



THE SCEA TEACHER SALARY SCHEDULE RECOMMENDATIONS

The South Carolina Education Association is pleased to submit recommendations to improve the teacher salary schedule as a result of Proviso 1.75.

Marcy Magid and Michael Petko

Senior Policy Analysts, NEA

Joanie Lawson

Government Relations Specialist, The SCEA

Overview

The South Carolina Education Association (The SCEA) is pleased to submit recommendations to improve the teacher salary schedule as a result of Proviso 1.75. This proviso directed all of the education stakeholder organizations to examine and make recommendations regarding changes to the statewide minimum state teacher salary schedule.

With the increasing numbers of educators leaving the profession annually, South Carolina must do all that it can to keep qualified and experienced teachers in the classroom. According to a supply and demand study conducted by the Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention and Advancement (CERRA) approximately **6,500** teachers left their positions in 2016-17. While some moved to different districts, more than **4,800** left South Carolina school districts. In addition, fewer students are graduating as teachers, only **1,900** in 2015-16. The state's teacher shortage is increasing every year! Our recommendations that are included in this proposal are designed to effectively address the teacher shortage crisis in our state.

The SCEA has a well-deserved reputation for defending and protecting children, as well as public education in our state. With over 135 years of service, the organization is a part of the National Education Association (NEA), the nation's largest professional employee organization. The NEA's 3 million members work at every level of education with affiliate organizations in every state and in more than 14,000 communities across the United States.

The SCEA utilized Marcy Magid and Michael Petko, Senior Policy Analysts at the NEA to assist in developing this proposal.

Magid joined the NEA's Department of Collective Bargaining and Member Advocacy in 2007. She works on a variety of compensation and advocacy issues and has almost 30 years of experience advocating for public sector employees.

Petko provided the economic analysis using the REMI model for the impact of increasing teacher salaries on South Carolina's economy. He joined the NEA in 2000 and has an extensive background in economic research.

Joanie Lawson is the Government Relations Specialist for The SCEA. Lawson has represented the organization since 2008 at the General Assembly and leads their effort to advocate for quality public education.



Our Proposal

South Carolina teachers earn less than comparable professionals.

South Carolina teachers' salaries continue to lag behind their counterparts in other states.

Attracting and retaining qualified and caring teachers in South Carolina's public schools requires treating them as professionals – and paying them a professional wage. We believe an educator's starting salary must be comparable to that of other college graduates who have similar education, training, and responsibilities. The SCEA realizes that we are not just competing with other states for teachers, but South Carolina school districts are also competing against **other** in-state employers who are willing to pay more to college-educated graduates. By all standards, South Carolina's salaries are not competitive.

Based on the salary schedules contained in the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) FY 2015-2016 DMSS report, the average starting salary for teachers with a BS degree in SC is **\$32,367**. According to data in Salary.com, the average starting salary for workers with a BS degree in SC is **\$34,716**, a \$2,000 variance. For young people starting their careers, who probably also have loan debt - \$2,000 will make a difference. According to The Hamilton Project, a 2012 study conducted by the Brookings Institution, elementary education majors will need approximately **18%** of their first year income to repay student loans. This study also indicated that the typical debt load for education majors was between \$24,000 to \$27,000.

For the 2015-16 school year (data for 2016-17 is not yet available), South Carolina's entry level teacher salaries are lower on a national and regional basis.

- South Carolina average starting bachelor's teacher salary ranked **47th** out of 50 nationally. (See Appendix Table 1). It is also worth noting that in the three years that the National Education has conducted this analysis, **South Carolina's starting salary has dropped nationally from 39th in 2014, to 45th in 2015, to 47th in 2016.**
- South Carolina's average starting salary ranks **last** in the Southeast region (defined as Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia¹)

¹ These states were identified by The SCEA to use in prior analyses.



- South Carolina’s average maximum bachelor’s degree ranks **9th** out of 12th in comparison to other states in the Southeast region and 30th nationally.

According to a report recently released by the Economic Policy Institute, on a national basis, teachers’ earnings are, on average, 17 percent less than comparable professionals (data is from 2015). In South Carolina, the “teaching penalty” was 21% in 2015, up from 18% five years before. (Allegretto and Mishel, 2016)².

