

Greenfield Public Schools

Susan D. Hollins, Ph.D.
Superintendent of Schools

Each Child's Success is Our Mission

TO: School Committee
FROM: Elizabeth Gilman
DATE: November 27, 2012
RE: Budgetary for 2013-2014

In the attached 13-page document, please go to page 5, the first bullet under #3. This shows that superintendent offices are being advised as to 1.8% inflation rate for 2014.

I have included the whole document to show the complicated factors involved in school finance.

TO: MASS Colleagues,
Copy: Tom Scott, MASS Executive Director
FROM: Dave Tobin, MASS School Finance October 2, 2012
SUBJECT: FY 2014, Review and Anticipating State Support

Soon the planning process for building the next fiscal budget year begins to intensify. This paper's purpose is to provide a deeper review of how the state's school funding was calculated for the current school year, and how that is likely to set the basis for FY14 funding. Attached also is a file with spreadsheets to provide specific related information for each school district.

For the many colleagues familiar with these dynamics a much shorter summary has been released to all list-serve members on October 2. With both versions, it is helpful to download the attached document providing specific related information for each school district.

Background:

After a sharp decline in FY09, followed by the Commonwealth's struggle to recover from a deep and long recession coupled with the loss of federal stimulus money, the state is funding for public elementary and secondary education turned more robust for Fiscal Year 2013. In the prior year FY12, 36.5% of actual Net School Spending was state funded by Chapter 70 State Aid. The remaining 63.5% came from local sources. A decade ago in FY03 Chapter 70 Aid provided 40% of actual net school spending. Thankfully, in FY2013 increased K-12 funding was added to the state's distribution of educational support.

- Chapter 70 General Educational Funding increased **\$180.2 million**, or 4.42%,
- The Special Education Circuit Breaker is funded at \$241.9 million, up **\$29 million**,
- Transportation of Homeless Students was added as new funding at **\$11.3 million**,
- Regional Transportation reimbursements are up **\$2 million**, totaling \$45.5 million,
- Kindergarten Expansion Grants were boosted **\$1 million** to \$24 million,
- Under-performing School support grew **\$926,872** to now total \$7.67 million,
- METCO increased **\$500 thousand** with funding at \$18.1 million,
- Expanded Learning Time grew **\$250 thousand** to \$14.1 million.

Roger Hatch, School Finance Programs Administrator has provided a brief "white paper" explaining how Chapter 70 was calculated for F13. It is available at this link:

http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/chapter70/chapter_13_explain.html

This paper is review and discussion on Chapter 70 factors, their trends, and possibilities as school districts move forward to develop their local budget plans for fiscal 2014, and beyond.

What can Massachusetts School Districts expect for Fiscal Year 2014?

Budgets are about - *values, priorities, and choice to be made and defended on their merits.* School Budgets are largely a locally controlled issue. Each community is different and has a unique history of responding to their educational needs that reflect not only their fiscal capacity, but also the interests and values of the local voting population and their collective understanding and commitment to education. The municipal funding process has varying degrees of contentiousness. A good majority of communities is supportive of educational funding and their schools reflect that support, which often enhances their town's relative housing values and community life. Data is available and utilized by the state in determining the fiscal capacity of municipalities to support the education of their student population.

Locally the process commonly found is that a budget is developed by the school district's administration with the guidance and approval of the local school committee. Ideally, the budget is based on a multiple year strategic plan with broad input. Key words of "transparency" and "collaboratively developed" appear more often in the presentation of school budgets. Most budgets respond to a review of the status in data and adjustment to goals. Priorities are established, changes from the present budget are weighed and decisions must be made. Voters focus most on changes and the justification for those changes and their related costs. Again, this year the state is adding work to be done, with growing rigor and complexity in tasks that set higher expectations and performance skills from both our students and staffs. Greater accountability and reporting documentation creates stress on financial and human resources that are limited. Local taxpayers, with some reluctance, are accustomed to the existing levels of financial effort. Leadership gets tested in the reconciliation between needs and the resources that can be made available. State aid is a component of any solution. Understanding that source of funding and its mechanics is helpful and that is the purpose of this piece.

