

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals
(text not searchable)

EDUCATION COMMITTEE 1ST DRAFT
STRATEGIC PLANNING

Discussion

Given the paramount importance of education at all levels, Government has a fundamental responsibility to establish policies and set priorities that enable educational systems to provide a quality education with the greatest efficiency. Long term strategic planning at the state-wide level and within individual education systems plays an integral role in the development of sensible education policy. Each of Maine's educational delivery systems (the University of Maine System, Maine Technical College System, Maine Maritime Academy and the K-12 system) already employ strategic planning to one extent or another. The executive and legislative branches of government both make significant contributions to education policy, but they have until now treated the different education systems largely as discrete entities for purposes of planning and funding.

Finding

There is an opportunity for greater coordination and planning between the state's educational delivery systems. There is also a need for continued commitment to planning within individual systems. Although planning within each system has become increasingly sophisticated in recent years, the absence of consistent, formal communication links between the four systems and opportunities to jointly discuss and promote policy priorities has delayed achievement of a fully coordinated and efficient education effort. The absence of full coordination is evidenced by instances of curriculum overlap and untapped opportunities for resource sharing.

Recommendation 1

An executive council for strategic planning in public education should be created by the Legislature. It's membership should include the Chancellor of the University of Maine System, the President of the Maine Technical College System, the President of the Maine Maritime Academy, the Commissioner of Education and one board member from each CEO's governing or advisory board. The executive council's primary responsibility should be to create and maintain a long term strategic plan for Maine education. The council should present annually to the Governor and the Legislature a report that outlines proposed adjustments in the plan along with recommendations for funding needs. The council should:

- Assess Maine's elementary, secondary and post-secondary education needs and examine whether current programs meet those needs;
- Ensure that the educational missions of the university campuses, technical colleges, maritime academy and K-12 system are consistent and do not overlap;
- Establish a 5 year strategic plan for education state-wide;

- Stress collaboration and collective use of education resources between the education systems with a particular emphasis on physical facilities;
- Review and recommend optimal program location for new education programs;
- Develop plans for full transferability of academic credit between post-secondary institutions;
- Promote the use of technology in academic curricula and for information exchange.

Recommendation 2

The State Board of Education should develop a 5 year strategic plan for elementary and secondary education in Maine. The board should consult with Maine citizens, the Governor, the Legislature, the Department of Education, teachers, administrators and interested groups in an attempt to develop a consensus on directions and expectations for K-12 education. During its deliberations the State Board should include consideration of the following issues:

- Outcome-based school curricula;
- Teacher licensure standards;
- Leadership training for local school boards, teachers and administrators;
- Strengthening the Department of Education's role in providing assistance and technical support to local schools and diminishing its regulatory role;
- Incorporation of performance-based measures in the education funding formula.

INCREASED REGIONALISM IN EDUCATION

Discussion

The increase in efficiency and quality that can result from regionalizing education services has long been recognized in Maine. The successful effort in the 1960s to consolidate schools into school administrative districts and creation of an interactive television system in the 1980s to deliver higher education services to every corner of the state are just two examples of Maine's commitment to regionalism. Balanced with a commitment to local decision making and control, SADs have created opportunities for vastly enriched curricula and school services while reducing the need to construct a full range of school facilities in adjacent municipalities. Similarly, the University of Maine System's ITV network has made possible the delivery of higher education throughout the state without adding new faculty or constructing new facilities. While both efforts have been complex and sometimes difficult processes, and while neither solve all the difficulties faced by education, they have created opportunities for Maine students and savings for Maine taxpayers that would otherwise not have been possible.

Finding

The need for still greater efficiencies and equitable delivery of education services requires that a deeper commitment to regional approaches be undertaken. While schools in many areas of the state have combined to offer education jointly, there are others that might practically be combined. There are also many possibilities for sharing resources between districts that have not been explored. Similarly, although Maine has been a pioneer in the development of the ITV system, wider applications of the system, input into the decision making process and changes in the governance structure are still needed. Beyond regionalization of elementary, secondary and post-secondary education, regionalization of non-school services to children and families using school facilities to house programs is occurring nationwide and holds promise for Maine.