One reason for this is that the State’s minimum salary schedule is poorly constructed. The starting salaries are low and the state salary schedule contains 24 steps, which means that it takes 24 years for a teacher to reach the maximum salary. Over time, this reduces a teacher’s career earnings. Because South Carolina’s school district salaries are based on the state salary schedule, the problems associated with the state schedule impact school district salary schedules. Moreover, most school districts have added steps to the state salary schedule, which has exacerbated the negative impact on career earnings.

South Carolina can improve the structure of its salary schedule by raising the overall minimum salary level and by reducing the number of steps. The National Education Association recommends ten years to reach the maximum salary level. In addition, the state and/or school districts can implement new compensation policies to provide incentives to work in high poverty and rural schools and to acquire additional knowledge, skills, and responsibilities such as mentoring and coaching.

The remainder of this proposal examines the status of South Carolina’s teacher compensation and then provides recommendations about ways to improve teacher pay. A summary of additional research related to teacher shortages and compensation is included as **Appendix 2**.

We also compare South Carolina teacher salaries to teacher salaries in other states in two ways. First, benchmark salaries are compared based on existing school district salary schedules. Second, South Carolina’s average teacher salary is compared to those of other southeastern states’ and nationally.

Benchmark Salaries

South Carolina’s benchmark salaries are below average nationally and regionally. NEA collects data on five teacher salary levels (B.A. minimum, B.A. maximum, M.A. minimum and

²Allegretto, Sylvia A and Lawrence Mishel (2016). The teacher pay gap is wider than ever. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute. (This is the most recent data available).



maximum, and the absolute maximum on the salary schedule if higher than the M.A. maximum). The data are for public schools only and contain salary schedule benchmark data for over 12,000 school districts.³ Since these data are based on actual school district salary schedules, this comparison is particularly relevant in conveying how South Carolina's low starting salaries are problematic for recruiting teachers.

Earlier in this proposal, we addressed bachelor's degree salaries. South Carolina teachers who have earned master's degrees are at a similar disadvantage.

- At the national level, South Carolina ranks 37th in starting salaries for teachers who hold a master's degree, and slightly higher (32nd) at the highest point on the master's degree lane (see Table A in Appendix).
- In the Southeast region, South Carolina ranks 11th (out of 12) for the minimum master's degree salary and 5th for the maximum master's degree salary.

South Carolina's salaries only compare favorably to other states (19th) at the highest salary offered, usually for teachers who hold a PhD (see Table A in Appendix 1). This benchmark has consistently been the most favorable comparison for South Carolina yet it too has dropped from prior years.

Please keep in mind, however, that this PhD benchmark ranking (as well as the Master's maximum) is misleading. Because there are so many steps to reach the maximum pay level, many teachers never reach this highest salary. Furthermore, not all teachers pursue advanced degrees, especially a doctorate.

These low salaries negatively impact South Carolina schools' ability to retain and recruit teachers. See Tables 1-2 for further details.

³ NEA's Collective Bargaining and Member Advocacy Salary Database comprises salary schedule data provided to NEA by NEA state affiliates, State Departments of Education, and on-line web research. The salary schedules contained in the database were the most current at the time of the reporting period. They may not reflect all local supplements if not reported by the affiliate or Department of Education. Data for 2015-16 is the most recent available.



Table 1. Southeastern States Ranked by Average Bachelor's Degree Minimum and Maximum Salary

Southeastern States Ranked by Average Bachelor's Degree Minimum Salary

	BA Min	BA Max	MA Min	MA Max	Max
LA	\$39,646	\$52,100	\$40,421	\$53,566	\$55,577
VA	\$39,398	\$63,157	\$42,576	NA	\$70,580
NC	\$37,370	\$52,370	\$40,870	\$57,370	\$59,900
FL	\$37,154	\$59,747	\$39,269	\$61,834	\$62,721
AL	\$36,946	\$47,672	\$42,397	\$54,560	\$62,712
KY	\$36,389	\$51,506	\$40,158	\$56,293	\$60,798
TN	\$35,334	\$47,000	\$38,247	\$51,435	\$59,609
MS	\$34,660	\$53,180	\$37,071	\$60,775	\$67,904
GA	\$34,607	\$52,150	\$39,664	\$59,882	\$74,902
WV	\$33,665	\$54,696	\$36,498	\$57,544	\$61,306
AR	\$33,664	\$46,315	\$37,531	\$46,025	\$51,699
SC	\$32,367	\$50,764	\$36,950	\$57,439	\$70,022



