

**Basic Education Program
Review Committee
Annual Report**

November 1, 2006

**State Board of Education
9th Floor Andrew Johnson Tower
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243**

615-741-2966

www.state.tn.us/sbe

2006-07 BEP Review Committee Members

Tommy Bragg

Mayor, City of Murfreesboro
Tennessee Municipal League

Douglas Goddard

Executive Director
Tennessee County Commissioners
Association

M. D. Goetz

Commissioner
Department of Finance and
Administration

Harry Green

Executive Director
Tennessee Advisory Commission on
Intergovernmental Relations (TACIR)

Graham Greeson

Manager of TEA Research
Tennessee Education Association

Connie Hardin

Director
Office of Legislative Budget Analysis

Vincent Harvell

Director of Business Operations
Haywood County Schools

Chris Henson

Assistant Superintendent
Metro Nashville Public Schools

Dr. Carol R. Johnson

Director of Schools
Memphis City Schools

Karen King

Director of Finance
Sevier County Schools

Richard Kitzmiller

Director of Schools
Kingsport City Schools

John Morgan

Comptroller of the Treasury

Gary Nixon

Executive Director
Tennessee State Board of Education

Kip Reel

Executive Director
Tennessee Organization of School
Superintendents

Larry Ridings

Director of Schools
Trenton Special School District

Fielding Rolston

Chairman
State Board of Education

Lana Seivers

Commissioner
Department of Education

Dr. Rebecca Sharber

Director of Schools
Williamson County Schools

Stephen Smith

Tennessee School Boards Association

Les Winningham

Chair, House Education Committee

Jamie Woodson

Chair, Senate Education Committee

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

Tennessee Code Annotated 49-1-302(4)(a) specifies that the State Board of Education shall establish a review committee for the Tennessee basic education program (BEP). This committee is directed to meet at least four times a year and regularly review the BEP components including the preparation of an annual report on or before November 1 of each year.

This report includes “recommendations on needed revisions, additions, and deletions to the formula, as well as, an analysis of instructional salary disparity among local education agencies”. This report considers “total instructional salary disparity among local education agencies, differences in benefits and other compensation among local education agencies, inflation, and instructional salaries in the southeast and other regions”.

The BEP review committee is also directed “to give special consideration to costs of enhanced services to address the needs of at-risk children, the cost of educating English language learners, and the development and implementation of a system level fiscal capacity model.”

In addition, House Resolution 286, adopted in 2006, directed the committee to “develop a consensus recommendation on a system-level fiscal capacity model which provides a phase-in process and hold harmless provisions and include such recommendation in its November 2006 report.” From the legislative discussion, it was clear that the committee was to consider alternative models.

The enclosed report fulfills the requirements of the legislation and addresses the issues identified in the resolution.

Table of Contents

I.	Work of the Committee_____	3
II.	Executive Summary_____	5
III.	Salary Disparity_____	7
IV.	Unit Cost Improvements_____	9
V.	System Level Fiscal Capacity_____	13
	A. Recommendation on Fiscal Capacity_____	14
VI.	Appendices_____	16
	A. Total Teacher Compensation Methodology_____	17
	B. Total Teacher Compensation System Level Results_____	18
	C. Regional Salary Disparity_____	23
	D. Tax Base Methodology, Alternative Fiscal Capacity Model_____	45

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the effort to improve essential components of the Basic Education Program (BEP)¹, the BEP Review Committee has performed a comprehensive review of the funding formula related to the following areas:

- System level fiscal capacity,
- Indemnification,
- Salary disparity, including salary and benefits,
- Funding for at-risk students,
- Funding for English language learners (ELL) and,
- Unit component cost improvements.

Each year, on or before November 1, this committee submits a report to the Governor, the Select Oversight Committee on Education, and the State Board of Education identifying funding formula needs. This third edition of the report summarizes the findings of the committee and presents the immediate and extended priorities identified by the committee.

Review of Salary Disparity

Based on an analysis of total teacher compensation, the statewide measure of salary disparity for 2005-06 is similar to the measure observed in the previous year. Although a slight statewide increase in total teacher compensation was observed, the difference is not statistically significant. Total teacher compensation is a procedure that compares instructional salary and health insurance benefit differences *independent* of variation in local teacher training and experience. Total teacher compensation analysis also controls for variation in the local health plans selected by teachers.

A regional analysis of statewide disparity reveals a general decrease in disparity within five regions, including a noticeable decrease in the Knoxville region. Two regions were assessed as having a mixed profile of disparity, reflecting a relative balance of increases and decreases within each respective region. Four regions experienced an increase in salary disparity.

Recommendations of the Committee

The BEP Review Committee has arrived at consensus on the following language related to system level fiscal capacity and the November 1, 2006 report.

The BEP Review Committee Report on November 1, 2006 will include a discussion of various models for measuring fiscal capacity, a report on salary disparity, and recommendations for immediate priorities and extended priorities. The committee will continue to work on system level fiscal capacity issues and a small group will address issues related to adequacy, with a report and recommendations on both issues to be presented by February 15, 2007.

¹Tennessee Code Annotated 49-1-302 (4)(a)

Immediate Priorities. The Basic Education Program (BEP) Review Committee recommends moving forward with comprehensive, simultaneous, and timely improvements to the BEP, consisting of the following immediate priorities:

- An increase in funding for at-risk students,
- An increase in funding for English language learners,
- Full funding of growth in Average Daily Membership, and
- The restoration of the BEP instructional salary state share to 75%.

Extended Priorities. Unit cost components should more appropriately reflect the basic requirements of providing a quality education for students. These recommended improvements relate to the following areas:

- Reduction of Class Size to Fund Current Positions Outside the BEP
- Professional Development
- School Nurses
- Teacher Classroom Materials and Supplies (\$100 addition)
- Technology Coordinators
- Technology
- Alternative Schools
- Capital Outlay
- Transportation per ADM
- Readjustment of the Cost Differential Factor, in accordance with the Governor's 2004 Task Force Recommendations on Teacher Pay Equity.

REVIEW OF COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SALARY DISPARITY

Background

The concluding opinion of Small Schools III² states that “the salary equity plan under Tennessee Code Annotated § 49-3-366 does not include equalization of teachers’ salaries according to the BEP formula because it contains no mechanism for cost determination or annual cost review of teachers’ salaries.” Revisions to the formula and the infusion of salary equity funding beginning in the 2004 fiscal year specifically addressed the issue of cost determination, incorporating real-world average salaries for teachers educating Tennessee students. Additionally, changes in statute now require the BEP Review Committee to conduct an annual cost review of teachers’ salaries.

The committee has determined that the most appropriate measure for calculating salary disparity is total teacher compensation, based on “salary schedule strength” and “health insurance package strength”, with the goal of representing a disparity baseline independent of regional and local variations in teacher training and experience, and which health plan a teacher selects.

Total teacher compensation is a procedure that compares instructional salary and health benefit differences *independent* of variation in local teacher training and experience. Total teacher compensation analysis also controls for variation in the local health plans selected by teachers.

The central tenets of this methodology include (Appendix A):

- 1) a statewide, weighted average salary for each cell, applied to the local salary schedule of each system;
- 2) a weighted average local health insurance benefit.

Discussion

Issues of total teacher compensation were reviewed by the committee using the weighted average salary and weighted average insurance for each local system³. The committee discussed the fact that health care costs have increased since the infusion of salary equity funds in 2004. The disparity in weighted average local health insurance benefit has decreased very slightly since 2004.

²Tennessee Small School Systems v. McWherter

³Total Teacher Compensation Data Analysis was performed by the Office of Education Accountability with data provided by the Department of Education and Tennessee Education Association.

Findings

An analysis of the coefficient of variation across Tennessee reveals that the statewide measure of salary disparity for 2005-06 is similar to the measure observed in the previous year. Although the analysis shows a slight statewide increase in disparity in total teacher compensation, the observed difference is not statistically significant.

	Coefficient of Variation⁴		
	Weighted Average Salary	Weighted Average Insurance Paid	Total Teacher Compensation (Salaries Plus Insurance Paid)
2006	0.0703	0.1863	0.0717
2005	0.0697	0.1894	0.0712
2004	0.0688	0.1894	0.0691
Change from 2004	0.0015	-0.0031	0.0026

Using the total teacher compensation methodology, the statewide weighted average salary for Tennessee was \$38,972.46 in 2006, an increase of \$1,943.25 from the baseline year of 2004. When weighted average insurance paid by school districts is included, the average increases to \$44,284.27, an increase of \$2,550.15 from the baseline year of 2004 (Appendix B).

⁴The Coefficient of Variation is a representation of how closely values are clustered around the average.

REVIEW OF COMMITTEE DISCUSSION UNIT COST COMPONENTS

Background

Tennessee Code Annotated 49-1-302(4)(a) authorizes the BEP Review Committee to recommend funding formula improvements to the Basic Education Program. Reports from the previous two years have outlined the specific need for formula improvements related to at-risk students and English language learners. Based on these recommendations, in fiscal year 2006 the at-risk component was changed from an instructional salary component to a classroom component of the BEP in 2005, allowing greater flexibility in the use of funds for at-risk students.

In fiscal year 2007, the BEP includes an additional \$33 million in funding for at-risk students and \$2 million in funding for English language learners (ELL). The additions increased the percentage of at-risk students funded from 20% to 38.5% and lowered the student/teacher and student/translator ratios for ELL students from 50:1 to 45:1 and 500:1 and 450:1 respectively. The committee has established targets of 100% funding for K-12 at-risk students and a reduction in the student/teacher and student/translator ratios for ELL students to 20:1 and 200:1 respectively.

