



INVESTING IN OUR FUTURE

HELPING TEACHERS AND SCHOOLS PREPARE OUR CHILDREN FOR COLLEGE AND CAREERS

The Executive Office of the President

February 2015



“[A]s a nation, we make the investment in every child as if they're our children. Because we're saying to ourselves, if every child is successful, then the world my child grows up in will be more successful. The America that my child grows up in will be more successful. “

-President Barack Obama

January 30, 2014

A strong K-12 school system is an economic imperative for working and middle class Americans because every student deserves the opportunity to rise as far as their hard work and initiative will take them. This year, Congress is expected to consider amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which will give us an opportunity to help all of our children succeed in college and their careers.

We have more work to do so every child has access to a great public education, but Republicans in the U.S. House of Representatives are advancing legislation (H.R. 5) that would cement recent education cuts, allow states and local communities to waste their education investments on unrelated projects, and take funding from the schools that need it most and giving it to some of the nation's wealthiest districts. This approach is backwards and our teachers and kids deserve better.

After an economic crisis that hit school budgets and educators hard, we cannot just cut our way to better schools and more opportunity. H.R. 5 would deny students and teachers the resources they need by:

- **Cementing recent education cuts**, ensuring that federal education funding will be lower in 2021 than it was in 2012, before the recent education cuts and despite inflation and growing enrollment. The House Republican proposal caps spending on the ESEA for the next six years at \$800 million lower than it was in 2012. In Title I alone, the bill will provide over \$7 billion less to our schools than the President's budget over six years, and the impact on each state is presented in Appendix 1.
- **Eliminating guarantees that education funding reaches the classroom**, while opening the door for education investments to be wasted on things like sports stadiums and other unrelated pet projects. The House Republican proposal would allow states and localities to reduce the overall amount they spend on education and the funding they direct to classrooms and teachers without losing a dime of federal resources.
- **Cutting investments to those schools that need help most** by allowing states to cut federal resources for schools that need it most, while giving it to wealthier schools instead. The 100 school districts facing the largest cuts in dollar terms face an average 15 percent cut, and some especially high-poverty school districts would see cuts as large as 74 percent. More information on these state cuts are presented in Appendix 2 and 3.

- **Eliminating accountability for taxpayer dollars** rather than working to use them in ways that improve student learning.

President Obama has a different vision to improve schools and help teachers by giving them the resources they need, identifying what is working, and fixing what doesn't work so that we can guarantee every child has a world-class education. He would reduce student testing to the bare minimum to let teachers get back to teaching, while ensuring that parents and teachers know how students and schools are doing each year and schools have the information they need to target attention and resources to the children who need the most help to achieve high standards. And his Budget would strengthen our schools by investing an additional \$2.7 billion in ESEA programs next year alone.

President Obama's Vision to Strengthen Our Schools

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the ESEA, a law that has served as a driving force to open up educational opportunity for all students, particularly the most disadvantaged. In recent years, our country has made historic gains:

- **High school students are graduating at the highest rate ever recorded.**
- **The high school dropout rate is at a historic low** and the greatest progress has been among students of color and low-income students.
- **Black and Latino 9-year-olds are doing math at nearly the same level** as their 13-year-old counterparts did in the 1970's.
- **More Americans are graduating from college than ever before**, helping increase the percentage of young adults with college degrees from 41 percent in 2009 to 46 percent in 2014.

Yet there is much more that needs to be done, particularly to help all of our students learn as much as their peers in other nations and to close troubling gaps facing too many black, Latino, students with disabilities, and low-income students. The President stands ready to work with Congress to advance a strong, bipartisan reauthorization that helps to prepare all students for a globally competitive economy by:

- **Holding all students to high expectations** that set them on a path to graduate from high school ready for success in college and a career.
- **Working with states to reduce testing** to make sure teachers and students have maximum time for learning and reduce testing to the bare minimum, following the lead of New York, which limits the amount of time spent on testing to no greater than 2 percent of total classroom time. This also means helping states and localities rigorously review their tests and eliminate those which are outdated, repetitive, or unnecessary, while maintaining annual statewide tests to ensure that all students

succeed, close achievement gaps, and do what works to improve schools with a focus on the lowest performing 5 percent of schools.

- **States should allow for greater creativity** in the classroom and more time for a balanced curriculum that includes arts, history, foreign languages, financial literacy, music, physical education and after school enrichment.
- **Investing in the expansion of high-quality preschool** so that all children arrive in kindergarten ready to learn.
- **Making sure that all students have equitable opportunity** to succeed, including access to excellent teachers and principals, rigorous coursework, and a continuum of community services and supports to meet the needs of the whole child.
- **Supporting teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals** with better information, preparation, development, support and recognition, including additional resources, and opportunities to advance in their roles. We should also ensure that the best teachers are serving the students who need them most.
- **Providing significant incentives and support for states**, school districts and nonprofit organizations to innovate with new ideas and then identify and expand what's working.

This school year, schools in nearly all states are teaching to higher academic standards that will prepare young people to graduate ready for college and a successful career. Yet, over time, resources to help America's students succeed have diminished. Title I funding for low-income children, for example, has fallen by 22 percent from \$1,546 in 2009 to \$1,212 in 2014.

Because we need to invest more in our schools when we are asking more of them, President Obama's FY 2016 budget would invest an additional \$2.7 billion in ESEA education programs next year. The President's plan includes an additional \$1 billion for Title I funding for low-income students. It would provide nearly \$1,800 per student for the 6.6 million students across the country that need special education services. It also includes additional new commitments to teachers, building evidence on what works, English language learners, and designing next generation high schools and STEM education.

The President's Budget also continues to call for historic expansions in access to high-quality preschool for all children. It supports the President's landmark Preschool for All proposal, providing \$75 billion over a ten-year period, while the House Republican bill provides no new resources for preschool.