State Aid and Requirements for Funding the Mission of Schools:

Massachusetts' schools continue to improve, topping the nation in student performance and in progress toward closing achievement gaps. By contrast the front page headline for the September 21, 2012 Boston Globe reads, "**Many schools in state are lagging**" followed by a sub-headline "Miss their goals on new MCAS rating system". More is expected from all our schools by law changes, in the regulatory process and in related accountability reporting. An accurate report on local progress is a needed component of any budget request.

Financial support from the state is an annual challenge, but with needs accelerated this year by the volume of changes being required, the challenge has grown. Without a greater state share in school costs, the perception that expanded requirements are "unfunded mandates" gains credence, as school districts are left to respond from local human and fiscal resources. This paper identifies the financial calculations and trends in state support to assist with planning.

Estimating the next years funding, particularly with continued economic uncertainty and a looming federal deficit, tilts probability more toward speculation. We can however identify the most recent state trends and provide information that frames what the state has done, what its requirements are for funding and some parameter of likelihood for the year ahead.

STATE TRENDS IN CHAPTER 70 RELATED SPENDING: By examination of trends, we can make determinations as to what might happen, *absent actions taken*.

I. **Local Financial Effort:** All school budgets are local. Led by local school committees and their administration, funding for school districts has increased on average statewide over the 20 years since the advent of school reform. By FY12 statewide actual net school spending as defined by Chapter 70 was budgeted as follows:

1. \$1.52 billion, 116.2% of the required net school spending level.
2. \$1.82 billion, above the state's established foundation budget allowance, or 20% above in spending per pupil.
3. Differences in Educational Budgeting; in early budgeting reports for FY12, 305 school districts that reported were reviewed.
 - 25 school districts reported spending just at, or below (15) the minimum required level. (Corrective action was required if below)
 - The remaining 280 school districts budgeted 101%, or higher than the minimum required net school spending level.
 - 75% of the school districts in the state budgeted greater than 110% of the state set requirement.
 - 58% of all school districts budgeted more than 120% of the net school spending requirement. A majority of municipalities, through their school appropriation recognize that the state funding requirements are based on dated and inadequate foundation assumptions and they respond with a greater local share to meet their district's real needs.
 - 62 school districts, representing 20% of all districts budgeted 150% to 300% of required spending. These districts by formula are having their local required contribution lowered, but continue to have both the capacity and willingness to support their valued local schools.
4. Trends in actual net school spending data for each school district are posted and can be compared on the DESE, School Finance webpage for Chapter 70. These "profiles" for each school district's data trends with a graphic display trace annual changes back to 1993.
 - 1) Go to: <http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/chapter70/> to download the Excel file: *Chapter 70 District Profiles*; Comparisons can be made between similar school districts. A dialogue with those districts that garner greater actual support above required spending may be helpful.

II. FOUNDATION ENROLLMENT: Enrollment drives the foundation budget for each school district. Each child included in the budget brings an amount of funding to the district's foundation budget. The cumulative foundation enrollment for each district and for the state establishes the state requirement to fund the total foundation budget that must, and has been, consistently funded since 1993. Foundation enrollment includes the school district's resident students who attend the district's schools and all students included the district's budget that are paid to other schools or educational providers including students being educated under individual educational plan placements off campus, choice and charter placements. Foundation enrollment does not include students attending district schools that are paid for by another entity, such as choice-in students attending the district's schools.

