

	Study author(s)	Method	Study release date	Year of basic cost estimate	Cost estimate includes students with disabilities
Arkansas	Lawrence O. Picus and Associates	Evidence-based	2003	2002	✓
Colorado	Augenblick and colleagues	Successful schools	2003	2001	
Colorado	Augenblick and colleagues	Professional judgment	2003	2001	
Illinois ¹	Augenblick and colleagues	Successful schools	2001	2000	
Illinois ¹	Augenblick and colleagues	Successful schools	2001	2000	
Indiana	Augenblick and colleagues	Professional judgment	2002	2002	
Kansas	Augenblick and colleagues	Successful schools	2001	2000	
Kansas	Augenblick and colleagues	Professional judgment	2001	2000	
Kentucky	Lawrence O. Picus and Associates	Evidence-based	2003	2003	
Kentucky	Deborah A. Versteegen	Professional judgment	2003	2003	✓
Maryland	Augenblick and colleagues	Successful schools	2001	2000	
Maryland	Augenblick and colleagues	Professional judgment	2001	2000	
Maryland (Low) ²	Management, Planning & Analysis Inc. (MAP)	Professional judgment	2001	1999	✓
Maryland (High) ²	Management, Planning & Analysis Inc. (MAP)	Professional judgment	2001	1999	✓
Missouri	Augenblick and colleagues	Successful schools	2003	2002	
Missouri	Augenblick and colleagues	Professional judgment	2003	2002	
Montana	Augenblick and colleagues	Professional judgment	2003	2002	
Nebraska	Augenblick and colleagues	Professional judgment	2003	2002	
New York	Duncombe and colleagues (Syracuse U.)	Cost function	2004	2004	
New York	American Institutes for Research & MAP	Professional judgment	2004	2002	✓
New York (140) ³	Duncombe and colleagues (Syracuse U.)	Cost function	2002	2000	
New York (150) ³	Duncombe and colleagues (Syracuse U.)	Cost function	2002	2000	
New York (160) ³	Duncombe and colleagues (Syracuse U.)	Cost function	2002	2000	
New York (Low) ⁴	Standard & Poor's	Successful schools	2004	2004	✓
New York (High) ⁴	Standard & Poor's	Successful schools	2004	2004	✓
North Dakota	Augenblick and colleagues	Professional judgment	2003	2002	
Ohio	Augenblick and colleagues	Successful schools	1997	1996	
Oregon	Oregon Quality Education Commission	Professional judgment	2000	1999	
Texas	Reschovsky and Imazeki	Cost function	2001	1996	✓
Texas (55%) ⁵	Reschovsky and Imazeki	Cost function	2004	2002	✓
Texas (70%) ⁵	Reschovsky and Imazeki	Cost function	2004	2002	✓
Texas (Low) ⁶	Joint Select Committee (Texas A&M)	Cost function	2004	2002	✓
Texas (High) ⁶	Joint Select Committee (Texas A&M)	Cost function	2004	2002	✓
Washington	Ranier Institute	Professional judgment	2003	2001	✓
Wisconsin	Institute for Wisconsin's Future	Professional judgment	2002	2002	
Wisconsin	Reschovsky and Imazeki	Cost function	1998	1995	✓

SOURCE: Special analysis for *Education Week* by Bruce D. Baker, University of Kansas

¹The first Illinois estimate listed is based on 1999-2000 data and the standard that 83 percent of students meet improvement over time. This study includes an adjustment for efficiency. The second estimate is based on 2000 data only and the standard that 67 percent of pupils meet or exceed the standard and 50 percent do so on all tests. There is no adjustment for efficient spending.

²The two Maryland estimates represent different estimates from the two professional-judgment panels convened for the study.

³These three estimates listed for New York represent the results of setting different outcome standards on a 200-point index. The estimates for each of the three standards include only the costs for districts below the target performance standard for the 1999-2000 school year.

⁴These two estimates listed for New York show the differences in estimates within a single study as a result of using two different cost indices. The estimate using the New York Regional Cost Index was \$13,420, and the estimate using the Geographic Cost of Education Index was \$12,679.

⁵The two estimates provided for Texas are based on a 55 percent and a 70 percent passing standard. Estimates include food and transportation costs.

⁶The authors of this study provided a range of values for the cost estimate, based on the margin of error of the statistical method used. The two values listed represent the high and low estimates.

