

**AMPLE SCHOOL FUNDING PROJECT FOR
WASHINGTON STATE**

Research Report May 9, 2005

**STATE TRANSITIONAL BILINGUAL
INSTRUCTION PROGRAM
FUNDING ISSUES**

Bill Freund
Project Consultant

Washington Association of School Administrators

Executive Summary

Washington State's school districts are mandated by state and federal laws to provide Transitional Bilingual Instruction Programs (TBIP) to students whose primary language is other than English and have English language skill deficiencies that impair learning in the regular classroom.

This program requirement was enacted by the 1979 Legislature but was not initially made part of basic education. In a 1983 school funding case, the Court held that TBIP was a basic education program that must be fully funded by the state without resort to special levies.

In 2003-04, state TBIP funds were allocated to each district based on a rate of \$721 per eligible student times the number of eligible students in each district. Determination of the funding rate per student was not based on a study of amounts needed.

In 2003-04, the state allocated \$50.8 million for TBIP. School districts in turn expended \$73.2 million, exceeding state allocations by \$22.4 million or about 43 percent. The source of the \$22.4 million was local funds whose principal source is special levy revenue.

Previous state studies of the TBIP concerned the operations of the program but not the adequacy of the funding. The percentage of special levy support for the TBIP exceeds that of all other basic education programs.

The lack of an adequacy study to establish the amount of funding needed for TBIP coupled with the extensive use of levies by some school districts to supplement state TBIP funding raises questions about the adequacy of state funding and whether it meets the requirements of the State Constitution as interpreted by Washington Courts.

The 2005 Legislature has funded a comprehensive K-12 funding study scheduled to begin in 2005 with a final report due in November of 2006. The adequacy of state TBIP funding may be addressed by the study.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 2
Rationale for the Ample School Funding Project 4
Introduction -- Study Purpose 4
Purpose and Definition of Transitional Bilingual Instruction..... 5
TBIP in a K-12 Budget Context..... 5
Statutory and Legal History of TBIP 6
Origin of the State TBIP Funding Formula 6
State Studies of TBIP 7
State and Federal Laws and Policies Regarding TBIP 8
Variations among School Districts in TBIP Enrollment..... 9
Local Funds Expenditures to Supplement State TBIP Funding 9
Conclusion 12

Appendixes

- Appendix A – 2003-04 ELL and K-12 Headcount Enrollment
- Appendix B – 2003-04 Transitional Bilingual Program Revenues and Expenditures
- Appendix C – 2003-04 TBIP Revenues vs. Expenditures per ELL Student

Rationale for the Ample School Funding Project

The Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA) initiated the Ample School Funding Project in November 2003. The project emerged from the growing perception that the State of Washington has not met its constitutional responsibility to make ample provision for education as required by the Washington State Constitution. This has led to increased frustration by the K-12 community in meeting new state and federal educational expectations with insufficient resources to accomplish the tasks delegated to them.

WASA established this project to study our state's K-12 finance system on a basic education program-by-program basis. This research paper is the fifth of a series of papers concerning the extent to which state funding of the Transitional Bilingual Instruction Program (TBIP) meets the requirements of the state Constitution to make ample provision for the education of resident children through a general and uniform system.

Introduction -- Study Purpose

This paper addresses funding issues in the Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program Assistance Program (TBIP). Four other papers previously published by the Ample School Funding Project addressed funding issues concerning the apportionment, special education, transportation and learning assistance programs.

Previous state studies of the TBIP concerned various program aspects of TBIP but not the adequacy of state funding levels. This paper concerns adequacy of state TBIP funding.

Purpose and Definition of Transitional Bilingual Instruction

The purpose of the Transitional Bilingual Instruction Program is to ensure equal educational opportunity for eligible students whose primary language is other than English and who have English language skill deficiencies that impair learning in the regular classroom. State and federal laws require school districts to provide students that are English language learners (ELL) with specialized instruction to help them access the educational curriculum.

State law defines transitional bilingual instruction to include both bilingual education and when not practical, English as a Second Language.

Bilingual education is defined as a “system of instruction which uses two languages, one of which is English, as a means of instruction to build upon and expand language skills to enable the pupil to achieve competency in English. Concepts and information are introduced in the primary language and reinforced in the second language.”¹ In situations where using two languages is not practical, an alternative system of instruction, which may include English as a Second Language (ESL) may be substituted.²

TBIP in a K-12 Budget Context

In 2003-04, the main state program for the core, regular education of students was apportionment, accounting for \$4.19 billion or 80.5 percent of the \$5.2 billion in state funds allocated to school districts. This averaged \$4,182 per full-time equivalent student.

State allocations for TBIP were \$731 per ELL student totaling \$50.8 million or about 1.2 percent of total state K-12 funds. School districts expended \$73.2 million, exceeding state allocated funds by \$22.4 million or 44 percent.³ The source of the extra \$22.4 million was local funds.⁴

The TBIP is funded by the state as a categorical excess cost program. “Categorical” means that state TBIP funds provided must be expended exclusively for TBIP. “Excess cost” means that TBIP funds are in addition to state funds provided for the regular education of students.

¹ RCW 28A.180.030(1)(a)

² RCW 28A.180.030(1)(b). This provision was added by the legislature in 1984.

