Efficiency and Effectiveness in Minnesota School Districts: How Do Districts Compare?

A Project of
Center of the American Experiment

Cheri Pierson Yecke, Ph.D.

Distinguished Senior Fellow for
Education and Social Policy

February 11, 2005

Center of the
American
Experiment

Efficiency and Effectiveness in Minnesota School Districts: How Do Districts Compare?

A Project of

Center of the American Experiment

Cheri Pierson Yecke, Ph.D.

Distinguished Senior Fellow for Education and Social Policy

February 11, 2005

Center of the American Experiment is a nonpartisan, tax-exempt, public policy and educational institution that brings conservative and free market ideas to bear on the most difficult issues facing Minnesota and the nation.

Center of the American Experiment

1024 Plymouth Building 12 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402

phone: 612-338-3605 fax: 612-338-3621 website: www.amexp.org

Table of Contents

Education Efficiency and Effectiveness in Minnesota School Districts: How Do They Compare?

It is no secret that public schools across the country have been coping with slower increases in funding, or even cuts, due to the recent economic downturn. And although the economy has now been recovering for some time, school administrators wisely continue to seek ways to streamline their operations by improving efficiency while maintaining and improving academic achievement.

For example, one consultant provided an analysis to the administrators of the Hopkins Public School District that detailed the relatively high costs of administration in that district compared to districts with similar achievement and demographics. His analysis stated: "Although equal to its peers nationwide in spending per pupil and student/teacher ratio, the Hopkins School District receives significantly more revenue on a local basis yet also spends a disproportionate amount of dollars on administrative expenses versus its peer group….[T]he Hopkins School District does not run as efficiently as it could, nor as efficiently as a private business would require." The analysis found that, on average, Hopkins spends 18 percent more on administrative costs than comparable districts. Going beyond Hopkins, this analysis concluded: "If Minnesota school districts would consolidate back-end office systems (like any good company would do with multiple locations) the state of Minnesota would save $39,988,000 [in] annual savings." These savings would pay for approximately 952 new teachers.[1]

While efforts that detail ways to implement cost-saving measures and other attempts to improve educational efficiency are making headlines across the state,[2] two national studies released in 2004 tell a conflicting story of the issue in Minnesota. While we are ranked as one of the most generous states in the nation with regard to funding for districts with high populations of poor and minority students, our largest city, Minneapolis, has the second largest gap in the nation between the graduation rates of white male students and black male students. In other words, it appears that the generosity of taxpayers is not paying the same dividends in Minneapolis as it does in other districts across the country.

Study One: Minnesota Generosity

Minnesota is recognized as a state that has been especially generous in its support of public schools. In fact, Kevin Carey and The Education Trust recently released a report that found Minnesota to be among the nation's most generous states when it comes to funding high-poverty and high-minority school districts.[3]

The Funding Gap 2004 examines the highest and lowest poverty districts in each state, as well as differences between districts with the highest and lowest minority populations. In terms of equity between high and low poverty districts, Minnesota ranks fifth in the nation as one of only twenty-four states that provide *higher* levels of funding to high-poverty districts (see Appendix A). We rank sixth among all states in terms of providing more funding for districts with high minority populations (see Appendix B).

Even after applying a 40 percent cost-adjustment for the added cost of educating poor children, Minnesota is one of only thirteen states to provide more funding for high-poverty districts, ranking fourth in the nation in its generosity toward students in poverty (see Appendix C). According to this report: "States like Massachusetts, Minnesota, and New Jersey provide substantially more resources to their highest-poverty districts, even after taking into account the additional cost of educating poor children….These states have decided not to radically disadvantage high-poverty districts in distributing education dollars."[4]

Likewise, after applying the 40 percent cost-adjustment for educating minority students, Minnesota is one of only thirteen states to provide more dollars to districts with high minority populations, and ranks sixth in the nation in its generosity (see Appendix D).

Looking at funding gaps over time, Minnesota again ranks well. From 1997 to 2002, the funding gaps in twenty-two states grew larger, while Minnesota was one of twenty-seven states that reduced the gap over time (see Appendix E). Furthermore, in 2002 Minnesota ranked fifth among all states in terms of providing extra funding for children living in poverty (see Appendix F).

Study Two: Dismal Graduation Rates in Minneapolis

While Minnesota is clearly a national leader in providing extra educational funding for poor and minority children, our largest city has a dismal record when it comes to graduating black male students. A Schott Foundation for Public Education study, which analyzed graduation data for sixty school districts with least 10,000 black male students, showed Minneapolis has the second worst record of graduating black male high school students. In 2002, the black/white gap in graduation rate for males in Minneapolis was 39 percent, second only to the gap in Washington, D.C. (see Appendix G).[5]

How can this be? As a state, we provide generous funding advantages to districts with high numbers of disadvantaged children, but it appears that this funding is not resulting in meaningful increases of disadvantaged students, especially males, graduating from high school.

Perhaps it is time to identify the districts that have demonstrated high levels of efficiency while maintaining high levels of effectiveness so that relatively non-efficient/non-effective districts can examine their policies and practices. Such information would be helpful not only to Minneapolis but to other districts dealing with the realities of tight budgets and looking for ways to deliver a quality education more efficiently.

Identifying Educational Efficiency and Effectiveness

There is a great deal of interest in the concept of efficiency in education. Many scholarly reports provide ideas for districts on using their resources most efficiently, addressing issues such as potential areas for cutting costs, the impact of state policies, and district and site-level strategies.[6]

One researcher said, "The highest priority for America's schools today is to use existing resources more efficiently."[7] But looking at efficiency alone is inadequate. Efficiency is meaningless in the absence of measures of effectiveness—how well goals are met. To restate that maxim: "The highest priority for America's schools today is to use existing resources more efficiently while maintaining and improving student academic achievement."

Objective measures can be used to identify districts that are the most financially *efficient* in meeting the goal of being *effective* as measured by the percent of students graduating from high school. Once identified, school board members and school administrators from less efficient/less effective districts can begin to learn from highly efficient/highly effective districts to see what policies and practices they might replicate.

Researchers have attempted to identify the relative efficiency of school districts, but these attempts have not always factored in relative effectiveness. A study of schools in Arkansas identified the relative efficiency of school districts, but did not associate this measure with any measures of effectiveness.[8] Another study identified the top ten and bottom ten districts in western New York using a linear programming technique known as data envelope analysis (DEA) to produce an efficiency and effectiveness index based on the variables of resources and outcomes.[9] A study of Nebraska schools that analyzed graduation rates found that some schools that had previously been identified as financially "efficient" actually had lower graduation rates than other schools—making the point that financial efficiency must be linked to effectiveness to be meaningful.[10]

Other studies take a slightly different approach and focus on the relative costs of producing students who are academically proficient. The Connecticut Policy and Economic Council (CPEC) developed a formula that determined that the annual cost of producing a proficient fourth grade student in Connecticut ranged from $8,317 in Simsbury to $67,684 in Hartford. The formula divides each school's spending per student (cumulative spending from kindergarten through grade four) by the percentage of students who reach proficiency on the state exams. This shifts the discussion from spending per student to spending per *proficient* student.[11] In another study, Professor Herb Walberg calculated the cost of a proficient fourth grade student for each state by adding up the cumulative per pupil costs for grades K-4 and then dividing that number by the percentage of students in grade four who were proficient, as determined by the state score on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Attempts to develop efficiency and effectiveness measures also have taken place in higher education. For example, a graduation efficiency index was developed by researchers at the University of Washington to determine the relative efficiency of colleges and universities in terms of graduation rates.[12] Data envelope analysis was used to provide a standard measure of the relative efficiency of public colleges and universities in Virginia.[13]

The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education developed a series of ratio analyses to provide a common basis for comparison among institutions of higher education on topics such as high school preparation, affordability, and completion.[14] Ratio analysis in higher education became popular under the leadership of John Minter, a pioneer in the field of comparative performance and institutional effectiveness. Minter, a businessman, sees the need to apply business concepts to educational institutions:

> Ratio analysis is a concept straight out of the business world. It is based on the principle that competing businesses compare with one another on many dimensions. In order to survive in a competitive marketplace, businesses have developed standard measurements…When businesses are in trouble and need to reallocate resources, they look at these factors and see how they measure up compared to others in the same industry. [15]

Methodology

In economic terms, to determine programs that produce the largest effects per dollar, effects must be divided by costs. In this analysis, which will identify school districts that are the most efficient in producing high school graduates, the *program* is an individual school district, the *effect* is the percentage of students who have graduated from high school, and the *cost* is a district's per pupil expenditure.

Data from Minnesota public school districts that include a twelfth grade were used for this analysis. Other educational entities, such as alternative learning programs and programs in correctional facilities, were omitted. All data is from the 2003-2004 school year except for graduation data, which is from spring 2003.

To control for poverty, all districts in the state were ranked according to the percentage of students receiving free and reduced-price lunch (as a proxy for poverty) and then were divided into quartiles (25 percent of the total number of districts): *Quartile One* contains districts with free/reduced-lunch percentages that range from 3.18 through 21.62; *Quartile Two* includes districts with free/reduced-price lunch percentages ranging from 21.70 through 31.06; the free/reduced-lunch percentages in *Quartile Three* range from 31.07 through 41.36; and *Quartile Four* has a range from 41.37 through 84.06.

An indexing system comparing two ratios will then be used to compute the Efficiency/ Effectiveness Index (EEI). The ratios are (1) a district's *graduation rate* divided by the average graduation rate of its peer group (quartile), and (2) the district *per pupil costs* divided by the average per pupil costs of the districts in its peer group (quartile). In this way, an index number can be obtained, and any number above *one* would identify an efficient/effective district.

Ratio: Graduation rate. Measures of school success can include scores or academic gains on standardized tests as well as graduation rates. Graduation rates are tangible evidence of a school district's ability to bring students to the culmination of twelve years of schooling and are the measure used in this analysis. The graduation rate for each district was provided by the Minnesota Department of Education, which uses the "emulated cohort" formula recommended by the National

Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). This formula provides a highly accurate picture of graduation rates as it takes into account students who drop out over the course of four years of high school, not just during their senior year.[16] A peer group average was then calculated based upon only the districts in each specific quartile. The district graduation rate was then divided by the peer group average graduation rate. The NCES graduation rate formula:

$$\frac{\text{Graduates in Year 4}}{\text{Dropouts (Grade 9 Year 1 + Grade 10 Year 2+ Grade 11 Year 3 + Grade 12 Year 4)} + \text{Graduates Year 4}}$$

Ratio: Average per pupil funding. The total per pupil funding for each district was calculated by adding together federal, state, and local per pupil funds. A peer group average was then calculated using data only from the districts in each specific peer group. The district average per pupil funding was then divided by the peer-group average per pupil funding for these districts.

These two ratios are then divided and multiplied by 100 to produce the Efficiency and Effectiveness Index (EEI)*:

$$\frac{\text{District graduation rate / peer group average graduation rate}}{\text{District per pupil costs / peer group average per pupil costs}} \times 100$$

The EEI formula was calculated for the districts in each quartile, providing a comparison among the districts in that specific peer group. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to compare districts that are not in the same quartile (peer group).

Discussion

Tables of all school districts in Minnesota, grouped into quartiles, can be seen in Appendices H through K. EEI ratings that are *less than 100* indicate a lower efficiency/effectiveness ratio than the other districts in that peer group. Those districts with an EEI of *100* are at the average among their peers. Districts with EEI numbers *above 100* are more efficient/effective than their peers, as measured by the EEI.

Some districts with similar demographics have EEI numbers that are very different from their peers. Is this because of geography? Does the size of a district impact the costs of operation? What is the impact of large numbers of transfer students? While an EEI number identifies a district's relative efficiency and effectiveness, it cannot explain *why* some districts operate more efficiently and effectively than others.

* The author wishes to thank Dr. Michael Podgursky, Chairman of the Department of Economics at the University of Missouri, for his technical assistance.

Quartile One

The districts in Quartile One (Appendix H) have poverty levels ranging from 3.18 through 21.62 percent. The top ten districts in this quartile are summarized in the table below.

