

www.kasb.org

## Testimony before the **House Committee on Taxation**

on

#### HB 2237 - Concerning taxation

by

#### **Rob Gilligan, Government Relations Specialist**

#### February 7, 2017

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to appear today as a proponent on **HB 2237** on behalf of the Kansas Association of School Boards. We support additional revenue for education and other state programs, which HB 2237 would address. KASB's position on revenue, adopted by the KASB Delegate Assembly in December, reads:

"The state should strive to achieve from the major revenue sources, sales, income and property taxes, a balanced and equitable mix of revenues that are suitable to support public services, including funding for quality education. Taxes should be broadly based to ensure all Kansans share fairly in the cost of public services."

We believe that there are several reasons that a comprehensive approach to tax reform is the best path forward for Kansas. We appreciate the opportunity to share that with you today.

#### Comprehensive tax reform will give Kansas a stable revenue outlook for the future.

The cuts to income tax rates for both individuals and businesses in 2012 proved to be unsustainable leading to significant cuts in many state organizations including K-12 Education operating funds that have been practically flatlined since 2009.

The volatility and unpredictability of the impact that the tax cuts had on revenue was best illustrated though the struggle of accurately developing consensus revenue estimates that have been off significantly since 2013. With revenue reserves, long since depleted, and a lower than expected revenue stream, painful cuts that have limited and even decreased services have hit every part of the state including education.

Comprehensive reform will also change the path towards zero which has proven to be detrimental to K-12 Education in other states.

#### The experience of no income tax states is not positive for education.

Because Kansas tax policy is based on the eventual goal of eliminating the state income tax, KASB studied the educational results of the seven states without income tax. Not only are none of these states ranked above Kansas – all seven are the bottom half of the nation, ranking as follows: Wyoming 28<sup>th</sup>, Texas 32<sup>nd</sup>, South Dakota, 34<sup>th</sup>, Washington, 35<sup>th</sup>, Florida 43<sup>rd</sup>, Alaska 49<sup>th</sup> and Nevada 50<sup>th</sup>.

As a group, these non-income tax states actually provide more total funding for K-12 education, but if mineral rich and sparsely populated Alaska and Wyoming are removed, the no income tax states provide a about \$2,000 less per pupil than Kansas when adjusted for regional cost differences.

Including Alaska and Wyoming, these states increased funding by 3.4 percent between 2008 and 2014, compared to Kansas' 1.7 percent, but if those states are removed, the increase was just 0.9 percent – far behind the national average of 6.3 percent and nearly 20 percent for the top achieving states.

A review of tax sources in those states makes another point – each of the no income tax states has some other "leg" of the stool of tax collection. They each rely more heavily on property tax at the state level; on "selective" sales taxes like alcohol and motor fuels, or "other" revenue such as mineral production. These states have alternatives to the income tax Kansas does not have.

Finally, the no income tax states are not eliminating a major revenue source, as Kansas is trying to do. Therefore, they do not have to keep diverting revenue growth to what Kansas calls the "ratchet" or "glide path" or "march to zero," or continue to raise other taxes to make up the loss – because they did not have an income tax in the first place.

A comprehensive revenue package will allow the state to restore needed investments in core services such as education.

# Increased funding supports improved educational attainment by allowing districts to hire more teachers and student support staff; expand services; offer competitive salaries; and provide safer, more efficient facilities and new instructional technology.

While there are many non-financial factors to improving education, Kansas and other higher achieving sates have done these things for the past several decades:

- School funding has increased more than inflation, which allowed districts to hire more teachers and support staff; provide competitive salaries and benefits; and improve school facilities, equipment and technology.
- This has allowed Kansas to have one of the lowest pupil-teacher ratios in the nation, have more total employees to work with students and families, expanding early childhood and career technical education programs, and keep average school and districts sizes small and rooted in the community.
- Like Kansas, the most successful states have smaller classes, schools, districts and staff positions compared to enrollment than the national average and less successful states.
- School funding has remained stable compared to state personal income, which means funding rises as incomes rise, but not faster. Since 1990, total K-12 expenditures have remained between 4.5 and 5.0 percent of Kansas personal income.

