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About this Report

The 17th annual edition of Education Week’s Quality Counts continues the tradition of tracking key education indicators and grading the states on their policy efforts and outcomes. This year’s report also tackles school climate and discipline as its special theme, examining the impact of a school’s social and disciplinary environment on students’ ability to learn and on the teachers and administrators tasked with guiding them. Education Week journalists take an in depth look at a range of school-climate factors—including strong peer relationships, a sense of safety and security, and school disciplinary policies and practices—that help to lay the groundwork for academic success.

To complement the report’s journalism, the Editorial Projects in Education Research Center conducted an original survey of more than 1,300 educators, who shared their insights and opinions on school climate and discipline in their schools. This survey was supported by grants from the Atlantic Philanthropies, the NoVo Foundation, the Raikes Foundation, and the California Endowment. This year’s report also features newly updated 50-state information on policies and conditions in three of the areas monitored by the report on an ongoing basis as part of Quality Counts’ State of the States framework: Chance for Success; transitions and alignment policies; and school finance.

To provide a comprehensive perspective on state policy and performance, the 2013 State Highlights Reports integrate findings from the 2012 and 2013 editions of Quality Counts. This approach allows us to capture state standings across the full set of six topical areas that comprise the report’s state-grading rubric. The overall state scores and letter grades awarded in Quality Counts are based on the following categories: Chance for Success; K-12 achievement; standards, assessments, and accountability; the teaching profession; school finance; and transitions and alignment. Most of the indicators that appear in Quality Counts are based on original analyses and state-survey data from the EPE Research Center, supplemented by information published by other organizations.

Overall findings from Quality Counts show that some states perform consistently well or poorly across the full range of graded categories. However, a closer examination of the results reveals that most states post a strong showing in at least one area. This suggests that while broad evaluations of state rankings and performance can be useful, a deeper reading of the results presented in this State Highlights Report will provide a more nuanced perspective on the educational condition of the nation and the states.

Editorial Projects in Education Research Center
January 2013

About Editorial Projects in Education

Editorial Projects in Education (EPE) is a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization based in Bethesda, Md. Its primary mission is to help raise the level of awareness and understanding among professionals and the public of important issues in American education. EPE covers local, state, national, and international news and issues from preschool through the 12th grade. Editorial Projects in Education publishes Education Week, America’s newspaper of record for precollegiate education, Digital Directions, the online Teacher channel, and the TopSchoolJobs employment resource. It also produces periodic special reports on issues ranging from technology to textbooks, as well as books of special interest to educators.

The EPE Research Center conducts annual policy surveys, collects data, and performs analyses that appear in the Quality Counts, Technology Counts, and Diplomas Count annual reports. The center also produces independent research reports, contributes original data and analysis to special coverage in Education Week, and maintains the Education Counts and EdWeek Maps online data resources.
# Quality Counts 2013 Grading Summary

## Vermont – State Highlights 2013

**Overall Grade**

A state’s overall grade is the average of the scores for the six graded categories.

**Vermont: B-**

**Rank:** 11

**Nation: C+**

**Online extra**

Calculate your own Quality Counts grades at [www.edweek.org/go/qc13calculate](http://www.edweek.org/go/qc13calculate)

### Quality Counts Grading Breakdown

This table reports the detailed scoring behind the grades for the six major topics examined in *Quality Counts*. Scores for those major categories are based on the respective subcategory scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vermont</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chance for success (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early foundations</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School years</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult outcomes</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions and alignment (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-childhood education</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College readiness</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy &amp; workforce</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School finance analysis (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 achievement (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards, assessments, and accountability (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School accountability</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teaching profession (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability for quality</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives &amp; allocation</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; supporting capacity</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grading Curve**

A (93-100), A- (90-92), B+ (87-89), B (83-86), B- (80-82), C+ (77-79), C (73-76), C- (70-72), D+ (67-69), D (63-66), D- (60-62), F (0-59)
Gauging Educator Attitudes

Teachers and school-based administrators have valuable first-hand experience with school climate, discipline, and safety. To learn more about educators’ views on these topics, the EPE Research Center conducted an online survey of teachers and school administrators who are registered users of edweek.org, Education Week’s flagship website. More than 1,300 respondents completed the survey, which was fielded in September 2012. These respondents included administrators, teachers, and instructional specialists (such as curriculum coordinators and instructional coaches). The results offer important insights into the attitudes and opinions of the educators providing responses to the survey.

