



# **STUDENT WEIGHTS**

## **English as a Second Language**

**RESEARCH REPORT # 2-06**

**March 2006**

**Legislative Revenue Office**

State Capitol Building  
900 Court Street NE, H-197  
Salem, Oregon 97301  
(503) 986-1266

<http://www.leg.state.or.us/comm/lro/home.htm>



STATE OF OREGON

Research Report

## **LEGISLATIVE REVENUE OFFICE**

H-197 State Capitol Building

Salem, Oregon 97301

(503) 986-1266

<http://www.leg.state.or.us/comm/lro/home.htm>

Research Report # 2-06

March 2006

# **STUDENT WEIGHTS**

## **English as a Second Language**

The first section of this report provides a brief background about the use of student weights in the school equalization formula. If the reader is generally familiar with this system, then the first short section can be skipped. The second section provides information about the student weight for students in an English as a Second Language (ESL) program. Students who are English language learners (ELL) qualify for ESL programs.

### **STUDENT WEIGHT BACKGROUND**

#### **Funding Equity**

In 1991 the Legislature changed school finance policy by creating a new measure of financial equity for school districts. "Equity" as a measure of fairness does not necessarily mean that all school districts get the same funding per student. School districts face different problems and costs that may justify different funding levels.

Funding equity per student or student group may generally provide for similar educational programs and opportunities. However funding equity does not necessarily result in equal educational results or achievement levels.

This policy change was implemented in a new school equalization formula to allocate revenue among school districts. The Legislature essentially adopted a policy of equal financial resources per student for similar groups of students. The new approach used student weights in the formula to improve funding equity among school districts. The weights are related to cost differences for various groups of students.

#### **Cost Differences**

The logic of funding equity is that differences in revenue resources between school districts must be justified in some rational manner. To accomplish this goal, one of the four principles that

guided the development of the new formula was to create funding differences only for uncontrollable cost differences.

In short, every district should get the same amount per student, adjusted only for unavoidable differences in costs. The cost factors adjust each district's allocation higher or lower to reflect cost differences. For example, districts cannot control the number of students living in the district who have English as their second language and teaching this group of students involves additional costs.

### Cost Factors

There are currently five different factors to adjust for cost differences among school districts:

- Weighted student count
- Teacher experience adjustment
- Transportation costs
- High cost disability students
- New facility costs.

The Legislature chose these equity factors as major contributors to differences in per student costs. They will no doubt continue to be reviewed and revised by future legislatures. Hence "equity" is an evolving target over time, and an analysis of the movement towards "equity" is one snapshot in a moving picture.

### Weighted Student Count

Rather than attempt to generate an individual cost factor for each district or type of district, the formula incorporates a system of weights directly into the student count. Weighting means counting a higher cost student as more than one. The table lists student weights currently used.

A weight applied to students represents the revenue requirements for funding the costs of that student group. A weight is a funding tool to recognize different student groups without differentiating among students in the group. Ideally the weight would provide the average revenue needed per student by each district for the additional costs of the weighted student group.

The student count begins with average daily membership (ADM). The ADM count is then weighted to reflect cost differences in educating different types of students. For example, an ELL student (one with limited English language proficiency) receives an extra weight of one-half. The total cost weight is then 1.5. In effect, one student counts as 1.5 students.

<b>STUDENT COST WEIGHTS</b>		
	<b>Added Weight</b>	<b>ADMw</b>
<b>Special Education and at Risk</b>		
Special education	1.00	2.00
English as second language	0.50	1.50
Pregnant and parenting	1.00	2.00
Students in poverty	.25	1.25
Neglected and delinquent	.25	1.25
Students in foster homes	.25	1.25
<b>Grade and School</b>		
Kindergarten	- .50	0.50
Elementary district students	- .10	0.90
Union High district students	.20	1.20
Small School	Varies	
Note: Maximum additional weight is 2.0 but not all weights are counted		

### Use in Equalization Formula

The complete measure of equity is the K-12 school equalization formula. The formula is a statutory definition of fairness applied to the financial needs of school districts. Using school district data the K-12 equalization formula determines an equalization funding amount for each district. This funding level is each school district's share of available State School Fund and local revenue used in the formula. State School Fund dollars for each district make up the difference between the district's equalization allocation and its local revenue.

The formula allocates this revenue based on the relative need of each district for funding by using the five cost factors listed on the prior page. Cost factors are used in four separate grant calculations that together determine the total allocation.

$$\text{District Formula Revenue (State and Local)} = \text{General Purpose Grant} + \text{Transportation Grant} + \text{High Cost Disability Grant} + \text{Facility Grant}$$

The K-12 school distribution formula allocates funds based largely on a per student basis. For purposes of the formula, "student" means weighted average daily membership (ADMw) extended. Extended means the higher of the current year or prior year ADMw.

Weighted students are used only in the calculation of the general purpose grant. This grant starts at a \$4,500 target per weighted student. Applying the teacher experience factor increases or decreases the \$4,500 per student target by \$25 for each year the district average experience is more or less than the statewide average teacher experience. A calculated percentage adjustment factor (currently about 116%) modifies the adjusted target amount to allocate the full state and local funds available. The general purpose grant accounts for about 95% of formula revenue. Thus number of students and their associated weights are a very important determinate of district formula revenue.

## ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE WEIGHT

This section of the report provides information about students in English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, their formula weight and the revenue and expenditures associated with the weight. Data is summarized by size of district and individual district data is in the appendix. The phrase 'ESL student' as used in this report refers to English language learners (ELL) in an ESL program.

### English Class Requirements

The goal of ESL programs is to make ELL students proficient in the English language. Oregon Revised Statute 336.079 requires courses to teach speaking, reading and writing in English to students who cannot learn in classes taught in English. English proficiency refers to all three abilities. English classes are to be available at all grade levels including kindergarten until a student's mastery of English is such that the student can learn in classes taught in English. These classes are one of two exceptions to classes being primarily taught in English as required in ORS 336.074.

The statute creating the ESL exception was passed in 1971 and amended in 1993 to include kindergarten. Prior to 1971 the only exception to teaching in English was to teach a foreign language.

ESL programs are different from bilingual programs. ESL programs do not attempt to teach students to be proficient in their native language. Bilingual programs have the goal of training students to be proficient in both English and their native language.

### Districts

Out of 199 school districts in 2003-04, 124 or 62% reported having ESL students, but the share of all students for these districts was almost 95%. Of the 75 districts reporting no ESL students, almost all were small districts. All but six of the 75 had student populations below 1,000 students.

ESL Status	Districts		Students (ADM)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No ESL Students	75	37.7%	28,955	5.5%
Some ESL Students	124	62.3%	498,073	94.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>527,028</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### Student Distribution

There are over 53,000 ESL students making up almost 11% of the student population. These students are not equally distributed among school districts. In districts with ESL students, the percent of ESL students varies from a low of 0.2% to a high of 69.5% of average daily membership (ADM) with the average being 10.7%.

The table summarizes the distribution of ESL students by district size for districts with students in ESL programs. The table in the appendix has information for each district.

ESL Student Percent of ADM By District Size 2003-04				
District Size by ADM	# of Districts	ADM	ESL Students	ESL % of ADM
0- 500	17	4,385	285	6.5%
500- 1,000	23	16,915	974	5.8%
1,000- 3,000	39	73,333	8,167	11.1%
3,000- 5,000	17	64,254	8,698	13.5%
5,000-10,000	16	103,618	8,926	8.6%
10,000-30,000	9	120,742	11,755	9.7%
30,000-50,000	3	114,825	14,474	12.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>498,073</b>	<b>53,272</b>	<b>10.7%</b>

ESL students are most concentrated in the 3,000-5,000 size districts. This range has the highest percentage primarily because the district with ESL students at 70% (Woodburn) falls in that range. The three largest districts have the next highest concentration at 12.6%. Note that each student range has districts varying substantially from the average.

### Student Weight

Oregon Revised Statute 327.013(7)(a)(B) specifies a weight of "0.5 for each student in average daily membership eligible for and enrolled in an English as a Second Language program under ORS 336.079." Adding the ESL ½ weight to the normal weight of 1 for each student gives a 1.5 weight total assuming the student does not qualify for another weight. For example, if the school district General Purpose Grant allocation is \$5,000 per weighted ADM in the school equalization formula, the extra weight adds \$2,500 for a total of \$7,500 per ESL student.

The ESL weight is to help provide the necessary funding for English classes. The extra cost of these classes may be a combination of factors such as smaller class size, teacher training, and special class materials. The statutes do not seem to imply that the weight is also for the student to gain some basic level of academic achievement other than English ability. The statute also does not specify the amount of class time to be spent in ESL classes.

### Student Weight Revenue

The school equalization formula allocates extra revenue to school districts with ESL students at the rate of formula generated revenue per weighted student (ADMw extended). The general purpose grant is the only portion of the formula that uses weighted students in its calculation so all weighted revenue is general purpose revenue. The grant accounts for about 95% of formula revenue. Thus number of students and their associated weights are a very important determinate of district formula revenue.

The grant is not a direct reimbursement for specific costs or dedicated for a specific purpose. There are no constraints on how this money can be spent. General purpose grant dollars can be budgeted and used as the school district chooses. However, a district must offer an ESL program to qualify for the extra weight and its associated general purpose grant dollars.

The additional ½ student weight for ESL students generated \$136.5 million in formula allocated revenue for these districts in 2003-04. Each ½ weight is worth on average \$2,562 in 2002-03. This amount will vary depending on the level of State School Fund appropriation and the share of formula revenue available for the general purpose grant after funding the three other formula grants. Since revenue is about the same per ESL weight in each district, the percent of total revenue in each size range is the same as for ESL students.

<b>Weight Revenue per ESL Student 2003-04</b>					
<b>District Size by ADM</b>	<b>ESL Students</b>		<b>Revenue</b>		<b>Revenue per ESL Student</b>
	<b>#</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	
0- 500	285	0.5%	725,618	0.5%	2,550
500- 1,000	974	1.8%	2,506,631	1.8%	2,572
1,000- 3,000	8,167	15.3%	20,917,218	15.3%	2,561
3,000- 5,000	8,698	16.3%	22,248,308	16.3%	2,560
5,000-10,000	8,926	16.8%	22,865,360	16.8%	2,562
10,000-30,000	11,755	22.1%	30,117,226	22.1%	2,562
30,000-50,000	14,474	27.2%	37,115,950	27.2%	2,564
<b>Total</b>	<b>53,272</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>136,496,312</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,562</b>

The variation in revenue per ESL student comes from the teacher experience adjustment in the calculation of the general purpose grant. The general purpose grant is weighted students (extended) times \$4,500 per student adjusted for teacher experience and balanced to total State School Fund and local revenue available. The teacher experience adjustment is a cost factor for differences in salary costs related to years of experience. This factor increases (or decreases) each district's base funding per weighted student by \$25 for each year the district's average teacher experience exceeds (or falls short of) the statewide average. Statewide these district gains and losses about balance out.

