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## Our Focus

Our goal, as the Loveland City School District's (LCSD) Planning Commission Finance Committee, is to research and analyze opportunities that can help make the district stable financially. We focused on both short-term and long-term possibilities that reduce spending and increase money coming in.

Our committee felt the following points were very important when thinking about salary:

1. Contracts for administrators need to be competitive as attracting and retaining top talent is important.
2. The contracts must also be sustainable financially and show responsible money management.
3. It is worth noting that the Retirement contribution the district makes for each administrator is $14 \%$ of their salary in the State Teachers Retirement System (STRS); non-STRS staff members are in the School Employee Retirement System (SERS) is $10 \%$. This is referred to as the retirement "pick up" as the school district picks up the cost for this expense instead of the administrative staff member. The $14 \%$ and $10 \%$ are consistent with the contribution made by certified and classified staff (not the district). All calculations in this analysis, including potential savings calculations, would be approximately $13 \%$ (the weighted average of the employees with the $14 \%$ and $10 \%$ noted above) larger than the numbers presented.
4. It is also worth noting that the employee portion of the Medicare contribution (referred to as the Medicare "pick up") is made by the district and equates to $1.45 \%$ of the administrator's salary. All calculations in this analysis, including potential savings calculations, would be approximately $1.45 \%$ larger than the numbers presented once the Medicare benefit is considered.
5. It is important to note we are not examining the appropriate number of administrators in the district, but rather the level of pay that the current administrators receive.

## Data Sources and Uses

We compared LCSD's administrator salaries to 40 districts in the Greater Cincinnati area. The salaries were obtained by using the salary data of employees in the Buckeye Institute's data from 2018-19. We used 2018-19 salaries (for all districts) as 2019-20 \& 2020-2021 were not available. While these data are also available via Ohio OpenCheckbook, the Buckeye Institute was used for
the ease of downloading. The CUPP report does not report salary information for administrators by position and thus was not used in the "by position" analysis. Our analysis compares the salary level of administrators across districts, but due to data limitations we were unable to control for the experience level of administrators.

Position titles for administrators are not precisely consistent across school districts. In order to narrow the search from all possible positions within this database, we used the bottom salary cutoff of \$60,000 and extracted all positions with salaries greater than this amount from the database. We then pulled out those with similar administrator job titles for comparison across the 40 districts.

The School Superintendents Association provided another data source for school superintendent salary information. We utilized information from the 2019-20 AASA Superintendent Salary \& Benefits Analysis, which was available without a membership requirement.

Beyond base salary, administrators receive benefits in the form of financial compensation that are not afforded to other employees. The data sources we found for school administrators did not show benefits, which are generally available in each school districts' administrator handbook. We did not have access to these, although they likely could be obtained for many comparison school districts through a public data request. It should be noted that even having access to the administrator handbook may not reveal the specifics of any one administrator's contract, which can be individualized for that person.

Two benefit items of interest for the district were the use of the payment of the retirement contribution as well as the payment for the employee's portion of the Medicare contribution. In a record request with LCSD we were able to obtain the data the district had for several comparable districts in the Eastern Cincinnati Conference.

While the CUPP report did not contain salary data for administrators, we were able to use the CUPP report to understand the demographics for LCSD and how it compares to other districts.

## Takeaways

1. Exhibit A shows a summary comparison of district administrator salaries. Included is the number of administrators (over $\$ 60 \mathrm{k}$ and with similar job titles), average administrator salary, assessed valuation per pupil, district median income, district average income and district enrollment. The number of administrators and corresponding salaries are
averaged across all 40 Greater Cincinnati districts, districts that border Loveland and also the districts within the Eastern Cincinnati Conference. For average (all 40 districts), border and ECC schools, LCSD total annual difference for all administrators' salaries combined if LCSD paid the same as the others average is

- Across all 40 districts: $\quad \$ 79,347$ more expensive; $\$ 3,174 / 3.1 \%$ per admin
- For Border districts: $\$ 9,155$ more expensive; $\$ 366 / 0.4 \%$ per admin
- For ECC districts: $\quad \$ 96,314$ more expensive; $\$ 3,853 / 3.8 \%$ per admin For completeness, at the bottom of Exhibit A, all administrator positions for LCSD are listed.

2. Exhibit B shows the data for each district individually. District demographics have LCSD ranking in the following areas:
a. Loveland's average administrator salary is $\$ 102,409$, ranking LCSD $13^{\text {th }}$ out of 40 districts, thereby placing LCSD in the top $33 \%$. It is important to note that nine (9) other school districts are within $2 \%$ of Loveland's average administrator's salary.
b. Assessed Valuation Per Pupil for the 2018 Tax Year: LCSD is 13 th highest out of 40 districts; placing LCSD within the top $33 \%$. The Ohio Department of Education CUPP Report defines "Assessed Valuation Per Pupil" as:
$\rightarrow$ Total unadjusted assessed property valuation for tax year 2018 (fiscal year 2020) divided by
$\rightarrow$ Total Average Daily Membership for 2019
(ADM is the number of public school students residing within a schools district's boundaries or non-resident students who are eligible to attend the district)
c. District Median Income for the 2017 Tax Year: 10th highest out of 40 districts, placing LCSD within the top $25 \%$.
d. District Average Income for the 2017 Tax Year: 8 th highest out of 40 districts, placing LCSD within the top $20 \%$.
3. Exhibit C presents the data for the superintendent position. LCSD's Superintendent salary is $\$ 149,000$. This ranks LCSD $15^{\text {th }}$ out of 40 districts, placing LCSD in the top $37 \%$. It should be noted that at the time of creating this report, LCSD's Superintendent position was open. All references to LCSD's Superintendent reference 2018-2019 compensation. The salary for the Superintendent was obtained from both the Buckeye Institute and a copy of the Superintendent's contract. In terms of number of students enrolled, Loveland also ranks 17 th out of 40 .
4. LCSD's ending enrollment for the fiscal year (FY) 2019 was 4,428 students according to the FY19 Cupp Report. Loveland's Superintendent salary is within the $25^{\text {th }}$ and $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile for districts with between 3,000 and 4,999 students according to the nationwide 2019-20 AASA Superintendent Salary \& Benefits Study Table 2.1 shown below. The following are the salary bands according to the study:

## SECTION \#2: SALARY

Table 2.1. Superintendent base salary 2019-2020 (Q6) and enrollment (Q2)

| Enrollment | Minimum | $25 \%$ | Median | $75 \%$ | Maximum | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 300 to 999 | 64250 | 102000 | 117500 | 135000 | 275000 | 372 |
| 1,000 to <br> 2,999 | 90000 | 120000 | 137475 | 158500 | 281000 | 476 |
| 3,000 to <br> 4,999 | 88000 | 140000 | 167431 | 194250 | 290000 | 166 |
| 5,000 to <br> 9,999 | 109273 | 159925 | 180102 | 200000 | 340000 | 138 |
| 10,000 to <br> 24,999 | 130000 | 179000 | 200000 | 237855 | 282000 | 76 |
| 25,000 to <br> 49,999 | 177021 | 201378 | 233023. | 261750 | 310000 | 21 |
| 50,000 to <br> 99,999 | 207532 | 225000 | 246000 | 261000 | 282560 | 7 |
| 100,000 or <br> more | 320000 | 329354 | 338709 | 348806 | 357418 | 3 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Finding:

- Consistent with previous years, salaries increase as district enrollment increases.

5. Exhibit D presents the data for the treasurer position. Salary for Loveland's Treasurer is $\$ 130,000$. This ranks LCSD $13^{\text {th }}$ out of 40 districts, placing LCSD in the top $33 \%$. Note: analysis of treasurer salaries was not provided in the AASA study. The salary for the Loveland's Treasurer was obtained from both the Buckeye Institute as well as by obtaining a copy of the treasurer's contract.
6. Exhibits $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{F}$ show the average salary information for principals and vice principals in each district. Loveland ranks $12^{\text {th }}$ and $7^{\text {th }}$ among the 40 districts, respectively, for these positions. The source of salary information was from the Buckeye Institute.
7. All administrator positions including those beyond superintendent, treasurer, principals, and vice principals were analyzed and are included in the average numbers for Exhibit A
and B. Exhibits for each individual position were not included for brevity. The results were comparable to the positions for which exhibits were provided.
8. Exhibit $\mathbf{G}$ reflects the number of students per administrator from the CUPP Report and compares LCSD to the other 40 districts. 24 of the 40 districts have a lower student per administrator ratio than Loveland School District. This means 24 other districts have more administrators to serve their staff and students.
9. Exhibit H reflects the ECC members (other than the Cincinnati School District for which data were not available) and which districts utilized the individual retirement contribution pick-up, pick-up on the increased retirement pick-up, and Medicare pick-up as an additional benefit for administrators. When a district pays the retirement contribution and/or Medicare contribution, the employee does not have to pay the retirement and/or Medicare contribution. This is called the "pick up."
a. For superintendents and treasurers, all three benefits were provided for all districts except for Little Miami which did not provide the pick-up on the increased retirement pick-up.
b. For all other administrators, all districts provided individual retirement contribution pick-up, while only 3 provided the pick-up on the increased retirement pick-up, and only Loveland provided the Medicare pick-up.
c. The "pick-up on the pick-up" as mentioned in the administrator handbook is an additional retirement contribution that is made for administrators. With this benefit the district covers both the district and employee contribution required for the employee pension to reflect the value of both the employee's salary and the original pick-up rather than just the employee's salary. For STRS employees the cost is $1.96 \%$ of salary for the employer side and an additional 1.96\% for the employee portion. For SERS employees the cost is $1.0 \%$ of salary for the employee side and $1.4 \%$ of salary for the employer portion. For an employee earning $\$ 100,000$ per year the "pickup-up on the pick-up" would cost the district \$3,920 for an STRS employee and $\$ 2,400$ for SERS.
10. The AASA study provided a summary of miscellaneous benefits that may be offered to administrators in Section 7 (reflected below). The list below is a summary of potential (yet not all inclusive) list of benefits that may be negotiated into individual administrator contracts. It is worth noting that this and this WCPO article reflect that the benefit packages for administrators are changing. For example, the WCPO report indicates that 14 out of the

20 districts are providing annuity benefits to 1 or more administrators. Section 4 from the AASA reflects a similar trend in this area. The only way to do a complete analysis of the benefits across districts would be to complete data requests for all administrator contracts. This effort would be extremely labor and time intensive and therefore was not conducted in this analysis.

Annuity Contributions: For LCSD, the Superintendent and Treasurer contracts were reviewed for these types of benefits. Both contracts contain a benefit for an annuity, which is a contribution for income in retirement. The Superintendent's contract contains a \$9,000 annual annuity contribution and the Treasurer's contract has a $\$ 10,000$ annual annuity contribution. Per Section 4 of the AASA superintendent study, a contribution of $\$ 5,000$ to $\$ 10,000$ is typical in $11.44 \%$ of contracts; another $18.59 \%$ receive annuity contributions of $\$ 5,000$ or less and $11.6 \%$ receive contributions of $\$ 10,000$ or more. $57.43 \%$ indicate not receiving an annuity contribution. The annuity contributions are included in compensation for purposes of retirement calculations.

Life Insurance Contributions: Every administrator in the district receives group term life insurance worth two times salary. LCSD's Superintendent contract also has $\$ 1$ million in term life insurance benefits. The AASA table below reflects that this is typical in $50.7 \%$ of superintendent contracts.

