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**WEIGHTED CATEGORIES**
- Special Education
- Compensatory Education
- Bilingual Education
- Career and Technology
- Gifted and Talented
- Public Education Grant Allotment
- High School Allotment*

**HISTORICAL PROGRAM DATA**
- History of Funding Weights
- Relative Size of Allotments
- Program Revenue & Expenditure Trends (General Fund only)
- Student Performance Trends
- Student Demographics (FY2017)

*High School Allotment receives a flat $275 per high school student in average daily attendance.*
## History of Funding Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Allotment / Weights</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Various Weights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensatory Education</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Updated for Pregnancy Related Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technology</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Reduced to 1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Gradual increase to current weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education Grant</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Allotment</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Moved to Tier I but no change to $275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In FY2018, Texas will spend over $10.2 billion, or 28% of Total Tier I funds ($37.1 billion), on weighted student funding allotments.
Since 1986, student enrollment has increased by 63%, while the five major special program allotments (excluding the PEG and high school allotments*) have increased by 772%

*PEG was authorized in FY1995 and HS Allotment was authorized in FY2007
Graduation Rate Trends by Student Group

- Overall State Avg
- State Avg SpEd
- State Avg Eco Dis
- State Avg ELL
- State Avg CTE
- State Avg GT

Graduation Rate Trends over Class of 2007 to Class of 2016.
Special Education Allotment (TEC §42.151)

student demographics, and other information

- In FY2018, total state Special Education allotment is estimated at over $3 billion.

- Special Education has a minimum direct spending requirement of 52%.

- Special Education funding begins by converting days of attendance to contact hours to full-time student equivalents (FTEs) based on 30 contact hours per week. Then FTEs are converted to weighted FTEs, except Mainstream, which is funded on an average daily attendance (ADA) basis.

*Other: includes American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races
Special Education Allotment (TEC §42.151)

weights & student demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING</th>
<th>FUNDING WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homebound</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital class</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech therapy</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource room</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-contained mild &amp; moderate</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-contained severe</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off home campus</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpublic day school</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational adjustment class</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential care &amp; treatment</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State schools</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream (ADA, not FTE basis)</td>
<td>1.1 (effectively 2.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other: includes American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races
Special Education Allotment (TEC §42.151)
Revenues vs. Expenditures since FY2007

Source: TEA Statewide Summary of Finances and PEIMS Financial Data
Special Education Allotment – Allowable Uses of Funds for Direct Expenditures

Examples of allowable direct expenditures include:

1. Expenses for special materials, supplies, and equipment which are directly related to the development and implementation of IEPs of students and which are not ordinarily purchased for the regular classroom.

2. Expenses for personnel assigned to instructional or other duties in the special education program and/or to provide support services to the regular education program in order for students with disabilities to be included in the regular program.
Federal Guidelines

Includes eight subparts:

• Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) including Child Find;
• Least Restrictive Environment (LRE);
• General Supervision;
• Evaluations and Reevaluations;
• Procedures for Identifying Learning Disabilities;
• Parent participation;
• Mediation, Due Process Complaint, and Resolution Processes;
• State Monitoring and Enforcement;
• Use of Funds;
• Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities;
Evaluation and Transition Guidelines

TEC 29.004 - Full Individual and Initial Evaluation
• Defines the state timeline for an initial evaluation and a written report to be completed not later than the 45th school day following the date on which the school district receives written consent for the evaluation,
• In the absence of a state established timeline, the federal requirement prevails at 60 calendar days and no extensions.

TEC 29.0111 – Beginning of Transition Planning
• Provides additional requirements for appropriate postsecondary state transition planning to begin for a student not later than their 14th birthday.
• The federal requirement at section 300.320(b) only requires the IEP to include appropriate measurable postsecondary goals based upon appropriate transition assessments by age 16 with no mention of early transition planning.
Special Education Determination

**Child Find:**
All children with disabilities (Homeless, Private Schools, regardless of disability, etc.) who are in need of special education and related services...

**Texas TAC:**
Prior to referral, students should be supported with tutorial, remediation, compensatory services and intervention services. If still experiencing difficulty then refer for individual and initial evaluation.

