

AN ESTIMATION OF THE COST OF EMPLOYING COMPARABLE NUMBERS OF PERSONNEL IN 2001-02: LOUISIANA COMPARED TO TWO GROUPS OF STATES SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Dr. John Augenblick and Dr. Douglas Rose
Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc.
Denver, CO

February 2004

Introduction

In December, 2003, the Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) approved a contract with Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc. (APA) to conduct two analyses in order to (1) help BESE better understand Louisiana's public K-12 education fiscal needs and (2) determine what role a statewide salary schedule might play in the state's school finance system, the Minimum Foundation Program (MFP). The purpose of this report is to focus on the first analysis. While there are several ways to analyze the fiscal needs of school districts in a state, APA agreed to update work it had done for BESE two years ago. That approach compared Louisiana to other states, ones with high levels of student performance, in terms of personnel employed by school districts and the cost of making Louisiana "look like" the average of the comparison states. Therefore, the purpose of this report is to compare Louisiana to two sets of states with high levels of student performance in order to: (1) understand how Louisiana compares to other states in terms of staffing patterns for public schools and teacher salary levels and (2) estimate the cost of making Louisiana similar to those sets of states in terms of staffing and salaries.

For quite some time, Louisiana policy makers have pursued the goal of raising teacher salary levels in the state in order to attract and retain the kind of staff public schools must have in order to improve student performance. Many people with an interest in salaries compare Louisiana to states that are members of the Southern Region Education Board (SREB), a voluntary association of states in the region that tracks data and policies among themselves in order to improve public education. While comparisons of Louisiana to the SREB states make sense under certain circumstances, they make little sense when the purpose is to develop policies in Louisiana that are designed to accomplish objectives that many of the SREB states do not achieve. Louisiana is not seeking to raise teacher salaries in isolation; rather, policy makers have

created an education accountability system designed to monitor the progress schools make, primarily in terms of student performance, which has consequences for schools when progress is slower than expected. One of the most important reasons to raise salaries is to assure that qualified personnel are available in sufficient numbers so that schools can meet the state's educational objectives.

This report identifies two sets of states with high levels of student performance and compares Louisiana in terms of staffing and salary levels to average staffing and salary levels for both sets of states. Using that information, it is possible to determine whether Louisiana employs more or less people than high performing states and whether salaries in Louisiana are higher than or lower than those paid in high performing states. It is also possible to estimate the cost of adding (or subtracting) personnel and raising (but not lowering) salaries so that Louisiana looks like the average of high performing states.

Selecting States for Comparison to Louisiana

One way to examine student performance for every state is to use the results of the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), an evaluation program operated by the U.S. Department of Education the results of which are reported by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). NCES provides information about 2003 reading and math tests at the 4th and 8th grade levels for all states. We focused on nine criteria in order to select states:

1. The statewide average scale score for 4th grade reading
2. The NCES designation of whether the proportion of students at or above "proficient" on 4th grade reading was significantly higher than the national average
3. The percentage of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch who were at or above "basic" on 4th grade reading
4. The statewide average scale score for 8th grade reading
5. The NCES designation of whether the proportion of students at or above "proficient" on 8th grade reading was significantly higher than the national average
6. The statewide average scale score for 4th grade math.

7. The NCES designation of whether the proportion of students at or above “proficient” on 4th grade math was significantly higher than the national average
8. The percentage of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch who were at or above “basic” on 4th math reading
9. The statewide average scale score for 8th grade math

APA set criteria for scale scores (for 4th grade reading, 8th grade reading, 4th grade math, and 8th grade math) and for percentages of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch who were graded at or above “basic” (4th grade reading and 4th grade math) so that nearly half of the states would be included (except for 4th grade math, where only a third of the states were included). We required that states meet eight of the nine criteria, including both criteria related to the performance of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch, in order to be considered to be performing at a high level. Nine states were identified that met these criteria (we designated these nine – Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming – as states that met all or almost all student performance criteria). There were nine other states that met at least seven of the nine criteria (we designated these nine – Connecticut, Indiana, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, Ohio, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin – as states that met most criteria). It should be noted that of these 18 states, ten states were among the 18 states we identified as being high performers two years ago. See Table 1 for a list of all states and how they fared on the nine criteria.

The figures shown in Table 2 provide demographic information and information about the average level of each criterion for the two groups of states and Louisiana. Those states that met all or almost all criteria are somewhat smaller than Louisiana while those states that met most criteria were somewhat larger than Louisiana. Both groups had higher percentages of students enrolled in special education programs and higher percentages of students with English language difficulty (we refer to them as English language learners or ELL students). However, the proportion of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch was more than twice as high in Louisiana as the average proportion of such students in the two groups of states. The NAEP scale scores were higher in both groups of states than they were in Louisiana (and all of the average scores for the group of states that met all or almost all criteria were higher than the average scores for the group of states that met most criteria). Finally, the percentages of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch that were graded as being at least “basic” on the fourth grade tests were lower in Louisiana than they were in the two groups of states (and, again, the percentages were higher in the states that met all or almost all criteria than they were in the states that met most of the criteria).

Comparisons of the Number of Personnel by Type

In 2001-02, the latest year for which data were available for all states, there were 101,552 people employed by school districts in Louisiana, including 49,980 teachers, 11,094 instructional aides, 3,264 guidance counselors, 1,201 librarians, 2,585 school administrators (such as principals and assistant principals), 1,303 instructional coordinators and supervisors, 398 district administrators, 3,823 administrative support personnel, and 27,904 non-instructional, non-administrative support personnel (including library assistants, school bus drivers, and food service workers). These people were employed to serve 731,328 students.¹

It would be very difficult to compare these numbers to those of another state unless there was a way to standardize them. One way to do that is to put them in the form of a number of personnel per 1,000 students. For example, given the number of teachers and students in Louisiana, this standardized form would be 68.341 teachers per 1,000 students ($49,980/[731,328/1,000]$). In this form, for example, there were 15.170 instructional aides per 1,000 students, 4.463 guidance counselors per 1,000 students, .544 district administrators per 1,000 students, and 38.155 other support staff per 1,000 students. These figures are shown in Table 3. The table also indicates the comparable numbers of personnel, on average, for the two groups of states with high performance. It is important to remember that when looking at numbers of personnel in this form, small differences can mean a lot. For example, if a state with 500,000 students had .500 more teachers per 1,000 students than another state, that means the state had a total of 250 more teachers (which would cost \$8,750,000 if each teacher were paid \$35,000).

The figures in Table 3 show that the states that meet all or almost all of the student performance criteria employ more teachers, instructional aides, district administrators, and administrative support staff per 1,000 students as compared to Louisiana. Those nine states also employ fewer guidance counselors, librarians, instructional coordinators, and other support staff per 1,000 students as compared to Louisiana. Overall, the highest performing states employed more than 10 more teachers/instructional aides and six more total people per 1,000 students than Louisiana did in 2001-02. Too, the states that meet all or almost all student performance criteria employed more educational personnel than the states that meet most of the performance criteria, particularly in terms of teachers, instructional aides, guidance counselors, and administrators (except administrative support staff).