Membership in Professional Organizations: LCSD's Superintendent and Treasurer also receive reimbursement for professional organizations' dues and related travel and conference fees. AASA indicates this is a benefit paid for $88.6 \%$ of superintendents.

Liability Insurance: LCSD's Superintendent and Treasurer contracts have \$2,000,000 of professional liability coverage at a cost of no more than $\$ 500$ per policy to the district. Although LCSD's Superintendent and Treasurer contracts include this provision, no additional liability insurance has been purchased specifically for either role. The AASA study indicates professional liability insurance is a benefit paid for $24.9 \%$ of superintendents.

Cell Phone Reimbursement: LCSD administrators receive an $\$ 80 /$ month cell phone reimbursement as well as a $\$ 500$ per year stipend for hardware.

## SECTION \#7: Miscellaneous Benefits

Table 7.1. Which of the following benefits are provided in your employment agreement? Mark all that apply. (Q35)

| Listing of Benefits | Count | $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| College savings plan | 6 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Computer (e.g., laptop) | 735 | $58.4 \%$ |
| Conference attendance with fees paid | 1116 | $88.6 \%$ |
| Deferred compensation (e.g., tax sheltered <br> annuity) | 543 | $43.1 \%$ |
| District credit card | 452 | $35.9 \%$ |
| Guaranteed vesting in a retirement plan | 434 | $34.5 \%$ |
| Life insurance (accumulates value for you) | 638 | $50.7 \%$ |
| Physical exam <br> Professional liability coverage in excess of any <br> amount specified in state or local law | 420 | $33.4 \%$ |
| Provision allowing you to engage in outside <br> consulting | 414 | $24.9 \%$ |
| Provision allowing you to engage in outside <br> teaching | 307 | $32.9 \%$ |
| Smart phone or similar communications device | 736 | $24.4 \%$ |
| Support for a coach or mentor for the |  |  |
| superintendent |  |  |

Note: Multiple answers per participant possible. Percentages added exceed 100 since a participant may select more than one answer for this question.

Finding:

- While the results vary, the trend of superintendents including specific language in their employment agreement that detail the benefits enjoyed is increasing.


## Section \#4: Retirement Benefits

Table 4.1. Does the school district make a contribution to an annuity or private retirement account that you have? (Q41)

| District Contribution to Annuity or Private Retirement | Count | $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
| No | 723 | $57.43 \%$ |
| Yes (Less than $\$ 1,000$ ) | 37 | $2.94 \%$ |
| Yes, ( $\$ 1,000-\$ 5.000)$ | 197 | $15.65 \%$ |
| Yes, $(\$ 5,001-\$ 10,000)$ | 144 | $11.44 \%$ |
| Yes, More than $\$ 10,000$ | 146 | $11.60 \%$ |
| Omitted | 12 | $0.95 \%$ |
| Total | 1259 | $100.00 \%$ |

Finding:

- Slightly less than four in ten respondents indicated they receive a district contribution to an annuity or private retirement account held by the superintendent. The trend over the years suggests that this benefit is slowly increasing in popularity with superintendents.

Table 4.2. Is your retirement plan/system contribution based on your salary? (Q39)

| Retirement Calculation Based on Salary | Count | $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | 43 | $3.42 \%$ |
| Yes | 1180 | $93.73 \%$ |
| The district does not contribute on my behalf to a <br> retirement plan/system. | 23 | $1.83 \%$ |
| Omitted | 13 | $1.03 \%$ |
| Total | 1259 | $100.00 \%$ |

Finding:

- More than nine out of ten of the respondents indicated that the district contribution to the retirement plan/system is based on salary.

11. Comparing private industry metrics for the public sector was an important takeaway. One of the key metrics cited in the AASA study compared the starting teacher salary to that of the superintendent. In the private sector, a similar comparison is made by viewing an entry level worker's salary compared to the CEO's salary. In LCSD, the entry level salary for a teacher on the 2019-20 contract is $\$ 43,301$, and the LCSD's superintendent's salary is $\$ 149,000$ creating a ratio of 1:3.44, which is below the average of 1:4.1. This means that nationwide, superintendents with similarly-sized student populations (3,000 to 4,999 students) are being paid more than that of LCSD's Superintendent. Applying the median ratio using our teachers' base pay would result in a corresponding superintendent salary of $\$ 177,534$ ( $\$ 43,301$ multiplied by 4.1 from the table below). Likewise, if we calculated the average of starting teacher salaries across all forty Greater Cincinnati districts as shown on this report, the 4.1 ratio would be $\$ 41,592 \times 4.1=\$ 170,527$.

Table 2.5 Ratio of median superintendent salary (Q6) and district enrollment (Q2)
2019-2020

| Enrollment | Superintendent <br> Median Salary | Beginning Teacher <br> Median Base Salary | Ratio 2019-2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 300 to 999 | 117500 | 38000 | $1: 3.1$ |
| 1,000 to 2,999 | 137475 | 40000 | $1: 3.4$ |
| 3,000 to 4,999 | 167431 | 41216 | $1: 4.1$ |
| 5,000 to 9,999 | 180102 | 42300 | $1: 4.2$ |
| 10,000 to 24,999 | 200000 | 41261 | $1: 4.8$ |
| 25,000 to 49,999 | 233023 | 43500 | $1: 5.4$ |
| 50,000 to 99,999 | 246000 | 41625 | $1: 5.9$ |
| 100,000 or more | 338709 | 43823 | $1: 7.7$ |

Finding

- As mentioned above, a metric of growing importance in the private sector is the ratio of the entry-level worker compensation with the base salary (without incentives) of the CEO. Accordingly, the median entry-level salary of teachers is presented compared with the median salary of the superintendents arrayed by district size. The data confirms that as the district enrolment increases so does the ratio. In addition, the ratio has appeared to generally widen over the past five survey periods, regardless of the district enrollment.


