

Appendix D

Fiscal and Staffing Individual Five-Year Data for 12 Improvement Districts

- Table D.1. Teachers Per 1000 Students in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1995 to 2000
- Table D.2. Administrative Staff Per 1000 Students in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1995 to 2000
- Table D.3. Current Expenditures Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.4. Expenditures on Instruction Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.5. Percent of Expenditures on Instruction in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.6. Expenditures on Non-Instructional Services Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.7. Percent of Expenditures on Non-Instructional Services in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.8. Core Expenditures Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.9. Percent of Core Expenditures in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.10. Expenditures on Student Support Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.11. Percent of Expenditures on Student Support in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.12. Expenditures on Instructional Staff Support Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.13. Percent of Expenditures on Instructional Staff Support in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.14. Expenditures on Other Support Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.15. Percent of Expenditures on Other Support in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.16. Total Revenue Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.17. Local Revenue Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999
- Table D.18. Local Percent of Total Revenue in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

Table D.1
Teachers Per 1000 Students in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1995 to 2000

	N	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-00	% increase
Small imp. district	1	56	55	53	63	73	60	17	30%
Small comp. districts	13	59	59	59	62	69	61	10	17%
Medium imp. district	1	61	58	59	65	68	62	7	12%
Medium comp. districts	13	58	56	57	60	65	59	7	13%
Large imp. district	1	56	61	57	62	65	60	9	16%
Large comp. districts	5	55	57	56	57	61	57	6	11%
Arkansas statewide	307	63	62	63	67	81	67	18	29%
Small imp. district	1	69	66	71	73	77	71	8	12%
Small comp. districts	13	64	63	68	70	73	67	9	14%
Medium imp. district	1	59	54	66	66	67	62	7	12%
Medium comp. districts	13	62	61	65	67	69	65	6	10%
Large imp. district	1	56	59	62	63	65	61	9	16%
Large comp. districts	13	58	58	61	63	65	61	7	13%
Louisiana statewide	66	61	60	65	66	68	64	7	11%
Small imp. district	1	66	68	68	68	69	68	3	5%
Small comp. districts	13	64	65	65	67	67	65	3	4%
Medium imp. district	1	55	56	58	61	63	59	9	16%
Medium comp. districts	9	55	56	56	59	59	57	5	8%
Large imp. district	1	60	62	60	63	63	62	3	5%
Large comp. districts	5	58	60	58	61	60	59	2	3%
New Mexico statewide	89	68	69	69	71	71	70	3	4%
Small imp. district	1	81	78	81	83	88	82	7	9%
Small comp. districts	13	72	72	73	74	76	73	4	6%
Medium imp. district	1	65	70	68	69	71	69	6	9%
Medium comp. districts	13	67	69	69	70	70	69	3	4%
Large imp. district	1	56	58	61	61	65	60	9	16%
Large comp. districts	13	62	63	64	65	67	64	5	8%
Texas statewide	1042	79	80	81	82	83	81	4	5%

Table D. 2
Administrative Staff Per 1000 Students in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1995 to 2000

	N	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-00	% increase
Small imp. district	1	9	9	9	5	6	7	-3	-34%
Small comp. districts	13	9	9	9	5	9	8	-1	-9%
Medium imp. district	1	7	7	7	5	5	6	-2	-33%
Medium comp. districts	13	9	9	9	6	8	8	-1	-14%
Large imp. district	1	12	12	12	6	11	11	-1	-7%
Large comp. districts	5	8	10	10	6	10	9	2	21%
Arkansas statewide	307	10	11	11	7	11	10	1	9%
Small imp. district	1	13	12	13	14	14	13	1	8%
Small comp. districts	13	10	9	10	11	11	10	2	17%
Medium imp. district	1	9	6	9	10	11	9	2	25%
Medium comp. districts	13	9	8	9	9	10	9	1	15%
Large imp. district	1	6	7	7	7	7	7	1	14%
Large comp. districts	13	7	7	8	8	8	8	1	15%
Louisiana statewide	66	8	8	9	9	10	9	1	15%
Small imp. district	1	19	21	20	16	22	20	2	12%
Small comp. districts	13	16	16	19	19	19	18	4	23%
Medium imp. district	1	88	30	32	14	21	37	-67	-76%
Medium comp. districts	9	23	13	14	12	16	16	-7	-30%
Large imp. district	1	9	10	12	12	12	11	3	35%
Large comp. districts	5	13	13	13	14	16	14	3	22%
New Mexico statewide	89	19	18	23	23	26	22	6	31%
Small imp. district	1	8	7	9	10	10	9	2	24%
Small comp. districts	13	9	9	10	10	10	10	1	14%
Medium imp. district	1	8	10	9	12	13	10	5	56%
Medium comp. districts	13	9	9	9	10	10	10	1	11%
Large imp. district	1	7	6	7	7	9	7	1	18%
Large comp. districts	13	7	8	8	8	9	8	1	17%
Texas statewide	1042	10	10	11	11	12	11	2	20%