³ Total expenditures include direct expenditures and indirect expenditures calculated using the state allowable indirect rate established by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

⁴ In 2003-04, special levy revenues comprised 88.4 percent of local funds.

Statutory and Legal History of TBIP

The adequacy of Washington's funding of its public schools was litigated in the late 1970s and early 1980s in two principal court cases, *School Funding I* (1978,) and *School Funding II* (1983).⁵ These cases concerned whether state funding of the public schools met the requirement of the Washington State Constitution that:

“It is the paramount duty of the state to make ample provision for the education of all children residing within its borders”(Article IX, Section 1)

In *School Funding I* the Supreme Court held that:

- The legislature state must define and adequately fund basic education through a general and uniform system
- Special levies may not be used to offset the state's basic education funding responsibility.

The 1977 Legislature responded to a January 1977 trial court ruling by enacting the Basic Education Act.⁶ This Act principally defined the state's basic education obligation for the core regular education of students. Two years later, the 1979 Legislature enacted the Transitional Bilingual Instruction Act.⁷

Initially TBIP was not included within the state's definition of basic education and was not separately funded. From 1981 to 1984, state funding of TBIP was provided within a block grant program that consolidated the funding of various educational programs. This funding method was challenged in *School Funding II*. In 1983, Judge Doran found that TBIP was a basic education program requiring “ample” funding by the state and held that:

*“..... these programs [Learning Assistance and Bilingual] are necessary if the eligible students are to attain the goal or reach any reasonable level of achievement in the regular programs, as established in the Basic Education Act. Furthermore, the legislative history would support the conclusion that the Legislature regarded these programs as “basic” and did not intend or provide they should be funded by excess levies as “enrichment programs”.”*⁸

The 1984 Legislature responded by providing separate funding for the TBIP based on the number of ELL students in each district at a specified dollar rate per student.

Origin of the State TBIP Funding Formula

The 1984 Legislature provided \$3.0 million in separate TBIP funding for Fiscal Year 1984-85 and this was allocated at \$350 dollars per ELL student. This funding rate per student was not determined through a study of amounts needed to provide adequate funding. From 1985 to 1993,

⁵ *School Funding I, Seattle School District v. State*, 90 Wn. 2nd 476, 585 P.2d 71, (1978)

School Funding II, Thurston County 81-2-1713-1, (1983)

⁶ Judge Doran's January 1977 trial court ruling was affirmed by the Washington Supreme Court on September 1978.

⁷ Chapter 95, Laws of 1979, Section 1

⁸ *School Funding II*, 73 and 156

the funding rate per student was increased annually to account for state granted cost-of-living adjustments and health benefit increases.

Following complaints by various school districts that TBIP funding was inadequate, the 1993 Legislature provided an additional \$5.0 million to increase the per student funding rate by 13.5 percent for the 1993-95 biennium. Again, this increase was not based on a study of amounts needed, but rather, reflected the outcome of budget negotiations between the House and Senate.

State Studies of TBIP

Since 1984, the annual growth rate of ELL students consistently outpaced overall K-12 enrollment growth. In 1984-85, ELL students that comprised 1.5 percent of total K-12 headcount enrollment had grown to an estimated 7.4 percent of total enrollment by 2004-05.

The increasing costs to the state of the TBIP and uncertainty about appropriate instructional methods prompted various requests for state studies of the program. These studies were completed in 1992⁹, 1993¹⁰, 1999¹¹, 2003¹² and 2005¹³ and taken together dealt mainly with three questions:

1. What instructional programs are most effective for English language learners (ELL),
2. How long should students remain in TBIP and continue to receive state funding?
3. Entry and exit criteria for TBIP eligibility

Adequacy of state funding levels was not addressed by these studies.

The most recent comprehensive study of TBIP was published in 2005 by the Institute for Public Policy. Below are some of the findings of the study:

1. TBIP annual enrollment increases continued to outpace general K-12 enrollment increases.
2. ELL students are not evenly distributed among districts. Certain parts of the state have greater concentrations of ELL students and the number of languages spoken varies among districts.
3. More than 66 percent of ELL students speak Spanish and the proportion is growing. Fifty percent of the districts with TBIP have students with two to ten native languages.

⁹ Legislative Budget Committee, *K-12 Transitional Bilingual Instruction Program Report 92-3*, (Olympia, WA, LBC, February 25, 1992)

¹⁰ A symposium held by the Institute for Public Policy in 1993 at the Evergreen State College concerning effective instructional practices for ELL students.

¹¹ In 1999, the Governor requested that OSPI expand its annual report to the legislature to include a review of current research on bilingual education. Ever since, OSPI has included reviews of current research in its comprehensive annual report "Educating English Language Learners in Washington State" to the legislature.

¹² Superintendent of Public Instruction, *Report to the Legislature on Exemption and Reporting Criteria and the Development of an Evaluation System for Students Enrolled in the Transitional Bilingual Education Program*, (Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, WA: January 2003)

¹³ A. Pennuchi and S. Kavanaugh, *English Language Learners in K-12: Trends, Policies, and Research in Washington State* (Institute for Public Policy, Olympia, WA: January 2005)

4. Over 80 percent of TBIP instruction in Washington is provided as ESL instruction with less than 10 percent of students receiving TBIP instruction in their native languages. After reviewing the research literature on the most effective programs, the Institute found some evidence that bilingual programs can improve ELL student test scores in the short term. However, the research does not address ESL instruction, the most common program used in Washington schools.
5. Most students remain in TBIP less than three years but the average length of stay has been increasing. While there is no clear consensus on the appropriate length of stay in TBIP, many researchers have concluded it takes four to seven years. The Institute's analysis of factors influencing length of stay using district data was inconclusive.
6. School districts have difficulties obtaining teachers with bilingual and ESL endorsements. Consequently, there is wide use of instructional assistants among school districts. (The 1992 LBC study contained similar findings).

