A PROCEDURE FOR CALCULATING A BASE COST FIGURE AND AN ADJUSTMENT FOR AT-RISK PUPILS THAT COULD BE USED IN THE ILLINOIS SCHOOL FINANCE SYSTEM

Prepared for

THE EDUCATION FUNDING ADVISORY BOARD

Prepared by

Augenblick & Myers, Inc.
Denver, CO

June 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Introduction 1

II. Alternative Ways to Identify Successful School Districts in Illinois 5

Criteria Used in Creating Alternatives 5

A Guide to the Tables 8

III. Calculating a Basic Expenditure Figure for School Districts 11

Developing A Basic Expenditure Figure for All School Districts 11

Geographic Cost Differences 13

Alternative Base Cost Figures 13

IV. Making Adjustments to the Base Cost Figure in Consideration of Presence of At-Risk Pupils 17

The Current Approach Used in Illinois 17

How Other States Provide Aid for At-Risk Pupils 18

The Cost and Success of Programs for At-Risk Pupils 19

Analysis of Alternative Ways to Count At-Risk Pupils and The Cost of At-Risk Programs 21

Tables

Table 1 1999-2000 Characteristics of School Districts in Illinois by Type of Districts

Table 2A Background Information Concerning Statewide Achievement Tests Used in Both 1999 and 2000 for Unit Districts in Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Table 2B Background Information Concerning Statewide Achievement Tests Used in Both 1999 and 2000 for Elementary Districts in Illinois

Table 3A Alternative Approaches to Identify Successful Unit and Elementary School Districts in Illinois Based on Statewide Achievement Test Results in 1999 and 2000 (Absolute Approaches)

Table 3B Alternative Approaches to Identify Successful Unit and Elementary School Districts in Illinois Based on Statewide Achievement Test Results in 1999 and 2000 (B-1 with Efficiency Criteria)

Table 4A Alternative Approaches to Identify Successful Unit and Elementary School Districts in Illinois Based on Statewide Achievement Test Results in 1999 and 2000 (Change Over Time Approaches)

Table 4B Alternative Approaches to Identify Successful Unit and Elementary School Districts in Illinois Based on Statewide Achievement Test Results in 1999 and 2000 (C-1 with Efficiency Criteria)

Table 5A Alternative Approaches to Identify Successful High School Districts in Illinois Based on Statewide Achievement Test Results in 1999 and 2000 (Absolute Approaches)

Table 5B Alternative Approaches to Identify High School Districts in Illinois Based on Statewide Achievement Test Results in 1999 and 2000 (Change Over Time Approaches)

Table 6 Comparison of the Actual Tuition Charge to the Fox River Learning Number

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Table 7 Alternative Base Cost Figures for Illinois Unit School Districts Based on Alternative Approaches to Selecting Successful Districts and Alternative Ways of Calculating a Base Cost Level

Table 8 Alternative Base Cost Figures for Illinois Elementary School Districts Based on Alternative Approaches to Selecting Successful Districts and Alternative Ways of Calculating a Base Cost Level

Table 9 Alternative Base Cost Figures for Illinois High School Districts Based on Alternative Approaches to Selecting Successful Districts and Alternative Ways of Calculating a Base Cost Level

Table 10A Comparison of Base Cost Figures (Using 80 Percent of Tuition Charge as a Base Cost) Associated With Different Decisions to Identify School Districts of Interest for Unit Districts in Illinois

Table 10B Comparison of Base Cost Figures (Using 80 Percent of Tuition Charge as a Base Cost) Associated With Different Decisions to Identify School Districts of Interest for Elementary Districts in Illinois

Table 10C Comparison of Base Cost Figures (Using 80 Percent of Tuition Charge as a Base Cost) Associated With Different Decisions to Identify School Districts of Interest for High School Districts in Illinois

Table 11-A At-Risk Student Funding Systems in Selected States (State Foundation Formulas)

Table 11-B At-Risk Student Funding Systems in Selected States (State Categorical Aid)

Table 11-C State Spending for At-Risk Categorical Aid

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Table 12A Alternative Level of Student/District Performance and Student Need Indicators for Quintiles of Unit School Districts in Illinois, Excluding Chicago, Based on the Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard on ISAT in 1999-2000

Table 12B Correlations Between Pairs of Alternative Indicators of Student/District Performance, Between Pairs of Alternative Indicators of Student Need, and Between Indicators of Performance and Need For All Unit Districts in Illinois Except Chicago in 1999-2000

Table 13A Alternative Level of Student/District Performance and Student Need Indicators for Quintiles of Elementary School Districts in Illinois Based on the Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard on ISAT in 1999-2000

Table 13B Correlations Between Pairs of Alternative Indicators of Student/District Performance, Between Pairs of Alternative Indicators of Student Need, and Between Indicators of Performance and Need For All Elementary School Districts in Illinois in 1999-2000

Table 14A Alternative Level of Student/District Performance and Student Need Indicators for Quintiles of High School Districts in Illinois Based on the Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard on ISAT in 1999-2000

Table 14B Correlations Between Pairs of Alternative Indicators of Student/District Performance, Between Pairs of Alternative Indicators of Student Need, and Between Indicators of Performance and Need For All High School Districts in Illinois in 1999-2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Appendix A	Regression Information
Appendix B-1	List of Unit Districts by Alternative Approaches to Success (Without Efficiency)
Appendix B-2	List of Unit Districts by Alternative Approaches to Success (With Efficiency)
Appendix B-3	List of Elementary Districts by Alternative Approaches to Success (Without Efficiency)
Appendix B-4	List of Elementary Districts by Alternative Approaches to Success (With Efficiency)
Appendix B-5	List of High School Districts by Alternative Approaches to Success (Without Efficiency)
Appendix B-6	List of High School Districts by Alternative Approaches to Success (With Efficiency)
Appendix C	Ranking of States Based on Number of School Districts, Enrollment, the Presence of At Least One Very Large District, and Title 1 Students as A Proportion of Enrollment
Appendix D	Fox River Learning Report to A&M

I. INTRODUCTION

This report was prepared by Augenblick & Myers, Inc. (A&M) for the Illinois Education Funding Advisory Board (EFAB) under contract with the Illinois Department of Revenue. The report describes the work A&M undertook to estimate a base cost, or foundation, level for use in the state aid formula and to examine how the base cost might be adjusted to reflect the added costs associated with serving students at risk of failure in school.

Illinois uses a foundation formula for the purpose of distributing a large portion of state aid to school districts. The foundation approach is used in many states to assure that all school districts have access to a specified level of resources. In addition, foundation formulas ensure that the state-local shares of those resources is sensitive to the variation in wealth that typically exists across the school districts of a state. A foundation formula is "driven" by a foundation level, a constant that applies to all districts. In 2000-2001, the foundation level was $4,425 in Illinois, an amount that fulfilled a legislative assurance. However, that amount is likely to be far less than the average level of per pupil spending based on the experience of prior years. In some sense it is difficult to say what the foundation level actually "means" -- it is a number that is set so that, given the formula, the state allocates as much total support as the state legislature provides. To ensure that an adequate level of support is provided, the foundation level must be set at an appropriate level. The appropriateness of the foundation level can be measured in terms of either the amount of services that can be delivered to students or the level of performance students are able to achieve.

Once a foundation level has been determined, states often adjust the level in each district so that the target revenue level is sensitive to cost pressures that are beyond the control of districts and that tend to vary across jurisdictions. Our work in Illinois was focused on the added cost pressures related to the presence of at-risk students, which requires that such students be identified, at least for funding purposes, and that an amount of funding be specified for them. States vary in the way they approach this issue. Some states provide no identifiable funding for at-risk pupils while some use pupil "weights" (that is they count pupils at a level designed to reflect the cost of serving them) and others use "categorical" programs to provide state support for particular programs and services. Such state aid may or may not be wealth equalized.

Illinois, like many other states, is implementing a "standards-based" approach as part of the effort it is making to improve student performance. In simple terms, the standards-based approach requires a state to do three things: (1) specify its expectations for student performance; (2) develop procedures to measure how well students are meeting those expectations; and (3) hold providers of education services (school districts, schools, teachers, and so on) accountable for student performance. The logic of the

approach also implies that the state will assure that sufficient resources are available in all school districts, if not in all schools, so that they can reasonably be expected to meet state standards. In effect, this means that the foundation level should reflect the per pupil spending a district needs to make so that students without special needs can meet state performance expectations.

While many states are pursuing the standards-based approach, most states, including those that use foundation formulas, have not made a concerted effort to assure that the amount of revenue available in school districts is related to the cost of meeting state standards. Although some states have created systems of ?rewards? and/or ?sanctions? in recognition of student performance, most states have failed to specify how their expectations for student performance might be related to the basic resource needs of school districts. In fact, it is not unusual among the states that little or no relationship exists between expected levels of performance and the availability of state aid; conversely, the level of state aid often reflects the availability of money, associated with the effort required to obtain it, not the resource needs of pupils, schools, or school districts.

A few states (Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Wyoming), however, are attempting to estimate the expenditures school districts need to make in order to fulfill state objectives. Some of these states have been required to review their funding systems as part of school finance litigation while others are doing so as a result of gubernatorial, legislative, or state board of education interest. These states are using calculation procedures based on one of two data-based approaches that have evolved over the past few years: (1) the “professional judgment” model or (2) the “successful school district” model. These two approaches are among the four approaches that academicians and policymakers have been examining in recent years (the other two approaches include one based on the cost of whole-school reform models and one based on statistical analysis of school district performance and expenditure data – neither one of which has actually been used by a state).

The professional judgement approach is a modern version of what used to be called a “resource cost model” approach (or “market-basket” approach) that asked educators to specify the resource needs of quality schools. Today, the approach asks educators to identify the resources they feel need to be in place in prototype schools in order for students to achieve a specific set of objectives. Once resources have been specified, prices are determined for the resources which, when applied to the resources, produces a hypothetical cost. Costs for elementary, middle, and high schools can be combined with district level costs (those expenditures that are in addition to school site expenditures, such as district administration, or those expenditures that cannot be disaggregated to school sites, such as plant maintenance and operation) to produce an overall cost per student. When undertaken carefully, the approach can be used to distinguish costs of special, high cost programs from basic services, allowing the user to determine a base cost, or foundation, level as well as adjustments to the base.

The successful school (district) approach relies on a different logic than the professional judgement approach, seeking to infer a base cost figure from the actual spending of school districts, or schools, determined to be successful because they meet whatever standards are used by a state to evaluate student and school performance. Using this approach, a set of school districts (or schools) are selected from among all school districts (or schools) that meet a variety of criteria related to: (1) their level of success in meeting state standards; (2) socio-economic characteristics such as district wealth or proportion of pupils from low income families; and (3) their efficiency in terms of spending. Once districts have been selected, their basic spending (excluding spending for capital purposes, transportation, special education, other special programs, and any service funded by federal revenue) is examined to determine a base cost level.

A&M used the successful schools approach to determine a base cost figure. Our understanding was that EFAB was particularly interested in that approach because its philosophical basis is consistent with the perspective of many state policy makers. Too, the state has attempted to use the approach in work undertaken several years ago, which examined the spending of a few school districts considered to be successful.[1] We also understood that EFAB was interested in examining alternative approaches that could be used to implement the successful school district approach in order to understand the kinds of decisions that can be made in using the approach as well as the implications of making different decisions. Ultimately, the purpose of our work was to create set of procedures that could be replicated once those decisions had been made.

In order to use this approach, we had to gather data for each of the elementary, high school, and unit districts in the state. We worked with the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) staff to create the databases that would be used to identify successful school districts. These databases included a variety of information for each district, including wealth and tax rates, enrollment and demographic information, and personnel information such as the average years of experience of teachers, the teachers per 1,000 pupils and the average salaries of teachers. A&M also collected a number of indicators that could be used as proxies for identifying at-risk students. Testing data included tests for a number of grades, in a number of subject areas, for a number of years. We were particularly interested in the tuition charge calculated for districts since that figure purported to be the base cost level that is required in using the successful school district approach.

The figures in Table 1 describe some statewide information for unit, elementary, and high school districts. In the rows labeled (1), the number of school districts and the enrollment of those districts is shown. We were only able to analyze information for the districts for which complete data were available, which included almost all unit and

---

[1] See “Report of the Governor’s Commission on Education Funding for the State of Illinois,” Dr. Stanley O. Ikenberry, Chairman, March 1996.

elementary districts but excluded a significant number of high school districts (we were only able to examine 78 percent of the high school districts, which enrolled 72 percent of the students in those districts). The figures in Table 1 also show that unit districts have a higher proportion of pupils from low income families than elementary or high school districts. Chicago has a much higher proportion of pupils from low income families than other unit districts.

Table 1 also displays performance data. Clearly unit districts perform at lower levels than elementary districts in all categories (while Chicago is much lower than the average of other unit districts). The figures for individual tests [rows (3a) through (3r)] suggest that performance varies widely across tests and that it would be possible for districts to attain a high performance level on average while performing well below that level on several individual tests. Too, the figures suggest that differences in the proportions of pupils in special education programs across types of districts are relatively small. Finally, the table shows the per pupil current operating expenditures and the tuition charge level of school districts by type of district. Clearly, different types of districts spend at different levels and the ratio of the tuition charge to operating expenditures varies. While Chicago spends much more than the average of other unit districts, its tuition charge is remarkably similar to the average of other unit districts. Elementary and high school districts spend at higher levels than unit districts and the tuition charge, on average, represents a higher proportion of operating expenditures.

Two other groups worked with A&M on this project. The Education Commission of the States (ECS) provided assistance in determining an adjustment for at-risk students. ECS helped to identify how a set of states identified as being similar to Illinois are approaching the issue of providing support for at-risk pupils. Fox River Learning, Inc. (FRL) provided assistance in examining the validity of the tuition charge figure. We asked FRL to obtain data from a number of school districts and to evaluate whether the tuition charge truly reflected school district spending for pupils without special needs.

The remainder of the report is organized as follows: Section II describes alternative ways to identify successful school districts in Illinois; Section III examines the base cost figures associated with the alternative definitions of success, including a discussion of how to calculate basic expenditure figures for every district; and Section IV describes ways to adjust the base cost figure to reflect the costs associated with at-risk pupils.

II. ALTERNATIVE WAYS TO IDENTIFY SUCCESSFUL SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN ILLINOIS

Criteria Used in Creating Alternatives

As described in the introduction, the successful school district approach is one of several procedures that might be used to calculate a base cost figure for use in a foundation formula. The fundamental premise of the approach is that it is possible to determine an adequate base cost level by examining the basic spending of successful school districts. Therefore, the first step in implementing the approach is to identify successful school districts. Our experience with the approach suggests that there are a variety of decisions that policy makers need to make in order to identify a set of districts as being successful and that making different decisions can produce a different set of districts, which can result in a different base cost figure.

The kinds of decisions that need to be made about success include the following:

1. Will statewide test scores be used alone or will other information be used to classify districts as being successful?

2. Will only one year of test scores be used or will more than one year be used?

3. Will other criteria, particularly ones related to the demographic characteristics, be used to "screen" districts?

4. Will only a minimum standard of success be used or will a maximum standard also be used?

5. In using multiple statewide tests, will the average score across all tests be used to meet the standard, will the standard need to be met on every test individually, or will some kind of minimum standard be used for individual tests?

6. Will an absolute criteria be used as the standard or will some other criteria, such as a relative standard or a "change over time" standard be used?

7. Will the spending efficiency of districts be taken into consideration or not?

Since the numbers of combinations that can be created in answering these questions become so numerous as to be unmanageable, A&M made several decisions in order to limit the number of alternatives to be investigated. First, we decided to focus on statewide

test scores only and to exclude other factors, such as attendance rates or drop-out rates, which the state currently uses in evaluating school districts; this decision was made in part based on work we had done for the Metropolitan Planning Council in fall 2000, which indicated that the use of non-test scores had little or no impact on the calculation of base cost figures.[2] The tests we used for unit and elementary districts were the 1999 and 2000 Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) for reading, writing, and math tests for third, fifth, and eighth grades.

Second, we chose to use either one year or two years of test scores, emphasizing a single year since the state uses an absolute standard of success; for some alternatives we used that absolute standard for both years while for some alternatives we used progress toward an absolute standard over time as the standard. This alternative is most easily described using a hypothetical example. Using change over time as the criteria, we assumed that 83 percent of all pupils should meet ISAT expectations in 2004 (five years beyond 1999, the first year of test data we used). Therefore, we expected districts to show progress between 1999 and 2000 in meeting the 2004 expectation; in fact, we expected districts to make 20 percent of the progress needed to move them from wherever they were in 1999 to the goal of 83 percent in 2004. For example, if 58 percent of the pupils in a district met ISAT standards in 1999, the district would be expected to rise 20 percent of the difference between 83 percent (the 2004 goal) and 58 percent (the level achieved in 1999) -- five percentage points — in order to be considered to be successful in 2000. This means that if 64 percent of the pupils in the district met the ISAT standard in 2000, it would be successful using the change standard even though it was not successful in meeting the absolute standard (67 percent).

Third, we paid a lot of attention to the proportion of at-risk pupils (based on the proportion of pupils eligible for free/reduced price meals) in selecting successful school districts; this reflected the fact that a significant part of the study dealt with that issue. In order to do this, we looked at all districts, those districts within one half of a standard deviation of the mean percent of at-risk pupils for each district type, those districts above one half standard deviation below the mean, and those districts above one half standard deviation above the mean. This approach allowed us to determine whether base costs are related to the proportion of at-risk pupils

Fourth, most of the alternatives we studied are based on using a minimum standard of success — that 67 percent of pupils meet the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) expectations for success; however, some alternatives are based on using a maximum level of success (83 percent of pupils meet the ISAT standard), which results in

---

[2] See “Report to the Metropolitan Planning Council Concerning the Cost of an Adequate Education In Illinois and an Adjustment to That Cost for Pupils from Low Income Families,” December 2000.

the selection of districts in which 67-83 percent of pupils meet the standard and excludes districts where more than 83 percent of pupils meet the standard.

Fifth, while most alternatives were based on the average proportion of pupils meeting the ISAT standard across all tests, we looked at a few alternatives in which we set a minimum level of performance on each test individually (at least 50 percent of the pupils had to meet ISAT standards on each test) but still required the overall average proportion of pupils meeting or exceeding ISAT standards to be 67 percent.

Finally, we developed a spending efficiency criteria for all alternatives so that results with and without such a criteria could be examined. In order to create the efficiency criteria, we undertook an analysis of per pupil operating spending using multiple regression. The purpose of the statistical analysis was to create a predicted level of spending for each school district based on their unique characteristics, including their enrollment, 1998 operating tax rate, property wealth per pupil, percent of students in special education, percent of students eligible for free or reduced price lunches, teachers per 1,000 pupils, and average salary of teachers. A separate regression was undertaken for unit districts, elementary districts, and high school districts. Based on the regression results, districts were considered to be efficient if their spending was less than the level predicted for them. Therefore, inefficient districts, those with spending above the level predicted for them, were excluded when we applied the efficiency criteria. Regression information is shown in Appendix A.

In addition, we established one other criteria that we used in evaluating the performance of school districts. We felt that districts needed to have a minimum level of participation on their tests to make their scores comparable to other districts and to allow us to feel that they had truly been successful. After examining the data, as shown in Tables 2-A (unit districts) and 2-B (elementary districts), we came to the conclusion that it was reasonable to expect a participation rate of 80 percent. As can be seen in the tables, this means that of the 405 unit districts for which we had the full set of data, 373 districts had at least 80 percent participation on all tests for 2000. This number drops to 351 districts when an 80 percent participation rate on all tests is required for both 1999 and 2000. If the participation rate were raised to 85 percent, only 289 of the 405 unit districts could have been used in selecting successful districts. The lowest participation rate for any particular test for any district was 43 percent. The number of districts that did not have a participation rate of at least 80 percent ranged from 15 districts for the 2000 writing test to only four districts for both fifth grade reading in 1999 and fifth grade mathematics in 2000. The high school districts did not have the individual test information that we used for unit and elementary districts. This is because the tests are given in grades that the high school districts do not serve. Since we did not have the test information we were not able see if the districts met our participation standards that we set for the unit and elementary districts. Instead we simply looked at success based on the districts composite ISAT scores for 1998-1999 and 1999-2000.

A Guide to the Tables

The tables included in the report are designed to show information about groups of districts selected on the basis of using the criteria described above. Tables 3-A and 3-B look at unit districts while Tables 4-A and 4-B examine elementary districts and Tables 5-A and 5-B show information for high school districts. Within the "A" tables, four sets of alternatives are presented, all of which use an absolute standard for evaluating ISAT results (for these tables, success is defined as having at least 67 percent of all pupils meeting ISAT standards); the "B" tables present one set of alternatives based on change in ISAT results between 1999 and 2000 (for these alternatives, success is defined as showing at least 20 percent of the improvement needed to move from the actual level of performance in 1999 to 83 percent of pupils meeting ISAT standards).

Within the "A" tables, the first set of four alternatives (1A, 1B, 1C, and 1D) all are based on both 1999 and 2000 ISAT results; all other sets of alternatives are based on ISAT results for 2000 only. Within each set of four alternatives, the "A" alternative includes all districts, the "B" alternative includes only those in which the percentage of pupils eligible for free/reduced price meals is within one half of a standard deviation of the statewide average, the "C" alternative includes districts in which the proportion of at-risk pupils is greater than one half of a standard deviation less than the statewide average, and the "D" alternative includes districts in which the proportion of at-risk pupils is greater than one half of a standard deviation more than the statewide average.

This means that we explore 20 alternatives for unit districts, 20 alternatives for elementary districts, and 16 alternatives for high school districts (because data are not available, we could not look at alternatives in which a minimum proportion of pupils must meet ISAT standards). The base cost figures for these options are summarized in Tables 10-A, 10-B, and 10-C. The table below summarizes the alternatives we examined in terms of the characteristics of each alternative as described above.

Alter-native	Test Years	Percent At-Risk	Percent that Meet Standard	Minimum % Meet Standard	Based on Change '99 to '00
1A	'99 + '00	Not Used	\$67%	Not Used	Not Used
1B	'99 + '00	16.5-34.8%	\$67%	Not Used	Not Used
1C	'99 + '00	\$16.5%	\$67%	Not Used	Not Used
1D	'99 + '00	\$34.8%	\$67%	Not Used	Not Used
2A	'00 Only	Not Used	\$67%	Not Used	Not Used
2B	'00 Only	16.5-34.8%	\$67%	Not Used	Not Used
2C	'00 Only	\$16.5%	\$67%	Not Used	Not Used
2D	'00 Only	\$34.8%	\$67%	Not Used	Not Used

Alter-native	Test Years	Percent At-Risk	Percent that Meet Standard	Minimum % Meet Standard	Based on Change '99 to '00
3A	'00 Only	Not Used	67%-83%	Not Used	Not Used
3B	'00 Only	16.5-34.8%	67%-83%	Not Used	Not Used
3C	'00 Only	$16.5%	67%-83%	Not Used	Not Used
3D	'00 Only	$34.8%	67%-83%	Not Used	Not Used
4A	'00 Only	Not Used	$67%	$50%	Not Used
4B	'00 Only	16.5-34.8%	$67%	$50%	Not Used
4C	'00 Only	$16.5%	$67%	$50%	Not Used
4D	'00 Only	$34.8%	$67%	$50%	Not Used
5A	'99 + '00	Not Used	N/A	Not Used	Yes
5B	'99 + '00	16.5-34.8%	N/A	Not Used	Yes
5C	'99 + '00	$16.5%	N/A	Not Used	Yes
5D	'99 + '00	$34.8%	N/A	Not Used	Yes

As an example, looking at Table 3-A, there are 149 unit districts in which at least 67 percent of all pupils met ISAT standards in both 1999 and 2000 [group (1A)]; those districts enrolled 323,870 pupils and 11.4 percent of those pupils were eligible for free/reduced price meals in 1999-2000. Of those 149 districts, 88 districts also met the spending efficiency criteria (actual spending was less than the level we predicted for them); those districts enrolled 185,806 pupils, 12.8 percent of which were from low income families. Too, of the 149 districts, only 51 districts had between 16.5 percent and 34.8 percent of their pupils eligible for free/reduced price meals (that is, within plus or minus one half of a standard deviation of the statewide average) -- group (1B). Those districts enrolled 76,298 pupils and, on average, 22.2 percent of their pupils were from low income families. Of those districts, 36 districts were considered to be efficient. However, there are 58 districts in which the proportion of at-risk pupils exceeds 16.5 percent [group (1C)]; those districts enroll 90,133 pupils and have an average of 25.7 percent of pupils from low income families. Of those districts, 41 districts had spending lower than we predicted. There are only seven districts in which the proportion of at-risk pupils exceeds 34.8 percent [group (1D)] and they only enroll 13,835 pupils and have an average of 45.2 percent of pupils from low income families. Five of those seven districts were efficient. Those five districts might be considered to be very successful given that they have both a very high proportion of pupils from low income families and per pupil spending lower than predicted levels.

Table 3-B also looks at unit districts but uses the change over time standard to define success. The table shows that 187 unit districts [group (5A)] met the change criteria (which, as expected, is higher than the 149 districts that met the absolute standard). In those 187 districts, 15.5 percent of the pupils were from low income families (a higher

proportion than the 11.4 percent of at-risk pupils in the 149 districts that met the absolute standard, which is also expected). Of the 187 districts in group (5A), 111 districts are considered to be efficient [about the same proportion of all districts in the group as was true looking at group (1A) based on the absolute standard of success].

The lists in Appendices B-1 through B-6 identify the districts that meet the various criteria used to group districts for analysis. Appendices B-1 and B-2 are for unit districts while Appendices B-3 and B-4 are for elementary districts and Appendices B-5 and B-6 are for high school districts. Odd numbered appendices do not use the efficiency criteria while even numbered appendices apply that criteria. Within each appendix, there are five major groups corresponding to the groups used in the tables described in this section. Within each group, there are four subgroups (A, B, C, and D) that are related to the criteria concerning the proportions of at-risk pupils included in the group.

III. CALCULATING A BASIC EXPENDITURE FIGURE FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Developing A Basic Expenditure Figure for All School Districts

Having identified successful school districts, it then becomes possible to calculate a base cost figure, which is the weighted average basic expenditure of the districts considered to be successful.[3] In order to make this calculation, it is necessary to have a "basic expenditure" figure for each district, which excludes capital spending, transportation spending, food services, adult education, community service, and spending associated with programs for pupils with special needs (such as special education) -- this is done under the assumption that the state aid system will deal with the costs of capital, transportation, special needs, and other programs separate from, or in addition to, the foundation program.

The question of how to obtain a basic spending figure for each district in Illinois was fundamental issue of our work. Based on our work for the Metropolitan Planning Council (MPC), to which we made reference above, we were familiar with the fact that Illinois calculates a figure, the "tuition charge," for each district that is similar in concept to the basic expenditure figure we needed for our work. We had used the tuition charge in our work for the MPC because we had neither the time nor the resources to develop a new figure on our own. However, we felt uncomfortable with the tuition charge figure because it seemed to be higher than what we expected based on our work in other states. In order to address the issue in this work, we specifically built into our proposal some resources devoted to analyzing the tuition charge in order to evaluate its validity. This component of our work was undertaken by Fox River Learning, Inc. (FRL), a company whose staff had worked with the spending figures of Illinois school districts in work undertaken for the 1995-96 Governor's Commission on Education Funding.

FRL uses a product that it developed, In$ites, that allows it to evaluate a district's general ledger to create a base cost figure. For this work FRL took the tuition charge and matched it to the In$ites program to use on the general ledgers of a group of selected districts. A&M worked with staff at the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) and with FRL to identify a group of 12 successful districts that would represent school districts with different characteristics throughout the state. Assuming their willingness to provide their

---

[3] For the purposes of this analysis, the weighted average of all districts is used to calculate a base cost figure. However, our experience suggests that other approaches could be used based either on using other statistical indicators of central tendency (such as the unweighted average or the median) or on other approaches than the one we used to deal with the issue of efficiency, such as calculating an average for some group of low spending districts among the whole group.

general ledgers in electronic form to FRL, we hoped it would be possible for FRL to examine how the tuition charge was calculated and verify that it accurately excluded the spending for all appropriate purposes. Among the 12 districts were two elementary school districts, two high school districts, and eight unit districts. The elementary and high school districts were chosen based on being successful and their geographic location in the state. The eight unit districts were selected based on success as well as their wealth, their enrollment, their percentage of low income pupils, and their location. Once FRL completed its work, we would determine whether the tuition charge accurately reflected the basic expenditure figure we needed; if FRL indicated that the tuition charge did not reflect a basic expenditure figure, whether too high or too low, we would adjust the actual tuition charge of all districts with similar characteristics to the sample districts to the extent suggested by FRL's work.

Once we had selected the twelve districts to be examined, they were contacted by ISBE staff and FRL staff. FRL staff told the districts what would be expected of them. This included the amount of time that would be expected of them and what materials they would need to supply electronically. Two districts said they would not be able meet the needs of FRL and they were replaced with districts with similar characteristics. In working with the twelve districts problems arose in meeting the time line of the project and, ultimately, with the ability to compile the data. In the end, FRL was only able to acquire the needed data from six of the districts. Of these six districts, four were unit districts, one was an elementary district, and one was a high school district.

In the end, based on the analysis of the six districts, we concluded that the tuition charge does not accurately reflect the basic expenditure figure we needed. From what we can tell, there is a straightforward explanation for this result: the tuition charge is based on eliminating revenues for specific purposes, which are inconsistent with expenditures for the same purposes. For example, the state lowers actual spending by subtracting federal and state revenue for special education -- but districts may actually spend more for special education than the amounts associated with those revenues. An accurate basic expenditure figure needs to be based on the removal of all spending for special education from total expenditures. FRL's basic expenditure figures are compared to tuition charge figures in Table 6. The comparison suggests that the tuition charge is typically higher than the real basic expenditure and that the tuition charge would have top be reduced by 10 to 20 percent in order to reflect actual expenditures. Since we were only able to obtain figures for half of the districts we hoped to analyze, we did not feel comfortable assuming that the six districts reflected a whole group of school districts -- at least not to the extent that we could adjust the tuition figures for those districts to precisely the same extent that FRL's figures suggested. Therefore, for the purpose of presentation, we show the weighted average tuition level of districts based on alternative ways of grouping them as discussed in Section II as well as figures that are 90 percent and 80 percent of those figures. Obviously, if the state moves ahead in using the approach we describe in this report to organize information for the purpose of calculating a base cost figure for use in the foundation program, additional work will need to be done either to modify the way the tuition charge is calculated or to develop a separate procedure to calculate a basic

expenditure figure for each school district, which should be based on the spending of districts in most cases (the possible exception being the removal of federal revenue that can be used for regular programs).