Recommendation 1

The State Board of Education should be charged with studying further consolidation of school units in Maine. Through deliberations with the Department of Education and any and all other interested groups and individuals, the board should investigate the possibility of combining existing schools in ways that provide efficiency and quality. Particular attention should be paid to the possibility of creating new school administrative districts. While studying consolidation, the State Board should consider, at a minimum, the following issues:

- Possible changes in current law concerning SADs;
- Incentives for formation of SADs;
- Possible changes in the rating system for school construction that might encourage consolidation;
- Disincentives for dissolution of SADs.

Recommendation 2

The Department of Education, school administrative associations and others should encourage schools to place greater emphasis on regional resource sharing. Joint use of faculty for teaching fine arts, language, special education and other subjects should be considered where individual schools or districts are unable to support them independently. Schools should also explore joint fiscal arrangements that could range from group purchasing of supplies to sharing personnel.

Recommendation 3

Schools are a logical place from which to deliver social and educational services of all kinds to Maine communities. By fully utilizing school space, construction and maintenance of separate facilities for such programs may be reduced, leading to potential cost savings while providing consistent access in a supportive environment to clients in need of those services. Careful consideration should therefore be given by all school districts to providing appropriate health and social service programs to pre-school students, K-12 students and their families. Communities should also examine the possibility of using their schools as community centers that provide a full range of services to citizens year round.

Recommendation 4

The State's commitment to using technology in education must continue to grow if Maine's educational institutions are to become first class and its students are to be adequately prepared for the 21st century. The following recommendations are crucial to educational excellence:

- Access to the ITV system must be assured for all elementary and secondary schools, the campuses of the Maine Technical College System and the Maine Maritime Academy;
- The University of Maine System should follow the advice of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Information Technology and join with State government, municipal governments and regional agencies, public schools, private educational institutions, not-for-profit organizations, business and labor organizations to form a not-for-profit consortium "to use and contribute to the development of information technology systems for education, training, communication, cultural and public policy purposes;"
- Increase integration of information technology into elementary and secondary curricula;
- Expand the use of technology to increase information sharing between the Department of Education and elementary and secondary schools. Also increase the use of technology to expand information sharing between the Department of Education, the University System, the Technical College System and the Maritime Academy.

POST-SECONDARY ISSUES

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION

Discussion

It has been suggested that administrative positions throughout the University of Maine System have grown disproportionately in recent years and that this growth has created a top-heavy administrative structure. The argument has also been advanced that the excess of administrative positions has squeezed out faculty positions and led to higher costs to students and taxpayers.

Finding

The University of Maine System's ratio of faculty to other employees is identical to the national average for institutions of higher education. The percentage of faculty, administrators and classified employees is equal to or less than the national average. (See Appendix A) While there has been significant growth in non-faculty positions during the last 6 years (292 new non-faculty professional positions since 1985, 155 funded from the University's E & G operating budget and 137 from sources outside that budget), there are compelling reasons for those increases. Some reasons include upgrading jobs formerly performed by classified employees due to increased complexity and responsibility, new initiatives such as ITV, Lewiston-Auburn College, and the six Centers for Excellence and Centers for Public Policy, additional services to students (such as day care, financial aid, and academic advising services), and increased emphasis on external fund raising.

While we support a trim administrative staff and appropriate focus on the University's primary tasks of teaching, research and public service, there is no credible evidence that any category of employees within the University of Maine System is disproportionately large. We are confident that the University Board of Trustees, in conjunction with the Legislature, is taking appropriate steps to employ a proper balance of needed employees.

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE SYSTEM CAMPUSES

Discussion

A perennial question has been the need to maintain the seven separate campuses of the University of Maine System. Maine's commitment to offering higher education programs throughout the state is well known and enjoys broad based support in the Legislature and among the citizenry. In a period of declining state support for all services, however, it is more important than ever to carefully review expenses for the various campuses in an effort to identify opportunities for consolidation and efficiency.

Finding

The regional benefits derived from the placement of the seven

campuses of the system cannot be overstated. They not only contribute to the education of Maine citizens, but they contribute substantially to the economic, cultural and social welfare of the state.

Our review of the costs of educating students at each campus does however, raise cause for some concern. While it is appropriate that the highest cost per full-time equivalent student should occur at the system's land-grant, sea-grant, graduate degree granting University of Maine, we are troubled that the University of Maine at Fort Kent, the smallest institution in the system, has the second highest cost per full-time equivalent student. (Appendix B) Because of the small size of its student body, Fort Kent cannot benefit from the economies of scale that are usual on the other regional campuses. However, the campus is crucial to the people of the Saint John Valley.