Factors Important to Student Achievement

Teachers and school administrators agree that school climate, discipline, and safety are significant factors in educational success. Eighty-three percent of administrators and 72 percent of teachers, for instance, say that school climate is “very important” to student achievement.

Perceived importance of factors to student achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching quality</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School climate</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School safety</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School discipline policies</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family background</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: EPE Research Center, 2013
Addressing Misbehavior

Opinions are split on the effectiveness of common methods of addressing student misbehavior. Respondents express the most support for in-school suspension, the least severe of the disciplinary approaches examined. Seventy-six percent of respondents agree that in-school suspension is effective, compared with 41 percent for expulsion.

SOURCE: EPE Research Center, 2013

Poverty-Climate Connections

Educators are more likely to express strong agreement with positive statements about the climate of their schools when they serve in low-poverty schools. For example, 83 percent of respondents in low-poverty schools strongly agree that students and staff feel safe, compared with 46 percent in high-poverty schools. A similar pattern is found for other indicators of school climate.

SOURCE: EPE Research Center, 2013
The Chance-for-Success Index

The EPE Research Center developed the Chance-for-Success Index to better understand the role of education across an individual’s lifetime. Based on an original state-by-state analysis, this index combines information from 13 indicators that span an individual’s life from cradle to career. The Chance-for-Success framework allows states to identify strong and weak links in their residents’ educational life course—their typical trajectory from childhood through adulthood. More importantly, the index also provides information that could be used to target the efforts of public education systems in ways that better serve students of all ages.

### State Success Indicators

**From Quality Counts 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Quality Counts 2013</th>
<th>Vermont</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Foundations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children from families with incomes at least 200% of poverty level (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with at least one parent with a postsecondary degree (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental employment</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with at least one parent working full time and year-round (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic integration</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children whose parents are fluent English-speakers (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool enrollment</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three- and 4-year-olds enrolled in preschool (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten enrollment</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible children enrolled in kindergarten programs (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary reading</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth grade public school students proficient on NAEP (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school mathematics</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth grade public school students proficient on NAEP (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduation</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public high school students who graduate with a diploma (class of 2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary participation</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adults enrolled in postsecondary education or with a degree (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult educational attainment</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults with a two- or four-year postsecondary degree (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual income</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults with incomes at or above national median (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady employment</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults in labor force working full time and year-round (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE B+ 2 C+**
The Chance-for-Success Index captures the importance of education in a person’s lifetime from cradle to career. Its 13 individual indicators span a variety of factors, including preparation in early childhood, the performance of the public schools, and educational and economic outcomes in adulthood.

The states are graded using a “best in class” rubric, where a score of 100 points on the index would mean that a state ranked first in the nation on each and every indicator. State scores range from 91.9 (Massachusetts, earning the only A-minus) to 65.1 (Nevada, with a D). A closer examination of results shows that, while early foundations and adult outcomes do contribute to the index, indicators related to formal education (the schooling years) are the driving force behind the state rankings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Early Foundations</th>
<th>School Years</th>
<th>Adult Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: State subscores may not sum to total score due to rounding.

SOURCE: EPE Research Center, 2013
# Vermont – State Highlights 2013

## Transitions and Alignment

### Education Alignment Policies

The national summary column indicates the number of states that have enacted a particular policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Vermont</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early-Childhood Education (2012-13)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early learning – State early-learning standards aligned with K-12 standards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-readiness definition – State formally defines school readiness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-readiness assessment – Readiness of entering students assessed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-readiness intervention – Programs for students not deemed ready</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten standards – Learning expectations aligned with elementary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postsecondary Education (2012-13)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College readiness – State defines college readiness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College preparation – College prep required to earn a high school diploma</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course alignment – Credits for high school diploma aligned with postsecondary system</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment alignment – High school assessment aligned with postsecondary system</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary decisions – High school assessment used for postsecondary decisions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy and Workforce (2012-13)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work readiness – State K-12 system defines work readiness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career-tech diploma – State offers high school diploma with career specialization</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry certification – K-12 has path for industry-recognized certificate or license</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable credits – K-12 pathway to earn career-tech. credits for postsecondary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE**

C- (rank=42) B-

### A National Perspective

The EPE Research Center examined state efforts to connect the K-12 education system with early learning, higher education, and the world of work. Fourteen key transitions and alignment policies were included in *Quality Counts 2013*.