Geographic Cost Differences

We also felt that it made sense to adjust raw spending figures of school districts by some factor to take into consideration the variation that likely exists across the state in the cost of providing education services. This is an extremely complex area of analysis that only a few states currently take into consideration -- given that none of those states approach the issue in the same way, no approach that is actually in use can be applied easily to Illinois. The problem is that what is needed is a measure of differences in "prices" of goods and services that are beyond the control of school districts (that is, for example, a state needs to be able to control for factors that affect the willingness of teachers to work in different communities, not simply the fact that some communities pay teachers at higher levels).[4]

For the purposes of our work, we decided to use the Geographic Cost of Education Index (GCEI) developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). This index builds on work done to adjust for the differences in the hiring of teachers between districts and tries to take into account the other costs that can make supplying education in one district more expensive than in another even when the same resources are being used. NCES has created figures for every school district in the nation (which, while somewhat old, are the only ones currently available). We modified those numbers so that the statewide average for Illinois would be 1.000. Therefore, in adjusting the raw figures for individual school districts, some figures increase and some decrease (a district with an index above the average would have its spending adjusted downward while a district with an index below the average would its spending adjusted upward). The use of the GCEI adjusted figures implies that if the state were to use a base cost figure that had been adjusted to reflect cost differences, a factor would need to be used in the state aid formula to make that adjustment for individual districts in the distribution of state aid.

Alternative Base Cost Figures

We have already discussed, in Section II, the alternative ways that we used to identify successful schools and we described the organization of some of the tables that display some of the characteristics of groups of districts. Those tables (3-A, 3-B, 4-A, 4-B, 5-A, and 5-B) and others (7, 8, 9, 10-A, 10-B, and 10-C) display the base cost figures associated with the alternative ways of grouping districts. We focus on four base cost figures for each alternative in Tables 3, 4, and 5: (1) the tuition level for all districts; (2) the

---

[4] See "A Primer for Making Cost Adjustments in Education," William J. Fowler, Jr. and David H. Monk, National Center for Education Statistics, March 2001 (NCES 2001-323) for a discussion of this issue.

tuition level for all districts adjusted by the cost-of-education (COE) factor; (3) the tuition figure for districts that meet the efficiency criteria; and (4) the tuition figure for districts that meet the efficiency criteria adjusted by the COE. In Tables 7,8, and 9 we modify figures by taking 80 percent or 90 percent of the tuition figure (in order to more accurately reflect a base cost figure) and in Tables 10-A, 10-B, and 10-C, we show only the 80 percent adjusted figures.

For example, looking at Table 3-A (unit districts) and concentrating only on the first set of alternatives (group 1), the 16 base cost figures, based on the full tuition charge, range from $5,282 to $6,026. Several patterns emerge for these figures: (1) COE adjusted figures are always higher than unadjusted figures, which reflects the fact that successful unit districts tend to be in regions with relatively low costs; (2) districts selected based on the efficiency criteria have lower base costs (which should logically be true although because of the way efficiency is defined, may not be true by definition); and (3) the figures for alternatives in which the proportion of pupils eligible for free/reduced price meals is taken into consideration, and is relatively high, are always lower than the figure for all districts that meet whatever success criteria is being used (which either reflects the fact that the resources available in districts with relatively low proportions of at-risk pupils are higher than those available in districts with relatively high proportions of at-risk pupils or that resources that would otherwise be available to regular pupils are being used to subsidize at-risk pupils).

Looking at all figures for unit districts (Tables 3-A and 3-B) similar patterns exist within the five groups of alternatives. It is difficult to recognize patterns across alternatives — although base cost is somewhat lower in general among districts identified as being successful based on change in pupil performance over time (which may be true because such districts have slightly higher proportions of at-risk pupils, which may be associated with lower total resources or a greater need to subsidize at-risk pupils at the expense of regular pupils.

For elementary school districts (Tables 4-A and 4-B), some patterns are similar to those of unit districts and some are different. For example, COE adjusted figures for elementary districts are lower than unadjusted figures, which suggests that successful elementary districts are located in places with somewhat higher costs of living. Too, in a number of cases, districts that meet the efficiency criteria have higher base cost levels than districts that do not meet the efficiency criteria; that is, successful elementary districts may need to spend at high levels. In some cases, elementary districts appear to spend at levels that are slightly higher than unit districts (although there are some cases where elementary districts spend at levels much higher than unit districts, particularly when small numbers of districts are involved).

The spending of high school districts is much higher than that of unit districts (Tables 5-A and 5-B). There is no pattern across the alternatives in regard to cost of living — sometimes successful high school districts are from places with relatively low cost of living while sometimes the opposite is true. High school districts that meet the efficiency

criteria tend to spend less than those that do not meet the criteria. And, in general, high school districts with the highest proportions of at-risk pupils have somewhat lower base cost figures than high school districts with lower proportions of pupils from low income families.

The figures in Tables 7, 8, and 9 make the adjustments to the base cost figures that make sense in light of the analysis that was undertaken to compare actual base cost figures to tuition charges in a small sample of districts. Given the way the figures were adjusted, the same patterns exist in these tables that exist in te tables that have been discussed above. However, the adjusted figures may be $1,000 or more lower than the tuition charge figures.

Finally, Tables 10-A, 10-B, and 10-C show only the figures that are adjusted by both the cost of education factor (the GCEI) and the adjustment to correct the tuition charge figure (using the 80 percent adjustment) but display them for all of the alternative ways to define success that we examined (and do so for all successful districts and for those that met the efficiency criteria). Looking at all successful unit districts, the figures range from $4,709 to $5,097 although after eliminating the figures that appear to be relatively high and those that appear to be relatively low, the base cost would be about $4,750. The figures suggest that requiring a minimum percentage of pupils to meet ISAT standards on all tests (group 4) results in a higher base cost figure and focusing on districts with the highest proportions of at-risk pupils ("D" alternatives) also produces a higher base cost figure. The most stable results (those close to $4,750) are associated with using one year of test results, the most inclusive (or most average) proportion of at-risk pupils, and no minimum requirement on meeting ISAT standards across all tests. When the efficiency criteria is added, average cost across all alternatives appears to be around $4,600 and the most stable results are for the alternatives that use one year of test results, a limit on the maximum proportion of pupils expected to meet ISAT standards, the most inclusive (or most average) proportion of at-risk pupils, and no minimum requirement on meeting ISAT standards across all tests.

Looking at elementary school districts (Table 10-B), the range in base cost figures across all alternatives is from $4,327 to $5,305, with a central figure of $4,650 or so (slightly lower than the figure for unit districts). Very low basic figures are associated with using change over time to measure success while high costs are associated with either a high proportion of at-risk pupils or by not taking the proportion of pupils from low income families into consideration. Once the efficiency criteria is used, the central figure decreases slightly to around $4,600 (about the same as for unit districts) and any alternative that does not exclude districts based on proportion of at-risk pupils produces results closer to the overall average than do approaches that restrict districts based on the proportion of pupils from low income families.

The base figures for high school districts (Table 10-C) are much higher than those for unit or elementary school districts and there is greater variation across the alternatives. The central figure is around $7,700 although no particular set of options is very stable.

Adding the efficiency criteria drops the overall average below $7,000 but the variation is so great across alternatives that all figures appear to be somewhat unstable.

There are a number of conclusions that can be drawn based on these figures:

1) It is possible to calculate a base cost figure for use in the Illinois school finance system by examining the basic expenditures of school districts that meet some set of pupil performance standards and some set of demographic characteristics.

2) Base cost figures are reasonably similar across alternative ways of setting criteria for measuring success and specifying demographic requirements, at least for unit districts.

3) It is necessary to develop a procedure to determine the basic expenditure level of each school district since using the tuition charge appears to overstate basic expenditures.

4) The procedures used to select appropriate districts and to calculate the basic expenditure level provide policy makers with a framework within which to link pupil performance with per pupil funding. The framework allows some flexibility so that policy makers can make decisions that best meet the Illinois' needs while being replicable once decisions have been made.

IV. MAKING ADJUSTMENTS TO THE BASE COST FIGURE IN CONSIDERATION OF THE PRESENCE OF AT-RISK PUPILS

The Current Approach Used in Illinois

The purpose of any foundation program is to provide a base level of support for all students. In effect, the way we approached the determination of the foundation, or base cost, level, it represents the amount of revenue needed to assure that pupils without special needs are able to meet state standards for pupil performance. But school districts do enroll pupils with special needs and because the proportions of such pupils vary across districts, it is difficult to adjust the foundation level in recognition of the added costs associated with such pupils. Therefore, the states have developed procedures to allocate additional support to school districts based primarily on the numbers of pupils with special needs and either constant amounts of funding or amounts that vary as the proportions of those pupils change.

EFAB was specifically interested in the added funding needed for pupils at risk of failing in school. Our charge was to develop procedures to count such pupils and to determine how much added funding they should receive. In order to fulfill this objective, A&M worked with ECS to: (1) review how Illinois currently deals with the issue; (2) review how other states provide added support for at-risk pupils; (3) review the approaches that have been developed to improve the performance of at-risk pupils in order to understand both how successful they have been and their costs; and (4) examine data concerning alternative ways to count pupils, use statistical techniques to infer the cost of programs for at-risk pupils, and develop a couple of ways that the state might use to distribute aid.

Illinois, like several other states, provides funding for at-risk pupils by using family income as an indirect measure for being at risk of failure. That is, while actual failure in school could be measured, the state does not allocate aid based on how many pupils are actually failing but rather uses family income to represent how many pupils are likely to have difficulty in school. This is not an unusual way to count pupils; most states avoid the use of actual performance as a way to distribute funds because it appears to create an inappropriate incentive -- the more pupils who perform at a low level, the greater the amount of aid provided. Since studies of pupil performance suggest that family income, and other socio-economic factors correlated with family income, are strongly associated with pupil performance, family income can serve as a proxy for performance (as long as the proxy is used to determine how much money should be provided and not the specific individuals on whom it should be spent).

Illinois uses a multi-level factor to provide additional funding for low income pupils. The factor provides different levels of support depending on the concentration of low income pupils (provided that the concentration exceeds 20 percent) as determined using 1990 Census figures (which can be updated once 2000 Census figures become available

for school districts). While the factor provides a dollar amount per pupil of between $800 (when the concentration of low income pupils is between 20 and 35 percent of all pupils) and $2,050 (when the concentration of low income pupils is greater than 60 percent of all pupils), it effectively operates as a pupil "weight" relative to the foundation level ($4,425). That is, depending on the concentration of pupils, the amount ranges between 18.1 percent and 46.3 percent of the .

There are several problems with this approach: (1) it uses Census figures that only change every ten years; (2) because the amounts of money provided per pupil are constant, the implicit weight for low income pupils is not constant — unless the amounts change over time, they decrease relative to the foundation level as the foundation level increases over time; and (3) the approach operates in a "stair-step" manner, which means that at each of the "break points" (such as the 20 percent level), state aid changes dramatically depending on which side of the break point a district sits — for example, a district with a low income proportion of 19 percent is not eligible for any additional aid while a district with a low income proportion of 21 percent is eligible for $800 per pupil.

How Other States Provide Aid for At-Risk Pupils

Over the past decade or so, states have begun to develop procedures to provide state support for pupils at risk of failure In school. Initially, the states did this to improve the equity of their funding systems -- that is, to make the allocation of state aid more sensitive to the different needs of school districts. But in the last few years, the states have justified added support in recognition of the fact that some pupils require more services than others in order to meet state performance expectations. Regardless of the motivation, more states are creating state aid programs, which requires them to specify how funds will be allocated, how much funding will be provided, and how funds may be spent.

We felt that it made sense to focus our attention on a set of states that could be considered to be similar to Illinois. Therefore, we created a procedure to identify states that had a combination of characteristics that would make them comparable to Illinois: (1) a large number of school districts; (2) a large student population; (3) one very large district; and (4) a similar proportion of pupils from low income families based on Title 1 eligibility. We weighted these factors ourselves and identified 14 states that we believe are similar to Illinois (as shown in Appendix C). Based on our analysis, we found that California, Texas, and New York are most similar to Illinois while Pennsylvania, Michigan, Ohio, and Florida are very similar and Georgia, North Carolina, Massachusetts, Missouri, Tennessee, Washington, and Wisconsin are somewhat similar. Having identified the states we wanted to examine, we asked the following questions, the answers to which are summarized below and in Tables 11-A, 11-B, and 11-C:

1. Does the state provide additional funding for at-risk students?

2. Is the funding provided through the foundation or categorical programs?

3. How are “at-risk” students defined and identified?

4. What is the funding level per at-risk student served?

All 14 comparable states provide additional funding for at-risk students. Four states provided funding through both the foundation and categorical programs (Georgia, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New York), nine states provide funding through categorical programs (California, Florida, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin), and only one state provides funding exclusively in the foundation program (Pennsylvania).

Within the states that provide for at-risk students in their foundation programs, there are two ways of disbursing the funding. Georgia and New York provide weights for at-risk students (.29 and .25, respectively). The other three states (Massachusetts, Missouri, and Pennsylvania) provide an additional dollar amount for identified at-risk students.

States that provide at-risk funding through categorical programs provide funds for specific purposes, often requiring districts to spend funds specifically for those purposes, such as lowering class size, extending the school year, providing pre-school or full-day kindergarten, or assuring additional staff.

Several different methods for identifying at-risk students are employed by the 14 states; in some cases a state uses multiple ways of counting pupils each of which is associated with a separate program. Five states (Massachusetts, Missouri, Michigan, New York, and Tennessee) identify at-risk students as those who qualify for federal free/reduced price lunches. Four states (California, North Carolina, Ohio, and Wisconsin) use a measure of wealth other than free/reduced lunch eligibility, which may be based on one or more measures associated with aid for needy families. Six states (Georgia, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, and Washington) base at-risk classification on low performance on standardized tests. Georgia identifies at-risk students as those in remedial education programs. Texas uses low academic achievement, students who are currently pregnant, limited-English proficiency, and students who have been identified as being abused.

The Cost and Success of Programs for At-Risk Pupils

The states tend to focus attention on programs for at-risk pupils that are either comprehensive in scope, intended to improve student performance in multiple academic areas, or geared toward improving the reading and comprehension skills of at-risk students. We examined some of the programs designed to accomplish these objectives in order to understand their costs and, if possible, their level of success.

We identified five comprehensive education programs, the supplemental cost of which is estimated below:

1. Accelerated Schools Project - Based on the idea that all children should have an education in which they are consistently challenged and expected to succeed, this type of program costs about $65,000 per year in a typical elementary school (at 500 pupils this is $130 per pupil). Both internal and external studies have shown that an Accelerated Schools Project has a positive impact on student achievement.

2. Community for Learning - This type of program subscribes to the notion that all children, regardless of their personal circumstances, can succeed academically when surrounded by a network of caring adults in a supportive community. This program typically costs around $160,000 per school (at 500 pupils this is $320 per pupil). Internal studies support the effectiveness of this type of program.

3. Direct Instruction - This program is based on three main principals: (1) all children can learn, (2) basic skills and their application in higher order skills are necessary for intelligent behavior, and (3) at-risk students must be taught at a faster rate in order to succeed. Costs associated with this program can be $240,000 per school (at 500 pupils this is $480 per pupil). The U.S. Department of Education conducted a study demonstrating the effectiveness of this type of program.

4. Roots and Wings - This program promotes a style of learning that is not only necessary for obtaining higher order skill, but is also relevant to children's everyday lives. The cost for this type of program can be as high as $225,000 per school per year over a three year period (at 500 pupils, this is $450 per pupil). Both internal and external studies have found this type of program to be effective.

5. School Development Program - This program subscribes to the idea that collaboration of all stakeholders in a school will provide an environment that facilitates growth and achievement in students. The costs for this type of program are around $75,000 per year. Two internal studies have found this program to be effective.

We identified six types of reading programs:

1. Failure Free Reading - This program is designed to work in conjunction with existing reading programs, and is targeted toward at-risk and students with language problems. The program costs around $10,000 per year, per school. Studies have shown that this program has had success in developing literacy rates.

2. Four Blocks - This program is predicated on the belief that success in reading is contingent upon being exposed to a variety of instructional approaches. The cost for this type of program is estimated to be around $162 per student. There have been several case studies documenting the success of this program, and other studies are currently being conducted.

3. HOSTS - This program facilitates improvements in reading and problem-solving skills through a highly structured language arts program and extensive one-on-one mentoring. This program costs around $20,000 per year, per school. An internal study reports that students in this program have shown improvement over several areas of literacy and development.

4. Invitations to Literacy - The idea behind this program is that all children can learn to read, and that teachers play a vital role in the development of these skills. Costs for this program are approximately $68 per student. An internal study shows that this program has had a positive impact in literacy rates.

5. Reading One-to-One - This program provides high quality, low-cost reading tutoring to low performing students during the regular school day. The program costs $11,000 per school for the first year and $600 per student in tutoring costs. An internal study reports that this program is capable of increasing a student's reading level by as much as half a grade level. This program is used in Texas.

6. Success for All - This program espouses the belief that every child can read and must succeed in early grades. Implementation for this type of program is estimated to cost $800-$1,200 per student. Both internal and external studies point to the effectiveness of this program, particularly for students achieving at a level below the 25th percentile.

Analysis of Alternative Ways to Count At-Risk Pupils and The Cost of At-Risk Programs

While it is interesting to understand how other states approach the funding of at-risk pupils and to learn whether particular ways of working with such pupils are successful at a particular cost, we hoped that it might be possible to analyze Illinois data in order to determine what proxy measure should be used to count at-risk pupils and the level of supplemental funding that would be appropriate.

We began our work by examining the relationship between the proportions of pupils meeting ISAT standards and the proportions of pupils with particular socio-economic characteristics for groups of unit, elementary, and high school districts. For the purposes of this analysis, the groups of districts are "quintiles" — groups of districts that each contain about 20 percent of all pupils. Quintiles were based on levels of pupil performance as reflected by the proportion of pupils meeting or exceeding ISAT standards. In addition,

we examined the correlations between pairs of variables representing both different components of district performance and different proxy measures of the socio-economic characteristics of pupils.

The figures in Tables 12-A and 12-B are for unit districts, excluding Chicago. Looking at row (3) in Table 12-A, the figures indicate the proportions of pupils meeting ISAT standards (across all tests), which rises from 50.0 percent in the lowest quintile to 82.7 percent in the highest quintile. Immediately below those figures is the ratio of the proportion of pupils *not* meeting ISAT standards to the average of all unit districts — for example, for the lowest quintile, the ratio of 1.515 means that the proportion of pupils in that quintile that fail to meet ISAT standards is 51.5 percent above the average of all pupils in unit districts. Rows (4), (5), and (6) indicate other indicators of school success, including attendance rate, chronic truant rate, and high school drop-out rate. What the figures suggest is that attendance rate increases slightly as the proportion of pupils that meet ISAT standards rises while the chronic truant rate and the high school drop-out rate both decrease as the proportion of pupils that meet ISAT standards rises.

Rows (7) through (11) show similar information for five alternative ways to count pupils from low income families. The census-based figures are those currently used in Illinois, based on 1990 census figures. The low income student percent is self-reported data from school districts. The free lunch, reduced-price lunch, and free/reduced price lunch counts are based on eligibility for federally subsidized meals. We did not have any other kind of information indicative of socio-economic characteristics on a school district basis. Clearly, the proportions of low income pupils represented by the census-based figures are far lower than those represented by the low income count; however, the census-based figures are very similar to the free/reduced price lunch figures.

One way to determine whether any of these figures would be a good proxy for low pupil performance is to compare the ratios (which are shown italicized and darkened). For example, looking at the third quintile, the most average group, there are about 3.3 percent less pupils than the statewide average with low performance while there are about five percent less pupils than the statewide average in terms of free/reduced price lunch eligibility — that is, the free/reduced price lunch count is a reasonable proxy for the number of low performing pupils. No other proxy measure is as close to representing performance for the third quintile. Looking at the second and fourth quintiles — moving further from the average — the free/reduced price lunch count is the best indicator for the second quintile while the census based count is the best indicator for the fourth quintile. For the first and fifth quintiles — those furthest from the average — the best indicator is the reduced-price lunch count. Given the very low levels of the reduced-price lunch count, however, it cannot be used on its own to represent the numbers of pupils failing to meet ISAT standards.

The figures in Table 12-B are correlations between the variables discussed above for unit districts. Looking at rows (1) through (3), it is clear that different measures of district performance are not necessarily strongly related to one another. For example, the

relationship between the chronic truancy rate and the high school drop-out rate is low, as are the relationships between the high school drop-out rate and both the attendance rate and the proportion of pupils that meet/exceed ISAT standards. And while some of the proxy measures are related to one another, some are not highly correlated. It appears that the low income student count is slightly more strongly correlated with each of the pupil performance indicators than any other proxy measure but the free/reduced price lunch count is very close.

Tables 13-A and 13-B display similar statistics for elementary school districts while Tables 14-A and 14-B show the data for high school districts. As far as we can tell, none of the proxy measures works as well for elementary or high school districts as it does for unit districts. However, in our opinion, given the choices available, the free/reduced price lunch count is the best proxy measure since it is based on data that is collected annually and it is not self-reported. While it might make sense to use the census-based data for a couple of years once it becomes available, it probably should not be used in the last 5-6 years of this decade. Obviously, the best indicator would be the actual proportion of pupils not meeting ISAT standards, which suffers from the misincentive issue raised above. Perhaps a combination of that figure, adjusted by a factor related to change in the free/reduced price lunch count, could be developed.

There are several approaches that could be used to calculate a level of support for at-risk pupils. If appropriate data were available, an accounting approach could be used, which would be based on the amounts being expended for at-risk pupils. A second approach is to undertake a statistical analysis of the spending of school districts and the performance of pupils, which, given a variation in the proportions of at-risk pupils, might say something about the added resources needed to assure success. Since the first approach relies on data that is not available and the second approach involves statistical procedures the use of which tends to be limited to academic discussions, we used s third approach.

The third approach requires some data of the sort needed to complete the first approach -- but that is available in Illinois — and uses statistical methods that are somewhat more understandable than the ones required to undertake the second approach. Under the third approach, it is possible to infer the amount being spent for at-risk pupils by using multiple regression to explain the variation in the per pupil operating spending of school districts. That is, if a number of variables, including the proportion of pupils from low income families, can account for a large part of the variation in per pupil spending, it is possible to infer the amount districts are currently spending for at-risk pupils. Further, by changing the way variables are specified in the analysis, it is possible to ascertain whether the amounts being spent are constant per pupil regardless of the magnitude of the proportion of at-risk pupils or whether the amounts vary on a per pupil basis as the proportion of at-risk pupils varies. This approach does not speak to the issue of whether the expenditures for at-risk pupils produce performance results but, as noted above, there is very little information available from any source that is capable of linking funding to performance in an unambiguous way.

We only undertook regression analysis for the unit districts. The first of the two approaches we used also excluded Chicago from the analysis. Under that approach, we used a model based on district enrollment, the proportion of pupils eligible for free/reduced price lunch, the proportion of pupils in special education programs, the GCEI, per pupil property wealth, the number of teachers per 1,000 pupils, average teacher salary, and the operating tax rate of each unit district to explain the variation in per pupil spending of every district. The resulting regression equation is shown in Appendix A. The equation accounts for 76 percent of the variation in per pupil spending. The equation indicates that districts are spending, on average, $2,005 per at-risk pupil. If this amount were divided by the $4,600 per pupil base cost figure discussed above, it would imply a constant pupil weight of .44 which would be applied to every at-risk pupil regardless of whether a district had only one such pupil or 80 percent of its pupils were from low income families.

The second approach used the same variables as the first approach but also included squared terms (the value of the variable multiplied by itself) for enrollment and at-risk pupils under the assumption that there might be a curvilinear relationship between those variables and per pupil spending. In this case, we included Chicago. The regression equation, which explained 84 percent of the variation in spending, is shown in Appendix A. The equation indicates that as the proportion of at-risk pupils increase, there is a slight increase in the amount of spending per at-risk pupil, assuming a base cost of $4,600, based on the following equation:

weight for at-risk pupils = [.228 X (percentage of at-risk pupils)] + .346

This means, for example, that the following amounts would need to be available per at-risk pupil at different proportions of at-risk pupils:

At-Risk %	Weight	$ per At-Risk Pupil
10%	.369	$1,697
20%	.392	$1,802

At-Risk %	Weight	$ per At-Risk Pupil
40%	.438	$2,013
60%	.483	$2,224
70%	.506	$2,329

In our view, the second approach makes more intuitive sense. While the amounts it generates are far higher than the amounts that other states seem to allocate for at-risk pupils (or that programs designed to serve the needs of at-risk pupils appear to spend), they are consistent with the amount generated by the first approach.

TABLE 1

1999-2000 CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN ILLINOIS BY TYPE OF DISTRICT

Characteristics	Unit Districts: Chicago	Unit Districts: Other Unit Districts	Elementary Districts	High School Districts
(1) Districts and Students				
Total Number of Districts	1	408	384	103
Total Number of Students	426,814	832,100	522,516	218,757
Number of Districts With Complete Data	1	404	381	80
Number of Students in Districts with Complete Data	426,814	809,978	521,030	158,142
(2) Alternative Counts of Proxy Measures for At-Risk Pupils				
(a) *Census-Based Poverty*				
Number of Students	162,752	107,477	45,220	9,000
% of All Students	38.1%	13.3%	8.7%	5.7%
(b) *Self-Reported Low Income*				
Number of Students	365,353	216,947	113,366	24,242
% of All Students	85.6%	26.8%	21.8%	15.3%

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Characteristics	Unit Districts: Chicago	Unit Districts: Other Unit Districts	Elementary Districts	High School Districts
(2) Alternative Counts of Proxy Measures for At-Risk Pupils				
(c) *Free Lunch*				
Number of Students	298,560	171,314	83,639	17,017
% of All Students	70.0%	21.2%	16.1%	10.8%
(d) *Reduced-Price Lunch*				
Number of Students	24,493	36,683	17,985	4,546
% of All Students	5.7%	4.5%	3.5%	2.9%
(3) Percentage of Students Who Meet/Exceed State Standards on State Achievement Tests				
(a) Districts with $ 67% Average Across Tests Meeting/Exceeding State Standards				
Number of Districts	0	234	264	39
% of Districts	--	57.9%	69.3%	48.8%
(3a) 3rd Grade Read (1999)	33.0%	68.0%	70.4%	--
(3b) 3rd Grade Read (2000)	33.0%	69.5%	70.7%	--
(3c) 3rd Grade Math (1999)	41.0%	75.0%	77.2%	--
(3d) 3rd Grade Math (2000)	38.0%	77.3%	78.4%	--
(3e) 3rd Grade Write (1999)	31.0%	59.4%	65.9%	--
(3f) 3rd Grade Write (2000)	38.0%	77.3%	78.4%	--

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Characteristics	Unit Districts: Chicago	Unit Districts: Other Unit Districts	Elementary Districts	High School Districts
(3g) 5th Grade Read (1999)	32.0%	59.0%	64.8%	--
(3h) 5th Grade Read (2000)	37.0%	`64.3%	66.7%	--
(3i) 5th Grade Math (1999)	29.0%	60.1%	63.3%	--
(3j) 5th Grade Math (2000)	28.0%	63.6%	65.3%	--
(3k) 5th Grade Write (1999)	53.0%	76.9%	83.4%	--
(3l) 5th Grade Write (2000)	50.0%	73.4%	79.0%	--
(3m) 8th Grade Read (1999)	57.0%	73.5%	77.3%	--
(3n) 8th Grade Read (2000)	57.0%	72.6%	77.3%	--
(3o) 8th Grade Math (1999)	19.0%	45.3%	50.4%	--
(3p) 8th Grade Math (2000)	20.0%	49.7%	54.7%	--
(3q) 8th Grade Write (1999)	35.0%	60.4%	68.1%	--
(3r) 8th Grade Write (2000)	52.0%	70.4%	76.5%	--
(4) Other Indicators of District Performance				
(4a) Attendance Rate	91.6%	94.9%	95.4%	92.8%
(4b) Chronic Truancy Rate	4.3%	1.9%	0.7%	2.5%
(4c) High School Drop Out Rate	15.7%	2.9%	--	3.6%
(5) Special Education				
Number of Students	51,800	125,432	81,182	19,559
% of All Students	12.1%	15.5%	15.6%	12.4%

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Characteristics	Unit Districts		Elementary Districts	High School Districts
	Chicago	Other Unit Districts		
(6) Per Pupil Expenditures				
(6a) Current	$8,038	$6,319	$6,970	$10,679
(6b) Tuition Charge	$5,335	$5,238	$6,023	$9,737

TABLE 2-A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION CONCERNING STATEWIDE ACHIEVEMENT TESTS USED IN BOTH 1999 AND 2000 FOR *UNIT DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS

	Subject Area					
	Reading		Mathematics		Writing	
	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000
Grade Level						
Third Grade						
Lowest % of Pupils Taking Any Test	56%	49%	56%	50%	55%	43%
Number of Districts with # 85% Taking Any Test	30	30	15	18	33	39
Number of Districts with # 80% Taking Any Test	6	11	6	10	14	15
Fifth Grade						
Lowest % of Pupils Taking Any Test	75%	51%	75%	51%	73%	50%
Number of Districts with # 85% Taking Any Test	16	21	15	14	20	23
Number of Districts with # 80% Taking Any Test	4	6	5	4	6	5

TABLE 2-A (Continued)

Grade Level	Subject Area					
	Reading		Mathematics		Writing	
	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000
Eighth Grade						
Lowest % of Pupils Taking Any Test	64%	75%	64%	72%	64%	77%
Number of Districts with # 85% Taking Any Test	30	20	35	23	36	33
Number of Districts with # 80% Taking Any Test	16	6	12	5	13	11

Note: The number of districts with at least 85% of pupils taking all nine tests in both 1999 and 2000 is 288.

The number of districts with at least 80% of pupils taking all nine tests in both 1999 and 2000 is 351.

The number of districts with at least 80% of pupils taking all nine tests in 2000 is 373.

TABLE 2-B

BACKGROUND INFORMATION CONCERNING STATEWIDE ACHIEVEMENT TESTS USED IN BOTH 1999 AND 2000 FOR *ELEMENTARY DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS

	Subject Area					
	Reading		Mathematics		Writing	
	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000
Grade Level						
Third Grade						
Lowest % of Pupils Taking Any Test	42%	44%	45%	45%	43%	33%
Number of Districts with # 85% Taking Any Test	49	32	40	39	53	67
Number of Districts with # 80% Taking Any Test	24	51	16	25	26	38
Fifth Grade						
Lowest % of Pupils Taking Any Test	40%	69%	60%	76%	40%	76%
Number of Districts with # 85% Taking Any Test	20	13	17	10	27	19
Number of Districts with # 80% Taking Any Test	5	2	7	2	10	5

TABLE 2-B (Continued)

Grade Level	Subject Area					
	Reading		Mathematics		Writing	
	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000
Eighth Grade						
Lowest % of Pupils Taking Any Test	14%	73%	56%	75%	63%	73%
Number of Districts with # 85% Taking Any Test	27	19	27	20	36	23
Number of Districts with # 80% Taking Any Test	10	6	6	6	9	10

Note: The number of districts with at least 85% of pupils taking all nine tests in both 1999 and 2000 is 251.