## Kansas needs to raise revenue now to avoid deeper cuts in school funding and other programs and remove the further automatic rate cuts that will hold down school funding indefinitely.

Unless this is done, Kansas will never able to provide the school funding policy which has been successful in the past.

School leaders understand the extremely difficult budget and tax choices the Legislature faces. But KASB believes the current tax policies of the state are making it impossible to deliver the services Kansas needs and wants, because these the costs of these services increase as public demands change.

While the Kansas Association of School Boards was not a partner in the Rise Up Coalition plan, we believe there is a need for additional revenue and this plan takes the broadest steps in that direction.

Just as we said in support of HB 2023 and HB 2178, a comprehensive and balanced approach to taxation is the best step towards finding a complete solution to the budget issues facing Kansas. We would encourage this committee to strongly support a comprehensive tax reform policy that will adequately and equitably restore necessary revenue to the State of Kansas for investment in core services like Education.

Thank you for your consideration.

	2014 Median Household Income		2015 Per Capital Income		2014 2 Some College or Higher		5-year-olds and Bachelors or higher		older Graduate degree or higher		2014 Income Below Poverty Level in the Past 12 Months		State-Local Tax Burden As Percent of State Income	
	Dollars	Rank	Dollars	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank
Alabama	\$ 42,278	48	\$38,030	47	53.3%	41	23.0	44	8.5	41	19.3	46	8.7	39
Alaska	\$ 67,629	5	\$56,147	5	64.3%	7	29.1	22	10.4	24	11.2	5	6.5	50
Arizona	\$ 49,254	37	\$39,156	42	61.7%	19	27.4	31	10.1	28	18.2	40	8.8	36
Arkansas	\$ 44,922	44	\$38,252	46	49.9%	47	21.4	48	7.3	48	18.9	44	10.1	17
California	\$ 60,487	14	\$53,741	10	61.0%	21	31.7	13	11.8	14	16.4	33	11	6
Colorado	\$ 60,940	11	\$50,899	13	68.9%	1	38.0	3	13.9	8	12.0	12	8.9	35
Connecticut	\$ 70,161	4	\$68,704	1	62.5%	16	37.9	4	16.7	3	10.8	3	12.6	2
Delaware	\$ 57,522	20	\$47,633	22	57.2%	33	30.3	18	12.4	11	12.5	16	10.2	16
Florida	\$ 46,140	42	\$44,429	28	57.4%	32	27.4	33	9.9	30	16.5	34	8.9	34
Georgia	\$ 49,555	36	\$40,306	40	57.0%	35	29.0	23	10.9	21	18.3	41	9.1	32
Hawaii	\$ 71,223	3	\$48,288	20	63.2%	12	31.6	14	10.7	22	11.4	6	10.2	14
Idaho	\$ 53,438	29	\$38,392	44	62.0%	17	25.2	41	8.2	43	14.8	25	9.3	26
Illinois	\$ 54,916	25	\$50,295	15	61.1%	20	33.0	12	12.8	10	14.4	24	11	5
Indiana	\$ 48,060	38	\$41,940	36	53.2%	42	24.8	42	9.0	39	15.2	24	9.5	22
lowa	\$ 57,810	19	\$45,902	26	59.3%	25	27.9	29	9.4	37	12.2	13	9.2	31
Kansas	\$ 53,444	28	\$47,161	23	63.2%	12	31.5	15	11.5	17	13.6	19	9.5	23