By the 2012-13 school year, most states had enacted at least nine of the 14 tracked policies; 19 states had 10 or more policies in place. This year, Georgia became the first state to earn a perfect score, having implemented all 14 policies. At the other end of the spectrum, Nebraska and South Dakota had just four such policies in place, and Montana only three.

**SOURCE:** EPE Research Center, 2013
### Vermont – State Highlights 2013

#### SCHOOL FINANCE ANALYSIS

### Equity and Spending Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Quality Counts 2013</th>
<th>Vermont State Average</th>
<th>Vermont Rank</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity (2010)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth-Neutrality Score  – Relationship between district funding and local property wealth</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLoone Index – Actual spending as percent of amount needed to bring all students to median level</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of Variation – Amount of disparity in spending across districts within a state</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Range – Difference in per-pupil spending levels at the 95th and 5th percentiles</td>
<td>$9,977</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$4,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spending (2010)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted per-pupil expenditures (PPE) – Analysis accounts for regional cost differences</td>
<td>$18,924</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$11,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students funded at or above national average – Percent of students in districts with PPE at or above U.S. average</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending Index – Per-pupil spending levels weighted by the degree to which districts meet or approach the national average for expenditures</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending on education – State expenditures on K-12 schooling as a percent of state taxable resources</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Definitions of School Finance Indicators

**Wealth-Neutrality Score:** The wealth-neutrality score shows the degree to which state and local revenue are related to the property wealth of districts. A negative score means that, on average, poorer districts spend more dollars per weighted pupil than do wealthy districts. A positive score means the opposite: Wealthy districts have more funding per weighted pupil than poor districts.

**McLoone Index:** The McLoone Index is based on the assumption that if all students in the state were lined up according to the amount their districts spent on them, perfect equity would be achieved if every district spent at least as much as that spent on the pupil in the middle of the distribution, or the median. The McLoone Index is the ratio of the total amount spent on pupils below the median to the amount that would be needed to raise all students to the median per-pupil expenditure in the state.

**Coefficient of Variation:** The coefficient of variation is a measure of the disparity in funding across school districts in a state. The value is calculated by dividing the standard deviation of adjusted spending per pupil by the state’s average spending per pupil. The standard deviation is a measure of dispersion (i.e., how spread out spending levels are across a state’s districts). If all districts in a state spent exactly the same amount per pupil, its coefficient of variation would be zero. As the coefficient gets higher, the variation in the amounts spent across districts also gets higher. As the coefficient gets lower, it indicates greater equity.

**Restricted Range:** This indicator captures the differences in funding levels found between the highest- and lowest-spending districts in a state. The index value is calculated as the difference in per-pupil spending levels at the 95th and 5th percentiles. Districts enrolling fewer than 200 students are excluded from the analysis.

**Spending Index:** The Spending Index takes into account both the proportion of students enrolled in districts with spending at the national average, and the degree to which spending is below that benchmark in districts where per-pupil expenditures fall below the national average. Each district in which the per-pupil-spending figure (adjusted for student needs and cost differences) reaches or exceeds the national average receives a score of 1 multiplied by the number of students in the district. A district whose adjusted spending per pupil is below the national average receives a score equal to its per-pupil spending divided by the national average and then multiplied by the number of pupils in the district. The Spending Index is the sum of district scores divided by the total number of students in the state. If all districts spend above the U.S. average, the state attains a perfect index score of 100 points.

