Deer Valley Unified School District

Maricopa County

Efficiency peer groups 1 and T-4, Achievement peer group 2

OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY


Legislative district(s): 1, 15, 20, and 22

District size, location: Very large, Suburb

Students attending: Number of schools: 32,889 38

State

STUDENT AND TEACHER MEASURES.



Efficiency measures relative to peer averages

| Operational | Manager | Diet | ! | Peer | State | |
|----------------|------------------------------------|----------|------|---------|-----------|--|
| area | Measure | Dist | rict | average | average | |
| | Cost per pupil | \$ | 689 | \$673 | \$806 | |
| Administration | Students per administrative pos | sition | 88 | 80 | 67 | |
| Plant | Cost per square f | oot \$5 | 5.82 | \$5.86 | \$6.10 | |
| operations | Square footage postudent | er | 138 | 147 | 154 | |
| Food service | Cost per meal | \$2 | 2.41 | \$2.73 | \$2.81 | |
| Transportation | Cost per mile | \$4 | 1.34 | \$3.58 | \$3.72 | |
| Transportation | Cost per rider | \$1, | 104 | \$1,168 | \$1,092 | |
| Very low | Low Co | mparable | | Hiah | Verv hiah | |

Per pupil spending


| | | | | | | Peer | State | | |
|--------------------------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----|--------|---------|-------|--|
| | | Di | istri | ct | a١ | verage | average | | |
| Spending by area | 2015 2016 | | | | | 2016 | 2016 | | |
| Instruction | \$ | 4,268 | \$ | 4,022 | \$ | 4,121 | \$ | 4,145 | |
| Administration | | 595 | | 689 | | 673 | | 806 | |
| Plant operations | | 720 | | 805 | | 859 | | 939 | |
| Food service | | 299 | | 288 | | 329 | | 415 | |
| Transportation | | 313 | | 289 | | 341 | | 364 | |
| Student support | | 506 | | 514 | | 639 | | 633 | |
| Instruction support | | 331 | | 273 | | 369 | | 444 | |
| Total operational | \$ | 7,032 | \$ | 6,880 | \$ | 7,331 | \$ | 7,746 | |
| Land and buildings | \$ | 1,087 | \$ | 485 | \$ | 396 | \$ | 621 | |
| Equipment | | 355 | | 278 | | 369 | | 400 | |
| Interest | | 171 | | 152 | | 247 | | 216 | |
| Other | | 301 | | 218 | | 194 | | 153 | |
| Total nonoperational | \$ | 1,914 | \$ | 1,133 | \$ | 1,206 | \$ | 1,390 | |
| Total per pupil spending | \$ | 8,946 | \$ | 8,013 | \$ | 8,537 | \$ | 9,136 | |

Student and teacher measures

| | | Peer | State |
|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Measure | District | average | average |
| Attendance rate (2015) | 95% | 94% | 94% |
| Graduation rate (2015) | 95% | 90% | 78% |
| Poverty rate (2015) | 11% | 14% | 23% |
| Students per teacher | 18.0 | 18.6 | 18.6 |
| Average teacher salary | \$44,712 | \$44,519 | \$46,384 |
| Amount from Proposition 301 | \$5,008 | \$5,402 | \$5,315 |
| Average years of teacher experience | 11.8 | 10.8 | 11.0 |
| Percentage of teachers in first 3 years | 17% | 21% | 20% |

FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT, AND REVENUES

Students who passed state assessments



Financial stress assessment

| Overall financial stress level: Low | I |
|---|-----------------|
| Measure: 2014 through 2016 | Assessment |
| Change in number of district students | Steady |
| Spending exceeded operating/capital budgets | No overspending |
| Spending increase election results | Voter-approved |
| Operating reserve percentage, Trend | 2.3%, Varying |
| Years of capital reserve held | 1 to 3 years |
| Current financial and internal control status | Compliant |
| | |

Per pupil revenues

| | | | | | 1 001 | Otato | |
|-----------|-------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| District | | | | a١ | verage | average | |
| 2015 2016 | | | 2016 | | 2016 | | |
| \$ | 622 | \$ | 670 | \$ | 838 | \$ | 1,301 |
| | 3,032 | | 3,207 | | 3,389 | | 3,780 |
| | 4,483 | | 4,465 | | 5,025 | | 4,268 |
| \$ | 8,137 | \$ | 8,342 | \$ | 9,252 | \$ | 9,349 |
| | Ť | 2015 \$ 622 3,032 | 2015 \$ 622 \$ 3,032 4,483 | 2015 2016 \$ 622 \$ 670 3,032 3,207 4,483 4,465 | District 2015 2016 \$ 622 | 2015 2016 2016 \$ 622 \$ 670 \$ 838 3,032 3,207 3,389 4,483 4,465 5,025 | District average 2016 average 2016 \$ 622 \$ 670 \$ 838 \$ 3,032 3,207 3,389 \$ 4,483 5,025 \$ 5,025 |

| Select revenues from common sources | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|
| Equalization formula funding | \$ | 4,976 | \$ | 5,138 | \$ | 5,384 | \$ | 5,471 |
| O | | 0.44 | | 000 | | 054 | | 4 400 |

| Select revenues from less co | Number o | • | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-----|-----|-------|
| Grants Donations and tax credits | 641 | 686 | 854 | 1,182 |
| | 61 | 82 | 94 | 86 |

| Select revenues from less co | receiving | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-----|---------|----------|--|
| Desegregation | \$ | 0 | \$ 0 | 4 of 10 | |
| Small school adjustment | | 0 | 0 | 0 of 10 | |
| Federal impact aid | | 0 | 0 | 2 of 10 | |
| Voter-approved levy increases | 1,3 | 394 | 1,311 | 10 of 10 | |

Arizona Auditor General

Arizona School District Spending—Fiscal Year 2016 | March 2017 | Report 17-204

Deer Valley USD—page 2

Classroom dollar percentage


2001 Year: 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Percentage: 61.6 62.8 61.9 61.2 61.5 60.6 59.6 58.9 58.6 58.5 62.2 60.5 60.6 58.3 60.7

OPERATIONAL TRENDS Fiscal years as indicated


5-year spending trend (2011 through 2016)

Total operational spending per pupil, adjusted for inflation, decreased by 4 percent. The percentage of dollars spent in the classroom varied year to year, decreasing overall from 59.6 to 58.5 percent. As a percentage of total operational spending, administration increased overall, while most other nonclassroom areas remained fairly stable.


Total operational and instructional spending per pupil (inflation adjusted to 2016 dollars)




Changes in operational spending percentages




Students attending




Administrative cost per pupil




Plant cost per square foot and square footage per student



Food service cost per meal



Transportation costs per mile and per rider



Arizona Auditor General