The number of districts with at least 80% of pupils taking all nine tests in both 1999 and 2000 is 309.

The number of districts with at least 80% of pupils taking all nine tests in 2000 is 331.

TABLE 3-A

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO IDENTIFY SUCCESSFUL *UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS BASED ON STATEWIDE ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS IN 1999 AND 2000

Using *Absolute Criteria* and *Average of All Tests* Approaches

		w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using Results for Both 1999 and 2000			
(1A)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 1999 and 2000[1]		
	Number of Districts	149	88
	Number of Pupils	323,870	185,806
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	11.4%	12.8%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,777 (*5,965*)	$5,479 (*5,594*)
(1B)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 1999 and 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 16.5% and 34.8%		
	Number of Districts	51	36
	Number of Pupils	76,298	57,483
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	22.2%	21.5%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,309 (*5,888*)	$5,279 (*5,748*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 1999 and 2000.

TABLE 3-A (Continued)

Using Results for Both 1999 and 2000	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
(1C) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 1999 and 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 16.5%		
Number of Districts	58	41
Number of Pupils	90,133	68,021
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	25.7%	25.5%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,335 (*5,963*)	$5,282 (*5,791*)
(1D) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 1999 and 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 34.8%		
Number of Districts	7	5
Number of Pupils	13,835	10,538
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	45.2%	47.5%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,483 (*6,371*)	$5,298 (*6,026*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 1999 and 2000.

TABLE 3-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using Results Only for 2000		
(2A) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1]		
Number of Districts	224	136
Number of Pupils	400,623	238,526
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	13.6%	15.3%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,649 (*5,954*)	$5,379 (*5,632*)
(2B) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 16.5% and 34.8%		
Number of Districts	104	72
Number of Pupils	130,458	98,702
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	23.4%	23.1%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,218 (5,915)	$5,182 (5,783)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 2000.

TABLE 3-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using results Only for 2000		
(2C) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 16.5%		
Number of Districts	118	82
Number of Pupils	149,683	113,416
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	26.0%	26.0%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,226 (*5,950*)	$5,175 *(5,797*)
(2D) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 34.8% (Unit)		
Number of Districts	14	10
Number of Pupils	19,225	14,714
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	44.0%	45.8%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,282 *(6,189)*	$5,126 *(5,896*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 2000.

TABLE 3-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using results Only for 2000		
(3A) 67-83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1]		
Number of Districts	208	127
Number of Pupils	319,383	178,113
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	16.4%	19.7%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,424 (*5,928*)	$5,187 (*5,704*)
(3B) 67-83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 16.5% and 34.8%		
Number of Districts	103	71
Number of Pupils	129,322	97,566
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	23.4%	23.1%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,230 (*5,925*)	$5,197 (*5,795*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 2000.

TABLE 3-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using results Only for 2000		
(3C) 67-83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 16.5%		
Number of Districts	117	81
Number of Pupils	148,547	112,280
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	26.0%	26.1%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,236 (*5,959*)	$5,188 (*5,808*)
(3D) 67-83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 34.8%		
Number of Districts	14	10
Number of Pupils	19,225	14,714
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	44.0%	45.8%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,282 (*6,189*)	$5,126 (*5,896*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 2000.

TABLE 3-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using results Only for 2000		
(4A) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard *and* At Least 50% Meet/Exceed Standard on Every Test in 2000[1]		
Number of Districts	145	82
Number of Pupils	292,240	163,298
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	11.1%	11.8%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,877 (*6,102*)	$5,586 (*5,734*)
(4B) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard *and* At Least 50% Meet/Exceed Standard on Every Test in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 16.5% and 34.8%		
Number of Districts	56	39
Number of Pupils	65,428	47,858
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	23.8%	23.0%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,456 (*6,223*)	$5,476 (*6,162*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 2000.

TABLE 3-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using Results Only for 2000		
(4C) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard *and* At Least 50% Meet/Exceed Standard on Every Test in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 16.5%		
Number of Districts	62	44
Number of Pupils	75,937	56,092
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	25.7%	25.2%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,505 (*6,286*)	$5,501 (*6,194*)
(4D) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard *and* At Least 50% Meet/Exceed Standard on Every Test in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 34.8%		
Number of Districts	6	5
Number of Pupils	10,509	8,234
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	37.5%	38.0%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,810 (*6,678*)	$5,651 (*6,379*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 2000.

TABLE 3-B

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO IDENTIFY SUCCESSFUL *UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS BASED ON STATEWIDE ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS IN 1999 AND 2000

Using *Change Over Time Criteria* and *Average of All Tests* Approaches

		w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency
(5A)	Change Between 1999 and 2000 Must be$ 20% of Amount Required so that 83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2004 *or* $ 83% of Pupils Meet/Exceed that Standard in 2000[1]		
	Number of Districts	187	111
	Number of Pupils	323,897	184,395
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	15.5%	16.3%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,614 (*5,962*)	$5,314 (*5,588*)
(5B)	Same as 5A *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 16.5% and 34.8%		
	Number of Districts	92	58
	Number of Pupils	101,623	68,485
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	26.6%	27.0%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,152 (*5,980*)	$5,084 (*5,844*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 1999 and 2000.

TABLE 3-B (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency
(5C) Same as 5A[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch $ 16.5%		
Number of Districts	107	66
Number of Pupils	127,150	82,327
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	30.1%	29.9%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,146 (*5,961*)	$5,028 (*5,747*)
(5D) Same as 5A[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch $ 34.8%		
Number of Districts	15	8
Number of Pupils	25,527	13,842
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	44.0%	44.5%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,124 *(5,886*)	$4,751 (*5,270*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 1999 and 2000.

TABLE 4-A

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO IDENTIFY SUCCESSFUL *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS BASED ON STATEWIDE ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS IN 1999 AND 2000

Using *Absolute Criteria* and *Average of All Tests* Approaches

Using Results for Both 1999 and 2000	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
(1A) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 1999 and 2000[1]		
Number of Districts	194	106
Number of Pupils	292,706	173,911
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	7.6%	6.5%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,410 (*6,117*)	$6,170 (*5,851*)
(1B) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/ Exceed Standard in 1999 and 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch is Between 8.8% and 30.2%		
Number of Districts	60	34
Number of Pupils	74,783	43,215
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	15.3%	14.8%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,795 (*5,663*)	$5,404 (*5,341*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 1999 and 2000.

TABLE 4-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using Results for Both 1999 and 2000		
(1C) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 1999 and 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 8.8%		
Number of Districts	71	38
Number of Pupils	91,275	51,463
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	19.4%	17.7%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,940 (*5,830*)	$5,847 (*5,715*)
(1D) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 1999 and 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 30.2%		
Number of Districts	11	4
Number of Pupils	16,492	8,248
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	38.0%	32.8%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,594 (*6,587*)	$8,171 (*7,674*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 1999 and 2000.

TABLE 4-A (Continued)

		w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using Results Only for 2000			
(2A)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1]		
	Number of Districts	236	123
	Number of Pupils	333,616	187,119
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	8.8%	7.5%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,385 (*6,112*)	$6,132 (*5,831*)
(2B)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 8.8% and 30.2%		
	Number of Districts	80	41
	Number of Pupils	98,706	48,497
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	16.4%	15.5%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,001 (*5,849*)	$5,492 (*5,396*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 2000.

TABLE 4-A (Continued)

		w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using results Only for 2000			
(2C)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 8.8%		
	Number of Districts	102	52
	Number of Pupils	119,784	60,379
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	20.5%	19.6%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,028 (*5,934*)	$5,801 (*5,695*)
(2D)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 30.2%		
	Number of Districts	22	11
	Number of Pupils	21,078	11,432
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	39.7%	37.4%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,156 (*6,334*)	$7,124 (*6,977*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 2000.

TABLE 4-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using results Only for 2000		
(3A) 67-83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1]		
Number of Districts	170	87
Number of Pupils	231,742	138,801
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	10.6%	9.2%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,872 (*5,677*)	$5,903 (*5,644*)
(3B) 67-83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 8.8% and 30.2%		
Number of Districts	74	36
Number of Pupils	84,716	47,540
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	16.0%	15.3%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,788 (*5,684*)	$5,537 (*5,419*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 2000.

TABLE 4-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using results Only for 2000		
(3C) 67-83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 8.8%		
Number of Districts	94	46
Number of Pupils	104,629	58,538
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	20.5%	19.5%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,883 (*5,826*)	$5,859 (*5,727*)
(3D) 67-83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 30.2%		
Number of Districts	20	10
Number of Pupils	19,913	10,998
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	39.8%	37.5%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,290 (*6,430*)	$7,252 (*7,061*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 2000.

TABLE 4-A (Continued)

		w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using results Only for 2000			
(4A)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard *and* At Least 50% Meet/Exceed Standard on Every Test in 2000[1]		
	Number of Districts	177	99
	Number of Pupils	286,518	171,064
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	7.6%	6.4%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,556 (*6,236*)	$6,210 (*5,877*)
(4B)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard *and* At Least 50% Meet/Exceed Standard on Every Test in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 8.8% and 30.2%		
	Number of Districts	51	30
	Number of Pupils	77,910	39,918
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	15.7%	14.6%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,161 (*5,941*)	$5,450 (*5,353*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 2000.

TABLE 4-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using Results Only for 2000		
(4C) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard *and* At Least 50% Meet/Exceed Standard on Every Test in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 8.8%		
Number of Districts	62	37
Number of Pupils	92,888	49,335
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	19.0%	18.1%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,242 (*6,052*)	$5,870 (*5,729*)
(4D) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard *and* At Least 50% Meet/Exceed Standard on Every Test in 2000[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 30.2%		
Number of Districts	11	7
Number of Pupils	14,978	9,417
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	36.5%	33.2%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,659 (*6,631*)	$7,648 (*7,325*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 2000.

TABLE 4-B

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO IDENTIFY SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN ILLINOIS BASED ON STATEWIDE ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS IN 1999 AND 2000

Using *Change Over Time Criteria* and *Average of All Tests* Approaches

		w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
(5A)	Change Between 1999 and 2000 Must be$ 20% of Amount Required so that 83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2004 *or* $ 83% of Pupils Meet/Exceed that Standard in 2000[1]		
	Number of Districts	150	77
	Number of Pupils	193,759	115,348
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	7.8%	6.2%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,394 (*6,165*)	$6,004 (*5,727*)
(5B)	Same as 5A *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 8.8% and 30.2%		
	Number of Districts	43	18
	Number of Pupils	39,504	21,228
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	18.3%	16.5%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,406 (5,480)	$5,335 (5,331)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 1999 and 2000.

TABLE 4-B (Continued)

		w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
(5C)	Same as 5A[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 8.8%		
	Number of Districts	57	24
	Number of Pupils	49,840	24,849
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	23.6%	21.1%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$5,289 (*5,465*)	$5,226 (*5,320*)
(5D)	Same as 5A[1] *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 30.2%		
	Number of Districts	14	6
	Number of Pupils	10,336	3,621
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	43.8%	48.0%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$4,841(*5,409*)	$4,585 (*5,259*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

[1] In addition, at least 80% of pupils must have taken each of the reading, mathematics, and writing tests in the third, fifth, and eighth grades in 1999 and 2000.

TABLE 5-A

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO IDENTIFY SUCCESSFUL *HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS BASED ON STATEWIDE ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS IN 1999 AND 2000

Using *Absolute Criteria* and *Average of All Tests* Approaches

		w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using Results for Both 1999 and 2000			
(1A)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 1999 and 2000		
	Number of Districts	33	19
	Number of Pupils	92,164	41,347
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	6.7%	6.6%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$10,449 (*9,884*)	$9,591 (*9,159*)
(1B)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 1999 and 2000 *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 6.6% and 20.7%		
	Number of Districts	14	7
	Number of Pupils	44,955	22,424
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	11.3%	10.3%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$10,691 (*10,072*)	$10,342 (*9,724*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

TABLE 5-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using Results for Both 1999 and 2000		
(1C) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 1999 and 2000 *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 6.6%		
Number of Districts	15	8
Number of Pupils	46,098	23,567
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	11.5%	10.8%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$10,590 (*10,014*)	$10,162 (*9,627*)
(1D) $ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 1999 and 2000 *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 20.7%		
Number of Districts	1	1
Number of Pupils	1,143	1,143
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	21.2%	21.2%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$6,643 (*7,724*)	$6,643 (*7,724*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

TABLE 5-A (Continued)

		w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using Results Only for 2000			
(2A)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000		
	Number of Districts	39	22
	Number of Pupils	96,899	43,518
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	7.2%	6.9%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$10,277 (*9,786*)	$9,476 (*9,106*)
(2B)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000 *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 6.6% and 20.7%		
	Number of Districts	18	9
	Number of Pupils	48,442	23,990
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	11.3%	10.3%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$10,407 (9,895)	$10,112 (9,578)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

TABLE 5-A (Continued)

		w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using results Only for 2000			
(2C)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000 *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 6.6%		
	Number of Districts	21	11
	Number of Pupils	50,833	25,738
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	12.0%	11.0%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$10,248 (*9,815*)	$9,918 *(9,499*)
(2D)	$ 67% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000 *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 20.7%		
	Number of Districts	3	2
	Number of Pupils	2,391	1,748
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	25.7%	21.1%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$7,028 *(8,191)*	$7,261 *(8,404)*

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

TABLE 5-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using results Only for 2000		
(3A) 67-83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000		
Number of Districts	34	19
Number of Pupils	86,080	38,136
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	8.1%	7.8%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$9,872 (*9,453*)	$9,166 (*8,864*)
(3B) 67-83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000 *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 6.6% and 20.7%		
Number of Districts	17	8
Number of Pupils	48,390	23,938
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	11.3%	10.3%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$10,406 (*9,890*)	$10,109 (*9,567*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

TABLE 5-A (Continued)

	w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
Using results Only for 2000		
(3C) 67-83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000 *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 6.6%		
Number of Districts	20	10
Number of Pupils	50,781	25,686
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	12.0%	11.0%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$10,247 (*9,810*)	$9,915 (*9,488*)
(3D) 67-83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2000 *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 20.7%		
Number of Districts	3	2
Number of Pupils	2,391	1,748
Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	25.7%	21.1%
Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$7,028 (*8,191*)	$7,261 (*8,404*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

TABLE 5-B

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO IDENTIFY SUCCESSFUL HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN ILLINOIS BASED ON STATEWIDE ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS IN 1999 AND 2000

Using *Change Over Time Criteria* and *Average of All Tests* Approaches

		w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
(5A)	Change Between 1999 and 2000 Must be$ 20% of Amount Required so that 83% of Pupils in a District Meet/Exceed Standard in 2004 *or* $ 83% of Pupils Meet/Exceed that Standard in 2000		
	Number of Districts	31	15
	Number of Pupils	40,567	16,353
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	15.0%	7.0%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$9,725 (*9,502)*	$9,202 (9,105)
(5B)	Same as 5A *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is Between 6.6% and 20.7%		
	Number of Districts	14	6
	Number of Pupils	16,880	7,712
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	10.1%	8.9%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$8,821 (*8,857*)	$8,119(*8,157*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

TABLE 5-B (Continued)

		w/o Efficiency	with Efficiency*
(5C)	Same as 5A *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 6.6%		
	Number of Districts	21	10
	Number of Pupils	26,276	9.722
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	22.8%	11.63%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$8,444 (*8,452*)	$7,921 (*8,201*)
(5D)	Same as 5A *and* % Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch is $ 20.7%		
	Number of Districts	7	4
	Number of Pupils	9,396	2,010
	Avg. % Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	45.6%	22.0%
	Weighted Average "Tuition" Level (*COE Adj.*)	$7,766 *(7,724*)	$7,161 (*8,371*)

* Efficient districts are those with per pupil spending equal to or less than expected, based on a statewide regression model.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF THE ACTUAL TUITION CHARGE TO THE FOX RIVER LEARING NUMBER

	School A	School B	School C	School D	School E	School F
Instruction	$2,852	$2,100	$2,902	$3,408	$3,294	$2,626
Instructional Support	$89	$164	$216	$139	$1,782	$376
Operations	$1,361	$748	$877	$769	$2,905	$1,062
Leadership	$469	$471	$507	$808	$389	$435
Fox River Number	$4,771	$3,483	$4,502	$5,124	$8,370	$4,499
Actual Tuition Charge	$5,035	$4,648	$5,327	$5,064	$11,828	$5,496
Fox River as a Percent of Actual Tuition Charge	**95%**	**75%**	**85%**	**101%**	**71%**	**82%**

TABLE 7

ALTERNATIVE BASE COST FIGURES FOR ILLINOIS *UNIT SCHOOL* DISTRICTS BASED ON ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SELECTING SUCCESSFUL DISTRICTS AND ALTERNATIVE WAYS OF CALCULATING A BASE COST LEVEL

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
1. Using Test Results for 1999 and 2000						
1A. 67% of Pupils Meet/ Exceed Standard	$5,777	$5,199	$4,621	**$5,965**	**$5,369**	**$4,772**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,479*	*$4,931*	*$4,383*	***$5,594***	***$5,035***	***$4,475***
1B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$5,309	$4,778	$4,247	**$5,888**	**$5,299**	**$4,710**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,279*	*$4,751*	*$4,223*	***$5,748***	***$5,173***	***$4,598***
1C. A. + F/R $ 16.5%	$5,335	$4,802	$4,268	**$5,963**	**$5,367**	**$4,770**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,282*	*$4,754*	*$4,226*	***$5,791***	***$5,212***	***$4,633***
1D. A. + F/R $ 34.8%	$5,483	$4,935	$4,386	**$6,371**	**$5,734**	**$5,097**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,298*	*$4,768*	*$4,238*	***$6,026***	***$5,423***	***$4,821***

TABLE 7 (Continued)

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
2. Using Test Results Only for 2000						
2A. 67% of Pupils Meet/ Exceed Standard	$5,649	$5,084	$4,519	**$5,954**	**$5,359**	**$4,763**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,379*	*$4,841*	*$4,303*	***$5,632***	***$5,069***	***$4,506***
2B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$5,218	$4,696	$4,174	**$5,915**	**$5,324**	**$4,732**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,182*	*$4,664*	*$4,146*	***$5,783***	***$5,205***	***$4,626***
2C. A. + F/R $ 16.5%	$5,226	$4,703	$4,181	**$5,950**	**$5,355**	**$4,760**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,175*	*$4,658*	*$4,140*	***$5,797***	***$5,217***	***$4,638***
2D. A. + F/R $ 34.8%	$5,282	$4,754	$4,226	***$6,189***	***$5,570***	***$4,951***
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,126*	*$4,613*	*$4,101*	***$5,896***	***$5,306***	***$4,717***

TABLE 7 (Continued)

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
3. Using Test Results Only for 2000						
3A. 67%-83% of Pupils Meet/Exceed Standard	$5,424	$4,882	$4,339	**$5,928**	**$5,335**	**$4,742**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,187*	*$4,668*	*$4,150*	***$5,704***	***$5,134***	***$4,563***
3B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$5,230	$4,707	$4,184	**$5,925**	**$5,333**	**$4,740**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,197*	*$4,677*	*$4,158*	***$5,795***	***$5,216***	***$4,636***
3C. A. + F/R $ 16.5%	$5,236	$4,712	$4,189	**$5,959**	**$5,363**	**$4,767**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,188*	*$4,669*	*$4,150*	***$5,808***	***$5,227***	***$4,646***
3D. A. + F/R $ 34.8%	$5,282	$4,754	$4,226	**$6,189**	**$5,570**	**$4,951**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,126*	*$4,613*	*$4,101*	***$5,896***	***$5,306***	***$4,717***

TABLE 7 (Continued)

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
4. Using Test Results Only for 2000						
4A. 67% of Pupils Meet/ Exceed Standard and $50% of Pupils do so on Every Test	$5,877	$5,289	$4,702	**$6,102**	**$5,492**	**$4,882**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,586*	*$5,027*	*$4,469*	***$5,734***	***$5,161***	***$4,587***
4B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$5,456	$4,910	$4,365	**$6,223**	**$5,601**	**$4,978**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,476*	*$4,928*	*$4,381*	***$6,162***	***$5,546***	***$4,930***
4C. A. + F/R $ 16.5%	$5,505	$4,955	$4,404	**$6,286**	**$5,657**	**$5,029**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,501*	*$4,951*	*$4,401*	***$6,194***	***$5,575***	***$4,955***
4D. A. + F/R $ 34.8%	$5,810	$5,229	$4,648	**$6,678**	**$6,010**	**$4,951**
w/*Efficiency Filter*	*$5,651*	*$5,086*	*$4,521*	***$6,379***	***$5,741***	***$5,103***

TABLE 7 (Continued)

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
5. Using Test Results for 1999 and 2000						
5A. 83% or meet improvement over time standard	$5,614	$5,053	$4,491	**$5,962**	**$5,366**	**$4,770**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,314*	*$4,783*	*$4,251*	***$5,588***	***$5,029***	***$4,470***
5B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$5,152	$4,637	$4,122	**$5,980**	**$5,382**	**$4,784**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,084*	*$4,576*	*$4,067*	***$5,844***	***$5,260***	***$4,675***
5C. A. + F/R $ 16.5%	$5,146	$4,631	$4,117	**$5,961**	**$5,365**	**$4,769**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,028*	*$4,525*	*$4,022*	***$5,747***	***$5,172***	***$4,598***
5D. A. + F/R $ 34.8%	$5,124	$4,612	$4,099	**$5,886**	**$5,297**	**$4,709**
w/*Efficiency Filter*	*$4,751*	*$4,276*	*$3,801*	***$5,270***	***$4,743***	***$4,216***

TABLE 8

ALTERNATIVE BASE COST FIGURES FOR ILLINOIS *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS* BASED ON ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SELECTING SUCCESSFUL DISTRICTS AND ALTERNATIVE WAYS OF CALCULATING A BASE COST LEVEL

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
1. Using Test Results for 1999 and 2000						
1A. 67% of Pupils Meet/ Exceed Standard	$6,410	$5,199	$4,621	**$6,117**	**$5,505**	**$4,894**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$6,170*	*$5,553*	*$4,936*	***$5,851***	***$5,266***	***$4,681***
1B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$5,795	$5,216	$4,636	**$5,663**	**$5,097**	**$4,530**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,404*	*$4,864*	*$4,323*	***$5,341***	***$4,807***	***$4,273***
1C. A. + F/R $ 8.8%	$5,940	$5,346	$4,752	**$5,830**	**$5,247**	**$4,664**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,847*	*$5,262*	*$4,678*	***$5,715***	***$5,144***	***$4,572***
1D. A. + F/R $ 30.2%	$6,594	$4,935	$4,386	**$6,587**	**$5,928**	**$5,270**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$8,171*	*$7,354*	*$6,537*	***$7,674***	***$6,907***	***$6,139***

TABLE 8 (Continued)

Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels						
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
2. Using Test Results Only for 2000						
2A. 67% of Pupils Meet/ Exceed Standard	$6,385	$5,747	$5,108	**$6,112**	**$5,501**	**$4,890**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$6,132*	*$5,519*	*$4,906*	***$5,831***	***$5,248***	***$4,665***
2B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$6,001	$5,401	$4,801	**$5,849**	**$5,264**	**$4,679**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,492*	*$4,943*	*$4,394*	***$5,396***	***$4,856***	***$4,317***
2C. A. + F/R $ 8.8%	$6,028	$5,425	$4,822	**$5,934**	**$5,341**	**$4,747**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,801*	*$5,221*	*$4,641*	***$5,695***	***$5,126***	***$4,556***
2D. A. + F/R $ 30.2%	$6,156	$5,549	$4,932	***$6,334***	***$5,701***	***$5,067***
w/Efficiency Filter	*$7,124*	*$6,412*	*$5,699*	***$6,977***	***$6,279***	***$5,582***

TABLE 8 (Continued)

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
3. Using Test Results Only for 2000						
3A. 67%-83% of Pupils Meet/Exceed Standard	$5,872	$5,285	$4,698	**$5,677**	**$5,109**	**$4,542**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,903*	*$5,313*	*$4,722*	***$5,644***	***$5,134***	***$4,563***
3B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$5,788	$5,209	$4,630	**$5,684**	**$5,116**	**$4,547**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,537*	*$4,983*	*$4,430*	***$5,419***	***$4,877***	***$4,335***
3C. A. + F/R $ 8.8%	$5,883	$5,295	$4,706	**$5,826**	**$5,243**	**$4,661**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,859*	*$5,273*	*$4,687*	***$5,727***	***$5,154***	***$4,582***
3D. A. + F/R $ 30.2%	$6,290	$5,661	$5,032	**$6,430**	**$5,787**	**$5,144**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$7,252*	*$6,527*	*$5,802*	***$7,061***	***$6,355***	***$5,649***

TABLE 8 (Continued)

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
4. Using Test Results Only for 2000						
4A. 67% of Pupils Meet/ Exceed Standard and $50% of Pupils do so on Every Test	$6,556	$5,900	$5,245	**$6,236**	**$5,612**	**$4,989**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$6,210*	*$5,581*	*$4,961*	***$5,877***	***$5,289***	***$4,701***
4B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$6,161	$5,545	$4,929	**$5,941**	**$5,347**	**$4,753**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,450*	*$4,905*	*$4,360*	***$5,353***	***$4,818***	***$4,282***
4C. A. + F/R $ 8.8%	$6,242	$5,618	$4,994	**$6,052**	**$5,447**	**$4,842**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,870*	*$5,283*	*$4,696*	***$5,729***	***$5,156***	***$4,583***
4D. A. + F/R $ 30.2%	$6,659	$5,993	$5,327	**$6,631**	**$5,968**	**$5,305**
w/*Efficiency Filter*	*$7,648*	*$6,883*	*$6,118*	***$7,325***	***$6,593***	***$5,860***

TABLE 8 (Continued)

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
5. Using Test Results for 1999 and 2000						
5A. 83% or meet improvement over time standard	$6,394	$5,755	$5,115	**$6,165**	**$5,549**	**$4,932**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$6,004*	*$5,404*	*$4,803*	***$5,727***	***$5,154***	***$4,582***
5B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$5,406	$4,865	$4,325	**$5,480**	**$4,932**	**$4,384**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,335*	*$4,802*	*$4,268*	***$5,331***	***$4,798***	***$4,265***
5C. A. + F/R $ 8.8%	$5,289	$4,760	$4,231	**$5,465**	**$4,919**	**$4,372**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$5,226*	*$4,703*	*$4,182*	***$5,320***	***$4,788***	***$4,256***
5D. A. + F/R $ 30.2%	$4,841	$4,357	$3,873	**$5,409**	**$4,868**	**$4,327**
w/*Efficiency Filter*	*$4,585*	*$4,127*	*$3,668*	***$5,259***	***$4,733***	***$4,207***

TABLE 9

ALTERNATIVE BASE COST FIGURES FOR ILLINOIS *HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS* BASED ON ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SELECTING SUCCESSFUL DISTRICTS AND ALTERNATIVE WAYS OF CALCULATING A BASE COST LEVEL

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
1. Using Test Results for 1999 and 2000						
1A. 67% of Pupils Meet/ Exceed Standard	$10,449	$9,404	$8,359	**$9,884**	**$8,896**	**$7,907**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$9,591*	*$8,632*	*$7,673*	***$9,159***	***$8,243***	***$7,327***
1B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$10,691	$9,622	$8,553	**$10,072**	**$9,065**	**$8,058**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$10,342*	*$9,308*	*$8,274*	***$9,724***	***$8,752***	***$7,779***
1C. A. + F/R $ 6.6%	$10,590	$9,531	$8,472	**$10,014**	**$9,013**	**$8,011**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$10,162*	*$9,146*	*$9,146*	***$9,627***	***$8,664***	***$7,702***
1D. A. + F/R $20.7%	$6,643	$5,979	$5,314	**$7,724**	**$6,952**	**$6,179**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$6,643*	*$5,979*	*$5,314*	***$7,724***	***$6,952***	***$6,179***

TABLE 9 (Continued)

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
2. Using Test Results Only for 2000						
2A. 67% of Pupils Meet/ Exceed Standard	$10,277	$9,249	$8,222	**$9,786**	**$8,807**	**$7,829**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$9,476*	*$8,528*	*$7,581*	***$9,106***	***$8,195***	***$7,285***
2B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$10,407	$9,366	$8,326	**$9,895**	**$8,906**	**$7,916**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$10,112*	*$9,101*	*$8,090*	***$9,578***	***$8,620***	***$7,662***
2C. A. + F/R $ 6.6%	$10,248	$9,223	$8,198	**$9,815**	**$8,834**	**$7,852**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$9,918*	*$8,926*	*$7,934*	***$9,499***	***$8,549***	***$7,599***
2D. A. + F/R $ 20.7%	$7,028	$6,325	$5,622	**$8,191**	**$7,372**	**$6,553**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$7,261*	*$6,535*	*$5,809*	***$8,404***	***$7,564***	***$6,723***

TABLE 9 (Continued)

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
3. Using Test Results Only for 2000						
3A. 67%-83% of Pupils Meet/Exceed Standard	$9,872	$8,885	$7,898	**$9,453**	**$8,508**	**$7,562**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$9,166*	*$8,249*	*$7,333*	***$8,864***	***$7,978***	***$7,091***
3B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$10,406	$9,365	$8,325	**$9,890**	**$8,901**	**$7,912**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$10,109*	*$9,098*	*$8,087*	***$9,567***	***$8,610***	***$7,654***
3C. A. + F/R $ 6.6%	$10,247	$9,222	$8,198	**$9,810**	**$8,829**	**$7,848**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$9,915*	*$8,924*	*$7,932*	***$9,488***	***$8,539***	***$7,590***
3D. A. + F/R $ 20.7%	$7,028	$6,325	$5,622	**$8,191**	**$7,372**	**$6,553**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$7,261*	*$6,859*	*$6,097*	***$8,404***	***$7,564***	***$6,723***

TABLE 9 (Continued)

	Alternative Approaches to Calculate Base Cost Levels					
	Using Raw Spending Data Tuition Level			**Spend. Data Adj. by COE Tuition Level**		
	100%	*90%*	*80%*	***100%***	***90%***	***80%***
Alternative Approach to Identify Successful Districts						
5. Using Test Results for 1999 and 2000						
5A. 83% or meet improvement over time standard	$9,725	$8,753	$7,780	**$9,502**	**$8,552**	**$7,602**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$9,202*	*$8,282*	*$7,362*	***$9,105***	***$8,195***	***$7,284***
5B. A. + ½ Std. Dev. Range on F/R	$8,821	$7,939	$7,057	**$8,857**	**$7,971**	**$7,086**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$8,119*	*$7,307*	*$6,495*	***$8,157***	***$7,341***	***$6,526***
5C. A. + F/R $ 6.6%	$8,444	$7,600	$6,755	**$8,452**	**$7,607**	**$6,762**
w/Efficiency Filter	*$7,921*	*$7,129*	*$6,337*	***$8,201***	***$7,381***	***$6,561***
5D. A. + F/R $ 20.7%	$7,766	$6,989	$6,213	**$7,724**	**$6,952**	**$6,179**
w/*Efficiency Filter*	*$7,161*	*$6,445*	*$5,729*	***$8,371***	***$7,534***	***$6,697***

TABLE 10-A

COMPARISON OF BASE COST FIGURES (USING 80 PERCENT OF TUITION CHARGE ADJUSTED BY REGIONAL COST OF EDUCATION AS THE BASE COST) ASSOCIATED WITH DIFFERENT DECISIONS TO IDENTIFY SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF INTEREST FOR *UNIT DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS

Option	Test Data Years	Percent At-Risk	Percent that Meet Standard	Minimum % Meet Standard	Based on Change 1999 to 2000	Efficiency Criteria Without	Efficiency Criteria With
1A	1999 + 2000	Not a Criteria	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	\$4,772	*$4,475*
1B	1999 + 2000	16.5%-34.8%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	*$4,710*	\$4,598
1C	1999 + 2000	\$16.5%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	\$4,770	\$4,633
1D	1999 + 2000	\$34.8%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**\$5,097**	**\$4,821**
2A	2000 Only	Not a Criteria	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	\$4,763	*$4,506*
2B	2000 Only	16.5%-34.8%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	\$4,732	\$4,626
2C	2000 Only	\$16.5%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	\$4,760	\$4,638
2D	2000 Only	\$34.8%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**\$4,951**	**\$4,717**
3A	2000 Only	Not a Criteria	67%-83%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	\$4,742	\$4,563
3B	2000 Only	16.5%-34.8%	67%-83%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	\$4,740	\$4,636
3C	2000 Only	\$16.5%	67%-83%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	\$4,767	\$4,646
3D	2000 Only	\$34.8%	67%-83%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**\$4,951**	**\$4,717**
4A	2000 Only	Not a Criteria	\$67%	\$50%	Not a Criteria	**\$4,882**	\$4,587
4B	2000 Only	16.5%-34.8%	\$67%	\$50%	Not a Criteria	**\$4,978**	**\$4,930**
4C	2000 Only	\$16.5%	\$67%	\$50%	Not a Criteria	**\$5,029**	**\$4,955**
4D	2000 Only	\$34.8%	\$67%	\$50%	Not a Criteria	**\$4,951**	**\$5,103**
5A	1999 + 2000	Not a Criteria	N/A	Not a Criteria	Yes	\$4,770	*$4,470*
5B	1999 + 2000	16.5%-34.8%	N/A	Not a Criteria	Yes	\$4,784	**\$4,675**
5C	1999 + 2000	\$16.5%	N/A	Not a Criteria	Yes	\$4,769	\$4,598
5D	1999 + 2000	\$34.8%	N/A	Not a Criteria	Yes	*$4,709*	*$4,216*

Note: Figures that are **bolded** appear to be relatively high while figures that are *italicized* appear to be relatively low.