Quartile One
Top Ten Districts as Identified by EEI

	EEI	Total number of students	Per pupil costs	Students graduating from high school	Free/reduced lunch (high poverty) students	American Indian students	Asian students	Hispanic students	Black students	White students
Dover-Eyota	120	1,105	$6,355	100.00%	14.57%	0	.72%	1.09%	.27%	97.92%
St. Michael-Albertville	120	3,587	$6,272	97.95%	7.50%	.20	2.59	.86	1.09	95.26
Hawley	120	890	$6,641	100.00%	17.42	.34	.11	.11	1.01	98.43
Pine Island	120	1,236	$6,405	95.35%	14.72	.49	.73	2.18	1.54	95.06
Big Lake	120	3,167	$6,436	94.83%	19.17	1.20	1.26	2.05	1.17	94.32
New London-Spicer	120	1,707	$6,715	98.64%	20.21	.18	.23	.41	.35	98.83
Hermantown	120	1,966	$6,773	99.26%	12.05	1.17	1.32	.71	.20	96.59
Kasson-Mantorville	110	1,886	$6,646	97.08%	11.45	.37	.90	2.12	.48	96.13
Delano	110	1,906	$6,838	98.46%	9.39	.52	1.15	.79	1.00	96.54
Princeton	110	3,390	$6,851	97.71%	20.21	.91	.68	.80	.91	96.70
Quartile 1 Average	**100**	**812**	**$7,488**	**95.37%**	**14.74%**	**.62%**	**2.05%**	**1.92%**	**1.77%**	**93.63%**
State Average	100	2,448	$8,265	93.44%	31.76%	2.98%	1.68%	3.38%	1.80%	90.15%

The top ten districts in this quartile spent $650 to $1,083 less than the peer group average per student in 2003-2004, yet graduated up to 5 percent more students than the peer group average. One of the districts with the lowest EEI scores in Quartile One, Hopkins (EEI=80), graduates similar percentages of students as its peers but spends $9,323 per student, which is $2,485 more than the highest cost district in the top ten (see Appendix H). Hopkins is quite effective, with a graduation rate of 97.88 percent, but as mentioned earlier, is currently looking at ways to become more efficient.

It is interesting to look at districts within the same peer group that have similar demographics but different EEI numbers. For example, Princeton and Fergus Falls share similarities in their student demographics and size, but differ in their efficiency and effectiveness. In 2003, Princeton graduated 18 percent more students than Fergus Falls, but spent around $900 less per student.

Princeton and Fergus Falls
(Peers in Quartile One)

	EEI	Total number of students	Per pupil costs	Students graduating from high school	Free/reduced lunch (high poverty) students	American Indian students	Asian students	Hispanic students	Black students	White students
Princeton	110	3,390	$6,851	97.71%	20.21%	.91%	.68%	.80%	.91%	96.70%
Fergus Falls	80	2,801	$7,781	80.14%	20.78%	1.25%	1.04%	1.04%	1.89%	94.79%

Quartile Two

The districts in Quartile Two (see Appendix I) have poverty levels ranging from 21.70 through 31.06 percent. The top ten districts in this quartile are summarized in the table below. Of particular note is the Tyler school district, which has the highest EEI number of any district in the group:150. Tyler stands out as highly efficient and effective, because it is able to spend $1,200 to $1,800 less per student than its top ten peers, while graduating 98 percent of its students. Two districts in this group, Brandon and Maple River, have graduation rates of 100 percent. All of these districts spend less per student than the state and peer group average.

Quartile Two
Top Ten Districts as Identified by EEI

	EEI	Total number of students	Per pupil costs	Students graduating from high school	Free/reduced lunch (high poverty) students	American Indian students	Asian students	Hispanic students	Black students	White students
Tyler	150	210	$5,502	98.04%	22.38%	.95	0	3.33	.95	94.76
Cambridge-Isanti	120	4,851	$6,743	98.33%	22.76	1.48	1.38	1.32	1.05	94.76
Springfield	120	673	$6,839	98.55%	26.89	.15	.45	1.49	.15	97.77
St. Charles	120	1,060	$6,717	96.10%	23.02	.28	3.77	5.38	.28	90.28
Hayfield	120	905	$6,853	96.43%	24.64	.77	1.33	3.09	.55	94.25
Holdingford	110	1,067	$6,986	96.94%	26.80	0	0	0	0	100.00
Maple River	110	1,257	$7,223	100.00%	26.41	.08	.80	1.03	.95	97.14
Roseau	110	1,467	$7,249	99.07%	26.99	.48	.89	.14	.34	98.16
Lakeview	110	558	$7,173	97.96%	22.40	0	1.61	2.87	.54	94.98
Brandon	110	304	$7,348	100.00%	26.97	0	.33	0	.66	99.01
Quartile 2 Average	**100**	**721**	**$7,778**	**94.74%**	**26.55%**	**1.42%**	**1.52%**	**3.56%**	**1.91%**	**91.59%**
State Average	100	2,448	$8,265	93.44%	31.76%	2.98%	1.68%	3.38%	1.80%	90.15%

Foley and Lake Superior are an example of two peers in this quartile with similar demographics but with different EEI ratings. Lake Superior spent around $2,000 per student more than Foley, but graduated 8 percent fewer students in 2003. Again, the EEI rating only identifies the relative efficiency and effectiveness of districts *within* a peer group.

Foley and Lake Superior
(Peers in Quartile Two)

	EEI	Total number of students	Per pupil costs	Students graduating from high school	Free/reduced lunch (high poverty) students	American Indian students	Asian students	Hispanic students	Black students	White students
Foley	110	1,667	$7,314	98.26%	22.92%	.48%	.30%	.36%	.78%	98.08%
Lake Superior	80	1,607	$9,384	89.91%	23.77%	.87%	.44%	.19%	.68%	97.82%

Quartile Three

The free/reduced-lunch percentages for districts in Quartile Three (see Appendix J) range from 31.07 through 41.36. Of special note is that three of these districts— Minneota, Alden, and Kerkhoven-Murdock-Sunburg—graduated 100 percent of their students in 2003.

Quartile Three
Top Ten Districts as Identified by EEI

	EEI	Total number of students	Per pupil costs	Students graduating from high school	Free/reduced lunch (high poverty) students	American Indian students	Asian students	Hispanic students	Black students	White students
Round Lake	150	174	$5,354	93.10%	32.18	0	.57	1.15	1.15	97.13
Ivanhoe	150	201	$5,976	97.87%	37.31%	0	0	.5	.5	99.00
Dilworth-Glyndon-Felton	130	1,350	$6,800	96.47%	31.26	2.96	.52	9.04	.96	86.52
Minneota	120	462	$7,272	100.00%	31.82	0	.43	4.76	.43	94.37
Alden	120	430	$7,498	100.00%	31.16	0	1.16	3.26	1.16	94.42
Paynesville	120	1,090	$7,356	97.80%	32.11	0	.09	1.28	.55	98.07
Adrian	120	652	$7,451	97.87%	38.96	.15	1.53	1.38	0	96.93
Kerkhoven-Murdock-Sunburg	120	632	$7,664	100.00%	38.29	.32	0	9.18	.79	89.72
East Grand Forks	110	1,785	$7,308	94.23%	31.32	1.57	.45	10.53	.78	86.67
Minnewaska	110	1,425	$7,719	99.17%	37.40	.56	.49	.42	.91	97.61
Quartile 3 Average	**100**	**791**	**$8,292**	**93.14%**	**35.70%**	**1.60%**	**1.22%**	**4.12%**	**1.21%**	**91.84%**
State Average	100	2,448	$8,265	93.44%	31.76%	2.98%	1.68%	3.38%	1.80%	90.15%

In this peer group, Minneota and Kittson Central are similar in terms of demographics. They have around the same number of students and the same percent of students receiving free/reduced-price lunches, and both graduated 100 percent of their students in 2003. However, Minneota accomplished this at $7,272 per student, while Kittson Central spent $10,729 per student. Again, the EEI only identifies districts, it does not account for the circumstances underlying the rating.

Minneota and Kittson Central
(Peers in Quartile Three)

	EEI	Total number of students	Per pupil costs	Students graduating from high school	Free/reduced lunch (high poverty) students	American Indian students	Asian students	Hispanic students	Black students	White students
Minneota	120	462	$7,272	100.00%	31.82%	0	.43%	4.76%	.43%	94.37%
Kittson Central	80	406	$10,729	100.00%	32.02%	.25%	.74%	6.16%	.25%	92.61%

Quartile Four

In Quartile Four (see Appendix K) the percentage of students receiving free/reduced-price lunches ranges from 41.37 through 84.06. In observing the top ten districts in this quartile, it should be noted that although the percentage of students receiving free and reduced-price lunches in these districts is above the state average, all of these districts spend less than the state average while they graduate students at rates above the state average.

Quartile Four
Top Ten Districts as Identified by EEI

	EEI	Total number of students	Per pupil costs	Students graduating from high school	Free/reduced lunch (high poverty) students	American Indian students	Asian students	Hispanic students	Black students	White students
New York Mills	140	742	$7,097	96.77%	43.94	1.48	0	.81	0	97.71
Long Prairie-Grey Eagle	140	1,359	$7,448	100.00%	43.86	.22	.59	16.26	.66	82.27
Sebeka	130	574	$7,630	96.36%	58.36	0	.17	0	.70	99.13
Hinckley-Finlayson	130	1,098	$7,343	91.86%	43.72	8.38	1.09	2.28	2.19	86.07
Ogilvie	130	687	$7,689	96.08%	41.92	.44	.44	0	.58	98.54
Red Rock Central	130	513	$8,026	100.00%	46.39	.39	.39	1.17	.39	97.66
Menahga	130	731	$7,739	96.23%	56.77	1.23	0	.68	.55	97.54
Belgrade-Brooten-Elrosa	130	814	$7,995	98.36%	48.16	.12	.25	7.25	0	92.38
Wadena-Deer Creek	130	1,314	$7,779	95.37%	44.37	.61	.15	.46	1.29	97.49
Browerville	130	509	$8,107	98.08%	45.78	0	.20	2.95	0	96.86
Quartile 4 Average	**100**	**884**	**$9,512**	**90.50%**	**50.12%**	**8.33%**	**1.95%**	**3.94%**	**2.31%**	**83.48%**
State Average	100	2,448	$8,265	93.44%	31.76%	2.98	1.68	3.38	1.80	90.15

Other districts in this peer group do not come close to that level of efficiency/effectiveness. Minneapolis is an example of a very low EEI district. A comparison of Minneapolis with St. Paul poses a stark contrast. Although similar in size and demographics, St. Paul manages to graduate 72 percent of its students, compared to 53 percent for Minneapolis—and spends over $1,000 less per student doing so.

Minneapolis and St. Paul
(Peers in Quartile Four)

	EEI	Total number of students	Per pupil costs	Students graduating from high school	Free/reduced lunch (high poverty) students	American Indian students	Asian students	Hispanic students	Black students	White students
Mpls	50	42,925	$11,214	52.80%	68.07	4.17	13.16	13.47	42.19	27.01
St. Paul	70	41,933	$10,126	71.96%	65.71	1.81	29.19	11.81	27.98	29.21

Disaggregating the average graduation rates for these districts, an even more disparate picture is revealed. In Minneapolis, only 20 percent of Hispanic students graduated in 2004, compared to 42 percent in St. Paul. Furthermore, while the graduation rate of American Indians remained relatively constant in Minneapolis from 2003-2004, in St. Paul the percentage of American Indian students graduating more than doubled in the same time, from 30 percent to 65.5 percent. St. Paul is also more successful with economically disadvantaged students, graduating 23 percent more of these students in 2004 than did Minneapolis.

Percentage of High School Graduates
2003 and 2004

	Minneapolis		St. Paul	
	2003	**2004**	**2003**	**2004**
American Indian	34.33	33.13	28.95	65.52
Asian	74.35	70.84	77.21	78.88
Hispanic	26.69	20.24	61.47	41.85
Black	51.95	49.58	55.29	59.68
White	74.64	73.26	80.19	83.15
LEP*	56.93	51.13	73.23	72.09
Special Ed	56.92	44.17	57.27	55.00
Free/reduced price lunch	56.50	52.57	72.59	75.16
Total students graduating	**58.34**	**52.80**	**72.33**	**71.96**

*Limited English Proficient Students
Data from the Minnesota Department of Education web site, District Report Cards.

While St. Paul has its challenges, including a steep decline in the percent of Hispanic graduates, it spends less per student than Minneapolis but produces better results. The new Minneapolis superintendent, Thandiwe Peebles, recognizes the enormous challenge before her and is approaching her commitment to children with a sense of urgency that has offended some, [17] but she makes no apologies for being a change-agent in a system that trails its peers in efficiency and effectiveness.

