



# Legislative Budget and Finance Committee

A JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Offices: Room 400 • Finance Building • Harrisburg • Tel: (717) 783-1600

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 8737 • Harrisburg, PA 17105-8737

Facsimile (717) 787-5487

## SENATORS

JOHN R. PIPPY

*Chairman*

GERALD J. LAVALLE

*Vice Chairman*

JAY COSTA, JR.

ROBERT M. TOMLINSON

ROBERT C. WONDERLING

JOHN N. WOZNAK

## Study of the Cost-Effectiveness of Consolidating Pennsylvania School Districts

## REPRESENTATIVES

RON RAYMOND

*Secretary*

VACANT

*Treasurer*

H. SCOTT CONKLIN

ANTHONY M. DELUCA

ROBERT W. GODSHALL

DAVID K. LEVDANSKY

T. MARK MUSTIO

Conducted Pursuant to SR 208 of 2006

## Part 2 of 2

## Profiles of Paired Districts

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PHILIP R. DURGIN

## CHIEF ANALYST

JOHN H. ROWE, JR.

June 2007

# School Evaluation Services

**STANDARD  
& POOR'S**



## **Study of the Cost-Effectiveness of Consolidating Pennsylvania School Districts**

**Part 2 of 2**

### **Profiles of Paired Districts**

Prepared for the Pennsylvania  
Legislative Budget and Finance Committee

Standard & Poor's  
School Evaluation Services  
55 Water Street • New York, NY 10041  
(212) 438-2045

June 1, 2007

Copyright © 2007 Standard & Poor's, a Division of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction and distribution of this Report is limited to non commercial purposes for the use in public policy discussions for purposes of studying the cost-effectiveness of consolidating Pennsylvania School Districts. Portions and excerpts of this Report may be disseminated provided that any such portions and excerpts accurately represent the analytical conclusions of Standard & Poor's and are attributed to Standard & Poor's. The content of this Report constitutes the opinions of Standard & Poor's based on information supplied to Standard & Poor's by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and other sources. Standard & Poor's makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to the consequences or results that may be obtained from the use of this Report and Standard & Poor's makes no warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose or use. This Report is separate and independent of any S&P Ratings Services relating to the credit worthiness of bonds or debt obligations.

060107

---

## INTRODUCTION TO PART 2

---

The Pennsylvania Legislative Budget and Finance Committee commissioned Standard & Poor's to conduct a Comprehensive Study of Consolidating Pennsylvania School Districts. The study is published in two parts. Part 1 includes Statewide Findings, while Part 2 includes Profiles of Paired Districts.

One of the central findings in Part 1 is that there is a relationship between per-pupil spending and size of enrollment across the state's 501 school systems. Districts with fewer than 500 students spend an average of \$9,674 per pupil in operating costs (in 2004 dollars). As districts get larger, their per-pupil spending tends to decrease, until it reaches an average of \$8,057 among districts with 2,500 – 2,9999 students. However, average per-pupil spending tends to go back up again as enrollments exceed 3,000 students.

Drawing from this empirically observed pattern, it appears that district consolidations that result in combine enrollments below 3,000 students would be more likely to save money than consolidations that produce districts with more than 3,000 students. Therefore, if the state wishes to reduce overall educational costs, or to re-invest cost-savings so as to expand educational services, it might reasonably focus on the potential benefits of consolidating relatively high-spending, smaller districts into lower-spending, larger districts with enrollments below 3,000 students. The underlying principle is that per-pupil spending might decrease the closer consolidated districts come to an enrollment of 2,500 – 2,999 students.

Although there are 312 districts with enrollments below 3,000 students, not all of them border another district with which they could consolidate without creating a combined enrollment above 3,000 students. Nor are all of them relatively high-spending when compared to similarly-sized districts. As a result, some consolidation scenarios would appear more likely than others to result in a net reduction in per-pupil costs for each of the districts involved (not just for one district at the expense of another).

Accordingly, Part 2 of this study focuses on a subset of 88 districts with enrollments below 3,000 students, which have the following characteristics:

- Their per-pupil spending is above the average amount spent by similarly-sized districts (and, by extension, the average amount spent by districts with 2,500 – 2,999 students).
- They border a district whose spending is also above the average for their size, with whom they could potentially consolidate without exceeding an enrollment of 3,000 students.

These 88 districts are used to create 97 hypothetical “pairings” of school systems that are profiled in Part 2. Some of the 88 districts analyzed in this study are included in more than one paring. The profiles of each pair of districts are provided for further analysis by local and state policymakers. However, Standard & Poor's analysis of these districts does not constitute a recommendation that they be consolidated. Their data are analyzed for modeling purposes only.

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

---

The districts listed in this table of contents include the 88 school systems used to create 97 sets of paired districts. A three-page data profile has been prepared for each pair of districts. Each district involved in a pairing is listed in alphabetical order, along with the page number for each profile in which it is included. Some school districts are included in more than one pairing.

<u>School District Name</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Allegheny Valley School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Riverview School District	11
Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Cranberry Area School District	14
<b>Paired with</b> Karns City Area School District	17
<b>Paired with</b> Keystone School District	20
Austin Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Galeton Area School District	23
<b>Paired with</b> Smethport Area School District	26
Avonworth School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Cornell School District	80
<b>Paired with</b> Northgate School District	29
Benton Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> East Lycoming School District	32
<b>Paired with</b> Millville Area School District	185
<b>Paired with</b> Northwest Area School District	35
<b>Paired with</b> Sullivan County School District	38
Berlin Brothersvalley School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Meyersdale Area School District	41
<b>Paired with</b> Rockwood Area School District	251
<b>Paired with</b> Shade-Central City School District	260
Bethlehem-Center School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Jefferson-Morgan School District	146
Blacklick Valley School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Central Cambria School District	44
<b>Paired with</b> Northern Cambria School District	47
<b>Paired with</b> Penns Manor Area School District	50
<b>Paired with</b> United School District	53

Blue Ridge School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Mountain View School District	56
Brookville Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Clarion-Limestone Area School District	65
<b>Paired with</b> Forest Area School District	104
<b>Paired with</b> North Clarion County School District	197
<b>Paired with</b> Ridgway Area School District	248
Brownsville Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Jefferson-Morgan School District	149
Cambria Heights School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Glendale School District	122
<b>Paired with</b> Harmony Area School District	131
<b>Paired with</b> Northern Cambria School District	224
Canton Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Sullivan County School District	275
Carmichaels Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Jefferson-Morgan School District	152
<b>Paired with</b> Southeastern Greene School District	266
Central Cambria School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Blacklick Valley School District	44
<b>Paired with</b> Conemaugh Valley School District	74
<b>Paired with</b> Ferndale Area School District	92
Central Fulton School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Forbes Road School District	98
Central Greene School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Southeastern Greene School District	269
Chartiers-Houston School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Fort Cherry School District	59
Clarion Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Keystone School District	62
<b>Paired with</b> North Clarion County School District	200
Clarion-Limestone Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Brookville Area School District	65

Conemaugh Township Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> North Star School District	68
<b>Paired with</b> Richland School District	71
<b>Paired with</b> Shade-Central City School District	263
Conemaugh Valley School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Central Cambria School District	74
<b>Paired with</b> Ferndale Area School District	95
<b>Paired with</b> Richland School District	77
Cornell School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Avonworth School District	80
<b>Paired with</b> Northgate School District	83
<b>Paired with</b> Quaker Valley School District	86
<b>Paired with</b> Sto-Rox School District	89
Cranberry Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District	14
<b>Paired with</b> Forest Area School District	107
<b>Paired with</b> Keystone School District	161
<b>Paired with</b> North Clarion County School District	203
<b>Paired with</b> Valley Grove School District	290
East Lycoming School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Benton Area School District	32
<b>Paired with</b> Millville Area School District	188
<b>Paired with</b> Muncy School District	194
<b>Paired with</b> Sullivan County School District	278
Ferndale Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Central Cambria School District	92
<b>Paired with</b> Conemaugh Valley School District	95
Forbes Road School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Central Fulton School District	98
<b>Paired with</b> Tussey Mountain School District	101
Forest Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Brookville Area School District	104
<b>Paired with</b> Cranberry Area School District	107
<b>Paired with</b> North Clarion County School District	206
<b>Paired with</b> Ridgway Area School District	110
Fort Cherry School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Chartiers-Houston School District	59

Freeport Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Leechburg Area School District	167
Galeton Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Austin Area School District	23
<b>Paired with</b> Northern Potter School District	113
<b>Paired with</b> Southern Tioga School District	116
<b>Paired with</b> Wellsboro Area School District	119
Glendale School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Cambria Heights School District	122
<b>Paired with</b> Harmony Area School District	134
<b>Paired with</b> Penn Cambria School District	125
Halifax Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Millersburg Area School District	179
<b>Paired with</b> Upper Dauphin Area School District	128
Harmony Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Cambria Heights School District	131
<b>Paired with</b> Glendale School District	134
<b>Paired with</b> Northern Cambria School District	137
<b>Paired with</b> Purchase Line School District	140
Homer-Center School District	
<b>Paired with</b> United School District	143
Jefferson-Morgan School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Bethlehem-Center School District	146
<b>Paired with</b> Brownsville Area School District	149
<b>Paired with</b> Carmichaels Area School District	152
<b>Paired with</b> Southeastern Greene School District	272
Jim Thorpe Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Weatherly Area School District	293
Johnsonburg Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Ridgway Area School District	155
<b>Paired with</b> Smethport Area School District	158
Karns City Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District	17



Keystone School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District	20
<b>Paired with</b> Clarion Area School District	62
<b>Paired with</b> Cranberry Area School District	161
<b>Paired with</b> North Clarion County School District	209
Lackawanna Trail School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Mountain View School District	164
Leechburg Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Freeport Area School District	167
Line Mountain School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Millersburg Area School District	182
<b>Paired with</b> Upper Dauphin Area School District	170
Marion Center Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Penns Manor Area School District	227
<b>Paired with</b> Purchase Line School District	242
Meyersdale Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Berlin Brothersvalley School District	41
<b>Paired with</b> Salisbury-Elk Lick School District	254
Midland Borough School District	
<b>Paired with</b> South Side Area School District	173
<b>Paired with</b> Western Beaver County School District	176
Millersburg Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Halifax Area School District	179
<b>Paired with</b> Line Mountain School District	182
Millville Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Benton Area School District	185
<b>Paired with</b> East Lycoming School District	188
Montgomery Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Muncy School District	191
Montrose Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Northeast Bradford School District	212
Mountain View School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Blue Ridge School District	56
<b>Paired with</b> Lackawanna Trail School District	164

Muncy School District	
<b>Paired with</b> East Lycoming School District	194
<b>Paired with</b> Montgomery Area School District	191
North Clarion County School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Brookville Area School District	197
<b>Paired with</b> Clarion Area School District	200
<b>Paired with</b> Cranberry Area School District	203
<b>Paired with</b> Forest Area School District	206
<b>Paired with</b> Keystone School District	209
North Star School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Conemaugh Township Area School District	68
Northeast Bradford School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Montrose Area School District	212
<b>Paired with</b> Sayre Area School District	215
<b>Paired with</b> Towanda Area School District	218
<b>Paired with</b> Wyalusing Area School District	221
Northern Cambria School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Blacklick Valley School District	47
<b>Paired with</b> Cambria Heights School District	224
<b>Paired with</b> Harmony Area School District	137
<b>Paired with</b> Penns Manor Area School District	230
<b>Paired with</b> Purchase Line School District	245
Northern Potter School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Galetton Area School District	113
Northgate School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Avonworth School District	29
<b>Paired with</b> Cornell School District	83
Northwest Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Benton Area School District	35
<b>Paired with</b> Sullivan County School District	281
Panther Valley School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Weatherly Area School District	296
Penn Cambria School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Glendale School District	125
<b>Paired with</b> Portage Area School District	239

Penns Manor Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Blacklick Valley School District	50
<b>Paired with</b> Marion Center Area School District	227
<b>Paired with</b> Northern Cambria School District	230
<b>Paired with</b> Purchase Line School District	233
<b>Paired with</b> United School District	236
Portage Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Penn Cambria School District	239
Purchase Line School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Harmony Area School District	140
<b>Paired with</b> Marion Center Area School District	242
<b>Paired with</b> Northern Cambria School District	245
<b>Paired with</b> Penns Manor Area School District	233
Quaker Valley School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Cornell School District	86
Richland School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Conemaugh Township Area School District	71
<b>Paired with</b> Conemaugh Valley School District	77
Ridgway Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Brookville Area School District	248
<b>Paired with</b> Forest Area School District	110
<b>Paired with</b> Johnsonburg Area School District	155
Riverview School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Allegheny Valley School District	11
Rockwood Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Berlin Brothersvalley School District	251
<b>Paired with</b> Salisbury-Elk Lick School District	257
<b>Paired with</b> Turkeyfoot Valley Area School District	287
Salisbury-Elk Lick School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Meyersdale Area School District	254
<b>Paired with</b> Rockwood Area School District	257
Sayre Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Northeast Bradford School District	215
Shade-Central City School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Berlin Brothersvalley School District	260
<b>Paired with</b> Conemaugh Township Area School District	263

Smethport Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Austin Area School District	26
<b>Paired with</b> Johnsonburg Area School District	158
South Side Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Midland Borough School District	173
<b>Paired with</b> Western Beaver County School District	299
Southeastern Greene School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Carmichaels Area School District	266
<b>Paired with</b> Central Greene School District	269
<b>Paired with</b> Jefferson-Morgan School District	272
Southern Tioga School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Galeton Area School District	116
Sto-Rox School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Cornell School District	89
Sullivan County School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Benton Area School District	38
<b>Paired with</b> Canton Area School District	275
<b>Paired with</b> East Lycoming School District	278
<b>Paired with</b> Northwest Area School District	281
<b>Paired with</b> Wyalusing Area School District	284
Towanda Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Northeast Bradford School District	218
Turkeyfoot Valley Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Rockwood Area School District	287
Tussey Mountain School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Forbes Road School District	101
United School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Blacklick Valley School District	53
<b>Paired with</b> Homer-Center School District	143
<b>Paired with</b> Penns Manor Area School District	236
Upper Dauphin Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Halifax Area School District	128
<b>Paired with</b> Line Mountain School District	170
Valley Grove School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Cranberry Area School District	290

Weatherly Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Jim Thorpe Area School District	293
<b>Paired with</b> Panther Valley School District	296
Wellsboro Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Galeton Area School District	119
Western Beaver County School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Midland Borough School District	176
<b>Paired with</b> South Side Area School District	299
Wyalusing Area School District	
<b>Paired with</b> Northeast Bradford School District	221
<b>Paired with</b> Sullivan County School District	284

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Allegheny Valley School District and Riverview School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Allegheny Valley School District</b>	<b>Riverview School District</b>
County: Allegheny	County: Allegheny
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City
District Enrollment: 1,212	District Enrollment: 1,274
Schools:	Schools:
Acmetonia Primary School (314 students in grades K-3); Colfax Upper Elementary School (292 students in grades 4-6); Springdale Jr./Sr. High School (606 students in grades 7-12)	Tenth Street Elementary School (378 students in grades K-6); Verner Elementary School (232 students in grades K-6); Riverview High School (664 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Allegheny IU 3	Intermediate Unit: Allegheny IU 3
AVTS/CTC: Forbes Road CTC	AVTS/CTC: Forbes Road CTC

Allegheny Valley School District and Riverview School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Allegheny Valley School District enrolled 1,212 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,189 per pupil. Riverview School District enrolled 1,274 students, and spent \$9,303 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,486 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$2,865 less than Allegheny Valley’s per-pupil spending, and \$979 less than Riverview’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$4,720,050 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Allegheny Valley School District and Riverview School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Allegheny Valley	Riverview	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,212	1,274	2,486	2,255	231
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	4.7	1.3
Square Miles	10	2	13	111	-98
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,189	\$9,303	10,222	\$8,324	\$1,899
Instruction	\$6,257	\$5,938	\$6,094	\$5,136	\$958
Instructional Staff Support	\$630	\$560	\$595	\$279	\$315
Pupil Support	\$489	\$243	\$363	\$370	-\$8
General Administration	\$357	\$330	\$343	\$234	\$109
School Administration	\$518	\$531	\$525	\$396	\$129
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,358	\$854	\$1,100	\$846	\$254
Student Transportation	\$767	\$293	\$524	\$510	\$14
Food Services	\$373	\$422	\$398	\$338	\$60
Other	\$438	\$132	\$281	\$184	\$97

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Allegheny Valley School District and Riverview School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Allegheny Valley	Riverview	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$8,722,000	\$17,130,000	\$25,852,000	\$24,347,120	\$1,504,880
Debt Payments (per student)	\$3,198	\$1,801	\$4,999	\$3,093	\$1,906
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,370	\$11,452	\$12,387	\$10,148	\$2,239
Local	\$10,096	\$7,891	\$8,966	\$5,489	\$3,477
State	\$2,856	\$3,013	\$2,936	\$4,221	-\$1,285
Federal	\$417	\$549	\$485	\$438	\$47
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	24.60	27.10	25.88	21.58	4.30
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$468	\$352	\$408	\$530	-\$122
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	2	5	2.5	2.5
Students Per District Administrator	404	637	497	1,037	-540
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.0	1.0
Students Per School Administrator	404	319	355	390	-35
Teachers	80	97	177	145.0	32.0
Students Per Teacher	15.2	13.1	14.0	15.7	-1.6
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	73.7%	76.2%	75.0%	70.0%	4.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	81.0%	82.0%	81.5%	72.2%	9.3 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	72.1%	84.7%	78.8%	71.9%	6.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	64.9%	81.9%	72.6%	62.1%	10.5 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	80.9%	74.5%	77.5%	70.6%	6.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	69.7%	75.5%	72.7%	71.4%	1.4 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	77.7%	71.5%	74.9%	73.9%	1.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	74.6%	69.0%	71.5%	68.0%	3.5 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	93.0%	93.0%	93.0%	87.0%	6.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	81.0%	92.3%	87.0%	80.0%	7.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	61.7%	83.2%	71.4%	68.9%	2.5 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	74.2%	76.5%	75.4%	72.3%	3.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	65.5%	70.2%	67.9%	70.1%	-2.1 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	76.8%	62.7%	70.5%	64.7%	5.8 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	65.1%	57.8%	61.1%	53.0%	8.0 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	24.1%	26.4%	25.3%	26.6%	-1.4 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.6%	15.2%	14.9%	14.4%	0.6 pts



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District and Cranberry School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District</b>	<b>Cranberry Area School District</b>
County: Clarion	County: Venango
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 989	District Enrollment: 1,483
Schools:	Schools:
Allegheny-Clarion Valley Elementary (517 students in grades K-6); Allegheny-Clarion Valley High School (472 students in grades 7-12)	Rockland Elementary School (80 students in grades K,2-5); Pinegrove Elementary School (107 students in grades K-5); Pinoak Primary Center (114 students in grades K-3); Cranberry Elementary School (356 students in grades K-6); Steffee Intermediate Center (73 students in grades 4-5); Cranberry Area Jr./Sr. High School (753 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Clarion Co Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center

Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District and Cranberry Area School District are located in different counties. However, they are served by the same Intermediate Unit, but by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District enrolled 989 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,780 per pupil. Cranberry Area School District enrolled 1,483 students, and spent \$9,003 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,472 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$456 less than Allegheny-Clarion Valley’s per-pupil spending, and \$680 less than Cranberry Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$1,458,593 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District and Cranberry School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Allegheny-Clarion Valley	Cranberry Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	989	1,483	2,472	2,255	217
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	6	8	4.7	3.3
Square Miles	125	158	283	111	172
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,780	\$9,003	8,914	\$8,324	\$590
Instruction	\$5,354	\$5,500	\$5,442	\$5,136	\$306
Instructional Staff Support	\$267	\$477	\$393	\$279	\$114
Pupil Support	\$384	\$337	\$356	\$370	-\$14
General Administration	\$240	\$322	\$289	\$234	\$55
School Administration	\$376	\$293	\$326	\$396	-\$69
Operations & Maintenance	\$860	\$869	\$865	\$846	\$19
Student Transportation	\$680	\$658	\$667	\$510	\$157
Food Services	\$470	\$376	\$413	\$338	\$75
Other	\$148	\$171	\$162	\$184	-\$22

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District and Cranberry School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Allegheny-Clarion Valley	Cranberry Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$7,345,000	\$9,923,000	\$17,268,000	\$24,347,120	-\$7,079,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$543	\$858	\$1,401	\$3,093	-\$1,692
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,143	\$10,860	\$10,973	\$10,148	\$825
Local	\$3,213	\$4,825	\$4,180	\$5,489	-\$1,308
State	\$6,770	\$5,410	\$5,954	\$4,221	\$1,733
Federal	\$1,159	\$625	\$839	\$438	\$400
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.20	16.90	17.02	21.58	-4.56
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$164	\$296	\$243	\$530	-\$287
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	495	742	618	1,037	-419
School Administrators	2	4	6	6.0	0.0
Students Per School Administrator	495	371	412	390	22
Teachers	71	102	173	145.0	28.0
Students Per Teacher	13.9	14.5	14.3	15.7	-1.4
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	66.4%	70.9%	68.9%	70.0%	-1.1 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	84.0%	70.0%	75.5%	72.2%	3.3 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	75.5%	68.9%	71.6%	71.9%	-0.3 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	48.8%	66.3%	57.9%	62.1%	-4.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	62.4%	69.4%	66.3%	70.6%	-4.3 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	64.5%	63.5%	64.0%	71.4%	-7.4 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	61.2%	65.1%	63.3%	73.9%	-10.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	63.4%	64.8%	64.2%	68.0%	-3.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	88.0%	87.0%	87.4%	87.0%	0.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	78.7%	77.8%	78.2%	80.0%	-1.9 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	56.1%	84.2%	70.7%	68.9%	1.9 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	70.2%	80.0%	75.6%	72.3%	3.3 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	78.9%	80.4%	79.7%	70.1%	9.7 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	59.2%	73.0%	66.8%	64.7%	2.1 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	53.5%	47.2%	49.7%	53.0%	-3.3 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	41.0%	34.1%	36.9%	26.6%	10.2 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.6%	19.5%	17.9%	14.4%	3.6 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District and Karns City Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District</b>	<b>Karns City Area School District</b>
County: Clarion	County: Butler
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 989	District Enrollment: 1,832
Schools:	Schools:
Allegheny-Clarion Valley Elementary (517 students in grades K-6); Allegheny-Clarion Valley High School (472 students in grades 7-12)	Bruin Elementary School (195 students in grades K-6); Chicora Elementary School (503 students in grades K-6); Sugarcreek Elementary School (264 students in grades K-6); Karns City High School (870 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Midwestern IU 4
AVTS/CTC: Clarion Co Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Butler Co AVTS

Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District and Karns City Area School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District enrolled 989 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,780 per pupil. Karns City Area School District enrolled 1,832 students, and spent \$8,257 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,821 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$723 less than Allegheny-Clarion Valley's per-pupil spending, and \$200 less than Karns City Area's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$1,080,989 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District and Karns City Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Allegheny-Clarion Valley	Karns City Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	989	1,832	2,821	2,726	95
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	4	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	125	132	257	109	148
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,780	\$8,257	8,440	\$8,057	\$383
Instruction	\$5,354	\$5,171	\$5,235	\$5,022	\$213
Instructional Staff Support	\$267	\$224	\$239	\$256	-\$17
Pupil Support	\$384	\$398	\$393	\$354	\$40
General Administration	\$240	\$246	\$244	\$210	\$33
School Administration	\$376	\$343	\$354	\$354	\$1
Operations & Maintenance	\$860	\$840	\$847	\$820	\$27
Student Transportation	\$680	\$591	\$622	\$500	\$123
Food Services	\$470	\$396	\$422	\$323	\$99
Other	\$148	\$49	\$83	\$202	-\$119

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District and Karns City Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Allegheny-Clarion Valley	Karns City Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$7,345,000	\$10,582,000	\$17,927,000	\$27,621,426	-\$9,694,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$543	\$711	\$1,254	\$1,905	-\$651
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,143	\$9,483	\$10,065	\$9,710	\$355
Local	\$3,213	\$3,088	\$3,132	\$5,542	-\$2,410
State	\$6,770	\$6,227	\$6,417	\$3,780	\$2,638
Federal	\$1,159	\$169	\$516	\$388	\$128
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.20	16.70	16.88	20.94	-4.07
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$164	\$273	\$235	\$660	-\$425
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	3	5	2.6	2.4
Students Per District Administrator	495	611	564	1,131	-566
School Administrators	2	4	6	6.4	-0.4
Students Per School Administrator	495	458	470	444	26
Teachers	71	115	186	170.0	16.0
Students Per Teacher	13.9	15.9	15.2	16.2	-1.0
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	66.4%	75.3%	72.0%	71.4%	0.6 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	84.0%	81.0%	82.0%	74.0%	8.0 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	75.5%	83.8%	81.0%	73.7%	7.3 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	48.8%	66.6%	59.0%	64.3%	-5.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	62.4%	83.7%	76.2%	70.7%	5.4 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	64.5%	70.1%	68.1%	72.0%	-3.9 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	61.2%	84.7%	74.6%	74.8%	-0.2 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	63.4%	64.6%	64.1%	69.0%	-4.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	88.0%	90.0%	89.3%	87.0%	2.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	78.7%	90.3%	86.5%	82.6%	3.9 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	56.1%	79.5%	69.6%	70.9%	-1.3 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	70.2%	85.9%	80.4%	72.3%	8.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	78.9%	61.4%	67.6%	71.1%	-3.4 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	59.2%	61.6%	60.6%	67.5%	-6.9 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	53.5%	51.7%	52.4%	54.1%	-1.7 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	41.0%	33.1%	35.9%	24.1%	11.8 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.6%	11.5%	12.9%	13.5%	-0.6 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District and Keystone School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District</b>	<b>Keystone School District</b>
County: Clarion	County: Clarion
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 989	District Enrollment: 1,225
Schools:	Schools:
Allegheny-Clarion Valley Elementary (517 students in grades K-6); Allegheny-Clarion Valley High School (472 students in grades 7-12)	Keystone Elementary School (642 students in grades K-6); Keystone Jr./Sr. High School (583 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Clarion Co Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Clarion Co Career Center

Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District and Keystone School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District enrolled 989 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,780 per pupil. Keystone School District enrolled 1,225 students, and spent \$8,850 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,214 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$456 less than Allegheny-Clarion Valley’s per-pupil spending, and \$526 less than Keystone’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$1,095,139 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District and Keystone School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Allegheny-Clarion Valley	Keystone	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	989	1,225	2,214	2,255	-41
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	4.7	-0.7
Square Miles	125	123	248	111	137
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,780	\$8,850	8,818	\$8,324	\$495
Instruction	\$5,354	\$5,283	\$5,315	\$5,136	\$179
Instructional Staff Support	\$267	\$199	\$229	\$279	-\$50
Pupil Support	\$384	\$358	\$370	\$370	-\$1
General Administration	\$240	\$238	\$239	\$234	\$5
School Administration	\$376	\$432	\$407	\$396	\$11
Operations & Maintenance	\$860	\$772	\$812	\$846	-\$35
Student Transportation	\$680	\$594	\$633	\$510	\$123
Food Services	\$470	\$384	\$423	\$338	\$85
Other	\$148	\$588	\$391	\$184	\$207



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Allegheny-Clarion Valley School District and Keystone School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Allegheny-Clarion Valley	Keystone	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$7,345,000	\$5,161,000	\$12,506,000	\$24,347,120	-\$11,841,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$543	\$709	\$1,252	\$3,093	-\$1,841
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,143	\$10,185	\$10,613	\$10,148	\$465
Local	\$3,213	\$3,003	\$3,097	\$5,489	-\$2,391
State	\$6,770	\$6,253	\$6,484	\$4,221	\$2,263
Federal	\$1,159	\$929	\$1,032	\$438	\$593
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.20	16.80	16.98	21.58	-4.60
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$164	\$188	\$177	\$530	-\$352
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	495	613	554	1,037	-484
School Administrators	2	3	5	6.0	-1.0
Students Per School Administrator	495	408	443	390	53
Teachers	71	90	161	145.0	16.0
Students Per Teacher	13.9	13.6	13.8	15.7	-1.9
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	66.4%	71.5%	69.1%	70.0%	-1.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	84.0%	74.0%	78.6%	72.2%	6.4 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	75.5%	76.2%	75.9%	71.9%	4.0 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	48.8%	63.3%	55.9%	62.1%	-6.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	62.4%	81.1%	72.7%	70.6%	2.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	64.5%	69.7%	67.1%	71.4%	-4.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	61.2%	78.3%	70.1%	73.9%	-3.8 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	63.4%	73.2%	68.3%	68.0%	0.3 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	88.0%	90.0%	89.1%	87.0%	2.1 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	78.7%	78.4%	78.5%	80.0%	-1.5 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	56.1%	52.6%	54.4%	68.9%	-14.5 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	70.2%	67.3%	68.6%	72.3%	-3.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	78.9%	70.5%	74.7%	70.1%	4.7 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	59.2%	69.3%	64.4%	64.7%	-0.2 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	53.5%	52.1%	52.8%	53.0%	-0.2 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	41.0%	36.1%	38.3%	26.6%	11.6 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.6%	15.6%	15.6%	14.4%	1.2 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Austin Area School District and Galeton Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Austin Area School District	Galeton Area School District
County: Potter	County: Potter
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 253	District Enrollment: 451
Schools:	Schools:
Austin Area Elementary School (131 students in grades PreK-6); Austin Area Jr./Sr. High School (122 students in grades 7-12)	Galeton Area School (451 students in grades PreK-12)
Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9	Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9
AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS

Austin Area School District and Galeton Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Austin Area School District enrolled 253 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,549 per pupil. Galeton Area School District enrolled 451 students, and spent \$11,601 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 704 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 500 and 749 students) spent an average of \$9,321 per pupil. This is \$229 less than Austin Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$2,280 less than Galeton Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$9,321 through consolidation, they could save \$1,086,236 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$9,321 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Austin Area School District and Galeton Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Austin Area	Galeton Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	253	451	704	656	48
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	1	3	2.4	0.6
Square Miles	226	317	543	115	428
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,549	\$11,601	10,864	\$9,321	\$1,543
Instruction	\$5,660	\$7,650	\$6,935	\$5,523	\$1,412
Instructional Staff Support	\$277	\$337	\$315	\$291	\$24
Pupil Support	\$451	\$574	\$530	\$398	\$132
General Administration	\$854	\$585	\$682	\$490	\$191
School Administration	\$486	\$448	\$462	\$442	\$20
Operations & Maintenance	\$727	\$849	\$805	\$891	-\$86
Student Transportation	\$415	\$395	\$402	\$642	-\$240
Food Services	\$466	\$541	\$514	\$409	\$106
Other	\$213	\$222	\$219	\$234	-\$16

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Austin Area School District and Galeton Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Austin Area	Galeton Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$1,687,000	\$6,101,000	\$7,788,000	\$5,224,357	\$2,563,643
Debt Payments (per student)	\$459	\$1,033	\$1,492	\$2,124	-\$632
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,273	\$11,969	\$11,719	\$11,408	\$311
Local	\$4,846	\$5,341	\$5,163	\$4,846	\$318
State	\$5,739	\$5,186	\$5,385	\$5,834	-\$449
Federal	\$688	\$1,441	\$1,170	\$729	\$442
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	21.70	17.60	19.07	19.11	-0.04
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$55	\$134	\$106	\$151	-\$45
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	1.8	2.2
Students Per District Administrator	127	226	176	407	-231
School Administrators	1	2	3	2.3	0.7
Students Per School Administrator	253	226	235	309	-75
Teachers	23	45	68	46.3	21.7
Students Per Teacher	11.0	10.0	10.4	14.4	-4.0
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	55.7%	56.2%	56.0%	68.0%	-12.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	53.0%	63.1%	70.2%	-7.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	63.1%	53.9%	57.8%	71.3%	-13.5 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	42.8%	42.3%	42.5%	59.0%	-16.5 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	60.8%	66.6%	68.7%	-2.0 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	58.9%	59.4%	59.2%	70.2%	-10.9 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	46.6%	53.3%	51.1%	71.6%	-20.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	45.5%	75.8%	63.7%	61.0%	2.6 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	63.0%	69.0%	66.3%	86.4%	-20.1 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	60.0%	61.5%	60.8%	80.3%	-19.4 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	78.5%	42.3%	55.0%	71.9%	-17.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	50.0%	60.9%	56.4%	75.0%	-18.6 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	70.6%	62.1%	64.8%	63.4%	1.4 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	40.0%	46.6%	44.4%	60.0%	-15.6 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	22.7%	45.5%	36.4%	46.0%	-9.7 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	37.1%	56.0%	49.2%	36.7%	12.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	11.9%	14.2%	13.4%	17.7%	-4.3 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Austin Area School District and Smethport Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Austin Area School District</b>	<b>Smethport Area School District</b>
County: Potter	County: Mckean
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 253	District Enrollment: 1,020
Schools:	Schools:
Austin Area Elementary School (131 students in grades PreK-6); Austin Area Jr./Sr. High School (122 students in grades 7-12)	Smethport Area Elementary School (499 students in grades K-6); Smethport Area Jr./Sr. High School (521 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9	Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9
AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS

Austin Area School District and Smethport Area School District are located in different counties, but they are served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Austin Area School District enrolled 253 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,549 per pupil. Smethport Area School District enrolled 1,020 students, and spent \$8,780 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,273 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,250 and 1,499 students) spent an average of \$8,437 per pupil. This is \$1,113 less than Austin Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$344 less than Smethport Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,437 through consolidation, they could save \$632,105 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,437 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Austin Area School District and Smethport Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Austin Area	Smethport Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	253	1,020	1,273	1,380	-107
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	3.0	1.0
Square Miles	226	340	566	72	494
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,549	\$8,780	8,933	\$8,437	\$497
Instruction	\$5,660	\$5,073	\$5,189	\$5,233	-\$44
Instructional Staff Support	\$277	\$225	\$235	\$275	-\$40
Pupil Support	\$451	\$427	\$432	\$352	\$80
General Administration	\$854	\$262	\$379	\$278	\$101
School Administration	\$486	\$443	\$452	\$386	\$66
Operations & Maintenance	\$727	\$889	\$857	\$834	\$23
Student Transportation	\$415	\$710	\$651	\$507	\$144
Food Services	\$466	\$551	\$534	\$361	\$173
Other	\$213	\$201	\$203	\$209	-\$6

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Austin Area School District and Smethport Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Austin Area	Smethport Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$1,687,000	\$12,300,000	\$13,987,000	\$13,035,068	\$951,932
Debt Payments (per student)	\$459	\$993	\$1,452	\$2,142	-\$690
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,273	\$11,550	\$11,495	\$10,312	\$1,182
Local	\$4,846	\$3,980	\$4,152	\$4,540	-\$387
State	\$5,739	\$7,073	\$6,808	\$5,209	\$1,599
Federal	\$688	\$497	\$535	\$564	-\$29
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	21.70	24.80	24.18	20.32	3.87
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$55	\$157	\$137	\$283	-\$146
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.0	2.0
Students Per District Administrator	127	510	318	773	-455
School Administrators	1	3	4	3.8	0.2
Students Per School Administrator	253	340	318	384	-66
Teachers	23	68	91	91.3	-0.3
Students Per Teacher	11.0	15.0	14.0	15.2	-1.2
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	55.7%	63.2%	61.8%	68.7%	-6.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	67.0%	68.5%	72.3%	-3.8 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	63.1%	70.2%	68.8%	68.8%	0.0 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	42.8%	38.3%	39.0%	61.6%	-22.6 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	71.2%	72.0%	68.1%	3.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	58.9%	64.5%	63.5%	69.1%	-5.6 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	46.6%	63.4%	60.5%	71.4%	-10.9 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	45.5%	65.9%	61.8%	67.5%	-5.7 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	63.0%	84.0%	80.0%	86.8%	-6.7 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	60.0%	78.0%	74.3%	77.7%	-3.4 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	78.5%	45.2%	50.6%	68.7%	-18.1 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	50.0%	71.2%	66.7%	71.8%	-5.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	70.6%	64.5%	65.6%	67.1%	-1.5 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	40.0%	64.8%	60.5%	62.5%	-2.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	22.7%	43.1%	39.0%	50.1%	-11.1 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	37.1%	31.4%	32.5%	32.5%	0.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	11.9%	13.6%	13.3%	14.6%	-1.4 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Avonworth School District and Northgate School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Avonworth School District	Northgate School District
County: Allegheny	County: Allegheny
District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City
District Enrollment: 1,339	District Enrollment: 1,526
Schools:	Schools:
Avonworth Elementary School (603 students in grades K-5); Avonworth Middle School (299 students in grades 6-8); Avonworth High School (437 students in grades 9-12)	Avalon Elementary School (335 students in grades K-6); Bellevue Elementary School (397 students in grades K-6); Northgate Middle School/High School (794 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Allegheny IU 3	Intermediate Unit: Allegheny IU 3
AVTS/CTC: A W Beattie Career Center	AVTS/CTC: A W Beattie Career Center

Avonworth School District and Northgate School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Avonworth School District enrolled 1,339 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,873 per pupil. Northgate School District enrolled 1,526 students, and spent \$8,868 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,865 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$816 less than Avonworth’s per-pupil spending, and \$811 less than Northgate’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$2,330,462 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Avonworth School District and Northgate School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Avonworth	Northgate	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,339	1,526	2,865	2,726	139
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	11	2	13	109	-96
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,873	\$8,868	8,871	\$8,057	\$813
Instruction	\$5,358	\$5,806	\$5,597	\$5,022	\$574
Instructional Staff Support	\$333	\$153	\$237	\$256	-\$19
Pupil Support	\$376	\$421	\$400	\$354	\$46
General Administration	\$437	\$339	\$385	\$210	\$174
School Administration	\$387	\$410	\$399	\$354	\$46
Operations & Maintenance	\$754	\$940	\$853	\$820	\$33
Student Transportation	\$711	\$193	\$435	\$500	-\$65
Food Services	\$280	\$320	\$302	\$323	-\$21
Other	\$237	\$286	\$263	\$202	\$61

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Avonworth School District and Northgate School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Avonworth	Northgate	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$21,428,000	\$10,223,000	\$31,651,000	\$27,621,426	\$4,029,574
Debt Payments (per student)	\$6,112	\$956	\$7,068	\$1,905	\$5,163
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,966	\$10,626	\$10,785	\$9,710	\$1,075
Local	\$7,814	\$6,880	\$7,317	\$5,542	\$1,774
State	\$2,817	\$3,290	\$3,069	\$3,780	-\$711
Federal	\$335	\$455	\$399	\$388	\$11
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	21.90	31.20	26.85	20.94	5.91
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$451	\$317	\$380	\$660	-\$280
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	2	5	2.6	2.4
Students Per District Administrator	446	763	573	1,131	-558
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	446	382	409	444	-35
Teachers	79	108	187	170.0	17.0
Students Per Teacher	16.9	14.1	15.3	16.2	-0.9
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	83.2%	76.5%	79.7%	71.4%	8.4 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	91.0%	80.0%	85.4%	74.0%	11.5 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	91.8%	83.9%	88.5%	73.7%	14.7 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	78.6%	81.1%	79.9%	64.3%	15.6 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	81.4%	81.9%	70.7%	11.2 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	77.0%	76.7%	76.8%	72.0%	4.8 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	86.6%	69.4%	76.3%	74.8%	1.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	71.9%	60.0%	65.2%	69.0%	-3.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	87.0%	8.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	94.6%	95.0%	94.8%	82.6%	12.2 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	86.7%	90.1%	88.5%	70.9%	17.6 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	83.2%	85.7%	84.3%	72.3%	12.0 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	79.0%	74.1%	76.4%	71.1%	5.4 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	79.7%	67.1%	72.1%	67.5%	4.6 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	64.1%	52.2%	57.4%	54.1%	3.3 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	9.3%	37.5%	24.3%	24.1%	0.2 pts
Students with Disabilities	7.8%	13.4%	10.8%	13.5%	-2.8 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Benton Area School District and East Lycoming School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Benton Area School District</b>	<b>East Lycoming School District</b>
County: Columbia	County: Lycoming
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 788	District Enrollment: 1,781
Schools:	Schools:
Appleman Elementary School (394 students in grades K-6); Benton Area MSHS (394 students in grades 7-12)	Carl G Renn Elementary School (214 students in grades K-6); George A Ferrell Elementary School (136 students in grades K-6); Joseph C Ashkar Elementary School (503 students in grades K-6); Hughesville Jr./Sr. High School (928 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Central Susquehanna 16	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Columbia-Montour AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Lycoming CTC

Benton Area School District and East Lycoming School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Benton Area School District enrolled 788 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,201 per pupil. East Lycoming School District enrolled 1,781 students, and spent \$8,494 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,569 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,143 less than Benton Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$436 less than East Lycoming’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$1,678,358 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Benton Area School District and East Lycoming School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Benton Area	East Lycoming	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	788	1,781	2,569	2,726	-157
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	4	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	97	146	243	109	134
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,201	\$8,494	8,710	\$8,057	\$653
Instruction	\$5,478	\$5,461	\$5,466	\$5,022	\$444
Instructional Staff Support	\$183	\$214	\$205	\$256	-\$51
Pupil Support	\$368	\$363	\$364	\$354	\$11
General Administration	\$352	\$145	\$209	\$210	-\$2
School Administration	\$490	\$360	\$400	\$354	\$46
Operations & Maintenance	\$958	\$713	\$788	\$820	-\$32
Student Transportation	\$675	\$552	\$590	\$500	\$90
Food Services	\$400	\$393	\$395	\$323	\$72
Other	\$297	\$292	\$293	\$202	\$91

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Benton Area School District and East Lycoming School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Benton Area	East Lycoming	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$14,763,000	\$17,383,000	\$32,146,000	\$27,621,426	\$4,524,574
Debt Payments (per student)	\$8,678	\$1,264	\$9,942	\$1,905	\$8,037
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,765	\$9,497	\$10,193	\$9,710	\$483
Local	\$5,750	\$3,780	\$4,385	\$5,542	-\$1,158
State	\$5,075	\$5,234	\$5,185	\$3,780	\$1,405
Federal	\$940	\$483	\$623	\$388	\$235
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	22.20	18.30	19.50	20.94	-1.44
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$187	\$320	\$279	\$660	-\$381
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	394	891	642	1,131	-488
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	263	445	367	444	-77
Teachers	66	123	189	170.0	19.0
Students Per Teacher	11.9	14.5	13.6	16.2	-2.6
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	77.7%	79.1%	78.7%	71.4%	7.3 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	73.0%	77.0%	75.7%	74.0%	1.7 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	81.7%	80.0%	73.7%	6.2 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	70.3%	69.7%	69.9%	64.3%	5.6 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	76.7%	73.8%	74.7%	70.7%	4.0 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	74.7%	77.1%	72.0%	5.1 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	78.1%	82.3%	80.9%	74.8%	6.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	67.5%	74.6%	73.0%	69.0%	4.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	89.0%	92.0%	91.0%	87.0%	4.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	88.6%	91.3%	90.6%	82.6%	8.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	87.5%	79.8%	82.6%	70.9%	11.7 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	83.3%	84.1%	83.8%	72.3%	11.6 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	72.6%	88.8%	83.7%	71.1%	12.6 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	75.0%	74.6%	74.7%	67.5%	7.2 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	65.9%	65.8%	65.8%	54.1%	11.7 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	39.4%	25.3%	29.6%	24.1%	5.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.5%	12.5%	13.1%	13.5%	-0.4 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Benton Area School District and Northwest Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Benton Area School District</b>	<b>Northwest Area School District</b>
County: Columbia	County: Luzerne
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 788	District Enrollment: 1,422
Schools:	Schools:
Appleman Elementary School (394 students in grades K-6); Benton Area MSHS (394 students in grades 7-12)	Garrison Memorial School (167 students in grades K-6); Hunlock Creek School (316 students in grades K-6); Huntington Mills School (291 students in grades K-6); Northwest Area High School (648 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Central Susquehanna 16	Intermediate Unit: Luzerne IU 18
AVTS/CTC: Columbia-Montour AVTS	AVTS/CTC: West Side AVTS

Benton Area School District and Northwest Area School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Benton Area School District enrolled 788 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,201 per pupil. Northwest Area School District enrolled 1,422 students, and spent \$9,125 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,210 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$877 less than Benton Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$801 less than Northwest Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$1,830,432 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Benton Area School District and Northwest Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Benton Area	Northwest Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	788	1,422	2,210	2,255	-45
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	4	6	4.7	1.3
Square Miles	97	120	217	111	107
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,201	\$9,125	9,152	\$8,324	\$828
Instruction	\$5,478	\$5,657	\$5,593	\$5,136	\$457
Instructional Staff Support	\$183	\$133	\$151	\$279	-\$128
Pupil Support	\$368	\$343	\$352	\$370	-\$18
General Administration	\$352	\$190	\$248	\$234	\$13
School Administration	\$490	\$376	\$417	\$396	\$21
Operations & Maintenance	\$958	\$669	\$772	\$846	-\$74
Student Transportation	\$675	\$1,026	\$901	\$510	\$391
Food Services	\$400	\$378	\$386	\$338	\$47
Other	\$297	\$354	\$333	\$184	\$150

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Benton Area School District and Northwest Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Benton Area	Northwest Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$14,763,000	\$5,273,000	\$20,036,000	\$24,347,120	-\$4,311,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$8,678	\$442	\$9,120	\$3,093	\$6,027
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,765	\$10,533	\$10,972	\$10,148	\$824
Local	\$5,750	\$3,788	\$4,487	\$5,489	-\$1,001
State	\$5,075	\$6,104	\$5,737	\$4,221	\$1,516
Federal	\$940	\$641	\$748	\$438	\$310
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	22.20	19.50	20.46	21.58	-1.12
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$187	\$247	\$226	\$530	-\$304
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	394	711	553	1,037	-485
School Administrators	3	3	6	6.0	0.0
Students Per School Administrator	263	474	368	390	-22
Teachers	66	90	156	145.0	11.0
Students Per Teacher	11.9	15.8	14.2	15.7	-1.5
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	77.7%	69.8%	72.4%	70.0%	2.4 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	73.0%	75.0%	74.3%	72.2%	2.1 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	72.0%	72.8%	71.9%	0.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	70.3%	60.6%	64.1%	62.1%	2.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	76.7%	61.9%	67.3%	70.6%	-3.3 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	70.9%	75.2%	71.4%	3.8 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	78.1%	78.9%	78.6%	73.9%	4.8 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	67.5%	74.8%	72.8%	68.0%	4.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	89.0%	91.0%	90.3%	87.0%	3.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	88.6%	76.5%	79.8%	80.0%	-0.3 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	87.5%	67.5%	74.7%	68.9%	5.8 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	83.3%	68.9%	74.1%	72.3%	1.8 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	72.6%	66.0%	68.5%	70.1%	-1.6 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	75.0%	68.6%	70.6%	64.7%	6.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	65.9%	44.3%	50.3%	53.0%	-2.8 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	39.4%	34.0%	35.9%	26.6%	9.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.5%	15.1%	14.8%	14.4%	0.5 pts



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Benton Area School District and Sullivan County School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Benton Area School District</b>	<b>Sullivan County School District</b>
County: Columbia	County: Sullivan
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 788	District Enrollment: 808
Schools:	Schools:
Appleman Elementary School (394 students in grades K-6); Benton Area MSHS (394 students in grades 7-12)	Sullivan County Elementary School (232 students in grades K-6); Turnpike Area Elementary School (168 students in grades K-6); Sullivan County Jr./Sr. High School (408 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Central Susquehanna 16	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Columbia-Montour AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center