Kentucky	\$ 42,786	46	\$38,588	43	50.6%	46	22.7	47	9.4	36	19.1	45	9.5	24
Louisiana	\$ 42,780	47	\$42,947	31	49.4%	40	22.9	47	7.8	45	19.1	43	7.6	45
Maine	\$ 51,710	32	\$42,947	33	58.4%	48 30	22.9	21	10.2	45 26	19.8	21	10.2	45
		1							_	20		21		
Maryland	\$ 76,165		\$55,972	7	63.8%	9	38.2	2	17.3		10.1		10.9	7
Massachusetts	\$ 63,151	10	\$62,603	2	64.4%	6	41.4	1	18.0	1	11.6	9	10.3	12
Michigan	\$ 52,005	31	\$42,812	32	59.7%	23	27.4	32	11.0	20	16.2	32	9.4	25
Minnesota	\$ 67,244	6	\$50,871	14	66.3%	4	34.0	10	11.6	15	11.5	7	10.8	8
Mississippi	\$ 35,521	50	\$34,771	50	52.0%	45	20.9	49	8.0	44	21.5	49	8.6	41
Missouri	\$ 56,630	22	\$42,300	34	57.1%	34	27.5	30	10.5	23	15.5	29	9.3	29
Montana	\$ 51,102	33	\$41,809	38	62.7%	15	28.1	27	9.6	34	15.4	28	8.7	38
Nebraska	\$ 56,870	21	\$48,544	19	63.1%	14	30.2	19	9.5	35	12.4	15	9.2	30
Nevada	\$ 49,875	34	\$41,889	37	56.9%	36	22.9	45	7.8	46	15.2	26	8.1	43
New Hampshire	\$ 73,397	2	\$55,905	9	63.4%	11	35.3	8	13.2	9	9.2	1	7.9	44
New Jersey	\$ 65,243	8	\$59,949	3	60.0%	22	37.2	5	14.2	7	11.1	4	12.2	3
New Mexico	\$ 46,686	41	\$37,938	48	57.7%	31	26.6	34	11.2	19	21.3	48	8.7	37
New York	\$ 54,310	26	\$58,670	4	58.9%	28	34.7	9	15.0	5	15.9	31	12.4	1
North Carolina	\$ 46,784	40	\$40,759	39	59.1%	26	28.7	25	10.1	27	17.2	37	9.8	20
North Dakota	\$ 60,730	12	\$55,950	8	64.3%	8	25.7	39	6.7	50	11.5	7	9	33
Ohio	\$ 49,644	35	\$43,566	30	55.0%	40	26.5	35	9.9	29	15.8	30	9.8	19
Oklahoma	\$ 47,199	39	\$45,573	27	55.2%	39	24.1	43	8.5	42	16.6	35	8.6	40
Oregon	\$ 58,875		\$43,783	29	65.5%	5	30.6	17	11.5	16	16.6	35	1.3	10
Pennsylvania	\$ 55,173	24	\$49,745	17	52.8%	43	28.8	24	11.3	18	13.6	19	10.2	15
Rhode Island	\$ 58,633	17	\$50,018	16	58.9%	28	30.2	20	12.2	12	14.3	23	10.8	9
South Carolina	\$ 44,929		\$38,302	45	55.7%	38	26.2	37	9.7	32	18.0	39	8.4	42
South Dakota	\$ 53,053	30	\$47,881	21	59.6%	24	26.5	36	6.7	49	14.2	22	7.1	49
Tennessee	\$ 43,716	45	\$42,094	35	52.5%	44	25.4	40	9.1	38	18.3	41	7.3	47
Texas	\$ 53,875	27	\$46,947	24	56.8%	37	27.9	28	9.7	33	17.2	37	7.6	46
Utah	\$ 63,383	9	\$39,308	41	68.2%	2	31.2	16	10.4	25	11.7	10	9.6	21
Vermont	\$ 60,708	13	\$48,587	18	61.8%	18	36.2	7	14.2	6	12.2	13	10.3	11
Virginia	\$ 66,155	7	\$52,052	11	63.6%	10	36.6	6	16.1	4	11.8	11	9.3	27
Washington	\$ 59,068	15	\$51,898	12	67.3%	3	33.2	11	12.0	13	13.2	17	9.3	28
West Virginia	\$ 39,552	49	\$36,758	49	44.2%	49	19.3	50	7.6	47	18.3	41	9.8	18
Wisconsin	\$ 58,080	18	\$45,914	25	59.0%	27	28.5	26	9.7	31	13.2	17	11	4
Wyoming	\$ 55,690	23	\$56,081	6	62.9%	15	25.9	38	9.0	40	11.2	5	7.1	48
<b>.</b>							0.000		0.677		0.55		0.055	
Correlation with Household Income					0.75913 0.53036		0.806		0.657		-0.89 -0.74		0.2074	

Table 1: State income correlation with educational attainment, poverty and tax burden.