Table D.3
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99	% increase
Small imp. district	1	4,909	4,986	4,976	5,142	5,353	5,073	444	9%
Small comp. districts	5	5,042	5,083	5,106	5,227	5,558	5,203	516	10%
Medium imp. district	1	4,087	4,268	4,297	4,195	4,626	4,295	539	13%
Medium comp. districts	13	4,342	4,379	4,414	4,568	4,678	4,476	337	8%
Large imp. district	1	4,592	4,583	4,520	4,742	4,864	4,660	273	6%
Large comp. districts	13	4,542	4,493	4,515	4,726	4,922	4,639	380	8%
Arkansas statewide	307	4,719	4,702	4,684	4,881	5,073	4,812	353	7%
Small imp. district	1	4,961	4,708	4,697	5,161	5,636	5,033	675	14%
Small comp. districts	13	4,870	4,675	4,644	5,206	5,647	5,009	776	16%
Medium imp. district	1	5,119	5,307	4,906	5,762	6,069	5,433	950	19%
Medium comp. districts	13	4,843	4,745	4,669	5,162	5,535	4,991	691	14%
Large imp. district	1	4,316	4,151	4,442	4,865	5,176	4,590	860	20%
Large comp. districts	13	4,561	4,531	4,611	5,026	5,310	4,808	749	16%
Louisiana statewide	66	4,696	4,599	4,604	5,077	5,418	4,879	722	15%
Small imp. district	1	5,591	6,114	6,487	6,611	7,071	6,375	1,479	26%
Small comp. districts	13	5,292	5,284	5,811	6,058	6,526	5,794	1,233	23%
Medium imp. district	1	4,130	4,159	4,484	4,585	4,959	4,463	829	20%
Medium comp. districts	9	4,126	4,087	4,380	4,577	4,978	4,430	852	21%
Large imp. district	1	4,433	4,375	4,685	4,843	5,339	4,735	906	20%
Large comp. districts	5	4,383	4,337	4,677	4,858	5,239	4,699	855	20%
New Mexico statewide	89	5,601	5,583	6,017	6,329	6,846	6,075	1,245	22%
Small imp. district	1	5,437	5,800	5,847	5,853	6,263	5,840	826	15%
Small comp. districts	13	5,337	5,552	5,684	5,757	5,862	5,638	526	10%
Medium imp. district	1	5,511	5,943	5,953	5,957	6,359	5,945	849	15%
Medium comp. districts	13	5,208	5,390	5,361	5,535	5,748	5,448	540	10%
Large imp. district	1	4,745	4,647	4,747	5,003	5,284	4,885	539	11%
Large comp. districts	13	5,092	5,117	5,099	5,248	5,376	5,187	284	6%
Texas statewide	1042	5,980	6,087	6,100	6,284	6,429	6,176	449	8%

Table D.4
Expenditures on Instruction Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99	% increase
Small imp. district	1	2,673	2,827	2,875	2,816	3,094	2,857	422	16%
Small comp. districts	13	2,783	2,813	2,756	2,830	2,897	2,816	114	4%
Medium imp. district	1	2,924	2,894	2,725	3,027	3,079	2,930	154	5%
Medium comp. districts	13	2,894	2,860	2,836	2,940	3,037	2,913	143	5%
Large imp. district	1	3,128	3,169	3,120	3,183	3,273	3,174	145	5%
Large comp. districts	5	3,122	3,180	3,146	3,194	3,399	3,208	277	9%
Arkansas statewide	307	2,984	2,962	2,860	2,969	3,081	2,971	97	3%
Small imp. district	1	2,774	2,620	2,542	2,905	3,158	2,800	384	14%
Small comp. districts	13	2,786	2,650	2,635	3,003	3,266	2,868	480	17%
Medium imp. district	1	2,894	2,852	2,727	3,311	3,458	3,049	564	19%
Medium comp. districts	13	2,778	2,679	2,660	2,984	3,197	2,860	419	15%
Large imp. district	1	2,710	2,587	2,840	3,154	3,424	2,943	714	26%
Large comp. districts	13	2,789	2,757	2,818	3,091	3,299	2,951	509	18%
Louisiana statewide	66	2,760	2,678	2,696	3,007	3,227	2,874	467	17%
Small imp. district	1	2,782	3,083	3,304	3,369	3,552	3,218	769	28%
Small comp. districts	13	2,786	2,755	3,093	3,225	3,420	3,056	634	23%
Medium imp. district	1	2,554	2,556	2,714	2,776	2,893	2,699	339	13%
Medium comp. districts	9	2,397	2,360	2,503	2,621	2,791	2,534	394	16%
Large imp. district	1	2,545	2,465	2,669	2,750	2,971	2,680	426	17%
Large comp. districts	5	2,498	2,458	2,662	2,745	2,916	2,656	418	17%
New Mexico statewide	89	2,961	2,956	3,218	3,353	3,553	3,208	592	20%
Small imp. district	1	3,430	3,597	3,729	3,672	3,938	3,673	508	15%
Small comp. districts	13	3,324	3,477	3,615	3,575	3,622	3,523	298	9%
Medium imp. district	1	3,165	3,539	3,547	3,424	3,540	3,443	375	12%
Medium comp. districts	13	3,170	3,302	3,370	3,430	3,532	3,361	363	11%
Large imp. district	1	2,672	2,634	2,779	2,942	3,097	2,825	426	16%
Large comp. districts	13	3,160	3,172	3,191	3,248	3,320	3,218	160	5%
Texas statewide	1042	3,657	3,762	3,848	3,901	3,993	3,832	336	9%

