

**ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL FINANCES IN  
NEW YORK STATE SCHOOL DISTRICTS  
2009-10**

The University of the State of New York  
**THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT**  
Fiscal Analysis and Research Unit  
Albany, New York 12234

January 2012

# THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

## Regents of The University

MERRYL H. TISCH, <i>Chancellor</i> , B.A., M.A., Ed.D. ....	New York
MILTON L. COFIELD, <i>Vice Chancellor</i> , B.S., M.B.A., Ph.D. ....	Rochester
ROBERT M. BENNETT, <i>Chancellor Emeritus</i> , B.A., M.S. ....	Tonawanda
JAMES C. DAWSON, A.A., B.A., M.S., Ph.D. ....	Plattsburgh
ANTHONY S. BOTTAR, B.A., J.D. ....	Syracuse
GERALDINE D. CHAPEY, B.A., M.A., Ed.D. ....	Belle Harbor
HARRY PHILLIPS, 3rd, B.A., M.S.F.S. ....	Hartsdale
JAMES R. TALLON, JR., B.A., M.A. ....	Binghamton
ROGER TILLES, B.A., J.D. ....	Great Neck
CHARLES R. BENDIT, B.A. ....	Manhattan
BETTY A. ROSA, B.A., M.S. in Ed., M.S. in Ed., M.Ed., Ed.D. ....	Bronx
LESTER W. YOUNG, JR., B.S., M.S., Ed. D. ....	Oakland Gardens
CHRISTINE D. CEA, B.A., M.A., Ph.D. ....	Staten Island
WADE S. NORWOOD, B.A. ....	Rochester
JAMES O. JACKSON, B.S., M.A., Ph.D. ....	Albany
KATHLEEN M. CASHIN, B.S., M.S., Ed.D. ....	Brooklyn
JAMES E. COTTRELL, B.S., M.D. ....	New York

### Commissioner of Education

#### President of The University of the State of New York

JOHN B. KING, JR.

### Executive Deputy Commissioner

VALERIE GREY

---

The State Education Department does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, religion, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status, national origin, race, gender, genetic predisposition or carrier status, or sexual orientation in its educational programs, services and activities. Portions of this publication can be made available in a variety of formats, including braille, large print or audio tape, upon request. Inquiries concerning this policy of nondiscrimination should be directed to the Department's Office for Diversity, Ethics, and Access, Room 530, Education Building, Albany, NY 12234.

## **PREFACE**

The "Analysis of School Finances in New York State School Districts" is an annual publication providing a meaningful perspective to staff in the Division of the Budget, the Legislature, the Education Department, and school officials concerning school expenditures, State Aid, and local support. This edition of the Analysis summarizes the finances of major school districts in school year 2009-10, as well as public school expenditures and State Aid since 1991-92.

In summarizing school district expenditures, the Analysis compares various percentiles of operating expenditures per pupil and describes the magnitude of the disparity in approved operating expenditures per pupil between districts in the 10th and 90th percentiles for each year. Also provided are decile tables ranked by wealth, expenditure per pupil and a need/resource index. These decile tables provide comparisons of school districts' expenditures per pupil, tax rates, and wealth per pupil.

Another feature of the Analysis is its presentation of five-year trend data on full value, expenditures, State Aid, tax rates, and local revenue. These items are displayed on a per pupil basis for the entire State, New York City and the rest of State (school districts outside New York City).

In terms of data collection, the total revenue from State sources displayed in the tables from 1991-92 through 2009-10 is the State Aid reported in the Annual Financial Report (Form ST-3) submitted by school districts. It should be noted that this data item may include prior year State Aid adjustment payments. Data for 2010-11 is based on State Aid payments to school districts and does not include some grants, prior year adjustments, and miscellaneous revenues from State sources. Total expenditures for 2010-11 are based on estimates provided by school districts. The 2009 Income data are as of October 2011. Other items contained in the Analysis are as of May 2011. School Tax Relief (STAR) revenue is also addressed in the report.

As in past years, an historical perspective of school finances in New York State is presented. Table 1 displays State Aid and total expenditures since 1991-92 and Appendix B contains data for school years 1944-45 through 1990-91.

To assist the reader less familiar with the technical terms used in the Analysis, a glossary of terms is provided at the end of the report.



# CONTENTS

<i>Section</i>	<i><u>Page</u></i>
Preface.....	ii
List of Tables .....	vi
List of Figures .....	vii
 I     The Financing of Public Education in New York State.....	 1
II    Comparisons of Per Pupil Expenditures and Wealth by Contiguous Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) .....	 8
III   Comparisons of Per Pupil Expenditures and Wealth by District Rank .....	13
IV    Four-Year Changes in School Finances, 2005-06 to 2009-10.....	21
Glossary:   Definitions Used in this Report .....	28
Appendix A: Historic Changes in Pupil Units .....	33
Appendix B: Revenues from State Sources Compared to Total Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools 1940-41 to 1990-91 .....	 36
Appendix C: Counties by Contiguous Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) -- 2000 Census .....	 38
Appendix D: District Type Groupings -- 2000 Census .....	39
Appendix E: New York State County Map .....	40

## LIST OF TABLES

<u><i>Table</i></u>	<u><i>Page</i></u>
1 Revenues from State Sources Compared to Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures, New York State Public School Districts, 1991-92 to 2010-11 .....	3
2 State Revenue Per Enrolled Pupil and Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures Per Enrolled Pupil, New York State Public School Districts, 1991-92 to 2010-11 .....	5
3 Total Revenues, Elementary and Secondary Education, New York State Public School Districts, 1991-92 to 2010-11 (In Thousands) .....	7
4 2009-10 Average Wealth, Expenditure, Revenue and Aid Data for Districts, by Contiguous MSA (2000 Census), All Major Districts Including New York City.....	9
5 Changes in Wealth Per Pupil and Wealth Pupils by Contiguous MSA (2000) .....	11
6 Changes in Approved Operating Expenditures and Tax Revenues Per TAPU for Expense and Tax Rate by Contiguous MSA (2000 Census).....	11
7 Number of School Districts Statewide Below the 25th and Above the 75th Percentile of 2009-10 AOE/TAPU for Expense .....	12
8 Distribution of Approved Operating Expenditures Per Weighted Pupil, Major School Districts, 1991-92 to 2009-10 .....	14
9 2009-10 Wealth, Expenditure, Revenue and Aid Data, Ranked by AOE Per TAPU for Expense, Deciles for All Major Districts Excluding New York City .....	16
10 2009-10 Wealth, Expenditure, Revenue and Aid Data, Ranked by Actual Valuation Per TWPU, Deciles for All Major Districts Excluding New York City .....	17
11 2009-10 Wealth, Expenditure, Revenue and Aid Data, Ranked by Income Per TWPU, Deciles for All Major Districts Excluding New York City .....	18
12 2009-10 Wealth, Expenditure, Revenue and Aid Data, Ranked by Need/Resource Index, Deciles for All Major Districts Excluding New York City .....	20
13 Selected Pupil Counts Used in School Aid Formulas – New York State Major School Districts, 2005-06 to 2009-10 .....	22
14 Selected Fiscal Data – New York State Major School Districts, 2005-06 to 2009-10.....	23
15 Average Expenditures, State Revenue, and Local Tax and Other Revenues Per Duplicated Combined Adjusted Average Daily Membership (DCAADM), New York State Major School Districts, 2005-06 to 2009-10 .....	26
16 Income and Actual Valuation Per TWPU, Actual Valuation Per RWADA, Actual Value Tax Rates, Approved Operating Expense per TAPU for Expense and Local Tax and Other Revenues per TWPU, New York State Major School Districts, 2005-06 to 2009-10 .....	27

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b><u>Figure</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Figure 1: Revenues from State Sources as a Percent of Total Expenditures .....	2
Figure 2: Revenues from State Sources and Total Expenditures per Enrolled Pupil .....	4
Figure 3: Total Revenues by Source, Elementary and Secondary Education .....	6





# I

## THE FINANCING OF PUBLIC EDUCATION IN NEW YORK STATE

### Introduction

The New York State commitment to elementary and secondary education, as measured by revenues to school districts from State sources, has increased by \$3.58 billion or 18.1 percent, from \$19.82 billion in 2005-06 to \$23.40 billion in 2009-10. While this was occurring at the State level, school districts increased local tax revenue support by \$5.15 billion, a 21.8 percent increase over the same period. This overall revenue commitment by State and local governments (combined with a \$1.64 billion or 57.7 percent increase in federal aid) contributed to a total expenditure increase of \$9.81 billion or 21.4 percent during the period. The State's percentage of participation, presently at 42.0 percent (Table 1) for 2009-10, in the expenditures of school districts over the past 60 years has varied from a 2001-02 peak of 48.2 percent to a low of 31.5 percent in 1944-45.


New York State's capacity to fund education has fluctuated over the years depending on State or national economic prosperity. A review of Table 1 (and Appendix B) reveals that State revenue has paralleled the State's economic climate. In the latter 1970's, the State provided relatively modest aid increases to schools caused in part by the economic adjustment to higher energy costs and inflation. As energy costs declined and economic activity within the State and nation rebounded, the State moved to incorporate new initiatives and continue support for excellence in education. Between 1983-84 and 1988-89, the State's economic climate was improving. This resulted in generous increases in State revenue, about 10.7 percent annually. As a result, the State revenue portion of Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures rose to 44.2 percent for 1988-89. Due to a restructuring of the New York State Teachers' Retirement System (TRS) payments, this percentage declined to 41.6 percent for 1989-90. Even with a \$257 million giveback by local districts (1990-91 State Aid to school districts was initially reduced \$67 million due to restructuring of TRS and Employees' Retirement System payments and further reduced \$190 million due to the December 1990 Deficit Reduction Assessment), the 1990-91 percentage rose to 42.9 percent.

As a result of the State's \$6 billion budget deficit in 1991-92 and the imposition of \$926 million deficit reduction assessments against school aid the proportionate share of public school expenditures funded from State sources declined to 40.4 percent. The continuing poor economic climate in 1992-93 also resulted in a \$1.03 billion deficit reduction assessment against school aid, with the result that the State's share of public school expenditures declined to 39.1 percent in 1992-93. The State's share of public school expenditures continued to decline, to 38.0 percent, in 1993-94 with a -\$167 million net transition adjustment. Since then, steady increases in State revenue have resulted in the State's share of total expenditures rising nearly every year through 2001-02. State revenue increased only slightly from 2001-02 to 2002-03 resulting in a drop in the State's share of expenditures from 48.2 percent in 2001-02 to 45.5 percent in 2002-03. The State's share of expenditures continued to decline through 2005-06 (see Figure 1). Phase-in to a new foundation aid formula (replacing operating aid) began in 2007-08, providing districts with an increase of \$1.1 billion and an increase in the State's share to 45.8 percent. The phase-in continued in 2008-09 with

a \$1.2 billion increase in foundation aid and an increase in the State's share to 42.5 percent, well above the 19-year average (1990-91 to 2008-09) of 43.4 percent.

The school aid situation changed dramatically in 2009-10 with a downturn in the economy. As a result, 2009-10 foundation aid was held to 2008-09 amounts and deficit reduction assessments of \$1,489 million were deducted from aid allocations. This continued, with 2010-11 and 2011-12 foundation aid held to 2008-09 amounts and gap elimination adjustments (GEA) of \$2,138 million for 2010-11 and \$2,556 million for 2011-12 further reducing the State's share of expenditures. Due to federal passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) in 2009, New York State will receive \$3 billion over two years to help stabilize State and local budgets and ameliorate reductions in education. For 2009-10, the \$1,489 million reduction in State funding was entirely offset with ARRA state fiscal stabilization funds. For 2010-11, the GEA reductions were partially restored through the remaining ARRA funds of \$726 million and a new federal Education Jobs Program (passed in August, 2010) provided another \$607.6 million. After the school year began, 2010-11 aid payments to districts were further reduced by \$131.5 million.

**Figure 1: Revenues from State Sources as a Percent of Total Expenditures  
Total State**



Although final data for 2010-11 will not be available until next Summer, preliminary information in Table 1 shows that Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools are expected to increase \$0.9 billion for 2010-11 to \$56.6 billion, a 1.6 percent increase over 2009-10. However, total State revenue including STAR in the same period is likely to decrease by about \$0.5 billion, or 2.35 percent, to \$22.85 billion, resulting in a State share of 40.4 percent.

Table 1

REVENUES FROM STATE SOURCES COMPARED TO TOTAL  
GENERAL AND SPECIAL AID FUND EXPENDITURES  
NEW YORK STATE PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1991-92 TO 2010-11\*

School Year	School Tax Relief (STAR)	Other Revenue from State Sources**	Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures***	as Percent of Total Exp. STAR	Other State Rev.
2010-11 ****	\$3,150,000,000	\$19,700,000,000	\$56,600,000,000	5.6 %	34.8 %
2009-10	3,208,332,714	20,191,035,404	55,710,402,445	5.8	36.2
2008-09	3,526,919,338	21,782,826,310	54,056,211,419	6.5	40.3
2007-08	3,711,368,299	19,890,048,582	51,558,636,211	7.2	38.6
2006-07	3,553,834,853	18,039,821,863	48,713,637,422	7.3	37.0
2005-06	3,215,197,535	16,605,805,901	45,904,234,450	7.0	36.2
2004-05	3,058,781,067	15,666,489,776	42,957,729,750	7.1	36.5
2003-04	2,819,756,904	14,700,831,875	39,809,145,006	7.1	36.9
2002-03	2,664,251,588	14,514,842,689	37,741,721,437	7.1	38.5
2001-02	2,507,313,532	14,585,910,355	35,488,090,183	7.1	41.1
2000-01	1,846,150,742	13,882,104,712	34,215,829,764	5.4	40.6
1999-00	1,191,615,221	12,499,522,343	31,704,767,501	3.8	39.4
1998-99	582,156,138	11,956,301,295	29,590,606,985	2.0	40.4
1997-98		10,964,334,068	27,717,505,209		39.6
1996-97		10,401,325,791	26,151,872,531		39.8
1995-96		10,188,856,301	25,603,561,680		39.8
1994-95		9,832,200,501	24,945,606,690		39.4
1993-94		9,065,208,519	23,860,073,256		38.0
1992-93		8,817,919,324	22,575,881,781		39.1
1991-92 *****		8,659,401,410	21,412,274,440		40.4

\* For comparisons prior to the 1991-92 school year, the reader is referred to Appendix B of this report.