Southeastern States Ranked by Average Bachelor's Degree Maximum Salary

	BA Min	BA Max	MA Min	MA Max	Max
VA	\$39,398	\$63,157	\$42,576	NA	\$70,580
FL	\$37,154	\$59,747	\$39,269	\$61,834	\$62,721
WV	\$33,665	\$54,696	\$36,498	\$57,544	\$61,306
MS	\$34,660	\$53,180	\$37,071	\$60,775	\$67,904
NC	\$37,370	\$52,370	\$40,870	\$57,370	\$59,900
GA	\$34,607	\$52,150	\$39,664	\$59,882	\$74,902
LA	\$39,646	\$52,100	\$40,421	\$53,566	\$55,577
KY	\$36,389	\$51,506	\$40,158	\$56,293	\$60,798
SC	\$32,367	\$50,764	\$36,950	\$57,439	\$70,022
AL	\$36,946	\$47,672	\$42,397	\$54,560	\$62,712
TN	\$35,334	\$47,000	\$38,247	\$51,435	\$59,609
AR	\$33,664	\$46,315	\$37,531	\$46,025	\$51,699



Table 2. Southeastern States Ranked by Average Master's Degree Minimum and Maximum Salary

Southeastern States Ranked by Average Master's Degree Minimum Salary

	BA Min	BA Max	MA Min	MA Max	Max
VA	\$39,398	\$63,157	\$42,576	NA	\$70,580
AL	\$36,946	\$47,672	\$42,397	\$54,560	\$62,712
NC	\$37,370	\$52,370	\$40,870	\$57,370	\$59,900
LA	\$39,646	\$52,100	\$40,421	\$53,566	\$55,577
KY	\$36,389	\$51,506	\$40,158	\$56,293	\$60,798
GA	\$34,607	\$52,150	\$39,664	\$59,882	\$74,902
FL	\$37,154	\$59,747	\$39,269	\$61,834	\$62,721
TN	\$35,334	\$47,000	\$38,247	\$51,435	\$59,609
AR	\$33,664	\$46,315	\$37,531	\$46,025	\$51,699
MS	\$34,660	\$53,180	\$37,071	\$60,775	\$67,904
SC	\$32,367	\$50,764	\$36,950	\$57,439	\$70,022
WV	\$33,665	\$54,696	\$36,498	\$57,544	\$61,306

Southeastern States Ranked by Average Master's Degree Maximum Salary

	BA Min	BA Max	MA Min	MA Max	Max
FL	\$37,154	\$59,747	\$39,269	\$61,834	\$62,721
MS	\$34,660	\$53,180	\$37,071	\$60,775	\$67,904
GA	\$34,607	\$52,150	\$39,664	\$59,882	\$74,902
WV	\$33,665	\$54,696	\$36,498	\$57,544	\$61,306
SC	\$32,367	\$50,764	\$36,950	\$57,439	\$70,022
NC	\$37,370	\$52,370	\$40,870	\$57,370	\$59,900
KY	\$36,389	\$51,506	\$40,158	\$56,293	\$60,798
AL	\$36,946	\$47,672	\$42,397	\$54,560	\$62,712
LA	\$39,646	\$52,100	\$40,421	\$53,566	\$55,577
TN	\$35,334	\$47,000	\$38,247	\$51,435	\$59,609
AR	\$33,664	\$46,315	\$37,531	\$46,025	\$51,699
VA	\$39,398	\$63,157	\$42,576	NA	\$70,580



Average Salaries

In the last ten years, South Carolina’s average teacher salaries have lost ground regionally and nationally. In 2008, the average South Carolina teacher salary was ranked 35th nationally. In ten years, the state’s ranking has fallen to 40th. Furthermore, these salaries have been eroded by inflation. While the average teacher salary for South Carolina has increased a modest 6.2% during the 10 years between 2008 and 2017, after an inflation adjustment, the South Carolina teacher salary has declined by **6.8%** since 2008. This is further evidence that South Carolina teachers have lost economic ground during the last several years.

On a regional basis, South Carolina’s average teacher salary ranked 9th (out of 12) in the Southeast region. (See Table 3 below for regional data and **Appendix 1**, Table B for national data).

Table 3. 2017 Average Teacher Salary Rankings, Southeastern States and the U.S.