Benton Area School District and Sullivan County School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Benton Area School District enrolled 788 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,201 per pupil. Sullivan County School District enrolled 808 students, and spent \$11,276 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,596 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,500 and 1,749 students) spent an average of \$8,479 per pupil. This is \$721 less than Benton Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$2,797 less than Sullivan County’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,479 through consolidation, they could save \$2,828,390 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,479 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Benton Area School District and Sullivan County School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Benton Area	Sullivan County	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	788	808	1,596	1,616	-20
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	3.4	1.6
Square Miles	97	452	549	95	454
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,201	\$11,276	10,251	\$8,479	\$1,772
Instruction	\$5,478	\$6,670	\$6,081	\$5,269	\$812
Instructional Staff Support	\$183	\$361	\$273	\$243	\$30
Pupil Support	\$368	\$475	\$422	\$387	\$35
General Administration	\$352	\$402	\$377	\$278	\$99
School Administration	\$490	\$442	\$466	\$373	\$93
Operations & Maintenance	\$958	\$1,027	\$993	\$853	\$140
Student Transportation	\$675	\$1,149	\$915	\$532	\$382
Food Services	\$400	\$425	\$412	\$353	\$59
Other	\$297	\$326	\$311	\$190	\$121

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Benton Area School District and Sullivan County School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Benton Area	Sullivan County	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$14,763,000	\$632,000	\$15,395,000	\$14,381,000	\$1,014,000
Debt Payments (per student)	\$8,678	\$731	\$9,409	\$1,826	\$7,583
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,765	\$12,165	\$11,967	\$10,111	\$1,857
Local	\$5,750	\$7,322	\$6,546	\$5,128	\$1,418
State	\$5,075	\$4,386	\$4,726	\$4,400	\$326
Federal	\$940	\$457	\$695	\$583	\$112
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	22.20	12.80	17.44	21.00	-3.56
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$187	\$440	\$315	\$367	-\$52
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.2	1.8
Students Per District Administrator	394	404	399	866	-467
School Administrators	3	2	5	3.8	1.2
Students Per School Administrator	263	404	319	457	-138
Teachers	66	62	128	105.8	22.2
Students Per Teacher	11.9	13.0	12.5	15.5	-3.0
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	77.7%	70.4%	73.9%	68.4%	5.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	73.0%	76.0%	74.4%	72.4%	2.1 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	70.7%	4.3 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	70.3%	67.7%	69.0%	62.8%	6.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	76.7%	82.3%	79.5%	67.7%	11.8 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	73.5%	77.8%	68.5%	9.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	78.1%	76.6%	77.4%	70.8%	6.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	67.5%	56.5%	60.7%	66.5%	-5.7 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	89.0%	88.0%	88.5%	86.7%	1.8 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	88.6%	80.3%	84.0%	78.8%	5.2 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	87.5%	65.1%	76.4%	67.4%	9.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	83.3%	85.5%	84.4%	69.1%	15.4 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	72.6%	73.5%	73.1%	66.6%	6.5 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	75.0%	65.0%	70.2%	62.5%	7.6 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	65.9%	31.9%	45.1%	51.3%	-6.2 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	39.4%	31.1%	35.2%	29.6%	5.6 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.5%	13.0%	13.7%	15.1%	-1.4 pts

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Berlin Brothersvalley School District and Meyersdale Area School District

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Berlin Brothersvalley School District	Meyersdale Area School District
County: Somerset	County: Somerset
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 940	District Enrollment: 1,087
Schools:	Schools:
Berlin Brothersvalley Elementary School (367 students in grades K-4); Berlin Brothersvalley Middle School (286 students in grades 5-8); Berlin Brothersvalley Senior High School (287 students in grades 9-12)	Meyersdale Area Elementary School (428 students in grades K-5); Meyersdale Area Middle School (249 students in grades 6-8); Meyersdale Area High School (410 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center

Berlin Brothersvalley School District and Meyersdale Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Berlin Brothersvalley School District enrolled 940 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,936 per pupil. Meyersdale Area School District enrolled 1,087 students, and spent \$9,013 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,027 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$612 less than Berlin Brothersvalley's per-pupil spending, and \$689 less than Meyersdale Area's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$1,324,678 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Berlin Brothersvalley School District and Meyersdale Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Berlin Brothersvalley	Meyersdale Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	940	1,087	2,027	2,255	-228
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	4.7	1.3
Square Miles	165	123	289	111	178
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,936	\$9,013	8,977	\$8,324	\$654
Instruction	\$5,805	\$5,426	\$5,602	\$5,136	\$466
Instructional Staff Support	\$194	\$366	\$286	\$279	\$7
Pupil Support	\$365	\$400	\$384	\$370	\$13
General Administration	\$295	\$279	\$286	\$234	\$52
School Administration	\$407	\$367	\$386	\$396	-\$10
Operations & Maintenance	\$668	\$897	\$791	\$846	-\$55
Student Transportation	\$541	\$511	\$525	\$510	\$15
Food Services	\$374	\$433	\$406	\$338	\$68
Other	\$286	\$334	\$312	\$184	\$128

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Berlin Brothersvalley School District and Meyersdale Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Berlin Brothersvalley	Meyersdale Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$5,875,000	\$10,954,000	\$16,829,000	\$24,347,120	-\$7,518,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$536	\$616	\$1,152	\$3,093	-\$1,941
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,680	\$10,420	\$10,077	\$10,148	-\$71
Local	\$2,781	\$2,431	\$2,593	\$5,489	-\$2,895
State	\$6,148	\$7,205	\$6,715	\$4,221	\$2,494
Federal	\$751	\$784	\$769	\$438	\$330
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	13.10	14.00	13.58	21.58	-8.00
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$178	\$161	\$168	\$530	-\$361
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	1	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	313	1,087	507	1,037	-530
School Administrators	3	2	5	6.0	-1.0
Students Per School Administrator	313	544	405	390	15
Teachers	68	74	142	145.0	-3.0
Students Per Teacher	13.8	14.7	14.3	15.7	-1.4
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	72.6%	64.3%	68.5%	70.0%	-1.6 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	53.0%	63.0%	57.3%	72.2%	-14.9 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	76.6%	74.7%	75.7%	71.9%	3.8 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	58.1%	74.2%	65.4%	62.1%	3.4 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	72.0%	66.7%	69.4%	70.6%	-1.2 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	75.8%	75.1%	75.4%	71.4%	4.0 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	70.2%	63.8%	66.9%	73.9%	-7.0 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	71.5%	54.4%	62.2%	68.0%	-5.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	78.0%	81.0%	79.3%	87.0%	-7.7 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	89.6%	67.6%	79.0%	80.0%	-1.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	68.9%	54.8%	62.5%	68.9%	-6.4 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.4%	50.7%	68.5%	72.3%	-3.8 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	79.1%	77.6%	78.3%	70.1%	8.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	70.2%	60.1%	65.0%	64.7%	0.3 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	68.4%	45.6%	55.9%	53.0%	2.9 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	37.4%	34.6%	35.9%	26.6%	9.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	12.8%	15.0%	14.0%	14.4%	-0.4 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blacklick Valley School District and Central Cambria School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Blacklick Valley School District</b>	<b>Central Cambria School District</b>
County: Cambria	County: Cambria
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 696	District Enrollment: 1,912
Schools:	Schools:
Blacklick Valley Elementary Center (364 students in grades K-6); Blacklick Valley Jr./Sr. High School (332 students in grades 7-12)	Jackson Elementary School (290 students in grades K-5); Cambria Elementary School (494 students in grades K-5); Central Cambria Middle School (441 students in grades 6-8); Central Cambria High School (687 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Blacklick Valley School District and Central Cambria School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Blacklick Valley School District enrolled 696 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,622 per pupil. Central Cambria School District enrolled 1,912 students, and spent \$8,576 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,608 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,565 less than Blacklick Valley’s per-pupil spending, and \$519 less than Central Cambria’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$2,081,144 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blacklick Valley School District and Central Cambria School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a “blueprint” for consolidation or an “ideal” state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Blacklick Valley	Central Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	696	1,912	2,608	2,726	-118
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	4	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	34	100	133	109	25
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,622	\$8,576	8,855	\$8,057	\$798
Instruction	\$5,894	\$5,138	\$5,339	\$5,022	\$317
Instructional Staff Support	\$184	\$325	\$287	\$256	\$31
Pupil Support	\$701	\$483	\$541	\$354	\$188
General Administration	\$368	\$269	\$296	\$210	\$85
School Administration	\$432	\$373	\$389	\$354	\$36
Operations & Maintenance	\$853	\$943	\$919	\$820	\$99
Student Transportation	\$445	\$510	\$493	\$500	-\$7
Food Services	\$513	\$437	\$457	\$323	\$134
Other	\$231	\$98	\$133	\$202	-\$69



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blacklick Valley School District and Central Cambria School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Blacklick Valley	Central Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$126,000	\$9,867,000	\$9,993,000	\$27,621,426	-\$17,628,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$207	\$490	\$697	\$1,905	-\$1,208
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,030	\$9,356	\$9,803	\$9,710	\$92
Local	\$2,132	\$4,251	\$3,686	\$5,542	-\$1,857
State	\$7,858	\$4,697	\$5,541	\$3,780	\$1,761
Federal	\$1,040	\$407	\$576	\$388	\$188
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.50	16.60	16.84	20.94	-4.10
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$79	\$406	\$319	\$660	-\$341
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	3	5	2.6	2.4
Students Per District Administrator	348	637	522	1,131	-609
School Administrators	2	5	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	348	382	373	444	-71
Teachers	53	122	175	170.0	5.0
Students Per Teacher	13.1	15.7	14.9	16.2	-1.3
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	65.4%	72.6%	70.6%	71.4%	-0.8 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	66.0%	81.0%	77.2%	74.0%	3.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	74.0%	74.4%	74.3%	73.7%	0.5 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	56.7%	72.6%	67.7%	64.3%	3.4 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	64.6%	66.9%	66.3%	70.7%	-4.4 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	67.3%	66.0%	66.3%	72.0%	-5.7 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	66.1%	74.3%	71.6%	74.8%	-3.2 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	62.7%	76.4%	73.0%	69.0%	4.1 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	82.0%	88.0%	86.5%	87.0%	-0.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	78.0%	76.8%	77.1%	82.6%	-5.5 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	63.3%	77.1%	72.9%	70.9%	1.9 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	75.0%	68.9%	70.4%	72.3%	-1.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	63.3%	72.5%	70.1%	71.1%	-1.0 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	55.4%	67.4%	63.4%	67.5%	-4.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	51.0%	59.9%	57.7%	54.1%	3.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	51.6%	29.4%	35.3%	24.1%	11.2 pts
Students with Disabilities	23.1%	15.0%	17.2%	13.5%	3.7 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blacklick Valley School District and Northern Cambria School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Blacklick Valley School District</b>	<b>Northern Cambria School District</b>
County: Cambria	County: Cambria
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 696	District Enrollment: 1,273
Schools:	Schools:
Blacklick Valley Elementary Center (364 students in grades K-6); Blacklick Valley Jr./Sr. High School (332 students in grades 7-12)	Northern Cambria Elementary School (441 students in grades K-4); Northern Cambria Middle School (408 students in grades 5-8); Northern Cambria High School (424 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Blacklick Valley School District and Northern Cambria School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Blacklick Valley School District enrolled 696 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,622 per pupil. Northern Cambria School District enrolled 1,273 students, and spent \$9,535 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,969 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,750 and 1,999 students) spent an average of \$8,498 per pupil. This is \$1,124 less than Blacklick Valley’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,037 less than Northern Cambria’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,498 through consolidation, they could save \$2,101,677 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,498 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blacklick Valley School District and Northern Cambria School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Blacklick Valley	Northern Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	696	1,273	1,969	1,888	81
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	3.9	1.1
Square Miles	34	62	96	84	12
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,622	\$9,535	9,566	\$8,498	\$1,067
Instruction	\$5,894	\$6,271	\$6,138	\$5,186	\$951
Instructional Staff Support	\$184	\$189	\$187	\$283	-\$96
Pupil Support	\$701	\$425	\$523	\$387	\$135
General Administration	\$368	\$213	\$268	\$254	\$14
School Administration	\$432	\$372	\$394	\$388	\$6
Operations & Maintenance	\$853	\$778	\$804	\$838	-\$33
Student Transportation	\$445	\$565	\$523	\$526	-\$3
Food Services	\$513	\$448	\$471	\$363	\$108
Other	\$231	\$274	\$259	\$254	\$5

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blacklick Valley School District and Northern Cambria School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Blacklick Valley	Northern Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$126,000	\$3,013,000	\$3,139,000	\$20,109,262	-\$16,970,262
Debt Payments (per student)	\$207	\$119	\$326	\$1,719	-\$1,393
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,030	\$10,595	\$10,749	\$10,236	\$513
Local	\$2,132	\$2,299	\$2,240	\$5,426	-\$3,186
State	\$7,858	\$7,364	\$7,538	\$4,332	\$3,206
Federal	\$1,040	\$932	\$971	\$478	\$493
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.50	17.40	17.44	20.72	-3.28
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$79	\$142	\$119	\$443	-\$323
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	348	637	492	826	-333
School Administrators	2	3	5	4.7	0.3
Students Per School Administrator	348	424	394	423	-29
Teachers	53	89	142	120.6	21.4
Students Per Teacher	13.1	14.3	13.9	15.7	-1.9
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	65.4%	70.9%	69.0%	71.7%	-2.7 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	66.0%	80.0%	76.0%	75.0%	1.0 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	74.0%	79.1%	77.3%	73.1%	4.2 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	56.7%	53.6%	54.9%	65.2%	-10.3 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	64.6%	60.6%	62.0%	70.1%	-8.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	67.3%	69.4%	68.7%	71.9%	-3.2 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	66.1%	76.4%	72.6%	75.1%	-2.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	62.7%	56.2%	58.5%	69.5%	-11.1 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	82.0%	93.0%	89.9%	88.5%	1.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	78.0%	74.8%	75.9%	81.6%	-5.6 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	63.3%	65.5%	64.6%	70.8%	-6.2 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	75.0%	75.3%	75.2%	74.7%	0.5 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	63.3%	78.6%	73.5%	70.3%	3.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	55.4%	72.7%	66.3%	67.3%	-1.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	51.0%	53.6%	52.7%	54.6%	-1.8 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	51.6%	51.3%	51.4%	28.1%	23.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	23.1%	14.0%	17.2%	13.8%	3.4 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blacklick Valley School District and Penns Manor Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Blacklick Valley School District</b>	<b>Penns Manor Area School District</b>
County: Cambria	County: Indiana
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 696	District Enrollment: 1,052
Schools:	Schools:
Blacklick Valley Elementary Center (364 students in grades K-6); Blacklick Valley Jr./Sr. High School (332 students in grades 7-12)	Penns Manor Area Elementary School (546 students in grades PreK-6); Penns Manor Area Jr./Sr. High School (506 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28
AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center

Blacklick Valley School District and Penns Manor Area School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Blacklick Valley School District enrolled 696 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,622 per pupil. Penns Manor Area School District enrolled 1,052 students, and spent \$9,398 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,748 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,500 and 1,749 students) spent an average of \$8,479 per pupil. This is \$1,143 less than Blacklick Valley’s per-pupil spending, and \$919 less than Penns Manor Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,479 through consolidation, they could save \$1,762,572 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,479 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blacklick Valley School District and Penns Manor Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Blacklick Valley	Penns Manor Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	696	1,052	1,748	1,616	132
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	3.4	0.6
Square Miles	34	81	115	95	20
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,622	\$9,398	9,487	\$8,479	\$1,008
Instruction	\$5,894	\$6,059	\$5,993	\$5,269	\$724
Instructional Staff Support	\$184	\$208	\$199	\$243	-\$45
Pupil Support	\$701	\$399	\$519	\$387	\$132
General Administration	\$368	\$446	\$415	\$278	\$137
School Administration	\$432	\$243	\$319	\$373	-\$54
Operations & Maintenance	\$853	\$840	\$846	\$853	-\$7
Student Transportation	\$445	\$604	\$541	\$532	\$8
Food Services	\$513	\$430	\$463	\$353	\$110
Other	\$231	\$169	\$194	\$190	\$4

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blacklick Valley School District and Penns Manor Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Blacklick Valley	Penns Manor Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$126,000	\$17,655,000	\$17,781,000	\$14,381,000	\$3,400,000
Debt Payments (per student)	\$207	\$9,484	\$9,691	\$1,826	\$7,865
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,030	\$11,661	\$11,410	\$10,111	\$1,299
Local	\$2,132	\$2,712	\$2,481	\$5,128	-\$2,647
State	\$7,858	\$8,183	\$8,054	\$4,400	\$3,654
Federal	\$1,040	\$765	\$875	\$583	\$292
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.50	21.60	19.97	21.00	-1.04
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$79	\$119	\$103	\$367	-\$264
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.2	1.8
Students Per District Administrator	348	526	437	866	-429
School Administrators	2	3	5	3.8	1.2
Students Per School Administrator	348	351	350	457	-107
Teachers	53	74	127	105.8	21.2
Students Per Teacher	13.1	14.2	13.8	15.5	-1.7
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	65.4%	59.0%	61.7%	68.4%	-6.7 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	66.0%	54.0%	58.7%	72.4%	-13.7 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	74.0%	69.9%	71.7%	70.7%	1.0 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	56.7%	62.9%	59.9%	62.8%	-2.9 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	64.6%	66.6%	65.7%	67.7%	-2.0 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	67.3%	66.0%	66.4%	68.5%	-2.1 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	66.1%	74.4%	70.6%	70.8%	-0.2 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	62.7%	52.7%	56.8%	66.5%	-9.7 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	82.0%	76.0%	78.3%	86.7%	-8.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	78.0%	55.6%	65.5%	78.8%	-13.3 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	63.3%	51.6%	57.4%	67.4%	-10.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	75.0%	55.5%	63.9%	69.1%	-5.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	63.3%	59.0%	60.4%	66.6%	-6.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	55.4%	46.1%	50.3%	62.5%	-12.2 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	51.0%	36.5%	42.4%	51.3%	-8.9 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	51.6%	40.8%	45.1%	29.6%	15.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	23.1%	15.3%	18.4%	15.1%	3.3 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blacklick Valley School District and United School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Blacklick Valley School District</b>	<b>United School District</b>
County: Cambria	County: Indiana
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 696	District Enrollment: 1,262
Schools:	Schools:
Blacklick Valley Elementary Center (364 students in grades K-6); Blacklick Valley Jr./Sr. High School (332 students in grades 7-12)	United Elementary School (623 students in grades K-6); United Jr./Sr. High School (639 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28
AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center

Blacklick Valley School District and United School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Blacklick Valley School District enrolled 696 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,622 per pupil. United School District enrolled 1,262 students, and spent \$10,196 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,958 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,750 and 1,999 students) spent an average of \$8,498 per pupil. This is \$1,124 less than Blacklick Valley’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,697 less than United’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,498 through consolidation, they could save \$2,924,154 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,498 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blacklick Valley School District and United School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Blacklick Valley	United	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	696	1,262	1,958	1,888	70
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	3.9	0.1
Square Miles	34	132	166	84	82
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,622	\$10,196	9,992	\$8,498	\$1,493
Instruction	\$5,894	\$6,272	\$6,137	\$5,186	\$951
Instructional Staff Support	\$184	\$556	\$424	\$283	\$141
Pupil Support	\$701	\$344	\$471	\$387	\$84
General Administration	\$368	\$250	\$292	\$254	\$38
School Administration	\$432	\$440	\$437	\$388	\$50
Operations & Maintenance	\$853	\$1,058	\$985	\$838	\$148
Student Transportation	\$445	\$697	\$608	\$526	\$82
Food Services	\$513	\$384	\$430	\$363	\$67
Other	\$231	\$195	\$208	\$254	-\$46

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blacklick Valley School District and United School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Blacklick Valley	United	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$126,000	\$1,984,000	\$2,110,000	\$20,109,262	-\$17,999,262
Debt Payments (per student)	\$207	\$521	\$728	\$1,719	-\$991
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,030	\$11,848	\$11,557	\$10,236	\$1,322
Local	\$2,132	\$3,448	\$2,981	\$5,426	-\$2,445
State	\$7,858	\$7,753	\$7,790	\$4,332	\$3,458
Federal	\$1,040	\$647	\$787	\$478	\$309
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.50	21.10	19.82	20.72	-0.90
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$79	\$190	\$150	\$443	-\$292
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	348	631	490	826	-336
School Administrators	2	3	5	4.7	0.3
Students Per School Administrator	348	421	392	423	-31
Teachers	53	96	149	120.6	28.4
Students Per Teacher	13.1	13.1	13.1	15.7	-2.6
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	65.4%	74.4%	71.1%	71.7%	-0.6 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	66.0%	81.0%	75.9%	75.0%	0.9 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	74.0%	70.4%	71.9%	73.1%	-1.2 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	56.7%	64.6%	61.2%	65.2%	-4.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	64.6%	62.9%	63.5%	70.1%	-6.6 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	67.3%	79.6%	75.5%	71.9%	3.6 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	66.1%	79.0%	73.9%	75.1%	-1.2 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	62.7%	80.2%	74.3%	69.5%	4.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	82.0%	86.0%	84.6%	88.5%	-3.9 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	78.0%	87.3%	83.5%	81.6%	1.9 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	63.3%	79.7%	72.6%	70.8%	1.9 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	75.0%	69.6%	71.5%	74.7%	-3.2 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	63.3%	77.6%	72.8%	70.3%	2.5 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	55.4%	71.0%	64.9%	67.3%	-2.4 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	51.0%	57.4%	55.3%	54.6%	0.7 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	51.6%	38.2%	43.0%	28.1%	14.8 pts
Students with Disabilities	23.1%	14.1%	17.3%	13.8%	3.5 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blue Ridge School District and Mountain View School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Blue Ridge School District</b>	<b>Mountain View School District</b>
County: Susquehanna	County: Susquehanna
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,216	District Enrollment: 1,446
Schools:	Schools:
Blue Ridge Elementary School (505 students in grades K-5); Blue Ridge Middle School (294 students in grades 6-8); Blue Ridge High School (417 students in grades 9-12)	Mountain View Elementary School (670 students in grades K-6); Mountain View Jr./Sr. High School (776 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Northeastern Educational IU 19	Intermediate Unit: Northeastern Educational IU 19
AVTS/CTC: Susquehanna Co CTC	AVTS/CTC: Susquehanna Co CTC

Blue Ridge School District and Mountain View School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Blue Ridge School District enrolled 1,216 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,196 per pupil. Mountain View School District enrolled 1,446 students, and spent \$8,408 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,662 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,139 less than Blue Ridge’s per-pupil spending, and \$351 less than Mountain View’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$1,892,045 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blue Ridge School District and Mountain View School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Blue Ridge	Mountain View	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,216	1,446	2,662	2,726	-64
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	2	5	5.2	-0.2
Square Miles	110	193	303	109	195
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,196	\$8,408	8,768	\$8,057	\$711
Instruction	\$5,579	\$5,250	\$5,400	\$5,022	\$378
Instructional Staff Support	\$184	\$259	\$225	\$256	-\$31
Pupil Support	\$436	\$233	\$326	\$354	-\$28
General Administration	\$295	\$210	\$249	\$210	\$39
School Administration	\$447	\$261	\$346	\$354	-\$7
Operations & Maintenance	\$863	\$656	\$750	\$820	-\$70
Student Transportation	\$760	\$920	\$847	\$500	\$347
Food Services	\$351	\$335	\$342	\$323	\$19
Other	\$280	\$284	\$282	\$202	\$80

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Blue Ridge School District and Mountain View School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Blue Ridge	Mountain View	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$15,055,000	\$9,375,000	\$24,430,000	\$27,621,426	-\$3,191,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$12,799	\$584	\$13,383	\$1,905	\$11,478
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,200	\$9,500	\$10,276	\$9,710	\$566
Local	\$4,625	\$4,140	\$4,362	\$5,542	-\$1,181
State	\$5,914	\$4,677	\$5,242	\$3,780	\$1,463
Federal	\$660	\$683	\$672	\$388	\$284
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	25.80	17.40	21.24	20.94	0.30
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$206	\$311	\$263	\$660	-\$396
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	608	723	666	1,131	-465
School Administrators	3	3	6	6.4	-0.4
Students Per School Administrator	405	482	444	444	0
Teachers	82	99	181	170.0	11.0
Students Per Teacher	14.8	14.6	14.7	16.2	-1.5
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	60.7%	62.8%	61.8%	71.4%	-9.6 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	65.0%	70.0%	67.6%	74.0%	-6.4 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	59.1%	59.0%	59.1%	73.7%	-14.7 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	46.9%	45.6%	46.2%	64.3%	-18.1 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	64.6%	70.7%	68.0%	70.7%	-2.7 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	65.7%	67.5%	66.7%	72.0%	-5.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	59.4%	70.0%	64.3%	74.8%	-10.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	69.0%	68.8%	68.9%	69.0%	-0.1 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	79.0%	83.0%	81.1%	87.0%	-5.9 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	68.6%	73.5%	71.1%	82.6%	-11.6 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	61.7%	45.6%	52.7%	70.9%	-18.2 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	63.4%	62.2%	62.7%	72.3%	-9.5 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	56.6%	62.1%	59.5%	71.1%	-11.6 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	45.2%	62.3%	53.1%	67.5%	-14.4 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	51.3%	46.0%	48.7%	54.1%	-5.4 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	32.4%	44.7%	39.1%	24.1%	15.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	16.3%	14.5%	15.3%	13.5%	1.8 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Chartiers-Houston School District and Fort Cherry School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Chartiers-Houston School District</b>	<b>Fort Cherry School District</b>
County: Washington	County: Washington
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,234	District Enrollment: 1,325
Schools:	Schools:
Allison Park Elementary School (600 students in grades K-6); Chartiers-Houston Jr./Sr. High School (634 students in grades 7-12)	Fort Cherry Elementary Center (659 students in grades K-6); Fort Cherry Jr./Sr. High School (666 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1	Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1
AVTS/CTC: Western Area CTC	AVTS/CTC: Western Area CTC

Chartiers-Houston School District and Fort Cherry School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Chartiers-Houston School District enrolled 1,234 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,194 per pupil. Fort Cherry School District enrolled 1,325 students, and spent \$8,169 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,559 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$137 less than Chartiers-Houston’s per-pupil spending, and \$112 less than Fort Cherry’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$317,937 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Chartiers-Houston School District and Fort Cherry School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Chartiers-Houston	Fort Cherry	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,234	1,325	2,559	2,726	-167
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	5.2	-1.2
Square Miles	25	58	83	109	-26
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,194	\$8,169	8,181	\$8,057	\$124
Instruction	\$4,754	\$4,792	\$4,774	\$5,022	-\$249
Instructional Staff Support	\$276	\$245	\$260	\$256	\$4
Pupil Support	\$289	\$319	\$305	\$354	-\$49
General Administration	\$374	\$231	\$300	\$210	\$90
School Administration	\$453	\$349	\$399	\$354	\$46
Operations & Maintenance	\$953	\$874	\$912	\$820	\$92
Student Transportation	\$464	\$652	\$561	\$500	\$61
Food Services	\$447	\$432	\$439	\$323	\$116
Other	\$184	\$275	\$231	\$202	\$29

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Chartiers-Houston School District and Fort Cherry School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Chartiers-Houston	Fort Cherry	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$2,960,000	\$13,430,000	\$16,390,000	\$27,621,426	-\$11,231,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$83	\$1,627	\$1,710	\$1,905	-\$195
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,681	\$10,218	\$9,959	\$9,710	\$249
Local	\$5,071	\$4,286	\$4,665	\$5,542	-\$878
State	\$4,340	\$5,565	\$4,974	\$3,780	\$1,195
Federal	\$269	\$368	\$320	\$388	-\$68
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	19.20	22.80	21.06	20.94	0.12
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$278	\$215	\$245	\$660	-\$414
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	2	5	2.6	2.4
Students Per District Administrator	411	663	512	1,131	-619
School Administrators	3	3	6	6.4	-0.4
Students Per School Administrator	411	442	427	444	-17
Teachers	78	90	168	170.0	-2.0
Students Per Teacher	15.8	14.7	15.2	16.2	-0.9
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	69.8%	68.2%	69.0%	71.4%	-2.4 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	76.0%	75.4%	74.0%	1.5 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	78.0%	67.0%	71.2%	73.7%	-2.5 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	66.3%	70.4%	68.3%	64.3%	4.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	59.8%	72.3%	66.1%	70.7%	-4.6 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	71.9%	59.1%	65.8%	72.0%	-6.2 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	75.9%	60.8%	67.7%	74.8%	-7.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	69.7%	79.0%	74.5%	69.0%	5.5 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	87.0%	86.0%	86.6%	87.0%	-0.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	86.5%	81.9%	83.7%	82.6%	1.1 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	65.2%	75.0%	69.9%	70.9%	-1.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	64.1%	67.0%	65.6%	72.3%	-6.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	70.9%	59.1%	65.3%	71.1%	-5.8 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	60.5%	57.9%	59.1%	67.5%	-8.4 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	53.6%	48.6%	51.0%	54.1%	-3.1 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	24.3%	29.5%	27.0%	24.1%	2.9 pts
Students with Disabilities	13.6%	13.1%	13.3%	13.5%	-0.2 pts



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Clarion Area School District and Keystone School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Clarion Area School District</b>	<b>Keystone School District</b>
County: Clarion	County: Clarion
District Locale: Small Town	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 910	District Enrollment: 1,225
Schools:	Schools:
Clarion Area Elementary School (456 students in grades K-6); Clarion Area Jr./Sr. High School (454 students in grades 7-12)	Keystone Elementary School (642 students in grades K-6); Keystone Jr./Sr. High School (583 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Clarion Co Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Clarion Co Career Center

Clarion Area School District and Keystone School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Clarion Area School District enrolled 910 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,120 per pupil. Keystone School District enrolled 1,225 students, and spent \$8,850 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,135 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$796 less than Clarion Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$526 less than Keystone’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$1,368,713 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Clarion Area School District and Keystone School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Clarion Area	Keystone	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	910	1,225	2,135	2,255	-120
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	4.7	-0.7
Square Miles	70	123	193	111	82
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,120	\$8,850	8,965	\$8,324	\$641
Instruction	\$5,611	\$5,283	\$5,423	\$5,136	\$287
Instructional Staff Support	\$289	\$199	\$237	\$279	-\$42
Pupil Support	\$479	\$358	\$410	\$370	\$39
General Administration	\$297	\$238	\$263	\$234	\$29
School Administration	\$479	\$432	\$452	\$396	\$56
Operations & Maintenance	\$963	\$772	\$853	\$846	\$7
Student Transportation	\$355	\$594	\$492	\$510	-\$18
Food Services	\$433	\$384	\$405	\$338	\$67
Other	\$214	\$588	\$429	\$184	\$245

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Clarion Area School District and Keystone School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Clarion Area	Keystone	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$7,589,000	\$5,161,000	\$12,750,000	\$24,347,120	-\$11,597,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,074	\$709	\$1,783	\$3,093	-\$1,310
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,673	\$10,185	\$10,393	\$10,148	\$245
Local	\$6,586	\$3,003	\$4,530	\$5,489	-\$958
State	\$3,692	\$6,253	\$5,162	\$4,221	\$940
Federal	\$395	\$929	\$701	\$438	\$263
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	18.60	16.80	17.57	21.58	-4.01
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$296	\$188	\$234	\$530	-\$296
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	2	5	2.5	2.5
Students Per District Administrator	303	613	427	1,037	-610
School Administrators	3	3	6	6.0	0.0
Students Per School Administrator	303	408	356	390	-34
Teachers	64	90	154	145.0	9.0
Students Per Teacher	14.2	13.6	13.9	15.7	-1.8
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	77.5%	71.5%	74.1%	70.0%	4.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	74.0%	74.4%	72.2%	2.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	80.3%	76.2%	77.8%	71.9%	5.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	56.6%	63.3%	60.0%	62.1%	-2.1 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	80.9%	81.1%	81.0%	70.6%	10.4 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	78.2%	69.7%	73.3%	71.4%	1.9 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	90.1%	78.3%	82.9%	73.9%	9.0 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	82.9%	73.2%	78.2%	68.0%	10.2 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	94.0%	90.0%	91.7%	87.0%	4.7 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	85.7%	78.4%	81.2%	80.0%	1.2 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	77.7%	52.6%	64.8%	68.9%	-4.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.7%	67.3%	74.6%	72.3%	2.3 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	78.1%	70.5%	73.7%	70.1%	3.6 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	70.4%	69.3%	69.7%	64.7%	5.1 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	59.2%	52.1%	55.8%	53.0%	2.7 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	22.7%	36.1%	30.4%	26.6%	3.7 pts
Students with Disabilities	11.1%	15.6%	13.7%	14.4%	-0.7 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Clarion-Limestone Area School District and Brookville Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Clarion-Limestone Area School District</b>	<b>Brookville Area School District</b>
County: Clarion	County: Jefferson
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Small Town
District Enrollment: 1,098	District Enrollment: 1,885
Schools:	Schools:
Clarion-Limestone Elementary School (597 students in grades K-6); Clarion-Limestone Area Jr./Sr. High School (501 students in grades 7-12)	Hickory Grove Elementary School (554 students in grades 3-6); Northside Elementary School (122 students in grades K); Pinecreek Elementary School (269 students in grades 1-2); Brookville Jr./Sr. High School (940 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Clarion Co Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Jefferson Co- Dubois AVTS

Clarion-Limestone Area School District and Brookville Area School District are located in different counties. However, they are served by the same Intermediate Unit, but by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Clarion-Limestone Area School District enrolled 1,098 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,153 per pupil. Brookville Area School District enrolled 1,885 students, and spent \$8,463 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,983 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$96 less than Clarion-Limestone Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$406 less than Brookville Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$870,735 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Clarion-Limestone Area School District and Brookville Area School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Clarion-Limestone Area	Brookville Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,098	1,885	2,983	2,726	257
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	4	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	117	262	380	109	271
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,153	\$8,463	8,349	\$8,057	\$292
Instruction	\$4,841	\$5,088	\$4,997	\$5,022	-\$25
Instructional Staff Support	\$386	\$264	\$309	\$256	\$53
Pupil Support	\$393	\$333	\$355	\$354	\$1
General Administration	\$222	\$222	\$222	\$210	\$12
School Administration	\$380	\$347	\$359	\$354	\$6
Operations & Maintenance	\$798	\$893	\$858	\$820	\$38
Student Transportation	\$634	\$740	\$701	\$500	\$201
Food Services	\$326	\$344	\$337	\$323	\$14
Other	\$174	\$232	\$211	\$202	\$8

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Clarion-Limestone Area School District and Brookville Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Clarion-Limestone Area	Brookville Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$7,120,000	\$21,650,000	\$28,770,000	\$27,621,426	\$1,148,574
Debt Payments (per student)	\$6,384	\$759	\$7,143	\$1,905	\$5,238
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,616	\$10,407	\$10,116	\$9,710	\$406
Local	\$3,491	\$4,182	\$3,928	\$5,542	-\$1,615
State	\$5,321	\$5,712	\$5,568	\$3,780	\$1,789
Federal	\$803	\$513	\$620	\$388	\$232
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	16.80	19.80	18.70	20.94	-2.24
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$205	\$363	\$305	\$660	-\$355
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	549	943	746	1,131	-385
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	366	471	426	444	-18
Teachers	76	125	201	170.0	31.0
Students Per Teacher	14.4	15.1	14.8	16.2	-1.3
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	75.3%	67.4%	70.4%	71.4%	-1.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	78.0%	67.0%	70.4%	74.0%	-3.6 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	77.4%	60.6%	68.7%	73.7%	-5.0 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	63.3%	57.0%	59.4%	64.3%	-4.9 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	74.7%	74.7%	74.7%	70.7%	4.0 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	75.3%	80.9%	78.7%	72.0%	6.8 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	79.3%	72.0%	74.7%	74.8%	-0.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	78.5%	70.2%	73.2%	69.0%	4.2 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	90.0%	85.0%	86.5%	87.0%	-0.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	84.0%	70.2%	76.8%	82.6%	-5.8 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	81.0%	54.7%	64.7%	70.9%	-6.2 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	71.2%	61.0%	64.8%	72.3%	-7.5 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	69.4%	63.3%	65.6%	71.1%	-5.4 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	72.4%	63.0%	66.5%	67.5%	-1.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	59.5%	60.3%	60.0%	54.1%	5.9 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	26.8%	41.0%	35.8%	24.1%	11.7 pts
Students with Disabilities	13.3%	15.9%	15.0%	13.5%	1.4 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Conemaugh Township Area School District and North Star School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Conemaugh Township Area School District</b>	<b>North Star School District</b>
County: Somerset	County: Somerset
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,139	District Enrollment: 1,429
Schools:	Schools:
Conemaugh Township Area Primary School (231 students in grades K-2); Conemaugh Township Area Intermediate School (331 students in grades 3-6); Conemaugh Township Area Jr./Sr. High School (577 students in grades 7-12)	North Star Central Elementary School (401 students in grades K-5); North Star East Elementary School (351 students in grades K-6); North Star East Middle School (236 students in grades 6-8); North Star High School (441 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Greater Johnstown AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center

Conemaugh Township Area School District and North Star School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit. However, they are served by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Conemaugh Township Area School District enrolled 1,139 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,671 per pupil. North Star School District enrolled 1,429 students, and spent \$8,220 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,568 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$614 less than Conemaugh Township Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$163 less than North Star’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$931,408 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Conemaugh Township Area School District and North Star School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Conemaugh Township Area	North Star	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,139	1,429	2,568	2,726	-158
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	4	7	5.2	1.8
Square Miles	55	105	159	109	51
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,671	\$8,220	8,420	\$8,057	\$363
Instruction	\$5,248	\$4,932	\$5,072	\$5,022	\$50
Instructional Staff Support	\$262	\$271	\$267	\$256	\$11
Pupil Support	\$442	\$338	\$384	\$354	\$30
General Administration	\$234	\$321	\$282	\$210	\$72
School Administration	\$379	\$318	\$345	\$354	-\$8
Operations & Maintenance	\$809	\$816	\$813	\$820	-\$7
Student Transportation	\$455	\$741	\$614	\$500	\$114
Food Services	\$511	\$328	\$409	\$323	\$86
Other	\$333	\$154	\$233	\$202	\$31



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Conemaugh Township Area School District and North Star School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Conemaugh Township Area	North Star	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$6,044,000	\$19,735,000	\$25,779,000	\$27,621,426	-\$1,842,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,052	\$6,789	\$7,841	\$1,905	\$5,936
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,327	\$9,920	\$10,100	\$9,710	\$390
Local	\$2,982	\$3,013	\$2,999	\$5,542	-\$2,543
State	\$6,716	\$6,189	\$6,423	\$3,780	\$2,643
Federal	\$630	\$717	\$678	\$388	\$290
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	15.20	17.90	16.70	20.94	-4.24
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$203	\$223	\$214	\$660	-\$446
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	570	715	642	1,131	-489
School Administrators	3	3	6	6.4	-0.4
Students Per School Administrator	380	476	428	444	-16
Teachers	77	104	181	170.0	11.0
Students Per Teacher	14.8	13.7	14.2	16.2	-2.0
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	74.8%	64.6%	69.2%	71.4%	-2.2 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	87.0%	72.0%	79.3%	74.0%	5.3 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	85.0%	69.9%	76.5%	73.7%	2.8 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	70.2%	48.9%	57.9%	64.3%	-6.4 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	72.0%	58.6%	64.8%	70.7%	-5.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	74.1%	68.9%	71.3%	72.0%	-0.7 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	75.7%	76.9%	76.4%	74.8%	1.6 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	51.8%	56.6%	54.4%	69.0%	-14.5 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	91.0%	88.0%	89.4%	87.0%	2.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	85.0%	77.7%	80.9%	82.6%	-1.7 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	77.6%	56.5%	65.4%	70.9%	-5.5 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	72.1%	65.6%	68.6%	72.3%	-3.6 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	82.7%	52.1%	66.4%	71.1%	-4.7 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	75.7%	71.8%	73.4%	67.5%	5.9 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	50.6%	43.5%	46.7%	54.1%	-7.4 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.8%	46.3%	39.9%	24.1%	15.8 pts
Students with Disabilities	16.1%	14.3%	15.1%	13.5%	1.6 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Conemaugh Township Area School District and Richland School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Conemaugh Township Area School District</b>	<b>Richland School District</b>
County: Somerset	County: Cambria
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 1,139	District Enrollment: 1,593
Schools:	Schools:
Conemaugh Township Area Primary School (231 students in grades K-2); Conemaugh Township Area Intermediate School (331 students in grades 3-6); Conemaugh Township Area Jr./Sr. High School (577 students in grades 7-12)	Richland Elementary School (660 students in grades K-5); Richland Middle School (416 students in grades 6-8); Richland Senior High School (517 students in grades 8-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Greater Johnstown AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Greater Johnstown AVTS

Conemaugh Township Area School District and Richland School District are located in different counties, but they are served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Conemaugh Township Area School District enrolled 1,139 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,671 per pupil. Richland School District enrolled 1,593 students, and spent \$8,276 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,732 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$614 less than Conemaugh Township Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$219 less than Richland’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$1,048,056 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Conemaugh Township Area School District and Richland School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Conemaugh Township Area	Richland	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,139	1,593	2,732	2,726	6
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	55	20	75	109	-34
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,671	\$8,276	8,441	\$8,057	\$384
Instruction	\$5,248	\$4,914	\$5,053	\$5,022	\$31
Instructional Staff Support	\$262	\$374	\$327	\$256	\$71
Pupil Support	\$442	\$383	\$407	\$354	\$54
General Administration	\$234	\$255	\$246	\$210	\$36
School Administration	\$379	\$471	\$433	\$354	\$79
Operations & Maintenance	\$809	\$998	\$919	\$820	\$99
Student Transportation	\$455	\$446	\$450	\$500	-\$50
Food Services	\$511	\$323	\$401	\$323	\$78
Other	\$333	\$112	\$204	\$202	\$2

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Conemaugh Township Area School District and Richland School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Conemaugh Township Area	Richland	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$6,044,000	\$13,850,000	\$19,894,000	\$27,621,426	-\$7,727,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,052	\$9,107	\$10,159	\$1,905	\$8,254
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,327	\$9,582	\$9,892	\$9,710	\$182
Local	\$2,982	\$6,590	\$5,086	\$5,542	-\$457
State	\$6,716	\$2,701	\$4,375	\$3,780	\$595
Federal	\$630	\$291	\$432	\$388	\$44
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	15.20	16.30	15.84	20.94	-5.10
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$203	\$606	\$438	\$660	-\$222
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	570	797	683	1,131	-448
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	380	398	390	444	-54
Teachers	77	93	170	170.0	0.0
Students Per Teacher	14.8	17.1	16.1	16.2	-0.1
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	74.8%	83.9%	80.2%	71.4%	8.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	87.0%	84.0%	85.2%	74.0%	11.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	85.0%	84.7%	84.8%	73.7%	11.1 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	70.2%	87.6%	80.1%	64.3%	15.8 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	72.0%	75.4%	74.0%	70.7%	3.3 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	74.1%	86.0%	80.7%	72.0%	8.7 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	75.7%	84.7%	81.4%	74.8%	6.6 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	51.8%	85.9%	72.0%	69.0%	3.1 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	91.0%	94.0%	92.8%	87.0%	5.9 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	85.0%	91.6%	89.1%	82.6%	6.5 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	77.6%	87.6%	83.3%	70.9%	12.4 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	72.1%	78.7%	76.0%	72.3%	3.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	82.7%	90.7%	87.1%	71.1%	16.1 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	75.7%	81.7%	79.5%	67.5%	12.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	50.6%	63.7%	58.4%	54.1%	4.3 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.8%	12.3%	20.4%	24.1%	-3.7 pts
Students with Disabilities	16.1%	9.5%	12.3%	13.5%	-1.3 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Conemaugh Valley School District and Central Cambria School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Conemaugh Valley School District</b>	<b>Central Cambria School District</b>
County: Cambria	County: Cambria
District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 915	District Enrollment: 1,912
Schools:	Schools:
East Taylor Elementary School (131 students in grades K-3); Conemaugh Valley Elementary School (354 students in grades K-6); Conemaugh Valley Jr./Sr. High School (430 students in grades 7-12)	Jackson Elementary School (290 students in grades K-5); Cambria Elementary School (494 students in grades K-5); Central Cambria Middle School (441 students in grades 6-8); Central Cambria High School (687 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Conemaugh Valley School District and Central Cambria School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Conemaugh Valley School District enrolled 915 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,719 per pupil. Central Cambria School District enrolled 1,912 students, and spent \$8,576 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,827 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$662 less than Conemaugh Valley’s per-pupil spending, and \$519 less than Central Cambria’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$1,597,645 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Conemaugh Valley School District and Central Cambria School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Conemaugh Valley	Central Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	915	1,912	2,827	2,726	101
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	4	7	5.2	1.8
Square Miles	22	100	121	109	13
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,719	\$8,576	8,622	\$8,057	\$565
Instruction	\$5,327	\$5,138	\$5,199	\$5,022	\$176
Instructional Staff Support	\$363	\$325	\$337	\$256	\$81
Pupil Support	\$336	\$483	\$435	\$354	\$82
General Administration	\$286	\$269	\$275	\$210	\$64
School Administration	\$385	\$373	\$377	\$354	\$24
Operations & Maintenance	\$999	\$943	\$961	\$820	\$141
Student Transportation	\$499	\$510	\$507	\$500	\$7
Food Services	\$336	\$437	\$404	\$323	\$81
Other	\$189	\$98	\$127	\$202	-\$75

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Conemaugh Valley School District and Central Cambria School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Conemaugh Valley	Central Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$2,270,000	\$9,867,000	\$12,137,000	\$27,621,426	-\$15,484,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$400	\$490	\$890	\$1,905	-\$1,015
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,817	\$9,356	\$9,505	\$9,710	-\$205
Local	\$2,339	\$4,251	\$3,632	\$5,542	-\$1,910
State	\$6,791	\$4,697	\$5,375	\$3,780	\$1,595
Federal	\$687	\$407	\$498	\$388	\$110
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	16.00	16.60	16.41	20.94	-4.53
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$118	\$406	\$313	\$660	-\$347
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	3	5	2.6	2.4
Students Per District Administrator	458	637	565	1,131	-565
School Administrators	3	5	8	6.4	1.6
Students Per School Administrator	305	382	353	444	-90
Teachers	72	122	194	170.0	24.0
Students Per Teacher	12.7	15.7	14.6	16.2	-1.6
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	73.2%	72.6%	72.8%	71.4%	1.4 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	89.0%	81.0%	83.8%	74.0%	9.8 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	60.5%	74.4%	69.4%	73.7%	-4.4 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	69.0%	72.6%	71.4%	64.3%	7.1 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	79.7%	66.9%	71.2%	70.7%	0.4 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	78.3%	66.0%	69.7%	72.0%	-2.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	68.4%	74.3%	72.1%	74.8%	-2.7 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	58.7%	76.4%	70.7%	69.0%	1.7 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	88.0%	90.5%	87.0%	3.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	74.6%	76.8%	76.0%	82.6%	-6.6 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	69.0%	77.1%	74.3%	70.9%	3.4 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	90.6%	68.9%	76.1%	72.3%	3.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	86.7%	72.5%	76.8%	71.1%	5.7 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	67.1%	67.4%	67.3%	67.5%	-0.2 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	48.0%	59.9%	56.1%	54.1%	2.0 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	42.2%	29.4%	33.5%	24.1%	9.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.5%	15.0%	15.2%	13.5%	1.7 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Conemaugh Valley School District and Richland School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Conemaugh Valley School District</b>	<b>Richland School District</b>
County: Cambria	County: Cambria
District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 915	District Enrollment: 1,593
Schools:	Schools:
East Taylor Elementary School (131 students in grades K-3); Conemaugh Valley Elementary School (354 students in grades K-6); Conemaugh Valley Jr./Sr. High School (430 students in grades 7-12)	Richland Elementary School (660 students in grades K-5); Richland Middle School (416 students in grades 6-8); Richland Senior High School (517 students in grades 8-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Greater Johnstown AVTS

