

## Public Funding Disparities Between Charters and Districts, 2006-07

Disparity	State	District PPR Weighted for Charter		State Disparity	Funding Disparity as a Percent of District PPR
		Enrollment*	Charter PPR		
Moderate	New Mexico	\$9,628	\$9,084	(\$544)	-5.7%
	South Carolina (est.***)	\$9,164	\$8,396	(\$768)	-8.4%
	Minnesota	\$12,185	\$10,953	(\$1,232)	-10.1%
	Texas	\$9,432	\$8,423	(\$1,009)	-10.7%
	North Carolina	\$8,452	\$7,520	(\$932)	-11.0%
	Indiana	\$8,644	\$7,662	(\$982)	-11.4%
	Wisconsin (est.***)	\$12,901	\$10,422	(\$2,479)	-19.2%
Large	Illinois	\$11,121	\$8,974	(\$2,147)	-19.3%
	Idaho	\$10,780	\$8,653	(\$2,127)	-19.7%
	Pennsylvania	\$12,405	\$9,864	(\$2,541)	-20.5%
	Connecticut	\$16,477	\$12,631	(\$3,846)	-23.3%
	Ohio	\$10,421	\$7,914	(\$2,507)	-24.1%
	Colorado	\$9,576	\$7,117	(\$2,459)	-25.7%
	Idaho	\$7,672	\$5,693	(\$1,979)	-25.8%
	Florida	\$10,320	\$7,637	(\$2,683)	-26.0%
	Arizona	\$9,572	\$7,060	(\$2,512)	-26.2%
	Massachusetts	\$15,349	\$11,292	(\$4,057)	-26.4%
	Georgia	\$11,487	\$8,293	(\$3,194)	-27.8%
Severe	Missouri**	\$13,389	\$9,601	(\$3,788)	-28.3%
	Delaware	\$13,293	\$8,705	(\$4,588)	-34.5%
	New Jersey	\$19,056	\$12,379	(\$6,677)	-35.0%
	California	\$9,614	\$6,114	(\$3,500)	-36.4%
	New York	\$19,694	\$11,917	(\$7,777)	-39.5%
	Washington, D.C.	\$29,259	\$15,785	(\$13,474)	-46.1%
	Louisiana****	\$29,489	\$9,305	(\$20,184)	-68.4%
<b>Average*</b> <b>(Weighted for Charter Enrollment)</b>		<b>\$11,097</b>	<b>\$8,171</b>	<b>(\$2,927)</b>	<b>-26.4%</b>

\* Since the data do not allow us to identify the district of residence for every charter school, it was not possible to weight every district by its charter enrollment. We therefore weighted the district PPR by charter enrollment only in focus districts and "all other districts." Full details on this calculation appear in the methodology.

\*\* In South Carolina and Wisconsin, we were unable to obtain statewide data on charter and / or district revenues. In those states, we used data from large districts as a proxy. Full details on this calculation appear in the methodology and that state chapters..

\*\*\* Includes just Kansas City and St. Louis

\*\*\*\* Louisiana is a poor point of comparison for the rest of the country with respect to school funding in 2006-07 because that was the first year the state re-opened schools after Hurricane Katrina. We therefore excluded Louisiana from the national average.

\*\*\*\*\* Data for Connecticut did not change. Indeterminate dollars for charter schools in Connecticut represents a combination of Other revenue and in-kind services from school districts. We could not verify how much of Indeterminate represented in-kind, therefore, all the dollars remained in the analysis.