



## School District Consolidation Study in 10 Michigan Counties

Is district consolidation cost effective?  
What is the alternative to consolidation?

Education Policy Center at Michigan State University  
Working Paper #15

Sharif M. Shakrani, Ph.D.  
Michigan State University

*The content of this paper does not necessarily reflect  
the views of the Education Policy Center or Michigan State University.*



The Education Policy Center  
at Michigan State University

MICHIGAN STATE  
UNIVERSITY

# School District Consolidation Study In 10 Michigan Counties

Is district consolidation cost effective?  
What is the alternative to consolidation?

Sharif M. Shakrani, Ph. D.  
Professor of Measurement & Quantitative Methods

Revised, September 3, 2010

## **Preamble**

The original paper was written as a newspaper article for Booth Newspaper in Michigan to estimate savings at the local district level from two administrative options: school district consolidation at the county level, and coordination of services between districts. For the inclusion of the paper on The Education Policy Center at MSU website (EPC.MSU.EDU), we have added relevant citations and references from public organizations such as the Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) Digests and the Pew Charitable Trust publication (Stateline.org). Also, we have added additional references related to district consolidations in the United States.

This study is based and builds on the research publication (Working Paper No. 33) “Does School District Consolidation Cut Costs?” written by William D. Duncombe and John M. Yinger of The Center for Policy Research at The Maxwell School, Syracuse University, and published in January 2001.

This study was funded by the Booth Newspapers of Michigan. The content of the report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Education Policy Center or of Michigan State University.

## **School District Consolidation Study In 10 Michigan Counties**

### **Introduction**

As Duncomb and Yinger (2001) have stated, “School consolidation represents the most dramatic change in education governance and management in the United States in the twentieth century. Over 100,000 school districts have been eliminated through consolidation since 1938, a drop of almost 90 percent (NCES 1999, Table 90). This longstanding trend continues throughout the country, largely because consolidation is widely regarded as a way for school districts to cut costs” (p. 1). The study described in the present paper applies Duncomb and Yinger’s methods to Michigan data, looking as possible to financial consequences of consolidation of school districts at the county level. Research data sets for ten counties in Michigan, are used to estimate cost-saving effects of consolidation, as in the Duncombe and Yinger study. The study does not address the impact of consolidation on student achievement, graduation rates, student and staff mobility rates, or the attitudes and perception of students, parents and the community toward consolidation.

In Michigan, the largest number of school district consolidations occurred in the two decades following World War II, during a time of economic prosperity, increasing urbanization and growing student enrollment. The number of school districts decreased from about 7,300 to about 4,900.

A second, smaller wave of consolidation occurred in the 1970’s when inflation was rampant, enrollment declining, and suburban areas were growing in population. The number of school districts decreased from about 4,900 to roughly 600 during that period. The number of public school districts or “Local Educational Agencies” (LEAs), as they are often called, held steady at about 550 between 1970 and 2010.

The district consolidations, annexation, and dissolutions in Michigan were due to public policy acts such as The 1917 Rural Agricultural School Act, the 1944 Michigan Public Education Study Commission recommendations, and The School District Reorganization Act of 1964. However, in 1994, the establishment of Public School Academies (PSAs) or charter schools in Michigan brought about an increase in the number of “school districts” in the state because in Michigan PSAs are considered school districts. In 1994, there were 33 charter schools. The number of charter schools has increased steadily over the years, and as of July 2010 Michigan has 240 charter schools. For this study, charter schools are not considered for potential inclusion in school district consolidation since they are intended to function independently of the school districts in their geographic proximity.

## Historical Perspective of Education in Michigan Public Schools

Year	Number of School Districts	Number of Pupils
1880	6,352	362,196
1915	7,337	598,159
1950	4,918	1,043,566
1965	1,227	1,917,890
1994	572	N/A
2010*	551*	1,757,604

- \* In addition, Michigan has 57 “Intermediate School Districts” which are a county or a regional service area.
- Starting in 1994, Michigan authorized the establishment of Charter Schools, also called “Public School Academies”. These schools are referred to as “districts”. In July 2010, there were 240 such “districts”.
- The Charter Schools would not be considered as part of any consolidation, but can participate in cooperative agreements with other schools for services.

### **School District Consolidation in Michigan and Across the Nation**

The number of school districts relative to enrollment varies greatly across individual states. Hawaii, for example, has one state-wide school district. Many states, like Maryland, Virginia and Florida, have county-wide districts. Texas has the largest number of districts with 1,040. With 551 local school districts, 57 intermediate school districts (which function as service agencies for schools at the county or regional level), Michigan has the 5<sup>th</sup> largest number of school districts in the nation. Only California, Illinois, New York, and Texas have more school districts than Michigan.

Enrollment variance across school districts in Michigan makes “average enrollment” quite misleading. For example, in 2009, the mean enrollment of a school district in Michigan was 2,972, but half of the districts had fewer than 1,500 students and three-quarters of the districts had fewer than 2,800 students. Ninety percent of the school districts in Michigan have fewer than 6,300 students (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). These statistics clearly indicate that the majority of school districts in Michigan are relatively small in size while a few districts in large cities and urban areas have student population in excess of 10,000 students.

The state of Indiana is undergoing an interesting reform effort related to consolidation. The Indiana Commission on Local Government Reform has called for school districts to be reorganized so that all have a minimum student population of 2,000. The Commission recommendations would also require that all purchasing be done through their ISD-like entity, unless additional savings through independent purchasing can be documented. Similar requirements applied in Michigan would impact more than 50 percent of the school districts in the state – those with less than 2,000 total student enrollments.

As Duncombe and Yinger noted in 2001, “the pace of school consolidation has slowed since the early 1970’s, [but] some states [New York, Maine, Indiana, New Jersey, and Vermont] still provide incentives to consolidate . . . , [including] separate programs designed to encourage school district ‘reorganization,’

typically in the form of district consolidation” (p.1). In contrast, about 16 states use school aid formulas that compensate school districts for sparse enrollment or small size and thereby discourage consolidation.

### **Is Consolidation Cost Effective?**

Educational researchers and policy studies do not agree on the financial impact of consolidation. Some studies suggest that the current political emphasis on the consolidation of small or rural districts is misplaced, and estimate that the potential savings from consolidating small districts is about 10 times smaller than the potential savings from breaking up large districts of 100,000 or more students. Other studies show that the potential value of consolidating small or rural districts goes beyond cost savings and would likely result in improved curriculum and educational opportunities for students. School district consolidation is likely to remain a prominent item on the education policy agenda, particularly when school districts in Michigan are under increasing pressure to cut costs and raise student academic performance. The increased use of technology in general and the computer in particular – coupled with more emphasis on higher order learning in mathematics, science, technology, and communication skills – is likely to prompt additional district reorganization efforts especially for rural and small districts.

School district consolidation has been used extensively as a strategy to reduce fiscal cost of education and address the quality of curricular and instructional efficiency of small and rural school districts. However, there is little research-based evidence to prove that consolidation has solved the problems for which it has been intended – those of finance, staff reduction, facilities and curriculum improvement. The consolidation of school districts has several opposing arguments from a psychological or emotional perspective. District residents might see a loss of community identity if their children’s district consolidates with another. For longtime community members, there is a loss of history because they might have once attended schools in that district. Some worry the loss of a school district will have a negative impact on the local economy due to a reduction in the number of employees who spend a portion of their salaries in the local economy.

In Michigan, most school districts abhor consolidation and resist any efforts in that direction. Communities often try to attract new residents and students (to increase revenue to their schools), attempt cost-cutting measures or suggest school closure. However, when and if consolidation talks begin, it can take years before school districts actually combine because consolidation in Michigan has a series of legal steps including the vote of all districts involved in the consolidation. Only two districts have consolidated in Michigan during the last 10 years. In 2003-04, Wakefield and Marenisco school districts in Gogebic County consolidated, due to very small enrollments in both districts totaling 340 students. A 2004 survey of Michigan citizens indicated that 47% of the adults favor consolidation of school districts in Michigan, while 53% prefer to keep their district within their local communities.

### **Considering Alternatives to Consolidation**

Given the resistance at the community level to consolidation of school districts, attention should be given to alternative strategies that could reduce costs and bring quality education to students living in rural or sparsely populated areas of the state of Michigan.

There are several alternatives to full school district consolidation that can help improve the quality of education while reducing cost. These alternatives are referred to generally as coordination of services.

Coordination of services among school districts basically entails two or more districts in close geographic proximity jointly sharing and providing services. The following are the major examples of coordination of services that are being applied in a few Michigan rural and small districts.