The Importance of Dedicated Funding for Low-Income Students

Title I, which is the largest program in ESEA, provides supplemental education funding to nearly 24 million students in more than half of all public schools, including 68 percent of elementary schools. School districts and schools have considerable flexibility in using Title I dollars to support education strategies that best meet the needs of students. Some schools use funds to target services to children most in need of special assistance. However, schools in which at least 40 percent of children are poor can add Title I funds to other resources to improve the overall instructional program for all children in a school. In the 2012-2013 school year, over 40,600 schools serving 94 percent of Title I students operated these “schoolwide” programs.

Extra help for disadvantaged students is more important than ever. In 2013, 51 percent of public school children qualified for free or reduced priced school meals, a benefit available to families living at or near the poverty level. Students living in these circumstances come to school with additional challenges. This Administration has aggressively pursued reforms at the state, district, and school level to provide disadvantaged students with an education that prepares them for college and career.

Resources are particularly important when over 40 states and the District of Columbia are working hard to raise standards for learning in their schools. These states are supporting the hard work teachers and principals are doing to enable their students to succeed. Most states have developed plans in partnership with the federal government to ensure access to higher quality standards and assessments for all students, including students with disabilities and English learners, intervene in the lowest-performing schools and those with the largest achievement gaps, ensuring strong accountability for the most vulnerable students (such as students with disabilities, low-income students, English learners, and racial and ethnic minorities) in all schools; and developing rigorous systems for the evaluation and support of teachers and principals.

Title I funding, however, has not kept pace with these positive transformations at the state and local level. Owing to the damaging effects of sequestration-era cuts in recent years, Title I funding has not increased beyond the levels provided in 2012. Recognizing that states and districts need greater capacity to implement key reforms, the President’s Budget for Fiscal Year 2016 proposes an increase of \$1 billion for Title I, which would place the program at its highest funding level in its history.

House Republican Proposal to Turn Back the Clock

The U.S. House of Representatives is currently considering legislation (H.R. 5) that would revise ESEA. The effort to eliminate some of the excesses inserted into ESEA by the No Child Left Behind Act -- which created dozens of ways for schools to fail but provided very few supports to help them succeed – is long overdue. However, the House bill under consideration marks a retreat from high standards for all students and would virtually eliminate accountability for the learning of historically underserved students, a huge step backward for efforts to improve academic achievement. It also could have disastrous fiscal consequences for schools across the country.

1. Cementing Recent Budget Cuts: Across the country, schools and teachers are still struggling with federal, state, and local budget cuts imposed during the Great Recession. Federal elementary and secondary education spending, including Title I spending, is \$800 million lower than in FY 2012. But despite the need to reverse those cuts and invest more in our schools to help them succeed, the House proposal would lock in federal cuts to ESEA programs by preventing any funding increases through FY 2021 -- effectively locking in sequestration-era cuts for the rest of the decade. This means that funding will fall well short of what's needed to make educational opportunity a reality for all students and the shortfall will grow as funding is eroded by inflation. The state-by-state impact of these cuts is presented in Appendix 1.

2. Supporting Reductions in State and Local Education Funding: To make matters worse, H.R. 5 would allow state and local governments to abdicate their responsibility to maintain school funding from year to year. As a result, there is no guarantee that state and local dollars historically dedicated to education will actually reach classrooms and teachers. Instead, the House plan would let states cut their own education budgets, effectively redirecting federal education funds to unrelated projects like prisons or sports stadiums.

3. Additional Cuts for Districts that Need Help Most: H.R. 5 would also allow states to impose additional cuts in Title I funding to districts serving the most disadvantaged students. Currently, Title I funds are concentrated in schools with large numbers of poor students, out of a recognition that these schools and communities face particular challenges in ensuring a high-quality education for all students. The House proposal, however, would allow states to spread Title I funds thinly across the wealthiest districts, doing less good, while sending less funding to many districts that need it most. This so-called "portability" proposal would undermine districts' ability to allocate funds as they see fit and undermine the half-century mission of Title I to provide critical support to the schools and districts with the highest concentrations of poverty. As a result:

- 112 school districts serving approximately 33,600 students would see a Title I cut in excess of 50 percent.
- The 100 school districts that face the most significant cuts would lose over 15 percent of their current Title I funding, totaling nearly \$570 million (see Appendix 2).
- Students attending schools in districts with a concentration of poverty above 25% could lose \$700 million in funding, while districts with low concentrations of poverty gain \$470 million.
- Some of the poorest school districts in every state would see cuts as high as 74 percent (see Appendix 3).

4. *Walking Away from Educational Progress:* H.R. 5 would allow tens of billions of dollars to flow to states, districts, and schools without any expectation that states use that money to ensure that all students – including students with disabilities, English learners, and students from racial and ethnic minorities - are achieving at levels that will prepare them for a college and career by the time they finish high school.

Appendix 1: The Impact of the H.R. 5 Education Freeze on Title I Spending in Every State

How to read this table: Under the President's 2016 Budget, Alabama is estimated to receive \$236 million in Title I funding in 2016 and \$1.48 billion over the 2016-2021 period. Under the H.R. 5 proposal, Alabama is projected to receive \$228 million in 2016 and \$1.37 billion over the 2016-2021 period - or \$8 million less in 2016 and \$113 million less over the 2016-2021 period as compared to the President's Budget.