1. Enrollment Trends:

- Statewide enrollment has gradually declined over a decade. In most recent years that decline has averaged .3 of a percent per year. Over the past decade enrollment lowered 2.78%. The range of change varies across the 326 operating school districts. DESE reports that 60% of the school districts experienced a decline in foundation enrollment for FY13.
- That gradual trend in total foundation enrollment is expected to continue but shall not be established for FY14 until after the filing of October 1, 2012 SIMS data by all public school districts.
- Some "Gateway" urban districts, particularly where housing is relatively less expensive and accessible, have experienced surprising enrollment increases. A significant portion of those increases includes low-income and English Language Learners (ELL) that often need supplementary educational support.
- School districts are advised to review their system for identifying all students and their program placements in the SIMS database. Significant supplemental funding is available in the foundation budget for the growing number of ELL and Low Income students. The date for SIMS certification by the superintendent is fast approaching. The window for corrections is short. Pupils = dollars.
 - Statewide a growing number of low-income students now make-up 35% of the state's student population, but numbers vary dramatically in their distribution across the state and its school districts. Each low income student adds supplemental support in the foundation budget of their district:
 - Elementary Low Income Student: + \$ 3,341;
 - High School Low Income Student: + \$ 2,702;
 - Not identified \$ 0; added funding to their base allowance.

III. FOUNDATION BUDGET:

1. Trends in the Foundation Budget

- 1) The state's foundation budget has grown each year since 1993 because it is annually adjusted to:
 - Inflation; Adjustment to per pupil amounts allowed each year.
 - Enrollment; Students, fund for in the budget, as of October 1st.
- 2) **FY13 Foundation: Calculations.**
 - Inflation: 3.65% = Average per foundation student amount is \$10,128.
 - Enrollment: 934,763 x \$10,128 = \$9,467,117,141 cumulative State Foundation Budget.
 - Each school and district has a unique average foundation budget per student based on their demographics and the allowed state amounts: at each grade level; and for each program. Allotment: regular, ELL, vocational.
 - Studies have identified the inadequacy of the foundation budget baseline of all funding goals. Just one example is the amount allowed per middle school student, which is unrealistically too low at \$6,678 per pupil compared to the actual cost of educating a middle school student today.
 - Supplementary money is added to the foundation budget for an "assumed" number of special education students' educated in-district (3.75% of enrolled students X \$24,368) and tuitioned-out (1.0% of students X \$25,454). These assumptions and amounts are well below actual experience.
- 3) **FY 14 Estimated District Foundation Budgets**
 - Inflation will not be set until December 2012 when the 3rd quarter (Q3) inflation baseline index is set. Q2 inflation was at an annual rate of 1.81%.
 - FY14 final inflation is expected to be lower than the 3.65% FY13 factor. Q3 however, is experiencing increases in fuel and food costs.
 - Making a Simple District Rough Estimate:
 - Divide the FY13 foundation budget of the district by its foundation students to provide average per pupil foundation amount for this year.
 - That amount per student can be multiplied by any estimated inflation factor (1.82 %?). Multiply that rough estimate by the October 1, 2012 foundation enrollment to determine a rough estimate of a district's FY14 foundation budget. Of

course, this should be adjusted by changes in the district's demographics, such as significant changes in the number in grade level and low-income students identified. Official preliminary foundation budgets shall be available with the release of the Governor's House I Budget on January 30th.

IV. **REQUIRED SOURCES OF REVENUE to fund the foundation budget**

A. The Foundation Budget is a per pupil standard set in M.G.L. Chapter 70. The cumulative total of all per pupil funding categories becomes a districts' foundation budget that by law must be funded.

Two sources of minimum revenue are required to fund this foundation:

B. Municipal Contribution is calculated first for each municipality.

C. State Chapter 70 Aid, foundation aid is the state aid amount above local minimum required contribution needed to fund the foundation budget. Additional Chapter 70 aid above foundation aid has been provided, in *most* past years, to either hold districts' harmless, or as added minimum per pupil aid, growth aid, or target aid.

Revenue effort targets are set each year based on each municipality's relative (aggregate) wealth in property value and income. Targets are set to fund a percentage of the foundation budget for each school district.