The committee has identified the need for additional formula improvements to reflect the actual cost of educating students in Tennessee. The committee requested analysis of the fiscal impact of various BEP unit cost components, based on the committee's identified extended priorities from the November 1, 2005 report. The unit component cost for the following components were analyzed.

Findings : Immediate Priorities

The Basic Education Program (BEP) Review Committee recommends moving forward with comprehensive, simultaneous, and timely improvements to the BEP consisting of the following immediate priorities:

- An increase in funding for at-risk students,
- An increase in funding for English language learners,
- Full funding of growth in Average Daily Membership, and
- The restoration of the BEP instructional salary state share to 75%.

At-Risk Students. As recommended by the committee in its 2004 and 2005 reports, the BEP should provide additional funding for 100 percent of at-risk students, as determined by the number of students eligible for free and reduced priced lunches. The BEP currently provides funding for 38.5 percent of at-risk students, based on funding required to reduce class size for such students by 5 at an average unit cost of \$509. The funds are provided as a classroom component, to allow schools flexibility in the types of services provided to at-risk students.

Additional Funding of At-Risk	
67% of Eligibles	\$51,708,000
100% of Eligibles	\$111,642,000

English Language Learners. As recommended by the committee in its 2004 and 2005 reports, the BEP should provide additional funding for one ELL teacher for each 20 students and one translator for each 200 students. In addition, the allocation of ELL funds should be made a classroom component. The BEP currently provides one teacher per 45 students and one translator per 450. The cost to reduce the ratios to 1:30 and 1:300 would be \$10.4 million.

Additional Funding of ESL Translators, Teachers	
1/200, 1/20	\$26,222,000
1/300, 1/30	\$10,407,000
1/400, 1/40	\$2,616,000

Full Funding of Growth. Currently, the BEP formula reimburses school systems during a current school year only for growth that exceeds 2 percent of ADM, at a cost of \$19 million. The BEP should provide funding to reimburse systems for 100 percent of growth in order to cover their actual costs for instructional positions and other costs. The additional cost to do this would be approximately \$24 million based on the experience of the last three years. This would be a one-time recurring improvement.

Growth Funding - 100%	
FY2003-04	\$20,802,000
FY2004-05	\$26,406,000
FY2005-06	\$24,781,000

State Share of Instructional Salary. In 2004, a new category of the BEP was created for instructional salaries. The state share for BEP salaries was established at 65 percent, with the local share becoming 35 percent. Before 2004, instructional salaries were considered a classroom component and the state provided 75 percent of the funding and the local systems provided 25 percent. School systems adversely affected by the change were provided indemnification and were held harmless. The state share of the BEP instructional salary should be restored to 75 percent.

State Funding	
68% Instructional	\$49,916,000
71% Instructional	\$119,690,000
75% Instructional	\$224,082,000

Findings : Extended Priorities

The BEP Review Committee re-affirmed that the following areas should be priorities as funding becomes available. Costs are based on 2007 funding levels.

Reduction in Class Size (Positions Outside the BEP). The BEP should provide funding to account for additional positions currently 100 percent locally funded outside the formula. This funding should be based upon a reduction in class sizes at grade levels K-12. Additional class size reductions should not be mandated, however. The cost to reduce class size by one student in regular classrooms K-12 (excluding art, music, physical education, vocational education, ELL, and special education) is \$54.1 million.

Class-Size Ratio	
Regular K-12 Classroom Tchrs Only*	
Reduced by One (1) Student	\$54,133,000
Reduced by Two (2) Students	\$114,215,000
Reduced by Three (3) Students	\$179,613,000
Reduced by Four (4) Students	\$252,128,000
Reduced by Five (5) Students	\$332,640,000
* Does not include Art, Music, PE, Vocational, ELL, and Special Education	

Professional Development. A new component for professional development should be incorporated into the BEP, funded at 1 percent of instructional salaries. Georgia, for example, funds professional development at a rate of 1 ½ percent of instructional salaries. The cost of funding at 1 percent of salary unit cost in the classroom component would be \$16.6 million.

Professional Development	\$16,560,000
1% of Salary Unit Cost	

School Nurses. The formula component for school nurses should be based upon a ratio of at least 1 nurse for every 1,500 students. Such a level of funding would still exceed the ratio of 750 recommended by the National Association of School Nurses. The component is currently funded at a ratio of 1 school nurse per 3,000 students. Additionally, the BEP spending mandate for school nurses should be removed from Tennessee code. The cost to reduce the ratio to 1:1,500 would be \$10.6 million.

Nurses	
1:750	\$32,764,000
1:1,500	\$10,583,000
1:2,000	\$5,213,000
1:2,500	\$2,103,000

Teacher Classroom Materials and Supplies. The materials and supply allocation for classroom teachers should be based upon a rate of no less than \$300

per teacher. This funding level would be \$100 above the existing \$200 allocation. In order to ensure an appropriate delineation between shared pool and direct teacher resources, TCA 49-3-359(a) should be updated to reflect an increase of \$100 directly to classroom teachers. The cost would be \$3.9 million.

Material and Supplies \$300 per Classroom Teacher	\$3,893,000
---	-------------

Technology Coordinators. Technology Coordinators should be funded based upon a ratio of at least 1 coordinator per 2,500 students, compared to the current ratio of 1 coordinator per 6,400 students. The cost to reduce the ratio to 1:3,000 students would be \$3.9 million.

Technology Coordinator	
1:3,000	\$3,850,000
1:4,000	\$1,947,000
1:5,000	\$845,000

Technology. Funding for technology should be substantially improved in accordance with a plan to support system-wide administrative and instructional technology. The recurring allocation of \$20 million has not been improved since the inception of the BEP.

Transportation. A review of funding components for transportation should be included in the committee’s next annual report. Currently, transportation funds are allocated to districts that provide transportation in accordance with a formula determined by the Commissioner of Education. Allocations are based upon the number of students transported, miles transported, and density of students per route mile at a cost of \$144.5 million.

Capital Outlay. A review of component improvements for capital outlay revealed an additional state cost of \$122,170,000 in order to achieve the recommended guidelines for capital outlay as contained within the School Planning & Management, 11th Annual Conference Report of 2006.

Capital Outlay - Reduction to Square Footage per Student	\$122,170,000
Elem - 120.2 sq. ft. per student, (100 sq. ft. per student)	
Middle - 146.2 sq. ft. per student, (110 sq. ft. per student)	
High - 162.5 sq. ft. per student, (130 sq. ft. per student)	
* Based on School Planning & Management - 11th Annual Construction Report 2006	

In addition to the unit cost factors listed above, the following component is also an extended priority:

Cost Differential Factor. The Cost Differential Factor should be readjusted in accordance with the recommendation of the Governor's 2004 Teacher Pay Equity Task Force.

REVIEW OF COMMITTEE DISCUSSION
SYSTEM LEVEL FISCAL CAPACITY: AN ALTERNATIVE MODEL

Background

Since inception of the BEP, the fiscal capacity index has served as the formula's equalization mechanism. TCA 49-3-356 specifies that "from the local portion of [BEP funding], there shall be a distribution of funds for equalization purposes pursuant to a formula adopted by the state board, as approved by the commissioners of education and finance and administration. It is the intent of the general assembly to provide funding on a fair and equitable basis by recognizing the differences in the ability of local jurisdictions to raise local revenues."

In response to House Resolution 286 and taking into account the committee's recommendations in its report of November 1, 2005, the committee developed and evaluated an alternative method for equalization, in consultation with the Peabody Center for Education Policy. The goal was the creation of a method of equalization that would be explainable, understandable, and defensible. It was understood that systems would be held harmless as recommended in the November 1, 2005 report.

Discussion

The committee reviewed the fiscal impacts of an alternative method for system level equalization. This method determines equalization on a computational flat tax rate based upon sales tax and property values as reported by the Department of Revenue for the State of Tennessee. The computational flat rate in the alternative model was not intended to establish a mandated tax levy, but rather a mechanism for determining the minimum local and state shares based on sales and property tax revenues that could be generated by specified sales and property tax rates.

Implementation of the alternative model would call for 1) the elimination of tax sharing across county, city, and special school district jurisdictions and 2) flexibility for local systems to raise the locally required match based on the flat computational rate applied for sales and property.

Although the methodology met each of the three identified criteria, members of the committee expressed a number of reservations including the potential impacts of tax revenue redistributions. Tax implications included the impact of the proposed methodology on county-wide debt service, increased complexity in annexation relationships, and the limited capacity of some counties to make up shortfalls based on the minimum revenue assessed at proposed computational tax rates. Concerns were also raised in regards to whether the methodology would meet constitutional requirements for equity.

Subsequent to this discussion, the committee came to consensus on the following recommendation in regards to system level fiscal capacity. Twenty votes "in favor", zero "opposed".

Fiscal Capacity Consensus Recommendation

The BEP Review Committee Report on November 1, 2006 will include a discussion of various models for measuring fiscal capacity, a report on salary disparity, and recommendations for immediate priorities and extended priorities. The committee will continue to work on system level fiscal capacity issues and a small group will address issues related to adequacy, with a report and recommendations on both issues to be presented by February 15, 2007.