But the figures in Table 3 do not take into consideration the need for personnel associated with the characteristics of students being served. For example, special education may require smaller classes or more assistance from a variety of people than

1 Data about numbers of employees and students are from the Education Statistics Quarterly (National Center for Education Statistics, Volume 5, Issue 2, p. 57 and pp. 60-61).

regular education leading to a need for more people relative to the number of students. Students from low income families may need more attention or special services that result in a need for more personnel (from teachers to academic support staff to non-academic support staff). The only way to compare states in terms of the personnel they employ is to adjust the ratios discussed above by a personnel need factor of some sort.

One approach to develop such a factor is to assign weights to the most important demographic characteristics of students, based on the cost of serving them, and apply such weights uniformly to all states being examined. Based on our work examining the adequacy of resources in several states we believe that the following weights reflect the added costs of serving students and, therefore, the need for additional personnel: for students in special education, 1.00; for students eligible for free/reduced price lunch (a proxy indicator for students from low income families), .50; and for English language learners, .90. If a state had 10 percent of its students in special education programs, 20 percent of its students were eligible for free/reduced price lunch, and two percent of its students were English language learners, its costs – and therefore its need for personnel, would be 21.8 percent higher than a state with no students in any of those categories ($.218 = [.10 \times 1.00] + [.20 \times .50] + [.02 \times .9]$); the need factor for that state would be 1.218. Dividing the ratios of personnel per 1,000 students discussed above by the appropriate need factors provides a way to compare the personnel available given the different demographic characteristics of the states.

The figures in Table 4 show the demographic characteristics, and associated need factors, of Louisiana and the individual states in each of the two groups of states we have been examining. Clearly, Louisiana's needs, reflected by a need factor of 1.4430, are higher than those of any of the 18 states in the two groups, driven primarily by Louisiana's higher proportion of students from low income families. Even among the 18 states, the need factor ranges from 1.2610 (Vermont) to 1.3525 (Indiana). Applying these need factors to the personnel ratios of the individual states and then recalculating the averages for the two groups of states results in the figures shown in Table 5.

One way to interpret the figures in Table 5 is that they represent the number of personnel per 1,000 students with no special needs (assuming that students with special needs receive added services, and personnel, reflected by the cost factors discussed above). This means that, on average, the nine states that meet all or almost all of the performance criteria had 56.289 teachers per 1,000 weighted students while Louisiana had 47.361 teachers per 1,000 weighted students (about 19 percent more). Those nine states had more teachers, instructional aides, school administrators, district administrators, and administrative support personnel but fewer guidance counselors and support staff than Louisiana had. And those nine states had more teachers and aides, more other school level personnel, and more total personnel than the nine states that meet most of the performance criteria.

In order to determine the cost of adding and subtracting personnel in Louisiana to match the numbers of personnel in the two groups of states, we need to know something about how the salaries of personnel in the states compare since salary levels, and the factors that drive salaries, may be an important factor in why the states are as successful as they are in terms of student performance.

Comparing Teacher Salary Levels

In order to compare teacher salary levels in Louisiana to those of other states it is important to take into consideration differences that might exist in both those factors that drive salary levels and inter-state cost-of-living. While approaches to do this have been developed in Louisiana in the past, we chose to use a new approach that APA has created.

In 2001-02, the year for which personnel data were available for all states, the average teacher salary in Louisiana was \$36,328.² At the same time, the starting salary was \$28,229 and, on average, teachers had 13.9 years of experience and 36.3 percent of teachers held more than a bachelors degree.³ Since teachers' salaries are determined primarily by their years of experience and their educational attainment, the relationship between the average salary and the starting salary is based on an equation that looks like this:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{statewide average salary} = & \text{statewide average starting salary} + \\ & (\text{Factor A}) \times (\text{number of years of experience}) + \\ & (\text{Factor B}) \times (\text{percent of teachers with more} \\ & \text{than a bachelors degree}) \end{aligned}$$

Based on our experience, we believe that it is reasonable to assume that Factor A is typically about five times as great as Factor B. If this is true then the equation above can be solved and Factor A would be \$383 per year of experience (or \$5,324 for a teacher with 13.9 years of experience) and Factor B would be \$77 per each one percent of teachers with more than a bachelors degree (or about \$7,700 for an individual teacher with more than a bachelors degree) – that is, $\$36,328 = \$28,229 + (13.9) \times (\$383) + (36.3) \times (\$77)$. In order to compare such figures to other states, it is necessary to adjust them by a cost-of-living factor, which is about 93.6 percent for

2 Comparative salary information is from Estimates of School Statistics, 2003 (National Education Association) and the Survey and Analysis of Teacher Salary Trends 2002 (American Federation of Teachers).

3 The percentage of teachers with more than a bachelors degree is for 1999-2000, the latest year for which such data are available from NCES (Digest of Education Statistics 2002, Table 69).

Louisiana.⁴ If the adjustment is made (by dividing all figures by .936) then the average salary was \$38,812, Factor A was \$409 and Factor B was \$82 in 2001-02 (all figures rounded).

This information is shown in Tables 6 and 7, in which Louisiana's figures are compared to those of the two groups of states we have been examining (Table 6 includes the states meeting all or almost all student performance criteria and Table 7 includes the states meeting most of the student performance criteria). For the purpose of comparing Louisiana to the other states, the calculation of the adjusted salary controls for experience and education by using Louisiana's levels (13.9 years of experience and 36.3 percent of teachers with more than a bachelors degree) and both the cost-of-living adjusted factors for experience and education. The adjusted salary was calculated by dividing each state's starting salary by the appropriate cost-of-living factor and then adding the adjustments for experience and education. Both the simple averages and the teacher-weighted averages for the comparison states are shown in Tables 6 and 7; for our purposes we used the simple average since the comparison states are not contiguous to Louisiana (if they were, there might be a market among the states that would be influenced by the numbers of teachers in certain states, making some states more important than others based on their size). Therefore, the average salary of states that meet all or almost all of the performance criteria was less than the average salary in Louisiana. At the same time, the average salary of states that meet almost all of the performance criteria was 5.7 percent higher than the average salary in Louisiana. These figures, and many of the component figures, will be useful below, where we estimate the cost of looking like the average of both groups of states, since it is possible to make different assumptions about salary levels in making the calculations.

Estimating the Cost of Making Louisiana Look Like High Performing States

In order to estimate the cost of making Louisiana "look like" the average of either of the two groups of states that we have been examining, it is necessary to look at each sub-group of personnel and determine whether there is a need to add personnel or to reduce the number of personnel and whether there is a need to adjust the salary of personnel in the group. These determinations can lead to three possible cost impacts: (1) a cost associated with raising the salaries of those people currently employed (either the number of people actually employed or the number of people that should be employed [if lower than the number actually employed] multiplied by the salary increase required); (2) a cost associated with employing more people (the number of new people times the new salary level); and (3) a saving associated with reducing the number of people employed (the number of people that do not need to be employed multiplied by the current salary of such people). In order to make these calculations, it is necessary to know the number of people currently employed for each personnel sub-group (such

⁴ American Federation of Teachers, 2003.

as teachers), the number of people that need to be employed in order to produce the same ratio of personnel per 1,000 weighted students as the average of the group of states being compared, and the change in salary necessary to make the salary in Louisiana be the same as the average salary of the group of states being examined. It is worth noting that the only salary that is actually compared across states is the one for teachers – all other salaries for sub-groups of personnel are based on the relative salary of each sub-group in Louisiana (for example, we do not know whether a sub-group, such as instructional aides, are paid the same proportion of teacher salary in the comparison states as is the case in Louisiana).