Conemaugh Valley School District and Richland School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit. However, they are served by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Conemaugh Valley School District enrolled 915 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,719 per pupil. Richland School District enrolled 1,593 students, and spent \$8,276 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,508 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$662 less than Conemaugh Valley’s per-pupil spending, and \$219 less than Richland’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$954,850 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Conemaugh Valley School District and Richland School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Conemaugh Valley	Richland	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	915	1,593	2,508	2,726	-218
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	22	20	42	109	-66
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,719	\$8,276	8,438	\$8,057	\$381
Instruction	\$5,327	\$4,914	\$5,065	\$5,022	\$42
Instructional Staff Support	\$363	\$374	\$370	\$256	\$114
Pupil Support	\$336	\$383	\$366	\$354	\$12
General Administration	\$286	\$255	\$266	\$210	\$56
School Administration	\$385	\$471	\$439	\$354	\$86
Operations & Maintenance	\$999	\$998	\$998	\$820	\$178
Student Transportation	\$499	\$446	\$466	\$500	-\$34
Food Services	\$336	\$323	\$327	\$323	\$5
Other	\$189	\$112	\$140	\$202	-\$62

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Conemaugh Valley School District and Richland School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Conemaugh Valley	Richland	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$2,270,000	\$13,850,000	\$16,120,000	\$27,621,426	-\$11,501,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$400	\$9,107	\$9,507	\$1,905	\$7,602
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,817	\$9,582	\$9,668	\$9,710	-\$42
Local	\$2,339	\$6,590	\$5,039	\$5,542	-\$503
State	\$6,791	\$2,701	\$4,193	\$3,780	\$414
Federal	\$687	\$291	\$435	\$388	\$47
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	16.00	16.30	16.19	20.94	-4.75
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$118	\$606	\$428	\$660	-\$232
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	458	797	627	1,131	-504
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	305	398	358	444	-86
Teachers	72	93	165	170.0	-5.0
Students Per Teacher	12.7	17.1	15.2	16.2	-1.0
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	73.2%	83.9%	80.0%	71.4%	8.6 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	89.0%	84.0%	85.8%	74.0%	11.8 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	60.5%	84.7%	76.2%	73.7%	2.5 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	69.0%	87.6%	79.3%	64.3%	15.1 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	79.7%	75.4%	77.0%	70.7%	6.3 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	78.3%	86.0%	83.6%	72.0%	11.6 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	68.4%	84.7%	78.7%	74.8%	3.9 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	58.7%	85.9%	75.5%	69.0%	6.5 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	94.0%	94.4%	87.0%	7.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	74.6%	91.6%	85.6%	82.6%	3.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	69.0%	87.6%	79.3%	70.9%	8.4 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	90.6%	78.7%	83.2%	72.3%	10.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	86.7%	90.7%	89.4%	71.1%	18.4 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	67.1%	81.7%	76.4%	67.5%	8.9 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	48.0%	63.7%	57.7%	54.1%	3.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	42.2%	12.3%	23.2%	24.1%	-0.9 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.5%	9.5%	11.7%	13.5%	-1.8 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Cornell School District and Avonworth School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Cornell School District	Avonworth School District
County: Allegheny	County: Allegheny
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 750	District Enrollment: 1,339
Schools:	Schools:
Cornell Elementary School (402 students in grades K-6); Cornell Junior High School (201 students in grades 7-9); Cornell Senior High School (147 students in grades 10-12)	Avonworth Elementary School (603 students in grades K-5); Avonworth Middle School (299 students in grades 6-8); Avonworth High School (437 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Allegheny IU 3	Intermediate Unit: Allegheny IU 3
AVTS/CTC: Parkway West AVTS	AVTS/CTC: A W Beattie Career Center

Cornell School District and Avonworth School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit. However, they are served by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Cornell School District enrolled 750 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,896 per pupil. Avonworth School District enrolled 1,339 students, and spent \$8,873 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,089 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$2,572 less than Cornell’s per-pupil spending, and \$549 less than Avonworth’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$2,664,603 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Cornell School District and Avonworth School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Cornell	Avonworth	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	750	1,339	2,089	2,255	-166
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	4.7	1.3
Square Miles	4	11	14	111	-96
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,896	\$8,873	9,599	\$8,324	\$1,276
Instruction	\$7,032	\$5,358	\$5,959	\$5,136	\$823
Instructional Staff Support	\$225	\$333	\$294	\$279	\$15
Pupil Support	\$213	\$376	\$318	\$370	-\$53
General Administration	\$645	\$437	\$512	\$234	\$278
School Administration	\$548	\$387	\$445	\$396	\$49
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,155	\$754	\$898	\$846	\$51
Student Transportation	\$533	\$711	\$647	\$510	\$137
Food Services	\$455	\$280	\$343	\$338	\$5
Other	\$89	\$237	\$184	\$184	\$0

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Cornell School District and Avonworth School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Cornell	Avonworth	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$6,514,000	\$21,428,000	\$27,942,000	\$24,347,120	\$3,594,880
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,549	\$6,112	\$7,661	\$3,093	\$4,568
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,451	\$10,966	\$11,858	\$10,148	\$1,710
Local	\$9,160	\$7,814	\$8,297	\$5,489	\$2,809
State	\$3,204	\$2,817	\$2,956	\$4,221	-\$1,265
Federal	\$1,087	\$335	\$605	\$438	\$166
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	28.80	21.90	24.38	21.58	2.80
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$225	\$451	\$370	\$530	-\$160
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	3	5	2.5	2.5
Students Per District Administrator	375	446	418	1,037	-619
School Administrators	1	3	4	6.0	-2.0
Students Per School Administrator	750	446	522	390	132
Teachers	61	79	140	145.0	-5.0
Students Per Teacher	12.3	16.9	14.9	15.7	-0.8
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	62.8%	83.2%	75.8%	70.0%	5.8 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	79.0%	91.0%	86.7%	72.2%	14.5 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	64.1%	91.8%	82.8%	71.9%	10.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	53.2%	78.6%	69.8%	62.1%	7.8 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	82.3%	72.5%	70.6%	1.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	62.6%	77.0%	70.6%	71.4%	-0.8 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	73.1%	86.6%	82.3%	73.9%	8.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	47.8%	71.9%	63.7%	68.0%	-4.3 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	87.0%	8.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	73.6%	94.6%	87.8%	80.0%	7.8 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	72.3%	86.7%	81.8%	68.9%	12.9 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	65.2%	83.2%	76.4%	72.3%	4.0 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	57.5%	79.0%	69.4%	70.1%	-0.6 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	43.9%	79.7%	68.4%	64.7%	3.8 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	36.9%	64.1%	54.8%	53.0%	1.8 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	54.7%	9.3%	25.6%	26.6%	-1.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	21.6%	7.8%	12.7%	14.4%	-1.6 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Cornell School District and Northgate School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Cornell School District	Northgate School District
County: Allegheny	County: Allegheny
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City
District Enrollment: 750	District Enrollment: 1,526
Schools:	Schools:
Cornell Elementary School (402 students in grades K-6); Cornell Junior High School (201 students in grades 7-9); Cornell Senior High School (147 students in grades 10-12)	Avalon Elementary School (335 students in grades K-6); Bellevue Elementary School (397 students in grades K-6); Northgate Middle School/High School (794 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Allegheny IU 3	Intermediate Unit: Allegheny IU 3
AVTS/CTC: Parkway West AVTS	AVTS/CTC: A W Beattie Career Center

Cornell School District and Northgate School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit. However, they are served by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Cornell School District enrolled 750 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,896 per pupil. Northgate School District enrolled 1,526 students, and spent \$8,868 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,276 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$2,572 less than Cornell’s per-pupil spending, and \$544 less than Northgate’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$2,760,049 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Cornell School District and Northgate School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Cornell	Northgate	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	750	1,526	2,276	2,255	21
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	4.7	1.3
Square Miles	4	2	5	111	-105
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,896	\$8,868	9,536	\$8,324	\$1,213
Instruction	\$7,032	\$5,806	\$6,210	\$5,136	\$1,074
Instructional Staff Support	\$225	\$153	\$177	\$279	-\$102
Pupil Support	\$213	\$421	\$352	\$370	-\$18
General Administration	\$645	\$339	\$440	\$234	\$206
School Administration	\$548	\$410	\$456	\$396	\$60
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,155	\$940	\$1,011	\$846	\$165
Student Transportation	\$533	\$193	\$305	\$510	-\$205
Food Services	\$455	\$320	\$365	\$338	\$27
Other	\$89	\$286	\$221	\$184	\$37

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Cornell School District and Northgate School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Cornell	Northgate	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$6,514,000	\$10,223,000	\$16,737,000	\$24,347,120	-\$7,610,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,549	\$956	\$2,505	\$3,093	-\$588
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,451	\$10,626	\$11,557	\$10,148	\$1,409
Local	\$9,160	\$6,880	\$7,631	\$5,489	\$2,143
State	\$3,204	\$3,290	\$3,262	\$4,221	-\$959
Federal	\$1,087	\$455	\$663	\$438	\$225
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	28.80	31.20	30.41	21.58	8.83
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$225	\$317	\$287	\$530	-\$243
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	375	763	569	1,037	-468
School Administrators	1	4	5	6.0	-1.0
Students Per School Administrator	750	382	455	390	65
Teachers	61	108	169	145.0	24.0
Students Per Teacher	12.3	14.1	13.5	15.7	-2.2
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	62.8%	76.5%	71.7%	70.0%	1.7 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	79.0%	80.0%	79.6%	72.2%	7.4 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	64.1%	83.9%	76.1%	71.9%	4.2 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	53.2%	81.1%	72.2%	62.1%	10.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	81.4%	70.7%	70.6%	0.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	62.6%	76.7%	70.8%	71.4%	-0.5 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	73.1%	69.4%	70.3%	73.9%	-3.6 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	47.8%	60.0%	56.5%	68.0%	-11.5 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	87.0%	8.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	73.6%	95.0%	86.5%	80.0%	6.5 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	72.3%	90.1%	84.4%	68.9%	15.6 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	65.2%	85.7%	76.9%	72.3%	4.5 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	57.5%	74.1%	67.2%	70.1%	-2.9 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	43.9%	67.1%	61.7%	64.7%	-3.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	36.9%	52.2%	47.8%	53.0%	-5.2 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	54.7%	37.5%	43.2%	26.6%	16.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	21.6%	13.4%	16.1%	14.4%	1.7 pts



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Cornell School District and Quaker Valley School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Cornell School District</b>	<b>Quaker Valley School District</b>
County: Allegheny	County: Allegheny
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City
District Enrollment: 750	District Enrollment: 1,962
Schools:	Schools:
Cornell Elementary School (402 students in grades K-6); Cornell Junior High School (201 students in grades 7-9); Cornell Senior High School (147 students in grades 10-12)	Edgeworth Elementary School (410 students in grades 1-5); Osborne Elementary School (454 students in grades K-5); Quaker Valley Middle School (454 students in grades 6-8); Quaker Valley High School (644 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Allegheny IU 3	Intermediate Unit: Allegheny IU 3
AVTS/CTC: Parkway West AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Parkway West AVTS

Cornell School District and Quaker Valley School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Cornell School District enrolled 750 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,896 per pupil. Quaker Valley School District enrolled 1,962 students, and spent \$12,075 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,712 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$2,839 less than Cornell’s per-pupil spending, and \$4,018 less than Quaker Valley’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$10,013,193 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Cornell School District and Quaker Valley School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Cornell	Quaker Valley	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	750	1,962	2,712	2,726	-14
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	4	7	5.2	1.8
Square Miles	4	24	28	109	-81
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,896	\$12,075	11,749	\$8,057	\$3,692
Instruction	\$7,032	\$6,734	\$6,817	\$5,022	\$1,794
Instructional Staff Support	\$225	\$1,312	\$1,011	\$256	\$755
Pupil Support	\$213	\$594	\$489	\$354	\$135
General Administration	\$645	\$436	\$494	\$210	\$283
School Administration	\$548	\$528	\$534	\$354	\$180
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,155	\$1,138	\$1,142	\$820	\$322
Student Transportation	\$533	\$675	\$636	\$500	\$136
Food Services	\$455	\$304	\$346	\$323	\$23
Other	\$89	\$354	\$281	\$202	\$79

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Cornell School District and Quaker Valley School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Cornell	Quaker Valley	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$6,514,000	\$49,946,000	\$56,460,000	\$27,621,426	\$28,838,574
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,549	\$1,122	\$2,671	\$1,905	\$766
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,451	\$13,895	\$13,772	\$9,710	\$4,062
Local	\$9,160	\$12,080	\$11,272	\$5,542	\$5,730
State	\$3,204	\$1,536	\$1,997	\$3,780	-\$1,783
Federal	\$1,087	\$279	\$502	\$388	\$114
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	28.80	18.90	21.64	20.94	0.70
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$225	\$1,219	\$944	\$660	\$284
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	4	6	2.6	3.4
Students Per District Administrator	375	491	452	1,131	-679
School Administrators	1	6	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	750	327	387	444	-56
Teachers	61	135	196	170.0	26.0
Students Per Teacher	12.3	14.5	13.8	16.2	-2.3
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	62.8%	83.7%	78.1%	71.4%	6.7 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	79.0%	76.0%	76.8%	74.0%	2.8 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	64.1%	88.2%	82.0%	73.7%	8.2 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	53.2%	83.7%	76.3%	64.3%	12.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	79.5%	72.4%	70.7%	1.7 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	62.6%	80.1%	73.9%	72.0%	1.9 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	73.1%	81.6%	79.8%	74.8%	5.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	47.8%	82.0%	74.0%	69.0%	5.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	89.0%	90.5%	87.0%	3.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	73.6%	94.8%	89.3%	82.6%	6.7 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	72.3%	83.6%	80.9%	70.9%	9.9 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	65.2%	81.4%	76.4%	72.3%	4.2 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	57.5%	87.7%	77.0%	71.1%	6.0 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	43.9%	87.4%	78.4%	67.5%	11.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	36.9%	77.3%	67.8%	54.1%	13.7 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	54.7%	11.7%	23.6%	24.1%	-0.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	21.6%	12.6%	15.1%	13.5%	1.6 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Cornell School District and Sto-Rox School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Cornell School District</b>	<b>Sto-Rox School District</b>
County: Allegheny	County: Allegheny
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City
District Enrollment: 750	District Enrollment: 1,528
Schools:	Schools:
Cornell Elementary School (402 students in grades K-6); Cornell Junior High School (201 students in grades 7-9); Cornell Senior High School (147 students in grades 10-12)	Foster Kindergarten Center (108 students in grades K); Sto-Rox Elementary School (561 students in grades 1-5); Sto-Rox Middle School (386 students in grades 6-8); Sto-Rox High School (473 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Allegheny IU 3	Intermediate Unit: Allegheny IU 3
AVTS/CTC: Parkway West AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Parkway West AVTS

Cornell School District and Sto-Rox School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Cornell School District enrolled 750 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,896 per pupil. Sto-Rox School District enrolled 1,528 students, and spent \$10,949 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,278 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$2,572 less than Cornell’s per-pupil spending, and \$2,625 less than Sto-Rox’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$5,940,402 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Cornell School District and Sto-Rox School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Cornell	Sto-Rox	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	750	1,528	2,278	2,255	23
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	4	7	4.7	2.3
Square Miles	4	3	7	111	-103
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,896	\$10,949	10,932	\$8,324	\$2,608
Instruction	\$7,032	\$6,449	\$6,641	\$5,136	\$1,505
Instructional Staff Support	\$225	\$420	\$356	\$279	\$77
Pupil Support	\$213	\$425	\$356	\$370	-\$15
General Administration	\$645	\$485	\$538	\$234	\$304
School Administration	\$548	\$508	\$521	\$396	\$125
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,155	\$1,231	\$1,206	\$846	\$360
Student Transportation	\$533	\$724	\$662	\$510	\$152
Food Services	\$455	\$517	\$496	\$338	\$158
Other	\$89	\$189	\$156	\$184	-\$28

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Cornell School District and Sto-Rox School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Cornell	Sto-Rox	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$6,514,000	\$20,799,000	\$27,313,000	\$24,347,120	\$2,965,880
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,549	\$995	\$2,544	\$3,093	-\$549
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,451	\$14,266	\$13,997	\$10,148	\$3,849
Local	\$9,160	\$5,757	\$6,878	\$5,489	\$1,389
State	\$3,204	\$6,173	\$5,196	\$4,221	\$974
Federal	\$1,087	\$2,335	\$1,924	\$438	\$1,486
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	28.80	32.60	31.35	21.58	9.77
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$225	\$234	\$231	\$530	-\$299
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	1	3	2.5	0.5
Students Per District Administrator	375	1,528	759	1,037	-278
School Administrators	1	3	4	6.0	-2.0
Students Per School Administrator	750	509	570	390	179
Teachers	61	109	170	145.0	25.0
Students Per Teacher	12.3	14.0	13.4	15.7	-2.3
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	62.8%	37.5%	46.6%	70.0%	-23.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	79.0%	44.0%	56.0%	72.2%	-16.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	64.1%	35.9%	46.4%	71.9%	-25.5 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	53.2%	41.6%	45.8%	62.1%	-16.3 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	27.9%	40.1%	70.6%	-30.5 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	62.6%	33.1%	45.8%	71.4%	-25.6 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	73.1%	36.5%	46.1%	73.9%	-27.7 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	47.8%	33.3%	37.7%	68.0%	-30.3 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	51.0%	65.8%	87.0%	-21.2 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	73.6%	43.8%	54.9%	80.0%	-25.1 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	72.3%	69.1%	70.2%	68.9%	1.4 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	65.2%	32.7%	46.4%	72.3%	-26.0 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	57.5%	40.2%	47.6%	70.1%	-22.5 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	43.9%	25.0%	29.9%	64.7%	-34.7 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	36.9%	20.9%	25.8%	53.0%	-27.3 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	54.7%	69.4%	64.6%	26.6%	37.9 pts
Students with Disabilities	21.6%	23.4%	22.8%	14.4%	8.5 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Ferndale Area School District and Central Cambria School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Ferndale Area School District</b>	<b>Central Cambria School District</b>
County: Cambria	County: Cambria
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 774	District Enrollment: 1,912
Schools:	Schools:
Ferndale Elementary School (422 students in grades K-6); Ferndale Area Jr./Sr. High School (352 students in grades 7-12)	Jackson Elementary School (290 students in grades K-5); Cambria Elementary School (494 students in grades K-5); Central Cambria Middle School (441 students in grades 6-8); Central Cambria High School (687 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Greater Johnstown AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Ferndale Area School District and Central Cambria School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit. However, they are served by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Ferndale Area School District enrolled 774 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,151 per pupil. Central Cambria School District enrolled 1,912 students, and spent \$8,576 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,686 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,094 less than Ferndale Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$519 less than Central Cambria’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$1,838,687 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Ferndale Area School District and Central Cambria School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Ferndale Area	Central Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	774	1,912	2,686	2,726	-40
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	4	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	6	100	106	109	-3
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,151	\$8,576	8,742	\$8,057	\$685
Instruction	\$5,323	\$5,138	\$5,191	\$5,022	\$169
Instructional Staff Support	\$444	\$325	\$359	\$256	\$103
Pupil Support	\$297	\$483	\$430	\$354	\$76
General Administration	\$415	\$269	\$311	\$210	\$101
School Administration	\$566	\$373	\$429	\$354	\$75
Operations & Maintenance	\$844	\$943	\$914	\$820	\$94
Student Transportation	\$521	\$510	\$513	\$500	\$13
Food Services	\$447	\$437	\$440	\$323	\$117
Other	\$295	\$98	\$155	\$202	-\$48



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Ferndale Area School District and Central Cambria School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Ferndale Area	Central Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$7,485,000	\$9,867,000	\$17,352,000	\$27,621,426	-\$10,269,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$589	\$490	\$1,079	\$1,905	-\$826
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,930	\$9,356	\$9,521	\$9,710	-\$189
Local	\$2,528	\$4,251	\$3,755	\$5,542	-\$1,788
State	\$6,720	\$4,697	\$5,280	\$3,780	\$1,500
Federal	\$682	\$407	\$487	\$388	\$98
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	24.30	16.60	18.82	20.94	-2.12
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$75	\$406	\$311	\$660	-\$349
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	3	5	2.6	2.4
Students Per District Administrator	387	637	537	1,131	-593
School Administrators	3	5	8	6.4	1.6
Students Per School Administrator	258	382	336	444	-108
Teachers	58	122	180	170.0	10.0
Students Per Teacher	13.3	15.7	14.9	16.2	-1.3
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	70.8%	72.6%	72.0%	71.4%	0.7 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	88.0%	81.0%	83.1%	74.0%	9.1 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	70.4%	74.4%	73.2%	73.7%	-0.5 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	68.7%	72.6%	71.3%	64.3%	7.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	62.8%	66.9%	65.6%	70.7%	-5.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	73.5%	66.0%	68.4%	72.0%	-3.6 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	62.9%	74.3%	70.7%	74.8%	-4.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	66.1%	76.4%	73.8%	69.0%	4.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	91.0%	88.0%	88.9%	87.0%	1.9 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	83.4%	76.8%	78.8%	82.6%	-3.8 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	70.2%	77.1%	74.8%	70.9%	3.9 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	60.0%	68.9%	66.0%	72.3%	-6.2 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	78.2%	72.5%	74.3%	71.1%	3.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	62.9%	67.4%	66.0%	67.5%	-1.5 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	62.3%	59.9%	60.5%	54.1%	6.4 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	50.6%	29.4%	35.5%	24.1%	11.4 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.9%	15.0%	15.0%	13.5%	1.4 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Ferndale Area School District and Conemaugh Valley School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Ferndale Area School District</b>	<b>Conemaugh Valley School District</b>
County: Cambria	County: Cambria
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 774	District Enrollment: 915
Schools:	Schools:
Ferndale Elementary School (422 students in grades K-6); Ferndale Area Jr./Sr. High School (352 students in grades 7-12)	East Taylor Elementary School (131 students in grades K-3); Conemaugh Valley Elementary School (354 students in grades K-6); Conemaugh Valley Jr./Sr. High School (430 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Greater Johnstown AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Ferndale Area School District and Conemaugh Valley School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit. However, they are served by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Ferndale Area School District enrolled 774 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,151 per pupil. Conemaugh Valley School District enrolled 915 students, and spent \$8,719 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,689 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,500 and 1,749 students) spent an average of \$8,479 per pupil. This is \$672 less than Ferndale Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$240 less than Conemaugh Valley’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,479 through consolidation, they could save \$739,836 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,479 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Ferndale Area School District and Conemaugh Valley School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Ferndale Area	Conemaugh Valley	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	774	915	1,689	1,616	73
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	3.4	1.6
Square Miles	6	22	28	95	-67
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,151	\$8,719	8,917	\$8,479	\$438
Instruction	\$5,323	\$5,327	\$5,325	\$5,269	\$56
Instructional Staff Support	\$444	\$363	\$400	\$243	\$157
Pupil Support	\$297	\$336	\$318	\$387	-\$69
General Administration	\$415	\$286	\$345	\$278	\$67
School Administration	\$566	\$385	\$468	\$373	\$95
Operations & Maintenance	\$844	\$999	\$928	\$853	\$75
Student Transportation	\$521	\$499	\$509	\$532	-\$23
Food Services	\$447	\$336	\$387	\$353	\$34
Other	\$295	\$189	\$237	\$190	\$47

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Ferndale Area School District and Conemaugh Valley School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Ferndale Area	Conemaugh Valley	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$7,485,000	\$2,270,000	\$9,755,000	\$14,381,000	-\$4,626,000
Debt Payments (per student)	\$589	\$400	\$989	\$1,826	-\$837
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,930	\$9,817	\$9,869	\$10,111	-\$241
Local	\$2,528	\$2,339	\$2,426	\$5,128	-\$2,702
State	\$6,720	\$6,791	\$6,758	\$4,400	\$2,359
Federal	\$682	\$687	\$685	\$583	\$102
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	24.30	16.00	19.80	21.00	-1.20
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$75	\$118	\$98	\$367	-\$268
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.2	1.8
Students Per District Administrator	387	458	422	866	-444
School Administrators	3	3	6	3.8	2.2
Students Per School Administrator	258	305	282	457	-176
Teachers	58	72	130	105.8	24.2
Students Per Teacher	13.3	12.7	13.0	15.5	-2.5
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	70.8%	73.2%	72.1%	68.4%	3.7 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	88.0%	89.0%	88.6%	72.4%	16.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	70.4%	60.5%	64.8%	70.7%	-5.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	68.7%	69.0%	68.9%	62.8%	6.1 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	62.8%	79.7%	71.5%	67.7%	3.8 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	73.5%	78.3%	75.8%	68.5%	7.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	62.9%	68.4%	66.0%	70.8%	-4.9 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	66.1%	58.7%	61.8%	66.5%	-4.7 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	91.0%	95.0%	93.2%	86.7%	6.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	83.4%	74.6%	78.4%	78.8%	-0.4 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	70.2%	69.0%	69.6%	67.4%	2.2 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	60.0%	90.6%	75.7%	69.1%	6.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	78.2%	86.7%	82.3%	66.6%	15.7 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	62.9%	67.1%	65.3%	62.5%	2.7 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	62.3%	48.0%	53.9%	51.3%	2.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	50.6%	42.2%	46.0%	29.6%	16.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.9%	15.5%	15.2%	15.1%	0.1 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forbes Road School District and Central Fulton School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Forbes Road School District</b>	<b>Central Fulton School District</b>
County: Fulton	County: Fulton
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 483	District Enrollment: 1,042
Schools:	Schools:
Forbes Road Elementary School (280 students in grades K-6); Forbes Road Jr./Sr. High School (203 students in grades 7-12)	McConnellsburg Elementary School (473 students in grades PreK-5); McConnellsburg Middle School (256 students in grades 6-8); McConnellsburg High School (313 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Tuscarora IU 11	Intermediate Unit: Tuscarora IU 11
AVTS/CTC: Fulton Co AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Fulton Co AVTS

Forbes Road School District and Central Fulton School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Forbes Road School District enrolled 483 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,205 per pupil. Central Fulton School District enrolled 1,042 students, and spent \$8,508 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,525 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,500 and 1,749 students) spent an average of \$8,479 per pupil. This is \$726 less than Forbes Road’s per-pupil spending, and \$29 less than Central Fulton’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,479 through consolidation, they could save \$380,406 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,479 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forbes Road School District and Central Fulton School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Forbes Road	Central Fulton	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	483	1,042	1,525	1,616	-91
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	3.4	1.6
Square Miles	107	121	227	95	133
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,205	\$8,508	8,729	\$8,479	\$249
Instruction	\$5,484	\$5,464	\$5,470	\$5,269	\$201
Instructional Staff Support	\$261	\$198	\$218	\$243	-\$25
Pupil Support	\$255	\$226	\$235	\$387	-\$153
General Administration	\$447	\$265	\$323	\$278	\$44
School Administration	\$538	\$345	\$406	\$373	\$33
Operations & Maintenance	\$747	\$834	\$807	\$853	-\$46
Student Transportation	\$857	\$458	\$584	\$532	\$52
Food Services	\$538	\$602	\$582	\$353	\$229
Other	\$77	\$118	\$105	\$190	-\$85

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forbes Road School District and Central Fulton School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Forbes Road	Central Fulton	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$10,378,000	\$17,185,000	\$27,563,000	\$14,381,000	\$13,182,000
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,292	\$5,886	\$7,178	\$1,826	\$5,352
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,093	\$11,027	\$11,048	\$10,111	\$937
Local	\$3,946	\$3,889	\$3,907	\$5,128	-\$1,221
State	\$6,439	\$5,912	\$6,079	\$4,400	\$1,679
Federal	\$708	\$1,226	\$1,062	\$583	\$479
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	22.80	19.30	20.41	21.00	-0.59
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$75	\$184	\$149	\$367	-\$217
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	1	2	2.2	-0.2
Students Per District Administrator	483	1,042	763	866	-104
School Administrators	2	3	5	3.8	1.2
Students Per School Administrator	242	347	305	457	-152
Teachers	40	77	117	105.8	11.2
Students Per Teacher	12.1	13.5	13.0	15.5	-2.4
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	59.0%	61.4%	60.6%	68.4%	-7.8 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	59.0%	65.0%	63.3%	72.4%	-9.1 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	62.6%	63.5%	63.2%	70.7%	-7.5 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	60.0%	50.0%	53.3%	62.8%	-9.5 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	73.6%	72.6%	72.8%	67.7%	5.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	56.0%	62.0%	59.2%	68.5%	-9.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	56.7%	65.5%	62.8%	70.8%	-8.0 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	54.0%	63.7%	60.2%	66.5%	-6.2 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	73.0%	81.0%	78.6%	86.7%	-8.1 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	81.2%	73.5%	76.1%	78.8%	-2.7 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	73.3%	37.1%	48.9%	67.4%	-18.5 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	73.7%	61.7%	64.2%	69.1%	-4.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	54.0%	56.9%	55.6%	66.6%	-11.0 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	37.8%	57.1%	51.2%	62.5%	-11.3 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	35.1%	40.9%	38.8%	51.3%	-12.5 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	32.1%	37.2%	35.6%	29.6%	6.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	9.7%	10.8%	10.4%	15.1%	-4.7 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forbes Road School District and Tussey Mountain School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Forbes Road School District</b>	<b>Tussey Mountain School District</b>
County: Fulton	County: Bedford
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 483	District Enrollment: 1,213
Schools:	Schools:
Forbes Road Elementary School (280 students in grades K-6); Forbes Road Jr./Sr. High School (203 students in grades 7-12)	Defiance Grade School (150 students in grades K-6); Robertsdale Grade School (149 students in grades K-6); Saxton-Liberty Grade School (306 students in grades K-6); Tussey Mountain Jr./Sr. High School (608 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Tuscarora IU 11	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Fulton Co AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Bedford Co Technical Center

Forbes Road School District and Tussey Mountain School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Forbes Road School District enrolled 483 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,205 per pupil. Tussey Mountain School District enrolled 1,213 students, and spent \$9,538 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,696 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,500 and 1,749 students) spent an average of \$8,479 per pupil. This is \$726 less than Forbes Road’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,059 less than Tussey Mountain’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,479 through consolidation, they could save \$1,635,475 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,479 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forbes Road School District and Tussey Mountain School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Forbes Road	Tussey Mountain	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	483	1,213	1,696	1,616	80
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	4	6	3.4	2.6
Square Miles	107	173	280	95	185
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,205	\$9,538	9,443	\$8,479	\$964
Instruction	\$5,484	\$5,837	\$5,736	\$5,269	\$467
Instructional Staff Support	\$261	\$338	\$316	\$243	\$73
Pupil Support	\$255	\$378	\$343	\$387	-\$45
General Administration	\$447	\$513	\$494	\$278	\$216
School Administration	\$538	\$307	\$373	\$373	\$0
Operations & Maintenance	\$747	\$798	\$784	\$853	-\$69
Student Transportation	\$857	\$766	\$792	\$532	\$259
Food Services	\$538	\$535	\$536	\$353	\$183
Other	\$77	\$68	\$70	\$190	-\$120

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forbes Road School District and Tussey Mountain School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Forbes Road	Tussey Mountain	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$10,378,000	\$66,000	\$10,444,000	\$14,381,000	-\$3,937,000
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,292	\$35	\$1,327	\$1,826	-\$499
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,093	\$10,723	\$10,828	\$10,111	\$718
Local	\$3,946	\$2,743	\$3,085	\$5,128	-\$2,042
State	\$6,439	\$6,768	\$6,675	\$4,400	\$2,275
Federal	\$708	\$1,212	\$1,068	\$583	\$485
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	22.80	15.30	17.44	21.00	-3.57
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$75	\$178	\$149	\$367	-\$218
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	3	4	2.2	1.8
Students Per District Administrator	483	404	424	866	-442
School Administrators	2	3	5	3.8	1.2
Students Per School Administrator	242	404	339	457	-118
Teachers	40	88	128	105.8	22.2
Students Per Teacher	12.1	13.8	13.3	15.5	-2.2
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	59.0%	59.5%	59.4%	68.4%	-9.1 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	59.0%	70.0%	66.7%	72.4%	-5.7 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	62.6%	67.1%	65.9%	70.7%	-4.8 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	60.0%	47.5%	50.8%	62.8%	-11.9 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	73.6%	56.6%	59.8%	67.7%	-7.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	56.0%	57.1%	56.7%	68.5%	-11.8 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	56.7%	49.4%	51.7%	70.8%	-19.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	54.0%	67.8%	63.7%	66.5%	-2.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	73.0%	87.0%	82.6%	86.7%	-4.1 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	81.2%	71.7%	74.3%	78.8%	-4.5 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	73.3%	52.4%	58.0%	67.4%	-9.4 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	73.7%	66.2%	67.6%	69.1%	-1.5 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	54.0%	52.4%	52.9%	66.6%	-13.7 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	37.8%	41.0%	40.0%	62.5%	-22.5 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	35.1%	49.4%	45.1%	51.3%	-6.2 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	32.1%	45.8%	41.9%	29.6%	12.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	9.7%	17.6%	15.4%	15.1%	0.2 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forest Area School District and Brookville Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Forest Area School District	Brookville Area School District
County: Forest	County: Jefferson
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Small Town
District Enrollment: 691	District Enrollment: 1,885
Schools:	Schools:
East Forest Elementary School (120 students in grades K-6); West Forest Elementary School (200 students in grades K-6); East Forest Jr./Sr. High School (127 students in grades 7-12); West Forest Jr./Sr. High School (244 students in grades 7-12)	Hickory Grove Elementary School (554 students in grades 3-6); Northside Elementary School (122 students in grades K); Pinecreek Elementary School (269 students in grades 1-2); Brookville Jr./Sr. High School (940 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Jefferson Co- Dubois AVTS

Forest Area School District and Brookville Area School District are located in different counties. However, they are served by the same Intermediate Unit, but by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Forest Area School District enrolled 691 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,760 per pupil. Brookville Area School District enrolled 1,885 students, and spent \$8,463 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,576 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$3,703 less than Forest Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$406 less than Brookville Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$3,323,963 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forest Area School District and Brookville Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Forest Area	Brookville Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	691	1,885	2,576	2,726	-150
Number of Schools (2003-04)	4	4	8	5.2	2.8
Square Miles	504	262	767	109	658
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,760	\$8,463	9,347	\$8,057	\$1,290
Instruction	\$6,760	\$5,088	\$5,536	\$5,022	\$514
Instructional Staff Support	\$449	\$264	\$313	\$256	\$57
Pupil Support	\$363	\$333	\$341	\$354	-\$13
General Administration	\$501	\$222	\$297	\$210	\$87
School Administration	\$699	\$347	\$442	\$354	\$88
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,110	\$893	\$951	\$820	\$131
Student Transportation	\$1,192	\$740	\$861	\$500	\$362
Food Services	\$531	\$344	\$394	\$323	\$71
Other	\$155	\$232	\$212	\$202	\$9

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forest Area School District and Brookville Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Forest Area	Brookville Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$9,583,000	\$21,650,000	\$31,233,000	\$27,621,426	\$3,611,574
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,388	\$759	\$2,147	\$1,905	\$242
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,651	\$10,407	\$11,277	\$9,710	\$1,567
Local	\$6,781	\$4,182	\$4,879	\$5,542	-\$663
State	\$5,133	\$5,712	\$5,557	\$3,780	\$1,777
Federal	\$1,737	\$513	\$841	\$388	\$453
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	18.20	19.80	19.37	20.94	-1.57
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$282	\$363	\$341	\$660	-\$318
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	346	943	644	1,131	-487
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	230	471	368	444	-76
Teachers	54	125	179	170.0	9.0
Students Per Teacher	12.8	15.1	14.4	16.2	-1.8
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	66.2%	67.4%	67.1%	71.4%	-4.3 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	61.0%	67.0%	65.6%	74.0%	-8.4 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	61.9%	60.6%	61.0%	73.7%	-12.8 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	52.5%	57.0%	55.9%	64.3%	-8.4 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	70.9%	74.7%	73.7%	70.7%	2.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	67.3%	80.9%	77.0%	72.0%	5.0 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	69.8%	72.0%	71.4%	74.8%	-3.4 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	65.1%	70.2%	68.6%	69.0%	-0.4 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	85.0%	87.4%	87.0%	0.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	71.5%	70.2%	70.6%	82.6%	-12.1 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	52.5%	54.7%	54.2%	70.9%	-16.7 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.5%	61.0%	67.7%	72.3%	-4.6 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	58.2%	63.3%	61.8%	71.1%	-9.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	58.5%	63.0%	61.8%	67.5%	-5.7 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	54.5%	60.3%	58.5%	54.1%	4.4 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	40.0%	41.0%	40.7%	24.1%	16.6 pts
Students with Disabilities	20.8%	15.9%	17.2%	13.5%	3.7 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forest Area School District and Cranberry Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Forest Area School District	Cranberry Area School District
County: Forest	County: Venango
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 691	District Enrollment: 1,483
Schools:	Schools:
East Forest Elementary School (120 students in grades K-6); West Forest Elementary School (200 students in grades K-6); East Forest Jr./Sr. High School (127 students in grades 7-12); West Forest Jr./Sr. High School (244 students in grades 7-12)	Rockland Elementary School (80 students in grades K,2-5); Pinegrove Elementary School (107 students in grades K-5); Pinoak Primary Center (114 students in grades K-3); Cranberry Elementary School (356 students in grades K-6); Steffee Intermediate Center (73 students in grades 4-5); Cranberry Area Jr./Sr. High School (753 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center

Forest Area School District and Cranberry Area School District are located in different counties, but they are served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Forest Area School District enrolled 691 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,760 per pupil. Cranberry Area School District enrolled 1,483 students, and spent \$9,003 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,174 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$3,436 less than Forest Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$680 less than Cranberry Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$3,382,079 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forest Area School District and Cranberry Area School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Forest Area	Cranberry Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	691	1,483	2,174	2,255	-81
Number of Schools (2003-04)	4	6	10	4.7	5.3
Square Miles	504	158	662	111	552
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,760	\$9,003	9,879	\$8,324	\$1,556
Instruction	\$6,760	\$5,500	\$5,901	\$5,136	\$765
Instructional Staff Support	\$449	\$477	\$468	\$279	\$189
Pupil Support	\$363	\$337	\$345	\$370	-\$25
General Administration	\$501	\$322	\$379	\$234	\$144
School Administration	\$699	\$293	\$422	\$396	\$26
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,110	\$869	\$945	\$846	\$99
Student Transportation	\$1,192	\$658	\$828	\$510	\$318
Food Services	\$531	\$376	\$425	\$338	\$87
Other	\$155	\$171	\$166	\$184	-\$18

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forest Area School District and Cranberry Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Forest Area	Cranberry Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$9,583,000	\$9,923,000	\$19,506,000	\$24,347,120	-\$4,841,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,388	\$858	\$2,246	\$3,093	-\$847
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,651	\$10,860	\$11,747	\$10,148	\$1,599
Local	\$6,781	\$4,825	\$5,447	\$5,489	-\$41
State	\$5,133	\$5,410	\$5,322	\$4,221	\$1,101
Federal	\$1,737	\$625	\$978	\$438	\$540
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	18.20	16.90	17.31	21.58	-4.27
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$282	\$296	\$291	\$530	-\$238
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	346	742	544	1,037	-494
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.0	1.0
Students Per School Administrator	230	371	311	390	-80
Teachers	54	102	156	145.0	11.0
Students Per Teacher	12.8	14.5	13.9	15.7	-1.7
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	66.2%	70.9%	69.3%	70.0%	-0.7 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	61.0%	70.0%	67.0%	72.2%	-5.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	61.9%	68.9%	66.7%	71.9%	-5.2 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	52.5%	66.3%	62.0%	62.1%	0.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	70.9%	69.4%	70.0%	70.6%	-0.6 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	67.3%	63.5%	64.8%	71.4%	-6.6 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	69.8%	65.1%	66.5%	73.9%	-7.4 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	65.1%	64.8%	64.9%	68.0%	-3.1 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	87.0%	89.7%	87.0%	2.7 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	71.5%	77.8%	75.8%	80.0%	-4.3 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	52.5%	84.2%	74.4%	68.9%	5.5 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.5%	80.0%	82.0%	72.3%	9.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	58.2%	80.4%	72.9%	70.1%	2.8 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	58.5%	73.0%	68.7%	64.7%	4.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	54.5%	47.2%	50.0%	53.0%	-3.1 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	40.0%	34.1%	36.0%	26.6%	9.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	20.8%	19.5%	19.9%	14.4%	5.6 pts



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forest Area School District and Ridgway Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Forest Area School District	Ridgway Area School District
County: Forest	County: Elk
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Small Town
District Enrollment: 691	District Enrollment: 1,091
Schools:	Schools:
East Forest Elementary School (120 students in grades K-6); West Forest Elementary School (200 students in grades K-6); East Forest Jr./Sr. High School (127 students in grades 7-12); West Forest Jr./Sr. High School (244 students in grades 7-12)	Ridgway Elementary School (475 students in grades K-5); Ridgway Area Middle School (235 students in grades 6-8); Ridgway Area High School (381 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9
AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS

Forest Area School District and Ridgway Area School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Forest Area School District enrolled 691 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,760 per pupil. Ridgway Area School District enrolled 1,091 students, and spent \$9,288 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,782 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,750 and 1,999 students) spent an average of \$8,498 per pupil. This is \$3,261 less than Forest Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$789 less than Ridgway Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,498 through consolidation, they could save \$3,114,871 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,498 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forest Area School District and Ridgway Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Forest Area	Ridgway Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	691	1,091	1,782	1,888	-106
Number of Schools (2003-04)	4	3	7	3.9	3.1
Square Miles	504	184	688	84	604
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,760	\$9,288	10,246	\$8,498	\$1,748
Instruction	\$6,760	\$5,453	\$5,960	\$5,186	\$773
Instructional Staff Support	\$449	\$258	\$332	\$283	\$49
Pupil Support	\$363	\$506	\$451	\$387	\$63
General Administration	\$501	\$238	\$340	\$254	\$86
School Administration	\$699	\$455	\$549	\$388	\$162
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,110	\$1,127	\$1,121	\$838	\$283
Student Transportation	\$1,192	\$434	\$728	\$526	\$203
Food Services	\$531	\$482	\$501	\$363	\$139
Other	\$155	\$334	\$264	\$254	\$10

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Forest Area School District and Ridgway Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Forest Area	Ridgway Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$9,583,000	\$5,315,000	\$14,898,000	\$20,109,262	-\$5,211,262
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,388	\$936	\$2,324	\$1,719	\$605
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,651	\$10,711	\$11,851	\$10,236	\$1,616
Local	\$6,781	\$4,498	\$5,383	\$5,426	-\$42
State	\$5,133	\$5,637	\$5,442	\$4,332	\$1,109
Federal	\$1,737	\$577	\$1,026	\$478	\$549
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	18.20	22.70	20.96	20.72	0.24
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$282	\$195	\$229	\$443	-\$214
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	346	546	446	826	-380
School Administrators	3	4	7	4.7	2.3
Students Per School Administrator	230	273	255	423	-168
Teachers	54	77	131	120.6	10.4
Students Per Teacher	12.8	14.2	13.6	15.7	-2.1
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	66.2%	73.6%	70.7%	71.7%	-1.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	61.0%	71.0%	66.7%	75.0%	-8.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	61.9%	68.5%	66.1%	73.1%	-7.0 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	52.5%	59.5%	57.0%	65.2%	-8.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	70.9%	68.1%	69.1%	70.1%	-1.0 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	67.3%	83.9%	77.2%	71.9%	5.2 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	69.8%	80.6%	75.8%	75.1%	0.7 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	65.1%	77.2%	72.1%	69.5%	2.6 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	90.0%	92.1%	88.5%	3.6 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	71.5%	76.7%	74.8%	81.6%	-6.8 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	52.5%	59.4%	57.0%	70.8%	-13.8 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.5%	85.1%	85.2%	74.7%	10.6 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	58.2%	77.8%	69.9%	70.3%	-0.5 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	58.5%	71.6%	65.8%	67.3%	-1.5 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	54.5%	61.6%	58.6%	54.6%	4.1 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	40.0%	36.9%	38.1%	28.1%	10.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	20.8%	13.5%	16.3%	13.8%	2.5 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Galeton Area School District and Northern Potter School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Galeton Area School District</b>	<b>Northern Potter School District</b>
County: Potter	County: Potter
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 451	District Enrollment: 703
Schools:	Schools:
Galeton Area School (451 students in grades PreK-12)	Northern Potter Children’s School (345 students in grades K-6); Northern Potter Jr./Sr. High School (358 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9	Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9
AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS

Galeton Area School District and Northern Potter School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Galeton Area School District enrolled 451 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,601 per pupil. Northern Potter School District enrolled 703 students, and spent \$8,936 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,154 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,000 and 1,249 students) spent an average of \$8,747 per pupil. This is \$2,854 less than Galeton Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$189 less than Northern Potter’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,747 through consolidation, they could save \$1,420,507 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,747 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Galeton Area School District and Northern Potter School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Galeton Area	Northern Potter	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	451	703	1,154	1,127	27
Number of Schools (2003-04)	1	2	3	2.8	0.2
Square Miles	317	228	546	84	462
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,601	\$8,936	9,977	\$8,747	\$1,231
Instruction	\$7,650	\$5,277	\$6,205	\$5,347	\$857
Instructional Staff Support	\$337	\$286	\$306	\$268	\$38
Pupil Support	\$574	\$364	\$446	\$348	\$98
General Administration	\$585	\$321	\$425	\$315	\$109
School Administration	\$448	\$380	\$406	\$404	\$3
Operations & Maintenance	\$849	\$888	\$873	\$867	\$6
Student Transportation	\$395	\$781	\$630	\$495	\$135
Food Services	\$541	\$400	\$455	\$429	\$26
Other	\$222	\$239	\$232	\$268	-\$36

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Galeton Area School District and Northern Potter School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Galeton Area	Northern Potter	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$6,101,000	\$914,000	\$7,015,000	\$26,913,550	-\$19,898,550
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,033	\$528	\$1,561	\$2,200	-\$639
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,969	\$11,486	\$11,675	\$10,558	\$1,117
Local	\$5,341	\$4,159	\$4,621	\$4,071	\$550
State	\$5,186	\$6,935	\$6,251	\$5,799	\$452
Federal	\$1,441	\$393	\$802	\$688	\$115
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.60	17.80	17.72	20.99	-3.27
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$134	\$125	\$128	\$196	-\$68
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.0	2.0
Students Per District Administrator	226	352	289	622	-333
School Administrators	2	2	4	3.0	1.0
Students Per School Administrator	226	352	289	399	-110
Teachers	45	51	96	77.8	18.2
Students Per Teacher	10.0	13.8	12.0	14.6	-2.6
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	56.2%	69.6%	64.5%	65.9%	-1.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	53.0%	88.0%	76.7%	69.3%	7.4 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	53.9%	70.7%	64.2%	67.1%	-2.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	42.3%	62.5%	54.5%	58.4%	-3.8 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	60.8%	63.4%	62.6%	66.3%	-3.7 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	59.4%	67.9%	64.4%	67.1%	-2.7 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	53.3%	70.7%	63.3%	67.5%	-4.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	75.8%	57.7%	65.4%	65.5%	-0.1 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	69.0%	95.0%	86.6%	85.1%	1.6 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	61.5%	87.8%	77.6%	74.6%	3.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	42.3%	82.5%	66.7%	63.5%	3.2 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	60.9%	73.1%	69.4%	67.7%	1.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	62.1%	66.0%	64.4%	66.3%	-1.9 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	46.6%	56.1%	52.1%	60.4%	-8.3 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	45.5%	40.0%	42.3%	48.4%	-6.1 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	56.0%	42.7%	47.9%	37.2%	10.7 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.2%	15.7%	15.1%	15.3%	-0.2 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Galeton Area School District and Southern Tioga School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Galeton Area School District	Southern Tioga School District
County: Potter	County: Tioga
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 451	District Enrollment: 2,228
Schools:	Schools:
Galeton Area School (451 students in grades PreK-12)	Blossburg Elementary School (336 students in grades K-6); Liberty Elementary School (244 students in grades K-6); Warren L Miller Elementary School (554 students in grades K-6); Liberty Jr./Sr. High School (267 students in grades 7-12); Mansfield Jr./Sr. High School (526 students in grades 7-12); North Penn Jr./Sr. High School (301 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS	AVTS/CTC: No AVTS/CTC