B. Required Municipal Contribution is the minimum amount a municipality must contribute to fund the education of students budgeted for at the school district(s) to which the municipality belongs. The amount is based on the previous year's required local contribution changed by the percentage growth of municipal revenues (MRGF), thus insuring that schools share in municipal revenue changes each year. While each municipality is different, the state average MRFG for FY13 is 3.77%. This first calculation produces the "Preliminary Municipal Contribution". The result is a new level of dollars that funds a preliminary percentage of the municipalities total foundation budget (sum of all school districts to which the municipality is a member). The preliminary total local contribution is adjusted once again toward a targeted standard of effort for greater equity (relative aggregate wealth).

- 1) **Standard of Effort uses the Aggregated Wealth Method** to determine the effort target goal for each municipality. Use of this method began in 2006 to align effort requirements to a municipality's fiscal

capacity. Its intent is to phase-in a rational basis so that municipalities of similar fiscal capacity would have similar standards of effort. In FY13 each municipality's total value of (EQV) property (at a statewide rate of .03221%) and the total municipality's resident income (at a statewide rate of 1.6124%) are both added together to produce the "combined effort yield". The amount of that product is the local fiscal capacity of the municipality to fund its share of the municipality's total foundation budget. The preliminary contribution is then adjusted toward that equity target contribution.

2) **Adjustment of "Preliminary Local Contribution: toward an Standard of Effort Target:** In FY13 that adjustment is again being phased-in for a 7th year, and closes 15% of the gap toward a target percent of the foundation.

- **Contribution targets have a cap of 82.5% of the foundation budget.** In FY13, 115 municipalities are at, or still above that target cap in required minimum local effort. Though these municipalities have relatively stronger capacity in property value and income, the state legislature has determined that there should be a limit on required contribution effort so that each municipality would receive (phased-in) at least 17.5% in state aid to fund 100% of their foundation budget. The intent of the cap is to encourage all municipalities to support Chapter 70's funding.
- **Municipalities Higher than Target Contribution, 249, or 71% (including the 115 capped) of the 351 municipalities still have a required contribution above their targeted share of the combined foundation budget(s) of their member school districts.** That gap from their "Preliminary Local Contribution" to target local contribution is being closed each year until the target is reached. In FY13, only 15% of the gap to their targets is closed. Most of these municipalities have had a long history of supporting their schools. Nearly all continue to appropriate actual contributions above the required level without effecting the determination of formula derived contribution. In total, these municipalities are required to contribute \$230 million above target in FY13. This phased-in lowering of minimum contribution in FY14 would be the 8th year. If 20% of the FY14 remaining contribution gaps are closed and the same dollar amount were to be made

available in the following years, then all of these municipalities would be near target contribution in 5 years. As this municipal contribution, gap closes lower, foundation aid to fund the foundation budget increases. This may not cause an increase in Chapter 70 total aid if the municipality has save-harmless aid.

- **Municipalities Lower than Target Contribution, 102, or 29% of municipalities** have a required contribution below their targeted share. In total, these municipalities are presently required to contribute \$196 million below their target share of foundation. In FY13, 39 of these municipalities were more than 5% below their target and they were required to increase their preliminary contribution an addition 1%-2%, totaling an additional \$4.1 million added to required contributions. The remaining 63 municipalities less than 5% below their target are not required to increase their contribution beyond their municipal revenue growth percentage. The limitations of Proposition 2 ½ are cited as a reason that leeway to target is not being closed. This relief in local contributions is funded with foundation aid.

3) **Allocation of Local Required Contribution Among Districts**

- A Total Municipal Foundation Budget is the sum of foundation budgets generated by students at each of the school districts the municipality is a member of, and fund. This varies from one (1) K-12 district, up to four (4) school districts including local, regional, vocational and county school districts.
- The total municipal required contribution is allocated to each school district in the same proportional share the member school districts' foundation budget is of the total municipality's foundation budget. Example: A vocational regional district may be 10% of the total municipality's foundation budget, then 10% of the municipality's local contribution would be assigned to that school district and be required for minimum municipal contribution for students from that community being educated at that district.