Recommendation

The structure of the University of Maine System offers the potential for reducing isolation through mutual cooperation and use of faculty and staff that has not yet been fully realized. The Board of Trustees should consider and report to the Legislature on the possibility of further administrative and academic cooperation and consolidation between the University of Maine at Fort Kent, the University of Maine at Machias and the University of Maine at Presque Isle. While such consolidation is not likely to dramatically reduce per student costs, a closer relationship focusing on resource sharing could lead to substantial savings and reduce academic isolation.

MAINE MARITIME ACADEMY

Discussion

The need to maintain the Maine Maritime Academy at Castine has been questioned given the decline in the U.S. maritime industry and the high cost of providing maritime education.

Finding

There has been persistent improvement in the quality of education at Maine Maritime Academy over the last several years. The addition of new academic programs has infused the Academy with new vitality. Applications have increased over 60% in the last 5 years, scholastic aptitude test scores of entering freshmen have increased, job placement following graduation is at 98% and the Academy is currently at full capacity.

The cost of educating Maine Maritime Academy students is significantly higher than educating those at the University of Maine System or the Maine Technical College System. The full time equivalent student cost at the Academy is \$17,589, compared to a system average of \$8,463 for the University and \$6,495 at the technical colleges (see Appendix B). Reasons for the increased costs include the small number of students, emphasis on hands-on training, need for sophisticated equipment

and facilities, and the approximately 10 month school year (opposed to the 8 month school year at the university and technical colleges.)

The Commission recognizes Maine Maritime Academy's heritage, increasing quality and recent success in broadening its curriculum. However, the share of the financial burden born by the State (approximately 49.9%) appears high. We envision an eventual decrease in state aid to the academy, to be replaced by greater fund raising from the private sector.

MAINE TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

Discussion

The Maine Technical College System operates 6 campuses around the state that provide a variety of technical education programs. The recent consolidation of the technical institutes into the current system has increased public support and permitted the system to provide a better coordinated array of programs. Maintaining a healthy and vital technical college system is seen by many as crucial to the State's economic future.

Finding

The Maine Technical College System is working well. Like the University of Maine System, it provides education opportunities throughout most of the state. Although there is considerable interest in expansion of the system, particularly into extreme southern Maine, current state budget realities may preclude any new campuses. Furthermore, underutilization of existing secondary school technical facilities provide untapped opportunities for delivering programs to new areas of the State.

Annual per student costs at Kennebec Valley, Southern Maine, Eastern Maine, Central Maine and Northern Maine Technical Colleges range from \$5,262 to \$7,249 (see Appendix B). The per student cost at Washington County Technical College is \$11,256. A number of factors contribute to higher costs in Washington County, including a 50 week program, maintenance of a campus in Calais and a Marine Trade Center in Eastport, capital intensive program offerings, small class sizes due to equipment needs, and other reasons.

Recommendations

Every effort should be made to satisfy program needs in York County without incremental investment in land and buildings. Increased cooperation and coordination between the Maine Technical College System and the secondary vocational technical centers as well as expanded use of the Instructional Television System should be undertaken before further funds are expended on bricks and mortar.

The Maine Technical College System must continue to aggressively pursue efforts to reduce per student costs at the Washington County Technical College. Although its presence in the county is fundamental to the State's education needs, further reductions in costs are needed.

The System should also seek to achieve full articulation between the academic programs offered at its various campuses and the greatest possible consistency in quality of instruction.

The Maine Technical College System is in desperate need of equipment. Equipment is fundamental to delivery of the curriculum in any technical program. Although the prospects for further state investment in equipment may be temporarily stalled, the committee recognizes the great need and potential benefit from such an investment.

STATE CULTURAL BUREAU

Discussion

It has been suggested that a state bureau be established to coordinate the activities of the Maine Arts Commission, the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, the Maine Library Commission and the Maine State Museum Commission.

Prior to 1990 Maine's four cultural affairs agencies were placed within the organizational jurisdiction of the Department of Education and Cultural Affairs. In response to concerns that that structure no longer served the needs of the cultural agencies, a Special Commission to Study the Organization of the State's Cultural Agencies recommended that the cultural agencies be removed from the Department of Education and function independently under the auspices of the Maine State Cultural Affairs Council. The Council would consist of members from the four cultural agencies. The Legislature agreed to the recommendation of the Special Commission and passed legislation in 1990 that separated the agencies from the department and established the Cultural Affairs Council.

