

2010 State School Report Card

A state-by-state analysis of
learning, efficiency, and standards

By Herbert J. Walberg and Marc Oestreich¹

1. Introduction

*A Nation at Risk*² pointed out more than 25 years ago that the poor quality of public schools in the United States is a threat to the continuing prosperity of the country. Despite substantially increased spending and many reforms, the failure of today's school system to provide a quality education for all students poses an even greater threat to the nation.

The failure of today's school system to provide a quality education for all students poses an even greater threat to the nation.

American students' achievement scores on international tests have been relatively poor and stagnant for the past quarter-century, while per-pupil spending increased by more than

¹ Herbert Walberg is distinguished visiting fellow at the Stanford University Hoover Institution and board chairman of The Heartland Institute, where Marc Oestreich is legislative specialist. More complete bios appear on page 14. Spreadsheets presenting the underlying data on which this report is based are available upon request.

The authors thank George Clowes for extensive comments on a previous version of this study; Joe Bast for organizational and editorial suggestions; and Diane Bast for skillful copy editing.

² National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1983).

65 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars.³ The 2009 *Digest of Education Statistics* shows employment in K-12 education nearly doubled, while enrollment rose by less than 9 percent, over the past 40 years.⁴ School failure and inefficiency, moreover, are much better known today than in past decades. In a national survey, less than 20 percent of Americans gave the nation's schools a grade of "A" or "B."⁵

State governments bear the major responsibility for public schools, which should make a 50-state ranking of school performance of keen interest to legislators, citizens, educators, and parents. This report presents such a ranking based on four indices of school performance:

1. learning
2. efficiency
3. standards
4. overall performance

This report brings the information together and uses it to grade the states according to learning progress, progress in relation to spending, and state standards.

The data on which these indices are based have been separately published on hundreds of somewhat-inaccessible-pages by the National Assessment of Educational Progress, National Center for Educational Statistics, and several think tanks. This report brings the information together and uses it to grade the states according to learning progress,

progress in relation to spending, and state standards.

Part 2 of this report presents the methodology used to create the indices and grade the 50 states plus the District of Columbia. Part 3 reports the results, giving each state a grade for each of the three indices and a final grade for overall performance. Part 4 briefly discusses the policy implications of the findings. The appendix provides data used in calculating the indices.

³ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics: 2009*, Table 80. <http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/>. Retrieved June 09, 2010.

⁴ Ibid. Table 33, "Historical summary of public elementary and secondary school statistics: Selected years, 1869–70 through 2006–07." <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/>. Retrieved June 09, 2010.

⁵ Paul E. Peterson, "What do Americans Think of the Nation's Schools?" *Education Next*, August 31, 2010. <http://educationnext.org/what-do-americans-think-of-the-nations-schools-how-widespread-is-the-support-for-charter-schools/>.

2. Methodology

The methodology used to construct the four indices used in this report is explained below. Internet links for the data sources refer the reader to the original data used for such measures as reading and mathematics proficiency. Much of the data used in our calculations appear in the appendix.

A. Learning

This index is based on gains (or losses) in test scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) mathematics and reading tests in each state from 2005 to 2009 – what we call *time gain* – and, to measure typical recent progress, the grade gain in NAEP proficiency between 4th graders and 8th graders in 2009, the latest year for which data were available.

These changes and differences are preferred to the states' status at a single point in time, the index used by some other rankings of states, because achievement proficiency is determined to a great extent by family demographics such as socioeconomic status rather than by the effectiveness of the state's schools.⁶ Some states may be making exemplary progress but still be far behind other states, which ought not to count against that state's overall grade. A fast rate of improvement over the long run would eventually put lagging states in leading positions. The present study assesses recent progress and makes no claim to assess long-run, decades-long progress in the past or future.

Some states may be making exemplary progress but still be far behind other states, which ought not to count against that state's overall grade.

An aggregate score for time gain was created by summing average math and reading scores in each state.⁷ Aggregate scores for Grade 4 students in 2005 were subtracted from aggregate scores for Grade 8 students in 2009. The resulting number was then assigned a rank (1 being greatest gain and 51 being least).