Rising to the Challenge

We can only speculate on the reasons underlying the EEI ratings. How much does geography positively or negatively impact a district's efficiency? How much do family and community emphases on education impact effectiveness? Districts with low EEI ratings can now begin to examine their practices and policies by communicating with members of their peer group that have higher EEI ratings.

Challenges remain as Minnesota schools, like schools across the nation, deal with the reality of having to adapt to slower growth in overall revenues. Some districts and other entities have addressed this challenge head-on by launching a number of creative and innovative initiatives.

Rural Service Cooperatives. For many years Minnesota's rural service cooperatives have provided joint purchasing arrangements for school districts and other services that would be cost-prohibitive for smaller districts. "Educational service agencies can be a catalyst for positive change," said Lee Warne, executive director of the SW/WC Service Cooperative and president-elect of the National

Association of Educational Service Agencies. "These trends toward cooperative problem solving by sharing resources are saving money that can be used to provide programs for kids. Across the country, service cooperatives are providing the catalyst for inter-agency solutions for kids and their families."[18]

The SW/WC Service Cooperative, which serves southwest and west central Minnesota, results in cost-savings ranging from 10 to 75 percent on purchases that include administrative and technology equipment, supplies, food, and playground equipment. Other services include administrative and academic assistance, shared business managers, curriculum coordinators, and teachers in hard-to-fill subject areas. Insurance, grant writing, and record management services are provided as well, and academic competitions, such as spelling bees and Knowledge Bowl, are also handled centrally. Other service cooperatives in the state offer similar services that help increase school district efficiency and effectiveness.

District-provided outsourcing. There are several examples of metro-area districts that have joined together in outsourcing relationships. The Roseville district provides food services to private schools and another public school district. Richfield and Bloomington share their computer-based registration system and a community education director. The St. James Public School District provides payroll and other business services to two smaller nearby districts.

Two entrepreneurial staff members in White Bear Lake, Chuck Corliss and Phil Fisher, have initiated a program that allows their district to provide multiple services to other districts. Capitalizing on its strengths, White Bear Lake now provides services such as transportation planning and building operations for five other metropolitan area districts. The goal is to improve efficiency with one district using its strengths to assist other districts. The White Bear district makes a profit providing these services, and the other districts save costs by outsourcing.[19]

Consolidation of services: Some rural districts have undergone complete consolidation, but others—both rural and metro—are moving to consolidate or share only specific services. As mentioned earlier, an analysis found that the Hopkins district spent more than its peers on administrative costs. That same report concluded that the potential savings for the district, should it consolidate its finances, payroll, human resources and student information technology services, could be $1.6 million per year.[20]

A Final Word

Ratios offer no magic answer to the challenge of efficiency and effectiveness, but they do identify districts with differences from the norm. This study is not intended to provide the final word on district efficiency and effectiveness; rather, the intent is to start a statewide dialogue by using an objective measure to identify the relative efficiency/effectiveness of our school districts.

All districts are searching for ways to become more efficient while they maintain or improve the percentage of students who graduate. To this end, districts that have been identified as more efficient/effective than their peers should be congratulated for their efforts, and are encouraged to share their strategies with districts seeking new approaches.

APPENDIX A

Poverty/Wealth Funding Gaps, 2001-2002			
State	**2001 - 2002 Gap Between Revenues Available per student in the highest- and lowest-poverty districts (cost-adjusted dollars, no adjustment for low-income students)**		**2001 - 2002 Gap Between Revenues Available per student in the highest- and lowest-poverty districts (cost-adjusted dollars, no adjustment for low-income students)**
Massachusetts	$1,343	Kentucky	($3)
New Jersey	$1,260	Mississippi	($18)
Alaska	$1,231	Indiana	($25)
Delaware	$1,184	Colorado	($38)
Minnesota	**$1,031**	Florida	($74)
Utah	$782	Maine	($79)
Georgia	$721	Idaho	($96)
North Dakota	$653	Rhode Island	($108)
Tennessee	$570	West Virginia	($135)
South Dakota	$552	Arkansas	($149)
Wyoming	$381	Iowa	($333)
New Mexico	$374	Texas	($388)
South Carolina	$370	North Carolina	($392)
Missouri	$354	Montana	($450)
Nevada	$333	Maryland	($558)
Connecticut	$277	Michigan	($564)
Nebraska	$233	Alabama	($613)
Oklahoma	$226	Arizona	($681)
Oregon	$186	Louisiana	($725)
Ohio	$186	Vermont	($766)
California	$173	New Hampshire	($795)
Washington	$160	USA	($868)
Kansas	$122	Pennsylvania	($882)
Wisconsin	$108	Virginia	($1,105)
		Illinois	($2,026)
		New York	($2,040)

This table is from *The Funding Gap 2004: Many States Still Shortchange Low-income and Minority Students*, a study written by Kevin Carey and published by The Education Trust. This report is available online at www.edtrust.org. The author is grateful to Kevin Carey and The Education Trust for their permission to use this table.

APPENDIX B

Minority/Majority Funding Gaps, 2001-2002			
State	**2001 - 2002 Gap Between Revenues Available per student in the highest- and lowest-minority districts (cost-adjusted dollars, no adjustment for low-income students)**	**State**	**2001 - 2002 Gap Between Revenues Available per student in the highest- and lowest-minority districts (cost-adjusted dollars, no adjustment for low-income students)**
Tennessee	*	California	($308)
Alaska	$2,558	Rhode Island	($316)
Massachusetts	$1,969	Utah	($325)
Georgia	$1,175	Pennsylvania	($377)
New Jersey	$1,062	Virginia	($407)
New Mexico	$825	Nevada	($504)
Minnesota	**$810**	Maine	($543)
Kentucky	$737	Idaho	($637)
Missouri	$737	Colorado	($687)
West Virginia	$502	Iowa	($700)
Oregon	$353	Arizona	($709)
Arkansas	$293	Wisconsin	($770)
South Carolina	$247	USA	($797)
Mississippi	$157	South Dakota	($1,001)
Florida	$136	Vermont	($1,056)
Ohio	$130	Texas	($1,061)
Michigan	$115	Delaware	($1,302)
Indiana	$96	Kansas	($1,590)
Connecticut	($13)	Illinois	($1,595)
North Carolina	($39)	North Dakota	($1,599)
Oklahoma	($55)	Nebraska	($1,683)
Louisiana	($143)	New York	($1,797)
Washington	($157)	New Hampshire	($1,851)
Maryland	($240)	Montana	($2,067)
Alabama	($301)	Wyoming	($2,425)

*No data.

This table is from *The Funding Gap 2004: Many States Still Shortchange Low-income and Minority Students*, a study written by Kevin Carey and published by The Education Trust. This report is available online at www.edtrust.org. The author is grateful to Kevin Carey and The Education Trust for their permission to use this table.

APPENDIX C

State and Local Poverty Funding Gaps 2002			
State	**Per-Student Funding in the Lowest-Poverty Districts** (*cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*	**Per-Student Funding in the Highest-Poverty Districts** *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*	**Gap Between Revenues Available per student in the highest- and lowest-poverty districts** *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*
Alabama	$6,648	$5,705	($942)
Alaska	$6,507	$7,347	$840
Arizona	$6,129	$4,957	($1,172)
Arkansas	$6,136	$5,656	($479)
California	$6,042	$5,741	($301)
Colorado	$6,776	$6,374	($402)
Connecticut	$8,591	$8,257	($334)
Delaware	$7,710	$8,640	$931
DC	*	*	*
Florida	$5,993	$5,745	($248)
Georgia	$7,504	$7,655	$150
Hawaii	*	*	*
Idaho	$6,198	$5,862	($336)
Illinois	$8,075	$5,610	($2,465)
Indiana	$8,139	$7,760	($379)
Iowa	$8,080	$7,512	($568)
Kansas	$7,227	$7,014	($214)
Kentucky	$5,955	$5,597	($357)
Louisiana	$6,226	$5,263	($963)
Maine	$8,099	$7,674	($426)
Maryland	$7,750	$6,979	($772)
Massachusetts	$6,972	$7,746	$774
Michigan	$8,205	$7,119	($1,085)
Minnesota	**$7,665**	**$8,322**	**$657**
Mississippi	$5,127	$4,767	($359)
Missouri	$6,728	$6,612	($116)
Montana	$6,910	$6,100	($809)
Nebraska	$7,361	$7,291	($70)
Nevada	$6,081	$6,336	$255
New Hampshire	$7,683	$6,711	($972)
New Jersey	$9,338	$9,904	$566
New Mexico	$5,748	$5,718	($30)
New York	$9,980	$7,365	($2,615)
North Carolina	$6,595	$5,973	($622)
North Dakota	$6,504	$6,866	$362

State	Per-Student Funding in the Lowest-Poverty Districts *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*	Per-Student Funding in the Highest-Poverty Districts *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*	Gap Between Revenues Available per student in the highest- and lowest-poverty districts *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*
Ohio	$7,983	$7,636	($347)
Oklahoma	$5,367	$5,220	($147)
Oregon	$6,643	$6,551	($92)
Pennsylvania	$8,223	$6,916	($1,308)
Rhode Island	$7,261	$6,587	($674)
South Carolina	$7,056	$7,100	$43
South Dakota	$6,437	$6,591	$154
Tennessee	$5,113	$5,393	$281
Texas	$6,963	$6,027	($936)
Utah	$4,950	$5,516	$566
Vermont	$11,656	$10,464	($1,192)
Virginia	$7,764	$6,334	($1,430)
Washington	$6,438	$6,264	($173)
West Virginia	$6,990	$6,574	($417)
Wisconsin	$8,554	$8,217	($337)
Wyoming	$9,275	$9,398	$123
USA	$7,731	$6,383	($1,348)

Source: Education Trust calculations based on U.S. Department of Education school district revenue data for the 2000-2001 school year. Note: All dollar amounts shown in this chart have been adjusted to account for regional cost differences, the additional cost of educating students with disabilities, and the additional cost of educating low- income students (40% adjustment). This has the effect of reducing the effective level of funding in high-cost districts and districts with larger numbers of low-income students and students with disabilities. This, in turn, has the effect of increasing the size of the calculated funding gap. For a more detailed explanation of the methodology used in this report, see Appendix A.

This table is from *The Funding Gap 2004: Many States Still Shortchange Low-income and Minority Students*, a study written by Kevin Carey and published by The Education Trust. This report is available online at www.edtrust.org. The author is grateful to Kevin Carey and The Education Trust for their permission to use this table

APPENDIX D

State and Local Minority Funding Gaps 2002			
State	**Per-student funding in the districts with the fewest minority students *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)***	**Per-student funding in the districts with the most minority students *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)***	**Gap Between Revenues Available per student in the highest- and lowest-minority districts *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)***
Alabama	$6,112	$5,640	($472)
Alaska	$5,875	$8,175	$2,300
Arizona	$5,847	$4,885	($962)
Arkansas	$5,900	$6,022	$122
California	$6,175	$5,602	($573)
Colorado	$6,964	$6,071	($892)
Connecticut	$9,073	$8,538	($535)
Delaware	$8,950	$7,682	($1,268)
DC	*		*
Florida	$5,798	$5,840	$42
Georgia	$7,251	$8,013	$762
Hawaii	*		*
Idaho	$6,076	$5,401	($675)
Illinois	$7,398	$5,536	($1,862)
Indiana	$7,893	$7,836	($57)
Iowa	$8,153	$7,420	($733)
Kansas	$8,115	$6,442	($1,674)
Kentucky	$5,639	$6,485	$846
Louisiana	$6,062	$5,746	($317)
Maine	$8,186	$7,629	($557)
Maryland	$7,271	$6,870	($401)
Massachusetts	$6,553	$8,035	$1,482
Michigan	$7,460	$7,233	($226)
Minnesota	**$7,707**	**$8,361**	**$654**
Mississippi	$5,031	$4,902	($130)
Missouri	$6,341	$6,974	$633
Montana	$7,593	$5,572	($2,022)
Nebraska	$8,475	$6,781	($1,695)
Nevada	$6,778	$6,273	($506)
New Hampshire	$8,074	$6,216	($1,858)
New Jersey	$9,317	$9,810	$493
New Mexico	$5,677	$6,334	$656
New York	$9,739	$7,573	($2,166)
North Carolina	$6,475	$6,353	($122)
North Dakota	$7,733	$6,162	($1,571)
Ohio	$7,700	$7,566	($134)
Oklahoma	$5,378	$5,177	($202)

State	Per-student funding in the districts with the fewest minority students *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*	Per-student funding in the districts with the most minority students *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*	Gap Between Revenues Available per student in the highest- and lowest-minority districts *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*
Oregon	$6,705	$6,986	$281
Pennsylvania	$7,531	$6,948	($583)
Rhode Island	$7,602	$6,728	($875)
South Carolina	$7,093	$7,098	$5
South Dakota	$7,115	$6,088	($1,027)
Tennessee	*		*
Texas	$7,275	$5,864	($1,411)
Utah	$5,135	$4,721	($414)
Vermont	$11,680	$10,669	($1,011)
Virginia	$7,309	$6,715	($594)
Washington	$6,567	$6,233	($333)
West Virginia	$6,577	$7,115	$538
Wisconsin	$8,806	$7,832	($974)
Wyoming	$10,133	$7,734	($2,399)
USA	$7,605	$6,506	($1,099)

*No data.