\*\* Other than 1998-99 STAR, all revenues from State sources are as reported on the Annual Financial Report by school districts. Depending on local accounting methods, this may include prior year adjustments.

\*\*\* Total Expenditures include expenditures made from the Federal Aid Fund from 1965-66 to 1973-74 and from the Special Aid Fund since 1974-75. Includes expenditures from the Debt Service Fund, which was established in 1978-79. Beginning in 1983-84, some districts including New York City reported negative interfund transfers to the General Fund, tending to reduce actual expenditures.

\*\*\*\* Estimated.


\*\*\*\*\* Annual Financial Report data was used; however, the State aid withheld as a State share of local Teachers' Retirement System and Employees' Retirement System savings, which resulted from the restructuring noted in Appendix B (1989-90 school year), was charged against revenues rather than expenditures.

The impact of the State revenue and total expenditure increases experienced during the last 20 years was further enhanced by enrollment declines which continued without interruption from 1973-74 until 1988-89. Enrollment increased steadily from 1989-90 until 2001-02 and has generally declined since then.

Table 2 accounts for these enrollment changes by depicting total expenditures and State revenues on a per enrolled pupil basis for school years 1991-92 to 2010-11. As Table 2 and Figure 2 illustrate, Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures per pupil increased from \$8,190 in 1991-92 to \$19,952 in 2009-10, a 144 percent increase over the entire period and an annual percentage increase per pupil of 5.1 percent. Increases in State revenue (including STAR starting in 1998-99) per pupil reflected a similar trend, increasing from \$3,312 in 1991-92 to \$8,380 in 2009-10, a 153 percent increase over the same time span, and an annual percentage increase of 5.3 percent.

The estimated 2010-11 Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures per enrolled pupil are \$20,298, an increase of \$346 (1.7 percent) over the 2009-10 school year. During this same period, State revenue including School Tax Relief (STAR) is expected to decrease by \$186 per enrolled pupil to \$8,194, a 2.2 percent decrease from the 2009-10 school year.

**Figure 2: Revenues from State Sources and Total Expenditures per Enrolled Pupil**  
Total State



**Table 2**

STATE REVENUE PER ENROLLED PUPIL AND TOTAL GENERAL AND SPECIAL  
AID FUND EXPENDITURES PER ENROLLED PUPIL\*  
NEW YORK STATE PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS  
1991-92 TO 2010-11

School Year	State Revenue** Per Enrolled Pupil	Percent Increase in State Revenue Per Enrolled Pupil Over Prior Year	Total General*** and Special Aid Fund Expenditures Per Enrolled Pupil	Percent Increase in Total Exp. Per Enrolled Pupil Over Prior Year
2010-11 ****	\$8,194	-2.2 %	\$20,298	1.7 %
2009-10	8,380	-8.1	19,952	2.4
2008-09	9,120	8.0	19,478	5.5
2007-08	8,448	10.2	18,455	6.7
2006-07	7,667	10.2	17,296	7.3
2005-06	6,959	6.7	16,115	7.7
2004-05	6,522	7.5	14,963	8.6
2003-04	6,065	1.6	13,779	5.1
2002-03	5,966	1.0	13,108	6.9
2001-02	5,908	8.6	12,267	3.6
2000-01	5,441	14.3	11,836	7.4
1999-00	4,759	8.5	11,020	6.4
1998-99	4,388	13.5	10,356	5.9
1997-98	3,867	4.6	9,776	5.2
1996-97	3,697	0.8	9,295	0.9
1995-96	3,667	2.0	9,215	1.1
1994-95	3,594	7.0	9,118	3.1
1993-94	3,359	1.1	8,842	4.0
1992-93	3,321	0.3	8,502	3.8
1991-92	3,312	--	8,190	--

\* See Glossary for definition.

\*\* Includes School Tax Relief (STAR) starting in 1998-99.

\*\*\* Includes Debt Service Fund, which was established in 1978-79.


\*\*\*\* Estimated.

Table 3 contains a breakdown of total revenues and includes General and Special Aid Fund Revenues by funding source. State revenue, Federal revenue and local tax and other revenues are listed over the past 20 years. As noted in the table, State revenue includes School Tax Relief (STAR) which began in 1998-99. Revenues come primarily from local taxes and other revenues (50.8 percent in 2009-10) and State revenue (41.3 percent of total in 2009-10); Federal revenue was \$4.48 billion in 2009-10, which amounted to 7.9 percent of total revenues.

Table 3 and Figure 3 also show that Total General and Special Aid Fund Revenues increased from \$21.25 billion in 1991-92 to \$56.68 billion in 2009-10, an increase of 167 percent, while State revenue increased from \$8.66 billion to \$23.40 billion, or 170 percent over the same period. At the same time, local and other revenues increased from \$11.71 billion to \$28.80 billion, a 146 percent increase; Federal revenues increased from \$880 million to \$4,480 million, a 409 percent increase over this period.

Current estimates indicate that, due to the second year of ARRA funding, Federal revenue will be approximately \$4.65 billion in 2010-11 and will comprise 8.1 percent of total revenues. It is estimated that the proportion of total revenues from State sources including School Tax Relief (STAR) will decrease to 39.7 percent for the 2010-11 school year while amounting to \$22.85 billion. Local tax and other revenues are expected to increase by about \$1.2 billion to \$30.03 billion, and their proportionate share of total revenues will increase by 1.4 percentage point to 52.2 percent.

**Figure 3: Total Revenues by Source, Elementary and Secondary Education  
Total State**



**Table 3**

**TOTAL REVENUES, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION  
NEW YORK STATE PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

1991-92 TO 2010-11  
(In Thousands)

School Year	Total General** & Special Aid Fund Revenues	STATE REVENUE*		FEDERAL REVENUE		LOCAL TAX & OTHER REVENUES	
		Amount	Percent of Total Revenues	Amount	Percent of Total Revenues	Amount	Percent of Total Revenues
2010-11 ***	\$57,527,556	\$22,850,000	39.7 %	\$4,650,000	8.1 %	\$30,027,556	52.2 %
2009-10	56,677,395	23,399,368	41.3	4,480,382	7.9	28,797,645	50.8
2008-09	55,056,998	25,309,746	46.0	2,614,226	4.7	27,133,026	49.3
2007-08	52,293,190	23,601,417	45.1	2,587,422	4.9	26,104,351	49.9
2006-07	49,437,635	21,593,657	43.7	2,746,120	5.6	25,097,858	50.8
2005-06	46,306,624	19,821,003	42.8	2,837,247	6.1	23,648,374	51.1
2004-05	43,185,271	18,725,271	43.4	2,674,224	6.2	21,785,776	50.4
2003-04	40,151,547	17,520,589	43.6	2,593,597	6.5	20,037,361	49.9
2002-03	37,470,378	17,179,094	45.8	2,149,320	5.7	18,141,964	48.4
2001-02	35,179,401	17,093,224	48.6	1,771,551	5.0	16,314,626	46.4
2000-01	33,816,802	15,728,255	46.5	1,488,430	4.4	16,600,117	49.1
1999-00	31,197,395	13,691,138	43.9	1,429,909	4.6	16,076,348	51.5
1998-99	29,437,657	12,538,457	42.6	1,350,041	4.6	15,549,159	52.8
1997-98	27,363,011	10,964,334	40.1	1,095,722	4.0	15,302,954	55.9
1996-97	26,132,515	10,401,326	39.8	1,049,139	4.0	14,682,050	56.2
1995-96	25,408,873	10,188,856	40.1	1,134,569	4.5	14,085,448	55.4
1994-95	24,488,976	9,832,201	40.1	1,047,208	4.3	13,609,567	55.6
1993-94	23,497,040	9,065,209	38.6	1,086,491	4.6	13,345,340	56.8
1992-93	22,266,332	8,817,919	39.6	992,456	4.5	12,455,957	55.9
1991-92	21,247,060	8,659,401	40.8	879,886	4.1	11,707,773	55.1

\* Includes School Tax Relief (STAR) starting in 1998-99.

\*\* Includes the Debt Service Fund, which was established in 1978-79.

\*\*\* Estimated.

## II

### **COMPARISONS OF PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES AND WEALTH BY CONTIGUOUS METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (MSAs)**

This section describes the variation in expenditures and resources among the contiguous Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) of the State and among school districts of different types, based on definitions from the 2000 Census. Appendix C depicts the counties in each contiguous MSA and Appendix D the district type classification of school district. While the variation in statewide expenditure and revenue per pupil has been substantial over time, dramatic differences in expenditure and resource data also exist among the different geographic regions at any given point in time.

Table 4 (based on the 2000 definition of MSAs) shows that the New York – Suffolk – Nassau area has by far the highest average Actual Value/TWPU (Total Wealth Pupil Units), AOE/TAPU (Approved Operating Expense/Total Aidable Pupil Units) for Expense, Total Expenditure/TAPU for Expense and Tax Revenue (excluding STAR)/TAPU for Expense of the contiguous MSAs. This region also has the highest Income/TWPU and Income/Tax Return and the second lowest average Tax Rate (excluding STAR) per \$1,000 Actual Value. The non-MSA districts are lowest on STAR Revenue/TAPU for Expense, Income/TWPU, Income/Tax Return and Tax Rate (excluding STAR) per \$1,000 Actual Value. Accordingly, they have the highest average among the regions on Other State Revenue/TAPU for Expense. The Syracuse – Utica – Rome region has the lowest average AV/TWPU and Total Expenditure/TAPU for Expense. The Binghamton – Elmira - Ithaca region has the highest average STAR Revenue/TAPU for Expense and the lowest enrollment. The Buffalo – Cheektowaga – Tonawanda – Rochester region has the highest average Tax Rate (excluding STAR) per \$1,000 Actual Value.

Table 4 also displays wealth, expenditure, and aid data in another fashion -- on the basis of pupil weighted averages for districts grouped by type. These type groupings are: 1) All Major Districts; 2) New York City; 3) Other Big 5 City School Districts; 4) Small City School Districts; 5) Suburban Districts; and, 6) Other School Districts. By comparing individual districts to both the decile groupings in Section III as well as the classification groups listed, a larger picture of the district's relative status can be gained.

As Table 4 reveals, the mean AOE/TAPU for Expense for all 676 major districts is \$12,150. New York City spends \$11,920 per pupil. The other Big 5 City School Districts have an average AOE/TAPU for Expense of \$11,348 (district spending per pupil ranges from \$10,381 in Syracuse to \$13,309 in Yonkers). The Small City Districts have an average AOE/TAPU for Expense of \$11,440 with the 50 Upstate districts averaging \$10,534 per pupil and the 7 Downstate districts averaging \$16,163 per pupil. The Suburban Districts have an average expenditure of \$12,813 per pupil with the 250 Upstate districts and the 167 Downstate districts spending \$10,396 and \$15,085 per pupil, respectively. The 197 Other districts have an average AOE/TAPU for Expense of \$10,847.



**Table 4**

2009-10 AVERAGE WEALTH, EXPENDITURE, REVENUE AND AID DATA FOR DISTRICTS, BY CONTIGUOUS MSA (2000 CENSUS),  
ALL MAJOR DISTRICTS INCLUDING NEW YORK CITY

2000 Census Contiguous MSAs	METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA AVERAGE									2009-10 Enrollment
	Actual Valuation per TW PU	AOE per TAPU for Exp.	Total Exp.* per TAPU for Exp.	STAR Revenue per TAPU for Exp.	Other Revenue from State** per TAPU for Exp.	Income per TW PU	Income per Return	Tax Rev. (excl. STAR) per TAPU for Exp.	Tax Rate (excl. STAR) per \$1,000 Full Value	
Albany-Sch-Troy-Glens F	\$498,062	\$10,613	\$14,258	\$869	\$5,566	\$128,500	\$49,312	\$6,528	\$13.20	146,247
Binghamton-Elmira-Ithaca	315,981	10,185	14,376	1,042	7,059	108,605	43,278	4,793	15.20	63,281
Buffalo-Cheek-Ton-Rochester	293,872	10,204	14,443	954	7,137	114,901	45,455	4,734	16.12	332,110
New York-Suffolk-Nassau	710,515	13,121	17,225	952	5,277	186,436	71,280	8,354	11.83	1,725,870
Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Mid	577,398	11,772	15,446	906	5,413	122,770	55,500	7,794	13.53	137,808
Syracuse-Utica-Rome	283,451	10,122	14,049	952	7,184	101,034	44,235	4,475	15.83	153,519
Non-MSA	398,943	10,590	15,412	863	8,578	89,273	38,287	4,517	11.39	230,540
All Major Districts Avg.(including NYC)	\$588,500	\$12,150	\$16,286	\$940	\$5,918	\$158,000	\$62,100	\$7,222	\$12.34	2,789,375
New York City	546,894	11,920	16,324	680	6,009	176,108	64,327	6,145	11.29	1,051,189
Other Big 5	245,055	11,348	16,538	519	10,808	81,399	36,915	2,315	9.44	124,930
Small City Districts	426,843	11,440	15,404	1,006	6,837	122,029	47,007	5,927	13.95	246,780
Upstate	314,277	10,534	14,453	853	7,403	97,612	38,891	4,586	14.65	206,810
Downstate	1,016,463	16,163	20,364	1,800	3,887	249,926	82,031	12,918	12.81	39,970
Suburban Districts	717,074	12,813	16,463	1,224	4,711	166,603	68,835	9,349	13.11	1,187,340
Upstate	428,872	10,396	14,155	1,061	5,544	128,495	51,613	6,380	14.92	578,173
Downstate	988,301	15,085	18,633	1,376	3,929	202,466	85,968	12,141	12.38	609,167
Other Districts	440,859	10,847	15,904	864	8,855	88,912	38,682	4,796	10.95	179,136

\* Total Expenditure includes Debt Service and Special Aid Fund.