### ESL Expenditures

Districts report ESL expenditures in audited accounting reports to the Department of Education. The accounting manual provides the following information for function code 1291:

English Second Language Programs. Instructional activities designed to improve English skills of students who do not speak English as their native language.

Districts reported \$79.6 million in expenditures for English as a Second language programs for 2003-04. This is the last year of audited data currently available. The average expenditure was about \$1,500 per ESL student.

<b>Expenditures per ESL Student 2003-04</b>					
<b>District Size by ADM</b>	<b>ESL Students</b>		<b>Expenditures</b>		<b>Expense per ESL Student</b>
	<b>#</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	
0- 500	285	0.5%	139,044	0.2%	489
500- 1,000	974	1.8%	522,903	0.7%	537
1,000- 3,000	8,167	15.3%	8,667,795	10.9%	1,061
3,000- 5,000	8,698	16.3%	11,319,895	14.2%	1,303
5,000-10,000	8,926	16.8%	14,899,449	18.7%	1,669
10,000-30,000	11,755	22.1%	16,485,638	20.7%	1,402
30,000-50,000	14,474	27.2%	27,654,581	34.6%	1,904
Total	53,272	100.0%	79,599,305	100.0%	1,494

The table shows that the larger the district the greater the expenditure per ESL student tends to be. The exception is the 5,000-10,000 range. The largest districts also have the biggest gap between their percent of total expenditures and percent of ESL students. One possible explanation for this is that the larger the district the more likely its ESL students have multiple native languages.

### ESD Expenditures

ESDs do not generally supplement district expenditures for ESL programs from their own revenue. Only one ESD reported expenditures for the ESL expenditure code. The eastern Oregon ESD amount was less than \$3,000. Smaller districts with lower ESL spending do not rely on their ESDs to provide ESL programs at ESD expense.

ESDs with small districts may directly receive federal dollars for a group of small component districts. The funds have to be used by the ESD to provide the same type of ESL services as though the federal funds went directly to the small school districts.

**Data Accuracy**

The expenditure data school districts report is audited. It is not known how much effort districts put into identifying eligible costs and there is no state revenue incentive to do so. A few inconsistencies exist. Twenty districts report ESL students but no ESL program expenditures. Almost all are small districts. It is easier to identify students than expenditures and some districts may not have the accounting resources to do so. Four districts report ESL expenditures totaling \$35,000 but no ESL students. These are likely to be accounting code errors.

**Revenue Vs. Expenditures**

The table below compares formula ESL weight revenue to expenditures. The difference column is revenue less expenditures. At all district groups, the ESL weight generates more revenue than reported program expenditures. The average difference statewide is \$1,068 per ESL student. This difference tends to get smaller as district size increases. The pattern is the reverse of the expenditure per student by district size since additional revenue per ESL student is about the same regardless of size.

ESL Revenue vs. Expenditures 2003-04						
District Size by ADM	Revenue		Expenditures		Difference	
	\$	\$ per ESL	\$	\$ per ESL	\$	\$ per ESL
0- 500	725,618	2,550	139,044	489	586,574	2,061
500- 1,000	2,506,631	2,572	522,903	537	1,983,727	2,036
1,000- 3,000	20,917,218	2,561	8,667,795	1,061	12,249,423	1,500
3,000- 5,000	22,248,308	2,560	11,319,895	1,303	10,928,413	1,258
5,000-10,000	22,865,360	2,562	14,899,449	1,669	7,965,911	892
10,000-30,000	30,117,226	2,562	16,485,638	1,402	13,631,588	1,160
30,000-50,000	37,115,950	2,564	27,654,581	1,904	9,551,368	660
Total	136,496,311	2,562	79,599,305	1,494	56,897,004	1,068

Expenditure % of Revenue	
% Range	# Districts
0-20%	35
20-40%	23
40-60%	24
60-80%	24
80-100%	6
Over 100%	12
Total	124

The ranges mask specific information. Not all districts have expenditures less than revenue. The small table lists the number of districts in each range of expenditures as a percent of revenue. Eighteen districts (15%) were at 80% or above, but 35 districts (28%) were below 20%. The range varies from 0% to 278%.

### Federal Revenue

The federal government provides some funding for ESL programs. Title III funds under the No Child Left Behind Act are distributed on a per student basis. Total federal dollars in 2004-05 were about \$5 million. This revenue is in addition to formula weighted revenue from state and local sources. The amount per student is in the accompanying table. If included in the difference amount in the above table, the gap between revenue and expenditures would be about \$80 more per student. The federal amounts are relatively small compared to about \$2,500 in state and local revenue per student.

Federal ESL Revenue	
Year	Per Student
2003-04	\$82.51
2004-05	\$83.80
2005-06	\$94.60

ESL expenditures are also part of the federal maintenance of effort requirement to qualify for federal funds. For example, if lower ESL revenue allocations caused ESL spending to decrease for some districts, the federal maintenance of effort may not be met for a potential reduction in federal funding for those districts.