Source: Education Trust calculations based on U.S. Department of Education school district revenue data for the 2001-2002 school year. Note: Minority data is unavailable for Tennessee. Note: All dollar amounts shown in this chart have been adjusted to account for regional cost differences the additional cost of educating students with disabilities, and the additional cost of educating low-income students (40% adjustment). This has the effect of reducing the effective level of funding in high-cost districts and districts with larger numbers of low-income students and students with disabilities. This, in turn, has the effect of increasing the size of the calculated funding gap. For a more detailed explanation of the methodology used in this report, see Appendix A.

This table is from *The Funding Gap 2004: Many States Still Shortchange Low-income and Minority Students*, a study written by Kevin Carey and published by The Education Trust. This report is available online at www.edtrust.org. The author is grateful to Kevin Carey and The Education Trust for their permission to use this table.

APPENDIX E

State	Gap Between Highest and Lowest-Poverty Districts 1997 *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*	Gap Between Highest and Lowest-Poverty Districts 2001 *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*	Gap Between Highest and Lowest-Poverty Districts 2002 *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*	Poverty Gap Change in Dollars 1997 - 2002 *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*
Alabama	($714)	($1,048)	($942)	($228)
Alaska	($555)	$607	$840	$1,395
Arizona	($906)	($1,149)	($1,172)	($266)
Arkansas	($478)	($256)	($479)	($1)
California	($205)	($418)	($301)	($96)
Colorado	($318)	($392)	($402)	($84)
Connecticut	($980)	($354)	($334)	$646
Delaware	($705)	$601	$931	$1,636
DC	*	*	*	*
Florida	($70)	($269)	($248)	($178)
Georgia	($369)	$121	$150	$519
Hawaii	*	*	*	*
Idaho	($459)	($495)	($336)	$123
Illinois	($2,247)	($2,374)	($2,465)	($218)
Indiana	($626)	($168)	($379)	$247
Iowa	($489)	($468)	($568)	($78)
Kansas	($130)	($150)	($214)	($83)
Kentucky	($119)	($143)	($357)	($239)
Louisiana	($1,085)	($1,026)	($963)	$123
Maine	($214)	($352)	($426)	($212)
Maryland	($961)	($735)	($772)	$189
Massachusetts	$459	$748	$774	$315
Michigan	($1,407)	($1,099)	($1,085)	$322
Minnesota	**$138**	**$713**	**$657**	**$519**
Mississippi	($348)	($181)	($359)	($11)
Missouri	($196)	($145)	($116)	$79
Montana	($1,380)	($578)	($809)	$571
Nebraska	($195)	($88)	($70)	$126
Nevada	($558)	$206	$255	$813
New Hampshire	($888)	($1,005)	($972)	($84)
New Jersey	($787)	$127	$566	$1,352
New Mexico	($591)	($109)	($30)	$561

State	Gap Between Highest and Lowest-Poverty Districts 1997 *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*	Gap Between Highest and Lowest-Poverty Districts 2001 *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*	Gap Between Highest and Lowest-Poverty Districts 2002 *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*	Poverty Gap Change in Dollars 1997 - 2002 *(cost-adjusted dollars, 40% adjustment for low-income students)*
New York	($2,938)	($2,264)	($2,615)	$323
North Carolina	($464)	($751)	($622)	($158)
North Dakota	$159	$391	$362	$203
Ohio	($861)	($560)	($347)	$514
Oklahoma	($52)	($72)	($147)	($95)
Oregon	$139	($119)	($92)	($231)
Pennsylvania	($1,209)	($1,469)	($1,308)	($99)
Rhode Island	($986)	($845)	($674)	$313
South Carolina	($370)	($343)	$43	$413
South Dakota	($108)	$248	$154	$262
Tennessee	$124	$536	$281	$156
Texas	($437)	($875)	($936)	($499)
Utah	$456	$561	$566	$110
Vermont	($751)	($1,212)	($1,192)	($441)
Virginia	($972)	($1,341)	($1,430)	($458)
Washington	($163)	($224)	($173)	($11)
West Virginia	($413)	($429)	($417)	($4)
Wisconsin	($576)	($442)	($337)	$239
Wyoming	($210)	($56)	$123	$332
USA	($1,208)	($1,287)	($1,348)	($140)

Source: Education Trust calculations based on U.S. Department of Education school district revenue data for the 1996-1997, 2000-2001, and 2001-2002 school years. Funding amounts were not adjusted for inflation.

Note: All dollar amounts shown in this chart have been adjusted to account for regional cost differences, the additional cost of educating students with disabilities, and the additional cost of educating low- income students (40% adjustment). This has the effect of reducing the effective level of funding in high-cost districts and districts with larger numbers of low-income students and students with disabilities. This, in turn, has the effect of increasing the size of the calculated funding gap.

This table is from *The Funding Gap 2004: Many States Still Shortchange Low-income and Minority Students*, a study written by Kevin Carey and published by The Education Trust. This report is available online at www.edtrust.org. The author is grateful to Kevin Carey and The Education Trust for their permission to use this table. Space did not permit all columns to be included.

APPENDIX F

Targeted Funding for Low-Income Students						
State	**Extra Poverty-Based Funding per Student Living Below the Poverty Line, 2002**	**Rank**		**State**	**Extra Poverty-Based Funding per Student Living Below the Poverty Line, 2002**	**Rank**
Massachusetts	$5,199	1		North Carolina	$910	26
Connecticut	$4,206	2		Washington	$574	27
New Jersey	$3,732	3		California	$403	28
New Hampshire	$3,529	4		Vermont	$387	29
Minnesota	**$3,075**	**5**		Wyoming	$252	30
Missouri	$2,700	6		Utah	$247	31
Rhode Island	$2,516	7		Mississippi	$237	32
New York	$2,240	8		Alabama	$197	33
Maryland	$2,033	9		Iowa	$196	34
Texas	$1,979	10		Tennessee	$155	35
Oklahoma	$1,876	11		Georgia	$146	36
Michigan	$1,792	12		Arizona	$121	37
Colorado	$1,739	13		Arkansas	$111	38
Indiana	$1,728	14		Alaska	$0	39*
Illinois	$1,658	15		Delaware	$0	39*
Kentucky	$1,642	16		Florida	$0	39*
Ohio	$1,444	17		Idaho	$0	39*
Oregon	$1,380	18		Maine	$0	39*
Louisiana	$1,232	19		Montana	$0	39*
Nebraska	$1,215	20		Nevada	$0	39*
Virginia	$1,174	21		North Dakota	$0	39*
Kansas	$1,164	22		Pennsylvania	$0	39*
South Carolina	$1,111	23		South Dakota	$0	39*
Wisconsin	$947	24		West Virginia	$0	39*
New Mexico	$919	25		USA	$1,191	

Source: Kevin Carey, *State Poverty-Based Education Funding: A Survey of Current Programs and Options for Improvement,* Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, November 2002.

*38 states provide some additional funds; all states that provide 0 additional dollars are ranked 39th.

This table also appears in *The Funding Gap 2004: Many States Still Shortchange Low-income and Minority Students*, a study written by Kevin Carey and published by The Education Trust. This report is available online at www.edtrust.org. The author is grateful to Kevin Carey and The Education Trust for their permission to use this table.

APPENDIX G

Graduation Gap
In Districts with Black Male Enrollment over 10,000 Students

District	Black Male Enrollment	2001/2002 Graduation Rates		White/ Black Gap
		Black Male	White Male	
Washington, DC	28,519	54%	97%	42%
Minneapolis, MN	**10,060**	**40%**	**79%**	**39%**
Newark, NJ	12,804	47%	83%	36%
Oakland, CA	11,298	27%	60%	33%
Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC	24,549	38%	71%	32%
Wake County, NC	15,362	44%	75%	31%
Fulton County, GA	14,182	50%	81%	31%
New York City, NY	180,093	24%	51%	27%
Pinellas County, FL	11,274	26%	52%	26%
Caddo Parish, LA	14,131	34%	60%	26%
Houston, TX	32,632	35%	61%	26%
Guilford County, NC	14,505	47%	72%	25%
San Diego, CA	10,730	47%	71%	25%
Chicago, IL	110,532	33%	56%	23%
Dekalb County, GA	38,636	42%	65%	23%
Los Angeles CA	45,164	45%	68%	23%
Milwaukee, WI	29,440	28%	50%	22%
Orleans Parish, LA	33,017	42%	62%	21%
Cincinnati, OH	14,629	18%	38%	20%
Orange County, FL	22,936	34%	54%	20%
Palm Beach County, FL	24,720	38%	57%	20%
East Baton Rouge, LA	19,205	45%	64%	20%
Rochester, NY	11,504	26%	44%	19%
Norfolk, VA	12,497	37%	56%	19%
Dade County, FL	55,809	37%	55%	18%
Hillsborough Cnty, FL	21,186	35%	53%	17%
Cobb County, GA	13,636	52%	69%	17%
Montgomery Cnty, AL	12,538	53%	70%	17%
Atlanta City, GA	24,186	35%	51%	16%
Fort Worth, TX	11,918	40%	54%	15%
Montgomery Cnty, MD	15,111	66%	81%	15%
Duval County, FL	28,067	30%	45%	14%
Clark County, NV	18,461	55%	68%	14%
Broward County, FL	49,839	45%	58%	13%
Chatham County, GA	11,443	25%	37%	12%
Gwinnett County, GA	12,275	56%	68%	12%
Jefferson County, KY	16,284	41%	52%	10%
Boston, MA	15,096	48%	58%	10%
Dallas, TX	26,755	37%	47%	9%
Virginia Beach, VA	11,072	55%	64%	9%
Richmond County, GA	12,281	32%	40%	8%

District	Black Male Enrollment	2001/2002 Graduation Rates		White/ Black Gap
		Black Male	White Male	
Mobile County, AL	16,315	37%	45%	8%
Cleveland, OH	25,561	25%	32%	7%
Jefferson Parish, LA	13,063	43%	49%	6%
Richmond, VA	11,716	45%	50%	5%
Cumberland Cnty, NC	13,038	52%	58%	6%
Baltimore County, MD	19,430	76%	80%	4%
St. Louis, MO	18,933	29%	29%	0%
Jackson, MS	15,064	38%	38%	0%
Indianapolis, IN	12,312	25%	23%	-2%
Detroit, MI	79,343	33%	31%	-3%
Buffalo, NY	12,724	46%	43%	-3%
Clayton County, GA	17,943	36%	33%	-4%
Baltimore City, MD	42,793	38%	34%	-4%
Columbus, OH	20,048	45%	41%	-4%
Kansas City, MO	13,964	39%	32%	-7%
Prince Georges, MD	53,719	69%	61%	-8%
Birmingham, AL	17,665	41%	9%	-32%

This information is from *Public Education and Black Male Students: A State Report Card,* (October 2004), The Schott Foundation for Public Education, Cambridge, MA, Table 3, pages 10-11. As of January 28, 2005, the October 2004 version of the Schott report was posted online; however, an update with new data is expected soon. The data cited in this present report are the updated data that will appear in subsequent editions of the Schott report. The analysis in the Schott report was conducted by independent consultant Michael Holzman. All demographic data include only non-Hispanic students. Diploma information is from 2001-2002 and enrollment numbers are from 2002-2003. Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Kentucky do not report to NCES. This means that Philadelphia and Memphis are missing from the analysis. Available online at:
http://www.schottfoundation.org/publications/Public_Education_and_Black_Male_Students.pdf.
The author is grateful to Michael Holzman and The Schott Foundation for Public Education for their permission to use this information.