### Table 2: State Funding of K-12 Education

	Actual Dollars						Sta	Funding 2008-14								
	Cu Total			Spending on Ir Spending Current Spending		Spen	Total		Current Spending Per Current Spendir			Spen	Ą		Pe	
	Total R	Total Revenue	Current Spending	Spendir	Spendi	ding on	Total R	l Revenue per	Current Spending Per	Spendir	Spendi	Spending on	Average Funding Per	Rank of	ercent C	Rank in
	evenue	ıe per Pupil	bending	Per	ng on Ir	on Instruction	fotal Revenue Per	ie per P	pending	ng Per F	ng on Ir	Instruction	unding	Averag	hange i	Fundir
	Total Revenue Per Pupi	upil Rank	Per Pupil	<sup>-</sup> Pupil Rank	Spending on Instruction	tion Rank	Per Pupil	Pupil Rank	Per Pupil	Pupil Rank	Spending on Instruction	tion Rank	Per Pupil	Rank of Average Funding	Percent Change in Funding	Funding Change
Kansas	= \$11,702	29	\$9,972	~ 28	\$6,112		= \$12,901	~ 25	≕ \$10,995	× 26	\$6,739	24	\$11,619	<sup>00</sup>	1.7	ო 38
United States Aspiration	\$12,774 \$16,514	11 1	\$11,009 \$14,432	11.1	\$6,654 \$8,803	10 1	\$16,232	10.9	\$14,189	10.6	\$8,663	9.9	\$12,353 \$15,215	12.3	6.2 18.9	8.4
Adjacent	\$10,924	34.0	\$9,604	33.3	\$5,743		\$11,788		\$10,372	32.3	\$6,208		\$10,596	34.8	6.9	28.0
Overall Peers	\$12,848	24.2	\$11,205	24.0	\$6,668	24.6	\$13,374		\$11,661	24.2	\$6,947		\$12,235	24.8	10.3	20.9
Student Peers	\$13,650		\$12,022	20.6	\$6,972		\$14,020		\$12,340	21.0	\$7,160		\$12,877	22.0	12.8	16.9
Adult Peers	\$12,698		\$10,998	24.9	\$6,593		\$13,013		\$11,277	25.9	\$6,763		\$12,147	25.3	8.4	23.9
Distribution Peers	\$12,588		\$10,987	26.3	\$6,489 \$5,823		\$13,393 \$11,882		\$11,681	25.0 33.4	\$6,904		\$12,090	27.3 33.4	8.4	25.6 37.4
BottonTen Achieve. No Income Tax	\$11,465 \$13,012		\$10,197 \$11,294	32.9 29.1	\$5,823 \$6,593		\$13,204		\$10,557 \$11,444	30.0	\$6,030 \$6,686	34.1	\$11,222 \$12,642	28.0	-0.3 3.4	30.4
Alabama	\$9,939	41	\$9,028	38	\$5,164		\$11,320		\$10,282	33	\$5,882	36	\$9,822	43	-4.4	45
Alaska	\$19,571		\$18,416	2	\$10,315		\$18,516		\$17,423	2	\$9,758		\$17,919	5	16.8	ç
Arizona	\$8,786	48	\$7,528	48	\$4,091	49	\$9,114	48	\$7,809	48	\$4,244	48	\$8,826	47	-5.6	47
Arkansas	\$10,785	35	\$9,616	33	\$5,430	34	\$12,326		\$10,989	27	\$6,206		\$10,469	36	11.9	18