### **1. Coordination of Administrative Services**

Local boards of education can select a superintendent or other specialized administrators (curriculum, budget, transportation, special education) who spend their time in more than one district. In Michigan, administrative coordination has been formed around math and science centers, technology and technical education centers and materials, staff development, and education for students with special needs.

### **2. Program Coordination Across Districts**

An ERIC Digest summary of earlier research on consolidation (Rincones, 1988) describes key advantages of program coordination

Neighboring school districts may, on a formal or informal basis, agree to share personnel, programs, and equipment to provide needed services to students. Sharing allows school districts to remain separate while gaining additional curricular programs of higher quality. It also lets the community keep its own high schools and consequently its own identity and vitality. Through shared services, a comprehensive educational program can be made available even though the school is not very comprehensive in its offerings (Hanuske, 1983). Instructional materials, teachers, equipment, ancillary services, transportation, staff development, counseling services, special education, and vocational education can be shared.

Some of the advantages of sharing have been identified as follows (Hanuske, 1983):  
--Program offerings can be secured and often expanded. --A balanced faculty is maintained and the academic expertise increases. --It enables schools to comply with federal mandates. --Transportation facilities can be shared. --Expenditures can be decreased through joint purchasing. --It increases community cooperation and support, a sense of local autonomy, teacher retention, and school district stability. (p.3)

In Michigan, the 57 intermediate school districts (ISDs) should take a larger role in helping constituent districts organize these kinds of program and administrative coordination. The ISDs in most cases are mandated, approved and directed by the Michigan Department of Education to facilitate the sharing of services and resources among school districts. Some ISDs are very effective in the coordination of services, while others are rather passive in their support. The ISDs can and should provide the mechanism whereby constituent school districts can share services such as purchasing, warehousing and data processing, as well as the coordination of contractual services for transportation, food and building maintenance.

### **3. Voluntary Inter-District Coordination**

This is a voluntary arrangement made by two or more districts to share services, programs, or resources. The less formalized structure of this voluntary agreement enables school districts to maintain their identity and autonomy. One district may take a lead on the coordination of a particular service such as transportation or data processing, while another district may coordinate food services or special education programs. This form of coordination differs from ISD coordination in that resources and services are shifted from district to district instead of a central location.

The advent of educational technology and distance learning comprises an alternative strategy for offering instruction. Education technology makes it possible for small schools to have access to a broader range of information and curricular offerings, so that learning opportunities can be expanded without the need for consolidation. The use of expensive equipment such as microwaves, satellites, fiber optics, and audio-video teleconferences make coordination of services at the ISD level more cost efficient and easier to manage.

The different alternative coordination of services described above is being used effectively in a few districts in Michigan. They are available for local school boards and school administrators to use to solve problems of rural and small school districts without resorting to full scale consolidation between districts or at the county level. These alternative approaches enable communities to retain the advantages of smallness while providing quality education for their students at a manageable cost.

#### **Economy of Scale**

This study empirically tests the notion that consolidating school districts at the county level will save money and reduce operational costs of schools. Research studies from across the country utilized mathematical modeling and statistical analyses to study the relationship between district size, per pupil expenditures, cost of services, and administrative, instructional and operational costs. The mathematical models developed by research studies across the nation clearly indicate that the savings are derived from the economic principle of “economy of scale,” which basically refers to “the relationship between per-pupil expenditure and enrollment, after accounting for other factors that might influence spending. . . . The conventional wisdom is that consolidating small districts (in terms of enrollment), particularly those in rural areas, can result in significant cost savings” (Duncomb & Yinger, 2001, p. 3). For example, “[l]arge districts may be able to take advantage of the price benefits of scale by negotiating bulk purchases of supplies and equipment” (Duncomb & Yinger, 2001, p. 4). Larger districts can make more efficient use of communication systems, data processing, and budget management, or make effective use of specialized facilities, such as science or computers and advanced technology laboratories.

#### **Mathematical Model to Predict Cost Savings**

Consolidation of school districts is considered as a way to improve school districts efficiency. This study evaluates the potential cost impacts of 10 county-wide consolidations in Michigan. The actual data for these counties and their constituent districts are derived from the 2009 state and national data provided by Michigan’s Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) and the National Center for

Education Statistics (NCES), respectively. Holding student performance constant, the study does not consider outcome variables such as student achievement on standardized tests, graduation rates, drop-out rates, teacher retention rates, and parental and community involvements in school activities.

This study relied on the mathematical model developed by William Duncombe and John Yinger (2001). The mathematical model predicts that consolidation of rural, small and medium size districts will produce savings of the following amounts after three years of consolidation:

- 8% of the Operating Cost,
- 4% of the Instructional Support Cost,
- 15% of the Administrative Cost, and
- 18% of the Transportation Cost.

While these savings percentages may not apply equally to all size districts, the average numbers may overestimate the savings for school districts with 10,000 or more students and underestimate the savings for districts with 1,500 or less students.

The cost savings for the alternative approach to consolidation, the coordination of services, considered only the savings produced by Operation Costs (8%) and Transportation Costs (18%). The general mathematical formulas used in this study were:

1. County Level Consolidation Cost Savings =
  - 0.08 (Operations and Maintenance Total – Column L)
  - + 0.04 (Instructional Support Total – Column B)
  - + 0.15 (Central Administration Total – Column J)
  - + 0.18 (Transportation Total – [N – (B + J + L)])
2. Coordination of Services Cost Savings =
  - 0.08 (Operations and Maintenance Total – Column L)
  - + 0.18 (Transportation Costs)

The attached tables, one for each of the 10 counties studied, show the baseline financial, student and staff, and per pupil expenditures for the school year 2008-2009 as well as the estimated savings for the consolidation and coordination of services options.

## **Conclusion**

It appears that significant savings can be achieved in consolidating school districts at the county level. The coordination of services also produces cost savings for the districts assuming participation in a county level (ISD) coordination of services. These findings are consistent with other research studies in New York and Indiana. However, consolidation studies conducted in Arizona and New Jersey indicated that the fiscal savings hoped for did not materialize to the extent expected. Overall, consolidation seems to make fiscal sense, particularly in rural and small districts. The coordination of services seems more palatable to Michigan communities and also produces significant reduction in cost of services such as transportation and operation. The results of this study should be of interest to state and local elected officials, to state education agency staff, and to public school administrators.

As the economy of the state declined in the past few years, so did state funds for education, and schools were forced to make cuts or reduce the quality of services. State and local boards of education, operating under pressure to run schools efficiently and meet national and state performance goals, must consider administrative options such as consolidation or the coordination of services to reduce operating costs and improve the quality of education for all students.

## ***ADDENDUM***

### **The Future of School Districts Consolidation in Michigan**

Additional information on the national discussion about consolidation was summarized in a recent article by Maynard (2010), which we quote here at length:

Brookings and the National Governors Association are among the national groups that have begun encouraging states to take a serious look at some form of school consolidation as a way to offset funding cuts to K-12 education and to keep as much money as possible in the classroom. “We are in such a financial crisis in this country that we can't afford to worry anymore about some of these considerations that in light of the financial situation appear minor,” says John Thomasian, director of the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. “Now that we are in such a clear and long-run fiscal climate of austerity, issues like school district consolidation have to be taken straight on.”

But savings in school administration have been difficult for states to achieve because of the limited control the states have over how school districts spend their money. According to an October 2009 survey by the American Association of School Administrators, more districts have cut core subject teachers to cope with budget cuts than have cut central office or administration personnel. For the current school year, 42 percent of the districts surveyed reported cutting core subject teachers, while 32 percent reported cutting administrative personnel. Next year, 36 percent of districts plan to cut additional core subject teachers, while only 20 percent plan to cut central office or administration personnel.

Even advocates of consolidation, such as Thomasian and Bradley, acknowledge that the savings potential of these initiatives can be somewhat unclear. When states such as Maine pair significant cuts with massive reorganization plans, it can be difficult to tell savings from outright cuts. “States don't go into budget cutting as a clinical test,” says Thomasian. “We don't have control groups, so a lot of it gets mixed together. That's why a lot of the research to date on school district consolidation has been mixed.”

States can approach school district consolidation in a number of different ways—using carrots, sticks or changing funding formulas to encourage rural districts to consolidate. (Maynard, 2010)

It would seem that without state level legislation, it is not likely that local districts in Michigan will consider consolidation at any level in the near future.

