

Separate and Unequal:
The State of the District of Columbia Public Schools
Fifty Years After *Brown* and *Bolling*



**A Parents United for the D.C.
Public Schools Civic Leader
Advisory Committee Report**

March 2005

Preface

The following report was prepared for Parents United for the D.C. Public Schools (“Parents Untied”) and a special Civil Leader Advisory Committee by the Washington Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights and the pro bono assistance of Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP, Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, Foley & Lardner, Fulbright & Jaworski, Steptoe & Johnson, Michael H. Dardzinski, and the Education Project at the Washington School of Law of American University.

Parents United is a citywide parent organization established in 1980 to support quality public education in the District of Columbia. Over the years it has collaborated with the Washington Lawyers’ Committee to issue a series of reports on a range of school finance and school reform issues. The most recent analysis, *Per Student Cost Figures for the District of Columbia Public School System*, was presented to the Mayor at his annual budget hearing in February 2005. The Washington Lawyers’ Committee serves as counsel to Parents United. Mary Levy of Parents United, and Ronald Flagg, Patrick Linehan, and Andrew Fausett, of Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP, are the primary authors of this report. Other contributors include Leslie Turner, Allison Binney, Fani C. Geroff, Shannon McManus, Mary Kathryn Meacham, Debra Millenson, Jennifer Saunders and Melissa Sembler of Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, Sandra Hanna, Joel Sandler, and Jeff Sullivan of Foley & Lardner LLP, Rena Scheinkman of Fulbright & Jaworski, Barbara Kagan and Linda Stein of Steptoe & Johnson, Michael H. Dardzinski, and Rebecca Freedman and Meagan Christiansen of the Education Project.

Parents United would like to express its deep appreciation to the following individuals who served as members of the Civic Leader Advisory Committee:

Barry Coburn---Mr. Coburn is a partner at the law firm of Coburn & Schertler, LLP

Maudine R. Cooper---Ms. Cooper is the President of the Greater Washington Urban League.

Ronald S. Flagg---Mr. Flagg is a partner in the law firm of Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP.

James O. Gibson---Mr. Gibson is a Senior Fellow at the Center for the Study of Social Policy.

James W. Jones---Mr. Jones is a Director of Hildebrandt International, a management consulting firm serving the legal industry, and a former managing partner at the law firm of Arnold & Porter.

Charles Lawrence---Mr. Lawrence is a professor at Georgetown University Law Center, and is a former member of the District of Columbia Board of Education.

Ignacia Moreno---Ms. Moreno is a partner at the law firm of Spriggs & Hollingsworth.

Stanley Samorajczyk---Mr. Samorajczyk is a partner at the law firm of Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld.

Jay Silberman---Mr. Silberman is the President of Alliance Management Group, and is a former member of the District of Columbia Board of Education.

Richard W. Snowdon---Mr. Snowdon is a partner at the law firm of Trainum, Snowdon & Deane.

Leslie Turner---Ms. Turner is a partner at the law firm of Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld.

Roger Wilkins---Mr. Wilkins is a professor at George Mason University, and is a former member of the District of Columbia Board of Education.

SEPARATE AND UNEQUAL:

THE STATE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS FIFTY YEARS AFTER *BROWN* AND *BOLLING*

“In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.”

— Decision of United States Supreme Court in *Brown v. Board of Education*

“The people of Metropolitan Washington are not really afraid of democracy. They have the capacity to meet and solve whatever . . . problems may arise from the abolition of compulsory segregation in the public schools. They will show the Nation and the World that our Nation’s capital can be the living symbol of American faith in democracy.”

— *Amicus Curiae* Brief submitted to the United States Supreme Court on behalf of American Veterans’ Committee in *Bolling v. Sharpe*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The year 2004 marked the fiftieth anniversary of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Bolling v. Sharpe* invalidating segregated public schooling in the District of Columbia. The *Bolling* decision came on the heels of the historic decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, which held that “separate but equal” had no place in the field of public education, “perhaps the most important function of state and local governments.” Indeed, as the Court in *Brown* recognized, public education is “a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment.” And by eradicating public school segregation in the District of Columbia, the Court in *Bolling* hoped to open the door to opportunity through educational excellence for generations of D.C. schoolchildren.

Unfortunately the long overdue promises embodied in *Brown* and *Bolling* have not been fulfilled for the children of the District of Columbia. The promise of an end to racial isolation

remains unrealized. The overwhelming majority of African-American students in District of Columbia public schools attend schools populated almost solely by other African-American students; 78% of African-American students attend schools where African-Americans comprise 90% or more of the student body. Nor has the promise of educational equity been kept. Schooling in the District of Columbia is still separate and unequal. The resources and facilities provided by the public school system to serve the children in our Nation's capital are considerably well below resources and facilities available in most of the surrounding suburban school districts. With a few notable exceptions,¹ educational programs in the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) fall woefully short of preparing our children for the challenges they will face as adults in our diverse, highly competitive and increasingly technology-driven global economy. This report highlights the following areas of failure:

◆ **Funding.** The conventional wisdom is that the District spends more money per student than any other school system in the country. This oft-repeated assertion is baseless. Indeed, although DCPS enrolls a far *higher* percentage of students with special educational needs, such as low-income students (64%), than surrounding school districts like Arlington (36%), Alexandria (47%), Fairfax (19%) and Montgomery (23%), the District spends *less* per student than most of its neighbors. The District spends over \$3,800 *less* per student than Arlington, \$2,100 *less* per student than Alexandria, \$500 *less* than Montgomery County, and only \$500

¹ DCPS has been a national leader for years in early childhood education, offering full day pre-kindergarten and kindergarten to almost all families seeking it. In addition, DCPS has adopted Massachusetts' academic standards, the nation's most highly rated. However, the system has yet to adopt and implement systemwide curricula to replace those abandoned over ten years ago. For a full exposition, see *Restoring Excellence to the District of Columbia Public Schools: Report of the Strategic Support Team of the Council of the Great City Schools* (December, 2003), available on the DCPS website, www.k12.dc.us.

more than Fairfax County, where the percentage of low-income students is less than one-third of that enrolled in District schools.

◆***Programming and Course Offerings.*** In many fundamental respects, the programs and course offerings of the District's public schools have *deteriorated* since the decisions in *Brown* and *Bolling*. For example, 50 years ago honors students were required to take four years of foreign language, and all comprehensive high schools offered either three or four different languages. Today, only five of the 16 regular high schools even offer a full four-year foreign language curriculum; most offer only two and some only one. In the pre-*Brown* system, junior high school students were offered annual courses in art and music, physical education, and vocational education in addition to French, Spanish or Latin in 8th and 9th grades, as well as English, math, science and social studies. Today, seven of the 27 schools that service 8th graders offer *no* foreign languages; half of these schools have *no* vocational education teacher, one-third of these schools have *no* art teacher and one-third of these schools have *no* music teacher. John Phillip Sousa Middle School, named for America's most famed band composer, has *no* band and, in fact, *no* courses in music at all. Of the District's 100 elementary schools, 21 have neither a music teacher nor an art teacher; 30 have no physical education teacher; and almost none has foreign language teachers. Vocational education is a shadow of its former self at all levels.

◆***Teacher and Principal Salaries.*** Attracting and retaining high-quality principals and teachers is essential to providing the children of the District of Columbia a high-quality education. However, the District is severely hampered in attracting and retaining good principals and teachers because salaries continue to be less than in surrounding jurisdictions. For example,

although D.C. teacher salary levels are now competitive with those in the surrounding suburbs for new teachers, maximum salaries for teachers are 10% *lower* than in surrounding districts. Similarly, while D.C. principals' entry-level salaries are competitive, at the levels of seniority that most principals have, the District's principal salary levels are 20% lower than those of their suburban counterparts.

◆ **Facilities.** According to an assessment conducted by the United States Army Corps of Engineers in 1998, 70% of the District's school buildings were in poor physical condition. As DCPS itself described the situation, the state of public school facilities "had reached an all-time low." Although a small number of new schools have been constructed in recent years thanks to a facilities "Master Plan" approved by the Board of Education four years ago, facilities improvement and repair have made little overall progress because the District's funding of this project has fallen far short of the levels set forth in the Master Plan. As a result, as shown in the pictures accompanying this Report (Appendix D), most of the District's school buildings remain rife with leaking roofs, broken windows, cracked ceilings, and faulty heating and plumbing systems. The situation is so dire that students often avoid the use of the bathrooms altogether. Faced with the apparent lack of funds necessary to carry out the Master Plan, District officials are now considering instead a plan to spend the smaller amounts available on fixing or replacing those components in each school in greatest need of repair. Surprisingly, in the recent debate over this issue there has been relatively little advocacy for the basic requirement that broken school buildings must be repaired and brought into immediate compliance with building and fire codes to assure the safety of our schoolchildren. The District's spending priorities must be changed to include funding for the replacement of buildings that are crumbling and adequate and permanent repair where possible.

◆ ***Special Education.*** The District's special education program suffers from outdated facilities, insufficient and uncertified staff and a lack of adequate programming. As a result, the system is clogged with more adversarial due process hearings than the state of California, which has over *six times* the special education student population of the District. DCPS' failure to address adequately the needs of its special needs students has resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars in spending for private school tuition and transportation costs for many of its special education students.

◆ ***Athletics and Extra-Curricular Activities.*** DCPS offers far fewer opportunities for participation in athletic and other extra-curricular programs than its suburban counterparts. Neighboring school districts spend a staggering 65% to 90% more on each high school athlete. And the few athletic opportunities that DCPS offers its students are compromised by health and safety risks, with malfunctioning showers in locker rooms, outdated and shopworn equipment, lack of air conditioning in gymnasiums, and fields with no grass or poorly maintained lawns. Three of the 13 athletic trainers in DCPS' once nationally recognized program have been dismissed for lack of funding, leaving the remaining trainers running among multiple simultaneous sporting events.

◆ ***School Health Services.*** Although the District government has taken steps to comply with the D.C. law requiring a school nurse at each school for at least 20 hours a week, school health suites continue to lack adequate running water, beds or cots, and refrigerators for storing medications. Only fifteen schools have computers with access to the Internet, forcing nurses to spend hours maintaining student immunization records manually and to rely upon information that may not be current or readily available.

◆ ***The Blame Game.*** One of the primary reasons for the perseverance of these problems has been the inability of District parents and other concerned community members to hold governmental leaders accountable for their policymaking and budgetary decisions regarding DCPS. Under the District’s current system of school district governance, the District’s independent Chief Financial Officer, and not the Superintendent or the Board of Education, controls the DCPS financial systems. The Mayor and City Council provide funding and exercise oversight over expenditures, while the Board allocates the funding and also oversees the approved expenditures. In other words, the Superintendent reports to a committee of officials and does not control his own financial operations. This has led to a “blame game,” in which the Board of Education, the Mayor’s Office and the City Council continually fault each other for the failures of the school system, including its financial failures, with no entity ever being held fully accountable for developing and implementing solutions to address the current crisis in DCPS. Moreover, this treatment of the public education budget as just another CFO-controlled agency budget – like roadwork and garbage collection – gives little credence to the Supreme Court’s proclamation in *Brown* that education is “the most important function of our state and local governments.”

The Immediate Need For Action And Accountability. The status of public schools in our Nation’s capital begs a whole host of questions, including “Where is the outrage?” and “Where are the leaders and community groups demanding that sufficient resources be committed to fix the undeniable problems plaguing our schools?” No responsible person would disagree with the premise that public education is one of, if not the most, important function of state and local governments. No knowledgeable person would argue with the conclusion that the District’s public schools are failing most of our children. Nor can anyone reasonably argue that

the problems facing District public schools are beyond solutions. While all large urban school systems confront substantial challenges, many have dealt with those challenges better than has DCPS. Demands from the D.C. community for solutions are long overdue. It is within our power and control to make a difference, but we must choose and make it a priority to do so. It is time for all interested stakeholders in public education in the District – students, parents, teachers, public officials, administrators, businesses and professional firms whose ranks are filled and will continue to be filled by DCPS graduates – to demand that in every one of the key areas of education, from course offerings to facilities, solutions be promptly identified and the resources necessary to implement those solutions be committed.

As a starting point, in view of the significant problems facing DCPS and the inability to effect change through the current system of school district governance, consideration should also be given to amending District of Columbia Charter to include a right of all children attending D.C. public schools to receive an adequate and meaningful public education. A charter amendment that provides a right to an adequate education similar to the provisions found in nearly every state constitution would serve to reinforce the fundamental principle of the importance of education in a free society and affixes the obligation to provide for it squarely on the shoulders of the D.C. government. It would ensure not just the necessary resources, but also accountability and ultimately the *delivery* of an adequate education for our children. As it has in many other states, a charter provision enumerating a right to an adequate education would help focus citizen, community, and government efforts to ensure that all of the District's children receive the quality education that they deserve.

**SEPARATE AND UNEQUAL:
THE STATE OF DCPS FIFTY YEARS AFTER *BROWN* AND *BOLLING***

I. D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS THEN & NOW

Simply stated, the promise of *Brown v. Board of Education* and *Bolling v. Sharpe* is that every child will have equal educational opportunities. Fifty years ago, that meant desegregating public schools so that African-American and white children could attend school together. Today, African-American and other minority children are not legally barred from attending school with white children, but increasingly, other factors, including discrimination and higher levels of poverty, prevent them from doing so. Most African-Americans in our area live in the District and Prince George's County and attend under-funded, low-achieving schools. Conversely, most white students live in the suburbs and attend well-funded, high-achieving schools. A half-century after *Brown*, African-American children attending the schools in and around Washington, D.C. are largely segregated *de facto* and have far more limited educational opportunities than their white counterparts in affluent suburban districts next door.

A. The Unrealized Promise of *Brown*: An End to Racial Isolation

Until 1954, the District's public schools were segregated by law. In *Bolling v. Sharpe*, a companion case to *Brown v. Board of Education*, the Supreme Court declared segregation in D.C. schools unconstitutional. The District, unlike its suburbs, desegregated immediately. Shortly after desegregation, only 20 out of 170 schools had all African-American student populations and only five were all white.² Today, 29 of 155 schools and centers are all African-

² Mid-1950s statistics from Erwin Knoll, *The Truth About Desegregation in Washington Schools* ("Knoll"), The Turnpike Press Inc. (1959); current statistics compiled by authors of this report.

American. Over three-quarters of African-American students are in schools over 90% African-American. Because white students constitute only five percent of DCPS enrollment, what little

50 YEARS AFTER *BROWN*: THEN AND NOW

DCPS Enrollment: White and African American

	1950s	2005
White	43%	5%
African-American	57%	84%

D.C. Population: White and African American

	1950s	2005
School-age (5-17)		
White		22%
African-American		74%
Total		
White	65%	31%
African-American	35%	60%

50 YEARS AFTER *BROWN*: THEN AND NOW

African-American Students in Predominantly African-American Schools


1950s: All African-American	2005: 90% or more African-American	2005: 70% or more African-American
100%	78%	91%

diversity most African-American students in the District experience is provided by other minorities, Latino and Asian-American students, mostly from immigrant families. When *Brown* and *Bolling* were decided, the trend in white enrollment was heading downward and African-American enrollment was increasing sharply, but the twelve years immediately following *Brown* brought a dramatic change in DCPS enrollment and *de facto* re-segregation based on residence. Whites, who were 43% of enrollment in 1954 pre-*Brown*, sank to

only 9% by 1966, while African-Americans rose from 57% to 91% of total enrollment. Today, 5% of DCPS students are white and 84% African-American. The remaining 11% are Latino or Asian-American, groups whose numbers only became significant in the 1980s.³

³ Enrollment numbers prior to 1950 from George D. Strayer, *Schoolhousing in the District of Columbia*, A Section of the Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, conducted under the auspices of the Subcommittees on District of Columbia Appropriations (“Strayer, Schoolhousing”) (1949), Table 12. 1950-60: *Hobson v. Hansen*, 269 F. Supp. 401, 409 (D.D.C. 1967). 1966: A. Harry Passow, *Toward Creating a Model Urban School System*, Teachers College, Columbia University (1967), p. 86. 1979 and later years: DCPS Annual Membership Reports. See Appendix A for precise numbers.

DC Population and DCPS Enrollment 1930-2003
Percent of total population and enrollment





To some extent this change followed a general movement of whites out of the District, but the shift in enrollment demographics was significantly sharper than the change in the District's overall population. Suburban schools integrated slowly and in some cases not until years after *Bolling* and *Brown*.⁴ Whites are now 32% of the population and 22% of the population ages 5-17, but only 5% of DCPS enrollment.⁵ For decades African-Americans have had more children in public schools than in the total population (as opposed to whites, who had fewer), but the differences increased greatly after *Brown* and *Bolling*, and they have never been greater than at present.

⁴ An oral history, along with citations to considerable literature on this subject, appears in *Washingtonian Magazine's* May 2004 article "The Decision That Changed Everything" by Drew Lindsay. See www.washingtonian.com.

⁵ Percentage by age derived from spreadsheets available from the U.S. Bureau of the Census website, www.census.gov. The enormous growth of public charter schools is *not* a factor: Of 14,000 charter school students in 2003-04, 92% were African-American, and only 1% white.


Contributing factors include the presence of more whites without school-age children, a lower white birthrate, and high rates of white private school enrollment. But another key factor is the concentration of white public school enrollment in the suburbs surrounding the District. This area has four large districts – the District and Prince George’s, Montgomery, and Fairfax Counties. Three-quarters of the African-American public school students are enrolled in D.C. and Prince George’s County, while these two districts enroll only 9% of the whites in this area. In contrast, 85% of the white students are enrolled in Fairfax and Montgomery Counties.⁶



Racial and ethnic composition differs strikingly by district: DCPS and Prince George’s County are heavily African-American, with few whites and low ethnic diversity. Arlington and Fairfax Counties have substantial white enrollment and ethnic diversity, with low numbers of

⁶ This information is based on a survey of suburban district websites reviewed in January 2005. See www.acps.k12.va.us (Alexandria); www.arlington.k12.va.us (Arlington); www.fcps.k12.va.us (Fairfax); www.mcps.k12.md.us (Montgomery); www.pgcps.org (Prince George’s).

African-American students and Alexandria and Montgomery fall somewhere in between.




Explaining the underlying causes of these differences is beyond the scope of this Report, but whatever the reasons, public education for the District’s African-American children is largely separate. Comparatively speaking, it is also unequal.