California	\$11,223	33	\$9,595	34	\$5,709	31	\$9,985	45	\$8,536	47	\$5,079	44	. ,	30	-3.7	44
Colorado Connecticut	\$10,538	37	\$8,985	39 4	\$5,159 \$11,031		\$10,331 \$18,912	41	\$8,809 \$16,309	44	. ,		\$10,322 \$18,374	38 4	4.8 24.0	33
Delaware	\$20,577 \$15,775		\$17,745 \$13,938	12	\$8,633		\$18,912		\$13,678	10	\$10,139 \$8,472		\$18,374	4	9.2	25
Florida	\$9,628	43	\$8,755	41	\$5,370	36	\$9,715	47	\$8,835	43	. ,	41	\$9,909	41	-15.1	50
Georgia	\$10,486	39	\$9,202	37	\$5,590		\$11,398		\$10,002	37	\$6,076		\$10,740	35	-7.6	48
Hawaii	\$14,434	16	\$12,458	15	\$7,464	15	\$12,358	29	\$10,666	30	\$6,390	28	\$14,029	13	2.2	37
Idaho	\$7,406	50	\$6,621	49	\$3,939	50	\$7,929	50	\$7,089	49	\$4,218	50	\$7,782	49	-8.5	49
Illinois	\$14,756		\$13,077	13	\$7,822		\$14,654		\$12,986	14	\$7,768		\$13,459	15	25.5	2
Indiana	\$12,064	26	\$9,548	35	\$5,471		\$13,199		\$10,446	32	\$5,985		\$12,016	24	12.7	15
lowa Kansas	\$12,346 <b>\$11,702</b>	24 29	\$10,668 \$9,972	26 28	\$6,510 <b>\$6,112</b>		\$13,673 \$12,901		\$11,814 <b>\$10,995</b>	20 26	\$7,210 <b>\$6,739</b>	20	\$11,716 <b>\$11,619</b>	26 27	13.0 1.7	12 38
Kentucky	\$10,523	38	\$9,312	36	\$5,328		\$11,864		\$10,498	31	\$6,007		\$10,322	39	5.6	31
Louisiana	\$12,508		\$10,749	25	\$6,050		\$13,684		\$11,760	22	\$6,619		\$12,134	23	7.8	27
Maine	\$14,604	15	\$12,707	14	\$7,284	18	\$15,041	14	\$13,086	13	\$7,502	17	\$13,844	14	12.9	13
Maryland	\$16,146		\$14,003	10	\$8,635		\$14,638		\$12,695	17	\$7,829	14		10	4.3	34
Massachusetts	\$17,896		\$15,087	7	\$9,225		\$16,710		\$14,087	9	\$8,614		\$16,618	7	15.6	10
Michigan	\$12,856		\$11,110	22	\$6,497		\$13,662		\$11,807	21	\$6,904		\$12,314	20	10.5	22
Minnesota Mississippi	\$13,693 \$9,072	18 46	\$11,464 \$8,263	18 46	\$7,441 \$4,628		\$14,030 \$10,464	40	\$11,746 \$9,531	23 40	\$7,624 \$5,338	42	\$13,044 \$9,048	17 45	12.0 0.8	17 40
Missouri	\$11,382	32	\$9,875	30	\$5,871		\$12,731		\$11,046	25	\$6,568		\$10,860	34	10.6	21
Montana	\$11,890		\$11,017	23	\$6,590		\$12,622		\$11,695	24	\$6,995	22		29	9.3	24
Nebraska	\$12,773	20	\$11,726	17	\$7,714	14	\$14,099	17	\$12,942	15	\$8,514	11	\$12,263	21	12.4	16
Nevada	\$9,642	42		45	\$4,829	45	\$9,869	46	\$8,612	46	\$4,943	46	\$9,827	42	-4.7	46