State and Federal Laws and Policies Regarding TBIP

State and federal laws and policies require school districts to provide TBIP.¹⁴ The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) provides school districts with state TBIP program guidelines, training and technical assistance to implement the TBIP.

Annually, each school district that seeks state TBIP funding is required to submit a program approval application to OSPI. The contents of the district application are specified, including a description of the bilingual instruction and alternative instructional programs planned for the next school year and a description of the research-based in-service training programs designed specifically for the instruction of ELL students.¹⁵

Student entrance and exit requirements for TBIP have been established by the state. State funding for any student is limited to three years but waivers of the limit are allowed for students not meeting the state's TBIP exit criteria.

The OSPI program guidelines refer to five research-based instructional models for provision of TBIP. The five models are variations of two instructional methods: Bilingual, which is a dual language model; and, English as a Second Language (ESL) in which ELL students are taught entirely in English.

State law grants school districts broad discretion to select and implement programs. The type of instructional models chosen by districts depend on the characteristics and needs of their ELL students, their distribution among schools, the availability of trained instructional staff and other factors.¹⁶

¹⁴ RCW 28A.180.040 (1) requires that every school board of directors make available to each eligible pupil, transitional bilingual instruction to achieve competency in English.

Federal policy regarding services to ELL students derives from two civil rights laws and two federal court cases, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, The Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, and the 1974 *Lau v. Nichols* and 1981 *Castaneda v. Pickard* U.S. Supreme Court cases. In summary these laws and cases require school districts with ELL students to eliminate barriers to equal educational participation.

¹⁵ WAC 392-160-026 and WAC 392-160-028

¹⁶ Institute, 1, 14-17

Variations among School Districts in TBIP Enrollment

In 2003-04, 182 of the states 296 districts had TBIP programs. The incidence of English Language Learners (ELL) students as a percent of total headcount enrollment differs among districts, ranging from zero to 83.6 percent. ELL enrollment data for the 182 districts with TBIP programs is provided in Appendix A. Figure 1 below is an extract of selected districts from Appendix I.

Figure 1
ELL as a % of Total Headcount Enrollment & Number Of Languages
Represented in Selected School Districts: 2003-04 School Year

School District	ELL Headcount	K-12 Headcount Enrollment	ELL as a % of K-12 Enrollment	Number of Languages
<u>Enrollment over 20,000</u>				
Seattle	5,641	46,160	12.2%	75
Tacoma	2,146	31,617	6.8%	41
Spokane	1,072	31,034	3.5%	38
Lake Washington	992	23,570	4.2%	46
Vancouver	1,765	21,632	8.2%	37
<u>Enrollment 10,000 to 19,999</u>				
Highline	2,265	17,659	12.8%	53
Bethel	146	17,058	0.9%	1
Kennewick	1,208	14,529	8.3%	25
Yakima	4,312	14,444	29.9%	11
Battle Ground	382	12,403	3.1%	17
<u>Enrollment 5,000 to 9,999</u>				
Shoreline	575	9,862	5.8%	51
Richland	272	9,855	2.8%	20
Mead	96	8,713	1.1%	13
Franklin Pierce	274	7,768	3.5%	11
Wenatchee	1,571	7,277	21.6%	10
<u>Enrollment 1,000 to 4,999</u>				
University Place	95	5,231	1.8%	16
Port Angeles	25	4,685	0.5%	9
Camas	67	4,710	1.4%	20
Mercer Island	72	4,144	1.7%	15
Wahluke	998	1,670	59.7%	1
<u>Enrollment Less Than 999</u>				
Brewster	412	963	42.8%	1
Warden	290	918	31.6%	2
College Place	186	856	21.7%	3
Winlock	67	774	8.6%	1
Manson	243	620	39.2%	1
State Total	70,908	1,001,952	7.1%	164

Source: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction

Local Funds Expenditures to Supplement State TBIP Funding

As shown in Figure 1, ELL students were not evenly distributed among the state's school districts. In addition, there were differences among districts in the number of languages spoken,

the grade distribution of students and in the educational ability of the students.¹⁷ These differences presented differing educational challenges and costs among districts. Figure 2 compares state TBIP funding with district expenditures for selected school districts. A complete listing of all districts is shown in Appendix B.