Finding

There appears to be general support for the current configuration of the four cultural commissions under the administrative umbrella of the Maine State Cultural Affairs Council. There does not appear to be any substantial interest in creating a new state bureau or agency to take the place of the Council. Given the brief life of the current arrangement, general satisfaction with the change and the absence of substantive discontent, there is no compelling reason to recommend changes in the present structure.

We would note that the four cultural commissions remain chronically under-funded, a state that has not been significantly improved by the recent organizational changes.

Recommendation

Given the lack of state resources to support the Maine Arts Commission, the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, the Maine Library Commission and the Maine State Museum Commission, the Maine State Cultural Affairs Council should study the possible creation of a not-for-profit corporation or foundation to assist in fund raising for the cultural commissions. The council should report to the Legislature on its findings.

OTHER FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There are a number of education issues that must be addressed if substantial savings in education costs are to be achieved. Many of these issues are tremendously complex and therefore beyond the capacity of the Commission to properly examine given time and resource limitations. Moreover, the sweeping changes that action on these issues could engender requires full public debate and deliberation on a scale not possible in the short time permitted for Commission study.

For instance, changes in education funding have been suggested by many groups and individuals. The Commissioner of Education's School Funding Task Force has spent a year studying education funding and has recently submitted a report outlining its findings and recommendations. Maine school superintendents are in the process of their own intensive year-long review of school funding in Maine and around the nation. There are citizen initiated drives to dramatically change the structure of the funding formula as well as proposals in the Legislature ranging from fine tuning to overhauls of the funding system. While we have reviewed a wide range of possible options, we do not believe the Commission is best suited to recommend policy on this subject.

Following are several issues that the education committee reviewed at some length, but were unable to make specific recommendations on due to their complexity and the need for additional examination and debate.

Early Childhood Education

There are some very good early childhood education programs available throughout Maine (Head Start, the Child Development Services system, individual child care programs, etc.), but there is currently no coherent statewide plan for consistent delivery of appropriate services to children.. After discussions with early childhood education providers, teachers, principals and experts in the area, the committee believes that serious consideration should be given to granting some entity, probably the Department of Education, a primary role in coordinating early childhood education services. There may also be a need for leadership from the Department in further integrating developmentally appropriate curriculum into the current elementary curriculum. Many other needs exist, including better coordination of screening services for children at risk, more high quality child care, more preschool programs, and a reexamination of standardized tests and assessment tools used to measure children's learning and development.

Although some ideas for improved early childhood programs require additional funding, the committee believes that a stronger emphasis must be placed on funding early childhood programs - even if that reduces the amount of resources available for educational programs at the secondary or post-secondary level.

Vocational Technical Education

No area of deliberation produced greater comment and concern than vocational technical education. The committee is convinced that the vitality of Maine's workforce and the health of its economy are inextricably tied to providing a first class technical education. Although the Maine Technical College System has been transformed in the last decade and new initiatives attempt to better tie together vocational technical education at the secondary and post-secondary levels, much more needs to be done. An uneasy tension remains between secondary vocational technical education and secondary academic and general studies programs. Better integration of academic skills into technical vocational education is needed.

A significant investment in equipment for the technical colleges is also desperately needed. Resource sharing between secondary and post-secondary technical schools and curriculum coordination must occur at much greater levels and should take precedence over investment in new physical facilities. Perhaps most important, consideration of fundamentally new relationships between secondary and post-secondary technical education systems may be necessary. The committee is not prepared to recommend a new structure for delivering technical vocational education, but it has discussed alternatives to the current structure that would split responsibility for technical education between the Department of Education and the Maine Technical College System. There is an obvious need for a more in-depth consideration of this matter.

Elementary and Secondary Education Funding

Discussion of changes in the school funding formula should include addition of outcome-based performance measures. Improvements in attaining learning goals, preventing students from dropping out, and successful transition to post-secondary schools are examples of possible outcome measures. These "outputs" would be measured and used to calculate increases or decreases in education funding. In contrast, the current formula seeks to assure that all Maine schools receive adequate funding, or "inputs".

There is considerable interest nationwide in introducing outcome measures into education funding formulas. Unfortunately, there is little data currently available on such approaches, although the new Kentucky Education Reform Act requires establishment of such a program. The committee believes strongly that new accountability measures are needed given the tremendous investment in education now provided through state funds. Taxpayers have a right to expect that their investment in education produces effective results. Development of performance measures with fiscal incentives could become an integral factor in assessing Maine schools. Therefore, it is essential that the Department of Education make recommendations concerning the use of such measures in Maine.