### English Test Results

In 2003-04 districts used one of four English proficiency tests. Thus there are not comparable test results to use for comparing district expenditure levels to test results. A uniform test is anticipated for use beginning in 2006-07. Comparable results could also be skewed by substantial variations in the initial skill level of new students to the district, the distribution of students by grade level and other factors.

### Weights in Other States

Based on 1998-99 state information supplied to the National Center for Education Statistics, eleven other states at the time used a weight for ELL students. The additional weight varied from 0.06 to 0.50. The weight is not applied to the same student count in each state and the

1998-99 ESL Student Additional Weight			
State	Weight	State	Weight
Arizona	0.06	Vermont	0.20
Connecticut	0.10	Florida	0.201
Texas	0.10	Nebraska	0.25
New York	0.16	Oklahoma	0.25
Iowa	0.19	New Mexico	0.50
Kansas	0.20	Oregon	0.50

same weight would not necessarily generate the same revenue because of different funding levels per student. Approaches used by other states typically fall into one of four categories: (1) no funding, (2) additional grant per student, (3) additional weight per student and (4) included as part of a basic education grant.

As the table shows, the central range for the weight is 0.20. Oregon's weight is at the high end of the list and is matched only by New Mexico.

### Correct Weight?

The current additional weight of ½ is generally providing more revenue for ESL programs than is being reported as spent for that purpose. The conclusion might be that the student weight is too high. However, what is being spent may not be the same as what should be spent. An important issue is whether programs at current costs are accomplishing the goal of proficiency in the English language. If proficiency is not being achieved, then programs are likely not adequate. Gaining improvement in proficiency would likely mean more expenditure and a

narrowing or elimination of the gap between revenue and expenditures. Also the dollar value of the weight can increase or decrease depending on the state funding level.

A rough estimate may be arrived at by making assumptions about (1) the size of an ESL class relative to a typical class and (2) the share of the school day devoted to English language training and special costs. For example, if an ESL class size is  $\frac{1}{2}$  a typical class, then the cost is somewhat over twice a typical class, say 2.25. If the class takes up  $\frac{1}{5}$  of the school day, then the cost for a whole school day for ESL students is 1.25 times that for students in a regular class all day for an extra weight of 0.25. Using various combinations of likely class size and class time would generally put the additional weight in a range between 0.25 and 0.50.

There is no simple answer for what the correct weight should be. It depends on what approach is used to arrive at an answer—an average of actual expenditures, likely average cost of achieving a proficiency goal, using costs of districts with successful programs, weights used by other states, typical ESL class size and time, professional judgment, or some other method.

### **Policy Options**

Some general policy options dealing with the ESL weight, funding and program are listed. Policy changes as usual involve potential trade offs between incentives, outcomes, equity and administrative costs. Federal maintenance of effort requirements and other restrictions, limitations or impacts may also be relevant factors.

#### **Weight**

- Change student additional weight of  $\frac{1}{2}$ , but keep uniform per student
- Use a different weight for different grade levels
- Measure student improvement in proficiency and weight accordingly
- Use different weights for district student concentration levels
- Modify weight for different foreign languages or number of district languages

#### **Revenue**

- Limit revenue to expenditures if below weighted revenue
- Use a grant per student entitlement
- Reimburse a percent of actual costs

#### **Eligibility**

- Use test results for continued eligibility
- Limit the number of years a student qualifies for weighting
- Assume a percent of prior year students become proficient and are disqualified

#### **Program**

- Require a minimum ESL standard program or instruction hours
- Require program approval by the Department of Education

## **OTHER SCHOOL FINANCE REPORTS**

The following reports deal with recent school finance legislation and issues. Reports are also available for the 1997, 1999 and 2001 legislative sessions. Reports after 1997 are available at the office website address on the title page. The summaries, not on the website, are a condensed overview of the K-12 equalization formula and ESD allocation.

- "2005 School Finance Legislation: Funding and Distribution," Research Report #3-05
- "K-12 and ESD School Finance: State School Fund Distribution," Research Report #3-04
- "K-12 School Equalization Formula: State School Fund," two page summary
- "ESD Equalization: State School Fund," one page summary
- "School Local Option Property Tax: Legislation and Utilization," Research Report #4-04
- "The Education Stability Fund," Research Report #5-04
- "2003 School Finance Legislation: Funding and Distribution," Research Report #7-03

**ENGLISH as a SECOND LANGUAGE**  
**2003-04 ESL Revenue and Expenditures**

- o ESL: English as a Second Language student with additional 1/2 weight
- o ADM: Average Daily Membership
- o ESL revenue: 1/2 of ESL students times General Purpose Grant per weighted ADM
- o ESL expense: district reports in ODE database (function code 1291)
- o Gap per ESL: revenue per ESL minus expense per ESL