Galeton Area School District and Southern Tioga School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Galeton Area School District enrolled 451 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,601 per pupil. Southern Tioga School District enrolled 2,228 students, and spent \$8,657 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,679 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$3,544 less than Galeton Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$600 less than Southern Tioga’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$2,935,081 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Galeton Area School District and Southern Tioga School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Galeton Area	Southern Tioga	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	451	2,228	2,679	2,726	-47
Number of Schools (2003-04)	1	6	7	5.2	1.8
Square Miles	317	486	803	109	694
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,601	\$8,657	9,153	\$8,057	\$1,096
Instruction	\$7,650	\$5,326	\$5,717	\$5,022	\$695
Instructional Staff Support	\$337	\$402	\$391	\$256	\$135
Pupil Support	\$574	\$412	\$440	\$354	\$86
General Administration	\$585	\$195	\$261	\$210	\$50
School Administration	\$448	\$447	\$447	\$354	\$93
Operations & Maintenance	\$849	\$836	\$838	\$820	\$18
Student Transportation	\$395	\$460	\$449	\$500	-\$51
Food Services	\$541	\$411	\$433	\$323	\$110
Other	\$222	\$168	\$177	\$202	-\$25



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Galeton Area School District and Southern Tioga School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Galeton Area	Southern Tioga	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$6,101,000	\$21,690,000	\$27,791,000	\$27,621,426	\$169,574
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,033	\$4,740	\$5,773	\$1,905	\$3,868
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,969	\$9,599	\$9,998	\$9,710	\$288
Local	\$5,341	\$4,197	\$4,389	\$5,542	-\$1,153
State	\$5,186	\$4,755	\$4,828	\$3,780	\$1,048
Federal	\$1,441	\$647	\$781	\$388	\$393
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.60	19.20	18.93	20.94	-2.01
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$134	\$436	\$386	\$660	-\$274
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	226	1,114	670	1,131	-461
School Administrators	2	6	8	6.4	1.6
Students Per School Administrator	226	371	335	444	-109
Teachers	45	156	201	170.0	31.0
Students Per Teacher	10.0	14.3	13.3	16.2	-2.8
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	56.2%	62.7%	61.8%	71.4%	-9.6 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	53.0%	67.0%	65.4%	74.0%	-8.6 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	53.9%	61.0%	59.9%	73.7%	-13.8 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	42.3%	60.4%	58.1%	64.3%	-6.1 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	60.8%	67.8%	66.9%	70.7%	-3.8 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	59.4%	63.3%	62.5%	72.0%	-9.5 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	53.3%	62.9%	61.6%	74.8%	-13.2 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	75.8%	57.6%	60.3%	69.0%	-8.7 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	69.0%	89.0%	86.7%	87.0%	-0.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	61.5%	69.8%	68.6%	82.6%	-14.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	42.3%	67.6%	64.4%	70.9%	-6.5 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	60.9%	63.4%	63.1%	72.3%	-9.2 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	62.1%	58.5%	59.2%	71.1%	-11.8 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	46.6%	49.2%	48.9%	67.5%	-18.6 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	45.5%	49.8%	49.2%	54.1%	-4.9 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	56.0%	36.6%	39.9%	24.1%	15.8 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.2%	13.2%	13.3%	13.5%	-0.2 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Galeton Area School District and Wellsboro Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Galeton Area School District</b>	<b>Wellsboro Area School District</b>
County: Potter	County: Tioga
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 451	District Enrollment: 1,660
Schools:	Schools:
Galeton Area School (451 students in grades PreK-12)	Charlotte Lappla Elementary School (210 students in grades K-1); Don Gill Elementary School (322 students in grades 2-4); Rock L Butler Middle School (540 students in grades 5-8); Wellsboro Area High School (588 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS	AVTS/CTC: No AVTS/CTC

Galeton Area School District and Wellsboro Area School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Galeton Area School District enrolled 451 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,601 per pupil. Wellsboro Area School District enrolled 1,660 students, and spent \$9,077 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,111 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$3,277 less than Galeton Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$753 less than Wellsboro Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$2,728,483 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Galeton Area School District and Wellsboro Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a “blueprint” for consolidation or an “ideal” state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Galeton Area	Wellsboro Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	451	1,660	2,111	2,255	-144
Number of Schools (2003-04)	1	4	5	4.7	0.3
Square Miles	317	332	649	111	538
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,601	\$9,077	9,616	\$8,324	\$1,293
Instruction	\$7,650	\$5,777	\$6,177	\$5,136	\$1,041
Instructional Staff Support	\$337	\$149	\$189	\$279	-\$90
Pupil Support	\$574	\$528	\$538	\$370	\$167
General Administration	\$585	\$168	\$257	\$234	\$23
School Administration	\$448	\$424	\$429	\$396	\$33
Operations & Maintenance	\$849	\$886	\$878	\$846	\$32
Student Transportation	\$395	\$390	\$391	\$510	-\$119
Food Services	\$541	\$342	\$384	\$338	\$46
Other	\$222	\$413	\$372	\$184	\$189

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Galeton Area School District and Wellsboro Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Galeton Area	Wellsboro Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$6,101,000	\$34,575,000	\$40,676,000	\$24,347,120	\$16,328,880
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,033	\$1,383	\$2,416	\$3,093	-\$677
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,969	\$10,515	\$10,826	\$10,148	\$678
Local	\$5,341	\$5,339	\$5,340	\$5,489	-\$149
State	\$5,186	\$4,492	\$4,640	\$4,221	\$419
Federal	\$1,441	\$684	\$846	\$438	\$407
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.60	17.90	17.84	21.58	-3.75
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$134	\$440	\$375	\$530	-\$155
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	1	3	2.5	0.5
Students Per District Administrator	226	1,660	704	1,037	-334
School Administrators	2	5	7	6.0	1.0
Students Per School Administrator	226	332	302	390	-89
Teachers	45	122	167	145.0	22.0
Students Per Teacher	10.0	13.6	12.6	15.7	-3.0
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	56.2%	71.9%	68.8%	70.0%	-1.3 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	53.0%	75.0%	71.2%	72.2%	-1.0 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	53.9%	79.5%	73.9%	71.9%	2.0 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	42.3%	64.9%	60.6%	62.1%	-1.5 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	60.8%	74.5%	72.3%	70.6%	1.7 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	59.4%	73.1%	69.9%	71.4%	-1.5 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	53.3%	74.1%	70.3%	73.9%	-3.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	75.8%	71.0%	72.1%	68.0%	4.1 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	69.0%	94.0%	89.7%	87.0%	2.8 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	61.5%	82.8%	78.1%	80.0%	-1.9 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	42.3%	72.9%	67.1%	68.9%	-1.8 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	60.9%	67.0%	66.0%	72.3%	-6.3 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	62.1%	68.9%	67.3%	70.1%	-2.8 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	46.6%	66.0%	62.5%	64.7%	-2.2 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	45.5%	51.8%	50.4%	53.0%	-2.7 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	56.0%	33.8%	38.5%	26.6%	11.9 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.2%	11.8%	12.3%	14.4%	-2.0 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Glendale School District and Cambria Heights School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Glendale School District	Cambria Heights School District
County: Clearfield	County: Cambria
District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 909	District Enrollment: 1,549
Schools:	Schools:
Glendale Elementary School (451 students in grades K-6); Glendale Jr./Sr. High School (458 students in grades 7-12)	Cambria Heights Elementary School (634 students in grades K-5); Cambria Heights Middle School (353 students in grades 6-8); Cambria Heights Senior High School (562 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Central IU 10	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Greater Altoona CTC	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Glendale School District and Cambria Heights School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Glendale School District enrolled 909 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,921 per pupil. Cambria Heights School District enrolled 1,549 students, and spent \$9,558 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,458 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$597 less than Glendale’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,235 less than Cambria Heights’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$2,455,115 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Glendale School District and Cambria Heights School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Glendale	Cambria Heights	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	909	1,549	2,458	2,255	203
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	4.7	0.3
Square Miles	99	112	211	111	100
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,921	\$9,558	9,323	\$8,324	\$999
Instruction	\$5,370	\$6,288	\$5,948	\$5,136	\$813
Instructional Staff Support	\$263	\$174	\$207	\$279	-\$72
Pupil Support	\$315	\$363	\$345	\$370	-\$25
General Administration	\$177	\$356	\$290	\$234	\$56
School Administration	\$389	\$325	\$349	\$396	-\$47
Operations & Maintenance	\$890	\$888	\$889	\$846	\$43
Student Transportation	\$484	\$689	\$614	\$510	\$104
Food Services	\$473	\$349	\$395	\$338	\$56
Other	\$560	\$125	\$286	\$184	\$102

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Glendale School District and Cambria Heights School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Glendale	Cambria Heights	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$6,260,000	\$11,020,000	\$17,280,000	\$24,347,120	-\$7,067,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$438	\$6,289	\$6,727	\$3,093	\$3,634
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,568	\$10,563	\$10,565	\$10,148	\$417
Local	\$3,084	\$2,843	\$2,932	\$5,489	-\$2,557
State	\$6,614	\$7,014	\$6,866	\$4,221	\$2,645
Federal	\$870	\$706	\$766	\$438	\$328
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	24.20	18.30	20.48	21.58	-1.10
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$101	\$212	\$171	\$530	-\$358
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	3	6	2.5	3.5
Students Per District Administrator	303	516	410	1,037	-628
School Administrators	3	2	5	6.0	-1.0
Students Per School Administrator	303	775	492	390	101
Teachers	69	115	184	145.0	39.0
Students Per Teacher	13.2	13.5	13.4	15.7	-2.3
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	61.3%	75.7%	70.6%	70.0%	0.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	60.0%	82.0%	73.1%	72.2%	0.9 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	69.5%	74.5%	72.8%	71.9%	0.8 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	46.6%	59.6%	55.5%	62.1%	-6.6 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	58.5%	77.0%	69.9%	70.6%	-0.7 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	64.7%	87.2%	79.3%	71.4%	7.9 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	55.2%	80.0%	71.3%	73.9%	-2.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	66.7%	75.0%	72.0%	68.0%	4.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	75.0%	93.0%	85.7%	87.0%	-1.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	86.7%	82.8%	84.2%	80.0%	4.1 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	44.1%	71.0%	62.6%	68.9%	-6.2 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	60.0%	69.5%	65.9%	72.3%	-6.5 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	64.7%	79.2%	74.1%	70.1%	4.0 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	55.9%	69.6%	64.8%	64.7%	0.1 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	52.1%	66.9%	61.6%	53.0%	8.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	53.0%	32.8%	40.3%	26.6%	13.6 pts
Students with Disabilities	19.3%	14.3%	16.1%	14.4%	1.8 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Glendale School District and Penn Cambria School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Glendale School District</b>	<b>Penn Cambria School District</b>
County: Clearfield	County: Cambria
District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 909	District Enrollment: 1,867
Schools:	Schools:
Glendale Elementary School (451 students in grades K-6); Glendale Jr./Sr. High School (458 students in grades 7-12)	Penn Cambria Pre-Primary (216 students in grades K-1); Penn Cambria Primary School (267 students in grades 2-3); Penn Cambria Intermediate School (227 students in grades 4-5); Penn Cambria Middle School (480 students in grades 6-8); Penn Cambria High School (677 students in grades 9-12);
Intermediate Unit: Central IU 10	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Greater Altoona CTC	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Glendale School District and Penn Cambria School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Glendale School District enrolled 909 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,921 per pupil. Penn Cambria School District enrolled 1,867 students, and spent \$9,134 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,776 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$864 less than Glendale's per-pupil spending, and \$1,077 less than Penn Cambria's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$2,796,544 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Glendale School District and Penn Cambria School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Glendale	Penn Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	909	1,867	2,776	2,726	50
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	5	7	5.2	1.8
Square Miles	99	110	209	109	100
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,921	\$9,134	9,064	\$8,057	\$1,007
Instruction	\$5,370	\$5,612	\$5,533	\$5,022	\$510
Instructional Staff Support	\$263	\$320	\$301	\$256	\$45
Pupil Support	\$315	\$393	\$367	\$354	\$14
General Administration	\$177	\$289	\$252	\$210	\$42
School Administration	\$389	\$373	\$378	\$354	\$25
Operations & Maintenance	\$890	\$785	\$820	\$820	\$0
Student Transportation	\$484	\$736	\$654	\$500	\$154
Food Services	\$473	\$513	\$500	\$323	\$177
Other	\$560	\$114	\$260	\$202	\$57

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Glendale School District and Penn Cambria School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Glendale	Penn Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$6,260,000	\$0	\$6,260,000	\$27,621,426	-\$21,361,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$438	\$324	\$762	\$1,905	-\$1,143
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,568	\$10,614	\$10,599	\$9,710	\$889
Local	\$3,084	\$3,415	\$3,306	\$5,542	-\$2,236
State	\$6,614	\$6,423	\$6,485	\$3,780	\$2,706
Federal	\$870	\$777	\$808	\$388	\$419
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	24.20	16.40	18.95	20.94	-1.99
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$101	\$292	\$230	\$660	-\$430
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	2	5	2.6	2.4
Students Per District Administrator	303	934	555	1,131	-575
School Administrators	3	5	8	6.4	1.6
Students Per School Administrator	303	373	347	444	-97
Teachers	69	125	194	170.0	24.0
Students Per Teacher	13.2	14.9	14.3	16.2	-1.9
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	61.3%	67.7%	65.5%	71.4%	-5.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	60.0%	80.0%	72.4%	74.0%	-1.6 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	69.5%	72.8%	71.8%	73.7%	-2.0 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	46.6%	56.7%	53.6%	64.3%	-10.7 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	58.5%	58.6%	58.6%	70.7%	-12.2 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	64.7%	78.2%	73.0%	72.0%	1.0 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	55.2%	73.0%	67.3%	74.8%	-7.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	66.7%	66.5%	66.6%	69.0%	-2.4 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	75.0%	95.0%	87.3%	87.0%	0.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	86.7%	69.8%	75.2%	82.6%	-7.4 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	44.1%	43.8%	43.9%	70.9%	-27.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	60.0%	72.4%	67.7%	72.3%	-4.6 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	64.7%	80.9%	74.7%	71.1%	3.7 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	55.9%	63.8%	61.2%	67.5%	-6.3 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	52.1%	51.8%	51.9%	54.1%	-2.2 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	53.0%	44.7%	47.4%	24.1%	23.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	19.3%	14.7%	16.2%	13.5%	2.7 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Halifax Area School District and Upper Dauphin Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Halifax Area School District</b>	<b>Upper Dauphin Area School District</b>
County: Dauphin	County: Dauphin
District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,211	District Enrollment: 1,396
Schools:	Schools:
Enders-Fisherville Elementary School (185 students in grades K-1); Halifax Area Elementary School (376 students in grades 2-5); Halifax Area Middle School (295 students in grades 6-8); Halifax Area High School (355 students in grades 9-12)	Upper Dauphin Area Elementary School (509 students in grades K-4); Upper Dauphin Area Middle School (453 students in grades 5-8); Upper Dauphin Area High School (434 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Capital Area IU 15	Intermediate Unit: Capital Area IU 15
AVTS/CTC: Dauphin Co AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Dauphin Co AVTS

Halifax Area School District and Upper Dauphin Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Halifax Area School District enrolled 1,211 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,513 per pupil. Upper Dauphin Area School District enrolled 1,396 students, and spent \$8,108 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,607 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,456 less than Halifax Area's per-pupil spending, and \$51 less than Upper Dauphin Area's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$1,834,199 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Halifax Area School District and Upper Dauphin Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Halifax Area	Upper Dauphin Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,211	1,396	2,607	2,726	-119
Number of Schools (2003-04)	4	3	7	5.2	1.8
Square Miles	85	91	176	109	67
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,513	\$8,108	8,761	\$8,057	\$704
Instruction	\$5,633	\$5,168	\$5,384	\$5,022	\$362
Instructional Staff Support	\$308	\$165	\$232	\$256	-\$24
Pupil Support	\$569	\$310	\$430	\$354	\$77
General Administration	\$413	\$268	\$335	\$210	\$125
School Administration	\$422	\$410	\$415	\$354	\$62
Operations & Maintenance	\$844	\$789	\$814	\$820	-\$6
Student Transportation	\$699	\$501	\$593	\$500	\$93
Food Services	\$372	\$312	\$340	\$323	\$17
Other	\$254	\$185	\$217	\$202	\$14

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Halifax Area School District and Upper Dauphin Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Halifax Area	Upper Dauphin Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$6,017,000	\$13,760,000	\$19,777,000	\$27,621,426	-\$7,844,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$622	\$1,001	\$1,623	\$1,905	-\$282
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,946	\$10,002	\$10,440	\$9,710	\$730
Local	\$5,215	\$4,622	\$4,897	\$5,542	-\$645
State	\$5,455	\$5,037	\$5,231	\$3,780	\$1,451
Federal	\$276	\$344	\$312	\$388	-\$76
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	22.00	20.90	21.41	20.94	0.47
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$257	\$283	\$271	\$660	-\$389
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	606	698	652	1,131	-479
School Administrators	4	4	8	6.4	1.6
Students Per School Administrator	303	349	326	444	-118
Teachers	96	101	197	170.0	27.0
Students Per Teacher	12.6	13.8	13.2	16.2	-2.9
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	67.9%	68.6%	68.3%	71.4%	-3.1 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	79.0%	77.1%	74.0%	3.1 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	72.0%	68.4%	70.0%	73.7%	-3.7 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	54.5%	55.5%	64.3%	-8.8 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	65.9%	67.4%	66.7%	70.7%	-4.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	69.5%	64.5%	66.8%	72.0%	-5.2 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	80.6%	76.3%	78.3%	74.8%	3.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	58.8%	65.2%	62.1%	69.0%	-6.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	87.0%	1.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	75.6%	74.5%	75.0%	82.6%	-7.6 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	64.1%	63.3%	63.7%	70.9%	-7.2 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	65.3%	58.9%	62.1%	72.3%	-10.2 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	64.6%	57.8%	61.0%	71.1%	-10.1 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	64.1%	77.1%	71.0%	67.5%	3.6 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	48.8%	62.0%	55.7%	54.1%	1.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	18.6%	19.0%	18.8%	24.1%	-5.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	13.8%	10.7%	12.1%	13.5%	-1.4 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Harmony Area School District and Cambria Heights School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Harmony Area School District	Cambria Heights School District
County: Clearfield	County: Cambria
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 414	District Enrollment: 1,549
Schools:	Schools:
Harmony Area Elementary School (193 students in grades PreK-5); Harmony Area Middle School (120 students in grades 6-9); Harmony Area High School (101 students in grades 10-12)	Cambria Heights Elementary School (634 students in grades K-5); Cambria Heights Middle School (353 students in grades 6-8); Cambria Heights Senior High School (562 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Central IU 10	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Clearfield Co CTC	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Harmony Area School District and Cambria Heights School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Harmony Area School District enrolled 414 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,553 per pupil. Cambria Heights School District enrolled 1,549 students, and spent \$9,558 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,963 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,750 and 1,999 students) spent an average of \$8,498 per pupil. This is \$2,055 less than Harmony Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,060 less than Cambria Heights’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,498 through consolidation, they could save \$2,492,653 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,498 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Harmony Area School District and Cambria Heights School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Harmony Area	Cambria Heights	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	414	1,549	1,963	1,888	75
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	3.9	2.1
Square Miles	83	112	195	84	111
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,553	\$9,558	9,768	\$8,498	\$1,270
Instruction	\$6,432	\$6,288	\$6,318	\$5,186	\$1,132
Instructional Staff Support	\$333	\$174	\$208	\$283	-\$76
Pupil Support	\$452	\$363	\$382	\$387	-\$5
General Administration	\$341	\$356	\$353	\$254	\$98
School Administration	\$244	\$325	\$308	\$388	-\$79
Operations & Maintenance	\$862	\$888	\$883	\$838	\$45
Student Transportation	\$763	\$689	\$705	\$526	\$179
Food Services	\$529	\$349	\$387	\$363	\$24
Other	\$597	\$125	\$225	\$254	-\$29

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Harmony Area School District and Cambria Heights School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Harmony Area	Cambria Heights	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$2,524,000	\$11,020,000	\$13,544,000	\$20,109,262	-\$6,565,262
Debt Payments (per student)	\$539	\$6,289	\$6,828	\$1,719	\$5,109
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,780	\$10,563	\$10,820	\$10,236	\$584
Local	\$2,449	\$2,843	\$2,760	\$5,426	-\$2,666
State	\$7,493	\$7,014	\$7,115	\$4,332	\$2,783
Federal	\$1,838	\$706	\$944	\$478	\$467
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	19.60	18.30	18.57	20.72	-2.14
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$46	\$212	\$177	\$443	-\$266
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	3	6	2.5	3.5
Students Per District Administrator	138	516	327	826	-498
School Administrators	1	2	3	4.7	-1.7
Students Per School Administrator	414	775	654	423	232
Teachers	40	115	155	120.6	34.4
Students Per Teacher	10.4	13.5	12.7	15.7	-3.1
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	62.0%	75.7%	73.2%	71.7%	1.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	48.0%	82.0%	75.4%	75.0%	0.5 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	66.6%	74.5%	73.2%	73.1%	0.1 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	64.5%	59.6%	60.5%	65.2%	-4.7 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	46.7%	77.0%	70.2%	70.1%	0.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	76.9%	87.2%	85.4%	71.9%	13.5 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	54.8%	80.0%	75.0%	75.1%	-0.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	75.0%	72.1%	69.5%	2.6 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	57.0%	93.0%	86.1%	88.5%	-2.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	76.2%	82.8%	81.8%	81.6%	0.2 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	67.8%	71.0%	70.4%	70.8%	-0.4 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	66.7%	69.5%	68.9%	74.7%	-5.8 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	92.3%	79.2%	81.5%	70.3%	11.1 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	54.9%	69.6%	66.7%	67.3%	-0.6 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	39.1%	66.9%	62.6%	54.6%	8.0 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	61.5%	32.8%	38.9%	28.1%	10.7 pts
Students with Disabilities	16.7%	14.3%	14.8%	13.8%	1.0 pts



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Harmony Area School District and Glendale School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Harmony Area School District</b>	<b>Glendale School District</b>
County: Clearfield	County: Clearfield
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 414	District Enrollment: 909
Schools:	Schools:
Harmony Area Elementary School (193 students in grades PreK-5); Harmony Area Middle School (120 students in grades 6-9); Harmony Area High School (101 students in grades 10-12)	Glendale Elementary School (451 students in grades K-6); Glendale Jr./Sr. High School (458 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Central IU 10	Intermediate Unit: Central IU 10
AVTS/CTC: Clearfield Co CTC	AVTS/CTC: Greater Altoona CTC

Harmony Area School District and Glendale School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit. However, they are served by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Harmony Area School District enrolled 414 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,553 per pupil. Glendale School District enrolled 909 students, and spent \$8,921 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,323 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,250 and 1,499 students) spent an average of \$8,437 per pupil. This is \$2,116 less than Harmony Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$484 less than Glendale’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,437 through consolidation, they could save \$1,316,270 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,437 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Harmony Area School District and Glendale School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Harmony Area	Glendale	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	414	909	1,323	1,380	-57
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	2	5	3.0	2.0
Square Miles	83	99	182	72	110
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,553	\$8,921	9,432	\$8,437	\$995
Instruction	\$6,432	\$5,370	\$5,702	\$5,233	\$469
Instructional Staff Support	\$333	\$263	\$285	\$275	\$10
Pupil Support	\$452	\$315	\$358	\$352	\$5
General Administration	\$341	\$177	\$228	\$278	-\$50
School Administration	\$244	\$389	\$344	\$386	-\$42
Operations & Maintenance	\$862	\$890	\$881	\$834	\$47
Student Transportation	\$763	\$484	\$571	\$507	\$64
Food Services	\$529	\$473	\$491	\$361	\$129
Other	\$597	\$560	\$571	\$209	\$362

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Harmony Area School District and Glendale School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Harmony Area	Glendale	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$2,524,000	\$6,260,000	\$8,784,000	\$13,035,068	-\$4,251,068
Debt Payments (per student)	\$539	\$438	\$977	\$2,142	-\$1,165
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,780	\$10,568	\$10,947	\$10,312	\$635
Local	\$2,449	\$3,084	\$2,885	\$4,540	-\$1,654
State	\$7,493	\$6,614	\$6,889	\$5,209	\$1,680
Federal	\$1,838	\$870	\$1,173	\$564	\$609
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	19.60	24.20	22.76	20.32	2.44
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$46	\$101	\$84	\$283	-\$199
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	3	6	2.0	4.0
Students Per District Administrator	138	303	221	773	-553
School Administrators	1	3	4	3.8	0.2
Students Per School Administrator	414	303	331	384	-53
Teachers	40	69	109	91.3	17.7
Students Per Teacher	10.4	13.2	12.1	15.2	-3.1
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	62.0%	61.3%	61.5%	68.7%	-7.2 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	48.0%	60.0%	56.9%	72.3%	-15.4 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	66.6%	69.5%	68.7%	68.8%	-0.1 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	64.5%	46.6%	52.7%	61.6%	-8.9 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	46.7%	58.5%	54.8%	68.1%	-13.3 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	76.9%	64.7%	68.1%	69.1%	-1.0 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	54.8%	55.2%	55.1%	71.4%	-16.3 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	66.7%	64.2%	67.5%	-3.3 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	57.0%	75.0%	70.4%	86.8%	-16.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	76.2%	86.7%	84.0%	77.7%	6.3 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	67.8%	44.1%	52.3%	68.7%	-16.4 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	66.7%	60.0%	62.1%	71.8%	-9.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	92.3%	64.7%	72.3%	67.1%	5.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	54.9%	55.9%	55.6%	62.5%	-6.9 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	39.1%	52.1%	48.9%	50.1%	-1.3 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	61.5%	53.0%	55.7%	32.5%	23.1 pts
Students with Disabilities	16.7%	19.3%	18.4%	14.6%	3.8 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Harmony Area School District and Northern Cambria School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Harmony Area School District</b>	<b>Northern Cambria School District</b>
County: Clearfield	County: Cambria
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 414	District Enrollment: 1,273
Schools:	Schools:
Harmony Area Elementary School (193 students in grades PreK-5); Harmony Area Middle School (120 students in grades 6-9); Harmony Area High School (101 students in grades 10-12)	Northern Cambria Elementary School (441 students in grades K-4); Northern Cambria Middle School (408 students in grades 5-8); Northern Cambria High School (424 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Central IU 10	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Clearfield Co CTC	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Harmony Area School District and Northern Cambria School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Harmony Area School District enrolled 414 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,553 per pupil. Northern Cambria School District enrolled 1,273 students, and spent \$9,535 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,687 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,500 and 1,749 students) spent an average of \$8,479 per pupil. This is \$2,074 less than Harmony Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,056 less than Northern Cambria’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,479 through consolidation, they could save \$2,202,796 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,479 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Harmony Area School District and Northern Cambria School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Harmony Area	Northern Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	414	1,273	1,687	1,616	71
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	3.4	2.6
Square Miles	83	62	146	95	51
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,553	\$9,535	9,785	\$8,479	\$1,306
Instruction	\$6,432	\$6,271	\$6,311	\$5,269	\$1,041
Instructional Staff Support	\$333	\$189	\$225	\$243	-\$18
Pupil Support	\$452	\$425	\$432	\$387	\$44
General Administration	\$341	\$213	\$244	\$278	-\$34
School Administration	\$244	\$372	\$341	\$373	-\$32
Operations & Maintenance	\$862	\$778	\$798	\$853	-\$54
Student Transportation	\$763	\$565	\$614	\$532	\$81
Food Services	\$529	\$448	\$468	\$353	\$115
Other	\$597	\$274	\$353	\$190	\$163

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Harmony Area School District and Northern Cambria School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Harmony Area	Northern Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$2,524,000	\$3,013,000	\$5,537,000	\$14,381,000	-\$8,844,000
Debt Payments (per student)	\$539	\$119	\$658	\$1,826	-\$1,168
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,780	\$10,595	\$10,886	\$10,111	\$775
Local	\$2,449	\$2,299	\$2,336	\$5,128	-\$2,792
State	\$7,493	\$7,364	\$7,395	\$4,400	\$2,996
Federal	\$1,838	\$932	\$1,155	\$583	\$572
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	19.60	17.40	17.94	21.00	-3.06
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$46	\$142	\$118	\$367	-\$249
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	2	5	2.2	2.8
Students Per District Administrator	138	637	337	866	-529
School Administrators	1	3	4	3.8	0.2
Students Per School Administrator	414	424	422	457	-35
Teachers	40	89	129	105.8	23.2
Students Per Teacher	10.4	14.3	13.1	15.5	-2.4
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	62.0%	70.9%	69.0%	68.4%	0.6 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	48.0%	80.0%	74.4%	72.4%	2.0 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	66.6%	79.1%	76.8%	70.7%	6.0 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	64.5%	53.6%	56.5%	62.8%	-6.3 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	46.7%	60.6%	57.1%	67.7%	-10.6 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	76.9%	69.4%	71.0%	68.5%	2.4 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	54.8%	76.4%	71.7%	70.8%	0.8 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	56.2%	56.3%	66.5%	-10.2 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	57.0%	93.0%	86.6%	86.7%	-0.1 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	76.2%	74.8%	75.1%	78.8%	-3.7 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	67.8%	65.5%	66.1%	67.4%	-1.3 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	66.7%	75.3%	73.1%	69.1%	4.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	92.3%	78.6%	81.5%	66.6%	14.9 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	54.9%	72.7%	68.8%	62.5%	6.3 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	39.1%	53.6%	50.8%	51.3%	-0.5 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	61.5%	51.3%	53.8%	29.6%	24.2 pts
Students with Disabilities	16.7%	14.0%	14.6%	15.1%	-0.5 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Harmony Area School District and Purchase Line School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Harmony Area School District</b>	<b>Purchase Line School District</b>
County: Clearfield	County: Indiana
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 414	District Enrollment: 1,218
Schools:	Schools:
Harmony Area Elementary School (193 students in grades PreK-5); Harmony Area Middle School (120 students in grades 6-9); Harmony Area High School (101 students in grades 10-12)	Purchase Line North Elementary School (160 students in grades K-6); Purchase Line South Elementary School (446 students in grades K-6); Purchase Line Jr./Sr. High School (612 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Central IU 10	Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28
AVTS/CTC: Clearfield Co CTC	AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center

Harmony Area School District and Purchase Line School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Harmony Area School District enrolled 414 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,553 per pupil. Purchase Line School District enrolled 1,218 students, and spent \$10,421 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,632 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,500 and 1,749 students) spent an average of \$8,479 per pupil. This is \$2,074 less than Harmony Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,942 less than Purchase Line’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,479 through consolidation, they could save \$3,224,139 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,479 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Harmony Area School District and Purchase Line School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Harmony Area	Purchase Line	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	414	1,218	1,632	1,616	16
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	3.4	2.6
Square Miles	83	146	229	95	134
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,553	\$10,421	10,455	\$8,479	\$1,976
Instruction	\$6,432	\$5,952	\$6,074	\$5,269	\$805
Instructional Staff Support	\$333	\$476	\$440	\$243	\$197
Pupil Support	\$452	\$493	\$483	\$387	\$95
General Administration	\$341	\$376	\$367	\$278	\$89
School Administration	\$244	\$438	\$388	\$373	\$16
Operations & Maintenance	\$862	\$989	\$957	\$853	\$104
Student Transportation	\$763	\$896	\$862	\$532	\$330
Food Services	\$529	\$511	\$515	\$353	\$162
Other	\$597	\$290	\$368	\$190	\$178



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Harmony Area School District and Purchase Line School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Harmony Area	Purchase Line	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$2,524,000	\$9,405,000	\$11,929,000	\$14,381,000	-\$2,452,000
Debt Payments (per student)	\$539	\$795	\$1,334	\$1,826	-\$492
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,780	\$11,964	\$11,917	\$10,111	\$1,807
Local	\$2,449	\$2,828	\$2,732	\$5,128	-\$2,395
State	\$7,493	\$8,183	\$8,008	\$4,400	\$3,608
Federal	\$1,838	\$952	\$1,177	\$583	\$594
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	19.60	22.60	21.84	21.00	0.84
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$46	\$132	\$110	\$367	-\$256
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	2	5	2.2	2.8
Students Per District Administrator	138	609	326	866	-540
School Administrators	1	4	5	3.8	1.2
Students Per School Administrator	414	305	326	457	-131
Teachers	40	97	137	105.8	31.2
Students Per Teacher	10.4	12.6	11.9	15.5	-3.6
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	62.0%	66.2%	65.3%	68.4%	-3.2 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	48.0%	74.0%	68.2%	72.4%	-4.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	66.6%	65.4%	65.6%	70.7%	-5.1 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	64.5%	64.9%	64.8%	62.8%	2.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	46.7%	70.2%	63.6%	67.7%	-4.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	76.9%	62.4%	65.6%	68.5%	-3.0 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	54.8%	72.0%	67.7%	70.8%	-3.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	70.1%	67.5%	66.5%	1.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	57.0%	79.0%	74.1%	86.7%	-12.6 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	76.2%	64.5%	66.5%	78.8%	-12.3 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	67.8%	67.0%	67.2%	67.4%	-0.2 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	66.7%	71.5%	70.2%	69.1%	1.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	92.3%	61.3%	68.1%	66.6%	1.5 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	54.9%	62.4%	60.5%	62.5%	-2.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	39.1%	49.5%	47.5%	51.3%	-3.8 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	61.5%	52.3%	54.6%	29.6%	25.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	16.7%	0.1%	4.3%	15.1%	-10.9 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Homer-Center School District and United School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Homer-Center School District</b>	<b>United School District</b>
County: Indiana	County: Indiana
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,007	District Enrollment: 1,262
Schools:	Schools:
Homer-Center Elementary School (503 students in grades K-6); Homer-Center Jr./Sr. High School (504 students in grades 7-12)	United Elementary School (623 students in grades K-6); United Jr./Sr. High School (639 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28	Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28
AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center

Homer-Center School District and United School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Homer-Center School District enrolled 1,007 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,202 per pupil. United School District enrolled 1,262 students, and spent \$10,196 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,269 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$878 less than Homer-Center’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,872 less than United’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$3,246,320 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Homer-Center School District and United School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Homer-Center	United	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,007	1,262	2,269	2,255	14
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	4.7	-0.7
Square Miles	41	132	173	111	63
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,202	\$10,196	9,755	\$8,324	\$1,431
Instruction	\$5,892	\$6,272	\$6,103	\$5,136	\$967
Instructional Staff Support	\$290	\$556	\$438	\$279	\$159
Pupil Support	\$359	\$344	\$351	\$370	-\$20
General Administration	\$295	\$250	\$270	\$234	\$36
School Administration	\$384	\$440	\$415	\$396	\$19
Operations & Maintenance	\$848	\$1,058	\$965	\$846	\$119
Student Transportation	\$354	\$697	\$545	\$510	\$35
Food Services	\$534	\$384	\$450	\$338	\$112
Other	\$245	\$195	\$217	\$184	\$33

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Homer-Center School District and United School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Homer-Center	United	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$7,010,000	\$1,984,000	\$8,994,000	\$24,347,120	-\$15,353,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$620	\$521	\$1,141	\$3,093	-\$1,952
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,662	\$11,848	\$11,322	\$10,148	\$1,174
Local	\$4,117	\$3,448	\$3,745	\$5,489	-\$1,743
State	\$5,833	\$7,753	\$6,901	\$4,221	\$2,679
Federal	\$712	\$647	\$676	\$438	\$237
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	20.10	21.10	20.66	21.58	-0.93
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$185	\$190	\$188	\$530	-\$342
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	504	631	567	1,037	-470
School Administrators	3	3	6	6.0	0.0
Students Per School Administrator	336	421	378	390	-12
Teachers	70	96	166	145.0	21.0
Students Per Teacher	14.4	13.1	13.7	15.7	-2.0
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	70.3%	74.4%	72.6%	70.0%	2.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	67.0%	81.0%	74.1%	72.2%	1.9 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	62.9%	70.4%	66.9%	71.9%	-5.0 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	59.0%	64.6%	62.3%	62.1%	0.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	62.3%	62.9%	62.6%	70.6%	-7.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	74.6%	79.6%	77.5%	71.4%	6.1 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	68.4%	79.0%	74.4%	73.9%	0.6 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	63.1%	80.2%	72.9%	68.0%	4.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	86.0%	90.4%	87.0%	3.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	75.8%	87.3%	81.9%	80.0%	1.9 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	67.9%	79.7%	74.8%	68.9%	5.9 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	69.6%	69.6%	69.6%	72.3%	-2.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	90.2%	77.6%	82.9%	70.1%	12.8 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	72.4%	71.0%	71.6%	64.7%	6.9 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	53.9%	57.4%	55.9%	53.0%	2.9 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	43.0%	38.2%	40.3%	26.6%	13.7 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.9%	14.1%	14.9%	14.4%	0.5 pts

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Jefferson-Morgan School District and Bethlehem-Center School District

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Jefferson-Morgan School District	Bethlehem-Center School District
County: Greene	County: Washington
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 942	District Enrollment: 1,414
Schools:	Schools:
Jefferson-Morgan Elementary School (481 students in grades K-6); Jefferson-Morgan Middle School/High School (461 students in grades 7-12)	Bethlehem-Center Elementary School (634 students in grades K-5); Bethlehem-Center Middle School (341 students in grades 6-8); Bethlehem-Center Senior High School (439 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1	Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1
AVTS/CTC: Greene Co CTC	AVTS/CTC: Mon Valley CTC

Jefferson-Morgan School District and Bethlehem-Center School District are located in different counties. However, they are served by the same Intermediate Unit, but by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Jefferson-Morgan School District enrolled 942 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,534 per pupil. Bethlehem-Center School District enrolled 1,414 students, and spent \$10,066 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,356 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$2,210 less than Jefferson-Morgan's per-pupil spending, and \$1,743 less than Bethlehem-Center's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$4,546,153 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Jefferson-Morgan School District and Bethlehem-Center School District

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Jefferson-Morgan	Bethlehem-Center	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	942	1,414	2,356	2,255	101
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	4.7	0.3
Square Miles	47	55	103	111	-8
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,534	\$10,066	10,253	\$8,324	\$1,930
Instruction	\$6,886	\$5,633	\$6,134	\$5,136	\$998
Instructional Staff Support	\$289	\$295	\$292	\$279	\$13
Pupil Support	\$285	\$349	\$323	\$370	-\$47
General Administration	\$269	\$341	\$312	\$234	\$78
School Administration	\$378	\$291	\$326	\$396	-\$70
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,200	\$1,048	\$1,109	\$846	\$262
Student Transportation	\$644	\$1,417	\$1,108	\$510	\$598
Food Services	\$408	\$525	\$478	\$338	\$140
Other	\$176	\$168	\$171	\$184	-\$12

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Jefferson-Morgan School District and Bethlehem-Center School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Jefferson-Morgan	Bethlehem-Center	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$8,665,000	\$9,731,000	\$18,396,000	\$24,347,120	-\$5,951,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$928	\$726	\$1,654	\$3,093	-\$1,439
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,677	\$11,274	\$11,435	\$10,148	\$1,287
Local	\$4,191	\$3,005	\$3,479	\$5,489	-\$2,009
State	\$6,570	\$7,519	\$7,140	\$4,221	\$2,918
Federal	\$916	\$750	\$817	\$438	\$378
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	27.20	21.40	23.72	21.58	2.14
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$122	\$169	\$151	\$530	-\$379
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	3	5	2.5	2.5
Students Per District Administrator	471	471	471	1,037	-566
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.0	1.0
Students Per School Administrator	314	354	337	390	-54
Teachers	68	101	169	145.0	24.0
Students Per Teacher	13.9	14.0	13.9	15.7	-1.7
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	59.4%	68.0%	64.6%	70.0%	-5.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	72.0%	73.4%	72.2%	1.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	59.7%	60.0%	59.9%	71.9%	-12.0 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	56.9%	66.3%	62.3%	62.1%	0.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	55.4%	61.5%	59.4%	70.6%	-11.2 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	61.7%	72.5%	68.1%	71.4%	-3.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	69.7%	80.5%	76.2%	73.9%	2.3 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	54.3%	71.3%	64.0%	68.0%	-4.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	85.0%	84.0%	84.4%	87.0%	-2.6 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	71.0%	76.2%	74.2%	80.0%	-5.8 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	61.1%	67.4%	64.7%	68.9%	-4.1 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	62.1%	77.8%	72.2%	72.3%	-0.2 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	61.7%	57.2%	59.0%	70.1%	-11.0 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	43.4%	57.6%	51.9%	64.7%	-12.8 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	32.6%	50.0%	42.5%	53.0%	-10.5 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	33.8%	43.2%	39.4%	26.6%	12.8 pts
Students with Disabilities	18.8%	16.2%	17.2%	14.4%	2.9 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Jefferson-Morgan School District and Brownsville Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Jefferson-Morgan School District</b>	<b>Brownsville Area School District</b>
County: Greene	County: Fayette
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City
District Enrollment: 942	District Enrollment: 1,974
Schools:	Schools:
Jefferson-Morgan Elementary School (481 students in grades K-6); Jefferson-Morgan Middle School/High School (461 students in grades 7-12)	Cardale Elementary School (316 students in grades K-6); Central Elementary School (268 students in grades K-6); Cox-Donahey Elementary School (428 students in grades K-6); Redstone Middle School (334 students in grades 6-8); Brownsville Area High School (628 students in grades 9-12);
Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1	Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1
AVTS/CTC: Greene Co CTC	AVTS/CTC: Fayette Co AVTS

Jefferson-Morgan School District and Brownsville Area School District are located in different counties. However, they are served by the same Intermediate Unit, but by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Jefferson-Morgan School District enrolled 942 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,534 per pupil. Brownsville Area School District enrolled 1,974 students, and spent \$9,377 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,916 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$2,477 less than Jefferson-Morgan's per-pupil spending, and \$1,320 less than Brownsville Area's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$4,938,555 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Jefferson-Morgan School District and Brownsville Area School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Jefferson-Morgan	Brownsville Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	942	1,974	2,916	2,726	190
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	5	7	5.2	1.8
Square Miles	47	57	104	109	-4
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,534	\$9,377	9,751	\$8,057	\$1,694
Instruction	\$6,886	\$5,737	\$6,108	\$5,022	\$1,086
Instructional Staff Support	\$289	\$278	\$282	\$256	\$26
Pupil Support	\$285	\$279	\$281	\$354	-\$73
General Administration	\$269	\$314	\$299	\$210	\$89
School Administration	\$378	\$364	\$368	\$354	\$15
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,200	\$932	\$1,019	\$820	\$199
Student Transportation	\$644	\$800	\$750	\$500	\$250
Food Services	\$408	\$391	\$396	\$323	\$74
Other	\$176	\$282	\$248	\$202	\$46

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Jefferson-Morgan School District and Brownsville Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Jefferson-Morgan	Brownsville Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$8,665,000	\$21,942,000	\$30,607,000	\$27,621,426	\$2,985,574
Debt Payments (per student)	\$928	\$606	\$1,534	\$1,905	-\$371
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,677	\$10,975	\$11,202	\$9,710	\$1,492
Local	\$4,191	\$2,275	\$2,894	\$5,542	-\$2,648
State	\$6,570	\$6,665	\$6,634	\$3,780	\$2,854
Federal	\$916	\$2,035	\$1,674	\$388	\$1,285
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	27.20	18.60	21.38	20.94	0.44
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$122	\$202	\$176	\$660	-\$484
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	1	3	2.6	0.4
Students Per District Administrator	471	1,974	972	1,131	-159
School Administrators	3	6	9	6.4	2.6
Students Per School Administrator	314	329	324	444	-120
Teachers	68	131	199	170.0	29.0
Students Per Teacher	13.9	15.1	14.7	16.2	-1.5
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	59.4%	55.7%	56.9%	71.4%	-14.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	67.0%	69.4%	74.0%	-4.6 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	59.7%	60.4%	60.2%	73.7%	-13.6 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	56.9%	58.1%	57.7%	64.3%	-6.6 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	55.4%	47.1%	49.7%	70.7%	-21.0 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	61.7%	47.5%	52.2%	72.0%	-19.8 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	69.7%	45.0%	54.1%	74.8%	-20.7 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	54.3%	61.9%	59.0%	69.0%	-10.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	85.0%	88.0%	87.2%	87.0%	0.2 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	71.0%	69.0%	69.6%	82.6%	-13.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	61.1%	55.2%	57.1%	70.9%	-13.9 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	62.1%	48.7%	53.0%	72.3%	-19.2 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	61.7%	43.5%	49.5%	71.1%	-21.6 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	43.4%	35.1%	38.1%	67.5%	-29.3 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	32.6%	44.6%	40.0%	54.1%	-14.1 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	33.8%	61.9%	52.8%	24.1%	28.7 pts
Students with Disabilities	18.8%	17.4%	17.8%	13.5%	4.3 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Jefferson-Morgan School District and Carmichaels Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Jefferson-Morgan School District</b>	<b>Carmichaels Area School District</b>
County: Greene	County: Greene
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 942	District Enrollment: 1,130
Schools:	Schools:
Jefferson-Morgan Elementary School (481 students in grades K-6); Jefferson-Morgan Middle School/High School (461 students in grades 7-12)	Carmichaels Area Elementary Center (604 students in grades K-6); Carmichaels Area Jr./Sr. High School (526 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1	Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1
AVTS/CTC: Greene Co CTC	AVTS/CTC: Greene Co CTC

Jefferson-Morgan School District and Carmichaels Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Jefferson-Morgan School District enrolled 942 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,534 per pupil. Carmichaels Area School District enrolled 1,130 students, and spent \$9,200 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,072 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$2,210 less than Jefferson-Morgan’s per-pupil spending, and \$876 less than Carmichaels Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$3,072,107 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Jefferson-Morgan School District and Carmichaels Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Jefferson-Morgan	Carmichaels Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	942	1,130	2,072	2,255	-183
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	4.7	-0.7
Square Miles	47	39	87	111	-24
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,534	\$9,200	9,806	\$8,324	\$1,483
Instruction	\$6,886	\$5,611	\$6,191	\$5,136	\$1,055
Instructional Staff Support	\$289	\$296	\$293	\$279	\$14
Pupil Support	\$285	\$150	\$211	\$370	-\$159
General Administration	\$269	\$236	\$251	\$234	\$17
School Administration	\$378	\$490	\$439	\$396	\$43
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,200	\$910	\$1,042	\$846	\$195
Student Transportation	\$644	\$750	\$702	\$510	\$192
Food Services	\$408	\$424	\$417	\$338	\$78
Other	\$176	\$333	\$262	\$184	\$78

