



CENTERPIECE

FOCUS ON: EDUCATION

• • • •

A DIALOGUE AMONG FRIENDS: EDUCATION SURVEY 2007

BY ANDREA ALLEN, LAURIE BASKIN, ALISSA A. MOORE
AND LAUREN P. BURNER

INTRODUCTION BY LAURIE BASKIN

DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS
THEATRE COMMUNICATIONS GROUP

One of the goals of TCG's Education Program has been to establish a theatre education community—a network of education directors who have participated in various TCG programs and who remain in contact with TCG and each other. A national conversation has been underway. And, there is a growing wealth of research, information and peers to help guide us in our work. This *Centerpiece* includes the most recent TCG Education Survey results. The 2007 Education Survey boasts its largest participation ever—123 theatres participated! This means that the online database is the richest source of information yet, on the educational offerings at TCG member theatres. And, there are many other resources available to theatre educators.

This *Centerpiece* also includes an article, steeped in the witty sarcasm and candid wisdom of Andrea Allen, Seattle Repertory Theatre's director of education. Her article highlights the power of convening and outlines the tools and resources that are available to theatre educators. Please utilize these materials—join our conversation and our theatre education community.

Copyright © 2008 by Theatre Communications Group, Inc. No portion of this publication may be reproduced in any form, or by any means, including photocopying, without written permission from the publisher or author. TCG, 520 Eighth Ave., 24th Fl., New York, NY 10018-4156, phone (212) 609-5900, fax (212) 609-5901, www.tcg.org. Teresa Eyring, executive director; Laurie Baskin, director of government & education programs; Alissa Alaine Moore, government & education programs assistant; Lauren Page Burner, government & education programs intern.

SHARING THE WEALTH: CONVERSATIONS IN THEATRE EDUCATION

BY ANDREA ALLEN

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION AND AUDIENCE DEVELOPMENT
SEATTLE REPERTORY THEATRE, SEATTLE, WA

Stealing. Borrowing. Paying homage. Tweaking. Morphing. It's all the same thing. As folks in education we know that stealing from one another is the only way to survive. We've all had those moments in the classroom when our brilliant, transformational curriculum goes woefully wrong. Our students stare at us blankly (if we're lucky) or throw things at us (if we're unlucky) and just when we have calculated how long it will take to distract the angry mob, run from the room, get into our cars and peel out of the parking lot, we remember that cool game/exercise/activity that our colleague showed us in that workshop. We whip out that game and we are SAVED. We remember why we do *so* love the children and the teaching and the artistry of it all.

Or we are in a strategic planning meeting with our board and bosses and colleagues, and someone says, "Why do we do all this education stuff anyway? Aren't we a theatre, not a school?" Sweat beads on our brow, we quickly calculate other career paths and why none of them is suitable for our peculiar blend of "talents," and then remember that teleconference and the colleague who had this same experience. We remember their pithy, passionate response. We whip out that response and we are SAVED. We remember why we do *so* love our jobs and our theatres and the artistry of it all.

This *Centerpiece* is a how-to guide for stealing from one another. Now, from my perspective, the sooner we acknowledge that our brains work better together—riffing off one another and making things up as we go along—the sooner we can get to the good stuff: learning, growing, changing the world etc. But I know there are those that feel funny about the notion of stealing. There *is* that commandment against it after all. So for those honest folk among us (there must be a couple, right?), I offer a different definition from Hillary Blair of the Denver Center: "Stealing? Nah, as a favorite Teaching Artist once said, 'I'm shopping; if it looks good on you, it will look good on me. Shop away!'"

STEP ONE: HOW DO WE KNOW WHO TO STEAL FROM?

You don't go to a jewelry store to steal, I mean shop, for jeans, and similarly you want to make sure that if you want internship program ideas that you go to a theatre that actually has an internship program. If you went to the handy TCG on-line Education Survey tool and ran a report, you'd find, for example, that there are 101 theatres with internship programs. [[The education survey is in the Arts Education section of the TCG website under the tab "Tools and Research" with easy to follow directions.](#)]

Or if you are a big ol' geek (like moi) who likes to search through data to try and spot trends (or possibly just to waste time) and you are also obsessed with professional development, you could find out that in 2007, 81 theatres reported having such programs for teachers and/or Teaching Artists and in 2001, there were only 43 theatres doing such things, while only 33 theatres were doing it in 1999. Or maybe if you wanted to start a web-based distance learning program, you'd find there were 11 theatres in 2007, ten in 2004, five in 2001 and one lone, visionary theatre in 1999 with such a program. (You'll have to run the report to find out which western theatre led the pack.)