C. **Chapter 70 State Aid:** Attached is a reference file "FY13 Actual Aid & Targets". Please download this file listing all school districts and use it as a reference to the discussion below on Chapter 70 Aid. This file has two parts:

Part I. Lists Chapter 70 Aid Targets for each school district:

- FY13 Actual Aid received as a percentage of the foundation budget is compared to target percentages of aid.
 - Differences between actual and target are shown as a percentage share of the foundation budget.
 - School districts aided below target (-) begin to receive increased aid, as Target Aid.

Part II. FY13 Actual Chapter 70 funding Increases for each district

- Three categories of increased aid and total increases are shown.

FY14 Chapter 70 funding may incorporate similar categories subject to revenues and the appropriation actions of an administration and legislature that has been supportive of education and the progress made by Massachusetts students and their schools. Many of those involved approved this distribution method in FY13.

C-1 Chapter 70 Formula Foundation Aid is required:

1. **A. Foundation Budget**
2. **B. (-) Less Municipal Required Contribution**
3. **C. = Equals Foundation Aid needed to fund the foundation budget.**
 - C-2 Target Aid reinstated in FY13 adds additional funds for school districts being aid below their target share of aid.
 - C-3 Hold harmless aid for school districts, increased by per pupil minimum aid funded in FY13 to provide at least a \$40 per pupil increase in aid.

B+C = Net School Spending (NSS) is required.

Statewide Required NSS exceeds the foundation budget for two reasons:

- B. Local contributions for 71% of municipalities remain above the target percent of foundation budget, but continue being corrected to close the gap to target.
- C. Chapter 70 aid is being held harmless and added per pupil minimum aid exceeds the foundation budget.

In FY13, total required NSS is 103.0% of the statewide foundation budget because the combination of the above two factors. Required NSS a decade ago in FY03 was 107.3% of foundation. .

- C-1 FOUNDATION AID for FY13 increase \$145.5 million** (81% of the total Chapter 70 aid increase) was formula generated for 133 of the state's 326 operating school districts, who represent 40.8% all school districts and who educate 51% of the state's students. Without this increase in aid, these districts fall below their required Chapter 70 foundation budget.

Foundation Aid is viewed by the courts as a constitutional obligation that has been consistently funded by the legislature. It is the amount needed above municipal contribution that is needed to fund the foundation budget. Other than changes in enrollment and inflation, the foundation budget has had few changes from the model designed a quarter of a century ago. Positive effects would be realized if improvements advocated by MASS and others were made to these foundation budget factors. Improvement to these factors (see newsletter for priority listing) would be timely when inflation is below prior year's and federal RTTT funds to relatively poorer school districts may expire after FY14.

FY14 Foundation Aid amounts are highly dependent on the inflation rates applied to the foundation budget. The current rate of inflation is trending at 1.81%. Foundation aid in my very rough estimate guessing actual enrollment would be around a **\$70 million increase**, as opposed to a FY13 increase of \$145 million in the FY13 baseline.

Municipalities that are having their local required contribution lowered to target would receive new foundation aid and if that required contribution, plus prior year's Chapter 70 aid falls below the FY14 foundation budget they would receive an increase in foundation aid.

- C-2 TARGET AID was reinstated in FY13, adding \$20.9 million** to 109 school districts, 1/3rd of all districts, who are being aided below their targeted amount of aid. For those school districts in FY13, 25% of the gap to the respective target is closed by this appropriation and distribution. Some additional operating school districts who also are below targeted aid did not receive this increase because it would require spending above a legislated cap of 107.5% of the foundation budget.