\*\* Other State Revenue does not include STAR.

Table 5 compares contiguous MSAs (2000 Census definition) on changes from 2005-06 to 2009-10 in Total Wealth Pupil Units (TWPU), Actual Value per TWPU, and Income per TWPU. The non-MSA districts MSA had the largest percent increase in AV/TWPU. The New York – Suffolk – Nassau region experienced the smallest percent increase in AV/TWPU and Income/TWPU and was the only region with an increase in TWPU. The non-MSA districts had the largest decline in TWPU. The Binghamton – Elmira - Ithaca MSA had the largest increase in Income/TWPU. Statewide, AV/TWPU increased 23.97 percent and Income/TWPU increased 6.76 percent. Statewide, TWPU decreased 0.62 percent. *It is important to note the currency of the Market Value Standard used to convert locally assessed property values to a uniform full value standard during the reporting period: the 2005 standard was set at July 2004 (no gap) and the 2009 standard is July 2008 (no gap).*

Table 6 compares contiguous MSAs on changes in AOE/TAPU for Expense, Tax Revenue/TAPU for Expense and Tax Rate per \$1,000 of Actual Value for the 2005-06 to 2009-10 period. Tax Revenue and Tax Rate data from 1998-99 onward exclude STAR Revenue. Statewide, the Tax Rate decreased 6.80 percent with the largest decrease in the non-MSA districts. Statewide, over the four-year period AOE/TAPU for Expense increased 22.73 percent and Tax Revenue per TAPU for Expense increased 15.59 percent. The Poughkeepsie – Newburgh – Middletown - Kingston had the largest percent increase in AOE/TAPU for Expense. The smallest percent increase in AOE/TAPU for Expense was in the Albany – Schenectady – Troy - Glens Falls MSA. The largest percent increase in Tax Revenue per TAPU was in the non-MSA districts. The smallest increase in Tax Revenue per TAPU for Expense was in the New York – Suffolk - Nassau MSA. As shown in Table 16, New York City had a 24.5 percent increase in AOE/TAPU for Expense, a 20.3 percent increase in Tax Revenue/TWPU and a 2.5 percent decrease in Tax Rate. Table 14 shows that New York City had a 30.0 percent increase in Actual Value for this same time period.

Table 7 shows the wide range in school district expenditure patterns based on AOE/TAPU for Expense among the contiguous MSAs when compared to the statewide 25th percentile (\$10,055) and 75th percentile (\$14,255). The New York - Suffolk - Nassau MSA contains by far the largest number and percent of school districts with AOE/TAPU for Expense above the 75th percentile; 124 of the 176 school districts in the region, or 70 percent, had expenditures above the 75th percentile. This contiguous MSA had no school district below the 25th percentile of spending. In most of the other contiguous MSAs and in non-MSA districts, the number of districts in excess of the 75th percentile was extremely small. Each of these contiguous MSAs and the non-MSA districts had substantially higher numbers of districts with AOE/TAPU for Expense less than the 25th percentile.

Table 5

CHANGES IN WEALTH PER PUPIL AND WEALTH PUPILS  
BY CONTIGUOUS MSA (2000 Census)

2000 Census Contiguous MSAs	<u>Actual Value Per TWPU</u>			<u>Income Per TWPU</u>			<u>Total Wealth Pupil Units</u>		
	2005-06	2009-10	Percent Change	2005-06	2009-10	Percent Change	2005-06	2009-10	Percent Change
Albany-Sch-Troy-Glens Falls	\$341,777	\$498,062	45.73%	\$113,702	\$128,500	13.01%	183,297	174,965	-4.55%
Binghamton-Elmira-Ithaca	221,397	315,981	42.72%	91,743	108,605	18.38%	79,953	74,666	-6.61%
Buffalo-Cheek-Ton-Rochester	234,319	293,872	25.42%	101,361	114,901	13.36%	416,390	390,847	-6.13%
New York-Suffolk-Nassau	600,241	710,515	18.37%	181,668	186,436	2.62%	2,074,156	2,134,380	2.90%
<i>without NYC</i>	<i>841,222</i>	<i>977,312</i>	<i>16.18%</i>	<i>199,821</i>	<i>203,276</i>	<i>1.73%</i>	<i>818,522</i>	<i>811,372</i>	<i>-0.87%</i>
Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown	457,097	577,398	26.32%	110,371	122,770	11.23%	173,858	167,535	-3.64%
Syracuse-Utica-Rome	212,044	283,451	33.68%	87,296	101,034	15.74%	194,224	182,724	-5.92%
Non-MSA	262,178	398,943	52.16%	76,043	89,273	17.40%	296,765	272,191	-8.28%
Average (incl. NYC)	\$474,700	\$588,500	23.97%	\$148,000	\$158,000	6.76%	3,418,643	3,397,308	-0.62%

Table 6

CHANGES IN APPROVED OPERATING EXPENDITURES AND TAX REVENUES PER TAPU FOR EXPENSE AND TAX RATE  
BY CONTIGUOUS MSA (2000 Census)

2000 Census Contiguous MSAs	<u>AOE/TAPU For Expense</u>			<u>Tax Revenue* Per TAPU For Expense</u>			<u>Tax Rate* Per \$1,000 of Actual Value</u>		
	2005-06	2009-10	Percent Change	2005-06	2009-10	Percent Change	2005-06	2009-10	Percent Change
Albany-Sch-Troy-Glens Falls	\$8,764	\$10,613	21.10%	\$5,277	\$6,528	23.71%	\$15.51	\$13.20	-14.89%
Binghamton-Elmira-Ithaca	8,345	10,185	22.05%	3,810	4,793	25.80%	17.22	15.20	-11.73%
Buffalo-Cheek-Ton-Rochester	8,382	10,204	21.74%	4,131	4,734	14.60%	17.61	16.12	-8.46%
New York-Suffolk-Nassau	10,740	13,121	22.17%	7,486	8,354	11.59%	12.58	11.83	-5.96%
<i>without NYC</i>	<i>12,536</i>	<i>15,082</i>	<i>20.31%</i>	<i>9,825</i>	<i>11,960</i>	<i>21.73%</i>	<i>11.78</i>	<i>12.33</i>	<i>4.67%</i>
Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown	9,493	11,772	24.01%	6,177	7,794	26.18%	13.58	13.53	-0.37%
Syracuse-Utica-Rome	8,253	10,122	22.65%	3,587	4,475	24.76%	16.96	15.83	-6.66%
Non-MSA	8,627	10,590	22.75%	3,536	4,517	27.74%	13.57	11.39	-16.06%
Average (incl. NYC)	\$9,900	\$12,150	22.73%	\$6,248	\$7,222	15.59%	\$13.24	\$12.34	-6.80%

\* In both 2005-06 and 2009-10, the Tax Revenue and Tax Rate exclude STAR revenue.

**Table 7**

NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS STATEWIDE  
BELOW THE 25TH AND ABOVE THE 75TH  
PERCENTILE OF 2009-10 AOE/TAPU FOR EXPENSE

2000 Census Contiguous MSAs	Number of Districts	# Below 25th %ile	# Above 75th %ile
Albany-Schenectady-Troy-Glens Falls	67	20	5
Binghamton-Elmira-Ithaca	27	12	0
Buffalo-Cheektowaga-Tonawanda-Rochester	89	44	0
New York-Suffolk-Nassau	176	0	124
Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown-Kingston	39	2	9
Syracuse-Utica-Rome	63	25	3
Non-MSA	<u>215</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>27</u>
 Number of Districts	 676	 169	 168

Statewide 25th percentile is \$ 10,055

Statewide 75th percentile is \$14,255

### III

## COMPARISONS OF PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES AND WEALTH BY DISTRICT RANK

Section III is designed to highlight the relationship between school district wealth and expenditure per pupil. A useful technique for portraying this relationship is first to rank order all districts in terms of their Approved Operating Expenditures per Total Aidable Pupil Unit for Expense (AOE/TAPU for Expense) from the lowest to the highest spending district. This array can then be split into 10 equally numbered groups, or deciles, and each of the expenditure deciles thus created can be described in terms of selected measures of district wealth as determined by Actual Value per Total Wealth Pupil Unit (AV/TWPU) and Income per Total Wealth Pupil Unit (Income/TWPU). The resulting decile tables (Tables 9 through 12) provide a quick comparison of school districts with similar approved operating expenditures per pupil and the degree to which changes in wealth are associated with changes in expenditure per TAPU.

Table 8 provides a comparison of AOE/TAPU for Expense, by selected district percentiles. As noted, Total Aidable Pupil Units (TAPU) was used for school years 1973-74 through 1979-80; and since 1980-81, TAPU for Expense, which includes weightings for students with disabilities, has been the pupil measure. The percentile values displayed (10th, 25th, 50th, 75th and 90th) are for all major school districts excluding New York City. New York City data are shown separately. Table 8 also displays the difference between the 90th and 10th percentiles, and the resulting expenditure gap expressed as a percent of the 10th percentile value. This expenditure gap measure can be viewed as a simple equality measure, with high values indicative of greater spending inequality among districts. As the last column of this table indicates, this expenditure gap generally decreased from 1991-92 until 1999-00, and, except for 2007-08 and 2009-10, has generally been increasing since the 2001-02 school year. At 84.4 percent, the 2001-02 expenditure gap is the smallest of the 19 years displayed.

Between the 2008-09 and 2009-10 school years, the median (50th percentile) district AOE per TAPU for Expense increased 2.4 percent or \$260. For the 10th percentile district, the change was an increase of \$204 or 2.2 percent; for the 90th percentile district, the per-pupil change was an increase of \$269 or 1.5 percent.

Over the 19-year period, the median approved operating expenditure per weighted pupil has increased by about 124 percent; however, the expenditure gap over the same period has increased by 95 percent.

In 1980-81, the method of computing the pupil count was changed to include weighted students with disabilities. Since there are a relatively large number of students with disabilities in New York City, this method of calculation has served to inflate New York City's pupil count, thus lowering their AOE per weighted pupil figures. New York City's AOE per pupil has been below the median from 1991-92 through 1999-00 and fell below the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile in 1996-97. Since 2002-03, New York City's AOE per pupil is above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile.

**Table 8**

DISTRIBUTION OF APPROVED OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER WEIGHTED PUPIL\*  
MAJOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS  
1991-92 TO 2009-10

School Year	New York City	District Percentiles** All Major Districts (Excluding New York City)					Difference 10th & 90th Percentiles	Difference as a Percent of 10th Percentile
		10	25	50	75	90		
2009-10	\$11,920	\$9,272	\$10,055	\$11,283	\$14,255	\$17,814	\$8,542	92.1 %
2008-09	12,100	9,068	9,702	11,023	14,007	17,545	8,477	93.5
2007-08	11,545	8,630	9,242	10,407	13,122	16,174	7,544	87.4
2006-07	10,581	8,096	8,662	9,761	12,377	15,558	7,462	92.2
2005-06	9,578	7,614	8,206	9,228	11,594	14,573	6,959	91.4
2004-05	8,776	7,100	7,668	8,630	10,781	13,681	6,581	92.7
2003-04	8,025	6,554	7,130	7,974	9,870	12,350	5,796	88.4
2002-03	7,639	6,313	6,784	7,555	9,391	11,769	5,456	86.4
2001-02	7,052	6,043	6,508	7,202	9,013	11,141	5,098	84.4
2000-01	6,927	5,739	6,164	6,916	8,712	10,714	4,975	86.7
1999-00	6,181	5,489	5,854	6,564	8,286	10,129	4,640	84.5
1998-99	5,847	5,219	5,594	6,227	7,964	9,832	4,613	88.4
1997-98	5,465	5,025	5,361	5,993	7,742	9,429	4,404	87.6
1996-97	5,118	4,875	5,201	5,906	7,616	9,443	4,568	93.7
1995-96	5,320	4,723	5,073	5,700	7,510	9,226	4,503	95.3
1994-95	5,256	4,609	4,977	5,638	7,359	9,200	4,591	99.6
1993-94	5,118	4,443	4,797	5,413	7,114	8,878	4,435	99.8
1992-93	4,966	4,224	4,594	5,187	6,816	8,626	4,402	104.2
1991-92	4,674	4,123	4,441	5,031	6,628	8,506	4,383	106.3

\* Weighted pupil count from 1973-74 to 1979-80, was TAPU; 1980-81 to present, TAPU for Expense (See Glossary for definitions).

\*\* The value of the district at the percentile shown below is listed.