B. The Unrealized Promise of *Brown*: Equity

Equity can be measured on two axes: providing similar levels of resources for all students is “horizontal equity” and providing higher levels of resources for students with greater needs is “vertical equity.” District schools have a high percentage of students with greater needs,

particularly low-income students; DCPS has three times the poverty rate of Fairfax and Montgomery County schools. Rates are higher in other neighboring districts, but nowhere near the District’s rate. Although D.C. has a relatively low percentage of students needing special services because of a lack of English proficiency, it enrolls one-third more special education students than Fairfax County, and 50% more than Montgomery or Prince George’s Counties⁷:



Shortly before the *Brown* and *Bolling* decisions, a detailed study documented the unequal treatment of the District’s “colored” school division: “its classrooms were considered more crowded, its buildings older and shabbier, its curricula narrower, its counseling services less adequate, its supplies more scarce.”⁸ The same is largely true today – except that the contrast is now between the 95% minority DCPS and its affluent suburbs where almost all the area’s white students are enrolled. The discussion below starts with per student funding, but then proceeds to


⁷ Washington Area Boards of Education (“WABE”), WABE Guide FY 2005, compiled by Fairfax County Public Schools, Dec. 2004. See www.fcps.k12.va.us.

⁸ As summarized in *Hobson v. Hansen*, 269 F. Supp. 401, 407 (D.D.C. 1967)

some of the specific kinds and quality of resources and educational practices of concern, comparing them with D.C. schools of 50 years ago. Because distribution of African-American and white students in this area is so skewed by school district, comparisons with surrounding suburbs are included where data are available

1. Funding

If District children had “vertical equity,” their higher levels of need would bring significantly *higher* spending per pupil than in the District’s advantaged suburbs. But even without taking account of differing needs, the District spends less than most of its neighbors – over \$3,800 less per student than Arlington, \$2,100 less per student than Alexandria, \$500 less



Excludes food service, capital, debt service, summer school, adult education, tuition for special education, transportation, state agency functions and short-term restricted grants.

than Montgomery County, and only \$500 more than Fairfax County. The only district that spends significantly less is the only other heavily African-American district – Prince George’s

County, which is 46% low-income.⁹ In other words, on a regional basis, the District's public school population, the great majority of which are African-American students, does not enjoy even basic horizontal equity.

Within DCPS, lack of funding equity on the basis of race was an issue at the time of *Brown* and later in *Hobson v. Hansen*. The system spent substantially more per pupil in predominantly white schools. No evidence of a correlation between race and funding exists in the District today. DCPS now allocates funds to local schools on the basis of enrollment at different grade levels, with 9% extra for each low-income student. Because almost no white students are low-income, most schools with significant white enrollment are among the lowest funded.¹⁰ Within the District, whites, African-Americans, and ethnic minorities now have access to equally shabby schools, equally underpaid teachers and principals, and equally scarce texts, equipment and supplies.

⁹ Suburban figures and methodology from WABE Guide FY 2005, adjusted herein to exclude transportation. D.C. figures calculated herein using WABE's methodology. Differences in recent past years have been similar. For example, in fiscal year 2003, DCPS placed 3rd among the same six districts/counties for per pupil spending. Arlington spent the most with \$12,716, followed by Alexandria with \$11,914, DCPS with \$9,827, Montgomery with \$9,741, Fairfax with \$9,388, and Prince George's spent \$6,554.

¹⁰ The exceptions are four small elementary schools without 6th grades (which are lower funded). All receive lower per pupil funding than predominantly black schools with similar total enrollment. The factors correlated to higher per pupil allocations are school size, with small schools receiving more, and percent of low-income students.

2. Program and course offerings

High schools. DCPS used to place high school students in tracks: a rigorous honors program for gifted students, a regular college preparatory program, a general program for students not planning to go to college, and a remedial basic curriculum for slow learners.¹¹ Except for computer science and Advance Placement (“AP”) courses, D.C. high schools offered all the courses they now do, plus a wide variety of vocational courses.

Formal tracks no longer exist, having been barred by the court in *Hobson v. Hansen*. Unfortunately, many program options also no longer exist. Students seeking high-level courses can apply to selective magnet schools -- Banneker, School Without Walls, and the newly opened McKinley -- but at the comprehensive high schools they are usually limited to a few AP or other advanced courses. Other academic course offerings are relatively thin at most high schools, and vocational course offerings have been reduced to a sprinkling.

For example, honors students 50 years ago had to take four years of foreign language and medieval and ancient history.¹² No D.C. high school today offers ancient or medieval history,¹³ and only five of the 16 regular high schools offer a full four-year sequence of any language.¹⁴ In

¹¹ Marie M.B. Racine, *Influences on Curriculum Development in the Public Schools of Washington D.C. 1804-1982*, University of the District of Columbia (1982) (“Racine”), pp. 57-58. Knoll, pp. 22-28.

¹² Racine, p. 57.

¹³ Ellington High School offers ancient and medieval *geography* this year, and all high schools do offer World History, then an elective, now a required course.

¹⁴ This figure excludes programs for returning dropouts, which are more limited, and combines staff of schools within schools with their parent school. Statistics on numbers of subject area teachers compiled by the authors from DCPS Schedule A (comprehensive listing of positions) as of November 13, 2004. Statistics on course offerings are derived from DCPS master schedules as of January 2005.

1948, all comprehensive high schools offered three, and most offered four foreign languages.¹⁵ Today, only one high school has a Latin teacher, and only two have German teachers. Two offer only one foreign language, either French or Spanish; of those that offer two, two schools have only two years of each language. Contrast Fairfax County high schools: all 24 offer French and Spanish, 20 offer German, and 9 offer Japanese. Any language offered includes courses at least through Level 4, enabling students to take at least four full years of a language.¹⁶

In 1948, every comprehensive high school had a band, an orchestra, choral group, and music appreciation. Art and music courses were so extensive, that students could “major” in either of those subjects.¹⁷ Today only six high schools have a course in band, none has orchestra, and some lack even a choral group.

In 1948, the District had five vocational schools with a long list of courses from aircraft engine mechanics to watchmaking. Every comprehensive high school offered courses in business, home economics and industrial arts, and extensive offerings in any one of these fields were available at several different schools.¹⁸ In 1955, McKinley High School’s “Guidance in Program Planning” listed vocational programs in business education, industrial arts, and home economics, including courses such as architectural drawing, electrical shop, print shop,

¹⁵ George D. Strayer, *The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia*, Government Printing Office (1949) (“Strayer Report”), p. 573.

¹⁶ See Appendix B for a summary of the Fairfax County foreign language program.

¹⁷ Strayer Report, pp. 574, 602-05. The authors praised music courses as providing “opportunities ... for practice, performance, listening, and composing” and “show[ing] high regard for a combination of the literature and theory of music” Despite a breadth and depth far beyond today’s program, they also found that “both art and music are treated like ‘stepchildren,’” pp. 603, 605.

¹⁸ Strayer Report, pp. 573-83. “Industrial arts” included preparatory courses for college engineering and architecture, as well as auto mechanics, printing, woodworking, and the like.

carpentry, welding, bookkeeping, retailing, foods, clothing, and child care. In addition, the school offered general and pre-engineering college preparatory, and an “enriched academic course” for pre-scientific, pre-engineering and technical students. Armstrong in 1948 had an even longer list of vocational courses, as well as a richer mix of academic courses than most DCPS high schools now offer.¹⁹ Today, according to current master schedules, five comprehensive high schools currently serving populations traditionally interested in vocational education offer *collectively* fewer vocational classes than in McKinley alone fifty years ago. Additionally, there is little depth or variety in most offerings.²⁰ In sum, for most students, course options are more limited now than they were fifty years ago.

Junior high schools. In the pre-*Brown* system, in addition to English, math, science and social studies, all junior high school students had courses in art, music, physical education, and vocational education *every year* plus a required course in business or French, Spanish or Latin in 8th and 9th grades.²¹ Today seven of the 27 schools serving eighth graders do not even *offer* a foreign language. Most of the remaining schools offer only Spanish. In contrast, all 8th grade

¹⁹ See Strayer Report, pp. 573-74.

²⁰ See Appendix C. The schools were Anacostia, Ballou, Coolidge, Eastern and Spingarn. Vocational high schools are no longer an alternative, since the District has closed all but one, specializing in health services, and relocated remnants of their programs to various comprehensive high schools. There are small “academy” programs at most high schools, including the five whose schedules we surveyed; apparently they do not offer much breadth or depth in vocational offerings. Vocational education is typically more expensive than general education because of the need for costly equipment and small class size needed to provide safe and adequate levels of supervision of hands-on work instruction.

²¹ Racine, pp. 32-33; Strayer Report, pp. 570-72; *see also* “8th Graders to Study Language, Business,” The Washington Post (“WASH. POST”), January 23, 1950.

students in Fairfax County have the choice to begin French or Spanish and sometimes other languages.²²

Half of the District’s middle-level schools have no vocational education teacher, one-third have no art teacher and one-third have no music teacher. All have physical education teachers, but physical education is generally limited to two or three out of six semesters.

Staffing gaps in junior high and middle schools	
Schools with 8th grade	27
No art teacher	9 (33%)
No music teacher	8 (30%)
No vocational ed teacher	13 (48%)
No foreign language teacher	7 (26%)

John Phillip Sousa Middle School, named for America’s most famed band composer, is the school to which Spottswood T. Bolling sought admission in the District’s companion case to *Brown*. Today, the school has no band, and in fact no courses in music at all. The schedule shows a beginning French course with a handful of students apparently taught by an itinerant teacher and a single course in vocational education (mechanical drawing).²³

Elementary schools. Elementary school classroom teachers are supposed to be qualified to teach elementary art, music, and physical education, so lack of a teacher certified in these

Staffing gaps in elementary schools	
Number of elementary schools	100
No art and no music teacher	21
No physical education teacher	30
No foreign language teacher	95

subjects does not necessarily mean a lack of instruction. Nonetheless, special-subject teachers are much better prepared to provide effective instruction in these areas. DCPS has 100 schools that serve sixth graders or younger. Of these, 21 have neither a music, nor an art

²² See Appendix B for a summary of the Fairfax County foreign language program.



²³ Derived from printouts of DCPS master schedules as of January 2005.

teacher even part-time, 30 have no physical education teacher, and almost none has a foreign language teacher.

3. Teacher and principal salaries

D.C. teacher salary levels are competitive with those in the suburbs only in starting years.

Maximum salaries for teachers are far lower than in surrounding districts.²⁴



D.C. principals' salaries are likewise competitive at the entry level, but not at the levels of seniority of most principals. A principal in Montgomery County can make over \$20,000 more than a District principal, a differential that can attract and retain a principal with great experience and education, the qualities needed most by DCPS schools.

4. School facilities

Facilities are an important factor in a child's education. Walls falling apart, lack of heat and air conditioning during seasonal changes, and electrical systems unable to support

²⁴ Teacher salaries: WABE Guide FY 2005; principal salaries: Internet survey of suburban districts. See *supra* note 5.

technology make teaching a struggle and dull the student's educational experience. Research has found that poor school facilities degrade learning and academic outcomes.²⁵

In 1948, the Strayer Report used the Strayer-Engelhardt index to scrutinize DCPS' buildings to determine their adequacy. Out of 140 school buildings surveyed, 71 -- or 51% -- were in unsatisfactory condition.²⁶ In 1998, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers assessed the facilities of each of the District's operating public schools; subsequent analysis determined that 84% of the schools were in poor physical condition.²⁷ As the DCPS itself described it, the state of public school facilities "had reached an all-time low."²⁸ Specifically, "[r]oofs were leaking, windows needed to be replaced, boilers were failing, plumbing, wiring and heating systems were old and unreliable. Many of the floors, walls and ceilings were in poor condition, and people often avoided the use of the bathrooms altogether. There were very few schools in the District of Columbia with working science laboratories."²⁹

²⁵ Mark Schneider, *Do School Facilities Affect Academic Outcomes* (2002), concludes that spatial configurations, noise, temperature, daylight, and air quality have an effect on students' and teachers' ability to perform in the classroom. See also studies listed in Schneider, *Public School Facilities and Teaching: Washington, D.C. and Chicago*, and Jack Buckley, Mark Schneider & Yi Shang, *The Effects of School Facility Quality on Teacher Retention in Urban School Districts* (2004), which concludes that the quality of school facilities is an important predictor of the decision of teachers to leave their current positions. The first and third are publications of the National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities, www.edfacilities.org. All may be accessed through the 21st Century School Fund, www.21csf.org.

²⁶ Derived from Strayer, *Schoolhousing*, pp. 39-66.

²⁷ Derived from DCPS, *Educational Facilities Master Plan*, 4-7, 4-13.

²⁸ PARENTS UNITED FOR THE D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS, *Leaving Children Behind: The Underfunding of D.C. Public Schools Building Repair and Capital Budget Needs* (July 2003) (the "July 2003 Report") p. 3.

²⁹ *Id.*

Condition of facilities: Then and Now	
1940s: Percent of buildings below "Adequacy Score"	51%
1998: Percent of buildings in poor physical condition	84%

The public schools in the District of Columbia remain in terrible physical condition today, with the average D.C. public school building being over 65 years old.³⁰ A recent report, prepared by Parents United for DCPS and a special Advisory Committee of Civic Leaders, documents the poor physical condition of schools in the District and the proposed cutbacks in capital budgeting that will permit the problems evident in school facilities to continue.³¹

After the Corps of Engineers' 1998 assessment, DCPS spent two years developing a facility master plan ("Master Plan"), which sought to modernize, not just renovate, the District's public schools. The Master Plan was approved by the Board of Education in early 2001. Under the Master Plan, modernization of the District's school buildings was to occur in successive groups of 10 schools over a 10- to 15-year period.³² Modernization of several schools in the first round, including Key, Miner, Oyster, and Kelly Miller, has been completed. Those modernized schools were operating at capacity within months of reopening.³³

However, the District of Columbia government's 2005 Budget and Financial Plan provides far less funding for the D.C. public schools over the next five years than the Master Plan says is needed to rebuild the city's schools. As the following table shows, the District of

³⁰ *Id.*, p. 2.

³¹ *Id.*, p. 3.

³² *Id.*

³³ *Id.*, p. 4.

Columbia budget for each year is well below the amount requested by the D.C. public schools to implement the Master Plan and, indeed, calls for no capital at all in FY 2008 and 2009.³⁴

	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09
DCPS Request	\$401m	\$372m	\$294m	\$314m	\$320m
Mayor's Proposed Budget	\$173m	\$149m	\$21m	\$0	\$0
Difference (shortfall)	(\$228m)	(\$223m)	(\$273m)	(\$314m)	(\$320m)

These chronic shortfalls in the DCPS facilities budget have led the District's new Superintendent of Schools, Clifford B. Janey, to propose that the D.C. Board of Education scrap the Master Plan altogether in favor of a much more modest program known as "Option D." Under Option D, the school board would spend \$640.8 million on partial renovations to schools in dire need of repair over the next six years, instead of spending \$3.5 billion on a full-scale modernization program over the next twenty years as envisioned by the Master Plan.³⁵ While funds would be provided for the replacement of existing building components like electrical systems, HVAC systems, roofing, plumbing, and window repair, construction scheduled under the Master Plan would be suspended pending review by the Superintendent.³⁶ Schools without basic facilities such as libraries, art rooms, cafeterias, and gymnasias, and schools so decrepit as

³⁴ *Id.*, p. 21.

³⁵ V. Dion Hayes, "D.C. Schools Revisit Capital Spending," WASH. POST, Feb. 15, 2005, at B1.

³⁶ District of Columbia Public Schools Briefing to the Board of Education, Facilities Master Plan Option D (Jan. 2005) (copy on file with author).

to need replacement would be left without a remedy for their problems, at least for the indefinite future.³⁷

If approved, Option D would be incorporated into a so-called “Master Education Plan” (“MEP”) to be developed by the Superintendent, which would allow the Superintendent to ensure that the facilities budget is allocated in the most productive manner.³⁸ It is not yet clear, however, whether the program will be adopted at all. The D.C. Board of Education has postponed a vote on the plan until March of 2005, and three of the seven members present at the Superintendent’s presentation of Option D expressed concern over the Superintendent’s suggestion that they scrap the Master Plan.³⁹ Either way – modernize a handful of schools or replace component systems individually in more – the great majority of public school buildings will continue indefinitely to suffer leaking roofs, rotted window frames, antiquated plumbing, crumbling walls, dysfunctional ventilation, and failure-prone boilers.

The decrepit conditions in D.C. public school buildings not only adversely effect educational outcomes, but also create serious safety and health risks. In March 1992, Parents United filed a lawsuit in the D.C. Superior Court alleging that the District was in repeated violation of the D.C. Fire Code. Following a bench trial, the court issued an order in June 1994 finding thousands of life-threatening violations, including defective fire doors, exposed wiring, breached ceilings, defective alarm systems, and serious electrical problems.⁴⁰ The court found 5,695 total fire code violations throughout the D.C. public schools and deemed the vast majority

³⁷ *Id.*

³⁸ *Id.*; *see also supra* note 26.

³⁹ “Vote Postponed on School Capital Plan,” WASH. POST, Feb. 17, 2005.

⁴⁰ *Parents United v. Kelly*, Civil Action No. 92-3478 (D.C. Sup. Ct. June 10, 1994).

of them to be life-threatening.⁴¹ The Court ordered the D.C. government to fix these violations and ordered the D.C. Fire Department to inspect all the D.C. public schools periodically and file reports detailing the department's findings. As a result, temporary and sporadic fixes of the fire code violations were undertaken in individual schools. Indeed, the entire school system was shut down due to the failure to make the fixes in a timely fashion.⁴² In 1997, Parents United and the D.C. government reached an out-of-court settlement of the lawsuit, under which the City promised to provide the D.C. public schools with a consistent share, namely 27.5%, of the city's capital funding.⁴³

Despite the lawsuit, despite the clarion call of the 1998 Corps of Engineers Report, and despite the 2001 Master Plan, the physical conditions of D.C. Public Schools remain a critical problem. As shown in the photographs in Appendix D, D.C. public schools are still in need of significant repairs to bathrooms, doors, windows, walls, roofs, playgrounds and heating and cooling systems.⁴⁴ It is simply unacceptable that District of Columbia students endure these unfit and unsafe conditions every day. The District's decades-long failure to correct decrepit conditions raises serious questions as to the City's budgetary priorities. Crumbling public school buildings have not just garnered the attention of Parents United: a group of concerned parents and students have posted on the Internet dozens of pictures taken in many of the District's public schools that display broken windows, ceiling leaks, cracked floors, and other examples of disrepair. Although they tell only a small part of the more widespread problem, these images, which can be found at www.fixourschools.net, effectively convey the magnitude of the need to

⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² July 2003 Report, p. 3.