TABLE 10-B

COMPARISON OF BASE COST FIGURES (USING 80 PERCENT OF TUITION CHARGE ADJUSTED BY REGIONAL COST OF EDUCATION AS THE BASE COST) ASSOCIATED WITH DIFFERENT DECISIONS TO IDENTIFY SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF INTEREST FOR *ELEMENTARY DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS

Option	Test Data Years	Percent At-Risk	Percent that Meet Standard	Minimum % Meet Standard	Based on Change 1999 to 2000	Efficiency Criteria Without	Efficiency Criteria With
1A	1999 + 2000	Not a Criteria	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**$4,894**	$4,681
1B	1999 + 2000	16.5%-34.8%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	$4,530	*$4,273*
1C	1999 + 2000	\$16.5%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	$4,664	$4,572
1D	1999 + 2000	\$34.8%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**$5,270**	**$6,139**
2A	2000 Only	Not a Criteria	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**$4,890**	$4,665
2B	2000 Only	16.5%-34.8%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	$4,679	*$4,317*
2C	2000 Only	\$16.5%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	$4,747	$4,556
2D	2000 Only	\$34.8%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**$5,067**	**$5,582**
3A	2000 Only	Not a Criteria	67%-83%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	$4,542	$4,563
3B	2000 Only	16.5%-34.8%	67%-83%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	$4,547	*$4,335*
3C	2000 Only	\$16.5%	67%-83%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	$4,661	$4,582
3D	2000 Only	\$34.8%	67%-83%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**$5,144**	**$5,649**
4A	2000 Only	Not a Criteria	\$67%	\$50%	Not a Criteria	**$4,989**	$4,701
4B	2000 Only	16.5%-34.8%	\$67%	\$50%	Not a Criteria	$4,753	*$4,282*
4C	2000 Only	\$16.5%	\$67%	\$50%	Not a Criteria	$4,842	$4,583
4D	2000 Only	\$34.8%	\$67%	\$50%	Not a Criteria	**$5,305**	**$5,860**
5A	1999 + 2000	Not a Criteria	N/A	Not a Criteria	Yes	**$4,932**	$4,582
5B	1999 + 2000	16.5%-34.8%	N/A	Not a Criteria	Yes	*$4,384*	*$4,265*
5C	1999 + 2000	\$16.5%	N/A	Not a Criteria	Yes	*$4,372*	*$4,256*
5D	1999 + 2000	\$34.8%	N/A	Not a Criteria	Yes	*$4,327*	*$4,207*

Note: Figures that are **bolded** appear to be relatively high while figures that are *italicized* appear to be relatively low.

TABLE 10-C

COMPARISON OF BASE COST FIGURES (USING 80 PERCENT OF TUITION CHARGE ADJUSTED BY REGIONAL COST OF EDUCATION AS THE BASE COST) ASSOCIATED WITH DIFFERENT DECISIONS TO IDENTIFY SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF INTEREST FOR *HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS

Option	Test Data Years	Percent At-Risk	Percent that Meet Standard	Minimum % Meet Standard	Based on Change 1999 to 2000	Efficiency Criteria Without	Efficiency Criteria With
1A	1999 + 2000	Not a Criteria	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**\$7,907**	\$7,327
1B	1999 + 2000	16.5%-34.8%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**\$8,058**	**\$7,779**
1C	1999 + 2000	\$16.5%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**\$8,011**	**\$7,702**
1D	1999 + 2000	\$34.8%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	*\$6,179*	*\$6,179*
2A	2000 Only	Not a Criteria	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	\$7,829	\$7,285
2B	2000 Only	16.5%-34.8%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**\$7,916**	**\$7,662**
2C	2000 Only	\$16.5%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	\$7,852	**\$7,599**
2D	2000 Only	\$34.8%	\$67%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	*\$6,553*	\$6,723
3A	2000 Only	Not a Criteria	67%-83%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	\$7,562	\$7,091
3B	2000 Only	16.5%-34.8%	67%-83%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	**\$7,912**	**\$7,654**
3C	2000 Only	\$16.5%	67%-83%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	\$7,848	**\$7,590**
3D	2000 Only	\$34.8%	67%-83%	Not a Criteria	Not a Criteria	*\$6,553*	\$6,723
5A	1999 + 2000	Not a Criteria	N/A	Not a Criteria	Yes	\$7,602	\$7,284
5B	1999 + 2000	16.5%-34.8%	N/A	Not a Criteria	Yes	\$7,086	*\$6,526*
5C	1999 + 2000	\$16.5%	N/A	Not a Criteria	Yes	\$6,762	*\$6,561*
5D	1999 + 2000	\$34.8%	N/A	Not a Criteria	Yes	*\$6,179*	*\$6,697*

Note: Figures that are **bolded** appear to be relatively high while figures that are *italicized* appear to be relatively low.

TABLE 11-A

AT-RISK STUDENT FUNDING SYSTEMS IN SELECTED STATES

(STATE FOUNDATION FORMULAS)

State	At-Risk Funding In the Foundation Formula	Identification for Foundation Formulas	Distribution for Base Funding
California	None	NA	NA
Florida	None	NA	NA
Georgia	Yes	Students in Remedial Education Programs	Identified students are provided with an extra .2918 weight.
Massachusetts	Yes	Per Student based on free and reduced lunch	Additional per student funding of: $2,228/Elem. - $1,794/H.S.
Michigan	None	NA	NA
Missouri	Yes	Per Student based on free and reduced lunch	$655 per identified student.
New York	Yes	% of students below minimum competence on 3rd & 6th grade test.	Identified students are provided with an extra .25 weight.
North Carolina	None	NA	NA
Ohio	None	NA	NA
Pennsylvania	Yes	If more than 10% of students age 5-17 are on AFDC	$50 per AFDC student
Tennessee	None	NA	NA
Texas	None	NA	NA
Washington	None	NA	NA
Wisconsin	None	NA	NA

PREPARED BY THE EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

TABLE 11-B

AT-RISK FUNDING SYSTEMS IN SELECTED STATES

(STATE CATEGORICAL AID)

State	Program Name	Categorical Funding Level (00-01)	Identification for Categorical
California	Economic Impact Aid	$426,928,000	Children 5 - 17 receiving AFDC + LEP Students
Florida	Supplemental Academic Instruction	$662,632,143	Funds for projects targeted to "help students gain at least a year of knowledge for each year in school."
Georgia	Remedial Education Program	$71,447,992	Students in grades 2-5 & 9-12 who are deficient in reading, math or writing.
Massachusetts	Academic Support Grants	$18,930,700	Students with low test scores
Michigan	At-Risk Pupils	$304,000,000	Free/Reduced Lunch
Missouri	Children At-Risk in Education	$333,000,000	Free/Reduced Lunch
Missouri	Remedial Reading	$11,096,925	Students with low test scores
New York	Extraordinary Needs Aid	$677,700,000	Free/Reduced Lunch or Students with low test scores (Grades 3 & 6)
New York	Educationally Related Support Services Aid	$70,900,000	Students are referred for services by school building administrator.
New York	Aid for Summer School Programs	$35,100,000	The program must provide help to students in required academic subject or on the regents exam.
New York	Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention	$55,500,000	Districts with attendance in the bottom decile for the state.
New York	Compensatory Education	$262,500,000	Districts that are in the top quartile of need, based on state testing.
North Carolina	At-Risk Student Services	$186,313,299	Students in treatment, poverty & ADM
North Carolina	Improving Student Account.	$39,015,255	Students with low test scores (Grade 3-8)
Ohio	Disadvantaged Pupil Impact Aid	$305,367,571	Students with families enrolled in the "Ohio Works First" (The State's welfare program).
Pennsylvania	None	NA	NA
Tennessee	None	NA	NA
Texas	Compensatory & Accelerated Instruction	$9,600,000	Low academic achievement, pregnant/parent, LEP and abused.
Washington	Learning Assistance Program	$62,276,834	Students with low test scores (Grades 4 & 8 based on a 5 yr. Average).
Wisconsin	Alternative Education Program	$5,000,000	Academic failure, truancy, expulsion, suspension, disruptive behavior or substance abuse.
Wisconsin	Preschool to Grade 5	$7,353,700	Based on districts drop-out rates.
Wisconsin	Student Achievement Guarantee in Ed.	$58,754,600	Districts with 30% or more of their students identified as low income.

PREPARED BY THE EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

TABLE 11-C

STATE SPENDING ON AT-RISK CATEGORICAL AID

(ALL INFORMATION IS FOR FY 2000-2001)

State	Categorical Spending (2000-2001)	Free/Reduced Lunch Students (2000-2001)	Spending Per Free/Reduced Lunch Students	Per Student Spending (1999-2000)	At-Risk Spending As A % of Total Per Student Funding
California	$426,928,000	2,856,230	$149.47	$5,580	2.68%
Florida	$662,632,143	1,078,003	$614.68	$6,068	10.13%
Georgia	$71,447,992	638,583	$111.89	$6,484	1.73%
Massachusetts	$18,930,700	257,590	$73.49	$7,943	0.93%
Michigan	$304,000,000	537,763	$565.30	$8,153	6.93%
Missouri	$333,096,925	332,099	$1,003.00	$5,692	17.62%
New York	$1,010,700,000	1,380,028	$732.38	$9,844	7.44%
North Carolina	$225,328,554	523,386	$430.52	$6,565	6.56%
Ohio	$305,367,571	536,806	$568.86	$7,152	7.95%
Pennsylvania	NA	572,153	NA	$7,815	NA
Tennessee	NA	374,196	NA	$5,682	NA
Texas	$9,600,000	2,037,761	$4.71	$6,475	0.07%
Washington	$62,276,834	317,394	$196.21	$6,558	2.99%
Wisconsin	$71,108,300	238,754	$297.83	$8,055	3.70%

PREPARED BY THE EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

TABLE 12-A

AVERAGE LEVELS OF STUDENT/DISTRICT PERFORMANCE AND STUDENT NEED INDICATORS FOR QUINTILES OF *UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS, *EXCLUDING CHICAGO*, BASED ON THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARD ON THE ISAT IN 1999-2000

		Quintile of Percent of Students Meeting ISAT Standard				
	Districts and Students	Lowest	Second	Third	Fourth	Highest
(1)	Number of Districts	51	81	100	115	57
(2)	Number of Students	163,222	161,905	168,690	156,348	159,813
	Performance					
(3)	Percent Meeting ISAT Standard	50.0%	61.0%	68.0%	73.7%	82.7%
	*Ratio of **Not Meeting** Standard to State Average*	*1.513*	*1.181*	*.969*	*.796*	*.524*
(4)	Attendance Rate	92.3%	94.1%	94.8%	95.0%	95.7%
(5)	Chronic Truant Rate	7.0%	2.5%	1.5%	1.2%	0.4%
(6)	High School Drop-Out Rate	5.0%	3.0%	2.7%	2.4%	0.9%

TABLE 12-A (Continued)

		Quintile of Percent of Students Meeting ISAT Standard				
		Lowest	Second	Third	Fourth	Highest
	Pupil Need Indicator					
(7)	Census-Based At-Risk Percent	25.7%	14.4%	11.9%	10.5%	3.5%
	Ratio to State Average	*1.937*	*1.085*	*.897*	*.791*	*.264*
(8)	Low Income Student Percent	53.0%	32.0%	23.5%	17.6%	7.2%
	Ratio to State Average	*1.979*	*1.195*	*.878*	*.657*	*.269*
(9)	Free Lunch Eligible Percent	42.8%	25.1%	19.6%	13.4%	4.3%
	Ratio to State Average	*2.024*	*1.187*	*.927*	*.634*	*.203*
(10)	Reduced-Price Lunch Percent	6.4%	5.4%	4.9%	4.1%	1.7%
	Ratio to State Average	*1.413*	*1.192*	*1.082*	*.905*	*.375*
(11)	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Percent	49.2%	30.5%	24.5%	17.6%	6.0%
	Ratio to State Average	*1.916*	*1.188*	*.954*	*.685*	*.234*

TABLE 12-B

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PAIRS OF ALTERNATIVE INDICATORS OF STUDENT/DISTRICT PERFORMANCE, BETWEEN PAIRS OF ALTERNATIVE INDICATORS OF STUDENT NEED, AND BETWEEN INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE AND NEED FOR ALL *UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN ILLINOIS EXCEPT CHICAGO* IN 1999-2000

Performance Indicators	Performance Indicators: Percent Meet/Exceed ISAT Standard	Attend. Rate	Chronic Truancy Rate	High School Drop-Out Rate
(1) Percent Meet/Exceed ISAT Standard	1.000	.769	-.676	-.375
(2) Attendance Rate	--	1.000	-.683	-.343
(3) Chronic Truancy Rate	--	--	1.000	.249

Need Indicators	Need Indicators: Census Based At-Risk Percent	Low Income Student Percent	Free Lunch Eligible Percent	Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Percent	Free/ Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Percent
(4) Census-Based At-Risk Percent	1.000	.824	.802	.430	.789
(5) Low Income Student Percent	--	1.000	.959	.633	.961
(6) Free Lunch Eligible Percent	--	--	1.000	.598	.993
(7) Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible Percent	--	--	--	1.000	.689

TABLE 12-B (Continued)

Performance Indicators	Need Indicators: Census Based At-Risk Percent	Low Income Student Percent	Free Lunch Eligible Percent	Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Percent	Free/ Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Percent
(8) Percent Meet/ Exceed ISAT Standard	-.633	-.864	-.835	-.550	-.837
(9) Attendance Rate	-.699	-.803	-.763	-.371	-.745
(10) Chronic Truancy Rate	.510	.683	.657	.356	.647
(11) High School Drop-Out Rate	.506	.434	.460	.308	.462

TABLE 13-A

AVERAGE LEVELS OF STUDENT/DISTRICT PERFORMANCE AND STUDENT NEED INDICATORS FOR QUINTILES OF *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS BASED ON THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARD ON THE ISAT IN 1999-2000

		Quintile of Percent of Students Meeting ISAT Standard				
	Districts and Students	Lowest	Second	Third	Fourth	Highest
(1)	Number of Districts	68	85	95	61	72
(2)	Number of Students	105,920	103,505	110,076	97,836	103,693
	Performance					
(3)	Percent Meeting ISAT Standard	45.5%	66.5%	74.9%	80.1%	86.2%
	*Ratio of **Not Meeting** Standard to State Average*	*1.847*	*1.136*	*.851*	*.675*	*.468*
(4)	Attendance Rate	94.3%	95.0%	95.7%	95.8%	96.0%
(5)	Chronic Truancy Rate	1.8%	0.7%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%
(6)	High School Drop-Out Rate	--	--	--	--	--

TABLE 13-A (Continued)

		Quintile of Percent of Students Meeting ISAT Standard				
		Lowest	Second	Third	Fourth	Highest
	Pupil Need Indicator					
(7)	Census-Based At-Risk Percent	19.2%	10.8%	5.9%	4.1%	3.1%
	Ratio to State Average	*2.212*	*1.244*	*.680*	*.472*	*.357*
(8)	Low Income Student Percent	55.2%	24.1%	13.0%	10.1%	5.5%
	Ratio to State Average	*2.537*	*1.108*	*.597*	*.464*	*.253*
(9)	Free Lunch Eligible Percent	46.0%	18.2%	7.9%	6.5%	3.5%
	Ratio to State Average	*2.777*	*1.099*	*.477*	*.393*	*.211*
(10)	Reduced-Price Lunch Percent	7.3%	4.5%	2.3%	2.0%	1.3%
	Ratio to State Average	*2.088*	*1.287*	*.658*	*.572*	*.372*
(11)	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Percent	50.6%	22.6%	10.2%	8.6%	4.8%
	Ratio to State Average	*2.594*	*1.159*	*.523*	*.441*	*.246*

TABLE 13-B

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PAIRS OF ALTERNATIVE INDICATORS OF STUDENT/DISTRICT PERFORMANCE, BETWEEN PAIRS OF ALTERNATIVE INDICATORS OF STUDENT NEED, AND BETWEEN INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE AND NEED FOR ALL *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS IN 1999-2000

	Performance Indicators			
Performance Indicators	Percent Meet/Exceed ISAT Standard	Attend. Rate	Chronic Truancy Rate	High School Drop-Out Rate
(1) Percent Meet/Exceed ISAT Standard	1.000	.676	-.443	--
(2) Attendance Rate	--	1.000	-.435	--
(3) Chronic Truancy Rate	--	--	1.000	--

	Need Indicators				
Need Indicators	Census Based At-Risk Percent	Low Income Student Percent	Free Lunch Eligible Percent	Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Percent	Free/ Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Percent
(4) Census-Based At-Risk Percent	1.000	.791	.716	.541	.713
(5) Low Income Student Percent	--	1.000	.878	.765	.888
(6) Free Lunch Eligible Percent	--	--	1.000	.759	.996
(7) Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible Percent	--	--	--	1.000	.814

TABLE 13-B (Continued)

Performance Indicators	Need Indicators: Census Based At-Risk Percent	Low Income Student Percent	Free Lunch Eligible Percent	Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Percent	Free/ Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Percent
(8) Percent Meet/ Exceed ISAT Standard	-.631	-.862	-.744	-.648	-.753
(9) Attendance Rate	-.601	-.686	-.626	-.516	-.629
(10) Chronic Truancy Rate	.530	.499	.410	.250	.400
(11) High School Drop-Out Rate	--	--	--	--	--

TABLE 14-A

AVERAGE LEVELS OF STUDENT/DISTRICT PERFORMANCE AND STUDENT NEED INDICATORS FOR QUINTILES OF *HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS BASED ON THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING MEETING OR EXCEEDING STANDARD ON THE ISAT IN 1999-2000

		Quintile of Percent of Students Meeting ISAT Standard				
	Districts and Students	Lowest	Second	Third	Fourth	Highest
(1)	Number of Districts	14	31	14	9	12
(2)	Number of Students	33,327	31,580	30,475	30,881	31,879
	Performance					
(3)	Percent Meeting ISAT Standard	53.2%	62.7%	73.9%	76.7%	82.5%
	*Ratio of **Not Meeting** Standard to State Average*	*1.539*	*1.227*	*.859*	*.766*	*.576*
(4)	Attendance Rate	89.9%	93.2%	93.8%	93.2%	93.8%
(5)	Chronic Truancy Rate	7.0%	2.4%	1.0%	0.9%	0.8%
(6)	High School Drop-Out Rate	5.2%	4.4%	3.2%	3.1%	1.8%

TABLE 14-A(Continued)

		Quintile of Percent of Students Meeting ISAT Standard				
		Lowest	Second	Third	Fourth	Highest
	Pupil Need Indicator					
(7)	Census-Based At-Risk Percent	11.8%	7.9%	4.2%	2.5%	1.6%
	Ratio to State Average	*2.070*	*1.386*	*.737*	*.439*	*.281*
(8)	Low Income Student Percent	36.6%	14.7%	8.3%	9.8%	5.8%
	Ratio to State Average	*2.392*	*.961*	*.542*	*.641*	*.379*
(9)	Free Lunch Eligible Percent	28.8%	7.7%	5.1%	7.8%	3.3%
	Ratio to State Average	*2.667*	*.713*	*.472*	*.722*	*.306*
(10)	Reduced-Price Lunch Percent	6.6%	2.4%	1.3%	2.7%	1.1%
	Ratio to State Average	*2.276*	*.828*	*.448*	*.931*	*.379*
(11)	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Percent	35.4%	9.9%	6.4%	10.5%	4.4%
	Ratio to State Average	*2.603*	*.728*	*.471*	*.772*	*.324*

TABLE 14-B

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PAIRS OF ALTERNATIVE INDICATORS OF STUDENT/DISTRICT PERFORMANCE, BETWEEN PAIRS OF ALTERNATIVE INDICATORS OF STUDENT NEED, AND BETWEEN INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE AND NEED FOR ALL *HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS* IN ILLINOIS IN 1999-2000

	Performance Indicators			
Performance Indicators	Percent Meet/Exceed ISAT Standard	Attend. Rate	Chronic Truancy Rate	High School Drop-Out Rate
(1) Percent Meet/Exceed ISAT Standard	1.000	.527	-.387	-.572
(2) Attendance Rate	--	1.000	-.460	-.376
(3) Chronic Truancy Rate	--	--	1.000	.401

	Need Indicators				
Need Indicators	Census Based At-Risk Percent	Low Income Student Percent	Free Lunch Eligible Percent	Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Percent	Free/ Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Percent
(4) Census-Based At-Risk Percent	1.000	.669	.624	.422	.592
(5) Low Income Student Percent	--	1.000	.939	.847	.934
(6) Free Lunch Eligible Percent	--	--	1.000	.909	.996
(7) Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible Percent	--	--	--	1.000	.942

TABLE 14-B (Continued)

Performance Indicators	Need Indicators: Census Based At-Risk Percent	Low Income Student Percent	Free Lunch Eligible Percent	Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Percent	Free/ Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Percent
(8) Percent Meet/ Exceed ISAT Standard	-.591	-.741	-.662	-.553	-.650
(9) Attendance Rate	-.375	-.558	-.584	-.424	-.560
(10) Chronic Truancy Rate	.421	.513	.640	.638	.649
(11) High School Drop-Out Rate	.490	.535	.464	.372	.452

APPENDIX A

REGRESSION INFORMATION

	UNIT w/out Chicago		UNIT w/ Chicago		ELEMENTARY		HIGH SCHOOL	
R Square	0.763		0.840		0.873		0.897	
Factors in Regression	**Beta**	**B**	**Beta**	**B**	**Beta**	**B**	**Beta**	**B**
1998 Operating Tax Rate	0.250	362.889	0.253	458.164	0.177	411.380	0.418	1660.664
Average Teacher Salary	0.264	0.04249	--	--	0.378	8.30E-02	--	--
District Enrollment	0.094	1.09E-02	2.790	0.0145	0.089	3.87E-02	--	--
EAV per Pupil	0.508	1.07E-02	0.488	1.31E-02	0.390	5.46E-03	0.669	9.07E-03
GCEI Adjustment	0.194	1992.593	0.245	2670.308	0.098	1964.407	0.241	7326.294
Limited English Proficient Percent	--	--	--	--	-0.055	-10.059	0.042	23.564
Percent Free or Reduced Priced Lunch	0.366	2005.351	0.430	1591.757	0.143	1018.86	0.038	663.011
Percent Special Education	0.061	1763.205	0.062	1971.925	0.043	2000.236	0.090	85.470
Teachers per 1,000 Pupils	0.339	41.903	0.230	31.217	0.413	69.869	0.164	60.504
Enrollment Squared	--	--	-2.851	-3.412E-08	--	--	--	--
Percent Free or Reduced Priced Lunch Squared	--	--	0.249	1053.347	--	--	--	--
Constant	-2852.130		-1,632.086		-5804.525		-8846.675	
Average Spending	$6,319		$7,152		$6,970		$10,679	

APPENDIX B-1

LIST OF UNIT DISTRICTS BY ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SUCCESS