Or if your theatre is doing John Patrick Shanley's *Doubt* and you are wondering how you will possibly have time to crank out a study guide, you could use the TCG Study Guide search tool and find out that Center Theatre Group created a guide for that play in 2006, and you could contact Rachel Fain at CTG for more information. [[The study guide tool is also in the Arts Education section of the website under the tab "Tools and Research".](#)]

So, there's no excuse for not knowing who is doing what, and where to go to steal.

STEP TWO: READING IS HARD

OK. Raise your hand if you have a stack of articles and reports somewhere in your office that you are planning to read. Keep your hand raised if that stack is now collecting dust while taunting you about all the free time that you don't have to do said reading. The purpose of the education survey is not to add to that stack. One of its main purposes is to narrow down our ever-expanding field into a manageable list of folks to talk to. And I mean actually talk to—you know, move your lips and make sound? In this world of internet connections it is easy to forget that live interactions are both necessary and invigorating. It's even funnier that we—as practitioners of a live art form—sometimes forget that fact.

Voice-to-Voice

Of course, you can and should call up your colleagues and ask them about their programs. But if you like the speed and efficiency of talking to a number of people at once, all from the comfort (or discomfort) of your very own desk, than TCG teleconferences are for you. I could take this time to talk about just how well those conversations are facilitated, but that would seem kind of biased coming from the facilitator. So, I asked a couple of my colleagues to chime in. (Full disclosure: I didn't call them up. I asked them via email because I wanted to cut and paste their quotes for this article. Sue me.)

“Being relatively new to the field, it has been enormously helpful to participate in the TCG teleconferences,” says Jenny Kostreva, from Milwaukee Rep in Wisconsin. “It's good to have a network of other education directors that face similar challenges. Everyone has different approaches to developing, marketing and assessing educational programming and we can learn from each other what works well, what needs revision, and how patrons in various communities respond to these programs.”

Ruth Feldman, our colleague from New Haven's Yale Rep, had an even more pragmatic reason for participating: “They afford me the opportunity to do something that financially I'd otherwise not be able to do—convene with colleagues beyond my geographical community and share strategies, challenges and solutions around learning in and through the arts. It's so incredibly valuable both personally and professionally.”

So call me. Why don't you ever call me?

Face-to-Face

At the TCG National Conference in Denver this past June, education directors showed up in droves. I'm not sure the exact numeric equivalent of a “drove”, but I do know that there were some 40 of us who gathered at 8:30a.m. (yes, IN THE MORNING) to chat. That's huge. There is no doubt that we are an expanding field.

“When I started as a Teaching Artist, there were few education departments attached to theatres,” remembers Mary Sutton of TheatreWorks in Palo Alto, CA. “So it was learning as you go and most often learning alone out in the field. As arts education plummeted in schools and education departments within regional theatres have flourished, the opportunities created by these deficits in schools has created a deep need to build, perfect and manage large community engagement departments that are as important to the ongoing making of theatre as the production departments. But now we are not going at it alone. There is no need to reinvent the wheel, we have a community of theatre educators that can help the entire field re-establish itself as valuable to the public we serve.”

There are all kinds of reasons not to go to conferences. Budgets are tight. It's hard to travel. What if no one likes me when I get to the conference and I have to eat lunch all by myself? But getting over our phobias and going outside of our little worlds (or fiefdoms as my predecessor used to call schools and education departments) is extremely important to us as individuals and leaders of our programs. As Mary Sutton continues: “Since we often work outside the walls of our theatres and rehearsal spaces, essentially out of view of the entire company, it's imperative that we support each other. I'd be lost without meeting, knowing and sharing with my counterparts across the country.”

And if travel is simply out of the question for you and your budget, try convening education folks in your city or region. I am consistently amazed when I get together with my counterparts in Seattle, by just how much we have to talk about. Chances are you are working in different schools with different students, so stealing is still an option (though you'll want to pay close attention to Step Four).