Summary of Committee Discussion on System Level Equalization Models

SYSTEM LEVEL PROTOTYPE	
ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
Captures multiple sources of revenue including property, sales, and shared taxes.	Double counts property and sales in counties and cities with school systems
Captures ability to pay (income, poverty)	Potentially reduces state \$ to poor counties if adequacy is not addressed.
Easily replicated from year to year	A change in one county causes a ripple effect
Quasi Familiar—not a big change from 95 county model	Requires hold harmless
Not too complicated; state uses econometric models for other purposes such as projecting revenue	
No impact on other finance issues	

ALTERNATIVE MODEL	
ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
Simplicity, transparency	Changes tax bases of counties and cities, with important implications
Step toward Total State system	Annexation issues, PC 1101; may increase competition between cities and counties for economic development
State picks up improvements, assuming tax rates stay constant	Debt service on outstanding bonds; counties are currently obligated
	Raises equity issues for supplementation, if the issue of adequacy is not addressed.
	Reduces state \$ to several poor counties. May not hold up in courts, if adequacy not addressed.
	Establishes arbitrary rates for sales and property; weights subject to manipulation
	Does not take into account ability to pay—median income or poverty
	Requires hold harmless

**Summary of Committee Discussion on
System Level Equalization Models**
Continued

TOTAL STATE FUNDING	
ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
Transparency, simplicity	Large change, politically difficult to enact
Equitable	Difficulty in enacting a state property tax
Not a “distribution” model	Public finance issues: tax abatements granted by industrial development boards
	Capital outlay not considered

95 COUNTY MODEL	
ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
No change, status quo, familiar	No change, status quo
Requires no new funds except for BEP maintenance	Treats unequal districts as if they faced the same fiscal challenges
Requires no hold harmless	Complexity because of multiple factors
Captures ability to pay (income)	Some factors are outdated, need to be changed
	A change in one county causes a ripple effect
	Contributes to disparity in salaries

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Total Teacher Compensation Methodology

The calculation of total teacher compensation uses personnel and salary schedule information data provided by the Department of Education and TEA.

1. **Calculation of statewide average teacher training and experience demographic.** A statewide average teacher training and experience demographic is generated based on the percentage of teachers in each cell, from a Bachelors degree with 0 years experience to a PhD degree with 30+ years experience.
2. **Calculation of weighted average teacher salary for each system.** This statewide average teaching demographic is applied to each individual system's salary schedule resulting in an average weighted teacher salary schedule for each system. Meaning, the percentage of teachers in each cell is multiplied by the salary value for the corresponding cell. These values are subsequently added together to result in a weighted average salary.
3. **Calculation of weighted average teacher insurance for each system.** In developing the weighted average insurance, a statewide analysis of PPO, HMO, and POS health plans was researched and applied, including individual and family coverage. Each school system may choose any combination of plans to offer their employees. Some systems offer all three, while some may only offer a PPO and POS or only a PPO. The weighted average cost of the insurance package is calculated by creating a grid that placed the percent of teachers statewide that chose each type of plan and then applying that to the amount that each system paid.
4. **Calculation of total teacher compensation.** The total teacher compensation for each system is determined by adding the weighted average teacher salary for each system to the weighted average insurance for each system

APPENDIX B.1 Total Teacher Compensation

SCHOOL SYSTEM	SALARY SCHEDULE FACTOR 04	SALARY SCHEDULE FACTOR 06	PERCENT CHANGE	INSURANCE PACKAGE FACTOR 04	INSURANCE PACKAGE FACTOR 06	PERCENT CHANGE	COMPENSATION FACTOR 04	COMPENSATION FACTOR 06	PERCENT CHANGE
10 Anderson County	101.04%	99.59%	-1.4%	91.53%	93.63%	2.1%	99.97%	98.88%	-1.1%
11 Clinton City	105.80%	105.30%	-0.5%	96.23%	95.13%	-1.1%	104.73%	104.08%	-0.6%
12 Oak Ridge	124.41%	121.67%	-2.7%	105.53%	109.65%	4.1%	122.30%	120.23%	-2.1%
20 Bedford County	98.33%	100.11%	1.8%	115.15%	95.74%	-19.4%	100.22%	99.59%	-0.6%
30 Benton County	95.93%	95.39%	-0.5%	114.96%	114.37%	-0.6%	98.06%	97.67%	-0.4%
40 Bledsoe County	94.44%	94.45%	0.0%	81.97%	90.44%	8.5%	93.05%	93.97%	0.9%
50 Blount County	107.07%	106.38%	-0.7%	105.91%	131.26%	25.4%	106.94%	109.37%	2.4%
51 Alcoa City	117.66%	117.49%	-0.2%	119.61%	121.05%	1.4%	117.88%	117.91%	0.0%
52 Maryville City	117.90%	117.61%	-0.3%	91.34%	95.73%	4.4%	114.92%	114.99%	0.1%
60 Bradley County	102.10%	103.24%	1.1%	94.43%	94.10%	-0.3%	101.24%	102.14%	0.9%
61 Cleveland City	104.44%	105.20%	0.8%	104.00%	103.72%	-0.3%	104.39%	105.02%	0.6%
70 Campbell County	95.22%	94.03%	-1.2%	132.80%	118.57%	-14.2%	99.43%	96.97%	-2.5%
80 Cannon County	101.95%	98.86%	-3.1%	91.38%	100.00%	8.6%	100.77%	99.00%	-1.8%
90 Carroll County	95.19%	95.33%	0.1%	65.78%	65.19%	-0.6%	91.89%	91.71%	-0.2%
92 Hollow Rock-Bruceton SSD	95.86%	94.62%	-1.2%	74.35%	72.72%	-1.6%	93.46%	91.99%	-1.5%
93 Huntingdon SSD	95.32%	94.15%	-1.2%	72.21%	72.72%	0.5%	92.73%	91.58%	-1.2%
94 McKenzie SSD	95.29%	94.70%	-0.6%	80.44%	79.59%	-0.8%	93.63%	92.89%	-0.7%
95 South Carroll SSD	95.30%	94.12%	-1.2%	73.18%	68.65%	-4.5%	92.82%	91.06%	-1.8%
97 West Carroll SSD	95.61%	94.44%	-1.2%	73.09%	72.43%	-0.7%	93.09%	91.80%	-1.3%
100 Carter County	95.85%	94.70%	-1.1%	115.24%	114.58%	-0.7%	98.02%	97.09%	-0.9%
101 Elizabethton City	100.65%	103.12%	2.5%	106.75%	106.24%	-0.5%	101.33%	103.49%	2.2%
110 Cheatham County	97.94%	99.57%	1.6%	126.81%	125.19%	-1.6%	101.17%	102.65%	1.5%
120 Chester County	95.41%	94.20%	-1.2%	99.31%	94.37%	-4.9%	95.85%	94.22%	-1.6%
130 Claiborne County	95.21%	94.03%	-1.2%	69.30%	84.57%	15.3%	92.31%	92.90%	0.6%
140 Clay County	95.54%	92.98%	-2.6%	65.78%	65.19%	-0.6%	92.21%	89.64%	-2.6%
150 Cocke County	95.06%	95.85%	0.8%	110.97%	108.82%	-2.2%	96.85%	97.41%	0.6%
151 Newport City	94.63%	93.50%	-1.1%	115.04%	114.62%	-0.4%	96.92%	96.04%	-0.9%
160 Coffee County	99.52%	100.86%	1.3%	115.23%	114.60%	-0.6%	101.28%	102.51%	1.2%
161 Manchester City	105.39%	105.01%	-0.4%	115.19%	114.37%	-0.8%	106.48%	106.14%	-0.3%
162 Tullahoma City	105.74%	106.30%	0.6%	127.49%	126.69%	-0.8%	108.18%	108.74%	0.6%
170 Crockett County	95.55%	95.22%	-0.3%	80.40%	79.39%	-1.0%	93.85%	93.32%	-0.5%
171 Alamo City*	101.09%	92.98%	-8.1%	73.09%	72.43%	-0.7%	97.96%	90.51%	-7.4%
172 Bells City	100.97%	100.50%	-0.5%	87.71%	86.92%	-0.8%	99.49%	98.87%	-0.6%
180 Cumberland County	95.06%	94.77%	-0.3%	132.34%	131.40%	-0.9%	99.23%	99.17%	-0.1%
190 Davidson County	119.83%	118.06%	-1.8%	114.74%	106.86%	-7.9%	119.26%	116.72%	-2.5%
200 Decatur County	95.71%	95.87%	0.2%	78.63%	76.48%	-2.1%	93.80%	93.54%	-0.3%
210 DeKalb County	97.85%	96.92%	-0.9%	92.22%	91.54%	-0.7%	97.22%	96.28%	-0.9%
220 Dickson County	98.37%	100.33%	2.0%	91.15%	91.87%	0.7%	97.56%	99.31%	1.8%
230 Dyer County	101.03%	101.20%	0.2%	98.37%	97.32%	-1.1%	100.73%	100.73%	0.0%
231 Dyersburg City	108.73%	108.72%	0.0%	122.29%	116.60%	-5.7%	110.25%	109.66%	-0.6%
240 Fayette County	98.32%	97.14%	-1.2%	88.06%	87.18%	-0.9%	97.18%	95.95%	-1.2%
250 Fentress County	95.21%	94.03%	-1.2%	115.94%	114.56%	-1.4%	97.53%	96.49%	-1.0%
260 Franklin County	96.39%	96.14%	-0.3%	106.26%	114.61%	8.4%	97.50%	98.35%	0.9%
271 Humboldt City	94.67%	94.47%	-0.2%	79.90%	78.16%	-1.7%	93.02%	92.51%	-0.5%