For Tables 9 through 12, districts were ranked respectively on Expenditure (AOE/TAPU for Expense), Property Wealth (AV/TWPU), Income Wealth (Income/TWPU) and a Need/Resource Index. Based on the ranking value for a given table, the State's 675 major districts (excluding New York City) were divided into ten decile groupings. (A district could conceivably be in a different decile group on each table.) Each table displays the highest value for each decile group on the ranking measure as well as the decile average for the ranking measure and eight other data measures, plus the 2009-10 enrollment (see Glossary for definition). State averages and New York City values for each data measure are also described at the bottom of each table.

The decile rankings of Tables 9, 10 and 11 permit the reader to compare individual school district information in a number of ways; it can be compared to other districts within its decile group, to other decile groups, or to the State average. For example, referring to Table 9, a district with a 2009-10 AOE/TAPU for Expense of \$12,150 would fall in the sixth expenditure decile (between \$11,283 and \$12,200). A district at or below \$9,272 would fall in the lowest spending first decile. With an AOE/TAPU for Expense of \$11,920, New York City would fall in the sixth decile, if the deciles had included New York City. The average AV/TWPU for the third AOE/TAPU for Expense decile grouping was \$348,205 and the average Total Expenditure/TAPU for Expense was \$13,967 for this same group of districts.

In a review of the three decile tables, attention should be drawn to the fact that all three ranking measures are positively skewed, since their respective State averages are heavily influenced by the extremely high values associated with districts in the ninth and tenth deciles. Thus, for example, the pupil weighted State average AOE/TAPU for Expense (including NYC) of \$12,150 shown in Table 9 falls into the sixth decile of expense, above the AOE/TAPU for Expense of the district at the 50th percentile of expense (\$11,283 per pupil). This is due to the pronounced effect of the more extreme per pupil spending patterns in the highest spending decile. This phenomenon is particularly pronounced in the case of Income/TWPU (shown in Table 11) since the statewide average of \$158,000 per pupil is well above the 50th percentile maximum value of \$109,357. Once again, this is attributable to the unusually high per pupil income of school districts in the tenth decile of income wealth where the average income per pupil (\$366,427) is 2.3 times the statewide average.

The School Tax Relief (STAR) program started in 1998-99. Tables 9, 10 and 11 show State revenue to school districts under the STAR program on a per-pupil basis. Generally, lower spending and lower wealth districts receive less STAR/TAPU for Expense, however this pattern is most pronounced in Table 11, which ranks districts based on Income/TWPU. Consistent with past issues of this report, Other Revenue from State/TAPU for Expense does not include State revenue for STAR.

For Table 12, districts are ranked using a Need/Resource Index. The need/resource index is designed to measure each district's (or decile's) student need in relation to its capacity to raise local revenues, indexed to State averages.

**Table 9**

2009-10 WEALTH, EXPENDITURE, REVENUE AND AID DATA  
RANKED BY AOE PER TAPU FOR EXPENSE  
DECILES FOR ALL MAJOR DISTRICTS EXCLUDING NEW YORK CITY

AOE/TAPU Deciles (upper limit shown)		DECILE AVERAGE*									2009-10 Enrollment
		AOE per TAPU for Exp.	Actual Valuation per TWPU	Total Exp.** per TAPU for Exp.	STAR Revenue per TAPU for Exp.	Other Revenue from State*** per TAPU for Exp.	Income per TWPU	Income (excl. STAR) per Return	Tax Rev. (excl. STAR) per TAPU for Exp.	Tax Rate (excl. STAR) per \$1,000 Full Value	
1=	\$9,272	\$8,618	\$283,478	\$12,516	\$823	\$6,737	\$100,224	\$43,600	\$3,822	\$13.54	165,055
2=	9,811	9,572	357,962	13,293	1,035	6,027	117,138	46,921	5,172	14.53	176,098
3=	10,302	10,081	348,205	13,967	1,010	6,465	122,245	49,726	5,313	15.31	157,510
4=	10,730	10,507	340,018	14,573	880	7,223	103,111	45,019	4,991	14.76	149,716
5=	11,283	10,995	299,393	15,753	805	8,694	95,297	40,204	4,105	13.72	194,629
6=	12,200	11,773	496,241	15,455	1,006	6,065	122,295	52,521	6,933	13.86	177,360
7=	13,467	12,869	590,208	16,620	1,162	6,214	129,601	53,103	7,897	13.18	217,313
8=	15,182	14,215	838,630	17,921	1,416	4,189	168,790	70,027	11,090	13.33	199,505
9=	17,814	16,123	912,104	19,792	1,592	4,034	195,412	77,693	12,749	14.06	187,876
10=	131,732	19,796	2,049,440	24,399	1,269	1,867	376,188	145,131	19,947	9.62	113,124
All Major Districts Avg. (excluding NYC)		12,317	614,991	16,262	1,107	5,860	146,441	60,577	7,911	12.93	1,738,186
New York City		11,920	546,894	16,324	680	6,009	176,108	64,327	6,145	11.29	1,051,189
All Major Districts Avg.(including NYC)		\$12,150	\$588,500	\$16,286	\$940	\$5,918	\$158,000	\$62,100	\$7,222	\$12.34	2,789,375
Decile Rank		6	7	6	4	5	8	8	6	4	

\* Values shown are the weighted averages for all 67 or 68 districts with an AOE/TAPU for Exp. less than or equal to the upper limit for the decile.

\*\* Total Expenditure includes Debt Service and Special Aid Fund.

\*\*\* Other State Revenue does not include STAR.



**Table 10**

2009-10 WEALTH, EXPENDITURE, REVENUE AND AID DATA  
RANKED BY ACTUAL VALUATION PER TWPU  
DECILES FOR ALL MAJOR DISTRICTS EXCLUDING NEW YORK CITY

		DECILE AVERAGE*								2009-10 Enrollment	
		Actual Valuation per TWPU	AOE per TAPU for Exp.	Total Exp.** per TAPU for Exp.	STAR Revenue per TAPU for Exp.	Other Revenue from State*** per TAPU for Exp.	Income per TWPU	Income (excl. STAR) per Return	Tax Rev. (excl. STAR) per TAPU for Exp.		Tax Rate (excl. STAR) per \$1,000 Full Value
Actual Valuation/TWPU Deciles (upper limit shown)											
1=	\$215,208	\$161,306	\$10,248	\$15,281	\$616	\$10,294	\$67,930	\$32,695	\$2,052	\$12.73	223,710
2=	251,358	233,699	9,778	14,027	1,011	8,385	89,037	37,699	3,543	15.23	104,613
3=	296,625	276,812	10,027	14,276	1,062	7,535	99,486	40,885	4,504	16.35	123,448
4=	348,929	323,675	10,582	14,401	1,022	7,070	104,966	41,893	4,993	15.47	162,559
5=	431,871	393,683	10,708	14,371	963	5,994	121,261	49,512	6,062	15.48	189,083
6=	543,542	495,936	11,749	15,355	1,087	5,479	136,024	55,708	7,524	15.21	196,507
7=	667,020	606,262	12,804	16,390	1,260	5,501	136,096	55,711	8,410	14.00	242,531
8=	927,079	789,398	13,760	17,265	1,409	3,612	177,747	72,304	11,014	14.20	236,122
9=	1,436,714	1,121,957	15,844	19,514	1,480	2,388	227,602	93,457	14,552	13.03	167,086
10=	46,788,158	2,493,300	19,394	24,151	1,058	1,702	414,477	148,235	19,795	7.98	92,527
All Major Districts Avg. (excluding NYC)		614,991	12,317	16,262	1,107	5,860	146,441	60,577	7,911	12.93	1,738,186
New York City		546,894	11,920	16,324	680	6,009	176,108	64,327	6,145	11.29	1,051,189
All Major Districts Avg.(including NYC)		\$588,500	\$12,150	\$16,286	\$940	\$5,918	\$158,000	\$62,100	\$7,222	\$12.34	2,789,375
Decile Rank		7	6	6	4	5	8	8	6	4	

\* Values shown are the weighted averages for all 67 or 68 districts with AV/TWPU less than or equal to the upper limit for the decile.

\*\* Total Expenditure includes Debt Service and Special Aid Fund.

\*\*\* Other State Revenue does not include STAR.

**Table 11**

2009-10 WEALTH, EXPENDITURE, REVENUE AND AID DATA  
RANKED BY INCOME PER TWPU  
DECILES FOR ALL MAJOR DISTRICTS EXCLUDING NEW YORK CITY

Income/TWPU Deciles (upper limit shown)		DECILE AVERAGE*									2009-10 Enrollment
		Income per TWPU	AOE per TAPU for Exp.	Total Exp.** per TAPU for Exp.	STAR Revenue per TAPU for Exp.	Other Revenue from State*** per TAPU for Exp.	Actual Valuation per TWPU	Income (excl. STAR) per Return	Tax Rev. (excl. STAR) per TAPU for Exp.	Tax Rate (excl. STAR) per \$1,000 Full Value	
1=	\$71,776	\$63,757	\$10,707	\$15,675	\$529	\$10,547	\$190,587	\$31,929	\$2,298	\$12.06	219,171
2=	80,795	77,342	10,750	15,361	823	9,482	301,960	35,451	3,685	12.26	74,963
3=	89,632	85,486	11,015	15,455	935	8,968	306,133	37,755	4,246	13.98	113,982
4=	98,225	94,043	10,663	14,691	942	7,633	361,478	40,890	5,030	13.97	116,514
5=	109,357	104,318	11,209	15,279	1,004	6,729	410,792	41,999	5,950	14.51	129,340
6=	123,468	117,188	11,072	14,742	1,126	5,857	445,487	45,379	6,501	14.67	194,345
7=	141,676	130,921	12,015	15,562	1,278	5,179	544,857	52,450	7,973	14.78	237,300
8=	169,506	154,370	12,577	16,127	1,260	4,209	694,501	60,473	9,334	13.45	248,464
9=	219,398	191,711	13,302	16,758	1,364	2,991	865,333	76,129	11,288	13.12	226,801
10=	996,299	366,427	17,834	21,822	1,426	1,765	1,636,370	143,563	17,356	10.73	177,306
All Major Districts Avg. (excluding NYC)		146,441	12,317	16,262	1,107	5,860	614,991	60,577	7,911	12.93	1,738,186
New York City		176,108	11,920	16,324	680	6,009	546,894	64,327	6,145	11.29	1,051,189
All Major Districts Avg.(including NYC)		\$158,000	\$12,150	\$16,286	\$940	\$5,918	\$588,500	\$62,100	\$7,222	\$12.34	2,789,375
Decile Rank		8	6	6	4	5	7	8	6	4	

\* Values shown are the weighted averages for all 67 or 68 districts with Income/TWPU less than or equal to the upper limit for the decile.

\*\* Total Expenditure includes Debt Service and Special Aid Fund.

\*\*\* Other State Revenue does not include STAR.

Need is based on the Extraordinary Needs (EN) percent compared to the State average EN percent. The EN percent is a ratio of the poverty count, sparsity count and limited English proficient pupils to the district enrollment. The EN percent has been used to calculate Extraordinary Needs Aid from 1993-94 until 2006-07. Starting in 2007-08, a census poverty measure was added to the poverty count which had been based on free and reduced price lunch. The Resource measure is based on the Combined Wealth Ratio (CWR), used in the calculation of Formula Operating Aid since 1984-85 and in the calculation of Foundation Aid starting in 2007-08. The CWR is based equally on property wealth per pupil compared to the State average and income wealth per pupil compared to the State average.

In order to measure each district's extraordinary student need relative to its wealth, the EN percent, compared to the State average, was divided by the Combined Wealth Ratio. The resulting index value was then used to array the 675 major districts in the State (excluding NYC) into the ten ascending decile groups in the table. Districts with relatively low needs and high resources will fall in the first decile (pages 13 and 15 describe the use of deciles). Districts (or district decile groups) that serve relatively high percentages of students with Extraordinary Needs but have limited resources available to address the need (a low Combined Wealth Ratio) would have a very high need/resource index. Had New York City been included in the ranking, with an index of 1.450, it would fall into the sixth decile.

A review of the table indicates that high Need/Resource Index districts generally have lower property and income wealth than the State average. They generally spend (AOE and Total Expenditures per pupil) less than the State average and raise less per pupil in local tax revenue. High Need/Resource Index districts tend to receive less STAR revenue per pupil than low need districts. They receive more Other State Revenue per pupil than low need districts. Although the average Tax Rate of districts in the tenth decile is 92 percent of the State average, the average Tax Revenue per pupil raised by those districts is about 25 percent of the State average. Conversely, districts in the first decile tax at 85 percent of the State average but, on average, raise over twice as much Tax Revenue per pupil as the State average.