STEP THREE: THAT'S JUST CRAZY ENOUGH TO WORK!

I'm trying to start a Meeting Revolution. I spend a lot of time in meetings and I need them to work for me. I want to get work done when I meet, not come up with a list of things to do outside of the meeting that makes me panic, hyperventilate and lie down. Happily, I've found that my fellow education directors are right there with me. Through convening—most particularly the informal chatting over grown-up beverages—we've hatched some pretty incredible ideas that harness our collective knowledge to get stuff done.

After Crossing Paths, an education conference in Charlotte, NC that included all of the performing arts, we realized the need for us theatre people to get specific about what we do, how we do it and what we expect from the Teaching Artists we hire to do it. Talking with Dawn McAndrews (then at the Shakespeare Theatre Company in Washington DC, now at St. Louis Shakespeare Festival) and Daniel Renner (then and now at the Denver Center) over, I'll admit it, a couple of glasses of wine, we nearly shouted one another down with our ideas for training TA's. A few months later, Dawn called me and said, “We got the money.” Now sober and back in Seattle, I replied, trying to be casual, “For what?” From that initial conversation in Charlotte the Teaching Artist Training Lab was created, with much thanks to and

support from the Dana Foundation. It has been tried out in New York, Denver, Seattle and Washington D.C. and the ideas—and morphings—keep coming.

“I couldn’t have asked for a better learning experience than the TAT Lab development process,” said our shopping friend Hillary in Denver. “Basically, sitting around trading favorite exercises, debating best practices and sharing stories of success and failure all with the end goal of creating a training so that those who follow can build an even better bridge to students and arts organizations and become even more creative and powerfully successful teaching artists.”

But that’s not the only thing that came out of that Crossing Paths conference. One day Laurie Baskin called me and said “We got the money” to which I again replied, trying to be casual, “For what?” And she told me we had received funding from the NEA for TEAM. [A note here for those of you who are all about accurate records. I do not, in fact, get regular calls from my colleagues telling me about money we’ve received for programs I can’t recall. For the purposes of humor and well-placed literary repetition—I am a playwright after all—I have included some made-up dialogue. Take it up in the aforementioned lawsuit.]

TEAM (Theatre Education Assessment Models) sprang directly from our field. Once we could articulate what we needed, we could then find ways to fill that need. Coming together allowed us to figure out some key issues and questions that needed to be addressed. This is such an important and often-overlooked part of the process: knowing what you need. TEAM created some great tools for the field, and impacted the working TEAM members. [\[For more information on TEAM, go to the Arts Education section under the tab “Tools and Research”.\]](#)

“By participating on the TEAM working group, I was able see what the field was using for assessment from across the country,” says Dan Welch of Walden Theatre, Louisville, KY. “This allowed me to re-assess my own models and re-design them. The working group also allowed me to get valuable feed back on various types of assessment models I use for programming.”

And, best of all, the tools are working. “Our grant was renewed for the Young Playwrights' Roundtable,” says Nancy Marcy, Coterie Theatre, Kansas City, MO. “So that means the assessment that Robert [Southworth, Project Consultant] helped me develop was good for the funders. I know that’s not the only reason we develop these things, but it is important to carrying on the work. I have actually learned a few things from the pre and post “test” that lets me know we need to have some teacher training before the workshops begin again in the fall. That's what's important!”

STEP FOUR: AREN'T THERE ANY RULES?

Some of you might think that I am calling for anarchy in our ranks—take what you want, do what you want, call it your own, size it to fit etc. Nope. There are rules, folks, or shall I say guidelines, as to how to steal appropriately and keep your friends and colleagues in the bargain.

- Ask. Nicely. If you see a cool program on someone’s website and you want to replicate it, call them up or email them. If you want to re-print my admittedly brilliant study guide for Shanley’s *Psychopathia Sexualis*, call me—if only to determine why you are doing a student matinee in the first place.
- Give credit where credit is due. Don’t say you wrote it if you didn’t.
- Be generous of spirit. When a colleague calls and wants your advice and you have a hundred million things on your list, take a deep breath, smile and talk to them. If necessary, schedule a better time, but talk to them.
- Say thank you as often as you can. Not only for the things you steal/borrow/shop for, but also for the time spent re-invigorating one another, talking each other off the ledge and sharing the passion for the work that we get to do.