State	Estimated FY16 Funding (in millions)			Estimated FY16 to FY21 Funding (in millions)		
	President's Budget	H.R. 5	Difference	President's Budget	H.R. 5	Difference
AL	\$236	\$228	-\$8	\$1,478	\$1,365	-\$113
AK	\$40	\$38	-\$2	\$252	\$230	-\$21
AZ	\$349	\$337	-\$12	\$2,180	\$2,012	-\$168
AR	\$163	\$157	-\$5	\$1,013	\$937	-\$75
CA	\$1,816	\$1,750	-\$67	\$11,408	\$10,531	-\$877
CO	\$159	\$153	-\$6	\$992	\$916	-\$76
CT	\$123	\$119	-\$4	\$774	\$716	-\$58
DE	\$48	\$46	-\$2	\$300	\$275	-\$25
DC	\$46	\$44	-\$2	\$290	\$266	-\$24
FL	\$843	\$809	-\$33	\$5,318	\$4,880	-\$437
GA	\$532	\$512	-\$19	\$3,329	\$3,070	-\$259
HI	\$50	\$48	-\$2	\$316	\$290	-\$26
ID	\$61	\$59	-\$2	\$382	\$354	-\$27
IL	\$718	\$691	-\$26	\$4,506	\$4,163	-\$344
IN	\$272	\$263	-\$9	\$1,705	\$1,578	-\$127
IA	\$98	\$95	-\$3	\$615	\$570	-\$45
KS	\$111	\$107	-\$4	\$693	\$642	-\$51
KY	\$223	\$215	-\$8	\$1,395	\$1,289	-\$106
LA	\$304	\$293	-\$11	\$1,899	\$1,753	-\$146
ME	\$53	\$51	-\$2	\$333	\$307	-\$26
MD	\$213	\$204	-\$8	\$1,341	\$1,234	-\$108
MA	\$249	\$240	-\$9	\$1,564	\$1,448	-\$116
MI	\$516	\$501	-\$15	\$3,184	\$2,948	-\$236
MN	\$160	\$155	-\$6	\$1,005	\$931	-\$74
MS	\$201	\$194	-\$7	\$1,251	\$1,156	-\$95
MO	\$255	\$247	-\$9	\$1,597	\$1,480	-\$117
MT	\$49	\$47	-\$2	\$306	\$280	-\$26
NE	\$75	\$72	-\$3	\$468	\$433	-\$35
NV	\$126	\$121	-\$5	\$796	\$729	-\$66
NH	\$42	\$41	-\$2	\$266	\$243	-\$22
NJ	\$357	\$344	-\$13	\$2,242	\$2,073	-\$168
NM	\$125	\$120	-\$5	\$783	\$722	-\$61

NY	\$1,198	\$1,152	-\$46	\$7,549	\$6,943	-\$606
NC	\$448	\$431	-\$17	\$2,821	\$2,601	-\$220
ND	\$36	\$35	-\$1	\$227	\$208	-\$19
OH	\$590	\$570	-\$21	\$3,695	\$3,416	-\$278
OK	\$167	\$161	-\$6	\$1,043	\$965	-\$78
OR	\$149	\$144	-\$5	\$931	\$862	-\$69
PA	\$575	\$555	-\$20	\$3,604	\$3,332	-\$272
PR	\$421	\$408	-\$12	\$2,553	\$2,357	-\$196
RI	\$53	\$51	-\$2	\$334	\$308	-\$26
SC	\$244	\$235	-\$9	\$1,533	\$1,415	-\$118
SD	\$47	\$45	-\$2	\$295	\$270	-\$25
TN	\$306	\$294	-\$11	\$1,924	\$1,774	-\$150
TX	\$1,413	\$1,361	-\$52	\$8,868	\$8,174	-\$694
UT	\$95	\$91	-\$4	\$595	\$549	-\$46
VT	\$36	\$34	-\$1	\$225	\$206	-\$19
VA	\$262	\$253	-\$9	\$1,644	\$1,523	-\$121
WA	\$246	\$238	-\$8	\$1,543	\$1,429	-\$114
WV	\$95	\$92	-\$3	\$595	\$551	-\$44
WI	\$224	\$216	-\$8	\$1,410	\$1,301	-\$109
WY	\$35	\$34	-\$1	\$223	\$204	-\$19
TOTAL	\$15,410	\$14,855	-\$550	\$96,581	\$89,127	-\$7,381

Source and Notes: U.S. Department of Education. After FY 2016, the Title I funding level under the President's Budget is assumed to grow at the same rate as the overall growth in non-defense discretionary funding called for in the President's FY 2016 Budget. This assumption does not reflect a policy decision, but is simply a representation of funding based upon the assumption that Title I will grow at the same rate as other non-defense discretionary funding.

Appendix 2: 100 School Districts that Experience the Largest Reduction in Title I Funding Under H.R. 5