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Jefferson-Morgan School District and Carmichaels Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Jefferson-Morgan	Carmichaels Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$8,665,000	\$7,895,000	\$16,560,000	\$24,347,120	-\$7,787,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$928	\$634	\$1,562	\$3,093	-\$1,531
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,677	\$10,547	\$11,061	\$10,148	\$913
Local	\$4,191	\$3,262	\$3,684	\$5,489	-\$1,804
State	\$6,570	\$6,403	\$6,479	\$4,221	\$2,257
Federal	\$916	\$882	\$898	\$438	\$459
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	27.20	24.20	25.56	21.58	3.98
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$122	\$125	\$124	\$530	-\$406
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	471	565	518	1,037	-519
School Administrators	3	3	6	6.0	0.0
Students Per School Administrator	314	377	345	390	-45
Teachers	68	80	148	145.0	3.0
Students Per Teacher	13.9	14.1	14.0	15.7	-1.7
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	59.4%	58.9%	59.1%	70.0%	-10.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	78.0%	77.1%	72.2%	4.9 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	59.7%	62.9%	61.3%	71.9%	-10.6 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	56.9%	46.3%	50.9%	62.1%	-11.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	55.4%	64.8%	60.8%	70.6%	-9.8 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	61.7%	54.1%	57.3%	71.4%	-14.1 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	69.7%	53.5%	61.1%	73.9%	-12.8 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	54.3%	50.6%	52.5%	68.0%	-15.5 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	85.0%	91.0%	88.2%	87.0%	1.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	71.0%	72.5%	71.8%	80.0%	-8.3 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	61.1%	53.7%	56.9%	68.9%	-12.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	62.1%	86.5%	75.8%	72.3%	3.4 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	61.7%	62.5%	62.2%	70.1%	-7.9 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	43.4%	41.8%	42.6%	64.7%	-22.1 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	32.6%	30.2%	31.4%	53.0%	-21.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	33.8%	36.2%	35.1%	26.6%	8.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	18.8%	18.0%	18.3%	14.4%	4.0 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Johnsonburg Area School District and Ridgway Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Johnsonburg Area School District</b>	<b>Ridgway Area School District</b>
County: Elk	County: Elk
District Locale: Small Town	District Locale: Small Town
District Enrollment: 807	District Enrollment: 1,091
Schools:	Schools:
Johnsonburg Area Elementary School (390 students in grades K-6); Johnsonburg Area High School (417 students in grades 7-12)	Ridgway Elementary School (475 students in grades K-5); Ridgway Area Middle School (235 students in grades 6-8); Ridgway Area High School (381 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9	Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9
AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS

Johnsonburg Area School District and Ridgway Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Johnsonburg Area School District enrolled 807 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,301 per pupil. Ridgway Area School District enrolled 1,091 students, and spent \$9,288 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,898 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,750 and 1,999 students) spent an average of \$8,498 per pupil. This is \$803 less than Johnsonburg Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$789 less than Ridgway Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,498 through consolidation, they could save \$1,509,060 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,498 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Johnsonburg Area School District and Ridgway Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Johnsonburg Area	Ridgway Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	807	1,091	1,898	1,888	10
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	3.9	1.1
Square Miles	167	184	351	84	267
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,301	\$9,288	9,293	\$8,498	\$795
Instruction	\$5,709	\$5,453	\$5,562	\$5,186	\$375
Instructional Staff Support	\$260	\$258	\$259	\$283	-\$24
Pupil Support	\$366	\$506	\$446	\$387	\$59
General Administration	\$302	\$238	\$266	\$254	\$11
School Administration	\$525	\$455	\$485	\$388	\$97
Operations & Maintenance	\$923	\$1,127	\$1,041	\$838	\$203
Student Transportation	\$512	\$434	\$467	\$526	-\$58
Food Services	\$390	\$482	\$443	\$363	\$81
Other	\$314	\$334	\$325	\$254	\$71

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Johnsonburg Area School District and Ridgway Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Johnsonburg Area	Ridgway Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$8,670,000	\$5,315,000	\$13,985,000	\$20,109,262	-\$6,124,262
Debt Payments (per student)	\$358	\$936	\$1,294	\$1,719	-\$425
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,223	\$10,711	\$10,504	\$10,236	\$268
Local	\$3,601	\$4,498	\$4,116	\$5,426	-\$1,309
State	\$6,486	\$5,637	\$5,998	\$4,332	\$1,666
Federal	\$136	\$577	\$389	\$478	-\$88
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	18.50	22.70	20.91	20.72	0.20
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$121	\$195	\$163	\$443	-\$279
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	2	5	2.5	2.5
Students Per District Administrator	269	546	380	826	-446
School Administrators	2	4	6	4.7	1.3
Students Per School Administrator	404	273	316	423	-106
Teachers	53	77	130	120.6	9.4
Students Per Teacher	15.2	14.2	14.6	15.7	-1.1
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	69.1%	73.6%	71.8%	71.7%	0.1 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	80.0%	71.0%	74.3%	75.0%	-0.6 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	74.5%	68.5%	70.9%	73.1%	-2.3 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	51.7%	59.5%	56.1%	65.2%	-9.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	68.1%	70.7%	70.1%	0.6 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	83.9%	80.9%	71.9%	8.9 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	71.7%	80.6%	76.4%	75.1%	1.3 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	62.7%	77.2%	71.5%	69.5%	2.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	90.0%	91.9%	88.5%	3.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	74.5%	76.7%	75.8%	81.6%	-5.7 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	52.5%	59.4%	56.3%	70.8%	-14.4 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	80.3%	85.1%	83.3%	74.7%	8.6 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	72.0%	77.8%	75.6%	70.3%	5.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	71.6%	71.6%	71.6%	67.3%	4.3 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	45.7%	61.6%	55.3%	54.6%	0.8 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	35.7%	36.9%	36.4%	28.1%	8.2 pts
Students with Disabilities	13.6%	13.5%	13.5%	13.8%	-0.3 pts



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Johnsonburg Area School District and Smethport Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Johnsonburg Area School District</b>	<b>Smethport Area School District</b>
County: Elk	County: Mckean
District Locale: Small Town	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 807	District Enrollment: 1,020
Schools:	Schools:
Johnsonburg Area Elementary School (390 students in grades K-6); Johnsonburg Area High School (417 students in grades 7-12)	Smethport Area Elementary School (499 students in grades K-6); Smethport Area Jr./Sr. High School (521 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9	Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9
AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS

Johnsonburg Area School District and Smethport Area School District are located in different counties, but they are served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Johnsonburg Area School District enrolled 807 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,301 per pupil. Smethport Area School District enrolled 1,020 students, and spent \$8,780 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,827 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,750 and 1,999 students) spent an average of \$8,498 per pupil. This is \$803 less than Johnsonburg Area's per-pupil spending, and \$282 less than Smethport Area's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,498 through consolidation, they could save \$935,443 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,498 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Johnsonburg Area School District and Smethport Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Johnsonburg Area	Smethport Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	807	1,020	1,827	1,888	-61
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	3.9	0.1
Square Miles	167	340	507	84	423
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,301	\$8,780	9,010	\$8,498	\$512
Instruction	\$5,709	\$5,073	\$5,354	\$5,186	\$167
Instructional Staff Support	\$260	\$225	\$240	\$283	-\$43
Pupil Support	\$366	\$427	\$400	\$387	\$13
General Administration	\$302	\$262	\$280	\$254	\$26
School Administration	\$525	\$443	\$479	\$388	\$92
Operations & Maintenance	\$923	\$889	\$904	\$838	\$67
Student Transportation	\$512	\$710	\$622	\$526	\$97
Food Services	\$390	\$551	\$480	\$363	\$117
Other	\$314	\$201	\$251	\$254	-\$3

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Johnsonburg Area School District and Smethport Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Johnsonburg Area	Smethport Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$8,670,000	\$12,300,000	\$20,970,000	\$20,109,262	\$860,738
Debt Payments (per student)	\$358	\$993	\$1,351	\$1,719	-\$368
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,223	\$11,550	\$10,964	\$10,236	\$728
Local	\$3,601	\$3,980	\$3,813	\$5,426	-\$1,613
State	\$6,486	\$7,073	\$6,813	\$4,332	\$2,481
Federal	\$136	\$497	\$338	\$478	-\$140
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	18.50	24.80	22.02	20.72	1.30
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$121	\$157	\$141	\$443	-\$302
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	2	5	2.5	2.5
Students Per District Administrator	269	510	365	826	-460
School Administrators	2	3	5	4.7	0.3
Students Per School Administrator	404	340	365	423	-57
Teachers	53	68	121	120.6	0.4
Students Per Teacher	15.2	15.0	15.1	15.7	-0.6
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	69.1%	63.2%	65.7%	71.7%	-6.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	80.0%	67.0%	71.7%	75.0%	-3.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	74.5%	70.2%	71.8%	73.1%	-1.3 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	51.7%	38.3%	44.2%	65.2%	-21.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	71.2%	73.1%	70.1%	2.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	64.5%	69.1%	71.9%	-2.9 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	71.7%	63.4%	67.2%	75.1%	-7.9 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	62.7%	65.9%	64.6%	69.5%	-4.9 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	84.0%	88.0%	88.5%	-0.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	74.5%	78.0%	76.7%	81.6%	-4.9 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	52.5%	45.2%	48.5%	70.8%	-22.3 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	80.3%	71.2%	75.6%	74.7%	1.0 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	72.0%	64.5%	67.5%	70.3%	-2.9 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	71.6%	64.8%	67.9%	67.3%	0.6 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	45.7%	43.1%	44.1%	54.6%	-10.4 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	35.7%	31.4%	33.3%	28.1%	5.2 pts
Students with Disabilities	13.6%	13.6%	13.6%	13.8%	-0.2 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Keystone School District and Cranberry Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Keystone School District	Cranberry Area School District
County: Clarion	County: Venango
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,225	District Enrollment: 1,483
Schools:	Schools:
Keystone Elementary School (642 students in grades K-6); Keystone Jr./Sr. High School (583 students in grades 7-12)	Rockland Elementary School (80 students in grades K,2-5); Pinegrove Elementary School (107 students in grades K-5); Pinoak Primary Center (114 students in grades K-3); Cranberry Elementary School (356 students in grades K-6); Steffee Intermediate Center (73 students in grades 4-5); Cranberry Area Jr./Sr. High School (753 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Clarion Co Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center

Keystone School District and Cranberry Area School District are located in different counties. However, they are served by the same Intermediate Unit, but by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Keystone School District enrolled 1,225 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,850 per pupil. Cranberry Area School District enrolled 1,483 students, and spent \$9,003 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,708 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$793 less than Keystone’s per-pupil spending, and \$946 less than Cranberry Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$2,374,430 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Keystone School District and Cranberry Area School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Keystone	Cranberry Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,225	1,483	2,708	2,726	-18
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	6	8	5.2	2.8
Square Miles	123	158	281	109	172
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,850	\$9,003	8,934	\$8,057	\$877
Instruction	\$5,283	\$5,500	\$5,402	\$5,022	\$380
Instructional Staff Support	\$199	\$477	\$352	\$256	\$96
Pupil Support	\$358	\$337	\$347	\$354	-\$7
General Administration	\$238	\$322	\$284	\$210	\$74
School Administration	\$432	\$293	\$356	\$354	\$2
Operations & Maintenance	\$772	\$869	\$825	\$820	\$5
Student Transportation	\$594	\$658	\$629	\$500	\$129
Food Services	\$384	\$376	\$380	\$323	\$57
Other	\$588	\$171	\$360	\$202	\$157

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Keystone School District and Cranberry Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Keystone	Cranberry Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$5,161,000	\$9,923,000	\$15,084,000	\$27,621,426	-\$12,537,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$709	\$858	\$1,567	\$1,905	-\$338
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,185	\$10,860	\$10,555	\$9,710	\$845
Local	\$3,003	\$4,825	\$4,001	\$5,542	-\$1,541
State	\$6,253	\$5,410	\$5,791	\$3,780	\$2,012
Federal	\$929	\$625	\$763	\$388	\$374
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	16.80	16.90	16.85	20.94	-4.09
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$188	\$296	\$247	\$660	-\$413
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	613	742	677	1,131	-454
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	408	371	387	444	-57
Teachers	90	102	192	170.0	22.0
Students Per Teacher	13.6	14.5	14.1	16.2	-2.1
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	71.5%	70.9%	71.2%	71.4%	-0.2 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	74.0%	70.0%	71.7%	74.0%	-2.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	76.2%	68.9%	72.5%	73.7%	-1.2 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	63.3%	66.3%	64.9%	64.3%	0.6 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	81.1%	69.4%	75.3%	70.7%	4.5 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	69.7%	63.5%	66.3%	72.0%	-5.7 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	78.3%	65.1%	71.3%	74.8%	-3.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	73.2%	64.8%	68.1%	69.0%	-0.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	90.0%	87.0%	88.3%	87.0%	1.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	78.4%	77.8%	78.1%	82.6%	-4.5 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	52.6%	84.2%	69.2%	70.9%	-1.7 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	67.3%	80.0%	73.7%	72.3%	1.4 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	70.5%	80.4%	75.9%	71.1%	4.9 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	69.3%	73.0%	71.3%	67.5%	3.8 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	52.1%	47.2%	49.1%	54.1%	-4.9 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	36.1%	34.1%	35.0%	24.1%	10.9 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.6%	19.5%	17.7%	13.5%	4.2 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Lackawanna Trail School District and Mountain View School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Lackawanna Trail School District</b>	<b>Mountain View School District</b>
County: Wyoming	County: Susquehanna
District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,386	District Enrollment: 1,446
Schools:	Schools:
Lackawanna Trail Elementary Center (682 students in grades K-6); Lackawanna Trail Jr./Sr. High School (704 students in grades 7-12)	Mountain View Elementary School (670 students in grades K-6); Mountain View Jr./Sr. High School (776 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Northeastern Educational IU 19	Intermediate Unit: Northeastern Educational IU 19
AVTS/CTC: No AVTS/CTC	AVTS/CTC: Susquehanna Co CTC

Lackawanna Trail School District and Mountain View School District are located in different counties. However, they are served by the same Intermediate Unit, but by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Lackawanna Trail School District enrolled 1,386 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,482 per pupil. Mountain View School District enrolled 1,446 students, and spent \$8,408 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,832 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,425 less than Lackawanna Trail’s per-pupil spending, and \$351 less than Mountain View’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$2,482,343 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Lackawanna Trail School District and Mountain View School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Lackawanna Trail	Mountain View	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,386	1,446	2,832	2,726	106
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	5.2	-1.2
Square Miles	73	193	266	109	157
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,482	\$8,408	8,934	\$8,057	\$877
Instruction	\$5,952	\$5,250	\$5,594	\$5,022	\$571
Instructional Staff Support	\$138	\$259	\$200	\$256	-\$56
Pupil Support	\$281	\$233	\$256	\$354	-\$97
General Administration	\$307	\$210	\$258	\$210	\$47
School Administration	\$348	\$261	\$304	\$354	-\$50
Operations & Maintenance	\$970	\$656	\$810	\$820	-\$10
Student Transportation	\$900	\$920	\$910	\$500	\$411
Food Services	\$388	\$335	\$361	\$323	\$38
Other	\$197	\$284	\$241	\$202	\$39



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Lackawanna Trail School District and Mountain View School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Lackawanna Trail	Mountain View	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$8,219,000	\$9,375,000	\$17,594,000	\$27,621,426	-\$10,027,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$990	\$584	\$1,574	\$1,905	-\$331
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,913	\$9,500	\$10,192	\$9,710	\$482
Local	\$4,909	\$4,140	\$4,517	\$5,542	-\$1,026
State	\$5,338	\$4,677	\$5,001	\$3,780	\$1,221
Federal	\$666	\$683	\$674	\$388	\$286
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	21.70	17.40	19.50	20.94	-1.44
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$293	\$311	\$302	\$660	-\$357
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	693	723	708	1,131	-423
School Administrators	3	3	6	6.4	-0.4
Students Per School Administrator	462	482	472	444	28
Teachers	95	99	194	170.0	24.0
Students Per Teacher	14.6	14.6	14.6	16.2	-1.6
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	70.8%	62.8%	66.8%	71.4%	-4.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	81.0%	70.0%	75.6%	74.0%	1.6 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	78.5%	59.0%	69.3%	73.7%	-4.4 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	65.7%	45.6%	55.6%	64.3%	-8.7 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	73.6%	70.7%	72.1%	70.7%	1.4 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	64.5%	67.5%	66.0%	72.0%	-6.0 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	68.0%	70.0%	68.9%	74.8%	-5.9 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	75.2%	68.8%	72.0%	69.0%	3.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	87.0%	83.0%	85.0%	87.0%	-2.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	68.8%	73.5%	71.0%	82.6%	-11.6 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	79.2%	45.6%	62.2%	70.9%	-8.7 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	81.4%	62.2%	71.6%	72.3%	-0.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	62.7%	62.1%	62.4%	71.1%	-8.7 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	63.7%	62.3%	63.0%	67.5%	-4.4 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	49.1%	46.0%	47.5%	54.1%	-6.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	29.3%	44.7%	37.2%	24.1%	13.1 pts
Students with Disabilities	17.8%	14.5%	16.1%	13.5%	2.6 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Leechburg Area School District and Freeport Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Leechburg Area School District</b>	<b>Freeport Area School District</b>
County: Armstrong	County: Armstrong
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 890	District Enrollment: 1,950
Schools:	Schools:
David Leech Elementary School (425 students in grades K-5); Leechburg Area Middle School (204 students in grades 6-8); Leechburg Area High School (261 students in grades 9-12)	Freeport Kindergarten Center (129 students in grades K); Buffalo Elementary School (590 students in grades 1-6); South Buffalo Elementary School (294 students in grades 1-6); Freeport Area Junior High School (318 students in grades 7-8); Freeport Area Senior High School (619 students in grades 9-12);
Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28	Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28
AVTS/CTC: Lenape Tech	AVTS/CTC: Lenape Tech

Leechburg Area School District and Freeport Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Leechburg Area School District enrolled 890 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,776 per pupil. Freeport Area School District enrolled 1,950 students, and spent \$8,637 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,840 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,719 less than Leechburg Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$580 less than Freeport Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$2,660,883 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Leechburg Area School District and Freeport Area School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Leechburg Area	Freeport Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	890	1,950	2,840	2,726	114
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	5	8	5.2	2.8
Square Miles	19	53	72	109	-37
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,776	\$8,637	8,994	\$8,057	\$937
Instruction	\$6,501	\$5,325	\$5,693	\$5,022	\$671
Instructional Staff Support	\$343	\$205	\$248	\$256	-\$8
Pupil Support	\$289	\$342	\$325	\$354	-\$28
General Administration	\$384	\$272	\$307	\$210	\$97
School Administration	\$322	\$424	\$392	\$354	\$39
Operations & Maintenance	\$812	\$969	\$920	\$820	\$100
Student Transportation	\$308	\$491	\$434	\$500	-\$66
Food Services	\$420	\$459	\$447	\$323	\$124
Other	\$397	\$150	\$227	\$202	\$25

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Leechburg Area School District and Freeport Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Leechburg Area	Freeport Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$9,567,000	\$11,555,000	\$21,122,000	\$27,621,426	-\$6,499,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,064	\$792	\$1,856	\$1,905	-\$49
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,379	\$9,438	\$10,046	\$9,710	\$336
Local	\$5,633	\$5,292	\$5,399	\$5,542	-\$143
State	\$5,316	\$3,898	\$4,343	\$3,780	\$563
Federal	\$430	\$248	\$305	\$388	-\$83
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	28.30	21.60	23.70	20.94	2.76
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$156	\$439	\$350	\$660	-\$309
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	3	6	2.6	3.4
Students Per District Administrator	297	650	473	1,131	-657
School Administrators	2	5	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	445	390	406	444	-38
Teachers	67	127	194	170.0	24.0
Students Per Teacher	13.3	15.4	14.6	16.2	-1.5
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	74.0%	81.9%	79.5%	71.4%	8.2 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	55.0%	84.0%	74.0%	74.0%	0.0 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	74.2%	92.0%	86.8%	73.7%	13.0 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	69.1%	73.7%	72.4%	64.3%	8.1 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	72.5%	80.1%	77.8%	70.7%	7.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	79.5%	86.3%	84.0%	72.0%	12.0 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	71.9%	88.6%	83.6%	74.8%	8.8 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	90.5%	73.5%	77.2%	69.0%	8.2 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	84.0%	95.0%	91.2%	87.0%	4.2 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	74.2%	94.6%	88.6%	82.6%	6.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	80.3%	85.5%	84.1%	70.9%	13.1 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	78.3%	85.6%	83.4%	72.3%	11.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	84.4%	77.0%	79.5%	71.1%	8.5 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	60.9%	71.0%	68.0%	67.5%	0.5 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	57.1%	61.6%	60.6%	54.1%	6.5 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.6%	20.3%	23.8%	24.1%	-0.2 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.7%	10.6%	12.2%	13.5%	-1.3 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Line Mountain School District and Upper Dauphin Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Line Mountain School District	Upper Dauphin Area School District
County: Northumberland	County: Dauphin
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,304	District Enrollment: 1,396
Schools:	Schools:
Dalmatia Elementary School (306 students in grades PreK-6); Trevorton Elementary School (238 students in grades PreK-6); Leck Kill Elementary School (115 students in grades K-6); Line Mountain JSHS (645 students in grades 7-12)	Upper Dauphin Area Elementary School (509 students in grades K-4); Upper Dauphin Area Middle School (453 students in grades 5-8); Upper Dauphin Area High School (434 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Central Susquehanna 16	Intermediate Unit: Capital Area IU 15
AVTS/CTC: Northumberland Co AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Dauphin Co AVTS

Line Mountain School District and Upper Dauphin Area School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Line Mountain School District enrolled 1,304 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,368 per pupil. Upper Dauphin Area School District enrolled 1,396 students, and spent \$8,108 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,700 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$311 less than Line Mountain’s per-pupil spending, and \$51 less than Upper Dauphin Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$476,892 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Line Mountain School District and Upper Dauphin Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Line Mountain	Upper Dauphin Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,304	1,396	2,700	2,726	-26
Number of Schools (2003-04)	4	3	7	5.2	1.8
Square Miles	155	91	245	109	137
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,368	\$8,108	8,234	\$8,057	\$177
Instruction	\$4,811	\$5,168	\$4,996	\$5,022	-\$27
Instructional Staff Support	\$130	\$165	\$149	\$256	-\$107
Pupil Support	\$308	\$310	\$309	\$354	-\$44
General Administration	\$318	\$268	\$292	\$210	\$82
School Administration	\$356	\$410	\$384	\$354	\$30
Operations & Maintenance	\$842	\$789	\$814	\$820	-\$6
Student Transportation	\$839	\$501	\$664	\$500	\$164
Food Services	\$335	\$312	\$323	\$323	\$0
Other	\$429	\$185	\$303	\$202	\$100

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Line Mountain School District and Upper Dauphin Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Line Mountain	Upper Dauphin Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$8,203,000	\$13,760,000	\$21,963,000	\$27,621,426	-\$5,658,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$466	\$1,001	\$1,467	\$1,905	-\$438
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,362	\$10,002	\$10,176	\$9,710	\$466
Local	\$3,946	\$4,622	\$4,296	\$5,542	-\$1,247
State	\$6,039	\$5,037	\$5,521	\$3,780	\$1,741
Federal	\$377	\$344	\$360	\$388	-\$29
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.10	20.90	19.06	20.94	-1.88
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$267	\$283	\$275	\$660	-\$385
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	652	698	675	1,131	-456
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	435	349	386	444	-58
Teachers	87	101	188	170.0	18.0
Students Per Teacher	15.0	13.8	14.4	16.2	-1.8
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	67.1%	68.6%	67.9%	71.4%	-3.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	79.0%	77.0%	74.0%	3.0 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	77.4%	68.4%	72.3%	73.7%	-1.4 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	62.5%	54.5%	58.3%	64.3%	-6.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	66.9%	67.4%	67.1%	70.7%	-3.6 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	66.6%	64.5%	65.4%	72.0%	-6.6 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	73.9%	76.3%	75.2%	74.8%	0.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	60.3%	65.2%	62.4%	69.0%	-6.5 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	81.0%	88.0%	84.5%	87.0%	-2.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	80.0%	74.5%	76.9%	82.6%	-5.7 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	67.5%	63.3%	65.3%	70.9%	-5.6 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	78.3%	58.9%	69.5%	72.3%	-2.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	70.4%	57.8%	63.2%	71.1%	-7.9 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	53.3%	77.1%	66.7%	67.5%	-0.8 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	35.1%	62.0%	46.9%	54.1%	-7.2 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.8%	19.0%	25.2%	24.1%	1.1 pts
Students with Disabilities	13.0%	10.7%	11.8%	13.5%	-1.7 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Midland Borough School District and South Side Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Midland Borough School District</b>	<b>South Side Area School District</b>
County: Beaver	County: Beaver
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 356	District Enrollment: 1,369
Schools:	Schools:
Midland Elementary/Middle School (356 students in grades PreK-8)	South Side Elementary School (569 students in grades K-5); South Side Middle School (354 students in grades 6-8); South Side High School (446 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Beaver Valley IU 27	Intermediate Unit: Beaver Valley IU 27
AVTS/CTC: Beaver Co AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Beaver Co AVTS

Midland Borough School District and South Side Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Midland Borough School District enrolled 356 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,228 per pupil. South Side Area School District enrolled 1,369 students, and spent \$10,709 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,725 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,500 and 1,749 students) spent an average of \$8,479 per pupil. This is \$1,748 less than Midland Borough's per-pupil spending, and \$2,229 less than South Side Area's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,479 through consolidation, they could save \$3,674,593 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,479 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Midland Borough School District and South Side Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Midland Borough	South Side Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	356	1,369	1,725	1,616	109
Number of Schools (2003-04)	1	3	4	3.4	0.6
Square Miles	2	76	78	95	-17
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,228	\$10,709	10,609	\$8,479	\$2,130
Instruction	\$5,803	\$6,612	\$6,445	\$5,269	\$1,176
Instructional Staff Support	\$649	\$327	\$393	\$243	\$150
Pupil Support	\$258	\$500	\$450	\$387	\$62
General Administration	\$685	\$435	\$487	\$278	\$209
School Administration	\$331	\$435	\$413	\$373	\$41
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,362	\$920	\$1,011	\$853	\$158
Student Transportation	\$270	\$873	\$748	\$532	\$216
Food Services	\$702	\$400	\$463	\$353	\$110
Other	\$166	\$207	\$199	\$190	\$9

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Midland Borough School District and South Side Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Midland Borough	South Side Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$1,760,000	\$22,229,000	\$23,989,000	\$14,381,000	\$9,608,000
Debt Payments (per student)	\$247	\$1,096	\$1,343	\$1,826	-\$483
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,719	\$14,378	\$14,242	\$10,111	\$4,132
Local	\$3,719	\$6,015	\$5,541	\$5,128	\$414
State	\$7,778	\$8,018	\$7,969	\$4,400	\$3,569
Federal	\$2,222	\$345	\$732	\$583	\$149
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	18.50	24.40	23.18	21.00	2.18
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$42	\$311	\$256	\$367	-\$111
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	2	3	2.2	0.8
Students Per District Administrator	356	685	575	866	-291
School Administrators	0	4	4	3.8	0.2
Students Per School Administrator	n.a.	342	431	457	-26
Teachers	21	98	119	105.8	13.2
Students Per Teacher	17.0	14.0	14.5	15.5	-1.0
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	83.4%	73.7%	n.a.%	68.4%	n.a. pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	91.0%	86.0%	87.0%	72.4%	14.6 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	88.8%	67.8%	72.6%	70.7%	1.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	70.0%	60.7%	63.1%	62.8%	0.4 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	68.0%	75.0%	73.6%	67.7%	5.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	83.4%	83.7%	83.6%	68.5%	15.1 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	90.0%	68.2%	71.6%	70.8%	0.7 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	n.a.%	73.0%	n.a.%	66.5%	n.a. pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	86.7%	8.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	85.1%	76.7%	78.6%	78.8%	-0.1 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	80.0%	74.1%	75.6%	67.4%	8.2 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	68.0%	78.0%	76.0%	69.1%	6.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	91.6%	80.6%	83.6%	66.6%	17.0 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	95.0%	60.0%	65.4%	62.5%	2.9 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	n.a.%	55.0%	n.a.%	51.3%	n.a. pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	70.2%	25.2%	34.5%	29.6%	4.9 pts
Students with Disabilities	12.9%	14.8%	14.4%	15.1%	-0.8 pts

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Midland Borough School District and Western Beaver County School District

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Midland Borough School District	Western Beaver County School District
County: Beaver	County: Beaver
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Large City	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 356	District Enrollment: 945
Schools:	Schools:
Midland Elementary/Middle School (356 students in grades PreK-8)	Fairview Elementary School (337 students in grades K-4); Snyder Elementary School (142 students in grades 5-6); Western Beaver County Jr./Sr. High School (466 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Beaver Valley IU 27	Intermediate Unit: Beaver Valley IU 27
AVTS/CTC: Beaver Co AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Beaver Co AVTS

Midland Borough School District and Western Beaver County School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Midland Borough School District enrolled 356 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,228 per pupil. Western Beaver County School District enrolled 945 students, and spent \$9,615 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,301 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,250 and 1,499 students) spent an average of \$8,437 per pupil. This is \$1,791 less than Midland Borough's per-pupil spending, and \$1,178 less than Western Beaver County's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,437 through consolidation, they could save \$1,750,875 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,437 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Midland Borough School District and Western Beaver County School District

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Midland Borough	Western Beaver County	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	356	945	1,301	1,380	-79
Number of Schools (2003-04)	1	3	4	3.0	1.0
Square Miles	2	34	37	72	-36
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,228	\$9,615	9,782	\$8,437	\$1,346
Instruction	\$5,803	\$5,974	\$5,927	\$5,233	\$694
Instructional Staff Support	\$649	\$99	\$250	\$275	-\$25
Pupil Support	\$258	\$234	\$241	\$352	-\$111
General Administration	\$685	\$410	\$485	\$278	\$207
School Administration	\$331	\$416	\$393	\$386	\$7
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,362	\$1,023	\$1,116	\$834	\$282
Student Transportation	\$270	\$879	\$713	\$507	\$205
Food Services	\$702	\$437	\$510	\$361	\$148
Other	\$166	\$143	\$149	\$209	-\$60

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Midland Borough School District and Western Beaver County School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Midland Borough	Western Beaver County	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$1,760,000	\$3,457,000	\$5,217,000	\$13,035,068	-\$7,818,068
Debt Payments (per student)	\$247	\$1,242	\$1,489	\$2,142	-\$653
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,719	\$10,069	\$11,068	\$10,312	\$755
Local	\$3,719	\$3,414	\$3,497	\$4,540	-\$1,042
State	\$7,778	\$6,214	\$6,642	\$5,209	\$1,433
Federal	\$2,222	\$441	\$929	\$564	\$364
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	18.50	17.50	17.77	20.32	-2.54
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$42	\$152	\$122	\$283	-\$161
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	1	2	2.0	0.0
Students Per District Administrator	356	945	651	773	-123
School Administrators	0	2	2	3.8	-1.8
Students Per School Administrator	n.a.	473	651	384	267
Teachers	21	71	92	91.3	0.7
Students Per Teacher	17.0	13.3	14.1	15.2	-1.1
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	83.4%	66.0%	n.a.%	68.7%	n.a. pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	91.0%	72.0%	77.1%	72.3%	4.8 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	88.8%	66.7%	73.1%	68.8%	4.3 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	70.0%	68.4%	68.9%	61.6%	7.3 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	68.0%	74.2%	72.5%	68.1%	4.4 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	83.4%	68.6%	73.6%	69.1%	4.5 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	90.0%	72.7%	76.7%	71.4%	5.3 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	n.a.%	38.9%	n.a.%	67.5%	n.a. pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	85.0%	87.7%	86.8%	0.9 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	85.1%	62.1%	68.8%	77.7%	-8.9 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	80.0%	72.6%	74.8%	68.7%	6.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	68.0%	66.7%	67.1%	71.8%	-4.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	91.6%	79.7%	83.8%	67.1%	16.7 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	95.0%	73.1%	78.1%	62.5%	15.7 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	n.a.%	42.3%	n.a.%	50.1%	n.a. pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	70.2%	31.1%	41.8%	32.5%	9.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	12.9%	14.4%	14.0%	14.6%	-0.7 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Millersburg Area School District and Halifax Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Millersburg Area School District	Halifax Area School District
County: Dauphin	County: Dauphin
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 938	District Enrollment: 1,211
Schools:	Schools:
Lenkerville Elementary School (414 students in grades K-5); Millersburg Area Middle School (237 students in grades 6-8); Millersburg Area Senior High School (287 students in grades 9-12)	Enders-Fisherville Elementary School (185 students in grades K-1); Halifax Area Elementary School (376 students in grades 2-5); Halifax Area Middle School (295 students in grades 6-8); Halifax Area High School (355 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Capital Area IU 15	Intermediate Unit: Capital Area IU 15
AVTS/CTC: Dauphin Co AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Dauphin Co AVTS

Millersburg Area School District and Halifax Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Millersburg Area School District enrolled 938 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,580 per pupil. Halifax Area School District enrolled 1,211 students, and spent \$9,513 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,149 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$256 less than Millersburg Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,189 less than Halifax Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$1,680,179 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Millersburg Area School District and Halifax Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Millersburg Area	Halifax Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	938	1,211	2,149	2,255	-106
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	4	7	4.7	2.3
Square Miles	32	85	117	111	7
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,580	\$9,513	9,106	\$8,324	\$782
Instruction	\$5,572	\$5,633	\$5,606	\$5,136	\$471
Instructional Staff Support	\$165	\$308	\$246	\$279	-\$33
Pupil Support	\$409	\$569	\$499	\$370	\$129
General Administration	\$295	\$413	\$362	\$234	\$127
School Administration	\$587	\$422	\$494	\$396	\$98
Operations & Maintenance	\$733	\$844	\$796	\$846	-\$51
Student Transportation	\$268	\$699	\$510	\$510	\$1
Food Services	\$301	\$372	\$341	\$338	\$3
Other	\$248	\$254	\$251	\$184	\$67

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Millersburg Area School District and Halifax Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Millersburg Area	Halifax Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$5,987,000	\$6,017,000	\$12,004,000	\$24,347,120	-\$12,343,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,200	\$622	\$1,822	\$3,093	-\$1,271
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,301	\$10,946	\$10,664	\$10,148	\$516
Local	\$5,093	\$5,215	\$5,161	\$5,489	-\$327
State	\$4,842	\$5,455	\$5,188	\$4,221	\$966
Federal	\$366	\$276	\$315	\$438	-\$123
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	20.40	22.00	21.30	21.58	-0.28
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$208	\$257	\$236	\$530	-\$294
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	469	606	537	1,037	-500
School Administrators	4	4	8	6.0	2.0
Students Per School Administrator	235	303	269	390	-122
Teachers	72	96	168	145.0	23.0
Students Per Teacher	13.0	12.6	12.8	15.7	-2.9
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	66.9%	67.9%	67.5%	70.0%	-2.6 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	69.0%	75.0%	72.5%	72.2%	0.3 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	86.9%	72.0%	78.4%	71.9%	6.4 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	62.9%	56.5%	59.1%	62.1%	-3.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	54.6%	65.9%	60.8%	70.6%	-9.8 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	69.7%	69.5%	69.6%	71.4%	-1.8 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	73.6%	80.6%	77.6%	73.9%	3.8 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	65.0%	58.8%	61.8%	68.0%	-6.2 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	87.0%	88.0%	87.6%	87.0%	0.6 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	83.6%	75.6%	79.0%	80.0%	-1.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	64.5%	64.1%	64.3%	68.9%	-4.6 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	53.3%	65.3%	59.9%	72.3%	-12.4 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	62.1%	64.6%	63.6%	70.1%	-6.5 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	65.8%	64.1%	64.8%	64.7%	0.2 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	48.1%	48.8%	48.5%	53.0%	-4.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	17.1%	18.6%	17.9%	26.6%	-8.7 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.6%	13.8%	14.1%	14.4%	-0.2 pts



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Millersburg Area School District and Line Mountain School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Millersburg Area School District</b>	<b>Line Mountain School District</b>
County: Dauphin	County: Northumberland
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 938	District Enrollment: 1,304
Schools:	Schools:
Lenkerville Elementary School (414 students in grades K-5); Millersburg Area Middle School (237 students in grades 6-8); Millersburg Area Senior High School (287 students in grades 9-12)	Dalmatia Elementary School (306 students in grades PreK-6); Trevorton Elementary School (238 students in grades PreK-6); Leck Kill Elementary School (115 students in grades K-6); Line Mountain JSBS (645 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Capital Area IU 15	Intermediate Unit: Central Susquehanna 16
AVTS/CTC: Dauphin Co AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Northumberland Co AVTS

Millersburg Area School District and Line Mountain School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Millersburg Area School District enrolled 938 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,580 per pupil. Line Mountain School District enrolled 1,304 students, and spent \$8,368 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,242 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$256 less than Millersburg Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$44 less than Line Mountain’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$298,068 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Millersburg Area School District and Line Mountain School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Millersburg Area	Line Mountain	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	938	1,304	2,242	2,255	-13
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	4	7	4.7	2.3
Square Miles	32	155	186	111	76
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,580	\$8,368	8,457	\$8,324	\$133
Instruction	\$5,572	\$4,811	\$5,129	\$5,136	-\$6
Instructional Staff Support	\$165	\$130	\$145	\$279	-\$134
Pupil Support	\$409	\$308	\$351	\$370	-\$20
General Administration	\$295	\$318	\$309	\$234	\$75
School Administration	\$587	\$356	\$453	\$396	\$57
Operations & Maintenance	\$733	\$842	\$797	\$846	-\$50
Student Transportation	\$268	\$839	\$600	\$510	\$90
Food Services	\$301	\$335	\$321	\$338	-\$17
Other	\$248	\$429	\$353	\$184	\$169

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Millersburg Area School District and Line Mountain School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Millersburg Area	Line Mountain	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$5,987,000	\$8,203,000	\$14,190,000	\$24,347,120	-\$10,157,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,200	\$466	\$1,666	\$3,093	-\$1,427
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,301	\$10,362	\$10,336	\$10,148	\$188
Local	\$5,093	\$3,946	\$4,426	\$5,489	-\$1,063
State	\$4,842	\$6,039	\$5,538	\$4,221	\$1,317
Federal	\$366	\$377	\$372	\$438	-\$66
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	20.40	17.10	18.48	21.58	-3.10
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$208	\$267	\$242	\$530	-\$288
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	469	652	561	1,037	-477
School Administrators	4	3	7	6.0	1.0
Students Per School Administrator	235	435	320	390	-70
Teachers	72	87	159	145.0	14.0
Students Per Teacher	13.0	15.0	14.1	15.7	-1.6
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	66.9%	67.1%	67.0%	70.0%	-3.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	69.0%	75.0%	72.6%	72.2%	0.4 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	86.9%	77.4%	81.7%	71.9%	9.8 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	62.9%	62.5%	62.7%	62.1%	0.6 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	54.6%	66.9%	62.0%	70.6%	-8.6 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	69.7%	66.6%	68.0%	71.4%	-3.4 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	73.6%	73.9%	73.8%	73.9%	-0.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	65.0%	60.3%	62.2%	68.0%	-5.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	87.0%	81.0%	83.4%	87.0%	-3.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	83.6%	80.0%	81.6%	80.0%	1.6 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	64.5%	67.5%	66.2%	68.9%	-2.7 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	53.3%	78.3%	68.3%	72.3%	-4.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	62.1%	70.4%	66.7%	70.1%	-3.4 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	65.8%	53.3%	59.0%	64.7%	-5.7 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	48.1%	35.1%	40.4%	53.0%	-12.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	17.1%	31.8%	25.6%	26.6%	-1.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.6%	13.0%	13.7%	14.4%	-0.7 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Millville Area School District and Benton Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Millville Area School District</b>	<b>Benton Area School District</b>
County: Columbia	County: Columbia
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 776	District Enrollment: 788
Schools:	Schools:
Millville Area Elementary School (424 students in grades K-6); Millville Area Jr./Sr. High School (352 students in grades 7-12)	Appleman Elementary School (394 students in grades K-6); Benton Area MSHS (394 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Central Susquehanna 16	Intermediate Unit: Central Susquehanna 16
AVTS/CTC: Columbia-Montour AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Columbia-Montour AVTS

Millville Area School District and Benton Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Millville Area School District enrolled 776 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,594 per pupil. Benton Area School District enrolled 788 students, and spent \$9,201 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,564 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,500 and 1,749 students) spent an average of \$8,479 per pupil. This is \$1,115 less than Millville Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$721 less than Benton Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,479 through consolidation, they could save \$1,433,719 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,479 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Millville Area School District and Benton Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a “blueprint” for consolidation or an “ideal” state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Millville Area	Benton Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	776	788	1,564	1,616	-52
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	3.4	0.6
Square Miles	91	97	188	95	93
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,594	\$9,201	9,396	\$8,479	\$917
Instruction	\$5,639	\$5,478	\$5,558	\$5,269	\$289
Instructional Staff Support	\$318	\$183	\$250	\$243	\$7
Pupil Support	\$420	\$368	\$394	\$387	\$6
General Administration	\$295	\$352	\$324	\$278	\$45
School Administration	\$452	\$490	\$471	\$373	\$99
Operations & Maintenance	\$972	\$958	\$965	\$853	\$112
Student Transportation	\$840	\$675	\$757	\$532	\$225
Food Services	\$383	\$400	\$391	\$353	\$38
Other	\$274	\$297	\$286	\$190	\$96

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Millville Area School District and Benton Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Millville Area	Benton Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$12,273,000	\$14,763,000	\$27,036,000	\$14,381,000	\$12,655,000
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,253	\$8,678	\$9,931	\$1,826	\$8,105
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$12,128	\$11,765	\$11,945	\$10,111	\$1,834
Local	\$4,987	\$5,750	\$5,371	\$5,128	\$244
State	\$6,419	\$5,075	\$5,742	\$4,400	\$1,342
Federal	\$722	\$940	\$832	\$583	\$249
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	21.90	22.20	22.05	21.00	1.05
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$169	\$187	\$178	\$367	-\$189
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.2	1.8
Students Per District Administrator	388	394	391	866	-475
School Administrators	2	3	5	3.8	1.2
Students Per School Administrator	388	263	313	457	-144
Teachers	66	66	132	105.8	26.2
Students Per Teacher	11.8	11.9	11.8	15.5	-3.6
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	72.0%	77.7%	74.8%	68.4%	6.4 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	84.0%	73.0%	78.5%	72.4%	6.1 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	80.8%	75.0%	78.1%	70.7%	7.4 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	55.3%	70.3%	63.9%	62.8%	1.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	68.8%	76.7%	72.6%	67.7%	4.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	71.7%	82.3%	77.1%	68.5%	8.6 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	69.5%	78.1%	73.6%	70.8%	2.8 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	87.5%	67.5%	78.0%	66.5%	11.6 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	87.0%	89.0%	88.0%	86.7%	1.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	95.0%	88.6%	92.1%	78.8%	13.3 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	72.3%	87.5%	81.1%	67.4%	13.7 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	79.7%	83.3%	81.4%	69.1%	12.4 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	61.6%	72.6%	67.2%	66.6%	0.6 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	49.3%	75.0%	61.7%	62.5%	-0.8 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	50.0%	65.9%	57.6%	51.3%	6.3 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	34.7%	39.4%	37.1%	29.6%	7.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	17.8%	14.5%	16.1%	15.1%	1.0 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Millville Area School District and East Lycoming School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Millville Area School District</b>	<b>East Lycoming School District</b>
County: Columbia	County: Lycoming
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 776	District Enrollment: 1,781
Schools:	Schools:
Millville Area Elementary School (424 students in grades K-6); Millville Area Jr./Sr. High School (352 students in grades 7-12)	Carl G Renn Elementary School (214 students in grades K-6); George A Ferrell Elementary School (136 students in grades K-6); Joseph C Ashkar Elementary School (503 students in grades K-6); Hughesville Jr./Sr. High School (928 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Central Susquehanna 16	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Columbia-Montour AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Lycoming CTC

Millville Area School District and East Lycoming School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Millville Area School District enrolled 776 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,594 per pupil. East Lycoming School District enrolled 1,781 students, and spent \$8,494 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,557 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,537 less than Millville Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$436 less than East Lycoming’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$1,970,040 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Millville Area School District and East Lycoming School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Millville Area	East Lycoming	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	776	1,781	2,557	2,726	-169
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	4	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	91	146	237	109	128
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,594	\$8,494	8,828	\$8,057	\$770
Instruction	\$5,639	\$5,461	\$5,515	\$5,022	\$493
Instructional Staff Support	\$318	\$214	\$246	\$256	-\$10
Pupil Support	\$420	\$363	\$380	\$354	\$26
General Administration	\$295	\$145	\$191	\$210	-\$20
School Administration	\$452	\$360	\$388	\$354	\$34
Operations & Maintenance	\$972	\$713	\$792	\$820	-\$28
Student Transportation	\$840	\$552	\$639	\$500	\$140
Food Services	\$383	\$393	\$390	\$323	\$67
Other	\$274	\$292	\$287	\$202	\$84



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Millville Area School District and East Lycoming School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Millville Area	East Lycoming	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$12,273,000	\$17,383,000	\$29,656,000	\$27,621,426	\$2,034,574
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,253	\$1,264	\$2,517	\$1,905	\$612
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$12,128	\$9,497	\$10,295	\$9,710	\$585
Local	\$4,987	\$3,780	\$4,147	\$5,542	-\$1,396
State	\$6,419	\$5,234	\$5,593	\$3,780	\$1,814
Federal	\$722	\$483	\$555	\$388	\$167
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	21.90	18.30	19.39	20.94	-1.55
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$169	\$320	\$274	\$660	-\$385
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	388	891	639	1,131	-491
School Administrators	2	4	6	6.4	-0.4
Students Per School Administrator	388	445	426	444	-18
Teachers	66	123	189	170.0	19.0
Students Per Teacher	11.8	14.5	13.5	16.2	-2.6
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	72.0%	79.1%	76.9%	71.4%	5.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	84.0%	77.0%	79.3%	74.0%	5.3 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	80.8%	81.7%	81.4%	73.7%	7.7 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	55.3%	69.7%	65.4%	64.3%	1.1 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	68.8%	73.8%	72.1%	70.7%	1.4 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	71.7%	74.7%	73.8%	72.0%	1.8 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	69.5%	82.3%	77.9%	74.8%	3.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	87.5%	74.6%	77.8%	69.0%	8.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	87.0%	92.0%	90.4%	87.0%	3.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	95.0%	91.3%	92.4%	82.6%	9.8 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	72.3%	79.8%	77.5%	70.9%	6.6 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	79.7%	84.1%	82.6%	72.3%	10.3 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	61.6%	88.8%	80.4%	71.1%	9.3 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	49.3%	74.6%	65.8%	67.5%	-1.7 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	50.0%	65.8%	61.9%	54.1%	7.8 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	34.7%	25.3%	28.2%	24.1%	4.1 pts
Students with Disabilities	17.8%	12.5%	14.1%	13.5%	0.6 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Montgomery Area School District and Muncy School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Montgomery Area School District</b>	<b>Muncy School District</b>
County: Lycoming	County: Lycoming
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 992	District Enrollment: 1,064
Schools:	Schools:
Elimsport Elementary School (92 students in grades K-5); Montgomery Elementary School (323 students in grades K-5); Montgomery Middle School (245 students in grades 6-8); Montgomery Senior High School (332 students in grades 9-12)	Ward L Myers Elementary School (537 students in grades K-6); Muncy Jr./Sr. High School (527 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Lycoming CTC	AVTS/CTC: Lycoming CTC

