


Flowing Wells Unified School District

Pima County
 Efficiency peer groups 3 and T-1, Achievement peer group 6
 Legislative district(s): 3, 9, and 11

District size, location: Medium-large, Suburb
 Students attending: 5,440
 Number of schools: 9

OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY

Spending by operational area



Efficiency measures relative to peer averages

Operational area	Measure	District	Peer average	State average
Administration	Cost per pupil	\$812	\$780	\$780
	Students per administrative position	72	68	67
Plant operations	Cost per square foot	\$7.05	\$5.87	\$6.09
	Square footage per student	145	160	153
Food service	Cost per meal equivalent	\$2.76	\$2.92	\$2.79
Transportation	Cost per mile	\$5.57	\$6.37	\$3.66
	Cost per rider	\$920	\$837	\$1,071

Very low Low Comparable High Very high

Per pupil spending


Spending by area	District		Peer average	State average
	2014	2015	2015	2015
Instruction	\$ 3,864	\$ 4,060	\$ 3,812	\$ 4,105
Administration	785	812	780	780
Plant operations	1,016	1,023	928	930
Food service	438	445	322	417
Transportation	279	270	412	371
Student support	578	599	553	613
Instruction support	314	286	304	442
Total operational	\$ 7,274	\$ 7,495	\$ 7,111	\$ 7,658
Land and buildings	\$ 270	\$ 233	\$ 676	\$ 641
Equipment	142	207	499	383
Interest	180	167	225	225
Other	5	6	145	150
Total nonoperational	\$ 597	\$ 613	\$ 1,545	\$ 1,399
Total per pupil spending	\$ 7,871	\$ 8,108	\$ 8,656	\$ 9,057

STUDENT AND TEACHER MEASURES, FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT, AND REVENUE

Student and teacher measures

Measure	District	Peer average	State average
Attendance rate	95%	93%	94%
Graduation rate (2014)	84%	80%	76%
Poverty rate (2014)	33%	31%	23%
Students per teacher	18.5	15.8	18.6
Average teacher salary	\$44,275	\$42,614	\$46,008
Average years of teacher experience	11.3	12.4	11.0
Percentage of teachers in first 3 years	23%	20%	20%

Students who met state standards



Financial stress assessment

Overall financial stress level: **Low**

Measure: 2013 through 2015

Measure	Assessment
Change in number of district students	Steady
Spending exceeded operating/capital budgets	No overspending
Spending increase election results	Voter-approved
Operating reserve percentage (max. 4%), trend	3.9%, Steady
Years of capital reserve held	More than 3 years
Current financial and internal control status	Compliant

Low Moderate High

Per pupil revenues

Revenues by source	District		Peer average	State average
	2014	2015	2015	2015
Federal	\$ 1,305	\$ 1,356	\$ 771	\$ 1,299
State	3,404	3,443	2,873	3,517
Local	3,108	3,079	4,889	4,248
Total revenues per pupil	\$ 7,817	\$ 7,878	\$ 8,533	\$ 9,064
Select revenues from common sources				
Equalization formula funding	\$ 4,934	\$ 4,688	\$ 5,412	\$ 5,303
Grants	1,372	1,442	798	1,167
Donations and tax credits	83	84	127	78
Select revenues from less common sources				
Desegregation	\$ 0	\$ 0	1 of 15	
Small school adjustment	0	0	0 of 15	
Federal impact aid	0	0	3 of 15	
Voter-approved levy increases	804	761	14 of 15	

Flowing Wells USD—page 2

Classroom dollar percentage

Year:	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Percentage:	57.8	59.4	59.7	60.6	60.7	60.0	59.0	57.7	58.4	54.8	53.2	51.9	52.3	53.1	54.2


OPERATIONAL TRENDS

Fiscal years as indicated


5-year spending trend (2010 through 2015)

Total operational spending per pupil, adjusted for inflation, decreased by 7 percent. The percentage of dollars spent in the classroom varied year to year, decreasing overall from 54.8 to 54.2 percent. As a percentage of total operational spending, administration increased and instruction support decreased, while plant operations decreased slightly. Other nonclassroom areas remained fairly stable.


Administrative cost per student




Total operational and instructional spending per student (inflation adjusted to 2015 dollars)




Plant cost per square foot and square footage per student




Changes in operational spending percentages



Food service cost per meal



Students attending



Transportation costs per mile and per rider