State	Average Salary	SE Rank
Alabama	\$ 48,868	7
Arkansas	\$ 48,616	8
Florida	\$ 49,407	6
Georgia	\$ 54,602	1
Kentucky	\$ 52,339	2
Louisiana	\$ 50,000	4
Mississippi	\$ 42,925	12
North Carolina	\$ 49,837	5
South Carolina	\$ 48,598	9
Tennessee	\$ 48,456	10
Virginia	\$ 51,049	3
West Virginia	\$ 45,701	11
U.S/DC. average	\$ 59,043	

Source: Rankings & Estimates, August 2017

South Carolina’s low average salaries could be caused by several reasons. Average salaries may be lower, not only because of low salary schedules, but also because of more difficult working conditions often inherent in high poverty schools. The low salaries and difficult working conditions contribute to higher turnover. When this happens, the incumbents are usually newer, less experienced teachers, who are paid at the lower steps of the salary schedule, which lead to a decrease in the average salary. Moreover, South Carolina school district salary schedules



contain so many steps, teachers often leave before they have reached the maximum salary so average salaries are reduced.

South Carolina salary schedules contain too many steps and reduce teachers’ career earnings.

Due to the structure of South Carolina school districts’ teacher salary schedules, most teachers have to work more than 24 years to reach the maximum salary. Table 4 shows that of the 81 school district salary schedules included on the South Carolina’s Department of Education’s website, 56 (or 69%) have added steps to the salary schedule. Moreover, 39 school districts require a teacher to work 30 years to reach the maximum salary level. This significantly reduces educator lifetime career earnings and has serious implications for a school district’s ability to retain educators. Optimally, teachers should reach the maximum step in ten years.

Table 4. Number of Steps in South Carolina School District Salary Schedules, 2016-17

# of Steps	# of School Districts
24	25
25	4
26	4
27	1
28	3
29	3
30	2
30+	39
Total	81
% of Total over 24 steps	69% (56)

If many teachers leave the profession before reaching the maximum step on their respective pay schedules, this suggests that South Carolina’s higher rankings at the upper ends of the pay schedules have little genuine impact as a retention tool.



Recommendation #1 – South Carolina should increase the state’s minimum salary schedule to raise the compensation floor for school districts. An increase in teacher compensation would help the state economy.

As described in this proposal, South Carolina educators’ salaries lag behind those of other teachers and professionals – nationally and regionally, both at the entry point and in terms of average salary. This has serious implications for recruiting and retaining quality educators. Before the State considers other changes to teacher compensation, it must increase the state minimum salary schedule so that teachers’ salaries better reflect the professional nature of their jobs and will attract college students to choose teaching as a career. **We recommend providing a 4% increase to teacher salaries below \$66K and 2% increase to teacher salaries above \$66K. This increase will require an investment of \$92M.**

According to a REMI analysis, provided by the NEA, the economic impact of an additional \$92 million into teacher’s salaries would result in the following for SC’s economy:

- **595** - employment increase in full time jobs in 2018, increasing to 616 by 2021
- **\$112M** - increase in personal income in 2018, rising to \$126M by 2021
- **\$8M** - increase in revenue for state and local governments, increasing to \$10M by 2021
- **\$73M** - increase in business sector growth in 2018, going to \$85M by 2021

Most of the increased wages goes to support educator’s household spending and most of that spending goes to businesses in South Carolina.

The chart below shows the impact on the South Carolina economy resulting from a \$92,652,805 increase in the wages paid to the state’s educators.

The Economic Impact of \$92.7 Million in Additional South Carolina Educator Wages					
Category	Units	2018	2019	2020	2021
Total Employment	Jobs, Full-time equivalent	595	659	658	616
Output	Millions of Current \$	\$73	\$84	\$88	\$85
Personal Income	Millions of Current \$	\$112	\$119	\$124	\$126
State and Local Tax Revenue	Millions of Current \$	\$8	\$9	\$9	\$10



Recommendation #2 -- The state should provide support to school districts to restructure salary schedules to reduce the number of steps and enhance educators' career earnings.

As previously noted, South Carolina's school district salary systems are poorly constructed (with too many steps) so that career earnings for teachers fall short compared to their counterparts in other states and in other professions.

In addition to increasing the entire schedule, South Carolina should reduce the number of steps on the schedule to encourage local school districts to do the same. The simplest way to do that would be to remove the bottom steps to shorten the schedule. At the school district level, this would mean that teachers on the lower steps would be moved to a higher step. In addition:

- Teachers should reach the maximum salary level within 10 years.
- Steps should not be added to a schedule. This only increases the number of years it takes a teacher to reach the maximum, which decreases career earnings.
- Salary steps should be uniform.
- There should be not be steps where teachers are frozen and do not earn a step increase.