WITHOUT EFFICIENCY

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
46009262026	A C CENTRAL CUSD 262					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
33048217026	ABINGDON C U SCHOOL DIST 217																				
44063019024	ALDEN HEBRON SCHOOL DIST 19	X				X				X								X			
27066201026	ALEDO COMM UNIT SCH DIST 201																				
27094400026	ALEXIS C U SCH DIST 400																				
20093017024	ALLENDALE C C SCHOOL DIST 17	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
3025010026	ALTAMONT COMM UNIT SCH DIST 10	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
41057011026	ALTON COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 11																	X		X	X
28037225026	ALWOOD COMM UNIT SCH DIST 225	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
47052272026	AMBOY COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 272					X	X	X		X	X	X									
28037226026	ANNAWAN COMM UNIT SCH DIST 226	X				X				X				X							
11021306026	ARCOLA C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 306					X				X				X				X			
39055001026	ARGENTA-OREANA COMM UNIT SCH D 1					X				X				X				X			
11021305026	ARTHUR C U SCHOOL DIST 305	X				X				X				X							
47052275026	ASHTON COMM UNIT SCH DIST 275																				
22029001026	ASTORIA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1																				
38065213026	ATHENS COMM UNIT SCH DIST 213																				
39074039026	ATWOOD HAMMOND C U SCH DIST 39					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
51084010026	AUBURN COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 10	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
31045131022	AURORA EAST UNIT SCHOOL DIST 131																				
31045129022	AURORA WEST UNIT SCHOOL DIST 129																				
22029176026	AVON COMM UNIT SCH DIST 176																				
51084005026	BALL CHATHAM C U SCHOOL DIST 5	X				X				X				X				X			
34049220026	BARRINGTON C U SCHOOL DIST 220	X				X								X				X			
1075001026	BARRY COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 1																				
31045101022	BATAVIA UNIT SCHOOL DIST 101	X				X				X				X				X			
46009015026	BEARDSTOWN C U SCH DIST 15																				
56099200U26	BEECHER C U SCH DIST 200U	X				X				X								X			
3025020026	BEECHER CITY C U SCHOOL DIST 20					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
4004100026	BELVIDERE C U SCH DIST 100					X	X	X		X	X	X									
39074005026	BEMENT COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 5	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
41057008026	BETHALTO C U SCHOOL DIST 8																	X	X	X	
11070301026	BETHANY C U SCHOOL DIST 301	X				X				X				X				X			
54092001026	BISMARCK HENNING C U SCHOOL DIST					X				X								X			
17064087025	BLOOMINGTON SCH DIST 87	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
17020018026	BLUE RIDGE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 18	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
3003002026	BOND CO C U SCHOOL DIST 2					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
28088001026	BRADFORD COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1																				
48072309026	BRIMFIELD C U SCHOOL DIST 309	X				X								X				X			
50082188022	BROOKLYN UNIT DISTRICT 188																				
46005001026	BROWN COUNTY C U SCH DIST 1																	X	X	X	
3026201026	BROWNSTOWN C U SCH DIST 201					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
40007042026	BRUSSELS COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 42																				
40056008026	BUNKER HILL C U SCHOOL DIST 8																				
28006340026	BUREAU VALLEY CUSD 340	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
26062170026	BUSHNELL PRAIRIE CITY CUS D 170																				
47071226026	BYRON COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 226	X				X								X				X			
2002001022	CAIRO UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT 1																				
40007040026	CALHOUN COMM UNIT SCH DIST 40																	X	X	X	
28037227026	CAMBRIDGE C U SCH DIST 227					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
1001003026	CAMP POINT C U SCHOOL DIST 3																				
22029066025	CANTON UNION SCHOOL DIST 66																				
40056001026	CARLINVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 1	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
13014001026	CARLYLE C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 1																				
20097005026	CARMI-WHITE COUNTY C U S DIST 5					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
20083002026	CARRIER MILLS-STONEFORT CUSD 2																				
40031001026	CARROLLTON C U SCHOOL DIST 1																	X	X	X	
21100005026	CARTERVILLE C U SCH DIST 5	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
26034338026	CARTHAGE COMM UNIT SCH DIST #338																				
11012004C26	CASEY-WESTFIELD C U SCH DIST 4C																				
54092005026	CATLIN C U SCH DIST 5	X				X				X								X			
11087021026	CENTRAL A & M C U DIST #21					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
31045301026	CENTRAL COMM UNIT SCH DIST 301	X				X				X				X				X			
32038004026	CENTRAL COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 4	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
2077100026	CENTURY COMM UNIT SCH DIST 100																				
39074100026	CERRO GORDO C U SCHOOL DIST 100	X				X				X								X			
8008399026	CHADWICK-MILLEDGEVILLE CUSD 399	X				X				X								X			
9010004026	CHAMPAIGN COMM UNIT SCH DIST 4																				
11015001026	CHARLESTON C U SCHOOL DIST 1	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
17064009026	CHENOA C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 9																				
45079139026	CHESTER COMM UNIT SCH DIST 139																				
32038006026	CISSNA PARK COMM UNIT SCH DIST 6	X				X				X				X							
15016299025	CITY OF CHICAGO SCHOOL DIST 299																				
12013010026	CLAY CITY COMM UNIT DIST 10					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
17020015026	CLINTON C U SCHOOL DIST 15	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
24032001026	COAL CITY C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 1	X				X				X											
2091017022	COBDEN SCH UNIT DIST 17																				
26062180026	COLCHESTER C U SCHOOL DIST 180																	X		X	X
41057010026	COLLINSVILLE C U SCH DIST 10																	X	X	X	
45067004026	COLUMBIA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 4	X				X				X				X							
22029003026	COMM UNIT SCH DIST 3 FULTON CTY																				
31045300026	COMM UNIT SCH DIST 300																				
35050002026	COMMUNITY UNIT SCH DIST 2	X				X				X				X				X			
51084016026	COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DIST 16					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
19022200026	COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DIST 200	X				X								X				X			
1001004026	COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DIST 4																				
45079001022	COULTERVILLE UNIT SCHOOL DIST 1					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
11087003A26	COWDEN-HERRICK CUD 3A																				
21100003026	CRAB ORCHARD C U SCH DIST 3																				
56099201U26	CRETE MONEE C U SCHOOL DIST 201U																				
11018077026	CUMBERLAND C U SCHOOL DIST 77																				
8089201026	DAKOTA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 201					X				X								X			
26034336026	DALLAS CITY C U SCH DIST 336																				
54092118024	DANVILLE C C SCHOOL DIST 118																				
39055061025	DECATUR SCHOOL DISTRICT 61																				
53090701026	DEER CREEK-MACKINAW CUSD 701	X				X				X											
16019428026	DEKALB COMM UNIT SCH DIST 428	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
39074057026	DELAND-WELDON C U SCH DIST 57					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
53090703026	DELAVAN COMM UNIT DIST 703	X				X				X				X				X			
28006103022	DEPUE UNIT SCHOOL DIST 103																				
3025030026	DIETERICH COMM UNIT SCH DIST 30					X	X	X		X	X	X									
51084013026	DIVERNON C U SCHOOL DIST 13	X				X				X				X				X			
47052170022	DIXON UNIT SCHOOL DIST 170																				
2091066022	DONGOLA SCH UNIT DIST 66																				
32038003026	DONOVAN COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 3																				
30073300026	DU QUOIN C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 300																	X	X	X	
48072323026	DUNLAP C U SCHOOL DIST 323	X				X				X				X				X			
50082196026	DUPO COMM UNIT SCH DISTRICT 196																	X	X	X	
4101322026	DURAND C U SCH DIST 322					X				X				X				X			
35050009026	EARLVILLE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 9					X				X								X			
8043119022	EAST DUBUQUE UNIT SCH DIST 119					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
12080001026	EAST RICHLAND C U SCH DIST 1	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
50082189022	EAST ST LOUIS SCHOOL DIST 189																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
8008308026	EASTLAND COMM UNIT SCH DIST 308	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
11023006026	EDGAR COUNTY C U DIST 6					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
10011004026	EDINBURG C U SCH DIST 4																	X			
20024001026	EDWARDS COUNTY C U SCH DIST 1	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
41057007026	EDWARDSVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 7	X				X				X				X				X			
3025040026	EFFINGHAM COMM UNIT SCH DIST 40					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
2002005026	EGYPTIAN COMM UNIT SCH DIST 5																				
43102375026	EL PASO C U DISTRICT 375					X				X				X				X			
20083004026	ELDORADO COMM UNIT DISTRICT 4																				
19022205026	ELMHURST SCHOOL DIST 205	X				X								X				X			
48072322026	ELMWOOD C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 322	X				X				X				X				X			
14016401026	ELMWOOD PARK C U SCH DIST 401																				
30039196026	ELVERADO C U SCHOOL DIST 196																	X		X	X
55098001026	ERIE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1	X				X				X				X				X			
43102140026	EUREKA C U DIST 140	X				X				X				X							
48072265026	FARMINGTON CENTRAL C U S D 265	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
43102006026	FIELDCREST CUSD #6	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
11087002026	FINDLAY COMM UNIT SCH DIST 2																	X	X	X	
9010001026	FISHER C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 1	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
17053004026	FLANAGAN C U SCHOOL DIST 4	X				X								X				X			
12013035026	FLORA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 35					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
47071221026	FORRESTVILLE VALLEY C U S D 221	X				X				X				X				X			
21028168026	FRANKFORT COMM UNIT SCH DIST 168																				
46069001026	FRANKLIN C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 1	X				X				X				X				X			
8089145022	FREEPORT SCHOOL DIST 145																				
20083001026	GALATIA C U SCHOOL DIST 1																				
8043120022	GALENA UNIT SCHOOL DIST 120																				
33048205026	GALESBURG C U SCHOOL DIST 205																				
20030007026	GALLATIN C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 7	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X								
28037224026	GALVA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 224																				
28037228026	GENESEO COMM UNIT SCH DIST 228	X				X				X				X				X			
31045304026	GENEVA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 304	X				X				X				X							
16019424026	GENOA KINGSTON C U S DIST 424	X				X				X											
54092004026	GEORGETOWN-RIDGE FARM C U D 4																	X	X	X	
9027005026	GIBSON CITY-MELVIN-SIBLEY CUSD 5	X				X				X				X				X			
40056007026	GILLESPIE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 7																				
40056003026	GIRARD COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 3																	X	X	X	
2044001026	GOREVILLE COMM UNIT DIST 1	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
41057009026	GRANITE CITY C U SCHOOL DIST 9																				
32046006026	GRANT PARK C U SCHOOL DIST 6																				
20097001026	GRAYVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 1					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
40031010026	GREENFIELD C U SCHOOL DIST 10																	X	X	X	
38065200026	GREENVIEW C U SCH DIST 200	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
17064010026	GRIDLEY C U SCH DIST 10	X				X								X				X			
1075004026	GRIGGSVILLE-PERRY C U SCH DIST 4					X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X
26034328024	HAMILTON C C SCHOOL DIST 328	X				X				X				X				X			
25033010026	HAMILTON CO C U SCHOOL DIST 10	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X								
20035001026	HARDIN CO COMM UNIT DIST 1																				
4101122022	HARLEM UNIT DIST 122																				
20083003026	HARRISBURG C U SCHOOL DIST 3																				
38054021026	HARTSBURG EMDEN C U S DIST 21	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
44063050026	HARVARD C U SCHOOL DIST 50																				
38060126026	HAVANA COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 126																				
43059005026	HENRY-SENACHWINE CUSD 5	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
9010008026	HERITAGE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 8	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
21100004026	HERRIN C U SCH DIST 4																				
32046002026	HERSCHER COMM UNIT SCH DIST 2	X				X				X				X				X			
17064004026	HEYWORTH C U SCH DIST 4	X				X				X				X				X			
16019426026	HIAWATHA C U SCHOOL DIST 426																				
41057005026	HIGHLAND COMM UNIT SCH DIST 5	X				X				X				X				X			

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
10068003026	HILLSBORO COMM UNIT SCH DIST 3																				
16019429026	HINCKLEY BIG ROCK C U S D 429																				
54092011026	HOOPESTON AREA C U SCH DIST 11																				
44063158022	HUNTLEY CONS SCHOOL DIST 158	X				X				X				X							
12017001026	HUTSONVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 1																	X	X	X	
48072321026	IL VALLEY CENTRAL UNIT DIST 321	X				X				X				X							
48072327026	ILLINI BLUFFS CU SCH DIST 327	X				X				X											
38060189026	ILLINI CENTRAL C U SCH DIST 189	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
51084012026	ILLIOPOLIS C U SCHOOL DIST 12																				
16019425026	INDIAN CREEK COMM UNIT DIST 425	X				X				X				X				X			
19022204026	INDIAN PRAIRIE C U SCH DIST 204	X				X								X				X			
26062165026	INDUSTRY C U SCH DIST 165																				
32038009026	IROQUOIS CO C U SCHOOL DIST 9																	X	X	X	
32038010026	IROQUOIS WEST C U S DIST 10																				
46069117022	JACKSONVILLE SCHOOL DIST 117					X	X	X		X	X	X									
54092012026	JAMAICA C U SCHOOL DIST 12					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
12040001026	JASPER COUNTY COMM UNIT DIST 1					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
40042100026	JERSEY C U SCH DIST 100																	X	X	X	
44063012026	JOHNSBURG C U SCHOOL DIST 12					X				X				X							
21100001026	JOHNSTON CITY C U SCH DIST 1																				
2061038026	JOPPA-MAPLE GROVE UNIT DIST 38					X		X	X	X		X	X								
31045302026	KANELAND C U SCHOOL DIST 302	X				X				X				X							
32046111025	KANKAKEE SCHOOL DIST 111																				
11023003026	KANSAS COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 3	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
28037229026	KEWANEE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 229																				
33048202026	KNOXVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 202					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
28006303026	LA MOILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 303																				
26034335026	LAHARPE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 335	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
34049095026	LAKE ZURICH C U SCH DIST 95	X				X				X				X							
12051020026	LAWRENCE CO C U DISTRICT 20	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
50082009026	LEBANON COMM UNIT SCH DIST 9																				
47052271026	LEE CENTER C U SCHOOL DIST 271																				
35050001026	LELAND COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1																				
8089202026	LENA WINSLOW C U SCH DIST 202	X				X				X				X				X			
17064002026	LEROY COMMUNITY UNIT SCH DIST 2					X				X								X			
22029097026	LEWISTOWN SCHOOL DIST 97																				
17064007026	LEXINGTON C U SCH DIST 7	X				X								X				X			
1001002026	LIBERTY COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 2	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
19022202026	LISLE C U SCH DIST 202	X				X				X				X							
10068012026	LITCHFIELD C U SCHOOL DIST 12					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
41057004024	LIVINGSTON C C SCHOOL DIST 4																				
35050425026	LOSTANT COMM UNIT SCH DIST 425																	X			
11070303026	LOVINGTON C U SCHOOL DIST 303					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
43102021026	LOWPOINT-WASHBURN C U S DIST 21	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
26062185026	MACOMB COMM UNIT SCH DIST 185	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
41057012026	MADISON COMM UNIT SCH DIST 12																				
9010003026	MAHOMET-SEYMOUR C U SCH DIST 3	X				X				X				X				X			
32046005026	MANTENO COMM UNIT SCH DIST 5																				
21100002026	MARION COMM UNIT SCH DIST 2																				
50082040026	MARISSA C U SCH DIST 40	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
39055002026	MAROA FORSYTH C U SCH DIST 2	X				X								X				X			
11012002C26	MARSHALL C U SCHOOL DIST 2C					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
11012003C26	MARTINSVILLE C U SCH DIST 3C																	X	X	X	
50082019026	MASCOUTAH C U DISTRICT 19	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
2061001026	MASSAC UNIT DISTRICT #1																				
11015002026	MATTOON C U SCHOOL DIST 2	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
17064005026	MCLEAN COUNTY UNIT DIST NO 5	X				X				X				X				X			
46069011026	MEREDOSIA-CHAMBERSBURG CUSD 11																	X	X	X	
47071223026	MERIDIAN C U SCH DIST 223	X				X				X				X							
2077101026	MERIDIAN C U SCH DISTRICT 101																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
39055015026	MERIDIAN COMM UNIT SCH DIST 15	X				X				X								X			
43059007026	MIDLAND COMMUNITY UNIT DIST 7	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
38060191026	MIDWEST CENTRAL CUSD 191					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
49081040022	MOLINE UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT 40																	X	X	X	
32046001026	MOMENCE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1					X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X
27094038022	MONMOUTH UNIT SCH DIST 38																				
39074025026	MONTICELLO C U SCHOOL DIST 25	X				X				X				X				X			
55098006026	MORRISON COMM UNIT SCH DIST 6	X				X				X				X				X			
10011001026	MORRISONVILLE C U SCH DIST 1																				
53090709026	MORTON C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 709	X				X								X				X			
40056005026	MOUNT OLIVE C U SCHOOL DIST 5																				
8008304026	MT CARROLL COMM UNIT DIST 304																				
38054023026	MT PULASKI COMM UNIT DIST 23					X				X				X				X			
39055003026	MT ZION COMM UNIT SCH DIST 3	X				X				X				X							
3003001026	MULBERRY GROVE C U SCH DIST 1	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
30039186026	MURPHYSBORO C U SCH DIST 186																	X		X	X
19022203026	NAPERVILLE C U DIST 203	X				X								X				X			
26034325026	NAUVOO-COLUSA C U S DIST 325					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
11018003026	NEOGA COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 3					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
28006307024	NEPONSET COM CONS DIST 307	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
50082060026	NEW ATHENS C U SCHOOL DIST 60	X				X				X				X				X			
39055006026	NIANTIC-HARRISTOWN C U S D 6					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
10068022026	NOKOMIS COMM UNIT SCH DIST 22																	X	X	X	
20097003026	NORRIS CITY-OMAHA-ENFIELD CUSD 3					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
4004200026	NORTH BOONE C U SCH DIST 200					X				X								X			
34049187026	NORTH CHICAGO SCHOOL DIST 187																				
12013025026	NORTH CLAY C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 25					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
40031003026	NORTH GREENE UNIT SCHOOL DIST 3																				
20096200026	NORTH WAYNE C U SCHOOL DIST 200					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
26062175026	NORTHWEST C U SCH DISTRICT 175																				
40056002026	NORTHWESTERN C U SCH DIST 2																	X	X	X	
11015005026	OAKLAND C U SCHOOL DIST 5					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
54092076026	OAKWOOD COMM UNIT DIST #76																				
12017004026	OBLONG C U SCHOOL DIST 4																				
17064016026	OLYMPIA C U SCHOOL DIST 16	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
8089203026	ORANGEVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 203	X				X				X								X			
47071220026	OREGON C U SCHOOL DIST-220																				
28037223026	ORION COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 223	X				X				X				X				X			
24047308026	OSWEGO COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 308	X				X				X				X				X			
12017003026	PALESTINE C U SCHOOL DIST 3																	X	X	X	
10011008026	PANA COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 8																	X	X	X	
10068002026	PANHANDLE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 2					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
11023004026	PARIS COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 4					X				X				X				X			
11023095025	PARIS-UNION SCHOOL DIST 95																				
13058100026	PATOKA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 100																	X		X	X
51084011026	PAWNEE COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 11	X				X				X				X				X			
9027010026	PAXTON-BUCKLEY-LODA CU DIST 10					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
1001001026	PAYSON COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 1																				
8089200026	PEARL CITY C U SCH DIST 200																				
4101321026	PECATONICA C U SCH DIST 321																	X			
48072325026	PEORIA HGHTS C U SCH DIST 325	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
48072150025	PEORIA SCHOOL DISTRICT 150																				
56099207U26	PEOTONE C U SCH DIST 207U	X				X				X				X				X			
1075010026	PIKELAND C U SCH DIST 10																				
56099202022	PLAINFIELD SCHOOL DIST 202	X				X				X								X			
24047088026	PLANO COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 88																				
1075003026	PLEASANT HILL C U SCH DIST 3																				
51084008026	PLEASANT PLAINS C U SCHOOL DIST 8	X				X				X				X				X			
47071222026	POLO COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 222	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
20076001026	POPE CO COMM UNIT DIST 1																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
38065202026	PORTA COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 202					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
54092010026	POTOMAC C U SCH DIST 10																				
17053008026	PRAIRIE CENTRAL C U SCHOOL DIST 8	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
48072326026	PRINCEVILLE C U SCH DIST 326	X				X				X								X			
55098003026	PROPHETSTOWN-LYNDON-TAMPICO CUSD3	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
43078535026	PUTNAM CO C U SCHOOL DIST 535					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
1001172022	QUINCY SCHOOL DISTRICT 172																	X		X	X
33048208026	R O W V A COMM UNIT SCH DIST 208	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
3026204026	RAMSEY COMM UNIT SCH DIST 204					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
45079132026	RED BUD C U SCHOOL DIST 132					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
12051010026	RED HILL C U SCHOOL DIST 10																				
56099255U26	REED CUSTER C U SCH DIST 255U					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
17064019026	RIDGEVIEW COMM UNIT SCH DIST 19	X				X				X				X				X			
55098002026	RIVER BEND COMM UNIT DIST 2	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
8043210026	RIVER RIDGE C U SCH DIST 210																				
49081100026	RIVERDALE C U SCHOOL DIST 100					X				X				X							
51084014026	RIVERTON C U SCHOOL DIST 14																	X	X	X	
43102060026	ROANOKE BENSON C U S DIST 60	X				X				X											
12017002026	ROBINSON C U SCHOOL DIST 2																				
51084003A26	ROCHESTER COMM UNIT SCH DIST 3A	X				X								X				X			
49081041025	ROCK ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT 41																				
4101205025	ROCKFORD SCHOOL DIST 205																				
49081300026	ROCKRIDGE C U SCHOOL DIST 300	X				X				X				X				X			
27094200026	ROSEVILLE C U SCH DIST 200	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
54092007026	ROSSVILLE-ALVIN CU SCH DIST 7					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
34049116026	ROUND LAKE AREA SCHS - DIST 116																				
41057001026	ROXANA COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 1					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
13058501026	SANDOVAL C U SCHOOL DIST 501																				
16019430026	SANDWICH C U SCHOOL DIST 430																				
8008300026	SAVANNA COMMUNITY UNIT DIST 300																				
8043211026	SCALES MOUND C U SCH DISTRICT 211																				
31045046022	SCHOOL DISTRICT 46																				
22085001026	SCHUYLER CO C U SCH DIST 1																	X	X	X	
46086002026	SCOTT-MORGAN C U SCHOOL DIST 2																				
21028196026	SESSER-VALIER COMM UNIT S D 196																				
2091084026	SHAWNEE C U SCH DIST 84																				
11087004026	SHELBYVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 4					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
32038005026	SHELDON COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 5																				
49081200026	SHERRARD COMM UNIT SCH DIST 200	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
11023001026	SHILOH COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
16019432026	SOMONAUK C U SCHOOL DIST 432	X				X				X				X							
4101320026	SOUTH BELOIT C U SCH DIST 320																				
13058401026	SOUTH CENTRAL COMM UNIT DIST 401																				
10011014024	SOUTH FORK SCHOOL DISTRICT 14																				
26034337026	SOUTHEASTERN C U SCH DIST 337																				
27036120026	SOUTHERN C U SCHOOL DIST 120																				
40056009026	SOUTHWESTERN C U SCH DIST 9					X				X											
45079140026	SPARTA C U SCHOOL DIST 140																				
22029004026	SPOON RIVER VALLEY C U S DIST 4					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
51084186025	SPRINGFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT 186																				
31045303026	ST CHARLES C U SCHOOL DIST 303	X				X				X				X				X			
3026202026	ST ELMO C U SCHOOL DIST 202																	X	X	X	
28088100026	STARK COUNTY C U SCH DIST 100					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
40056006026	STAUNTON COMM UNIT SCH DIST 6	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
45079138026	STEELEVILLE C U SCH DIST 138																				
55098005026	STERLING C U DIST 5																				
11087005A26	STEWARDSON-STRASBURG CU DIST 5A					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
8043206026	STOCKTON C U SCHOOL DIST 206					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
11070300026	SULLIVAN C U SCHOOL DIST 300	X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X		X	X	X	
16019427026	SYCAMORE C U SCHOOL DIST 427	X				X				X				X							

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
10011003026	TAYLORVILLE C U SCH DIST 3	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X								
3025050026	TEUTOPOLIS C U SCHOOL DIST 50	X				X				X				X				X			
8008301026	THOMSON COM UNIT DIST 301					X	X	X		X	X	X									
9010007026	TOLONO C U SCHOOL DIST 7																				
11087006026	TOWER HILL CUSD 6																				
53090702026	TREMONT COMM UNIT DIST 702	X				X								X				X			
51084001026	TRI CITY COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1																				
17053006J26	TRI POINT C U SCH DIST 6-J	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
17064003026	TRI VALLEY C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 3	X				X								X				X			
41057002026	TRIAD COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 2	X				X				X				X				X			
30039176026	TRICO COMM UNIT SCH DISTRICT 176																				
46069027026	TRIOPIA C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 27	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
11021301026	TUSCOLA C U SCHOOL DIST 301	X				X				X				X							
27036115026	UNION COMMUNITY UNIT SCH DIST 115																	X		X	X
9010116022	URBANA SCHOOL DIST 116																				
22029002026	V I T COMM UNIT SCH DISTRICT 2																				
56099365U26	VALLEY VIEW CUSD #365U	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
45067003026	VALMEYER COMM UNIT SCH DIST 3	X				X				X				X				X			
3026203026	VANDALIA C U SCH DIST 203																				
41057003026	VENICE COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 3																				
11021302026	VILLA GROVE C U SCH DIST 302					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
40056004026	VIRDEN COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 4																				
46009064026	VIRGINIA C U SCH DIST 64																				
20093348026	WABASH C U SCH DIST 348																				
25041001026	WALTONVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 1																				
27094222026	WARREN C U SCH DIST 222																				
8043205026	WARREN COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 205																				
39055011026	WARRENSBURG-LATHAM C U DIST 11	X				X				X				X				X			
26034316026	WARSAW COMM UNIT SCH DISTRICT 316					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
45067005026	WATERLOO COMM UNIT SCH DIST 5	X				X				X				X				X			
34049118026	WAUCONDA COMM UNIT S DIST 118	X				X				X											
34049060026	WAUKEGAN C U SCHOOL DIST 60																				
46069006026	WAVERLY C U SCHOOL DIST 6	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
20096100026	WAYNE CITY C U SCHOOL DIST 100					X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X
13014003026	WESCLIN C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 3	X				X				X				X				X			
1075002026	WEST PIKE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 2																				
12080002026	WEST RICHLAND C U SCH DISTRICT 2					X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X
13095010026	WEST WASHINGTON CO C U DIST 10	X				X				X				X				X			
27066203026	WESTMER COMM UNIT SCH DIST 203																	X	X	X	
19022201026	WESTMONT C U SCHOOL DIST 201	X				X				X				X							
54092002026	WESTVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 2																				
28037230026	WETHERSFIELD C U SCH DIST 230																	X	X	X	
33048210026	WILLIAMSFIELD C U S DIST 210																	X	X	X	
51084015026	WILLIAMSVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 15	X				X				X				X				X			
56099209U26	WILMINGTON C U SCH DIST 209U	X				X				X											
46086001026	WINCHESTER C U SCH DIST 1																				
11087001026	WINDSOR COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
4101323026	WINNEBAGO C U SCH DIST 323	X				X				X											
17053005026	WOODLAND C U S DIST 5	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
44063200026	WOODSTOCK C U SCHOOL DIST 200	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
24047115026	YORKVILLE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 115					X				X				X							
27094225026	YORKWOOD C U SCH DIST 225					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	

APPENDIX B-2

LIST OF UNIT DISTRICTS BY ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SUCCESS