Table D.5
Percent of Expenditures on Instruction in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99
Small imp. district	1	65%	66%	67%	67%	67%	67%	1%
Small comp. districts	13	64%	64%	63%	62%	62%	63%	-2%
Medium imp. district	1	64%	63%	60%	64%	63%	63%	0%
Medium comp. districts	13	64%	64%	63%	62%	62%	63%	-2%
Large imp. district	1	64%	64%	63%	62%	61%	63%	-3%
Large comp. districts	5	62%	63%	62%	61%	61%	62%	-1%
Arkansas statewide	307	63%	63%	61%	61%	61%	62%	-2%
Small imp. district	1	56%	56%	54%	56%	56%	56%	0%
Small comp. districts	13	57%	57%	57%	58%	58%	57%	1%
Medium imp. district	1	57%	54%	56%	57%	57%	56%	0%
Medium comp. districts	13	58%	57%	57%	58%	58%	57%	0%
Large imp. district	1	63%	62%	64%	65%	66%	64%	3%
Large comp. districts	13	61%	61%	61%	62%	62%	61%	1%
Louisiana statewide	66	59%	58%	59%	59%	60%	59%	1%
Small imp. district	1	50%	50%	51%	51%	50%	50%	0%
Small comp. districts	13	53%	52%	53%	53%	53%	53%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	62%	61%	61%	61%	58%	61%	-3%
Medium comp. districts	9	58%	58%	57%	57%	56%	57%	-2%
Large imp. district	1	57%	56%	57%	57%	56%	57%	-2%
Large comp. districts	5	57%	57%	57%	57%	56%	57%	-1%
New Mexico statewide	89	54%	54%	54%	54%	53%	54%	-1%
Small imp. district	1	63%	62%	64%	63%	63%	63%	0%
Small comp. districts	13	62%	63%	64%	62%	62%	63%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	57%	60%	60%	57%	56%	58%	-2%
Medium comp. districts	13	61%	61%	63%	62%	62%	62%	0%
Large imp. district	1	56%	57%	59%	59%	59%	58%	2%
Large comp. districts	13	62%	62%	63%	62%	62%	62%	0%
Texas statewide	1042	62%	62%	63%	62%	62%	62%	1%

Table D.6
Expenditures on Non-Instructional Services Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99	% increase
Small imp. district	1	263	253	268	271	287	269	24	9%
Small comp. districts	13	289	278	335	362	352	323	63	22%
Medium imp. district	1	282	276	309	275	272	283	-10	-4%
Medium comp. districts	13	286	272	305	324	359	309	72	25%
Large imp. district	1	282	269	272	273	298	279	16	6%
Large comp. districts	5	288	268	303	313	339	302	51	18%
Arkansas statewide	307	308	293	348	366	374	338	66	21%
Small imp. district	1	467	449	462	460	463	460	-4	-1%
Small comp. districts	13	449	429	425	448	469	444	20	4%
Medium imp. district	1	356	354	353	378	362	361	6	2%
Medium comp. districts	13	423	407	400	420	439	418	16	4%
Large imp. district	1	293	269	291	294	277	285	-16	-5%
Large comp. districts	13	345	343	338	365	358	350	13	4%
Louisiana statewide	66	404	394	388	407	419	402	15	4%
Small imp. district	1	480	493	522	517	530	508	49	10%
Small comp. districts	13	296	310	321	320	356	320	59	20%
Medium imp. district	1	190	191	221	222	239	213	49	26%
Medium comp. districts	9	254	245	254	267	294	263	41	16%
Large imp. district	1	279	270	272	264	301	277	21	8%
Large comp. districts	5	265	255	252	268	285	265	20	7%
New Mexico statewide	89	303	306	316	325	351	320	48	16%
Small imp. district	1	369	342	333	335	306	337	-63	-17%
Small comp. districts	13	311	303	302	305	304	305	-7	-2%
Medium imp. district	1	364	306	261	346	362	328	-2	-1%
Medium comp. districts	13	318	299	281	301	312	302	-6	-2%
Large imp. district	1	354	318	308	293	304	315	-50	-14%
Large comp. districts	13	313	331	294	291	298	306	-15	-5%
Texas statewide	1042	346	335	326	322	334	333	-12	-4%

