## EDUCATION IN AMERICA: STATE-BY-STATE SCORECARD

	Inputs and Outputs			Education Reform Action		
State-by-State	Per Pupil Spending <sup>1</sup> Lowest (1) to Highest (51)	Education Performance <sup>2</sup> Rank	Graduation Rate Percentage <sup>3</sup>	Charter School⁴ Law CER Grade	School Choice⁵	Change in Proficiency <sup>6</sup> Standards 2003-2009
Alabama	18 (\$9,103)	40	62.5%	No Law	none	-3.0
Alaska	49 (\$14,630)	11	65.2%	34 (D)	public	+22.1
Arizona	3 (\$7,608)	45	68.2%	4 (B)	public, tax credit	-48.5
Arkansas	11 (\$8,541)	44	69.3%	32 (D)	public	-32.2
California	29 (\$9,863)	30	62.7%	3 (A)	public	-35.3
Colorado	16 (\$9,079)	17	73.2%	6 (B)	public	+57.0
Connecticut	46 (\$13,848)	29	77.7%	33 (D)	public	+7.2
Delaware	41 (\$12,253)	19	65.0%	14 (C)	public	-4.1
District of Columbia	48 (\$14,594)	26	59.5%	I (A)	public, voucher*	+5.8
Florida	13 (\$9,035)	3	62.1%	10 (B)	public, tax credit, voucher	-5.0
Georgia	27 (9,788)	27	57.8%	15 (C)	public, tax credit, voucher	+24,2
Hawaii	39 (\$11,800)	15	65.1%	36 (D)	public public	+9.2
Idaho	2 (\$6,931)	22	73.5%	22 (C)	public	-2.1
Illinois	34 (\$10,246)	38	74.6%	27 (D)	public, tax credits	-30.5
Indiana	14 (\$9,036)	13	72.4%	8 (B)	public, tax credits	+22,1
lowa	21 (\$9,267)	31	80.2%	39 (F)	public, tax credits	+9.0
Kansas	25 (\$9,667)	7	75.1%	38 (F)	public public	-2.5
Kentucky	12 (\$8,686)	37	71.8%	No Law	public	-17.3
Louisiana	30 (\$9,954)	47	57.4%	13 (C)	public, tax credits, vouchers	-2.4
Maine	37 (\$11,572)	14	77.6%	No Law	public, voucher	-11,5
Maryland	42 (\$12,966)	20	73.7%	35 (D)		-39.1
Massachusetts		20	77.3%	17 (C)	none public	+8.2
	43 (\$13,454)	49	77.8%	. ,		-27.8
Michigan Minnesota	31 (\$10,069)	23	77.2%	5 (B)	public	-27.8 New
	32 (\$10,140)			2 (A)	public, tax credits	
Mississippi	6 (\$7,901)	46	62.5%	41 (F)	public	+38.5
Missouri	20 (\$9,216)	34	75.3%	9 (B)	public	+4.8
Montana	24 (\$9,666)	9	75.2%	No Law	public	+50.5
Nebraska	23 (\$9,577)	33	74.3%	No Law	public	-8.2
Nevada	8 (\$8,285)	18	41.8%	23 (C)	public	+2,2
New Hampshire	38 (\$11,619)	4	76.2%	31 (D)	public	New
New Jersey	50 (\$16,491)	10	83.3%	19 (C)	public	+36.1
New Mexico	15 (9,068)	48	54.9%	24 (B)	public	+19.4
New York	51 (\$17,173)	5	70.6%	7 (B)	public	-36.9
North Carolina	7 (\$7,996)	41	57.8%	30 (D)	none	+32.8
North Dakota	26 (\$9,675)	24	80.9%	No Law	public	-8.9
Ohio	33 (\$10,173)	35	74.6%	18 (C)	public, vouchers	-5.3
Oklahoma	4 (\$7,685)	43	71.8%	26 (C)	public, vouchers	+44.4
Oregon	22 (\$9,558)	32	74.1%	21 (C)	public	-13.7
Pennsylvania	40 (\$12,035)	6	77.6%	12 (B)	public, tax credits	-2.3
Rhode Island	44 (\$13,539)	25	71.1%	28 (D)	public, tax credits	+2.9
South Carolina	19 (\$9,170)	51	54.9%	20 (C)	public	-65.2
South Dakota	10 (\$8,367)	39	75.4%	No Law	public	+18.5
Tennessee	5 (\$7,739)	36	65.8%	25 (C)	public	-1.0
Texas	9 (\$8,320)	8	65.1%	29 (D)	public	+14.5
Utah	l (\$5,765)	42	77.1%	II (B)	public, vouchers	+40.3
Vermont	47 (\$14,300)	1	82.3%	No Law	public, vouchers	+15.9
Virginia	35 (\$10,659)	12	69.9%	40 (F)	none	+4.2
Washington	17 (\$9,099)	16	67.9%	No Law	public	+33.8
West Virginia	28 (\$9,825)	50	71.6%	No Law	public	+46.7
Wisconsin	36 (\$10,680)	21	81.0%	16 (C)	public, vouchers (Milwaukee)	+28.9
Wyoming	45 (\$13,840)	28	72.6%	37 (D)	public	-41.3

<sup>1 2008</sup> Annual Survey of Local Government Finances - School Systems, Per Pupil Amounts for Current Spending of Public Elementary-Secondary School Systems by State: 2007-08. U.S. Census Bureau, 2008. http://www.census.gov/govs/school/

 $http://whttp://www.alec.org/AM/pdf/education/2010\_reportcard/final copy condensed.pdf$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> American Legislative Exchange Council Report Card on Education 16th Edition, p 112, Ranking based on the overall 2009 scores for low-income children and their gains/ losses on NAEP 4th and 8th grade reading and math exams from 2003-2009.

 $<sup>^3</sup>$  Graduation by the Numbers, Diplomas Count: Education Week. Vol. 98, No. 34. June 2010. http://www.edweek.org/ew/toc/2010/06/10/index.html

<sup>4 2011</sup> Charter School Laws Across the States: Ranking and Scorecard. The Center for Education Reform, Washgington DC. 2010. http://www.edreform.com/\_upload/ranking\_chart.pdf

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> School Choice Key: public = open enrollment policies between and/or among public school districts; voucher = publically funded voucher program, which may include public, private, or parochial schools, and may support specific student populations; tax credit = business or individual credit for monetary contributions to school tuition organizations (reference: The Heritage Foundation, "School Choice in America," December 2009, http://www.heritage.org/sphications/schoolchoice. The Foundation for Educational Choice in Your State," December 2010, http://www.edchoice.org/School-Choice/School-Choice-in-Your-State.aspx.) \*DC Opportunity Scholarship is no longer accepting new students.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> This rating compared state achievement test standards with those in NAEP math and reading tests for the years 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009. For each available test, the difference between the percentage of students who were proficient on NAEP and the percentage reported to be proficient on the state's own tests were computed for the same year. The standard deviation for this difference was also computed. Then, it was determined how many standard deviations each state's difference was above or below the average difference of all observations on each test. State Standards Rise in Reading, Fall in Math, Education Next. Vol. 10, No. 4. Fall 2010 http://educationnext.org/state-standards-rising-in-reading-but-not-in-math/