WITH EFFICIENCY

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
46009262026	A C CENTRAL CUSD 262																				
33048217026	ABINGDON C U SCHOOL DIST 217																				
44063019024	ALDEN HEBRON SCHOOL DIST 19	X				X				X								X			
27066201026	ALEDO COMM UNIT SCH DIST 201																				
27094400026	ALEXIS C U SCH DIST 400																				
20093017024	ALLENDALE C C SCHOOL DIST 17	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
3025010026	ALTAMONT COMM UNIT SCH DIST 10	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
41057011026	ALTON COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 11																	X		X	X
28037225026	ALWOOD COMM UNIT SCH DIST 225	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
47052272026	AMBOY COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 272																				
28037226026	ANNAWAN COMM UNIT SCH DIST 226	X				X				X				X							
11021306026	ARCOLA C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 306					X				X				X				X			
39055001026	ARGENTA-OREANA COMM UNIT SCH D 1																				
11021305026	ARTHUR C U SCHOOL DIST 305																				
47052275026	ASHTON COMM UNIT SCH DIST 275																				
22029001026	ASTORIA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1																				
38065213026	ATHENS COMM UNIT SCH DIST 213																				
39074039026	ATWOOD HAMMOND C U SCH DIST 39					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
51084010026	AUBURN COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 10	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
31045131022	AURORA EAST UNIT SCHOOL DIST 131																				
31045129022	AURORA WEST UNIT SCHOOL DIST 129																				
22029176026	AVON COMM UNIT SCH DIST 176																				
51084005026	BALL CHATHAM C U SCHOOL DIST 5																				
34049220026	BARRINGTON C U SCHOOL DIST 220																				
1075001026	BARRY COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 1																				
31045101022	BATAVIA UNIT SCHOOL DIST 101																				
46009015026	BEARDSTOWN C U SCH DIST 15																				
56099200U26	BEECHER C U SCH DIST 200U	X				X				X								X			
3025020026	BEECHER CITY C U SCHOOL DIST 20					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
4004100026	BELVIDERE C U SCH DIST 100					X	X	X		X	X	X									
39074005026	BEMENT COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 5	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
41057008026	BETHALTO C U SCHOOL DIST 8																	X	X	X	
11070301026	BETHANY C U SCHOOL DIST 301	X				X				X				X				X			
54092001026	BISMARCK HENNING C U SCHOOL DIST					X				X								X			
17064087025	BLOOMINGTON SCH DIST 87	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
17020018026	BLUE RIDGE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 18	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
3003002026	BOND CO C U SCHOOL DIST 2					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
28088001026	BRADFORD COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1																				
48072309026	BRIMFIELD C U SCHOOL DIST 309	X				X								X				X			
50082188022	BROOKLYN UNIT DISTRICT 188																				
46005001026	BROWN COUNTY C U SCH DIST 1																				
3026201026	BROWNSTOWN C U SCH DIST 201																				
40007042026	BRUSSELS COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 42																				
40056008026	BUNKER HILL C U SCHOOL DIST 8																				
28006340026	BUREAU VALLEY CUSD 340																				
26062170026	BUSHNELL PRAIRIE CITY CUS D 170																				
47071226026	BYRON COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 226																				
2002001022	CAIRO UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT 1																				
40007040026	CALHOUN COMM UNIT SCH DIST 40																				
28037227026	CAMBRIDGE C U SCH DIST 227					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
1001003026	CAMP POINT C U SCHOOL DIST 3																				
22029066025	CANTON UNION SCHOOL DIST 66																				
40056001026	CARLINVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 1	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
13014001026	CARLYLE C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 1																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
20097005026	CARMI-WHITE COUNTY C U S DIST 5					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
20083002026	CARRIER MILLS-STONEFORT CUSD 2																				
40031001026	CARROLLTON C U SCHOOL DIST 1																	X	X	X	
21100005026	CARTERVILLE C U SCH DIST 5	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
26034338026	CARTHAGE COMM UNIT SCH DIST #338																				
11012004C26	CASEY-WESTFIELD C U SCH DIST 4C																				
54092005026	CATLIN C U SCH DIST 5	X				X				X								X			
11087021026	CENTRAL A & M C U DIST #21					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
31045301026	CENTRAL COMM UNIT SCH DIST 301																				
32038004026	CENTRAL COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 4	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
2077100026	CENTURY COMM UNIT SCH DIST 100																				
39074100026	CERRO GORDO C U SCHOOL DIST 100																				
8008399026	CHADWICK-MILLEDGEVILLE CUSD 399	X				X				X								X			
9010004026	CHAMPAIGN COMM UNIT SCH DIST 4																				
11015001026	CHARLESTON C U SCHOOL DIST 1																				
17064009026	CHENOA C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 9																				
45079139026	CHESTER COMM UNIT SCH DIST 139																				
32038006026	CISSNA PARK COMM UNIT SCH DIST 6																				
15016299025	CITY OF CHICAGO SCHOOL DIST 299																				
12013010026	CLAY CITY COMM UNIT DIST 10																				
17020015026	CLINTON C U SCHOOL DIST 15	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
24032001026	COAL CITY C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 1	X				X				X											
2091017022	COBDEN SCH UNIT DIST 17																				
26062180026	COLCHESTER C U SCHOOL DIST 180																	X		X	X
41057010026	COLLINSVILLE C U SCH DIST 10																	X	X	X	
45067004026	COLUMBIA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 4	X				X				X				X							
22029003026	COMM UNIT SCH DIST 3 FULTON CTY																				
31045300026	COMM UNIT SCH DIST 300																				
35050002026	COMMUNITY UNIT SCH DIST 2	X				X				X				X				X			
51084016026	COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DIST 16																				
19022200026	COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DIST 200	X				X								X				X			
1001004026	COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DIST 4																				
45079001022	COULTERVILLE UNIT SCHOOL DIST 1																				
11087003A26	COWDEN-HERRICK CUD 3A																				
21100003026	CRAB ORCHARD C U SCH DIST 3																				
56099201U26	CRETE MONEE C U SCHOOL DIST 201U																				
11018077026	CUMBERLAND C U SCHOOL DIST 77																				
8089201026	DAKOTA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 201																				
26034336026	DALLAS CITY C U SCH DIST 336																				
54092118024	DANVILLE C C SCHOOL DIST 118																				
39055061025	DECATUR SCHOOL DISTRICT 61																				
53090701026	DEER CREEK-MACKINAW CUSD 701	X				X				X											
16019428026	DEKALB COMM UNIT SCH DIST 428	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
39074057026	DELAND-WELDON C U SCH DIST 57																				
53090703026	DELAVAN COMM UNIT DIST 703	X				X				X				X				X			
28006103022	DEPUE UNIT SCHOOL DIST 103																				
3025030026	DIETERICH COMM UNIT SCH DIST 30					X	X	X		X	X	X									
51084013026	DIVERNON C U SCHOOL DIST 13																				
47052170022	DIXON UNIT SCHOOL DIST 170																				
2091066022	DONGOLA SCH UNIT DIST 66																				
32038003026	DONOVAN COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 3																				
30073300026	DU QUOIN C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 300																				
48072323026	DUNLAP C U SCHOOL DIST 323	X				X				X				X				X			
50082196026	DUPO COMM UNIT SCH DISTRICT 196																				
4101322026	DURAND C U SCH DIST 322																				
35050009026	EARLVILLE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 9					X				X								X			
8043119022	EAST DUBUQUE UNIT SCH DIST 119					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
12080001026	EAST RICHLAND C U SCH DIST 1																				
50082189022	EAST ST LOUIS SCHOOL DIST 189																				
8008308026	EASTLAND COMM UNIT SCH DIST 308	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
11023006026	EDGAR COUNTY C U DIST 6																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
10011004026	EDINBURG C U SCH DIST 4																	X			
20024001026	EDWARDS COUNTY C U SCH DIST 1																				
41057007026	EDWARDSVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 7																				
3025040026	EFFINGHAM COMM UNIT SCH DIST 40					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
2002005026	EGYPTIAN COMM UNIT SCH DIST 5																				
43102375026	EL PASO C U DISTRICT 375																				
20083004026	ELDORADO COMM UNIT DISTRICT 4																				
19022205026	ELMHURST SCHOOL DIST 205																				
48072322026	ELMWOOD C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 322	X				X				X				X				X			
14016401026	ELMWOOD PARK C U SCH DIST 401																				
30039196026	ELVERADO C U SCHOOL DIST 196																				
55098001026	ERIE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1																				
43102140026	EUREKA C U DIST 140	X				X				X				X							
48072265026	FARMINGTON CENTRAL C U S D 265																				
43102006026	FIELDCREST CUSD #6	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
11087002026	FINDLAY COMM UNIT SCH DIST 2																	X	X	X	
9010001026	FISHER C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 1	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
17053004026	FLANAGAN C U SCHOOL DIST 4																				
12013035026	FLORA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 35					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
47071221026	FORRESTVILLE VALLEY C U S D 221																				
21028168026	FRANKFORT COMM UNIT SCH DIST 168																				
46069001026	FRANKLIN C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 1	X				X				X				X				X			
8089145022	FREEPORT SCHOOL DIST 145																				
20083001026	GALATIA C U SCHOOL DIST 1																				
8043120022	GALENA UNIT SCHOOL DIST 120																				
33048205026	GALESBURG C U SCHOOL DIST 205																				
20030007026	GALLATIN C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 7																				
28037224026	GALVA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 224																				
28037228026	GENESEO COMM UNIT SCH DIST 228	X				X				X				X				X			
31045304026	GENEVA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 304																				
16019424026	GENOA KINGSTON C U S DIST 424	X				X				X											
54092004026	GEORGETOWN-RIDGE FARM C U D 4																				
9027005026	GIBSON CITY-MELVIN-SIBLEY CUSD 5																				
40056007026	GILLESPIE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 7																				
40056003026	GIRARD COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 3																	X	X	X	
2044001026	GOREVILLE COMM UNIT DIST 1																				
41057009026	GRANITE CITY C U SCHOOL DIST 9																				
32046006026	GRANT PARK C U SCHOOL DIST 6																				
20097001026	GRAYVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 1					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
40031010026	GREENFIELD C U SCHOOL DIST 10																	X	X	X	
38065200026	GREENVIEW C U SCH DIST 200	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
17064010026	GRIDLEY C U SCH DIST 10																				
1075004026	GRIGGSVILLE-PERRY C U SCH DIST 4																				
26034328024	HAMILTON C C SCHOOL DIST 328	X				X				X				X				X			
25033010026	HAMILTON CO C U SCHOOL DIST 10	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X								
20035001026	HARDIN CO COMM UNIT DIST 1																				
4101122022	HARLEM UNIT DIST 122																				
20083003026	HARRISBURG C U SCHOOL DIST 3																				
38054021026	HARTSBURG EMDEN C U S DIST 21																				
44063050026	HARVARD C U SCHOOL DIST 50																				
38060126026	HAVANA COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 126																				
43059005026	HENRY-SENACHWINE CUSD 5	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
9010008026	HERITAGE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 8	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
21100004026	HERRIN C U SCH DIST 4																				
32046002026	HERSCHER COMM UNIT SCH DIST 2	X				X				X				X				X			
17064004026	HEYWORTH C U SCH DIST 4	X				X				X				X				X			
16019426026	HIAWATHA C U SCHOOL DIST 426																				
41057005026	HIGHLAND COMM UNIT SCH DIST 5																				
10068003026	HILLSBORO COMM UNIT SCH DIST 3																				
16019429026	HINCKLEY BIG ROCK C U S D 429																				
54092011026	HOOPESTON AREA C U SCH DIST 11																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
44063158022	HUNTLEY CONS SCHOOL DIST 158																				
12017001026	HUTSONVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 1																	X	X	X	
48072321026	IL VALLEY CENTRAL UNIT DIST 321																				
48072327026	ILLINI BLUFFS CU SCH DIST 327																				
38060189026	ILLINI CENTRAL C U SCH DIST 189	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
51084012026	ILLIOPOLIS C U SCHOOL DIST 12																				
16019425026	INDIAN CREEK COMM UNIT DIST 425	X				X				X				X				X			
19022204026	INDIAN PRAIRIE C U SCH DIST 204	X				X								X				X			
26062165026	INDUSTRY C U SCH DIST 165																				
32038009026	IROQUOIS CO C U SCHOOL DIST 9																				
32038010026	IROQUOIS WEST C U S DIST 10																				
46069117022	JACKSONVILLE SCHOOL DIST 117					X	X	X		X	X	X									
54092012026	JAMAICA C U SCHOOL DIST 12																				
12040001026	JASPER COUNTY COMM UNIT DIST 1																				
40042100026	JERSEY C U SCH DIST 100																				
44063012026	JOHNSBURG C U SCHOOL DIST 12					X				X				X							
21100001026	JOHNSTON CITY C U SCH DIST 1																				
2061038026	JOPPA-MAPLE GROVE UNIT DIST 38					X		X	X	X		X	X								
31045302026	KANELAND C U SCHOOL DIST 302																				
32046111025	KANKAKEE SCHOOL DIST 111																				
11023003026	KANSAS COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 3																				
28037229026	KEWANEE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 229																				
33048202026	KNOXVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 202					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
28006303026	LA MOILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 303																				
26034335026	LAHARPE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 335																				
34049095026	LAKE ZURICH C U SCH DIST 95	X				X				X				X							
12051020026	LAWRENCE CO C U DISTRICT 20																				
50082009026	LEBANON COMM UNIT SCH DIST 9																				
47052271026	LEE CENTER C U SCHOOL DIST 271																				
35050001026	LELAND COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1																				
8089202026	LENA WINSLOW C U SCH DIST 202																				
17064002026	LEROY COMMUNITY UNIT SCH DIST 2					X				X								X			
22029097026	LEWISTOWN SCHOOL DIST 97																				
17064007026	LEXINGTON C U SCH DIST 7																				
1001002026	LIBERTY COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 2	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
19022202026	LISLE C U SCH DIST 202																				
10068012026	LITCHFIELD C U SCHOOL DIST 12					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
41057004024	LIVINGSTON C C SCHOOL DIST 4																				
35050425026	LOSTANT COMM UNIT SCH DIST 425																	X			
11070303026	LOVINGTON C U SCHOOL DIST 303					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
43102021026	LOWPOINT-WASHBURN C U S DIST 21																				
26062185026	MACOMB COMM UNIT SCH DIST 185																				
41057012026	MADISON COMM UNIT SCH DIST 12																				
9010003026	MAHOMET-SEYMOUR C U SCH DIST 3																				
32046005026	MANTENO COMM UNIT SCH DIST 5																				
21100002026	MARION COMM UNIT SCH DIST 2																				
50082040026	MARISSA C U SCH DIST 40	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
39055002026	MAROA FORSYTH C U SCH DIST 2	X				X								X				X			
11012002C26	MARSHALL C U SCHOOL DIST 2C					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
11012003C26	MARTINSVILLE C U SCH DIST 3C																				
50082019026	MASCOUTAH C U DISTRICT 19																				
2061001026	MASSAC UNIT DISTRICT #1																				
11015002026	MATTOON C U SCHOOL DIST 2	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
17064005026	MCLEAN COUNTY UNIT DIST NO 5																				
46069011026	MEREDOSIA-CHAMBERSBURG CUSD 11																	X	X	X	
47071223026	MERIDIAN C U SCH DIST 223	X				X				X				X							
2077101026	MERIDIAN C U SCH DISTRICT 101																				
39055015026	MERIDIAN COMM UNIT SCH DIST 15	X				X				X								X			
43059007026	MIDLAND COMMUNITY UNIT DIST 7	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
38060191026	MIDWEST CENTRAL CUSD 191																				
49081040022	MOLINE UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT 40																	X	X	X	

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
32046001026	MOMENCE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1					X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X
27094038022	MONMOUTH UNIT SCH DIST 38																				
39074025026	MONTICELLO C U SCHOOL DIST 25																				
55098006026	MORRISON COMM UNIT SCH DIST 6	X				X				X				X				X			
10011001026	MORRISONVILLE C U SCH DIST 1																				
53090709026	MORTON C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 709																				
40056005026	MOUNT OLIVE C U SCHOOL DIST 5																				
8008304026	MT CARROLL COMM UNIT DIST 304																				
38054023026	MT PULASKI COMM UNIT DIST 23																				
39055003026	MT ZION COMM UNIT SCH DIST 3																				
3003001026	MULBERRY GROVE C U SCH DIST 1	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
30039186026	MURPHYSBORO C U SCH DIST 186																	X		X	X
19022203026	NAPERVILLE C U DIST 203	X				X								X				X			
26034325026	NAUVOO-COLUSA C U S DIST 325					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
11018003026	NEOGA COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 3					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
28006307024	NEPONSET COM CONS DIST 307	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
50082060026	NEW ATHENS C U SCHOOL DIST 60																				
39055006026	NIANTIC-HARRISTOWN C U S D 6					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
10068022026	NOKOMIS COMM UNIT SCH DIST 22																	X	X	X	
20097003026	NORRIS CITY-OMAHA-ENFIELD CUSD 3																				
4004200026	NORTH BOONE C U SCH DIST 200					X				X								X			
34049187026	NORTH CHICAGO SCHOOL DIST 187																				
12013025026	NORTH CLAY C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 25					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
40031003026	NORTH GREENE UNIT SCHOOL DIST 3																				
20096200026	NORTH WAYNE C U SCHOOL DIST 200					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
26062175026	NORTHWEST C U SCH DISTRICT 175																				
40056002026	NORTHWESTERN C U SCH DIST 2																				
11015005026	OAKLAND C U SCHOOL DIST 5					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
54092076026	OAKWOOD COMM UNIT DIST #76																				
12017004026	OBLONG C U SCHOOL DIST 4																				
17064016026	OLYMPIA C U SCHOOL DIST 16	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
8089203026	ORANGEVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 203	X				X				X								X			
47071220026	OREGON C U SCHOOL DIST-220																				
28037223026	ORION COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 223	X				X				X				X				X			
24047308026	OSWEGO COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 308	X				X				X				X				X			
12017003026	PALESTINE C U SCHOOL DIST 3																				
10011008026	PANA COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 8																				
10068002026	PANHANDLE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 2					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
11023004026	PARIS COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 4					X				X				X				X			
11023095025	PARIS-UNION SCHOOL DIST 95																				
13058100026	PATOKA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 100																				
51084011026	PAWNEE COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 11	X				X				X				X				X			
9027010026	PAXTON-BUCKLEY-LODA CU DIST 10					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
1001001026	PAYSON COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 1																				
8089200026	PEARL CITY C U SCH DIST 200																				
4101321026	PECATONICA C U SCH DIST 321																	X			
48072325026	PEORIA HGHTS C U SCH DIST 325	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
48072150025	PEORIA SCHOOL DISTRICT 150																				
56099207U26	PEOTONE C U SCH DIST 207U	X				X				X				X				X			
1075010026	PIKELAND C U SCH DIST 10																				
56099202022	PLAINFIELD SCHOOL DIST 202																				
24047088026	PLANO COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 88																				
1075003026	PLEASANT HILL C U SCH DIST 3																				
51084008026	PLEASANT PLAINS C U SCHOOL DIST 8																				
47071222026	POLO COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 222	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
20076001026	POPE CO COMM UNIT DIST 1																				
38065202026	PORTA COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 202																				
54092010026	POTOMAC C U SCH DIST 10																				
17053008026	PRAIRIE CENTRAL C U SCHOOL DIST 8																				
48072326026	PRINCEVILLE C U SCH DIST 326	X				X				X								X			
55098003026	PROPHETSTOWN-LYNDON-TAMPICO CUSD3	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
43078535026	PUTNAM CO C U SCHOOL DIST 535																				
1001172022	QUINCY SCHOOL DISTRICT 172																				
33048208026	R O W V A COMM UNIT SCH DIST 208	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
3026204026	RAMSEY COMM UNIT SCH DIST 204					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
45079132026	RED BUD C U SCHOOL DIST 132																				
12051010026	RED HILL C U SCHOOL DIST 10																				
56099255U26	REED CUSTER C U SCH DIST 255U					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
17064019026	RIDGEVIEW COMM UNIT SCH DIST 19																				
55098002026	RIVER BEND COMM UNIT DIST 2	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
8043210026	RIVER RIDGE C U SCH DIST 210																				
49081100026	RIVERDALE C U SCHOOL DIST 100																				
51084014026	RIVERTON C U SCHOOL DIST 14																	X	X	X	
43102060026	ROANOKE BENSON C U S DIST 60																				
12017002026	ROBINSON C U SCHOOL DIST 2																				
51084003A26	ROCHESTER COMM UNIT SCH DIST 3A	X				X								X				X			
49081041025	ROCK ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT 41																				
4101205025	ROCKFORD SCHOOL DIST 205																				
49081300026	ROCKRIDGE C U SCHOOL DIST 300	X				X				X				X				X			
27094200026	ROSEVILLE C U SCH DIST 200	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
54092007026	ROSSVILLE-ALVIN CU SCH DIST 7					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
34049116026	ROUND LAKE AREA SCHS - DIST 116																				
41057001026	ROXANA COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 1					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
13058501026	SANDOVAL C U SCHOOL DIST 501																				
16019430026	SANDWICH C U SCHOOL DIST 430																				
8008300026	SAVANNA COMMUNITY UNIT DIST 300																				
8043211026	SCALES MOUND C U SCH DISTRICT 211																				
31045046022	SCHOOL DISTRICT 46																				
22085001026	SCHUYLER CO C U SCH DIST 1																				
46086002026	SCOTT-MORGAN C U SCHOOL DIST 2																				
21028196026	SESSER-VALIER COMM UNIT S D 196																				
2091084026	SHAWNEE C U SCH DIST 84																				
11087004026	SHELBYVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 4					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
32038005026	SHELDON COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 5																				
49081200026	SHERRARD COMM UNIT SCH DIST 200	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
11023001026	SHILOH COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
16019432026	SOMONAUK C U SCHOOL DIST 432																				
4101320026	SOUTH BELOIT C U SCH DIST 320																				
13058401026	SOUTH CENTRAL COMM UNIT DIST 401																				
10011014024	SOUTH FORK SCHOOL DISTRICT 14																				
26034337026	SOUTHEASTERN C U SCH DIST 337																				
27036120026	SOUTHERN C U SCHOOL DIST 120																				
40056009026	SOUTHWESTERN C U SCH DIST 9																				
45079140026	SPARTA C U SCHOOL DIST 140																				
22029004026	SPOON RIVER VALLEY C U S DIST 4																				
51084186025	SPRINGFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT 186																				
31045303026	ST CHARLES C U SCHOOL DIST 303																				
3026202026	ST ELMO C U SCHOOL DIST 202																				
28088100026	STARK COUNTY C U SCH DIST 100					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
40056006026	STAUNTON COMM UNIT SCH DIST 6	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
45079138026	STEELEVILLE C U SCH DIST 138																				
55098005026	STERLING C U DIST 5																				
11087005A26	STEWARDSON-STRASBURG CU DIST 5A					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
8043206026	STOCKTON C U SCHOOL DIST 206					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
11070300026	SULLIVAN C U SCHOOL DIST 300	X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X		X	X	X	
16019427026	SYCAMORE C U SCHOOL DIST 427																				
10011003026	TAYLORVILLE C U SCH DIST 3	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X								
3025050026	TEUTOPOLIS C U SCHOOL DIST 50	X				X				X				X				X			
8008301026	THOMSON COM UNIT DIST 301																				
9010007026	TOLONO C U SCHOOL DIST 7																				
11087006026	TOWER HILL CUSD 6																				
53090702026	TREMONT COMM UNIT DIST 702	X				X								X				X			

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
51084001026	TRI CITY COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1																				
17053006J26	TRI POINT C U SCH DIST 6-J	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
17064003026	TRI VALLEY C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 3	X				X								X				X			
41057002026	TRIAD COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 2																				
30039176026	TRICO COMM UNIT SCH DISTRICT 176																				
46069027026	TRIOPIA C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 27																				
11021301026	TUSCOLA C U SCHOOL DIST 301	X				X				X				X							
27036115026	UNION COMMUNITY UNIT SCH DIST 115																				
9010116022	URBANA SCHOOL DIST 116																				
22029002026	V I T COMM UNIT SCH DISTRICT 2																				
56099365U26	VALLEY VIEW CUSD #365U	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
45067003026	VALMEYER COMM UNIT SCH DIST 3																				
3026203026	VANDALIA C U SCH DIST 203																				
41057003026	VENICE COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 3																				
11021302026	VILLA GROVE C U SCH DIST 302					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
40056004026	VIRDEN COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 4																				
46009064026	VIRGINIA C U SCH DIST 64																				
20093348026	WABASH C U SCH DIST 348																				
25041001026	WALTONVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 1																				
27094222026	WARREN C U SCH DIST 222																				
8043205026	WARREN COMM UNIT SCHOOL DIST 205																				
39055011026	WARRENSBURG-LATHAM C U DIST 11	X				X				X				X				X			
26034316026	WARSAW COMM UNIT SCH DISTRICT 316					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
45067005026	WATERLOO COMM UNIT SCH DIST 5	X				X				X				X				X			
34049118026	WAUCONDA COMM UNIT S DIST 118	X				X				X											
34049060026	WAUKEGAN C U SCHOOL DIST 60																				
46069006026	WAVERLY C U SCHOOL DIST 6	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
20096100026	WAYNE CITY C U SCHOOL DIST 100																				
13014003026	WESCLIN C U SCHOOL DISTRICT 3	X				X				X				X				X			
1075002026	WEST PIKE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 2																				
12080002026	WEST RICHLAND C U SCH DISTRICT 2					X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X
13095010026	WEST WASHINGTON CO C U DIST 10																				
27066203026	WESTMER COMM UNIT SCH DIST 203																	X	X	X	
19022201026	WESTMONT C U SCHOOL DIST 201																				
54092002026	WESTVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 2																				
28037230026	WETHERSFIELD C U SCH DIST 230																				
33048210026	WILLIAMSFIELD C U S DIST 210																				
51084015026	WILLIAMSVILLE C U SCHOOL DIST 15																				
56099209U26	WILMINGTON C U SCH DIST 209U	X				X				X											
46086001026	WINCHESTER C U SCH DIST 1																				
11087001026	WINDSOR COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
4101323026	WINNEBAGO C U SCH DIST 323																				
17053005026	WOODLAND C U S DIST 5																				
44063200026	WOODSTOCK C U SCHOOL DIST 200	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
24047115026	YORKVILLE COMM UNIT SCH DIST 115																				
27094225026	YORKWOOD C U SCH DIST 225					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	

APPENDIX B-3

LIST OF ELEMENTARY DISTRICTS BY ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SUCCESS

WITHOUT EFFICIENCY

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
19022004002	ADDISON SCHOOL DIST 4																				
21028091004	AKIN COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 91																				
13014063002	ALBERS SCHOOL DISTRICT 63					X	X	X		X	X	X									
35050065004	ALLEN TWP C C SCHOOL DIST 65																				
14016126002	ALSIP-HAZLGRN-OAKLWN S DIST 126	X				X				X				X				X			
2091037004	ANNA C C SCH DIST 37					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
34049034004	ANTIOCH C C SCHOOL DISTRICT 34	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
34049102004	APTAKISIC-TRIPP C C S DIST 102					X				X				X							
14016145002	ARBOR PARK SCHOOL DISTRICT 145	X				X				X											
14016025002	ARLINGTON HEIGHTS SCH DIST 25	X				X								X				X			
54092061003	ARMSTRONG-ELLIS CONS SCH DIST 61					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
13095015004	ASHLEY C C SCH DISTRICT 15																	X		X	X
14016125002	ATWOOD HEIGHTS DISTRICT 125					X				X				X							
13014021002	AVISTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 21	X				X								X				X			
14016037002	AVOCA SCHOOL DIST 37	X				X								X				X			
34049106002	BANNOCKBURN SCHOOL DIST 106	X				X								X				X			
13014057002	BARTELSO SCHOOL DISTRICT 57	X				X								X				X			
48072066002	BARTONVILLE SCHOOL DIST 66					X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X
34049003004	BEACH PARK C C SCHOOL DIST 3																				
50082119002	BELLE VALLEY SCHOOL DIST 119	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
50082118002	BELLEVILLE SCHOOL DIST 118	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
14016088002	BELLWOOD SCHOOL DIST 88																				
19022025002	BENJAMIN SCHOOL DISTRICT 25	X				X								X				X			
19022002002	BENSENVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 2																				
21028047004	BENTON COMM CONS SCH DIST 47	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X								
14016087002	BERKELEY SCHOOL DIST 87																				
14016098002	BERWYN NORTH SCHOOL DIST 98																				
14016100002	BERWYN SOUTH SCHOOL DISTRICT 100																				
25041082002	BETHEL SCHOOL DISTRICT 82																				
34049038002	BIG HOLLOW SCHOOL DIST 38	X				X				X											
19022013002	BLOOMINGDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT 13	X				X				X				X				X			
25041114004	BLUFORD C C SCHOOL DIST 114																				
32046053002	BOURBONNAIS SCHOOL DIST 53	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
24032075002	BRACEVILLE SCHOOL DIST 75					X		X	X	X		X	X								
32046061002	BRADLEY SCHOOL DIST 61																				
13014012004	BREESE SCHOOL DISTRICT 12	X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016095002	BROOKFIELD SCHOOL DIST 95					X				X				X				X			
14016167002	BROOKWOOD SCHOOL DIST 167																				
2044043003	BUNCOMBE CONS SCHOOL DIST 43																				
14016111002	BURBANK SCHOOL DISTRICT 111					X				X				X				X			
14016154502	BURNHAM SCHOOL DISTRICT 154-5																				
19022053002	BUTLER SCHOOL DISTRICT 53	X				X								X				X			
14016155002	CALUMET CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 155																				
14016132002	CALUMET PUBLIC SCHOOLS DIST 132																				
49081036002	CARBON CLIFF-BARSTOW SCH DIST 36																				
30039095002	CARBONDALE ELEM SCH DIST 95																				
44063026004	CARY C C SCHOOL DIST 26	X				X								X				X			
19022063002	CASS SCHOOL DIST 63	X				X								X				X			
19022066002	CENTER CASS SCHOOL DIST 66	X				X								X				X			
13058133002	CENTRAL CITY SCHOOL DIST 133	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X								
50082104002	CENTRAL SCHOOL DIST 104	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
53090051002	CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 51	X				X				X				X				X			
14016110002	CENTRAL STICKNEY SCH DIST 110																				
13058135002	CENTRALIA SCHOOL DIST 135					X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
56099088002	CHANEY-MONGE SCH DISTRICT 88																	X	X	X	
56099017002	CHANNAHON SCHOOL DISTRICT 17	X				X				X				X				X			
28006092002	CHERRY SCHOOL DIST 92	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
38054061004	CHESTER-EAST LINCOLN CCS DIST 61	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
14016170002	CHICAGO HEIGHTS SCHOOL DIST 170																				
14016127502	CHICAGO RIDGE SCHOOL DIST 127-5																				
14016099002	CICERO SCHOOL DISTRICT 99																				
28037190002	COLONA SCHOOL DISTRICT 190																				
14016059004	COMM CONS SCH DIST 59																				
14016168004	COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 168																				
19022180004	COMMUNITY CONS SCH DIST 180	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
30073204004	COMMUNITY CONS SCH DIST 204	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
19022093004	COMMUNITY CONSOLIDATED S D 93	X				X				X				X				X			
14016130002	COOK COUNTY SCHOOL DIST 130																				
17053426004	CORNELL C C SCH DIST 426	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
14016160002	COUNTRY CLUB HILLS SCH DIST 160																				
32038275004	CRESCENT CITY C C SCHOOL DIST 275	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
47071161004	CRESTON COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 161																				
53090076002	CREVE COEUR SCHOOL DISTRICT 76																				
44063047004	CRYSTAL LAKE C C SCH DIST 47	X				X				X				X				X			
2044064002	CYPRESS SCHOOL DIST 64																				
28006098002	DALZELL SCHOOL DISTRICT 98	X				X								X				X			
13014062002	DAMIANSVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 62																				
19022061002	DARIEN SCHOOL DIST 61	X				X								X				X			
35050082004	DEER PARK C C SCHOOL DIST 82	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
34049109002	DEERFIELD SCHOOL DIST 109	X				X								X				X			
14016062004	DES PLAINES C C SCH DIST 62																				
30039086003	DESOTO CONS SCHOOL DISTRICT 86																				
34049076002	DIAMOND LAKE SCHOOL DIST 76					X	X	X		X	X	X									
35050175004	DIMMICK C C SCHOOL DIST 175	X				X								X				X			
53090050002	DISTRICT 50 SCHOOLS	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
25041007004	DODDS COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 7																				
14016148002	DOLTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 148																				
14016149002	DOLTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 149																				
19022058002	DOWNERS GROVE GRADE SCH DIST 58	X				X								X				X			
17053232002	DWIGHT COMMON SCHOOL DIST 232					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
41057013002	EAST ALTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 13																				
55098012002	EAST COLOMA SCHOOL DIST 12	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
14016063002	EAST MAINE SCHOOL DIST 63	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
49081037002	EAST MOLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT 37																				
53090086002	EAST PEORIA SCHOOL DISTRICT 86	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
14016073002	EAST PRAIRIE SCHOOL DIST 73																				
14016159002	ELEM SCHOOL DISTRICT 159																				
56099203004	ELWOOD C C SCH DIST 203					X				X								X			
34049033002	EMMONS SCHOOL DISTRICT 33	X				X				X											
47071269004	ESWOOD C C DISTRICT 269	X				X				X											
14016065004	EVANSTON C C SCHOOL DIST 65	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
14016124002	EVERGREEN PK ELEM SCH DIST 124	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
21028115004	EWING NORTHERN C C DISTRICT 115	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X								
20096112004	FAIRFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOL DIST 112					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
56099089002	FAIRMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT 89																				
25041099004	FARRINGTON C C SCHOOL DIST 99					X		X	X	X		X	X								
25041003004	FIELD COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 3					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016161002	FLOSSMOOR SCHOOL DISTRICT 161	X				X				X				X							
14016169002	FORD HEIGHTS SCHOOL DISTRICT 169																				
14016091002	FOREST PARK SCHOOL DIST 91																				
14016142002	FOREST RIDGE SCHOOL DIST 142	X				X				X											
34049114002	FOX LAKE GRADE SCHOOL DIST 114																				
44063003003	FOX RIVER GROVE CONS S D 3	X				X				X				X							
56099157C04	FRANKFORT C C SCH DIST 157C	X				X				X				X				X			
14016084002	FRANKLIN PARK SCHOOL DIST 84	X				X				X											