Table D.7
Percent of Expenditures on Non-Instructional Services in Improvement and Comparison
Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99
Small imp. district	1	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	0%
Small comp. districts	13	7%	6%	8%	8%	8%	7%	1%
Medium imp. district	1	6%	6%	7%	6%	6%	6%	-1%
Medium comp. districts	13	6%	6%	7%	7%	7%	7%	1%
Large imp. district	1	6%	5%	5%	5%	6%	6%	0%
Large comp. districts	5	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%	6%	0%
Arkansas statewide	307	7%	6%	7%	7%	7%	7%	1%
Small imp. district	1	9%	10%	10%	9%	8%	9%	-1%
Small comp. districts	13	9%	9%	9%	9%	8%	9%	-1%
Medium imp. district	1	7%	7%	7%	7%	6%	7%	-1%
Medium comp. districts	13	9%	9%	9%	8%	8%	8%	-1%
Large imp. district	1	7%	6%	7%	6%	5%	6%	-1%
Large comp. districts	13	8%	8%	7%	7%	7%	7%	-1%
Louisiana statewide	66	9%	9%	9%	8%	8%	8%	-1%
Small imp. district	1	9%	8%	8%	8%	7%	8%	-1%
Small comp. districts	13	6%	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	0%
Medium comp. districts	9	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	0%
Large imp. district	1	6%	6%	6%	5%	6%	6%	-1%
Large comp. districts	5	6%	6%	5%	5%	5%	6%	-1%
New Mexico statewide	89	6%	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%	0%
Small imp. district	1	7%	6%	6%	6%	5%	6%	-2%
Small comp. districts	13	6%	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%	-1%
Medium imp. district	1	7%	5%	4%	6%	6%	6%	-1%
Medium comp. districts	13	6%	6%	5%	5%	5%	6%	-1%
Large imp. district	1	7%	7%	6%	6%	6%	6%	-2%
Large comp. districts	13	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	-1%
Texas statewide	1042	6%	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%	-1%

Table D.8
Core Expenditures Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99	% increase
Small imp. district	1	2,895	3,074	3,100	3,034	3,322	3,085	426	15%
Small comp. districts	13	3,067	3,105	3,050	3,144	3,228	3,119	161	5%
Medium imp. district	1	3,355	3,338	3,134	3,465	3,543	3,367	189	6%
Medium comp. districts	13	3,270	3,234	3,206	3,325	3,430	3,293	159	5%
Large imp. district	1	3,680	3,743	3,694	3,799	3,932	3,770	252	7%
Large comp. districts	5	3,608	3,659	3,631	3,699	3,946	3,708	338	9%
Arkansas statewide	307	3,295	3,277	3,175	3,297	3,431	3,295	136	4%
Small imp. district	1	3,153	3,028	2,995	3,383	3,777	3,267	623	20%
Small comp. districts	13	3,176	3,034	3,028	3,461	3,788	3,297	612	19%
Medium imp. district	1	3,289	3,272	3,089	3,729	3,901	3,456	612	19%
Medium comp. districts	13	3,158	3,062	3,025	3,387	3,661	3,259	503	16%
Large imp. district	1	3,073	2,974	3,214	3,607	3,886	3,351	813	26%
Large comp. districts	13	3,135	3,103	3,175	3,496	3,742	3,330	607	19%
Louisiana statewide	66	3,125	3,047	3,069	3,430	3,694	3,273	569	18%
Small imp. district	1	3,380	3,758	3,977	4,216	4,422	3,951	1,042	31%
Small comp. districts	13	3,355	3,335	3,777	4,054	4,263	3,757	907	27%
Medium imp. district	1	3,009	3,016	3,252	3,410	3,537	3,245	528	18%
Medium comp. districts	9	2,840	2,814	3,052	3,236	3,441	3,077	601	21%
Large imp. district	1	3,179	3,112	3,408	3,543	3,739	3,396	560	18%
Large comp. districts	5	3,041	3,016	3,323	3,476	3,648	3,301	607	20%
New Mexico statewide	89	3,513	3,518	3,898	4,135	4,363	3,885	851	24%
Small imp. district	1	3,781	3,974	4,135	4,133	4,427	4,090	646	17%
Small comp. districts	13	3,762	3,935	4,111	4,089	4,141	4,007	379	10%
Medium imp. district	1	3,701	4,108	4,234	4,058	4,203	4,061	502	14%
Medium comp. districts	13	3,598	3,746	3,844	3,936	4,068	3,838	470	13%
Large imp. district	1	3,121	3,088	3,240	3,415	3,604	3,293	483	15%
Large comp. districts	13	3,638	3,640	3,672	3,742	3,843	3,707	205	6%
Texas statewide	1042	4,021	4,133	4,228	4,310	4,417	4,222	395	10%