⁴³ *Id.*

rectify immediately the intolerable physical conditions that our children must face in school every day.

5. Special Education

Of the 65,099 students enrolled in DCPS for the 2003-2004 academic year, 12,970 (20%) had various disabilities and received special education.⁴⁵ The District's obligation to provide special education services arises from the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ("IDEA"), which requires that students with disabilities have access to a free and appropriate education designed to meet their individualized needs, in the least restrictive available environment, and preferably in their neighborhood school. Under IDEA, DCPS is required to have a system in place for the identification of students with disabilities and the development and implementation of a comprehensive individualized education program that identifies the student's needs and the services to be provided, as well as a mediation process and due process hearings for the resolution of special education-related disputes.

While DCPS has incorporated the basic mandate of IDEA into its educational structure, its special education program suffers from systemic deficiencies, including a lack of DCPS-operated programs, outdated facilities, and inadequate and uncertified staff. One significant problem plaguing DCPS' special education program, however, is the extent to which the already strained special education budget is diverted away from the delivery of substantive services in order to cover the legal and administrative costs associated with the large number of disputes

⁴⁴ *Id.*, pp. 7-15.

⁴⁵ Testimony of Dr. Raymond Bryant, Associate Superintendent for Special Education Reform and Student Services, DCPS, District of Columbia City Council, Committee on Education, Libraries and Recreation, November 10, 2004 ("Bryant Testimony"), p. 5 and Att. 1.

concerning its compliance with IDEA.⁴⁶ As of 2003, DCPS was spending over \$13 million per year on these disputes.⁴⁷ While formal due process hearings are a tool of last resort within most school districts, such hearings are the norm in the District. The District of Columbia has both a higher ratio of disputes per special education student than any other state and the highest percentage of disputes that are resolved through due process hearings. In 2002, for example, DCPS, which had 11,492 students with special education needs that year, conducted more due process hearings regarding those students than did the entire state of California, which had a special education enrollment of over 67,000.⁴⁸

Largely as a result of these hearings, \$158 million – over half of the DCPS special education budget – is used to pay for private school tuition and transportation costs this year.⁴⁹ While any given public school system may be unable to provide *all* the services to which its students with disabilities are entitled, the diversion of such a significant portion of the DCPS special education budget for private school placement is far from the norm. Moreover, although large urban school districts like DCPS are expected to have larger numbers of special needs students, other school districts in comparable urban, high-poverty areas and with similar special education enrollments have been able to address their special education needs without undue

⁴⁶ *Id.*, p. 13.

⁴⁷ *Id.*, pp. 57-58.

⁴⁸ *Id.*, p. 17.

⁴⁹ See PARENTS UNITED FOR D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS, *DCPS Funds: Where Does the Money Go?* (Feb. 7, 2005) (analysis of DCPS budget printout).

resort to costly and time-consuming hearings and without the high subsidization of private school placements.⁵⁰

Many of the issues surrounding the special education budget relate to the *process* of identifying and assigning students to appropriate special education services, without even reaching the nature of the services DCPS provides to these students. Areas of deficiency, according to a report issued by the D.C. Applesseed Center in 2003, include the inability to ensure early resolution of special education disputes and a persistent mistrust between parents and school personnel throughout the decision-making process. Exacerbating these problems are the unethical practices of a number of plaintiff's attorneys that take advantage of these failures by bringing cases on behalf of low-performing (but not necessarily learning disabled) students and insisting that these students need to be placed in private schools at DCPS expense.

Some improvements to the system have been made recently, including better attendance at hearings by DCPS personnel and an improved mediation program. Unfortunately, however, many of the deficiencies in DCPS special education continue to persist, and the school system has struggled to address them. Most recently, David Gilmore, the court-appointed special master overseeing transportation of special education students as part of a 1995 federal lawsuit, reported that he will need *\$14 million more* than what the Board of Education and D.C. Council originally allotted, in order to bring the special education transportation system into compliance with the consent decree and federal special education laws. According to Gilmore, although significant progress has been made in the transportation program, there has been no discernable movement toward the goal of shifting more special education students from outside schools to in-house

⁵⁰ DCPS Special Education: Five Year Plan (Aug. 21, 2003), available at <http://dcpswatch/special/030821c.htm>.

services. DCPS officials respond that they have created 1,800 additional in-house placements in new and expanded programs but that the ever-increasing numbers of students newly identified as needing intensive special education services are filling the new slots.⁵¹ They add that once a hearing officer or judge orders a private placement, it is difficult to secure a child's later return to DCPS.⁵²

6. Athletics and Extra-Curricular Activities

Historically, DCPS' athletic programs were so robust as to be completely self-sustaining. Each school budgeted for equipment and purchased it itself. Congress first passed a bill authorizing external funding for athletics in 1951.⁵³ Fifty years ago, every high school had a student council, a school paper, and a variety of intra-mural and inter-scholastic sports.⁵⁴ Today intra-mural sports are a rarity in the secondary schools, few junior highs have school newspapers, and the inter-scholastic athletics program suffers from player-short teams, poor attendance, low coaching stipends, and insufficient equipment. At John Philip Sousa Middle School, there is no marching band.

Virtually all facilities for African-American students in 1954 were inferior to those for whites, including athletic facilities. For example, Armstrong, a African-American public high

⁵¹ Bryant Testimony, pp. 1, 9.

⁵² Personal communication to the authors.

⁵³ In 1951, \$110,000 was appropriated for sports in DCPS, of which, \$82,000 went to reorganizing the athletic departments, with the remaining \$28,000 used for new equipment. The plan called for an assistant school superintendent to buy equipment for all the schools and for athletic directors and several assistants. "If Truman Signs Bill DC High Sports Get \$110,000 from US," *Washington Daily News*, August 2, 1951, p. 48.

⁵⁴ District of Columbia, Committee on the White House Conference on Education (1955), p. 69.

school, had a gym floor composed of asphalt. The best facilities among the African-American schools at that time were at Cardozo -- because it had recently moved into Central High, previously a white school.⁵⁵

Today, athletic facilities in the DCPS are inadequate for all students, and are vastly inferior to the facilities available in surrounding school districts. Cardozo now plays home games at Roosevelt because its gym bleachers have been condemned for years; its swimming pool, a small mid-century period piece, has been empty for a decade. In June 2001, Parents United released a comprehensive report on the state of athletic programs in the D.C. public school system entitled “Unlevel Playing Fields: A Comparative Study of Athletic Programs, Facilities and Funding in the District of Columbia and Suburban Public School Districts” (“Unlevel Playing Fields”). The report found that participation rates, per student funding, and community and business support for DCPS athletics are far inferior to those of its suburban counterparts.

Parents United reexamined this issue in July 2002, and, aside from some nominal improvements in certain school facilities primarily due to private sponsorship, found continuing glaring inadequacies in athletic facilities and opportunities for District of Columbia students, particularly female students. Despite these findings, the city allocated \$235,000 *less* for athletics and activities in 2003 than it did in 2001. The funding for athletics for 2004 was equally abysmal.

⁵⁵ Dave McKenna, “Preserving the Sanctity of Segregation,” *Washington CityPaper*, March 5, 2004.

The sparse funding for athletic programs in DCPS is even more troubling when compared to that of its suburban counterparts. Schools in suburban areas adjacent to the District spend a staggering 65% to 90% more on each high school athlete than their District counterparts. DCPS coaches make less than half the pay of suburban coaches. A typical large suburban school fields around thirty-three separate athletic teams; one of its District counterparts fields only thirteen. Another District school offers only *two* sports for girls, including cheerleading. And the revenue generated by such ancillary activities as booster club activities, gate receipts, and concession sales in Fairfax County and Montgomery County equal the total budget available to the District. As the Unlevel Playing Fields report notes, “[t]he suburban icing is the entire cake for D.C. student-athletes.”

Athletic programs in the District are also compromised on matters of student-athlete health and safety. Many school facilities cannot even be used by students because they have fallen into desuetude and are not trustworthy. For example, students at Cardozo High School do not use the locker room showers at their school because the showers do not regulate temperature properly and regularly scald the students who use them. Other problems include defective lockers, outdated and shopworn equipment, and a lack of air conditioning in offices and gymnasias. Absent an influx of funding to rehabilitate current facilities, these health and safety problems will only worsen.

Unfortunately, there does not seem to be any effort to correct the numerous problems afflicting DCPS athletics. Only a small increase in the athletics budget was realized in FY 2005, raising the total athletics budget to \$3,079,345. Further, the Proposed Budget for FY 2006, released on January 12, 2005, contains just a nominal increase (\$1,650) for athletics. Absent an

immediate effort to correct the core funding problems, DCPS athletic programs will continue to suffer.

5. School Health Services

School health services have been a chronic problem for the D.C. public schools for the past two decades. The District of Columbia passed the Nurse Assignment Act in 1987 (“Act”). D.C. Code §31-2421 *et seq.* The Act required District health officials to staff schools with registered nurses at a minimum of twenty hours a week, and also guaranteed medical services at inter-scholastic school sponsored athletic events.⁵⁶ By 1988, it was apparent that the D.C. government had failed and would continue to fail to comply with the Act, forcing Parents United to sue for enforcement of the statute. Parents United prevailed and was granted summary judgment and a permanent injunction mandating compliance with the Act.⁵⁷

DCPS nurses are currently funded through the D.C. Healthcare Alliance, a public-private partnership between the Department of Health and several private sector partners designed to provide the uninsured with healthcare. In 2001, the Children’s National Medical Center, a private sector partner, was contracted to provide school nurses in all public schools. Although the Alliance to our knowledge funds the statutory minimum hours of nursing at each school through a Department of Health grant, many cash-strapped schools need more hours of service and pay for an additional twenty hours of nursing services from their already thin budgets.

⁵⁶ The statute also bars cutting service levels in force at the time of its enactment; at that time, most junior high schools had three days of service per week, and most high schools full-time nurses.

⁵⁷ *Kelly v. Parents United for the District of Columbia Public Schools*, 641 A.2d 159 (D.C. 1994), *amended on reh’g in part*, 648 A.2d 675 (1994).

Moreover, the health facilities and equipment that DCPS provides are substandard, to put it mildly. A recent report notes that:

[o]ne third of nurse suites had inadequate running water (“adequate defined as having hot and cold). . . . [m]ore than half had inadequate screens, beds or cots, and pillows [and] . . . 60% of nurse suites did not have a separate refrigerator for medications. And lastly, it was reported that only 15 schools at the time had computers and internet connectivity in the health suites.⁵⁸

The lack of computers forces nurses to spend many hours maintaining student immunization records by hand; time that is unavailable for health instruction and medical services. Furthermore, D.C. parents face significant challenges in trying to gather information about the DCPS nursing program. Public information sources, such as the DCPS website, contain virtually no information about school health programs or the availability of school nurses in the community. This near complete lack of transparency muddies communication between parents and schools and further diminishes the ability of the nurses to provide the services that children need.

C. **The Unrealized Promise of *Brown*: Effective Education**

Perhaps the most important promise of *Brown v. Board of Education* was not just that children would receive education on equal terms, but that they would be *educated*. In today’s parlance, legislatures and courts are asking whether the education provided by states and localities is *adequate* to enable students to meet state and national standards.⁵⁹ Under the federal

⁵⁸ *School-Based Health Care and the District of Columbia Safety Net: Medical Homes DC Report*, 21ST CENTURY SCHOOL FUND., p. 16 (revised November 5, 2004), available at http://www.21csf.org/csf-home/publications/MHDC_Nov_2004.pdf (last viewed January 30, 2005).

⁵⁹ Most education finance cases in state courts now focus on the resources needed to provide the opportunity for an adequate education to all students, and this court emphasis is connected with the standards-based reform movement now being implemented in virtually all

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), states must adopt standards acceptable to the U.S. Department of Education, create assessments to measure student performance and progress, and take action to improve schools where students, within various subgroups, fail to make “adequate yearly progress.”⁶⁰ Under both approaches, the measure of adequacy looks to student outcomes.

Information on the state of student outcomes at the time of *Brown* is scarce: the public judged school quality at that time by inputs, not student achievement; and student test scores were not reported in the press.⁶¹ The descriptions available indicate that District students as a group were one year, sometimes more, below national norms as measured by standardized tests both before and in the years immediately following *Brown*.⁶² For example, in 1947 African-American eighth graders were significantly behind in reading and math, while white eighth graders were one year behind in math and at the norm in reading. African-American tenth

states.

⁶⁰ 20 U.S.C. § 6301 *et seq.* The legislation requires, *inter alia*, that states and local education agencies develop plans to ensure that by the 2013-14 school year all students score at the proficient or advanced levels on state tests aligned to state standards. Schools and districts that fail to make adequate yearly progress towards this objective may receive technical assistance or be subject to corrective action. Adequate yearly progress must be achieved by each of the following groups: low-income students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency. The U.S. Department of Education has information on the legislation and its implementation at www.ed.gov.

⁶¹ Steven J. Diner, *Crisis of Confidence*, University of the District of Columbia (1982), pp. 7-22. The predominant concerns in the years before *Brown* were facilities, recruiting and retaining adequate teaching staff and addressing the “blatant inequality” in facilities and staff between African-American and white schools. There were problems with reading ability, test scores, promotional standards and discipline, but these became public issues only after desegregation.

⁶² See generally Knoll; “DC School Standards Unchanged, Corning Says,” WASH. POST (Feb. 3, 1956); John McKelway, “Student Gains Indicated in Achievement Tests,” WASH. POST (Jan. 22, 1958); Diner, *Crisis of Confidence*, pp.18-19 (citing the Strayer Report, pp. 461-63, 552-53) and pp. 26-27 (citing “Do Mixed Schools Lower Classroom Standards?,” *U.S. News & World Report*, Feb. 3, 1956, pp. 38-40).

graders were a semester behind in both subjects.⁶³ In 1957, scores demonstrated that a typical District fifth grader was working at the national fourth grade level in math and the third grade level in reading comprehension. Ninth graders tested a year earlier were two or three years behind the national norm in math and one to two years behind in reading. Twelfth graders averaged slightly above the national norm in science, equal to the norm in English expression, and fell slightly below on social studies.⁶⁴

Standardized Tests: 1956/1957 and 2004 Stanford-9

	1947/48		1956/1957		2004		
	African-American Students Behind Norm		Behind Norm		Below Basic	Basic	Total
<u>Grade 5</u>							
Reading			2 years		29%	48%	77%
Math			1 year		41%	34%	75%
<u>Grade 8</u>							
Reading	3 years		1 year+		29%	48%	77%
Math	2 ½ years		1 year+		60%	27%	87%
<u>Grade 9</u>							
Reading			1-2 years		48%	38%	86%
Math			2-3 years		59%	27%	86%
<u>Grade 10</u>							
Reading	½ year				55%	33%	88%
Math	½ year				78%	15%	93%

Below basic: little or no mastery for grade level **Basic:** partial mastery of grade level

The above test scores cannot be compared directly, since they use different benchmarks, but they suggest that DCPS students as a group probably test further behind norms and standards than they did at the time of *Brown*. Today’s tenth grade scores are certainly not as good as those of African-American tenth graders alone before desegregation. The scores certainly, however, show that DCPS academic achievement levels for most students are unsatisfactory. Almost half

⁶³ Strayer Report, pp. 553-55.

⁶⁴ McKelway, “Student Gains Indicated in Achievement Tests.”

of ninth graders have little or no mastery of grade level reading skills and about 60% have little or no mastery of grade level math. When the percentages for “Basic” and “Below Basic” achievement levels are combined, over 85% of DCPS students are not up to grade level. SAT scores today for DCPS students are 200 points below the national average.

II. DCPS GOVERNANCE: THE BLAME GAME CONTINUES

The severe problems in the areas described above (and others) since *Brown* and *Bolling* have been allowed to persist under a woefully ineffective system of governance, including external control of financial management within the school system. Budget and finance have been beset by a fractured and irrational separation of powers that de-links the substantive policymaking authority and operations from the budgetary decision-making authority governing DCPS. As discussed in more detail in Parents United’s December 2001 Report “The Blame Game: Searching For Financially Accountable Schools in the District of Columbia,” vesting authority over DCPS finances in the Office of the Chief Financial Officer while leaving substantive policy-making in the hands of the Board of Education has allowed both of these governmental entities, as well as the Mayor and Council, to point fingers at each other as the school system they all oversee continues to fail its students. This fragmentation of responsibility deviates from the time-tested accountability structure of linking budgetary authority to educational policymaking authority in place in the rest of the nation’s school districts. Left unchanged, this flawed system will continue to undermine both the fiscal soundness and educational quality of what is an already struggling public school system.

In 1996, intended as a temporary measure, Congress enacted a law charging the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia (“District CFO”) with responsibility over the fiscal operations of DCPS through the installation of a school district CFO (“DCPS CFO”),

who reports directly to the District's Chief Financial Officer. In 2001, the D.C. Council made this arrangement permanent, mandating that the CFOs of each governmental agency (including the Board of Education) be appointed by the District CFO, with the approval from the heads of those respective agencies. With the power to appoint these agency CFOs, the District CFO, for all practical purposes, also has the power to remove them. Moreover, under this law, the Board of Education is responsible for evaluating the DCPS CFO's performance from an *operational* perspective, while the District CFO is responsible for evaluating performance from a *financial management* perspective.

This split in governance severely constrains the Board's ability to implement its policy initiatives, and indeed to obtain basic fiscal information, because it lacks any meaningful control over its own CFO, its own financial systems, and ultimately its own budget. This arrangement has had dysfunctional consequences, both fiscally and educationally. Unforeseen multi-million dollar budget deficits emerged in 1998 and 2001. Frustration with divided loyalties between the Board and the District CFO and an inability to satisfy each entity's needs simultaneously has led to high turnover and a lack of continuity in school fiscal leadership, including at least nine DCPS CFOs and ten budget directors over the last nine years. School system managers and officials have been unable to make informed policy decisions because they lack the ability to track cost categories wrapped up in broader categories within the District CFO's financial systems and because financial systems provide information weeks out of date. Most significantly, important decisions of educational policy made by the Board have often been stymied by the Mayor's decisions, justified and implemented through the District CFO, not to provide the Board with the necessary funding.