For example, if Louisiana had 740,000 students, the need factor for the state was 1.400, the number of instructional aides per 1,000 weighted students was 10.000, the average number of instructional aides per 1,000 weighted students for the states that met all or almost all performance criteria was 12.000, the average salary of instructional aides in Louisiana was \$10,000, and the average salary of instructional aides in the comparison states was \$10,500, then in order to make Louisiana look like the comparison states it would be necessary to: (1) raise the salary of currently employed instructional aides (that number is 10,360 or $[740,000/1,000] \times 10.000 \times 1.400$) by \$500 at a cost of \$5,180,000 and (2) pay the new instructional aides that need to be hired at the rate of \$10,500 (2,072 instructional aides would need to be hired or $[740,000/1,000] \times [12.000-10.000] \times 1.400$) or \$21,756,000. Therefore, the total cost would be \$26,936,000.

The figures in Table 8 show these calculations for the situation in which we are trying to make Louisiana look like the average of the nine states that meet all or almost all student performance criteria. The table indicates the figures for each of the sub-groups of personnel for which we made a comparison in Table 5. It should be noted that no salary adjustment is required since the adjusted salary in Louisiana is more than the average of the nine comparison states, although the use of Louisiana's average salary assumes Louisiana's levels of experience and education. Looking at the section of Table 8 that deals with teachers, it would be necessary to increase the number of teachers from 49,980 to 59,402, which would cost \$342.3 million. But, there would be a net savings of \$34.5 million relative to guidance counselors since their number could drop by 827 people at an average salary of \$41,777 (based on the fact that guidance counselors are paid about 115 percent the rate at which teachers are paid in Louisiana). It should be noted that these estimates do not include the cost of benefits.

The figures in Table 9 show the same calculations needed to make Louisiana look like the nine states that meet most of the student performance criteria. In this case, a primary cause of cost increases is the higher salary needed to make Louisiana's salaries look like the average salaries of the comparison states. For example, in the case of teachers, it would have been necessary to both raise the salary of the 49,980 teachers actually employed in 2001-02 by \$2,071 (at a total cost of \$103.5 million) and hire 5,849 new teachers at a salary of \$38,399 (at a cost of \$224.6 million), which would

have required a total of \$328.1 million more than was being spent at the time. In the case of guidance counselors, it would have been necessary to raise the salaries of 1,824 people by \$2,382 (at a cost of \$4.3 million) while eliminating 1,440 counselors (at a saving of \$60.2 million), which would have resulted in a net saving of \$55.8 million.

Table 10 summarizes the total net cost by combining costs and savings across all sub-groups of personnel and allowing a comparison of the two groups of states. In order for Louisiana to look like the nine states that meet all or almost all student performance criteria, state/local funding for education would have had to increase by \$518.7 million in 2001-02, including \$608.2 million to add personnel and savings of \$89.5 million, which are driven by a reduction in the number of guidance counselors and non-instructional, non-administrative support personnel. If Louisiana wanted to look like the nine states that meet most of the student performance criteria, state/local funding would have had to rise by \$443.8 million in 2001-02, including \$162.1 million to raise the salaries of existing personnel, \$428.3 million to add personnel, and savings of \$146.7 million. In the end, it is more expensive for Louisiana to look like the nine states that meet all or almost all of the performance criteria than it is for Louisiana to look like the nine states that meet most of the performance criteria – this is true because the cost of hiring new personnel in the case of the first nine states is greater than the cost of raising salaries and hiring new personnel in the case of the second nine states. Despite the fact that, on average, the performance of both groups of states is similar (see Table 2), it appears to be more costly to meet all of the criteria associated with the first group of states than it is to meet the lower number, and type, of criteria associated with the second group of states (it is worth noting that the criteria met by the first group of states include a focus on the performance of students from low income families).

There are other factors that could be taken into consideration in calculating the cost of making Louisiana look like a group of other states. For example, it would be possible to estimate costs without modifying salary levels at all under the assumption that the number of people, not their salary level, is the driving force behind their success. Another approach would require the estimate to be made assuming that it was important to raise the levels of teacher experience and education in Louisiana to match the average levels of a group of states, under the assumption that perhaps higher levels of experience and education, in addition to more personnel, might explain the success of the other states. The overall results of taking these two approaches and comparing them to what has already been examined are shown in Table 11. In the case of the nine states that meet all or almost all of the performance criteria, the cost does not change when the salary assumption is made because salary levels were not adjusted in making the original cost estimates. However, if it had been possible to have raised the experience and education levels of teachers in Louisiana to those of the nine high performing states, it would have cost \$591.4 million (an added cost of \$72.7 million attributable entirely to teachers – no other salaries were modified just because the average teacher salary would have risen due to the change in experience and education). In the case of the nine states that met almost all of the performance criteria,

it would have only cost \$252.6 million to have added needed personnel if salary levels had not had to have been increased and it would have cost \$516.0 million (an increase of \$72.7 million) if teacher experience and education in Louisiana could have been raised to the levels of the second group of nine states.

One way to put the costs discussed above into perspective is to compare them to the cost of simply raising per student spending in Louisiana to the average level of the two groups of states that we have been examining. The figures in Table 12 indicate how to compare per student expenditures for Louisiana and the two groups of states. While the actual per student current operating spending of Louisiana and all 18 states is shown in Table 12, the basis of comparison is adjusted spending after taking into consideration both inter-state cost-of-living differences and variations in the relative needs of students served in the states (cost-of-living figures are the same as those used in Tables 6 and 7 and relative need figures are the same as those shown in Table 4). Once those factors are considered, Louisiana's per student spending was \$4,857 in 2001-02, about \$1,156 lower than the average of the nine states that meet all or almost all of the student performance criteria and about \$1,368 lower than the average of the nine states that meet most student performance criteria. It would have cost \$1.142 billion to have raised Louisiana's spending up to the level of the first group of states and \$1.352 billion to have raised Louisiana's spending up to the level of the second group of states. These amounts are far more than the amounts discussed above – in part this is because benefits are not included in the cost estimates shown in Tables 8-11 (which would have raised costs by 25 percent or so) and in part it may reflect higher spending for supplies and materials, transportation, or some other cost that were not examined in our comparison.

There are several conclusions that can be drawn from this analysis.

- # It is possible to compare Louisiana to other states based on the student performance of the states. In making such comparisons, it is important to take into consideration both the relative needs of states, based on their demographic characteristics, and inter-state cost-of-living differences. Louisiana's needs are considerably higher than those of states that have levels of high student performance while its cost of living is somewhat lower than the average of the two groups of high performing states we examined.
- # If Louisiana wanted to "look like" states that had higher levels of student performance, it would be necessary to add personnel to those already working in the state's school districts. The most critical needs are for teachers, instructional aides, district-level administrators, and administrative support personnel.