The role of prior expenditures in determining education funding should also be examined. The amount of education funding a school

district receives is driven in part by actual prior expenditures for debt service, school program costs and operating costs. A review of the role expenditures play in determining education funding should be an important ingredient in an examination school funding in Maine.

The treatment of teacher retirement in the context of the school funding formula should also be examined. Currently, 100% of the employer's share for teacher retirement costs is paid by the state, regardless of a district's ability to pay. Ability to pay, or "equalization", is an important feature of the funding formula. The cost to the State for teacher retirement is approximately 20% of its' total annual expenditure on education. Given the size of this investment, consideration of whether the state share of retirement costs should be equalized is in order.

Lengthening the School Year

Concern over the quality of education in Maine and across the country has led many to suggest that the school year should be lengthened. The decline in American education relative to Europe's and Japan's is regularly attributed to the shorter time available for school instruction. Students, teachers, administrators, school board members and experts testifying before the education committee were unanimous in the belief that alternatives to the current school calendar should be encouraged. They noted that the current school calendar evolved when the nation was essentially agrarian in character. The nature of Maine's economy having changed, they argue that individual school districts should consider alternatives, including a longer school year. In addition, many advocated departing from the current system of September to June attendance, opting instead for 8 week modules punctuated by short vacations, citing concern that the length of the traditional summer vacation contributes to learning atrophy. There was near unanimous agreement that a longer school year, no matter what form it assumes, should include more alternatives to the standard lecture approach to instruction. Students and most teachers and administrators stated forcefully that schools need to better understand and adapt to diverse student learning styles. They also advocated "restructuring" the school day, emphasizing quality of instruction over simply offering more of the same thing.

School Choice

The education committee heard conflicting testimony on the merits of permitting students to choose to attend schools outside their local district. Proponents argued that a choice between schools would create competition, which would in turn force schools to improve in much the same way that a market system forces businesses to improve or perish. Some challenged that theory, observing that less effective schools would likely continue to teach students whose parents fail to make good choices or who cannot take advantage of other choices. Choice within the public school system (between districts with superintendent approval and within large districts like Portland) is already working well. In general, the committee supports greater choice within the public school system and

notes that choice of private school alternatives is a complex and difficult issue. Further consideration of the issue at the state and local level is clearly needed.

Citizen Participation

The driving force behind education reform in Maine cannot be the Department of Education, the Legislature, or any state organization. Rather, it is parents, community members, businesses and other groups at the local level who must unite to identify learning outcomes for their children and commit themselves to achieving the goals which will produce those outcomes. While those charged with delivery of public education services have made profoundly positive contributions to elementary and secondary education, they cannot by themselves improve education statewide. That task lies in the hands of local communities, and with financing, technical support, outside advice and leadership at the state level, true education reform can be achieved.

Since educating the state's children is every citizen's business, the Department of Education should make every effort to assist parents, community members, businesses and other groups in participating in education. In particular, the Department should work to open up the education process to new groups and new and innovative approaches to education. Similarly, local school districts should encourage participation of the same variety at the local level.

Local Control Versus Centralization

An important reason for the high cost of education in Maine is the emphasis placed on local control of education. The existence of 283 separate school districts leads to inevitable economic results: the necessity of operating 283 school districts, supporting the teaching and administrative staff that run them, and providing Department of Education support to operate each district. The State's commitment to small class sizes further compounds the costs. According to national education statistics, only 4 states enjoy smaller class sizes than Maine, where average school enrollments cannot exceed 25 and no class can exceed 30.

The committee does not advocate that the state move away from local control of education programs, but it is aware that economic costs accompany the benefits of home town schools and small class sizes. Any serious search for substantial education savings should include consideration of fewer school districts and larger class sizes.

APPENDIX A

The University System's ratio of faculty to other employees is almost identical to the national average for institutions of higher education.