**Note:** The District of Columbia and Hawaii are single-district jurisdictions. As a result, it is not possible to calculate measures of financial equity, which capture the distribution of funding across districts within a state. The District of Columbia and Hawaii do not receive grades for school finance and are not included in the rankings reported in this table.
The K-12 Achievement Index

The K-12 Achievement Index examines 18 distinct state achievement measures related to reading and math performance, high school graduation rates, and the results of Advanced Placement exams. The index assigns equal weight to current levels of performance and changes over time. It also places an emphasis on equity, by examining both poverty-based achievement gaps and progress in closing those gaps.

### State Achievement Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Quality Counts 2012</th>
<th>Vermont State Average</th>
<th>Vermont Rank</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement Levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade math – Percent proficient on NAEP (2011)</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade math – Percent proficient on NAEP (2011)</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade reading – Percent proficient on NAEP (2011)</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade reading – Percent proficient on NAEP (2011)</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement Gains</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade math – Scale-score change on NAEP (2003-2011)</td>
<td>+4.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>+6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade math – Scale-score change on NAEP (2003-2011)</td>
<td>+8.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade reading – Scale-score change on NAEP (2003-2011)</td>
<td>+0.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>+3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade reading – Scale-score change on NAEP (2003-2011)</td>
<td>+3.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Gap</strong> (National School Lunch Program, noneligible minus eligible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading gap – 4th grade NAEP scale score (2011)</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math gap – 8th grade NAEP scale score (2011)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading-gap change – 4th grade NAEP (2003-2011), negative value = closing gap</td>
<td>+5.7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math-gap change – 8th grade NAEP (2003-2011), negative value = closing gap</td>
<td>+1.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achieving Excellence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math excellence – Percent advanced on 8th grade NAEP (2011)</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in math excellence – Percent advanced on NAEP (2003-2011)</td>
<td>+6.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Graduation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate – Public schools (class of 2008)</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in graduation rate – Public schools (2000-2008)</td>
<td>+9.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Placement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High AP test scores – Scores of 3 or higher per 100 students (2010)</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in AP Scores – Change in high scores per 100 students (2000-2010)</td>
<td>+13.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRADE C+ 4 C-
The EPE Research Center’s K-12 Achievement Index awards states points based on three distinct aspects of student achievement: current levels of performance (status), improvements over time (change), and achievement gaps between poor and nonpoor students (equity).

The nation as a whole earns 69.7 points, on a 100-point scale, for a grade of C-minus. The leading state, Massachusetts, earns 85.9 points and a B, while the District of Columbia finishes last with a score of 56.3.

Only two states—Massachusetts and New Jersey—demonstrate consistently high marks across all three elements of the K-12 Achievement Index, earning a grade of B-minus or better in each of the three achievement dimensions.

NOTE: State subscores may not sum to total score due to rounding.

SOURCE: EPE Research Center, 2012

Nation Posts Middling Grade on Achievement

The U.S. earned 69.7 points, on a 100-point scale, for a grade of C-minus. The leading state, Massachusetts, earned 85.9 points and a B, while the District of Columbia finished last with a score of 56.3. Only two states—Massachusetts and New Jersey—demonstrate consistently high marks across all three elements of the K-12 Achievement Index, earning a grade of B-minus or better in each of the three achievement dimensions.
### Vermont – State Highlights 2013

#### STANDARDS, ASSESSMENTS, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Indicators</th>
<th>Vermont</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/language arts standards are course- or grade-specific (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS</td>
<td>33 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics standards are course- or grade-specific (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science standards are course- or grade-specific (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies/history standards are course- or grade-specific (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary resources – Materials elaborate on standards in all core subjects (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary resources – Materials provided for particular student populations (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test items used to measure student performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-choice items (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-answer items (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended-response items – English/language arts (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended-response items – Other subjects (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios of student work (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment of assessments to academic standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/language arts (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (2011-12)</td>
<td>ES MS HS</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies/history (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment systems</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vertically equated scores on assessments in grades 3-8 in English (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertically equated scores on assessments in grades 3-8 in math (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark assessments or item banks provided to educators (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Accountability (policies must apply to Title I and non-Title I schools)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State ratings – State assigns ratings to all schools on criteria other than AYP (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide student ID – State has a statewide student-identification system (2010)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards – State provides rewards to high-performing or improving schools (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance – State provides assistance to low-performing schools (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions – State sanctions low-performing schools (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE:** B (rank=30) **B**

