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## Greatically speaking

## Public education



Current expenditures include all per pupil cosis except capital outlays and debt service.
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Estimated average annual salary of instructional staff


- The pupil/reacher ratio has been reduced dramatically during the past 40 years, down to 17 students per teacher (figure 3).
- Per pupil funding growth has been fueled by a shift from local to state funding for primary and secondary education (figure 4). This graph shows the national statistics: however, there is wide variation across states; Hawaii with 87 percent state funding, to New Hampshire with 89 percent local funding.


## Output

Funding growth and decreases in the pupil/ teacher ratio are associated with litcle or no improvement in student outcome measures.

- Scores for scholastic aptitude tests for col-lege-bound seniors (SAT) have had a downward trend over the past 25 years (figure 5).
- School dropout rates (figure 6) for the most part have shown only slight improvement over the last decade. The percentage of dropouts for all persons aged 16 through 24 fell only two percentage points, from 15 per-
cent in 1972 to 13 percent in 1991. There was dramatic improvement in the rate for black, non-Hispanic srudents, which declined from 22 percent to 14 percent; the rate for white, non-Hispanic persons declined from 12 percent to 9 percent; but the drop-out rate for Hispanics has remained close to 35 percent over the past two decades.


## The puzzle

Despite increases in school funding and lower pupil/reacher ratios, student performance a: measured by achievement rest scores and drop out rates has worsened or shown only sligh improvement. Research provides little insigh into the issue. Smaller class size, graduate train ing for teachers, teacher experience, and highe teacher salaries do not appear to be systemati cally associated with improved student per formance on standardized achievement test (Hanushek).

What are explanations for poor studen performance, despite increased public invest

## vestment

## and performance



Total public elementary and secondary school revenues by source

ment in education? One might be that the performance measures are not appropriate measures of school outcomes. In 1990, 42 percent of all high school students took the SAT exam. Thus a measure of the cognitive skills of less than 50 percent of high school students in cheir final year of school may not provide a representative performance measure. Test bias, shifts in the population taking the SAT, and the interaction of school, home, and community support in the learning process raise concerns about comparisons of SAT scores across time, and as a criterion for school evaluations.

The dropout rate may not be an appropriare performance measure either. Household and community factors may impact dropout rates independent of school resources. Evaluation of schools' success independent of these non-school factors might lead to incorrect conclusions about schools' effectiveness.

Part of the problem may be that schools are not efficient. Use of average salary and
average pupil/teacher ratios as an input measure assumes school administrators can allocate salary money and teachers to encourage teacher and student productivity. Teacher contracts and state mandates, however, often influence or control these decisions.

Social changes over the last two decades also impact the education process. There have been dramatic increases in both dual income and single parent households. As a result, parents have less time and energy to work with and supervise their children. The result may be that more student time is allocated to television, recreation and work, rather than reading and studying. Schools also are influenced by these social changes. Teachers' expectations for pupil performance may change. School resources may be shifed to other services, such as security, after school day care, and meal programs.
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