*Parent or district can refer.*

**Prior to referral**
supports, interventions, services
Not specifically funded by IDEA

**After referral**
evaluation(s) may include outside or independent evaluations
IDEA, State, and/or Local Funds

**Eligibility**
special education services determined
IDEA, State, and/or Local Funds
Compensatory Education Allotment (TEC §42.152) weights, student demographics, and other information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING</th>
<th>FUNDING WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy Related Services</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In FY2018, total State Compensatory Education allotment is estimated at over $4 billion.
- Compensatory Education has a minimum direct spending requirement of 52%.
- The primary calculation for compensatory education funding involves student eligibility for the free and reduced price lunch program administered by the Texas Department of Agriculture.

*Other: includes American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races
Compensatory Education Allotment (TEC §42.152)
Revenues vs. Expenditures since FY2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Compensatory Education Revenue</th>
<th>Compensatory Education Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2007</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2008</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2009</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2016</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2017</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct Spending Requirement:
- 2007-2009: 85%
- 2010-2017: 52%

Source: TEA Statewide Summary of Finances and PEIMS Financial Data
Compensatory Education Allotment - Allowable Uses of Funds for Direct Expenditures

Examples of allowable direct expenditures include:

1. Supplemental cost for equipment and other supplies required for quality instruction.
2. Supplemental staff expenses to reduce class size or provide individualized instruction for at risk students.
3. Supplemental Stipends, and extra-duty pay.
1996-2016: SAT/ACT Performance By Socioeconomic Status

% Above "Passing" on SAT/ACT

- Non Economically Disadvantaged (red, solid line): 6.1 point rise, 31% increase
- Economically Disadvantaged (blue, solid line): 1.8 point rise, 45% increase
- All Students in Texas (green, dashed line)

Legend:
- Economically disadvantaged
- Not economically disadvantaged
- All
Bilingual Education Allotment (TEC §42.153)

weight, student demographics, and other information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING</th>
<th>FUNDING WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• In FY2018, total Bilingual Education allotment is estimated at over $505 million.

• Bilingual Education has a minimum direct spending requirement of 52%.

• Bilingual Education is funded on an average daily attendance (ADA) basis.

*Other: includes American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races
Bilingual Education Allotment (TEC §42.153)
Revenues vs. Expenditures since FY2007

Source: TEA Statewide Summary of Finances and PEIMS Financial Data

Decreases in bilingual program expenditures over time are mainly attributable to improvements in managerial accounting practices after spending requirements were revisited and changed in FY2010.
Bilingual Education Allotment – Allowable Uses of Funds for Direct Expenditures

Examples of allowable direct expenditures include:

1. Bilingual thesauruses and dictionaries.

2. Salary supplements for certified bilingual and ESL teachers such as Stipends, and one time hiring bonuses, extra duty pay that are approved in employment contracts and local policy.
State Programmatic Guidelines for English Learners (EL)

- TEC 29.051 provides for the establishment of bilingual education and special language programs.
- TEC 29.053 requires children be identified as English learners within four weeks of enrollment and served through bilingual education (BE) or special language programs (English as a Second Language - ESL).
Federal Programmatic Guidelines for ELs

Title III, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA):

- Aims to ensure that ELs and immigrant students attain English proficiency and develop high levels of academic achievement in English.

- Assists all ELs to meet the same challenging State academic standards that all children are expected to meet.
EL Program Models in Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six State-Recognized English Learner Program Models</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English as a Second Language (ESL)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bilingual Education (BE)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ESL Pull Out</td>
<td>• Transitional – Early Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transitional – Late Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Content-based ESL</td>
<td>• Dual Language – One Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dual Language – Two Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESL program models provide grade-level content instruction in English (allowing for minimal support in the child’s primary language)

- ESL Pull-out: Students receive instruction from an ESL-certified teacher with a focus on language arts/reading
- ESL Content-based: Students receive instruction from an ESL-certified teacher in the four core content areas (Language arts/reading, math, science, social studies)

BE program models provide children who share a common primary language (in Texas, for the most part Spanish) instruction in their primary language (language and literacy), and in English
Transitional BE Program Models

Two models: Early Exit and Late Exit

- Differ in program length and instructional time devoted to primary language development

Goal: Program participants use their primary language as a resource while acquiring full proficiency in English

- Initial literacy instruction in the primary language, with the transfer of skills to English over time
- Accessibility to grade-level core content curriculum in primary language, as needed, so that students stay on grade level while acquiring English
- Decrease in time devoted to primary language instruction over time, as children transition to increasing amounts of instruction provided in English, ultimately culminating in English-only instruction