A “strong, short” single salary schedule is based on the fewest possible steps/increments from entry level to the maximum rate of compensation. It is a compensation system that is bias-free and prevents discrimination by race, gender, grade level, or academic field. NEA recommends ten steps to reach the maximum salary level.

Teachers earn more under strong salary schedules. A schedule that moves employees to the “career” rate in a shorter period of time maximizes the number of years they make higher pay, boosting their career earnings and pension.

Long schedules are really extended apprenticeships. The shorter the schedule, the higher the average pay in the unit—which means more money in the “base” (the total salary outlay). Is South Carolina really suggesting it takes 24 years for teachers to master their jobs and reach the “career rate?”

A strong, short salary schedule—offering competitive starting rates, rewards for professional development, and a snapshot of future earnings—is an effective recruitment and retention tool. It can help stem high recruiting/retraining costs, preserve “institutional memory” in the work- place, reinforce long-term relationships with students, and put more spending power into the local economy.

The example below shows how shortening a schedule can increase career earnings. In Guide A



(another term for salary schedule) the maximum is reached at step/year 20, Guide B is 15 years, and Guide C is 10 years. The career earnings for Guide C are significantly higher.

GUIDE A			GUIDE B				GUIDE C			
Step	Salary	Career \$	Step	Salary	Career \$	\$ over 'A'	Step	Salary	Career \$	\$ over 'A'
1	42,000	\$ 42,000	1	42,000	\$ 42,000	\$ -	1	\$42,000	\$ 42,000	\$ -
2	42,789	84,789	2	43,071	85,071	282	2	43,666	85,666	877
3	43,578	128,367	3	44,142	129,213	846	3	45,332	130,998	2,631
4	44,367	172,734	4	45,213	174,426	1,692	4	46,998	177,996	5,262
5	45,156	217,890	5	46,284	220,710	2,820	5	48,664	226,660	8,770
6	45,945	263,835	6	47,355	268,065	4,230	6	50,330	276,990	13,155
7	46,734	310,569	7	48,426	316,491	5,922	7	51,996	328,986	18,417
8	47,523	358,092	8	49,497	365,988	7,896	8	53,662	382,648	24,556
9	48,312	406,404	9	50,568	416,556	10,152	9	55,328	437,976	31,572
10	49,101	455,505	10	51,639	468,195	12,690	10	56,994	494,970	39,465
11	49,890	505,395	11	52,710	520,905	15,510		56,994	551,964	46,569
12	50,679	556,074	12	53,781	574,686	18,612		56,994	608,958	52,884
13	51,468	607,542	13	54,852	629,538	21,996		56,994	665,952	58,410
14	52,257	659,799	14	55,923	685,461	25,662		56,994	722,946	63,147
15	53,046	712,845	15	56,994	742,455	29,610		56,994	779,940	67,095
16	53,835	766,680		56,994	799,449	32,769		56,994	836,934	70,254
17	54,624	821,304		56,994	856,443	35,139		56,994	893,928	72,624
18	55,413	876,717		56,994	913,437	36,720		56,994	950,922	74,205
19	56,202	932,919		56,994	970,431	37,512		56,994	1,007,916	74,997
20	56,991	989,910		56,994	1,027,425	37,515		56,994	1,064,910	75,000

Recommendation #3 -- All educator compensation systems should be co-created or designed with educators in collaboration with teacher associations, based on sound compensation principles.

There is no single one-size-fits-all model, so pay systems must be developed with teacher input and reflect local context. *Most states do not have minimum statewide teacher salary schedules, but usually have local schedules.* Any new pay schedule must be based on sound compensation principles:

- It must start with a professional level base salary that will attract and retain high quality educators. It must include several levels through which teacher’s progress based on professional growth.
- A standard salary schedule with lanes should include multiple lanes. Salary increases must be larger than the typical costs of continuing education.
- A career ladder, should be based on prescribed skills, knowledge, licenses, certifications, degrees, responsibilities, and/or accomplishments.
- Additional compensation can be paid for the following responsibilities or accomplishments:
 - Working in hard-to-staff and rural schools.