Thanks for your time. I hope to talk to you soon.

This is the ninth year that TCG has reported findings from the Education Survey of its membership. For the fifth year we are aligning the Education Survey with TCG's Fiscal Survey. The Education Survey tabulation reflects education programming data from the 123 participating theatres, while the Fiscal Survey tabulation reflects fiscal data from the 198 participating theatres. Though there was some overlap in theatres filling out both surveys, there is a significantly different pool of responding theatres, which the tabulations reflect.

EDUCATION SURVEY RESULTS

A total of 123 theatres participated in TCG's 2007 Education Survey. Throughout this report, the theatres are grouped by total annual expenses: Group 1: \$499,999 and less; Group 2: \$500,000 to \$999,999; Group 3: \$1 million to \$2.9 million; Group 4: \$3 million to \$4.9 million; Group 5: \$5 million to \$9.9 million; and Group 6: \$10 million and over.

	<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	<u>Group 3</u>	<u>Group 4</u>	<u>Group 5</u>	<u>Group 6</u>
Number of total responses	11	14	36	23	20	19

1. Budget Information

Total theatre expenses

Average	\$304,602	\$632,986	\$1,744,213	\$3,753,244	\$7,143,919	\$17,651,399
Minimum	\$123,000	\$500,000	\$1,003,693	\$3,011,283	\$5,264,678	\$10,118,307
Maximum	\$490,170	\$938,847	\$2,950,901	\$4,878,553	\$9,872,601	\$50,702,234

Theatres with an education endowment	0	3	3	6	1	5
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

2. Personnel Information

Number of full-time education staff

Average	1	1	2	2	2	5
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	1
Maximum	2	3	6	8	6	16

Number of part-time education staff

Average	1	2	1	4	2	6
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	2	10	10	26	9	90

Number of artist educators

Average	7	11	11	13	14	31
Minimum	1	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	20	65	50	55	50	125

Number of education interns


Average	2	2	3	3	3	3
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	15	6	24	16	16	12

Number of education volunteers

Average	1	1	79	3	6	7
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	2	4	2,604	24	70	31

3. Educational Programming

Number of Responses Out of 123 Theatres



4. Audience Statistics

Total number of *students (K-12)* served in 2006–07 season

Average	859	5,813	17,830	17,208	19,106	28,776
Minimum	10	200	175	400	1,000	1,523
Maximum	4,000	22,225	200,000	85,000	44,370	95,579

AGE DEMOGRAPHICS – For all education programming, the percent of programs geared to each age group:

Ages 5–11

Average	18%	15%	29%	27%	32%	24%
Minimum	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maximum	60%	45%	80%	80%	73%	87%

Ages 12–18

Average	44%	48%	52%	55%	45%	51%
Minimum	2%	0%	0%	1%	10%	6%
Maximum	100%	100%	100%	100%	85%	95%

Ages 19–25

Average	17%	20%	7%	8%	8%	6%
Minimum	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Maximum	60%	100%	100%	26%	25%	20%

Ages 26–40

Average	13%	8%	4%	3%	6%	8%
Minimum	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maximum	40%	34%	30%	15%	20%	35%

Ages 41–60


Average	7%	5%	4%	4%	5%	8%
Minimum	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maximum	32%	21%	30%	40%	15%	33%

Ages 61 and over

Average	2%	3%	4%	4%	4%	5%
Minimum	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maximum	10%	10%	34%	31%	15%	25%

Education Program Age Demographics

(average among all budget groups)