## **Impact of School District Consolidation on Student Achievement**

Research studies on the relationship school district consolidation and student achievement suggests that no consensus exists. Some recent research on student performance at the school (not district) level indicates that “small may be beautiful.” Small high schools have evident advantage for achievement, at least among disadvantaged students. Although they are controversial, performance measures, such as achievement data in math, science, reading, and writing, or graduation and drop-out rates, are available and reflect what parents and voters in a school district ultimately care about. But as is well recognized, student achievement is a function of school activities produced from purchased services (teachers, administrators, and instructional materials), but also of student, family and neighborhood socio-economic characteristics.

## **Impact of Consolidation at the County Level**

The model used in this study is designed to determine the impact of school district consolidation on costs, holding constant student performance and other factors such as staff salaries and “quality of education.” The model develops estimates based on district-specific cost factors for a specific year.

The study of the 10 counties finds that consolidation clearly cuts cost for small and rural districts in Michigan, the cost saving appears to be driven entirely by the economics of scale or size. Consolidation impacts the pattern of both operating and capital spending. We conclude that consolidation at the county level is likely to cut cost of general fund expenditures exclusive of capital outlay by about 8-11 percent. However, these percentages are averages for all districts in the counties. The saving may be significantly more for districts of less than 2000 students, and significantly less for districts with more than 10,000 students.

The Impact of consolidation on Transportation cost is rather complicated. Transportation is a service that impacts the estimate of saving from consolidation. School districts targeted for consolidation are often rural or with low student densities distributed over large geographic areas. As a result, more students qualify for busing which forces the districts to add more buses and longer routes. Consolidations often result in more efficient transportation operations by maximizing use of buses and scheduling of school operations.

Transportation and operational costs may be worth further investigation when outright consolidation is not practical due to other factors. Transportation and operational costs are more susceptible to the economy of scale factor.

However, in a countywide consolidation, research studies tell us that school bus travel time over 45 minutes should be avoided if at all possible. The use of natural gas fueling facilities should be utilized to power buses as a method of saving money that can find better use in the classroom to improve student learning, which is the primary purpose of schooling.

#### REFERENCES

Duncome, W., & Yinger, J. (2001). Does School District Consolidation Cut Costs? (Working Paper No. 33) Center for Policy Research, Syracuse, NY: Center for Policy Research, Syracuse University.

Hanuske, S. (1983). Shared services for rural and small schools. Las Cruces, NM: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ED 259 874)

Maynard, M. (2010). Still too many schools? Stateline.org. (Retrieved from <http://www.stateline.org/live/details/story?contentId=470554> )

Rincones, R. (1988) Exploring alternatives to consolidation. Las Cruces, NM: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ED 296 817)

## Estimated Cost Savings at the State Level from School District Consolidation or Coordination of Services

<b>The State of Michigan K-12 Public Education Expenditure<sup>i</sup></b>	
Types of Support	FY 08 Expenditures in Thousands of Dollars
Instruction Total	9,665,947
Instructional Support	2,087,801
General Administration Cost	1,337,231
Operation, Maintenance & Food	2,367,117
Transportation	769,771
Other Support Services	825,594

### Estimate of Potential Saving of Consolidation at the County Level

$$\begin{aligned}
 &8\% \text{ of } 2,367,117 + 4\% \text{ of } 2,087,801 + 15\% \text{ of } 1,337,231 + 18\% \text{ of } 769,771 = \\
 &189,369 \text{ (Operation + Food)} + 83,512 \text{ (Instructional Support)} + 200,584 \text{ (Administration)} \\
 &\quad + 138,558 \text{ (Transportation)} = \\
 &\$612,023 \text{ Total Estimated Savings at the State Level (In Thousands of \$)}
 \end{aligned}$$

### Estimated Saving from Statewide Level Coordination of Services at the County Level

$$\begin{aligned}
 &8\% \text{ of Operation/Maintenance, Food Service} + 18\% \text{ of Transportation Costs} \\
 &0.08 (2,367,117) + 0.18 (769,771) = \\
 &189,369 + 138,558 = \\
 &\$327,927 \text{ Total Estimated Savings from Coordinating Services at the State Level (In Thousands of \$)}
 \end{aligned}$$

<sup>i</sup> The National Center for Education Statistics, Current Expenditure by Function 2007-08 Fiscal Years, U.S. Dept. of Education; The Common Core of Data, Table 2, 2010.

---

## Additional References:

1. School Consolidation: The Benefits and Costs. Duncombe, W, and Yinger, J., The School Administrator, AASA, May 2010.
2. How the Economic Downturn Continues to Impact School Districts, By Ellerson, N & McCord, R., American Association of School Administrators, October 2009.
3. Why Does Michigan have over 700 School Districts? The Education Policy Center at MSU, May 2006, MSU.
4. Transportation Cost Changes with Statewide School District Consolidation, Hanley, Paul. Socio-Economic Planning Sciences, June 2007.
5. Donna Driscoll, Dennis Halcoussis, and Shirly Svorny, 2003. School District Size and Student Performance. Economics of Education Review (22)2.
6. Economics of Scale in Public Education: An Econometric Analysis. Chkvaborty, K., Biswas, B & Lewis, C. Contemporary Economic Policy, Vol. 18, 2000.
7. Economies of Scale for Large School Districts: A National Study, Robertson, Frank. The Social Science Journal, Vol. 44, Issue 4, 2007.

---

The data for the 10 Counties are attached below.

---

The data for the 10 Counties are attached below.

A- Per pupil Instructional Support-The cost of activities dealing directly with the teaching of students in the classroom or in a classroom situation. \*

B-Total instructional support- Column A times pupil count

C-Per pupil Basic Programs-The classroom costs related to basic instructional programs. This includes pre-school, elementary, middle and high school . These expenditures do not include capital outlay. The denominator for this category includes k-12 and special education pupils.\*

D-Basic Programs total Column C times pupil count\*

E- Per pupil Added Needs-The classroom costs of added needs instructional programs offered by the school. This includes special education, compensatory education, and vocational education. These expenditures do not include capital outlay. The denominator for this category includes k-12 and special education pupils\*

F- Added needs total-Column E times pupil count\*

G-Per pupil total Instruction- The total basic, added needs, and adult education classroom instructional costs. These expenditures do not include capital outlay.\*

H-Total Instruction- Column G times the pupil count\*

I-Per pupil Business and Administration-The total cost of general administration, school administration, business services, central services, and other support services. Non-capital facilities acquisition costs are included in this total. For fiscal year 1999-2000 and following, the source data breaks out the facility acquisition costs from other business services. These expenditures do not include capital outlay.\*

J- Business and Administration total- Column I times the pupil count\*

K- Per pupil Operations and Maintenance-The cost of those activities concerned with keeping the physical plant open, comfortable, and safe for use. These expenditures do not include capital outlay.\*

L-Operations and Maintenance Total- Column K times pupil count\*

M- Per pupil Total Support Services- -The total cost of support services. In addition to instructional support, business and administration, and operations and maintenance, the total includes transportation services. These expenditures do not include capital outlay\*

N-Total Support Services- Column M times the pupil count\*

O- Per pupil General Fund Expenditures- A descriptive heading under which are grouped all General Fund expenditure accounts reported by the school district. These activities include current operating expenditures, community services, debt service, capital outlay, and other transactions.\*

P-General Fund Expenditures- Column O times pupil count\*

Q- Pupil Count- number of students as of the fall count in 2009\*

R-# of students with a Disability- December count of number of students with a disability^

\*CEPI 1014 2008-2009 data

^CEPI 2008-2009 Students with Disabilities Data

&Information from district website

Legend (Shortened Version)

- A- Per Pupil Instructional Support
- B-Total Instructional Support
- C-Per Pupil Basic Programs
- D-Basic Programs Total
- E- Per Pupil Added Needs
- F- Added Needs Total
- G-Per Pupil Total Instruction
- H-Total District Instruction
- I-Per Pupil Business & Administration
- J- Business and Administration Total
- K- Per Pupil Operations and Maintenance
- L-Operations and Maintenance Total
- M- Per Pupil Total Support Services
- N-Total Support Services
- O- Per Pupil General Fund Expenditures
- P-General Fund Expenditures
- Q- District Pupil Count
- R-# of Students w/a Disability