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
50082070004	FREEBURG C C SCHOOL DIST 70	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
34049079002	FREMONT SCHOOL DIST 79	X				X				X				X							
24032072C04	GARDNER COMM CONS SCH DIST 72C	X				X				X				X							
34049037002	GAVIN SCHOOL DIST 37																	X	X	X	
20096014004	GEFF C C SCHOOL DISTRICT 14					X	X	X						X	X	X					
14016133002	GEN GEO PATTON SCHOOL DIST 133																				
43102069002	GERMANTOWN HILLS SCHOOL DIST 69	X				X								X				X			
13014060002	GERMANTOWN SCHOOL DISTRICT 60																				
30039130004	GIANT CITY C C SCHOOL DIST 130	X				X								X				X			
9010188004	GIFFORD C C SCHOOL DIST 188																				
19022089004	GLEN ELLYN C C SCHOOL DIST 89	X				X								X				X			
19022041002	GLEN ELLYN SCHOOL DISTRICT 41	X				X				X				X							
14016035002	GLENCOE SCHOOL DIST 35	X				X								X				X			
14016034004	GLENVIEW C C SCHOOL DIST 34	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
14016067002	GOLF ELEM SCHOOL DIST 67	X				X				X				X							
19022062002	GOWER SCHOOL DIST 62	X				X								X				X			
25041006004	GRAND PRAIRIE C C SCH DIST 6																				
35050095004	GRAND RIDGE C C SCHOOL DIST 95	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
50082110004	GRANT COMM CONS SCH DIST 110																				
34049036002	GRASS LAKE SCHOOL DIST 36																				
34049046004	GRAYSLAKE C C SCHOOL DISTRICT 46	X				X				X				X							
34049056002	GURNEE SCHOOL DIST 56																				
49081029002	HAMPTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 29																	X	X	X	
50082175002	HARMONY EMGE SCHOOL DIST 175	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
44063036002	HARRISON SCHOOL DISTRICT 36																				
14016152002	HARVEY SCHOOL DISTRICT 152																				
34049073004	HAWTHORN C C SCHOOL DIST 73	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016152502	HAZEL CREST SCHOOL DIST 152-5																				
50082116002	HIGH MOUNT SCHOOL DIST 116	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
14016093002	HILLSIDE SCHOOL DIST 93																				
19022181004	HINSDALE C C SCHOOL DIST 181	X				X								X				X			
48072328003	HOLLIS CONS SCHOOL DIST 328					X								X							
56099033C04	HOMER COMM CONS SCH DIST 33C	X				X				X				X				X			
14016153002	HOMEWOOD SCHOOL DISTRICT 153	X				X				X				X				X			
14016157002	HOOVER-SCHRUM MEMORIAL SD 157																				
13095029003	HOYLETON CONS SCH DISTRICT 29					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
25041008004	INA COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 8																				
14016109002	INDIAN SPRINGS SCHOOL DIST 109																				
13095011004	IRVINGTON C C SCH DISTRICT 11	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
19022010002	ITASCA SCHOOL DIST 10	X				X								X				X			
13058007004	IUKA COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 7																				
20096017004	JASPER COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 17	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
56099086005	JOLIET SCHOOL DIST 86																				
2091043004	JONESBORO C C SCHOOL DIST 43																				
19022020002	KEENEYVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 20	X				X				X				X							
13058002003	KELL CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DIST 2					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
14016038002	KENILWORTH SCHOOL DIST 38	X				X								X				X			
34049096004	KILDEER COUNTRYSIDE C C S DIST 96	X				X								X				X			
47071144003	KINGS CONSOLIDATED SCH DIST 144	X				X				X								X			
4101131004	KINNIKINNICK C C SCH DIST 131	X				X				X				X				X			
14016140002	KIRBY SCHOOL DIST 140	X				X				X				X							
14016094002	KOMAREK SCHOOL DIST 94	X				X				X											
14016102002	LA GRANGE SCHOOL DIST 102	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
14016105002	LA GRANGE SCHOOL DIST 105 (SOUTH)					X	X	X		X	X	X									
28006094004	LADD COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 94					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016106002	LAGRANGE HIGHLANDS SCH DIST 106	X				X								X				X			
34049065002	LAKE BLUFF ELEM SCHOOL DIST 65	X				X								X				X			
34049067005	LAKE FOREST SCHOOL DIST 67	X				X								X				X			
34049041004	LAKE VILLA C C SCHOOL DIST 41					X				X											
14016158002	LANSING SCHOOL DISTRICT 158																	X			
56099070C04	LARAWAY C C SCHOOL DIST 70C																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
35050122002	LASALLE ELEM SCHOOL DIST 122																				
28006175004	LEEPERTOWN C C SCH DIST 175																				
14016113A02	LEMONT-BROMBEREK CSD 113A	X				X				X				X				X			
34049070002	LIBERTYVILLE SCHOOL DIST 70	X				X								X				X			
2091016004	LICK CREEK C C SCH DISTRICT 16																				
48072316004	LIMESTONE WALTERS C C S DIST 316	X				X				X				X				X			
14016156002	LINCOLN ELEM SCHOOL DIST 156																				
38054027002	LINCOLN ELEM SCHOOL DIST 27																				
34049103002	LINCOLNSHIRE-PRAIRIEVIEW S D 103	X				X								X				X			
14016074002	LINCOLNWOOD SCHOOL DIST 74	X				X				X				X				X			
14016092002	LINDOP SCHOOL DISTRICT 92																				
24047090004	LISBON COMM CONS SCH DIST 90	X				X								X				X			
56099091002	LOCKPORT SCHOOL DIST 91																				
21028110004	LOGAN COMM CONS SCH DIST 110																				
19022044002	LOMBARD SCHOOL DISTRICT 44	X				X				X				X				X			
9010142004	LUDLOW C C SCHOOL DIST 142																				
14016103002	LYONS SCHOOL DIST 103																				
19022060002	MAERCKER SCHOOL DISTRICT 60	X				X								X				X			
28006084004	MALDEN COMM CONS SCH DIST 84	X				X				X											
56099114002	MANHATTAN SCHOOL DIST 114	X				X				X				X				X			
14016083002	MANNHEIM SCHOOL DIST 83																				
44063165003	MARENGO-UNION ELEM CONS DIST 165	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
19022015002	MARQUARDT SCHOOL DISTRICT 15					X	X	X		X	X	X									
35050150002	MARSEILLES ELEM SCHOOL DIST 150																	X	X	X	
14016162002	MATTESON ELEM SCHOOL DIST 162																				
14016089002	MAYWOOD-MELROSE PARK-BROADVIEW-89																				
24032002C02	MAZON-VERONA-KINSMAN ESD 2C					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
25041012004	MCCLELLAN C C SCHOOL DIST 12																				
44063015004	MCHENRY C C SCHOOL DIST 15	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
19022011002	MEDINAH SCHOOL DISTRICT 11					X								X							
35050289004	MENDOTA C C SCHOOL DIST 289					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
20096019004	MERRIAM COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 19																				
43102001004	METAMORA C C SCH DIST 1	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016143002	MIDLOTHIAN SCHOOL DIST 143																				
32038280004	MILFORD COMM CONS SCH DIST 280					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
34049024004	MILLBURN C C SCHOOL DIST 24	X				X				X				X				X			
35050210004	MILLER TWP CC SCH DIST 210	X				X								X				X			
50082160004	MILLSTADT C C SCH DIST 160	X				X				X				X							
24032201004	MINOOKA COMM CONS S DIST 201	X				X				X				X				X			
56099159002	MOKENA SCHOOL DIST 159	X				X				X				X							
48072070002	MONROE SCHOOL DIST 70	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
55098145004	MONTMORENCY C C SCH DIST 145	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
24032054002	MORRIS SCHOOL DISTRICT 54	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
14016070002	MORTON GROVE SCHOOL DIST 70	X				X				X				X				X			
14016057002	MOUNT PROSPECT SCHOOL DIST 57	X				X								X				X			
25041080002	MOUNT VERNON SCHOOL DIST 80																				
34049075002	MUNDELEIN ELEM SCHOOL DIST 75	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
53090102002	N PEKIN & MARQUETTE HGHT S D 102					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
13095049004	NASHVILLE C C SCH DISTRICT 49					X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
47052008002	NELSON PUBLIC SCHOOL DIST 8																				
24032024C04	NETTLE CREEK C C SCH DIST 24C	X				X								X				X			
38054088002	NEW HOLLAND-MIDDLETOWN E DIST 88					X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X
20096006004	NEW HOPE C C SCHOOL DIST 6																				
56099122002	NEW LENOX SCHOOL DIST 122	X				X				X				X							
2044032003	NEW SIMPSON HILL CONS DIST 32																				
24047066004	NEWARK COMM CONS SCH DIST 66					X				X				X				X			
14016071002	NILES ELEM SCHOOL DIST 71																				
14016080002	NORRIDGE SCHOOL DIST 80	X				X				X				X							
14016117002	NORTH PALOS SCHOOL DIST 117	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
34049112002	NORTH SHORE SD 112	X				X								X				X			
13014186002	NORTH WAMAC SCHOOL DISTRICT 186																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
14016027002	NORTHBROOK ELEM SCHOOL DIST 27	X				X								X				X			
14016028002	NORTHBROOK SCHOOL DIST 28	X				X								X				X			
14016030002	NORTHBROOK/GLENVIEW SCH DIST 30	X				X								X				X			
48072063002	NORWOOD ELEM SCHOOL DIST 63																	X	X	X	
50082090004	O FALLON C C SCHOOL DIST 90	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
34049068002	OAK GROVE SCHOOL DIST 68	X				X				X				X				X			
48072068002	OAK GROVE SCHOOL DIST 68	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
14016123002	OAK LAWN-HOMETOWN SCH DIST 123	X				X				X				X				X			
14016097002	OAK PARK ELEM SCHOOL DIST 97	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
13095001004	OAKDALE C C SCHOOL DISTRICT 1																				
17053435004	ODELL COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 435																				
13058122002	ODIN SCHOOL DIST 122																				
9010212004	OGDEN COMM CONS SCH DIST 212					X				X								X			
35050125002	OGLESBY ELEM SCH DIST 125																				
28006017004	OHIO COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 17	X				X				X											
25041005004	OPDYKE-BELLE-RIVE CC SCH DIST 5	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
14016135002	ORLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT 135	X				X								X				X			
35050141002	OTTAWA ELEM SCHOOL DIST 141																				
35050056002	OTTER CREEK-HYATT SCHOOL DIST 56	X				X				X				X							
14016015004	PALATINE C C SCHOOL DIST 15					X	X	X						X	X	X					
14016118004	PALOS COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 118	X				X								X				X			
14016128002	PALOS HEIGHTS SCHOOL DIST 128	X				X				X				X							
14016163002	PARK FOREST SCHOOL DIST 163																				
14016064004	PARK RIDGE C C SCHOOL DIST 64	X				X								X				X			
53090108002	PEKIN PUBLIC SCHOOL DIST 108																				
32046259004	PEMBROKE C C SCHOOL DISTRICT 259																				
14016079002	PENNOYER SCHOOL DIST 79	X				X				X											
35050124002	PERU ELEM SCHOOL DISTRICT 124																				
30073050002	PINCKNEYVILLE SCH DIST 50	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
48072069002	PLEASANT HILL SCHOOL DIST 69																				
48072062002	PLEASANT VALLEY SCH DIST 62																				
14016107002	PLEASANTDALE SCHOOL DIST 107	X				X				X				X							
17053429004	PONTIAC C C SCHOOL DIST 429	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
50082105002	PONTIAC-W HOLLIDAY SCH DIST 105																				
14016143502	POSEN-ROBBINS EL SCH DIST 143-5																				
45079134004	PRAIRIE DU ROCHER C C S D 134																				
44063046003	PRAIRIE GROVE C SCH DIST 46	X				X				X				X				X			
4101133004	PRAIRIE HILL C C SCH DIST 133	X				X								X				X			
14016144002	PRAIRIE-HILLS ELEM SCH DIST 144																				
9010192004	PRAIRIEVIEW COMM CONS DIST 192	X				X								X				X			
28006115002	PRINCETON ELEM SCHOOL DIST 115	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016023002	PROSPECT HEIGHTS SCHOOL DIST 23	X				X								X				X			
19022069002	PUFFER HEFTY SCHOOL DIST 69	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
19022016002	QUEEN BEE SCHOOL DISTRICT 16	X				X				X				X							
13058001003	RACCOON CONS SCHOOL DIST 1					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
53090098002	RANKIN COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIST 98					X	X	X						X	X	X					
9010137002	RANTOUL CITY SCHOOL DIST 137																				
14016084502	RHODES SCHOOL DIST 84-5																				
56099088A02	RICHLAND SCHOOL DIST 88A																				
14016122002	RIDGELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT 122	X				X				X								X			
44063018004	RILEY C C SCHOOL DIST 18	X				X				X				X							
14016090002	RIVER FOREST SCHOOL DIST 90	X				X								X				X			
14016085502	RIVER GROVE SCHOOL DIST 85-5	X				X				X				X				X			
14016026002	RIVER TRAILS SCHOOL DIST 26	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
55098014002	RIVERDALE SCHOOL DIST 14																				
14016096002	RIVERSIDE SCHOOL DIST 96	X				X								X				X			
43102002004	RIVERVIEW C C SCHOOL DISTRICT 2																				
53090085002	ROBEIN SCHOOL DISTRICT 85	X				X				X				X				X			
47071231004	ROCHELLE COMM CONS DIST 231																				
55098013002	ROCK FALLS ELEMENTARY SCH DIST 13																	X		X	X
56099084002	ROCKDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT 84																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
4101140004	ROCKTON SCH DIST 140	X				X				X				X				X			
25041002004	ROME COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 2	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
34049072002	RONDOUT SCHOOL DIST 72	X				X				X											
17053425004	ROOKS CREEK C C SCH DIST 425																				
19022012002	ROSELLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 12	X				X				X				X							
14016078002	ROSEMONT ELEM SCHOOL DIST 78	X				X				X				X				X			
35050230004	RUTLAND C C SCHOOL DIST 230	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
13058111002	SALEM SCHOOL DIST 111																				
19022048002	SALT CREEK SCHOOL DIST 48	X				X				X				X							
14016172002	SANDRIDGE SCHOOL DISTRICT 172																				
24032060C04	SARATOGA COMM CONS S DIST 60C					X				X				X				X			
17053438004	SAUNEMIN C CONSOL SCH DIST 438																				
14016054004	SCHAUMBURG C C SCHOOL DIST 54	X				X				X				X							
14016081002	SCHILLER PARK SCHOOL DIST 81																				
13058010004	SELMAVILLE C C SCH DIST 10	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
35050170004	SENECA COMM CONS SCH DIST 170																				
50082085002	SHILOH VILLAGE SCHOOL DIST 85	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
4101134004	SHIRLAND C C SCHOOL DIST 134	X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X		X	X	X	
50082181002	SIGNAL HILL SCH DIST 181	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
49081034002	SILVIS SCHOOL DISTRICT 34																				
14016072002	SKOKIE FAIRVIEW SCHOOL DIST 72																				
14016068002	SKOKIE SCHOOL DIST 68																				
14016069002	SKOKIE SCHOOL DIST 69	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016073502	SKOKIE SCHOOL DIST 73-5	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
50082130004	SMITHTON C C SCHOOL DIST 130	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
14016150002	SOUTH HOLLAND SCHOOL DIST 150																				
14016151002	SOUTH HOLLAND SCHOOL DIST 151																				
53090137002	SOUTH PEKIN SCHOOL DIST 137																				
24032074003	SOUTH WILMINGTON CONS SCH DIST 74	X				X								X				X			
28006099004	SPRING VALLEY C C SCH DIST 99					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
32046256004	ST ANNE C C SCHOOL DIST 256																	X	X	X	
32046258004	ST GEORGE C C SCHOOL DIST 258	X				X				X				X							
9010169004	ST JOSEPH C C SCHOOL DIST 169	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
50082030003	ST LIBORY CONS SCH DIST 30																				
13014141502	ST ROSE SCHOOL DISTRICT 14-15	X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016194002	STEGER SCHOOL DISTRICT 194																				
47052220002	STEWARD ELEM SCHOOL DIST 220	X				X				X				X							
35050044002	STREATOR ELEM SCHOOL DIST 44	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X								
25041079002	SUMMERSVILLE SCHOOL DIST 79					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
56099161002	SUMMIT HILL SCHOOL DIST 161	X				X				X				X				X			
14016104002	SUMMIT SCHOOL DIST 104																				
14016171002	SUNNYBROOK SCHOOL DISTRICT 171																				
14016029002	SUNSET RIDGE SCHOOL DIST 29	X				X								X				X			
56099090002	TAFT SCHOOL DISTRICT 90																				
30073005002	TAMAROA SCHOOL DIST 5																				
9010130004	THOMASBORO C C SCHOOL DIST 130																	X		X	X
21028062002	THOMPSONVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 62																				
14016154002	THORNTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 154	X				X								X				X			
14016146004	TINLEY PARK COMM SCH DIST 146	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
35050079004	TONICA COMM CONS SCH DIST 79	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X
56099030C04	TROY COMM CONS SCH DIST 30C	X				X				X				X							
14016086002	UNION RIDGE SCHOOL DIST 86	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
56099081002	UNION SCHOOL DIST 81																				
30039140004	UNITY POINT C C SCHOOL DIST 140	X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X	X		X	X
35050135002	UTICA ELEM SCHOOL DIST 135																				
2044055002	VIENNA SCHOOL DIST 55					X		X	X					X		X	X				
19022045002	VILLA PARK SCHOOL DIST 45	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016147002	W HARVEY-DIXMOOR PUB SCH DIST147																				
35050195004	WALLACE C C SCHOOL DIST 195	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
35050185004	WALTHAM C C SCHOOL DIST 185	X				X				X								X			
53090052002	WASHINGTON SCHOOL DIST 52	X				X								X				X			

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
19022033002	WEST CHICAGO SCHOOL DIST 33																				
38054092004	WEST LINCOLN-BROADWELL E S D #92	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
14016031002	WEST NORTHFIELD SCHOOL DIST 31	X				X								X				X			
14016092502	WESTCHESTER SCHOOL DIST 92-5	X				X				X				X				X			
14016101002	WESTERN SPRINGS SCHOOL DIST 101	X				X								X				X			
14016021004	WHEELING C C SCHOOL DIST 21																				
50082115002	WHITESIDE SCHOOL DIST 115	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
56099092002	WILL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 92	X				X				X											
13014046002	WILLOW GROVE SCHOOL DISTRICT 46					X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X
14016108002	WILLOW SPRINGS SCHOOL DIST 108																				
14016039002	WILMETTE SCHOOL DIST 39	X				X								X				X			
19022034002	WINFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT 34	X				X								X				X			
14016036002	WINNETKA SCHOOL DIST 36	X				X								X				X			
34049001002	WINTHROP HARBOR SCHOOL DIST 1	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
50082113002	WOLF BRANCH SCH DIST 113	X				X								X				X			
19022007002	WOOD DALE SCHOOL DISTRICT 7																				
41057015003	WOOD RIVER-HARTFORD ELEM S D 15																	X		X	X
34049050004	WOODLAND C C SCHOOL DIST 50	X				X				X											
25041004004	WOODLAWN COMM CONS SCH DIST 4					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
19022068002	WOODRIDGE SCHOOL DIST 68	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016127002	WORTH SCHOOL DISTRICT 127	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
34049006002	ZION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT 6																				

APPENDIX B-4

LIST OF ELEMENTARY DISTRICTS BY ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SUCCESS

WITH EFFICIENCY

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
19022004002	ADDISON SCHOOL DIST 4																				
21028091004	AKIN COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 91																				
13014063002	ALBERS SCHOOL DISTRICT 63																				
35050065004	ALLEN TWP C C SCHOOL DIST 65																				
14016126002	ALSIP-HAZLGRN-OAKLWN S DIST 126	X				X				X				X				X			
2091037004	ANNA C C SCH DIST 37																				
34049034004	ANTIOCH C C SCHOOL DISTRICT 34																				
34049102004	APTAKISIC-TRIPP C C S DIST 102																				
14016145002	ARBOR PARK SCHOOL DISTRICT 145																				
14016025002	ARLINGTON HEIGHTS SCH DIST 25																				
54092061003	ARMSTRONG-ELLIS CONS SCH DIST 61																				
13095015004	ASHLEY C C SCH DISTRICT 15																				
14016125002	ATWOOD HEIGHTS DISTRICT 125																				
13014021002	AVISTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 21																				
14016037002	AVOCA SCHOOL DIST 37																				
34049106002	BANNOCKBURN SCHOOL DIST 106	X				X								X				X			
13014057002	BARTELSO SCHOOL DISTRICT 57	X				X								X				X			
48072066002	BARTONVILLE SCHOOL DIST 66					X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X
34049003004	BEACH PARK C C SCHOOL DIST 3																				
50082119002	BELLE VALLEY SCHOOL DIST 119	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
50082118002	BELLEVILLE SCHOOL DIST 118																				
14016088002	BELLWOOD SCHOOL DIST 88																				
19022025002	BENJAMIN SCHOOL DISTRICT 25																				
19022002002	BENSENVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 2																				
21028047004	BENTON COMM CONS SCH DIST 47																				
14016087002	BERKELEY SCHOOL DIST 87																				
14016098002	BERWYN NORTH SCHOOL DIST 98																				
14016100002	BERWYN SOUTH SCHOOL DISTRICT 100																				
25041082002	BETHEL SCHOOL DISTRICT 82																				
34049038002	BIG HOLLOW SCHOOL DIST 38	X				X				X											
19022013002	BLOOMINGDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT 13																				
25041114004	BLUFORD C C SCHOOL DIST 114																				
32046053002	BOURBONNAIS SCHOOL DIST 53	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
24032075002	BRACEVILLE SCHOOL DIST 75					X		X	X	X		X	X								
32046061002	BRADLEY SCHOOL DIST 61																				
13014012004	BREESE SCHOOL DISTRICT 12	X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016095002	BROOKFIELD SCHOOL DIST 95					X				X				X				X			
14016167002	BROOKWOOD SCHOOL DIST 167																				
2044043003	BUNCOMBE CONS SCHOOL DIST 43																				
14016111002	BURBANK SCHOOL DISTRICT 111					X				X				X				X			
14016154502	BURNHAM SCHOOL DISTRICT 154-5																				
19022053002	BUTLER SCHOOL DISTRICT 53	X				X								X				X			
14016155002	CALUMET CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 155																				
14016132002	CALUMET PUBLIC SCHOOLS DIST 132																				
49081036002	CARBON CLIFF-BARSTOW SCH DIST 36																				
30039095002	CARBONDALE ELEM SCH DIST 95																				
44063026004	CARY C C SCHOOL DIST 26	X				X								X				X			
19022063002	CASS SCHOOL DIST 63	X				X								X				X			
19022066002	CENTER CASS SCHOOL DIST 66	X				X								X				X			
13058133002	CENTRAL CITY SCHOOL DIST 133																				
50082104002	CENTRAL SCHOOL DIST 104																				
53090051002	CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 51	X				X				X				X				X			
14016110002	CENTRAL STICKNEY SCH DIST 110																				
13058135002	CENTRALIA SCHOOL DIST 135					X		X	X	X		X	X					X		X	X

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
56099088002	CHANEY-MONGE SCH DISTRICT 88																	X	X	X	
56099017002	CHANNAHON SCHOOL DISTRICT 17	X				X				X				X				X			
28006092002	CHERRY SCHOOL DIST 92																				
38054061004	CHESTER-EAST LINCOLN CCS DIST 61	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
14016170002	CHICAGO HEIGHTS SCHOOL DIST 170																				
14016127502	CHICAGO RIDGE SCHOOL DIST 127-5																				
14016099002	CICERO SCHOOL DISTRICT 99																				
28037190002	COLONA SCHOOL DISTRICT 190																				
14016059004	COMM CONS SCH DIST 59																				
14016168004	COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 168																				
19022180004	COMMUNITY CONS SCH DIST 180																				
30073204004	COMMUNITY CONS SCH DIST 204																				
19022093004	COMMUNITY CONSOLIDATED S D 93	X				X				X				X				X			
14016130002	COOK COUNTY SCHOOL DIST 130																				
17053426004	CORNELL C C SCH DIST 426																				
14016160002	COUNTRY CLUB HILLS SCH DIST 160																				
32038275004	CRESCENT CITY C C SCHOOL DIST 275	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
47071161004	CRESTON COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 161																				
53090076002	CREVE COEUR SCHOOL DISTRICT 76																				
44063047004	CRYSTAL LAKE C C SCH DIST 47	X				X				X				X				X			
2044064002	CYPRESS SCHOOL DIST 64																				
28006098002	DALZELL SCHOOL DISTRICT 98																				
13014062002	DAMIANSVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 62																				
19022061002	DARIEN SCHOOL DIST 61	X				X								X				X			
35050082004	DEER PARK C C SCHOOL DIST 82																				
34049109002	DEERFIELD SCHOOL DIST 109	X				X								X				X			
14016062004	DES PLAINES C C SCH DIST 62																				
30039086003	DESOTO CONS SCHOOL DISTRICT 86																				
34049076002	DIAMOND LAKE SCHOOL DIST 76					X	X	X		X	X	X									
35050175004	DIMMICK C C SCHOOL DIST 175	X				X								X				X			
53090050002	DISTRICT 50 SCHOOLS	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
25041007004	DODDS COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 7																				
14016148002	DOLTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 148																				
14016149002	DOLTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 149																				
19022058002	DOWNERS GROVE GRADE SCH DIST 58	X				X								X				X			
17053232002	DWIGHT COMMON SCHOOL DIST 232																				
41057013002	EAST ALTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 13																				
55098012002	EAST COLOMA SCHOOL DIST 12																				
14016063002	EAST MAINE SCHOOL DIST 63	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
49081037002	EAST MOLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT 37																				
53090086002	EAST PEORIA SCHOOL DISTRICT 86																				
14016073002	EAST PRAIRIE SCHOOL DIST 73																				
14016159002	ELEM SCHOOL DISTRICT 159																				
56099203004	ELWOOD C C SCH DIST 203																				
34049033002	EMMONS SCHOOL DISTRICT 33																				
47071269004	ESWOOD C C DISTRICT 269	X				X				X											
14016065004	EVANSTON C C SCHOOL DIST 65	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
14016124002	EVERGREEN PK ELEM SCH DIST 124	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
21028115004	EWING NORTHERN C C DISTRICT 115																				
20096112004	FAIRFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOL DIST 112					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
56099089002	FAIRMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT 89																				
25041099004	FARRINGTON C C SCHOOL DIST 99					X		X	X	X		X	X								
25041003004	FIELD COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 3																				
14016161002	FLOSSMOOR SCHOOL DISTRICT 161	X				X				X				X							
14016169002	FORD HEIGHTS SCHOOL DISTRICT 169																				
14016091002	FOREST PARK SCHOOL DIST 91																				
14016142002	FOREST RIDGE SCHOOL DIST 142	X				X				X											
34049114002	FOX LAKE GRADE SCHOOL DIST 114																				
44063003003	FOX RIVER GROVE CONS S D 3	X				X				X				X							
56099157C04	FRANKFORT C C SCH DIST 157C	X				X				X				X				X			
14016084002	FRANKLIN PARK SCHOOL DIST 84																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
50082070004	FREEBURG C C SCHOOL DIST 70	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
34049079002	FREMONT SCHOOL DIST 79																				
24032072C04	GARDNER COMM CONS SCH DIST 72C																				
34049037002	GAVIN SCHOOL DIST 37																				
20096014004	GEFF C C SCHOOL DISTRICT 14					X	X	X						X	X	X					
14016133002	GEN GEO PATTON SCHOOL DIST 133																				
43102069002	GERMANTOWN HILLS SCHOOL DIST 69	X				X								X				X			
13014060002	GERMANTOWN SCHOOL DISTRICT 60																				
30039130004	GIANT CITY C C SCHOOL DIST 130																				
9010188004	GIFFORD C C SCHOOL DIST 188																				
19022089004	GLEN ELLYN C C SCHOOL DIST 89	X				X								X				X			
19022041002	GLEN ELLYN SCHOOL DISTRICT 41	X				X				X				X							
14016035002	GLENCOE SCHOOL DIST 35																				
14016034004	GLENVIEW C C SCHOOL DIST 34																				
14016067002	GOLF ELEM SCHOOL DIST 67																				
19022062002	GOWER SCHOOL DIST 62	X				X								X				X			
25041006004	GRAND PRAIRIE C C SCH DIST 6																				
35050095004	GRAND RIDGE C C SCHOOL DIST 95	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
50082110004	GRANT COMM CONS SCH DIST 110																				
34049036002	GRASS LAKE SCHOOL DIST 36																				
34049046004	GRAYSLAKE C C SCHOOL DISTRICT 46																				
34049056002	GURNEE SCHOOL DIST 56																				
49081029002	HAMPTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 29																				
50082175002	HARMONY EMGE SCHOOL DIST 175	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
44063036002	HARRISON SCHOOL DISTRICT 36																				
14016152002	HARVEY SCHOOL DISTRICT 152																				
34049073004	HAWTHORN C C SCHOOL DIST 73	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016152502	HAZEL CREST SCHOOL DIST 152-5																				
50082116002	HIGH MOUNT SCHOOL DIST 116	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
14016093002	HILLSIDE SCHOOL DIST 93																				
19022181004	HINSDALE C C SCHOOL DIST 181	X				X								X				X			
48072328003	HOLLIS CONS SCHOOL DIST 328																				
56099033C04	HOMER COMM CONS SCH DIST 33C	X				X				X				X				X			
14016153002	HOMEWOOD SCHOOL DISTRICT 153																				
14016157002	HOOVER-SCHRUM MEMORIAL SD 157																				
13095029003	HOYLETON CONS SCH DISTRICT 29					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
25041008004	INA COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 8																				
14016109002	INDIAN SPRINGS SCHOOL DIST 109																				
13095011004	IRVINGTON C C SCH DISTRICT 11	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
19022010002	ITASCA SCHOOL DIST 10																				
13058007004	IUKA COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 7																				
20096017004	JASPER COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 17																				
56099086005	JOLIET SCHOOL DIST 86																				
2091043004	JONESBORO C C SCHOOL DIST 43																				
19022020002	KEENEYVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 20	X				X				X				X							
13058002003	KELL CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DIST 2																				
14016038002	KENILWORTH SCHOOL DIST 38																				
34049096004	KILDEER COUNTRYSIDE C C S DIST 96	X				X								X				X			
47071144003	KINGS CONSOLIDATED SCH DIST 144	X				X				X								X			
4101131004	KINNIKINNICK C C SCH DIST 131																				
14016140002	KIRBY SCHOOL DIST 140	X				X				X				X							
14016094002	KOMAREK SCHOOL DIST 94	X				X				X											
14016102002	LA GRANGE SCHOOL DIST 102	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
14016105002	LA GRANGE SCHOOL DIST 105 (SOUTH)					X	X	X		X	X	X									
28006094004	LADD COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 94					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016106002	LAGRANGE HIGHLANDS SCH DIST 106																				
34049065002	LAKE BLUFF ELEM SCHOOL DIST 65																				
34049067005	LAKE FOREST SCHOOL DIST 67	X				X								X				X			
34049041004	LAKE VILLA C C SCHOOL DIST 41																				
14016158002	LANSING SCHOOL DISTRICT 158																	X			
56099070C04	LARAWAY C C SCHOOL DIST 70C																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
35050122002	LASALLE ELEM SCHOOL DIST 122																				
28006175004	LEEPERTOWN C C SCH DIST 175																				
14016113A02	LEMONT-BROMBEREK CSD 113A	X				X				X				X				X			
34049070002	LIBERTYVILLE SCHOOL DIST 70	X				X								X				X			
2091016004	LICK CREEK C C SCH DISTRICT 16																				
48072316004	LIMESTONE WALTERS C C S DIST 316	X				X				X				X				X			
14016156002	LINCOLN ELEM SCHOOL DIST 156																				
38054027002	LINCOLN ELEM SCHOOL DIST 27																				
34049103002	LINCOLNSHIRE-PRAIRIEVIEW S D 103	X				X								X				X			
14016074002	LINCOLNWOOD SCHOOL DIST 74	X				X				X				X				X			
14016092002	LINDOP SCHOOL DISTRICT 92																				
24047090004	LISBON COMM CONS SCH DIST 90	X				X								X				X			
56099091002	LOCKPORT SCHOOL DIST 91																				
21028110004	LOGAN COMM CONS SCH DIST 110																				
19022044002	LOMBARD SCHOOL DISTRICT 44	X				X				X				X				X			
9010142004	LUDLOW C C SCHOOL DIST 142																				
14016103002	LYONS SCHOOL DIST 103																				
19022060002	MAERCKER SCHOOL DISTRICT 60	X				X								X				X			
28006084004	MALDEN COMM CONS SCH DIST 84																				
56099114002	MANHATTAN SCHOOL DIST 114																				
14016083002	MANNHEIM SCHOOL DIST 83																				
44063165003	MARENGO-UNION ELEM CONS DIST 165																				
19022015002	MARQUARDT SCHOOL DISTRICT 15					X	X	X		X	X	X									
35050150002	MARSEILLES ELEM SCHOOL DIST 150																	X	X	X	
14016162002	MATTESON ELEM SCHOOL DIST 162																				
14016089002	MAYWOOD-MELROSE PARK-BROADVIEW-89																				
24032002C02	MAZON-VERONA-KINSMAN ESD 2C																				
25041012004	MCCLELLAN C C SCHOOL DIST 12																				
44063015004	MCHENRY C C SCHOOL DIST 15	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
19022011002	MEDINAH SCHOOL DISTRICT 11																				
35050289004	MENDOTA C C SCHOOL DIST 289																				
20096019004	MERRIAM COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 19																				
43102001004	METAMORA C C SCH DIST 1	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016143002	MIDLOTHIAN SCHOOL DIST 143																				
32038280004	MILFORD COMM CONS SCH DIST 280																				
34049024004	MILLBURN C C SCHOOL DIST 24	X				X				X				X				X			
35050210004	MILLER TWP CC SCH DIST 210	X				X								X				X			
50082160004	MILLSTADT C C SCH DIST 160	X				X				X				X							
24032201004	MINOOKA COMM CONS S DIST 201																				
56099159002	MOKENA SCHOOL DIST 159																				
48072070002	MONROE SCHOOL DIST 70	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
55098145004	MONTMORENCY C C SCH DIST 145	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
24032054002	MORRIS SCHOOL DISTRICT 54																				
14016070002	MORTON GROVE SCHOOL DIST 70	X				X				X				X				X			
14016057002	MOUNT PROSPECT SCHOOL DIST 57																				
25041080002	MOUNT VERNON SCHOOL DIST 80																				
34049075002	MUNDELEIN ELEM SCHOOL DIST 75																				
53090102002	N PEKIN & MARQUETTE HGHT S D 102																				
13095049004	NASHVILLE C C SCH DISTRICT 49																				
47052008002	NELSON PUBLIC SCHOOL DIST 8																				
24032024C04	NETTLE CREEK C C SCH DIST 24C																				
38054088002	NEW HOLLAND-MIDDLETOWN E DIST 88																				
20096006004	NEW HOPE C C SCHOOL DIST 6																				
56099122002	NEW LENOX SCHOOL DIST 122																				
2044032003	NEW SIMPSON HILL CONS DIST 32																				
24047066004	NEWARK COMM CONS SCH DIST 66																				
14016071002	NILES ELEM SCHOOL DIST 71																				
14016080002	NORRIDGE SCHOOL DIST 80	X				X				X				X							
14016117002	NORTH PALOS SCHOOL DIST 117																				
34049112002	NORTH SHORE SD 112																				
13014186002	NORTH WAMAC SCHOOL DISTRICT 186																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
14016027002	NORTHBROOK ELEM SCHOOL DIST 27																				
14016028002	NORTHBROOK SCHOOL DIST 28																				
14016030002	NORTHBROOK/GLENVIEW SCH DIST 30																				
48072063002	NORWOOD ELEM SCHOOL DIST 63																				
50082090004	O FALLON C C SCHOOL DIST 90	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
34049068002	OAK GROVE SCHOOL DIST 68	X				X				X				X				X			
48072068002	OAK GROVE SCHOOL DIST 68	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
14016123002	OAK LAWN-HOMETOWN SCH DIST 123	X				X				X				X				X			
14016097002	OAK PARK ELEM SCHOOL DIST 97																				
13095001004	OAKDALE C C SCHOOL DISTRICT 1																				
17053435004	ODELL COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 435																				
13058122002	ODIN SCHOOL DIST 122																				
9010212004	OGDEN COMM CONS SCH DIST 212					X				X								X			
35050125002	OGLESBY ELEM SCH DIST 125																				
28006017004	OHIO COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 17	X				X				X											
25041005004	OPDYKE-BELLE-RIVE CC SCH DIST 5																				
14016135002	ORLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT 135																				
35050141002	OTTAWA ELEM SCHOOL DIST 141																				
35050056002	OTTER CREEK-HYATT SCHOOL DIST 56	X				X				X				X							
14016015004	PALATINE C C SCHOOL DIST 15																				
14016118004	PALOS COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 118																				
14016128002	PALOS HEIGHTS SCHOOL DIST 128																				
14016163002	PARK FOREST SCHOOL DIST 163																				
14016064004	PARK RIDGE C C SCHOOL DIST 64																				
53090108002	PEKIN PUBLIC SCHOOL DIST 108																				
32046259004	PEMBROKE C C SCHOOL DISTRICT 259																				
14016079002	PENNOYER SCHOOL DIST 79																				
35050124002	PERU ELEM SCHOOL DISTRICT 124																				
30073050002	PINCKNEYVILLE SCH DIST 50	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
48072069002	PLEASANT HILL SCHOOL DIST 69																				
48072062002	PLEASANT VALLEY SCH DIST 62																				
14016107002	PLEASANTDALE SCHOOL DIST 107																				
17053429004	PONTIAC C C SCHOOL DIST 429																				
50082105002	PONTIAC-W HOLLIDAY SCH DIST 105																				
14016143502	POSEN-ROBBINS EL SCH DIST 143-5																				
45079134004	PRAIRIE DU ROCHER C C S D 134																				
44063046003	PRAIRIE GROVE C SCH DIST 46																				
4101133004	PRAIRIE HILL C C SCH DIST 133																				
14016144002	PRAIRIE-HILLS ELEM SCH DIST 144																				
9010192004	PRAIRIEVIEW COMM CONS DIST 192	X				X								X				X			
28006115002	PRINCETON ELEM SCHOOL DIST 115	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016023002	PROSPECT HEIGHTS SCHOOL DIST 23																				
19022069002	PUFFER HEFTY SCHOOL DIST 69	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
19022016002	QUEEN BEE SCHOOL DISTRICT 16	X				X				X				X							
13058001003	RACCOON CONS SCHOOL DIST 1																				
53090098002	RANKIN COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIST 98					X	X	X						X	X	X					
9010137002	RANTOUL CITY SCHOOL DIST 137																				
14016084502	RHODES SCHOOL DIST 84-5																				
56099088A02	RICHLAND SCHOOL DIST 88A																				
14016122002	RIDGELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT 122																				
44063018004	RILEY C C SCHOOL DIST 18																				
14016090002	RIVER FOREST SCHOOL DIST 90	X				X								X				X			
14016085502	RIVER GROVE SCHOOL DIST 85-5																				
14016026002	RIVER TRAILS SCHOOL DIST 26	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
55098014002	RIVERDALE SCHOOL DIST 14																				
14016096002	RIVERSIDE SCHOOL DIST 96																				
43102002004	RIVERVIEW C C SCHOOL DISTRICT 2																				
53090085002	ROBEIN SCHOOL DISTRICT 85																				
47071231004	ROCHELLE COMM CONS DIST 231																				
55098013002	ROCK FALLS ELEMENTARY SCH DIST 13																				
56099084002	ROCKDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT 84																				