Montgomery Area School District and Muncy School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Montgomery Area School District enrolled 992 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,381 per pupil. Muncy School District enrolled 1,064 students, and spent \$9,353 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,056 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$1,057 less than Montgomery Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,030 less than Muncy’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$2,144,286 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Montgomery Area School District and Muncy School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Montgomery Area	Muncy	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	992	1,064	2,056	2,255	-199
Number of Schools (2003-04)	4	2	6	4.7	1.3
Square Miles	87	37	124	111	13
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,381	\$9,353	9,367	\$8,324	\$1,043
Instruction	\$6,005	\$5,916	\$5,959	\$5,136	\$823
Instructional Staff Support	\$377	\$441	\$410	\$279	\$131
Pupil Support	\$438	\$337	\$386	\$370	\$15
General Administration	\$254	\$501	\$382	\$234	\$148
School Administration	\$368	\$336	\$352	\$396	-\$44
Operations & Maintenance	\$982	\$882	\$930	\$846	\$84
Student Transportation	\$374	\$353	\$363	\$510	-\$147
Food Services	\$350	\$368	\$359	\$338	\$21
Other	\$234	\$218	\$226	\$184	\$42

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Montgomery Area School District and Muncy School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Montgomery Area	Muncy	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$8,518,000	\$14,563,000	\$23,081,000	\$24,347,120	-\$1,266,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$959	\$1,007	\$1,966	\$3,093	-\$1,127
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,299	\$11,207	\$10,769	\$10,148	\$621
Local	\$3,747	\$6,396	\$5,118	\$5,489	-\$371
State	\$5,997	\$4,197	\$5,066	\$4,221	\$844
Federal	\$555	\$614	\$586	\$438	\$147
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	18.40	19.60	19.02	21.58	-2.56
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$172	\$328	\$253	\$530	-\$277
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	496	532	514	1,037	-523
School Administrators	3	2	5	6.0	-1.0
Students Per School Administrator	331	532	411	390	21
Teachers	78	74	152	145.0	7.0
Students Per Teacher	12.7	14.4	13.5	15.7	-2.2
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	81.6%	77.2%	79.3%	70.0%	9.3 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	84.0%	73.0%	77.8%	72.2%	5.6 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	86.6%	71.4%	78.1%	71.9%	6.2 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	71.8%	68.1%	70.1%	62.1%	8.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	74.6%	84.8%	79.7%	70.6%	9.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	71.3%	73.8%	72.6%	71.4%	1.2 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	77.6%	70.4%	73.7%	73.9%	-0.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	75.7%	84.1%	79.9%	68.0%	11.9 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	94.0%	88.0%	90.6%	87.0%	3.7 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	92.5%	89.3%	90.7%	80.0%	10.7 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	92.3%	76.8%	85.0%	68.9%	16.2 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	91.1%	83.3%	87.2%	72.3%	14.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	77.6%	79.8%	78.7%	70.1%	8.7 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	80.7%	73.0%	76.6%	64.7%	11.9 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	78.2%	66.6%	72.4%	53.0%	19.4 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	28.8%	22.4%	25.5%	26.6%	-1.2 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.5%	17.4%	16.5%	14.4%	2.1 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Muncy School District and East Lycoming School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Muncy School District</b>	<b>East Lycoming School District</b>
County: Lycoming	County: Lycoming
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 1,064	District Enrollment: 1,781
Schools:	Schools:
Ward L Myers Elementary School (537 students in grades K-6); Muncy Jr./Sr. High School (527 students in grades 7-12)	Carl G Renn Elementary School (214 students in grades K-6); George A Ferrell Elementary School (136 students in grades K-6); Joseph C Ashkar Elementary School (503 students in grades K-6); Hughesville Jr./Sr. High School (928 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Lycoming CTC	AVTS/CTC: Lycoming CTC

Muncy School District and East Lycoming School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Muncy School District enrolled 1,064 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,353 per pupil. East Lycoming School District enrolled 1,781 students, and spent \$8,494 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,845 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,296 less than Muncy’s per-pupil spending, and \$436 less than East Lycoming’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$2,156,598 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Muncy School District and East Lycoming School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Muncy	East Lycoming	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,064	1,781	2,845	2,726	119
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	4	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	37	146	183	109	75
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,353	\$8,494	8,815	\$8,057	\$758
Instruction	\$5,916	\$5,461	\$5,631	\$5,022	\$609
Instructional Staff Support	\$441	\$214	\$299	\$256	\$43
Pupil Support	\$337	\$363	\$353	\$354	\$0
General Administration	\$501	\$145	\$278	\$210	\$68
School Administration	\$336	\$360	\$351	\$354	-\$2
Operations & Maintenance	\$882	\$713	\$776	\$820	-\$44
Student Transportation	\$353	\$552	\$478	\$500	-\$22
Food Services	\$368	\$393	\$384	\$323	\$61
Other	\$218	\$292	\$264	\$202	\$62

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Muncy School District and East Lycoming School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Muncy	East Lycoming	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$14,563,000	\$17,383,000	\$31,946,000	\$27,621,426	\$4,324,574
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,007	\$1,264	\$2,271	\$1,905	\$366
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,207	\$9,497	\$10,136	\$9,710	\$426
Local	\$6,396	\$3,780	\$4,759	\$5,542	-\$784
State	\$4,197	\$5,234	\$4,846	\$3,780	\$1,066
Federal	\$614	\$483	\$532	\$388	\$144
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	19.60	18.30	18.79	20.94	-2.15
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$328	\$320	\$323	\$660	-\$337
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	532	891	711	1,131	-419
School Administrators	2	4	6	6.4	-0.4
Students Per School Administrator	532	445	474	444	30
Teachers	74	123	197	170.0	27.0
Students Per Teacher	14.4	14.5	14.4	16.2	-1.7
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	77.2%	79.1%	78.4%	71.4%	7.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	73.0%	77.0%	75.3%	74.0%	1.4 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	71.4%	81.7%	77.6%	73.7%	3.8 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	68.1%	69.7%	69.1%	64.3%	4.8 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	84.8%	73.8%	77.6%	70.7%	6.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	73.8%	74.7%	74.4%	72.0%	2.4 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	70.4%	82.3%	77.5%	74.8%	2.7 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	84.1%	74.6%	77.6%	69.0%	8.7 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	88.0%	92.0%	90.3%	87.0%	3.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	89.3%	91.3%	90.5%	82.6%	7.9 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	76.8%	79.8%	78.6%	70.9%	7.7 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	83.3%	84.1%	83.8%	72.3%	11.6 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	79.8%	88.8%	85.3%	71.1%	14.3 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	73.0%	74.6%	73.9%	67.5%	6.5 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	66.6%	65.8%	66.1%	54.1%	12.0 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	22.4%	25.3%	24.2%	24.1%	0.1 pts
Students with Disabilities	17.4%	12.5%	14.3%	13.5%	0.8 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Brookville Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

North Clarion County School District	Brookville Area School District
County: Clarion	County: Jefferson
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Small Town
District Enrollment: 680	District Enrollment: 1,885
Schools:	Schools:
North Clarion County Elementary School (313 students in grades K-6); North Clarion County Jr./Sr. High School (367 students in grades 7-12)	Hickory Grove Elementary School (554 students in grades 3-6); Northside Elementary School (122 students in grades K); Pinecreek Elementary School (269 students in grades 1-2); Brookville Jr./Sr. High School (940 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Jefferson Co- Dubois AVTS

North Clarion County School District and Brookville Area School District are located in different counties. However, they are served by the same Intermediate Unit, but by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, North Clarion County School District enrolled 680 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,793 per pupil. Brookville Area School District enrolled 1,885 students, and spent \$8,463 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,565 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$736 less than North Clarion County’s per-pupil spending, and \$406 less than Brookville Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$1,265,592 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Brookville Area School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	North Clarion County	Brookville Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	680	1,885	2,565	2,726	-161
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	4	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	112	262	375	109	266
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,793	\$8,463	8,550	\$8,057	\$493
Instruction	\$5,350	\$5,088	\$5,158	\$5,022	\$135
Instructional Staff Support	\$262	\$264	\$263	\$256	\$7
Pupil Support	\$372	\$333	\$343	\$354	-\$11
General Administration	\$285	\$222	\$239	\$210	\$29
School Administration	\$538	\$347	\$398	\$354	\$44
Operations & Maintenance	\$679	\$893	\$836	\$820	\$16
Student Transportation	\$668	\$740	\$721	\$500	\$221
Food Services	\$390	\$344	\$356	\$323	\$33
Other	\$249	\$232	\$237	\$202	\$34

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Brookville Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	North Clarion County	Brookville Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$4,873,000	\$21,650,000	\$26,523,000	\$27,621,426	-\$1,098,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$703	\$759	\$1,462	\$1,905	-\$443
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,937	\$10,407	\$10,282	\$9,710	\$572
Local	\$3,121	\$4,182	\$3,901	\$5,542	-\$1,642
State	\$5,953	\$5,712	\$5,776	\$3,780	\$1,996
Federal	\$863	\$513	\$606	\$388	\$218
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	12.50	19.80	17.86	20.94	-3.08
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$153	\$363	\$307	\$660	-\$352
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	2	3	2.6	0.4
Students Per District Administrator	680	943	855	1,131	-276
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	227	471	366	444	-77
Teachers	51	125	176	170.0	6.0
Students Per Teacher	13.3	15.1	14.6	16.2	-1.6
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	75.6%	67.4%	69.7%	71.4%	-1.7 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	67.0%	69.3%	74.0%	-4.6 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	74.4%	60.6%	64.6%	73.7%	-9.1 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	63.9%	57.0%	58.5%	64.3%	-5.8 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	64.2%	74.7%	71.9%	70.7%	1.2 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	80.9%	81.3%	72.0%	9.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	90.0%	72.0%	77.2%	74.8%	2.4 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	57.6%	70.2%	66.5%	69.0%	-2.5 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	92.0%	85.0%	86.8%	87.0%	-0.2 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	80.9%	70.2%	73.3%	82.6%	-9.3 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	86.1%	54.7%	61.6%	70.9%	-9.3 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	81.1%	61.0%	66.4%	72.3%	-5.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	71.4%	63.3%	65.9%	71.1%	-5.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	80.0%	63.0%	68.0%	67.5%	0.5 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	59.3%	60.3%	60.0%	54.1%	5.9 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	30.6%	41.0%	38.2%	24.1%	14.2 pts
Students with Disabilities	18.8%	15.9%	16.7%	13.5%	3.2 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Clarion Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

North Clarion County School District	Clarion Area School District
County: Clarion	County: Clarion
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Small Town
District Enrollment: 680	District Enrollment: 910
Schools:	Schools:
North Clarion County Elementary School (313 students in grades K-6); North Clarion County Jr./Sr. High School (367 students in grades 7-12)	Clarion Area Elementary School (456 students in grades K-6); Clarion Area Jr./Sr. High School (454 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Clarion Co Career Center

North Clarion County School District and Clarion Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit. However, they are served by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, North Clarion County School District enrolled 680 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,793 per pupil. Clarion Area School District enrolled 910 students, and spent \$9,120 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,590 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,500 and 1,749 students) spent an average of \$8,479 per pupil. This is \$314 less than North Clarion County’s per-pupil spending, and \$641 less than Clarion Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,479 through consolidation, they could save \$796,265 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,479 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Clarion Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	North Clarion County	Clarion Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	680	910	1,590	1,616	-26
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	3.4	0.6
Square Miles	112	70	182	95	87
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,793	\$9,120	8,980	\$8,479	\$501
Instruction	\$5,350	\$5,611	\$5,499	\$5,269	\$230
Instructional Staff Support	\$262	\$289	\$277	\$243	\$34
Pupil Support	\$372	\$479	\$433	\$387	\$46
General Administration	\$285	\$297	\$292	\$278	\$14
School Administration	\$538	\$479	\$504	\$373	\$132
Operations & Maintenance	\$679	\$963	\$842	\$853	-\$11
Student Transportation	\$668	\$355	\$489	\$532	-\$44
Food Services	\$390	\$433	\$414	\$353	\$62
Other	\$249	\$214	\$229	\$190	\$39

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Clarion Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	North Clarion County	Clarion Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$4,873,000	\$7,589,000	\$12,462,000	\$14,381,000	-\$1,919,000
Debt Payments (per student)	\$703	\$1,074	\$1,777	\$1,826	-\$49
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,937	\$10,673	\$10,358	\$10,111	\$247
Local	\$3,121	\$6,586	\$5,104	\$5,128	-\$24
State	\$5,953	\$3,692	\$4,659	\$4,400	\$259
Federal	\$863	\$395	\$595	\$583	\$12
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	12.50	18.60	15.99	21.00	-5.01
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$153	\$296	\$235	\$367	-\$132
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	3	4	2.2	1.8
Students Per District Administrator	680	303	398	866	-469
School Administrators	3	3	6	3.8	2.2
Students Per School Administrator	227	303	265	457	-192
Teachers	51	64	115	105.8	9.2
Students Per Teacher	13.3	14.2	13.8	15.5	-1.7
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	75.6%	77.5%	76.6%	68.4%	8.2 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	75.0%	75.5%	72.4%	3.1 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	74.4%	80.3%	77.6%	70.7%	6.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	63.9%	56.6%	58.9%	62.8%	-3.8 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	64.2%	80.9%	73.3%	67.7%	5.6 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	78.2%	80.2%	68.5%	11.7 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	90.0%	90.1%	90.1%	70.8%	19.2 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	57.6%	82.9%	71.8%	66.5%	5.4 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	92.0%	94.0%	93.0%	86.7%	6.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	80.9%	85.7%	83.5%	78.8%	4.7 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	86.1%	77.7%	80.4%	67.4%	13.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	81.1%	85.7%	83.6%	69.1%	14.5 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	71.4%	78.1%	74.8%	66.6%	8.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	80.0%	70.4%	74.8%	62.5%	12.3 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	59.3%	59.2%	59.2%	51.3%	7.9 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	30.6%	22.7%	26.1%	29.6%	-3.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	18.8%	11.1%	14.4%	15.1%	-0.7 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Cranberry Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

North Clarion County School District	Cranberry Area School District
County: Clarion	County: Venango
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 680	District Enrollment: 1,483
Schools:	Schools:
North Clarion County Elementary School (313 students in grades K-6); North Clarion County Jr./Sr. High School (367 students in grades 7-12)	Rockland Elementary School (80 students in grades K,2-5); Pinegrove Elementary School (107 students in grades K-5); Pinoak Primary Center (114 students in grades K-3); Cranberry Elementary School (356 students in grades K-6); Steffee Intermediate Center (73 students in grades 4-5); Cranberry Area Jr./Sr. High School (753 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center

North Clarion County School District and Cranberry Area School District are located in different counties, but they are served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, North Clarion County School District enrolled 680 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,793 per pupil. Cranberry Area School District enrolled 1,483 students, and spent \$9,003 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,163 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$469 less than North Clarion County’s per-pupil spending, and \$680 less than Cranberry Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$1,326,642 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Cranberry Area School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	North Clarion County	Cranberry Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	680	1,483	2,163	2,255	-92
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	6	8	4.7	3.3
Square Miles	112	158	270	111	160
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,793	\$9,003	8,937	\$8,324	\$613
Instruction	\$5,350	\$5,500	\$5,453	\$5,136	\$317
Instructional Staff Support	\$262	\$477	\$410	\$279	\$130
Pupil Support	\$372	\$337	\$348	\$370	-\$22
General Administration	\$285	\$322	\$310	\$234	\$76
School Administration	\$538	\$293	\$370	\$396	-\$25
Operations & Maintenance	\$679	\$869	\$809	\$846	-\$37
Student Transportation	\$668	\$658	\$661	\$510	\$151
Food Services	\$390	\$376	\$380	\$338	\$42
Other	\$249	\$171	\$196	\$184	\$12

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Cranberry Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	North Clarion County	Cranberry Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$4,873,000	\$9,923,000	\$14,796,000	\$24,347,120	-\$9,551,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$703	\$858	\$1,561	\$3,093	-\$1,532
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,937	\$10,860	\$10,570	\$10,148	\$422
Local	\$3,121	\$4,825	\$4,289	\$5,489	-\$1,199
State	\$5,953	\$5,410	\$5,581	\$4,221	\$1,359
Federal	\$863	\$625	\$700	\$438	\$262
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	12.50	16.90	15.52	21.58	-6.07
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$153	\$296	\$251	\$530	-\$279
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	2	3	2.5	0.5
Students Per District Administrator	680	742	721	1,037	-316
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.0	1.0
Students Per School Administrator	227	371	309	390	-81
Teachers	51	102	153	145.0	8.0
Students Per Teacher	13.3	14.5	14.1	15.7	-1.5
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	75.6%	70.9%	72.5%	70.0%	2.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	70.0%	72.1%	72.2%	-0.1 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	74.4%	68.9%	70.8%	71.9%	-1.1 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	63.9%	66.3%	65.6%	62.1%	3.5 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	64.2%	69.4%	67.5%	70.6%	-3.0 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	63.5%	70.4%	71.4%	-1.0 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	90.0%	65.1%	73.1%	73.9%	-0.7 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	57.6%	64.8%	62.3%	68.0%	-5.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	92.0%	87.0%	88.8%	87.0%	1.8 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	80.9%	77.8%	78.9%	80.0%	-1.2 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	86.1%	84.2%	84.7%	68.9%	15.9 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	81.1%	80.0%	80.4%	72.3%	8.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	71.4%	80.4%	77.1%	70.1%	7.0 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	80.0%	73.0%	75.3%	64.7%	10.6 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	59.3%	47.2%	51.5%	53.0%	-1.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	30.6%	34.1%	33.0%	26.6%	6.4 pts
Students with Disabilities	18.8%	19.5%	19.3%	14.4%	4.9 pts



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Forest Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

North Clarion County School District	Forest Area School District
County: Clarion	County: Forest
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 680	District Enrollment: 691
Schools:	Schools:
North Clarion County Elementary School (313 students in grades K-6); North Clarion County Jr./Sr. High School (367 students in grades 7-12)	East Forest Elementary School (120 students in grades K-6); West Forest Elementary School (200 students in grades K-6); East Forest Jr./Sr. High School (127 students in grades 7-12); West Forest Jr./Sr. High School (244 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center

North Clarion County School District and Forest Area School District are located in different counties, but they are served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, North Clarion County School District enrolled 680 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,793 per pupil. Forest Area School District enrolled 691 students, and spent \$11,760 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,371 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,250 and 1,499 students) spent an average of \$8,437 per pupil. This is \$356 less than North Clarion County’s per-pupil spending, and \$3,323 less than Forest Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,437 through consolidation, they could save \$2,538,315 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,437 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Forest Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	North Clarion County	Forest Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	680	691	1,371	1,380	-9
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	4	6	3.0	3.0
Square Miles	112	504	616	72	544
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,793	\$11,760	10,288	\$8,437	\$1,851
Instruction	\$5,350	\$6,760	\$6,061	\$5,233	\$827
Instructional Staff Support	\$262	\$449	\$356	\$275	\$81
Pupil Support	\$372	\$363	\$368	\$352	\$16
General Administration	\$285	\$501	\$394	\$278	\$115
School Administration	\$538	\$699	\$619	\$386	\$233
Operations & Maintenance	\$679	\$1,110	\$896	\$834	\$62
Student Transportation	\$668	\$1,192	\$932	\$507	\$425
Food Services	\$390	\$531	\$461	\$361	\$100
Other	\$249	\$155	\$201	\$209	-\$8

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Forest Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	North Clarion County	Forest Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$4,873,000	\$9,583,000	\$14,456,000	\$13,035,068	\$1,420,932
Debt Payments (per student)	\$703	\$1,388	\$2,091	\$2,142	-\$51
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,937	\$13,651	\$11,809	\$10,312	\$1,496
Local	\$3,121	\$6,781	\$4,966	\$4,540	\$426
State	\$5,953	\$5,133	\$5,540	\$5,209	\$331
Federal	\$863	\$1,737	\$1,303	\$564	\$739
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	12.50	18.20	15.37	20.32	-4.95
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$153	\$282	\$218	\$283	-\$65
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	2	3	2.0	1.0
Students Per District Administrator	680	346	457	773	-316
School Administrators	3	3	6	3.8	2.2
Students Per School Administrator	227	230	229	384	-155
Teachers	51	54	105	91.3	13.7
Students Per Teacher	13.3	12.8	13.1	15.2	-2.2
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	75.6%	66.2%	71.0%	68.7%	2.3 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	61.0%	68.9%	72.3%	-3.5 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	74.4%	61.9%	68.5%	68.8%	-0.3 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	63.9%	52.5%	57.9%	61.6%	-3.7 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	64.2%	70.9%	67.6%	68.1%	-0.5 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	67.3%	75.2%	69.1%	6.1 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	90.0%	69.8%	80.5%	71.4%	9.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	57.6%	65.1%	61.6%	67.5%	-5.9 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	92.0%	95.0%	93.4%	86.8%	6.6 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	80.9%	71.5%	76.5%	77.7%	-1.2 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	86.1%	52.5%	68.4%	68.7%	-0.3 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	81.1%	85.5%	83.3%	71.8%	11.6 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	71.4%	58.2%	65.2%	67.1%	-1.9 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	80.0%	58.5%	69.9%	62.5%	7.5 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	59.3%	54.5%	56.8%	50.1%	6.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	30.6%	40.0%	35.3%	32.5%	2.8 pts
Students with Disabilities	18.8%	20.8%	19.8%	14.6%	5.2 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Keystone School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

North Clarion County School District	Keystone School District
County: Clarion	County: Clarion
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 680	District Enrollment: 1,225
Schools:	Schools:
North Clarion County Elementary School (313 students in grades K-6); North Clarion County Jr./Sr. High School (367 students in grades 7-12)	Keystone Elementary School (642 students in grades K-6); Keystone Jr./Sr. High School (583 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Clarion Co Career Center

North Clarion County School District and Keystone School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit. However, they are served by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, North Clarion County School District enrolled 680 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,793 per pupil. Keystone School District enrolled 1,225 students, and spent \$8,850 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,905 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,750 and 1,999 students) spent an average of \$8,498 per pupil. This is \$294 less than North Clarion County’s per-pupil spending, and \$351 less than Keystone’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,498 through consolidation, they could save \$630,574 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,498 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Keystone School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	North Clarion County	Keystone	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	680	1,225	1,905	1,888	17
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	3.9	0.1
Square Miles	112	123	235	84	151
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,793	\$8,850	8,829	\$8,498	\$331
Instruction	\$5,350	\$5,283	\$5,307	\$5,186	\$121
Instructional Staff Support	\$262	\$199	\$222	\$283	-\$62
Pupil Support	\$372	\$358	\$363	\$387	-\$24
General Administration	\$285	\$238	\$255	\$254	\$1
School Administration	\$538	\$432	\$470	\$388	\$82
Operations & Maintenance	\$679	\$772	\$739	\$838	-\$98
Student Transportation	\$668	\$594	\$620	\$526	\$95
Food Services	\$390	\$384	\$386	\$363	\$24
Other	\$249	\$588	\$467	\$254	\$213

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**North Clarion County School District and Keystone School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	North Clarion County	Keystone	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$4,873,000	\$5,161,000	\$10,034,000	\$20,109,262	-\$10,075,262
Debt Payments (per student)	\$703	\$709	\$1,412	\$1,719	-\$307
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,937	\$10,185	\$10,097	\$10,236	-\$139
Local	\$3,121	\$3,003	\$3,045	\$5,426	-\$2,380
State	\$5,953	\$6,253	\$6,146	\$4,332	\$1,814
Federal	\$863	\$929	\$906	\$478	\$428
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	12.50	16.80	15.27	20.72	-5.45
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$153	\$188	\$176	\$443	-\$267
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	2	3	2.5	0.5
Students Per District Administrator	680	613	635	826	-191
School Administrators	3	3	6	4.7	1.3
Students Per School Administrator	227	408	318	423	-105
Teachers	51	90	141	120.6	20.4
Students Per Teacher	13.3	13.6	13.5	15.7	-2.2
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	75.6%	71.5%	73.1%	71.7%	1.4 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	74.0%	74.8%	75.0%	-0.1 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	74.4%	76.2%	75.6%	73.1%	2.5 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	63.9%	63.3%	63.5%	65.2%	-1.7 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	64.2%	81.1%	75.0%	70.1%	4.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	69.7%	74.9%	71.9%	2.9 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	90.0%	78.3%	82.4%	75.1%	7.3 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	57.6%	73.2%	66.1%	69.5%	-3.4 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	92.0%	90.0%	90.8%	88.5%	2.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	80.9%	78.4%	79.3%	81.6%	-2.3 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	86.1%	52.6%	63.0%	70.8%	-7.8 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	81.1%	67.3%	72.2%	74.7%	-2.4 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	71.4%	70.5%	70.9%	70.3%	0.5 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	80.0%	69.3%	73.1%	67.3%	5.8 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	59.3%	52.1%	55.4%	54.6%	0.8 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	30.6%	36.1%	34.1%	28.1%	6.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	18.8%	15.6%	16.7%	13.8%	2.9 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northeast Bradford School District and Montrose Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Northeast Bradford School District</b>	<b>Montrose Area School District</b>
County: Bradford	County: Susquehanna
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 917	District Enrollment: 1,917
Schools:	Schools:
Northeast Bradford Elementary School (445 students in grades K-6); Northeast Bradford Jr./Sr. High School (472 students in grades 7-12)	Choconut Valley Elementary School (416 students in grades K-6); Lathrop Street Elementary School (549 students in grades K-6); Montrose Area Jr./Sr. High School (952 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17	Intermediate Unit: Northeastern Educational IU 19
AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Susquehanna Co CTC

Northeast Bradford School District and Montrose Area School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Northeast Bradford School District enrolled 917 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,749 per pupil. Montrose Area School District enrolled 1,917 students, and spent \$8,899 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,834 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,692 less than Northeast Bradford’s per-pupil spending, and \$842 less than Montrose Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$3,165,233 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northeast Bradford School District and Montrose Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a “blueprint” for consolidation or an “ideal” state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Northeast Bradford	Montrose Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	917	1,917	2,834	2,726	108
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	5.2	-0.2
Square Miles	167	228	396	109	287
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,749	\$8,899	9,174	\$8,057	\$1,117
Instruction	\$5,986	\$5,594	\$5,721	\$5,022	\$698
Instructional Staff Support	\$349	\$155	\$218	\$256	-\$38
Pupil Support	\$395	\$333	\$353	\$354	-\$1
General Administration	\$263	\$196	\$218	\$210	\$7
School Administration	\$402	\$296	\$330	\$354	-\$23
Operations & Maintenance	\$785	\$647	\$692	\$820	-\$128
Student Transportation	\$862	\$939	\$914	\$500	\$414
Food Services	\$386	\$334	\$351	\$323	\$28
Other	\$322	\$394	\$370	\$202	\$168



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northeast Bradford School District and Montrose Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Northeast Bradford	Montrose Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$4,440,000	\$4,610,000	\$9,050,000	\$27,621,426	-\$18,571,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$966	\$364	\$1,330	\$1,905	-\$575
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,049	\$10,158	\$10,446	\$9,710	\$736
Local	\$2,627	\$4,595	\$3,958	\$5,542	-\$1,584
State	\$7,483	\$5,107	\$5,876	\$3,780	\$2,097
Federal	\$939	\$455	\$612	\$388	\$223
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	14.40	22.30	19.74	20.94	-1.20
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$143	\$369	\$296	\$660	-\$364
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	459	959	709	1,131	-422
School Administrators	2	4	6	6.4	-0.4
Students Per School Administrator	459	479	472	444	28
Teachers	68	129	197	170.0	27.0
Students Per Teacher	13.5	14.9	14.4	16.2	-1.8
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	60.6%	71.6%	68.2%	71.4%	-3.2 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	78.0%	77.3%	74.0%	3.3 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	59.1%	65.2%	63.6%	73.7%	-10.2 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	54.2%	68.1%	62.9%	64.3%	-1.4 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	57.6%	69.7%	65.9%	70.7%	-4.8 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	71.6%	79.9%	77.7%	72.0%	5.7 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	59.1%	68.2%	65.4%	74.8%	-9.4 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	46.3%	75.4%	66.1%	69.0%	-2.9 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	75.0%	94.0%	87.4%	87.0%	0.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	81.6%	77.0%	78.2%	82.6%	-4.4 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	55.6%	70.6%	64.9%	70.9%	-6.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	65.2%	75.0%	71.9%	72.3%	-0.4 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	70.0%	72.5%	71.8%	71.1%	0.8 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	51.6%	59.2%	56.9%	67.5%	-10.6 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	32.8%	50.7%	45.0%	54.1%	-9.1 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.2%	26.7%	28.2%	24.1%	4.1 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.6%	20.3%	18.8%	13.5%	5.3 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northeast Bradford School District and Sayre Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Northeast Bradford School District	Sayre Area School District
County: Bradford	County: Bradford
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Small Town
District Enrollment: 917	District Enrollment: 1,248
Schools:	Schools:
Northeast Bradford Elementary School (445 students in grades K-6); Northeast Bradford Jr./Sr. High School (472 students in grades 7-12)	Litchfield Township Elementary School (95 students in grades K-4); Snyder Elementary School (577 students in grades PreK-6); Sayre Area High School (576 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center

Northeast Bradford School District and Sayre Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Northeast Bradford School District enrolled 917 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,749 per pupil. Sayre Area School District enrolled 1,248 students, and spent \$8,784 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,165 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$1,425 less than Northeast Bradford’s per-pupil spending, and \$461 less than Sayre Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$1,881,999 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northeast Bradford School District and Sayre Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Northeast Bradford	Sayre Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	917	1,248	2,165	2,255	-90
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	4.7	0.3
Square Miles	167	33	200	111	90
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,749	\$8,784	9,193	\$8,324	\$869
Instruction	\$5,986	\$5,514	\$5,714	\$5,136	\$578
Instructional Staff Support	\$349	\$126	\$220	\$279	-\$59
Pupil Support	\$395	\$333	\$359	\$370	-\$12
General Administration	\$263	\$220	\$238	\$234	\$4
School Administration	\$402	\$411	\$407	\$396	\$12
Operations & Maintenance	\$785	\$1,082	\$956	\$846	\$110
Student Transportation	\$862	\$329	\$555	\$510	\$45
Food Services	\$386	\$393	\$390	\$338	\$52
Other	\$322	\$376	\$353	\$184	\$169

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northeast Bradford School District and Sayre Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Northeast Bradford	Sayre Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$4,440,000	\$730,943,000	\$735,383,000	\$24,347,120	\$711,035,880
Debt Payments (per student)	\$966	\$186	\$1,152	\$3,093	-\$1,941
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,049	\$9,916	\$10,396	\$10,148	\$248
Local	\$2,627	\$4,413	\$3,657	\$5,489	-\$1,832
State	\$7,483	\$5,038	\$6,074	\$4,221	\$1,853
Federal	\$939	\$464	\$665	\$438	\$227
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	14.40	25.40	20.74	21.58	-0.84
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$143	\$203	\$177	\$530	-\$352
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	459	624	541	1,037	-496
School Administrators	2	4	6	6.0	0.0
Students Per School Administrator	459	312	361	390	-29
Teachers	68	79	147	145.0	2.0
Students Per Teacher	13.5	15.8	14.7	15.7	-1.0
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	60.6%	73.8%	68.2%	70.0%	-1.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	79.0%	77.6%	72.2%	5.4 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	59.1%	59.8%	59.5%	71.9%	-12.4 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	54.2%	64.5%	59.5%	62.1%	-2.6 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	57.6%	79.4%	70.3%	70.6%	-0.3 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	71.6%	76.5%	74.7%	71.4%	3.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	59.1%	71.0%	66.1%	73.9%	-7.8 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	46.3%	65.0%	56.3%	68.0%	-11.7 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	75.0%	83.0%	79.3%	87.0%	-7.6 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	81.6%	74.7%	77.2%	80.0%	-2.9 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	55.6%	73.7%	64.9%	68.9%	-4.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	65.2%	92.4%	81.0%	72.3%	8.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	70.0%	86.3%	80.3%	70.1%	10.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	51.6%	69.9%	62.3%	64.7%	-2.4 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	32.8%	50.7%	42.4%	53.0%	-10.7 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.2%	35.5%	33.7%	26.6%	7.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.6%	14.3%	14.8%	14.4%	0.5 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northeast Bradford School District and Towanda Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Northeast Bradford School District	Towanda Area School District
County: Bradford	County: Bradford
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Small Town
District Enrollment: 917	District Enrollment: 1,853
Schools:	Schools:
Northeast Bradford Elementary School (445 students in grades K-6); Northeast Bradford Jr./Sr. High School (472 students in grades 7-12)	Morrow Elementary School (247 students in grades PreK,1-4); Mulberry Street School (111 students in grades K,4-6); Monroe-Franklin Elementary School (130 students in grades 1-6); Wysox Elementary School (172 students in grades 1-6); Towanda Area Middle School (586 students in grades 5-8); Towanda Area Senior High School (607 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center

Northeast Bradford School District and Towanda Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Northeast Bradford School District enrolled 917 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,749 per pupil. Towanda Area School District enrolled 1,853 students, and spent \$8,821 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,770 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,692 less than Northeast Bradford’s per-pupil spending, and \$764 less than Towanda Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$2,966,884 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northeast Bradford School District and Towanda Area School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Northeast Bradford	Towanda Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	917	1,853	2,770	2,726	44
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	5	7	5.2	1.8
Square Miles	167	163	330	109	221
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,749	\$8,821	9,128	\$8,057	\$1,071
Instruction	\$5,986	\$5,413	\$5,603	\$5,022	\$580
Instructional Staff Support	\$349	\$221	\$264	\$256	\$8
Pupil Support	\$395	\$506	\$469	\$354	\$116
General Administration	\$263	\$142	\$182	\$210	-\$28
School Administration	\$402	\$431	\$422	\$354	\$68
Operations & Maintenance	\$785	\$787	\$786	\$820	-\$34
Student Transportation	\$862	\$613	\$695	\$500	\$196
Food Services	\$386	\$455	\$432	\$323	\$110
Other	\$322	\$252	\$275	\$202	\$73

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northeast Bradford School District and Towanda Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Northeast Bradford	Towanda Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$4,440,000	\$18,513,000	\$22,953,000	\$27,621,426	-\$4,668,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$966	\$745	\$1,711	\$1,905	-\$194
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,049	\$9,658	\$10,119	\$9,710	\$409
Local	\$2,627	\$4,390	\$3,806	\$5,542	-\$1,736
State	\$7,483	\$4,516	\$5,499	\$3,780	\$1,719
Federal	\$939	\$752	\$814	\$388	\$426
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	14.40	18.70	17.28	20.94	-3.66
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$143	\$370	\$295	\$660	-\$365
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	3	5	2.6	2.4
Students Per District Administrator	459	618	554	1,131	-577
School Administrators	2	5	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	459	371	396	444	-48
Teachers	68	119	187	170.0	17.0
Students Per Teacher	13.5	15.6	14.8	16.2	-1.4
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	60.6%	58.0%	58.9%	71.4%	-12.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	61.0%	67.7%	74.0%	-6.3 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	59.1%	54.4%	55.8%	73.7%	-17.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	54.2%	44.6%	48.2%	64.3%	-16.1 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	57.6%	60.6%	59.6%	70.7%	-11.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	71.6%	60.6%	64.0%	72.0%	-8.0 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	59.1%	60.8%	60.2%	74.8%	-14.6 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	46.3%	52.2%	50.3%	69.0%	-18.7 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	75.0%	80.0%	77.8%	87.0%	-9.2 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	81.6%	78.6%	79.5%	82.6%	-3.1 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	55.6%	40.8%	46.4%	70.9%	-24.6 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	65.2%	65.0%	65.1%	72.3%	-7.2 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	70.0%	59.1%	62.4%	71.1%	-8.6 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	51.6%	62.3%	58.8%	67.5%	-8.7 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	32.8%	40.4%	37.9%	54.1%	-16.2 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.2%	43.7%	39.6%	24.1%	15.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.6%	14.4%	14.8%	13.5%	1.3 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northeast Bradford School District and Wyalusing Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Northeast Bradford School District	Wyalusing Area School District
County: Bradford	County: Bradford
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 917	District Enrollment: 1,504
Schools:	Schools:
Northeast Bradford Elementary School (445 students in grades K-6); Northeast Bradford Jr./Sr. High School (472 students in grades 7-12)	Camptown Elementary School (143 students in grades K-6); Laceyville Elementary School (170 students in grades K-6); New Albany Elementary School (102 students in grades K-6); Wyalusing Elementary School (378 students in grades K-6); Wyalusing Valley Jr./Sr. High School (711 students in grades 7-12);
Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center

Northeast Bradford School District and Wyalusing Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Northeast Bradford School District enrolled 917 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,749 per pupil. Wyalusing Area School District enrolled 1,504 students, and spent \$8,670 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,421 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$1,425 less than Northeast Bradford’s per-pupil spending, and \$346 less than Wyalusing Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$1,827,106 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northeast Bradford School District and Wyalusing Area School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Northeast Bradford	Wyalusing Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	917	1,504	2,421	2,255	166
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	5	7	4.7	2.3
Square Miles	167	277	444	111	334
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,749	\$8,670	9,078	\$8,324	\$755
Instruction	\$5,986	\$5,320	\$5,572	\$5,136	\$436
Instructional Staff Support	\$349	\$352	\$351	\$279	\$72
Pupil Support	\$395	\$392	\$393	\$370	\$23
General Administration	\$263	\$185	\$214	\$234	-\$20
School Administration	\$402	\$315	\$348	\$396	-\$48
Operations & Maintenance	\$785	\$682	\$721	\$846	-\$125
Student Transportation	\$862	\$790	\$817	\$510	\$307
Food Services	\$386	\$359	\$369	\$338	\$31
Other	\$322	\$274	\$292	\$184	\$108

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northeast Bradford School District and Wyalusing Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Northeast Bradford	Wyalusing Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$4,440,000	\$0	\$4,440,000	\$24,347,120	-\$19,907,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$966	\$1,594	\$2,560	\$3,093	-\$533
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,049	\$9,275	\$9,947	\$10,148	-\$201
Local	\$2,627	\$3,388	\$3,100	\$5,489	-\$2,389
State	\$7,483	\$5,293	\$6,122	\$4,221	\$1,901
Federal	\$939	\$595	\$725	\$438	\$287
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	14.40	15.50	15.08	21.58	-6.50
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$143	\$288	\$233	\$530	-\$296
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	459	752	605	1,037	-432
School Administrators	2	3	5	6.0	-1.0
Students Per School Administrator	459	501	484	390	94
Teachers	68	95	163	145.0	18.0
Students Per Teacher	13.5	15.8	14.9	15.7	-0.8
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	60.6%	67.7%	65.1%	70.0%	-5.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	78.0%	77.2%	72.2%	5.0 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	59.1%	74.5%	69.6%	71.9%	-2.3 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	54.2%	70.0%	63.4%	62.1%	1.3 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	57.6%	70.6%	65.5%	70.6%	-5.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	71.6%	67.3%	68.8%	71.4%	-2.6 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	59.1%	60.2%	59.8%	73.9%	-14.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	46.3%	56.3%	52.6%	68.0%	-15.5 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	75.0%	88.0%	82.9%	87.0%	-4.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	81.6%	67.9%	72.2%	80.0%	-7.8 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	55.6%	71.3%	64.8%	68.9%	-4.1 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	65.2%	70.6%	68.5%	72.3%	-3.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	70.0%	64.3%	66.3%	70.1%	-3.8 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	51.6%	64.5%	59.9%	64.7%	-4.8 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	32.8%	47.3%	41.9%	53.0%	-11.2 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.2%	33.2%	32.4%	26.6%	5.8 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.6%	10.8%	12.6%	14.4%	-1.7 pts

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Northern Cambria School District and Cambria Heights School District

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Northern Cambria School District	Cambria Heights School District
County: Cambria	County: Cambria
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,273	District Enrollment: 1,549
Schools:	Schools:
Northern Cambria Elementary School (441 students in grades K-4); Northern Cambria Middle School (408 students in grades 5-8); Northern Cambria High School (424 students in grades 9-12)	Cambria Heights Elementary School (634 students in grades K-5); Cambria Heights Middle School (353 students in grades 6-8); Cambria Heights Senior High School (562 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Northern Cambria School District and Cambria Heights School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Northern Cambria School District enrolled 1,273 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,535 per pupil. Cambria Heights School District enrolled 1,549 students, and spent \$9,558 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,822 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,478 less than Northern Cambria's per-pupil spending, and \$1,501 less than Cambria Heights's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$4,206,917 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Northern Cambria School District and Cambria Heights School District

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Northern Cambria	Cambria Heights	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,273	1,549	2,822	2,726	96
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	62	112	174	109	65
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,535	\$9,558	9,548	\$8,057	\$1,491
Instruction	\$6,271	\$6,288	\$6,280	\$5,022	\$1,258
Instructional Staff Support	\$189	\$174	\$181	\$256	-\$75
Pupil Support	\$425	\$363	\$391	\$354	\$37
General Administration	\$213	\$356	\$291	\$210	\$81
School Administration	\$372	\$325	\$347	\$354	-\$7
Operations & Maintenance	\$778	\$888	\$838	\$820	\$18
Student Transportation	\$565	\$689	\$633	\$500	\$133
Food Services	\$448	\$349	\$393	\$323	\$70
Other	\$274	\$125	\$192	\$202	-\$10

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Northern Cambria School District and Cambria Heights School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Northern Cambria	Cambria Heights	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$3,013,000	\$11,020,000	\$14,033,000	\$27,621,426	-\$13,588,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$119	\$6,289	\$6,408	\$1,905	\$4,503
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,595	\$10,563	\$10,577	\$9,710	\$867
Local	\$2,299	\$2,843	\$2,597	\$5,542	-\$2,945
State	\$7,364	\$7,014	\$7,172	\$3,780	\$3,392
Federal	\$932	\$706	\$808	\$388	\$420
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.40	18.30	17.89	20.94	-3.05
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$142	\$212	\$180	\$660	-\$479
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	3	5	2.6	2.4
Students Per District Administrator	637	516	564	1,131	-566
School Administrators	3	2	5	6.4	-1.4
Students Per School Administrator	424	775	564	444	121
Teachers	89	115	204	170.0	34.0
Students Per Teacher	14.3	13.5	13.8	16.2	-2.3
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	70.9%	75.7%	73.5%	71.4%	2.2 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	80.0%	82.0%	80.9%	74.0%	7.0 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	79.1%	74.5%	76.6%	73.7%	2.8 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	53.6%	59.6%	57.3%	64.3%	-7.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	60.6%	77.0%	69.4%	70.7%	-1.3 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	69.4%	87.2%	79.4%	72.0%	7.4 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	76.4%	80.0%	78.3%	74.8%	3.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	56.2%	75.0%	66.8%	69.0%	-2.2 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	93.0%	93.0%	93.0%	87.0%	6.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	74.8%	82.8%	79.2%	82.6%	-3.4 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	65.5%	71.0%	68.9%	70.9%	-2.1 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	75.3%	69.5%	72.2%	72.3%	-0.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	78.6%	79.2%	78.9%	71.1%	7.9 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	72.7%	69.6%	71.1%	67.5%	3.6 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	53.6%	66.9%	61.1%	54.1%	7.0 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	51.3%	32.8%	41.1%	24.1%	17.1 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.0%	14.3%	14.2%	13.5%	0.7 pts

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Penns Manor Area School District and Marion Center Area School District

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Penns Manor Area School District	Marion Center Area School District
County: Indiana	County: Indiana
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,052	District Enrollment: 1,706
Schools:	Schools:
Penns Manor Area Elementary School (546 students in grades PreK-6); Penns Manor Area Jr./Sr. High School (506 students in grades 7-12)	Marion Center Area Elementary School (623 students in grades PreK-4); Marion Center Area Middle School (528 students in grades 5-8); Marion Center Area High School (555 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28	Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28
AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center

Penns Manor Area School District and Marion Center Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Penns Manor Area School District enrolled 1,052 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,398 per pupil. Marion Center Area School District enrolled 1,706 students, and spent \$9,396 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,758 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,341 less than Penns Manor Area's per-pupil spending, and \$1,339 less than Marion Center Area's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$3,695,577 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Penns Manor Area School District and Marion Center Area School District

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Penns Manor Area	Marion Center Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,052	1,706	2,758	2,726	32
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	5.2	-0.2
Square Miles	81	193	274	109	165
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,398	\$9,396	9,397	\$8,057	\$1,340
Instruction	\$6,059	\$5,570	\$5,756	\$5,022	\$734
Instructional Staff Support	\$208	\$332	\$285	\$256	\$29
Pupil Support	\$399	\$460	\$437	\$354	\$83
General Administration	\$446	\$366	\$397	\$210	\$186
School Administration	\$243	\$404	\$343	\$354	-\$11
Operations & Maintenance	\$840	\$940	\$902	\$820	\$82
Student Transportation	\$604	\$688	\$656	\$500	\$156
Food Services	\$430	\$426	\$427	\$323	\$104
Other	\$169	\$210	\$195	\$202	-\$8

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Penns Manor Area School District and Marion Center Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Penns Manor Area	Marion Center Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$17,655,000	\$14,546,000	\$32,201,000	\$27,621,426	\$4,579,574
Debt Payments (per student)	\$9,484	\$790	\$10,274	\$1,905	\$8,369
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,661	\$11,310	\$11,443	\$9,710	\$1,733
Local	\$2,712	\$3,692	\$3,318	\$5,542	-\$2,224
State	\$8,183	\$6,791	\$7,322	\$3,780	\$3,543
Federal	\$765	\$826	\$803	\$388	\$415
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	21.60	23.70	22.90	20.94	1.96
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$119	\$239	\$193	\$660	-\$467
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	526	853	690	1,131	-441
School Administrators	3	5	8	6.4	1.6
Students Per School Administrator	351	341	345	444	-99
Teachers	74	123	197	170.0	27.0
Students Per Teacher	14.2	13.9	14.0	16.2	-2.2
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	59.0%	70.9%	66.4%	71.4%	-4.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	54.0%	64.0%	60.4%	74.0%	-13.6 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	69.9%	71.7%	71.1%	73.7%	-2.7 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	62.9%	51.0%	55.6%	64.3%	-8.7 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	66.6%	64.4%	65.2%	70.7%	-5.6 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	66.0%	73.7%	70.4%	72.0%	-1.6 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	74.4%	81.2%	78.7%	74.8%	3.9 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	52.7%	68.5%	62.8%	69.0%	-6.2 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	76.0%	92.0%	86.2%	87.0%	-0.8 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	55.6%	84.9%	74.4%	82.6%	-8.2 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	51.6%	67.4%	61.3%	70.9%	-9.6 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	55.5%	68.7%	64.1%	72.3%	-8.2 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	59.0%	76.2%	68.8%	71.1%	-2.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	46.1%	72.2%	62.6%	67.5%	-4.9 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	36.5%	54.2%	47.8%	54.1%	-6.3 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	40.8%	38.1%	39.1%	24.1%	15.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.3%	13.0%	13.9%	13.5%	0.4 pts



## Profile of Paired Districts

### Penns Manor Area School District and Northern Cambria School District

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Penns Manor Area School District	Northern Cambria School District
County: Indiana	County: Cambria
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 1,052	District Enrollment: 1,273
Schools:	Schools:
Penns Manor Area Elementary School (546 students in grades PreK-6); Penns Manor Area Jr./Sr. High School (506 students in grades 7-12)	Northern Cambria Elementary School (441 students in grades K-4); Northern Cambria Middle School (408 students in grades 5-8); Northern Cambria High School (424 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Penns Manor Area School District and Northern Cambria School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Penns Manor Area School District enrolled 1,052 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,398 per pupil. Northern Cambria School District enrolled 1,273 students, and spent \$9,535 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,325 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$1,075 less than Penns Manor Area's per-pupil spending, and \$1,211 less than Northern Cambria's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$2,672,193 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Penns Manor Area School District and Northern Cambria School District