Figure 2
Transitional Bilingual Program Revenues Vs. Expenditures
Of Selected School Districts: 2003-04 School Year

<u>School District</u>	State TBIP Allocation	Total Expend **	Difference Expenditures vs. TBIP Revenue	Difference as a % of State TBIP Funds
<u>Enrollment over 20,000</u>				
Seattle	\$4,069,105	\$14,763,984	\$10,694,879	262.8%
Tacoma	\$1,547,678	\$1,818,638	\$270,960	17.5%
Spokane	\$773,031	\$2,220,500	\$1,447,469	187.2%
Lake Washington	\$715,503	\$1,106,076	\$390,573	54.6%
Vancouver	\$1,273,020	\$1,573,875	\$300,855	23.6%
<u>Enrollment 10,000 to 19,999</u>				
Highline	\$1,633,974	\$1,892,686	\$258,712	15.8%
Bethel	\$104,958	\$191,241	\$86,283	82.2%
Kennewick	\$871,497	\$987,900	\$116,403	13.4%
Yakima	\$3,110,598	\$3,148,333	\$37,735	1.2%
Battle Ground	\$275,199	\$423,109	\$147,911	53.7%
<u>Enrollment 5,000 to 9,999</u>				
Shoreline	\$415,056	\$469,322	\$54,266	13.1%
Richland	\$195,943	\$345,402	\$149,459	76.3%
Mead	\$66,096	\$72,740	\$6,644	10.1%
Franklin Pierce	\$197,746	\$296,866	\$99,119	50.1%
Wenatchee	\$1,133,076	\$1,198,366	\$65,290	5.8%
<u>Enrollment 1,000 to 4,999</u>				
University Place	\$68,529	\$115,648	\$47,119	68.8%
Port Angeles	\$18,034	\$17,419	(\$615)	-3.4%
Camas	\$48,605	\$71,764	\$23,159	47.6%
Mercer Island	\$51,671	\$108,686	\$57,015	110.3%
Wahluke	\$719,650	\$841,536	\$121,885	16.9%
<u>Enrollment Less Than 999</u>				
Brewster	\$270,211	\$310,558	\$40,347	14.9%
Warden	\$209,375	\$243,283	\$33,908	16.2%
College Place	\$133,812	\$154,492	\$20,680	15.5%
Winlock	\$47,970	\$50,454	\$2,483	5.2%
Manson	\$175,204	\$175,899	\$695	0.4%
State Total	\$50,799,581	\$73,183,528	\$22,383,947	44.1%

** Total Expenditures includes direct and indirect expenditures at the state allowable rate.

¹⁷ Differences in student ELL populations among districts are documented in the annual publication by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, *Educating English Language Learners in Washington State*, (Olympia, WA: OSPI, April 2005)

In 2003-04, each district received \$720.51 per ELL student from the state.¹⁸ Since the state funding amount per ELL student is uniform but the costs of TBIP differ among districts for a variety of reason, districts make up the difference with varying amounts of local funds per student. The non-uniform impact of the uniform state funding rate is illustrated in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3
TBIP Revenue Vs. Expenditures Per ELL Student
Of Selected School Districts: 2003-04 School Year

<u>School District</u>	<u>State TBIP \$/ELL Student</u>	<u>Expend per Student **</u>	<u>Difference Expend. vs. Revenue per Student</u>
<u>Enrollment over 20,000</u>			
Seattle	\$721	\$2,617	\$1,896
Tacoma	\$721	\$848	\$126
Spokane	\$721	\$2,072	\$1,351
Lake Washington	\$721	\$1,115	\$394
Vancouver	\$721	\$892	\$170
<u>Enrollment 10,000 to 19,999</u>			
Highline	\$721	\$836	\$114
Bethel	\$721	\$1,314	\$593
Kennewick	\$721	\$818	\$96
Yakima	\$721	\$730	\$9
Battle Ground	\$721	\$1,109	\$388
<u>Enrollment 5,000 to 9,999</u>			
Shoreline	\$721	\$816	\$94
Richland	\$721	\$1,272	\$550
Mead	\$721	\$761	\$39
Franklin Pierce	\$721	\$1,083	\$362
Wenatchee	\$721	\$763	\$42
<u>Enrollment 1,000 to 4,999</u>			
University Place	\$721	\$1,217	\$496
Port Angeles	\$721	\$697	-\$25
Camas	\$721	\$1,065	\$344
Mercer Island	\$721	\$1,517	\$796
Wahluke	\$721	\$844	\$122
<u>Enrollment Less Than 999</u>			
Brewster	\$721	\$754	\$32
Warden	\$721	\$838	\$117
College Place	\$721	\$833	\$111
Winlock	\$721	\$759	\$37
Manson	\$721	\$724	\$3
State Average	\$721	\$1,032	\$311

** **Expenditures** includes direct and indirect expenditures at the state allowable rate.

¹⁸ The state allocated \$731.48 per ELL student but \$700,000 to be withheld by OSPI to pay for the central provision of assessments.

Differences between revenues and expenditures per ELL student averaged \$312 more than received from the state and ranged from plus \$721 to a high of \$2,648 in the West Valley School district in Spokane County.

In 1993, the Senate proposed a new bilingual weighted funding formula that adjusted individual school district funding based on a number of variables including: number of languages spoken; grade levels of the bilingual students; time in program; and, the percent of the district's enrollment eligible for free and reduced price lunch. In addition, the Senate would have increased bilingual funding by \$12.7 million. The final compromise budget between the House and Senate did not include a new funding formula but provided \$5.0 million to increase the ELL rate per student by 13.5 percent.

A new weighted bilingual funding formula was approved by the legislature for the 1997-99 biennium. However, the Governor vetoed the new formula stating that the formula might be a good idea but lacked the supporting analysis necessary for a change in a basic education program. Since then, no other funding changes have been proposed by either the House or Senate.