School District Consolidation Study in 10 Michigan Counties June 2010

<b>Allegan County</b>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Plainwell Community Schools	623	1,792,371	4,140	11,910,780	791	2,275,707	4,895	14,082,915	867	2,494,359	861	2,477,097
Otsego Public Schools	656	1,479,280	4,100	9,245,500	671	1,513,105	4,767	10,749,585	1,412	3,184,060	985	2,221,175
Allegan Public Schools	710	2,060,420	3,975	11,535,450	880	2,553,760	4,722	13,703,244	858	2,489,916	877	2,545,054
Wayland Union Schools	789	2,328,339	3,939	11,623,989	806	2,378,506	4,744	13,999,544	973	2,871,323	790	2,331,290
Fennville Public Schools	537	816,777	3,405	5,179,005	1,596	2,427,516	4,870	7,407,270	1,026	1,560,546	1,100	1,673,100
Martin Public Schools	641	444,213	4,249	2,944,557	1,100	762,300	5,350	3,707,550	1,556	1,078,308	838	580,734
Hopkins Public Schools	510	803,250	4,153	6,540,975	569	896,175	4,722	7,437,150	1,204	1,896,300	916	1,442,700
Saugatuck Public Schools	879	747,150	5,287	4,493,950	704	598,400	5,990	5,091,500	1,663	1,413,550	810	688,500
Hamilton Community Schools	723	1,879,800	4,600	11,960,000	675	1,755,000	5,275	13,715,000	867	2,254,200	895	2,327,000
Glenn Public School District	101	2,525	5,536	138,400	882	22,050	6,418	160,450	1,228	30,700	950	23,750
Other additional ISD exp.		0		0		0		0		0		0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$6,169</b>	<b>\$12,354,125</b>	<b>\$43,384</b>	<b>\$75,572,606</b>	<b>\$8,674</b>	<b>\$15,182,519</b>	<b>\$51,753</b>	<b>\$90,054,208</b>	<b>\$11,654</b>	<b>\$19,273,262</b>	<b>\$9,022</b>	<b>\$16,310,400</b>

<b>Allegan County</b>	M	N	O	P	Q
Plainwell Community Schools	2,582	7,428,414	7,944	22,854,888	2,877
Otsego Public Schools	3,499	7,890,245	9,319	21,014,345	2,255
Allegan Public Schools	2,813	8,163,326	7,961	23,102,822	2,902
Wayland Union Schools	2,908	8,581,508	8,221	24,260,171	2,951
Fennville Public Schools	3,101	4,716,621	8,347	12,695,787	1,521
Martin Public Schools	3,387	2,347,191	8,903	6,169,779	693
Hopkins Public Schools	3,094	4,873,050	7,976	12,562,200	1,575
Saugatuck Public Schools	3,639	3,093,150	10,053	8,545,050	850
Hamilton Community Schools	3,017	7,844,200	8,809	22,903,400	2,600
Glenn Public School District	2,279	56,975	9,744	243,600	25
Other additional ISD exp.		0		0	149
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$30,319</b>	<b>\$54,994,680</b>	<b>\$87,277</b>	<b>\$154,352,042</b>	<b>18,398</b>

<b>Allegan County</b>	Operation	Instruction	Administration	Transportation	County Level Consolidation	Coordination of Services
Plainwell Community Schools	198168	71695	374154	119626	763642	317793
Otsego Public Schools	177694	59171	477609	181031	895506	358725
Allegan Public Schools	203604	82417	373487	192228	851737	395833
Wayland Union Schools	186503	93134	430698	189100	899435	375603
Fennville Public Schools	133848	32671	234082	119916	520517	253764
Martin Public Schools	46459	17769	161746	43908	269882	90367
Hopkins Public Schools	115416	32130	284445	131544	563535	246960
Saugatuck Public Schools	55080	29886	212033	43911	340910	98991
Hamilton Community Schools	186160	75192	338130	248976	848458	435136
Glenn Public School District	1900	101	4605	0	6606	1900
Other additional ISD exp.	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 1,304,832</b>	<b>\$ 494,165</b>	<b>\$ 2,890,989</b>	<b>\$ 1,270,241</b>	<b>\$ 5,960,227</b>	<b>\$ 2,575,073</b>

School District Consolidation Study in 10 Michigan Counties June 2010

<b>Bay County</b>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Bay City School District	683	6226911	4073	37133541	981	8943777	5042	45967914	945	8615565	889	8105013
Bangor Township Schools	490	1244600	3728	9469120	1156	2936240	4885	12407900	983	2496820	800	2032000
Essexville- Hampton Public Schools	479	921117	4420	8499660	814	1565322	5233	10063059	1056	2030688	857	1648011
Pinconning Area Schools	590	967600	4518	7409520	748	1226720	5285	8667400	1040	1705600	837	1372680
Bay County ISD		0				0						
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,242</b>	<b>\$ 9,360,228</b>	<b>\$ 16,739</b>	<b>\$ 62,511,841</b>	<b>\$ 3,699</b>	<b>\$ 14,672,059</b>	<b>\$ 20,445</b>	<b>\$ 77,106,273</b>	<b>\$ 4,024</b>	<b>\$ 14,848,673</b>	<b>\$ 3,383</b>	<b>\$ 13,157,704</b>

<b>Bay County</b>	M	N	O	P	Q
Bay City School District	2930	26712810	8557	78014169	9117
Bangor Township Schools	2746	6974840	7832	19893280	2540
Essexville- Hampton Public Schools	2585	4970955	8090	15557070	1923
Pinconning Area Schools	2950	4838000	8671	14220440	1640
Bay County ISD					
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 11,211</b>	<b>\$ 43,496,605</b>	<b>\$ 33,150</b>	<b>\$ 127,684,959</b>	<b>15220</b>

<b>Bay County</b>	Operation	Instruction	Administration	Transportation	County Level Consolidation	Coordination of Services
Bay City School District	648,401	249,076	1,292,335	677,758	2,867,570	1,326,159
Bangor Township Schools	162,560	49,784	374,523	216,256	803,123	378,816
Essexville- Hampton Public Schools	131,841	36,845	304,603	66,805	540,094	198,646
Pinconning Area Schools	109,814	38,704	255,840	142,582	546,940	252,396
Bay County ISD	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,052,616</b>	<b>\$ 374,409</b>	<b>\$ 2,227,301</b>	<b>\$ 1,103,400</b>	<b>\$ 4,757,726</b>	<b>\$ 2,156,016</b>

Genesee County	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Flint City School District	1870	26260410	4768	66957024	2536	35613048	7291	102387513	1630	22890090	1622	22777746
Grand Blanc Community Schools	787	6655659	3982	33675774	963	8144091	4946	41828322	794	6714858	1022	8643054
Mt. Morris Consolidated Schools	981	3057777	3725	11610825	1221	3805857	4777	14889909	1185	3693645	969	3020373
Goodrich Area Schools	470	1038700	4122	9109620	756	1670760	4878	10780380	953	2106130	784	1732640
Bendle Public Schools	1041	1718691	3395	5605145	917	1513967	5512	9100312	879	1451229	852	1406652
Genesee School District	364	293748	4297	3467679	1417	1143519	5714	4611198	1331	1074117	763	615741
Carman-Ainsworth Community Schools	1203	5853798	4639	22573374	1370	6666420	6009	29239794	1110	5401260	1020	4963320
Fenton Area Public Schools	927	3222252	4160	14460160	1128	3920928	5333	18537508	873	3034548	907	3152732
Kearsley Community Schools	968	3480928	4096	14729216	991	3563636	5087	18292852	927	3333492	724	2603504
Flushing Community Schools	738	3182994	4329	18670977	958	4131854	5295	22837335	765	3299445	789	3402957
Atherton Community Schools	532	524552	4254	4194444	1167	1150662	5421	5345106	1367	1347862	781	770066
Davison Community Schools	836	4562888	3961	21619138	806	4399148	4767	26018286	953	5201474	837	4568346
Clio Area School District	726	2495988	4035	13872330	971	3338298	5006	17210628	916	3149208	962	3307356
Swartz Creek Community Schools	899	3734446	4289	17816506	941	3908914	5230	21725420	939	3900606	800	3323200
Lake Fenton Community Schools	862	1531774	3978	7068906	886	1574422	4864	8643328	971	1725467	1058	1880066
Westwood Heights Schools	1098	1242936	4279	4843828	1283	1452356	5562	6296184	1423	1610836	1171	1325572
Bentley Community Schools	687	638910	4551	4232430	1057	983010	5608	5215440	1276	1186680	798	742140
Beecher Community School District	1606	2983948	4204	7811032	1508	2801864	5569	10347202	1098	2040084	1618	3006244
Linden Community Schools	747	2286567	4164	12746004	876	2681436	5040	15427440	1036	3171196	700	2142700
Montrose Community Schools	740	1188440	3896	6256976	1591	2555146	5488	8813728	1197	1922382	946	1519276
Lakeville Community Schools	819	1430793	3785	6612395	892	1558324	4677	8170719	957	1671879	930	1624710
Genesee ISD		0		0		0		0		0		0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 18,901</b>	<b>\$ 77,386,199</b>	<b>\$ 86,909</b>	<b>\$ 307,933,783</b>	<b>\$ 24,235</b>	<b>\$ 96,577,660</b>	<b>\$ 112,074</b>	<b>\$ 405,718,604</b>	<b>\$22,580</b>	<b>\$ 79,926,488</b>	<b>\$ 20,053</b>	<b>\$ 76,528,395</b>