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Penns Manor Area	Northern Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,052	1,273	2,325	2,255	70
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	4.7	0.3
Square Miles	81	62	143	111	33
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,398	\$9,535	9,473	\$8,324	\$1,149
Instruction	\$6,059	\$6,271	\$6,175	\$5,136	\$1,039
Instructional Staff Support	\$208	\$189	\$198	\$279	-\$81
Pupil Support	\$399	\$425	\$413	\$370	\$43
General Administration	\$446	\$213	\$318	\$234	\$84
School Administration	\$243	\$372	\$314	\$396	-\$82
Operations & Maintenance	\$840	\$778	\$806	\$846	-\$40
Student Transportation	\$604	\$565	\$582	\$510	\$72
Food Services	\$430	\$448	\$440	\$338	\$101
Other	\$169	\$274	\$227	\$184	\$43

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Penns Manor Area School District and Northern Cambria School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Penns Manor Area	Northern Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$17,655,000	\$3,013,000	\$20,668,000	\$24,347,120	-\$3,679,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$9,484	\$119	\$9,603	\$3,093	\$6,510
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,661	\$10,595	\$11,077	\$10,148	\$929
Local	\$2,712	\$2,299	\$2,486	\$5,489	-\$3,003
State	\$8,183	\$7,364	\$7,735	\$4,221	\$3,513
Federal	\$765	\$932	\$857	\$438	\$419
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	21.60	17.40	19.30	21.58	-2.28
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$119	\$142	\$131	\$530	-\$398
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	526	637	581	1,037	-456
School Administrators	3	3	6	6.0	0.0
Students Per School Administrator	351	424	388	390	-3
Teachers	74	89	163	145.0	18.0
Students Per Teacher	14.2	14.3	14.3	15.7	-1.4
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	59.0%	70.9%	65.8%	70.0%	-4.3 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	54.0%	80.0%	70.0%	72.2%	-2.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	69.9%	79.1%	75.3%	71.9%	3.4 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	62.9%	53.6%	57.5%	62.1%	-4.5 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	66.6%	60.6%	63.1%	70.6%	-7.5 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	66.0%	69.4%	67.7%	71.4%	-3.7 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	74.4%	76.4%	75.6%	73.9%	1.7 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	52.7%	56.2%	54.7%	68.0%	-13.3 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	76.0%	93.0%	86.5%	87.0%	-0.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	55.6%	74.8%	66.9%	80.0%	-13.1 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	51.6%	65.5%	59.6%	68.9%	-9.3 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	55.5%	75.3%	67.1%	72.3%	-5.2 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	59.0%	78.6%	68.7%	70.1%	-1.4 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	46.1%	72.7%	61.7%	64.7%	-3.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	36.5%	53.6%	46.2%	53.0%	-6.8 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	40.8%	51.3%	46.5%	26.6%	19.9 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.3%	14.0%	14.6%	14.4%	0.2 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Penns Manor Area School District and Purchase Line School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Penns Manor Area School District</b>	<b>Purchase Line School District</b>
County: Indiana	County: Indiana
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,052	District Enrollment: 1,218
Schools:	Schools:
Penns Manor Area Elementary School (546 students in grades PreK-6); Penns Manor Area Jr./Sr. High School (506 students in grades 7-12)	Purchase Line North Elementary School (160 students in grades K-6); Purchase Line South Elementary School (446 students in grades K-6); Purchase Line Jr./Sr. High School (612 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28	Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28
AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center

Penns Manor Area School District and Purchase Line School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Penns Manor Area School District enrolled 1,052 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,398 per pupil. Purchase Line School District enrolled 1,218 students, and spent \$10,421 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,270 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$1,075 less than Penns Manor Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$2,097 less than Purchase Line’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$3,684,995 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Penns Manor Area School District and Purchase Line School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Penns Manor Area	Purchase Line	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,052	1,218	2,270	2,255	15
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	4.7	0.3
Square Miles	81	146	227	111	116
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,398	\$10,421	9,947	\$8,324	\$1,623
Instruction	\$6,059	\$5,952	\$6,002	\$5,136	\$866
Instructional Staff Support	\$208	\$476	\$352	\$279	\$73
Pupil Support	\$399	\$493	\$450	\$370	\$79
General Administration	\$446	\$376	\$408	\$234	\$174
School Administration	\$243	\$438	\$348	\$396	-\$48
Operations & Maintenance	\$840	\$989	\$920	\$846	\$74
Student Transportation	\$604	\$896	\$760	\$510	\$250
Food Services	\$430	\$511	\$473	\$338	\$135
Other	\$169	\$290	\$234	\$184	\$50

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Penns Manor Area School District and Purchase Line School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Penns Manor Area	Purchase Line	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$17,655,000	\$9,405,000	\$27,060,000	\$24,347,120	\$2,712,880
Debt Payments (per student)	\$9,484	\$795	\$10,279	\$3,093	\$7,186
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,661	\$11,964	\$11,823	\$10,148	\$1,675
Local	\$2,712	\$2,828	\$2,774	\$5,489	-\$2,714
State	\$8,183	\$8,183	\$8,183	\$4,221	\$3,962
Federal	\$765	\$952	\$866	\$438	\$427
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	21.60	22.60	22.14	21.58	0.55
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$119	\$132	\$126	\$530	-\$404
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	526	609	568	1,037	-470
School Administrators	3	4	7	6.0	1.0
Students Per School Administrator	351	305	324	390	-66
Teachers	74	97	171	145.0	26.0
Students Per Teacher	14.2	12.6	13.3	15.7	-2.4
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	59.0%	66.2%	63.0%	70.0%	-7.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	54.0%	74.0%	64.9%	72.2%	-7.3 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	69.9%	65.4%	67.1%	71.9%	-4.8 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	62.9%	64.9%	64.1%	62.1%	2.1 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	66.6%	70.2%	68.6%	70.6%	-2.0 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	66.0%	62.4%	64.3%	71.4%	-7.1 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	74.4%	72.0%	73.1%	73.9%	-0.8 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	52.7%	70.1%	62.6%	68.0%	-5.4 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	76.0%	79.0%	77.6%	87.0%	-9.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	55.6%	64.5%	61.1%	80.0%	-18.9 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	51.6%	67.0%	61.0%	68.9%	-7.9 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	55.5%	71.5%	64.3%	72.3%	-8.0 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	59.0%	61.3%	60.1%	70.1%	-9.9 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	46.1%	62.4%	55.0%	64.7%	-9.7 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	36.5%	49.5%	43.9%	53.0%	-9.2 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	40.8%	52.3%	47.0%	26.6%	20.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.3%	0.1%	7.1%	14.4%	-7.2 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Penns Manor Area School District and United School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Penns Manor Area School District</b>	<b>United School District</b>
County: Indiana	County: Indiana
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,052	District Enrollment: 1,262
Schools:	Schools:
Penns Manor Area Elementary School (546 students in grades PreK-6); Penns Manor Area Jr./Sr. High School (506 students in grades 7-12)	United Elementary School (623 students in grades K-6); United Jr./Sr. High School (639 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28	Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28
AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center

Penns Manor Area School District and United School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Penns Manor Area School District enrolled 1,052 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,398 per pupil. United School District enrolled 1,262 students, and spent \$10,196 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,314 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$1,075 less than Penns Manor Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,872 less than United’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$3,492,750 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Penns Manor Area School District and United School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a “blueprint” for consolidation or an “ideal” state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Penns Manor Area	United	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,052	1,262	2,314	2,255	59
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	4.7	-0.7
Square Miles	81	132	214	111	103
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,398	\$10,196	9,833	\$8,324	\$1,509
Instruction	\$6,059	\$6,272	\$6,175	\$5,136	\$1,039
Instructional Staff Support	\$208	\$556	\$398	\$279	\$119
Pupil Support	\$399	\$344	\$369	\$370	-\$1
General Administration	\$446	\$250	\$339	\$234	\$105
School Administration	\$243	\$440	\$350	\$396	-\$45
Operations & Maintenance	\$840	\$1,058	\$959	\$846	\$113
Student Transportation	\$604	\$697	\$655	\$510	\$145
Food Services	\$430	\$384	\$404	\$338	\$66
Other	\$169	\$195	\$183	\$184	-\$1



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Penns Manor Area School District and United School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Penns Manor Area	United	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$17,655,000	\$1,984,000	\$19,639,000	\$24,347,120	-\$4,708,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$9,484	\$521	\$10,005	\$3,093	\$6,912
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,661	\$11,848	\$11,763	\$10,148	\$1,615
Local	\$2,712	\$3,448	\$3,114	\$5,489	-\$2,375
State	\$8,183	\$7,753	\$7,949	\$4,221	\$3,727
Federal	\$765	\$647	\$701	\$438	\$262
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	21.60	21.10	21.33	21.58	-0.25
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$119	\$190	\$158	\$530	-\$372
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	526	631	579	1,037	-459
School Administrators	3	3	6	6.0	0.0
Students Per School Administrator	351	421	386	390	-5
Teachers	74	96	170	145.0	25.0
Students Per Teacher	14.2	13.1	13.6	15.7	-2.1
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	59.0%	74.4%	67.5%	70.0%	-2.6 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	54.0%	81.0%	68.9%	72.2%	-3.3 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	69.9%	70.4%	70.2%	71.9%	-1.7 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	62.9%	64.6%	63.9%	62.1%	1.8 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	66.6%	62.9%	64.4%	70.6%	-6.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	66.0%	79.6%	72.7%	71.4%	1.4 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	74.4%	79.0%	77.0%	73.9%	3.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	52.7%	80.2%	68.6%	68.0%	0.6 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	76.0%	86.0%	81.5%	87.0%	-5.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	55.6%	87.3%	72.4%	80.0%	-7.7 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	51.6%	79.7%	67.3%	68.9%	-1.5 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	55.5%	69.6%	63.8%	72.3%	-8.6 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	59.0%	77.6%	68.2%	70.1%	-1.8 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	46.1%	71.0%	60.1%	64.7%	-4.6 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	36.5%	57.4%	48.6%	53.0%	-4.5 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	40.8%	38.2%	39.4%	26.6%	12.7 pts
Students with Disabilities	15.3%	14.1%	14.6%	14.4%	0.3 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Portage Area School District and Penn Cambria School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Portage Area School District</b>	<b>Penn Cambria School District</b>
County: Cambria	County: Cambria
District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 1,009	District Enrollment: 1,867
Schools:	Schools:
Portage Area Elementary School (298 students in grades PreK-3); Portage Area Middle School (293 students in grades 4-7); Portage Area High School (418 students in grades 8-12)	Penn Cambria Pre-Primary (216 students in grades K-1); Penn Cambria Primary School (267 students in grades 2-3); Penn Cambria Intermediate School (227 students in grades 4-5); Penn Cambria Middle School (480 students in grades 6-8); Penn Cambria High School (677 students in grades 9-12);
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Portage Area School District and Penn Cambria School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Portage Area School District enrolled 1,009 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,757 per pupil. Penn Cambria School District enrolled 1,867 students, and spent \$9,134 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,876 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$700 less than Portage Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,077 less than Penn Cambria’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$2,717,842 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Portage Area School District and Penn Cambria School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Portage Area	Penn Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,009	1,867	2,876	2,726	150
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	5	8	5.2	2.8
Square Miles	25	110	135	109	27
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,757	\$9,134	9,002	\$8,057	\$945
Instruction	\$5,525	\$5,612	\$5,582	\$5,022	\$559
Instructional Staff Support	\$326	\$320	\$322	\$256	\$66
Pupil Support	\$307	\$393	\$363	\$354	\$9
General Administration	\$230	\$289	\$268	\$210	\$58
School Administration	\$464	\$373	\$405	\$354	\$51
Operations & Maintenance	\$777	\$785	\$782	\$820	-\$38
Student Transportation	\$346	\$736	\$599	\$500	\$100
Food Services	\$467	\$513	\$497	\$323	\$174
Other	\$315	\$114	\$184	\$202	-\$18

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Portage Area School District and Penn Cambria School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Portage Area	Penn Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$1,359,000	\$0	\$1,359,000	\$27,621,426	-\$26,262,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$426	\$324	\$750	\$1,905	-\$1,155
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$9,923	\$10,614	\$10,372	\$9,710	\$662
Local	\$2,600	\$3,415	\$3,129	\$5,542	-\$2,414
State	\$6,652	\$6,423	\$6,503	\$3,780	\$2,723
Federal	\$671	\$777	\$740	\$388	\$352
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	18.90	16.40	17.28	20.94	-3.66
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$117	\$292	\$231	\$660	-\$429
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	505	934	719	1,131	-412
School Administrators	2	5	7	6.4	0.6
Students Per School Administrator	505	373	411	444	-33
Teachers	71	125	196	170.0	26.0
Students Per Teacher	14.2	14.9	14.7	16.2	-1.5
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	69.8%	67.7%	68.5%	71.4%	-2.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	70.0%	80.0%	76.0%	74.0%	2.1 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	70.1%	72.8%	71.9%	73.7%	-1.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	67.2%	56.7%	60.1%	64.3%	-4.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	66.2%	58.6%	62.0%	70.7%	-8.8 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	78.2%	79.7%	72.0%	7.7 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	71.2%	73.0%	72.4%	74.8%	-2.4 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	74.2%	66.5%	69.5%	69.0%	0.5 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	91.0%	95.0%	93.4%	87.0%	6.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	83.6%	69.8%	74.5%	82.6%	-8.1 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	59.4%	43.8%	48.8%	70.9%	-22.1 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	58.4%	72.4%	66.2%	72.3%	-6.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	79.0%	80.9%	80.2%	71.1%	9.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	54.8%	63.8%	60.7%	67.5%	-6.8 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	58.4%	51.8%	54.3%	54.1%	0.2 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	53.6%	44.7%	47.8%	24.1%	23.7 pts
Students with Disabilities	13.9%	14.7%	14.4%	13.5%	0.9 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Purchase Line School District and Marion Center Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Purchase Line School District</b>	<b>Marion Center Area School District</b>
County: Indiana	County: Indiana
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,218	District Enrollment: 1,706
Schools:	Schools:
Purchase Line North Elementary School (160 students in grades K-6); Purchase Line South Elementary School (446 students in grades K-6); Purchase Line Jr./Sr. High School (612 students in grades 7-12)	Marion Center Area Elementary School (623 students in grades PreK-4); Marion Center Area Middle School (528 students in grades 5-8); Marion Center Area High School (555 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28	Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28
AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center

Purchase Line School District and Marion Center Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Purchase Line School District enrolled 1,218 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,421 per pupil. Marion Center Area School District enrolled 1,706 students, and spent \$9,396 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,924 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$2,364 less than Purchase Line’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,339 less than Marion Center Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$5,164,098 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Purchase Line School District and Marion Center Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Purchase Line	Marion Center Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,218	1,706	2,924	2,726	198
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	146	193	338	109	230
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,421	\$9,396	9,823	\$8,057	\$1,766
Instruction	\$5,952	\$5,570	\$5,729	\$5,022	\$707
Instructional Staff Support	\$476	\$332	\$392	\$256	\$136
Pupil Support	\$493	\$460	\$474	\$354	\$120
General Administration	\$376	\$366	\$370	\$210	\$160
School Administration	\$438	\$404	\$418	\$354	\$65
Operations & Maintenance	\$989	\$940	\$960	\$820	\$140
Student Transportation	\$896	\$688	\$775	\$500	\$275
Food Services	\$511	\$426	\$461	\$323	\$138
Other	\$290	\$210	\$244	\$202	\$41

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Purchase Line School District and Marion Center Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Purchase Line	Marion Center Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$9,405,000	\$14,546,000	\$23,951,000	\$27,621,426	-\$3,670,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$795	\$790	\$1,585	\$1,905	-\$320
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,964	\$11,310	\$11,582	\$9,710	\$1,872
Local	\$2,828	\$3,692	\$3,332	\$5,542	-\$2,210
State	\$8,183	\$6,791	\$7,371	\$3,780	\$3,591
Federal	\$952	\$826	\$879	\$388	\$490
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	22.60	23.70	23.24	20.94	2.30
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$132	\$239	\$195	\$660	-\$465
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	609	853	731	1,131	-400
School Administrators	4	5	9	6.4	2.6
Students Per School Administrator	305	341	325	444	-119
Teachers	97	123	220	170.0	50.0
Students Per Teacher	12.6	13.9	13.3	16.2	-2.9
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	66.2%	70.9%	68.9%	71.4%	-2.5 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	74.0%	64.0%	68.1%	74.0%	-5.9 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	65.4%	71.7%	68.7%	73.7%	-5.1 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	64.9%	51.0%	57.9%	64.3%	-6.4 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	70.2%	64.4%	66.7%	70.7%	-4.0 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	62.4%	73.7%	69.1%	72.0%	-2.9 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	72.0%	81.2%	77.4%	74.8%	2.6 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	70.1%	68.5%	69.2%	69.0%	0.2 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	79.0%	92.0%	86.7%	87.0%	-0.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	64.5%	84.9%	75.1%	82.6%	-7.5 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	67.0%	67.4%	67.2%	70.9%	-3.7 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	71.5%	68.7%	69.8%	72.3%	-2.5 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	61.3%	76.2%	70.1%	71.1%	-1.0 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	62.4%	72.2%	68.2%	67.5%	0.7 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	49.5%	54.2%	52.2%	54.1%	-1.9 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	52.3%	38.1%	44.0%	24.1%	19.9 pts
Students with Disabilities	0.1%	13.0%	7.6%	13.5%	-5.9 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Purchase Line School District and Northern Cambria School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Purchase Line School District</b>	<b>Northern Cambria School District</b>
County: Indiana	County: Cambria
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 1,218	District Enrollment: 1,273
Schools:	Schools:
Purchase Line North Elementary School (160 students in grades K-6); Purchase Line South Elementary School (446 students in grades K-6); Purchase Line Jr./Sr. High School (612 students in grades 7-12)	Northern Cambria Elementary School (441 students in grades K-4); Northern Cambria Middle School (408 students in grades 5-8); Northern Cambria High School (424 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Arin IU 28	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Indiana Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Admiral Peary AVTS

Purchase Line School District and Northern Cambria School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Purchase Line School District enrolled 1,218 students, and had operating expenditures of \$10,421 per pupil. Northern Cambria School District enrolled 1,273 students, and spent \$9,535 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,491 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$2,097 less than Purchase Line’s per-pupil spending, and \$1,211 less than Northern Cambria’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$4,096,440 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Purchase Line School District and Northern Cambria School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Purchase Line	Northern Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,218	1,273	2,491	2,255	236
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	4.7	1.3
Square Miles	146	62	208	111	98
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$10,421	\$9,535	9,968	\$8,324	\$1,644
Instruction	\$5,952	\$6,271	\$6,115	\$5,136	\$979
Instructional Staff Support	\$476	\$189	\$330	\$279	\$50
Pupil Support	\$493	\$425	\$458	\$370	\$88
General Administration	\$376	\$213	\$293	\$234	\$59
School Administration	\$438	\$372	\$404	\$396	\$8
Operations & Maintenance	\$989	\$778	\$881	\$846	\$35
Student Transportation	\$896	\$565	\$727	\$510	\$217
Food Services	\$511	\$448	\$479	\$338	\$140
Other	\$290	\$274	\$282	\$184	\$98

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Purchase Line School District and Northern Cambria School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Purchase Line	Northern Cambria	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$9,405,000	\$3,013,000	\$12,418,000	\$24,347,120	-\$11,929,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$795	\$119	\$914	\$3,093	-\$2,179
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,964	\$10,595	\$11,264	\$10,148	\$1,116
Local	\$2,828	\$2,299	\$2,558	\$5,489	-\$2,931
State	\$8,183	\$7,364	\$7,764	\$4,221	\$3,543
Federal	\$952	\$932	\$942	\$438	\$504
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	22.60	17.40	19.94	21.58	-1.64
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$132	\$142	\$137	\$530	-\$393
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	609	637	623	1,037	-414
School Administrators	4	3	7	6.0	1.0
Students Per School Administrator	305	424	356	390	-34
Teachers	97	89	186	145.0	41.0
Students Per Teacher	12.6	14.3	13.4	15.7	-2.3
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	66.2%	70.9%	68.6%	70.0%	-1.4 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	74.0%	80.0%	77.4%	72.2%	5.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	65.4%	79.1%	71.8%	71.9%	-0.1 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	64.9%	53.6%	59.7%	62.1%	-2.4 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	70.2%	60.6%	65.1%	70.6%	-5.5 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	62.4%	69.4%	66.0%	71.4%	-5.4 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	72.0%	76.4%	74.4%	73.9%	0.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	70.1%	56.2%	63.2%	68.0%	-4.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	79.0%	93.0%	87.0%	87.0%	0.1 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	64.5%	74.8%	69.3%	80.0%	-10.7 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	67.0%	65.5%	66.3%	68.9%	-2.6 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	71.5%	75.3%	73.5%	72.3%	1.2 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	61.3%	78.6%	70.2%	70.1%	0.1 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	62.4%	72.7%	68.0%	64.7%	3.3 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	49.5%	53.6%	51.6%	53.0%	-1.5 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	52.3%	51.3%	51.8%	26.6%	25.1 pts
Students with Disabilities	0.1%	14.0%	7.2%	14.4%	-7.2 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Ridgway Area School District and Brookville Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Ridgway Area School District</b>	<b>Brookville Area School District</b>
County: Elk	County: Jefferson
District Locale: Small Town	District Locale: Small Town
District Enrollment: 1,091	District Enrollment: 1,885
Schools:	Schools:
Ridgway Elementary School (475 students in grades K-5); Ridgway Area Middle School (235 students in grades 6-8); Ridgway Area High School (381 students in grades 9-12)	Hickory Grove Elementary School (554 students in grades 3-6); Northside Elementary School (122 students in grades K); Pinecreek Elementary School (269 students in grades 1-2); Brookville Jr./Sr. High School (940 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Seneca Highlands IU 9	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Seneca Highlands AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Jefferson Co- Dubois AVTS

Ridgway Area School District and Brookville Area School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Ridgway Area School District enrolled 1,091 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,288 per pupil. Brookville Area School District enrolled 1,885 students, and spent \$8,463 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,976 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$1,231 less than Ridgway Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$406 less than Brookville Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$2,108,131 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Ridgway Area School District and Brookville Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Ridgway Area	Brookville Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,091	1,885	2,976	2,726	250
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	4	7	5.2	1.8
Square Miles	184	262	447	109	338
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,288	\$8,463	8,765	\$8,057	\$708
Instruction	\$5,453	\$5,088	\$5,222	\$5,022	\$199
Instructional Staff Support	\$258	\$264	\$262	\$256	\$6
Pupil Support	\$506	\$333	\$396	\$354	\$42
General Administration	\$238	\$222	\$228	\$210	\$18
School Administration	\$455	\$347	\$387	\$354	\$33
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,127	\$893	\$979	\$820	\$159
Student Transportation	\$434	\$740	\$628	\$500	\$128
Food Services	\$482	\$344	\$394	\$323	\$72
Other	\$334	\$232	\$269	\$202	\$67

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Ridgway Area School District and Brookville Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Ridgway Area	Brookville Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$5,315,000	\$21,650,000	\$26,965,000	\$27,621,426	-\$656,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$936	\$759	\$1,695	\$1,905	-\$210
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,711	\$10,407	\$10,518	\$9,710	\$808
Local	\$4,498	\$4,182	\$4,298	\$5,542	-\$1,245
State	\$5,637	\$5,712	\$5,684	\$3,780	\$1,905
Federal	\$577	\$513	\$536	\$388	\$148
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	22.70	19.80	20.86	20.94	-0.08
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$195	\$363	\$302	\$660	-\$358
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	546	943	744	1,131	-387
School Administrators	4	4	8	6.4	1.6
Students Per School Administrator	273	471	372	444	-72
Teachers	77	125	202	170.0	32.0
Students Per Teacher	14.2	15.1	14.7	16.2	-1.4
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	73.6%	67.4%	69.6%	71.4%	-1.7 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	71.0%	67.0%	68.2%	74.0%	-5.8 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	68.5%	60.6%	63.7%	73.7%	-10.1 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	59.5%	57.0%	57.9%	64.3%	-6.4 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	68.1%	74.7%	72.1%	70.7%	1.4 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	83.9%	80.9%	82.0%	72.0%	10.0 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	80.6%	72.0%	74.7%	74.8%	-0.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	77.2%	70.2%	73.0%	69.0%	4.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	90.0%	85.0%	86.5%	87.0%	-0.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	76.7%	70.2%	72.7%	82.6%	-9.9 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	59.4%	54.7%	56.4%	70.9%	-14.5 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.1%	61.0%	70.4%	72.3%	-1.8 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	77.8%	63.3%	68.7%	71.1%	-2.3 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	71.6%	63.0%	65.7%	67.5%	-1.8 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	61.6%	60.3%	60.8%	54.1%	6.7 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	36.9%	41.0%	39.5%	24.1%	15.4 pts
Students with Disabilities	13.5%	15.9%	15.0%	13.5%	1.5 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Rockwood Area School District and Berlin Brothersvalley School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Rockwood Area School District</b>	<b>Berlin Brothersvalley School District</b>
County: Somerset	County: Somerset
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 862	District Enrollment: 940
Schools:	Schools:
Kingwood Elementary School (103 students in grades K-6); Rockwood Area Elementary School (325 students in grades K-6); Rockwood Area Jr./Sr. High School (434 students in grades 7-12)	Berlin Brothersvalley Elementary School (367 students in grades K-4); Berlin Brothersvalley Middle School (286 students in grades 5-8); Berlin Brothersvalley Senior High School (287 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center

Rockwood Area School District and Berlin Brothersvalley School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Rockwood Area School District enrolled 862 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,818 per pupil. Berlin Brothersvalley School District enrolled 940 students, and spent \$8,936 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,802 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,750 and 1,999 students) spent an average of \$8,498 per pupil. This is \$319 less than Rockwood Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$438 less than Berlin Brothersvalley’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,498 through consolidation, they could save \$686,905 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,498 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Rockwood Area School District and Berlin Brothersvalley School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Rockwood Area	Berlin Brothers-valley	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	862	940	1,802	1,888	-86
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	3.9	2.1
Square Miles	146	165	311	84	227
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,818	\$8,936	8,880	\$8,498	\$381
Instruction	\$5,509	\$5,805	\$5,664	\$5,186	\$477
Instructional Staff Support	\$212	\$194	\$203	\$283	-\$81
Pupil Support	\$355	\$365	\$360	\$387	-\$27
General Administration	\$367	\$295	\$329	\$254	\$75
School Administration	\$363	\$407	\$386	\$388	-\$1
Operations & Maintenance	\$780	\$668	\$721	\$838	-\$116
Student Transportation	\$689	\$541	\$612	\$526	\$86
Food Services	\$326	\$374	\$351	\$363	-\$11
Other	\$217	\$286	\$253	\$254	-\$1

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Rockwood Area School District and Berlin Brothersvalley School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Rockwood Area	Berlin Brothersvalley	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$7,965,000	\$5,875,000	\$13,840,000	\$20,109,262	-\$6,269,262
Debt Payments (per student)	\$968	\$536	\$1,504	\$1,719	-\$215
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,227	\$9,680	\$9,942	\$10,236	-\$294
Local	\$4,778	\$2,781	\$3,736	\$5,426	-\$1,689
State	\$4,934	\$6,148	\$5,567	\$4,332	\$1,235
Federal	\$515	\$751	\$638	\$478	\$160
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	11.10	13.10	12.14	20.72	-8.57
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$334	\$178	\$252	\$443	-\$190
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	3	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	862	313	451	826	-375
School Administrators	1	3	4	4.7	-0.7
Students Per School Administrator	862	313	451	423	28
Teachers	66	68	134	120.6	13.4
Students Per Teacher	13.1	13.8	13.4	15.7	-2.3
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	76.4%	72.6%	74.4%	71.7%	2.7 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	79.0%	53.0%	64.4%	75.0%	-10.6 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	71.5%	76.6%	74.5%	73.1%	1.4 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	75.5%	58.1%	65.7%	65.2%	0.4 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	74.1%	72.0%	72.9%	70.1%	2.8 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	79.0%	75.8%	77.7%	71.9%	5.7 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	70.9%	70.2%	70.6%	75.1%	-4.5 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	81.0%	71.5%	76.3%	69.5%	6.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	94.0%	78.0%	85.0%	88.5%	-3.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	83.9%	89.6%	87.2%	81.6%	5.6 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	91.2%	68.9%	78.6%	70.8%	7.8 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	79.3%	85.4%	82.7%	74.7%	8.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	80.2%	79.1%	79.7%	70.3%	9.4 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	63.3%	70.2%	66.6%	67.3%	-0.6 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	56.9%	68.4%	62.5%	54.6%	8.0 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	37.5%	37.4%	37.4%	28.1%	9.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	11.3%	12.8%	12.0%	13.8%	-1.8 pts



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Salisbury-Elk Lick School District and Meyersdale Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Salisbury-Elk Lick School District</b>	<b>Meyersdale Area School District</b>
County: Somerset	County: Somerset
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 375	District Enrollment: 1,087
Schools:	Schools:
Salisbury-Elk Lick Elementary School (180 students in grades K-6); Salisbury-Elk Lick Jr./Sr. High School (195 students in grades 7-12)	Meyersdale Area Elementary School (428 students in grades K-5); Meyersdale Area Middle School (249 students in grades 6-8); Meyersdale Area High School (410 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center

Salisbury-Elk Lick School District and Meyersdale Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Salisbury-Elk Lick School District enrolled 375 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,043 per pupil. Meyersdale Area School District enrolled 1,087 students, and spent \$9,013 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,462 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,250 and 1,499 students) spent an average of \$8,437 per pupil. This is \$606 less than Salisbury-Elk Lick’s per-pupil spending, and \$576 less than Meyersdale Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,437 through consolidation, they could save \$853,576 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,437 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Salisbury-Elk Lick School District and Meyersdale Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Salisbury-Elk Lick	Meyersdale Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	375	1,087	1,462	1,380	82
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	3.0	2.0
Square Miles	58	123	181	72	109
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,043	\$9,013	9,021	\$8,437	\$584
Instruction	\$5,773	\$5,426	\$5,515	\$5,233	\$282
Instructional Staff Support	\$400	\$366	\$375	\$275	\$100
Pupil Support	\$373	\$400	\$393	\$352	\$41
General Administration	\$349	\$279	\$297	\$278	\$18
School Administration	\$547	\$367	\$413	\$386	\$27
Operations & Maintenance	\$707	\$897	\$848	\$834	\$14
Student Transportation	\$333	\$511	\$465	\$507	-\$42
Food Services	\$347	\$433	\$411	\$361	\$50
Other	\$213	\$334	\$303	\$209	\$94

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Salisbury-Elk Lick School District and Meyersdale Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Salisbury-Elk Lick	Meyersdale Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$0	\$10,954,000	\$10,954,000	\$13,035,068	-\$2,081,068
Debt Payments (per student)	\$5	\$616	\$621	\$2,142	-\$1,521
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,704	\$10,420	\$10,493	\$10,312	\$181
Local	\$3,245	\$2,431	\$2,640	\$4,540	-\$1,899
State	\$5,419	\$7,205	\$6,747	\$5,209	\$1,538
Federal	\$2,040	\$784	\$1,106	\$564	\$542
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	15.20	14.00	14.31	20.32	-6.01
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$70	\$161	\$137	\$283	-\$146
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	1	3	2.0	1.0
Students Per District Administrator	188	1,087	487	773	-286
School Administrators	1	2	3	3.8	-0.8
Students Per School Administrator	375	544	487	384	103
Teachers	34	74	108	91.3	16.7
Students Per Teacher	11.0	14.7	13.5	15.2	-1.7
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	74.3%	64.3%	67.1%	68.7%	-1.6 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	79.0%	63.0%	68.6%	72.3%	-3.7 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	59.1%	74.7%	71.0%	68.8%	2.2 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	47.1%	74.2%	68.4%	61.6%	6.8 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	85.3%	66.7%	72.7%	68.1%	4.6 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	65.6%	75.1%	72.4%	69.1%	3.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	69.5%	63.8%	65.6%	71.4%	-5.8 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	71.4%	54.4%	58.4%	67.5%	-9.1 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	81.0%	85.9%	86.8%	-0.9 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	86.4%	67.6%	72.0%	77.7%	-5.6 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	58.8%	54.8%	55.7%	68.7%	-13.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	88.2%	50.7%	62.8%	71.8%	-8.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	74.2%	77.6%	76.7%	67.1%	9.5 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	72.2%	60.1%	63.9%	62.5%	1.4 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	67.8%	45.6%	50.8%	50.1%	0.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	40.6%	34.6%	36.1%	32.5%	3.6 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.9%	15.0%	15.0%	14.6%	0.3 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Salisbury-Elk Lick School District and Rockwood Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Salisbury-Elk Lick School District</b>	<b>Rockwood Area School District</b>
County: Somerset	County: Somerset
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 375	District Enrollment: 862
Schools:	Schools:
Salisbury-Elk Lick Elementary School (180 students in grades K-6); Salisbury-Elk Lick Jr./Sr. High School (195 students in grades 7-12)	Kingwood Elementary School (103 students in grades K-6); Rockwood Area Elementary School (325 students in grades K-6); Rockwood Area Jr./Sr. High School (434 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center

Salisbury-Elk Lick School District and Rockwood Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Salisbury-Elk Lick School District enrolled 375 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,043 per pupil. Rockwood Area School District enrolled 862 students, and spent \$8,818 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,237 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,000 and 1,249 students) spent an average of \$8,747 per pupil. This is \$296 less than Salisbury-Elk Lick’s per-pupil spending, and \$71 less than Rockwood Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,747 through consolidation, they could save \$172,548 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,747 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Salisbury-Elk Lick School District and Rockwood Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Salisbury-Elk Lick	Rockwood Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	375	862	1,237	1,127	110
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	2.8	2.2
Square Miles	58	146	204	84	120
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,043	\$8,818	8,886	\$8,747	\$139
Instruction	\$5,773	\$5,509	\$5,589	\$5,347	\$242
Instructional Staff Support	\$400	\$212	\$269	\$268	\$1
Pupil Support	\$373	\$355	\$361	\$348	\$12
General Administration	\$349	\$367	\$361	\$315	\$46
School Administration	\$547	\$363	\$419	\$404	\$15
Operations & Maintenance	\$707	\$780	\$757	\$867	-\$109
Student Transportation	\$333	\$689	\$581	\$495	\$86
Food Services	\$347	\$326	\$332	\$429	-\$96
Other	\$213	\$217	\$216	\$268	-\$52

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Salisbury-Elk Lick School District and Rockwood Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Salisbury-Elk Lick	Rockwood Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$0	\$7,965,000	\$7,965,000	\$26,913,550	-\$18,948,550
Debt Payments (per student)	\$5	\$968	\$973	\$2,200	-\$1,227
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,704	\$10,227	\$10,372	\$10,558	-\$186
Local	\$3,245	\$4,778	\$4,314	\$4,071	\$243
State	\$5,419	\$4,934	\$5,081	\$5,799	-\$718
Federal	\$2,040	\$515	\$977	\$688	\$290
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	15.20	11.10	12.34	20.99	-8.65
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$70	\$334	\$254	\$196	\$58
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	1	3	2.0	1.0
Students Per District Administrator	188	862	412	622	-209
School Administrators	1	1	2	3.0	-1.0
Students Per School Administrator	375	862	619	399	220
Teachers	34	66	100	77.8	22.2
Students Per Teacher	11.0	13.1	12.4	14.6	-2.2
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	74.3%	76.4%	75.8%	65.9%	9.8 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	79.0%	79.0%	79.0%	69.3%	9.7 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	59.1%	71.5%	68.0%	67.1%	0.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	47.1%	75.5%	69.0%	58.4%	10.6 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	85.3%	74.1%	78.2%	66.3%	11.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	65.6%	79.0%	75.4%	67.1%	8.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	69.5%	70.9%	70.5%	67.5%	3.0 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	71.4%	81.0%	78.5%	65.5%	13.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	94.0%	94.3%	85.1%	9.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	86.4%	83.9%	84.6%	74.6%	10.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	58.8%	91.2%	83.8%	63.5%	20.3 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	88.2%	79.3%	82.6%	67.7%	14.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	74.2%	80.2%	78.6%	66.3%	12.3 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	72.2%	63.3%	66.1%	60.4%	5.7 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	67.8%	56.9%	59.8%	48.4%	11.3 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	40.6%	37.5%	38.4%	37.2%	1.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.9%	11.3%	12.4%	15.3%	-3.0 pts

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Shade-Central City School District and Berlin Brothersvalley School District

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Shade-Central City School District	Berlin Brothersvalley School District
County: Somerset	County: Somerset
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 646	District Enrollment: 940
Schools:	Schools:
Cairnbrook Elementary School (321 students in grades K-6); Shade Jr./Sr. High School (325 students in grades 7-12)	Berlin Brothersvalley Elementary School (367 students in grades K-4); Berlin Brothersvalley Middle School (286 students in grades 5-8); Berlin Brothersvalley Senior High School (287 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center

Shade-Central City School District and Berlin Brothersvalley School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Shade-Central City School District enrolled 646 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,276 per pupil. Berlin Brothersvalley School District enrolled 940 students, and spent \$8,936 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,586 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,500 and 1,749 students) spent an average of \$8,479 per pupil. This is \$796 less than Shade-Central City's per-pupil spending, and \$457 less than Berlin Brothersvalley's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,479 through consolidation, they could save \$944,178 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,479 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Shade-Central City School District and Berlin Brothersvalley School District

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Shade-Central City	Berlin Brothers-valley	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	646	940	1,586	1,616	-30
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	3.4	1.6
Square Miles	68	165	233	95	139
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,276	\$8,936	9,074	\$8,479	\$595
Instruction	\$5,189	\$5,805	\$5,554	\$5,269	\$285
Instructional Staff Support	\$257	\$194	\$219	\$243	-\$24
Pupil Support	\$404	\$365	\$381	\$387	-\$7
General Administration	\$978	\$295	\$573	\$278	\$295
School Administration	\$406	\$407	\$407	\$373	\$34
Operations & Maintenance	\$850	\$668	\$742	\$853	-\$111
Student Transportation	\$540	\$541	\$541	\$532	\$8
Food Services	\$435	\$374	\$399	\$353	\$46
Other	\$217	\$286	\$258	\$190	\$68



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Shade-Central City School District and Berlin Brothersvalley School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Shade-Central City	Berlin Brothersvalley	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$12,497,000	\$5,875,000	\$18,372,000	\$14,381,000	\$3,991,000
Debt Payments (per student)	\$8,421	\$536	\$8,957	\$1,826	\$7,131
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,105	\$9,680	\$9,853	\$10,111	-\$258
Local	\$2,748	\$2,781	\$2,767	\$5,128	-\$2,360
State	\$6,454	\$6,148	\$6,272	\$4,400	\$1,873
Federal	\$904	\$751	\$813	\$583	\$230
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	19.50	13.10	15.71	21.00	-5.30
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$85	\$178	\$140	\$367	-\$227
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	3	5	2.2	2.8
Students Per District Administrator	323	313	317	866	-549
School Administrators	3	3	6	3.8	2.2
Students Per School Administrator	215	313	264	457	-193
Teachers	39	68	107	105.8	1.2
Students Per Teacher	16.6	13.8	14.8	15.5	-0.7
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	68.9%	72.6%	71.2%	68.4%	2.7 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	85.0%	53.0%	64.7%	72.4%	-7.7 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	76.2%	76.6%	76.5%	70.7%	5.7 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	54.9%	58.1%	56.8%	62.8%	-6.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	70.5%	72.0%	71.3%	67.7%	3.6 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	56.7%	75.8%	68.7%	68.5%	0.1 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	78.6%	70.2%	73.2%	70.8%	2.4 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	50.0%	71.5%	63.5%	66.5%	-3.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	78.0%	84.2%	86.7%	-2.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	92.8%	89.6%	90.7%	78.8%	12.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	82.3%	68.9%	74.4%	67.4%	7.0 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.3%	85.4%	85.4%	69.1%	16.3 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	48.6%	79.1%	67.7%	66.6%	1.1 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	38.0%	70.2%	58.5%	62.5%	-4.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	43.5%	68.4%	59.0%	51.3%	7.7 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	43.9%	37.4%	40.0%	29.6%	10.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.7%	12.8%	13.6%	15.1%	-1.6 pts

## Profile of Paired Districts

### Shade-Central City School District and Conemaugh Township Area School District

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Shade-Central City School District	Conemaugh Township Area School District
County: Somerset	County: Somerset
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 646	District Enrollment: 1,139
Schools:	Schools:
Cairnbrook Elementary School (321 students in grades K-6); Shade Jr./Sr. High School (325 students in grades 7-12)	Conemaugh Township Area Primary School (231 students in grades K-2); Conemaugh Township Area Intermediate School (331 students in grades 3-6); Conemaugh Township Area Jr./Sr. High School (577 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Greater Johnstown AVTS

Shade-Central City School District and Conemaugh Township Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit. However, they are served by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Shade-Central City School District enrolled 646 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,276 per pupil. Conemaugh Township Area School District enrolled 1,139 students, and spent \$8,671 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,785 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,750 and 1,999 students) spent an average of \$8,498 per pupil. This is \$777 less than Shade-Central City's per-pupil spending, and \$172 less than Conemaugh Township Area's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,498 through consolidation, they could save \$698,368 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,498 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Shade-Central City School District and Conemaugh Township Area School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Shade-Central City	Conemaugh Township Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	646	1,139	1,785	1,888	-103
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	3.9	1.1
Square Miles	68	55	122	84	38
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,276	\$8,671	8,890	\$8,498	\$391
Instruction	\$5,189	\$5,248	\$5,226	\$5,186	\$40
Instructional Staff Support	\$257	\$262	\$260	\$283	-\$23
Pupil Support	\$404	\$442	\$428	\$387	\$41
General Administration	\$978	\$234	\$503	\$254	\$249
School Administration	\$406	\$379	\$389	\$388	\$1
Operations & Maintenance	\$850	\$809	\$824	\$838	-\$14
Student Transportation	\$540	\$455	\$486	\$526	-\$40
Food Services	\$435	\$511	\$483	\$363	\$121
Other	\$217	\$333	\$291	\$254	\$37

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Shade-Central City School District and Conemaugh Township Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Shade-Central City	Conemaugh Township Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$12,497,000	\$6,044,000	\$18,541,000	\$20,109,262	-\$1,568,262
Debt Payments (per student)	\$8,421	\$1,052	\$9,473	\$1,719	\$7,754
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,105	\$10,327	\$10,246	\$10,236	\$11
Local	\$2,748	\$2,982	\$2,897	\$5,426	-\$2,529
State	\$6,454	\$6,716	\$6,621	\$4,332	\$2,288
Federal	\$904	\$630	\$729	\$478	\$251
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	19.50	15.20	16.76	20.72	-3.96
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$85	\$203	\$160	\$443	-\$283
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	323	570	446	826	-379
School Administrators	3	3	6	4.7	1.3
Students Per School Administrator	215	380	298	423	-125
Teachers	39	77	116	120.6	-4.6
Students Per Teacher	16.6	14.8	15.4	15.7	-0.4
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	68.9%	74.8%	72.7%	71.7%	1.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	85.0%	87.0%	86.3%	75.0%	11.3 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	76.2%	85.0%	82.0%	73.1%	8.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	54.9%	70.2%	63.6%	65.2%	-1.6 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	70.5%	72.0%	71.4%	70.1%	1.3 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	56.7%	74.1%	69.5%	71.9%	-2.4 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	78.6%	75.7%	76.7%	75.1%	1.6 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	50.0%	51.8%	51.2%	69.5%	-18.4 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	91.0%	92.5%	88.5%	4.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	92.8%	85.0%	87.7%	81.6%	6.1 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	82.3%	77.6%	79.6%	70.8%	8.9 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.3%	72.1%	77.6%	74.7%	2.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	48.6%	82.7%	73.8%	70.3%	3.4 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	38.0%	75.7%	62.5%	67.3%	-4.8 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	43.5%	50.6%	48.1%	54.6%	-6.5 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	43.9%	31.8%	36.2%	28.1%	8.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.7%	16.1%	15.6%	13.8%	1.7 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Southeastern Greene School District and Carmichaels Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Southeastern Greene School District</b>	<b>Carmichaels Area School District</b>
County: Greene	County: Greene
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 687	District Enrollment: 1,130
Schools:	Schools:
Bobtown Elementary School (363 students in grades K-6); Mapletown Jr./Sr. High School (324 students in grades 7-12)	Carmichaels Area Elementary Center (604 students in grades K-6); Carmichaels Area Jr./Sr. High School (526 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1	Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1
AVTS/CTC: Greene Co CTC	AVTS/CTC: Greene Co CTC

Southeastern Greene School District and Carmichaels Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Southeastern Greene School District enrolled 687 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,159 per pupil. Carmichaels Area School District enrolled 1,130 students, and spent \$9,200 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,817 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,750 and 1,999 students) spent an average of \$8,498 per pupil. This is \$2,660 less than Southeastern Greene’s per-pupil spending, and \$702 less than Carmichaels Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,498 through consolidation, they could save \$2,620,425 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,498 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Southeastern Greene School District and Carmichaels Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Southeastern Greene	Carmichaels Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	687	1,130	1,817	1,888	-71
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	3.9	0.1
Square Miles	69	39	108	84	24
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,159	\$9,200	9,941	\$8,498	\$1,442
Instruction	\$6,361	\$5,611	\$5,894	\$5,186	\$708
Instructional Staff Support	\$183	\$296	\$254	\$283	-\$30
Pupil Support	\$214	\$150	\$174	\$387	-\$213
General Administration	\$827	\$236	\$460	\$254	\$205
School Administration	\$400	\$490	\$456	\$388	\$69
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,039	\$910	\$959	\$838	\$121
Student Transportation	\$1,277	\$750	\$949	\$526	\$423
Food Services	\$448	\$424	\$433	\$363	\$71
Other	\$409	\$333	\$362	\$254	\$107

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Southeastern Greene School District and Carmichaels Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Southeastern Greene	Carmichaels Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$3,571,000	\$7,895,000	\$11,466,000	\$20,109,262	-\$8,643,262
Debt Payments (per student)	\$959	\$634	\$1,593	\$1,719	-\$126
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,827	\$10,547	\$11,787	\$10,236	\$1,551
Local	\$5,051	\$3,262	\$3,938	\$5,426	-\$1,487
State	\$7,949	\$6,403	\$6,987	\$4,332	\$2,655
Federal	\$827	\$882	\$861	\$478	\$383
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	33.60	24.20	27.75	20.72	7.04
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$91	\$125	\$112	\$443	-\$330
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	344	565	454	826	-371
School Administrators	2	3	5	4.7	0.3
Students Per School Administrator	344	377	363	423	-59
Teachers	54	80	134	120.6	13.4
Students Per Teacher	12.7	14.1	13.6	15.7	-2.2
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	42.9%	58.9%	52.7%	71.7%	-19.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	52.0%	78.0%	69.0%	75.0%	-6.0 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	57.8%	62.9%	60.8%	73.1%	-12.3 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	37.2%	46.3%	43.5%	65.2%	-21.8 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	50.0%	64.8%	58.2%	70.1%	-11.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	45.5%	54.1%	50.6%	71.9%	-21.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	36.1%	53.5%	46.3%	75.1%	-28.8 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	53.3%	50.6%	51.5%	69.5%	-18.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	77.0%	91.0%	86.1%	88.5%	-2.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	71.1%	72.5%	71.9%	81.6%	-9.7 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	39.6%	53.7%	49.3%	70.8%	-21.5 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	45.0%	86.5%	67.9%	74.7%	-6.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	24.3%	62.5%	46.9%	70.3%	-23.4 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	22.6%	41.8%	33.8%	67.3%	-33.5 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	13.3%	30.2%	24.4%	54.6%	-30.2 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	56.0%	36.2%	43.7%	28.1%	15.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	18.1%	18.0%	18.0%	13.8%	4.2 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Southeastern Greene School District and Central Greene School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Southeastern Greene School District</b>	<b>Central Greene School District</b>
County: Greene	County: Greene
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Small Town
District Enrollment: 687	District Enrollment: 2,310
Schools:	Schools:
Bobtown Elementary School (363 students in grades K-6); Mapletown Jr./Sr. High School (324 students in grades 7-12)	Perry Elementary School (127 students in grades K-5); Waynesburg Central Elementary School (880 students in grades K-5); Miller Middle School (565 students in grades 6-8); Waynesburg Central High School (738 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1	Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1
AVTS/CTC: Greene Co CTC	AVTS/CTC: Greene Co CTC