	<u>University of Maine System</u>	<u>All U.S. Colleges and Universities</u>
Faculty	29%	29%
Administrators	8%	8%
Professional Specialists	20%	18%
Classified Employees	43%	45%
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

*Source: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (Survey from 2685 institutions)

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE SYSTEM
FY 1991 TOTAL COST PER FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENTS

University of Maine	\$9,907
University of Maine at Augusta	\$6,820
University of Maine at Farmington	\$6,092
University of Maine at Fort Kent	\$9,684
University of Maine at Machias	\$7,640
University of Maine at Presque Isle	\$7,219
University of Southern Maine	\$7,586
SYSTEM AVERAGE	\$8,463

MAINE TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM
FY 1991 TOTAL COST PER FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT

Central ME Technical College	\$7,249
Eastern ME Technical College	\$5,744
Kennebec Valley Technical College	\$5,262
Northern ME Technical College	\$5,798
Southern ME Technical College	\$5,548
Washington County Technical College	\$11,256
SYSTEM AVERAGE	\$6,495

MAINE MARITIME ACADEMY

Cost for Eight Months	\$14,071
Cost for Ten Month Academic Year	\$17,589

APPENDIX C

PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY STUDENTS
TOTAL CURRENT EXPENDITURES PER STUDENT
IN AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE

RANK	STATE	1990-1991 EXPENDITURE
1	NEW YORK	\$8,680
2	CONNECTICUT	\$8,455
3	NEW JERSEY	\$8,451
4	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	\$8,221
5	RHODE ISLAND	\$6,989
6	ALASKA	\$6,952
7	PENNSYLVANIA	\$6,534
8	MASSACHUSETTS	\$6,351
9	MARYLAND	\$6,184
10	DELAWARE	\$6,016
11	WISCONSIN	\$5,946
12	MAINE	\$5,894
13	VERMONT	\$5,740
14	NEW HAMPSHIRE	\$5,474
15	MINNESOTA	\$5,360
16	VIRGINIA	\$5,335
17	OREGON	\$5,291
18	OHIO	\$5,269
19	MICHIGAN	\$5,257
20	WYOMING	\$5,255
21	ILLINOIS	\$5,062
22	KANSAS	\$5,044
23	WASHINGTON	\$5,042
24	HAWAII	\$5,008
25	FLORIDA	\$5,003
26	IOWA	\$4,877
27	GEORGIA	\$4,852
28	CALIFORNIA	\$4,826
29	MONTANA	\$4,794
30	COLORADO	\$4,702
31	WEST VIRGINIA	\$4,695
32	NEVADA	\$4,677
33	NORTH CAROLINA	\$4,635
34	MISSOURI	\$4,479
35	NEW MEXICO	\$4,446
36	INDIANA	\$4,398
37	KENTUCKY	\$4,390
38	TEXAS	\$4,326
39	ARIZONA	\$4,196
40	NEBRASKA	\$4,080
41	LOUISIANA	\$4,041
42	SOUTH CAROLINA	\$3,843
43	OKLAHOMA	\$3,835
44	SOURTH DAKOTA	\$3,730
45	TENNESEE	\$3,707
46	NORTH DAKOTA	\$3,685
47	ALABAMA	\$3,648
48	ARKANSAS	\$3,419
49	MISSISSIPPI	\$3,322
50	IDAHO	\$3,211
51	UTAH	\$2,767