- # The numbers of people that need to be hired are significant, ranging between 5,800 and 9,400 teachers, between 1,450 and 6,300 instructional aides, between 1,200-1,400 district administrators, and between 2,700 and 3,700 administrative support personnel depending on the set of states to which Louisiana chooses to compare itself.
- # The cost of adding such personnel depends on whether there is also a need to raise teacher salary levels. When Louisiana is compared to one set of high performing states, it appears that teacher salary levels are comparable and no increase is necessary. However, when Louisiana is compared to another set of high performing states, it appears that teacher salary levels would need to rise by almost six percent.
- # At the same time, there are several types of personnel for whom the number of people employed in Louisiana exceeds the numbers employed, on average, in groups of high performing states. For example, Louisiana appears to have between 800 and 1,400 more counselors and between 3,050 and 3,800 more non-instructional, non-administrative support staff than is necessary.
- # Taking into consideration the need to add some personnel, to eliminate other personnel, and to raise the salaries of some personnel, it would cost between \$444 and \$519 million to have modified the numbers of personnel and their salaries in Louisiana so that the state looked like the averages of two groups of high performing states in 2001-02. It might have cost about \$72 million more than the higher figure or \$191 million less than the lower figure if salary levels were not adjusted or if teachers in Louisiana had the same levels of experience and education as teachers had in the other groups of states. These figures exclude personnel benefits, which would increase them by about 25 percent.
- # These amounts of money are considerably less than the cost of raising per student spending in Louisiana to the average levels of the two groups of high performing states.

TABLE 1

STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA USED TO IDENTIFY STATES PERFORMING AT HIGH LEVELS FOR COMPARISON TO LOUISIANA

State	Performance Criteria									Group
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
<i>Louisiana</i>	205		38%	253		226		59%	280	
Alabama	207		37%	253		223		50%	262	
Alaska	212		37%	256		233		59%	279	
Arizona	209		37%	255		229		55%	271	
Arkansas	214		49%	258		229		61%	266	
California	206		33%	251		227		54%	267	
Colorado	224	x	51%	268	x	235		58%	283	
Connecticut	228	x	50%	267	x	241	x	60%	284	2
Delaware	224	x	56%	265		236		69%	277	
Florida	218		49%	257		234		63%	271	
Georgia	214		43%	258		230		59%	270	
Hawaii	208		41%	251		227		54%	266	
Idaho	218		52%	264		235		69%	280	
Illinois	216		41%	266	x	233		52%	277	
Indiana	220	x	49%	265		238	x	69%	281	2
Iowa	223	x	53%	268	x	238	x	70%	284	1
Kansas	220		51%	266	x	242	x	75%	284	1
Kentucky	219		53%	266		229		62%	274	
Maine	224	x	57%	268	x	238		71%	282	1
Maryland	219		40%	262		233		52%	278	
Massachusetts	228	x	53%	273	x	242	x	69%	287	1
Michigan	219		43%	264		236	x	59%	276	
Minnesota	223	x	48%	268	x	242	x	67%	291	2
Mississippi	205		38%	255		223		53%	261	
Missouri	222	x	52%	267	x	235		68%	279	
Montana	223	x	53%	270	x	236		71%	286	2
Nebraska	221		52%	266	x	236		63%	282	
Nevada	207		35%	252		228		53%	268	
New Hampshire	228	x	51%	271	x	243	x	72%	286	1
New Jersey	225	x	46%	268	x	239	x	60%	281	2
New Mexico	203		38%	252		223		55%	263	
New York	222	x	51%	265	x	236		66%	280	

TABLE 1 (Continued)

State	Performance Criteria									Group
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
North Carolina	221	x	48%	262		242	x	73%	281	
North Dakota	222		55%	270	x	238	x	72%	287	1
Ohio	222	x	51%	267	x	238	x	64%	282	2
Oklahoma	214		49%	262		229		65%	272	
Oregon	218		50%	264	x	236		68%	281	
Pennsylvania	219	x	42%	264		236	x	60%	279	
Rhode Island	216		44%	261		230		55%	272	
South Carolina	215		45%	258		236		69%	277	
South Dakota	222	x	55%	270	x	237		70%	285	2
Tennessee	212		42%	258		228		54%	268	
Texas	215		48%	259		237		75%	277	
Utah	219		51%	264		235		67%	281	
Vermont	226	x	59%	271	x	242	x	71%	286	1
Virginia	223	x	47%	268	x	239	x	68%	282	2
Washington	221	x	53%	264	x	238	x	68%	281	1
West Virginia	219		57%	260		231		68%	271	
Wisconsin	221	x	50%	266	x	237	x	61%	284	2
Wyoming	222	x	56%	267	x	241	x	80%	284	1

Note: The criteria are as follows:

- 1 The statewide average scale score for 4th grade reading (2003). Scores at or over 220 are bolded.
- 2 The NCES designation of whether the proportion of students at or above “proficient” on 4th grade reading (2003) was significantly higher than the national average (indicated by an x).
- 3 The percentage of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch who are at or above “basic” on 4th grade reading (2003). Scores at or over 50 are bolded.
- 4 The statewide average scale score for 8th grade reading (2003). Scores at or over 265 are bolded.
- 5 The NCES designation of whether the proportion of students at or above “proficient” on 8th grade reading (2003) was significantly higher than the national average (indicated by an x).

TABLE 1 (Continued)

- 6 The statewide average scale score for 4th grade math (2003). Scores at or over 238 are bolded.
- 7 The NCES designation of whether the proportion of students at or above “proficient” on 4th grade math (2003) was significantly higher than the national average (indicated by an x).
- 8 The percentage of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch who are at or above “basic” on 4th grade math (2003). Scores at or over 67 are bolded.
- 9 The statewide average scale score for 8th grade math (2003). Scores at or over 280 are bolded.

Note: In order to be placed in Group 1, a state had to meet at least eight of the nine criteria, including both criteria related to the performance of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch. In order to be placed in Group 2, a state had to meet seven out of the nine criteria (and not be in Group 1).

Source: Data are from the National Center of Education Statistics website (nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard).

TABLE 2

CHARACTERISTICS OF LOUISIANA, NINE STATES THAT MEET OR ALMOST MEET ALL OF A SET OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA, AND NINE STATES THAT MEET MOST OF A SET OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

<u>Characteristics</u>	<u>Louisiana</u>	<u>Nine States That Meet All or Almost All Student Performance Criteria</u>	<u>Nine States That Meet Most Student Performance Criteria</u>
<u>Demographic</u>			
Average Enrollment (2001-02)	731,328	405,140	879,147
Percent of Students in Special Education	13.4%	13.9%	14.1%
Percent of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch	59.1%	28.0%	28.1%
Percent of English Language Learners	1.5%	4.4%	4.0%
<u>Performance</u>			
<i>NAEP Average Score 2003</i>			
4 th Grade Reading	205	223.8	222.8
8 th Grade Reading	253	268.3	267.2
4 th Grade Math	226	240.0	238.8
8 th Grade Math	266	284.1	283.2

TABLE 2 (Continued)

<u>Characteristics</u>	<u>Louisiana</u>	<u>Nine States That Meet All or Almost All Student Performance Criteria</u>	<u>Nine States That Meet Most Student Performance Criteria</u>
<u>Performance</u>			
<i>Percent of Those Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch Graded as Basic or Above</i>			
4 th Grade Reading	38%	53.2%	48.9%
4 th Grade Math	59%	70.3%	64.5%

Source: Data are taken from the Education Statistics Quarterly (National Center for Education Statistics, Volume 5, Issue 2, p. 89), NCES 2004-608.

