Peoria Unified School District

Maricopa County

Efficiency peer groups 1 and T-5, Achievement peer group 2

Legislative district(s): 20, 21, 22 and 29


District size / location: Students attending: Number of schools: Very large, Suburb 35,058

40

OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY

Spending by operational area

Nonclassroom dollars



5-year spending trend

Total spending per pupil increased by 2 percent. Spending in the classroom varied year to year, decreasing overall from 59.6 to 57.6 percent. Spending on administration increased, while spending on other nonclassroom areas remained stable.

Cost measures relative to peer averages

Operational	erational			State
area	Measure	District	average	average
Administration	Cost per pupil	\$596	\$620	\$736
	Students per administrator	79	79	66
Plant	Cost per square foot	\$5.93	\$5.88	\$6.09
operations	Square footage per student	134	144	152
Food service	Cost per meal equivalent	\$2.47	\$2.46	\$2.47
Transportation	Cost per mile	\$3.02	\$3.54	\$3.50
	Cost per rider	\$1,031	\$1,372	\$982
Very low	Low Comparab	le Hiç	gh V	ery high


Per-pupil spending by operational area

		Peer	State	inational
District		average	average	average
2011	2012	2012	2012	2010
\$6,773	\$6,814	\$7,111	\$7,475	\$10,652
3,872	3,924	4,052	4,053	6,526
2,901	2,890	3,059	3,422	4,126
591	596	620	736	1,139
761	795	843	928	1,012
308	284	321	382	405
234	226	340	362	443
627	628	567	578	592
380	361	368	436	535
	2011 \$6,773 3,872 2,901 591 761 308 234 627	2011 2012 \$6,773 \$6,814 3,872 3,924 2,901 2,890 591 596 761 795 308 284 234 226 627 628	District average 2011 2012 2012 \$6,773 \$6,814 \$7,111 3,872 3,924 4,052 2,901 2,890 3,059 591 596 620 761 795 843 308 284 321 234 226 340 627 628 567	District average average 2011 2012 2012 2012 \$6,773 \$6,814 \$7,111 \$7,475 3,872 3,924 4,052 4,053 2,901 2,890 3,059 3,422 591 596 620 736 761 795 843 928 308 284 321 382 234 226 340 362 627 628 567 578


STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, TEACHER MEASURES, AND FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT

ADE-reported district and school letter grades

District grade:



Percentage of students who met state standards (AIMS)



Student and teacher measures

	Peer	State
District	average	average
96%	95%	94%
94%	90%	78%
15%	14%	25%
17.6	18.0	18.1
\$43,611	\$45,087	\$45,193
\$2,247	\$3,095	\$3,195
9.6	10.9	11.0
22%	14%	16%
	96% 94% 15% 17.6 \$43,611 \$2,247 9.6	District average 96% 95% 94% 90% 15% 14% 17.6 18.0 \$43,611 \$45,087 \$2,247 \$3,095 9.6 10.9

Financial stress assessment

Overall financial stre	ess level: Mo	derate	
Measure: 2010 through		Assessment	
Number of students attending			Moderate decrease
Spending exceeded operating/capital budgets			No overspending
Spending increase election results			Voter-approved
Operating reserve percentage (max. 4%), trend			0.4%, Decreasing
Years of capital reserve held			1 to 3 years
Current financial and internal control status			Compliant
Stress level			
Low	Moderate	ż	High

Office of the Auditor General

FY2012 page 151