School District	Students			Formula Revenue		Expense		Comparison	
	ESL	ADM	ESL % of ADM	1/2 Weight \$	\$ per ESL	Reported \$	\$ per ESL	Gap per ESL	Exp. % of Rev.
<b>State</b>	53,271.7	528,185.6	10.1%	136,496,312	2,562	79,634,316	1,495	1,067	58.3%
<b>Agency</b>									
Youth Corrections	0.0	815.8	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Youth Detention	0.0	342.2	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
<b>Baker</b>									
Baker SD 5J	19.2	2,125.2	0.9%	50,364	2,623	25,372	1,321	1,302	50.4%
Huntington SD 16J	0.0	108.7	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Burnt River SD 30J	0.0	85.8	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Pine Eagle SD 61	0.0	245.7	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
<b>Benton</b>									
Monroe SD 1J	50.3	412.8	12.2%	130,570	2,596	14,274	284	2,312	10.9%
Alsea SD 7J	5.0	156.2	3.2%	12,678	2,536	0	0	2,536	0.0%
Philomath SD 17J	20.9	1,759.8	1.2%	54,220	2,594	21,343	1,021	1,573	39.4%
Corvallis SD 509J	461.9	6,624.8	7.0%	1,206,928	2,613	694,402	1,503	1,110	57.5%
<b>Clackamas</b>									
West Linn-Wilsonville	225.7	7,628.7	3.0%	578,782	2,564	239,692	1,062	1,502	41.4%
Lake Oswego SD 7J	60.1	6,764.8	0.9%	154,609	2,573	153,232	2,550	23	99.1%
North Clackamas SD 12	1,720.3	15,711.6	10.9%	4,378,828	2,545	1,645,771	957	1,589	37.6%
Molalla River SD 35	303.0	2,743.6	11.0%	777,486	2,566	450,406	1,486	1,079	57.9%
Oregon Trail SD 46	236.2	4,028.8	5.9%	611,108	2,587	170,441	722	1,866	27.9%
Colton SD 53	6.4	732.8	0.9%	16,350	2,555	0	0	2,555	0.0%
Oregon City SD 62	468.7	7,819.2	6.0%	1,202,197	2,565	911,997	1,946	619	75.9%
Canby SD 86	805.3	5,016.3	16.1%	2,079,944	2,583	1,314,109	1,632	951	63.2%
Estacada SD 108	182.2	2,433.7	7.5%	463,639	2,545	156,703	860	1,685	33.8%
Gladstone SD 115	139.6	2,166.8	6.4%	363,773	2,606	181,235	1,298	1,308	49.8%
<b>Clatsop</b>									
Astoria SD 1	75.1	2,036.1	3.7%	192,253	2,560	120,723	1,607	952	62.8%
Knappa SD 4	0.0	585.8	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Jewell SD 8	0.0	177.1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Seaside SD 10	66.6	1,623.8	4.1%	170,864	2,566	96,714	1,452	1,113	56.6%
Warrenton-Hammond	2.7	785.8	0.3%	6,981	2,586	0	0	2,586	0.0%
<b>Columbia</b>									
Scappoose SD 1J	0.0	2,103.1	0.0%	0	0	10,327	0	0	0.0%

School District	Students			Formula Revenue		Expense		Comparison	
	ESL	ADM	ESL % of ADM	1/2 Weight \$	\$ per ESL	Reported \$	\$ per ESL	Gap per ESL	Exp. % of Rev.
Clatskanie SD 6J	0.0	870.5	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Rainier SD 13	0.0	1,152.3	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Vernonia SD 47J	0.0	728.9	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
St Helens SD 502	23.9	3,356.4	0.7%	61,781	2,585	192	8	2,577	0.3%
<b>Coos</b>									
Coquille SD 8	6.5	1,014.0	0.6%	16,500	2,539	27,528	4,235	-1,697	166.8%
Coos Bay SD 9	84.7	3,588.6	2.4%	219,007	2,586	121,183	1,431	1,155	55.3%
North Bend SD 13	11.5	2,175.2	0.5%	30,021	2,611	44,363	3,858	-1,247	147.8%
Powers SD 31	0.0	141.7	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Myrtle Point SD 41	0.0	741.7	0.0%	0	0	10,193	0	0	0.0%
Bandon SD 54	5.1	784.0	0.7%	13,333	2,614	0	0	2,614	0.0%
<b>Crook</b>									
Crook County Unit SD	176.0	3,034.8	5.8%	452,137	2,569	163,680	930	1,639	36.2%
<b>Curry</b>									
Central Curry SD 1	0.0	710.9	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Port Orford-Langlois SD	2.0	369.6	0.5%	5,146	2,573	0	0	2,573	0.0%
Brookings-Harbor SD	34.4	1,766.3	1.9%	89,925	2,614	70,728	2,056	558	78.7%
<b>Deschutes</b>									
Bend-LaPine	433.2	13,427.4	3.2%	1,116,835	2,578	692,816	1,599	979	62.0%
Redmond SD 2J	242.7	5,949.6	4.1%	626,885	2,583	378,390	1,559	1,024	60.4%
Sisters SD 6	5.4	1,299.0	0.4%	14,014	2,595	0	0	2,595	0.0%
Brothers SD 15	0.0	2.7	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
<b>Douglas</b>									
Oakland SD 1	0.0	551.7	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Douglas County SD 4	70.4	6,472.2	1.1%	182,947	2,599	222,189	3,156	-557	121.4%
Glide SD 12	0.0	765.5	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Douglas County SD 15	0.0	194.0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
South Umpqua SD 19	3.8	1,818.4	0.2%	9,803	2,580	14,360	3,779	-1,199	146.5%
Camas Valley SD 21J	0.0	126.0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
North Douglas SD 22	0.0	358.5	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Yoncalla SD 32	0.0	371.2	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Elkton SD 34	0.0	176.6	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Riddle SD 70	0.0	459.6	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Glendale SD 77	0.0	449.8	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Reedsport SD 105	0.0	850.4	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Winston-Dillard SD 116	0.0	1,537.6	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Sutherlin SD 130	9.7	1,488.5	0.7%	24,972	2,574	13,683	1,411	1,164	54.8%
<b>Gilliam</b>									
Arlington SD 3	0.0	144.0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Condon SD 25J	0.0	166.0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
<b>Grant</b>									
John Day SD 3	6.4	803.1	0.8%	16,663	2,604	16,695	2,609	-5	100.2%
Prairie City SD 4	0.0	197.9	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%