TABLE 3

**COMPARISON OF LOUISIANA IN TERMS OF 2001-02
PERSONNEL PER 1,000 STUDENTS TO THE AVERAGES
OF TWO DIFFERENT SETS OF STATES SELECTED
ON THE BASIS OF THEIR STUDENT PERFORMANCE**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Louisiana</u>	<u>9 States That Meet All or Almost All Student Perform. Criteria</u>	<u>9 States That Meet Most Student Perform. Criteria</u>
Teachers	68.341	73.057	69.716
Instructional Aides	15.170	21.278	15.690
<i>Teachers and Aides</i>	<i>83.511</i>	<i>94.335</i>	<i>85.406</i>
Guidance Counselors	4.463	2.987	2.280
Librarians	1.642	1.509	1.431
School Administrators	3.535	3.565	3.196
Instruction Coordinators	1.782	1.716	1.284
District Officials/Administrators	0.544	2.211	2.021
Admin. Support Staff	5.227	8.093	9.359
Non-Instructional, Non-Administrative Support Staff	38.155	30.596	30.102
<i>Total Staff</i>	<i>138.860</i>	<i>145.012</i>	<i>135.079</i>

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Note 1: The nine states that meet all or almost all student performance criteria are: Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming. The nine states that meet most student performance criteria are: Connecticut, Indiana, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, Ohio, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Note 2: Most personnel categories are self explanatory. However, it is worth noting that administrative staff support includes school and district level personnel and that support services staff includes non-instructional aides, school bus drivers, and food service workers.

Source: Data are from the Education Statistics Quarterly (National Center for Education Statistics, Volume 5, Issue 2), NCES 2004-608, p. 57, enrollment and pp. 60-61, raw numbers of personnel.

TABLE 4

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF STATES AND
HOW THEY ARE USED TO CREATE AN INDEX TO
EVALUATE STATE PERSONNEL NEEDS**

<u>State</u>	<u>Indicators of Personnel Need</u>			<u>Need Index</u>
	<u>Percent In Special Education</u>	<u>Percent Eligible for Free and Reduced Price Lunch</u>	<u>Percent Who are English Language Learners</u>	
<i>LOUISIANA</i>	13.4%	59.1%	1.5%	1.4430
<p>Nine States that Meet All or Almost All Student Performance Criteria</p>				
Iowa	14.9%	26.7%	2.7%	1.3068
Kansas	13.1%	34.1%	3.7%	1.3348
Maine	15.9%	29.6%	1.1%	1.3169
Massachusetts	15.4%	25.3%	4.7%	1.3228
New Hampshire	13.9%	14.8%	1.6%	1.2274
North Dakota	12.6%	28.0%	3.9%	1.3011
Vermont	13.3%	23.8%	1.0%	1.2610
Washington	12.0%	31.4%	7.0%	1.3400
Wyoming	13.3%	26.5%	3.2%	1.2944

TABLE 4 (Continued)

<u>State</u>	<u>Indicators of Personnel Need</u>			<u>Need Index</u>
	<u>Percent In Special Education</u>	<u>Percent Eligible for Free and Reduced Price Lunch</u>	<u>Percent Who are English Language Learners</u>	
Nine States that Meet Most Student Performance Criteria				
Connecticut	13.0%	28.3%	3.8%	1.3055
Indiana	16.1%	31.1%	4.0%	1.3525
Minnesota	13.0%	26.4%	5.6%	1.3124
Montana	12.6%	31.5%	5.0%	1.3285
New Jersey	16.3%	27.8%	4.2%	1.3398
Ohio	12.4%	27.4%	3.9%	1.2961
South Dakota	13.1%	30.1%	3.3%	1.3112
Virginia	14.1%	29.3%	3.7%	1.3208
Wisconsin	14.3%	26.0%	2.7%	1.2973

Note: The need index is calculated by adding 100 to the sum of 1.00 times the percent of students in special education programs plus .50 times the percent of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch plus .90 times the percent of English language learners and then dividing the sum by 100. This is based on an estimation that, on average, the added cost of special education is 100 percent as much as the cost of regular education, the added cost of students from low income families is half as much as the cost of regular education, and that added cost of serving English language learners is 90 percent as much as the cost of regular education. Using the same approach to deal with every state for comparative purposes mitigates the need for the relative cost figures to be perfect.

Source: Demographic data are from the state profiles available on the National Center for Education Statistics website under the "nationsreportcard" site (where results of the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) are reported. In some cases, an individual item was missing in which case the average for that item, for the states in the appropriate group, was used.

TABLE 5

**COMPARISON OF LOUISIANA IN TERMS OF 2001-02
PERSONNEL PER 1,000 WEIGHTED STUDENTS TO THE
AVERAGES OF TWO DIFFERENT SETS OF STATES SELECTED
ON THE BASIS OF THEIR STUDENT PERFORMANCE**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Louisiana</u>	<u>9 States That Meet All or Almost All Student Perform. Criteria</u>	<u>9 States That Meet Most Student Perform. Criteria</u>
Teachers	47.361	56.289	52.903
Instructional Aides	10.513	16.495	11.891
<i>Teachers and Aides</i>	<i>57.873</i>	<i>72.784</i>	<i>64.794</i>
Guidance Counselors	3.093	2.309	1.729
Librarians	1.138	1.163	1.085
School Administrators	2.450	2.741	2.424
Instruction Coordinators	1.235	1.314	0.973
District Officials/Administrators	0.377	1.703	1.539
Admin. Support Staff	3.623	6.223	7.105
Non-Instructional, Non-Administrative Support Staff	26.442	23.518	22.832
<i>Total Staff</i>	<i>96.230</i>	<i>111.752</i>	<i>102.481</i>

TABLE 5 (Continued)

Note 1: The nine states that meet all or almost all student performance criteria are: Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming. The nine states that meet most student performance criteria are: Connecticut, Indiana, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, Ohio, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Note 2: Most personnel categories are self explanatory. However, it is worth noting that administrative staff support includes school and district level personnel and that support services staff includes non-instructional aides, school bus drivers, and food service workers.

Source: Based on data shown in Tables 3 and 4.