Results: Students develop low to medium levels of bilingualism and biliteracy, dependent on model specifics
Dual Language Program Models

Two models: One-way and Two-way

- Differ in students served, with one-way serving exclusively ELs sharing the same primary language, and two-way integrating students proficient in English and students identified as ELs

Goal: Program participants continue to develop grade-level language and literacy skills in the primary language while acquiring English

- Provision of instruction in academic content in the EL's primary language as well as in English, with transfer of skills taking place in both directions and for the duration of the program
- Accessibility to grade-level core content curriculum in primary language, so that students develop high levels of academic vocabulary and language skills in both English and another language
- At least half of the grade-level instruction delivered in the EL's primary language for the duration of the program, with no full transition to English-only instruction

Results: Students develop high levels of bilingualism and biliteracy, and high levels of academic achievement in the long term
ELs Long-Term K-12 Achievement

Normal Curve Equivalents on standardized tests in English Reading

Two Way Dual Language Ed
One Way Dual Language Ed
Transitional Bilingual Ed (Academic content)
Transitional Bilingual Ed (Taught Traditionally)
ESL taught with academic content
ESL pullout from mainstream
Proposition 227 in California

Career and Technology Allotment (TEC §42.154) weights, student demographics, and other information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING</th>
<th>FUNDING WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Career and Technology</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Career and Technology (When student is enrolled in two or more advanced CTE classes)</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In FY2018, total Career and Technology Education allotment is estimated at over $2.1 billion.

- Career and Technology has a minimum direct spending requirement of 58%.

- Career and Technology is also funded on a student FTE basis similar to special education.

*Other: includes American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races
Career and Technology Allotment (TEC §42.154)

Revenues vs. Expenditures since FY2007

Source: TEA Statewide Summary of Finances and PEIMS Financial Data
Career and Technology (CTE) Allotment – Allowable Uses of Funds for Direct Expenditures

Examples of allowable direct expenditures include:

1. Salaries, benefits, stipends, extra-duty pay for CTE teachers, CTE paraprofessionals, and CTE administrators.

2. Expenses related to improving or modernizing CTE equipment, supplies, and/or renovation of existing CTE facilities.

3. Expenses for motorized vehicles and trailers used exclusively for the benefit of CTE students in the CTE program.
Gifted and Talented Student Allotment (TEC §42.156) weight, student demographics, and other information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING</th>
<th>FUNDING WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In FY2018, total Gifted and Talented Student allotment is estimated at $165 million.
- Gifted and Talented has a minimum direct spending requirement of 55%.
- Gifted and Talented funding is limited to five percent (5%) of a district’s number of students in average daily attendance.

*Other: includes American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races*
Gifted and Talented Student Allotment (TEC §42.156)
Revenues vs. Expenditures since FY2007

Source: TEA Statewide Summary of Finances and PEIMS Financial Data
Gifted and Talented Student Allotment –
Allowable Uses of Funds for Direct Expenditures

Examples of allowable direct expenditures include:

1. Salaries for administrators that are 100% dedicated to administrating and development of the Gifted and Talented (GT) program and services.

2. Stipends for teachers providing GT services serving only GT students in the GT program outside of their regular duties.

3. Salaries for “GT Specialists” that serve only GT students in the GT Program.
GT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

TEC 29.121 and 29.122 define and establish a program to meet the unique needs of students who are identified as gifted in Texas public schools.

TEC 29.123 gives the State Board of Education the responsibility for developing and updating a plan to guide LEAs in providing effective services for students who are identified as gifted.
The State Plan for Gifted Education, and Gifted Education Programming

TEA is currently working with the SBOE to revise the State’s Plan for Gifted Education

- Focus on increased rigor and expectations
- Increased emphasis on, and support for, the identification and service provision for students identified with giftedness and another exceptionality such as English learner status, or a disability.

Current State Plan:

- Offers an outline for services without prohibitive regulation
- Accountability centers on “compliance”
- Performance measures for five aspects of service design
- Some LEAs provide more comprehensive services incorporating research-based best practices
Public Education Grant Allotment (TEC §42.157) weight and other information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING</th>
<th>FUNDING WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Education Grant</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In FY2017, total Public Education Grant (PEG) allotment was over $3 million.
- PEG does not have a minimum spending requirement or its own assigned managerial accounting code, and thus expenditures are not captured separately.