**Table 12**

2009-10 WEALTH, EXPENDITURE, REVENUE AND AID DATA  
RANKED BY NEED/RESOURCE INDEX  
DECILES FOR ALL MAJOR DISTRICTS EXCLUDING NEW YORK CITY

Need/Resource Index Deciles (upper limit shown) (decile 1 = low need)		DECILE AVERAGE*									2009-10 Enrollment
		AOE per TAPU for Exp.	Actual Valuation per TWPU	Total Exp.** per TAPU for Exp.	STAR Revenue per TAPU for Exp.	Other Revenue from State*** per TAPU for Exp.	Income per TWPU	Income per Return	Tax Rev. (excl. STAR) per TAPU for Exp.	Tax Rate (excl. STAR) per \$1,000 Full Value	
1=	0.081	\$16,721	\$1,548,055	\$20,295	\$1,344	\$2,021	\$317,653	\$143,622	\$16,014	\$10.51	180,008
2=	0.204	13,579	809,529	16,989	1,331	3,201	191,690	81,395	11,416	14.09	227,984
3=	0.414	12,120	674,257	15,528	1,246	3,937	164,034	64,322	9,150	13.58	248,414
4=	0.739	11,921	606,882	15,514	1,254	4,777	140,839	54,223	8,221	13.71	231,695
5=	1.076	11,722	494,469	15,728	1,204	5,807	122,710	44,998	7,240	14.73	174,633
6=	1.504	11,846	476,228	15,923	1,145	7,076	113,933	44,131	6,167	12.97	156,461
7=	2.065	11,100	356,890	15,229	918	7,756	97,295	38,971	5,174	14.59	125,470
8=	2.618	11,301	322,530	15,925	915	9,022	86,582	37,864	4,461	13.91	102,364
9=	3.497	10,868	270,117	15,071	741	9,408	75,593	34,849	3,548	13.25	106,599
10=	10.151	10,360	161,845	15,721	533	10,944	63,906	31,778	1,832	11.31	184,558
All Major Districts Avg. (excluding NYC)		12,317	614,991	16,262	1,107	5,860	146,441	60,577	7,911	12.93	1,738,186
New York City (1.450)		11,920	546,894	16,324	680	6,009	176,108	64,327	6,145	11.29	1,051,189
All Major Districts Avg.(including NYC)		\$12,015	\$588,500	\$16,286	\$940	\$5,918	\$158,000	\$62,100	\$7,222	\$12.34	2,789,375
Decile Rank		6	7	6	4	5	8	8	6	4	

\* Values shown are the weighted averages for all 67 or 68 districts with a Need/Resource Index less than or equal to the upper limit for the decile.

\*\* Includes Debt Service and Special Aid Fund.

\*\*\* Other State Revenue does not include STAR.

## **IV**

### **FOUR-YEAR CHANGES IN SCHOOL FINANCES 2005-06 to 2009-10**

This section contains longitudinal information concerning total pupils, key expenditure categories, school district taxes and other revenues, actual valuation and personal income. Each of these items of information is presented by Total State, New York City and Rest of State. Percent changes for year-to-year increments, as well as over the four-year period, are shown also. Table 13 contains five pupil counts. Table 14 contains gross financial amounts, which are then presented on a per-pupil basis in Tables 15 and 16. In this fashion, trends can be reviewed; State totals are analyzed including and excluding New York City. Data in Tables 13 through 16 include major districts only.

Over the four-year period, the Total Aidable Pupil Units (TAPU) for Expense, displayed in Table 13, have decreased 0.7 percent in the State. Although consistent in recent years, changes in the definition of TAPU make year-to-year comparisons of TAPU with enrollment difficult unless the changes in definition and their impact are reviewed (See Glossary for changes in definition). For example, a significant change in the 1992-93 pupil counts was the legislated change in definition to exclude students with disabilities attending private and State operated schools. All of New York City's pupil counts increased in 2009-10 with the largest increases in TAPU for Expense, TWPU and RWADA. Rest of State and statewide, all five pupil counts decreased each year.

Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures shown in Table 14 have increased by at least 2.3 percent every year for both Rest of State districts and New York City. In 2009-10, total expenditures increased 3.1 percent statewide. Over the four-year period, total expenditures increased 21.4 percent statewide and 26.8 percent in New York City.

Approved operating expenditures (AOE) over the four-year period increased 30.8 percent in New York City, and 17.0 percent in the Rest of State school districts. Statewide, approved operating expenditures increased only 1.0 percent in 2009-10.

Similar to total expenditures and AOE, instructional expenses increased in each year. In 2007-08 (the first year of Foundation Aid), New York City's instructional expenses increased 8.7 percent over 2006-07. Statewide, instructional expenses increased 20.0 percent over the four-year period.

Statewide, debt service increased 10.2 percent over the past four years. Over the past four years debt service for New York City decreased 20.3 percent, while Rest of State increased 30.9 percent.

From 2005-06 to 2009-10, Total Revenue from State sources (including STAR Revenue starting in 1998-99) increased by 15.2 percent for Rest of State districts and by 23.1 percent for New York City.

**Table 13**

SELECTED PUPIL COUNTS USED IN SCHOOL AID FORMULAS  
NEW YORK STATE MAJOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS  
2005-06 TO 2009-10

	2005-06	2006-07	Prcnt Chng	2007-08	Prcnt Chng	2008-09	Prcnt Chng	2009-10	Prcnt Chng	4-Yr Prcnt Chng
<b>I. Total Aidable Pupil Units (TAPU) for Expense**</b>										
New York City	1,265,602	1,262,682	-0.2 %	1,277,558	1.2 %	1,301,550	1.9 %	1,329,632	2.2 %	5.1 %
Rest of State	2,168,783	2,152,940	-0.7	2,131,286	-1.0	2,102,077	-1.4	2,081,810	-1.0	-4.0
Total State	3,434,385	3,415,622	-0.5	3,408,844	-0.2	3,403,627	-0.2	3,411,442	0.2	-0.7
<b>II. Total Enrolled Pupils</b>										
New York City	1,048,361	1,034,261	-1.3 %	1,027,904	-0.6 %	1,035,819	0.8 %	1,051,189	1.5 %	0.3 %
Rest of State	1,798,055	1,781,907	-0.9	1,762,743	-1.1	1,752,461	-0.6	1,738,186	-0.8	-3.3
Total State	2,846,416	2,816,168	-1.1	2,790,647	-0.9	2,788,280	-0.1	2,789,375	0.0	-2.0
<b>III. Total Wealth Pupil Units (TWPU)</b>										
New York City	1,255,634	1,252,804	-0.2 %	1,269,684	1.3 %	1,293,732	1.9 %	1,323,008	2.3 %	5.4 %
Rest of State	2,161,456	2,145,079	-0.8	2,123,144	-1.0	2,093,696	-1.4	2,074,300	-0.9	-4.0
Total State	3,417,090	3,397,883	-0.6	3,392,828	-0.1	3,387,428	-0.2	3,397,308	0.3	-0.6
<b>IV. Resident Weighted Average Daily Attendance (RWADA)***</b>										
New York City	992,806	990,175	-0.3 %	990,521	0.0 %	995,489	0.5 %	1,015,963	2.1 %	2.3 %
Rest of State	1,866,378	1,853,352	-0.7	1,835,076	-1.0	1,811,849	-1.3	1,795,592	-0.9	-3.8
Total State	2,859,184	2,843,527	-0.5	2,825,597	-0.6	2,807,338	-0.6	2,811,555	0.2	-1.7
<b>V. Duplicated Combined Adjusted Average Daily Membership (DCAADM)****</b>										
New York City	1,030,180	1,018,959	-1.1 %	1,024,062	0.5 %	1,027,178	0.3 %	1,044,163	1.7 %	1.4 %
Rest of State	1,790,335	1,780,459	-0.6	1,771,573	-0.5	1,755,798	-0.9	1,744,219	-0.7	-2.6
Total State	2,820,515	2,799,418	-0.7	2,795,635	-0.1	2,782,976	-0.5	2,788,382	0.2	-1.1

\* Starting in 1992-93, all counts except DCAADM exclude students with disabilities attending private schools.

\*\* TAPU for Expense is the one year TAPU with the weights prescribed in law for each year.

\*\*\* RWADA for 1988-89 and thereafter uses all attendance periods.

\*\*\*\* DCAADM, starting in 1990-91, includes resident students attending other public school districts. Starting in 2007-08, full-day pre-K enrollment is weighted at 1.0.

Table 14

SELECTED FISCAL DATA - NEW YORK STATE MAJOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS  
2005-06 TO 2009-10

	2005-06	2006-07	Prcnt Chng	2007-08	Prcnt Chng	2008-09	Prcnt Chng	2009-10	Prcnt Chng	4-Yr Prcnt Chng
I. Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures, in thousands										
New York City	\$17,124,044	\$18,195,451	6.3 %	\$19,530,164	7.3 %	\$20,803,240	6.5 %	\$21,705,342	4.3 %	26.8 %
Rest of State	28,646,178	30,371,135	6.0	31,873,906	4.9	33,099,512	3.8	33,849,525	2.3	18.2
Total State	45,770,222	48,566,586	6.1	51,404,070	5.8	53,902,752	4.9	55,554,867	3.1	21.4
II. Approved Operating Expenditures, in thousands										
New York City	\$12,121,377	\$13,360,617	10.2 %	\$14,749,266	10.4 %	\$15,749,181	6.8 %	\$15,849,392	0.6 %	30.8 %
Rest of State	21,923,824	23,059,660	5.2	24,465,556	6.1	25,337,294	3.6	25,641,002	1.2	17.0
Total State	34,045,201	36,420,277	7.0	39,214,822	7.7	41,086,475	4.8	41,490,394	1.0	21.9
III. Instructional Expenses, in thousands										
New York City	\$13,369,011	\$14,043,716	5.0 %	\$15,261,393	8.7 %	\$15,666,618	2.7 %	\$16,870,608	7.7 %	26.2 %
Rest of State	21,411,265	22,136,032	3.4	23,302,552	5.3	24,224,735	4.0	24,866,360	2.6	16.1
Total State	34,780,276	36,179,748	4.0	38,563,945	6.6	39,891,353	3.4	41,736,968	4.6	20.0
IV. Total Debt Service, in thousands										
New York City	\$1,163,440	\$915,972	-21.3 %	\$804,349	-12.2 %	\$843,769	4.9 %	\$927,334	9.9 %	-20.3 %
Rest of State	1,714,944	1,863,136	8.6	1,962,721	5.3	2,079,677	6.0	2,244,628	7.9	30.9
Total State	2,878,384	2,779,108	-3.4	2,767,070	-0.4	2,923,446	5.7	3,171,962	8.5	10.2
V. Total Revenue from State Sources, in thousands (including STAR starting in 1998-99)										
New York City	\$7,223,905	\$8,073,019	11.8 %	\$9,030,628	11.9 %	\$9,811,367	8.6 %	\$8,893,415	-9.4 %	23.1 %
Rest of State	12,595,699	13,518,215	7.3	14,568,664	7.8	15,496,178	6.4	14,504,185	-6.4	15.2
Total State	19,819,604	21,591,234	8.9	23,599,292	9.3	25,307,545	7.2	23,397,600	-7.5	18.1
VI. Local Tax and Other Revenues, in thousands (excluding STAR)										
New York City	\$8,259,253	\$8,536,341	3.4 %	\$9,037,216	5.9 %	\$9,505,091	5.2 %	\$10,469,609	10.1 %	26.8 %
Rest of State	15,260,745	16,429,472	7.7	16,929,776	3.0	17,482,407	3.3	18,183,004	4.0	19.1
Total State	23,519,998	24,965,813	6.1	25,966,992	4.0	26,987,498	3.9	28,652,613	6.2	21.8
VII. Total Personal Income, in millions										
New York City	\$213,249	\$239,201	12.2 %	\$292,028	22.1 %	\$262,884	-10.0 %	\$232,993	-11.4 %	9.3 %
Rest of State	292,651	320,772	9.6	350,030	9.1	324,072	-7.4	303,762	-6.3	3.8
Total State	505,900	559,973	10.7	642,058	14.7	586,956	-8.6	536,755	-8.6	6.1
VIII. Actual Valuation of Real Property, in millions										
New York City	\$556,433	\$607,288	9.1 %	\$722,858	19.0 %	\$737,073	2.0 %	\$723,545	-1.8 %	30.0 %
Rest of State	1,065,781	1,197,593	12.4	1,301,559	8.7	1,301,598	0.0	1,275,675	-2.0	19.7
Total State	1,622,214	1,804,881	11.3	2,024,417	12.2	2,038,671	0.7	1,999,220	-1.9	23.2

During the same 2005-06 to 2009-10 period, school district local tax and other revenues (excluding STAR starting in 1998-99) for non-New York City districts increased 19.1 percent, a total increase of approximately \$2.92 billion. Local tax and other revenues in New York City increased by 26.8 percent, or \$2.21 billion, over the same period.

Property value and income data form the basis upon which most State Aid to school districts is distributed. School districts having increases in actual value per pupil or income per pupil in excess of the State average would receive less formula operating aid per pupil. Between 1986-87 and 1991-92, the yearly percent increases in actual value registered in double digits. This steep increase was due to a general rise in property values and was also due in part to steps taken by the NYS Office of Real Property Tax Services to reduce the lag between the full value standard date and the assessment roll date that had been allowed to develop during the early 1980's. The lag was reduced incrementally from 54 months (in 1985) to 12 months (starting in 1993). The lag increased to 24 months for the 1996 actual value and dropped to 12 months for the 1997 actual value. Beginning with 1999 equalization rates, the lag drops to 0 months. There is an additional lag between the assessment roll date and the use of valuation data for school aid. For example, the 2006 assessment roll data converted to actual value on the basis of a July 2005 equalization rate standard were used in the calculation of 2009-10 aid, a 3.5 year lag from the full value standard of the rate to the aid year (2005 to 2009-10). Income data is more current, with 2006 calendar year income used for 2009-10 school aid. The 1996 legislation specified the use of 1994 actual value and income for 1997-98 aid in order to allow for the use of more final data for the State's budgeting purposes. This added one more year to the lag starting with 1997-98 school aid.

