

Table IX

Staffing and Expenditures for Program, 1984-85

Extreme caution is advised in interpreting the information in this table. For many reasons it is not reasonable to compare costs among states because of the difference in the size of programs, the numbers of students served, the number of areas tested, and the size of the population of the state itself. In some instances staffing costs could not be accurately reflected in the budget to the complexity of the programs or departmental structure. In a few cases it appears that assessment total budget figures also include costs of the minimum competency program. Also, some states do their own scoring and did not count this cost; others have booklets already produced and in the schools and did not report these costs. And, finally, some districts reported usually large budgets this year because they are involved in developmental work.

Perhaps the most useful statistic in the table is the one relating to the budgeted amount per pupil for the state assessment program. Since it is arrived at by a division of the total budgeted amount by the total number of students tested, it provides a basis for interpreting the state per pupil investment. Even here, factors not named above might also contribute to the wide differences in reported costs: 1) state use of its own tests, in which case the cost of development may not be reflected in the current budget; 2) administration of whole batteries of tests to the same students as compared with matrix sampling or rotation of subjects and grade levels from year to year; 3) size of the state, in which case the maintenance of the staff and program may be somewhat more costly than in states with larger numbers of students; 4) the use of outside contractors when the entire testing process is simply reported in the contract costs, excluding state personnel costs; 5) and perhaps most important, the character and scope of the program itself. For example, programs with large writing components obviously have higher scoring costs.

Staffing of assessment offices is also variable, and is generally, but not always, related to the size and scope of the program offered. Size of staff varies considerably among states having comparable budgets. For example, Kentucky, with a budget of \$1.5 million has a staff of 1.5, whereas Michigan with a budget of \$1.25 million has a staff of six. Another contrast is Mississippi which administers \$200,000 budget with one staff member and Missouri, which has six staff members administering a budget of \$124,000. It would be difficult to evaluate the meaning of these differences without detailed information on the history and current status of these programs and the reasons money is budgeted as it is.

Wide differences in expenditures for scoring, purchasing, and developing tests were also encountered. This is to be expected in view of the fact that many states score their own tests and do not have this expenditure broken out.

Apparently, accounting for the cost of development of tests in the states is difficult, for very few states were able to provide these costs unless they were in a development year, with a specific budget for this. New York and Michigan were the only states providing them for the 1984-85 school year.

In general, changes in expenditures for state assessment have not changed radically over the past 4 years, or in the most recent 2 years. There are exceptions to this. For example, California has increased 250 percent in the past 4 years and 175 percent in the past 2 years and Hawaii has increased 300 percent over the past 4 years. Minnesota showed an increase of 500 percent over a 7-year period. Washington increased its expenditures 100 percent over the past 2 years while Oklahoma had an increase of 90 percent in that same period. Other states reported modest increases or budgets that remained the same or declined somewhat over these periods.

State Assessment

Table IX
Staffing and Expenditures for Program, 1984-85

State	Total S.A. budget, 1984-85	Total S.A. Staff	Total SEA curriculum staff	Total students tested 1984-85	Budgeted per pupil	1984-B Scoring	Expenditures for: Purchasing/ Developing cost	Approximate Change in Expenditures for S.A.	
								1980-81 to 1982-83	1984-85
Alabama	\$770 ,000	B	45 'Separate but work closely)	385,000	\$2.00	385,000	\$385.000	Increase	90% increase.
Alaska	\$50-60K	1	3	15,000	\$3.67 using 55K	\$5,000	N	50% decrease.	50% decrease.
Arizona	\$795 ,4652 (Excluding personnel		0	461,000	14A	440,000 std'd) 9,500 " wr.)	\$274,000 (std'd) \$500.00 (wr.)	18.5	31.6
Arkansas	\$190,000 (Includes scoring; cost is mostly scoring since test booklets in schools	4		100,000	\$1.90	Note column.	information in first	↑2-3%	Stayed same.
California	3 Million	11	35 50-65 for comparable group)	1,100 Million	\$2.73	560,000	N	50% increase	1759 increase Added 5th grade. Includes cash for CAP proctors.)
Colorado - no state program									
Connecticut	\$100,000	1.5	2	7,500	NA	NA	NA	increase 10% year.	Increase 10.
Mastery Program:	1.4 MILLION over 3 years starting 1984	1	2	40,000	NA	NA	NA	New funded separate	New.
Delaware	\$140,522 (std'd) \$36,000 (writing)	2	N	60,000 (std'd) 7,500 (wr.)	\$2.34 (std'd) \$4.80 (wr.)	71,900 std'd) Do not have figures dying teachers or scoring writing.	NA	↑5%	↑5%