Table D.9
Percent of Core Expenditures in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99
Small imp. district	1	72%	71%	73%	73%	70%	72%	-2%
Small comp. districts	13	63%	63%	65%	67%	65%	65%	2%
Medium imp. district	1	64%	64%	66%	66%	65%	65%	1%
Medium comp. districts	5	69%	69%	70%	71%	69%	69%	0%
Large imp. district	1	60%	61%	61%	64%	63%	62%	2%
Large comp. districts	13	69%	69%	71%	72%	70%	70%	0%
Arkansas statewide	307	73%	73%	73%	74%	71%	73%	-2%
Small imp. district	1	64%	64%	64%	66%	67%	65%	3%
Small comp. districts	13	65%	65%	65%	66%	67%	66%	2%
Medium imp. district	1	64%	62%	63%	65%	64%	64%	0%
Medium comp. districts	13	65%	65%	65%	66%	66%	65%	1%
Large imp. district	1	71%	72%	72%	74%	75%	73%	4%
Large comp. districts	13	69%	69%	69%	70%	70%	69%	2%
Louisiana statewide	66	67%	66%	67%	68%	68%	67%	2%
Small imp. district	1	72%	71%	73%	73%	70%	72%	-2%
Small comp. districts	13	63%	63%	65%	67%	65%	65%	2%
Medium imp. district	1	64%	64%	66%	66%	65%	65%	1%
Medium comp. districts	9	69%	69%	70%	71%	69%	69%	0%
Large imp. district	1	60%	61%	61%	64%	63%	62%	2%
Large comp. districts	5	69%	69%	71%	72%	70%	70%	0%
New Mexico statewide	89	73%	73%	73%	74%	71%	73%	-2%
Small imp. district	1	66%	66%	68%	68%	68%	67%	2%
Small comp. districts	13	70%	71%	72%	71%	70%	71%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	68%	68%	70%	69%	69%	69%	1%
Medium comp. districts	13	69%	70%	72%	71%	71%	71%	2%
Large imp. district	1	70%	69%	71%	71%	71%	70%	1%
Large comp. districts	13	71%	71%	72%	71%	72%	71%	0%
Texas statewide	1042	67%	69%	71%	68%	66%	68%	-1%

Table D.10
Expenditures on Student Support Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99	% increase
Small imp. district	1	138	141	139	136	137	138	0	0%
Small comp. districts	13	164	164	166	184	192	174	28	17%
Medium imp. district	1	235	227	234	258	272	245	37	16%
Medium comp. districts	13	193	190	194	203	209	198	16	8%
Large imp. district	1	313	322	308	311	331	317	18	6%
Large comp. districts	5	245	245	240	243	259	246	14	6%
Arkansas statewide	307	160	164	166	174	187	170	28	17%
Small imp. district	1	160	154	157	189	228	178	68	43%
Small comp. districts	13	166	151	157	179	216	174	49	30%
Medium imp. district	1	181	186	159	197	205	186	24	14%
Medium comp. districts	13	171	165	158	170	193	171	21	12%
Large imp. district	1	199	197	208	211	219	207	20	10%
Large comp. districts	13	173	172	181	197	215	187	42	24%
Louisiana statewide	66	165	163	166	184	205	177	39	24%
Small imp. district	1	325	396	312	481	564	416	239	74%
Small comp. districts	13	335	327	349	442	537	398	202	60%
Medium imp. district	1	285	297	330	371	445	346	159	56%
Medium comp. districts	9	263	276	318	358	436	330	174	66%
Large imp. district	1	337	369	390	450	546	419	209	62%
Large comp. districts	5	321	334	369	423	501	390	179	56%
New Mexico statewide	89	298	311	327	402	485	364	187	63%
Small imp. district	1	172	183	188	192	206	188	34	20%
Small comp. districts	13	218	232	245	247	255	239	37	17%
Medium imp. district	1	267	299	395	379	376	343	109	41%
Medium comp. districts	13	228	240	266	290	309	267	81	35%
Large imp. district	1	224	223	215	208	234	221	11	5%
Large comp. districts	13	254	250	251	256	269	256	15	6%
Texas statewide	1042	183	187	192	205	216	197	33	18%

Table D.11
Percent of Expenditures on Student Support in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99
Small imp. district	1	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%
Small comp. districts	13	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	5%	0%
Medium comp. districts	13	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Large imp. district	1	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	0%
Large comp. districts	5	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	0%
Arkansas statewide	307	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Small imp. district	1	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	1%
Small comp. districts	13	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	4%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%
Medium comp. districts	13	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%
Large imp. district	1	5%	5%	5%	4%	4%	5%	0%
Large comp. districts	13	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Louisiana statewide	66	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Small imp. district	1	6%	6%	5%	7%	8%	6%	2%
Small comp. districts	13	6%	6%	6%	7%	8%	7%	2%
Medium imp. district	1	7%	7%	7%	8%	9%	8%	2%
Medium comp. districts	9	6%	7%	7%	8%	9%	7%	2%
Large imp. district	1	8%	8%	8%	9%	10%	9%	3%
Large comp. districts	5	7%	8%	8%	9%	10%	8%	2%
New Mexico statewide	89	6%	6%	6%	7%	7%	6%	2%
Small imp. district	1	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%
Small comp. districts	13	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	5%	5%	7%	6%	6%	6%	1%
Medium comp. districts	13	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	1%
Large imp. district	1	5%	5%	5%	4%	4%	5%	0%
Large comp. districts	13	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	0%
Texas statewide	1042	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%