The grade gain indicator uses a similar calculation, but uses only data from the 2009 NAEP assessment. Aggregate math and reading scores for Grade 4 students were subtracted from

⁶ No claim is made here that the proficiency gains control for all state variations in demographic and other factors. Some states, such as Florida and Texas, are attracting migrants from other states, while California and New York are losing migrants to other states.

⁷ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2005 and 2009 Mathematics and Reading Assessments. <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>. Retrieved June 21, 2010.

aggregate math and reading scores for Grade 8 students. The resulting number was then assigned a rank (1 being largest difference and 51 being least).

B. Efficiency

Efficiency is an index of outcomes relative to how much each state spends per student adjusted for state cost of living. Five indices of efficiency were used:

1. Cost per graduate
2. Cost per student
3. Cost per unit of learning gain over time
4. Cost per unit of learning gain between grades
5. Ratio of teachers to staff

Efficiency is an index of outcomes relative to how much each state spends per student adjusted for state cost of living. Five indices of efficiency were used.

These rankings are summed and divided by five, and their average was used to determine a final 1-51 rank.

Per Graduate – The National Center for Education Statistics' report on 2007 public school expenditures provided a measure of total spending on education in each state.⁸

The data were adjusted by a per-state cost of living index.⁹ The cost of living index was expressed as a percentage of the mean score and its inverse multiplied by each state's total expenditures to create an adjusted spending figure. The resulting number – “adjusted state expenditures” – was divided by the number of public school diplomas issued by each state, as reported by the National Center for Education Statistics in 2007¹⁰, to calculate a per-graduate spending indicator. The indicator is assigned a 1-51 rank (best to worst).

⁸ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, "National Public Education Financial Survey (State Fiscal)" 2006-07 (FY 2007) v.1a, in *Common Core of Data* (CCD). <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/stfis.asp>. Retrieved June 21, 2010.

⁹ The Council for Community and Economic Research, ACCRA Cost of Living Index, 1st Quarter 2010. <http://www.coli.org/store.asp>.

¹⁰ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, "State Dropout and Completion Data File" 2006-07 v.1av.1a, in *Common Core of Data* (CCD). <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2009316>. Retrieved June 21, 2010.

Per Pupil – To find a per-pupil spending indicator, the adjusted state expenditures were divided by total public school enrollment figures reported by the National Center for Education Statistics in 2009.¹¹ The indicator was assigned a 1-51 rank (best to worst).

Per Unit of Learning over Time – To find an efficiency per time indicator, the adjusted state expenditures were divided by the time gain measure from the achievement analysis. The indicator was assigned a 1-51 rank (best to worst).

Per Unit of Learning Between Grades – To find an efficiency per grade indicator, the adjusted state expenditures were divided by the grade gain measure from the achievement analysis above. The indicator was assigned a 1-51 rank (best to worst).

Ratio of Teachers to Staff – The National Center for Education Statistics' 2009 report¹² includes both the number of public school teachers per state and the number of non-teaching staff, including administrators. The raw indicator (before ranking) was expressed as a ratio (teachers divided by all staff) and assigned a 1-51 rank (best to worst, fewer staff per teacher being considered desirable).

C. Standards

State standards are indicated by an average of two rankings. The first, calculated by Paul Peterson at *Education Next* (EdNext), the Henry Lee Shattuck Professor of Government and director of the Program on Education Policy and Governance at Harvard University, ranks state standards as of 2009 according to how they compare to NAEP test scores for the state.¹³ To the extent that a state claimed higher proficiency levels than the national test score results reveal, the state's standard is taken as commensurately lower. For example, if the state claimed 70 percent of its students were proficient, but if the NAEP test scores showed only 25 percent were proficient, the state ranks relatively low in Peterson's report.

State standards are indicated by an average of two rankings.
--

¹¹ *Supra* note 8.

¹² U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, "State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education" 2006-07 v.1c, 2007-08 v.1a, in *Common Core of Data* (CCD). <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/stNfis.asp>. Retrieved June 21, 2010.

¹³ Paul Peterson, "State Standards Rising in Reading but Not in Math," *Education Next* 10:4 (Fall 2010). <http://educationnext.org/state-standards-rising-in-reading-but-not-in-math/>.

The second indicator is a rank from the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, which assigns scores to each state based on the rigor and content of its math, reading, and science standards.¹⁴ The institute has, for more than a decade, been examining and grading state standards; its most recent assessment, published in 2010, is used here.