APPENDIX H

QUARTILE ONE - EDUCATION EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

District No.	District Name	Graduation Rate	Number of Students	Per pupil total	EEI*	FRL**	% Am. Indian	% Asian	% Hispanic	% Black	% White
256	RED WING	83.33%	2,961	$9,091	70	19.49	3.48	1.72	2.57	3.17	89.06
544	FERGUS FALLS	80.14%	2,801	$7,781	80	20.78	1.25	1.04	1.04	1.89	94.79
696	ELY	90.16%	683	$8,740	80	20.79	8.20	0.59	0.15	0.73	90.34
270	HOPKINS	97.88%	8,223	$9,323	80	16.32	0.61	3.59	4.52	11.53	79.75
16	SPRING LAKE PARK	82.74%	4,291	$7,864	80	17.92	1.96	6.11	4.73	4.43	82.78
507	NICOLLET	97.67%	290	$8,913	90	19.31	0.00	0.69	1.03	0.00	98.28
191	BURNSVILLE	91.03%	11,037	$8,192	90	17.51	0.61	7.60	4.28	11.45	76.06
199	INVER GROVE	92.20%	3,821	$8,279	90	20.05	0.79	3.30	6.65	4.82	84.45
277	WESTONKA	97.71%	2,245	$8,639	90	13.85	0.53	1.16	0.85	1.38	96.08
11	ANOKA-HENNEPIN	88.99%	40,671	$7,756	90	19.44	1.37	4.63	2.10	4.81	87.09
284	WAYZATA	97.97%	9,615	$8,534	90	8.36	0.35	6.04	1.73	4.77	87.10
728	ELK RIVER	87.26%	10,315	$7,554	90	10.83	0.93	1.52	1.37	0.93	95.25
623	ROSEVILLE	98.05%	6,312	$8,455	90	20.87	0.90	11.41	4.47	7.67	75.55
621	MOUNDS VIEW	95.11%	10,629	$8,172	90	16.75	0.97	7.09	2.72	5.01	84.20
624	WHITE BEAR LAKE	93.85%	8,795	$8,061	90	16.07	0.57	5.84	1.94	2.29	89.36
831	FOREST LAKE	89.98%	7,660	$7,691	90	14.28	0.59	2.05	0.86	0.81	95.69
273	EDINA	100.00%	7,214	$8,542	90	5.74	0.25	4.78	1.72	3.65	89.60
276	MINNETONKA	98.29%	7,568	$8,354	90	3.18	0.46	3.55	1.80	1.89	92.30
2887	MCLEOD WEST SCHOOLS	95.45%	475	$8,070	90	21.26	0.00	1.26	2.95	0.42	95.37
75	ST. CLAIR	91.84%	634	$7,764	90	18.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	99.84
882	MONTICELLO	93.31%	3,831	$7,863	90	15.66	0.16	0.94	1.75	0.73	96.42
196	ROSEMOUNT-APPLE VALLEY-EAGAN	93.44%	28,153	$7,833	90	9.28	0.55	5.70	2.98	5.84	84.94
2137	KINGSLAND	91.40%	866	$7,578	90	20.09	0.58	0.81	0.46	0.46	97.69
2144	CHISAGO LAKES	95.18%	3,594	$7,819	100	15.14	0.53	1.84	1.11	1.20	95.33
833	SOUTH WASHINGTON COUNTY	92.37%	15,495	$7,588	100	10.20	0.56	6.24	3.35	5.12	84.72
88	NEW ULM	98.56%	2,344	$8,089	100	18.94	0.30	0.81	1.83	0.73	96.33
876	ANNANDALE	88.37%	1,802	$7,241	100	21.37	0.33	0.55	0.55	1.05	97.50
423	HUTCHINSON	87.64%	3,035	$7,121	100	16.90	0.36	0.99	4.05	1.02	93.57
832	MAHTOMEDI	97.35%	3,052	$7,871	100	5.67	0.20	2.29	1.38	1.93	94.20
108	NORWOOD	100.00%	983	$8,061	100	18.01	0.41	1.42	4.27	1.32	92.57
806	ELGIN-MILLVILLE	100.00%	532	$8,043	100	16.54	0.75	0.94	0.56	0.38	97.37
659	NORTHFIELD	90.63%	3,791	$7,285	100	14.69	0.26	1.56	6.49	1.21	90.48
278	ORONO	98.06%	2,506	$7,881	100	4.35	0.36	2.08	1.80	0.80	94.97
300	LACRESCENT-HOKAH	91.33%	1,584	$7,338	100	14.96	0.25	1.26	0.57	2.34	95.58
112	CHASKA	97.78%	7,938	$7,853	100	11.83	0.15	3.10	5.47	2.24	89.04
2805	ZUMBROTA-MAZEPPA	96.88%	1,173	$7,775	100	12.70	0.51	0.94	1.02	1.88	95.65
195	RANDOLPH	100.00%	473	$7,995	100	14.80	0.00	0.42	1.06	0.21	98.31
282	ST. ANTHONY-NEW BRIGHTON	97.37%	1,638	$7,772	100	5.74	1.16	8.00	2.99	4.95	82.91
500	SOUTHLAND	95.31%	712	$7,524	100	19.10	0.42	0.56	0.70	0.28	98.03
2172	KENYON-WANAMINGO	94.81%	921	$7,456	100	21.39	0.00	0.65	2.61	0.33	96.42
704	PROCTOR	97.84%	1,853	$7,671	100	20.94	0.49	0.38	0.22	0.43	98.49
834	STILLWATER	97.79%	8,882	$7,658	100	8.33	0.18	2.40	1.07	1.14	95.22

District No.	District Name	Graduation Rate	Number of Students	Per pupil total	EEI*	FRL**	% Am. Indian	% Asian	% Hispanic	% Black	% White
294	HOUSTON	95.12%	744	$7,442	100	17.61	0.54	0.40	1.21	0.40	97.45
138	NORTH BRANCH	86.94%	3,940	$6,737	100	20.05	0.76	1.78	1.62	0.48	95.36
881	MAPLE LAKE	95.83%	919	$7,420	100	17.19	0.00	0.65	0.76	0.44	98.15
726	BECKER	97.14%	2,420	$7,481	100	11.24	0.45	0.87	0.74	0.58	97.36
877	BUFFALO	95.62%	5,218	$7,355	100	21.62	0.63	0.98	1.65	1.26	95.48
2687	HOWARD LAKE-WAVERLY-WINSTED	95.38%	957	$7,299	100	20.38	0.21	0.31	0.84	1.04	97.60
15	ST. FRANCIS	95.47%	5,860	$7,265	100	17.35	1.48	2.05	1.30	1.42	93.75
200	HASTINGS	95.53%	5,093	$7,223	100	13.61	1.35	1.32	2.16	1.65	93.52
272	EDEN PRAIRIE	97.68%	10,172	$7,363	100	7.98	0.99	6.21	1.28	5.46	86.06
111	WATERTOWN-MAYER	96.12%	1,453	$7,220	100	17.76	0.48	1.58	1.38	1.17	95.39
194	LAKEVILLE	95.03%	10,398	$7,105	110	5.24	0.26	1.85	1.57	1.81	94.52
110	WACONIA	98.67%	2,386	$7,364	110	8.68	0.46	1.63	2.01	1.59	94.30
12	CENTENNIAL	93.16%	6,979	$6,923	110	10.40	1.62	2.59	1.40	1.25	93.14
750	ROCORI	99.05%	2,342	$7,341	110	18.79	0.00	0.56	2.86	0.60	95.99
227	CHATFIELD	95.71%	932	$7,071	110	13.84	0.00	0.75	1.18	0.43	97.64
883	ROCKFORD	97.39%	1,733	$7,101	110	20.25	0.81	1.73	1.21	1.15	95.10
745	ALBANY	97.16%	1,562	$7,079	110	18.82	0.32	0.19	1.02	0.45	98.02
721	NEW PRAGUE AREA SCHOOLS	97.56%	2,866	$7,107	110	7.43	0.07	0.98	0.87	0.28	97.80
810	PLAINVIEW	98.82%	1,157	$7,183	110	19.36	0.09	0.35	6.83	0.61	92.13
748	SARTELL	99.46%	2,752	$7,215	110	9.56	0.15	2.07	0.58	0.44	96.77
719	PRIOR LAKE	98.46%	5,530	$7,131	110	6.47	1.36	4.18	1.41	1.84	91.21
717	JORDAN	95.40%	1,474	$6,879	110	16.69	0.00	0.34	3.73	0.07	95.86
252	CANNON FALLS	96.72%	1,411	$6,963	110	16.51	0.50	1.49	0.50	0.78	96.74
716	BELLE PLAINE	100.00%	1,367	$7,138	110	11.27	0.37	1.39	1.83	1.02	95.39
531	BYRON	98.88%	1,535	$7,047	110	8.27	0.13	0.91	0.91	0.46	97.59
253	GOODHUE	95.74%	599	$6,819	110	18.86	0.17	0.83	2.67	0.17	96.16
192	FARMINGTON	96.07%	5,360	$6,828	110	8.94	0.22	2.54	2.07	1.49	93.68
534	STEWARTVILLE	97.78%	1,758	$6,934	110	14.22	0.34	0.85	1.19	0.91	96.70
424	LESTER PRAIRIE	97.22%	484	$6,888	110	18.39	0.00	0.00	5.79	0.00	94.21
813	LAKE CITY	95.24%	1,403	$6,723	110	14.47	0.07	0.93	1.64	1.64	95.72
99	ESKO	97.30%	1,122	$6,829	110	7.31	0.09	0.71	0.09	0.80	98.31
477	PRINCETON	97.71%	3,390	$6,851	110	20.21	0.91	0.68	0.80	0.91	96.70
879	DELANO	98.46%	1,906	$6,838	110	9.39	0.52	1.15	0.79	1.00	96.54
204	KASSON-MANTORVILLE	97.08%	1,886	$6,646	110	11.45	0.37	0.90	2.12	0.48	96.13
700	HERMANTOWN	99.26%	1,966	$6,773	120	12.05	1.17	1.32	0.71	0.20	96.59
345	NEW LONDON-SPICER	98.64%	1,707	$6,715	120	20.21	0.18	0.23	0.41	0.35	98.83
727	BIG LAKE	94.83%	3,167	$6,436	120	19.17	1.20	1.26	2.05	1.17	94.32
255	PINE ISLAND	95.35%	1,236	$6,405	120	14.72	0.49	0.73	2.18	1.54	95.06
150	HAWLEY	100.00%	890	$6,641	120	17.42	0.34	0.11	0.11	1.01	98.43
885	ST. MICHAEL-ALBERTVILLE	97.95%	3,587	$6,272	120	7.50	0.20	2.59	0.86	1.09	95.26
533	DOVER-EYOTA	100.00%	1,105	$6,355	120	14.57	0.00	0.72	1.09	0.27	97.92
	Averages: Quartile One	**95.37%**	**812**	**$7,488**	**100**	**14.74%**	**0.62%**	**2.05%**	**1.92%**	**1.77%**	**93.63%**
	Averages: State	**93.44%**	**2,448**	**$8,265**	**100**	**31.76**	**2.98%**	**1.68%**	**3.38%**	**1.80%**	**90.15%**

Source: Minnesota Department of Education. All data are from the 2003-2004 school year except for graduation data, which is for Spring 2003.