This system not only hinders effective educational policymaking in the District, but also permits a “blame game,” in which each of these entities escapes political accountability by blaming the other for the school system’s failures. The system provides little incentive for these entities to take necessary action. And as this finger-pointing persists, the District’s children continue to stagnate in low-performing schools. Indeed, as long as this disjointed system of educational governance is in place, the promise of educational opportunity embodied in *Brown* and *Bolling* will remain out of reach in the District of Columbia.

III. CONCLUSION: THE IMMEDIATE NEED FOR ACTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

As this Report illustrates, 50 years after *Brown* and *Bolling*, racial separation and inequitable education remain critical problems in the District. Putting equity aside, the D.C. Public School system today fails in a myriad of ways to provide the District’s children with the education they require and deserve. To a large degree, the conclusions in this Report will be neither surprising nor controversial. No one disputes that public education is among the most important, if not the most important function performed by the District government. No one disputes that DCPS has to a substantial degree failed in carrying out this critical function. Nor can it be reasonably argued that the problems facing District public schools are beyond solutions; while all large urban school systems confront substantial challenges, many have succeeded in dealing with those challenges better than has DCPS. Indeed, the solutions to many of the problems facing the District’s schools are relatively straightforward. For example, broken doors, electrical systems, roofs and walls need to be replaced or repaired. Other city systems have curricula and far more effective teacher evaluation systems than the District. Effective information and management systems are widely available and in use throughout the country. The Superintendent could be given control over his own financial operations and relieved of

having to report to five independent government entities with conflicting and overlapping missions.

What is surprising, indeed appalling, is the seeming lack of will among the leaders in our community to demand that sufficient resources be committed to fix the undeniable problems plaguing our schools. Demands from the D.C. community for solutions are long overdue. It is time for all interested stakeholders in public education in the District – students, parents, teachers, administrators, residents, businesses and professional firms whose ranks are filled and will continue to be filled by DCPS graduates – to demand that in every one of the key areas of education, from programs and course offerings to facilities, solutions be immediately identified and the resources needed to carry out those solutions be committed. The need to devote additional financial resources to fix the District’s schools cannot be understated. The conventional wisdom that DCPS is spending more money per student than any other school system is patently false. The intense needs of the population served by DCPS and the concomitant need for relatively greater funding to serve that population are undeniable. The budget reprioritization required to steer additional dollars to public education in the District will require a sustained advocacy missing today -- advocacy not just by students, parents and teachers, but by community leaders both inside and outside the government. Failure to advocate for such change will ensure that DCPS continues to fail.

We recognize the recent formation of the DC Education Compact (DCEC), a group of foundation, civic, university, and business leaders, parents, teachers, principals, social service providers, school officials, and elected officials seeking to improve student achievement. It promises some of the collaboration and commitment that have been sorely lacking in recent years. But DCEC will necessarily focus on development of action plans and areas of consensus

– of which money is not one. The need to devote additional financial resources to fix critical aspects of the District’s schools *now* cannot be understated.

In view of the significant problems facing DCPS and the inability to effect change through the current system of school district governance, consideration should also be given to amending District of Columbia Charter to include a right of all children attending D.C. public schools to receive an adequate and meaningful public education. Nearly every single state constitution in the United States contains a provision providing, in some way, for the establishment of a system of free public education. The District of Columbia Charter does not. Citizens throughout the United States have agreed that the establishment and maintenance of a free, public school system is an essential responsibility of their state governments. These state constitutional provisions serve as statements of fundamental principles that both affirm the importance of education in a free society, and affix the obligation to provide for it with the state government. Education is a priority for all D.C. residents, and the District Charter should be amended to create a governmental obligation to provide for a system of free public schools in the District. An amendment to the D.C. Charter would be a first step toward reflecting the firmly-held belief of D.C. residents that education must be a fundamental priority for the D.C. Government and would help focus the efforts of citizens, community groups and the city government around one of their most fundamental obligations: preparing our children for their future – something we are currently failing to do.

APPENDIX A

DCPS Schools by Racial Composition (White/Black)

Right after desegregation, only 20 out of 170 schools had all black student population and five were all white.¹ Most schools in the mid-1950s had 70 percent of one race; four schools had 50-70 percent white students; and 10 had a 50-70 percent black student population. In School Year 2003-04, 29 of 155 schools and programs were all black; the great majority of schools were more than 70 percent black. Two elementary schools were over 70 percent white but barely so: 70.2% and 71.1%. Five more, all elementary, were between 50 and 70 percent white. But 43% of the white students are in schools less than 30 percent white.

DCPS Schools by White/Black Racial Composition SY 2003-04

Range	Black enrollment		Range	White enrollment	
	No. of Schools	No. of Students		No. of Schools	No. of Students
0% Black	-	-	0% White	92	-
<5% Black	-	-	<5% White	44	168
6-10% Black	1	20	6-10% White	2	26
10-29% Black	9	736	10-29% White	8	1,069
30-49% Black	12	2,034	30-49% White	3	437
50-69% Black	10	2,725	50-69% White	4	660
70-89% Black	18	7,260	70-89% White	2	542
90-95% Black	14	4,116	90-95% White	-	-
96-99% Black	62	24,544	96-99% White	-	-
100% Black	29	10,642	100% White	-	-
	155	52,077		155	2,902
<30% Black	10	756	<30% White	146	1,263
	6.5%	1.5%		94.2%	43.5%
30-70% Black	22	4,759	30-70% White	7	1,202
	14.2%	9.1%		4.5%	41.4%
50%+ Black	133	49,287	50%+ White	6	1,202
	85.8%	94.6%		3.9%	41.4%
70%+ Black	123	46,562	70%+ White	2	542
	79.4%	89.4%		1.3%	18.7%
75%+ Black	108	40,240	75%+ White	-	-
	69.7%	77.3%		0.0%	0.0%
90%+ Black	105	39,302	90%+ White	-	-
	67.7%	75.5%		-	-
95%+ Black	91	35,186	95%+ White	-	-
	58.7%	67.6%		-	-

¹ Mid-1950s statistics from Erwin Knoll, *The Truth About Desegregation in Washington Schools* (“Knoll”), The Turnpike Press Inc. (1959); current statistics compiled by authors of this report.

**DCPS Enrollment by Race (White/Black)²
1930-2003**

Year	Total Enroll	Number White	Percent White	Number Black	Percent Black
1930	80,063	53,027	66.2%	27,036	33.8%
1935	98,643	62,836	63.7%	35,807	36.3%
1940	99,402	62,353	62.7%	37,049	37.3%
1945	94,545	54,660	57.8%	39,507	41.8%
1948	93,025	53,094	57.1%	43,065	46.3%
1954	104,860	44,897	42.8%	59,963	57.2%
1958	105,000	41,000	39.0%	64,000	61.0%
1966	146,644	13,369	9.1%	133,275	90.9%
1979	106,156	4,040	3.8%	100,300	94.5%
1985	87,677	3,264	3.7%	80,681	92.0%
1990	80,694	3,123	3.9%	72,474	89.8%
1995	79,802	3,207	4.0%	69,892	87.6%
2000	68,925	3,113	4.5%	58,320	84.6%
2003	65,099	3,167	4.9%	54,429	83.6%

**District of Columbia Population by Race (White/Black)
1930-2003**


The racial makeup of the District's population underwent changes similar in direction, but not as dramatic as the public school enrollment. The District's white population peaked in 1950, shortly before the *Brown* and *Bolling* decisions, then fell

Year	Number White	Percent White	Number Black	Percent Black
1930	353,981	72.7%	132,068	27.1%
1940	474,326	71.5%	187,266	28.2%
1950	517,865	64.5%	280,803	35.0%
1960	345,263	45.2%	411,737	53.9%
1970	209,272	27.7%	537,712	71.1%
1980	171,768	26.9%	448,906	70.3%
1990	179,667	29.6%	399,604	65.8%
2000	197,168	34.5%	349,390	61.1%
2003 est	204,547	36.2%	331,650	58.8%
Ages 5-17				
2000	14,804	18.0%	64,864	78.7%
2003 est	16,635	22.2%	54,993	73.5%

² Enrollment numbers prior to 1950 from George D. Strayer, *Schoolhousing in the District of Columbia*, A Section of the Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, conducted under the auspices of the Subcommittees on District of Columbia Appropriations ("Strayer, Schoolhousing") (1949), Table 12. 1950-60: *Hobson v. Hansen*, 269 F. Supp. 401, 409 (D.D.C. 1967). 1966: A. Harry Passow, *Toward Creating a Model Urban School System*, Teachers College, Columbia University (1967), p. 86. 1979 and later years: DCPS Annual Membership Reports.

sharply over the next two decades, while the black population rose significantly every decade until 1970. Since then the white population dipped, then rose while blacks have diminished in both number and as a percentage of the population.³

Enrollment in DC and Surrounding Suburbs by Race⁴



³ Bureau of the Census, Historical Census Statistics on Population Totals by Race, 1790 to 1990, by Hispanic Origin, 1970-1990. Population Division Working Paper No. 56, Table 23 (District of Columbia-Race and Hispanic Origin: 1800 to 1990); numbers for 2000 and 2003 estimate from downloadable files on the Census Bureau website, *see* www.census.gov.

⁴ DCPS: school system documents. Suburbs: Minority students - individual district websites. Total enrollment--WABE Guide, 2005. Tuition enrollment--individual district websites. Special education students, ESL students and free & reduced price lunch student--WABE Guide, 2005.

APPENDIX B

FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM OFFERINGS IN FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

1. **Elementary School:** Fairfax County has the following two types of elementary school language programs:
 - a. **Partial Immersion.** Of approximately 130 elementary schools, 13 have partial immersion programs for grade 1-6 in four languages (7 in Spanish, 2 in French, 3 in Japanese, 1 in German)
--In partial immersion, the student learns one-half day in the foreign language (subject areas covered are science, math and health)
 - b. **FLES (Foreign Language in Elementary School).** Four schools participate in four languages (French, Spanish, Latin, Italian)
--Foreign language teachers come twice a week for half an hour and teach subject currently being taught in class
2. **Middle School:** Typical language programs begin in middle school and the languages offered are determined partially based on the demand of students/parents
 - a. Seventh grade students are offered a class entitled “Intro to Foreign Language.” The class offers a sampling of languages taught at the associated high school, with the purpose of giving students a chance to decide which language they want to pursue in 8th grade and high school.
 - b. Eighth grade students can begin to take the Level 1 course in the language of their choice. Approximately 7,500 of the approximately 11,000 8th grade students take a language course in 8th grade. Different schools offer different languages based on demand, but all have French and Spanish.
3. **High School**
 - a. The school system will not offer a language class that they do not intend to offer though at least Level 4. Schools that want to add a new language must do a survey that demonstrates at least 40-60 students interested in taking the language. Many local universities like to see at least 3-4 years of a language. The VA Advanced Studies degree requires at least three years of one language or two years of two different languages.
 - b. FCPS offer a total of 10 different languages in the high schools. Not all high schools offer each language. For example, all 24 offer French and Spanish; 20 offer German; 9 offer Japanese; and 2 offer Chinese.

Source: Telephone conversation between one of the authors of this report (Michael Dardzinski) and the FCPS foreign language coordinator.

D.C. Population

Year	D.C. Population		D.C. Population		DCPS		
	Number White	Percent White	Number Black	Percent Black	DCPS Percent White	DCPS Percent Black	
1930	353,981	72.7%	132,068	27.1%	66.23%	33.77%	1935
1940	474,326	71.5%	187,266	28.2%	63.70%	37.27%	1945
1950	517,865	64.5%	280,803	35.0%	57.07%	46.29%	1953
1960	345,263	45.2%	411,737	53.9%	39.05%	60.95%	1958
1970	209,272	27.7%	537,712	71.1%	9.12%	90.88%	1966
1980	171,768	26.9%	448,906	70.3%	3.81%	94.48%	1979
1990	179,667	29.6%	399,604	65.8%	3.87%	89.81%	1990
2000	197,168	34.5%	349,390	61.1%	4.52%	84.61%	2000
2003 est	204,547	36.2%	331,650	58.8%	4.86%	83.61%	2003
Ages 5-17							
2000	14,804	18.0%	64,864	78.7%			
2003 est	16,635	22.2%	54,993	73.5%			

DCPS

Year	Total Enroll	DCPS		DCPS		D.C. Population	
		Number White	Percent White	Number Black	Percent Black	Percent White	Percent Black
1930	80,063	53,027	66.2%	27,036	33.8%	72.70%	27.10%
1935	98,643	62,836	63.7%	35,807	36.3%		
1940	99,402	62,353	62.7%	37,049	37.3%	71.50%	28.20%
1945	94,545	54,660	57.8%	39,507	41.8%		
1948	93,025	53,094	57.1%	43,065	46.3%	64.50%	35.00%
1954	104,860	44,897	42.8%	59,963	57.2%		
1958	105,000	41,000	39.0%	64,000	61.0%	45.20%	53.90%
1966	146,644	13,369	9.1%	133,275	90.9%		
1979	106,156	4,040	3.8%	100,300	94.5%	26.90%	70.30%
1985	87,677	3,264	3.7%	80,681	92.0%		
1990	80,694	3,123	3.9%	72,474	89.8%	29.60%	65.80%
1995	79,802	3,207	4.0%	69,892	87.6%		
2000	68,925	3,113	4.5%	58,320	84.6%	34.50%	61.10%
2003	65,099	3,167	4.9%	54,429	83.6%	36.20%	58.80%

Schools


	Total	All black							No B
		70-99% B	50-70% B	30-50% B	10-30% B	<10% B			
mid 50s	170	20		10				5	
2003-04	145	27	8600.0%	10	1200.0%	9	1	0	
	Total	No W							All W
		< 10% W	10-30% W	30-50% W	50-70% W	70-75% W			
mid 50s	170	20				4		5	
2003-04	145	85	4300.0%	8	300.0%	4	2	0	
ele	106		8100.0%			2	0		
jh/ms	21		1600.0%	2					
shs	21		1800.0%						
	148	0	11500.0%	2	0.0%	2	0		

50%+ B

0 0
#DIV/0! #DIV/0!

50%+ W

0



Black enrollment**White enrollment**

Range	No. of Schools	No. of Students
0% Black	-	-
<5% Black	-	-
6-10% Black	1	20
10-29% Black	9	736
30-49% Black	12	2,034
50-69% Black	10	2,725
70-89% Black	18	7,260
90-95% Black	14	4,116
96-99% Black	62	24,544
100% Black	29	10,642
	155	52,077
<30% Black	10	756
	6.5%	1.5%
30-70% Black	22	4,759
	14.2%	9.1%
50%+ Black	133	49,287
	85.8%	94.6%
70%+ Black	123	46,562
	79.4%	89.4%
75%+ Black	108	40,240
	69.7%	77.3%
90%+ Black	105	39,302
	67.7%	75.5%
95%+ Black	91	35,186
	58.7%	67.6%

Range	No. of Schools	No. of Students
0% White	92	-
<5% White	44	168
6-10% White	2	26
10-29% White	8	1,069
30-49% White	3	437
50-69% White	4	660
70-89% White	2	542
90-95% White	-	-
96-99% White	-	-
100% White	-	-
	155	2,902
<30% White	146	1,263
	94.2%	43.5%
30-70% White	7	1,202
	4.5%	41.4%
50%+ White	6	1,202
	3.9%	41.4%
70%+ White	2	542
	1.3%	18.7%
75%+ White	-	-
	0.0%	0.0%
90%+ White	-	-
	-	-
95%+ White	-	-
	-	-