State	School District	FY14 Estimated Title I Allocation (in millions)	Poverty Rate	Cut under H.R. 5	
				Millions of Dollars	Percent
CA	Los Angeles Unified School District	\$339	30.9%	-\$80.6	-23.8%
IL	Chicago Public School District 299	\$274	32.4%	-\$64.2	-23.5%
MI	Detroit City School District	\$147	53.5%	-\$50.6	-34.4%
PA	Philadelphia City School District	\$178	36.4%	-\$44.6	-25.0%
NY	Kings County	\$266	33.3%	-\$39.9	-15.0%
NY	Bronx County	\$217	42.6%	-\$34.8	-16.1%
TX	Houston Independent School District	\$99	33.9%	-\$17.1	-17.2%
WI	Milwaukee School District	\$75	39.0%	-\$17.1	-22.7%
NY	Queens County	\$139	23.0%	-\$15.7	-11.3%
OH	Cleveland Municipal School District	\$55	44.5%	-\$14.1	-25.8%
TX	Dallas Independent School District	\$88	36.8%	-\$13.0	-14.7%
FL	Dade County School District	\$137	28.7%	-\$12.6	-9.2%
OH	Columbus City School District	\$47	36.7%	-\$11.8	-25.1%
GA	Atlanta City School District	\$33	36.9%	-\$9.9	-29.8%
MO	St. Louis City School District	\$30	40.3%	-\$9.1	-30.0%
TN	Memphis City School District	\$55	37.6%	-\$8.9	-16.2%
MA	Boston School District	\$38	27.2%	-\$8.4	-22.3%
NJ	Newark City School District	\$34	36.7%	-\$7.9	-22.9%
LA	Orleans Parish School District	\$37	40.4%	-\$7.3	-19.7%
IN	Indianapolis Public Schools	\$32	45.7%	-\$7.2	-22.0%
KY	Jefferson County School District	\$42	23.4%	-\$6.3	-15.1%
TX	El Paso Independent School District	\$28	31.1%	-\$6.0	-21.6%
CO	Denver County School District 1	\$33	29.0%	-\$5.9	-18.2%
NY	New York County	\$77	27.5%	-\$5.7	-7.4%
MD	Baltimore City Public Schools	\$52	31.8%	-\$5.7	-10.9%
MN	Minneapolis Public School District	\$23	29.3%	-\$5.4	-22.8%
MN	St. Paul Public School District	\$23	29.2%	-\$5.2	-22.9%
NE	Omaha Public Schools	\$26	24.4%	-\$5.1	-19.5%
VA	Richmond City Public Schools	\$17	35.9%	-\$5.1	-30.2%
OH	Cincinnati City School District	\$34	43.7%	-\$5.1	-15.1%
KS	Wichita Unified School District 259	\$24	28.0%	-\$5.0	-20.8%
CA	Fresno Unified School District	\$46	46.8%	-\$4.9	-10.7%
NJ	Paterson City School District	\$18	31.4%	-\$4.7	-26.2%
IN	Gary Community School Corporation	\$14	56.3%	-\$4.6	-32.4%
NV	Clark County School District	\$90	21.5%	-\$4.5	-5.0%
NJ	Camden City School District	\$14	41.5%	-\$4.4	-30.7%
MA	Springfield School District	\$21	40.2%	-\$4.3	-19.8%
NC	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	\$42	20.8%	-\$4.2	-10.1%
FL	Broward County School District	\$67	19.6%	-\$4.1	-6.2%
CA	San Diego City Unified School District	\$41	23.6%	-\$4.1	-10.2%

CT	Hartford School District	\$16	38.2%	-\$4.0	-24.7%
AZ	Phoenix Elementary District	\$8	61.4%	-\$3.8	-44.9%
NJ	Lakewood Township School District	\$16	37.9%	-\$3.8	-23.2%
FL	Hillsborough County School District	\$62	24.5%	-\$3.6	-5.8%
RI	Providence School District	\$21	36.1%	-\$3.6	-17.3%
TN	Nashville-Davidson County School District	\$31	27.5%	-\$3.5	-11.1%
VA	Fairfax County Public Schools	\$21	7.6%	-\$3.4	-15.9%
OK	Oklahoma City Public Schools	\$23	36.3%	-\$3.4	-14.7%
GA	DeKalb County School District	\$42	31.9%	-\$3.4	-7.9%
NJ	Jersey City School District	\$18	30.2%	-\$3.0	-16.1%
TX	San Antonio Independent School District	\$29	41.7%	-\$2.9	-9.9%
OH	Toledo City School District	\$24	41.3%	-\$2.8	-11.6%
GA	Gwinnett County School District	\$39	18.5%	-\$2.8	-7.2%
UT	Granite School District	\$18	19.3%	-\$2.8	-15.0%
FL	Orange County School District	\$61	25.8%	-\$2.8	-4.5%
TX	Fort Worth Independent School District	\$36	34.2%	-\$2.7	-7.5%
PA	Reading School District	\$16	48.4%	-\$2.7	-16.3%
MI	Flint City School District	\$16	52.6%	-\$2.6	-16.4%
TX	Laredo Independent School District	\$16	57.4%	-\$2.6	-16.3%
MI	Saginaw City School District	\$9	41.7%	-\$2.6	-29.9%
SC	Greenville County School District	\$22	21.3%	-\$2.5	-11.5%
CA	San Bernardino City Unified School District	\$28	41.1%	-\$2.5	-9.0%
AL	Mobile County School District	\$24	28.3%	-\$2.5	-10.7%
PA	Pittsburgh School District	\$18	29.3%	-\$2.5	-14.2%
NC	Wake County Schools	\$28	13.7%	-\$2.4	-8.6%
CA	Long Beach Unified School District	\$28	26.5%	-\$2.4	-8.4%
IL	East St. Louis School District 189	\$9	55.9%	-\$2.3	-26.3%
OH	Youngstown City School District	\$10	53.6%	-\$2.2	-21.5%
MD	Baltimore County Public Schools	\$27	12.2%	-\$2.2	-8.0%
IA	Des Moines Independent Community School District	\$11	23.2%	-\$2.1	-18.7%
OH	Dayton City School District	\$16	43.0%	-\$2.1	-13.5%
OK	Tulsa Public Schools	\$18	31.6%	-\$2.1	-11.9%
CT	New Haven School District	\$13	36.5%	-\$2.1	-16.8%
MD	Prince George's County Public Schools	\$33	13.5%	-\$2.1	-6.3%
NY	Buffalo City School District	\$29	38.1%	-\$2.1	-7.3%
AZ	Tucson Unified District	\$27	29.9%	-\$2.0	-7.7%
NM	Albuquerque Public Schools	\$31	22.4%	-\$2.0	-6.5%
MA	Holyoke School District	\$7	42.7%	-\$2.0	-30.6%
OH	East Cleveland City School District	\$4	50.7%	-\$2.0	-47.1%
TX	Austin Independent School District	\$33	29.6%	-\$1.9	-5.8%
NM	Deming Public Schools	\$4	41.3%	-\$1.9	-46.7%
IN	Fort Wayne Community Schools	\$14	27.5%	-\$1.9	-13.6%
VA	Norfolk City Public Schools	\$13	26.8%	-\$1.8	-14.2%
TX	Ysleta Independent School District	\$17	34.6%	-\$1.8	-11.0%