Southeastern Greene School District and Central Greene School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Southeastern Greene School District enrolled 687 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,159 per pupil. Central Greene School District enrolled 2,310 students, and spent \$8,976 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,997 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$3,102 less than Southeastern Greene’s per-pupil spending, and \$919 less than Central Greene’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$4,252,936 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Southeastern Greene School District and Central Greene School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Southeastern Greene	Central Greene	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	687	2,310	2,997	2,726	271
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	4	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	69	170	238	109	130
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,159	\$8,976	9,476	\$8,057	\$1,419
Instruction	\$6,361	\$5,505	\$5,701	\$5,022	\$679
Instructional Staff Support	\$183	\$279	\$257	\$256	\$1
Pupil Support	\$214	\$269	\$257	\$354	-\$97
General Administration	\$827	\$164	\$316	\$210	\$106
School Administration	\$400	\$432	\$425	\$354	\$71
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,039	\$984	\$997	\$820	\$177
Student Transportation	\$1,277	\$771	\$887	\$500	\$387
Food Services	\$448	\$393	\$405	\$323	\$83
Other	\$409	\$178	\$231	\$202	\$29

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Southeastern Greene School District and Central Greene School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Southeastern Greene	Central Greene	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$3,571,000	\$24,135,000	\$27,706,000	\$27,621,426	\$84,574
Debt Payments (per student)	\$959	\$649	\$1,608	\$1,905	-\$297
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,827	\$10,662	\$11,388	\$9,710	\$1,678
Local	\$5,051	\$5,722	\$5,568	\$5,542	\$26
State	\$7,949	\$4,206	\$5,064	\$3,780	\$1,285
Federal	\$827	\$734	\$755	\$388	\$367
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	33.60	26.30	27.97	20.94	7.03
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$91	\$454	\$371	\$660	-\$289
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	344	1,155	749	1,131	-381
School Administrators	2	6	8	6.4	1.6
Students Per School Administrator	344	385	375	444	-69
Teachers	54	162	216	170.0	46.0
Students Per Teacher	12.7	14.3	13.9	16.2	-2.3
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	42.9%	61.3%	57.0%	71.4%	-14.4 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	52.0%	53.0%	52.8%	74.0%	-21.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	57.8%	58.2%	58.1%	73.7%	-15.6 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	37.2%	43.9%	42.5%	64.3%	-21.8 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	50.0%	58.2%	56.0%	70.7%	-14.7 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	45.5%	57.0%	53.9%	72.0%	-18.1 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	36.1%	63.1%	56.7%	74.8%	-18.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	53.3%	60.1%	58.7%	69.0%	-10.3 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	77.0%	73.0%	73.8%	87.0%	-13.2 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	71.1%	81.0%	78.8%	82.6%	-3.8 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	39.6%	57.9%	54.1%	70.9%	-16.8 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	45.0%	72.8%	65.4%	72.3%	-6.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	24.3%	66.1%	54.7%	71.1%	-16.3 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	22.6%	59.8%	51.0%	67.5%	-16.5 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	13.3%	56.1%	47.3%	54.1%	-6.8 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	56.0%	45.4%	47.8%	24.1%	23.7 pts
Students with Disabilities	18.1%	22.2%	21.3%	13.5%	7.7 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Southeastern Greene School District and Jefferson-Morgan School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Southeastern Greene School District</b>	<b>Jefferson-Morgan School District</b>
County: Greene	County: Greene
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 687	District Enrollment: 942
Schools:	Schools:
Bobtown Elementary School (363 students in grades K-6); Mapletown Jr./Sr. High School (324 students in grades 7-12)	Jefferson-Morgan Elementary School (481 students in grades K-6); Jefferson-Morgan Middle School/High School (461 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1	Intermediate Unit: Intermediate Unit 1
AVTS/CTC: Greene Co CTC	AVTS/CTC: Greene Co CTC

Southeastern Greene School District and Jefferson-Morgan School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Southeastern Greene School District enrolled 687 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,159 per pupil. Jefferson-Morgan School District enrolled 942 students, and spent \$10,534 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,629 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,500 and 1,749 students) spent an average of \$8,479 per pupil. This is \$2,680 less than Southeastern Greene's per-pupil spending, and \$2,055 less than Jefferson-Morgan's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,479 through consolidation, they could save \$3,776,578 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,479 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Southeastern Greene School District and Jefferson-Morgan School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Southeastern Greene	Jefferson-Morgan	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	687	942	1,629	1,616	13
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	2	4	3.4	0.6
Square Miles	69	47	116	95	21
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,159	\$10,534	10,797	\$8,479	\$2,318
Instruction	\$6,361	\$6,886	\$6,665	\$5,269	\$1,395
Instructional Staff Support	\$183	\$289	\$244	\$243	\$1
Pupil Support	\$214	\$285	\$255	\$387	-\$133
General Administration	\$827	\$269	\$504	\$278	\$226
School Administration	\$400	\$378	\$387	\$373	\$15
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,039	\$1,200	\$1,132	\$853	\$279
Student Transportation	\$1,277	\$644	\$911	\$532	\$378
Food Services	\$448	\$408	\$425	\$353	\$72
Other	\$409	\$176	\$274	\$190	\$84

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Southeastern Greene School District and Jefferson-Morgan School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Southeastern Greene	Jefferson-Morgan	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$3,571,000	\$8,665,000	\$12,236,000	\$14,381,000	-\$2,145,000
Debt Payments (per student)	\$959	\$928	\$1,887	\$1,826	\$61
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$13,827	\$11,677	\$12,584	\$10,111	\$2,473
Local	\$5,051	\$4,191	\$4,554	\$5,128	-\$574
State	\$7,949	\$6,570	\$7,152	\$4,400	\$2,752
Federal	\$827	\$916	\$878	\$583	\$295
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	33.60	27.20	29.90	21.00	8.90
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$91	\$122	\$109	\$367	-\$258
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.2	1.8
Students Per District Administrator	344	471	407	866	-459
School Administrators	2	3	5	3.8	1.2
Students Per School Administrator	344	314	326	457	-131
Teachers	54	68	122	105.8	16.2
Students Per Teacher	12.7	13.9	13.4	15.5	-2.1
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	42.9%	59.4%	52.4%	68.4%	-16.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	52.0%	76.0%	66.9%	72.4%	-5.5 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	57.8%	59.7%	58.9%	70.7%	-11.8 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	37.2%	56.9%	49.5%	62.8%	-13.3 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	50.0%	55.4%	52.6%	67.7%	-15.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	45.5%	61.7%	53.7%	68.5%	-14.8 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	36.1%	69.7%	54.7%	70.8%	-16.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	53.3%	54.3%	54.0%	66.5%	-12.5 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	77.0%	85.0%	82.0%	86.7%	-4.8 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	71.1%	71.0%	71.0%	78.8%	-7.7 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	39.6%	61.1%	53.1%	67.4%	-14.3 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	45.0%	62.1%	53.4%	69.1%	-15.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	24.3%	61.7%	43.3%	66.6%	-23.3 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	22.6%	43.4%	34.1%	62.5%	-28.5 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	13.3%	32.6%	26.3%	51.3%	-25.0 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	56.0%	33.8%	43.2%	29.6%	13.6 pts
Students with Disabilities	18.1%	18.8%	18.5%	15.1%	3.3 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Sullivan County School District and Canton Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor's to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor's. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Sullivan County School District	Canton Area School District
County: Sullivan	County: Bradford
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 808	District Enrollment: 1,180
Schools:	Schools:
Sullivan County Elementary School (232 students in grades K-6); Turnpike Area Elementary School (168 students in grades K-6); Sullivan County Jr./Sr. High School (408 students in grades 7-12)	Canton Area Elementary School (569 students in grades K-6); Canton Jr./Sr. High School (611 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center

Sullivan County School District and Canton Area School District are located in different counties, but they are served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Sullivan County School District enrolled 808 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,276 per pupil. Canton Area School District enrolled 1,180 students, and spent \$8,588 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,988 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,750 and 1,999 students) spent an average of \$8,498 per pupil. This is \$2,778 less than Sullivan County's per-pupil spending, and \$90 less than Canton Area's spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,498 through consolidation, they could save \$2,350,206 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,498 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts' control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Sullivan County School District and Canton Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Sullivan County	Canton Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	808	1,180	1,988	1,888	100
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	2	5	3.9	1.1
Square Miles	452	211	664	84	580
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,276	\$8,588	9,681	\$8,498	\$1,182
Instruction	\$6,670	\$5,358	\$5,891	\$5,186	\$705
Instructional Staff Support	\$361	\$369	\$366	\$283	\$82
Pupil Support	\$475	\$275	\$356	\$387	-\$31
General Administration	\$402	\$231	\$300	\$254	\$46
School Administration	\$442	\$365	\$396	\$388	\$9
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,027	\$721	\$846	\$838	\$8
Student Transportation	\$1,149	\$607	\$827	\$526	\$301
Food Services	\$425	\$383	\$400	\$363	\$37
Other	\$326	\$280	\$298	\$254	\$44

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Sullivan County School District and Canton Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Sullivan County	Canton Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$632,000	\$13,330,000	\$13,962,000	\$20,109,262	-\$6,147,262
Debt Payments (per student)	\$731	\$460	\$1,191	\$1,719	-\$528
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$12,165	\$9,749	\$10,731	\$10,236	\$495
Local	\$7,322	\$2,812	\$4,645	\$5,426	-\$781
State	\$4,386	\$6,308	\$5,527	\$4,332	\$1,194
Federal	\$457	\$630	\$559	\$478	\$81
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	12.80	17.30	15.47	20.72	-5.25
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$440	\$160	\$274	\$443	-\$169
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	1	3	2.5	0.5
Students Per District Administrator	404	1,180	663	826	-163
School Administrators	2	3	5	4.7	0.3
Students Per School Administrator	404	393	398	423	-25
Teachers	62	77	139	120.6	18.4
Students Per Teacher	13.0	15.3	14.3	15.7	-1.4
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	70.4%	60.7%	64.8%	71.7%	-6.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	76.0%	76.0%	75.0%	1.0 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	59.4%	65.1%	73.1%	-8.0 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	67.7%	56.0%	61.0%	65.2%	-4.3 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	71.4%	76.5%	70.1%	6.4 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	73.5%	66.7%	69.7%	71.9%	-2.2 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	76.6%	69.2%	72.1%	75.1%	-3.0 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	74.2%	66.7%	69.5%	-2.9 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	88.0%	75.0%	80.5%	88.5%	-8.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	80.3%	65.0%	70.6%	81.6%	-11.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	65.1%	39.3%	50.4%	70.8%	-20.4 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.5%	65.7%	75.0%	74.7%	0.3 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	73.5%	51.8%	61.4%	70.3%	-9.0 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	65.0%	43.6%	51.9%	67.3%	-15.3 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	31.9%	45.2%	39.5%	54.6%	-15.0 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.1%	36.9%	34.5%	28.1%	6.4 pts
Students with Disabilities	13.0%	12.7%	12.8%	13.8%	-1.0 pts



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Sullivan County School District and East Lycoming School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Sullivan County School District	East Lycoming School District
County: Sullivan	County: Lycoming
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 808	District Enrollment: 1,781
Schools:	Schools:
Sullivan County Elementary School (232 students in grades K-6); Turnpike Area Elementary School (168 students in grades K-6); Sullivan County Jr./Sr. High School (408 students in grades 7-12)	Carl G Renn Elementary School (214 students in grades K-6); George A Ferrell Elementary School (136 students in grades K-6); Joseph C Ashkar Elementary School (503 students in grades K-6); Hughesville Jr./Sr. High School (928 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Lycoming CTC

Sullivan County School District and East Lycoming School District are located in different counties. However, they are served by the same Intermediate Unit, but by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Sullivan County School District enrolled 808 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,276 per pupil. East Lycoming School District enrolled 1,781 students, and spent \$8,494 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,589 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$3,219 less than Sullivan County’s per-pupil spending, and \$436 less than East Lycoming’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$3,378,215 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Sullivan County School District and East Lycoming School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Sullivan County	East Lycoming	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	808	1,781	2,589	2,726	-137
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	4	7	5.2	1.8
Square Miles	452	146	598	109	490
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,276	\$8,494	9,362	\$8,057	\$1,305
Instruction	\$6,670	\$5,461	\$5,838	\$5,022	\$816
Instructional Staff Support	\$361	\$214	\$260	\$256	\$4
Pupil Support	\$475	\$363	\$398	\$354	\$44
General Administration	\$402	\$145	\$226	\$210	\$15
School Administration	\$442	\$360	\$385	\$354	\$32
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,027	\$713	\$811	\$820	-\$9
Student Transportation	\$1,149	\$552	\$738	\$500	\$238
Food Services	\$425	\$393	\$403	\$323	\$80
Other	\$326	\$292	\$302	\$202	\$100

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Sullivan County School District and East Lycoming School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Sullivan County	East Lycoming	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$632,000	\$17,383,000	\$18,015,000	\$27,621,426	-\$9,606,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$731	\$1,264	\$1,995	\$1,905	\$90
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$12,165	\$9,497	\$10,329	\$9,710	\$619
Local	\$7,322	\$3,780	\$4,886	\$5,542	-\$657
State	\$4,386	\$5,234	\$4,969	\$3,780	\$1,189
Federal	\$457	\$483	\$475	\$388	\$87
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	12.80	18.30	16.58	20.94	-4.36
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$440	\$320	\$358	\$660	-\$302
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.6	1.4
Students Per District Administrator	404	891	647	1,131	-483
School Administrators	2	4	6	6.4	-0.4
Students Per School Administrator	404	445	432	444	-12
Teachers	62	123	185	170.0	15.0
Students Per Teacher	13.0	14.5	14.0	16.2	-2.2
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	70.4%	79.1%	76.3%	71.4%	4.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	77.0%	76.7%	74.0%	2.7 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	81.7%	79.6%	73.7%	5.9 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	67.7%	69.7%	69.0%	64.3%	4.7 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	73.8%	76.6%	70.7%	5.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	73.5%	74.7%	74.3%	72.0%	2.3 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	76.6%	82.3%	80.5%	74.8%	5.7 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	74.6%	68.8%	69.0%	-0.2 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	88.0%	92.0%	90.7%	87.0%	3.8 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	80.3%	91.3%	87.9%	82.6%	5.3 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	65.1%	79.8%	74.4%	70.9%	3.5 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.5%	84.1%	84.6%	72.3%	12.3 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	73.5%	88.8%	83.9%	71.1%	12.8 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	65.0%	74.6%	71.6%	67.5%	4.1 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	31.9%	65.8%	54.9%	54.1%	0.8 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.1%	25.3%	27.1%	24.1%	3.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	13.0%	12.5%	12.7%	13.5%	-0.8 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Sullivan County School District and Northwest Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Sullivan County School District	Northwest Area School District
County: Sullivan	County: Luzerne
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 808	District Enrollment: 1,422
Schools:	Schools:
Sullivan County Elementary School (232 students in grades K-6); Turnpike Area Elementary School (168 students in grades K-6); Sullivan County Jr./Sr. High School (408 students in grades 7-12)	Garrison Memorial School (167 students in grades K-6); Hunlock Creek School (316 students in grades K-6); Huntington Mills School (291 students in grades K-6); Northwest Area High School (648 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17	Intermediate Unit: Luzerne IU 18
AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center	AVTS/CTC: West Side AVTS

Sullivan County School District and Northwest Area School District are located in different counties. They are served by different Intermediate Units and by different AVTS/CTCs.

In 2004, Sullivan County School District enrolled 808 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,276 per pupil. Northwest Area School District enrolled 1,422 students, and spent \$9,125 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,230 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$2,952 less than Sullivan County’s per-pupil spending, and \$801 less than Northwest Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$3,524,954 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Sullivan County School District and Northwest Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Sullivan County	Northwest Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	808	1,422	2,230	2,255	-25
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	4	7	4.7	2.3
Square Miles	452	120	573	111	462
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,276	\$9,125	9,904	\$8,324	\$1,581
Instruction	\$6,670	\$5,657	\$6,024	\$5,136	\$888
Instructional Staff Support	\$361	\$133	\$216	\$279	-\$63
Pupil Support	\$475	\$343	\$391	\$370	\$21
General Administration	\$402	\$190	\$267	\$234	\$33
School Administration	\$442	\$376	\$400	\$396	\$4
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,027	\$669	\$799	\$846	-\$48
Student Transportation	\$1,149	\$1,026	\$1,070	\$510	\$561
Food Services	\$425	\$378	\$395	\$338	\$56
Other	\$326	\$354	\$344	\$184	\$160

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Sullivan County School District and Northwest Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Sullivan County	Northwest Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$632,000	\$5,273,000	\$5,905,000	\$24,347,120	-\$18,442,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$731	\$442	\$1,173	\$3,093	-\$1,920
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$12,165	\$10,533	\$11,124	\$10,148	\$976
Local	\$7,322	\$3,788	\$5,068	\$5,489	-\$420
State	\$4,386	\$6,104	\$5,482	\$4,221	\$1,260
Federal	\$457	\$641	\$574	\$438	\$136
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	12.80	19.50	17.07	21.58	-4.51
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$440	\$247	\$317	\$530	-\$212
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	404	711	558	1,037	-480
School Administrators	2	3	5	6.0	-1.0
Students Per School Administrator	404	474	446	390	56
Teachers	62	90	152	145.0	7.0
Students Per Teacher	13.0	15.8	14.7	15.7	-1.0
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	70.4%	69.8%	70.0%	70.0%	0.0 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	75.0%	75.3%	72.2%	3.1 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	72.0%	73.0%	71.9%	1.1 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	67.7%	60.6%	63.1%	62.1%	1.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	61.9%	69.5%	70.6%	-1.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	73.5%	70.9%	71.9%	71.4%	0.5 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	76.6%	78.9%	78.2%	73.9%	4.3 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	74.8%	67.9%	68.0%	-0.1 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	88.0%	91.0%	90.0%	87.0%	3.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	80.3%	76.5%	77.7%	80.0%	-2.3 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	65.1%	67.5%	66.6%	68.9%	-2.2 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.5%	68.9%	75.0%	72.3%	2.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	73.5%	66.0%	68.9%	70.1%	-1.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	65.0%	68.6%	67.5%	64.7%	2.8 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	31.9%	44.3%	39.7%	53.0%	-13.4 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.1%	34.0%	32.9%	26.6%	6.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	13.0%	15.1%	14.3%	14.4%	0.0 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Sullivan County School District and Wyalusing Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Sullivan County School District	Wyalusing Area School District
County: Sullivan	County: Bradford
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 808	District Enrollment: 1,504
Schools:	Schools:
Sullivan County Elementary School (232 students in grades K-6); Turnpike Area Elementary School (168 students in grades K-6); Sullivan County Jr./Sr. High School (408 students in grades 7-12)	Camptown Elementary School (143 students in grades K-6); Laceyville Elementary School (170 students in grades K-6); New Albany Elementary School (102 students in grades K-6); Wyalusing Elementary School (378 students in grades K-6); Wyalusing Valley Jr./Sr. High School (711 students in grades 7-12);
Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17	Intermediate Unit: Blast IU 17
AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center	AVTS/CTC: Northern Tier Career Center

Sullivan County School District and Wyalusing Area School District are located in different counties, but they are served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Sullivan County School District enrolled 808 students, and had operating expenditures of \$11,276 per pupil. Wyalusing Area School District enrolled 1,504 students, and spent \$8,670 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,312 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$2,952 less than Sullivan County’s per-pupil spending, and \$346 less than Wyalusing Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$2,905,401 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Sullivan County School District and Wyalusing Area School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Sullivan County	Wyalusing Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	808	1,504	2,312	2,255	57
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	5	8	4.7	3.3
Square Miles	452	277	729	111	619
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$11,276	\$8,670	9,580	\$8,324	\$1,257
Instruction	\$6,670	\$5,320	\$5,792	\$5,136	\$656
Instructional Staff Support	\$361	\$352	\$356	\$279	\$76
Pupil Support	\$475	\$392	\$421	\$370	\$51
General Administration	\$402	\$185	\$261	\$234	\$27
School Administration	\$442	\$315	\$359	\$396	-\$36
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,027	\$682	\$803	\$846	-\$43
Student Transportation	\$1,149	\$790	\$915	\$510	\$405
Food Services	\$425	\$359	\$382	\$338	\$44
Other	\$326	\$274	\$292	\$184	\$108



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Sullivan County School District and Wyalusing Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Sullivan County	Wyalusing Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$632,000	\$0	\$632,000	\$24,347,120	-\$23,715,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$731	\$1,594	\$2,325	\$3,093	-\$768
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$12,165	\$9,275	\$10,285	\$10,148	\$137
Local	\$7,322	\$3,388	\$4,763	\$5,489	-\$726
State	\$4,386	\$5,293	\$4,976	\$4,221	\$754
Federal	\$457	\$595	\$547	\$438	\$109
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	12.80	15.50	14.56	21.58	-7.03
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$440	\$288	\$341	\$530	-\$188
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	2	2	4	2.5	1.5
Students Per District Administrator	404	752	578	1,037	-459
School Administrators	2	3	5	6.0	-1.0
Students Per School Administrator	404	501	462	390	72
Teachers	62	95	157	145.0	12.0
Students Per Teacher	13.0	15.8	14.7	15.7	-1.0
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	70.4%	67.7%	68.7%	70.0%	-1.4 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	76.0%	78.0%	77.4%	72.2%	5.2 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	75.0%	74.5%	74.7%	71.9%	2.8 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	67.7%	70.0%	69.1%	62.1%	7.0 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	82.3%	70.6%	75.0%	70.6%	4.4 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	73.5%	67.3%	69.5%	71.4%	-1.9 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	76.6%	60.2%	65.7%	73.9%	-8.1 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	56.5%	56.3%	56.4%	68.0%	-11.6 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	88.0%	88.0%	88.0%	87.0%	1.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	80.3%	67.9%	72.2%	80.0%	-7.9 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	65.1%	71.3%	68.9%	68.9%	0.1 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.5%	70.6%	76.2%	72.3%	3.9 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	73.5%	64.3%	67.6%	70.1%	-2.5 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	65.0%	64.5%	64.7%	64.7%	0.0 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	31.9%	47.3%	41.4%	53.0%	-11.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.1%	33.2%	32.5%	26.6%	5.8 pts
Students with Disabilities	13.0%	10.8%	11.6%	14.4%	-2.8 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Turkeyfoot Valley Area School District and Rockwood Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Turkeyfoot Valley Area School District</b>	<b>Rockwood Area School District</b>
County: Somerset	County: Somerset
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 395	District Enrollment: 862
Schools:	Schools:
Turkeyfoot Valley Area Elementary School (202 students in grades K-6); Turkeyfoot Valley Area Jr./Sr. High School (193 students in grades 7-12)	Kingwood Elementary School (103 students in grades K-6); Rockwood Area Elementary School (325 students in grades K-6); Rockwood Area Jr./Sr. High School (434 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8	Intermediate Unit: Appalachia IU 8
AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Somerset Co Technology Center

Turkeyfoot Valley Area School District and Rockwood Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Turkeyfoot Valley Area School District enrolled 395 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,241 per pupil. Rockwood Area School District enrolled 862 students, and spent \$8,818 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 1,257 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 1,250 and 1,499 students) spent an average of \$8,437 per pupil. This is \$804 less than Turkeyfoot Valley Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$381 less than Rockwood Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,437 through consolidation, they could save \$646,099 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,437 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Turkeyfoot Valley Area School District and Rockwood Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Turkeyfoot Valley Area	Rockwood Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	395	862	1,257	1,380	-123
Number of Schools (2003-04)	2	3	5	3.0	2.0
Square Miles	103	146	249	72	176
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,241	\$8,818	8,951	\$8,437	\$514
Instruction	\$4,709	\$5,509	\$5,258	\$5,233	\$25
Instructional Staff Support	\$441	\$212	\$284	\$275	\$9
Pupil Support	\$478	\$355	\$394	\$352	\$42
General Administration	\$608	\$367	\$442	\$278	\$164
School Administration	\$359	\$363	\$362	\$386	-\$24
Operations & Maintenance	\$942	\$780	\$831	\$834	-\$4
Student Transportation	\$1,013	\$689	\$791	\$507	\$283
Food Services	\$453	\$326	\$366	\$361	\$4
Other	\$238	\$217	\$224	\$209	\$14

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Turkeyfoot Valley Area School District and Rockwood Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Turkeyfoot Valley Area	Rockwood Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$0	\$7,965,000	\$7,965,000	\$13,035,068	-\$5,070,068
Debt Payments (per student)	\$46	\$968	\$1,014	\$2,142	-\$1,128
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,410	\$10,227	\$10,285	\$10,312	-\$28
Local	\$2,813	\$4,778	\$4,161	\$4,540	-\$379
State	\$6,461	\$4,934	\$5,414	\$5,209	\$205
Federal	\$1,137	\$515	\$710	\$564	\$146
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	11.20	11.10	11.13	20.32	-9.19
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$93	\$334	\$258	\$283	-\$25
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	1	2	2.0	0.0
Students Per District Administrator	395	862	629	773	-145
School Administrators	1	1	2	3.8	-1.8
Students Per School Administrator	395	862	629	384	245
Teachers	35	66	101	91.3	9.7
Students Per Teacher	11.3	13.1	12.4	15.2	-2.8
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	69.6%	76.4%	74.6%	68.7%	5.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	86.0%	79.0%	80.9%	72.3%	8.6 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	73.1%	71.5%	72.0%	68.8%	3.2 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	73.0%	75.5%	74.7%	61.6%	13.1 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	82.1%	74.1%	76.7%	68.1%	8.6 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	63.6%	79.0%	75.9%	69.1%	6.8 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	40.0%	70.9%	63.5%	71.4%	-7.9 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	60.9%	81.0%	76.5%	67.5%	9.0 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	95.0%	94.0%	94.3%	86.8%	7.5 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	88.4%	83.9%	85.3%	77.7%	7.6 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	80.8%	91.2%	87.9%	68.7%	19.2 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	89.3%	79.3%	82.6%	71.8%	10.8 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	59.1%	80.2%	75.9%	67.1%	8.8 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	36.0%	63.3%	56.7%	62.5%	-5.7 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	43.4%	56.9%	53.9%	50.1%	3.7 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	47.2%	37.5%	40.5%	32.5%	8.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	16.0%	11.3%	12.7%	14.6%	-1.9 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Valley Grove School District and Cranberry Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

Valley Grove School District	Cranberry Area School District
County: Venango	County: Venango
District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Outside CBSA
District Enrollment: 1,043	District Enrollment: 1,483
Schools:	Schools:
Cooperstown Elementary School (99 students in grades K-4); Rocky Grove Elementary School (300 students in grades K-4); Sugarcreek Intermediate School (173 students in grades 5-6); Rocky Grove Jr./Sr. High School (471 students in grades 7-12)	Rockland Elementary School (80 students in grades K,2-5); Pinegrove Elementary School (107 students in grades K-5); Pinoak Primary Center (114 students in grades K-3); Cranberry Elementary School (356 students in grades K-6); Steffee Intermediate Center (73 students in grades 4-5); Cranberry Area Jr./Sr. High School (753 students in grades 7-12)
Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6	Intermediate Unit: Riverview IU 6
AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center	AVTS/CTC: Venango Technology Center

Valley Grove School District and Cranberry Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Valley Grove School District enrolled 1,043 students, and had operating expenditures of \$8,202 per pupil. Cranberry Area School District enrolled 1,483 students, and spent \$9,003 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,526 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$145 less than Valley Grove’s per-pupil spending, and \$946 less than Cranberry Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$1,554,813 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Valley Grove School District and Cranberry Area School District**

routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Valley Grove	Cranberry Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	1,043	1,483	2,526	2,726	-200
Number of Schools (2003-04)	4	6	10	5.2	4.8
Square Miles	63	158	221	109	113
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$8,202	\$9,003	8,673	\$8,057	\$616
Instruction	\$4,773	\$5,500	\$5,200	\$5,022	\$177
Instructional Staff Support	\$181	\$477	\$355	\$256	\$99
Pupil Support	\$361	\$337	\$347	\$354	-\$7
General Administration	\$271	\$322	\$301	\$210	\$90
School Administration	\$414	\$293	\$343	\$354	-\$10
Operations & Maintenance	\$969	\$869	\$910	\$820	\$90
Student Transportation	\$486	\$658	\$587	\$500	\$87
Food Services	\$412	\$376	\$391	\$323	\$68
Other	\$334	\$171	\$238	\$202	\$36

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Valley Grove School District and Cranberry Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Valley Grove	Cranberry Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$364,000	\$9,923,000	\$10,287,000	\$27,621,426	-\$17,334,426
Debt Payments (per student)	\$616	\$858	\$1,474	\$1,905	-\$431
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,479	\$10,860	\$10,703	\$9,710	\$993
Local	\$3,258	\$4,825	\$4,178	\$5,542	-\$1,364
State	\$6,610	\$5,410	\$5,905	\$3,780	\$2,126
Federal	\$612	\$625	\$620	\$388	\$231
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	19.70	16.90	18.06	20.94	-2.88
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$151	\$296	\$236	\$660	-\$424
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	2	3	2.6	0.4
Students Per District Administrator	1,043	742	842	1,131	-289
School Administrators	4	4	8	6.4	1.6
Students Per School Administrator	261	371	316	444	-128
Teachers	70	102	172	170.0	2.0
Students Per Teacher	14.9	14.5	14.7	16.2	-1.5
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	66.0%	70.9%	69.0%	71.4%	-2.4 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%	74.0%	-4.0 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	83.0%	68.9%	74.1%	73.7%	0.4 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	51.5%	66.3%	59.8%	64.3%	-4.5 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	67.8%	69.4%	68.8%	70.7%	-1.9 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	61.7%	63.5%	62.8%	72.0%	-9.2 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	61.4%	65.1%	63.6%	74.8%	-11.2 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	67.4%	64.8%	65.6%	69.0%	-3.3 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	92.0%	87.0%	89.0%	87.0%	2.0 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	84.9%	77.8%	80.4%	82.6%	-2.2 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	62.9%	84.2%	74.8%	70.9%	3.9 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	72.9%	80.0%	77.3%	72.3%	5.0 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	67.2%	80.4%	75.0%	71.1%	4.0 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	47.2%	73.0%	62.3%	67.5%	-5.2 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	48.1%	47.2%	47.5%	54.1%	-6.6 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	38.9%	34.1%	36.1%	24.1%	12.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	16.8%	19.5%	18.4%	13.5%	4.9 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Weatherly Area School District and Jim Thorpe Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Weatherly Area School District</b>	<b>Jim Thorpe Area School District</b>
County: Carbon	County: Carbon
District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 730	District Enrollment: 1,822
Schools:	Schools:
Weatherly Area Elementary School (309 students in grades K-5); Weatherly Area Middle School (178 students in grades 6-8); Weatherly Area Senior High School (243 students in grades 9-12)	L B Morris Elementary School (941 students in grades K-8); Penn/Kidder Campus (students in grades 3-8); Jim Thorpe Area Junior High School (170 students in grades 7); Jim Thorpe Area Senior High School (711 students in grades 8-12)
Intermediate Unit: Carbon-Lehigh IU 21	Intermediate Unit: Carbon-Lehigh IU 21
AVTS/CTC: Carbon Career and Technical Institute	AVTS/CTC: Carbon Career and Technical Institute

Weatherly Area School District and Jim Thorpe Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Weatherly Area School District enrolled 730 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,045 per pupil. Jim Thorpe Area School District enrolled 1,822 students, and spent \$9,052 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,552 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,500 and 2,999 students) spent an average of \$8,057 per pupil. This is \$988 less than Weatherly Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$995 less than Jim Thorpe Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,057 through consolidation, they could save \$2,534,334 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,057 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.



**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Weatherly Area School District and Jim Thorpe Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Weatherly Area	Jim Thorpe Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	730	1,822	2,552	2,726	-174
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	5.2	0.8
Square Miles	108	117	225	109	117
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,045	\$9,052	9,050	\$8,057	\$993
Instruction	\$5,167	\$5,231	\$5,213	\$5,022	\$190
Instructional Staff Support	\$238	\$286	\$272	\$256	\$16
Pupil Support	\$338	\$343	\$342	\$354	-\$12
General Administration	\$463	\$288	\$338	\$210	\$127
School Administration	\$547	\$440	\$470	\$354	\$117
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,151	\$1,272	\$1,237	\$820	\$417
Student Transportation	\$427	\$530	\$500	\$500	\$1
Food Services	\$396	\$380	\$385	\$323	\$62
Other	\$318	\$283	\$293	\$202	\$90

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Weatherly Area School District and Jim Thorpe Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Weatherly Area	Jim Thorpe Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$3,975,000	\$46,614,000	\$50,589,000	\$27,621,426	\$22,967,574
Debt Payments (per student)	\$7,356	\$1,552	\$8,908	\$1,905	\$7,003
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,570	\$13,165	\$12,708	\$9,710	\$2,998
Local	\$6,332	\$10,113	\$9,031	\$5,542	\$3,489
State	\$4,697	\$2,458	\$3,098	\$3,780	-\$681
Federal	\$541	\$594	\$579	\$388	\$191
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	23.50	22.90	23.07	20.94	2.13
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$186	\$769	\$602	\$660	-\$58
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	2	5	2.6	2.4
Students Per District Administrator	243	911	510	1,131	-620
School Administrators	2	3	5	6.4	-1.4
Students Per School Administrator	365	607	510	444	67
Teachers	47	114	161	170.0	-9.0
Students Per Teacher	15.5	16.0	15.9	16.2	-0.3
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	79.0%	64.3%	68.5%	71.4%	-2.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	73.0%	68.0%	69.2%	74.0%	-4.8 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	84.9%	67.5%	72.2%	73.7%	-1.6 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	58.5%	51.2%	53.6%	64.3%	-10.6 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	83.0%	61.7%	67.0%	70.7%	-3.7 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	77.2%	63.0%	67.0%	72.0%	-5.0 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	74.6%	71.0%	72.0%	74.8%	-2.8 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	80.0%	68.9%	72.6%	69.0%	3.7 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	93.0%	87.0%	88.4%	87.0%	1.4 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	92.5%	79.3%	82.8%	82.6%	0.2 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	78.4%	65.9%	70.1%	70.9%	-0.8 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.1%	61.7%	67.6%	72.3%	-4.7 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	87.1%	56.4%	65.0%	71.1%	-6.1 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	79.3%	50.3%	58.4%	67.5%	-9.1 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	66.7%	50.0%	55.6%	54.1%	1.5 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	25.5%	23.1%	23.8%	24.1%	-0.3 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.5%	16.5%	15.9%	13.5%	2.4 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Weatherly Area School District and Panther Valley School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Weatherly Area School District</b>	<b>Panther Valley School District</b>
County: Carbon	County: Carbon
District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA	District Locale: Urban Fringe of a Mid-Size City
District Enrollment: 730	District Enrollment: 1,497
Schools:	Schools:
Weatherly Area Elementary School (309 students in grades K-5); Weatherly Area Middle School (178 students in grades 6-8); Weatherly Area Senior High School (243 students in grades 9-12)	Panther Valley Elementary School (669 students in grades K-5); Panther Valley Middle School (379 students in grades 6-8); Panther Valley Senior High School (449 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Carbon-Lehigh IU 21	Intermediate Unit: Carbon-Lehigh IU 21
AVTS/CTC: Carbon Career and Technical Institute	AVTS/CTC: Carbon Career and Technical Institute

Weatherly Area School District and Panther Valley School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Weatherly Area School District enrolled 730 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,045 per pupil. Panther Valley School District enrolled 1,497 students, and spent \$8,792 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,227 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$721 less than Weatherly Area’s per-pupil spending, and \$468 less than Panther Valley’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$1,226,918 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Weatherly Area School District and Panther Valley School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Weatherly Area	Panther Valley	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	730	1,497	2,227	2,255	-28
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	4.7	1.3
Square Miles	108	35	143	111	32
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,045	\$8,792	8,875	\$8,324	\$551
Instruction	\$5,167	\$5,700	\$5,525	\$5,136	\$390
Instructional Staff Support	\$238	\$230	\$233	\$279	-\$47
Pupil Support	\$338	\$327	\$330	\$370	-\$40
General Administration	\$463	\$263	\$328	\$234	\$94
School Administration	\$547	\$406	\$452	\$396	\$56
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,151	\$834	\$938	\$846	\$91
Student Transportation	\$427	\$369	\$388	\$510	-\$122
Food Services	\$396	\$474	\$449	\$338	\$110
Other	\$318	\$190	\$232	\$184	\$48

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Weatherly Area School District and Panther Valley School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Weatherly Area	Panther Valley	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$3,975,000	\$12,145,000	\$16,120,000	\$24,347,120	-\$8,227,120
Debt Payments (per student)	\$7,356	\$405	\$7,761	\$3,093	\$4,668
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$11,570	\$10,438	\$10,809	\$10,148	\$661
Local	\$6,332	\$4,967	\$5,414	\$5,489	-\$75
State	\$4,697	\$4,673	\$4,681	\$4,221	\$459
Federal	\$541	\$799	\$714	\$438	\$276
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	23.50	27.20	25.99	21.58	4.41
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$186	\$259	\$235	\$530	-\$295
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	3	3	6	2.5	3.5
Students Per District Administrator	243	499	371	1,037	-666
School Administrators	2	4	6	6.0	0.0
Students Per School Administrator	365	374	371	390	-19
Teachers	47	104	151	145.0	6.0
Students Per Teacher	15.5	14.4	14.7	15.7	-0.9
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	79.0%	52.4%	61.1%	70.0%	-8.9 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	73.0%	66.0%	67.9%	72.2%	-4.3 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	84.9%	54.3%	64.7%	71.9%	-7.2 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	58.5%	41.6%	47.8%	62.1%	-14.3 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	83.0%	42.7%	54.2%	70.6%	-16.3 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	77.2%	57.9%	65.0%	71.4%	-6.4 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	74.6%	71.6%	72.6%	73.9%	-1.3 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	80.0%	50.4%	60.2%	68.0%	-7.8 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	93.0%	80.0%	83.6%	87.0%	-3.3 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	92.5%	51.0%	65.0%	80.0%	-15.0 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	78.4%	56.1%	64.2%	68.9%	-4.7 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	85.1%	37.6%	51.2%	72.3%	-21.1 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	87.1%	59.5%	69.6%	70.1%	-0.4 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	79.3%	51.5%	60.4%	64.7%	-4.3 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	66.7%	14.3%	31.9%	53.0%	-21.2 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	25.5%	53.2%	44.1%	26.6%	17.5 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.5%	17.9%	16.8%	14.4%	2.4 pts

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Western Beaver County School District and South Side Area School District**

The following analysis is provided by Standard & Poor’s to help users of this statewide study consider the hypothetical consolidation of the two particular school districts named above. No recommendation for or against the consolidation of any school district is made or implied by Standard & Poor’s. The following information is provided for analytical purposes only.

<b>Western Beaver County School District</b>	<b>South Side Area School District</b>
County: Beaver	County: Beaver
District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA	District Locale: Rural, Inside CBSA
District Enrollment: 945	District Enrollment: 1,369
Schools:	Schools:
Fairview Elementary School (337 students in grades K-4); Snyder Elementary School (142 students in grades 5-6); Western Beaver County Jr./Sr. High School (466 students in grades 7-12)	South Side Elementary School (569 students in grades K-5); South Side Middle School (354 students in grades 6-8); South Side High School (446 students in grades 9-12)
Intermediate Unit: Beaver Valley IU 27	Intermediate Unit: Beaver Valley IU 27
AVTS/CTC: Beaver Co AVTS	AVTS/CTC: Beaver Co AVTS

Western Beaver County School District and South Side Area School District are both located in the same county and served by the same Intermediate Unit and AVTS/CTC.

In 2004, Western Beaver County School District enrolled 945 students, and had operating expenditures of \$9,615 per pupil. South Side Area School District enrolled 1,369 students, and spent \$10,709 per pupil. The combined enrollment of the two districts is 2,314 students. Similarly-sized districts across the state (those with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,499 students) spent an average of \$8,324 per pupil. This is \$1,291 less than Western Beaver County’s per-pupil spending, and \$2,385 less than South Side Area’s spending.

Hypothetically, if the two districts could lower their per-pupil spending to the average of \$8,324 through consolidation, they could save \$4,484,750 over their 2004 spending levels (or perhaps use these funds differently to expand educational opportunities for students). Note, however, that these figures are hypothetical, and are not predictive of actual savings if the districts were to consolidate. The average expenditure of similarly-sized districts (\$8,324 per-pupil) is provided only as a reference point that may or may not be attainable, depending on local circumstances.

The actual impact of consolidation on spending would depend on a number of variables, not all of which are necessarily within the districts’ control. One factor to consider is whether or not the districts could merge any of their schools. If no schools were merged, potential savings – if any – might be limited primarily to central administrative costs. However, if sufficient building capacity existed so that two or more schools could be merged, cost-savings might also be realized in the areas of school (building) administration, instruction, instructional support, pupil support, food services, and/or operations and maintenance. The effect of school mergers on student transportation costs would depend on the logistical ramifications of redrawn transit routes, which could affect the number of vehicles and drivers needed, the number of daily miles driven, the length of bus runs, and vehicle maintenance needs.

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Western Beaver County School District and South Side Area School District**

While consolidation has the potential to decrease some costs, it may have the potential to increase others; thus, cost savings are not guaranteed. For example, if one school district has a higher pay scale for teachers, then the salaries of the lower-paid faculty might need to be increased if the two districts consolidated. On the other hand, depending on the student-teacher ratio desired by the consolidated district, it might not need the entire contingent of teachers that were employed prior to consolidation. Ultimately, local officials should contemplate the *net* impact that different consolidation scenarios could have on different areas of spending, by combining objective data with community input and knowledge of local circumstances.

Toward that end, the following table has been created to inform local deliberations with relevant data. Columns 1 and 2 display key indicators for each of the two districts. Column 3 shows the combination of the two districts' data, using either the sum or the average, depending on the indicator. Column 4 shows the average value for similarly-sized school districts across the state. The differences between the values in Columns 3 and 4 are shown in Column 5.

Some of these differences may be suggestive of changes the two school districts might consider making (if possible) if they wanted their consolidated circumstances to resemble those of similarly-sized districts. For example, if two districts wanted to merge, and the combined number of their central administrators exceeded the average number found in similarly-sized districts, then they might consider the feasibility of reducing their administrative staff. It is important to note, however, that the average values found in Column 4 do not represent a "blueprint" for consolidation or an "ideal" state; they are simply provided as reference points.

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Western Beaver County	South Side Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
Student Enrollment (2003-04)	945	1,369	2,314	2,255	59
Number of Schools (2003-04)	3	3	6	4.7	1.3
Square Miles	34	76	110	111	-1
<b>Spending (2003-04)</b>					
Total Operating Spending (per student)	\$9,615	\$10,709	10,262	\$8,324	\$1,938
Instruction	\$5,974	\$6,612	\$6,351	\$5,136	\$1,216
Instructional Staff Support	\$99	\$327	\$234	\$279	-\$45
Pupil Support	\$234	\$500	\$391	\$370	\$21
General Administration	\$410	\$435	\$425	\$234	\$191
School Administration	\$416	\$435	\$427	\$396	\$31
Operations & Maintenance	\$1,023	\$920	\$962	\$846	\$116
Student Transportation	\$879	\$873	\$876	\$510	\$366
Food Services	\$437	\$400	\$415	\$338	\$77
Other	\$143	\$207	\$181	\$184	-\$3

**Profile of Paired Districts**  
**Western Beaver County School District and South Side Area School District**

Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
	Western Beaver County	South Side Area	Sum or Average of Columns 1 and 2	Average of Similarly Sized Districts	Difference Between Columns 3 and 4
<b>Debt (2003-04)</b>					
Long-Term Debt Outstanding	\$3,457,000	\$22,229,000	\$25,686,000	\$24,347,120	\$1,338,880
Debt Payments (per student)	\$1,242	\$1,096	\$2,338	\$3,093	-\$755
<b>Revenue (2003-04)</b>					
Total Revenue (per student)	\$10,069	\$14,378	\$12,618	\$10,148	\$2,470
Local	\$3,414	\$6,015	\$4,953	\$5,489	-\$536
State	\$6,214	\$8,018	\$7,281	\$4,221	\$3,060
Federal	\$441	\$345	\$384	\$438	-\$54
<b>Taxes (2003-04)</b>					
Equalized Mills	17.50	24.40	21.58	21.58	0.00
Market Value (2003, in millions)	\$152	\$311	\$246	\$530	-\$283
<b>Staffing (2003-04)</b>					
District Administrators	1	2	3	2.5	0.5
Students Per District Administrator	945	685	771	1,037	-266
School Administrators	2	4	6	6.0	0.0
Students Per School Administrator	473	342	386	390	-5
Teachers	71	98	169	145.0	24.0
Students Per Teacher	13.3	14.0	13.7	15.7	-2.0
<b>Reading and Math Proficiency (2005-06)</b>					
Combined Reading and Math Proficiency (RaMP)	66.0%	73.7%	70.5%	70.0%	0.4 pts
<b>Reading Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Reading Proficiency	72.0%	86.0%	80.5%	72.2%	8.3 pts
Grade 4 Reading Proficiency	66.7%	67.8%	67.3%	71.9%	-4.6 pts
Grade 5 Reading Proficiency	68.4%	60.7%	64.3%	62.1%	2.2 pts
Grade 6 Reading Proficiency	74.2%	75.0%	74.7%	70.6%	4.1 pts
Grade 7 Reading Proficiency	68.6%	83.7%	77.4%	71.4%	6.0 pts
Grade 8 Reading Proficiency	72.7%	68.2%	69.9%	73.9%	-4.0 pts
Grade 11 Reading Proficiency	38.9%	73.0%	56.8%	68.0%	-11.2 pts
<b>Math Proficiency Levels (2005-06)</b>					
Grade 3 Math Proficiency	85.0%	95.0%	91.1%	87.0%	4.1 pts
Grade 4 Math Proficiency	62.1%	76.7%	70.5%	80.0%	-9.5 pts
Grade 5 Math Proficiency	72.6%	74.1%	73.4%	68.9%	4.5 pts
Grade 6 Math Proficiency	66.7%	78.0%	73.5%	72.3%	1.2 pts
Grade 7 Math Proficiency	79.7%	80.6%	80.2%	70.1%	10.2 pts
Grade 8 Math Proficiency	73.1%	60.0%	65.0%	64.7%	0.3 pts
Grade 11 Math Proficiency	42.3%	55.0%	49.0%	53.0%	-4.1 pts
<b>Enrollment Characteristics (2003-04)</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	31.1%	25.2%	27.6%	26.6%	1.0 pts
Students with Disabilities	14.4%	14.8%	14.6%	14.4%	0.3 pts