- Target Aid is not required in Chapter 70 and its use was suspended after FY08 as state revenues fell.

- A logical conclusion could be made that the remaining gap to target would be incrementally closed over the next three (3) years. That would result in a need for an estimated **\$20 million in FY14** in new **Chapter 70 Target Aid** to be distributed to most of the same school districts unless a districts experiences changes to foundation budget of some significance. The hope generated by the legislature reinstating Target Aid is that the amount in FY14 to districts below targeted could be similar to this year's amount. To provide that amount, 1/3rd of the remaining the gap to target would need to be closed. If that occurs, hope springs forward to FY15-16 for districts that remain below target. Increased distributed in FY13 would be retained in any "save-harmless" provision for FY14.
- Caution: However, logic does not always prevail and other circumstances may change. Actual appropriations in FY14 and the following years will depend on continued growth in state revenues and the press from other priorities calling upon state support. The changes instituted in 2006 to lower required local contribution were intended to be phased in over five years has continued to be extended over many more years. The good news is that the effort continues to the intent, though the reality of state revenues influences the speed in closing the gaps to target set.
- **Planning for FY14:** Target Aid in FY13 was not part of the Governor's budget (H-1). It did not become apparent for FY13 until the Senate Ways and Means budget release. Recipient districts may not have considered that increase in their budget planning. For FY14 planning districts that remain below target might consider budgeting for identified items that would be dependent on this target aid funding and as state budget progresses in the spring, then set final budget plans based on estimates that are more concrete. That same strategy may also be considered for per pupil minimum aid reviewed below.

C-3 Save Harmless and Minimum Aid: In FY13, 55.2%, 180 school districts, are held-harmless to the previous year's Chapter 70 aid level as well as also receiving a minimum increase in Chapter 70 aid of \$40 per foundation student:

Save Harmless in FY13 required \$251 million in Chapter 70 funding, above foundation aid distributed for this year. It did provide stability to municipalities and school districts. Back in

2004 this aid, then called Base Aid, was cut for over 60% of the state's school districts. 40% of the state's school districts received a 20% cut. The remaining cuts experienced that year ranged from 1% - 19%. Cuts were made again to Chapter 70 in 2009, but those losses were replaced with federal stimulus funds.

Per Pupil Aid (\$40) brought \$13.8 million to the FY13 Chapter 70 distribution, so that every school district received an increase in this election year.

Save Harmless and Per Pupil aid that requires spending above the foundation budget are vulnerable categories in the FY14 Chapter 70 distribution. Both are not required in the Chapter 70 formula. In unstable times, the application of stability trumped other options in resolution of the budget drafted by state planners. That solution has been supported in the political process. Applying the principal of adequacy by raising the foundation budget benchmark would shift hold harmless aid to all in school districts causing increases foundation aid to all, but could cause some to have lower total aid.

Some would argue that both of these stabilizing distributions do not contribute to the equitable allocation of aid and that this stability draws money away from funding the needed improvements in the foundation budget and the speed of targeted local contribution being phased-in over multiple years. The majority of school districts are recipients of this aid and point out that normal inflation, the loss of federal stimulus funds and state demands require funds, and local funds are capped by property tax limitations.

FY14 Planning: Both of these forms of Chapter 70 "stabilization" aid are to some degree vulnerable.

- I. **Save Harmless in FY14** would provide the assurance of at least the same amount of Chapter 70 aid to school districts received in FY13. Formerly referred to as "Base Aid" in Chapter 70, this stabilization in aid is most often funded except in years when the state experiences steep revenue loss. State revenues are presently not robust but are on a positive track. Schools and municipalities argue strongly for this stability in aid. Its funding is likely in FY14, but follow revenue changes as budgets develop.
- II. **Per Pupil Minimum Aid** has varied from \$25-\$50 over the years, but has not been funded in some years, and commonly in election

years so that there is something for everyone. Its FY14 funding is also probable, but weaker than hold harmless aid. If other categories of Chapter 70 aid were funded as intended the amount needed to fund minimum aid would diminish.

