	\$ 3,470,602
33	358	425	1.31	555.2	\$ 3,447,594
33	334	450	1.23	554.8	\$ 3,445,360
33	326	457	1.19	543.1	\$ 3,372,783
33	318	474	1.13	537.8	\$ 3,339,970
33	350	401	1.25	501.7	\$ 3,115,496
33	314	430	1.12	481.2	\$ 2,988,326
33	332	368	1.22	448.1	\$ 2,782,642

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	TOTAL STUDENTS	AVERAGE WEIGHT PER STUDENT	TOTAL WEIGHTS	SCHOOL-LEVEL FUNDING
33	310	321	1.26	405.6	\$ 2,519,018
33	538	152	2.66	404.5	\$ 2,511,745
33	545	255	1.55	396.1	\$ 2,459,688
33	362	311	1.17	364.2	\$ 2,261,950
33	356	257	1.18	302.1	\$ 1,876,241
33	540	112	2.65	297.1	\$ 1,844,658
33	354	104	1.12	116.6	\$ 723,982
33	537	73	1.38	100.5	\$ 623,959
34	490	2,173	1.16	2,523.4	\$ 15,670,332
34	422	1,114	1.08	1,207.8	\$ 7,500,154
34	470	991	1.16	1,145.3	\$ 7,112,282
34	427	859	1.22	1,045.6	\$ 6,492,879
34	476	740	1.21	897.0	\$ 5,570,405
34	474	671	1.24	833.5	\$ 5,176,090
34	412	658	1.17	769.1	\$ 4,775,946
34	432	553	1.17	649.6	\$ 4,034,141
34	456	539	1.19	643.8	\$ 3,997,750
34	418	484	1.14	551.1	\$ 3,422,140
34	420	371	1.19	440.3	\$ 2,734,012
34	410	354	1.18	417.1	\$ 2,590,247
34	514	94	2.63	247.3	\$ 1,535,459
34	522	114	1.42	162.0	\$ 1,005,967
34	450	110	1.32	145.2	\$ 901,480
35	775	608	1.24	752.1	\$ 4,670,444
35	780	606	1.21	736.3	\$ 4,572,087
35	776	594	1.17	692.3	\$ 4,299,217
35	779	576	1.17	673.6	\$ 4,182,768
36	748	1,316	1.19	1,559.7	\$ 9,685,908
36	692	756	1.36	1,031.3	\$ 6,404,443
36	746	859	1.15	992.1	\$ 6,160,921

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	TOTAL STUDENTS	AVERAGE WEIGHT PER STUDENT	TOTAL WEIGHTS	SCHOOL-LEVEL FUNDING
36	734	704	1.37	961.2	\$ 5,969,233
36	742	731	1.18	864.9	\$ 5,371,128
36	690	763	1.13	862.2	\$ 5,353,966
36	738	770	1.10	847.8	\$ 5,264,462
36	743	657	1.25	818.2	\$ 5,081,116
36	741	656	1.19	778.6	\$ 4,834,933
36	732	588	1.25	737.7	\$ 4,580,818
36	736	662	1.08	718.0	\$ 4,458,774
36	749	446	1.10	489.4	\$ 3,038,978
36	740	359	1.18	422.3	\$ 2,622,301
36	691	349	1.10	385.5	\$ 2,394,025
36	750	131	2.52	329.5	\$ 2,046,306
36	689	49	2.35	115.0	\$ 714,296
36	745	46	1.17	53.7	\$ 333,473
37	733	728	1.13	822.2	\$ 5,105,756
37	730	639	1.12	713.5	\$ 4,430,807
38	80	1,588	1.15	1,818.7	\$ 11,293,824
38	66	1,058	1.12	1,183.2	\$ 7,347,574
38	44	1,043	1.09	1,135.2	\$ 7,049,512
38	26	940	1.13	1,060.6	\$ 6,586,321
39	652	1,192	1.09	1,294.3	\$ 8,037,284
40	770	1,545	1.09	1,686.8	\$ 10,475,166
66	565	203	1.10	222.5	\$ 1,381,832
67	566	246	1.18	290.8	\$ 1,805,604
68	567	363	1.15	416.2	\$ 2,584,427
69	568	541	1.21	656.3	\$ 4,075,497
70	295	972	1.05	1,024.0	\$ 6,358,974
71	570	126	1.55	195.7	\$ 1,215,554
72	571	418	1.19	499.5	\$ 3,101,879
73	572	377	1.11	417.1	\$ 2,590,299

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	TOTAL STUDENTS	AVERAGE WEIGHT PER STUDENT	TOTAL WEIGHTS	SCHOOL-LEVEL FUNDING
74	573	410	1.10	452.2	\$ 2,808,391
75	574	208	1.23	256.8	\$ 1,594,440
76	575	745	1.12	834.4	\$ 5,181,706
77	576	498	1.10	549.4	\$ 3,412,028
79	578	569	1.06	604.1	\$ 3,751,210
80	579	811	1.09	882.9	\$ 5,482,965
82	581	464	1.09	507.3	\$ 3,149,986
85	584	290	1.15	332.5	\$ 2,064,775
86	585	933	1.04	974.6	\$ 6,052,447
87	586	688	1.06	725.9	\$ 4,507,566
88	587	869	1.07	926.9	\$ 5,755,894
89	588	1,948	1.06	2,066.6	\$ 12,833,554
92	543	212	1.23	260.5	\$ 1,617,659
9604	4040	129	1.10	141.7	\$ 880,231
9605	4045	221	1.16	256.5	\$ 1,592,994
9606	4050	280	1.04	290.8	\$ 1,805,605
<b>Grand Total</b>	-	<b>134,442</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>156,255.3</b>	<b>\$ 970,333,296</b>