APPENDIX B.1 (cont'd)
Total Teacher Compensation

SCHOOL SYSTEM	SALARY SCHEDULE FACTOR 04	SALARY SCHEDULE FACTOR 06	PERCENT CHANGE	INSURANCE PACKAGE FACTOR 04	INSURANCE PACKAGE FACTOR 06	PERCENT CHANGE	COMPENSATION FACTOR 04	COMPENSATION FACTOR 06	PERCENT CHANGE
272 Milan SSD	95.20%	94.05%	-1.2%	85.98%	87.01%	1.0%	94.17%	93.20%	-1.0%
273 Trenton SSD	94.88%	93.85%	-1.0%	78.63%	80.78%	2.1%	93.06%	92.28%	-0.8%
274 Bradford SSD	94.58%	93.45%	-1.1%	78.63%	85.97%	7.3%	92.79%	92.55%	-0.2%
275 Gibson SSD	96.13%	95.78%	-0.3%	84.58%	83.86%	-0.7%	94.84%	94.35%	-0.5%
280 Giles County	94.66%	95.23%	0.6%	115.19%	114.37%	-0.8%	96.96%	97.53%	0.6%
290 Grainger County	96.49%	95.07%	-1.4%	100.94%	107.51%	6.6%	96.98%	96.57%	-0.4%
300 Greene County	96.24%	95.99%	-0.2%	105.91%	105.84%	-0.1%	97.32%	97.17%	-0.1%
301 Greeneville City	109.13%	107.62%	-1.5%	101.34%	94.74%	-6.6%	108.26%	106.07%	-2.2%
310 Grundy County	96.66%	95.09%	-1.6%	83.10%	80.61%	-2.5%	95.14%	93.36%	-1.8%
320 Hamblen County	97.89%	98.56%	0.7%	128.57%	125.20%	-3.4%	101.33%	101.76%	0.4%
330 Hamilton County	109.09%	109.36%	0.3%	108.33%	91.81%	-16.5%	109.01%	107.25%	-1.8%
340 Hancock County	95.79%	92.98%	-2.8%	65.87%	65.39%	-0.5%	92.44%	89.67%	-2.8%
350 Hardeman County	99.09%	100.91%	1.8%	119.33%	118.44%	-0.9%	101.36%	103.01%	1.7%
360 Hardin County	94.77%	93.63%	-1.1%	114.57%	114.37%	-0.2%	96.99%	96.12%	-0.9%
370 Hawkins County	97.09%	96.07%	-1.0%	111.19%	110.43%	-0.8%	98.67%	97.79%	-0.9%
371 Rogersville City	98.03%	102.87%	4.8%	90.15%	101.72%	11.6%	97.14%	102.73%	5.6%
380 Haywood County	96.79%	99.62%	2.8%	90.63%	95.99%	5.4%	96.10%	99.18%	3.1%
390 Henderson County	96.91%	97.50%	0.6%	87.71%	84.07%	-3.6%	95.88%	95.89%	0.0%
391 Lexington City	96.75%	96.25%	-0.5%	92.10%	102.62%	10.5%	96.23%	97.01%	0.8%
400 Henry County	95.33%	95.12%	-0.2%	96.03%	109.32%	13.3%	95.40%	96.82%	1.4%
401 Paris SSD	96.75%	100.35%	3.6%	87.39%	92.77%	5.4%	95.70%	99.44%	3.7%
410 Hickman County	99.09%	97.98%	-1.1%	107.18%	103.13%	-4.0%	99.99%	98.60%	-1.4%
420 Houston County	96.21%	95.10%	-1.1%	91.48%	87.78%	-3.7%	95.68%	94.22%	-1.5%
430 Humphreys County	95.46%	95.70%	0.2%	106.42%	106.40%	0.0%	96.69%	96.99%	0.3%
440 Jackson County	95.87%	94.59%	-1.3%	105.79%	65.19%	-40.6%	96.98%	91.06%	-5.9%
450 Jefferson County	95.30%	94.09%	-1.2%	115.24%	114.62%	-0.6%	97.53%	96.55%	-1.0%
460 Johnson County	96.36%	95.21%	-1.1%	84.22%	79.93%	-4.3%	95.00%	93.38%	-1.6%
470 Knox County	104.23%	105.18%	0.9%	87.42%	87.12%	-0.3%	102.35%	103.01%	0.7%
480 Lake County	96.54%	95.29%	-1.2%	102.83%	107.55%	4.7%	97.24%	96.76%	-0.5%
490 Lauderdale County	97.20%	100.80%	3.6%	125.76%	126.26%	0.5%	100.39%	103.85%	3.5%
500 Lawrence County	94.73%	94.48%	-0.3%	115.19%	114.37%	-0.8%	97.02%	96.87%	-0.2%
510 Lewis County	96.09%	94.87%	-1.2%	74.39%	72.18%	-2.2%	93.66%	92.15%	-1.5%
520 Lincoln County	95.25%	95.43%	0.2%	86.67%	88.10%	1.4%	94.29%	94.55%	0.3%
521 Fayetteville City	96.66%	99.33%	2.7%	106.46%	105.32%	-1.1%	97.76%	100.05%	2.3%
530 Loudon County	100.48%	100.97%	0.5%	115.24%	114.61%	-0.6%	102.13%	102.61%	0.5%
531 Lenoir City	101.72%	103.77%	2.0%	110.67%	109.55%	-1.1%	102.73%	104.46%	1.7%
540 McMinn County	101.47%	101.83%	0.4%	115.24%	114.62%	-0.6%	103.01%	103.37%	0.4%
541 Athens City	111.19%	111.73%	0.5%	115.24%	114.61%	-0.6%	111.64%	112.07%	0.4%
542 Etowah City	98.65%	99.04%	0.4%	119.14%	117.20%	-1.9%	100.95%	101.22%	0.3%
550 McNairy County	95.54%	94.34%	-1.2%	82.23%	93.66%	11.4%	94.05%	94.26%	0.2%
560 Macon County	96.81%	95.55%	-1.3%	92.83%	92.39%	-0.4%	96.36%	95.17%	-1.2%
570 Madison County	104.94%	104.77%	-0.2%	56.73%	72.43%	15.7%	99.55%	100.89%	1.3%
580 Marion County	95.09%	94.08%	-1.0%	115.13%	116.44%	1.3%	97.33%	96.76%	-0.6%
581 Richard City	100.28%	98.94%	-1.3%	68.01%	67.14%	-0.9%	96.66%	95.12%	-1.5%