	<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	<u>Group 3</u>	<u>Group 4</u>	<u>Group 5</u>	<u>Group 6</u>
5. Student Matinee Information						
Student matinee ticket prices						
Number of responses	5	10	27	18	19	15
Average	\$10.10	\$8.60	\$10.50	\$10.86	\$11.79	\$13.40
Minimum	\$8.00	\$3.00	\$5.00	\$4.50	\$2.00	\$9.50
Maximum	\$12.50	\$14.00	\$25.00	\$20.00	\$22.00	\$20.00
Total attendance for all student matinees for all productions						
Number of responses	5	10	26	20	20	19
Average	577	3,409	10,764	14,278	13,468	19,355
Minimum	160	300	300	210	400	823
Maximum	1,268	18,000	85,000	140,301	90,465	76,049
Number of student matinee performances for all productions						
Number of responses	5	10	28	20	20	18
Average	9	20	46	37	41	33
Minimum	2	3	2	1	1	2
Maximum	20	80	500	278	264	97
Number of productions for which student matinees were offered						
Number of responses	5	10	29	20	20	19
Average	3	5	5	4	5	6
Minimum	1	1	1	1	2	1
Maximum	4	16	36	11	10	12

EDUCATION PROGRAMS INFORMATION BASED ON TCG'S FISCAL SURVEY 2007

A total of 198 theatres participated in TCG's Fiscal Survey 2007. Throughout this report, the theatres are grouped by total annual expenses: Group 1: \$499,999 and less; Group 2: \$500,000 to \$999,999; Group 3: \$1 million to \$2.9 million; Group 4: \$3 million to \$4.9 million; Group 5: \$5 million to \$9.9 million; and Group 6: \$10 million and over.

	<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	<u>Group 3</u>	<u>Group 4</u>	<u>Group 5</u>	<u>Group 6</u>
Number of total responses	19	35	54	28	31	29

1. Education Programs

	<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	<u>Group 3</u>	<u>Group 4</u>	<u>Group 5</u>	<u>Group 6</u>
Number of education programs						
Number of responses	13	27	44	26	31	27
Average	6	4	5	9	9	9
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	45	13	24	55	22	33
Number of individuals of all ages served by the education program(s)						
Number of responses	13	26	44	27	31	26
Average	6,456	6,343	12,882	15,476	17,124	27,964
Minimum	20	24	1	250	1,375	198
Maximum	45,564	50,000	166,060	58,214	92,000	125,896

	<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	<u>Group 3</u>	<u>Group 4</u>	<u>Group 5</u>	<u>Group 6</u>
2. Expenses						
Total theatre expenses						
Number of responses	19	35	54	28	31	29
Average	\$327,979	\$655,766	\$1,733,985	\$3,712,372	\$6,784,194	\$17,320,454
Minimum	\$120,802	\$500,660	\$1,003,693	\$3,011,283	\$5,096,092	\$10,066,692
Maximum	\$489,846	\$938,847	\$2,950,901	\$4,878,553	\$9,872,601	\$50,702,234
Education programs payroll						
Number of responses	8	18	39	25	29	27
Average	\$20,397	\$31,289	\$46,983	\$122,717	\$191,814	\$354,324
Minimum	\$1,847	\$644	\$5,000	\$26,692	\$17,276	\$14,912
Maximum	\$92,890	\$180,239	\$202,673	\$438,491	\$1,100,354	\$1,554,198
Education programs fringe benefits						
Number of responses	5	17	36	25	29	27
Average	\$4,500	\$4,604	\$7,896	\$19,499	\$34,187	\$63,905
Minimum	\$141	\$250	\$402	\$1,487	\$3,917	\$1,926
Maximum	\$15,791	\$16,743	\$20,505	\$63,792	\$155,436	\$348,746
Education programs/outreach costs						
Number of responses	9	27	44	27	30	28
Average	\$25,087	\$17,316	\$32,920	\$59,250	\$110,183	\$154,409
Minimum	\$210	\$208	\$207	\$2,457	\$5,313	\$17,890
Maximum	\$79,745	\$81,176	\$145,236	\$370,141	\$460,931	\$578,044
Total education programs expenses						
Number of responses	8	18	39	25	29	27
Average	\$23,210	\$35,637	\$54,272	\$142,217	\$226,000	\$418,229
Minimum	\$1,988	\$644	\$5,400	\$28,179	\$21,193	\$16,838
Maximum	\$108,681	\$186,642	\$219,778	\$493,171	\$1,255,790	\$1,902,944
Education as % of total theatre expenses						
Number of responses	8	18	39	25	29	27
Average	6%	5.5%	3.2%	3.7%	3.5%	2.6%
Minimum	0.7%	0.1%	0.3%	0.9%	0.4%	0.2%
Maximum	28%	29%	13.3%	11.9%	19.6%	10.3%
Theatres with 100% of their expenses devoted to educational programming	0	0	0	0	0	0