TABLE 6

**COMPARISON OF 2001-02 STATEWIDE AVERAGE TEACHER SALARY
IN LOUISIANA TO THAT OF A SET OF NINE STATES THAT MEET ALL OR
ALMOST ALL STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA – ADJUSTING
FOR TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AND INTER-STATE
COST-OF-LIVING DIFFERENCES**

	Number of Teachers 2001-02	Relative Salary Levels		Teacher Characteristics		Relative Cost of Living 2000	Louisiana Adjusted Average Salary 2001-02
		Starting Salary 2001-02	Average Salary 2001-02	Average Years of Experience 2001-02	Percent of of Teachers With More than a B.A. 1999-00		
Louisiana <i>(Cost Factors)*</i>	49,980	\$28,229	\$36,328	13.9 (\$409)	36.3% (\$82)	.936	\$38,812
<u>Comparison States</u>							
Iowa <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	34,906	\$27,553 .976	\$38,230 1.052	17.0 (\$487)	34.0% (\$97)	.921	\$40,223 1.036
Kansas <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	33,084	\$26,596 .942	\$37,059 1.020	14.3 (\$514)	39.1% (\$103)	.921	\$39,745 1.024
Maine <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	16,741	\$24,054 .852	\$37,300 1.027	16.9 (\$565)	33.7% (\$113)	.992	\$36,200 .932
Massachusetts <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	68,942	\$32,746 1.160	\$48,732 1.341	17.2 (\$474)	61.4% (\$95)	1.144	\$38,654 .996
New Hampshire <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	14,677	\$25,611 .907	\$39,915 1.099	15.8 (\$530)	48.1% (\$106)	1.062	\$35,328 .910
North Dakota <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	8,035	\$20,988 .743	\$32,468 .893	16.2 (\$602)	22.1% (\$120)	.924	\$35,452 .913
Vermont <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	8,554	\$25,229 .894	\$39,771 1.095	15.3 (\$572)	50.7% (\$114)	.999	\$37,362 .963
Washington <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	52,534	\$28,348 1.065	\$43,470 1.197	15.0 (\$546)	54.0% (\$109)	1.073	\$37,978 .979
Wyoming <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	7,026	\$26,773 .962	\$37,853 1.042	15.9 (\$507)	30.2% (\$101)	.997	\$37,572 .968

TABLE 6 (Continued)

Average Salary of Nearby States

Unweighted	\$26,433	\$39,422	16.0	41.5%	\$37,613
Relative to Louisiana	.936	1.085	(\$533)	(\$107)	.969
Weighted by Number of Teachers	\$28,383	\$42,050	16.1	47.6%	\$38,331
Relative to Louisiana	1.005	1.158	(\$515)	(\$103)	.988

* Cost factors for all states are shown adjusted for cost of living to 1.000.

Note: To calculate each state's cost factors for experience and education: (1) multiply years of experience by five and add the product to the percent of teachers with more than a B.A. (if experience is 14 years and percent with more than a B.A. is 40.0, total is 110); (2) divide the difference between average salary and starting salary by this total; (3) divide the result by the relative cost-of-living factor to get the factor for the percentage of teachers with more than a B.A.; and (4) multiply this by five to get the factor for average years of experience. For example, if a state's average salary was \$40,000, its starting salary was \$28,000, the average years of teacher experience was 15, the proportion of teachers with more than a B. A. was 45 percent, and its relative cost of living was .9, the cost factor for percent of teachers with more than a B.A. would be \$111 and the cost factor for years of experience would be \$556.

To calculate the comparable salary for each state: (1) divide the starting salary by the cost-of-living factor; (2) multiply the experience cost factor and the education cost factor for the comparison state by the levels of experience and education of the target state; and (3) add the results of steps (1) and (2) For example, if the comparison state had a starting salary of \$29,000, a cost-of-living factor of .95, an experience cost factor of \$400 and an education cost factor of \$80 and the target state had 15 years of experience and 50 percent of its teachers had more than a bachelors degree, then its comparable salary would be \$40,526.

Sources: Digest of Education Statistics, 2002, Thomas D. Snyder and Charlene M. Hoffman (National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC, June 2003), Table 69.

Survey and Analysis of Teacher Salary Trends, 2002, F. Howard Nelson and Rachel Drown (American Federation of Teachers: Washington, DC, 2003), Tables I-1, I-9, and III-1.

TABLE 7

**COMPARISON OF 2001-02 STATEWIDE AVERAGE TEACHER SALARY
IN LOUISIANA TO THAT OF A SET OF NINE STATES THAT MEET MOST
STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA – ADJUSTING FOR
TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AND INTER-STATE
COST-OF-LIVING DIFFERENCES**

	Number of Teachers 2001-02	Relative Salary Levels		Teacher Characteristics		Relative Cost of Living 2000	Louisiana Adjusted Average Salary 2001-02
		Starting Salary 2001-02	Average Salary 2001-02	Average Years of Experience 2001-02	Percent of of Teachers With More than a B.A. 1999-00		
Louisiana <i>(Cost Factors)*</i>	49,980	\$28,229	\$36,328	13.9 <i>(\$409)</i>	36.3% <i>(\$82)</i>	.936	\$38,812
<u>Comparison States</u>							
Connecticut <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	41,773	\$34,551 <i>1.224</i>	\$52,376 <i>1.442</i>	16.2 <i>(\$499)</i>	83.3% <i>(\$100)</i>	1.087	\$42,345 <i>1.091</i>
Indiana <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	59,658	\$28,440 <i>1.007</i>	\$44,609 <i>1.228</i>	16.7 <i>(\$577)</i>	68.2% <i>(\$115)</i>	.924	\$42,983 <i>1.107</i>
Minnesota <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	53,081	\$29,998 <i>1.063</i>	\$42,175 <i>1.161</i>	15.1 <i>(\$508)</i>	45.6% <i>(\$102)</i>	.989	\$41,089 <i>1.059</i>
Montana <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	10,408	\$27,554 <i>.976</i>	\$36,053 <i>.992</i>	15.4 <i>(\$407)</i>	29.6% <i>(\$81)</i>	.979	\$36,761 <i>.947</i>
New Jersey <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	103,611	\$35,311 <i>1.251</i>	\$50,115 <i>1.380</i>	16.2 <i>(\$571)</i>	41.6% <i>(\$114)</i>	1.057	\$45,493 <i>1.172</i>
Ohio <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	122,115	\$29,953 <i>1.061</i>	\$44,266 <i>1.219</i>	15.3 <i>(\$589)</i>	49.6% <i>(\$118)</i>	.964	\$43,529 <i>1.122</i>
South Dakota <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	9,370	\$23,938 <i>.848</i>	\$31,383 <i>.864</i>	14.8 <i>(\$412)</i>	24.6% <i>(\$82)</i>	.917	\$34,816 <i>.897</i>
Virginia <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	89,314	\$31,238 <i>1.107</i>	\$41,752 <i>1.149</i>	14.3 <i>(\$475)</i>	44.6% <i>(\$95)</i>	.954	\$42,787 <i>1.102</i>
Wisconsin <i>Rel. to LA + (Cost Factors)</i>	60,918	\$27,397 <i>.971</i>	\$41,056 <i>1.130</i>	15.5 <i>(\$585)</i>	43.5% <i>(\$117)</i>	.964	\$40,809 <i>1.051</i>

TABLE 7 (Continued)

Average Salary of Nearby States

Unweighted	\$29,820	\$42,643	15.50	47.8%	\$41,034
<i>Relative to Louisiana</i>	1.056	1.174	(\$514)	(\$103)	1.057
Weighted by Number					
of Teachers	\$30,929	\$44,680	15.50	50.0%	\$42,817
<i>Relative to Louisiana</i>	1.096	1.230	(\$544)	(\$109)	1.103

* Cost factors for all states are shown adjusted for cost of living to 1.000.