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
4101140004	ROCKTON SCH DIST 140																				
25041002004	ROME COMM CONS SCHOOL DIST 2																				
34049072002	RONDOUT SCHOOL DIST 72	X				X				X											
17053425004	ROOKS CREEK C C SCH DIST 425																				
19022012002	ROSELLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 12	X				X				X				X							
14016078002	ROSEMONT ELEM SCHOOL DIST 78	X				X				X				X				X			
35050230004	RUTLAND C C SCHOOL DIST 230																				
13058111002	SALEM SCHOOL DIST 111																				
19022048002	SALT CREEK SCHOOL DIST 48																				
14016172002	SANDRIDGE SCHOOL DISTRICT 172																				
24032060C04	SARATOGA COMM CONS S DIST 60C																				
17053438004	SAUNEMIN C CONSOL SCH DIST 438																				
14016054004	SCHAUMBURG C C SCHOOL DIST 54	X				X				X				X							
14016081002	SCHILLER PARK SCHOOL DIST 81																				
13058010004	SELMAVILLE C C SCH DIST 10																				
35050170004	SENECA COMM CONS SCH DIST 170																				
50082085002	SHILOH VILLAGE SCHOOL DIST 85																				
4101134004	SHIRLAND C C SCHOOL DIST 134	X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X		X	X	X	
50082181002	SIGNAL HILL SCH DIST 181	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X				
49081034002	SILVIS SCHOOL DISTRICT 34																				
14016072002	SKOKIE FAIRVIEW SCHOOL DIST 72																				
14016068002	SKOKIE SCHOOL DIST 68																				
14016069002	SKOKIE SCHOOL DIST 69																				
14016073502	SKOKIE SCHOOL DIST 73-5																				
50082130004	SMITHTON C C SCHOOL DIST 130	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
14016150002	SOUTH HOLLAND SCHOOL DIST 150																				
14016151002	SOUTH HOLLAND SCHOOL DIST 151																				
53090137002	SOUTH PEKIN SCHOOL DIST 137																				
24032074003	SOUTH WILMINGTON CONS SCH DIST 74	X				X								X				X			
28006099004	SPRING VALLEY C C SCH DIST 99																				
32046256004	ST ANNE C C SCHOOL DIST 256																				
32046258004	ST GEORGE C C SCHOOL DIST 258	X				X				X				X							
9010169004	ST JOSEPH C C SCHOOL DIST 169	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
50082030003	ST LIBORY CONS SCH DIST 30																				
13014141502	ST ROSE SCHOOL DISTRICT 14-15	X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016194002	STEGER SCHOOL DISTRICT 194																				
47052220002	STEWARD ELEM SCHOOL DIST 220																				
35050044002	STREATOR ELEM SCHOOL DIST 44																				
25041079002	SUMMERSVILLE SCHOOL DIST 79					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
56099161002	SUMMIT HILL SCHOOL DIST 161	X				X				X				X				X			
14016104002	SUMMIT SCHOOL DIST 104																				
14016171002	SUNNYBROOK SCHOOL DISTRICT 171																				
14016029002	SUNSET RIDGE SCHOOL DIST 29																				
56099090002	TAFT SCHOOL DISTRICT 90																				
30073005002	TAMAROA SCHOOL DIST 5																				
9010130004	THOMASBORO C C SCHOOL DIST 130																	X		X	X
21028062002	THOMPSONVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 62																				
14016154002	THORNTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 154	X				X								X				X			
14016146004	TINLEY PARK COMM SCH DIST 146	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
35050079004	TONICA COMM CONS SCH DIST 79																				
56099030C04	TROY COMM CONS SCH DIST 30C																				
14016086002	UNION RIDGE SCHOOL DIST 86																				
56099081002	UNION SCHOOL DIST 81																				
30039140004	UNITY POINT C C SCHOOL DIST 140																				
35050135002	UTICA ELEM SCHOOL DIST 135																				
2044055002	VIENNA SCHOOL DIST 55					X		X	X					X		X	X				
19022045002	VILLA PARK SCHOOL DIST 45	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016147002	W HARVEY-DIXMOOR PUB SCH DIST147																				
35050195004	WALLACE C C SCHOOL DIST 195	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
35050185004	WALTHAM C C SCHOOL DIST 185																				
53090052002	WASHINGTON SCHOOL DIST 52	X				X								X				X			

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	4A	4B	4C	4D	5A	5B	5C	5D
19022033002	WEST CHICAGO SCHOOL DIST 33																				
38054092004	WEST LINCOLN-BROADWELL E S D #92	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
14016031002	WEST NORTHFIELD SCHOOL DIST 31																				
14016092502	WESTCHESTER SCHOOL DIST 92-5	X				X				X				X				X			
14016101002	WESTERN SPRINGS SCHOOL DIST 101	X				X								X				X			
14016021004	WHEELING C C SCHOOL DIST 21																				
50082115002	WHITESIDE SCHOOL DIST 115	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
56099092002	WILL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 92	X				X				X											
13014046002	WILLOW GROVE SCHOOL DISTRICT 46																				
14016108002	WILLOW SPRINGS SCHOOL DIST 108																				
14016039002	WILMETTE SCHOOL DIST 39	X				X								X				X			
19022034002	WINFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT 34																				
14016036002	WINNETKA SCHOOL DIST 36	X				X								X				X			
34049001002	WINTHROP HARBOR SCHOOL DIST 1	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X									
50082113002	WOLF BRANCH SCH DIST 113	X				X								X				X			
19022007002	WOOD DALE SCHOOL DISTRICT 7																				
41057015003	WOOD RIVER-HARTFORD ELEM S D 15																	X		X	X
34049050004	WOODLAND C C SCHOOL DIST 50																				
25041004004	WOODLAWN COMM CONS SCH DIST 4																				
19022068002	WOODRIDGE SCHOOL DIST 68																				
14016127002	WORTH SCHOOL DISTRICT 127	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
34049006002	ZION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT 6																				

APPENDIX B-5

LIST OF HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SUCCESS

WITHOUT EFFICIENCY

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	5A	5B	5C	5D
34049125013	ADLAI E STEVENSON DIST 125	X				X								X			
2091081016	ANNA JONESBORO COMM H S DIST 81													X		X	X
34049117016	ANTIOCH COMM HIGH SCH DIST 117	X				X				X							
54092225017	ARMSTRONG TWP HS DIST 225																
50082201017	BELLEVILLE TWP HS DIST 201	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
21028103013	BENTON CONS HIGH SCHOOL DIST 103					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
32046307016	BRADLEY BOURBONNAIS C HS D 307	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
14016228016	BREMEN COMM H S DISTRICT 228																
30039165016	CARBONDALE COMM H S DISTRICT 165	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
13014071016	CENTRAL COMMUNITY H S DIST 71													X	X	X	
13058200017	CENTRALIA H S DIST 200																
14016218016	COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL DIST 218																
14016230013	CONS HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 230	X				X				X							
32038252016	CRESCENT IROQUOIS COMM DIST 252	X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
19022088016	DU PAGE HIGH SCHOOL DIST 88	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
17053230017	DWIGHT TWP H S DIST 230	X				X				X				X			
41057014016	EAST ALTON-WOOD RIVER C H S D 14																
53090309016	EAST PEORIA COMM H S DIST 309													X	X	X	
20096225016	FAIRFIELD COMM H S DIST 225																
24032073017	GARDNER S WILMINGTON THS DIST 73	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
34049124016	GRANT COMM H S DISTRICT 124																
28006502017	HALL HIGH SCH DIST 502					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016233016	HOMEWOOD FLOSSMOOR C H S D 233	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
4101207016	HONONEGAH COMM H S DIST 207	X				X				X				X			
14016201017	J S MORTON H S DISTRICT 201													X		X	X
56099204017	JOLIET TWP HS DIST 204																
35050120017	LA SALLE-PERU TWP H S D 120																
34049115016	LAKE FOREST COMM H S DISTRICT 115	X				X								X			
14016210017	LEMONT TWP H S DIST 210	X				X				X							
14016212016	LEYDEN COMM H S DIST 212	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
34049128016	LIBERTYVILLE COMM H SCH DIST 128	X				X								X			
48072310016	LIMESTONE COMM HIGH SCH DIST 310																
38054404016	LINCOLN COMM H S DIST 404																
56099210016	LINCOLN WAY COMM H S DIST 210	X				X				X							
14016207017	MAINE TOWNSHIP H S DIST 207	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
44063154016	MARENGO COMM HS DIST 154																
35050280017	MENDOTA TWP H S DIST 280					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
43102122017	METAMORA TWP H S DIST 122																
32038233017	MILFORD TWP HIGH SCH DIST 233													X		X	X
24032111016	MINOOKA COMM H S DISTRICT 111	X				X				X							
24032101016	MORRIS COMM HIGH SCH DIST 101	X				X				X							

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	5A	5B	5C	5D
25041201017	MT VERNON TWP H S DIST 201					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
34049120013	MUNDELEIN CONS HIGH SCH DIST 120	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
13095099016	NASHVILLE COMM H S DISTRICT 99	X				X				X				X			
24047018016	NEWARK COMM H S DIST 18																
14016219017	NILES TWP COMM HIGH SCH DIST 219	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
50082203017	O FALLON TWP HIGH SCH DIST 203	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016229016	OAK LAWN COMM H S DIST 229																
14016200013	OAK PARK & RIVER FOREST DIST 200	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
13058700016	ODIN COMM H S DIST 700																
28006505016	OHIO COMMUNITY H S DIST 505													X			
35050140017	OTTAWA TWP H S DIST 140																
53090303016	PEKIN COMM H S DIST 303																
30073101016	PINCKNEYVILLE COMM H S DIST 101																
17053090017	PONTIAC TWP H S DIST 90																
28006500015	PRINCETON HIGH SCH DIST 500													X	X	X	
14016209017	PROVISO TWP H S DIST 209																
9010193017	RANTOUL TOWNSHIP H S DIST 193																
14016220017	REAVIS TWP H S DIST 220																
14016227017	RICH TWP H S DISTRICT 227																
44063157016	RICHMOND-BURTON COMM H SC D 157	X				X				X							
14016234016	RIDGEWOOD COMM H S DIST 234	X				X				X				X			
14016208017	RIVERSIDE BROOKFIELD TWP DIST 208	X				X				X							
47071212017	ROCHELLE TWP HIGH SCH DIST 212					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
55098301017	ROCK FALLS TWP H S DIST 301					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
13058600016	SALEM COMM H S DIST 600	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
35050160017	SENECA TWP H S DIST 160																
32046302016	ST ANNE COMM H S DIST 302																
35050040017	STREATOR TWP H S DIST 40																
21028112016	THOMPSONVILLE COMM H S DIST 112													X		X	X
14016215017	THORNTON FRACTIONAL T H S D 215																
14016205017	THORNTON TWP H S DIST 205																
14016211017	TOWNSHIP H S DIST 211	X				X				X							
34049113017	TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DIST 113	X				X								X			
14016214017	TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DIST 214	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
49081030017	UNITED TWP HS DISTRICT 30																
2044133017	VIENNA H S DISTRICT 133																
53090308016	WASHINGTON COMM H S DIST 308	X				X				X							
25041204017	WEBBER TOWNSHIP H S DIST 204													X			
25041205016	WOODLAWN COMM H S DIST 205																

APPENDIX B-6

LIST OF HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SUCCESS

WITH EFFICIENCY

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	5A	5B	5C	5D
34049125013	ADLAI E STEVENSON DIST 125	X				X								X			
2091081016	ANNA JONESBORO COMM H S DIST 81																
34049117016	ANTIOCH COMM HIGH SCH DIST 117	X				X				X							
54092225017	ARMSTRONG TWP HS DIST 225																
50082201017	BELLEVILLE TWP HS DIST 201																
21028103013	BENTON CONS HIGH SCHOOL DIST 103																
32046307016	BRADLEY BOURBONNAIS C HS D 307	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
14016228016	BREMEN COMM H S DISTRICT 228																
30039165016	CARBONDALE COMM H S DISTRICT 165	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
13014071016	CENTRAL COMMUNITY H S DIST 71																
13058200017	CENTRALIA H S DIST 200																
14016218016	COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL DIST 218																
14016230013	CONS HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 230																
32038252016	CRESCENT IROQUOIS COMM DIST 252	X	X	X		X	X	X						X	X	X	
19022088016	DU PAGE HIGH SCHOOL DIST 88	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
17053230017	DWIGHT TWP H S DIST 230	X				X				X				X			
41057014016	EAST ALTON-WOOD RIVER C H S D 14																
53090309016	EAST PEORIA COMM H S DIST 309																
20096225016	FAIRFIELD COMM H S DIST 225																
24032073017	GARDNER S WILMINGTON THS DIST 73																
34049124016	GRANT COMM H S DISTRICT 124																
28006502017	HALL HIGH SCH DIST 502																
14016233016	HOMEWOOD FLOSSMOOR C H S D 233																
4101207016	HONONEGAH COMM H S DIST 207																
14016201017	J S MORTON H S DISTRICT 201																
56099204017	JOLIET TWP HS DIST 204																
35050120017	LA SALLE-PERU TWP H S D 120																
34049115016	LAKE FOREST COMM H S DISTRICT 115	X				X								X			
14016210017	LEMONT TWP H S DIST 210	X				X				X							
14016212016	LEYDEN COMM H S DIST 212	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
34049128016	LIBERTYVILLE COMM H SCH DIST 128																
48072310016	LIMESTONE COMM HIGH SCH DIST 310																
38054404016	LINCOLN COMM H S DIST 404																
56099210016	LINCOLN WAY COMM H S DIST 210	X				X				X							
14016207017	MAINE TOWNSHIP H S DIST 207																
44063154016	MARENGO COMM HS DIST 154																
35050280017	MENDOTA TWP H S DIST 280					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
43102122017	METAMORA TWP H S DIST 122																
32038233017	MILFORD TWP HIGH SCH DIST 233													X		X	X
24032111016	MINOOKA COMM H S DISTRICT 111	X				X				X							
24032101016	MORRIS COMM HIGH SCH DIST 101	X				X				X							

District #	District Name	1A	1B	1C	1D	2A	2B	2C	2D	3A	3B	3C	3D	5A	5B	5C	5D
25041201017	MT VERNON TWP H S DIST 201																
34049120013	MUNDELEIN CONS HIGH SCH DIST 120																
13095099016	NASHVILLE COMM H S DISTRICT 99																
24047018016	NEWARK COMM H S DIST 18																
14016219017	NILES TWP COMM HIGH SCH DIST 219																
50082203017	O FALLON TWP HIGH SCH DIST 203	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
14016229016	OAK LAWN COMM H S DIST 229																
14016200013	OAK PARK & RIVER FOREST DIST 200																
13058700016	ODIN COMM H S DIST 700																
28006505016	OHIO COMMUNITY H S DIST 505																
35050140017	OTTAWA TWP H S DIST 140																
53090303016	PEKIN COMM H S DIST 303																
30073101016	PINCKNEYVILLE COMM H S DIST 101																
17053090017	PONTIAC TWP H S DIST 90																
28006500015	PRINCETON HIGH SCH DIST 500																
14016209017	PROVISO TWP H S DIST 209																
9010193017	RANTOUL TOWNSHIP H S DIST 193																
14016220017	REAVIS TWP H S DIST 220																
14016227017	RICH TWP H S DISTRICT 227																
44063157016	RICHMOND-BURTON COMM H SC D 157	X				X				X							
14016234016	RIDGEWOOD COMM H S DIST 234	X				X				X				X			
14016208017	RIVERSIDE BROOKFIELD TWP DIST 208																
47071212017	ROCHELLE TWP HIGH SCH DIST 212					X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
55098301017	ROCK FALLS TWP H S DIST 301					X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
13058600016	SALEM COMM H S DIST 600	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
35050160017	SENECA TWP H S DIST 160																
32046302016	ST ANNE COMM H S DIST 302																
35050040017	STREATOR TWP H S DIST 40																
21028112016	THOMPSONVILLE COMM H S DIST 112													X		X	X
14016215017	THORNTON FRACTIONAL T H S D 215																
14016205017	THORNTON TWP H S DIST 205																
14016211017	TOWNSHIP H S DIST 211																
34049113017	TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DIST 113																
14016214017	TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DIST 214	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X					
49081030017	UNITED TWP HS DISTRICT 30																
2044133017	VIENNA H S DISTRICT 133																
53090308016	WASHINGTON COMM H S DIST 308	X				X				X							
25041204017	WEBBER TOWNSHIP H S DIST 204													X			
25041205016	WOODLAWN COMM H S DIST 205																

APPENDIX C

RANKING OF STATES BASED ON NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ENROLLMENT, THE PRESENCE OF AT LEAST ONE VERY LARGE DISTRICT, AND TITLE 1 STUDENTS AS A PROPORTION OF ENROLLMENT

State	Number of Districts	1999-2000 Enrollment	Districts Over 200,000 Students	Title 1 as % of Enrollment	Total Points*
ILLINOIS	***899***	***2,016,409***	***1***	***24.2%***	***17***
California	991	5,778,247	1	37.4%	17
Texas	1,043	3,971,269	1	45.7%	17
New York	705	2,850,729	1	23.9%	16
Pennsylvania	500	1,817,530	1	18.3%	12
Michigan	753	1,693,508	0	28.4%	10
Ohio	611	1,837,000	0	17.5%	9
Florida	67	2,394,243	2	26.7%	9
Georgia	180	1,401,227	0	24.0%	6
North Carolina	117	1,264,048	0	23.5%	6
Massachusetts	363	955,534	0	22.5%	5
Missouri	525	898,654	0	18.1%	5
Tennessee	140	907,899	0	25.2%	5
Washington	296	1,004,427	0	17.1%	5
Wisconsin	426	884,103	0	18.5%	5
Arizona	225	834,991	0	18.5%	4
New Jersey	595	1,249,803	0	12.5%	4
Virginia	137	1,125,799	0	10.2%	3
Oklahoma	577	628,820	0	30.8%	3
Indiana	292	990,478	0	10.5%	2
Minnesota	392	861,488	0	12.1%	2
Alabama	128	741,179	0	34.8%	2
Kentucky	176	645,208	0	41.7%	2
Arkansas	311	457,782	0	34.0%	1
Mississippi	176	503,479	0	55.9%	1

Note: the remaining 25 states had a point total of zero or less (of those states, one had more than 500 districts, all had fewer than 850,000 students, one had a district larger than 200,000 students, and six had more than 20 percent Title 1 pupils).

APPENDIX C (CONTINUED)

* Points are based on the following:

Number of districts:	*5* for over 850; *4* for 600-849; *1* for 400-599; *0* for 100-399; *-3* for less than 100
Total enrollment:	*5* for over 1,000,000; *4* for 800,000 -999,999; *1* for 500,000 - 799,999; *0* for 300,000 - 499,000; *-3* for less than 300,000
Number of districts with more than 200,000 pupils:	*4* for one or more; *-2* for none
Proportion of Title 1 pupils:	*3* for more than 20.0%; *2* for 15-19.9%; *0* for 10-14.9%; *-2* for less than 10%

APPENDIX D

REPORT TO A&M FROM FOX RIVER LEARNING, INC.

Fox River Learning (Fox River) participated in the contract for services let by the Education Funding Advisory Board of Illinois with partner Augenblick & Myers. As part of this contract, Fox River was asked to review the state's calculation of the tuition level for each district and to determine whether the state's figure accurately represented basic expenditures or whether adjustments needed to be made to the tuition figure so that it can be used appropriately.

Fox River used its patented finance analysis software, In$ite® – the Finance Analysis Model for Education™, to complete this task. In$ite supports the identification, purchase, and use of effective instructional programs and resource strategies in the classroom. As a policy-neutral financial analysis tool, In$ite allows a district's administration and its teachers to dedicate new and reallocated resources where they will make the biggest impact on student learning.

In$ite allows school districts to export budget and expenditure information from any accounting package into a relational database for financial analysis using a common financial language. In$ite is a complementary tool to a school district's existing financial system. It is a methodology and technology that enables a state to significantly broaden consistent, performance-based reporting across all districts without expensive financial system conversions, and without operational intrusion into local jurisdictions.

When a complete implementation is performed, In$ite — initially developed and brought to the educational marketplace by Coopers & Lybrand L.L.P. — provides 280 easy to understand analytical and statistical reports that show how individual schools expend money and connect costs to instructional practices.

For the Illinois work, Fox River used specific functions of the software given the parameters of the work. Specifically, Fox River was asked to analyze only those dollars related to the base tuition level calculation, which meant that any expenditures related to any programs not part of the tuition level calculation had to be eliminated (reconciled) from the analysis. Fox example, expenditures related to such educational functions as Special Education, Title 1, Vocational Education, Bilingual Education, as well as expenditures related to transportation and food service, among others were reconciled for this study.

To determine the full list of items for reconciliation, Fox River requested and received a list of programs and activities to reconcile from the analysis, which originated from Appendix H of the state data collection document provided to school districts. Appendix H contained several sections, one of which related to the reconciliation of revenues, the other of which related to the reconciliation of expenditures. This established a quandary in the analysis as the data we received for the study included only expenditure data. Upon close evaluation of these two sections, Fox River determined that, given we were contracted to conduct an expenditure analysis of school district general ledgers, the work could not be completed successfully using the Appendix H expenditure section exclusively as the expenditures section did not mirror the revenue section.

Therefore, Fox River developed a hybrid list that combined items from the revenue section of Schedule H, as well as the expenditure section of the same document. The full list of items used for reconciliation can be found in the body of the report.

In addition to identifying expenditures for reconciliation, Fox River contacted candidate districts selected in tandem by Augenblick & Myers and the Education Funding Advisory Board of Illinois. The 12 districts chosen represented a spectrum of education realities in the state of Illinois, ranging from High Income, High Performance to Low Income, Low Performance. In several cases, districts declined as they did not identify any means for exporting general ledger data from their accounting system into the ascii format required for import into In$ite. Fox River received full general ledger information on paper from two districts. However, a requirement of In$ite and Fox River is that the data be submitted in electronic format. Therefore, the data for those two districts were not included in the study. A total of 6 of the12 districts agreed to participate.

Once a suitable number of districts agreed to participate, the analytical work began. For this study, specific features of the In$ite program were used while others were not utilized:

- With traditional implementations, all locations in the district are included during the Setup operations, as well as the Education Level and Student Enrollment for each school. However, this contract did not call for any school level analysis. We asked the districts only for the total enrollment for the entire district so that the base per pupil cost could be calculated.

- Under normal circumstances, program enrollments are entered into In$ite during the Setup operations so that per pupil program level expenditures can be identified. However, for this study, program level expenditures were reconciled, so no enrollments were entered.

- Since this study was designed to identify a base cost for a district, Fox River did not conduct any allocations to school locations, nor did it conduct a benefits allocation.

- Fox River developed a different reporting structure based on the requirements of this contract and did not use the reports generated by the software.

Once a district's data was loaded into In$ite, Fox River contacted all the school districts to confirm expenditure totals in the analysis. As some of the districts included information from their general ledger accounting systems that was not expenditure related, the company wanted to assure that the correct expenditure totals were being analyzed.

Second, Fox River began the process of reconciling expenditures that were not intended to be included in the study. Fox River made the decision to include 100% of the district's expenditures when importing district data so that if questions arose related to the expenditures not included in the study, quick reference could be made to those expenditures through the software. Using the hybrid list of reconciliation items mentioned previously, Fox River created a series of Reconciliation Accounts in the software in case the client wanted to identify the total expenditures for any reconciled account. Additionally, the process of using detailed reconciliation accounts would make it easier for Fox River to incorporate expenditures back into the base calculation if the client questioned any of the reconciled expenditures. To assist the client in that end, Fox River prepared .pdf files that included reports of every line item reconciled, clustered by reconciliation account.

Once all items were reconciled from the In$ite program, Fox River mapped the remaining line items to the In$ite Function methodology. The Function methodology contains a series of accounts for identifying expenditures in a school district's general ledger. The most basic Function level of analysis was used for this study:

- Instruction – those costs related directly to classroom instruction (unless otherwise reconciled), included expenses related to classroom teachers, instructional substitutes, instructional paraprofessionals, pupil-use technology and software, and classroom materials, trips, tests and supplies.

- Instructional Support – those expenses related to, unless otherwise reconciled, guidance and counseling, library & media, student health and services, curriculum development, in-service, staff development and support, sabbaticals, program management, and therapists, evaluators, psychologists and social workers (if not identified for reconciliation)

- Operations – those expenses related to, unless otherwise reconciled, building operations and maintenance, data processing and business operations

- Other Commitments – Not included in this study.

- Leadership – expenditures for principals and assistant principals, the school office, deputies, senior administrators and researchers, the superintendent and school board, and legal expenses.

The phrase used above "unless otherwise reconciled" is important when reviewing the work in this study. In some cases, dollars remained in the study, which might have been candidates for reconciliation, if insufficient information was available. A case in point is our category for Library & Media expenditures. Schedule H requires districts to reconcile state library grants. There was not a consistent treatment of grant information among all six districts in this study. However, some of the districts referred to "state library grant" in their code structure, in which case, those expenditures were reconciled.

Once all remaining expenditure line items were analyzed in the In$ite system, Fox River prepared a .pdf report for each district, which included all the line items used to calculate the per pupil expenditure for that district.

Finally, Fox River prepared a separate document showing total expenditures by each of the function categories above, and the per pupil expenditure for each function as well. The function subtotals were combined for a total expenditure and per pupil amount for each district.