New Hampshire	\$15,919		\$14,335	9	\$9,016		\$15,132		\$13,627	11	\$8,570		\$14,654	12	19.2	5
New Jersey New Mexico	\$20,531 \$11,026	3 34	\$17,907 \$9,734	3	\$10,395 \$5,234		\$17,931 \$11,606		\$15,639 \$10,247	6 34	\$9,079		\$19,287 \$10,899	2 33	11.2 1.7	19 39
New York	\$11,026 \$23,326		\$9,734	31			\$20,161		\$10,247		\$5,509 \$12,350		\$10,899	33 1	20.2	39
North Carolina	\$9,340	44		44	\$5,254		\$10,186	42	\$9,282	41		38	\$9,768	44	-2.2	43
North Dakota	\$14,817		\$12,358	16	\$7,346		\$16,193		\$13,505	12			\$12,986	18		1
Ohio	\$14,041	17	\$11,354	19	\$6,509	23	\$15,723	11	\$12,715	16	\$7,289	19	\$13,405	16	10.5	23
Oklahoma	\$9,003	47	\$7,829	47	\$4,228	47	\$9,992	44	\$8,689	45	\$4,693	47	\$8,940	46	0.0	42
Oregon	\$11,602	30		29	\$5,766		\$11,720		\$10,045	36			\$10,922	32	8.0	26
Pennsylvania Rhode Island	\$17,223 \$16,948		\$13,961 \$14,767	11	\$8,497 \$8,550		\$17,538 \$17,171		\$14,217 \$14,962	8 7	\$8,652 \$8,663		\$15,915 \$15,885	8 9	17.7 12.7	7 14
South Carolina	\$10,948	31		32	\$5,425		\$12,734		\$10,754	28	\$5,994		\$11,033	31	6.0	28
South Dakota	\$10,278	40	\$8,881	40	\$5,247		\$11,680		\$10,092	35	\$5,962		\$10,135	40	5.2	32
Tennessee	\$9,046	45		42	\$5,336		\$10,029	43	\$9,568	39		35	\$8,766	48		20
Texas	\$10,629	36	\$8,593	43	\$5,125		\$11,003	39	\$8,895	42	\$5,305		\$10,380	37	5.6	30
Utah	\$7,714	49		50	\$4,096	48	. ,	49	\$6,701	50		49	\$7,683	50	2.3	36
Vermont	\$19,009		\$16,988		\$10,165		\$18,783		\$16,786		\$10,044		\$17,579	6		8
Virginia Washington	\$11,847 \$12,227		\$10,973	24	\$6,645 \$5,925		\$11,546		\$10,695	29	\$6,477		\$11,818 \$11,459	25	0.3	41
Washington West Virginia	\$12,237 \$12,497		\$10,202 \$11,260	27 20	\$5,925 \$6,507		\$11,789 \$14,058	32 18	\$9,828 \$12,666	38 18	\$5,709 \$7,319		\$11,459 \$12,219	28 22	13.5 18.7	11
Wisconsin	\$12,716		\$11,186	20	\$6,572		\$13,615		\$11,977	19	\$7,037		\$12,219	19	5.8	29
Wyoming	\$19,098		\$15,797	6	\$9,338		\$19,853		\$16,421	4	\$9,707		\$18,869	3	2.6	35
B10, w/out Alaska No InC., No AK, WY	\$10,299 \$10,483	38.3 37.2	\$9,069 \$8,969	37.8 39.2	\$5,191 \$5,299		\$10,988 \$10,811	38.2 39.6	\$9,680 \$9,253	37.7 40.8	\$5,539 \$5,468		\$10,236 \$10,342	37.9 37.6	-2.1 0.9	40.9 33.8