* Efficiency and Effectiveness Index

** Free/reduced price lunch

APPENDIX I

QUARTILE TWO - EDUCATION EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

District Number	District Name	Graduation Rate	Number of Students	Per pupil total (no debt service)	EEI*	FRL**	Percent American Indian	Percent Asian	Percent Hispanic	Percent Black	Percent White
283	ST. LOUIS PARK	93.22%	4,247	$10,148	80	24.63	1.13	5.16	5.67	15.47	72.57
381	LAKE SUPERIOR	89.81%	1,607	$9,384	80	23.77	0.87	0.44	0.19	0.68	97.82
6	SOUTH ST. PAUL	80.20%	3,314	$8,060	80	28.27	0.88	1.36	10.92	4.19	82.65
499	LEROY	87.88%	373	$8,642	80	30.83	0.00	0.27	0.54	0.00	99.20
94	CLOQUET	85.86%	2,316	$8,420	80	30.87	15.24	0.95	0.78	0.82	82.21
2835	JANESVILLE-WALDORF-PEMBERTON	90.38%	557	$8,805	80	21.90	0.00	0.90	0.36	0.18	98.56
361	INTERNATIONAL FALLS	90.63%	1,423	$8,611	90	29.44	13.70	0.14	0.42	0.77	84.96
829	WASECA	83.57%	2,128	$7,902	90	26.55	0.52	0.99	6.81	2.87	88.82
2180	M.A.C.C.R.A.Y.	94.85%	808	$8,759	90	31.06	0.25	0.00	4.33	1.36	94.06
281	ROBBINSDALE	95.46%	13,642	$8,798	90	29.89	1.39	7.15	6.61	17.99	66.87
166	COOK COUNTY	94.29%	640	$8,645	90	24.84	14.06	1.41	0.16	0.47	83.91
197	WEST ST. PAUL-MENDOTA HTS.-EAGAN	94.16%	4,700	$8,550	90	24.72	0.81	4.94	13.23	7.38	73.64
535	ROCHESTER	88.66%	16,279	$7,986	90	25.38	0.36	8.51	4.67	9.85	76.60
279	OSSEO	91.92%	21,424	$8,263	90	24.44	0.78	11.93	3.37	16.93	66.99
771	CHOKIO-ALBERTA	100.00%	210	$8,984	90	29.52	0.95	0.00	0.48	0.00	98.57
695	CHISHOLM	93.94%	762	$8,427	90	30.31	2.62	0.66	0.00	0.26	96.46
177	WINDOM	97.14%	1,021	$8,701	90	30.66	1.18	1.08	5.39	0.98	91.38
93	CARLTON	92.86%	656	$8,315	90	29.57	13.41	0.15	0.00	0.00	86.43
600	FISHER	91.30%	303	$8,156	90	29.04	1.98	0.00	8.91	0.00	89.11
578	PINE CITY	87.50%	1,701	$7,730	90	30.51	0.88	0.24	0.47	0.71	97.71
391	CLEVELAND	90.91%	414	$7,970	90	22.71	0.24	0.24	1.69	0.00	97.83
413	MARSHALL	90.16%	2,206	$7,884	90	26.25	0.32	2.95	8.39	3.90	84.45
152	MOORHEAD	91.04%	5,266	$7,932	90	28.09	3.10	1.54	8.32	2.43	84.62
2071	LAKE CRYSTAL-WELLCOME MEMORIAL	96.15%	787	$8,364	90	24.65	0.00	0.38	0.89	0.64	98.09
297	SPRING GROVE	100.00%	366	$8,691	90	27.32	0.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	99.45
508	ST. PETER	96.41%	1,852	$8,376	90	25.43	0.49	1.40	5.62	2.59	89.90
690	WARROAD	89.36%	1,295	$7,741	90	28.57	9.96	6.02	0.00	0.31	83.71
2184	LUVERNE	94.55%	1,274	$8,176	90	27.55	1.41	2.04	2.28	1.02	93.25
495	GRAND MEADOW	100.00%	341	$8,625	100	23.46	0.00	1.17	0.88	1.17	96.77
756	BLOOMING PRAIRIE	90.14%	765	$7,727	100	23.40	0.00	0.39	8.24	0.39	90.98
238	MABEL-CANTON	91.89%	365	$7,860	100	29.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
2169	MURRAY COUNTY CENTRAL	96.88%	793	$8,259	100	30.39	0.38	0.00	2.02	0.25	97.35
2859	GLENCOE-SILVER LAKE	88.10%	1,769	$7,460	100	25.44	0.17	0.34	15.21	0.06	84.23
739	KIMBALL	95.52%	823	$8,022	100	24.79	0.73	0.24	0.36	0.85	97.81
2143	WATERVILLE-ELYSIAN-MORRISTOWN	91.78%	990	$7,648	100	27.47	0.40	0.51	3.64	0.20	95.25
77	MANKATO	89.88%	6,924	$7,482	100	29.48	0.39	2.44	3.51	5.39	88.27
139	RUSH CITY	85.51%	975	$7,111	100	24.31	1.13	0.82	1.13	1.23	95.69
271	BLOOMINGTON	96.64%	10,507	$8,004	100	24.81	0.96	8.85	6.97	11.63	71.59
769	MORRIS	97.39%	1,002	$8,019	100	21.76	0.80	1.00	1.10	1.80	95.31
97	MOOSE LAKE	92.45%	791	$7,588	100	28.45	1.90	1.39	0.88	1.39	94.44
2342	WEST CENTRAL AREA	97.14%	842	$7,922	100	31.00	0.71	0.48	1.54	0.83	96.44
811	WABASHA-KELLOGG	96.30%	696	$7,774	100	21.70	0.29	0.00	0.43	1.01	98.28

Efficiency and Effectiveness in Minnesota School Districts: How Do Districts Compare?
Center of the American Experiment

District Number	District Name	Graduation Rate	Number of Students	Per pupil total (no debt service)	EEI*	FRL**	Percent American Indian	Percent Asian	Percent Hispanic	Percent Black	Percent White
564	THIEF RIVER FALLS	96.88%	2,071	$7,797	100	29.45	2.61	0.53	3.09	0.97	92.81
720	SHAKOPEE	89.41%	4,812	$7,186	100	24.94	2.14	6.03	9.77	3.05	79.01
2397	LESUEUR-HENDERSON	95.24%	1,286	$7,637	100	24.18	0.23	0.39	9.88	0.86	88.65
777	BENSON	99.02%	1,070	$7,935	100	29.25	0.19	0.65	2.06	1.59	95.51
2154	EVELETH-GILBERT	97.54%	1,368	$7,810	100	27.78	1.97	1.83	0.44	0.73	95.03
2886	GLENVILLE-EMMONS	96.00%	376	$7,628	100	25.80	1.33	2.93	2.13	0.27	93.35
299	CALEDONIA	99.05%	921	$7,848	100	27.04	0.22	0.33	0.11	1.52	97.83
761	OWATONNA	90.14%	4,913	$7,126	100	22.86	0.08	1.18	7.84	5.48	85.43
2310	SIBLEY EAST	95.83%	1,253	$7,560	100	28.65	0.08	1.44	17.40	0.64	80.45
2198	FILLMORE CENTRAL	98.55%	679	$7,685	110	24.59	0.00	0.15	1.77	0.29	97.79
743	SAUK CENTRE	99.24%	1,137	$7,711	110	30.78	0.00	0.26	1.50	0.18	98.07
261	ASHBY	100.00%	289	$7,753	110	23.53	0.69	0.00	1.04	0.69	97.58
2125	TRITON	96.51%	1,095	$7,481	110	28.49	0.00	0.18	10.50	0.09	89.22
394	MONTGOMERY-LONSDALE	96.25%	1,069	$7,454	110	27.97	0.19	0.19	8.89	0.37	90.36
47	SAUK RAPIDS	98.46%	3,577	$7,560	110	22.81	0.20	1.73	0.81	1.29	95.97
465	LITCHFIELD	95.29%	1,927	$7,293	110	27.92	0.26	0.67	6.38	0.78	91.90
466	DASSEL-COKATO	91.28%	2,250	$6,950	110	25.73	0.36	0.80	2.04	0.31	96.49
487	UPSALA	100.00%	396	$7,571	110	31.06	0.00	0.25	0.25	0.00	99.49
146	BARNESVILLE	98.18%	780	$7,422	110	24.10	0.00	0.26	0.64	0.77	98.33
206	ALEXANDRIA	97.26%	4,080	$7,339	110	22.72	0.22	0.74	0.78	1.05	97.21
622	NORTH ST PAUL-MAPLEWOOD	94.48%	11,199	$7,124	110	22.41	1.17	8.26	3.87	8.06	78.64
392	LECENTER	100.00%	692	$7,522	110	24.71	0.00	1.45	13.73	0.29	84.54
213	OSAKIS	100.00%	657	$7,469	110	30.90	0.00	0.91	0.15	0.15	98.78
51	FOLEY	98.26%	1,667	$7,314	110	22.92	0.48	0.30	0.36	0.78	98.08
912	MILACA	94.37%	1,901	$7,011	110	29.77	2.31	1.00	0.89	0.42	95.37
846	BRECKENRIDGE	100.00%	887	$7,404	110	28.07	1.92	0.45	4.28	1.01	92.33
2168	N.R.H.E.G.	94.37%	988	$6,983	110	26.72	0.00	0.71	0.30	0.10	98.89
186	PEQUOT LAKES	98.84%	1,375	$7,313	110	28.58	0.44	0.15	0.44	0.15	98.84
740	MELROSE	98.64%	1,460	$7,273	110	28.90	0.00	0.14	11.37	0.82	87.67
763	MEDFORD	96.30%	662	$7,083	110	22.96	0.30	1.36	3.93	0.76	93.66
207	BRANDON	100.00%	304	$7,348	110	26.97	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.66	99.01
2167	LAKEVIEW	97.96%	558	$7,173	110	22.40	0.00	1.61	2.87	0.54	94.98
682	ROSEAU	99.07%	1,467	$7,249	110	26.99	0.48	0.89	0.14	0.34	98.16
2135	MAPLE RIVER	100.00%	1,257	$7,223	110	26.41	0.08	0.80	1.03	0.95	97.14
738	HOLDINGFORD	96.94%	1,067	$6,986	110	26.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
203	HAYFIELD	96.43%	905	$6,853	120	24.64	0.77	1.33	3.09	0.55	94.25
858	ST. CHARLES	96.10%	1,060	$6,717	120	23.02	0.28	3.77	5.38	0.28	90.28
85	SPRINGFIELD	98.55%	673	$6,839	120	26.89	0.15	0.45	1.49	0.15	97.77
911	CAMBRIDGE-ISANTI	98.33%	4,851	$6,743	120	22.76	1.48	1.38	1.32	1.05	94.76
409	TYLER	98.04%	210	$5,502	150	22.38	0.95	0.00	3.33	0.95	94.76
	Averages: Quartile Two	**94.74%**	**721**	**$7,778**	**100**	**26.5%**	**1.42%**	**1.52%**	**3.56%**	**1.91%**	**91.59%**
	Averages: State	**93.44%**	**2,448**	**$8,265**	**100**	**31.76%**	**2.98%**	**1.68%**	**3.38%**	**1.80%**	**90.15%**

Source: Minnesota Department of Education. All data are from the 2003-2004 school year except for graduation data, which is for Spring 2003.

* Efficiency and Effectiveness Index

** Free/reduced price lunch

APPENDIX J

QUARTILE THREE - EDUCATION EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