In 2009-10, actual value decreased an average of 1.9 percent for the year, while personal income decreased 8.6 percent. Over the four-year period, personal income increased by 6.1 percent for the State, while actual value increased by 23.2 percent. For New York City, over the four-year period, personal income increased by 9.3 percent while actual value increased by 30.0 percent. In 2009-10, New York City's personal income decreased 11.4 percent compared to a 6.3 percent decrease for Rest of State.

Table 15 displays per pupil (Duplicated Combined Adjusted Average Daily Membership) averages of the first six data elements contained in Table 14. Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures per Pupil, Approved Operating Expenditures per Pupil and Instructional Expense per Pupil roughly parallel each other since 2005-06 with annual percentage increases in New York City higher than those for the Rest of State except for 2008-09 Instructional Expense per DCAADM and 2009-10 Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures per Pupil and Approved Operating Expenses per Pupil. Debt service per pupil decreased in New York City in 2005-06 and 2006-07 while, in the Rest of State, debt service increased each year. The percentage increase (or decrease) in total revenue from State sources (including STAR starting in 1998-99) per pupil for New York City outpaced the Rest of State each year. The 7.7 percent decrease in 2009-10 reflects the \$1,489 million deficit reduction assessment. On a statewide-basis, over the four-year period, total State revenues per pupil increased 19.4 percent while Total Expenditures per pupil increased 22.8 percent.

Local tax and other revenues (excluding STAR starting in 1998-99) per pupil increased each year. Over the four-year period, local tax and other revenues per pupil increased 25.1 percent for New York City and 23.2 percent for Rest of State.



Table 16 also displays yearly per pupil averages based on the data elements contained in Table 14, but in this instance, by using pupil counts traditionally used for State Aid purposes. Personal income per TWPU increased by 6.7 percent over the four-year period. Since 2005-06, the percent changes for New York City and Rest of State generally reflect the percent changes in personal income. Since 2005-06, New York City's average income per TWPU is higher than the State average.

New York City's average actual value per TWPU was lower than the State average each year. New York City's average actual value per RWADA also was lower than the State average in each year until 2007-08. Over the four-year period, the State average actual value per TWPU and actual value per RWADA have increased 24.0 percent and 25.3 percent, respectively.

The New York City and Rest of State tax rate decreased every year until 2008-09. Part of the reason is that STAR revenues are not counted as local tax and other revenues; the other is that actual value increased dramatically each year until 2008-09. New York City's tax rate was higher than the State average except for 2007-08 and 2008-09. The State average tax rate decreased 1.2 percent over the four-year period.

The percent increases in Approved Operating Expense per TAPU for Expense generally follow the trend in Approved Operating Expense per DCAADM shown in Table 15. New York City spends less than the State average in every year except for 2007-08 and 2008-09.

Local tax and other revenues (excluding STAR starting in 1998-99) per TWPU increased 20.3 percent in New York City for the four-year period while Rest of State increased 24.2 percent. New York City's per pupil average was lower than the State average in each year.

**Table 15**

AVERAGE EXPENDITURES, STATE REVENUE, AND LOCAL TAX AND OTHER REVENUES  
PER DUPLICATED COMBINED ADJUSTED AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (DCAADM)  
NEW YORK STATE MAJOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS  
2005-06 TO 2009-10

	2005-06	2006-07	Prcnt Chng	2007-08	Prcnt Chng	2008-09	Prcnt Chng	2009-10	Prcnt Chng	4-Yr Prcnt Chng
<b>I. Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures per DCAADM</b>										
New York City	\$16,622	\$17,857	7.4 %	\$19,071	6.8 %	\$20,253	6.2 %	\$20,787	2.6 %	25.1 %
Rest of State	16,000	17,058	6.6	17,992	5.5	18,852	4.8	19,407	2.9	21.3
Total State	16,228	17,349	6.9	18,387	6.0	19,369	5.3	19,924	2.9	22.8
<b>II. Approved Operating Expenditures per DCAADM</b>										
New York City	\$11,766	\$13,112	11.4 %	\$14,403	9.8 %	\$15,332	6.5 %	\$15,179	-1.0 %	29.0 %
Rest of State	12,246	12,952	5.8	13,810	6.6	14,431	4.5	14,701	1.9	20.0
Total State	12,071	13,010	7.8	14,027	7.8	14,764	5.2	14,880	0.8	23.3
<b>III. Instructional Expenses per DCAADM</b>										
New York City	\$12,977	\$13,782	6.2 %	\$14,903	8.1 %	\$15,252	2.3 %	\$16,157	5.9 %	24.5 %
Rest of State	11,959	12,433	4.0	13,154	5.8	13,797	4.9	14,256	3.3	19.2
Total State	12,331	12,924	4.8	13,794	6.7	14,334	3.9	14,968	4.4	21.4
<b>IV. Total Debt Service per DCAADM</b>										
New York City	\$1,129	\$899	-20.4 %	\$785	-12.6 %	\$821	4.6 %	\$888	8.1 %	-21.4 %
Rest of State	958	1,046	9.2	1,108	5.9	1,184	6.9	1,287	8.6	34.3
Total State	1,021	993	-2.7	990	-0.3	1,050	6.1	1,138	8.3	11.5
<b>V. Total Revenue from State Sources (including STAR starting in 1998-99) per DCAADM</b>										
New York City	\$7,012	\$7,923	13.0 %	\$8,818	11.3 %	\$9,552	8.3 %	\$8,517	-10.8 %	21.5 %
Rest of State	7,035	7,593	7.9	8,224	8.3	8,826	7.3	8,316	-5.8	18.2
Total State	7,027	7,713	9.8	8,441	9.4	9,094	7.7	8,391	-7.7	19.4
<b>VI. Local Tax and Other Revenues (excluding STAR) per DCAADM</b>										
New York City	\$8,017	\$8,378	4.5 %	\$8,825	5.3 %	\$9,254	4.9 %	\$10,027	8.4 %	25.1 %
Rest of State	8,524	9,228	8.3	9,556	3.6	9,957	4.2	10,425	4.7	22.3
Total State	8,339	8,918	6.9	9,288	4.2	9,697	4.4	10,276	6.0	23.2

**Table 16**

INCOME AND ACTUAL VALUATION PER TWPU,  
ACTUAL VALUATION PER RWADA, ACTUAL VALUE TAX RATES,  
APPROVED OPERATING EXPENSE PER TAPU FOR EXPENSE AND  
LOCAL TAX AND OTHER REVENUES PER TWPU  
NEW YORK STATE MAJOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS  
2005-06 TO 2009-10

	2005-06	2006-07	Prcnt Chng	2007-08	Prcnt Chng	2008-09	Prcnt Chng	2009-10	Prcnt Chng	4-Yr Prcnt Chng
<b>I. Income per Total Wealth Pupil Units, in thousands</b>										
New York City	\$169.8	\$190.9	12.4 %	\$230.0	20.5 %	\$203.2	-11.7 %	\$176.1	-13.3 %	3.7 %
Rest of State	135.4	149.5	10.4	164.9	10.2	154.8	-6.1	146.4	-5.4	8.2
Total State	148.0	164.8	11.3	189.2	14.8	173.3	-8.4	158.0	-8.8	6.7
<b>II. Actual Valuation of Taxable Real Property per Total Wealth Pupil Units, in thousands</b>										
New York City	\$443.1	\$484.7	9.4 %	\$569.3	17.4 %	\$569.7	0.1 %	\$546.9	-4.0 %	23.4 %
Rest of State	493.1	558.3	13.2	613.0	9.8	621.7	1.4	615.0	-1.1	24.7
Total State	474.7	531.2	11.9	596.7	12.3	601.8	0.9	588.5	-2.2	24.0
<b>III. Actual Valuation of Taxable Real Property per Resident Weighted Average Daily Attendance (RWADA), in thousands</b>										
New York City	\$560.5	\$613.3	9.4 %	\$729.8	19.0 %	\$740.4	1.5 %	\$712.2	-3.8 %	27.1 %
Rest of State	571.0	646.2	13.2	709.3	9.8	718.4	1.3	710.4	-1.1	24.4
Total State	567.4	634.7	11.9	716.5	12.9	726.2	1.4	711.1	-2.1	25.3
<b>IV. Tax Rate (Local Tax and Other Tax Revenues (excluding STAR)) per \$1,000 Actual Valuation</b>										
New York City	\$14.84	\$14.06	-5.3 %	\$12.50	-11.1 %	\$12.90	3.1 %	\$14.47	12.2 %	-2.5 %
Rest of State	14.32	13.72	-4.2	13.01	-5.2	13.43	3.3	14.25	6.1	-0.5
Total State	14.50	13.83	-4.6	12.83	-7.3	13.24	3.2	14.33	8.3	-1.2
<b>V. Approved Operating Expenditures per TAPU for Expense</b>										
New York City	\$9,578	\$10,581	10.5 %	\$11,545	9.1 %	\$12,100	4.8 %	\$11,920	-1.5 %	24.5 %
Rest of State	10,109	10,711	6.0	11,479	7.2	12,053	5.0	\$12,317	2.2	21.8
Total State	9,900	10,650	7.6	11,500	8.0	\$12,050	4.8	\$12,150	0.8	22.7
<b>VI. Local Tax and Other Revenues (excluding STAR) per TWPU</b>										
New York City	\$6,578	\$6,814	3.6 %	\$7,118	4.5 %	\$7,347	3.2 %	\$7,913	7.7 %	20.3 %
Rest of State	7,060	7,659	8.5	7,974	4.1	8,350	4.7	8,766	5.0	24.2
Total State	6,883	7,347	6.7	7,653	4.2	7,967	4.1	8,434	5.9	22.5

## **GLOSSARY**

### Definitions Used in This Report

*Actual Valuation of Taxable Real Property (AV):* Total assessed valuation of property on the tax rolls within the district adjusted by the State equalization rate determined for such rolls. Data are obtained from the NYS Office of Real Property Tax Services, through the Office of the State Comptroller.

*Adjusted Average Daily Attendance (AADA):* Adjusted Average Daily Attendance is the same as Average Daily Attendance (ADA) except half-day kindergarten ADA is weighted at .50 and is an average for the school year. Unadjusted ADA is the unweighted ADA for the school year.

*Approved Operating Expenditures (AOE):* Approved Operating Expenditures (AOE) are the operating expenditures for the day-to-day operation of the school as defined in Education Law. Not included are expenditures for building construction, transportation of pupils, some expenditures made to purchase services from a Board of Cooperative Educational Services or County Vocational Education and Extension Board, tuition payments to other districts, and expenditures for programs which do not conform to law or regulation. Money received as Federal aid revenue, proceeds of borrowing, and State aid for special programs are first deducted from total annual expenditures when approved operating expenditures are computed. For 1989-90, AOE was adjusted to include the TRS expense that would have been incurred without restructuring. Starting with 1992-93, AOE excludes expenditures for students with disabilities in private and State operated (Rome and Batavia) schools.

*Average Daily Attendance (ADA):* This pupil count is the average number of pupils present on each regular school day in a given period, an average determined by dividing the total number of attendance days of all pupils by the number of days school was in session. ADA for a group of classes or schools in session for varying numbers of days is obtained by adding together the ADA for each group. In addition, adjustments are made for the adverse effects of religious holidays on attendance. Equivalent secondary attendance of students under 21 years of age who are not on a regular day school register is added to adjusted ADA in calculating TAPU and TWPU beginning in school year 1984-85. For students 21 years of age and older, refer to the definition of Employment Preparation Education Aid. Starting in 1992-93, the attendance of pupils attending private and State operated (Rome and Batavia) schools for students with disabilities is excluded from ADA. Starting in 1999-00, charter school pupils are added to ADA.

*Contiguous MSAs:* Contain two adjacent MSAs (See Metropolitan Statistical Areas and Appendix C).

*Debt Service:* Debt Service is a combination of principal and interest on approved building projects, transportation issues and other debt instruments, both short- and long-term.

*Deciles:* Deciles are composed of 10 percent of the major school districts in New York State (for 2009-10, 67 or 68 school districts). The deciles exclude New York City. For example, decile 1 would contain the lowest 68 districts in a category; the value listed as the upper limit is the maximum value (10th percentile) for the group.

*Duplicated Combined Adjusted Average Daily Membership (DCAADM):* This pupil count consists of the average number of students receiving their educational program at district expense. It is the sum of: students enrolled in district programs (half-day kindergarten pupil weighted at 0.5); students with disabilities educated in BOCES full-time; students with disabilities educated in nonpublic schools including the State schools at Rome and Batavia; equivalent attendance; and prekindergarten enrollment weighted at 0.5. Since 1990-91, it includes resident students attending another public school. Since 1997-98, it includes incarcerated youth. Starting in 2007-08, full-day prekindergarten enrollment is weighted at 1.0 and half-day at 0.5.

*Employment Preparation Education (EPE) Aid:* Pupils 21 years of age and older who have not received a high school diploma or a high school equivalency diploma and attend employment education programs leading to a high school diploma or high school equivalency are eligible for aid under Employment Preparation Education (EPE). Aid is provided on a current year basis and is calculated based on the statewide average per pupil expenditure and an actual value aid ratio.

*Enrollment/Enrolled Pupils:* The total number of students entered on the roll as of the date in the fall on which data for the Basic Educational Data System are collected for the current year, including equivalent attendance and students attending full-time programs for the disabled in BOCES or nonpublic schools. In addition, prekindergarten and half-day kindergarten enrollments are weighted at 0.5. Since 1992-93, it excludes students attending private and State operated (Rome and Batavia) schools for students with disabilities. Starting in 1999-00, charter school pupils are added to enrollment. Starting in 2008-09, full-day prekindergarten enrollment is weighted at 1.0 and half-day at 0.5.