Overall Outcome Ranks and Aspiration States National Assessment of 18-24-Year-Olds Adjusted Cohort ACT and SAT Education Progress, % at Unweighted Ranking Education Graduation Rate. Adjusted Weighted Ranking and Aspiration States Benchmarks, 2015 and Aspiration States Attainment, 2014 Ranks % at Basic % at Proficient Average of Average of Assessment Average of Individual Economically Disadvantaged Students Limited English Proficiency Students Rank Average of 18-24 Rank of Average ACT Pct Meeting All 4 Benchmar High school graduate and NSLP Ineligible **NSLP Ineligible (Not Low** Assessment Ranks (Unweighted) of Average Ranks (Unweighted Aspiration Average of Aspii Ave SAT Mean Bachelor's degree or NSLP Eligible (Low NSLP Eligible Students with ration age of Individual Some Average of States States 1 Score -Graduation Ranks Ranks (Weighted) (Not Low Income) Ranks Attain college or (Low Unweigh Disabilities ₽ Imen NAEP All Students All Students (Weighted (Weighted (Weighted) Combined Income) Income) Students Income) higher Ranks higher highe Ranks Ranks Ran ted) 궀 42.5 37.5 Alabama 40.7 17.5 47.7 44.2 34.1 Alaska 45.0 43.4 47 41.3 48.3 40.7 43.6 44.4 Arizona 46.5 36.1 44 42.7 39.5 27.2 40.1 40.7 Arkansas 34.0 28.2 34 34.3 5.8 38.2 35.4 25.2 California 35.5 33.7 20.3 27.3 44.0 38.3 28.6 9.5 22.5 14.0 40.8 19.0 12.7 22.5 Colorado 2.0 10.3 23.8 8.1 Connecticut 16.8 20.3 14.1 х Delaware 27.5 27.6 32 31.3 12.8 35.7 30.2 24.8 Florida 40.5 30.8 34.3 39.8 19.8 33.6 35.9 Georgia 28 10 35.0 35.6 43 39.0 47.0 26.5 32.2 39.4 Hawaii 41.0 34.7 42 24.3 31.0 40.3 40.8 32.0 Idaho 25.0 27.1 41.7 28.0 20.0 23.3 31.0 5.5 Illinois 16.8 12.3 14.5 24.3 11.8 12.9 х ndiana 30.5 14.6 х 37.3 5.3 4.2 21.7 21.4 17 21 15.5 12.0 9.7 3.3 17.8 9.7 х х 16.3 lowa 15.5 14.4 ansa 14.0 14.7 13.3 17.8 15.3 Kentucky 20.0 17.0 15 29.0 12.0 13.3 17.8 19.6 Louisiana 39.0 44.0 48 45.0 43.0 45.8 41.3 43.1 Maine 22.0 16.6 12 14.0 14.5 17.5 20.5 16.3 Maryland 43 26 26.0 24.9 29 15.0 25.5 29.0 27.0 22.5 Massachusetts 2.0 7.3 2.0 23.0 1.2 1.7 8.9 х х 47 42 31.9 42.5 25.8 Michigan 13.5 20.7 33.5 23.2 /linnesota 4.0 13.9 х 9.7 34.5 5.7 4.6 16.2 37.0 39.7 43.0 35.3 42.0 38.7 39.0 Mississippi Missouri 13.5 19.7 23.0 13.3 24.3 17.1 17.8 6 10 24.0 21.8 20 26.6 Montana 37.0 22.5 13.0 20.3 Nebraska 12.0 9.8 х 7.3 12.8 8.3 10.8 10.3 х Nevada 48.5 46.6 50 48.8 46 7 New Hampshire 4.0 6.9 х 11.7 10.8 3.0 3.7 8.7 х New Jersey 12.5 9.5 х 8.7 8.8 9.3 11.4 9.6 х New Mexico 45.5 45.3 45.3 41.0 48.2 46.4 44.2 14.0 26.9 8.7 41.5 30.7 19.6 23.2 New York North Carolina 42 26 36.0 23.1 23 27.3 28.9 27.2 25.3 14.8 North Dakota 25 17 11 21 11.5 15.1 х 4.3 21.0 17.7 13.6 13.0 х Ohio 23.5 21.1 19 26.7 27.0 13.7 20.2 24.6 Oklahoma 10 26 35.5 30.4 36 42.3 29.8 33.6 31 9 11 21 37.5 30.3 35 27.7 44.5 19.8 31.6 34.6 Oregon 24 14 31 10 26.5 18.3 16 21.0 15.0 19.9 Pennsylvania 16.0 22.7 Rhode Island 26.0 23.1 9.3 27.5 26.2 26.1 21.0 South Carolina 39 26 44.5 34.2 41 30.3 29.8 35.7 41.6 33.9 12.5 27.7 23.8 South Dakota 35.7 35.3 16.3 29.1 28 26 23.5 23.4 26 22.5 Tennessee 31.0 11.8 27.3 24.8 Texas 11 26 48.5 24.2 27 37.0 5.8 22.0 39.7 27.5 Utah 11 26 28 23.0 23.3 25 33.0 15.8 20.6 27.0 Vermont 16 17 13 13.0 8.9 х 7.0 14.0 5.2 10.4 10.5 х 15.0 19.0 19.6 Virginia 9.3 34.5 14.8 14.9 Washington 31.5 24.7 28 28.7 39.0 11.0 24.7 30.8 48.0 32.8 39 40.3 13.3 37.0 44.3 32.6 West Virginia 25 20 38 10 8.5 16.3 11 Wisconsin 16.0 16.3 19.2 12.1 14.8 Wyoming 21.0 21.9 21 28.0 32.8 11.8 17.9 26.2 

#### Table 3: State Educational Outcomes Rankings