The standards category is calculated as a 1-51 ranking of the averages of the two indicators. Each state is ranked twice; the ranks are summed and divided by two; and the concluding number is assigned a final 1-51 rank.

D. Overall

A composite score was calculated for each state using the average of the three individual rankings with no differential weighting. Each state's rankings for learning, efficiency, and standards were summed, divided by three, and ranked from 1-51 (with 1 being most desirable).

¹⁴ S.B. Carmichael, et al., *The State of State Standards – and The Common Core - In 2010* (Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute, July 2010).

3. Results and Rankings

A. Learning

Table 1 ranks the 50 states and the District of Columbia according to the amount of learning taking place in the state’s schools. Ties are indicated by more than one state having the same ranking. Each state and the District of Columbia is assigned a letter grade of A to F based on a curve with the ten highest-scorers getting As, the next ten getting Bs, and so on until the final 11 receive Fs.

Of the top ten states, seven are west of the Mississippi—Arizona at the top, followed by South Dakota, Montana, Alaska, Oregon, North Dakota, and Minnesota. The non-western states in the top ten are New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

Starting with West Virginia in last place, the bottom states in reverse rank order are Florida, Arkansas, Mississippi, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Delaware, Virginia, California, New York, and Oklahoma. Half of these are in the South.

Table 1				
Ranking of States by Learning Achievement				
A	B	C	D	F
1. Arizona	11. Missouri	21. New Mexico	31. Georgia	41. Oklahoma
2. South Dakota	12. Vermont	22. Idaho	31. Maine	42. New York
3. Montana	13. Washington	23. Tennessee	31. Nevada	43. California
4. Alaska	14. Wisconsin	24. Wyoming	31. New Hampshire	43. Virginia
5. Oregon	15. Nebraska	25. Kentucky	35. District of Columbia	45. Delaware
6. New Jersey	16. Maryland	26. Kansas	36. Iowa	46. Rhode Island
6. Pennsylvania	17. Indiana	27. Ohio	37. Alabama	47. North Carolina
8. Illinois	18. Massachusetts	27. Louisiana	37. Hawaii	48. Mississippi
9. North Dakota	19. Utah	29. Colorado	39. South Carolina	49. Arkansas
10. Minnesota	20. Connecticut	30. Texas	40. Michigan	50. Florida
				51. West Virginia

B. Efficiency

Table 2 ranks the 50 states and the District of Columbia according to their relative efficiency in producing the learning outcomes ranked in Table 1. It shows Hawaii leading the states. Seven of the other top ten states are also west of the Mississippi; Tennessee and North Carolina are the remaining two states. Of the 11 states receiving a grade of F, eight are located along the Atlantic coast. Wyoming, however, was the least efficient state.

Table 2 Ranking of States by Efficiency				
A	B	C	D	F
1. Hawaii	10. North Dakota	20. Maryland	31. Texas	41. Georgia
2. Idaho	12. Oregon	22. Maine	32. Massachusetts	42. Florida
3. Utah	13. Washington	23. Iowa	33. Alaska	43. Michigan
4. California	14. Nevada	24. New Hampshire	34. Rhode Island	44. New Jersey
5. South Dakota	15. Mississippi	25. Kansas	35. Kentucky	44. New York
6. Arizona	16. Colorado	26. Minnesota	36. Indiana	46. Connecticut
7. Montana	17. Missouri	26. South Carolina	37. Arkansas	47. Delaware
8. Oklahoma	18. Illinois	28. West Virginia	38. Nebraska	48. Virginia
9. Tennessee	19. New Mexico	29. Wisconsin	39. Vermont	49. District of Columbia
10. North Carolina	20. Alabama	30. Louisiana	40. Pennsylvania	50. Ohio
				51. Wyoming

It may seem surprising that the much-criticized California school system ranks fourth. Two reasons may account for its high efficiency: California spends surprisingly little per student, and its cost per high school graduate is among the lowest of all states – about half the cost of the District of Columbia.

It is noteworthy that Hawaii educates students at less than half the cost of the least-efficient states, such as Florida, New York, and Wyoming. The District of Columbia, with the only public school system for which the federal government is ultimately responsible, graduates students at more than twice the cost of Hawaii (\$465,000 vs. \$202,000).