District Number	District Name	Graduation Rate	Number of Students	Per pupil total (no debt service)	EEI*	FRL**	% American Indian	% Asian	% Hispanic	% Black	% Whit
81	COMFREY	87.50%	162	$10,973	70	35.19	0.00	0.00	4.94	0.62	94.44
2536	GRANADA HUNTLEY-EAST CHAIN	90.91%	302	$11,008	70	40.07	0.33	0.66	1.99	0.33	96.69
318	GRAND RAPIDS	78.05%	3,982	$8,537	80	31.34	5.32	0.65	0.58	0.83	92.62
599	FERTILE-BELTRAMI	97.87%	545	$10,654	80	40.18	4.22	1.10	1.65	0.37	92.66
914	ULEN-HITTERDAL	90.91%	284	$9,833	80	37.32	3.52	0.35	0.70	0.00	95.42
2856	STEPHEN-ARGYLE CENTRAL SCHOOLS	96.00%	391	$10,321	80	34.78	0.77	0.51	7.93	0.00	90.79
2171	KITTSON CENTRAL	100.00%	406	$10,729	80	32.02	0.25	0.74	6.16	0.25	92.61
709	DULUTH	81.62%	11,152	$8,678	80	35.70	5.00	2.44	1.21	4.66	86.68
2711	MESABI EAST	96.59%	936	$10,198	80	40.17	0.75	0.53	0.21	0.53	97.97
706	VIRGINIA	92.81%	1,661	$9,747	80	31.07	3.97	1.02	0.90	1.69	92.41
2527	NORMAN COUNTY WEST	89.29%	369	$9,340	90	39.30	2.44	0.27	9.76	0.00	87.53
113	WALKER-HACKENSACK/AKELEY	84.52%	1,011	$8,828	90	40.26	21.07	0.40	0.49	0.30	77.74
181	BRAINERD	82.47%	7,159	$8,535	90	32.73	1.40	0.54	0.52	1.24	96.30
593	CROOKSTON	82.69%	1,502	$8,448	90	39.48	2.80	0.27	15.71	0.73	80.49
280	RICHFIELD	87.35%	4,050	$8,898	90	39.83	1.41	8.94	16.35	18.86	54.44
2890	RENVILLE COUNTY WEST	85.51%	746	$8,684	90	40.21	0.54	0.54	19.30	0.40	79.22
492	AUSTIN	79.58%	4,021	$7,979	90	37.85	0.40	3.06	11.81	3.53	81.20
2854	ADA-BORUP	89.19%	529	$8,911	90	38.19	2.65	1.89	8.32	1.32	85.82
656	FARIBAULT	83.78%	3,976	$8,321	90	36.44	0.20	2.01	15.82	2.21	79.75
2176	WARREN-ALVARADO-OSLO	94.83%	549	$9,408	90	39.71	0.91	0.00	11.11	0.00	87.98
742	ST. CLOUD	87.11%	9,666	$8,484	90	34.61	1.03	4.13	2.50	6.67	85.66
550	UNDERWOOD	82.50%	474	$7,947	90	36.71	0.63	2.11	0.63	0.00	96.62
861	WINONA AREA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	90.59%	4,002	$8,675	90	32.53	0.20	4.50	2.12	2.47	90.70
14	FRIDLEY	83.33%	2,557	$7,861	90	35.28	2.70	7.47	3.05	13.49	73.29
701	HIBBING	90.23%	2,699	$8,417	100	31.53	2.19	0.30	0.48	0.48	96.55
62	ORTONVILLE	95.74%	604	$8,855	100	37.91	1.49	0.00	0.66	0.00	97.85
330	HERON LAKE-OKABENA	100.00%	331	$9,232	100	35.95	0.91	0.91	14.80	0.00	83.38
803	WHEATON AREA SCHOOL	98.00%	442	$8,993	100	31.22	0.68	1.13	2.94	0.45	94.80
208	EVANSVILLE	100.00%	219	$9,147	100	38.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
2190	YELLOW MEDICINE EAST	93.62%	1,088	$8,545	100	39.98	4.87	1.01	6.07	0.55	87.50
390	LAKE OF THE WOODS	94.44%	695	$8,555	100	34.39	1.15	0.58	0.86	1.01	96.40
514	ELLSWORTH	93.94%	198	$8,484	100	34.85	0.51	0.00	1.01	3.54	94.95
182	CROSBY-IRONTON	90.70%	1,401	$8,187	100	38.54	1.43	0.29	0.71	0.71	96.86
2754	CEDAR MOUNTAIN	93.94%	430	$8,449	100	32.56	0.23	0.00	1.16	0.00	98.60
2752	FAIRMONT AREA SCHOOLS	91.52%	1,793	$8,151	100	33.80	0.17	0.84	5.69	0.95	92.36
100	WRENSHALL	92.68%	370	$8,230	100	31.62	1.62	0.81	0.00	0.54	97.03
2853	LAC QUI PARLE VALLEY	96.67%	1,111	$8,571	100	37.80	0.54	2.25	2.61	1.62	92.98
768	HANCOCK	91.67%	218	$8,080	100	31.19	0.46	0.92	0.00	0.00	98.62
22	DETROIT LAKES	89.96%	2,732	$7,898	100	34.04	11.75	0.73	1.28	0.84	85.40
458	TRUMAN	97.73%	378	$8,540	100	38.36	0.00	0.00	2.91	2.38	94.71
581	EDGERTON	100.00%	286	$8,735	100	38.81	0.35	0.70	2.80	0.35	95.80
549	PERHAM	87.43%	1,620	$7,609	100	33.70	1.05	0.56	2.59	1.23	94.57

District Number	District Name	Graduation Rate	Number of Students	Per pupil total (no debt service)	EEI*	FRL**	% American Indian	% Asian	% Hispanic	% Black	% White
671	HILLS-BEAVER CREEK	93.33%	305	$8,103	100	34.10	0.33	0.98	0.00	0.00	98.69
241	ALBERT LEA	89.21%	3,572	$7,744	100	34.97	0.22	1.20	12.23	1.01	85.33
1	AITKIN	93.08%	1,308	$8,060	100	35.78	1.30	0.69	0.84	0.69	96.48
378	DAWSON-BOYD	95.92%	579	$8,287	100	33.33	0.35	0.86	1.21	0.86	96.72
505	FULDA	100.00%	531	$8,600	100	33.90	0.75	1.13	5.46	0.00	92.66
91	BARNUM	87.50%	655	$7,510	100	37.25	3.36	0.61	0.61	0.61	94.81
239	RUSHFORD-PETERSON	97.22%	682	$8,329	100	35.63	0.15	0.59	0.15	0.15	98.97
2448	MARTIN COUNTY WEST	96.10%	901	$8,204	100	32.74	0.00	0.55	0.78	0.78	97.89
95	CROMWELL-WRIGHT	100.00%	298	$8,532	100	38.26	3.69	0.00	0.00	0.34	95.97
630	RED LAKE FALLS	100.00%	386	$8,523	100	38.60	0.26	0.00	2.07	0.52	97.15
2897	REDWOOD FALLS AREA SCHOOLS	90.00%	1,435	$7,645	100	33.38	14.49	1.11	3.41	0.21	80.77
2365	G.F.W.	95.45%	886	$8,089	110	35.21	0.00	0.00	9.14	0.11	90.74
332	MORA	85.71%	1,900	$7,256	110	33.95	2.00	1.16	1.63	0.63	94.58
2860	BLUE EARTH AREA PUBLIC SCHOOL	96.35%	1,388	$8,071	110	36.17	0.07	0.43	7.56	0.94	90.99
547	PARKERS PRAIRIE	100.00%	580	$8,297	110	36.21	0.17	0.52	0.17	0.69	98.45
2396	A.C.G.C.	97.59%	904	$8,087	110	38.05	0.00	0.55	2.88	0.11	96.46
2609	WIN-E-MAC	91.43%	555	$7,576	110	34.95	1.26	0.18	0.54	0.18	97.84
482	LITTLE FALLS	91.86%	2,930	$7,611	110	37.61	0.51	0.89	0.92	1.06	96.62
129	MONTEVIDEO	98.21%	1,452	$8,120	110	35.47	0.48	0.55	4.48	0.62	93.87
2889	LAKE PARK AUDUBON DISTRICT	92.16%	676	$7,611	110	38.02	1.48	1.33	1.04	0.15	96.01
417	TRACY	97.01%	793	$8,010	110	41.36	0.13	17.02	3.78	0.76	78.31
2689	PIPESTONE AREA SCHOOLS	92.37%	1,312	$7,557	110	39.94	2.36	0.61	1.52	0.69	94.82
2534	BIRD ISLAND-OLIVIA-LAKE LILLIAN	97.06%	964	$7,930	110	35.89	0.21	0.62	14.11	0.52	84.54
463	EDEN VALLEY-WATKINS	90.91%	821	$7,405	110	37.03	0.00	0.24	0.49	0.85	98.42
314	BRAHAM	96.10%	952	$7,725	110	33.40	0.74	0.32	0.74	0.42	97.79
548	PELICAN RAPIDS	89.29%	1,189	$7,041	110	37.09	0.08	2.19	20.35	2.10	75.27
2895	JACKSON COUNTY CENTRAL	95.05%	1,225	$7,489	110	34.69	0.08	4.49	1.22	0.65	93.55
485	ROYALTON	93.33%	722	$7,343	110	31.72	0.69	0.83	1.25	0.83	96.40
640	WABASSO	100.00%	398	$7,866	110	33.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	99.75
2159	BUFFALO LAKE-HECTOR	98.36%	570	$7,719	110	35.96	0.18	0.53	10.35	1.23	87.72
857	LEWISTON-ALTURA	100.00%	774	$7,838	110	31.27	0.39	0.52	1.29	0.26	97.55
2149	MINNEWASKA	99.17%	1,425	$7,719	110	37.40	0.56	0.49	0.42	0.91	97.61
595	EAST GRAND FORKS	94.23%	1,785	$7,308	110	31.32	1.57	0.45	10.53	0.78	86.67
775	KERKHOVEN-MURDOCK-SUNBURG	100.00%	632	$7,664	120	38.29	0.32	0.00	9.18	0.79	89.72
511	ADRIAN	97.87%	652	$7,451	120	38.96	0.15	1.53	1.38	0.00	96.93
741	PAYNESVILLE	97.80%	1,090	$7,356	120	32.11	0.00	0.09	1.28	0.55	98.07
242	ALDEN	100.00%	430	$7,498	120	31.16	0.00	1.16	3.26	1.16	94.42
414	MINNEOTA	100.00%	462	$7,272	120	31.82	0.00	0.43	4.76	0.43	94.37
2164	DILWORTH-GLYNDON-FELTON	96.47%	1,350	$6,800	130	31.26	2.96	0.52	9.04	0.96	86.52
403	IVANHOE	97.87%	201	$5,976	150	37.31	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	99.00
516	ROUND LAKE	93.10%	174	$5,354	150	32.18	0.00	0.57	1.15	1.15	97.13
	Averages: Quartile Three	**93.14%**	**791**	**$8,292**	**100**	**35.70%**	**1.60%**	**1.22%**	**4.12%**	**1.21%**	**91.84%**
	Averages: State	**93.44%**	**2,448**	**$8,265**	**100**	**31.76%**	**2.98%**	**1.68%**	**3.38%**	**1.85%**	**90.15%**

Source: Minnesota Department of Education. All data are from the 2003-2004 school year except for graduation data, which is for Spring 2003.
* Efficiency and Effectiveness Index ** Free/reduced price lunch

APPENDIX K

QUARTILE FOUR - EDUCATION EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

District Number	District Name	Graduation Rate	Number of Students	Per pupil total (no debt service)	EEI*	FRL**	% American Indian	% Asian	% Hispani	% Black	% White
38	RED LAKE	46.81%	1,474	$15,634	30	83.85	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1	MINNEAPOLIS	52.80%	42,925	$11,214	50	68.07	4.17	13.16	13.47	42.19	27.01
592	CLIMAX	81.82%	147	$16,525	50	54.42	2.04	0.00	14.97	0.68	82.31
115	CASS LAKE-BENA	65.22%	1,149	$11,829	60	66.49	80.59	0.35	0.09	0.26	18.71
497	LYLE	62.50%	273	$9,573	70	43.96	0.00	0.73	0.73	0.00	98.53
36	KELLIHER	89.29%	276	$13,090	70	84.06	30.43	0.00	0.00	1.45	68.12
801	BROWNS VALLEY	100.00%	159	$14,322	70	69.18	39.62	0.63	0.00	1.26	58.49
625	ST. PAUL	71.96%	41,933	$10,126	70	65.71	1.81	29.19	11.81	27.98	29.21
363	SOUTH KOOCHICHING	95.24%	381	$13,281	80	46.46	2.89	0.26	0.26	0.26	96.33
118	NORTHLAND CMTY SCHOOLS	86.54%	526	$12,029	80	55.13	16.92	0.00	0.19	1.33	81.56
2580	EAST CENTRAL	69.77%	958	$9,417	80	48.75	6.89	1.15	1.25	2.40	88.31
432	MAHNOMEN	83.58%	717	$11,217	80	66.95	62.76	0.28	0.84	0.14	35.98
4	MCGREGOR	79.41%	513	$10,438	80	64.33	15.59	0.58	0.19	0.39	83.24
435	WAUBUN	90.91%	604	$11,902	80	63.74	66.89	0.00	0.17	0.00	32.95
447	GRYGLA	100.00%	214	$12,808	80	50.93	1.87	0.93	0.00	0.00	97.20
473	ISLE	62.26%	578	$7,974	80	45.67	6.92	0.17	0.35	0.52	92.04
2358	TRI-COUNTY	100.00%	281	$12,580	80	53.74	0.00	0.00	0.71	1.42	97.86
264	HERMAN-NORCROSS	94.12%	123	$11,733	80	41.46	3.25	0.81	1.63	0.00	94.31
836	BUTTERFIELD	93.75%	195	$11,415	90	49.74	0.00	6.67	17.44	0.00	75.90
306	LAPORTE	86.21%	306	$10,432	90	51.31	18.30	0.65	2.29	0.00	78.76
561	GOODRIDGE	90.48%	167	$10,788	90	53.29	2.99	1.80	0.00	0.00	95.21
852	CAMPBELL-TINTAH	91.67%	148	$10,825	90	51.35	0.68	0.00	6.76	1.35	91.22
2142	ST. LOUIS COUNTY	92.86%	2,379	$10,440	90	41.61	10.59	0.42	0.25	0.55	88.19
480	ONAMIA	80.30%	832	$8,810	100	53.73	19.35	0.96	0.48	1.80	77.40
2898	WESTBROOK-WALNUT GROVE	86.49%	518	$9,473	100	45.37	0.00	20.66	0.77	1.16	77.41
362	LITTLEFORK-BIG FALLS	96.67%	360	$10,395	100	43.06	0.83	0.28	0.83	0.56	97.50
2683	GREENBUSH-MIDDLE RIVER	97.56%	457	$10,467	100	42.23	0.22	0.44	0.22	0.66	98.47
2	HILL CITY	100.00%	356	$10,579	100	51.40	1.97	0.00	1.12	0.00	96.91
286	BROOKLYN CENTER	84.96%	1,717	$8,976	100	60.57	1.40	18.70	7.11	34.71	38.09
84	SLEEPY EYE	86.76%	651	$9,161	100	43.32	0.00	1.08	29.03	0.00	69.89
309	PARK RAPIDS	82.52%	1,718	$8,521	100	41.56	6.64	0.58	1.51	0.64	90.63
2888	CLINTON-GRACEVILLE-BEARDSLEY	93.62%	496	$9,653	100	52.42	1.21	0.60	0.20	0.81	97.18
13	COLUMBIA HEIGHTS	89.36%	2,935	$9,212	100	46.10	3.30	7.02	10.09	17.82	61.77
319	NASHWAUK-KEEWATIN	95.35%	664	$9,790	100	46.69	5.72	0.00	0.45	1.51	92.32
31	BEMIDJI	80.83%	4,837	$8,196	100	44.01	16.15	0.89	0.95	1.24	80.77
316	GREENWAY	93.50%	1,263	$9,414	100	41.49	12.35	0.24	0.16	0.08	87.17
518	WORTHINGTON	80.45%	2,264	$8,026	110	46.29	0.31	10.51	28.05	2.12	59.01
441	MARSHALL COUNTY CENTRAL	96.15%	364	$9,555	110	50.00	1.10	0.00	0.55	1.10	97.25
577	WILLOW RIVER	86.84%	462	$8,627	110	46.75	0.22	0.43	0.43	0.65	98.27
486	SWANVILLE	85.00%	357	$8,364	110	45.10	0.00	0.28	0.00	0.00	99.72
627	OKLEE	97.22%	175	$9,551	110	49.71	3.43	1.14	0.00	0.00	95.43