Genesee County	M	N	O	P	Q
Flint City School District	5571	78233553	13421	188471103	14043
Grand Blanc Community Schools	2986	25252602	8553	72332721	8457
Mt. Morris Consolidated Schools	3424	10672608	8961	27931437	3117
Goodrich Area Schools	2591	5726110	7673	16957330	2210
Bendle Public Schools	2877	4749927	8879	14659229	1651
Genesee School District	2674	2157918	8718	7035426	807
Carman-Ainsworth Community Schools	3752	18257232	10152	49399632	4866
Fenton Area Public Schools	3025	10514900	8620	29963120	3476
Kearsley Community Schools	2942	10579432	8504	30580384	3596
Flushing Community Schools	2704	11662352	8204	35383852	4313
Atherton Community Schools	2981	2939266	8512	8392832	986
Davison Community Schools	2987	16303046	8212	44821096	5458
Clio Area School District	3159	10860642	8585	29515230	3438
Swartz Creek Community Schools	2946	12237684	8525	35412850	4154
Lake Fenton Community Schools	3256	5785912	8487	15081399	1777
Westwood Heights Schools	4090	4629880	9930	11240760	1132
Bentley Community Schools	3042	2829060	8846	8226780	930
Beecher Community School District	4574	8498492	10781	20031098	1858
Linden Community Schools	2937	8990157	8373	25629753	3061
Montrose Community Schools	3260	5235560	9522	15292332	1606
Lakeville Community Schools	3228	5639316	8288	14479136	1747
Genesee ISD		0		0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 69,006</b>	<b>\$261,755,649</b>	<b>\$ 189,746</b>	<b>\$ 700,837,500</b>	<b>72683</b>

<b>Genesee County</b>	Operation	Instruction	Administration	Transportation	County Level Consolidation	Coordination of Services
Flint City School District	1822220	1050416	3433514	1134955	7441105	2957175
Grand Blanc Community Schools	691444	266226	1007229	583026	2547925	1274470
Mt. Morris Consolidated Schools	241630	122311	554047	162146	1080134	403776
Goodrich Area Schools	138611	41548	315920	152755	648834	291366
Bendle Public Schools	112532	68748	217684	31204	430168	143736
Genesee School District	49259	11750	161118	31376	253503	80635
Carman-Ainsworth Community Schools	397066	234152	810189	366994	1808400	764059
Fenton Area Public Schools	252219	128890	455182	198966	1035257	451185
Kearsley Community Schools	208280	139237	500024	209071	1056613	417352
Flushing Community Schools	272237	127320	494917	319852	1214325	592089
Atherton Community Schools	61605	20982	202179	53421	338188	115027
Davison Community Schools	365468	182516	780221	354661	1682865	720129
Clio Area School District	264588	99840	472381	343456	1180265	608045
Swartz Creek Community Schools	265856	149378	585091	230298	1230623	496154
Lake Fenton Community Schools	150405	61271	258820	116749	587245	267154
Westwood Heights Schools	106046	49717	241625	81096	478485	187142
Bentley Community Schools	59371	25556	178002	47039	309969	106411
Beecher Community School District	240500	119358	306013	84279	750149	324778
Linden Community Schools	171416	91463	475679	250145	988703	421561
Montrose Community Schools	121542	47538	288357	108983	566420	230525
Lakeville Community Schools	129977	57232	250782	164148	602138	294125
Genesee ISD	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 6,122,272</b>	<b>\$ 3,095,448</b>	<b>\$ 11,988,973</b>	<b>\$ 5,024,622</b>	<b>\$ 26,231,315</b>	<b>\$ 11,146,894</b>

School District Consolidation Study in 10 Michigan Counties June 2010

<b>Jackson County</b>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Western School District	366	1048590	4122	11809530	1073	3074145	5201	14900865	1186	3397890	677	1939605
Vandercook Lake Public Schools	513	667926	4549	5922798	985	1282470	5534	7205268	992	1291584	771	1003842
Columbia School District	573	986706	4183	7203126	848	1460256	5033	8666826	991	1706502	827	1424094
Grass Lake Community Schools	320	407360	4518	5751414	529	673417	5047	6424831	959	1220807	1098	1397754
Concord Community Schools	530	488660	4196	3868712	1026	945972	5222	4814684	1090	1004980	793	731146
East Jackson Community Schools	511	681674	4178	5573452	1373	1831582	5551	7405034	929	1239286	1087	1450058
Hanover- Horton Schools	409	552150	4447	6003450	521	703350	4968	6706800	1005	1356750	694	936900
Michigan Center School District	600	843000	3821	5368505	1016	1427480	4837	6795985	1120	1573600	935	1313675
Napolean Community Schools	237	377067	4201	6683791	1243	1977613	5444	8661404	1198	1906018	679	1080289
Northwest Community Schools	454	1381068	3967	12067614	1424	4331808	5390	16396380	1089	3312738	814	2476188
Springport Public Schools	316	327060	4017	4157595	1142	1181970	5159	5339565	890	921150	988	1022580
Jackson Public Schools	1302	8293740	4842	30843540	1549	9867130	6391	40710670	1222	7784140	741	4720170
Jackson ISD		0		0		0						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 6,131</b>	<b>\$ 16,055,001</b>	<b>\$ 51,041</b>	<b>\$ 105,253,527</b>	<b>\$ 12,729</b>	<b>\$ 28,757,193</b>	<b>\$ 63,777</b>	<b>\$ 134,028,312</b>	<b>\$ 12,671</b>	<b>\$ 26,715,445</b>	<b>\$ 10,104</b>	<b>\$ 19,496,301</b>

<b>Jackson County</b>	M	N	O	P	Q
Western School District	2661	7623765	8192	23470080	2865
Vandercook Lake Public Schools	2387	3107874	8260	10754520	1302
Columbia School District	2795	4812990	8274	14247828	1722
Grass Lake Community Schools	2726	3470198	8448	10754304	1273
Concord Community Schools	2812	2592664	8306	7658132	922
East Jackson Community Schools	2847	3797898	8574	11437716	1334
Hanover- Horton Schools	2500	3375000	8042	10856700	1350
Michigan Center School District	2828	3973340	8357	11741585	1405
Napolean Community Schools	2477	3940907	8224	13084384	1591
Northwest Community Schools	2901	8824842	8622	26228124	3042
Springport Public Schools	2665	2758275	8230	8518050	1035
Jackson Public Schools	3768	24002160	10525	67044250	6370
Jackson ISD					
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 33,367</b>	<b>\$ 72,279,913</b>	<b>\$ 102,054</b>	<b>\$ 215,795,673</b>	<b>24211</b>

<b>Jackson County</b>	Operation	Instruction	Administration	Transportation	County Level Consolidation	Coordination of Services
Western School District	155168	41944	509684	222782	929578	377951
Vandercook Lake Public Schools	80307	26717	193738	26014	326776	106321
Columbia School District	113928	39468	255975	125224	534595	239151
Grass Lake Community Schools	111820	16294	183121	79970	391206	191790
Concord Community Schools	58492	19546	150747	66218	295003	124710
East Jackson Community Schools	116005	27267	185893	76838	406003	192843
Hanover- Horton Schools	74952	22086	203513	95256	395807	170208
Michigan Center School District	105094	33720	236040	43752	418606	148846
Napolean Community Schools	86423	15083	285903	103956	491364	190379
Northwest Community Schools	198095	55243	496911	297873	1048121	495968
Springport Public Schools	81806	13082	138173	87747	320809	169554
Jackson Public Schools	377614	331750	1167621	576740	2453724	954353
Jackson ISD	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 1,559,704</b>	<b>\$ 642,200</b>	<b>\$ 4,007,317</b>	<b>\$ 1,802,370</b>	<b>\$ 8,011,591</b>	<b>\$ 3,362,074</b>