APPENDIX B.1 (cont'd)
Total Teacher Compensation

SCHOOL SYSTEM	SALARY SCHEDULE FACTOR 04	SALARY SCHEDULE FACTOR 06	PERCENT CHANGE	INSURANCE PACKAGE FACTOR 04	INSURANCE PACKAGE FACTOR 06	PERCENT CHANGE	COMPENSATION FACTOR 04	COMPENSATION FACTOR 06	PERCENT CHANGE
590 Marshall County	100.83%	100.77%	-0.1%	121.33%	115.89%	-5.4%	103.12%	102.59%	-0.5%
600 Maury County	105.67%	106.26%	0.6%	115.19%	114.37%	-0.8%	106.74%	107.24%	0.5%
610 Meigs County	97.19%	106.16%	9.0%	103.62%	112.48%	8.9%	97.91%	106.92%	9.0%
620 Monroe County	99.58%	100.16%	0.6%	132.21%	131.34%	-0.9%	103.24%	103.90%	0.7%
621 Sweetwater City	99.81%	104.96%	5.1%	124.55%	122.47%	-2.1%	102.58%	107.06%	4.5%
630 Montgomery County	106.84%	107.89%	1.0%	107.01%	103.86%	-3.1%	106.86%	107.41%	0.5%
640 Moore County	95.92%	97.00%	1.1%	116.95%	115.89%	-1.1%	98.27%	99.27%	1.0%
650 Morgan County	95.94%	92.98%	-3.0%	94.43%	94.10%	-0.3%	95.77%	93.11%	-2.7%
660 Obion County	96.28%	97.23%	1.0%	97.27%	103.22%	5.9%	96.39%	97.95%	1.6%
661 Union City	99.17%	97.97%	-1.2%	128.96%	116.17%	-12.8%	102.50%	100.15%	-2.3%
670 Overton County	96.50%	95.25%	-1.2%	90.50%	87.04%	-3.5%	95.83%	94.27%	-1.6%
680 Perry County	95.22%	94.04%	-1.2%	70.92%	69.71%	-1.2%	92.50%	91.12%	-1.4%
690 Pickett County	95.08%	93.91%	-1.2%	65.78%	65.19%	-0.6%	91.80%	90.46%	-1.3%
700 Polk County	94.67%	100.47%	5.8%	111.27%	108.74%	-2.5%	96.53%	101.46%	4.9%
710 Putnam County	99.23%	98.28%	-1.0%	138.46%	130.72%	-7.7%	103.63%	102.17%	-1.5%
720 Rhea County	98.11%	97.03%	-1.1%	100.20%	114.61%	14.4%	98.34%	99.14%	0.8%
721 Dayton City	99.05%	98.73%	-0.3%	114.90%	117.41%	2.5%	100.83%	100.97%	0.1%
730 Roane County	100.75%	101.72%	1.0%	129.45%	124.98%	-4.5%	103.96%	104.51%	0.5%
740 Robertson County	98.33%	100.24%	1.9%	145.10%	134.39%	-10.7%	103.57%	104.34%	0.8%
750 Rutherford County	107.43%	107.97%	0.5%	125.38%	109.04%	-16.3%	109.44%	108.10%	-1.3%
751 Murfreesboro City	113.09%	113.76%	0.7%	110.43%	107.57%	-2.9%	112.79%	113.02%	0.2%
760 Scott County	96.05%	94.84%	-1.2%	104.76%	103.58%	-1.2%	97.02%	95.89%	-1.1%
761 Oneida SSD	95.32%	94.13%	-1.2%	89.12%	95.38%	6.3%	94.63%	94.28%	-0.3%
770 Sequatchie County	98.22%	99.76%	1.5%	102.24%	108.97%	6.7%	98.67%	100.87%	2.2%
780 Sevier County	99.60%	100.69%	1.1%	107.97%	107.16%	-0.8%	100.54%	101.47%	0.9%
790 Shelby County	127.56%	125.98%	-1.6%	84.13%	88.84%	4.7%	122.70%	121.52%	-1.2%
791 Memphis City	127.56%	125.90%	-1.7%	110.98%	107.09%	-3.9%	125.70%	123.64%	-2.1%
800 Smith County	96.44%	95.18%	-1.3%	115.24%	113.27%	-2.0%	98.54%	97.35%	-1.2%
810 Stewart County	96.22%	99.25%	3.0%	116.95%	115.89%	-1.1%	98.54%	101.25%	2.7%
820 Sullivan County	96.68%	96.95%	0.3%	111.17%	108.88%	-2.3%	98.31%	98.38%	0.1%
821 Bristol City	112.38%	113.22%	0.8%	99.98%	96.66%	-3.3%	110.99%	111.23%	0.2%
822 Kingsport City	117.84%	116.79%	-1.0%	98.69%	96.52%	-2.2%	115.69%	114.36%	-1.3%
830 Sumner County	101.99%	103.54%	1.5%	122.88%	122.05%	-0.8%	104.33%	105.76%	1.4%
840 Tipton County	99.08%	107.10%	8.0%	116.79%	116.03%	-0.8%	101.07%	108.17%	7.1%
850 Trousdale County	96.10%	95.90%	-0.2%	80.78%	72.84%	-7.9%	94.38%	93.13%	-1.2%
860 Unicoi County	96.06%	96.76%	0.7%	117.13%	111.31%	-5.8%	98.42%	98.50%	0.1%
870 Union County	97.14%	98.86%	1.7%	75.05%	78.85%	3.8%	94.67%	96.46%	1.8%
880 Van Buren County	97.37%	95.82%	-1.5%	65.87%	65.39%	-0.5%	93.84%	92.17%	-1.7%
890 Warren County	95.03%	94.29%	-0.7%	65.87%	71.60%	5.7%	91.76%	91.57%	-0.2%
900 Washington County	98.00%	100.66%	2.7%	99.16%	124.96%	25.8%	98.13%	103.57%	5.4%
901 Johnson City	109.98%	113.16%	3.2%	106.75%	99.48%	-7.3%	109.61%	111.52%	1.9%
910 Wayne County	94.48%	93.35%	-1.1%	77.56%	76.48%	-1.1%	92.59%	91.33%	-1.3%
920 Weakley County	96.53%	95.85%	-0.7%	88.24%	87.54%	-0.7%	95.60%	94.86%	-0.7%
930 White County	95.80%	94.28%	-1.5%	82.92%	91.55%	8.6%	94.36%	93.96%	-0.4%

APPENDIX B.1 (cont'd)
Total Teacher Compensation

SCHOOL SYSTEM	SALARY SCHEDULE FACTOR 04	SALARY SCHEDULE FACTOR 06	PERCENT CHANGE	INSURANCE PACKAGE FACTOR 04	INSURANCE PACKAGE FACTOR 06	PERCENT CHANGE	COMPENSATION FACTOR 04	COMPENSATION FACTOR 06	PERCENT CHANGE
940 Williamson County	113.21%	111.57%	-1.6%	120.08%	155.65%	35.6%	113.98%	116.86%	2.9%
941 Franklin SSD	115.69%	115.77%	0.1%	112.34%	111.39%	-0.9%	115.32%	115.25%	-0.1%
950 Wilson County	97.83%	97.76%	-0.1%	80.32%	75.61%	-4.7%	95.87%	95.10%	-0.8%
951 Lebanon SSD	105.15%	104.26%	-0.9%	65.30%	65.19%	-0.1%	100.69%	99.57%	-1.1%
STATEWIDE FACTOR	100.00%	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%	

* Applied salary equity money only to existing personnel as of passage of act.

APPENDIX B.2 (cont'd)
Total Teacher Compensation

	WEIGHTED AVERAGE SALARY	WEIGHTED AVERAGE INSURANCE PAID	SALARIES PLUS INSURANCE PAID
Max versus Min	35.49%	138.76%	37.93%
Range Ratio 95-5	24.73%	88.70%	26.19%
Range Ratio 90-10	16.28%	68.50%	18.97%
Range Ratio 75-25	8.69%	31.66%	9.77%
Top 10 / Bottom 10	1.27	1.99	1.29
Coefficient of Variation	0.0703	0.1863	0.0717
Max Salary vs. Min Salary		64.27%	37.93%
Range Ratio 95-5 by Salary		-15.60%	18.97%
Range Ratio 90-10 by Salary		5.52%	15.08%
Range Ratio 75-25 by Salary		47.19%	12.31%
Top 10 / Bottom 10 by Salary		1.25	1.27

Review of 2004 Disparity Findings*

	WEIGHTED AVERAGE SALARY	WEIGHTED AVERAGE INSURANCE PAID	SALARIES PLUS INSURANCE PAID
Max versus Min	35.28%	155.79%	37.33%
Range Ratio 95-5	24.36%	95.78%	24.55%
Range Ratio 90-10	15.12%	67.92%	17.67%
Range Ratio 75-25	5.63%	33.98%	7.03%
Top 10 / Bottom 10	1.26	2.02	1.28
Coefficient of Variation	0.0688	0.1894	0.0691
Max Salary vs. Min Salary		-3.70%	30.08%
Range Ratio 95-5 by Salary		3.83%	21.63%
Range Ratio 90-10 by Salary		1.07%	13.37%
Range Ratio 75-25 by Salary		20.00%	7.04%
Top 10 / Bottom 10 by Salary		1.17	1.25

* - Post 2004 revisions occurred on certain school systems

APPENDIX C.1
Regional Salary Disparity
Based on Total Teacher Compensation

Region	Immediate Trend <i>FY 06 to FY 05</i>	General Trend (2 Years) <i>Comparison of FY06 to FY04</i>
Nashville	Mixed <i>Evenly Split</i>	Decrease Decrease in 8 surrounding systems Increase in 1 surrounding system
Dyersburg	Increase <i>A negative change from last year</i>	Increase Increase in 10 surrounding systems Decrease in 2 surrounding systems
Greenville	Increase <i>Similar to last year</i>	Mixed (Increase) Increase in 6 surrounding systems Decrease in 3 surrounding systems
Chattanooga	Mostly Increase <i>A reversal from last year</i>	Decrease Decrease in 8 surrounding systems Increase in 1 surrounding system
Knoxville	Decrease <i>Improvement from last year</i>	Decrease Increase in 2 surrounding systems Decrease in 12 surrounding systems
Jackson	Mostly Decrease <i>Improvement from last year</i>	Increase Increase in 18 surrounding systems Decrease in 2 surrounding systems
Clarksville	Increase <i>A reversal from last year</i>	Mixed (Increase) Increase in 3 surrounding systems Decrease in 2 surrounding systems
Memphis	Mixed <i>Evenly Split</i>	Decrease Decrease in 3 surrounding systems Increase in 1 surrounding systems
Cookeville	Mostly Decrease <i>Improvement from last year</i>	Increase Increase in 6 surrounding systems Decrease in 1 surrounding system
Tri-Cities	Mostly Decrease <i>Improvement from last year</i>	Mixed (Decrease) Decrease in 8 surrounding systems Increase in 3 surrounding systems
Franklin	Mostly Decrease <i>Improvement from last year</i>	Decrease Decrease in 9 surrounding systems

REGIONAL DOLLAR DISPARITY
Immediate Year Comparisons (FY 06 to FY 05)

General DECREASING Trend

5 Total County Regions

General MIXED Trend

2 Total County Regions

General INCREASING Trend

4 Total County Regions

APPENDIX C.2

Regional Disparity Methodology

All Calculations are Based on Total Teacher Compensation Data

Calculation of Dollar Disparity:

1. All dollar disparity values are compared to the system with the maximum total teacher compensation, within each fiscal year.
2. The ranked dollar value for each system is subtracted from the maximum, within each fiscal year.

Calculation of Percentage Disparity:

1. All percentage disparity values are compared to the system with the maximum total teacher compensation, within each fiscal year.
2. The dollar value for each ranked system is divided by the maximum. This percentage values is then subtracted from the number 1 or 100%.

Calculation of Change in Dollar Disparity:

1. Within each ranked position (e.g. rank #2 – rank #10), the dollar disparity value of FY04 is subtracted from FY05. The calculation of the dollar disparity value is described above.
2. The calculation of change in dollar disparity should always be interpreted in comparison to the system with the maximum total teacher compensation.