NJ	Passaic City School District	\$9	32.5%	-\$1.8	-20.5%
TX	La Joya Independent School District	\$17	54.1%	-\$1.8	-10.2%
TX	North Forest Independent School District	\$7	40.9%	-\$1.8	-26.9%
AZ	Chinle Unified District	\$4	38.2%	-\$1.8	-44.5%
PA	Harrisburg City School District	\$7	42.6%	-\$1.7	-23.4%
OR	Salem-Keizer School District 24J	\$14	24.0%	-\$1.7	-11.8%
NH	Manchester School District	\$8	23.5%	-\$1.7	-20.8%
NC	Guilford County Schools	\$23	23.4%	-\$1.7	-7.4%
KS	Kansas City Unified School District 500	\$12	36.5%	-\$1.6	-14.2%
TX	Eagle Pass Independent School District	\$7	39.3%	-\$1.6	-22.5%
HI	Honolulu County	\$34	14.0%	-\$1.6	-4.8%
MA	Worcester School District	\$12	26.6%	-\$1.6	-13.1%
TX	Brownsville Independent School District	\$26	47.5%	-\$1.6	-6.1%
MO	Kansas City School District	\$14	38.0%	-\$1.6	-10.8%
LA	East Baton Rouge Parish School District	\$26	30.4%	-\$1.6	-5.9%
OR	Portland School District 1J	\$13	17.0%	-\$1.5	-12.2%

Source: U.S. Department of Education.

Appendix 3: School Districts that Stand to Lose the Most Title I Funding, By State, Under H.R. 5

State	School Districts	FY14 Estimated Title I Allocation (in millions)	Poverty Rate	Cut under H.R. 5	
				Millions of Dollars	Percent
AK	Anchorage School District	\$13.5	10.8%	-\$1.1	-7.9%
AK	Lower Yukon School District	\$2.0	35.5%	-\$0.6	-30.5%
AK	Iditarod Area School District	\$0.3	20.5%	-\$0.2	-62.8%
AK	Bering Strait School District	\$1.4	35.4%	-\$0.2	-11.7%
AK	Lower Kuskokwim School District	\$2.7	31.0%	-\$0.2	-5.9%
AL	Mobile County School District	\$23.7	28.3%	-\$2.5	-10.7%
AL	Birmingham City School District	\$15.6	43.7%	-\$1.5	-9.5%
AL	Montgomery County School District	\$13.1	29.8%	-\$0.6	-4.9%
AL	Dallas County School District	\$2.7	47.6%	-\$0.6	-22.6%
AL	Selma City School District	\$3.0	58.4%	-\$0.6	-19.1%
AR	West Memphis School District	\$3.5	42.4%	-\$0.9	-24.8%
AR	Blytheville School District	\$2.2	37.2%	-\$0.7	-31.3%
AR	Lee County School District	\$1.3	41.9%	-\$0.6	-42.3%
AR	Helena-West Helena School District	\$2.4	55.8%	-\$0.5	-22.4%
AR	Dollarway School District	\$1.1	31.6%	-\$0.5	-42.8%
AZ	Phoenix Elementary District	\$8.5	61.4%	-\$3.8	-44.9%
AZ	Tucson Unified District	\$26.5	29.9%	-\$2.0	-7.7%
AZ	Chinle Unified District	\$4.0	38.2%	-\$1.8	-44.5%
AZ	Mesa Unified District	\$24.4	25.6%	-\$1.3	-5.5%
AZ	Murphy Elementary District	\$2.3	51.1%	-\$1.1	-47.4%
CA	Los Angeles Unified School District	\$338.6	30.9%	-\$80.6	-23.8%
CA	Fresno Unified School District	\$46.1	46.8%	-\$4.9	-10.70%
CA	San Diego City Unified School District	\$40.7	23.6%	-\$4.1	-10.2%
CA	San Bernardino City Unified School District	\$28.3	41.1%	-\$2.5	-9.0%
CA	Long Beach Unified School District	\$28.4	26.5%	-\$2.4	-8.4%
CO	Denver County School District 1	\$32.8	29.0%	-\$5.9	-18.2%
CO	Adams-Arapahoe School District 28J	\$12.2	26.8%	-\$1.2	-9.8%
CO	Jefferson County School District R-1	\$11.3	11.3%	-\$1.1	-10.0%
CO	Colorado Springs School District 11	\$8.3	22.3%	-\$0.4	-4.3%
CO	East Otero School District R-1	\$0.8	31.8%	-\$0.3	-36.1%
CT	Hartford School District	\$16.3	38.2%	-\$4.0	-24.7%
CT	New Haven School District	\$12.6	36.5%	-\$2.1	-16.8%
CT	Bridgeport School District	\$11.4	27.0%	-\$1.5	-13.4%
CT	Waterbury School District	\$11.0	33.0%	-\$1.5	-13.8%
CT	New Britain School District	\$6.2	32.4%	-\$0.7	-12.0%