DCPS Schools by Race 2003-04

SCHOOL	TYPE	TOTAL	Black enroll	White enroll	Other enroll	% Black	% White	% Other
Fletcher-Johnson Educational Cen	Educational Cen	470	468	-	2	99.6%	0.0%	0.4%
P.R. Harris Educational Center	Educational Cen	917	917	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Winston Educational Center	Educational Cen	531	528	-	3	99.4%	0.0%	0.6%
Adams Elementary School	Elementary Schc	276	130	10	146	47.1%	3.6%	52.9%
Aiton Elementary School	Elementary Schc	455	455	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Amidon Elementary School	Elementary Schc	400	370	4	30	92.5%	1.0%	7.5%
Bancroft Elementary School	Elementary Schc	497	360	10	137	72.4%	2.0%	27.6%
Barnard Elementary School	Elementary Schc	338	273	-	65	80.8%	0.0%	19.2%
Beers Elementary School	Elementary Schc	439	439	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Benning Elementary School	Elementary Schc	232	230	-	2	99.1%	0.0%	0.9%
Birney Elementary School	Elementary Schc	493	493	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bowen Elementary School	Elementary Schc	299	295	-	4	98.7%	0.0%	1.3%
Brent Elementary School	Elementary Schc	255	236	10	19	92.5%	3.9%	7.5%
Brightwood Elementary School	Elementary Schc	465	187	-	278	40.2%	0.0%	59.8%
Brookland Elementary School	Elementary Schc	301	276	4	25	91.7%	1.3%	8.3%
Bruce-Monroe Elementary School	Elementary Schc	347	167	3	180	48.1%	0.9%	51.9%
Bunker Hill Elementary School	Elementary Schc	329	327	-	2	99.4%	0.0%	0.6%
Burroughs Elementary School	Elementary Schc	266	254	-	12	95.5%	0.0%	4.5%
Burrville Elementary School	Elementary Schc	332	352	-	(20)	106.0%	0.0%	-6.0%
C.W. Harris Elementary School	Elementary Schc	501	501	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clark Elementary School	Elementary Schc	280	205	-	75	73.2%	0.0%	26.8%
Cleveland Elementary School	Elementary Schc	209	159	-	50	76.1%	0.0%	23.9%
Davis Elementary School	Elementary Schc	323	323	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Draper Elementary School	Elementary Schc	263	263	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Drew Elementary School	Elementary Schc	260	259	-	1	99.6%	0.0%	0.4%
Eaton Elementary School	Elementary Schc	411	170	124	241	41.4%	30.2%	58.6%
Emery Elementary School	Elementary Schc	357	342	2	15	95.8%	0.6%	4.2%
Ferebee-Hope Elementary School	Elementary Schc	267	267	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Gage-Eckington Elementary Schoc	Elementary Schc	357	350	-	7	98.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Garfield Elementary School	Elementary Schc	504	504	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Garrison Elementary School	Elementary Schc	385	308	6	77	80.0%	1.6%	20.0%
Gibbs Elementary School	Elementary Schc	462	458	-	4	99.1%	0.0%	0.9%
Green Elementary School	Elementary Schc	402	399	-	3	99.3%	0.0%	0.7%
H.D. Cooke Elementary School	Elementary Schc	394	126	8	268	32.0%	2.0%	68.0%
Hearst Elementary School	Elementary Schc	148	99	22	49	66.9%	14.9%	33.1%
Hendley Elementary School	Elementary Schc	349	347	1	2	99.4%	0.3%	0.6%
Houston Elementary School	Elementary Schc	345	345	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hyde Elementary School	Elementary Schc	183	55	88	128	30.1%	48.1%	69.9%
J.F. Cook Elementary School	Elementary Schc	237	231	1	6	97.5%	0.4%	2.5%
J.O. Wilson Elementary School	Elementary Schc	416	412	-	4	99.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Janney Elementary School	Elementary Schc	479	95	319	384	19.8%	66.6%	80.2%
Kenilworth Elementary School	Elementary Schc	380	379	-	1	99.7%	0.0%	0.3%
Ketcham Elementary School	Elementary Schc	413	413	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Key Elementary School	Elementary Schc	234	33	162	201	14.1%	69.2%	85.9%
Kimball Elementary School	Elementary Schc	413	412	-	1	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%
King Elementary School	Elementary Schc	454	453	1	1	99.8%	0.2%	0.2%
Lafayette Elementary School	Elementary Schc	537	121	382	416	22.5%	71.1%	77.5%
Langdon Elementary School	Elementary Schc	408	401	1	7	98.3%	0.2%	1.7%
Lasalle Elementary School	Elementary Schc	302	291	1	11	96.4%	0.3%	3.6%
Leckie Elementary School	Elementary Schc	315	293	12	22	93.0%	3.8%	7.0%
Ludlow-Taylor Elementary School	Elementary Schc	272	254	2	18	93.4%	0.7%	6.6%
M.C. Terrell Elementary School	Elementary Schc	279	279	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Malcolm X Elementary School	Elementary Schc	534	534	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mann Elementary School	Elementary Schc	228	20	160	208	8.8%	70.2%	91.2%
Maury Elementary School	Elementary Schc	268	267	-	1	99.6%	0.0%	0.4%
McGogney Elementary School	Elementary Schc	398	394	2	4	99.0%	0.5%	1.0%
Merritt Elementary School	Elementary Schc	488	485	-	3	99.4%	0.0%	0.6%
Meyer Elementary School	Elementary Schc	354	230	1	124	65.0%	0.3%	35.0%
Miner Elementary School	Elementary Schc	508	499	-	9	98.2%	0.0%	1.8%

SCHOOL	TYPE	TOTAL	Black enroll	White enroll	Other enroll	% Black	% White	% Other
Montgomery Elementary School	Elementary Schc	265	259	-	6	97.7%	0.0%	2.3%
Moten Elementary School	Elementary Schc	380	379	-	1	99.7%	0.0%	0.3%
Murch Elementary School	Elementary Schc	488	169	225	319	34.6%	46.1%	65.4%
Nalle Elementary School	Elementary Schc	356	356	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Noyes Elementary School	Elementary Schc	194	181	1	13	93.3%	0.5%	6.7%
Orr Elementary School	Elementary Schc	423	423	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Oyster Elementary School	Elementary Schc	402	51	120	351	12.7%	29.9%	87.3%
Park View Elementary School	Elementary Schc	346	307	-	39	88.7%	0.0%	11.3%
Patterson Elementary School	Elementary Schc	295	295	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Payne Elementary School	Elementary Schc	289	284	1	5	98.3%	0.3%	1.7%
Peabody Elementary School	Elementary Schc	154	132	15	22	85.7%	9.7%	14.3%
Plummer Elementary School	Elementary Schc	360	343	-	17	95.3%	0.0%	4.7%
Powell Elementary School	Elementary Schc	318	93	-	225	29.2%	0.0%	70.8%
Randle-Highlands Elementary Schc	Elementary Schc	493	489	-	4	99.2%	0.0%	0.8%
Raymond Elementary School	Elementary Schc	403	209	-	194	51.9%	0.0%	48.1%
Reed Elementary School	Elementary Schc	413	100	-	313	24.2%	0.0%	75.8%
River-Terrace Elementary School	Elementary Schc	251	248	-	3	98.8%	0.0%	1.2%
Ross Elementary School	Elementary Schc	164	51	11	113	31.1%	6.7%	68.9%
Rudolph Elementary School	Elementary Schc	488	400	-	88	82.0%	0.0%	18.0%
Savoy Elementary School	Elementary Schc	380	380	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Seaton Elementary School	Elementary Schc	427	263	-	164	61.6%	0.0%	38.4%
Shadd Elementary School	Elementary Schc	161	161	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Shaed Elementary School	Elementary Schc	307	284	1	23	92.5%	0.3%	7.5%
Shepherd Elementary School	Elementary Schc	351	320	13	31	91.2%	3.7%	8.8%
Simon Elementary School	Elementary Schc	364	363	-	1	99.7%	0.0%	0.3%
Slowe Elementary School	Elementary Schc	396	395	-	1	99.7%	0.0%	0.3%
Smothers Elementary School	Elementary Schc	244	244	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Stanton Elementary School	Elementary Schc	576	576	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Stevens Elementary School	Elementary Schc	283	248	2	35	87.6%	0.7%	12.4%
Stoddert Elementary School	Elementary Schc	213	49	125	164	23.0%	58.7%	77.0%
Takoma Elementary School	Elementary Schc	426	346	4	80	81.2%	0.9%	18.8%
Thomas Elementary School	Elementary Schc	387	386	1	1	99.7%	0.3%	0.3%
Thomson Elementary School	Elementary Schc	285	130	-	155	45.6%	0.0%	54.4%
Thurgood Marshall Elementary Schc	Elementary Schc	327	321	-	6	98.2%	0.0%	1.8%
Truesdell Elementary School	Elementary Schc	422	274	-	148	64.9%	0.0%	35.1%
Tubman Elementary School	Elementary Schc	580	251	3	329	43.3%	0.5%	56.7%
Turner Elementary School	Elementary Schc	484	482	-	2	99.6%	0.0%	0.4%
Tyler Elementary School	Elementary Schc	276	274	-	2	99.3%	0.0%	0.7%
Van Ness Elementary School	Elementary Schc	177	177	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Walker-Jones Elementary School	Elementary Schc	509	505	-	4	99.2%	0.0%	0.8%
Watkins Elementary School	Elementary Schc	505	368	111	137	72.9%	22.0%	27.1%
Webb Elementary School	Elementary Schc	496	496	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
West Elementary School	Elementary Schc	280	194	1	86	69.3%	0.4%	30.7%
Wheatley Elementary School	Elementary Schc	286	281	-	5	98.3%	0.0%	1.7%
Whittier Elementary School	Elementary Schc	433	392	1	41	90.5%	0.2%	9.5%
Wilkinson Elementary School	Elementary Schc	497	495	-	2	99.6%	0.0%	0.4%
Young Elementary School	Elementary Schc	428	428	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Browne Junior High School	Junior High Schc	509	508	-	1	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%
Deal Junior High School	Junior High Schc	940	446	273	494	47.4%	29.0%	52.6%
Eliot Junior High School	Junior High Schc	333	330	-	3	99.1%	0.0%	0.9%
Francis Junior High School	Junior High Schc	395	269	9	126	68.1%	2.3%	31.9%
Hine Junior High School	Junior High Schc	657	653	-	4	99.4%	0.0%	0.6%
Jefferson Junior High School	Junior High Schc	798	704	1	94	88.2%	0.1%	11.8%
Johnson Junior High School	Junior High Schc	689	687	-	2	99.7%	0.0%	0.3%
R.H. Terrell Junior High School	Junior High Schc	284	279	3	5	98.2%	1.1%	1.8%
Shaw Junior High School	Junior High Schc	506	478	-	28	94.5%	0.0%	5.5%
Backus Middle School	Middle School	505	495	-	10	98.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Evans Middle School	Middle School	231	231	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Garnet-Patterson Middle School	Middle School	345	263	4	82	76.2%	1.2%	23.8%
Hardy Middle School	Middle School	410	215	110	195	52.4%	26.8%	47.6%
Hart Middle School	Middle School	557	555	1	2	99.6%	0.2%	0.4%
Kramer Middle School	Middle School	400	400	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

SCHOOL	TYPE	TOTAL	Black enroll	White enroll	Other enroll	% Black	% White	% Other
Lincoln Middle School	Middle School	321	152	1	169	47.4%	0.3%	52.6%
MacFarland Middle School	Middle School	635	448	-	187	70.6%	0.0%	29.4%
Ron Brown Middle School	Middle School	419	418	-	1	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%
Sousa Middle School	Middle School	405	401	-	4	99.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Stuart-Hobson Middle School	Middle School	410	392	14	18	95.6%	3.4%	4.4%
Ellington School of the Arts	School of the Art	457	377	54	80	82.5%	11.8%	17.5%
Business and Finance @ Woodsor	School-Within-School	209	209	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Emilia Reggio @ Peabody	School-Within-School	88	26	54	62	29.5%	61.4%	70.5%
Pre-Engineering @ Dunbar	School-Within-School	150	146	-	4	97.3%	0.0%	2.7%
Anacostia Senior High School	Senior High School	618	617	-	1	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%
Ballou Senior High School	Senior High School	1,090	1084	-	6	99.4%	0.0%	0.6%
Banneker Senior High School	Senior High School	412	368	11	44	89.3%	2.7%	10.7%
Bell Senior High School	Senior High School	723	168	3	555	23.2%	0.4%	76.8%
Cardozo Senior High School	Senior High School	814	599	4	215	73.6%	0.5%	26.4%
Coolidge Senior High School	Senior High School	795	753	-	42	94.7%	0.0%	5.3%
Dunbar Senior High School	Senior High School	912	897	1	15	98.4%	0.1%	1.6%
Eastern Senior High School	Senior High School	911	905	1	6	99.3%	0.1%	0.7%
Luke Moore Academy	Senior High School	225	221	-	4	98.2%	0.0%	1.8%
M.M. Washington Senior High School	Senior High School	287	286	-	1	99.7%	0.0%	0.3%
Roosevelt Senior High School	Senior High School	793	612	-	181	77.2%	0.0%	22.8%
School Without Walls	Senior High School	325	224	71	101	68.9%	21.8%	31.1%
Spingarn Senior High School	Senior High School	573	572	-	1	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%
Wilson Senior High School	Senior High School	1,442	748	308	694	51.9%	21.4%	48.1%
Woodson Senior High School	Senior High School	695	693	1	2	99.7%	0.1%	0.3%
Browne Center	Special Education	80	80	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hamilton Center	Special Education	72	71	-	1	98.6%	0.0%	1.4%
Mamie D. Lee	Special Education	154	148	1	6	96.1%	0.6%	3.9%
Moten Center	Special Education	101	101	-	-	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Prospect	Special Education	96	89	-	7	92.7%	0.0%	7.3%
Sharpe-Health	Special Education	206	190	3	16	92.2%	1.5%	7.8%
Spingarn Center	Special Education	40	39	-	1	97.5%	0.0%	2.5%
Taft	Special Education	79	77	-	2	97.5%	0.0%	2.5%
Washington Center	Special Education	87	85	-	2	97.7%	0.0%	2.3%
STAY (Consolidated)	STAY School	880	783	3	97	89.0%	0.3%	11.0%
GRAND TOTAL		62,004	52,077	2,902	9,927			

Range	Black enrollment		Range	White enrollment	
	Schools	Students		Schools	Students
0% B	-	-	0% W	92	-
<5% B	-	-	<5% W	44	168
6-10% B	1	20	6-10% W	2	26
10-29% B	9	736	10-29% W	8	1,069
30-49% B	12	2,034	30-49% W	3	437
50-69% B	10	2,725	50-69% W	4	660
70-89% B	18	7,260	70-89% W	2	542
90-95% B	14	4,116	90-95% W	-	-
> 95% B	62	24,544	> 95% W	-	-
100% B	29	10,642	100% W	-	-
	155	52,077		155	2,902
<30% B	10	756	<30% W	146	1263
	6.5%	1.5%		94.2%	43.5%
30-70% B	22	4,759	30-70% W	7	1,202
	14.2%	9.1%		4.5%	41.4%
70%+ B	123	46,562	70%+ W	2	542
	79.4%	89.4%		1.3%	18.7%
90%+ B	105	39,302	90%+ W	-	-
	67.7%	75.5%		-	-
95%+ B	91	35,186	95%+ W	-	-
	58.7%	67.6%		-	-
50%+ B	133	49,287	50%+ W	6	1,202

SCHOOL	TYPE	TOTAL	Black enroll	White enroll	Other enroll	% Black	% White	% Other
		85.8%	94.6%			3.9%	41.4%	
75%+ B		108	40240	75%+ W		-	-	
		69.7%	77.3%			0.0%	0.0%	

Comparison of DCPS and Surrounding Jurisdictions Per Pupil Spending

FY 2005 Approved Budgets Local and Federal Revenues

DISTRICT	FY 2005 Total	Transporta- tion	Net
Arlington	\$ 15,298	\$ 392	\$ 14,906
Alexandria	\$ 13,670	\$ 472	\$ 13,198
Montgomery	\$ 12,108	\$ 472	\$ 11,636
DCPS	\$ 12,221	\$ 1,127	\$ 11,094
Fairfax	\$ 11,022	\$ 513	\$ 10,509
Prince George's	\$ 8,612	\$ 623	\$ 7,989

Includes all local and federal funding in the districts' budgets except


- Food service
- Construction/capital
- Debt service
- Summer school
- Adult education
- State level costs funded locally
 - Special ed tuition, transpor tation
 - State agency functions
 - Charter school oversight
- Federal funding for
 - State agency functions
 - Private and charter schools
 - Short-term restricted programs
 - Private grants and intra-District transfers

Also Includes


- Teacher Retirement
- Transit subsidy
- Federal '05 funding for DCPS LEA
- Titles I, II, IV, V, VII
- Vocational education
- Special education
- Impact Aid, Indirect Cost
- Head Start
- Reading First
- Tech Literacy Challenge Fund
- Comprehensive School Reform
- State assessments

Sources: Suburbs: Washington Area Boards of Education, WABE Guide FY 20035; DC: Prepared by Mary Levy for DCPS, using WABE methodology
NOTE that uniform formulas were developed by the WABE committee for consistency areawide, so that numbers are comparable. However, the cost per pupil will vary from that reported in individual district materials.

**Per Pupil Operating Budget: Including Transportation
DCPS and Surrounding Suburbs FY 2005
State, Local and Federal Entitlement Revenues**



**Per Pupil Operating Budget: Excluding Transportation
DCPS and Surrounding Suburbs FY 2005
State, Local and Federal Entitlement Revenues**



Comparison of DCPS and Surrounding Jurisdictions Per Pupil Spending

Numbers	Total enrollment	Low income	ESL	Special ed	In system Special Ed	Tuition	Black	White	Hispanic	Other/NA	
DCPS	61,870	39,971	4,742	11,616	8,952	2,664	51,729	3,010	6,029	1,102	
Alexandria	10,922	5,020	1,641	2,059	2,059	113	4,723	2,547	2,919	733	
Arlington	18,907	6,895	4,373	3,207	3,207		2,580	7,890	5,538	2,539	
Fairfax	166,275	31,885	21,366	23,796	23,113	557	17,480	84,241	25,441	36,668	
Montgomery	140,492	31,419	12,100	17,746	17,013		31,049	62,659	26,272	20,512	
Pr George's	139,770	68,620	8,857	16,436	14,922	1,514	108,699	11,224	14,788	5,060	
Percentages											
DCPS		64.3%	7.7%	18.8%	14.5%	4.3%	83.6%	4.9%	9.7%	1.8%	100.0%
Alexandria		47.1%	15.0%	18.9%	18.9%	1.0%	43.2%	23.3%	26.7%	6.7%	100.0%
Arlington		36.1%	23.1%	17.0%	17.0%	0.0%	14.4%	44.0%	30.9%	10.7%	100.0%
Fairfax		19.1%	12.8%	14.3%	13.9%	0.3%	10.7%	51.4%	15.5%	22.4%	100.0%
Montgom'y		22.6%	7.7%	12.6%	12.1%	0.0%	22.1%	44.6%	18.7%	14.6%	100.0%
Pr George's		46.0%	6.3%	11.8%	10.7%	1.1%	77.8%	8.0%	10.6%	3.6%	100.0%

Sources:

DCPS: school system documents

Suburbs:

Total enrollment: WABE Guide, 2005

Tuition enrollment: Individual district websites





Special education students: WABE Guide, 2005

ESL students: WABE Guide, 2003

Free and reduced price lunch: WABE Guide, 2005

Minority students: Individual district websites

Comparison of DCPS and Surrounding Jurisdictions Per Pupil Spending



Comparison of DCPS and Surrounding Jurisdictions Per Pupil Spending

DC Per Pupil	FY 05 Approved Budget	FY 04 Board's Requested Bud	FY 03 Revised Budget	FY 02 Actual Expenditures	FY 01 Actual Expenditures
Local	\$ 760,494,705	\$ 754,759,253	\$ 727,264,276	\$ 739,670,387	\$ 727,572,135
Exclusions					
<i>State level funds</i>					
Tuition	\$ (76,056,907)	\$ (72,372,606)	\$ (58,674,897)	\$ (86,410,295)	\$ (61,783,077)
Special ed transportation		\$ (61,203,000)	\$ (44,681,750)	\$ (43,096,205)	
LaShawn AND CMH	\$ (19,967,185)	\$ (20,179,199)	\$ (20,183,175)	\$ (19,435,860)	
Other special ed state level	\$ (10,263,602)	\$ (8,988,276)	\$ (17,101,766)	\$ (25,714,000)	
Oak Hill	\$ (5,423,362)	\$ (3,118,945)	\$ (3,237,335)	\$ (2,711,013)	
Charter school oversight	\$ (307,340)	\$ (307,340)	\$ (300,000)	\$ (410,582)	
SAT 9 Administration	\$ (2,000,000)	\$ (2,000,000)	\$ (2,000,000)	\$ (1,750,000)	
Student Hearings	\$ (1,284,732)	\$ (1,310,575)	\$ (1,112,973)	\$ (584,445)	
Teacher credentialing	\$ (533,168)	\$ (345,663)	\$ (345,663)	\$ (352,403)	
Grants administration	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
<i>Other exclusions</i>					
Construction	\$ (258,113)	\$ (262,792)	\$ (262,792)	\$ (237,950)	\$ (398,000)
Food Service	\$ (2,829,815)	\$ (2,881,114)	\$ (3,096,889)	\$ (3,000,000)	\$ (720,000)
Summer School	\$ (2,440,953)	\$ (2,440,953)	\$ (6,296,165)	\$ (6,300,000)	\$ (1,334,000)
Channel 28		\$ (567,120)	\$ (443,778)	\$ (256,521)	\$ (287,000)