**Appendix C.3
Regional Salary Disparity**

Regional Salary Disparity Comparison, Based on Total Teacher Compensation Data

Nashville	FY 04				FY 06		
	FY 04	\$ Disparity	% Disparity		FY 06	\$ Disparity	% Disparity
Davidson County	\$50,094.39			Williamson County	\$51,749.40		
Franklin SSD	\$48,420.39	\$1,673.99	3.34%	Davidson County	\$51,687.93	\$61.47	0.12%
Williamson County	\$47,840.12	\$2,254.26	4.50%	Franklin SSD	\$51,037.31	\$712.09	1.38%
Murfreesboro City	\$47,518.00	\$2,576.39	5.14%	Murfreesboro City	\$50,049.02	\$1,700.38	3.29%
Rutherford County	\$46,213.11	\$3,881.27	7.75%	Rutherford County	\$47,870.15	\$3,879.25	7.50%
Sumner County	\$44,098.27	\$5,996.11	11.97%	Sumner County	\$46,836.23	\$4,913.17	9.49%
Robertson County	\$43,903.03	\$6,191.35	12.36%	Robertson County	\$46,204.90	\$5,544.50	10.71%
Cheatham County	\$42,819.34	\$7,275.05	14.52%	Cheatham County	\$45,456.39	\$6,293.01	12.16%
Lebanon SSD	\$42,440.85	\$7,653.53	15.28%	Lebanon SSD	\$44,093.64	\$7,655.76	14.79%
Wilson County	\$40,442.33	\$9,652.05	19.27%	Wilson County	\$42,116.18	\$9,633.22	18.62%

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

FY 06 REPORT

Nashville	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, <u>Compared to the Maximum (FY06 to FY04)</u>
1	
2	(1612.52)
3	(1542.17)
4	(876.01)
5	(2.03)
6	(1082.94)
7	(646.85)
8	(982.03)
9	2.23
10	(18.84)
General Trend	Decrease in Disparity

FY 05 REPORT

Nashville	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, <u>Compared to the Maximum (FY05 to FY04)</u>
1	
2	(799.92)
3	(650.51)
4	(287.55)
5	(1334.57)
6	(627.38)
7	(794.14)
8	(1249.69)
9	(1020.62)
10	12.16
General Trend	Decrease in Disparity

Comparison to last year (FY 06 to FY 05)
(812.60)
(891.66)
(588.46)
1332.55
(455.56)
147.29
267.66
1022.85
(30.99)
Mixed

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

Regional Salary Disparity Comparison, Based on Total Teacher Compensation Data

Dyersburg	FY 04				FY 06		
	FY 04	\$ Disparity	% Disparity		FY 06	\$ Disparity	% Disparity
Dyersburg City	\$46,413.44			Dyersburg City	\$48,562.36		
Union City	\$43,029.29	\$3,384.15	7.29%	Dyer County	\$44,607.78	\$3,954.58	8.14%
Dyer County	\$42,401.68	\$4,011.76	8.64%	Union City	\$44,352.78	\$4,209.59	8.67%
Bells City	\$41,925.45	\$4,487.99	9.67%	Bells City	\$43,783.41	\$4,778.95	9.84%
Lake County	\$40,822.79	\$5,590.65	12.05%	Obion County	\$43,377.46	\$5,184.90	10.68%
Obion County	\$40,683.65	\$5,729.79	12.35%	Lake County	\$42,850.58	\$5,711.78	11.76%
Alamo City**	\$40,093.10	\$6,320.34	13.62%	Gibson SSD	\$41,782.31	\$6,780.06	13.96%
Gibson SSD	\$39,877.66	\$6,535.78	14.08%	Crockett County	\$41,326.70	\$7,235.66	14.90%
Milan SSD	\$39,541.42	\$6,872.02	14.81%	Milan SSD	\$41,273.98	\$7,288.39	15.01%
Crockett County	\$39,535.59	\$6,877.85	14.82%	Bradford SSD	\$40,986.81	\$7,575.55	15.60%
Humboldt City	\$39,141.99	\$7,271.45	15.67%	Humboldt City	\$40,967.60	\$7,594.76	15.64%
Trenton SSD	\$39,055.12	\$7,358.32	15.85%	Trenton SSD	\$40,864.97	\$7,697.40	15.85%
Bradford SSD	\$38,967.93	\$7,445.52	16.04%	Alamo City**	\$40,083.08	\$8,479.28	17.46%

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

FY 06 REPORT

Dyersburg	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, <u>Compared to the Maximum (FY06 to FY04)</u>
1	
2	570.43
3	197.82
4	290.96
5	(405.74)
6	(18.01)
7	459.72
8	699.88
9	416.37
10	697.71
11	323.31
12	339.07
13	1033.76
General Trend	Increase in Disparity

FY 05 REPORT

Dyersburg	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, <u>Compared to the Maximum (FY05 to FY04)</u>
1	
2	563.31
3	(32.44)
4	(20.89)
5	(402.72)
6	(25.20)
7	163.15
8	362.39
9	170.66
10	345.92
11	154.22
12	324.38
13	689.84
General Trend	Mostly Increase (8 Increase, 4 Decrease)

Comparison to last year (FY 06 to FY 05)
7.12
230.27
311.85
(3.02)
7.19
296.57
337.49
245.70
351.79
169.09
14.70
343.93
Increase

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

Regional Salary Disparity Comparison, Based on Total Teacher Compensation Data

Greenville	FY 04				FY 06		
	FY 04	\$ Disparity	% Disparity		FY 06	\$ Disparity	% Disparity
Johnson City	\$46,513.41			Johnson City	\$49,386.79		
Greenville City	\$45,452.16	\$1,061.25	2.28%	Greenville City	\$46,974.21	\$2,412.58	4.89%
Hamblen County	\$42,535.50	\$3,977.91	8.55%	Washington County	\$45,865.35	\$3,521.44	7.13%
Newport City	\$42,098.24	\$4,415.17	9.49%	Rogersville City	\$45,493.42	\$3,893.37	7.88%
Washington County	\$41,760.27	\$4,753.14	10.22%	Hamblen County	\$45,061.75	\$4,325.04	8.76%
Rogersville City	\$41,537.30	\$4,976.11	10.70%	Unicoi County	\$43,620.94	\$5,765.84	11.67%
Hawkins County	\$41,448.75	\$5,064.66	10.89%	Hawkins County	\$43,307.10	\$6,079.69	12.31%
Unicoi County	\$41,313.20	\$5,200.21	11.18%	Cocke County	\$43,137.44	\$6,249.35	12.65%
Greene County	\$40,858.95	\$5,654.46	12.16%	Greene County	\$43,032.95	\$6,353.83	12.87%
Cocke County	\$40,660.45	\$5,852.96	12.58%	Newport City	\$42,529.33	\$6,857.45	13.89%

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

FY 06 REPORT

Greenville	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY06 to FY04)
1	
2	1351.33
3	(456.47)
4	(521.80)
5	(428.10)
6	789.73
7	1015.03
8	1049.14
9	699.37
10	1004.49
General Trend	Mostly Increase (6 Increase, 3 Decrease)

FY 05 REPORT

Greenville	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY05 to FY04)
1	
2	551.90
3	(878.50)
4	111.07
5	(210.59)
6	(73.65)
7	489.10
8	765.61
9	625.20
10	624.89
General Trend	Mostly Increase (6 Increase, 3 Decrease)

Comparison to last year (FY 06 to FY 05)
799.43
422.03
(632.87)
(217.52)
863.38
525.93
283.53
74.17
379.61
Mostly Increase

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

Regional Salary Disparity Comparison, Based on Total Teacher Compensation Data

Chattanooga	FY 04				FY 06		
	FY 04	\$ Disparity	% Disparity		FY 06	\$ Disparity	% Disparity
Hamilton County	\$45,760.79			Hamilton County	\$47,496.78		
Cleveland City	\$43,981.52	\$1,779.27	3.89%	Meigs County	\$47,347.55	\$149.23	0.31%
Bradley County	\$42,733.74	\$3,027.05	6.61%	Cleveland City	\$46,508.18	\$988.60	2.08%
Meigs County	\$42,545.95	\$3,214.84	7.03%	Bradley County	\$45,233.07	\$2,263.71	4.77%
Dayton City	\$42,512.41	\$3,248.38	7.10%	Dayton City	\$44,713.63	\$2,783.16	5.86%
Sequatchie County	\$41,419.67	\$4,341.12	9.49%	Sequatchie County	\$44,667.81	\$2,828.97	5.96%
Rhea County	\$41,280.54	\$4,480.24	9.79%	Rhea County	\$43,903.84	\$3,592.94	7.56%
Marion County	\$40,894.51	\$4,866.27	10.63%	Marion County	\$42,850.63	\$4,646.15	9.78%
Richard City	\$40,571.60	\$5,189.19	11.34%	Richard City	\$42,125.35	\$5,371.43	11.31%
Bledsoe County	\$39,068.72	\$6,692.06	14.62%	Bledsoe County	\$41,614.01	\$5,882.78	12.39%

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

FY 06 REPORT

Chattanooga	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY06 to FY04)
1	
2	(1630.03)
3	(2038.45)
4	(951.13)
5	(465.22)
6	(1512.15)
7	(887.30)
8	(220.13)
9	182.24
10	(809.29)
General Trend	Decrease in Disparity