Table D.12
Expenditures on Instructional Staff Support Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99	% increase
Small imp. district	1	85	106	85	82	90	90	5	6%
Small comp. districts	13	120	127	127	130	139	129	19	16%
Medium imp. district	1	195	218	174	181	192	192	-3	-1%
Medium comp. districts	13	184	184	176	182	184	182	0	0%
Large imp. district	1	239	252	267	305	328	278	89	37%
Large comp. districts	5	241	234	245	262	288	254	47	20%
Arkansas statewide	307	151	151	148	154	162	153	11	7%
Small imp. district	1	219	254	296	288	390	290	171	78%
Small comp. districts	13	224	233	235	280	307	256	83	37%
Medium imp. district	1	214	234	203	221	238	222	24	11%
Medium comp. districts	13	209	218	207	234	271	228	62	30%
Large imp. district	1	164	191	166	242	243	201	80	49%
Large comp. districts	13	173	175	175	208	229	192	56	32%
Louisiana statewide	66	200	205	206	239	262	222	62	31%
Small imp. district	1	273	279	361	366	307	317	33	12%
Small comp. districts	13	234	253	335	387	306	303	72	31%
Medium imp. district	1	170	163	209	263	199	201	30	18%
Medium comp. districts	9	180	179	231	257	214	212	34	19%
Large imp. district	1	297	278	349	343	222	298	-75	-25%
Large comp. districts	5	222	224	292	308	232	256	10	4%
New Mexico statewide	89	254	252	352	380	326	313	72	28%
Small imp. district	1	179	195	217	269	282	228	103	58%
Small comp. districts	13	220	226	251	267	264	245	44	20%
Medium imp. district	1	269	269	292	255	287	274	17	7%
Medium comp. districts	13	200	205	207	216	227	211	26	13%
Large imp. district	1	226	231	246	265	272	248	47	21%
Large comp. districts	13	223	218	230	238	253	233	30	14%
Texas statewide	1042	181	184	188	204	208	193	27	15%

Table D.13
Percent of Expenditures on Instructional Staff Support in Improvement and Comparison
Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99
Small imp. district	1	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%
Small comp. districts	13	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Medium comp. districts	13	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Large imp. district	1	5%	5%	5%	6%	6%	5%	1%
Large comp. districts	5	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	0%
Arkansas statewide	307	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%
Small imp. district	1	4%	5%	6%	6%	7%	6%	3%
Small comp. districts	13	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	1%
Medium imp. district	1	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Medium comp. districts	13	4%	5%	4%	5%	5%	5%	1%
Large imp. district	1	4%	5%	4%	5%	5%	4%	1%
Large comp. districts	13	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	1%
Louisiana statewide	66	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	1%
Small imp. district	1	5%	5%	6%	6%	4%	5%	-1%
Small comp. districts	13	4%	5%	6%	6%	5%	5%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	4%	4%	5%	6%	4%	4%	0%
Medium comp. districts	9	4%	4%	5%	6%	4%	5%	0%
Large imp. district	1	7%	6%	7%	7%	4%	6%	-3%
Large comp. districts	5	5%	5%	6%	6%	4%	5%	-1%
New Mexico statewide	89	5%	5%	6%	6%	5%	5%	0%
Small imp. district	1	3%	3%	4%	5%	5%	4%	1%
Small comp. districts	13	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	5%	5%	5%	4%	5%	5%	0%
Medium comp. districts	13	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Large imp. district	1	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	0%
Large comp. districts	13	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	4%	0%
Texas statewide	1042	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%