Total, Local	\$ 639,129,528	\$ 578,781,670	\$ 569,527,093	\$ 549,411,113	\$ 663,050,058	
per pupil	\$ 10,797	\$ 8,910	\$ 8,767	\$ 8,356		
Federal				Total	Total	W/out State Admin
Title I				\$ 26,287,114	\$ 28,724,258	\$ 22,979,406
EAA local administration	\$ 1,973,673		\$ 2,085,251			
EAB homeless			\$ 225,000			
EAC parent involvement	\$ 381,516		\$ 450,000			
EAD CHOICE	\$ 300,000		\$ 163,708			
EAE program improvement	\$ 1,990,511		\$ 252,000			
EAP	\$ 2,309,292					
EAR evaluation			\$ 300,000			
EAS,EAT	\$ 7,894,694					
EAZ DCPS LEA	\$ 18,835,778		\$ 26,249,637			
EJZ accountability			\$ 483,186			
Title II/Teacher Quality	\$ 9,765,979		\$ 12,031,700	\$ 1,014,634	\$ 1,458,211	\$ 1,166,569
Title IV	\$ 1,351,285		\$ 1,916,112	\$ 1,465,331		
Title V	\$ 1,090,816					
Title VI			\$ 1,063,697	\$ 1,429,691	\$ 1,922,118	\$ 1,537,694
Title VII/Language Acquisition	\$ 828,773		\$ 983,363	\$ 236,047	\$ 390,869	\$ 312,695
Head Start	\$ 6,434,734		\$ 5,134,166	\$ 4,798,290	\$ 4,664,895	\$ 3,731,916
Voc Ed	\$ 4,128,605		\$ 4,250,737	\$ 4,310,592	\$ 4,214,921	\$ 3,371,937
Goals 2000			\$ -	\$ 1,261,710	\$ 1,902,226	\$ 1,521,781
Impact Aid	\$ 900,000		\$ 1,339,432	\$ 907,902	\$ 840,780	\$ 672,624

FY 2005 Original Weighted Student Formula Allocation											
Sorted by per pupil allocation for basic education plus free/reduced lunch weighting											
Basic Education					Free and Reduced Lunch						
Basic Ed WSF	Floor plan Exception Funds	General ed (sum)	Projected Enrollment	General ed per pupil	F&R Lunch WSF	F&R Lunch Enrollment	F&R Lunch per pupil	Total per pupil	Percent White		
Elementary to Grade 6											
Van Ness Elementary School	6	\$ 459,018	\$ 333,267	\$ 792,285	100	\$ 7,923	\$ 34,196	89	\$ 342	\$ 8,265	0.0%
Shadd Elementary School	7	\$ 698,628	\$ 281,300	\$ 979,928	152	\$ 6,447	\$ 44,025	116	\$ 290	\$ 6,737	0.0%
Ross Elementary School	2	\$ 748,104	\$ 282,343	\$ 1,030,447	166	\$ 6,208	\$ 47,847	124	\$ 288	\$ 6,496	6.7%
Cleveland Elementary School	1	\$ 901,656	\$ 237,047	\$ 1,138,703	196	\$ 5,810	\$ 59,270	157	\$ 302	\$ 6,112	0.0%
Noyes Elementary School	5	\$ 973,812	\$ 226,236	\$ 1,200,048	213	\$ 5,634	\$ 65,926	172	\$ 310	\$ 5,944	0.5%
Hyde Elementary School	2	\$ 896,994	\$ 241,709	\$ 1,138,703	196	\$ 5,810	\$ 15,241	40	\$ 78	\$ 5,887	48.1%
J.F. Cook Elementary School	5	\$ 999,306	\$ 233,218	\$ 1,232,524	222	\$ 5,552	\$ 74,103	192	\$ 334	\$ 5,886	0.4%
Draper Elementary School	8	\$ 1,001,406	\$ 238,335	\$ 1,239,741	224	\$ 5,535	\$ 77,916	202	\$ 348	\$ 5,882	0.0%
Benning Elementary School	7	\$ 994,854	\$ 230,453	\$ 1,225,307	220	\$ 5,570	\$ 60,792	158	\$ 276	\$ 5,846	0.0%
Drew Elementary School	7	\$ 1,075,326	\$ 214,935	\$ 1,290,261	238	\$ 5,421	\$ 86,001	225	\$ 361	\$ 5,783	0.0%
Smothers Elementary School	7	\$ 1,049,496	\$ 222,722	\$ 1,272,218	233	\$ 5,460	\$ 64,245	168	\$ 276	\$ 5,736	0.0%
Stoddert Elementary School	3	\$ 968,226	\$ 231,822	\$ 1,200,048	213	\$ 5,634	\$ 15,719	42	\$ 74	\$ 5,708	58.7%
River-Terrace Elementary School	7	\$ 1,085,532	\$ 211,946	\$ 1,297,478	240	\$ 5,406	\$ 69,720	182	\$ 290	\$ 5,697	0.0%
Tyler Elementary School	6	\$ 1,143,702	\$ 207,903	\$ 1,351,605	255	\$ 5,300	\$ 91,744	239	\$ 360	\$ 5,660	0.0%
Burroughs Elementary School	5	\$ 1,088,304	\$ 205,565	\$ 1,293,869	239	\$ 5,414	\$ 52,555	137	\$ 220	\$ 5,634	0.0%
Adams Elementary School	1	\$ 1,104,348	\$ 211,172	\$ 1,315,520	245	\$ 5,369	\$ 64,290	167	\$ 262	\$ 5,632	3.6%
Maury Elementary School	6	\$ 1,087,800	\$ 224,112	\$ 1,311,912	244	\$ 5,377	\$ 60,768	157	\$ 249	\$ 5,626	0.0%
Montgomery Elementary School	2	\$ 1,130,136	\$ 214,252	\$ 1,344,388	253	\$ 5,314	\$ 72,710	188	\$ 287	\$ 5,601	0.0%
Ferebee-Hope Elementary School	8	\$ 1,193,598	\$ 179,658	\$ 1,373,256	261	\$ 5,262	\$ 88,389	234	\$ 339	\$ 5,600	0.0%
West Elementary School	4	\$ 1,161,930	\$ 204,109	\$ 1,366,039	259	\$ 5,274	\$ 68,284	178	\$ 264	\$ 5,538	0.4%
Wheatley Elementary School	5	\$ 1,200,654	\$ 190,645	\$ 1,391,299	266	\$ 5,230	\$ 80,284	210	\$ 302	\$ 5,532	0.0%
Clark Elementary School	4	\$ 1,231,020	\$ 174,713	\$ 1,405,733	270	\$ 5,206	\$ 82,155	217	\$ 304	\$ 5,511	0.0%
Payne Elementary School	6	\$ 1,223,376	\$ 193,183	\$ 1,416,559	273	\$ 5,189	\$ 84,610	219	\$ 310	\$ 5,499	0.3%
Ludlow-Taylor Elementary School	6	\$ 1,219,554	\$ 193,396	\$ 1,412,950	272	\$ 5,195	\$ 81,959	214	\$ 301	\$ 5,496	0.7%
Thomson Elementary School	2	\$ 1,226,736	\$ 182,606	\$ 1,409,342	271	\$ 5,201	\$ 75,187	195	\$ 277	\$ 5,478	0.0%
Mann Elementary School	3	\$ 1,073,562	\$ 216,699	\$ 1,290,261	238	\$ 5,421	\$ 4,729	12	\$ 20	\$ 5,441	70.2%
Bowen Elementary School	2	\$ 1,308,342	\$ 173,170	\$ 1,481,512	291	\$ 5,091	\$ 94,325	245	\$ 324	\$ 5,415	0.0%
Shaed Elementary School	5	\$ 1,321,194	\$ 163,927	\$ 1,485,121	292	\$ 5,086	\$ 94,360	245	\$ 323	\$ 5,409	0.3%
Key Elementary School	3	\$ 1,122,618	\$ 192,902	\$ 1,315,520	245	\$ 5,369	\$ 6,226	16	\$ 25	\$ 5,395	69.2%
Hendley Elementary School	8	\$ 1,372,518	\$ 159,513	\$ 1,532,031	305	\$ 5,023	\$ 108,911	285	\$ 357	\$ 5,380	0.3%
Brent Elementary School	6	\$ 1,208,382	\$ 190,134	\$ 1,398,516	268	\$ 5,218	\$ 36,894	96	\$ 138	\$ 5,356	3.9%
Leckie Elementary School	8	\$ 1,322,370	\$ 177,185	\$ 1,499,555	296	\$ 5,066	\$ 78,378	204	\$ 265	\$ 5,331	3.8%

		Basic Education					Free and Reduced Lunch					
		Basic Ed WSF	Floor plan Exception Funds	General ed (sum)	Projected Enrollment	General ed per pupil	F&R Lunch WSF	F&R Lunch Enrollment	F&R Lunch per pupil	Total per pupil	Percent White	
Powell Elementary School	4	\$ 1,398,390	\$ 144,467	\$ 1,542,857	308	\$ 5,009	\$ 95,122	252	\$ 309	\$ 5,318	0.0%	
Lasalle Elementary School	4	\$ 1,355,970	\$ 172,453	\$ 1,528,423	304	\$ 5,028	\$ 84,086	217	\$ 277	\$ 5,304	0.3%	
Stevens Elementary School	2	\$ 1,250,760	\$ 176,624	\$ 1,427,384	276	\$ 5,172	\$ 36,299	95	\$ 132	\$ 5,303	0.7%	
M.C. Terrell Elementary School	8	\$ 1,400,784	\$ 145,681	\$ 1,546,465	309	\$ 5,005	\$ 89,749	237	\$ 290	\$ 5,295	0.0%	
Gage-Eckington Elementary School	1	\$ 1,440,684	\$ 141,867	\$ 1,582,551	319	\$ 4,961	\$ 101,970	265	\$ 320	\$ 5,281	0.0%	
Brookland Elementary School	5	\$ 1,298,766	\$ 182,746	\$ 1,481,512	291	\$ 5,091	\$ 54,493	142	\$ 187	\$ 5,278	1.3%	
Davis Elementary School	7	\$ 1,486,254	\$ 117,948	\$ 1,604,202	325	\$ 4,936	\$ 108,442	287	\$ 334	\$ 5,270	0.0%	
Aiton Elementary School	7	\$ 1,847,286	\$ 147,934	\$ 1,995,220	407	\$ 4,902	\$ 148,302	386	\$ 364	\$ 5,267	0.0%	
Barnard Elementary School	4	\$ 1,465,338	\$ 113,604	\$ 1,578,942	318	\$ 4,965	\$ 95,476	253	\$ 300	\$ 5,265	0.0%	
Meyer Elementary School	1	\$ 1,521,576	\$ 118,711	\$ 1,640,287	335	\$ 4,896	\$ 117,611	311	\$ 351	\$ 5,247	0.3%	
Bruce-Monroe Elementary School	1	\$ 1,451,562	\$ 123,771	\$ 1,575,333	317	\$ 4,970	\$ 86,899	227	\$ 274	\$ 5,244	0.9%	
Ketcham Elementary School	6	\$ 1,824,186	\$ 160,208	\$ 1,984,394	404	\$ 4,912	\$ 133,497	348	\$ 330	\$ 5,242	0.0%	
Patterson Elementary School	8	\$ 1,464,036	\$ 143,774	\$ 1,607,810	326	\$ 4,932	\$ 98,908	258	\$ 303	\$ 5,235	0.0%	
Seaton Elementary School	2	\$ 1,855,056	\$ 140,164	\$ 1,995,220	407	\$ 4,902	\$ 132,700	346	\$ 326	\$ 5,228	0.0%	
Emery Elementary School	5	\$ 1,465,800	\$ 142,010	\$ 1,607,810	326	\$ 4,932	\$ 95,679	248	\$ 293	\$ 5,225	0.6%	
Park View Elementary School	1	\$ 1,523,340	\$ 116,947	\$ 1,640,287	335	\$ 4,896	\$ 106,384	281	\$ 318	\$ 5,214	0.0%	
Gibbs Elementary School	6	\$ 1,865,976	\$ 161,720	\$ 2,027,696	416	\$ 4,874	\$ 135,124	351	\$ 325	\$ 5,199	0.0%	
Houston Elementary School	7	\$ 1,491,378	\$ 134,475	\$ 1,625,853	331	\$ 4,912	\$ 93,512	243	\$ 283	\$ 5,194	0.0%	
Burrville Elementary School	7	\$ 1,504,860	\$ 135,427	\$ 1,640,287	335	\$ 4,896	\$ 98,831	256	\$ 295	\$ 5,191	0.0%	
Kenilworth Elementary School	7	\$ 1,571,598	\$ 122,817	\$ 1,694,415	350	\$ 4,841	\$ 118,619	308	\$ 339	\$ 5,180	0.0%	
Simon Elementary School	8	\$ 1,564,332	\$ 115,649	\$ 1,679,981	346	\$ 4,855	\$ 107,198	284	\$ 310	\$ 5,165	0.0%	
Brightwood Elementary School	4	\$ 1,915,284	\$ 144,889	\$ 2,060,173	425	\$ 4,847	\$ 132,940	346	\$ 313	\$ 5,160	0.0%	
Whittier Elementary School	4	\$ 1,828,806	\$ 166,414	\$ 1,995,220	407	\$ 4,902	\$ 104,920	272	\$ 258	\$ 5,160	0.2%	
Young Elementary School	5	\$ 1,903,104	\$ 157,069	\$ 2,060,173	425	\$ 4,847	\$ 128,580	333	\$ 303	\$ 5,150	0.0%	
King Elementary School	8	\$ 1,969,002	\$ 116,430	\$ 2,085,432	432	\$ 4,827	\$ 137,183	363	\$ 318	\$ 5,145	0.2%	
Plummer Elementary School	7	\$ 1,596,840	\$ 104,792	\$ 1,701,632	352	\$ 4,834	\$ 107,661	285	\$ 306	\$ 5,140	0.0%	
Garrison Elementary School	2	\$ 1,597,722	\$ 118,344	\$ 1,716,066	356	\$ 4,820	\$ 110,493	289	\$ 310	\$ 5,131	1.6%	
Raymond Elementary School	4	\$ 1,630,692	\$ 110,633	\$ 1,741,325	363	\$ 4,797	\$ 120,062	318	\$ 331	\$ 5,128	0.0%	
H.D. Cooke Elementary School	1	\$ 1,687,812	\$ 85,990	\$ 1,773,802	372	\$ 4,768	\$ 129,476	337	\$ 348	\$ 5,116	2.0%	
Bunker Hill Elementary School	5	\$ 1,486,044	\$ 132,592	\$ 1,618,636	329	\$ 4,920	\$ 63,004	165	\$ 192	\$ 5,111	0.0%	
Nalle Elementary School	7	\$ 1,715,616	\$ 58,186	\$ 1,773,802	372	\$ 4,768	\$ 125,173	331	\$ 336	\$ 5,105	0.0%	
Green Elementary School	8	\$ 1,680,714	\$ 89,479	\$ 1,770,193	371	\$ 4,771	\$ 117,335	305	\$ 316	\$ 5,088	0.0%	
Thomas Elementary School	7	\$ 1,660,008	\$ 92,143	\$ 1,752,151	366	\$ 4,787	\$ 109,034	288	\$ 298	\$ 5,085	0.3%	
Amidon Elementary School	2	\$ 1,648,710	\$ 103,441	\$ 1,752,151	366	\$ 4,787	\$ 107,040	279	\$ 292	\$ 5,080	1.0%	
Reed Elementary School	1	\$ 1,734,054	\$ 68,616	\$ 1,802,670	380	\$ 4,744	\$ 127,279	331	\$ 335	\$ 5,079	0.0%	
J.O. Wilson Elementary School	6	\$ 1,748,040	\$ 76,281	\$ 1,824,321	386	\$ 4,726	\$ 132,818	345	\$ 344	\$ 5,070	0.0%	
Orr Elementary School	6	\$ 1,961,736	\$ 116,479	\$ 2,078,215	430	\$ 4,833	\$ 99,264	263	\$ 231	\$ 5,064	0.0%	
Kimball Elementary School	7	\$ 1,762,614	\$ 86,967	\$ 1,849,581	393	\$ 4,706	\$ 136,798	362	\$ 348	\$ 5,054	0.0%	