Figure A.2: District Level Funding

DISTRICT	COUNT OF SCHOOLS	TOTAL STUDENTS	AVERAGE WEIGHT PER STUDENT	TOTAL WEIGHTS	FUNDING LEA LEVEL	FUNDING TOTAL OF SCHOOLS EXCLUDING LEA ADMIN FUNDING
33	30	16,255	1.23	20,007.9	\$ 146,173,414	\$ 124,247,402
32	27	16,302	1.18	19,211.7	\$ 140,356,344	\$ 119,302,892
31	16	10,740	1.12	12,076.8	\$ 88,230,265	\$ 74,995,725
36	17	9,842	1.22	11,967.2	\$ 87,429,507	\$ 74,315,081
34	15	9,825	1.19	11,678.0	\$ 85,316,804	\$ 72,519,283
29	16	9,877	1.08	10,708.1	\$ 78,230,960	\$ 66,496,316
10	13	7,249	1.16	8,387.7	\$ 61,279,036	\$ 52,087,181
13	12	6,665	1.20	7,985.6	\$ 58,341,456	\$ 49,590,238
17	8	5,075	1.19	6,026.8	\$ 44,030,200	\$ 37,425,670
24	8	5,279	1.11	5,872.4	\$ 42,902,315	\$ 36,466,968
38	4	4,629	1.12	5,197.7	\$ 37,973,213	\$ 32,277,231
18	6	4,197	1.16	4,867.9	\$ 35,563,637	\$ 30,229,092
15	7	3,812	1.13	4,299.4	\$ 31,410,520	\$ 26,698,942
23	6	3,509	1.22	4,279.6	\$ 31,266,167	\$ 26,576,242
35	4	2,384	1.20	2,854.2	\$ 20,852,371	\$ 17,724,515
16	5	2,177	1.16	2,532.4	\$ 18,501,165	\$ 15,725,990
89	1	1,948	1.06	2,066.6	\$ 15,098,299	\$ 12,833,554
40	1	1,545	1.09	1,686.8	\$ 12,323,724	\$ 10,475,166
37	2	1,367	1.12	1,535.7	\$ 11,219,486	\$ 9,536,563
39	1	1,192	1.09	1,294.3	\$ 9,455,628	\$ 8,037,284
70	1	972	1.05	1,024.0	\$ 7,481,145	\$ 6,358,974
86	1	933	1.04	974.6	\$ 7,120,526	\$ 6,052,447
88	1	869	1.07	926.9	\$ 6,771,640	\$ 5,755,894
80	1	811	1.09	882.9	\$ 6,450,547	\$ 5,482,965
76	1	745	1.12	834.4	\$ 6,096,124	\$ 5,181,706
87	1	688	1.06	725.9	\$ 5,303,018	\$ 4,507,566
69	1	541	1.21	656.3	\$ 4,794,702	\$ 4,075,497
79	1	569	1.06	604.1	\$ 4,413,189	\$ 3,751,210

DISTRICT	COUNT OF SCHOOLS	TOTAL STUDENTS	AVERAGE WEIGHT PER STUDENT	TOTAL WEIGHTS	FUNDING LEA LEVEL	FUNDING TOTAL OF SCHOOLS EXCLUDING LEA ADMIN FUNDING
77	1	498	1.10	549.4	\$ 4,014,150	\$ 3,412,028
82	1	464	1.09	507.3	\$ 3,705,866	\$ 3,149,986
72	1	418	1.19	499.5	\$ 3,649,269	\$ 3,101,879
74	1	410	1.10	452.2	\$ 3,303,989	\$ 2,808,391
73	1	377	1.11	417.1	\$ 3,047,411	\$ 2,590,299
68	1	363	1.15	416.2	\$ 3,040,502	\$ 2,584,427
85	1	290	1.15	332.5	\$ 2,429,147	\$ 2,064,775
9606	1	280	1.04	290.8	\$ 2,124,241	\$ 1,805,605
67	1	246	1.18	290.8	\$ 2,124,240	\$ 1,805,604
92	1	212	1.23	260.5	\$ 1,903,129	\$ 1,617,659
75	1	208	1.23	256.8	\$ 1,875,812	\$ 1,594,440
9605	1	221	1.16	256.5	\$ 1,874,111	\$ 1,592,994
66	1	203	1.10	222.5	\$ 1,625,685	\$ 1,381,832
71	1	126	1.55	195.7	\$ 1,430,064	\$ 1,215,554
9604	1	129	1.10	141.7	\$ 1,035,565	\$ 880,231
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>134,442</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>156,255.3</b>	<b>\$ 1,141,568,583</b>	<b>\$ 970,333,296</b>

# PROJECT EVALUATION FORM

Hanover Research is committed to providing a work product that meets or exceeds partner expectations. In keeping with that goal, we would like to hear your opinions regarding our reports. Feedback is critically important and serves as the strongest mechanism by which we tailor our research to your organization. When you have had a chance to evaluate this report, please take a moment to fill out the following questionnaire.

<http://www.hanoverresearch.com/evaluation/index.php>

## CAVEAT

The publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this brief. The publisher and authors make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this brief and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of fitness for a particular purpose. There are no warranties that extend beyond the descriptions contained in this paragraph. No warranty may be created or extended by representatives of Hanover Research or its marketing materials. The accuracy and completeness of the information provided herein and the opinions stated herein are not guaranteed or warranted to produce any particular results, and the advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for every partner. Neither the publisher nor the authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages. Moreover, Hanover Research is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. Partners requiring such services are advised to consult an appropriate professional.



**4401 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 400**

**Arlington, VA 22203**

**P 202.559.0500 F 866.808.6585**

**[www.hanoverresearch.com](http://www.hanoverresearch.com)**