School District Consolidation Study in 10 Michigan Counties June 2010

<b>Kalamazoo County</b>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Kalamazoo Public School District	1594	18857020	4944	58487520	1191	14089530	6085	71985550	1149	13592670	1006	11900980
Climax-Scotts Community Schools	623	417410	3933	2635110	789	528630	4536	3039120	1185	793950	880	589600
Comstock Public Schools	931	2140369	3979	9147721	1389	3193311	5408	12432992	1243	2857657	824	1894376
Galesburg-Augusta Community Schools	374	454410	4339	5271885	1386	1683990	5725	6955875	1091	1325565	1113	1352295
Gull Lake Community Schools	812	2285780	4366	12290290	604	1700260	4971	13993365	1172	3299180	932	2623580
Parchment School District	835	1492980	4254	7606152	820	1466160	5010	8957880	1298	2320824	907	1621716
Portage Public Schools	1099	9590973	4539	39611853	747	6519069	5269	45982563	911	7950297	869	7583763
Schoolcraft Community Schools	527	614482	4320	5037120	913	1064558	5233	6101678	1002	1168332	953	1111198
Vicksburg Community Schools	774	1989954	3956	10170876	888	2283048	4873	12528483	1086	2792106	839	2157069
Kalamazoo ISD												
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 7,569</b>	<b>\$ 37,843,378</b>	<b>\$ 38,630</b>	<b>\$ 150,258,527</b>	<b>\$ 8,727</b>	<b>\$ 32,528,556</b>	<b>\$ 47,110</b>	<b>\$ 181,977,506</b>	<b>\$ 10,137</b>	<b>\$ 36,100,581</b>	<b>\$ 8,323</b>	<b>\$ 30,834,577</b>

<b>Kalamazoo County</b>	M	N	O	P	Q
Kalamazoo Public School District	4239	50147370	10640	125871200	11830
Climax-Scotts Community Schools	3219	2156730	8196	5491320	670
Comstock Public Schools	3473	7984427	9337	21465763	2299
Galesburg-Augusta Community Schools	3132	3805380	9003	10938645	1215
Gull Lake Community Schools	3327	9365505	8864	24952160	2815
Parchment School District	3414	6104232	8909	15929292	1788
Portage Public Schools	3196	27891492	8904	77705208	8727
Schoolcraft Community Schools	2925	3410550	8750	10202500	1166
Vicksburg Community Schools	3212	8258052	8675	22303425	2571
Kalamazoo ISD					
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 30,137</b>	<b>\$ 119,123,738</b>	<b>\$ 81,278</b>	<b>\$ 314,859,513</b>	<b>33081</b>

<b>Kalamazoo County</b>	Operation	Instruction	Administration	Transportation	County Level Consolidation	Coordination of Services
Kalamazoo Public School District	952078	754281	2038901	1043406	4788666	1995484
Climax-Scotts Community Schools	47168	16696	119093	64039	246996	111207
Comstock Public Schools	151550	85615	428649	196565	862378	348115
Galesburg-Augusta Community Schools	108184	18176	198835	121160	446355	229343
Gull Lake Community Schools	209886	91431	494877	208254	1004448	418140
Parchment School District	129737	59719	348124	120368	657948	250105
Portage Public Schools	606701	383639	1192545	497963	2680847	1104664
Schoolcraft Community Schools	88896	24579	175250	92977	381702	181873
Vicksburg Community Schools	172566	79598	418816	237406	908386	409972
Kalamazoo ISD	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 2,466,766</b>	<b>\$ 1,513,735</b>	<b>\$ 5,415,087</b>	<b>\$ 2,582,136</b>	<b>\$ 11,977,725</b>	<b>\$ 5,048,903</b>

Kent County	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Grand Rapids Public Schools	1689	33264855	4008	78937560	1932	38050740	5887	115944465	1265	24914175	1119	22038705
Godwin Heights Public Schools	928	2309792	4311	10730079	1337	3327793	5735	14274415	936	2329704	1162	2892218
Northview Public School District	886	3009742	4385	14895845	1504	5109088	5902	20049094	1114	3784258	817	2775349
Wyoming Public Schools	1149	6502191	4636	26235124	1261	7135999	5809	32873131	1034	5851406	774	4380066
Byron Center Public Schools	718	2347142	4649	15197581	1011	3304959	5660	18502540	1056	3452064	1231	4024139
Caledonia Community Schools	343	1397725	4590	18704250	1132	4612900	5722	23317150	1148	4678100	1073	4372475
Cedar Springs Public Schools	690	2368080	4016	13782912	1247	4279704	5263	18062616	1117	3833544	702	2409264
Comstock Park Public Schools	737	1890405	4073	10447245	1203	3085695	5275	13530375	1113	2854845	763	1957095
East Grand Rapids Public Schools	1188	3530736	4798	14259656	633	1881276	5431	16140932	1172	3483184	1094	3251368
Forest Hills Public Schools	1023	10317978	5005	50480430	960	9682560	5965	60162990	938	9460668	925	9329550
Godfrey-Lee Public Schools	1115	1884350	4765	8052850	1615	2729350	6353	10736570	1115	1884350	670	1132300
Grandville Public Schools	822	4911450	4496	26863600	864	5162400	5361	32031975	881	5263975	877	5240075
Kelloggsville Public Schools	865	1979120	4521	10344048	1243	2843984	5764	13188032	1219	2789072	754	1725152
Kenowa Hills Public Schools	941	3313261	4371	15390291	1281	4510401	5652	19900692	1161	4087881	939	3306219
Kent City Community Schools	446	627968	4259	5996672	955	1344640	5214	7341312	1110	1562880	889	1251712
Kentwood Public Schools	988	8698352	4563	40172652	1556	13699024	6085	53572340	860	7571440	955	8407820
Lowell Area Schools	777	3033408	4017	15682368	942	3677568	4959	19359936	921	3595584	876	3419904
Rockford Public Schools	885	7198590	4415	35911610	885	7198590	5298	43093932	947	7702898	820	6669880
Sparta Area Schools	793	2354417	4226	12546994	1375	4082375	5380	15973220	932	2767108	579	1719051

Kent ISD  
**TOTAL**                                    \$    16,983    \$100,939,562    \$    84,104    \$424,631,767    \$    22,936    \$125,719,046    \$106,715    \$548,055,717    \$20,039    \$ 101,867,136    \$ 17,019    \$ 90,302,342

Kent County	M	N	O	P	Q
Grand Rapids Public Schools	4722	92999790	11007	216782865	19695
Godwin Heights Public Schools	3366	8377974	9371	23324419	2489
Northview Public School District	3198	10863606	9594	32590818	3397
Wyoming Public Schools	3475	19665025	9732	55073388	5659
Byron Center Public Schools	3600	11768400	9683	31653727	3269
Caledonia Community Schools	3109	12669175	8986	36617950	4075
Cedar Springs Public Schools	3221	11054472	8716	29913312	3432
Comstock Park Public Schools	3170	8131050	8786	22536090	2565
East Grand Rapids Public Schools	3530	10491160	9317	27690124	2972
Forest Hills Public Schools	3411	34403346	9749	98328414	10086
Godfrey-Lee Public Schools	3149	5321810	9821	16597490	1690
Grandville Public Schools	3090	18462750	8950	53476250	5975
Kelloggsville Public Schools	3212	7349056	9490	21713120	2288
Kenowa Hills Public Schools	3656	12872776	9830	34611430	3521
Kent City Community Schools	3049	4292992	8820	12418560	1408
Kentwood Public Schools	3211	28269644	9631	84791324	8804
Lowell Area Schools	3303	12894912	8655	33789120	3904
Rockford Public Schools	3200	26028800	8983	73067722	8134
Sparta Area Schools	2844	8443836	8524	25307756	2969

Kent ISD  
**TOTAL**                                    \$    63,516    \$344,360,574    \$    177,645    \$930,283,879    96332    0

<b>Kent County</b>	Operation	Instruction	Administration	Transportation	County Level Consolidation	Coordination of Services
Grand Rapids Public Schools	1763096	1330594	3737126	2300770	9131587	4063866
Godwin Heights Public Schools	231377	92392	349456	152327	825552	383704
Northview Public School District	222028	120390	567639	232966	1143023	454994
Wyoming Public Schools	350405	260088	877711	527645	2015849	878050
Byron Center Public Schools	321931	93886	517810	350110	1283736	672041
Caledonia Community Schools	349798	55909	701715	399758	1507180	749556
Cedar Springs Public Schools	192741	94723	575032	439845	1302341	632586
Comstock Park Public Schools	156568	75616	428227	257167	917577	413735
East Grand Rapids Public Schools	260109	141229	522478	40657	964473	300766
Forest Hills Public Schools	746364	412719	1419100	953127	3531310	1699491
Godfrey-Lee Public Schools	90584	75374	282653	75746	524356	166330
Grandville Public Schools	419206	196458	789596	548505	1953765	967711
Kelloggsville Public Schools	138012	79165	418361	154028	789566	292040
Kenowa Hills Public Schools	264498	132530	613182	389775	1399985	654272
Kent City Community Schools	100137	25119	234432	153078	512765	253215
Kentwood Public Schools	672626	347934	1135716	646566	2802841	1319191
Lowell Area Schools	273592	121336	539338	512283	1446549	785875
Rockford Public Schools	533590	287944	1155435	802338	2779306	1335928
Sparta Area Schools	137524	94177	415066	288587	935354	426111
Kent ISD	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 7,224,187</b>	<b>\$ 4,037,582</b>	<b>\$ 15,280,070</b>	<b>\$ 9,225,276</b>	<b>\$ 35,767,116</b>	<b>\$ 16,449,463</b>