*Other: includes American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races
High School Allotment (TEC §42.160) weights, student demographics, and other information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING</th>
<th>FUNDING WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in Grades 9 - 12</td>
<td>$275 per ADA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In FY2018, total High School Allotment is estimated at nearly $392 million.
- High School Allotment has a minimum direct spending requirement of 100%.
- High school allotment is funded on an average daily attendance (ADA) basis for all the students in Grades 9 through 12.

*Other: includes American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races*
High School Allotment (TEC §42.160)
Revenues vs. Expenditures since FY2007

Source: TEA Statewide Summary of Finances and PEIMS Financial Data

High School Allotment expenditures not available before FY2010.
High School Allotment – Allowable Uses of Funds for Direct Expenditures

Examples of allowable direct expenditures include:

1. Professional development for teachers providing instruction in advanced placement (AP) courses.

2. Tuition and Fees for students taking dual credit classes and/or ACT/SAT tests.

3. Activities supporting college readiness and awareness, including transportation for college visits.
Appendix

WEIGHTED STUDENT FUNDING TRENDS UNDER THE FOUNDATION SCHOOL PROGRAM
Bilingual Education: EL Identification and Program Entry

TEC 29.056 (a) requires the state to develop standardized criteria for the identification, assessment, and classification of English learners

Upon initial enrollment of a child in school (PK-12), parent/guardian completes a Home Language Survey (HLS)

If a language other than English is indicated on the HLS, school district personnel administer an English language proficiency assessment to determine if the child shall be identified as an English learner and thus be eligible to receive special language program services

School district personnel notify the parent/guardian that the child has been identified as an EL; parents approve or deny services for the child

Child enters into special language programming (with parental permission) and is monitored for academic progress and attainment of English on an annual basis, with parental notification of child’s progress provided in writing at the end of each school year, until the student attains full English proficiency
Bilingual Education:
EL Program Exit

TEC 29.056 (g) describes the State’s standardized criteria to determine that an EL has attained full English proficiency and is eligible to exit from special language program services:

- At the end of each school year, assessment and teacher evaluation data are reviewed to determine EL readiness for exit
- Parent/guardian is notified in writing and child is exited upon receipt of parent approval
- Academic progress of the child is monitored for two years after program exit, and if determined necessary, the child may re-enter EL program services

The Texas ESSA State Plan, Approved by USDE in March 2018, assures that Texas will utilize:

- A single, standardized, statewide assessment for English learner identification, program entry, and program exit
- A standardized Student Exit Rubric for the subjective teacher evaluation component of the exit criteria
## Statewide Demographics for the 2016-2017 School Year (FY2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Statewide Demographics</th>
<th>Special Education Demographics</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged Demographics</th>
<th>English (Language) Learners Demographics</th>
<th>Career &amp; Technology Demographics</th>
<th>Gifted and Talented Demographics</th>
<th>High School Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since 1986, per-student special program revenues (excluding PEG and High School Allotment) have increased from $336 to $1,797 per student (unadjusted for inflation).

*PEG was authorized in FY1995 and HS Allotment was authorized in FY2007*
History of ASATR funding

During the time that ASATR existed (FY2007 – FY2017), increases to the Basic Allotment, Tier I, and the special program allotments generally meant a dollar for dollar reduction in ASATR. This meant that often times spending requirements increased without corresponding revenue increases for districts.
Example of interplay between ASATR and direct expenditure requirement levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anywhere ISD</th>
<th>FY2007</th>
<th>FY2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Allotment (BA)</td>
<td>$2,748</td>
<td>$3,135 (~14% increase over FY2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Allotment (AA)</td>
<td>$2,943</td>
<td>$3,358 (~14% increase over FY2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education Weight</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual ADA</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Allotment (Bilingual ADA x AA x Bilingual Weight)</td>
<td>$5,297,400</td>
<td>$6,044,400 (increase of $747,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Expenditure Requirement (85%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,502,790</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,137,740 (increase of $634,950)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASATR Allotment (All else being equal)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$253,000 (decrease of $747,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change in Revenue (All else being equal)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td>(Bilingual Allotment and ASATR offset)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>