Note: To calculate each state's cost factors for experience and education: (1) multiply years of experience by five and add the product to the percent of teachers with more than a B.A. (if experience is 14 years and percent with more than a B.A. is 40.0, total is 110); (2) divide the difference between average salary and starting salary by this total; (3) divide the result by the relative cost-of-living factor to get the factor for the percentage of teachers with more than a B.A.; and (4) multiply this by five to get the factor for average years of experience. For example, if a state's average salary was \$40,000, its starting salary was \$28,000, the average years of teacher experience was 15, the proportion of teachers with more than a B.A. was 45 percent, and its relative cost of living was .9, the cost factor for percent of teachers with more than a B.A. would be \$111 and the cost factor for years of experience would be \$556.

To calculate the comparable salary for each state: (1) divide the starting salary by the cost-of-living factor; (2) multiply the experience cost factor and the education cost factor for the comparison state by the levels of experience and education of the target state; and (3) add the results of steps (1) and (2). For example, if the comparison state had a starting salary of \$29,000, a cost-of-living factor of .95, an experience cost factor of \$400 and an education cost factor of \$80 and the target state had 15 years of experience and 50 percent of its teachers had more than a bachelors degree, then its comparable salary would be \$40,526.

Sources: Digest of Education Statistics, 2002, Thomas D. Snyder and Charlene M. Hoffman (National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education: Washington, DC, June 2003), Table 69.

Survey and Analysis of Teacher Salary Trends, 2002, F. Howard Nelson and Rachel Drown (American Federation of Teachers: Washington, DC, 2003), Tables I-1, I-9, and III-1.

TABLE 8

CALCULATION OF THE 2001-02 COST OF ADJUSTING THE NUMBER OF LOUISIANA SCHOOL PERSONNEL, BY CATEGORY, AND THEIR SALARY TO THE AVERAGE LEVELS OF NINE STATES THAT MEET ALL OR ALMOST ALL STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Personnel</u>	More/ (Less) <u>Personnel</u>	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Salary</u>	<u>Salary Increase</u>	<u>Personnel Times Salary</u>
Teachers					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (100%) ¹	49,980		\$36,328		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	59,402	9,422	\$36,328	--	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	49,916			--	\$0
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		9,422	\$36,328		<u>\$342,282,416</u>
<i>Total</i>					<u>\$342,282,416</u>
Instructional Aides					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (37%)	11,094		\$13,441		
2. Target Personnel/Salary (17,407)		6,313	\$13,441	--	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	11,094			--	\$0
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		6,313	\$13,441		<u>\$84,853,033</u>
<i>Total</i>					<u>\$84,853,033</u>

¹ Figures in parentheses throughout the table indicate the average salary for the category as a proportion of the average teacher salary in Louisiana.

TABLE 8 (Continued)

	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Personnel</u>	More/ (Less) <u>Personnel</u>	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Salary</u>	<u>Salary Increase</u>	<u>Personnel Times Salary</u>
Guidance Counselors					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (115%)	3,264		\$41,777		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	2,437	(827)	\$41,777	--	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	2,437			--	\$0
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		(827)	\$41,777		- \$34,549,579
<i>Total</i>					- \$34,549,579
Librarians					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (111%)	1,201		\$40,324		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	1,228	27	\$40,324	--	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	1,201			--	\$0
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		27	\$40,324		\$1,088,748
<i>Total</i>					\$1,088,748
Non-Instructional, Non-Administrative Support Staff					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (49%)	27,904		\$17,801		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	24,819	(3,085)	\$17,801	--	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	27,904			--	\$0
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target/Current Salary		(3,085)	\$17,801		- \$54,916,085
<i>Total</i>					- \$54,916,085

TABLE 8 (Continued)

	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Personnel</u>	More/ (Less) <u>Personnel</u>	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Salary</u>	<u>Salary Increase</u>	<u>Personnel Times Salary</u>
Instructional Coord. and Super.					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (149%)	1,303		\$54,129		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	1,387	84	\$54,129	--	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	1,303			--	\$0
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		84	\$54,129		<u>\$4,546,836</u>
<i>Total</i>					<u>\$4,546,836</u>
School-Level Administration					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (155%)	2,585		\$56,308		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	2,892	307	\$56,308	--	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	2,585			--	\$0
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		307	\$56,308		<u>\$17,286,556</u>
<i>Total</i>					<u>\$17,286,556</u>
School District Administrators					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (164%)	398		\$59,578		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	1,797	1,399	\$59,578	--	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	398			--	\$0
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target/Current Salary		1,399	\$59,578		<u>\$83,349,622</u>
<i>Total</i>					<u>\$83,349,622</u>

TABLE 8 (Continued)

	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Personnel</u>	More/ (Less) <u>Personnel</u>	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Salary</u>	<u>Salary Increase</u>	<u>Personnel Times Salary</u>
Administrative Support Staff					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (75%)	3,823		\$27,246		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	6,567	2,744	\$27,246	--	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	3,823			--	\$0
4. Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		2,744	\$27,246		<u>\$74,763,024</u>
<i>Total</i>					<u>\$74,763,024</u>

TABLE 9

CALCULATION OF THE 2001-02 COST OF ADJUSTING THE NUMBER OF LOUISIANA SCHOOL PERSONNEL, BY CATEGORY, AND THEIR SALARY TO THE AVERAGE LEVELS OF NINE STATES THAT MEET ALMOST ALL STUDENT PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Personnel</u>	More/ (Less) <u>Personnel</u>	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Salary</u>	<u>Salary Increase</u>	<u>Personnel Times Salary</u>
Teachers					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (100%) ¹	49,980		\$36,328		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	55,829	5,849	\$38,399	\$2,071	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	49,980			\$2,071	\$103,508,580
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		5,849	\$38,399		<u>\$224,595,751</u>
<i>Total</i>					<u>\$328,104,331</u>
Instructional Aides					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (37%)	11,094		\$13,441		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	12,549	1,455	\$14,208	\$767	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	11,094			\$767	\$8,509,098
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		1,455	\$14,208		<u>\$20,672,640</u>
<i>Total</i>					<u>\$29,181,738</u>

¹ Figures in parentheses throughout the table indicate the average salary for the category as a proportion of the average teacher salary in Louisiana.