- Gaining new or maintaining advanced knowledge and skills such as National Board Certification.
- Taking on additional roles and responsibilities that require greater autonomy and discretion such as peer assistance, mentoring, instructional coaching, or other such teacher leadership roles.
- Working longer hours (extended contract year or extended days).
- A compensation system must be linked to quality induction and a professional development program.
- Compensation should not be based on student test scores.
- A pay system must have an adequate and sustainable funding source. Grants are only temporary and cannot sustain an ongoing compensation system.
- The pay schedule must be transparent, fair, and understandable to all employees and the public.
- A new pay system must be piloted before full implementation.

Though there are other compensation approaches, there are many benefits associated with a strong single salary schedule. Below are general principles and advantages of a strong salary schedule.

- A single salary schedule supports equity. Prior to a single salary schedule, salaries for teachers were determined on an individual basis. High school teachers generally earned more than elementary school teachers and men received more than women. The salary schedule assures that initial placement, advancement, and promotions are based on objective criteria.
- It promotes collaboration and collegiality among colleagues. There is no competition among educators about who receives bonuses.
- It is easy for a school district to administer the single salary schedule and project future costs. Few administrative staff are needed to maintain the system. This point is particularly important for small, rural school districts with limited human resources staffing.
- There are no quotas. The pay increases apply to everyone.
- The single salary schedule is transparent and understandable to all stakeholders - to teachers, prospective teachers, the school district, parents and the community.



Conclusion

The SCEA's recommendations for improving the current teacher salary schedule are focused on:

- Enhancing recruitment and retention efforts so that every South Carolina School District has access to a great teacher.
- Providing a competitive, professional income for educators so educators can focus on improving their practice and not worry about their financial stability.
- Demonstrating the impact that educators have on the state's economy.

While salary increases are not the only reason teachers leave the field, it is an important aspect. With high student debt and low wages, it is hard for anyone to have a financially stable career as an educator. Based on a study by the Center for American Progress, 16% of teachers have a second job to make ends meet.

In addition, the looming increase in retirement of baby boomers, indicate that our shortage crisis will only get worse.

The SCEA looks forward to continued dialog on our recommendations to improve the current teacher salary schedule. We stand ready to partner with the education stakeholders and the South Carolina General Assembly on this important endeavor.



Appendices

Appendix 1 – Salary Tables

Appendix 2 – Summary of Learning Policy Institute Research



Appendix 1, Table A. States Ranked by Benchmark Salaries, 2015-16

State	Avg BA Min	Rank - BA Min	Avg BA Max	Rank BA Max	Avg MA Min	MA Min	Avg MA Max	Rank MA Max	Avg Max	Rank Max
Alabama	\$ 36,946	22	\$ 47,672	36	\$ 42,397	16	\$ 54,560	37	\$ 62,712	31
Alaska	\$ 46,354	2	\$ 59,536	10	\$ 51,461	2	\$ 73,774	8	\$ 83,202	6
Arizona	\$ 32,810	44			\$ 35,432	43	\$ 57,471	31	\$ 58,420	42
Arkansas	\$ 33,664	40	\$ 46,315	38	\$ 37,531	34	\$ 46,025	46	\$ 51,699	48
California	\$ 43,206	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 81,018	11
Colorado	\$ 32,613	45	\$ 42,259	42	\$ 36,120	41	\$ 53,892	38	\$ 59,826	39
Connecticut	\$ 44,725	5	\$ 78,061	2	\$ 48,335	6	\$ 83,273	3	\$ 88,647	3
Delaware	\$ 40,736	12	\$ 59,314	11	\$ 46,295	11	\$ 72,100	9	\$ 81,882	9
Florida	\$ 37,154	20	\$ 59,747	9	\$ 39,269	26	\$ 61,834	20	\$ 62,721	30
Georgia	\$ 34,607	35	\$ 52,150	26	\$ 39,664	24	\$ 59,882	28	\$ 74,902	13
Hawaii	\$ 45,157	3	\$ 64,327	7	\$ 48,768	5	\$ 69,474	12	\$ 82,838	7
Idaho	\$ 33,046	43	\$ 45,507	39	\$ 34,059	45	\$ 51,695	40	\$ 54,372	46
Illinois	\$ 38,483	17	\$ 56,940	15	\$ 42,477	15	\$ 71,369	10	\$ 79,353	12
Indiana	\$ 34,780	33	\$ 49,237	34	\$ 36,803	38	\$ 61,530	23	\$ 64,427	28
Iowa	\$ 35,057	31	\$ 49,470	33	\$ 38,709	29	\$ 58,857	29	\$ 62,760	29
Kansas	\$ 34,377	38	\$ 39,282	46	\$ 37,253	35	\$ 48,873	43	\$ 54,943	45
Kentucky	\$ 36,389	25	\$ 51,506	28	\$ 40,158	23	\$ 56,293	34	\$ 60,798	35
Louisiana	\$ 39,646	13	\$ 52,100	27	\$ 40,421	22	\$ 53,566	39	\$ 55,577	44
Maine	\$ 33,189	41	\$ 56,409	16	\$ 35,736	42	\$ 59,938	27	\$ 61,965	33
Maryland	\$ 44,484	7	\$ 59,255	12	\$ 47,080	7	\$ 80,803	4	\$ 88,165	4
Massachusetts	\$ 43,097	10	\$ 68,587	6	\$ 46,569	9	\$ 75,683	7	\$ 84,235	5
Michigan	\$ 35,858	28	\$ 57,920	14	\$ 38,966	28	\$ 65,980	14	\$ 69,080	20
Minnesota	\$ 36,713	24	\$ 50,893	29	\$ 41,429	19	\$ 61,618	22	\$ 66,407	24
Mississippi	\$ 34,660	34	\$ 53,180	22	\$ 37,071	36	\$ 60,775	24	\$ 67,904	23
Missouri	\$ 31,344	49	\$ 39,771	45	\$ 34,198	44	\$ 49,037	42	\$ 53,495	47
Montana	\$ 29,314	50	\$ 40,351	44	\$ 33,051	47	\$ 55,282	36	\$ 59,196	41
Nebraska	\$ 33,110	42	\$ 40,559	43	\$ 39,211	27	\$ 55,766	35	\$ 62,634	32