School District Consolidation Study in 10 Michigan Counties June 2010

<b>Muskegon County</b>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Muskegon City School District	2115	11600775	4420	24243700	1954	10717690	6277	34429345	1130	6198050	1238	6790430
Muskegon Heights School District	1935	3655215	4374	8262486	2397	4527933	6587	12442843	1454	2746606	1315	2484035
Mona Shores Public School District	873	3405573	4405	17183905	789	3077889	5194	20261794	1036	4041436	803	3132503
Oakridge Public Schools	689	1306344	4168	7902528	1105	2095080	5288	10026048	1062	2013552	843	1598328
Fruitport Community Schools	1248	4069728	3938	12841818	1503	4901283	5375	17527875	788	2569668	823	2683803
Holton Public Schools	453	479274	3874	4098692	1518	1606044	5392	5704736	1013	1071754	930	983940
Montague Area Public Schools	613	898658	3865	5666090	1612	2363192	5477	8029282	965	1414690	974	1427884
Orchard View Schools	439	1363095	4268	13252140	930	2887650	5063	15720615	860	2670300	642	1993410
Ravenna Public Schools	648	694008	4072	4361112	1498	1604358	5570	5965470	1063	1138473	909	973539
Reeths-Puffer Schools	1038	4182102	4314	17381106	1140	4593060	5454	21974166	954	3843666	643	2590647
North Muskegon Public Schools	437	443555	4601	4670015	930	943950	5254	5332810	800	812000	625	634375
Whitehall District Schools	682	1620432	3965	9420840	1168	2775168	5376	12773376	879	2088504	775	1841400
Muskegon ISD												
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 11,170</b>	<b>\$ 33,718,759</b>	<b>\$ 50,264</b>	<b>\$ 129,284,432</b>	<b>\$ 16,544</b>	<b>\$ 42,093,297</b>	<b>\$ 66,307</b>	<b>\$ 170,188,360</b>	<b>\$ 12,004</b>	<b>\$ 30,608,699</b>	<b>\$ 10,520</b>	<b>\$ 27,134,294</b>

<b>Muskegon County</b>	M	N	O	P	Q
Muskegon City School District	4967	27243995	11755	64476175	5485
Muskegon Heights School District	5078	9592342	12499	23610611	1889
Mona Shores Public School District	2986	11648386	8459	32998559	3901
Oakridge Public Schools	3094	5866224	8712	16517952	1896
Fruitport Community Schools	3283	10705863	9046	29499006	3261
Holton Public Schools	3002	3176116	8806	9316748	1058
Montague Area Public Schools	3004	4403864	8691	12741006	1466
Orchard View Schools	2259	7014195	7544	23424120	3105
Ravenna Public Schools	3157	3381147	9259	9916389	1071
Reeths-Puffer Schools	3027	12195783	8721	35136909	4029
North Muskegon Public Schools	1958	1987370	7431	7542465	1015
Whitehall District Schools	2780	6605280	8437	20046312	2376
Muskegon ISD				0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 38,595</b>	<b>\$ 103,820,565</b>	<b>\$ 109,360</b>	<b>\$ 285,226,252</b>	<b>30552</b>

<b>Muskegon County</b>	Operation	Instruction	Administration	Transportation	County Level Consolidation	Coordination of Services
Muskegon City School District	543234	464031	929708	477853	2414826	1021088
Muskegon Heights School District	198723	146209	411991	127167	884090	325890
Mona Shores Public School District	250600	136223	606215	192397	1185436	442998
Oakridge Public Schools	127866	52254	302033	170640	652793	298506
Fruitport Community Schools	214704	162789	385450	248880	1011823	463584
Holton Public Schools	78715	19171	160763	115407	374056	194122
Montague Area Public Schools	114231	35946	212204	119274	481654	233504
Orchard View Schools	159473	54524	400545	177730	792272	337203
Ravenna Public Schools	77883	27760	170771	103523	379937	181406
Reeths-Puffer Schools	207252	167284	576550	284286	1235372	491538
North Muskegon Public Schools	50750	17742	121800	17539	207831	68289
Whitehall District Schools	147312	64817	313276	189890	715295	337202
Muskegon ISD	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 2,170,744</b>	<b>\$ 1,348,750</b>	<b>\$ 4,591,305</b>	<b>\$ 2,224,586</b>	<b>\$ 10,335,385</b>	<b>\$ 4,395,330</b>

School District Consolidation Study in 10 Michigan Counties June 2010

Ottawa County	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Grand Haven Area Public Schools	1001	5945940	4764	28298160	1202	7139880	5966	35438040	886	5262840	922	5476680
Holland City School District	1178	4993542	4427	18766053	1797	7617483	6097	25845183	1140	4832460	848	3594672
Allendale Public School District	686	1534582	4249	9505013	761	1702357	5010	11207370	1228	2747036	1007	2252659
West Ottawa Public School District	706	5392428	4647	35493786	1241	9478758	5888	44972544	880	6721440	857	6545766
Coopersville Public School District	423	1087533	4302	11060442	876	2252196	5178	13312638	1133	2912943	885	2275335
Jenison Public Schools	984	4561824	4511	20912996	1560	7232160	6071	28145156	840	3894240	746	3458456
Hudsonville Public School District	740	4209120	4430	25197840	862	4903056	5293	30106584	813	4624344	727	4135176
Spring Lake Public Schools	712	1712360	4621	11113505	1074	2582970	5695	13696475	951	2287155	985	2368925
Zeeland Public Schools	732	4129212	4123	23257843	754	4253314	4843	27319363	852	4806132	891	5026131
Ottawa ISD		0				0		0		0		0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 7,162</b>	<b>\$ 33,566,541</b>	<b>\$ 40,074</b>	<b>\$ 183,605,638</b>	<b>\$ 10,127</b>	<b>\$ 47,162,174</b>	<b>\$ 50,041</b>	<b>\$ 230,043,353</b>	<b>\$ 8,723</b>	<b>\$ 38,088,590</b>	<b>\$ 7,868</b>	<b>\$ 35,133,800</b>

Ottawa County	M	N	O	P	Q
Grand Haven Area Public Schools	3173	18847620	9499	56424060	5940
Holland City School District	3384	14344776	9822	41635458	4239
Allendale Public School District	3258	7288146	8527	19074899	2237
West Ottawa Public School District	2802	21401676	8958	68421204	7638
Coopersville Public School District	2811	7227081	8597	22102887	2571
Jenison Public Schools	2909	13486124	9603	44519508	4636
Hudsonville Public School District	2613	14862744	8317	47307096	5688
Spring Lake Public Schools	3031	7289555	9161	22032205	2405
Zeeland Public Schools	2780	15681980	8132	45872612	5641
Ottawa ISD		0		0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 26,761</b>	<b>\$ 120,429,702</b>	<b>\$ 80,616</b>	<b>\$ 367,389,929</b>	<b>40995</b>

Ottawa County	Operation	Instruction	Administration	Transportation	County Level Consolidation	Coordination of Services
Grand Haven Area Public Schools	438134	237838	789426	389189	1854587	827323
Holland City School District	287574	199742	724869	166338	1378523	453912
Allendale Public School District	180213	61383	412055	135696	789348	315909
West Ottawa Public School District	523661	215697	1008216	493568	2241142	1017229
Coopersville Public School District	182027	43501	436941	171229	833698	353255
Jenison Public Schools	276676	182473	584136	282889	1326174	559565
Hudsonville Public School District	330814	168365	693652	340939	1533769	671753
Spring Lake Public Schools	189514	68494	343073	165801	766882	355315
Zeeland Public Schools	402090	165168	720920	309691	1597870	711781
Ottawa ISD	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,810,704</b>	<b>\$ 1,342,662</b>	<b>\$ 5,713,289</b>	<b>\$ 2,455,339</b>	<b>\$ 12,321,993</b>	<b>\$ 5,266,043</b>