		Basic Education					Free and Reduced Lunch				
		Basic Ed WSF	Floor plan Exception Funds	General ed (sum)	Projected Enrollment	General ed per pupil	F&R Lunch WSF	F&R Lunch Enrollment	F&R Lunch per pupil	Total per pupil	Percent White
McGogney Elementary School	8	\$ 1,752,618	\$ 71,703	\$ 1,824,321	386	\$ 4,726	\$ 126,574	331	\$ 328	\$ 5,054	0.5%
Slowe Elementary School	5	\$ 1,729,686	\$ 83,810	\$ 1,813,496	383	\$ 4,735	\$ 121,698	317	\$ 318	\$ 5,053	0.0%
Turner Elementary School	8	\$ 2,143,386	\$ 108,038	\$ 2,251,424	478	\$ 4,710	\$ 161,158	418	\$ 337	\$ 5,047	0.0%
Truesdell Elementary School	4	\$ 1,722,378	\$ 94,726	\$ 1,817,104	384	\$ 4,732	\$ 118,453	308	\$ 308	\$ 5,041	0.0%
C.W. Harris Elementary School	7	\$ 2,081,520	\$ 115,777	\$ 2,197,297	463	\$ 4,746	\$ 134,625	348	\$ 291	\$ 5,037	0.0%
Webb Elementary School	5	\$ 2,137,926	\$ 95,456	\$ 2,233,382	473	\$ 4,722	\$ 148,488	386	\$ 314	\$ 5,036	0.0%
Walker-Jones Elementary School	2	\$ 2,141,580	\$ 113,453	\$ 2,255,033	479	\$ 4,708	\$ 156,596	405	\$ 327	\$ 5,035	0.0%
Birney Elementary School	8	\$ 2,113,356	\$ 109,200	\$ 2,222,556	470	\$ 4,729	\$ 142,350	369	\$ 303	\$ 5,032	0.0%
Rudolph Elementary School	4	\$ 2,130,366	\$ 99,407	\$ 2,229,773	472	\$ 4,724	\$ 142,633	371	\$ 302	\$ 5,026	0.0%
Garfield Elementary School	8	\$ 2,108,358	\$ 128,632	\$ 2,236,990	474	\$ 4,719	\$ 143,890	373	\$ 304	\$ 5,023	0.0%
Bancroft Elementary School	1	\$ 2,216,592	\$ 70,918	\$ 2,287,510	488	\$ 4,688	\$ 162,191	422	\$ 332	\$ 5,020	2.0%
Savoy Elementary School	8	\$ 1,800,078	\$ 71,154	\$ 1,871,232	399	\$ 4,690	\$ 124,928	324	\$ 313	\$ 5,003	0.0%
Miner Elementary School	6	\$ 2,279,676	\$ 69,178	\$ 2,348,854	505	\$ 4,651	\$ 171,645	447	\$ 340	\$ 4,991	0.0%
Beers Elementary School	7	\$ 1,741,362	\$ 93,785	\$ 1,835,147	389	\$ 4,718	\$ 94,690	248	\$ 243	\$ 4,961	0.0%
Stanton Elementary School	8	\$ 2,383,878	\$ 51,581	\$ 2,435,459	529	\$ 4,604	\$ 178,681	465	\$ 338	\$ 4,942	0.0%
Randle-Highlands Elementary School	7	\$ 2,234,022	\$ 93,181	\$ 2,327,203	499	\$ 4,664	\$ 136,673	355	\$ 274	\$ 4,938	0.0%
Malcolm X Elementary School	8	\$ 2,431,968	\$ 50,401	\$ 2,482,369	542	\$ 4,580	\$ 189,302	492	\$ 349	\$ 4,929	0.0%
Langdon Elementary School	5	\$ 1,832,544	\$ 31,471	\$ 1,864,015	397	\$ 4,695	\$ 91,214	239	\$ 230	\$ 4,925	0.2%
Tubman Elementary School	1	\$ 2,343,264	\$ 70,544	\$ 2,413,808	523	\$ 4,615	\$ 156,514	405	\$ 299	\$ 4,915	0.5%
Shepherd Elementary School	4	\$ 1,559,460	\$ 124,129	\$ 1,683,589	347	\$ 4,852	\$ 21,288	55	\$ 61	\$ 4,913	3.7%
Watkins Elementary School	6	\$ 2,269,008	\$ 79,846	\$ 2,348,854	505	\$ 4,651	\$ 60,841	161	\$ 120	\$ 4,772	22.0%
Eaton Elementary School	3	\$ 1,744,008	\$ 94,747	\$ 1,838,755	390	\$ 4,715	\$ 14,779	38	\$ 38	\$ 4,753	30.2%
Murch Elementary School	3	\$ 2,184,924	\$ 102,586	\$ 2,287,510	488	\$ 4,688	\$ 31,425	81	\$ 64	\$ 4,752	46.1%
Janney Elementary School	3	\$ 2,151,660	\$ 99,764	\$ 2,251,424	478	\$ 4,710	\$ 8,611	22	\$ 18	\$ 4,728	66.6%
Lafayette Elementary School	3	\$ 2,528,862	\$ 18,461	\$ 2,547,323	560	\$ 4,549	\$ 3,272	9	\$ 6	\$ 4,555	71.1%
Pre-K - Grade 8											
Thurgood Marshall Elementary School	5	\$ 1,549,884	\$ 144,531	\$ 1,694,415	350	\$ 4,841	\$ 95,498	235	\$ 273	\$ 5,114	0.0%
Takoma Elementary School	4	\$ 1,866,606	\$ 186,350	\$ 2,052,956	423	\$ 4,853	\$ 87,403	220	\$ 207	\$ 5,060	0.9%
Merritt Elementary School	7	\$ 2,154,474	\$ 114,993	\$ 2,269,467	483	\$ 4,699	\$ 120,282	304	\$ 249	\$ 4,948	0.0%
Winston Educational Center	7	\$ 2,553,390	\$ 66,103	\$ 2,619,493	580	\$ 4,516	\$ 190,894	475	\$ 329	\$ 4,845	0.0%
P.R. Harris Educational Center	8	\$ 3,759,588	\$ -	\$ 3,759,588	865	\$ 4,346	\$ 303,990	745	\$ 351	\$ 4,698	0.0%
Fletcher-Johnson Educational Center	7	\$ 2,707,068	\$ -	\$ 2,707,068	629	\$ 4,304	\$ 224,588	539	\$ 357	\$ 4,661	0.0%
Middle/Junior High											
R.H. Terrell Junior High School	2	\$ 1,155,000	\$ 161,041	\$ 1,316,041	275	\$ 4,786	\$ 97,710	224	\$ 355	\$ 5,141	1.1%
Eliot Junior High School	6	\$ 1,325,520	\$ 112,563	\$ 1,438,083	315	\$ 4,565	\$ 110,018	253	\$ 349	\$ 4,915	0.0%
Garnet-Patterson Middle School	1	\$ 1,391,712	\$ 95,187	\$ 1,486,899	331	\$ 4,492	\$ 129,847	298	\$ 392	\$ 4,884	1.2%

		Basic Education					Free and Reduced Lunch					Total per pupil	Percent White
		Basic Ed WSF	Floor plan Exception Funds	General ed (sum)	Projected Enrollment	General ed per pupil	F&R Lunch WSF	F&R Lunch Enrollment	F&R Lunch per pupil				
Kelly Miller Middle School	7	\$ 1,749,720	\$ 91,637	\$ 1,841,357	416	\$ 4,426	\$ 162,055	372	\$ 390	\$ 4,816	#N/A		
Lincoln Middle School	5	\$ 1,449,000	\$ 80,614	\$ 1,529,614	345	\$ 4,434	\$ 124,189	284	\$ 360	\$ 4,794	0.3%		
Francis Junior High School	2	\$ 1,737,120	\$ 95,084	\$ 1,832,204	413	\$ 4,436	\$ 130,895	301	\$ 317	\$ 4,753	2.3%		
Sousa Middle School	7	\$ 1,609,440	\$ 33,063	\$ 1,642,503	382	\$ 4,300	\$ 137,445	317	\$ 360	\$ 4,660	0.0%		
Kramer Middle School	6	\$ 1,942,080	\$ 33,523	\$ 1,975,603	460	\$ 4,295	\$ 152,558	353	\$ 332	\$ 4,626	0.0%		
Stuart-Hobson Middle School	6	\$ 1,725,990	\$ 97,061	\$ 1,823,051	410	\$ 4,446	\$ 72,400	171	\$ 177	\$ 4,623	3.4%		
Ron Brown Middle School	7	\$ 1,622,040	\$ 29,616	\$ 1,651,656	385	\$ 4,290	\$ 124,062	286	\$ 322	\$ 4,612	0.0%		
Johnson Junior High School	8	\$ 2,971,332	\$ -	\$ 2,971,332	705	\$ 4,215	\$ 242,011	558	\$ 343	\$ 4,558	0.0%		
Shaw Junior High School	2	\$ 2,016,000	\$ 20,624	\$ 2,036,624	480	\$ 4,243	\$ 139,355	319	\$ 290	\$ 4,533	0.0%		
Hart Middle School	8	\$ 2,551,920	\$ -	\$ 2,551,920	607	\$ 4,204	\$ 192,702	442	\$ 317	\$ 4,522	0.2%		
MacFarland Middle School	4	\$ 2,840,040	\$ -	\$ 2,840,040	675	\$ 4,207	\$ 207,238	476	\$ 307	\$ 4,514	0.0%		
Browne Junior High School	5	\$ 2,190,720	\$ -	\$ 2,190,720	521	\$ 4,205	\$ 156,442	359	\$ 300	\$ 4,505	0.0%		
Backus Middle School	5	\$ 2,079,000	\$ 3,390	\$ 2,082,390	495	\$ 4,207	\$ 140,101	321	\$ 283	\$ 4,490	0.0%		
Hardy Middle School	2	\$ 1,787,520	\$ 81,297	\$ 1,868,817	425	\$ 4,397	\$ 34,149	78	\$ 80	\$ 4,478	26.8%		
Jefferson Junior High School	2	\$ 3,192,000	\$ -	\$ 3,192,000	760	\$ 4,200	\$ 209,220	479	\$ 275	\$ 4,475	0.1%		
Hine Junior High School	6	\$ 2,562,000	\$ -	\$ 2,562,000	610	\$ 4,200	\$ 167,733	384	\$ 275	\$ 4,475	0.0%		
Deal Junior High School	3	\$ 3,832,920	\$ -	\$ 3,832,920	912	\$ 4,203	\$ 118,850	272	\$ 130	\$ 4,333	29.0%		
Senior High													
Ellington School of the Arts	2	\$ 1,911,000	\$ 2,735,256	\$ 4,646,256	455	\$ 10,212	\$ 64,326	147	\$ 141	\$ 10,353	11.8%		
McKinley Senior High School		\$ 1,683,780	\$ 2,364,746	\$ 4,048,526	400	\$ 10,121	\$ 88,657	204	\$ 222	\$ 10,343	#N/A		
School Without Walls	2	\$ 1,423,800	\$ 732,460	\$ 2,156,260	339	\$ 6,361	\$ 21,088	48	\$ 62	\$ 6,423	21.8%		
Banneker Senior High School	1	\$ 1,722,000	\$ 646,844	\$ 2,368,844	410	\$ 5,778	\$ 64,311	147	\$ 157	\$ 5,935	2.7%		
Luke Moore Academy	5	\$ 1,051,260	\$ 384,118	\$ 1,435,378	250	\$ 5,742	\$ 37,815	87	\$ 151	\$ 5,893	0.0%		
M.M. Washington Senior High School	5	\$ 1,176,000	\$ 362,008	\$ 1,538,008	280	\$ 5,493	\$ 61,583	141	\$ 220	\$ 5,713	0.0%		
Spingarn Senior High School	5	\$ 2,386,440	\$ 228,511	\$ 2,614,951	567	\$ 4,612	\$ 161,381	371	\$ 285	\$ 4,897	0.0%		
Anacostia Senior High School	6	\$ 2,542,260	\$ 192,425	\$ 2,734,685	602	\$ 4,543	\$ 192,519	446	\$ 320	\$ 4,862	0.0%		
Bell Senior High School	1	\$ 2,956,800	\$ 221,945	\$ 3,178,745	704	\$ 4,515	\$ 227,611	521	\$ 323	\$ 4,839	0.4%		
Ballou Senior High School	8	\$ 3,803,520	\$ 157,963	\$ 3,961,483	905	\$ 4,377	\$ 324,245	743	\$ 358	\$ 4,736	0.0%		
Cardozo Senior High School	1	\$ 3,360,000	\$ 147,160	\$ 3,507,160	800	\$ 4,384	\$ 232,211	532	\$ 290	\$ 4,674	0.5%		
Coolidge Senior High School	4	\$ 3,115,560	\$ 186,341	\$ 3,301,901	740	\$ 4,462	\$ 153,123	352	\$ 207	\$ 4,669	0.0%		
Woodson Senior High School	7	\$ 2,924,040	\$ 128,797	\$ 3,052,837	695	\$ 4,393	\$ 180,875	416	\$ 260	\$ 4,653	0.1%		
Roosevelt Senior High School	4	\$ 3,240,972	\$ 166,979	\$ 3,407,951	771	\$ 4,420	\$ 142,904	328	\$ 185	\$ 4,606	0.0%		
Dunbar Senior High School	5	\$ 3,927,000	\$ 137,113	\$ 4,064,113	935	\$ 4,347	\$ 194,313	445	\$ 208	\$ 4,554	0.1%		
Eastern Senior High School	6	\$ 3,729,600	\$ 78,607	\$ 3,808,207	888	\$ 4,289	\$ 224,699	514	\$ 253	\$ 4,542	0.1%		
Wilson Senior High School	3	\$ 6,093,024	\$ -	\$ 6,093,024	1,450	\$ 4,202	\$ 191,356	439	\$ 132	\$ 4,334	21.4%		
Business and Finance @ Woodson	7	\$ 882,000	\$ -	\$ 882,000	210	\$ 4,200	\$ 50,562	116	\$ 241	\$ 4,441	0.0%		
Pre-Engineering @ Dunbar	5	\$ 630,000	\$ -	\$ 630,000	150	\$ 4,200	\$ 29,022	66	\$ 193	\$ 4,393	0.0%		

		Basic Education					Free and Reduced Lunch				Total per pupil	Percent White
		Basic Ed WSF	Floor plan Exception Funds	General ed (sum)	Projected Enrollment	General ed per pupil	F&R Lunch WSF	F&R Lunch Enrollment	F&R Lunch per pupil			
Exceptional grade structure												
Peabody Elementary School pre-K/K	6	\$ 769,692	\$ 351,540	\$ 1,121,232	154	\$ 7,281	\$ 23,970	63	\$ 156	\$ 7,436	9.7%	
Emilia Reggio @ Peabody pre-K/K	6	\$ 439,824	\$ 23,108	\$ 462,932	88	\$ 5,261	\$ 2,739	7	\$ 31	\$ 5,292	61.4%	
Hearst Elementary School pre-K-3	3	\$ 737,730	\$ 345,834	\$ 1,083,564	157	\$ 6,902	\$ 10,271	27	\$ 65	\$ 6,967	33.1%	
Wilkinson Elementary School pre-K-3	8	\$ 2,355,444	\$ 277,035	\$ 2,632,479	507	\$ 5,192	\$ 137,896	365	\$ 272	\$ 5,464	0.0%	
Moten Elementary School 4-6	8	\$ 1,703,394	\$ 142,578	\$ 1,845,972	392	\$ 4,709	\$ 144,184	365	\$ 368	\$ 5,077	0.0%	
Oyster Elementary School (model biling	1	\$ 1,746,318	\$ 764,772	\$ 2,511,090	390	\$ 6,439	\$ 44,266	115	\$ 114	\$ 6,552	29.9%	
STAY and Special Education Schools												
STAY (Consolidated)	8	\$ 3,383,520	\$ -	\$ 3,383,520	760	\$ 4,452	\$ -	0	\$ -	\$ 4,452	0.3%	
Mamie D. Lee	4	\$ 690,060	\$ -	\$ 690,060	155	\$ 4,452	\$ 47,580	126	\$ 307	\$ 4,759	0.6%	
Prospect	6	\$ 578,760	\$ -	\$ 578,760	130	\$ 4,452	\$ 43,856	116	\$ 337	\$ 4,789	0.0%	
Taft	5	\$ 534,240	\$ -	\$ 534,240	120	\$ 4,452	\$ 38,304	101	\$ 319	\$ 4,771	0.0%	
Browne Center	5	\$ 356,160	\$ -	\$ 356,160	80	\$ 4,452	\$ 27,340	72	\$ 342	\$ 4,794	0.0%	
Moten Center	8	\$ 534,240	\$ -	\$ 534,240	120	\$ 4,452	\$ 42,525	113	\$ 354	\$ 4,806	0.0%	
Hamilton Center	5	\$ 378,420	\$ -	\$ 378,420	85	\$ 4,452	\$ 29,209	77	\$ 344	\$ 4,796	0.0%	
Washington Center	5	\$ 356,160	\$ -	\$ 356,160	80	\$ 4,452	\$ 18,144	48	\$ 227	\$ 4,679	0.0%	
Spingarn Center	5	\$ 222,600	\$ -	\$ 222,600	50	\$ 4,452	\$ 16,100	43	\$ 322	\$ 4,774	0.0%	
Sharpe-Health	4	\$ 914,928	\$ -	\$ 914,928	208	\$ 4,399	\$ 68,522	176	\$ 329	\$ 4,728	1.5%	

COURSE OFFERINGS AT DCPS COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS THEN AND NOW								
	Central 1948	Armstr 1948	McKinley 1955	Anacos 2005	Ballou 2005	Coolidge 2005	Eastern 2005	Spingarn 2005
Art								
Art (general)	1.75	1.25	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Art (specialized)	5	6.5		4	1	2	2	
English								
English 1-4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Writing	1			2.5		0.5	0.5	
African-American literature								1
SAT preparation				0.5	0.5		0.5	
Speech/grammar	1	1.5	1	0.5			0.5	
Journalism	1	1	x		2	1	1	1
Yearbook			x	1			0.5	0.5
Theater/radio	0.5			3		1		
Social Studies								
U.S. history	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
World history	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Government/civics	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
D.C. history				0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
African-American history					0.5			
Modern European history	1		1					
Ancient/medieval history	0.5							
Latin American history		0.5	x					
Geography		1	x	1.5	1	1	1.5	0.5
Law	1		x	1.5		1	1	
Sociology	1	0.5	x					
Economics		0.5			0.5			
Other social studies					1			
Foreign Language								
French	4	4	x	2	2		2	2
Spanish	3.5	3	x	2	3	4	3	2
Latin	4		x					
German	1	3						
Math								
General math	1	1	x		x			
Algebra	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Plane geometry	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Solid geometry	0.5	0.5	0.5					
Advanced algebra	1	1.5	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Trigonometry	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Applied math	0.5	1	x					
Analytics			x					
Calculus					1			
Surveying		0.5						
Computer science								
				2	3	1		3
Science								
General science	1	1	1					
Biology	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
Chemistry	1	3	1	1	2	1	2	1
Earth/physical science				2	1	1	1	1
Physics	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1
Aviation	1		x					
Radio			x					