School District	Students			Formula Revenue		Expense		Comparison	
	ESL	ADM	ESL % of ADM	1/2 Weight \$	\$ per ESL	Reported \$	\$ per ESL	Gap per ESL	Exp. % of Rev.
Monument SD 8	0.0	50.7	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Dayville SD 16J	0.0	72.2	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Long Creek SD 17	0.0	70.7	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
<b>Harney</b>									
Harney County SD 3	26.3	1,028.6	2.6%	68,112	2,590	45,878	1,744	845	67.4%
Harney County SD 4	0.0	77.4	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Pine Creek SD 5	0.0	13.9	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Diamond SD 7	0.0	5.7	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Suntex SD 10	0.0	14.0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Drewsey SD 13	0.0	12.7	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Frenchglen SD 16	0.0	13.3	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Double O SD 28	0.0	4.0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
South Harney SD 33	0.0	10.3	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Harney County Union	0.0	87.0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
<b>Hood River</b>									
Hood River County SD	1,092.0	3,725.9	29.3%	2,833,231	2,595	552,515	506	2,089	19.5%
<b>Jackson</b>									
Phoenix-Talent SD 4	491.0	2,768.6	17.7%	1,268,585	2,584	235,140	479	2,105	18.5%
Ashland SD 5	80.4	2,998.5	2.7%	208,601	2,595	150,437	1,871	723	72.1%
Central Point SD 6	118.6	4,490.0	2.6%	303,696	2,561	94,363	796	1,765	31.1%
Eagle Point SD 9	410.6	3,927.1	10.5%	1,052,645	2,564	227,675	554	2,009	21.6%
Rogue River SD 35	6.8	1,143.3	0.6%	17,551	2,581	13,876	2,041	540	79.1%
Prospect SD 59	0.0	186.4	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Butte Falls SD 91	0.0	212.1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Pinehurst SD 94	0.0	52.9	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Medford SD 549C	1,061.1	12,271.5	8.6%	2,721,527	2,565	1,909,334	1,799	765	70.2%
<b>Jefferson</b>									
Culver SD 4	94.0	554.9	16.9%	238,756	2,540	0	0	2,540	0.0%
Ashwood SD 8	0.0	9.8	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Black Butte SD 41	0.0	38.3	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Jefferson County SD	876.6	2,954.2	29.7%	2,222,519	2,535	469,792	536	1,999	21.1%
<b>Josephine</b>									
Grants Pass SD 7	59.8	5,449.0	1.1%	153,325	2,564	129,745	2,170	394	84.6%
Three Rivers/Josephine	0.0	5,669.4	0.0%	0	0	13,885	0	0	0.0%
<b>Klamath</b>									
Klamath Falls City	462.1	3,921.4	11.8%	1,191,936	2,579	205,417	445	2,135	17.2%
Klamath County SD	418.3	6,450.0	6.5%	1,083,202	2,590	535,982	1,281	1,308	49.5%
<b>Lake</b>									
Lake County SD 7	18.5	762.1	2.4%	48,998	2,649	1,001	54	2,594	2.0%
Paisley SD 11	0.0	79.7	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
North Lake SD 14	0.0	213.8	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Plush SD 18	0.0	13.8	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Adel SD 21	0.0	22.9	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%