School District Consolidation Study in 10 Michigan Counties June 2010

<b>Saginaw County</b>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Saginaw City School District	1433	13285343	3805	35276155	2317	21480907	6104	56590184	1256	11644376	1201	11134471
Carrllton School District	658	1215984	3275	6052200	2428	4486944	5689	10513272	877	1620696	705	1302840
Saginaw Township Community Schools	876	4672584	4305	22962870	1243	6630162	5548	29593032	891	4752594	749	3995166
Buena Vista School District	1494	1416312	3920	3716160	3556	3371088	7475	7086300	2192	2078016	1700	1611600
Chesaning Union Schools	527	950181	4216	7601448	1318	2376354	5533	9975999	944	1702032	862	1554186
Birch Run Area School District	803	1478323	3962	7294042	846	1557486	4808	8851528	1050	1933050	825	1518825
Bridgeport-Spaulding Community Schools	630	1068480	3693	6263328	2059	3492064	6129	10394784	1420	2408320	1157	1962272
Frankenmuth School District	799	1011534	4565	5779290	538	681108	5103	6460398	1100	1392600	880	1114080
Freeland Community School District	502	906612	3874	6996444	948	1712088	4822	8708532	967	1746402	816	1473696
Hemlock Public School District	491	672670	3859	5286830	1467	2009790	5335	7308950	1079	1478230	817	1119290
Merrill Community Schools	704	558976	3782	3002908	1083	859902	4865	3862810	1174	932156	756	600264
St. Charles Community Schools	584	654080	4193	4696160	1046	1171520	5239	5867680	990	1108800	632	707840
Swan Valley School District	403	724997	3919	7050281	1344	2417856	5249	9442951	898	1615502	814	1464386
Saginaw ISD		0		0		0		0		0		0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 9,904</b>	<b>\$ 28,616,076</b>	<b>\$ 51,368</b>	<b>\$ 121,978,116</b>	<b>\$ 20,193</b>	<b>\$ 52,247,269</b>	<b>\$ 71,899</b>	<b>\$ 174,656,420</b>	<b>\$ 14,838</b>	<b>\$ 34,412,774</b>	<b>\$ 11,914</b>	<b>\$ 29,558,916</b>

<b>Saginaw County</b>	M	N	O	P	Q
Saginaw City School District	4177	38724967	10573	98022283	9271
Carrllton School District	2326	4298448	8405	15532440	1848
Saginaw Township Community Schools	2706	14433804	8424	44933616	5334
Buena Vista School District	5883	5577084	13620	12911760	948
Chesaning Union Schools	2725	4913175	8654	15603162	1803
Birch Run Area School District	3110	5725510	8201	15098041	1841
Bridgeport-Spaulding Community Schools	3635	6164960	10110	17146560	1696
Frankenmuth School District	3074	3891684	9221	11673786	1266
Freeland Community School District	2579	4657674	7749	13994694	1806
Hemlock Public School District	2897	3968890	8584	11760080	1370
Merrill Community Schools	3053	2424082	8254	6553676	794
St. Charles Community Schools	2561	2868320	8141	9117920	1120
Swan Valley School District	2434	4378766	7964	14327236	1799
Saginaw ISD		0		0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 41,160</b>	<b>\$ 102,027,364</b>	<b>\$ 117,900</b>	<b>\$ 286,675,254</b>	<b>30896</b>

<b>Saginaw County</b>	Operation	Instruction	Administration	Transportation	County Level Consolidation	Coordination of Services
Saginaw City School District	890758	531414	1746656	478940	3647768	1369698
Carrllton School District	104227	48639	243104	28607	424578	132834
Saginaw Township Community Schools	319613	186903	712889	182423	1401829	502036
Buena Vista School District	128928	56652	311702	84808	582091	213736
Chesaning Union Schools	124335	38007	255305	127220	544867	251555
Birch Run Area School District	121506	59133	289958	143156	613753	264662
Bridgeport-Spaulding Community Schools	156982	42739	361248	130660	691629	287642
Frankenmuth School District	89126	40461	208890	67225	405702	156351
Freeland Community School District	117896	36264	261960	95574	511694	213469
Hemlock Public School District	89543	26907	221735	125766	463951	215309
Merrill Community Schools	48021	22359	139823	59883	270087	107905
St. Charles Community Schools	56627	26163	166320	71568	320678	128195
Swan Valley School District	117151	29000	242325	103299	491775	220449
Saginaw ISD	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,364,713</b>	<b>\$ 1,144,643</b>	<b>\$ 5,161,916</b>	<b>\$ 1,699,128</b>	<b>\$ 10,370,400</b>	<b>\$ 4,063,841</b>

School District Consolidation Study in 10 Michigan Counties June 2010

Washtenaw County	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Ann Arbor Public Schools	2065	34058045	5521	91057853	1484	24475612	6993	115335549	1240	20451320	1156	19065908
School District of Ypsilanti	2568	10125624	4661	18378323	2061	8126523	6699	26414157	1238	4881434	1448	5709464
Chelsea School District	1291	3432769	4684	12454756	1011	2688249	5735	15249365	1082	2877038	1123	2986057
Dexter Community School District	1526	5554640	4649	16922360	824	2999360	5473	19921720	818	2977520	916	3334240
Lincoln Consolidated School District	1117	5352664	4756	22790752	1563	7489896	6319	30280648	860	4121120	838	4015696
Manchester Community Schools	1416	1801152	4105	5221560	762	969264	4868	6192096	1019	1296168	1054	1340688
Milan Area Schools	986	2616844	4415	11717410	593	1573822	4882	12956828	729	1934766	966	2563764
Saline Area Schools	1473	8111811	4492	24737444	1096	6035672	5587	30767609	810	4460670	944	5198608
Whitmore Lake Public Schools	1294	1579974	4510	5506710	843	1029303	5354	6537234	1313	1603173	1038	1267398
Willow Run Community Schools	1611	3249387	4788	9657396	1763	3555971	6490	13090330	1496	3017432	1528	3081976
Honey Creek Community Schools	937	177093	4463	843507	964	182196	5427	1025703	1687	318843	530	100170
Washtenaw ISD												
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 16,284</b>	<b>\$ 76,060,003</b>	<b>\$ 51,044</b>	<b>\$ 219,288,071</b>	<b>\$ 12,964</b>	<b>\$ 59,125,868</b>	<b>\$ 63,827</b>	<b>\$ 277,771,239</b>	<b>\$ 12,292</b>	<b>\$ 47,939,484</b>	<b>\$ 11,541</b>	<b>\$ 48,663,969</b>

Washtenaw County	M	N	O	P	Q
Ann Arbor Public Schools	4885	80568305	12165	200637345	16493
School District of Ypsilanti	6119	24127217	13509	53265987	3943
Chelsea School District	3969	10553571	9983	26544797	2659
Dexter Community School District	3831	13944840	9601	34947640	3640
Lincoln Consolidated School District	3311	15866312	9825	47081400	4792
Manchester Community Schools	3983	5066376	9087	11558664	1272
Milan Area Schools	3054	8105316	8262	21927348	2654
Saline Area Schools	3570	19659990	9685	53335295	5507
Whitmore Lake Public Schools	4030	4920630	9641	11771661	1221
Willow Run Community Schools	5221	10530757	12085	24375445	2017
Honey Creek Community Schools	3172	599508	9629	1819881	189
Washtenaw ISD					
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 45,145</b>	<b>\$ 193,942,822</b>	<b>\$ 113,472</b>	<b>\$ 487,265,463</b>	<b>44387</b>

Washtenaw County	Operation	Instruction	Administration	Transportation	County Level Consolidation	Coordination of Services
Ann Arbor Public Schools	1525273	1362322	3067698	1258746	7214038	2784018
School District of Ypsilanti	456757	405025	732215	613925	2207922	1070682
Chelsea School District	238885	137311	431556	226387	1034138	465272
Dexter Community School District	266739	222186	446628	374119	1309672	640858
Lincoln Consolidated School District	321256	214107	618168	427830	1581360	749085
Manchester Community Schools	107255	72046	194425	113106	486833	220361
Milan Area Schools	205101	104674	290215	178190	778179	383291
Saline Area Schools	415889	324472	669101	340002	1749464	755891
Whitmore Lake Public Schools	101392	63199	240476	84615	489682	186007
Willow Run Community Schools	246558	129975	452615	212753	1041902	459311
Honey Creek Community Schools	8014	7084	47826	612	63536	8626
Washtenaw ISD	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 3,893,118</b>	<b>\$ 3,042,400</b>	<b>\$ 7,190,923</b>	<b>\$ 3,830,286</b>	<b>\$ 17,956,726</b>	<b>\$ 7,723,403</b>