## Statistical Analysis of Cost Differences Between Districts

There is large variation in administrator salaries across the Cincinnati area districts. To understand the key drivers of these differences, we performed a regression analysis (a reliable statistical method of determining which factors matter most, which can be ignored, and how factors influence each other) of administrator pay using district information from the CUPP report.

Utilizing these demographic data, we performed an analysis comparing Loveland's administrator costs to that of the other districts based on key attributes: the number of students in the district, district average income, the district square mileage, district assessed home valuation per pupil, the number of administrators in the district, and the district administrator-student ratio.

Further, for superintendents we found that the demographic data could explain over 80\% of the variation in salary across the 40 districts. In statistical terms, this is referred to as R-Squared. The model would predict a Loveland Superintendent salary of $\$ 157,000$ given these demographics.

This is $\$ 8,000$ more than the Superintendent's actual salary over this period. Similar, but weaker predictive results are generated for the treasurer and other positions in the district. For example, only $60 \%$ of the variation in treasurer compensation could be explained by the model using these same demographic characteristics. The model predicted the Treasurer salary for LCSD of $\$ 128,000$ when the actual salary was $\$ 130,000$.

## Alternatives

When considering the district administrator pay levels, we measured the impact of potential changes.

- Overall base pay looks comparable to surrounding districts. Exhibit A shows that a change to pay levels of border districts would save the district less than \$10,000 per year in total across all administrator positions. A similar change to the same average salary as ECC schools would save the district less than \$100,000 per year in total across all administrator positions.
- It should be noted that for the 2020-21 school year, the following changes occurred for administrators between the 2019-20 school year:
o Four administrators who changed positions between 2019-20 to 2020-21 received promotional increases.
- School administrators (if eligible) did receive step increases for the 2020-21 year.
- Step increases per the LCSD's administrator handbook are 0.9\% (just under $1 \%)$ per step. The step index does not equate to years of experience or years employed by the school district. A one step increase is a merit based increase as determined by a required written annual evaluation.
- Two administrators were not on the current step based on their experience and received a two step increase. This was an administrative error that was rectified in 2020-21.
- Two administrators are on the top of the experience level and did not receive an increase.
- LCSD's Superintendent and Treasurer did not take any salary increases for both the 2019-20 and the 2020-21 school year.
- No administrators received inflationary increases for the 2020-21 school year. In 2018-19 and 2019-20, the inflationary increase for administrators was $2 \%$. If administrators in other districts received an inflationary increase of $2 \%$ for the 2020-21 school year, this could potentially put them in line with their peers as shown on Exhibit A.
- Overall, there are a couple of additional items to review including: salary reductions and additional benefit pick-ups.


## Salary Reduction

It is noted that our administrator salaries appear to be very comparable to local and national norms. If, however, administrators were asked to take a decrease in their pay beyond the waived merit increases noted above, for each $1 \%$ decrease it would save the district $\$ 25,600$ in salary (1\% of total salaries in Exhibit A of \$2,560,234).

## Additional Benefit Pick-ups

Beyond the superintendent and treasurer roles, Medicare pick-up and pick-up on the increased retirement pick-up are not common benefits. The "pick-up on the pick-up" for other administrators is estimated to cost the district \$86,000 per year (1.96\% of salary for those in STRS (State Teachers Retirement System) and $1.00 \%$ of salary for those in SERS (School Employee Retirement System)), while the Medicare pick-up is estimated to cost the district \$36,000 per year ( $1.45 \%$ of salary for all administrators). Both of these benefit estimates are for administrators other than the superintendent and treasurer and combined cost \$78,000 per year. These costs could be partially mitigated by making the benefits conditional on years of service.

- Medicare pick up occurs when the district pays the employee's portion of the Medicare tax.
- Retirement pick up occurs when the district pays the employee's portion of the retirement contribution. This is defined by the STRS here.


## Considerations for Future Analysis

- Analysis of healthcare benefits. Please note that Loveland's split of healthcare costs at 85\% employer paid and $15 \%$ employee paid is within a common benefit salary structure for public school districts according to the Madeira City Schools Planning Commission Annual Salary and Benefits Study (March 2020).
- Research how salary benefits impact state retirement benefits.
- Analysis of the appropriate number of administrators for the district.

Exhibit A: Summary Information for the Comparison 40 Districts in Greater Cincinnati

- The following data were captured from the Ohio Department of Education CUPP Reports
- Assessed Valuation Per Pupil FY 2018
- District Median Income Tax Year (TY) 2017
- District Average Income TY 2017
- Administrator Average
- Count of number of positions over $\$ 60,000$ from salaries downloaded from the Buckeye Institute with like administrator job titles
- Average salary of administrator positions
- Border district averages are summarized with borders being defined as those districts that are adjacent to Loveland.
- Eastern Cincinnati Conference (ECC) reflects the averages for schools in the same conference as LCSD.
- The two accounting and one other official administrator were not included in the district average because their titles were not directly comparable to other districts. The three positions have an average salary of $\$ 72,121$. If those three administrator positions were included in the average, the average administrator cost for LCSD would be \$99,164.