Efficient states, like Hawaii, Idaho, Utah, California, and South Dakota, provide models for other states. On average, their schools perform relatively well, at relatively low cost.

C. Standards

Table 3 ranks the 50 states and the District of Columbia according to the quality of their academic standards. The top ten states are located in all parts of the country. Massachusetts, California, and the state of Washington rank in the top ten of both indicators used to rank the quality of academic standards. Colorado, Florida, Minnesota, Indiana, Oklahoma, Hawaii, and Maine are the other top ten states in the composite index. The Midwest dominates the 10 worst states with five of the six worst states: Kansas, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Nebraska.

Table 3				
Ranking of States by the Quality of Academic Standards				
A	B	C	D	F
1. Massachusetts	11. New Jersey	21. Arizona	30. Louisiana	40. South Carolina
2. California	12. Delaware	21. Mississippi	32. Kentucky	42. Connecticut
3. Washington	13. New Hampshire	21. Ohio	32. Virginia	42. Montana
4. Colorado	13. New Mexico	24. South Dakota	34. North Dakota	44. North Carolina
5. Florida	15. Missouri	25. Rhode Island	35. Maryland	44. Pennsylvania
5. Minnesota	16. West Virginia	26. New York	35. Wyoming	46. Kansas
7. Indiana	17. Nevada	27. Georgia	37. Arkansas	47. Illinois
8. Oklahoma	17. Oregon	28. Texas	38. Tennessee	48. Iowa
9. Hawaii	17. Utah	28. Vermont	39. Michigan	49. Wisconsin
10. Maine	20. District of Columbia	30. Alabama	40. Idaho	50. Alaska
				51. Nebraska

D. Overall

Table 4 ranks the 50 states and the District of Columbia according to the overall quality of their K-12 education systems using an average of the ranks reported in the three earlier tables. A high rank requires a state to show substantial learning progress at relatively low cost and to hold itself to high standards.

Arizona, Washington, South Dakota, Oregon, and Utah—five Western states—have the highest ranks and consistently rank in the top half of states among indices. Also receiving “A” grades are Minnesota, Missouri, Hawaii, Massachusetts, and California.

The five states that tended to make least learning progress, to be most inefficient, and to have poor academic standards include the jointly worst-ranked Virginia and Arkansas together with Michigan, New York, and Wyoming.

Table 4				
Ranking of States by Overall Achievement				
A	B	C	D	F
1. Arizona	9. Colorado	21. Tennessee	31. Pennsylvania	41. District of Columbia
1. Washington	12. Montana	22. Maryland	31. Wisconsin	42. Nebraska
3. South Dakota	13. North Dakota	22. New Hampshire	33. Kentucky	43. South Carolina
4. Oregon	13. New Mexico	24. Illinois	34. West Virginia	43. Rhode Island
5. Utah	15. Oklahoma	25. Vermont	35. Kansas	43. Iowa
6. Minnesota	16. Indiana	26. Mississippi	36. Florida	46. Connecticut
7. Missouri	17. New Jersey	27. Alabama	37. Ohio	47. Wyoming
8. Hawaii	18. Nevada	28. Alaska	38. North Carolina	48. New York
9. Massachusetts	19. Maine	28. Louisiana	39. Georgia	49. Michigan
9. California	20. Idaho	30. Texas	40. Delaware	50. Arkansas
				50. Virginia

California, the largest state when ranked by population with 37 million residents in 2009, tied for ninth in overall performance. Next-largest Texas ranked 30th, then New York at 48th, Florida at 36th, and Illinois, with 13 million residents, at 24th. Neither the large states nor those with small populations, such as New Mexico with 2 million residents or Nevada, Utah, Kansas, and Arkansas with 2.5 million, showed any consistent advantage.

4. Policy Implications

The present study shows that some states – Arizona, South Dakota, Washington, Oregon, and Utah, to name the top five -- are doing better than others in achieving learning outcomes, spending taxpayers’ money efficiently on schools, and holding themselves to high standards. If the United States is to maintain its traditions of relative prosperity and high economic growth, more states need to follow the lead of these high-performers.

Other states – Virginia, Arkansas, Michigan, New York, and Wyoming, to name the bottom five – are plainly doing worse. Students in these states tend to achieve less than would be expected, and the schools are high-cost and have weak standards. Parents and taxpayers in those states – indeed, in any of the states receiving grades lower than an “A” – ought to be upset and demanding change.