Table D.14
Expenditures on Other Support Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99	% increase
Small imp. district	1	33	25	38	31	74	40	41	125%
Small comp. districts	13	33	23	28	38	53	35	20	61%
Medium imp. district	1	88	89	111	104	111	101	23	26%
Medium comp. districts	13	51	54	64	67	71	61	21	41%
Large imp. district	1	106	109	109	116	131	114	26	24%
Large comp. districts	5	147	137	134	140	151	142	4	3%
Arkansas statewide	307	39	38	55	54	56	49	17	43%
Small imp. district	1	98	109	119	139	155	124	56	57%
Small comp. districts	13	71	73	79	94	105	84	34	48%
Medium imp. district	1	116	118	120	151	164	134	48	42%
Medium comp. districts	13	71	74	77	88	90	80	19	26%
Large imp. district	1	66	62	60	65	74	66	9	13%
Large comp. districts	13	78	79	78	89	108	86	30	38%
Louisiana statewide	66	71	73	75	85	96	80	25	35%
Small imp. district	1	160	168	139	130	153	150	-7	-5%
Small comp. districts	13	113	116	122	128	150	126	37	32%
Medium imp. district	1	52	55	74	66	73	64	20	39%
Medium comp. districts	9	57	58	59	63	67	61	10	17%
Large imp. district	1	45	43	42	44	49	45	4	10%
Large comp. districts	5	50	50	49	54	59	53	10	19%
New Mexico statewide	89	117	118	120	136	157	130	40	34%
Small imp. district	1	26	28	99	165	173	98	146	558%
Small comp. districts	13	27	26	155	135	144	97	117	435%
Medium imp. district	1	26	40	130	226	348	154	322	1217%
Medium comp. districts	13	25	24	130	128	148	91	123	489%
Large imp. district	1	41	35	89	124	187	95	146	357%
Large comp. districts	13	44	49	85	126	168	94	124	283%
Texas statewide	1042	40	43	208	167	181	128	141	351%

Table D.15
Percent of Expenditures on Other Support in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99
Small imp. district	1	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Small comp. districts	13	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%
Medium comp. districts	13	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Large imp. district	1	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%
Large comp. districts	5	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%
Arkansas statewide	307	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Small imp. district	1	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	1%
Small comp. districts	13	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	0%
Medium comp. districts	13	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%
Large imp. district	1	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Large comp. districts	13	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%
Louisiana statewide	66	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%
Small imp. district	1	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	-1%
Small comp. districts	13	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%
Medium imp. district	1	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Medium comp. districts	9	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Large imp. district	1	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Large comp. districts	5	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
New Mexico statewide	89	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%
Small imp. district	1	0%	0%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%
Small comp. districts	13	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Medium imp. district	1	0%	1%	2%	4%	5%	3%	5%
Medium comp. districts	13	0%	0%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%
Large imp. district	1	1%	1%	2%	2%	4%	2%	3%
Large comp. districts	13	1%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%
Texas statewide	1042	1%	1%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%

Table D.16
Total Revenue Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99	% increase
Small imp. district	1	4,557	4,547	4,963	5,148	5,512	4,945	956	21%
Small comp. districts	13	4,796	4,773	4,972	5,284	5,419	5,049	623	13%
Medium imp. district	1	4,482	4,471	4,435	5,167	5,230	4,757	748	17%
Medium comp. districts	13	4,786	4,820	5,026	5,256	5,507	5,079	721	15%
Large imp. district	1	4,859	5,242	5,439	5,520	5,776	5,367	916	19%
Large comp. districts	5	5,490	5,549	5,735	5,910	6,354	5,808	864	16%
Arkansas statewide	307	4,975	5,051	5,232	5,600	5,790	5,330	815	16%
Small imp. district	1	5,272	5,126	5,284	5,758	6,217	5,531	945	18%
Small comp. districts	13	5,188	5,086	5,150	5,923	6,202	5,510	1,014	20%
Medium imp. district	1	6,096	6,207	5,745	6,628	6,629	6,261	533	9%
Medium comp. districts	13	5,365	5,429	5,248	5,909	6,108	5,612	744	14%
Large imp. district	1	5,025	4,840	5,177	5,526	5,641	5,242	616	12%
Large comp. districts	13	5,181	5,118	5,212	5,672	5,951	5,427	769	15%
Louisiana statewide	66	5,180	5,135	5,180	5,758	6,014	5,454	834	16%
Small imp. district	1	6,558	7,177	7,229	7,856	8,402	7,445	1,844	28%
Small comp. districts	13	6,846	7,020	6,479	7,736	7,876	7,191	1,030	15%
Medium imp. district	1	4,639	4,733	4,774	4,971	5,381	4,899	742	16%
Medium comp. districts	9	5,068	5,149	4,940	5,241	5,586	5,197	519	10%
Large imp. district	1	5,462	5,461	5,348	5,492	6,081	5,569	619	11%
Large comp. districts	5	5,456	5,600	5,396	5,598	6,016	5,613	560	10%
New Mexico statewide	89	6,985	7,171	6,765	7,589	8,107	7,323	1,121	16%
Small imp. district	1	6,137	6,839	6,869	6,612	6,984	6,688	847	14%
Small comp. districts	13	6,205	6,506	6,711	6,745	6,600	6,553	395	6%
Medium imp. district	1	5,869	6,839	6,995	6,414	6,628	6,549	759	13%
Medium comp. districts	13	5,882	6,153	6,249	6,245	6,771	6,260	889	15%
Large imp. district	1	4,503	4,641	5,314	5,846	6,118	5,285	1,615	36%
Large comp. districts	13	5,808	5,972	6,059	6,164	6,329	6,066	522	9%
Texas statewide	1042	7,671	7,786	7,635	7,766	7,862	7,744	191	2%