| District | Assessed <br> Valuation <br> Per Pupil TY18 | District Median Income TY17 | District Average Income TY17 | Administrator Averages |  | Loveland Average - Comparison Average |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Count | Salary |  | Admin |  | Total | Percent |
| Average | \$ 175,357 | \$ 42,667 | \$ 81,362 | 29.0 | \$ 99,235 | \$ | $(3,174)$ | \$ | $(79,347)$ | -3.1\% |
| Border | \$ 260,474 | \$ 53,764 | \$ 135,367 | 26.9 | \$ 102,043 | \$ | (366) | \$ | $(9,155)$ | -0.4\% |
| ECC | \$ 168,592 | \$ 43,099 | \$ 76,810 | 54.6 | \$ 98,557 | \$ | $(3,853)$ | \$ | $(96,314)$ | -3.8\% |
| Loveland City | \$ 194,658 | \$ 53,111 | \$ 113,907 | 25 | \$ 102,409 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 0.0\% |


| Position Title | Salary |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Superintendent Assignment | $\$$ | 149,000 |
| Treasurer Assignment | $\$$ | 130,000 |
| Director Assignment | $\$$ | 125,889 |
| Education Administrative Specialist Assignment | $\$$ | 120,644 |
| Principal Assignment | $\$$ | 119,568 |
| Principal Assignment | $\$$ | 113,349 |
| Education Administrative Specialist Assignment | $\$$ | 110,343 |
| Principal Assignment | $\$$ | 106,458 |
| Principal Assignment | $\$$ | 106,458 |
| Director Assignment | $\$$ | 103,440 |
| Principal Assignment | $\$$ | 102,711 |
| Director Assignment | $\$$ | 101,794 |
| Principal Assignment | $\$$ | 100,886 |
| Education Administrative Specialist Assignment | $\$$ | 98,211 |
| Assistant Principal Assignment | $\$$ | 98,042 |
| Assistant Principal Assignment | $\$$ | 95,442 |
| Director Assignment | $\$$ | 93,373 |
| Assistant Principal Assignment | $\$$ | 92,540 |
| Assistant Principal Assignment | $\$$ | 92,540 |
| Assistant Principal Assignment | $\$$ | 88,723 |
| Assistant Principal Assignment | $\$$ | 87,148 |
| Coordinator Assignment | $\$$ | 84,836 |
| Publicity Relations Assignment | $\$$ | 83,330 |
| Supervisor/Manager Assignment | $\$$ | 79,844 |
| Supervisor/Manager Assignment | $\$$ | 75,665 |


| Roles Not Included |  | Salary |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Accounting Assignment | $\$$ | 84,080 |
| Other Official/Administrative Assignment | $\$$ | 66,493 |
| Accounting Assignment | $\$$ | 65,789 |

## Exhibit B: Average Salary for All Administrators by Individual District

- The following data were captured from the Ohio Department of Education CUPP Reports
- Assessed Valuation Per Pupil FY 2018
- District Median Income Tax Year (TY) 2017
- District Average Income TY 2017
- Average Daily Number of Students
- The following data were captured from the Buckeye Institute
- Count of number of positions over $\$ 60,000$ with like administrator job titles
- Average administrator salary
- Per Admin is the cost per administrator over/(under) the LCSD average administrator cost
- Total is the total cost of all administrators over/(under) the LCSD average administrators