Conclusion

By law, school districts are required to provide TBIP to eligible students. TBIP has been declared a basic education program requiring ample funding by the state. School districts supplement the mandated TBIP program with local funds exceeding state funding by 43 percent.

In the past, the state has conducted various studies of the bilingual program. These studies have concentrated on the operation of the bilingual program but not the adequacy of state funding.

The lack of an adequacy study to establish the amount of funding needed for TBIP coupled with the extensive use of levies by some school districts to supplement state TBIP funding raises questions about the adequacy of state funding and whether it meets the requirements of the State Constitution as interpreted by Washington Courts.

The 2005 Legislature has funded a comprehensive K-12 funding study scheduled to begin in 2005 with a final report due in November of 2006. The adequacy of state TBIP funding may be addressed by the study.

Appendix C
2003-04 TBIP Revenue Vs. Expenditures Per ELL Student

	ELL Headcount Enrollment	State TBIP \$/ELL Student	Expend per ELL Student **	Difference Expenditures vs. Revenue per Student	% Difference Expenditures vs. Revenue per Student
State Total or Average	70,908	\$721	\$1,032	\$311	43.1%
01109 WASHTUCNA	0				
01122 BENGE	0				
01147 OTHELLO	1,233	\$721	\$737	\$15	2.1%
01158 LIND	28	\$721	\$954	\$233	32.2%
01160 RITZVILLE	0				
02250 CLARKSTON	15	\$721	\$862	\$140	19.5%
02420 ASOTIN	5	\$721	\$844	\$123	17.0%
03017 KENNEWICK	1,208	\$721	\$818	\$96	13.4%
03050 PATERSON	45	\$721	\$907	\$186	25.7%
03052 KIONA BENTON	146	\$721	\$647	(\$75)	-10.4%
03053 FINLEY	65	\$721	\$727	\$6	0.8%
03116 PROSSER	577	\$721	\$731	\$10	1.4%
03400 RICHLAND	272	\$721	\$1,272	\$550	76.3%
04019 MANSON	243	\$721	\$724	\$3	0.4%
04069 STEHEKIN	0				
04127 ENTIAT	51	\$721	\$735	\$13	1.9%
04129 LAKE CHELAN	188	\$721	\$712	(\$9)	-1.3%
04222 CASHMERE	166	\$721	\$847	\$126	17.4%
04228 CASCADE	206	\$721	\$828	\$107	14.8%
04246 WENATCHEE	1,571	\$721	\$763	\$42	5.8%
05121 PORT ANGELES	25	\$721	\$697	(\$25)	-3.4%
05313 CRESCENT	0				
05323 SEQUIM	54	\$721	\$727	\$5	0.8%
05401 CAPE FLATTERY	118	\$721	\$1,147	\$426	59.0%
05402 QUILLAYUTE VALLEY	121	\$721	\$791	\$69	9.6%
06037 VANCOUVER	1,765	\$721	\$892	\$170	23.6%
06098 HOCKINSON	6	\$721	\$926	\$205	28.4%
06101 LACENTER	13	\$721	\$781	\$60	8.3%
06103 GREEN MOUNTAIN	0				
06112 WASHOUGAL	27	\$721	\$861	\$140	19.4%
06114 EVERGREEN	1,560	\$721	\$1,461	\$739	102.5%
06117 CAMAS	67	\$721	\$1,065	\$344	47.6%
06119 BATTLE GROUND	382	\$721	\$1,109	\$388	53.7%
06122 RIDGEFIELD	21	\$721	\$858	\$137	19.0%
07002 DAYTON	19	\$721	\$912	\$191	26.4%
07035 STARBUCK	0				
08122 LONGVIEW	301	\$721	\$801	\$80	11.0%
08130 TOUTLE LAKE	0				
08401 CASTLE ROCK	8	\$721	\$0	(\$721)	-100.0%
08402 KALAMA	0				
08404 WOODLAND	51	\$721	\$895	\$174	24.1%
08458 KELSO	138	\$721	\$761	\$40	5.6%
09013 ORONDO	85	\$721	\$765	\$43	6.0%
09075 BRIDGEPORT	402	\$721	\$858	\$136	18.9%
09102 PALISADES	29	\$721	\$859	\$138	19.1%
09206 EASTMONT	705	\$721	\$695	(\$27)	-3.7%
09207 MANSFIELD	0				
09209 WATERVILLE	26	\$721	\$789	\$68	9.4%
10003 KELLER	0				
10050 CURLEW	0				
10065 ORIENT	0				
10070 INCHELIUM	0				
10309 REPUBLIC	0				
11001 PASCO	4,052	\$721	\$797	\$76	10.5%