Nevada	\$ 36,939	23	\$ 50,452	31	\$ 42,099	18	\$ 64,129	18	\$ 71,564	17
New Hampshire	\$ 36,115	26	\$ 54,605	21	\$ 39,582	25	\$ 61,646	21	\$ 65,522	26
New Jersey	\$ 50,799	1	\$ 81,385	1	\$ 54,440	1	\$ 85,959	1	\$ 89,746	2
New Mexico	\$ 36,544	36	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 60,621	36
New York	\$ 44,722	6	\$ 73,592	4	\$ 49,432	3	\$ 85,382	2	\$ 90,726	1
North Carolina	\$ 37,370	19	\$ 52,370	25	\$ 40,870	20	\$ 57,370	33	\$ 59,900	38
North Dakota	\$ 37,144	21	\$ 56,378	17	\$ 40,816	21	\$ 47,588	44	\$ 60,242	37
Ohio	\$ 34,523	37	\$ 55,525	18	\$ 38,261	32	\$ 64,452	17	\$ 73,712	14
Oklahoma	\$ 31,918	48	\$ 43,629	41	\$ 33,156	46	\$ 45,436	47	\$ 47,360	49
Oregon	\$ 34,849	32	\$ 49,165	35	\$ 38,680	30	\$ 60,759	25	\$ 65,649	25
Pennsylvania	\$ 43,265	8	\$ 69,640	5	\$ 46,736	8	\$ 76,859	6	\$ 82,027	8
Rhode Island	\$ 40,886	11	\$ 76,245	3	\$ 43,967	12	\$ 79,334	5	\$ 81,781	10
South Carolina	\$ 32,367	47	\$ 50,764	30	\$ 36,950	37	\$ 57,439	32	\$ 70,022	19
South Dakota	\$ 32,583	46	\$ 45,157	40	\$ 36,229	40	\$ 47,354	45	NA	NA
Tennessee	\$ 35,334	29	\$ 47,000	37	\$ 38,247	33	\$ 51,435	41	\$ 59,609	40
Texas	\$ 39,400	14	\$ 58,424	13	\$ 43,551	13	\$ 59,947	26	\$ 57,380	43
Utah	\$ 35,262	30	\$ 50,093	32	\$ 38,655	31	\$ 62,154	19	\$ 65,254	27
Vermont	\$ 37,707	18	\$ 52,719	24	\$ 42,168	17	\$ 64,901	15	\$ 71,782	16
Virginia*	\$ 39,398	15	\$ 63,157	8	\$ 42,576	14	\$ 70,580	11	\$ 67,982	22
Washington	\$ 38,868	16	\$ 55,477	19	\$ 46,427	10	\$ 66,040	13	\$ 73,562	15
West Virginia	\$ 33,665	39	\$ 54,696	20	\$ 36,498	39	\$ 57,544	30	\$ 61,306	34
Wisconsin	\$ 36,102	27	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 68,183	21
Wyoming	\$ 45,042	4	\$ 53,166	23	\$ 49,323	4	\$ 64,527	16	\$ 71,183	18
as of 12/31/2016, *Due to data anomalies and reporting issues, the VA "MA Maximum" exceeds the "Highest" salary. We used the MA Max as the MA max in this analysis. SOURCE: NEA Collective Bargaining and Member Advocacy Salary Database, December 2016										