| Rank [istrict | Ascessed <br> Valuation <br> Per Pupil <br> TY18 | Distriat <br> Median <br> Inoame <br> TY17 | Distrid <br> Average <br> Income <br> TY17 | Average Daily Number of Students | Count | Average Admin Salary |  | Per Admin | Tota | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Cak HillsLoca | \$ 140,866 | \$ 41,579 | \$ 70,144 | 7,782 | 36 | \$ 114,126 | \$ | 11,716 | \$ 292,906 | 11.4\% |
| 2 MadeiraCity | \$ 247,568 | \$ 61,511 | \$ 124,039 | 1,528 | 8 | \$ 113,932 |  | 11,522 | \$ 288,057 | 11.3\% |
| 3 Wyoringaty | \$ 153,463 | \$ 69,284 | \$ 151,172 | 2,009 | 11 | \$ 110,009 | \$ | 7,600 | \$ 189,996 | 7.4\% |
| 4 Mariemont City | \$ 232,569 | \$ 57,030 | \$ 146,065 | 1,671 | 11 | \$ 109,514 | \$ | 7,105 | \$ 177,625 | 6.9\% |
| 5 Southmest Local | \$ 163,501 | \$ 39,051 | \$ 59,212 | 3,958 | 16 | \$ 108,300 | \$ | 5,891 | \$ 147,274 | 5.8\% |
| 6 Mason City | \$ 194,982 | \$ 59,755 | \$ 115,924 | 10,015 | 45 | \$ 107,975 | \$ | 5,566 | \$ 139,147 | 5.4\% |
| 7 Indian HIII Exempted Village | \$ 603,021 | \$ 76,495 | \$ 393,918 | 2,080 | 15 | \$ 107,125 | \$ | 4,716 | \$ 117,901 | 4.6\% |
| 8 Mt Heathy City | \$ 73,383 | \$ 30,373 | \$ 42,470 | 4,019 | 27 | \$ 104,096 | \$ | 1,687 | \$ 42,171 | 1.6\% |
| 9 Sycamore Community ${ }^{\text {aty }}$ | \$ 339,337 | \$ 57,882 | \$ 134,817 | 5,460 | 31 | \$ 104,075 | \$ | 1,666 | \$ 41,639 | 1.6\% |
| 10 Goshen Local | \$ 110,312 | \$ 35,549 | \$ 53,480 | 2,682 | 12 | \$ 103,759 | \$ | 1,350 | \$ 33,747 | 1.3\% |
| 11 Clermont Northeastem Loca | \$ 205,665 | \$ 36,855 | \$ 63,497 | 1,654 | 8 | \$ 102,913 | \$ | 504 | \$ 12,600 | 0.5\% |
| 12 West Clermont Local | \$ 162,815 | \$ 37,528 | \$ 56,329 | 8,842 | 38 | \$ 102,480 | \$ | 71 | \$ 1,776 | 0.1\% |
| 13 Loveland Ity | \$ 194,658 | \$ 53,111 | \$ 113,907 | 4,510 | 25 | \$ 102,409 | \$ |  |  | 0.0\% |
| 14 Winton WoodsCity | \$ 111,265 | \$ 33,698 | \$ 51,890 | 4,130 | 28 | \$ 102,353 | \$ | (56) | \$ ( 1,412$)$ | -0.1\% |
| 15 LodJ and Local | \$ 98,053 | \$ 26,008 | \$ 32,846 | 634 | 5 | \$ 102,200 | \$ | (209) | \$ $(5,234)$ | -0.2\% |
| 16 Kings Local | \$ 200,488 | \$ 49,741 | \$ 89,991 | 4,603 | 23 | \$ 100,894 |  | $(1,516)$ | \$ $(37,888)$ | -1.5\% |
| 17 St Bernard-Emwood Place City | \$ 126,273 | \$ 29,797 | \$ 42,567 | 797 | 7 | \$ 100,456 |  | $(1,954)$ | \$ $(48,845)$ | -1.9\% |
| 18 Nornood Gity | \$ 205,409 | \$ 33,123 | \$ 47,102 | 1,991 | 13 | \$ 99,552 |  | $(2,858)$ | \$ $(71,444)$ | -2.8\% |
| 19 Princeton aty | \$ 259,730 | \$ 36,958 | \$ 70,280 | 5,963 | 45 | \$ 99,526 |  | $(2,883)$ | \$ $(72,073)$ | -2.8\% |
| 20 Reading Community ${ }^{\text {aty }}$ | \$ 135,360 | \$ 33,414 | \$ 47,477 | 1,346 | 8 | \$ 99,376 |  | $(3,034)$ | \$ $(75,843)$ | -3.0\% |
| 21 Bethel-Tate Local | \$ 119,896 | \$ 34,713 | \$ 51,571 | 1,562 | 8 | \$ 98,849 |  | $(3,561)$ | \$ $(89,018)$ | -3.5\% |
| 22 Cindinnati Public Schools | \$ 141,344 | \$ 31,638 | \$ 65,122 | 45,483 | 214 | \$ 98,719 | \$ | $(3,690)$ | \$ $(92,254)$ | -3.6\% |
| 23 Mil ford Exempted Village | \$ 166,013 | \$ 44,537 | \$ 79,355 | 6,465 | 31 | \$ 98,415 |  | $(3,994)$ | \$ $(99,858)$ | -3.9\% |
| 24 Forest Hills Local | \$ 179,379 | \$ 54,209 | \$ 119,337 | 7,422 | 51 | \$ 97,554 |  | $(4,856)$ | \$ (121,308) | -4.7\% |
| 25 Deer Park Community Gity | \$ 189,375 | \$ 38,493 | \$ 50,315 | 1,305 | 10 | \$ 96,750 |  | $(5,659)$ | \$ $(141,484)$ | -5.5\% |
| 26 Lakota Loca | \$ 182,966 | \$ 53,253 | \$ 94,455 | 16,655 | 90 | \$ 96,618 |  | $(5,792)$ | \$ $(144,793)$ | -5.7\% |
| 27 Trree RiversLocal | \$ 176,001 | \$ 45,385 | \$ 83,070 | 2,008 | 11 | \$ 96,446 |  | $(5,963)$ | \$ (149,077) | -5.8\% |
| 28 Lebanon Gity | \$ 178,263 | \$ 41,053 | \$ 72,366 | 5,626 | 21 | \$ 95,981 | \$ | $(6,429)$ | \$ $(160,714)$ | -6.3\% |
| 29 Finneytown Loca | \$ 127,852 | \$ 39,319 | \$ 60,490 | 1,522 | 9 | \$ 95,021 | \$ | $(7,388)$ | \$ $(184,706)$ | -7.2\% |
| 30 Springooro Cormunity Gity | \$ 212,518 | \$ 62,206 | \$ 107,810 | 6,069 | 29 | \$ 94,758 | \$ | $(7,651)$ | \$ $(191,275)$ | -7.5\% |
| 31 Hamilton Gty | \$ 78,248 | \$ 29,397 | \$ 42,760 | 10,126 | 53 | \$ 94,734 | \$ | $(7,676)$ | \$ $(191,889)$ | -7.5\% |
| 32 North College Hill aty | \$ 65,390 | \$ 29,123 | \$ 37,598 | 1,852 | 15 | \$ 94,013 |  | $(8,396)$ | \$ $(209,899)$ | -8.2\% |
| 33 Northmest Local | \$ 157,585 | \$ 37,612 | \$ 60,358 | 9,643 | 73 | \$ 92,521 | \$ | $(9,888)$ | \$ $(247,201)$ | -9.7\% |
| 34 Little Miari Loca | \$ 209,166 | \$ 52,387 | \$ 80,087 | 4,988 | 31 | \$ 92,059 |  | $(10,351)$ | \$ $(258,771)$ | -10.1\% |
| 35 Batavia Local | \$ 101,984 | \$ 36,824 | \$ 62,003 | 2,355 | 11 | \$ 91,023 |  | $(11,387)$ | \$ ( 284,670$)$ | -11.1\% |
| 36 WilliamsburgLocal | \$ 142,577 | \$ 35,264 | \$ 53,589 | 966 | 7 | \$ 90,123 |  | $(12,286)$ | \$ $(307,148)$ | -12.0\% |
| 37 New Ridmond Exempted Village | \$ 215,246 | \$ 39,163 | \$ 81,666 | 2,116 | 13 | \$ 88,748 |  | $(13,661)$ | \$ $(341,522)$ | -13.3\% |
| 38 Fairfieldaty | \$ 153,288 | \$ 37,912 | \$ 59,065 | 9,804 | 45 | \$ 88,566 |  | $(13,843)$ | \$ $(346,076)$ | -13.5\% |
| 39 Felidity-Frankin Loca | \$ 125,346 | \$ 32,105 | \$ 48,928 | 838 | 7 | \$ 87,322 |  | $(15,087)$ | \$ $(377,184)$ | -14.7\% |
| 40 Ross Loca | \$ 152,424 | \$ 43,778 | \$ 69,967 | 2,778 | 18 | \$ 86,127 |  | $(16,282)$ | \$ $(407,060)$ | -15.9\% |