Appendix C
2003-04 TBIP Revenue Vs. Expenditures Per ELL Student

	ELL Headcount Enrollment	State TBIP \$/ELL Student	Expend per ELL Student **	Difference Expenditures vs. Revenue per Student	% Difference Expenditures vs. Revenue per Student	
11051	NORTH FRANKLIN	638	\$721	\$836	\$114	15.8%
11054	STAR	0				
11056	KAHLOTUS	0				
12110	POMEROY	4	\$721	\$900	\$178	24.7%
13073	WAHLUKE	998	\$721	\$844	\$122	16.9%
13144	QUINCY	859	\$721	\$727	\$6	0.8%
13146	WARDEN	290	\$721	\$838	\$117	16.2%
13151	COULEE-HARTLINE	0				
13156	SOAP LAKE	118	\$721	\$926	\$204	28.3%
13160	ROYAL	543	\$721	\$736	\$15	2.1%
13161	MOSES LAKE	708	\$721	\$805	\$84	11.6%
13165	EPHRATA	180	\$721	\$732	\$10	1.5%
13167	WILSON CREEK	0				
13301	GRAND COULEE DAM	0				
14005	ABERDEEN	271	\$721	\$755	\$34	4.7%
14028	HOQUIAM	63	\$721	\$922	\$201	27.9%
14064	NORTH BEACH	0				
14065	MC CLEARY	0				
14066	MONTESANO	11	\$721	\$1,270	\$548	76.0%
14068	ELMA	61	\$721	\$672	(\$49)	-6.8%
14077	TAHOLAH	0				
14097	QUINAULT	48	\$721	\$769	\$48	6.6%
14099	COSMOPOLIS	0				
14104	SATSOP	0				
14117	WISHKAH VALLEY	0				
14172	OCOSTA	17	\$721	\$881	\$159	22.1%
14400	OAKVILLE	0				
15201	OAK HARBOR	166	\$721	\$848	\$127	17.6%
15204	COUPEVILLE	23	\$721	\$923	\$202	28.0%
15206	SOUTH WHIDBEY	8	\$721	\$1,477	\$756	104.7%
16020	CLEARWATER	0				
16046	BRINNON	0				
16048	QUILCENE	0				
16049	CHIMACUM	0				
16050	PORT TOWNSEND	18	\$721	\$1,061	\$340	47.1%
17001	SEATTLE	5,641	\$721	\$2,617	\$1,896	262.8%
17210	FEDERAL WAY	2,151	\$721	\$1,088	\$366	50.8%
17216	ENUMCLAW	74	\$721	\$840	\$119	16.5%
17400	MERCER ISLAND	72	\$721	\$1,517	\$796	110.3%
17401	HIGHLINE	2,265	\$721	\$836	\$114	15.8%
17402	VASHON ISLAND	14	\$721	\$1,185	\$463	64.2%
17403	RENTON	1,284	\$721	\$1,000	\$279	38.7%
17404	SKYKOMISH	0				
17405	BELLEVUE	1,234	\$721	\$1,676	\$955	132.4%
17406	SOUTH CENTRAL	761	\$721	\$867	\$145	20.1%
17407	RIVERVIEW	51	\$721	\$1,771	\$1,049	145.4%
17408	AUBURN	1,097	\$721	\$749	\$28	3.9%
17409	TAHOMA	67	\$721	\$677	(\$44)	-6.2%
17410	SNOQUALMIE VALLEY	23	\$721	\$981	\$260	36.0%
17411	ISSAQUAH	226	\$721	\$1,143	\$422	58.5%
17412	SHORELINE	575	\$721	\$816	\$94	13.1%
17414	LAKE WASHINGTON	992	\$721	\$1,115	\$394	54.6%
17415	KENT	3,397	\$721	\$843	\$122	16.9%
17417	NORTHSHORE	519	\$721	\$1,060	\$339	46.9%
18100	BREMERTON	76	\$721	\$714	(\$7)	-1.0%

Appendix C
2003-04 TBIP Revenue Vs. Expenditures Per ELL Student

	ELL Headcount Enrollment	State TBIP \$/ELL Student	Expend per ELL Student **	Difference Expenditures vs. Revenue per Student	% Difference Expenditures vs. Revenue per Student	
18303	BAINBRIDGE	21	\$721	\$880	\$158	21.9%
18400	NORTH KITSAP	118	\$721	\$826	\$104	14.4%
18401	CENTRAL KITSAP	195	\$721	\$1,375	\$654	90.6%
18402	SOUTH KITSAP	57	\$721	\$843	\$121	16.8%
19007	DAMMAN	0				
19028	EASTON	0				
19400	THORP	3	\$721	\$849	\$127	17.7%
19401	ELLENSBURG	104	\$721	\$726	\$5	0.7%
19403	KITTITAS	33	\$721	\$927	\$205	28.5%
19404	CLE ELUM-ROSLYN	4	\$721	\$0	(\$721)	-100.0%
20094	WISHRAM	0				
20203	BICKLETON	0				
20215	CENTERVILLE	0				
20400	TROUT LAKE	3	\$721	\$811	\$90	12.5%
20401	GLENWOOD	0				
20402	KLICKITAT	0				
20403	ROOSEVELT	9	\$721	\$1,136	\$415	57.5%
20404	GOLDENDALE	35	\$721	\$761	\$40	5.5%
20405	WHITE SALMON	205	\$721	\$829	\$108	14.9%
20406	LYLE	5	\$721	\$727	\$6	0.8%
21014	NAPAVINE	0				
21018	VADER	0				
21036	EVALINE	0				
21206	MOSSYROCK	11	\$721	\$857	\$136	18.8%
21214	MORTON	0				
21226	ADNA	0				
21232	WINLOCK	67	\$721	\$759	\$37	5.2%
21234	BOISTFORT	0				
21237	TOLEDO	3	\$721	\$2,639	\$1,917	265.8%
21300	ONALASKA	17	\$721	\$872	\$150	20.8%
21301	PE ELL	0				
21302	CHEHALIS	67	\$721	\$831	\$110	15.2%
21303	WHITE PASS	0				
21401	CENTRALIA	193	\$721	\$821	\$99	13.8%
22008	SPRAGUE	0				
22009	REARDAN	0				
22017	ALMIRA	0				
22073	CRESTON	0				
22105	ODESSA	0				
22200	WILBUR	0				
22204	HARRINGTON	0				
22207	DAVENPORT	0				
23042	SOUTHSIDE	0				
23054	GRAPEVIEW	0				
23309	SHELTON	153	\$721	\$1,117	\$396	54.9%
23311	MARY M KNIGHT	0				
23402	PIONEER	0				
23403	NORTH MASON	44	\$721	\$847	\$126	17.4%
23404	HOOD CANAL	0				
24014	NESPELEM	0				
24019	OMAK	58	\$721	\$768	\$47	6.5%
24105	OKANOGAN	112	\$721	\$806	\$85	11.7%
24111	BREWSTER	412	\$721	\$754	\$32	4.5%
24122	PATEROS	30	\$721	\$865	\$144	20.0%
24350	METHOW VALLEY	11	\$721	\$843	\$121	16.8%