SOURCE: NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

PERCENT OF TOTAL STATE AND LOCAL EXPENDITURES SPENT FOR EDUCATION
FISCAL 1989

	GRADES K-12		POST SECONDARY		TOTAL			
1	NEW HAMPSHIRE	25.5%	1	IOWA	12.2%	1	INDIANA	35.7%
2	MISSOURI	25.4%	2	NORTH DAKOTA	12.0%	2	VERMONT	35.0%
3	INDIANA	25.1%	3	NEW MEXICO	11.4%	3	IOWA	34.4%
4	ARKANSAS	24.8%	4	DELAWARE	11.4%	4	ARKANSAS	34.3%
5	TEXAS	24.3%	5	UTAH	11.2%	5	KANSAS	34.3%
6	PENNSYLVANIA	24.1%	6	VERMONT	11.2%	6	WISCONSIN	34.1%
7	VIRGINIA	23.9%	7	NORTH CAROLINA	11.1%	7	TEXAS	34.0%
8	VERMONT	23.8%	8	KANSAS	11.0%	8	MISSOURI	33.9%
9	MONTANA	23.7%	9	WISCONSIN	10.6%	9	VIRGINIA	33.5%
10	WISCONSIN	23.4%	10	INDIANA	10.6%	10	NORTH CAROLINA	33.1%
11	WEST VIRGINIA	23.3%	11	ALABAMA	10.4%	11	MICHIGAN	32.6%
12	OREGON	23.3%	12	MISSISSIPPI	10.3%	12	NEW MEXICO	32.5%
13	KANSAS	23.3%	13	IDAHO	10.1%	13	NORTH DAKOTA	32.5%
14	MAINE	23.2%	14	MICHIGAN	10.0%	14	OREGON	32.4%
15	WYOMING	22.8%	15	OKLAHOMA	9.8%	15	NEW HAMPSHIRE	32.3%
16	SOUTH DAKOTA	22.8%	16	TEXAS	9.7%	16	IDAHO	31.8%
17	NEW JERSEY	22.6%	17	VIRGINIA	9.5%	17	OKLAHOMA	31.8%
18	MICHIGAN	22.6%	18	ARKANSAS	9.5%	18	MISSISSIPPI	31.7%
19	GEORGIA	22.3%	19	NEBRASKA	9.1%	19	WEST VIRGINIA	31.6%
20	IOWA	22.2%	20	OREGON	9.1%	20	WYOMING	31.6%
21	NORTH CAROLINA	22.0%	21	KENTUCKY	9.0%	21	MAINE	31.1%
22	OHIO	22.0%	22	ARIZONA	9.0%	22	DELAWARE	30.9%
23	OKLAHOMA	22.0%	23	HAWAII	8.9%	23	UTAH	30.8%
24	SOUTH CAROLINA	21.8%	24	WYOMING	8.7%	24	SOUTH CAROLINA	30.5%
25	IDAHO	21.7%	25	SOUTH CAROLINA	8.7%	25	SOUTH DAKOTA	30.1%
26	CONNECTICUT	21.5%	26	MISSOURI	8.5%	26	MONTANA	30.0%
27	COLORADO	21.5%	27	WEST VIRGINIA	8.3%	27	OHIO	29.8%
28	MISSISSIPPI	21.4%	28	WASHINGTON	8.1%	28	COLORADO	29.5%
29	MARYLAND	21.2%	29	MINNESOTA	8.0%	29	ALABAMA	29.4%
30	NEW MEXICO	21.0%	30	TENNESSEE	8.0%	30	ARIZONA	29.1%
31	ILLINOIS	20.9%	31	COLORADO	8.0%	31	MARYLAND	29.0%
32	FLORIDA	20.9%	32	MAINE	7.9%	32	PENNSYLVANIA	28.8%
33	MINNESOTA	20.7%	33	OHIO	7.8%	33	GEORGIA	28.8%
34	NORTH DAKOTA	20.5%	34	MARYLAND	7.8%	34	MINNESOTA	28.7%
35	ARIZONA	20.1%	35	CALIFORNIA	7.7%	35	NEW JERSEY	28.6%
36	UTAH	19.6%	36	ILLINOIS	7.6%	36	ILLINOIS	28.5%
37	DELAWARE	19.5%	37	SOUTH DAKOTA	7.3%	37	NEBRASKA	28.3%
38	WASHINGTON	19.2%	38	LOUISIANA	7.0%	38	KENTUCKY	27.5%
39	NEBRASKA	19.1%	39	RHODE ISLAND	6.8%	39	WASHINGTON	27.3%
40	ALABAMA	19.0%	40	NEW HAMPSHIRE	6.8%	40	FLORIDA	26.6%
41	LOUISIANA	18.9%	41	GEORGIA	6.5%	41	CONNECTICUT	26.2%
42	NEW YORK	18.8%	42	MONTANA	6.4%	42	LOUISIANA	25.9%
43	RHODE ISLAND	18.6%	43	NEW JERSEY	6.0%	43	CALIFORNIA	25.8%
44	KENTUCKY	18.4%	44	NEVADA	6.0%	44	RHODE ISLAND	25.4%
45	CALIFORNIA	18.0%	45	FLORIDA	5.7%	45	NEVADA	23.8%
46	NEVADA	17.8%	46	PENNSYLVANIA	4.8%	46	TENNESSEE	23.5%
47	MASSACHUSETTS	17.0%	47	CONNECTICUT	4.7%	47	HAWAII	23.4%
48	TENNESSEE	15.5%	48	MASSACHUSETTS	4.6%	48	NEW YORK	23.0%
49	ALASKA	15.4%	49	NEW YORK	4.2%	49	MASSACHUSETTS	21.6%
50	HAWAII	14.6%	50	ALASKA	4.1%	50	ALASKA	19.5%
51	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	11.0%	51	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	1.9%	51	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	12.9%

SOURCE: U.S. CENSUS BUREAU