Exhibit C: Superintendent Salary by Individual District

Salary of each superintendent as obtained from the Buckeye Institute for 2018-19 school year..

| Rank District |  | Salary |  | District Total Average Daily Membership FY19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Cincinnati Public Schools |  | \$ | 244,800 | 45,483 |
| 2 Oak Hills Local |  | \$ | 194,946 | 7,782 |
| 3 Wyoming City |  | \$ | 176,846 | 2,009 |
| 4 Indian Hill Exempted Village |  | \$ | 173,073 | 2,080 |
| 5 Sycamore Community City |  | \$ | 173,000 | 5,460 |
| 6 Lakota Local |  | \$ | 169,900 | 16,655 |
| 7 Southwest Local |  | \$ | 169,533 | 3,958 |
| 8 Forest Hills Local |  | \$ | 165,113 | 7,422 |
| 9 Mason City |  | \$ | 163,000 | 10,015 |
| 10 Mariemont City |  | \$ | 158,841 | 1,671 |
| 11 Hamilton City |  | \$ | 156,818 | 10,126 |
| 12 Springboro Community City |  | \$ | 154,000 | 6,069 |
| 13 Winton Woods City |  | \$ | 154,000 | 4,130 |
| 14 West Clermont Local |  | \$ | 151,304 | 8,842 |
| 15 Loveland City |  | \$ | 149,000 | 4,510 |
| 16 Madeira City |  | \$ | 149,000 | 1,528 |
| 17 Kings Local |  | \$ | 148,596 | 4,603 |
| 18 Princeton City |  | \$ | 147,485 | 5,963 |
| 19 Lebanon City |  | \$ | 145,000 | 5,626 |
| 20 Milford Exempted Village |  | \$ | 144,520 | 6,465 |
| 21 Fairfield City |  | \$ | 144,282 | 9,804 |
| 22 North College Hill City |  | \$ | 144,200 | 1,852 |
| 23 Three Rivers Local |  | \$ | 144,200 | 2,008 |
| 24 Goshen Local |  | \$ | 143,500 | 2,682 |
| 25 Northwest Local |  | \$ | 143,295 | 9,643 |
| 26 Mt Healthy City |  | \$ | 134,171 | 4,019 |
| 27 Norwood City |  | \$ | 131,552 | 1,991 |
| 28 St Bernard-Elmwood Place City |  | \$ | 131,351 | 797 |
| 29 Little Miami Local |  | \$ | 128,720 | 4,988 |
| 30 Batavia Local |  | \$ | 128,000 | 2,355 |
| 31 Clermont Northeastern Local |  | \$ | 127,930 | 1,654 |
| 32 Deer Park Community City |  | \$ | 124,000 | 1,305 |
| 33 Bethel-Tate Local |  | \$ | 121,676 | 1,562 |
| 34 Reading Community City |  | \$ | 120,686 | 1,346 |
| 35 Ross Local |  | \$ | 118,742 | 2,778 |
| 36 Finneytown Local |  | \$ | 117,312 | 1,522 |
| 37 Lockland Local |  | \$ | 117,000 | 634 |
| 38 New Richmond Exempted Village |  | \$ | 116,529 | 2,116 |
| 39 Williamsburg Local |  | \$ | 112,476 | 966 |
| 40 Felicity-Franklin Local |  | \$ | 90,900 | 838 |

Exhibit D: Treasurer Salary by Individual District

Salary of each district's treasurer as obtained from the Buckeye Institute for 2018-19 school year.

| Rank | k District | Salary |  | District Total <br> Average Daily <br> Membership FY19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Cincinnati Public Schools |  | \$ | 181,901 | 45,483 |
| 2 Oak Hills Local |  | \$ | 167,606 | 7,782 |
| 3 Sycamore Community City |  | \$ | 158,600 | 5,460 |
| 4 Mason City |  | \$ | 151,187 | 10,015 |
| 5 Lakota Local |  | \$ | 150,000 | 16,655 |
| 6 Princeton City |  | \$ | 141,735 | 5,963 |
| 7 Hamilton City |  | \$ | 140,288 | 10,126 |
| 8 Kings Local |  | \$ | 139,725 | 4,603 |
| 9 Wyoming City |  | \$ | 135,890 | 2,009 |
| 10 Northwest Local |  | \$ | 135,832 | 9,643 |
| 11 Winton Woods City |  | \$ | 133,500 | 4,130 |
| 12 Milford Exempted Village |  | \$ | 132,500 | 6,465 |
| 13 Loveland City |  | \$ | 130,000 | 4,510 |
| 14 Fairfield City |  | \$ | 129,996 | 9,804 |
| 15 Southwest Local |  | \$ | 128,500 | 3,958 |
| 16 Lebanon City |  | \$ | 128,260 | 5,626 |
| 17 Mt Healthy City |  | \$ | 128,000 | 4,019 |
| 18 Mariemont City |  | \$ | 126,705 | 1,671 |
| 19 Springboro Community City |  | \$ | 126,000 | 6,069 |
| 20 Norwood City |  | \$ | 124,000 | 1,991 |
| 21 Little Miami Local |  | \$ | 121,389 | 4,988 |
| 22 Goshen Local |  | \$ | 118,000 | 2,682 |
| 23 Madeira City |  | \$ | 116,000 | 1,528 |
| 24 Finneytown Local |  | \$ | 114,753 | 1,522 |
| 25 Indian Hill Exempted Village |  | \$ | 112,750 | 2,080 |
| 26 New Richmond Exempted Village |  | \$ | 109,799 | 2,116 |
| 27 North College Hill City |  | \$ | 107,500 | 1,852 |
| 28 Reading Community City |  | \$ | 107,100 | 1,346 |
| 29 Three Rivers Local |  | \$ | 107,084 | 2,008 |
| 30 Batavia Local |  | \$ | 106,440 | 2,355 |
| 31 Lockland Local |  | \$ | 105,000 | 634 |
| 32 St Bernard-Elmwood Place City |  | \$ | 104,681 | 797 |
| 33 Ross Local |  | \$ | 101,370 | 2,778 |
| 34 Forest Hills Local |  | \$ | 98,492 | 7,422 |
| 35 Bethel-Tate Local |  | \$ | 95,236 | 1,562 |
| 36 Clermont Northeastern Local |  | \$ | 92,056 | 1,654 |
| 37 Williamsburg Local |  | \$ | 90,000 | 966 |
| 38 Deer Park Community City |  | \$ | 87,000 | 1,305 |
| 39 West Clermont Local |  | \$ | 86,250 | 8,842 |
| 40 Felicity-Franklin Local |  | \$ | 85,791 | 838 |