Key: E = English, M = Math, S = Science, H = History/social studies
ES = elementary school, MS = middle school, HS = high school
## Efforts to Improve Teaching

### Accountability for Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Vermont</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements for initial licensure (2011-12) (*)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial coursework in subject area(s) taught</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of basic skills</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of subject-specific knowledge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of subject-specific pedagogy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-teaching during teacher training</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other clinical experiences during teacher training</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discouraging out-of-field teaching (2011-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct parental notification of out-of-field teachers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban or cap on the number of out-of-field teachers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating teacher performance (2011-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal evaluations of all teachers’ performance required</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement is tied to teacher evaluations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual basis for teacher evaluations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All evaluators of teachers receive formal training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education programs (2011-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankings/results published for teacher-preparation institutions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs accountable for graduates’ classroom performance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data systems to monitor quality (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State links teachers to student-growth data</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State links teachers and their performance data back to teacher education programs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Incentives and Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>Vermont</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of entry and transfer barriers (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative-route program for teacher preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-license reciprocity or portability arrangement with other state(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-pension portability across state lines</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-pay parity – Teacher salaries at least equal to comparable occupations (2010)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts report school-level salaries for teachers (2011-12)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay-for-performance program or pilot rewards teachers for raising student achievement (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated roles for teachers formally recognized by state (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for teachers taking on differentiated roles (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives for teachers to earn national-board certification (2011-12)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Incentives and Allocation (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vermont</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Managing and allocating teaching talent (2011-12)

- Incentives to teachers working in targeted schools: No
- Incentives to teachers working in hard-to-staff teaching-assignment areas: No
- Incentives to board-certified teachers working in targeted schools: No
- Incentives to principals working in targeted schools: No

### Building and Supporting Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vermont</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Supports for beginning teachers (2011-12)

- Induction program for all new teachers funded by state: No
- Mentoring program for all new teachers funded by state: No
- Mentoring-program standards for selecting, training, and/or matching mentors: No
- Reduced workload for all first-year teachers: No

Professional development (2011-12)

- Formal professional-development standards: Yes
- Professional development financed by state for all districts: No
- Districts/schools required to set aside time for professional development: Yes
- Professional development aligned with local priorities: Yes

School leadership (2011-12)

- Standards for licensure of school administrators: Yes
- Required internship for aspiring principals: No
- Induction or mentoring program for aspiring principals: No

School working conditions

- Program to reduce or limit class size implemented by state (2011-12): Yes
- Student-to-teacher ratio median in elementary schools is 15:1 or less (2009-10): Yes
- State tracks condition of school facilities (2011-12): No
- State posts school-level teacher-survey data on climate, working conditions (2011-12): No

**GRADE**

C- (rank=30) C
Reaching the Parity Line

An original analysis by the EPE Research Center finds that public school teachers nationwide make 94 cents for every dollar earned by workers in 16 comparable occupations. Thirteen states reach or surpass the pay-parity line, meaning teachers earn at least as much as comparable workers.

Occupations Comparable to K-12 Teachers

- Accountants and auditors
- Architects, except naval
- Archivists, curators, and museum technicians
- Clergy
- Compliance officers, except agriculture, construction, health and safety, and transportation
- Computer programmers
- Conservation scientists and foresters
- Counselors
- Editors, news analysts, reporters, and correspondents
- Human-resources, training, and labor-relations specialists
- Insurance underwriters
- Occupational therapists
- Other teachers and instructors (excludes preschool, K-12, and postsecondary)
- Physical therapists
- Registered nurses
- Technical writers

Quality Counts 2013

This year’s 17th edition of Quality Counts examines the impact of a school’s social and disciplinary environment on teaching and learning. Quality Counts 2013 also provides a 50-state update on policies and conditions in three distinct areas: Chance for Success; transitions and alignment; and school finance.