Table D. 17
Local Revenue Per Pupil in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99	% increase
Small imp. district	1	956	1,013	1,220	1,287	1,423	1,180	467	49%
Small comp. districts	13	1,143	1,171	1,230	1,362	1,414	1,264	271	24%
Medium imp. district	1	1,256	1,273	1,147	1,694	1,648	1,404	391	31%
Medium comp. districts	13	1,333	1,459	1,505	1,586	1,712	1,519	380	28%
Large imp. district	1	2,022	2,379	2,387	2,372	2,452	2,322	431	21%
Large comp. districts	5	2,253	2,413	2,554	2,553	2,757	2,506	504	22%
Arkansas statewide	307	1,287	1,384	1,406	1,563	1,673	1,463	386	30%
Small imp. district	1	1,196	1,195	1,228	1,295	1,347	1,252	150	13%
Small comp. districts	13	1,328	1,360	1,416	1,741	1,784	1,526	456	34%
Medium imp. district	1	3,285	3,524	3,409	3,829	3,766	3,563	481	15%
Medium comp. districts	13	1,744	1,893	1,819	2,024	2,028	1,902	283	16%
Large imp. district	1	1,983	2,014	2,250	2,418	2,475	2,228	493	25%
Large comp. districts	13	1,901	1,958	2,020	2,215	2,304	2,080	403	21%
Louisiana statewide	66	1,610	1,682	1,735	1,932	1,991	1,790	381	24%
Small imp. district	1	491	577	650	860	968	709	477	97%
Small comp. districts	13	872	906	758	922	794	850	-78	-9%
Medium imp. district	1	349	383	411	446	454	409	105	30%
Medium comp. districts	9	712	792	703	734	704	729	-9	-1%
Large imp. district	1	720	782	698	783	696	736	-23	-3%
Large comp. districts	5	779	879	816	852	804	826	26	3%
New Mexico statewide	89	842	975	827	943	946	907	104	12%
Small imp. district	1	1,584	1,548	1,666	1,495	1,485	1,555	-99	-6%
Small comp. districts	13	2,447	2,341	2,579	2,398	2,390	2,431	-57	-2%
Medium imp. district	1	1,666	2,015	2,428	1,946	2,021	2,015	355	21%
Medium comp. districts	13	2,405	2,484	2,530	2,442	2,970	2,566	564	23%
Large imp. district	1	2,684	2,629	2,733	2,627	2,764	2,688	80	3%
Large comp. districts	13	2,687	2,705	2,834	2,806	3,030	2,812	343	13%
Texas statewide	1042	3,792	3,588	3,519	3,515	3,713	3,625	-79	-2%

Table D.18
Local Percent of Total Revenue in Improvement and Comparison Districts, 1994 to 1999

	N	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	Average of 5 yrs	Increase 95-99
Small imp. district	1	21%	22%	25%	25%	26%	24%	5%
Small comp. districts	13	24%	25%	25%	26%	26%	25%	2%
Medium imp. district	1	28%	28%	26%	33%	32%	29%	3%
Medium comp. districts	13	28%	30%	30%	30%	31%	30%	3%
Large imp. district	1	42%	45%	44%	43%	42%	43%	1%
Large comp. districts	5	41%	43%	44%	43%	43%	43%	2%
Arkansas statewide	307	26%	27%	27%	28%	29%	27%	3%
Small imp. district	1	23%	23%	23%	22%	22%	23%	-1%
Small comp. districts	13	25%	26%	26%	27%	27%	26%	3%
Medium imp. district	1	54%	57%	59%	58%	57%	57%	3%
Medium comp. districts	13	31%	33%	33%	33%	32%	32%	1%
Large imp. district	1	39%	42%	43%	44%	44%	42%	4%
Large comp. districts	13	36%	38%	38%	39%	38%	38%	3%
Louisiana statewide	66	30%	32%	32%	32%	32%	32%	2%
Small imp. district	1	7%	8%	9%	11%	12%	9%	4%
Small comp. districts	13	12%	13%	11%	12%	10%	12%	-2%
Medium imp. district	1	8%	8%	9%	9%	8%	8%	1%
Medium comp. districts	9	14%	15%	14%	14%	13%	14%	-1%
Large imp. district	1	13%	14%	13%	14%	11%	13%	-2%
Large comp. districts	5	14%	16%	15%	15%	13%	15%	-1%
New Mexico statewide	89	12%	13%	12%	12%	12%	12%	0%
Small imp. district	1	26%	23%	24%	23%	21%	23%	-5%
Small comp. districts	13	39%	36%	38%	35%	36%	37%	-3%
Medium imp. district	1	28%	29%	35%	30%	30%	31%	2%
Medium comp. districts	13	41%	40%	40%	38%	40%	40%	0%
Large imp. district	1	60%	57%	51%	45%	45%	52%	-14%
Large comp. districts	13	47%	46%	47%	46%	48%	46%	1%
Texas statewide	1042	44%	42%	43%	41%	43%	42%	-1%