If the United States is to maintain its traditions of relative prosperity and high economic growth, more states need to follow the lead of these high-performing states.

What are the highest-ranking states doing right? While there is a voluminous literature that purports to describe “what works” in K-12 schooling, there is actually very little empirical data on why some states achieve more or are more efficient achievers than other states. The closest we have come to finding a 50-state study of this kind is the *Education Freedom Index*, last updated in 2001 by Jay Greene, an endowed professor of education reform at the University of Arkansas, who found that the greater the degree of school choice within a state, the better its achievement.¹⁵

Greene’s index is based on the percentage of charter schools in the state, the freedom of parents to send their children to schools outside their home school districts, the percentage of students enrolled in voucher programs, the size of tax credits for parents’ private school expenses, parents’ freedom to home-school their children, and the percentage of home-schooled children in the state. Greene statistically adjusted differences among states in median household income, per-pupil spending, previous achievement test scores, and the percentage of ethnic minorities in the state.

According to Greene, “if a state could improve its Education Freedom Index Score by one point, we would expect that an additional 4.1% of its students would perform proficiently on the NAEP math test.”¹⁶ Per-student spending, per-capita income, and other factors were statistically controlled; the states with superior achievement did not excel because they spend more on each student or because they have higher average state incomes.

¹⁵ Jay Greene, *2001 Education Freedom Index* (New York, NY: Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, 2001). http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cr_24.htm.

¹⁶ Ibid.

A recent and promising innovation to accelerate school choice is the “Parent Trigger,” legislation passed by the California legislature and signed into law in January 2010.

Greene’s work corroborates many smaller-scale, within-state comparative studies of school choice including those of charter schools, private schools, and vouchers that enable parents to send their children to schools of their choice rather than being restricted by school districts to an assigned school.¹⁷ Private and charter schools cost less,

on average, than public schools (charter schools cost on average about 80 percent of nearby traditional public schools), while their students learn more than average. There is evidence, moreover, that competition from choice schools prompts traditional public schools to improve.¹⁸

Even so, ten states have no legislative provision for charter schools and other states place caps on the number of charter schools. Relatively few states give parents vouchers or tax credits to enable their children to attend private schools, though the number and size of such programs are growing.¹⁹

A recent and promising innovation to accelerate school choice is the “Parent Trigger,” legislation passed by the California legislature and signed into law in January 2010. The law allows parents whose children attend a failing public school to sign a petition demanding immediate reform of their school. If more than half of the parents sign the petition, the school district must either close the school and allow parents to choose another public school, convert the failing school into a charter school, or implement one of two other school reform plans (“turn-around” or “transformation”) described by the federal Race to the Top legislation.²⁰ If

¹⁷ For a comprehensive review of this literature, see Herbert J. Walberg, *School Choice: the Evidence* (Washington, DC: Cato Institute, 2007) and Herbert J. Walberg, *Advancing Student Achievement* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 2010). The correlation between Greene's 2000 measure of education freedom and our overall outcome at roughly the year 2009 is not significant ($r = 0.20$, $p > .05$). Aside from the time difference, school spending, efficiency, and standards would not necessarily be expected to be related to the amount of school choice in a state for several reasons. Our measure of learning is contemporary, roughly a decade more recent than Greene's, and too few students are in schools of choice to affect the overall efficiency of state school systems. A new study comparable to Greene's that links outcomes to choice would require contemporary measures of school choice. In any case, however, many studies discussed subsequently link school choice and outcomes including not only student achievement but parent satisfaction.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice, *ABCs of School Choice*, October 2009. <http://www.edchoice.org/Foundation-Services/Publications/ABCs-of-School-Choice.aspx>.

²⁰ See California Education Code, Section 53300-53303, Article 3 – Parent Empowerment. The text appears in Appendix 1 of Joseph L. Bast, Bruno Behrend, Ben Boychuk, and Marc Oestreich, "The Parent Trigger: A Model for Transforming Leadership," *Policy Brief*, The Heartland Institute, August 2010. <http://www.schoolreform-news.org/article/28202>.

Parent Trigger legislation were adopted in other states, the number of charter schools probably would increase dramatically.