3. Income

EARNED INCOME

Children's series ticket sales

Number of responses	2	7	14	10	8	8
Average	\$3,579	\$33,715	\$22,462	\$107,291	\$70,568	\$238,427
Minimum	\$500	\$3,371	\$1,492	\$3,435	\$2,875	\$7,948
Maximum	\$6,657	\$175,907	\$68,264	\$507,011	\$194,056	\$707,957

Arts in education/youth services

Number of responses	10	18	33	19	21	18
Average	\$25,413	\$40,990	\$59,286	\$84,493	\$77,394	\$138,456
Minimum	\$1,000	\$250	\$500	\$224	\$1,165	\$9,995
Maximum	\$150,726	\$241,311	\$381,305	\$403,449	\$441,161	\$621,588

	<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	<u>Group 3</u>	<u>Group 4</u>	<u>Group 5</u>	<u>Group 6</u>
Adult access/outreach programs						
Number of responses	1	6	5	3	3	3
Average	\$1,500	\$4,997	\$8,620	\$5,797	\$16,309	\$79,719
Minimum	\$1,500	\$1,000	\$1,200	\$3,003	\$1,663	\$10,606
Maximum	\$1,500	\$20,500	\$23,785	\$8,512	\$45,115	\$202,234

Training programs

Number of responses	4	13	20	16	17	16
Average	\$14,270	\$48,500	\$54,436	\$129,609	\$404,945	\$479,242
Minimum	\$300	\$700	\$800	\$3,520	\$9,236	\$4,575
Maximum	\$49,808	\$287,552	\$168,661	\$383,855	\$2,284,305	\$1,942,183

Total income from education/outreach programs

(sum of AIE/Youth Services, Adult Access and training programs income)

Number of responses	11	21	39	25	27	23
Average	\$28,428	\$66,454	\$79,186	\$147,859	\$316,973	\$452,141
Minimum	\$370	\$700	\$2,470	\$224	\$10,425	\$4,575
Maximum	\$150,726	\$319,422	\$415,578	\$430,141	\$2,284,305	\$2,563,771

CONTRIBUTED INCOME

NEA education grants

Number of responses	0	1	1	0	1	1
Average	-	\$20,000	\$46,500	-	\$50,000	\$70,000
Minimum	-	\$20,000	\$46,500	-	\$50,000	\$70,000
Maximum	-	\$20,000	\$46,500	-	\$50,000	\$70,000

Department of Education and other government agencies

Number of responses	2	1	4	3	3	5
Average	\$46,133	\$8,000	\$221,878	\$126,051	\$55,410	\$331,672
Minimum	\$30,000	\$8,000	\$115,079	\$104,890	\$466	\$25,849
Maximum	\$62,266	\$8,000	\$318,652	\$166,181	\$140,763	\$597,332

Total income from federal government

Number of responses	8	14	22	16	20	24
Average	\$32,483	\$19,621	\$66,865	\$72,293	\$48,208	\$127,938
Minimum	\$8,000	\$2,250	\$10,000	\$6,000	\$466	\$15,000
Maximum	\$72,266	\$56,300	\$333,652	\$429,890	\$244,592	\$622,332

Amount of total income from federal government supporting education programs

Number of responses	1	2	3	4	3	5
Average	\$3,892	\$26,500	\$53,360	\$65,383	\$42,500	\$75,132
Minimum	\$3,892	\$25,000	\$20,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$4,283
Maximum	\$3,892	\$28,000	\$115,079	\$112,000	\$75,000	\$226,375

Total income from state government

Number of responses	16	29	42	24	29	22
Average	\$16,526	\$25,474	\$54,813	\$361,510	\$143,270	\$153,201
Minimum	\$1,835	\$2,025	\$5,412	\$14,125	\$4,000	\$10,000
Maximum	\$46,000	\$77,529	\$258,794	\$5,058,816	\$863,234	\$762,994

Amount of total income from state government supporting education programs

Number of responses	3	6	15	10	7	7
Average	\$5,833	\$11,915	\$21,773	\$15,994	\$24,135	\$37,129
Minimum	\$5,000	\$2,025	\$2,221	\$2,295	\$5,686	\$8,000
Maximum	\$7,500	\$23,266	\$90,354	\$39,000	\$60,000	\$76,000