MASS has supported two major themes to increase state support that will relieve the growing burden of actual educational funding that has been shifting to the local side for resources while the state's expectations, accountability, and demands for reporting and documentation continue to grow. MASS supports the following:

- A. **Increase funding factors provided in the foundation budget** that are clearly not adequate to the growing tasks schools face as we move deeper into the 21st century with a school base model crafted in the last century.
- B. **Begin to move local municipal contribution share from the present target of 59% of the foundation budget** toward a balanced 50-50 share of effort requirements, as targets. An incremental first step would be to change the municipal target to 58%, resulting in a \$95 M shift from required municipal contributions to Chapter 70 foundation aid.

These changes are best when phased-in over time so that school districts can engage their community in a plan that implements incremental improvements in the delivery of teaching and learning. More quality learning time on those tasks with improved methods, technology, curriculum development, and staff skills requires a revised thoughtful use of resources funded. For Chapter 70 Aid to be 50% of the required effort would require renewed revenue sources.

MASS also advocates for the full funding to the needs of specific educational line items in the FY14 State Budget that are not provided through Chapter 70:

- Special Education Circuit Breaker
- Transportation of Homeless Children
- Regional School Transportation Reimbursements
- Charter School Reimbursements
- Kindergarten Expansion Grants
- MCAS Low Scoring Assistance
- Underperforming School Assistance
- Expanded Learning Time Grants
- METCO.

Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers
Original Data Value

Series Id:	CUUR0100SA0.CUUS0100SA0														
Not Seasonally Adjusted	Northeast urban														
Area:	All items														
Item:	1982-84=100														
Base Period:	2002 to 2012														
Years:															
Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual	HALF1	HALF2
2002	184.9	186.1	187.0	187.8	187.7	187.8	188.3	189.3	189.5	189.9	190.1	189.6	188.2	186.9	189.5
2003	190.5	191.7	193.0	192.6	192.7	192.8	193.5	194.3	195.0	195.4	195.1	194.9	193.5	192.2	194.7
2004	195.9	196.8	198.6	199.4	199.9	201.1	201.0	201.0	201.2	202.5	202.6	201.9	200.2	198.6	201.7
2005	202.6	203.6	206.0	206.9	206.2	206.2	207.9	208.7	210.8	211.5	210.0	209.0	207.5	205.3	209.7
2006	211.0	211.6	212.8	214.7	215.7	216.7	217.5	218.1	216.3	215.2	214.8	215.2	215.0	213.8	216.2
2007	215.813	216.651	218.334	219.501	220.591	221.579	221.945	221.559	221.436	221.951	223.356	223.425	220.512	218.745	222.279
2008	224.325	225.213	226.926	228.133	230.089	232.649	234.545	233.788	232.841	230.837	227.236	225.091	229.306	227.889	230.723
2009	225.436	226.754	227.309	227.840	228.136	229.930	230.154	230.883	231.200	231.304	231.708	231.462	229.343	227.568	231.119
2010	232.294	232.382	233.188	233.615	234.130	233.834	233.985	234.150	234.027	234.671	235.094	235.141	233.868	233.241	234.495
2011	235.969	237.110	239.074	240.267	241.566	241.690	242.282	243.033	243.323	243.014	242.652	241.987	240.997	239.279	242.715
2012	242.879	243.850	245.125	245.850	245.709	245.201	244.984	246.252	247.409	247.564				244.769	
	Oct 2011 to Oct 2012: 1.87%														

Note from Elizabeth Gilman:

The above Bureau of Labor Statistics data will be the basis of the inflation adjustment for 2014 Foundation Budget. The inflation from October 2011 to October 2012 is trending at 1.87%. This conforms with the Massachusetts Superintendent's Association estimated inflation adjustment of 1.81% for 2014.