TABLE 9 (Continued)

	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Personnel</u>	More/ (Less) <u>Personnel</u>	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Salary</u>	<u>Salary Increase</u>	<u>Personnel Times Salary</u>
Guidance Counselors					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (115%)	3,264		\$41,777		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	1,824	(1,440)	\$44,159	\$2,382	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	1,824			\$2,382	\$4,344,768
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		(1,440)	\$41,777		- \$60,158,880
<i>Total</i>					- \$55,814,112
Librarians					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (111%)	1,201		\$40,324		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	1,145	(56)	\$42,623	\$2,299	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	1,145			\$2,299	\$2,632,355
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		(56)	\$40,324		- \$2,258,144
<i>Total</i>					\$374,211
Non-Instructional, Non-Administrative Support Staff					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (49%)	27,904		\$17,801		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	24,095	(3,809)	\$18,816	\$1,015	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	24,095			\$1,015	\$24,456,425
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target/Current Salary		(3,809)	\$17,801		- \$67,804,009
<i>Total</i>					- \$43,347,584

TABLE 9 (Continued)

	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Personnel</u>	More/ (Less) <u>Personnel</u>	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Salary</u>	<u>Salary Increase</u>	<u>Personnel Times Salary</u>
Instructional Coord. and Super.					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (149%)	1,303		\$54,129		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	1,027	(276)	\$57,215	\$3,086	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	1,027			\$3,086	\$3,169,322
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		(276)	\$54,129		- \$14,939,604
<i>Total</i>					- \$11,770,282
School-Level Administration					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (155%)	2,585		\$56,308		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	2,558	(27)	\$59,518	\$3,210	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	2,558			\$3,210	\$8,211,180
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		(27)	\$56,308		- \$1,520,316
<i>Total</i>					\$6,690,864
School District Administrators					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (164%)	398		\$59,578		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	1,624	1,226	\$62,974	\$3,396	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	398			\$3,396	\$1,351,608
4 Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target/Current Salary		1,226	\$62,974		\$77,206,124
<i>Total</i>					\$78,557,732

TABLE 9 (Continued)

	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Personnel</u>	More/ (Less) <u>Personnel</u>	2001-02 Current/ Target <u>Salary</u>	<u>Salary Increase</u>	<u>Personnel Times Salary</u>
Administrative Support Staff					
1. Current Personnel/Salary (75%)	3,823		\$27,246		
2. Target Personnel/Salary	7,498	3,675	\$28,799	\$1,553	
3. Cost of Existing/Needed Personnel and Salary Increase	3,823			\$1,553	\$5,937,119
4. Cost/Saving of Added/Less Personnel and Target Salary		3,675	\$28,799		<u>\$105,836,325</u>
<i>Total</i>					<u>\$111,773,444</u>

TABLE 10

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF 2001-02 COSTS, SAVINGS, AND NET COSTS OF MAKING LOUISIANA COMPARABLE IN TERMS OF PUBLIC K-12 EDUCATION EMPLOYEES AND SALARIES TO TWO DIFFERENT SETS OF STATES SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF THEIR STUDENT PERFORMANCE

	<u>Nine States That Meet or Almost Meet All Student Performance Criteria</u>	<u>Nine States That Meet Most Student Performance Criteria</u>
Cost of Raising Salaries of Existing Personnel (Only Up to Needed Levels of Personnel)	\$0	\$162,120,455
Cost of Adding Needed Personnel (at New Salary Levels if Required)	<u>\$608,170,235</u>	<u>\$428,310,840</u>
Total Cost	\$608,170,235	\$590,431,295
Savings Associated with Fewer Personnel (at Old Salary Levels)	<u>- \$89,465,664</u>	<u>- \$146,680,953</u>
Net Cost in 2001-02 Dollars	\$518,704,571	\$443,750,342
Net Cost in 2001-02 Dollars per Student (731,328 Students)	\$709	\$607

TABLE 11

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF 2001-02 NET COSTS OF MAKING LOUISIANA COMPARABLE IN TERMS OF PUBLIC K-12 EDUCATION EMPLOYEES AND SALARIES TO TWO DIFFERENT SETS OF STATES SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF THEIR STUDENT PERFORMANCE

<u>Alternative Policy Factors Used to Calculate Net Cost</u>	<u>Nine States That Meet or Almost Meet All Student Performance Criteria</u>	<u>Nine States That Meet Most Student Performance Criteria</u>
1) Net Cost of Adding Personnel Using Actual Statewide Average Salaries for Louisiana	\$518,704,571	\$252,634,194
2) Net Cost of Adding Personnel and Adjusting Salaries Using Actual Statewide Average Levels of Education and Experience	\$518,704,571	\$443,750,342
3) Net Cost of Adding Personnel and Adjusting Salaries Using the Average Education and Experience of Comparison States for Teachers	\$591,393,621	\$516,048,897

Note: In calculating net costs, a constant amount of saving was used for each group of states based on reducing the number of people employed in certain categories and multiplying such people by their actual Louisiana statewide average salary. The amounts are as follows: (1) for the nine states that meet or almost meet all criteria, \$93,948,169 and (2) for the nine states that meet most criteria, \$152,576,611. For the third approach, only the additional cost of changing teacher salaries were added (all other salaries were not changed because teacher salaries were changed to reflect new levels of experience and education.

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF LOUISIANA TO TWO GROUPS OF OTHER STATES SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA IN TERMS OF 2001-02 PER STUDENT SPENDING AND PER STUDENT SPENDING ADJUSTED BY INTER-STATE COST-OF-LIVING AND EDUCATION NEED FACTORS

<u>State</u>	<u>2001-02 Per Student Spending</u>	<u>Adjusted Per Student Spending</u>		
		<u>Relative Inter-State Cost of Living</u>	<u>Student Need Factor</u>	<u>2001-02 Per Student Adjusted Spending</u>
Louisiana	\$6,560	.936	1.4430	\$4,857
Total Actual Expenditures				\$4,797,500,000
<p><u>Nine States that Meet All or Almost All Student Performance Criteria</u></p>				
Iowa	\$6,819	.921	1.3068	\$5,666
Kansas	\$7,354	.921	1.3348	\$5,982
Maine	\$8,831	.992	1.3169	\$6,760
Massachusetts	\$10,190	1.144	1.3228	\$6,734
New Hampshire	\$7,847	1.062	1.2274	\$6,020
North Dakota	\$4,612	.924	1.3011	\$3,836
Vermont	\$9,352	.999	1.2610	\$7,424
Washington	\$6,999	1.073	1.3400	\$4,868
Wyoming	\$8,813	.997	1.2944	\$6,829
Simple Average				\$6,013
Added Cost to Raise Louisiana up to the Average				\$1,142,100,000

TABLE 12 (Continued)

<u>State</u>	<u>Adjusted Per Student Spending</u>			
	2001-02 Per Student Spending	Relative Inter-State Cost of Living	Student Need Factor	2001-02 Per Student Adjusted Spending
<u>Nine States that Meet Most Student Performance Criteria</u>				
Connecticut	\$10,825	1.087	1.3055	\$7,628
Indiana	\$7,866	.924	1.3525	\$6,294
Minnesota	\$7,567	.989	1.3124	\$5,830
Montana	\$7,130	.979	1.3285	\$5,482
New Jersey	\$10,869	1.057	1.3398	\$7,675
Ohio	\$7,204	.964	1.2961	\$5,766
South Dakota	\$6,540	.917	1.3112	\$5,439
Virginia	\$6,343	.954	1.3208	\$5,034
Wisconsin	\$8,604	.964	1.2973	\$6,880
Simple Average				\$6,225
Added Cost to Raise Louisiana up to the Average				\$1,351,700,000