*Evening School ADA:* Evening School ADA was the ADA generated by half-day equivalent attendance in an approved program during the evening hours in school years prior to 1984-85 by individuals who were sixteen years of age or older. Such programs were approved by the Commissioner and lead to a high school diploma or its equivalent. The additional weighting for evening school pupils of .50 was in effect through 1984-85. (See the Average Daily Attendance definition above for attendance not on a regular day school register.)

*Federal Revenue:* All revenues received from the Federal Government directly or through the State Education Department in the Special Aid Fund and includes Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and other Federal revenues received in the General Fund. Federal revenues also include funding from: the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act; and, the 2010 Education Jobs Program (revenues from each may be recorded over more than one year).

*Instructional Expense (IE):* The calculation of IE, defined in subdivision 11-a of Section 3602 of Education Law and enumerated in Commissioner's Regulations 175.39 (revised 9/92), requires the summation of school district expenses which are identified in the Commissioner's Regulations as instructional plus a prorated share of fringe benefit expenses. Examples of the expenses included are: teachers' salaries, other instructional salaries, fringe benefits related to instruction, tuition expenditures, Special Aid Fund instructional expenditures, and other expenditures related to instruction, including BOCES instructional expenditures.

*Local Tax and Other Revenues:* Tax revenues are described below. Other revenues are any local funds other than real property taxes or non-property taxes such as a sales tax or utility tax; they may include interest income, fees, tuition, etc. Starting in 1998-99, STAR revenue is excluded.

*Major School Districts:* Major School Districts are school districts having eight or more teachers, exclusive of institutional (special act) school districts.

*Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA):* A MSA has one or more central counties containing the area's main population concentration: an urbanized area with at least 50,000 inhabitants. A MSA may also include outlying counties which have close economic and social relationships with the central counties. The outlying counties must have a specified level of commuting to the central counties and must also meet certain standards regarding metropolitan character, such as population density, urban population and population growth. The MSAs are designated and defined by the Federal government's Office of Management and Budget (OMB). (Material for the 2000 definitions was obtained from Metropolitan Statistical Areas 2003, Bulletin No. 04-03, OMB, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Statistical and Science Policy Branch, December 2003.)

*Minor School Districts:* Minor School Districts are school districts with fewer than eight teachers, including those districts contracting 100 percent with other districts for the education of all their students, and institutional (special act) districts.

*Pupils with Special Educational Needs (PSEN):* The ADA of Pupils with Special Educational Needs is determined by multiplying the composite percentage of pupils scoring below minimum competence on the third- and sixth-grade reading and mathematics Pupil Evaluation Program tests by the district's combined adjusted ADA to produce the number of pupils for weighting. Prior to 1978-79, the average was based on the 1971 and 1972 sixth-grade reading and mathematics tests. From 1978-79 through 1984-85, the average was based on the 1974 and 1975 third- and sixth-grade reading and mathematics tests. Beginning in school year 1984-85, the average was based on tests administered in 1977, 1978, 1979 and 1980. Beginning in school year 1986-87, the average was based on tests administered in the Spring of 1983 and 1984. Beginning in school year 1988-89, the average was based on tests administered in the Spring of 1985 and 1986. The weighting for eligible pupils is .25 pupil units.

*Resident Weighted Average Daily Attendance (RWADA):* RWADA is calculated by subtracting the WADA of non-resident pupils attending public school in the district from the district's WADA and adding the WADA of pupils resident in the district but attending full-time a school operated by a Board of Cooperative Educational Services or a county vocational education and extension board, or another public school district.

*Secondary School Pupil Weighting:* Secondary school ADA not otherwise weighted are eligible for an additional weight of .25. Secondary PSEN ADA (pupils with special educational needs) are eligible for an additional weight of .15 beginning in 1978-79 and a weighting of .25 beginning in 1980-81. Beginning in school year 1988-89 (aid year), Big Five occupational education pupils are no longer excluded from the additional .25 weighting for secondary.

*Small City Districts:* Small Cities School Districts are fiscally independent school districts located entirely or mainly within a city which had a population of less than 125,000. Prior to 1986-87 these districts had tax limits of 1.25 percent, 1.50 percent, 1.75 percent, or 2.00 percent of the five-year average Full Value. A Constitutional Amendment enacted in 1985 eliminated, as of the 1986-87 school year, the tax limits for school districts in cities with less than 125,000 population. Legislation enacted in 1997 allowed residents to vote on their school budgets.

*Special Aid Fund:* Since 1974-75, expenditures in this fund are for the majority of a school district's Federal funds for specific programs. Beginning with the 1987-88 school year, it also includes expenditures for certain State aid or grant programs. It includes expenditures for students with disabilities and for prekindergarten programs.

*Students with Disabilities:* Pupils resident of the district and attending special services or programs in public schools and BOCES, with additional weightings assigned as follows: pupils attending special services or programs 60 percent or more of the school day, 1.7; pupils in special services or programs 20 percent or more of the school week, .9; and pupils in special services or programs two periods or more of the school week, .13. Beginning with school year 1988-89 (aid year), pupils receiving direct and indirect consultant teacher services are assigned an additional .8 weighting; beginning in 1994-95 (aid year), their weighting is increased to .9. In 1998-99 (aid year), the .13 weighting was eliminated.

*Summer School ADA:* This is the ADA of pupils attending approved programs of instruction operated by the district during the months of July and August of the base year in accordance with the Commissioner's Regulations. The summer school weighting is .12.

*Tax Rate:* The tax revenue or local tax and other revenue divided by the actual valuation of real property, expressed as a rate per \$1,000 of actual valuation. Starting in 1998-99, STAR revenue is excluded.

*Tax Revenues:* Local revenues raised by taxation for school purposes, including property and non-property tax revenues. For the Big 5 City School Districts in the decile and contiguous MSA tables, and for New York City in general, tax revenue is Total General Fund Expenditures minus non-tax revenues. Starting in 1998-99, STAR revenue is excluded.

*Total Aidable Pupil Units (TAPU):* The pupil measure for Formula Operating Aid through the 2006-07 aid year. It includes combined adjusted ADA (weighted for half-day kindergarten), weighted pupils with special educational needs, weighted summer school pupils, dual enrollment pupils, and additional pupils weighted for secondary school. Aidable evening school pupils were included in TAPU through the 1984-85 school year. For Operating Aid from 1997-98 through 2006-07, one year older ADA, adjusted by an enrollment index, is used.

*Total Aidable Pupil Units for Expense (TAPU for Expense):* TAPU for Expense is used to compute the approved operating expense per pupil. This is the same definition as TAPU except it includes additional weightings for students with disabilities and does not use enrollment index-adjusted ADA.

*Total General and Special Aid Fund Expenditures (Total Expenditures):* These are the expenditures and transfers for the total school program from a district's Total General, Debt Service, and Special Aid Funds. For 1990-91 and 1991-92, the State aid withheld as a State share of local Teachers' Retirement System and Employees' Retirement System savings was excluded.

*Total Personal Income:* The adjusted gross personal income, including results from the school district income verification process, as reported by the Department of Taxation and Finance.

*Total Revenue from State Sources:* The sum total of all State aid paid to school districts pursuant to State Education Law, principally Sections 3602, 1950, 701, 711, 751 and 3609, and to related portions of the unconsolidated laws as reported on the Annual Financial Report (ST-3) by school districts. For 1990-91 and 1991-92, the State aid withheld as a State share of local Teachers' Retirement System and Employees' Retirement System savings was included. Starting in 1998-99, State revenues include School Tax Relief (STAR).

*Total Wealth Pupil Units (TWPU):* TWPU is based upon the AADA of pupils resident in the district plus additional weightings for PSEN, students with disabilities and secondary school pupils.

*Wealth:* School district wealth is determined by Actual Value per TWPU and/or Income per TWPU. Relative wealth can be calculated by dividing district Actual Value per TWPU by the State average and Income per TWPU by the State average. Wealth for computing Building, BOCES, Hardware and Transportation Aids is based on Actual Value per RWADA.

*Weighted Average Daily Attendance (WADA):* WADA is determined by applying the following weightings to the average daily attendance: half-day kindergarten, .50; full day kindergarten and grades one through six, 1.00; grades seven through twelve, 1.25. Beginning with 1988-89 data, the selection of best attendance periods (4 of 8, or 5 of 10) was eliminated.



## APPENDIX A

### HISTORIC CHANGES IN PUPIL UNITS

***Pupil Units to Determine Expenditures Per Pupil:*** Pupil units used to compute expenditures per pupil have changed over the last decades.

*Use of WADA Prior to 1974-75:* Prior to school year 1974-75, expenditure per pupil was based on Weighted Average Daily Attendance (WADA) computed using full-time attendance in the best 4 of 8 or 5 of 10 attendance periods with half-day kindergarten weighted at .5 and secondary pupils at an additional .25.

*TAPU Definitions from 1974-75 Through 1979-80:* From 1974-75 to 1977-78, the pupil count was Total Aidable Pupil Units (TAPU) based on full year attendance plus half-day kindergarten weighted at .5; pupils with special educational needs (PSEN) at an additional .25; summer school pupils at an additional .12; evening school at an additional .50; students with disabilities weighted at an additional 1.0; and secondary pupils not weighted as PSEN or students with disabilities at an additional .25. Pupils with special educational needs are determined based on third and sixth grade math and reading PEP tests. (See Glossary for year of test.)

In school years 1978-79 and 1979-80, pupil counts were based on TAPU except secondary school PSEN which had not previously received the secondary weighting including the PSEN, received an additional .15 secondary weighting. The PSEN weightings were based on 1974 and 1975 third- and sixth-grade math and reading PEP tests.

The 1980-81 school year was the first year of the new and separate formula for providing State aid for students with disabilities. Therefore, TAPU for payment of operating aid in school year 1980-81 did not contain a weighting for students with disabilities while the newly defined TAPU for Expense equaled TAPU plus the new weightings for students with disabilities. Secondary school PSEN received the PSEN weighting plus an additional .25 for secondary attendance.

Beginning in school year 1988-89, TAPU for payment was computed with occupational education pupils in Big 5 city school districts eligible for the additional .25 secondary weighting.

*TAPU For Expense:* Used since 1980-81 for measuring expense per pupil, a district's TAPU for Expense equals the sum of TAPU for payment of formula operating aid (which includes additional weightings as follows: PSEN at .25; secondary at .25; evening school at .5; summer school at .12); plus weighted students with disabilities (60 percent of the day, an additional 1.7; 20 percent of the week, an additional .9; 2 periods per week, an additional .13). TAPU for Expense is a one year pupil count even though TAPU for payment of operating aid may be a two-year average. For aid payable in 1984-85, TAPU and TAPU for Expense were computed based on PSEN weightings for third- and sixth-grade reading and mathematics PEP tests in the years 1977 through 1980.

For the 1984-85 school year, the additional .5 evening school weighting was applied to evening school pupils counted as contact hours/1,000. Thereafter, the evening school weighting was eliminated. Beginning with the 1984-85 school year, pupils under age 21 who were not on a regular day school register were counted as secondary pupils in the computation of ADA, based on contact hours/1,000. The contact hours of individuals 21 years old and over attending programs

leading to a high school diploma or equivalency diploma would be aided based on the new Employment Preparation Education Aid.

Beginning with school year 1988-89 (aid year), pupils receiving direct and indirect consultant teacher services are assigned an additional .8 weighting. Beginning in school year 1994-95 (aid year), their weighting is increased to .9.

PSEN weightings for school years 1986-87 and 1987-88 were based on third- and sixth-grade reading and mathematics PEP test scores, averaged for the years 1984-85 and 1984-85. These scores were used to determine weightings to be included in TAPU and TAPU for Expense. Beginning in school year 1988-89, the average was based on tests administered in the Spring of 1985 and 1986. The weighting for eligible pupils is .25 additional pupil units.

Beginning with school year 1993-94 (aid year), the attendance of pupils attending private and State operated (Rome and Batavia) schools for students with disabilities is excluded from Average Daily Attendance. Also, pupils attending private and State operated schools are excluded from receiving the additional 1.7 weighting.

For six years, beginning with school year 1997-98 (aid year), the TAPUs for the Rome, Plattsburgh and Peru school districts (districts experiencing pupil losses due to federal military base closings) are limited to decreases of no more than 2.5 percent from the prior year. The Laws of 2002 extended this provision until June 30, 2007. The Laws of 2007 extended this provision until June 30, 2012.

In 1997-98 (aid year), the .13 weighting for students with disabilities was eliminated.

Charter schools were first allowed in 1999-00. To avoid negatively impacting TAPU and TAPU for Expense, charter school pupils are added to the basic pupil count (ADA).

***Pupil Units to Compute District Wealth Per Pupil:*** The pupil units used to compute school district wealth prior to school year 1978-79 were based on Resident Weighted Average Daily Attendance (RWADA) computed based on the best 4 of 8 or 5 of 10 attendance periods of the district. Beginning with the 1990-91 aid year (1988-89 attendance), all attendance periods are used. This pupil count is based upon resident pupils with half-day kindergarten pupils weighted at .5 and secondary pupils weighted at 1.25. The difference between RWADA and WADA is: RWADA is resident pupils attending public school and WADA is based on attendance of resident and non-resident pupils. RWADA continues to be used to calculate Building, Hardware, Transportation and BOCES Aids.