DE	Seaford School District	\$3.1	34.5%	-\$0.6	-18.1%
DE	Christina School District	\$7.7	15.3%	-\$0.5	-6.9%
DE	Capital School District	\$3.9	23.0%	-\$0.4	-9.6%
DE	Red Clay Consolidated School District	\$6.3	15.5%	-\$0.3	-4.5%
DE	Woodbridge School District	\$1.5	29.0%	-\$0.1	-6.5%
FL	Dade County School District	\$137.4	28.7%	-\$12.6	-9.2%
FL	Broward County School District	\$66.7	19.6%	-\$4.1	-6.2%
FL	Hillsborough County School District	\$62.3	24.5%	-\$3.6	-5.8%
FL	Orange County School District	\$60.6	25.8%	-\$2.8	-4.5%
FL	Palm Beach County School District	\$47.2	20.5%	-\$1.3	-2.8%
GA	Atlanta City School District	\$33.2	36.9%	-\$9.9	-29.8%
GA	DeKalb County School District	\$42.5	31.9%	-\$3.4	-7.9%
GA	Gwinnett County School District	\$38.6	18.5%	-\$2.8	-7.2%
GA	Cobb County School District	\$24.6	17.4%	-\$1.3	-5.4%
GA	Clayton County School District	\$24.4	38.6%	-\$1.2	-4.8%
HI	Honolulu County	\$34.1	14.0%	-\$1.6	-4.8%
IA	Des Moines Independent Community School District	\$11.5	23.2%	-\$2.1	-18.7%
IA	Waterloo Community School District	\$3.4	20.1%	-\$0.5	-15.1%
IA	Davenport Community School District	\$4.8	20.9%	-\$0.5	-10.2%
IA	Sioux City Community School District	\$4.0	20.7%	-\$0.4	-9.2%
IA	Cedar Rapids Community School District	\$3.0	11.8%	-\$0.3	-9.8%
ID	Nampa School District 131	\$5.7	27.6%	-\$0.6	-10.1%
ID	Boise City Independent School District 1	\$5.2	16.3%	-\$0.5	-9.6%
ID	Caldwell School District 132	\$2.9	35.5%	-\$0.4	-13.6%
ID	Wilder School District 133	\$0.3	33.7%	-\$0.1	-35.9%
ID	Marsing Joint School District 363	\$0.4	31.3%	-\$0.1	-27.9%
IL	Chicago Public School District 299	\$273.5	32.4%	-\$64.2	-23.5%
IL	East St. Louis School District 189	\$8.7	55.9%	-\$2.3	-26.3%
IL	Rockford School District 205	\$14.3	26.1%	-\$1.1	-7.9%
IL	Decatur School District 61	\$8.2	44.6%	-\$0.9	-11.4%
IL	Cahokia Community Unit School District 187	\$4.0	49.8%	-\$0.6	-13.9%
IN	Indianapolis Public Schools	\$32.4	45.7%	-\$7.2	-22.0%
IN	Gary Community School Corporation	\$14.1	56.3%	-\$4.6	-32.4%
IN	Fort Wayne Community Schools	\$13.9	27.5%	-\$1.9	-13.6%
IN	City of East Chicago School District	\$4.7	49.0%	-\$1.2	-25.6%
IN	South Bend Community School Corporation	\$9.5	29.4%	-\$0.7	-6.9%
KS	Wichita Unified School District 259	\$23.9	28.0%	-\$5.0	-20.8%
KS	Kansas City Unified School District 500	\$11.6	36.5%	-\$1.6	-14.2%

KS	Topeka Public Schools Unified School District 501	\$6.9	31.8%	-\$0.9	-12.3%
KS	Salina Unified School District 305	\$1.9	18.0%	-\$0.1	-3.9%
KS	Hiawatha Unified School District 415	\$0.3	22.0%	\$0.0	-12.3%
KY	Jefferson County School District	\$41.8	23.4%	-\$6.3	-15.1%
KY	Perry County School District	\$2.2	31.2%	-\$0.7	-33.0%
KY	Knox County School District	\$3.0	40.3%	-\$0.5	-16.9%
KY	Harlan County School District	\$2.3	35.2%	-\$0.5	-21.5%
KY	Martin County School District	\$1.4	38.3%	-\$0.5	-33.7%
LA	Orleans Parish School District	\$37.2	40.4%	-\$7.3	-19.7%
LA	East Baton Rouge Parish School District	\$26.4	30.4%	-\$1.6	-5.9%
LA	Morehouse Parish School District	\$3.9	41.7%	-\$1.2	-31.4%
LA	Jefferson Parish School District	\$23.5	24.2%	-\$1.2	-5.0%
LA	Monroe City School District	\$7.2	49.8%	-\$0.9	-12.4%
MA	Boston School District	\$37.6	27.2%	-\$8.4	-22.3%
MA	Springfield School District	\$21.5	40.2%	-\$4.3	-19.8%
MA	Holyoke School District	\$6.5	42.7%	-\$2.0	-30.6%
MA	Worcester School District	\$12.3	26.6%	-\$1.6	-13.1%
MA	Lawrence School District	\$9.0	35.0%	-\$1.1	-11.6%
MD	Baltimore City Public Schools	\$52.1	31.8%	-\$5.7	-10.9%
MD	Baltimore County Public Schools	\$27.0	12.2%	-\$2.2	-8.0%
MD	Prince George's County Public Schools	\$33.2	13.5%	-\$2.1	-6.3%
MD	Montgomery County Public Schools	\$21.5	7.6%	-\$0.8	-3.9%
ME	Waterville	\$1.1	24.4%	-\$0.4	-33.8%
ME	Lewiston	\$2.7	29.5%	-\$0.2	-9.1%
ME	School Administrative District 37	\$0.5	23.4%	-\$0.2	-42.9%
ME	School Administrative District 19	\$0.3	31.9%	-\$0.2	-73.5%
ME	Bangor	\$1.8	26.6%	-\$0.1	-7.5%
MI	Detroit City School District	\$147.0	53.5%	-\$50.6	-34.4%
MI	Flint City School District	\$16.1	52.6%	-\$2.6	-16.4%
MI	Saginaw City School District	\$8.5	41.7%	-\$2.6	-29.9%
MI	Highland Park City Schools	\$2.8	60.5%	-\$1.2	-42.5%
MI	Benton Harbor Area Schools	\$5.2	50.1%	-\$1.1	-21.7%
MN	Minneapolis Public School District	\$23.5	29.3%	-\$5.4	-22.8%
MN	St. Paul Public School District	\$22.7	29.2%	-\$5.2	-22.9%
MN	Red Lake Public School District	\$1.4	39.1%	-\$0.7	-47.4%
MN	Duluth Public School District	\$3.1	17.4%	-\$0.6	-18.4%
MN	Onamia Public School District	\$0.4	23.5%	-\$0.1	-33.5%
MO	St. Louis City School District	\$30.3	40.3%	-\$9.1	-30.0%
MO	Kansas City School District	\$14.5	38.0%	-\$1.6	-10.8%
MO	Normandy School District	\$3.8	41.5%	-\$0.5	-14.2%
MO	Springfield School District	\$7.8	22.8%	-\$0.4	-5.0%