Researchers at The Heartland Institute have proposed replacing the “turn-around” and “transformation” options of California’s Parent Trigger with a provision that would grant parents vouchers or scholarships to pay for tuition at independent, parochial, or other public schools for their children.²¹ Such a revised Parent Trigger could boost

dramatically the number of students participating in school voucher programs. Based on Greene’s work and now ours, this outcome is likely to improve student achievement and possibly efficiency and overall performance. Given the increasing inefficiency of traditional public schools and slow pace of school reform over the past half-century, this idea might be a much-needed breakthrough for school reformers nationwide.

We hope the results reported here will motivate legislators, governors, and others to further assess their states’ learning progress and standards and to make the changes needed.

We hope the results reported here will motivate legislators, governors, and others to further assess their states’ learning progress and standards and to make the changes needed to substantially improve student proficiency and benefit the nation as a whole.

© 2010 The Heartland Institute. Distributed by **The Heartland Institute**, a nonprofit and nonpartisan public policy research organization. Nothing in this report should be construed as reflecting the views of The Heartland Institute, nor as an attempt to aid or hinder the passage of legislation. Additional copies of this study are available for \$8.95 from The Heartland Institute, 19 South LaSalle Street #903, Chicago, IL 60603; phone 312/377-4000; fax 312/377-5000; email think@heartland.org; Web <http://www.heartland.org>.

²¹ Bast et al., *ibid.*

About the Authors

Herbert J. Walberg is distinguished visiting fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institution and chief scientific advisor to the U.S. Department of Education-sponsored Center on Innovation and Improvement. He has written and edited more than 65 books and written some 350 articles on such topics as school choice, the psychology of learning, testing and evaluation, and exceptional human accomplishments. He served as a professor at Harvard University and the University of Illinois at Chicago for 35 years after earning a Ph.D. in educational psychology at The University of Chicago. Walberg has given invited lectures in Australia, Belgium, China, England, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, South Africa, Sweden, Taiwan, the United States, and Venezuela. He has frequently testified before congressional committees, state legislatures, and federal courts. He is the only American to have served on the National Assessment Governing Board, which oversees the National Assessment of Educational Progress, and the presidentially appointed National Board for Educational Sciences. He has served on seven boards, including that of the California-based Foundation for Teaching Economics. He currently chairs the boards of the Beck Foundation and The Heartland Institute.

Marc Oestreich is legislative specialist on education and telecommunications at The Heartland Institute, where his responsibilities include interacting with elected officials and staff on those issues, tracking new legislation, and drafting responses to emerging issues. Prior to joining Heartland he was a graduate student at Purdue University studying political psychology and education policy.

Appendix

Data Used in Making the Final Calculations

	Achievement		Efficiency					Standards	
	Time Gain	Grade Gain	Cost Per Graduate	Cost Per Pupil	Cost Per Time Gain	Cost Per Grade Gain	Teacher/ Other Staff	EdNext	Fordham
Alabama	91	79	\$181,809.00	\$9,498	\$119.11	\$136	0.82	48	9
Alaska	96	94	\$252,096.67	\$14,749	\$119.82	\$122	0.85	40	45
Arizona	98	95	\$169,496.01	\$8,721	\$89.09	\$92	1.07	35	12
Arkansas	81	80	\$170,003.18	\$9,641	\$137.03	\$139	0.93	30	32
California	86	82	\$193,322.36	\$10,869	\$100.10	\$106	1.10	8	1
Colorado	90	84	\$175,619.94	\$9,993	\$114.92	\$123	0.93	3	16
Connecticut	93	87	\$243,959.88	\$16,050	\$140.53	\$150	0.83	28	38
Delaware	83	84	\$239,205.53	\$14,061	\$175.44	\$174	1.12	37	32
District of Columbia	94	75	\$464,980.34	\$17,456	\$140.28	\$177	1.03	14	1
Florida	85	76	\$207,980.39	\$11,097	\$138.55	\$155	1.05	17	4
Georgia	90	84	\$221,825.53	\$10,466	\$131.72	\$141	0.99	49	4
Hawaii	89	82	\$201,891.61	\$12,416	\$89.50	\$97	1.11	9	22
Idaho	89	90	\$132,029.59	\$7,880	\$100.79	\$99	1.24	45	20
Illinois	97	89	\$176,646.03	\$10,887	\$119.67	\$130	1.75	43	38
Indiana	94	87	\$180,490.11	\$10,326	\$120.20	\$130	0.81	24	1
Iowa	88	85	\$145,444.49	\$10,232	\$127.51	\$133	1.01	38	45
Kansas	89	86	\$161,356.85	\$10,385	\$132.91	\$138	1.87	42	38
Kentucky	95	82	\$161,240.06	\$9,463	\$116.92	\$136	0.77	20	38
Louisiana	86	89	\$197,580.76	\$9,943	\$124.07	\$121	0.95	41	16
Maine	89	86	\$182,238.11	\$12,212	\$120.42	\$125	0.71	11	22
Maryland	97	86	\$200,161.29	\$13,624	\$116.67	\$132	1.03	32	29
Massachusetts	94	86	\$209,036.55	\$13,872	\$131.77	\$143	1.35	1	4
Michigan	84	86	\$175,105.57	\$11,569	\$146.93	\$144	0.85	44	20
Minnesota	93	91	\$160,767.41	\$11,420	\$125.88	\$128	0.96	5	16
Mississippi	85	79	\$167,739.29	\$8,210	\$109.98	\$119	0.89	18	29
Missouri	96	88	\$152,123.20	\$9,997	\$119.11	\$128	1.05	2	38
Montana	97	93	\$142,257.91	\$10,082	\$107.30	\$112	1.21	15	51