Appendix 1, Table B. Average Salary by State Ranking, 2017



State Name	2017 Avg Salary	Rank	State Name	2017 Avg Salary	Rank
Alabama	\$48,868	38	Missouri	\$48,293	42
Alaska	\$68,138	7	Montana	\$51,422	31
Arizona	\$47,403	46	Nebraska	\$52,338	28
Arkansas	\$48,616	39	Nevada	\$57,376	18
California	\$78,711	2	New Hampshire	\$57,253	20
Colorado	\$51,808	29	New Jersey	\$69,623	6
Connecticut	\$72,561	5	New Mexico	\$47,500	45
Delaware	\$60,214	14	New York	\$79,637	1
District of Columbia	\$76,131	4	North Carolina	\$49,837	36
Florida	\$49,407	37	North Dakota	\$51,618	30
Georgia	\$54,602	24	Ohio	\$57,000	21
Hawaii	\$57,674	17	Oklahoma	\$45,245	49
Idaho	\$47,504	44	Oregon	\$61,631	12
Illinois	\$61,602	13	Pennsylvania	\$65,863	10
Indiana	\$50,554	34	Rhode Island	\$66,477	9
Iowa	\$55,443	22	South Carolina	\$48,598	40
Kansas	\$47,984	43	South Dakota	\$42,668	51
Kentucky	\$52,339	27	Tennessee	\$48,456	41
Louisiana	\$50,000	35	Texas	\$52,575	26
Maine	\$51,077	32	Utah	\$47,244	47
Maryland	\$66,961	8	Vermont	\$60,187	15
Massachusetts	\$77,804	3	Virginia	\$51,049	33
Michigan	\$62,200	11	Washington	\$54,147	25
Minnesota	\$57,346	19	West Virginia	\$45,701	48
Mississippi	\$42,925	50	Wisconsin	\$54,998	23



			Wyoming	\$58,650	16
U.S.	\$59,043				

Source: NEA Rankings and Estimates, August 2017



Appendix 2 – Learning Policy Institute Research

The Learning Policy Institute’s report titled *Solving the Teacher Shortage: How to Attract and Retain Excellent Educators*, published in 2016, includes an extensive review of the research literature on teacher recruitment and retention policies. The authors (Podolsky, Kini, Bishop, and Darling-Hammond) identified sustainable state policies that can relieve shortages while also advancing student learning and a quality teacher workforce. The full report is available at <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/solving-teacher-shortage>. One of the key strategies noted from the research is to **increase teacher compensation**. Three strategies cited directly from the brief are related to salaries, resources, and incentives, including:

1. Increase teacher salaries in schools and communities where salaries are not able to support a middle-class lifestyle and create salary incentives for accomplishments such as National Board Certification or taking on additional responsibilities.
2. Use federal levers in ESSA to provide low-income schools and districts with additional resources to attract and retain high-quality teachers.
3. Increase teachers’ overall compensation by offering housing incentives, such as money for rent, relocation, and down-payment assistance as well as discounted homes and subsidized teacher housing. States also can fund research on how these types of creative compensation structures impact teacher recruitment and retention.

Also, the Learning Policy Institute has published a Research Brief (September 2016) titled *Solving the Teacher Shortage: How to Attract and Retain Excellent Teachers*. It is available at https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Solving_Teacher_Shortage_Attract_Retain_Educators_BRIEF.pdf

It focuses on the major factors that influence teachers to enter the profession, stay or leave the teaching profession: The brief focuses on five elements, including:

1. Salaries and other compensation.
2. Preparation and costs to entry.
3. Hiring and personnel management.
4. Induction and support for new teachers.
5. Working conditions, including school leadership, professional collaboration and shared decision-making, accountability systems, and resources for teaching and learning.