MO	New Madrid County R-I School District	\$1.0	35.8%	-\$0.3	-32.2%
MS	Holmes County School District	\$2.9	54.3%	-\$1.0	-34.5%
MS	Greenwood Public School District	\$2.6	50.0%	-\$0.9	-36.0%
MS	Coahoma County School District	\$1.4	43.6%	-\$0.7	-48.5%
MS	Greenville Public School District	\$4.6	56.4%	-\$0.6	-14.0%
MS	Leflore County School District	\$2.4	53.0%	-\$0.6	-26.2%
MT	Poplar Elementary School District	\$0.8	44.9%	-\$0.4	-52.6%
MT	Browning Elementary School District	\$1.3	43.3%	-\$0.4	-27.6%
MT	Lame Deer Elementary School District	\$0.6	36.6%	-\$0.3	-46.2%
MT	St. Ignatius K-12 Schools	\$0.4	21.6%	-\$0.2	-42.9%
MT	Ronan Elementary School District	\$0.6	24.5%	-\$0.2	-26.7%
NC	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	\$41.8	20.8%	-\$4.2	-10.1%
NC	Wake County Schools	\$28.0	13.7%	-\$2.4	-8.6%
NC	Guilford County Schools	\$22.5	23.4%	-\$1.7	-7.4%
NC	Forsyth County Schools	\$21.1	30.1%	-\$1.4	-6.7%
NC	Robeson County Schools	\$13.1	44.4%	-\$0.9	-7.0%
ND	Belcourt Public School District 7	\$2.0	31.8%	-\$0.6	-30.2%
ND	Solen Public School District 3	\$0.8	37.3%	-\$0.5	-60.9%
ND	Dunseith Public School District 1	\$1.1	32.9%	-\$0.4	-39.6%
ND	Fort Yates Public School District 4	\$1.2	36.2%	-\$0.4	-37.4%
ND	Fort Totten Public School District 30	\$1.1	42.7%	-\$0.4	-38.5%
NE	Omaha Public Schools	\$26.3	24.4%	-\$5.1	-19.5%
NE	Lincoln Public Schools	\$9.0	14.7%	-\$0.6	-6.3%
NE	Umonhon Nation Public Schools	\$0.4	44.3%	-\$0.2	-36.4%
NE	Winnebago Public Schools	\$0.4	33.5%	-\$0.1	-34.4%
NE	West Holt Public Schools	\$0.1	8.0%	\$0.0	-48.8%
NH	Manchester School District	\$8.0	23.5%	-\$1.7	-20.8%
NH	Nashua School District	\$3.9	15.2%	-\$0.4	-10.8%
NH	Franklin School District	\$0.9	29.1%	-\$0.2	-23.0%
NH	Conway School District	\$0.4	11.3%	-\$0.2	-38.5%
NH	Berlin School District	\$0.7	23.6%	-\$0.2	-23.5%
NJ	Newark City School District	\$34.4	36.7%	-\$7.9	-22.9%
NJ	Paterson City School District	\$17.8	31.4%	-\$4.7	-26.2%
NJ	Camden City School District	\$14.3	41.5%	-\$4.4	-30.7%
NJ	Lakewood Township School District	\$16.4	37.9%	-\$3.8	-23.2%
NJ	Jersey City School District	\$18.5	30.2%	-\$3.0	-16.1%
NM	Albuquerque Public Schools	\$30.7	22.4%	-\$2.0	-6.5%
NM	Deming Public Schools	\$4.1	41.3%	-\$1.9	-46.7%
NM	Gadsden Independent Schools	\$8.7	46.2%	-\$0.9	-10.7%
NM	Hatch Valley Municipal Schools	\$1.1	37.8%	-\$0.5	-43.8%
NM	Cuba Independent Schools	\$0.7	43.1%	-\$0.2	-28.0%
NV	Clark County School District	\$90.2	21.5%	-\$4.5	-5.0%