	<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	<u>Group 3</u>	<u>Group 4</u>	<u>Group 5</u>	<u>Group 6</u>
Total income from city/county government						
Number of responses	12	22	41	25	26	24
Average	\$16,289	\$38,548	\$61,259	\$256,445	\$145,403	\$286,469
Minimum	\$1,200	\$2,500	\$1,250	\$1,300	\$6,900	\$4,000
Maximum	\$53,250	\$371,256	\$406,506	\$3,027,098	\$728,970	\$1,320,099
<i>Amount of total income from city/county government supporting education programs</i>						
Number of responses	2	4	10	5	10	10
Average	\$27,281	\$13,432	\$10,677	\$23,705	\$14,561	\$27,577
Minimum	\$1,311	\$2,500	\$1,250	\$8,000	\$5,000	\$4,000
Maximum	\$53,250	\$33,401	\$34,566	\$60,000	\$54,800	\$109,000
Total income from corporations						
Number of responses	16	33	54	28	31	29
Average	\$31,064	\$44,005	\$109,597	\$207,187	\$294,947	\$908,509
Minimum	\$2,400	\$715	\$1,675	\$18,100	\$52,331	\$64,103
Maximum	\$154,037	\$220,807	\$734,350	\$1,131,105	\$869,962	\$4,175,413
<i>Amount of total income from corporations supporting education programs</i>						
Number of responses	2	11	18	19	19	20
Average	\$14,235	\$10,736	\$17,208	\$49,235	\$69,234	\$145,407
Minimum	\$3,139	\$3,000	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$5,000	\$10,000
Maximum	\$25,331	\$18,500	\$56,000	\$171,000	\$165,000	\$417,810
Total income from foundations						
Number of responses	17	33	53	28	31	29
Average	\$83,883	\$120,592	\$202,351	\$452,474	\$509,263	\$1,465,384
Minimum	\$3,000	\$2,500	\$1,000	\$61,850	\$65,000	\$353,500
Maximum	\$248,324	\$609,308	\$1,334,232	\$1,259,050	\$1,011,638	\$10,778,429
<i>Amount of total income from foundations supporting education programs</i>						
Number of responses	7	11	22	21	20	19
Average	\$50,828	\$31,044	\$27,027	\$82,409	\$71,237	\$172,279
Minimum	\$3,000	\$1,000	\$2,500	\$17,000	\$7,500	\$35,000
Maximum	\$205,544	\$84,837	\$78,000	\$320,000	\$314,231	\$512,320
Total income from individuals						
Number of responses	18	35	54	28	31	29
Average	\$53,861	\$141,599	\$301,983	\$851,365	\$1,137,723	\$2,742,535
Minimum	\$2,671	\$2,770	\$10,812	\$103,688	\$77,574	\$486,617
Maximum	\$196,695	\$1,351,290	\$2,794,470	\$4,950,260	\$3,116,970	\$7,388,773
<i>Amount of total income from individuals supporting education programs</i>						
Number of responses	3	5	12	9	13	10
Average	\$4,462	\$8,230	\$7,402	\$89,943	\$12,845	\$61,744
Minimum	\$150	\$1,267	\$100	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$265
Maximum	\$12,236	\$33,565	\$25,000	\$387,000	\$51,000	\$275,181
Total income from other contributions						
Number of responses	1	7	13	6	10	7
Average	\$22,762	\$39,951	\$356,065	\$151,047	\$599,221	\$539,889
Minimum	\$22,762	\$333	\$9,940	\$1,598	\$2,409	\$8,057
Maximum	\$22,762	\$236,599	\$1,276,188	\$657,500	\$3,784,737	\$2,295,928

	<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	<u>Group 3</u>	<u>Group 4</u>	<u>Group 5</u>	<u>Group 6</u>
<i>Amount of total income from other contributions supporting education programs</i>						
Number of responses	0	2	1	0	0	1
Average	-	\$93,406	\$1,000	-	-	\$34,730
Minimum	-	\$200	\$1,000	-	-	\$34,730
Maximum	-	\$186,612	\$1,000	-	-	\$34,730