School District	Students			Formula Revenue		Expense		Comparison	
	ESL	ADM	ESL % of ADM	1/2 Weight \$	\$ per ESL	Reported \$	\$ per ESL	Gap per ESL	Exp. % of Rev.
<b>Lane</b>									
Pleasant Hill SD 1	0.0	1,051.6	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Eugene SD 4J	351.8	17,709.5	2.0%	907,831	2,581	629,232	1,789	792	69.3%
Springfield SD 19	590.5	10,624.7	5.6%	1,528,276	2,588	1,074,502	1,820	768	70.3%
Fern Ridge SD 28J	0.0	1,637.1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Mapleton SD 32	2.0	216.6	0.9%	5,070	2,535	0	0	2,535	0.0%
Creswell SD 40	47.3	1,134.7	4.2%	120,667	2,551	31,423	664	1,887	26.0%
South Lane SD 45J3	66.4	2,833.7	2.3%	170,152	2,563	102,680	1,546	1,016	60.3%
Bethel SD 52	118.1	5,573.7	2.1%	306,735	2,597	221,614	1,876	721	72.2%
Crow-Applegate-Lorane	0.0	274.4	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
McKenzie SD 68	0.0	290.4	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Junction City SD 69	44.8	1,787.3	2.5%	117,445	2,622	63,585	1,419	1,202	54.1%
Lowell SD 71	0.0	332.0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Oakridge SD 76	2.0	687.1	0.3%	5,181	2,591	5,252	2,626	-36	101.4%
Marcola SD 79J	0.0	300.2	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Blachly SD 90	0.0	141.8	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Siuslaw SD 97J	128.2	1,505.1	8.5%	332,381	2,593	49,297	385	2,208	14.8%
<b>Lincoln</b>									
Lincoln County SD	317.2	5,716.4	5.5%	830,872	2,619	836,164	2,636	-17	100.6%
<b>Linn</b>									
Harrisburg SD 7	17.3	743.8	2.3%	43,491	2,514	23,346	1,349	1,164	53.7%
Greater Albany Public	316.5	8,047.7	3.9%	822,391	2,598	547,835	1,731	867	66.6%
Lebanon Community	132.4	4,218.9	3.1%	341,681	2,581	97,946	740	1,841	28.7%
Sweet Home SD 55	3.9	2,243.7	0.2%	9,949	2,551	11,498	2,948	-397	115.6%
Scio SD 95	3.3	657.3	0.5%	8,466	2,565	0	0	2,565	0.0%
Santiam Canyon SD	32.3	647.5	5.0%	83,342	2,580	99,878	3,092	-512	119.8%
Central Linn SD 552	11.1	575.1	1.9%	28,100	2,532	0	0	2,532	0.0%
<b>Malheur</b>									
Jordan Valley SD 3	0.0	90.2	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Ontario SD 8C	820.9	2,681.2	30.6%	2,117,538	2,580	305,011	372	2,208	14.4%
Juntura SD 12	0.0	8.0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Nyssa SD 26	610.1	1,120.4	54.5%	1,554,945	2,549	1,126,334	1,846	703	72.4%
Annex SD 29	9.0	103.2	8.7%	23,490	2,610	0	0	2,610	0.0%
Malheur County SD 51	0.0	18.2	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Adrian SD 61	43.9	249.1	17.6%	110,676	2,521	0	0	2,521	0.0%
Harper SD 66	0.0	108.3	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Arock SD 81	0.0	25.3	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Vale SD 84	120.8	949.2	12.7%	313,368	2,594	0	0	2,594	0.0%
<b>Marion</b>									
Gervais SD 1	518.3	1,053.2	49.2%	1,316,090	2,539	716,268	1,382	1,157	54.4%
Silver Falls SD 4J	339.5	3,374.6	10.1%	887,538	2,614	505,669	1,489	1,125	57.0%
Cascade SD 5	108.1	2,172.5	5.0%	275,048	2,544	193,242	1,788	757	70.3%
Jefferson SD 14J	100.9	875.8	11.5%	257,536	2,552	37,483	371	2,181	14.6%

School District	Students			Formula Revenue		Expense		Comparison	
	ESL	ADM	ESL % of ADM	1/2 Weight \$	\$ per ESL	Reported \$	\$ per ESL	Gap per ESL	Exp. % of Rev.
North Marion SD 15	417.8	1,721.2	24.3%	1,055,464	2,526	289,020	692	1,834	27.4%
Salem-Keizer SD 24J	4,965.2	35,616.0	13.9%	12,755,401	2,569	7,080,819	1,426	1,143	55.5%
North Santiam SD 29J	156.8	2,375.3	6.6%	400,125	2,552	135,569	865	1,687	33.9%
St Paul SD 45	64.8	241.8	26.8%	160,081	2,470	43,834	676	1,794	27.4%
Mt Angel SD 91	111.7	759.2	14.7%	285,086	2,552	53,653	480	2,072	18.8%
Woodburn SD 103	3,110.0	4,472.0	69.5%	7,893,047	2,538	6,796,051	2,185	353	86.1%
<b>Morrow</b>									
Morrow SD 1	716.8	2,113.8	33.9%	1,824,635	2,546	1,019,896	1,423	1,123	55.9%
Ione SD	4.0	148.7	2.7%	10,346	2,587	0	0	2,587	0.0%
<b>Multnomah</b>									
Portland SD 1J	5,004.4	45,464.2	11.0%	12,902,578	2,578	12,610,383	2,520	58	97.7%
Parkrose SD 3	599.9	3,557.7	16.9%	1,528,263	2,548	694,477	1,158	1,390	45.4%
Reynolds SD 7	2,272.7	10,046.3	22.6%	5,808,278	2,556	2,247,922	989	1,567	38.7%
Gresham-Barlow SD 10J	1,109.1	11,477.9	9.7%	2,847,174	2,567	1,188,072	1,071	1,496	41.7%
Centennial SD 28J	920.2	6,192.4	14.9%	2,331,353	2,534	1,245,446	1,353	1,180	53.4%
Corbett SD 39	0.0	616.3	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
David Douglas SD 40	2,311.0	8,938.5	25.9%	5,839,465	2,527	3,229,971	1,398	1,129	55.3%
Riverdale SD 51J	0.0	459.7	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
<b>Polk</b>									
Dallas SD 2	66.7	3,080.3	2.2%	172,360	2,584	121,239	1,818	766	70.3%
Central SD 13J	449.5	2,486.2	18.1%	1,153,849	2,567	1,056,347	2,350	217	91.5%
Perrydale SD 21	9.4	320.2	2.9%	23,968	2,550	955	102	2,448	4.0%
Falls City SD 57	3.2	173.8	1.8%	8,271	2,585	0	0	2,585	0.0%
<b>Sherman</b>									
Sherman County SD	4.3	286.9	1.5%	11,387	2,648	12,861	2,991	-343	112.9%
<b>Tillamook</b>									
Tillamook SD 9	251.9	1,987.3	12.7%	648,777	2,576	419,506	1,665	910	64.7%
Neah-Kah-Nie SD 56	38.1	774.6	4.9%	98,297	2,580	5,901	155	2,425	6.0%
Nestucca Valley SD 101	31.7	580.7	5.5%	81,336	2,566	54,772	1,728	838	67.3%
<b>Umatilla</b>									
Helix SD 1	0.0	171.0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Pilot Rock SD 2	0.0	425.0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Echo SD 5	15.3	234.4	6.5%	38,947	2,546	0	0	2,546	0.0%
Umatilla SD 6R	526.4	1,254.8	41.9%	1,342,674	2,551	317,849	604	1,947	23.7%
Milton-Freewater Unified	515.9	1,855.4	27.8%	1,336,604	2,591	297,435	577	2,014	22.3%
Hermiston SD 8	1,242.6	4,249.6	29.2%	3,172,129	2,553	812,804	654	1,899	25.6%
Pendleton SD 16	55.6	3,230.3	1.7%	143,779	2,586	173,472	3,120	-534	120.7%
Athena-Weston SD	4.8	598.0	0.8%	12,189	2,539	0	0	2,539	0.0%
Stanfield SD 61	139.3	548.9	25.4%	354,294	2,543	5,602	40	2,503	1.6%
Ukiah SD 80	0.0	55.8	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
<b>Union</b>									
La Grande SD 1	16.4	2,262.4	0.7%	42,864	2,614	2,089	127	2,486	4.9%
Union SD 5	0.0	489.2	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%