	Achievement		Efficiency					Standards	
	Time Gain	Grade Gain	Cost Per Graduate	Cost Per Pupil	Cost Per Time Gain	Cost Per Grade Gain	Teacher/ Other Staff	EdNext	Fordham
Nebraska	92	90	\$163,028.97	\$11,124	\$137.30	\$141	1.01	50	38
Nevada	91	82	\$258,541.07	\$9,908	\$110.95	\$124	1.93	21	22
New Hampshire	90	83	\$173,412.05	\$12,483	\$123.61	\$134	0.91	7	32
New Jersey	98	90	\$265,693.09	\$17,877	\$149.37	\$164	1.24	12	22
New Mexico	93	86	\$200,689.49	\$9,839	\$110.51	\$119	0.91	10	29
New York	86	82	\$283,428.13	\$17,252	\$163.56	\$172	1.31	36	16
North Carolina	85	81	\$168,077.38	\$8,579	\$108.62	\$115	1.10	29	38
North Dakota	95	91	\$131,267.95	\$9,886	\$115.25	\$120	1.10	27	32
Ohio	90	86	\$180,604.06	\$11,630	\$144.63	\$151	0.82	25	22
Oklahoma	87	81	\$140,587.08	\$8,123	\$108.42	\$117	1.17	23	7
Oregon	95	94	\$166,056.49	\$9,820	\$102.82	\$104	0.87	31	12
Pennsylvania	96	92	\$185,636.46	\$13,248	\$143.30	\$149	1.13	22	45
Rhode Island	88	76	\$203,876.61	\$14,340	\$139.86	\$161	1.79	13	37
South Carolina	86	86	\$216,682.04	\$10,680	\$131.19	\$131	2.53	33	32
South Dakota	97	96	\$132,162.13	\$9,070	\$105.51	\$106	1.24	26	22
Tennessee	90	87	\$141,314.15	\$7,987	\$104.25	\$107	1.04	51	12
Texas	86	88	\$186,041.10	\$9,599	\$127.16	\$125	1.03	47	9
Utah	90	90	\$131,409.38	\$6,448	\$78.90	\$78	1.01	34	9
Vermont	95	89	\$189,419.11	\$14,739	\$135.39	\$145	0.84	6	50
Virginia	85	82	\$191,322.03	\$11,502	\$143.44	\$149	0.54	46	12
Washington	90	92	\$171,401.61	\$10,448	\$116.36	\$114	1.08	4	7
West Virginia	80	78	\$161,305.30	\$9,938	\$137.62	\$141	1.13	19	22
Wisconsin	92	90	\$158,064.23	\$11,560	\$135.14	\$138	1.28	39	45
Wyoming	88	90	\$252,123.16	\$15,873	\$191.42	\$188	0.81	16	45