The State Highlights Reports present state-specific summaries of key findings across all six areas of policy and performance that comprise the report’s state-grading rubric. Information is drawn from the 2012 and 2013 editions of Quality Counts. Reports for the 50 states and the District of Columbia are available on the Web at www.edweek.org/go/qc13.

State Policy Indicators

Quality Counts regularly tracks and grades state progress in six categories comprising more than 150 different state-by-state indicators. Most of these 50-state indicators are based on original analyses and state-survey data from the EPE Research Center. The report also draws on published information from other organizations.

The methodology section of Quality Counts provides detailed descriptions of our indicators and procedures for grading the states. That information can be accessed online at www.edweek.org/go/qc13 (2013) and www.edweek.org/go/qc12 (2012).

Between June and October of 2012, the EPE Research Center conducted an original survey of state education agencies and the District of Columbia public schools. This survey provided information for most of our state policy measures. Indicators derived from other sources are noted below.

Chance for Success (2013)


Other Indicators: EPE Research Center analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey, 2011.

Transitions and Alignment (2013)

All Indicators: EPE Research Center annual state policy survey, 2012.

School Finance Analysis (2013)

Original EPE Research Center Analysis of Equity and Spending: Data for these analyses were obtained from a variety of sources, including: U.S. Census Bureau’s Public Elementary-Secondary Education Finance Data for 2010; U.S. Department of Education’s Common Core of Data 2008-09 and 2009-10 (district-level data); NCES’ Comparable Wage Index 2005; U.S. Census Bureau’s Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates 2010; U.S. Department of Education’s School District Demographics data, based on the 2000 U.S. Census; NCES, Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education: School Year 2009-10 (Fiscal Year 2010), November 2012; and 2010 gross-state-product data from the U.S. Department of Commerce’s Bureau of Economic Analysis.

K-12 Achievement (2012)


High School Graduation: Cumulative Promotion Index, calculated using the U.S. Department of Education’s Common Core of Data, 2007-08. EPE Research Center, 2011.


Standards, Assessments, and Accountability (2012)

Assessment item types and alignment to state standards: EPE Research Center review of testing calendars and other materials from state education agency websites, as verified by states, 2011.

State has a statewide student-identification system: Data Quality Campaign, 2010.

Other Indicators: EPE Research Center annual state policy survey, 2011.

The Teaching Profession (2012)


Teacher-Pay Parity: EPE Research Center analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey, 2009 and 2010.


Other Indicators: EPE Research Center annual state policy survey, 2011.

School Climate, Safety, and Discipline

In September 2012, the EPE Research Center conducted an online survey of teachers and school administrators who are registered users of the Education Week website. Key findings, based on responses from administrators, public school teachers, and instructional specialists, are presented on pages 3 and 4 of this report.
Code of Conduct
Safety, Discipline, and School Climate

The 17th edition of Quality Counts examines the impact of school climate, safety, and discipline on student learning. The report also provides a 50-state update on policies and conditions in three of the areas monitored by the report on an ongoing basis: Chance for Success; transitions and alignment; and school finance.

Highlights from this year’s report

A comprehensive look at school climate, safety, and discipline, including timely journalistic coverage and original survey data and analyses

EPE Research Center’s Chance-for-Success Index, a cradle-to-career perspective on the importance of education throughout a person’s lifetime

State of the States—Our comprehensive annual review of state policy and performance, this year highlighting: Chance for Success; transitions and alignment; and school finance

Online Extras

State Highlights Reports—Download individualized reports featuring state-specific findings from Quality Counts

Webinar—On Tuesday, Jan. 15 (and archived for later viewing), specialists will discuss ways to involve students in improving school climate

Education Counts—Access hundreds of education indicators from Quality Counts using our exclusive online database

Interactive tools—Readers can delve into state data and use an online calculator to recompute grades based on the indicators they feel are most important

Visit Quality Counts Online

www.edweek.org/go/qc13

> Purchase extra copies of Quality Counts by visiting www.edweek.org/go/buyQC.
> Continue getting access to edweek.org, Quality Counts, other annual reports, and the entire archives of Education Week. Subscribe today! www.edweek.org/go/subscribe
> To place orders by phone, call 1-800-445-8250.