FY 05 REPORT

Chattanooga	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY05 to FY04)
1	
2	(1095.55)
3	(2046.36)
4	(1038.26)
5	(732.98)
6	(1152.01)
7	(1093.54)
8	(609.45)
9	(332.49)
10	(802.49)
General Trend	Decrease in Disparity

Comparison to last year (FY 06 to FY 05)
(534.48)
7.91
87.14
267.76
(360.14)
206.24
389.32
514.73
(6.79)
Mostly Increase

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

Regional Salary Disparity Comparison, Based on Total Teacher Compensation Data

Knoxville	FY 04				FY 06		
	FY 04	\$ Disparity	% Disparity		FY 06	\$ Disparity	% Disparity
Oak Ridge	\$51,359.95			Oak Ridge	\$53,241.11		
Alcoa City	\$49,510.75	\$1,849.20	3.60%	Alcoa City	\$52,217.43	\$1,023.68	1.92%
Maryville City	\$48,447.78	\$2,912.17	5.67%	Maryville City	\$50,921.64	\$2,319.47	4.36%
Blount County	\$44,904.20	\$6,455.75	12.57%	Blount County	\$48,432.92	\$4,808.19	9.03%
Clinton City	\$43,974.76	\$7,385.19	14.38%	Roane County	\$46,281.10	\$6,960.01	13.07%
Roane County	\$43,814.23	\$7,545.72	14.69%	Roane County	\$46,281.10	\$6,960.01	13.07%
Roane County	\$43,814.23	\$7,545.72	14.69%	Lenoir City	\$46,260.21	\$6,980.90	13.11%
Lenoir City	\$43,482.81	\$7,877.14	15.34%	Clinton City	\$46,089.49	\$7,151.62	13.43%
Knox County	\$43,329.87	\$8,030.08	15.63%	Knox County	\$45,617.02	\$7,624.09	14.32%
Loudon County	\$43,050.50	\$8,309.45	16.18%	Loudon County	\$45,440.53	\$7,800.58	14.65%
Sevier County	\$42,253.68	\$9,106.27	17.73%	Sevier County	\$44,933.75	\$8,307.36	15.60%
Anderson County	\$41,961.07	\$9,398.89	18.30%	Anderson County	\$43,786.71	\$9,454.40	17.76%
Jefferson County	\$40,943.22	\$10,416.73	20.28%	Grainger County	\$42,763.35	\$10,477.76	19.68%
Grainger County	\$40,715.40	\$10,644.55	20.73%	Jefferson County	\$42,758.49	\$10,482.62	19.69%
Union County	\$40,093.13	\$11,266.83	21.94%	Union County	\$42,716.36	\$10,524.75	19.77%

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

FY 06 REPORT

Knoxville	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY06 to FY04)
1	
2	(825.52)
3	(592.70)
4	(1647.56)
5	(425.18)
6	(585.71)
7	(564.83)
8	(725.52)
9	(405.99)
10	(508.87)
11	(798.92)
12	55.51
13	61.03
14	(161.93)
15	(742.08)
General Trend	Decrease in Disparity

FY 05 REPORT

Knoxville	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY05 to FY04)
1	
2	111.73
3	460.12
4	(106.88)
5	88.28
6	(72.25)
7	146.10
8	(71.64)
9	(200.05)
10	32.98
11	299.14
12	565.38
13	193.61
14	296.91
15	(251.85)
General Trend	Mostly Increase (9 Increase, 5 Decrease)

Comparison to last year (FY 06 to FY 05)
(937.26)
(1052.81)
(1540.68)
(513.47)
(513.47)
(710.92)
(653.88)
(205.95)
(541.85)
(1098.05)
(509.87)
(132.59)
(458.84)
(490.23)
Decrease

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

Regional Salary Disparity Comparison, Based on Total Teacher Compensation Data

Jackson	FY 04				FY 06		
	FY 04	\$ Disparity	% Disparity		FY 06	\$ Disparity	% Disparity
Hardeman County	\$43,026.06			Hardeman County	\$45,619.20		
Madison County	\$41,969.69	\$1,056.37	2.46%	Madison County	\$44,679.91	\$939.29	2.06%
Bells City	\$41,925.45	\$1,100.61	2.56%	Haywood County	\$43,921.56	\$1,697.64	3.72%
Haywood County	\$40,891.54	\$2,134.52	4.96%	Bells City	\$43,783.41	\$1,835.79	4.02%
Lexington City	\$40,464.56	\$2,561.50	5.95%	Lexington City	\$42,961.33	\$2,657.86	5.83%
Chester County	\$40,319.24	\$2,706.82	6.29%	Henderson County	\$42,462.65	\$3,156.55	6.92%
Henderson County	\$40,253.90	\$2,772.16	6.44%	Gibson SSD	\$41,782.31	\$3,836.89	8.41%
Alamo City**	\$40,093.10	\$2,932.96	6.82%	McNairy County	\$41,743.19	\$3,876.00	8.50%
Gibson SSD	\$39,877.66	\$3,148.40	7.32%	Chester County	\$41,723.35	\$3,895.84	8.54%
Milan SSD	\$39,541.42	\$3,484.64	8.10%	Crockett County	\$41,326.70	\$4,292.49	9.41%
Crockett County	\$39,535.59	\$3,490.47	8.11%	Milan SSD	\$41,273.98	\$4,345.22	9.52%
McNairy County	\$39,492.10	\$3,533.96	8.21%	McKenzie SSD	\$41,133.89	\$4,485.30	9.83%
McKenzie SSD	\$39,316.13	\$3,709.93	8.62%	Bradford SSD	\$40,986.81	\$4,632.39	10.15%
Hollow Rock-Bruceton SSD	\$39,243.64	\$3,782.42	8.79%	Humboldt City	\$40,967.60	\$4,651.59	10.20%
Humboldt City	\$39,141.99	\$3,884.07	9.03%	Trenton SSD	\$40,864.97	\$4,754.23	10.42%
West Carroll SSD	\$39,091.22	\$3,934.84	9.15%	Hollow Rock-Bruceton	\$40,738.17	\$4,881.03	10.70%
Trenton SSD	\$39,055.12	\$3,970.94	9.23%	West Carroll SSD	\$40,654.28	\$4,964.92	10.88%
South Carroll SSD	\$38,980.47	\$4,045.59	9.40%	Carroll County	\$40,615.23	\$5,003.97	10.97%
Bradford SSD	\$38,967.93	\$4,058.14	9.43%	Huntingdon SSD	\$40,553.51	\$5,065.69	11.10%
Huntingdon SSD	\$38,942.06	\$4,084.00	9.49%	South Carroll SSD	\$40,327.05	\$5,292.15	11.60%
Carroll County	\$38,588.36	\$4,437.70	10.31%	Alamo City**	\$40,083.08	\$5,536.11	12.14%

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

FY 06 REPORT

Jackson	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, <u>Compared to the Maximum (FY06 to FY04)</u>
1	
2	(117.09)
3	597.03
4	(298.73)
5	96.37
6	449.73
7	1064.73
8	943.05
9	747.44
10	807.85
11	854.75
12	951.34
13	922.46
14	869.18
15	870.16
16	946.18
17	993.98
18	958.37
19	1007.56
20	1208.15
21	1098.41
General Trend	Increase in Disparity

FY 05 REPORT

Jackson	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, <u>Compared to the Maximum (FY05 to FY04)</u>
1	
2	723.91
3	848.28
4	(73.75)
5	430.51
6	995.73
7	1023.83
8	863.71
9	841.18
10	726.72
11	865.40
12	1002.99
13	916.19
14	956.44
15	967.80
16	949.88
17	1024.94
18	1021.19
19	1053.50
20	1331.45
21	1010.84
General Trend	Increase in Disparity

Comparison to last year (FY 06 to FY 05)
(841.00)
(251.25)
(224.98)
(334.14)
(546.01)
40.90
79.34
(93.74)
81.14
(10.65)
(51.64)
6.26
(87.26)
(97.64)
(3.70)
(30.96)
(62.82)
(45.94)
(123.29)
87.58
Mostly Decrease

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

Regional Salary Disparity Comparison, Based on Total Teacher Compensation Data

Clarksville	FY 04				FY 06		
	FY 04	\$ Disparity	% Disparity		FY 06	\$ Disparity	% Disparity
Montgomery County	\$45,002.88			Montgomery County	\$47,564.24		
Robertson County	\$43,903.03	\$1,099.84	2.44%	Robertson County	\$46,204.90	\$1,359.34	2.86%
Cheatham County	\$42,819.34	\$2,183.54	4.85%	Cheatham County	\$45,456.39	\$2,107.85	4.43%
Stewart County	\$42,171.03	\$2,831.84	6.29%	Stewart County	\$44,837.84	\$2,726.40	5.73%
Dickson County	\$41,445.41	\$3,557.47	7.90%	Dickson County	\$43,980.82	\$3,583.42	7.53%
Houston County	\$40,171.29	\$4,831.58	10.74%	Houston County	\$41,726.81	\$5,837.43	12.27%

Memphis	FY 04				FY 06		
	FY 04	\$ Disparity	% Disparity		FY 06	\$ Disparity	% Disparity
Memphis City	\$52,782.06			Memphis City	\$54,754.48		
Shelby County	\$51,528.69	\$1,253.37	2.37%	Shelby County	\$53,815.28	\$939.20	1.72%
Tipton County	\$43,832.11	\$8,949.95	16.96%	Tipton County	\$47,902.13	\$6,852.35	12.51%
Haywood County	\$40,891.54	\$11,890.51	22.53%	Haywood County	\$43,921.56	\$10,832.92	19.78%
Fayette County	\$40,794.95	\$11,987.11	22.71%	Fayette County	\$42,490.24	\$12,264.24	22.40%