Appendix C
2003-04 TBIP Revenue Vs. Expenditures Per ELL Student

	ELL Headcount Enrollment	State TBIP \$/ELL Student	Expend per ELL Student **	Difference Expenditures vs. Revenue per Student	% Difference Expenditures vs. Revenue per Student	
24404	TONASKET	93	\$721	\$726	\$5	0.6%
24410	OROVILLE	121	\$721	\$773	\$52	7.2%
25101	OCEAN BEACH	56	\$721	\$857	\$136	18.8%
25116	RAYMOND	62	\$721	\$965	\$244	33.8%
25118	SOUTH BEND	83	\$721	\$889	\$168	23.3%
25155	NASELLE GRAYS RIVER	13	\$721	\$1,086	\$365	50.6%
25160	WILLAPA VALLEY	0				
25200	NORTH RIVER	0				
26056	NEWPORT	0				
26059	CUSICK	0				
26070	SELKIRK	0				
27001	STEILACOOM HIST.	39	\$721	\$887	\$165	22.9%
27003	PUYALLUP	221	\$721	\$1,237	\$516	71.5%
27010	TACOMA	2,146	\$721	\$848	\$126	17.5%
27019	CARBONADO	0				
27083	UNIVERSITY PLACE	95	\$721	\$1,217	\$496	68.8%
27320	SUMNER	95	\$721	\$772	\$51	7.1%
27343	DIERINGER	0				
27344	ORTING	19	\$721	\$1,481	\$760	105.4%
27400	CLOVER PARK	851	\$721	\$935	\$214	29.6%
27401	PENINSULA	22	\$721	\$838	\$117	16.2%
27402	FRANKLIN PIERCE	274	\$721	\$1,083	\$362	50.1%
27403	BETHEL	146	\$721	\$1,314	\$593	82.2%
27404	EATONVILLE	6	\$721	\$855	\$133	18.5%
27416	WHITE RIVER	17	\$721	\$1,251	\$530	73.4%
27417	FIFE	201	\$721	\$728	\$7	1.0%
28010	SHAW	0				
28137	ORCAS	3	\$721	\$866	\$144	20.0%
28144	LOPEZ	4	\$721	\$932	\$211	29.2%
28149	SAN JUAN	5	\$721	\$890	\$169	23.4%
29011	CONCRETE	2	\$721	\$0	(\$721)	-100.0%
29100	BURLINGTON EDISON	434	\$721	\$885	\$164	22.7%
29101	SEDRO WOOLLEY	216	\$721	\$787	\$65	9.0%
29103	ANACORTES	35	\$721	\$748	\$26	3.6%
29311	LA CONNER	2	\$721	\$886	\$165	22.9%
29317	CONWAY	11	\$721	\$1,127	\$406	56.3%
29320	MT VERNON	1,492	\$721	\$722	\$1	0.2%
30002	SKAMANIA	0				
30029	MOUNT PLEASANT	0				
30031	MILL A	0				
30303	STEVENSON-CARSON	17	\$721	\$839	\$118	16.4%
31002	EVERETT	1,232	\$721	\$818	\$97	13.4%
31004	LAKE STEVENS	111	\$721	\$691	(\$30)	-4.1%
31006	MUKILTEO	1,444	\$721	\$724	\$3	0.4%
31015	EDMONDS	1,451	\$721	\$836	\$115	16.0%
31016	ARLINGTON	107	\$721	\$835	\$113	15.7%
31025	MARYSVILLE	403	\$721	\$818	\$97	13.5%
31063	INDEX	0				
31103	MONROE	265	\$721	\$843	\$121	16.8%
31201	SNOHOMISH	81	\$721	\$725	\$4	0.5%
31306	LAKEWOOD	48	\$721	\$729	\$8	1.1%
31311	SULTAN	58	\$721	\$504	(\$218)	-30.2%
31330	DARRINGTON	0				
31332	GRANITE FALLS	14	\$721	\$576	(\$146)	-20.2%
31401	STANWOOD	48	\$721	\$807	\$86	11.9%