NY	Kings County	\$265.9	33.3%	-\$39.9	-15.0%
NY	Bronx County	\$216.5	42.6%	-\$34.8	-16.1%
NY	Queens County	\$138.6	23.0%	-\$15.7	-11.3%
NY	New York County	\$76.6	27.5%	-\$5.7	-7.4%
NY	Buffalo City School District	\$28.6	38.1%	-\$2.1	-7.3%
OH	Cleveland Municipal School District	\$54.7	44.5%	-\$14.1	-25.8%
OH	Columbus City School District	\$47.1	36.7%	-\$11.8	-25.1%
OH	Cincinnati City School District	\$33.8	43.7%	-\$5.1	-15.1%
OH	Toledo City School District	\$24.4	41.3%	-\$2.8	-11.6%
OH	Youngstown City School District	\$10.0	53.6%	-\$2.2	-21.5%
OK	Oklahoma City Public Schools	\$23.0	36.3%	-\$3.4	-14.7%
OK	Tulsa Public Schools	\$18.0	31.6%	-\$2.1	-11.9%
OK	Okmulgee Public Schools	\$1.1	32.7%	-\$0.3	-30.8%
OK	Broken Bow Public Schools	\$0.6	28.2%	-\$0.2	-28.6%
OK	Idabel Public Schools	\$0.7	36.5%	-\$0.2	-23.1%
OR	Salem-Keizer School District 24J	\$14.4	24.0%	-\$1.7	-11.8%
OR	Portland School District 1J	\$12.6	17.0%	-\$1.5	-12.2%
OR	Reynolds School District 7	\$5.5	31.7%	-\$0.4	-7.8%
OR	Three Rivers School District	\$2.5	30.0%	-\$0.3	-11.9%
OR	Woodburn School District 103	\$2.7	34.9%	-\$0.3	-10.6%
PA	Philadelphia City School District	\$178.5	36.4%	-\$44.6	-25.0%
PA	Reading School District	\$16.4	48.4%	-\$2.7	-16.3%
PA	Pittsburgh School District	\$17.9	29.3%	-\$2.5	-14.2%
PA	Harrisburg City School District	\$7.4	42.6%	-\$1.7	-23.4%
PA	Chester-Upland School District	\$5.4	39.3%	-\$0.7	-12.7%
RI	Providence School District	\$20.5	36.1%	-\$3.6	-17.3%
RI	Woonsocket School District	\$4.6	37.7%	-\$0.5	-10.7%
RI	Central Falls School District	\$2.6	37.5%	-\$0.2	-9.1%
SC	Greenville County School District	\$22.1	21.3%	-\$2.5	-11.5%
SC	Charleston County School District	\$17.0	27.1%	-\$1.4	-8.1%
SC	Williamsburg County School District	\$3.5	40.1%	-\$1.0	-28.1%
SC	Horry County School District	\$14.2	29.4%	-\$0.9	-6.1%
SC	Marlboro County School District	\$2.0	33.3%	-\$0.4	-19.7%
SD	Shannon County School District 65-1	\$4.4	45.0%	-\$1.3	-29.2%
SD	Todd County School District 66-1	\$3.1	44.7%	-\$0.8	-27.1%
SD	Chamberlain School District 07-1	\$1.0	25.2%	-\$0.4	-42.5%
SD	Dupree School District 64-2	\$0.7	39.4%	-\$0.4	-53.5%
SD	Wagner School District 11-4	\$0.7	30.6%	-\$0.3	-34.2%
TN	Memphis City School District	\$55.2	37.6%	-\$8.9	-16.2%
TN	Nashville-Davidson County School District	\$31.4	27.5%	-\$3.5	-11.1%
TN	Knox County School District	\$15.8	20.0%	-\$1.2	-7.9%
TN	Hamilton County School District	\$12.8	21.4%	-\$0.7	-5.8%

TN	Shelby County School District	\$7.1	11.1%	-\$0.3	-4.2%
TX	Houston Independent School District	\$99.1	33.9%	-\$17.1	-17.2%
TX	Dallas Independent School District	\$88.4	36.8%	-\$13.0	-14.7%
TX	El Paso Independent School District	\$28.0	31.1%	-\$6.0	-21.6%
TX	San Antonio Independent School District	\$29.2	41.7%	-\$2.9	-9.9%
TX	Fort Worth Independent School District	\$36.1	34.2%	-\$2.7	-7.5%
UT	Granite School District	\$18.3	19.3%	-\$2.8	-15.0%
UT	Alpine School District	\$9.6	11.1%	-\$0.9	-8.9%
UT	Davis School District	\$7.6	9.4%	-\$0.3	-4.4%
UT	Salt Lake City School District	\$7.1	24.2%	-\$0.2	-3.3%
UT	Washington School District	\$6.6	20.7%	-\$0.2	-3.0%
VA	Richmond City Public Schools	\$16.9	35.9%	-\$5.1	-30.2%
VA	Fairfax County Public Schools	\$21.3	7.6%	-\$3.4	-15.9%
VA	Norfolk City Public Schools	\$12.9	26.8%	-\$1.8	-14.2%
VA	Virginia Beach City Public Schools	\$12.7	12.5%	-\$1.3	-10.2%
VA	Prince William County Public Schools	\$10.1	8.9%	-\$0.6	-6.2%
VT	Bennington Incorporated School District	\$1.3	30.3%	-\$0.5	-42.4%
VT	Westminster School District	\$0.7	20.4%	-\$0.5	-72.6%
VT	Winooski Incorporated School District	\$1.0	33.8%	-\$0.2	-25.3%
VT	Hardwick School District	\$0.2	18.9%	-\$0.1	-44.3%
VT	Newport City School District	\$0.3	32.2%	-\$0.1	-20.7%
WA	Seattle School District	\$11.2	14.0%	-\$1.3	-11.2%
WA	Spokane Public Schools	\$9.5	22.4%	-\$0.9	-9.9%
WA	Tacoma Public Schools	\$9.4	22.8%	-\$0.8	-8.9%
WA	Pasco School District	\$5.3	22.9%	-\$0.7	-12.7%
WA	Sunnyside School District	\$3.1	34.5%	-\$0.6	-21.1%
WI	Milwaukee School District	\$75.0	39.0%	-\$17.1	-22.7%
WI	Racine School District	\$7.7	23.0%	-\$0.3	-4.1%
WI	Madison Metropolitan School District	\$6.9	19.1%	-\$0.3	-3.9%
WI	Menominee Indian School District	\$0.8	46.7%	-\$0.2	-27.7%
WI	Kenosha School District	\$6.1	18.6%	-\$0.2	-3.2%
WV	McDowell County School District	\$3.5	48.5%	-\$1.4	-40.4%
WV	Cabell County School District	\$5.2	23.2%	-\$0.8	-15.1%
WV	Kanawha County School District	\$9.0	20.7%	-\$0.8	-8.5%
WV	Webster County School District	\$0.9	38.0%	-\$0.2	-19.3%
WV	Clay County School District	\$0.8	31.4%	-\$0.1	-16.6%
WY	Natrona County School District 1	\$5.0	13.9%	-\$0.4	-7.2%
WY	Fremont County School District 14	\$0.5	13.1%	-\$0.3	-59.9%
WY	Fremont County School District 25	\$2.2	25.3%	-\$0.3	-12.0%
WY	Fremont County School District 38	\$0.4	24.7%	-\$0.2	-38.8%

WY	Washakie County School District 2	\$0.2	31.4%	-\$0.1	-60.4%
-----------	-----------------------------------	-------	-------	--------	--------

Source: U.S. Department of Education.