	Central 1948	Armstr 1948	McKinley 1955	Anacos 2005	Ballou 2005	Coolidge 2005	Eastern 2005	Spingarn 2005
Elec laboratory			x					
Anatomy & physiology					1	1	1	
Robotics					1			
Zoology					0.5			
Botany					0.5			
Applied science/other		4.5						
Music theory								
General music		1					0.5	0.5
Chorus	x	x	x					
Choir	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Orchestra	x		x					
Band	x	x	x		x	x		x
Marching band					x		x	
Instrumental music-specialized	x	x	1		1	1		
History/appreciation of music	1	1		0.5	0.5	0.5		
Harmony	1	2						
Music theory						1		
Industrial arts								
Industrial arts			x					
Architectural drawing		3	x					
Engineering drawing			0.5					
Mechanical drawing	3	1	0.5					
Cabinet shop			0.5					
Electrical shop		3	0.5					4
Machine shop	2	3	0.5					
Print shop	3	3	0.5		5			
Woodshop/carpentry	1.5	3	x					4
Pattern shop			x					
Forging/welding			x					
Drafting shop		0.5	x					
Principles of engineering					1			
Home economics								
Home economics unspecified		3						
Foods	1	0.5	x		2		1	2
Clothing	1		x					
Millinery		1						
Home living/family living			x				0.5	
Child study/child care	0.5	0.5	x				1.5	2
Home management	0.5		x				0.5	
Home nursing	0.5							
Crafts/special projects		0.5	x				0.5	
Dynamics of relationships							1	
Business								
General business	1	1	x					
Typing/keyboarding	1.5	1	1	0.5			0.5	0.5
Business math	1		x			1		
Bookkeeping/accounting	2	1.5	x		2	1		2
Shorthand	2		x					
Transcription			x					
Business communication					0.5	0.5		
Office machines			x					
Computer applications				0.5			1	1
Management information				0.5				

	Central 1948	Armstr 1948	McKinley 1955	Anacos 2005	Ballou 2005	Coolidge 2005	Eastern 2005	Spingarn 2005
Banking	2		x		1	0.5		
Distributive education/marketing			x			1		
Advertising			x					
Salesmanship			x					
Merchandising			x					
Entrepreneurship/bus prin				0.5	2			
Career orientation					0.5	1.5	0.5	
Other vocational								
TV/radio production				0.5	2			
Auto shop/mechanics etc.		3			4			
Auto & sign painting		3						4
Cosmetology/barbering					3			7
Shoe/leather		3						4
Graphic arts		1			2			
Floriculture							1	
Health careers							1	

Sources: 1948: George D. Strayer, *The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia*, Government Printing Office (1949), pp. 570-625; 1955: McKinley High School, "Guidance in Program Planning: A Statement of General Requirements," copy on file with the authors; 2005: derived from printouts of DCPS master schedules as of January 2005.

Key: Numbers = years of credit available. X = present but years of credit unknown

Notes:

In 1948 Central and Armstrong were three year programs; figures above include 9th grade program for junior high schools, as reported in the Strayer Report.

Advanced algebra and trigonometry also taught today as Pre-Calculus

Vocational offerings at Ballou and Spingarn are remains of vprograms at closed vocational schools and are more appropriately compared with specialized vocational schools fifty years ago not shown here.

Includes all employees and vacant positions funded by Senior High School WSF as of November 13, 2004																										
SCH CLASS	SH																									
Sum of FTE	SCHOOL/OFFICE																									
		Ballou	Ballou	Banne											Dunbar	Roose			Spin			Wood	Grand			
JOB TITLE	Anacostia	IT	Ballou	STAY	IB	Banneker	Bell	Cardozo	Coolidge	Dunbar	Eastern	Ellington	Moore	McKinley	Phelps	Pre-Eng	Roosevelt	STAY	SWW	Spingarn	STAY	Washing- ton	Wilson	B&F	Woodson	Total
ADMINISTRATIVE AIDE		1.00	4.00	1.00		1.00	3.00		2.00	1.00						1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	5.00	1.00		25.00
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	1.00							1.00		1.00	1.60		1.00	1.00	1.00					1.00			1.00		1.00	10.60
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER							2.00						1.00										1.00			4.00
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL	1.00		3.00			1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	2.00			2.00		1.00	3.00		2.00	4.00		2.00	35.00
ATTENDANCE AIDE						1.00																				1.00
ATTENDANCE COUNSELOR	1.00		1.00				1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00								1.00	2.00	0.36	1.00	1.00		1.00	15.36
BUSINESS MANAGER	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00						1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	15.50
CLERK,WAE																		0.40								0.40
CLERK/DATA ENTRY CLERK	2.00		4.00	3.00			2.00	3.00	1.24	4.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	3.00			3.00	2.00	1.00	2.50	0.82		1.50		1.00	38.06
COMPUTER LAB COORDINATOR	1.00	1.00		1.00			1.00	2.00	0.88	1.00	1.00							1.00		1.00			2.00			12.88
COMPUTER LABORATORY AIDE																									1.00	1.00
COMPUTER TECHNICIAN COORDINATOR																						1.00				1.00
COORDINATOR, ACADEMY PROG				1.00																						1.00
COORDINATOR, SCHOOLS TO CAREER																			1.00							1.00
COORDINATOR,9TH GRADE ACADEMY							1.00																			1.00
COORDINATOR,ACADEMY											1.00						1.00							1.00		3.00
COORDINATOR,ART OF COMMUNICATION							1.00																			1.00
COORDINATOR,CAREER AND TECH																				1.00						1.00
COORDINATOR_JOB SITE																						1.00				1.00
COORDINATOR,SCHOOL TO CAREER							2.00	1.00		1.00													1.00			5.00
COORDINATOR,SPECIAL EDUCATION			1.00					1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00	1.00					1.00					1.00	8.00
COORDINATOR,SPECIAL EDUCATION (SETS)										1.00																1.00
COORDINATOR,SPECIAL EDUCATION&MATH,SCIENC E&BUSINESS							1.00																			1.00
COUNSELOR	2.00		3.00	2.02		3.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.40	1.80	3.00	0.72			5.00	1.00	2.00	44.94
COUNSELOR WAE																	0.40									0.40
COUNSELOR,BILINGUAL CTE COORDINATOR							3.00	1.00								1.00							1.00			6.00
CUSTODIAN	6.00		9.00	1.00		2.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	9.00	9.00		2.00	11.00			5.00	1.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	7.00		7.00	91.00
CUSTODIAN FOREMAN	3.00		3.00	1.00		1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	2.00			1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00		1.00	2.00		1.00	30.00
DEAN OF STUDENTS	1.00																									1.00
DIRECTOR,RADIO/BROADC AST		1.00																								1.00
EDP ADVISOR																						0.58				0.58
EDUCATION THERAPY ASSISTANT							1.00																			1.00
EDUCATIONAL AIDE				0.75																						0.75
EDUCATIONAL AIDE,70HR,BILINGUAL							1.42	0.71								0.71							0.71			3.55
EDUCATIONAL AIDE,70HR,GENERAL EDUCATION				0.71				0.71	1.42	1.42		0.71													0.71	5.68
EDUCATIONAL AIDE,70HR,SPECIAL EDUCATION	1.32	0.71	4.26					4.97	0.71	1.42	2.84					2.84			1.00	4.97			4.26		2.84	31.14
GUIDANCE CLERK						1.00				1.00	1.00					1.00		1.00							1.00	7.00
INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITATOR			1.00													2.00										3.00
ISS COORDINATOR										1.00																1.00
JOB COACH							1.00																			1.00
LIBRARIAN/MEDIA SPECIALIST	1.00		1.00	0.21		1.00			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00					1.00		0.21	1.00	2.00			13.42

LIBRARY AIDE	1.00		2.00			1.00						1.00								1.00	6.00					
PARENT COORDINATOR	1.50					1.00					0.50										3.50					
PRINCIPAL				1.00															1.00		2.00					
PRINCIPAL,SHS	1.00		1.00			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	16.00					
PRINCIPAL,SHS (ACTING)															1.00						1.00					
PROGRAM COORDINATOR/COUNSELOR																					1.00	1.00				
PROJECT MANAGER (EG)											1.80											1.80				
PSYCHOLOGIST,SCHOOL	1.00		1.00				1.00							1.00								4.00				
REGISTRAR	1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00				1.00					1.00		1.00	12.00				
SCHOOL TO CAREER FACILITATOR				1.00																		1.00				
SOCIAL WORKER,SCHOOL TEACHER	1.00			0.17			2.00													1.00		3.17				
TEACHER,ACCOUNTING&DATA PROCESSING							1.00															1.00				
TEACHER,ART	2.00		2.00	0.29			2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.20	1.00	1.00		1.00	4.00		23.49				
TEACHER,ART/MUSIC																					0.50	0.50				
TEACHER,AUTO BODY																1.00						1.00				
TEACHER,AUTO MECHANICS			2.00	0.15																		2.15				
TEACHER,BARBERING				1.00										1.00			1.00					4.00				
TEACHER,BROADCAST TECHNOLOGY													1.00									1.00				
TEACHER,BUSINESS	2.00		3.00				1.00		4.00	2.00	2.00				2.00		1.00	0.29		1.00	3.00	1.00	22.29			
TEACHER,CHILD CARE									1.00														1.00			
TEACHER,COMMUNICATIONS															1.00								1.00			
TEACHER,COMPUTER REPAIR												1.00				1.00							2.00			
TEACHER,COMPUTER SCIENCE	2.00	6.00			1.00	1.00				1.00					2.00					1.00		1.00	16.00			
TEACHER,COSMETOLOGY				1.00																			3.00			
TEACHER,CSI													1.00										1.00			
TEACHER,CULINARY ARTS			1.00												1.00					1.00			3.00			
TEACHER,DANCE/PE																0.80							0.80			
TEACHER,DENTAL ASSISTANT																				0.50			0.50			
TEACHER,EDP				2.32											2.40								4.72			
TEACHER,ELECTRICAL WIRING																					1.00		1.00			
TEACHER,ENGLISH	6.00	1.00	10.00	1.45	1.00	4.00		6.00	8.00	8.00	9.00	2.00	2.00		1.00	6.00	2.00	4.50	4.00	0.73	3.00	11.00	2.00	9.00	101.68	
TEACHER,ESL/BILINGUAL							27.00	10.00	3.00	0.50						8.00	1.78					9.50			59.78	
TEACHER,FINEARTS,DANCE												1.00													1.00	
TEACHER,FINEARTS,PAINT,VI												2.00													2.00	
TEACHER,FINEARTS,THEATER	1.00											2.00													3.00	
TEACHER,FLORICULTURE											1.00														1.00	
TEACHER,FOREIGN LANGUAGE			3.00																						3.00	
TEACHER,FRENCH	1.00		1.00			1.00		2.00						1.00	0.20	1.00	1.00				1.00		1.00		11.20	
TEACHER,FRENCH/VIETNAMESE							1.00																		1.00	
TEACHER,GERMAN						1.00																1.00			2.00	
TEACHER,GRAPHIC ARTS										1.00	1.00												1.00		3.00	
TEACHER,HEALTH&PE	2.00		3.00	0.29		2.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	5.00		1.00	2.00		3.00	1.00	2.00	0.29		4.00		4.00	38.58		
TEACHER,HOME ECONOMICS								1.00			2.00							1.00				1.00		1.00	6.00	
TEACHER,INTERVENTION																		0.29							0.29	
TEACHER,LANGUAGE ARTS																									5.00	
TEACHER,LATIN																									5.00	
TEACHER,MARKETING															1.00							1.00			1.00	
TEACHER,MATHEMATICS	6.00		8.00	1.16	1.00	4.00	8.00	7.00	5.00	8.00	9.00	4.00	2.00	4.00		2.00	5.00	1.20	4.00	3.00	0.58	2.00	11.00	2.00	4.00	101.94
TEACHER,MOUS				1.15																					1.15	
TEACHER,MUSIC			2.00	0.29		0.50	1.50	1.00	2.00	3.00						1.00	0.20	1.00	1.00			0.50			13.99	
TEACHER,MUSIC,INSTRUMENTAL																								1.00	4.00	
TEACHER,MUSIC,VOCAL										1.00	2.00		1.00											1.00	5.00	


TEACHER,NURSING ASSISTANT																					1.00					1.00
TEACHER,PRINTING			1.00																							1.00
TEACHER,RADIO TELEVISION		1.00																								1.00
TEACHER,READING	1.00			0.58				2.00				1.00			1.00	0.40									1.00	6.98
TEACHER,SCIENCE	5.00		8.00	1.73			5.00	4.00	6.00			2.00	1.00	2.00		1.00	4.00	1.20			2.00	0.58	2.00	8.00	1.00	54.51
TEACHER,SCIENCE,BIOLOGY						2.00				2.00	1.00			2.00					1.00	1.00					1.00	10.00
TEACHER,SCIENCE,BIOLOGY/CHEMISTRY																				1.00						1.00
TEACHER,SCIENCE,CHEMISTRY					1.00					1.00	2.00			1.00					1.00						2.00	8.00
TEACHER,SCIENCE,EARTH SCIENCE										1.00																1.00
TEACHER,SCIENCE,GENERAL													5.00												1.00	6.00
TEACHER,SCIENCE,MARINE										1.00																1.00
TEACHER,SCIENCE,PHYSICS					1.00														1.00					1.00	1.00	5.00
TEACHER,SENIOR HIGH														1.00		1.00								3.00	1.00	7.00
TEACHER,SH RETIRED RETURN			1.00						1.00																	2.00
TEACHER,SOCIAL STUDIES	6.00		5.00	1.16	2.00	5.00	2.00	6.00	6.00	5.00	8.00	2.00	1.00	5.00		1.00	4.00	1.20	4.00	3.00	0.44	2.00	13.00	2.00	6.00	90.80
TEACHER,SPANISH	2.00			0.44		2.00		2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	3.00			1.00	0.40	1.00	1.00	0.29	1.00	5.00	1.00	2.00	36.13
TEACHER,SPECIAL EDUCATION	8.00	1.00	23.00	0.59			3.00	12.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	1.00	1.00	1.00			6.00	0.40	1.00	13.00	0.29	4.00	11.00		12.00	120.28
TEACHER,STREET LAW CLINIC													1.00													1.00
TEACHER,TECHNOLOGY																								1.00		1.00
TEACHER,TRAVEL&TOURISM																	1.00									1.00
TEACHER,TV BROADCAST		1.00																								1.00
TEACHER,VOCATIONAL				2.00				4.00										1.00			0.60		1.00			8.60
TEACHER,WAE				1.00																						1.00
TEACHER,WAE,ART							0.19																			0.19
TEACHER,WAE,MUSIC,VOCAL							0.19																			0.19
TEACHER,WAE,NFTE INSTRUCTOR	0.34																									0.34
TEACHER,WAE,VOCAL MUSIC	0.43																									0.43
TECHNOLOGIST													1.00													1.00
THERAPEUTIC AIDE			1.00																							1.00
COMPUTER LAB COORDINATORWAE		0.92																								0.92
Grand Total	70.59	16.63	115.26	31.46	5.00	38.88	84.92	93.39	72.25	85.34	96.74	30.71	25.00	64.00	1.00	####	72.55	22.28	38.10	66.97	10.07	32.00	133.97	16.50	77.55	#####

D.C. TEACHERS SALARIES COMPARED WITH SALARIES IN SURROUNDING SUBURBS					
Annual Teacher Salaries FY 2004-2005					
School System	Minimum	Difference	Maximum	Difference	
Arlington	\$ 37,747		\$ 87,061		
Montgomery	\$ 39,457		\$ 86,169		
Fairfax	\$ 36,887		\$ 83,276		
Alexandria	\$ 34,866		\$ 81,531		
Prince George's	\$ 37,004		\$ 77,645		
DC	\$ 38,325		\$ 75,366		
Average (excluding DC)	\$ 37,192	\$ (1,133)	\$ 83,136	\$ 7,770	
Percent more (- = less) than DC		-3.0%		10.3%	
Highest	\$ 39,457	\$ 1,132	\$ 87,061	\$ 11,695	
Percent more than DC		3.0%		15.5%	


	1955	Adj'd	2004	
BA	4000	11	38,434	354329%
BA	6000	16	60,943	374567%
MA	4500	12	40,996	335949%
MA	7500	20	71,116	349667%
MA+30	5000	14	42,277	311794%
MA+30	8000	22	72,986	336429%
CPI	26.8		188.9	
CPI 04 base	14,1874			

*DC: 2003-2004 levels; 2004-2005 to be negotiated
 **Prince George's County: average of phased in pay increase making entering and top salaries \$36,823 and \$77,645 as of July 1, 2004 and \$37,184 and \$78,407 as of January 1, 2005.

Source: Internet survey of suburban school districts, October 2004.
 "Teacher" in DCPS includes all ET 15s and EG09s in the collective bargaining unit represented by the Washington Teachers Union (classroom teachers, librarians, guidance counselors, psychologists, social workers, therapists, etc.)



D.C. PRINCIPAL SALARIES COMPARED WITH SALARIES IN SURROUNDING SUBURBS					
Annual Principal Salaries FY 2003-2004					
School System	Minimum	Difference	Maximum	Difference	
Arlington County	\$ 81,888		\$ 137,059		
Montgomery County	\$ 84,254		\$ 120,627		
Fairfax County	\$ 62,292		\$ 118,924		
Alexandria City	\$ 69,433		\$ 115,623		
Prince George's County*	\$ 73,041		\$ 105,610		
District of Columbia	\$ 81,461		\$ 102,603		
Average (excluding DC)	\$ 74,182	\$ (7,279)	\$ 119,569	\$ 16,966	
Percent more (- = less) than DC		-8.9%		16.5%	
Highest	\$ 84,254	\$ 2,793	\$ 137,059	\$ 34,456	
Percent more than DC		3.4%		33.6%	



*2002-2003 levels; 2003-2004 to be negotiated

Appendix D

Coolidge Senior High School



Coolidge Senior High School



Stanton Elementary School



Stanton Elementary School



Appendix D
Raymond Elementary School



Raymond Elementary School



Roosevelt Senior High School



Roosevelt Senior High School