In 1978-79, the pupil units used to compute wealth were Resident Total Aidable Pupil Units (RTAPU). This computation was like TAPU except that it was adjusted for residency by adding the full-time equivalent attendance of pupils residing in the district and attending other public schools, and subtracting such attendance for non-resident pupils attending district schools. Pupil weightings included were as follows: half-day kindergarten at .5; secondary at an additional .25; PSEN at an additional .25; students with disabilities at an additional 1.00; and, PSEN secondary at an additional .15. The PSEN weightings were based on third- and sixth-grade reading and mathematics PEP test score averages for 1974-75 and 1975-76.

In school year 1979-80, the RTAPU was changed to Total Wealth Pupil Units (TWPU) by using the best 7 of 8 or 9 of 10 attendance periods. Pupil weightings used in calculating RTAPU were continued in the calculation of TWPU.

In school year 1980-81, TWPU was adjusted by changing the PSEN secondary weighting to .25. Beginning with school year 1981-82, TWPU was further changed by adjusting the weighting for students with disabilities based on time in special services or programs as follows: 60 percent of the school day, an additional 1.7; 20 percent of the school week, an additional .9; and, two periods per week, an additional .13. Students with disabilities attending private schools were included and weighted at an additional 1.7. Beginning with school year 1988-89 (aid year), pupils receiving direct and indirect consultant teacher services are assigned an additional .8 weighting; beginning in 1994-95 (aid year), their weighting is increased to .9.

Beginning with school year 1984-85, PSEN weightings were based on third- and sixth-grade reading and mathematics PEP test scores averaged for the years 1977 through 1980. The definition of TWPU was also changed to include the equivalent secondary attendance of students under age 21 who are not on a regular day school register.

Beginning with the 1985-86 school year, TWPU was based on full year attendance.

For the 1986-87 and 1987-88 school years, PSEN weightings were based on third- and sixth-grade reading and mathematics PEP test scores, averaged for Spring 1983 and Spring 1984. These scores were used to determine weightings to be included in TWPU.

Beginning with the 1988-89 school year, PSEN weightings are based on third- and sixth-grade reading and mathematics PEP test scores, averaged for Spring 1985 and Spring 1986. These scores are used to determine weightings to be included in TWPU. Beginning with the 1988-89 school year, Big Five occupational education pupils are duplicated for secondary weighting.

Beginning with school year 1993-94 (aid year), the attendance of pupils attending private and State operated (Rome and Batavia) schools for students with disabilities is excluded from Average Daily Attendance. Also, pupils attending private and State operated schools are excluded from receiving the additional 1.7 weighting.

For six years, beginning with school year 1997-98 (aid year), the TWPU and RWADAs for the Rome, Plattsburgh and Peru school districts (districts experiencing pupil losses due to federal military base closings) are limited to decreases of no more than 2.5 percent from the prior year. The Laws of 2002 extended this provision until June 30, 2007. The Laws of 2007 extended this provision until June 30, 2012.

In 1997-98 (aid year), the .13 weighting for students with disabilities was eliminated.

Charter schools were first allowed in 1999-00. To avoid negatively impacting TWPU and RWADA, charter school pupils are added to the basic pupil count (ADA).

In 2007-08 (aid year), enactment of the new Foundation Aid required creation of another wealth count, Total Wealth Foundation Pupil Units (TWFPU). TWFPU is based on resident adjusted Average Daily Membership (ADM) which weights half-day kindergarten ADM at .5 and eliminates additional weightings.

## APPENDIX B

### REVENUES FROM STATE SOURCES COMPARED TO TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS 1940-41 TO 1990-91

School Year	Revenues from State Sources*	Total Expenditures**	Percent from State Sources
1990-91 ***	\$8,982,872,311	\$20,933,527,589	42.9 %
1989-90 ****	8,036,519,519	19,333,012,175	41.6
1988-89	8,095,692,650	18,317,487,868	44.2
1987-88	7,391,573,034	16,885,749,512	43.8
1986-87	6,663,866,747	15,461,097,106	43.1
1985-86	6,001,342,481	14,456,668,228	41.5
1984-85	5,483,139,256	13,224,994,555	41.5
1983-84	4,876,658,568	12,414,761,000	39.3
1982-83	4,644,807,892	11,549,609,412	40.2
1981-82	4,272,493,491	10,879,138,373	39.3
1980-81	3,957,793,730	9,969,092,216	39.7
1979-80	3,595,146,853	9,239,986,028	38.9
1978-79	3,367,330,294	8,687,679,124	38.8
1977-78	3,142,598,229	8,353,194,633	37.6
1976-77	3,094,496,700	7,901,601,390	39.2
1975-76	3,069,968,464	7,624,134,286	40.3
1974-75	2,922,894,314	7,392,525,957	39.5
1973-74	2,551,036,661	6,675,066,632	38.2
1972-73	2,439,706,794	5,969,276,199	40.9
1971-72	2,373,770,523	5,571,103,406	42.6
1970-71	2,325,327,909	5,253,769,955	44.3
1969-70	2,047,705,263	4,549,830,449	45.0
1968-69	1,997,898,769	4,155,247,592	48.1
1967-68	1,638,346,054 *****	3,622,486,588	45.2
1966-67	1,461,332,593	3,285,027,751	44.5
1965-66	1,272,117,831	2,799,355,786	45.4
1964-65	1,078,501,941	2,538,791,834	42.5
1963-64	1,016,065,918	2,333,788,895	43.5
1962-63	953,579,515	2,146,273,214	44.4
1961-62	800,834,961	1,915,199,813	41.8
1960-61	747,807,022	1,750,175,348	42.7
1959-60	639,233,653	1,596,411,569	40.0
1958-59	593,554,985	1,459,752,597	40.7
1957-58	514,202,929	1,328,651,873	38.7
1956-57	464,965,442	1,187,779,753	39.1
1955-56	374,038,629	1,031,370,877	36.3

## APPENDIX B (con't.)

### REVENUES FROM STATE SOURCES COMPARED TO TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS 1940-41 TO 1990-91

School Year	Revenues from State Sources*	Total Expenditures**	Percent from State Sources
1954-55	342,111,458	925,362,728	37.0
1953-54	300,616,864	821,271,032	36.6
1952-53	283,792,717	754,721,654	37.6
1951-52	271,893,281	686,883,519	39.6
1950-51	249,978,815	616,183,761	40.6
1949-50	239,305,992	563,376,271	42.5
1948-49	180,313,480	528,719,498	34.1
1947-48	154,718,759	477,887,493	32.4
1946-47	137,329,874	425,614,877	32.3
1945-46	120,916,352	378,143,894	32.0
1944-45	110,877,648	352,480,890	31.5
1943-44	111,813,743	347,016,624	32.2
1942-43	117,769,828	348,833,575	33.8
1941-42	118,765,954	356,183,375	33.3
1940-41	121,563,209	357,923,285	34.0

\* Includes aid to New York City on a five-borough basis since 1968-69.

\*\* Total Expenditures include expenditures made from the Federal Aid Fund from 1965-66 to 1973-74 and from the Special Aid Fund since 1974-75. Includes expenditures from the Debt Service Fund, which was established in 1978-79. Beginning in 1983-84, some districts including New York City reported negative interfund transfers to the General Fund, tending to reduce actual expenditures.

\*\*\* Annual Financial Report data was used; however, the State aid withheld as a State share of local Teachers' Retirement System and Employees' Retirement System savings, which resulted from the restructuring noted in Appendix B (1989-90 school year), was charged against revenues rather than expenditures.

\*\*\*\* Legislation for 1989-90 reduced State aid by approximately \$684 million due to a restructuring of Teachers' Retirement System (TRS) payments for 1988-89 salaries. However, differences among districts in both accounting method used and payment schedule for the 1988-89 TRS salaries resulted in a total expenditure amount which includes about \$306 million in TRS expenditures.

\*\*\*\*\* Includes an additional one-half year's payment of \$51,857,477 to New York City for aid on a five-borough basis.

NOTE: Expenditures made from the Federal Aid fund are included in total expenditures from 1965-66 to 1973-74. State aid figures revised to exclude School Lunch and Breakfast aid since 1964-65 when the School Lunch expenditures and revenues were established as a separate fund.

SOURCE: Table 1, "State Aid to New York State School Districts, 1965-66," January 1967. School years 1963-64 through 1966-67 have been updated, and school years since 1966-67 have been added.

## APPENDIX C

### COUNTIES BY CONTIGUOUS METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (MSAs) -- 2000 Census

A district was classified as belonging to a specific MSA grouping based on the county in which its central office is located. Counties assigned to each regional grouping are shown below.

#### **Albany-Schenectady-Troy-Glens Falls**

Albany  
Rensselaer  
Saratoga  
Schenectady  
Schoharie  
Warren  
Washington

#### **Binghamton-Elmira**

Broome  
Chemung  
Tioga  
Tompkins

#### **Buffalo-Rochester-Jamestown**

Erie  
Livingston  
Monroe  
Niagara  
Ontario  
Orleans  
Wayne

#### **New York Metro-Long Island**

Nassau  
New York City  
Putnam  
Rockland  
Suffolk  
Westchester

#### **Poughkeepsie-Newburgh**

Dutchess  
Orange  
Ulster

#### **Syracuse-Utica-Rome**

Herkimer  
Madison  
Oneida  
Onondaga  
Oswego

#### **Non-MSA Counties**

Allegany  
Cattaraugus  
Cayuga  
Chautauqua  
Chenango  
Clinton  
Columbia  
Cortland  
Delaware  
Essex  
Franklin  
Fulton  
Genesee  
Greene  
Hamilton  
Jefferson  
Lewis  
Montgomery  
Otsego  
St. Lawrence  
Schuyler  
Seneca  
Steuben  
Sullivan  
Wyoming  
Yates

## APPENDIX D

### DISTRICT TYPE GROUPINGS -- 2000 Census

One of the aggregation groupings used in this report was District Type. The combined district types were: New York City, Other Big 4 Cities, Small Cities (Upstate and Downstate), Suburbs (Upstate and Downstate), and Other. Districts were classified as belonging to a specific type, as shown below.

**Upstate Suburbs Counties**  
**(Non-City Districts in the**  
**Counties of):**

### Downstate Small Cities

Glen Cove  
Long Beach  
Mount Vernon  
New Rochelle  
Peekskill  
Rye  
White Plains

**Downstate Suburbs**  
**(Non-City Districts in the**  
**Counties of):**

Nassau  
Suffolk  
Putnam  
Rockland  
Westchester

## Big-5 Cities

Buffalo  
Rochester  
New York City  
Syracuse  
Yonkers

Albany  
Broome  
Chemung  
Dutchess  
Erie  
Herkimer  
Livingston  
Madison  
Monroe  
Niagara  
Oneida  
Onondaga  
Ontario  
Orange  
Orleans  
Oswego  
Rensselaer  
Saratoga  
Schenectad  
Schoharie  
Tioga  
Tompkins  
Ulster  
Warren  
Washington  
Wayne

**Other**  
**(Non-City Districts in the**  
**Counties of):**

Allegany  
Cattaraugus  
Cayuga  
Chautauqua  
Chenango  
Clinton  
Columbia  
Cortland  
Delaware  
Essex  
Franklin  
Fulton  
Genesee  
Greene  
Hamilton  
Jefferson  
Lewis  
Montgomery  
Otsego  
St. Lawrence  
Schuyler  
Seneca  
Steuben  
Sullivan  
Wyoming  
Yates


### Upstate Small Cities

Albany  
Cohoes  
Watervliet  
Binghamton  
Olean  
Salamanca  
Auburn  
Dunkirk  
Jamestown  
Elmira  
Norwich  
Plattsburgh  
Hudson  
Cortland  
Beacon  
Poughkeepsie  
Lackawanna

Tonawanda  
Gloversville  
Johnstown  
Batavia  
Little Falls  
Watertown  
Oneida  
Amsterdam  
Lockport  
Niagara Falls  
N. Tonawanda  
Rome  
Sherrill  
Utica  
Canandaigua  
Geneva  
Middletown

Newburgh  
Port Jervis  
Fulton  
Oswego  
Oneonta  
Rensselaer  
Troy  
Ogdensburg  
Mechanicville  
Saratoga Spring  
Schenectady  
Corning  
Hornell  
Ithaca  
Kingston  
Glens Falls

## Appendix E: New York State Counties





**FROM:** Fiscal Analysis & Research Unit, New York State Education Department,  
Room 301 EB, Albany, New York 12234 (Fax #: 518/474-5214)

**RE:** Analysis of School Finances in New York State School Districts Report

**Introduction:** As you know, the purpose of the Analysis report is to accurately summarize major trends in school district finances over time and by major aggregation groups of interest to school district officials, policy makers and legislators. In order to improve the quality of this product, we have prepared a brief (1-page) survey, which we would ask you to complete. It should take no more than 5 minutes to complete. Won't you please take a moment or two to share your thoughts with us? Should you have any questions about the survey, do not hesitate to contact Ms. Darlene Tegza (518/473-8299).

**Survey Questions:**

1. **Have you or other members of your staff made use of the information contained in this report?** (Check appropriate box)

☐ NO --->And why is that? (Describe Briefly): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ YES --->And how did you make use of the report's information? (Describe Briefly):

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2. **Are there any specific sections of the report which you found especially helpful or useful?** (Describe):

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. **Thinking now about the enclosed report overall, how would you rate it on a 1-5 scale (where "1" = excellent and "5"= very poor) in terms of the following dimensions? Circle the scale value that best reflects your judgement about each aspect of the report.**

	Excellent			Very Poor	
<input type="checkbox"/> Clarity	1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Utility	1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Ease of Understanding	1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Level of Detail	1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Overall Quality	1	2	3	4	5

**NOTE:** Please return (or fax) the survey form to the address (Fax #) shown above.  
Thank you.