	Cost type	Basic cost estimate	Basic cost estimate (2004 dollars)	Adjusted cost estimate (2004 dollars)
Arkansas	State mean	\$6,741 ⁷	\$7,268	\$8,332
Colorado	Low	\$4,654	\$5,217	\$5,263
Colorado	Base	\$6,815	\$7,639	\$7,707
Illinois ¹	Low	\$4,470	\$5,210	\$5,009
Illinois ¹	Low	\$4,882	\$5,691	\$5,470
Indiana	Base	\$7,094	\$7,649	\$8,174
Kansas	Low	\$4,547	\$5,300	\$5,900
Kansas	Base	\$5,811	\$6,774	\$7,540
Kentucky	State mean	\$6,893	\$7,159	\$8,013
Kentucky	State mean	\$8,438 ⁹	\$8,763	\$9,809
Maryland	Low	\$5,969	\$6,958	\$6,820
Maryland	Base	\$6,612	\$7,707	\$7,555
Maryland (Low) ²	State mean	\$7,461	\$9,077	\$8,898
Maryland (High) ²	State mean	\$9,313	\$11,331	\$11,107
Missouri	Low	\$5,664	\$6,107	\$6,428
Missouri	Base	\$7,832	\$8,444	\$8,889
Montana	Base	\$6,004	\$6,473	\$7,106
Nebraska	Base	\$5,845	\$6,302	\$7,029
New York	State mean	\$14,107	\$14,107	\$12,484
New York	State mean	\$12,975	\$13,989	\$12,397
New York (140) ³	State mean	\$14,083	\$16,416	\$14,548
New York (150) ³	State mean	\$14,716	\$17,154	\$15,202
New York (160) ³	State mean	\$15,139	\$17,647	\$15,639
New York (Low) ⁴	State mean	\$12,679	\$12,679	\$11,220
New York (High) ⁴	State mean	\$13,420	\$13,420	\$11,876
North Dakota	Base	\$6,005	\$6,474	\$7,534
Ohio	Low	\$3,930	\$5,244	\$5,303
Oregon	Base	\$5,448	\$6,628	\$6,846
Texas	Average district	\$5,608	\$7,483	\$7,898
Texas (55%) ⁵	State mean	\$7,476	\$8,060	\$8,507
Texas (70%) ⁵	State mean	\$9,135	\$9,849	\$10,395
Texas (Low) ⁶	State mean	\$5,715	\$6,162 ⁹	\$6,503
Texas (High) ⁶	State mean	\$5,807	\$6,261 ⁹	\$6,608
Washington	State mean	\$7,753	\$8,691	\$8,355
Wisconsin	Base	\$8,730	\$9,412	\$9,826
Wisconsin	Average district	\$6,370	\$8,730	\$9,114

Interpretation

This table is not a comprehensive list of all adequacy studies conducted across the 50 states. Studies not listed generally only included school-level costs, were not statewide, or included only certain types of districts. Other studies not included were too old, or original reports were not available.

METHOD: In successful-schools studies, researchers select a group of schools or districts meeting a certain level of achievement, and then use the average expenditures of those schools as the basis for an adequate amount. A modified successful-schools study typically involves some measure of efficient spending for the schools or districts chosen. Professional-judgment studies gather a group of educators to develop an education program that will allow students to reach a certain level of achievement. The panel then determines the resources needed to implement that program. The evidence-based approach is based on a "proven effective" comprehensive school reform model (a significant point of debate), or a combination of research-based strategies, and determines the cost of an adequate education by calculating the cost of implementing those programs or strategies. The cost-function method uses a statistical analysis to determine the average cost associated with a certain desired level of student achievement, based on a district with average student characteristics.

COST TYPE: Base costs from the studies listed represent the estimated cost of resources required for the basic education program of prototype schools, assuming no additional accommodations for special student needs. Low costs represent the average expenditures of districts with low incidence of student demographics commonly associated with lower student achievement (e.g., the cost of outcomes in low-need districts). State mean costs represent the statewide average cost of educating students. Average district costs represent the cost of achieving adequate student outcomes in a district of average characteristics.

BASIC COST ESTIMATES: Basic cost estimates must be interpreted carefully. Because the achievement standards, methods, and assumptions of student demographics vary greatly across the different studies listed, these estimates are not directly comparable. Also, it is important to note that adequacy studies typically provide a complex listing of several estimates for the cost of an adequate education. The basic cost estimates listed here are just one estimate chosen from these studies. In general, they are the base costs of a large K-12 district. Basic cost estimates were adjusted to reflect 2004 dollars using the Employment Cost Index (ECI) of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

ADJUSTED COST ESTIMATES: Costs were adjusted for regional variations in price, using state average prices (weighted by district enrollment) generated from the NCES Geographic Cost of Education Index.

⁷Picus and Associates provide a total cost of about \$3 billion. To calculate a per-pupil estimate, this figure was divided by the 449,161 students in the state in the 2001-02 school year.

⁸This figure represents large to very large districts.

⁹These estimates exclude costs for food and transportation. Also, the authors of this study adjusted their cost estimates to 2004 dollars using a different method from the one used here. The figures listed here are only slightly lower than those in the original report.