School District	Students			Formula Revenue		Expense		Comparison	
	ESL	ADM	ESL % of ADM	1/2 Weight \$	\$ per ESL	Reported \$	\$ per ESL	Gap per ESL	Exp. % of Rev.
North Powder SD 8J	14.8	230.0	6.4%	37,936	2,563	0	0	2,563	0.0%
Imbler SD 11	0.0	313.7	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Cove SD 15	6.4	246.5	2.6%	16,501	2,578	0	0	2,578	0.0%
Elgin SD 23	4.0	468.1	0.9%	10,149	2,537	28,204	7,051	-4,514	277.9%
<b>Wallowa</b>									
Joseph SD 6	0.0	309.4	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Wallowa SD 12	2.5	283.4	0.9%	6,471	2,589	0	0	2,589	0.0%
Enterprise SD 21	0.0	407.6	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Troy SD 54	0.0	4.6	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
<b>Wasco</b>									
South Wasco County	43.7	243.9	17.9%	113,931	2,607	38,916	891	1,717	34.2%
Chenoweth SD 9	110.7	878.2	12.6%	291,564	2,634	55,432	501	2,133	19.0%
The Dalles SD 12	250.4	2,020.3	12.4%	649,850	2,595	207,895	830	1,765	32.0%
Dufur SD 29	0.0	262.6	0.0%	0	0	605	0	0	0.0%
<b>Washington</b>									
Hillsboro SD 1J	2,744.9	18,078.9	15.2%	7,038,205	2,564	5,111,408	1,862	702	72.6%
Banks SD 13	18.4	1,163.5	1.6%	47,374	2,575	12,931	703	1,872	27.3%
Forest Grove SD 15	1,181.4	5,472.7	21.6%	3,031,594	2,566	2,674,859	2,264	302	88.2%
Tigard-Tualatin SD 23J	1,471.8	11,394.7	12.9%	3,770,271	2,562	1,986,583	1,350	1,212	52.7%
Beaverton SD 48J	4,504.5	33,744.7	13.3%	11,457,971	2,544	7,873,380	1,748	796	68.7%
Sherwood SD 88J	88.6	3,243.5	2.7%	223,888	2,527	121,994	1,377	1,150	54.5%
Gaston SD 511J	5.0	522.9	1.0%	12,772	2,554	4,391	878	1,676	34.4%
<b>Wheeler</b>									
Spray SD 1	0.0	62.1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Fossil SD 21J	0.0	90.2	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Mitchell SD 55	0.0	75.3	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
<b>Yamhill</b>									
Yamhill-Carlton SD 1	7.1	1,204.4	0.6%	18,479	2,603	8,733	1,230	1,373	47.3%
Amity SD 4J	49.0	821.0	6.0%	128,462	2,622	63,261	1,291	1,331	49.2%
Dayton SD 8	133.0	1,013.6	13.1%	339,106	2,550	162,907	1,225	1,325	48.0%
Newberg SD 29J	450.0	4,754.3	9.5%	1,160,082	2,578	460,776	1,024	1,554	39.7%
Willamina SD 30J	28.6	929.0	3.1%	73,889	2,584	29,157	1,019	1,564	39.5%
McMinnville SD 40	949.1	5,502.3	17.2%	2,434,132	2,565	1,563,822	1,648	917	64.2%
Sheridan SD 48J	34.7	944.2	3.7%	88,176	2,541	67,079	1,933	608	76.1%

Notes:

RevELL0304Rpt