Appendix C
2003-04 TBIP Revenue Vs. Expenditures Per ELL Student

	ELL Headcount Enrollment	State TBIP \$/ELL Student	Expend per ELL Student **	Difference Expenditures vs. Revenue per Student	% Difference Expenditures vs. Revenue per Student	
32081	SPOKANE	1,072	\$721	\$2,072	\$1,351	187.2%
32123	ORCHARD PRAIRIE	0				
32312	GREAT NORTHERN	0				
32325	NINE MILE FALLS	0				
32326	MEDICAL LAKE	4	\$721	\$0	(\$721)	-100.0%
32354	MEAD	96	\$721	\$761	\$39	5.4%
32356	CENTRAL VALLEY	159	\$721	\$825	\$104	14.4%
32358	FREEMAN	0				
32360	CHENEY	26	\$721	\$769	\$48	6.6%
32361	EAST VALLEY	67	\$721	\$581	(\$140)	-19.4%
32362	LIBERTY	0				
32363	WEST VALLEY	58	\$721	\$3,369	\$2,647	367.0%
32414	DEER PARK	4	\$721	\$781	\$59	8.2%
32416	RIVERSIDE	0				
33030	ONION CREEK	0				
33036	CHEWELAH	2	\$721	\$727	\$6	0.8%
33049	WELLPINIT	0				
33070	VALLEY	0				
33115	COLVILLE	56	\$721	\$714	(\$8)	-1.0%
33183	LOON LAKE	0				
33202	SUMMIT VALLEY	0				
33205	EVERGREEN	0				
33206	COLUMBIA	0				
33207	MARY WALKER	0				
33211	NORTHPORT	0				
33212	KETTLE FALLS	0				
34002	YELM	32	\$721	\$830	\$109	15.1%
34003	NORTH THURSTON	151	\$721	\$2,359	\$1,638	227.1%
34033	TUMWATER	47	\$721	\$1,679	\$958	132.8%
34111	OLYMPIA	133	\$721	\$1,178	\$456	63.3%
34307	RAINIER	0				
34324	GRIFFIN	0				
34401	ROCHESTER	70	\$721	\$764	\$43	5.9%
34402	TENINO	8	\$721	\$749	\$27	3.8%
35200	WAHKIAKUM	0				
36101	DIXIE	0	\$721	\$0	(\$721)	-100.0%
36140	WALLA WALLA	644	\$721	\$797	\$76	10.6%
36250	COLLEGE PLACE	186	\$721	\$833	\$111	15.5%
36300	TOUCHET	31	\$721	\$881	\$160	22.1%
36400	COLUMBIA (Walla)	73	\$721	\$856	\$135	18.7%
36401	WAITSBURG	0				
36402	PRESCOTT	90	\$721	\$856	\$134	18.6%
37501	BELLINGHAM	430	\$721	\$1,051	\$329	45.7%
37502	FERNDALE	222	\$721	\$919	\$198	27.5%
37503	BLAINE	133	\$721	\$881	\$160	22.2%
37504	LYNDEN	222	\$721	\$840	\$119	16.5%
37505	MERIDIAN	141	\$721	\$828	\$107	14.8%
37506	NOOKSACK VALLEY	155	\$721	\$816	\$94	13.1%
37507	MOUNT BAKER	231	\$721	\$774	\$53	7.3%
38126	LACROSSE JOINT	0				
38264	LAMONT	0				
38265	TEKOA	0				
38267	PULLMAN	36	\$721	\$2,310	\$1,589	220.2%
38300	COLFAX	0				
38301	PALOUSE	0				

Appendix C
2003-04 TBIP Revenue Vs. Expenditures Per ELL Student

	ELL Headcount Enrollment	State TBIP \$/ELL Student	Expend per ELL Student **	Difference Expenditures vs. Revenue per Student	% Difference Expenditures vs. Revenue per Student	
38302	GARFIELD	0				
38304	STEPTOE	0				
38306	COLTON	0				
38308	ENDICOTT	0				
38320	ROSALIA	0				
38322	ST JOHN	0				
38324	OAKESDALE	0				
39002	UNION GAP	75	\$721	\$1,084	\$362	50.2%
39003	NACHES VALLEY	76	\$721	\$1,190	\$468	64.9%
39007	YAKIMA	4,312	\$721	\$730	\$9	1.2%
39090	EAST VALLEY (Yak)	101	\$721	\$1,068	\$346	48.0%
39119	SELAH	129	\$721	\$809	\$87	12.1%
39120	MABTON	290	\$721	\$729	\$8	1.1%
39200	GRANDVIEW	655	\$721	\$734	\$12	1.7%
39201	SUNNYSIDE	1,342	\$721	\$750	\$28	3.9%
39202	TOPPENISH	1,938	\$721	\$727	\$5	0.8%
39203	HIGHLAND	218	\$721	\$867	\$145	20.1%
39204	GRANGER	400	\$721	\$737	\$16	2.2%
39205	ZILLAH	108	\$721	\$730	\$9	1.2%
39207	WAPATO	963	\$721	\$831	\$109	15.2%
39208	WEST VALLEY	38	\$721	\$723	\$2	0.2%
39209	MOUNT ADAMS	145	\$721	\$1,178	\$457	63.3%