1. SA and MC program may be combined, thus breakdown of money may be in excess of SA and MC program may be the same and the same.
2. SA and MC program may be combined or one and the same, thus figure may reflect a combined SA and MC staff.
3. Students tested, not number of tests administered.

State Assessment
Table IX
Staffing and Expenditures for Program, 1984-85

State	Total S.A. budget, 1984-85'	Total S A staff	Total SE curriculum staff	Total student tested. 1984-85'	Budgeted per pupil	1984- Scoring	Expenditures for: Purchasing/ Developing cost	Approximate xpenditures for	
								980-81 1984-85	1982-83 1984-
D.C.	\$300,000	11	Not part discussion	39,000 NRT' 45,000 CRT	\$2.00	\$150,00(\$150,000	Same (Doing less.)	Same ! with
Florida	Combined	w i t h	M.C. c	comments next to	ate.				
Georgia	\$720,000 Including personnel)	3.5	31	320,000	\$1.80	\$1.50/ student	\$250,000	%	
Hawii	,200,000	2	N	88,000	\$2.27	N	\$200,000	3009 increase	same
Idaho	\$21,000	.5	8	11,917	\$1.76	Note in	in first column.		
Illinois	200,000	5	NA	7,500	\$26.67	54,000	NA	- 7	
Indiana	229,900	2	NR	80,500	\$3.69	NA	NR		ch e, s
Iowa - No state program									s c
Kansas	\$230,000	1	2	150,000	NA	NA	NA		
Kentucky	.5 Million	1.5	15	710,000	\$2.11	\$500K	1 Million	Same	s crea: in 198
Louisiana	\$240,000	7	45	120,000	\$2.00	NR	NR	%	
Maine	\$830,000	6	17	48,000	10.40	Contract develop new test scoring high.	includes test lt and scoring for Writing test costs are signifia		reasc a 5(past r .
Maryland	Local system to pay all costs.	12 n all pograms. in this program.)	35	175,000	N	//		o state	Its.
SA and MC program may be combined, t s breakdc of costs may' be inexact 5A thus figure may reflect a aae.									
Students tested,									

State Assessment

Table IX
staffing and Expenditures for Program, 1984-85

State	Total S.A. budget, 1984-85 ¹	total S.A. staff ²	Total SEA curriculum staff	Total students tested 1984-85 ³	Budgeted per pupil ¹	1984-8 Scoring	Expenditures for: Purchasing/ Developing cost	Approximate Change in Expenditures	
								for 1980-81 to 1984-85	S.A. 1982-83 1984-85
Massachusetts state program	.								
Michigan	1.25 Mil.	6	7	330,000	3.79	\$300K	\$150,000	2 0 %	↑ 10%
Minnesota	\$265,000	7	0	270,000	1.10 Local assmt.. .98 [State assmt. cost is less.)	\$.98 per pupil	N	5 0 0 % over 7 years	Increase Big increase in 1985.
Mississippi	\$200,000	1	0	140,000	1.43	. 75/p Available	booklets. for grades 3 \$ 4.	Decrease Gone to M.C.T.	Decrease
Missouri	\$ 24,000	6	6	17,000	7.29	\$1.58 per		N	Anticipate Increase 1985.
Montana - No state program									
Nebraska - No state program									
Nevada - No State program									
New Hampshire No state program									
New Jersey - No state program									
New Mexico	NA	7	37	55,000	NA	NA	Local costs.	NA	NA

¹ SA and MC program may be combined, thus breakdown of costs may be in excess of SA and MC program may be the same.
² SA and MC program may be combined or one and the same figure may reflect a combined SA and MC staff.
³ Students tested, not number of tests administered.