District Number	District Name	Graduation Rate	Number of Students	Per pupil total (no debt service)	EEI*	FRL**	% American Indian	% Asian	% Hispani	% Black	% White
601	FOSSTON	94.34%	666	$9,191	110	41.89	6.01	0.45	0.30	0.75	92.49
347	WILLMAR	88.71%	4,244	$8,591	110	42.27	0.54	0.66	25.57	2.21	71.02
317	DEER RIVER	95.77%	1,014	$9,259	110	53.55	31.16	0.30	0.10	0.89	67.55
837	MADELIA	98.21%	627	$9,419	110	42.58	0.00	0.00	30.78	1.75	67.46
2174	PINE RIVER-BACKUS	91.74%	1,059	$8,665	110	48.91	1.42	0.85	0.76	1.23	95.75
2311	CLEARBROOK-GONVICK	94.12%	494	$8,878	110	49.19	10.12	1.62	0.81	0.81	86.64
712	MOUNTAIN IRON-BUHL	95.00%	659	$8,947	110	43.70	1.37	0.30	0.15	3.03	95.14
2170	STAPLES-MOTLEY	95.20%	1,471	$8,920	110	52.14	1.63	0.54	2.58	0.88	94.36
32	BLACKDUCK	90.00%	786	$8,351	110	49.24	9.67	0.00	1.40	1.53	87.40
356	LANCASTER	100.00%	207	$9,253	110	46.38	0.00	1.93	0.00	1.45	96.62
698	FLOODWOOD	97.56%	428	$9,018	110	43.93	1.64	0.00	1.17	1.40	95.79
840	ST. JAMES	89.91%	1,245	$8,275	110	41.85	0.32	0.72	31.08	1.77	66.10
676	BADGER	95.83%	220	$8,818	110	45.91	0.00	0.00	0.91	2.27	96.82
229	LANESBORO	96.55%	349	$8,882	110	43.55	0.00	0.00	0.86	0.57	98.57
2215	NORMAN COUNTY EAST	100.00%	394	$9,197	110	50.51	9.64	0.76	3.81	1.27	84.52
545	HENNING	97.56%	345	$8,882	120	42.32	2.32	2.32	0.00	0.58	94.78
2759	EAGLE VALLEY	93.75%	361	$8,531	120	53.19	0.00	0.28	0.83	0.55	98.34
850	ROTHSAY	100.00%	237	$9,025	120	45.15	2.11	0.00	6.33	1.69	89.87
173	MOUNTAIN LAKE	100.00%	506	$9,004	120	50.00	0.00	17.79	9.29	1.19	71.74
308	NEVIS	92.00%	549	$8,198	120	44.08	1.64	0.55	3.83	1.28	92.71
628	PLUMMER	92.00%	177	$8,137	120	60.45	5.08	0.56	0.56	0.56	93.22
2134	UNITED SOUTH CENTRAL	97.00%	974	$8,513	120	43.53	0.41	1.23	7.39	0.62	90.35
162	BAGLEY	94.74%	1,066	$8,264	120	52.53	23.64	0.56	1.03	0.19	74.58
891	CANBY	95.89%	629	$8,285	120	48.49	0.16	0.16	1.91	0.32	97.46
786	BERTHA-HEWITT	97.92%	475	$8,415	120	56.42	0.63	0.00	0.42	0.42	98.53
23	FRAZEE	93.68%	1,167	$7,968	120	42.67	7.11	0.69	0.60	0.69	90.92
116	PILLAGER	98.11%	750	$8,328	120	48.80	0.40	0.40	0.00	0.27	98.93
484	PIERZ	91.95%	977	$7,804	120	45.34	0.41	0.61	0.51	0.10	98.36
818	VERNDALE	90.00%	461	$7,583	120	57.48	1.74	0.87	1.74	1.08	94.58
404	LAKE BENTON	100.00%	201	$8,419	120	46.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.99	97.01
542	BATTLE LAKE	93.18%	527	$7,714	130	41.37	1.52	0.76	1.14	1.33	95.26
787	BROWERVILLE	98.08%	509	$8,107	130	45.78	0.00	0.20	2.95	0.00	96.86
2155	WADENA-DEER CREEK	95.37%	1,314	$7,779	130	44.37	0.61	0.15	0.46	1.29	97.49
2364	BELGRADE-BROOTEN-ELROSA	98.36%	814	$7,995	130	48.16	0.12	0.25	7.25	0.00	92.38
821	MENAHGA	96.23%	731	$7,739	130	56.77	1.23	0.00	0.68	0.55	97.54
2884	RED ROCK CENTRAL	100.00%	513	$8,026	130	46.39	0.39	0.39	1.17	0.39	97.66
333	OGILVIE	96.08%	687	$7,689	130	41.92	0.44	0.44	0.00	0.58	98.54
2165	HINCKLEY-FINLAYSON	91.86%	1,098	$7,343	130	43.72	8.38	1.09	2.28	2.19	86.07
820	SEBEKA	96.36%	574	$7,630	130	58.36	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.70	99.13
2753	LONG PRAIRIE-GREY EAGLE	100.00%	1,359	$7,448	140	43.86	0.22	0.59	16.26	0.66	82.27
553	NEW YORK MILLS	96.77%	742	$7,097	140	43.94	1.48	0.00	0.81	0.00	97.71
	Averages: Quartile Four	**90.50%**	**884**	**$9,512**	**100**	**50.21**	**8.33%**	**1.95%**	**3.94%**	**2.31%**	**83.48%**
	Averages: State	93.44%	2,448	$8,265	100	31.76	2.98%	1.68%	3.38%	1.80%	90.15%

Source: Minnesota Department of Education. All data are from the 2003-2004 school year except for graduation data, which is for Spring 2003.
* Efficiency and Effectiveness Index ** Free/reduced price lunch

Endnotes

[1] Richter, Sam. (March 16, 2004). *Hopkins School District Administrative Cost Evaluation*. PowerPoint presentation.*
[2] For example, see Boyd, Cynthia. (January 22, 2005). "Strapped schools find ways to cut costs." *St. Paul Pioneer Press.*
[3] Carey, Kevin. (2004). *The Funding Gap 2004: Many States Still Shortchange Low-income and minority Students*. The Education Trust, Washington, D.C.,
[4] Ibid., page 4.
[5] *Public Education and Black Male Students: A State Report Card.* (October 2004). The Schott Foundation for Public Education, Cambridge, MA, Table 3, pages 10-11. As of January 28, 2005, the October 2004 version of the Schott report was posted online; however, an update with new data is expected soon. The data cited in this present report are the updated data that will appear in subsequent editions of the Schott report. The analysis in the Schott report was conducted by independent consultant Michael Holzman. All demographic data include only non-Hispanic students. Diploma information is from 2001-2002 and enrollment numbers are from 2002-2003. Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Kentucky do not report to NCES. This means that Philadelphia and Memphis are missing from the analysis. Available online at: http://www.schottfoundation.org/publications/Public_Education_and_Black_Male_Students.pdf.
[6] Oswald, Lori Jo. (1995). *Priority on Learning: Efficient use of Resources*. ERIC Digest, number 100, ERIC identifier ED 384 951.
[7] Hanushek, Eric A. (March-April 1995). "Money and education: Making America's schools work," *Current*, page 10.
[8] Rainey, Daniel & Murova, Olga. (Fall 2003). "Arkansas public school districts efficiency estimation: Is restructuring necessary? *Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, volume 3, number 2.
[9] Swanson, Austin. (1995). *School District Effects and Efficiency*. ERIC identifier ED 391 249.
[10] Funk, Patricia & Bailey, John. (1999). *Small Schools, Big Results: Nebraska High School Completion and Postsecondary Enrollment Rates by Size of School District*. ERIC identifier ED 441 633.
[11] Beckman, Susan. (1998). *1998 Connecticut Public Schools Guide*. Connecticut Policy and Economic Council, Hartford, CT. See also Clowes, George. (September 1, 1998). "New measure calculates cost per prepared student." *Education Reform News*, The Heartland Institute, Chicago, IL.
[12] See Gillmore, Gerald & Hoffman, Phillip. (December 1997). "The graduation efficiency index: Validity and use as an accountability and research measure." *Research in Higher Education*, volume 38, number 6, pages 677-698; and Poch, Susan. (January 1998). "Confusing time-to-degree and the graduation efficiency index: What are the issues?" ERIC identifier ED 435 303.
[13] Cherik, Moula, Eyob, Ephrem & Ikem, Fidelis. (2004). "Efficiency analysis and standardization of input output measures: The case of public institutions of higher education in Virginia*." International Journal of Services and Standards (IJSS)*, volume 1, number 2.
[14] Martinez, Mario. (2001). *Supplementary Analysis for Measuring Up 2000: An Exploratory Report*. National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, San Jose, CA. Available online at http://www.highereducation.org/reports/martinez/martinez.shtml.
[15] Minter, John. (September 2003). "Hang onto the railing: Climbing the uncertain budgetary stairs." *The Higher Education Digest*, issue 2. Available online at http://www.internetviz-newsletters.com/datatel/e_article000173780.cfm?x=[[IMN.LID]],[[IMN.USER_ID].
[16] *2003 NCLB Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) System Requirements/Business Rules*. (July 2003). Minnesota Department of Education, page 24. Available online at http://education.state.mn.us/content/065953.pdf.
[17] Brandt, Steve. "Peebles' strong ways chafe some; No one's neutral on superintendent." *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, January 5, 2005.
[18] Email correspondence with the author, February 3, 2005.
[19] Boyd, Cynthia. (January 22, 2005). "Strapped schools find ways to cut costs." *St. Paul Pioneer Press*.
[20] Richter, Sam. (March 16, 2004). *Hopkins School District Administrative Cost Evaluation*. PowerPoint presentation*

*Note: Sam Richter was not a paid consultant to the Hopkins School District. In correspondence dated February 23, 2005 he stated: "I will stand by my opinions presented in my presentation about Hopkins and the state of MN and that is consolidation of back end office and reporting systems will save the district and state a lot of money. But I do think any reference to my presentation should also be followed with a statement that A) the data used in the presentation was more than three years old, and B) since 2002, the Hopkins School District has done a lot to improve."

1024 Plymouth Building
12 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

612-338-3605 • Fax 612-338-3621
www.amexp.org