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

FY 06 REPORT

Clarksville	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY06 to FY04)
1	
2	259.50
3	(75.69)
4	(105.44)
5	25.95
6	1005.85
General Trend	Mixed Trend

FY 05 REPORT

Clarksville	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY05 to FY04)
1	
2	(724.53)
3	(544.05)
4	(815.10)
5	(840.07)
6	(72.61)
General Trend	Decrease in Disparity

Comparison to last year (FY 06 to FY 05)
984.03
468.37
709.66
866.02
1078.46
Increase

Memphis	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY06 to FY04)
1	
2	(314.17)
3	(2097.60)
4	(1057.59)
5	277.13
General Trend	Decrease in Disparity

Memphis	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY05 to FY04)
1	
2	(142.06)
3	(2139.13)
4	(914.28)
5	147.89
General Trend	Decrease in Disparity

Comparison to last year (FY 06 to FY 05)
(172.11)
41.53
(143.31)
129.24
Mixed

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

Regional Salary Disparity Comparison, Based on Total Teacher Compensation Data

Cookeville	FY 04				FY 06		
	FY 04	\$ Disparity	% Disparity		FY 06	\$ Disparity	% Disparity
Putnam County	\$43,475.06			Putnam County	\$45,244.30		
Cumberland County	\$41,654.99	\$1,820.07	4.19%	Cumberland County	\$43,915.55	\$1,328.75	2.94%
Smith County	\$41,365.17	\$2,109.89	4.85%	Smith County	\$43,110.27	\$2,134.03	4.72%
Fentress County	\$41,059.21	\$2,415.85	5.56%	Fentress County	\$42,730.05	\$2,514.25	5.56%
DeKalb County	\$40,868.22	\$2,606.84	6.00%	DeKalb County	\$42,635.17	\$2,609.13	5.77%
Jackson County	\$40,712.40	\$2,762.67	6.35%	Overton County	\$41,746.17	\$3,498.13	7.73%
Overton County	\$40,231.80	\$3,243.26	7.46%	White County	\$41,607.50	\$3,636.80	8.04%
White County	\$39,615.42	\$3,859.64	8.88%	Jackson County	\$40,326.36	\$4,917.94	10.87%

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

FY 06 REPORT

Cookeville	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, <u>Compared to the Maximum (FY06 to FY04)</u>
1	
2	(491.32)
3	24.14
4	98.40
5	2.29
6	735.47
7	393.54
8	1058.30
General Trend	Increase in Disparity

FY 05 REPORT

Cookeville	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, <u>Compared to the Maximum (FY05 to FY04)</u>
1	
2	(766.92)
3	194.06
4	11.12
5	145.98
6	846.87
7	618.96
8	1217.97
General Trend	Increase in Disparity

Comparison to last year (FY 06 to FY 05)	
	275.60
	(169.92)
	87.28
	(143.69)
	(111.41)
	(225.42)
	(159.67)
	Mostly Decrease

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

Regional Salary Disparity Comparison, Based on Total Teacher Compensation Data

Tri-Cities	FY 04				FY 06		
	FY 04	\$ Disparity	% Disparity		FY 06	\$ Disparity	% Disparity
Kingsport City	\$48,588.55			Kingsport City	\$50,643.36		
Bristol City	\$46,852.66	\$1,735.89	3.57%	Johnson City	\$49,386.79	\$1,256.57	2.48%
Johnson City	\$46,513.41	\$2,075.14	4.27%	Bristol City	\$49,257.28	\$1,386.07	2.74%
Elizabethton City	\$42,939.03	\$5,649.52	11.63%	Washington County	\$45,865.35	\$4,778.01	9.43%
Washington County	\$41,760.27	\$6,828.28	14.05%	Elizabethton City	\$45,831.53	\$4,811.83	9.50%
Rogersville City	\$41,537.30	\$7,051.25	14.51%	Rogersville City	\$45,493.42	\$5,149.94	10.17%
Hawkins County	\$41,448.75	\$7,139.80	14.69%	Unicoi County	\$43,620.94	\$7,022.42	13.87%
Unicoi County	\$41,313.20	\$7,275.35	14.97%	Sullivan County	\$43,565.17	\$7,078.19	13.98%
Sullivan County	\$41,302.14	\$7,286.41	15.00%	Hawkins County	\$43,307.10	\$7,336.26	14.49%
Carter County	\$41,149.46	\$7,439.09	15.31%	Greene County	\$43,032.95	\$7,610.41	15.03%
Greene County	\$40,858.95	\$7,729.60	15.91%	Carter County	\$42,993.47	\$7,649.89	15.11%
Johnson County	\$39,889.64	\$8,698.91	17.90%	Johnson County	\$41,350.58	\$9,292.78	18.35%

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

FY 06 REPORT

Tri-Cities	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY06 to FY04)
1	
2	(479.32)
3	(689.07)
4	(871.51)
5	(2016.45)
6	(1901.31)
7	(117.39)
8	(197.17)
9	49.85
10	171.32
11	(79.72)
12	593.86
General Trend	Mostly Decrease (8 Decrease, 3 Increase)

FY 05 REPORT

Tri-Cities	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY05 to FY04)
1	
2	(291.50)
3	(577.29)
4	(1052.26)
5	(1838.08)
6	(1010.85)
7	(88.20)
8	(14.98)
9	102.13
10	24.58
11	47.91
12	569.83
General Trend	Mostly Decrease (7 Decrease, 4 Increase)

Comparison to last year (FY 06 to FY 05)
(187.82)
(111.77)
180.75
(178.37)
(890.46)
(29.19)
(182.19)
(52.28)
146.74
(127.63)
24.03
Mostly Decrease

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

Regional Salary Disparity Comparison, Based on Total Teacher Compensation Data

	FY 04				FY 06		
	FY 04	\$ Disparity	% Disparity		FY 06	\$ Disparity	% Disparity
Franklin							
Davidson County	\$50,094.39			Williamson County	\$51,749.40		
Franklin SSD	\$48,420.39	\$1,673.99	3.34%	Davidson County	\$51,687.93	\$61.47	0.12%
Williamson County	\$47,840.12	\$2,254.26	4.50%	Franklin SSD	\$51,037.31	\$712.09	1.38%
Murfreesboro City	\$47,518.00	\$2,576.39	5.14%	Murfreesboro City	\$50,049.02	\$1,700.38	3.29%
Rutherford County	\$46,213.11	\$3,881.27	7.75%	Rutherford County	\$47,870.15	\$3,879.25	7.50%
Maury County	\$44,967.76	\$5,126.62	10.23%	Maury County	\$47,488.42	\$4,260.98	8.23%
Marshall County	\$43,490.14	\$6,604.25	13.18%	Cheatham County	\$45,456.39	\$6,293.01	12.16%
Cheatham County	\$42,819.34	\$7,275.05	14.52%	Marshall County	\$45,429.13	\$6,320.27	12.21%
Hickman County	\$42,003.58	\$8,090.81	16.15%	Dickson County	\$43,980.82	\$7,768.58	15.01%
Dickson County	\$41,445.41	\$8,648.98	17.27%	Hickman County	\$43,662.37	\$8,087.03	15.63%

**Appendix C.3 (cont'd)
Regional Salary Disparity**

FY 06 REPORT

Franklin	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY06 to FY04)
1	
2	(1612.52)
3	(1542.17)
4	(876.01)
5	(2.03)
6	(865.64)
7	(311.23)
8	(954.77)
9	(322.23)
10	(561.95)
General Trend	Decrease in Disparity

FY 05 REPORT

Franklin	
Regional Rank	Change in \$ Disparity, Compared to the Maximum (FY05 to FY04)
1	
2	(799.92)
3	(650.51)
4	(287.55)
5	(1334.57)
6	(126.75)
7	(183.71)
8	(642.14)
9	(379.99)
10	(107.39)
General Trend	Decrease in Disparity

Comparison to last year (FY 06 to FY 05)
(812.60)
(891.66)
(588.46)
1332.55
(738.89)
(127.52)
(312.64)
57.76
(454.55)
Mostly Decrease

Appendix D

Tax Base Methodology, Alternative Fiscal Capacity Model

This alternative fiscal capacity model presumes that each school district will draw all local revenues from the tax base within its boundary. Several adjustments in the data were necessary to build this structure.

County-wide School Districts

Generally, the county tax base is the school district tax base. The only exceptions are when the county-wide district contains a portion of a school district that crosses county lines. In this case, the portion of the school district is subtracted from the county tax base.

County School Districts in Counties with More than One School District

City and/or special school district tax bases are subtracted from the county tax base to arrive at the school district tax base. Adjustments may also be made if the county contains a portion of a school district that crosses county lines.

City School Districts

The city tax base is the school district tax base.

Special School Districts

The special school district property tax base and the WFTEADA share of the county sales tax base is the school district tax base.

Other Adjustments

Grade configuration – The tax bases for city and special school districts with grade configurations other than K-12 are divided among the city/ssd and the county school district. For example, the school district tax base for a city school district that serves grades K-8 will be 9/13 of the city tax base. The school district tax base for the county school district will include 4/13 of the city tax base.

Cross-county districts – The school district tax base for school districts that cross county lines is the sum of tax bases in all counties.