State Assessment

Table IX
Staffing and Expenditures for Program, 1984-85

State	total S.A. budget, 1984-85	Total S.A. staff	Total SEA curriculum staff	Total student tested 1984-85	Budgeted per pupil	1984-1 Scoring	Expenditures for: Purchasing/ Developing cost	Approximate Change in Expenditures for A.	
								1980-61 1984-85	1982-83 to 1984-85
New York	\$210,000	10 test develors 4 prof. editors; 4 admis's spread over several programs.	NA	Info. available from LEA's only	NA	Local cost	\$210,000	Approx. 7 Same as inflation increase,	Approx. 7 Same as inflation (increase) .
North Carolina	\$1.1 Mil	1; pro- rated portion 16 others for this testing program.	NA	475,000	NA	80 of total budget.	NA	decreased in price over year until added science writing.	note comment in previous column.
North Dakota	-	No state program							
Oklahoma	-	No state program							
Oregon	\$100,000	2	8	25,000	\$4.00	\$65K	N	25%	same
Pennsylvania	\$550 - \$600,000	9 Also includes l.c.	NA	150,000 428,000 (M.C.) 578,000 Total	\$3.04	NA	NA	Stayed the	same.
Rhode Island	\$45,000	1	0	1,300	\$34.62	\$1,200	\$10,000 Admin. \$20,000	Same	Expected Increase 300 in ,985.
South Carolina	\$420K (1.2 Mil budget, combined SA&MC)	14 Includes C. staff units in one.	NA	300,000 (M.C.) .75,000 (SA)	\$2.18	\$00K	\$60K in 84/85 because of addition of 5th grade.	Same	Same with basic skills no part of program.

SA and MC program may be combined, as breakdown of costs may or SA and MC program may be one and the same.
SA and UC program may be combined or one and the same. thus figure may reflect a combined SA and MC staff.
Students tested, not number of tests administered.

Stat. Assessment

Table IX
Staffing and Expenditures for Program, 1984-85

State	Total S.A. budget, 1984-85 ¹	Total S.A. staff ²	Total SEA Curriculum staff	Total students tested 1984-85 ³	Budgeted per pupil	1984- Scoring	Expenditures for: Purchasing/ Developing cost	Approximate Change in Expenditures	
								for .980-81 to 1984-85	A. ,982-83 to 1984-85
South Dakota	\$70,000	1	9	21,000	\$3.33	NR	NR	\$ 7 0 K	\$ 7 0 K
Tennessee - Not available for interview									
Texas - No state program									
Utah	\$100,000	1	40	7,500	\$3.08	15,250	\$10,000 (Special purchase in 1984-85.)	15 1 5	5
Vermont - No state program									
Virginia	\$1,600,000	6	40	200,000	NR	95,000	N	Increase NR.	Increase NR.
Washington	3150,000	1.5	NA They play no role in assmt.	110,000	\$1.36	\$100,000	N	Increase 5-10	Increase 0 0 cover 8 grade c e n s
West Virginia	NR	1		115,000	NR	NR		NR	NR
Wisconsin available for interview									
Wyoming	\$ 100K	0	3	8,000	\$12.50	18K	\$71K to ETS	NA	NA Budget will increase by 10 in 5/86.

¹ SA and MC program may be combined, this breakdown of costs may be exact or SA and MC program may be the same.
² SA and MC program may be combined or one and the same. The figure may reflect a combined SA and MC staff.
³ Students tested, not number of tests administered.