Exhibit E: Average Principal Salary by Individual District

Average salary of each district's principals and the number of principals as obtained from the Buckeye Institute for 2018-19 school year.

| Rank District | Count | Average Salary |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Mason Cty | 8 |  | 126,469 |
| 2 Oak Hills Local | 9 |  | 121,909 |
| 3 Mariemont aty | 5 |  | 114,145 |
| 4 Mt Healthy Cty | 7 |  | 112,852 |
| 5 Sycamore Community 1 aty | 7 |  | 112,516 |
| 6 Wyoming aty | 2 |  | 112,478 |
| 7 Southwest Local | 7 |  | 110,947 |
| 8dermont Northeastern Local | 3 |  | 110,748 |
| 9 Kings Local | 6 |  | 109,783 |
| 10 Madeira Oty | 3 |  | 109,534 |
| 11 ancinnati Public Schools | 61 | \$ | 109,455 |
| 12 Loveland Caty | 6 | \$ | 108,238 |
| 13 West dermont Local | 10 | \$ | 106,932 |
| 14 Winton Woods City | 6 |  | 106,483 |
| 15 Forest Hills Local | 9 |  | 106,328 |
| 16 Indian Hill Exempted Village | 4 |  | 104,014 |
| 17 Goshen Local | 3 | \$ | 103,992 |
| 18 Princeton 9 aty | 14 |  | 103,688 |
| 19 Little Miami Local | 6 | \$ | 103,257 |
| 20 Milford Exempted Village | 8 |  | 102,798 |
| 21 Hamilton Gty | 12 | \$ | 102,323 |
| 22 Three Rivers Local | 2 | \$ | 101,024 |
| 23 Northwest Local | 20 | \$ | 100,845 |
| 24 Norwood City | 5 | \$ | 100,212 |
| 25 Bethel-Tate Local | 4 | \$ | 100,015 |
| 26 St Bernard-Emwood PlaceCity | 3 | \$ | 99,270 |
| 27 Springboro Community 1 aty | 7 | \$ | 98,968 |
| 28 Deer Park Community Gty | 3 | \$ | 98,833 |
| 29 Lakota Loca | 23 | \$ | 98,758 |
| 30 Batavia Local | 3 | \$ | 97,943 |
| 31 Lebanon Oty | 6 | \$ | 97,038 |
| 32 Ross Local | 5 | \$ | 96,357 |
| 33 Fairfield Oty | 11 \$ |  | 96,016 |
| 34 Finneytown Local | 3 | \$ | 95,792 |
| 35 Reading Community Gty | 4 |  | 94,951 |
| 36 New Richmond Exempted Village | 5 |  | 92,884 |
| 37 North College Hill City | 4 |  | 91,1® |
| 38 Williamsburg Local | 3 | \$ | 91,146 |
| 39 Felicity-Frankin Local | 3 | \$ | 90,029 |
| 40 Lockland Local | 1 \$ | \$ | 79,000 |

Exhibit F: Average Vice Principal Salary by Individual District

Average salary of each district's vice principals and the number of vice principals as obtained from the Buckeye Institute for 2018-19 school year.

| Ristrict | Count |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |

Exhibit G: Number of Students per Administrator for each Individual District per the FY19 CUPP
Report
District PupilAdministrator Ratio
RankDistrictFY19
1 Felicity-Franklin Local ..... 60.9
2 St Bernard-Elmwood Place City ..... 81.5
3 Deer ParkCommunityCity ..... 89.2
4 Finneytown Local ..... 97.6
5 North College Hill City ..... 97.9
6 Mt Healthy City ..... 101.6
7 Bethel-Tate Local ..... 109.3
8 Williamsburg Local ..... 110.4
9 Norwood City ..... 113.2
10 Lockland Local ..... 116.4
11 Indian Hill Exempted Village ..... 118.8
12 Princeton City ..... 119.5
13 Forest Hills Local ..... 128.3
14 Clermont Northeastern Local ..... 133.3
15 Little Miami Local ..... 136.7
16 Ross Local ..... 138.7
17 Winton Woods City ..... 139.1
18 New Richmond Exempted Village ..... 142.2
19 Mariemont Gity ..... 144.9
20 Northwest Local ..... 147.9
21 Wyoming G̛ty ..... 149.4
22 Hamilton City ..... 157.4
23 Reading Community Uity ..... 160.8
24 Sycamore Community City ..... 163.3
25 Loveland City ..... 165.3
26 Batavia Local ..... 169.1
27 Goshen Local ..... 172.5
28 Lakota Local ..... 173.5
29 Kings Local ..... 177.2
30 Madeira City ..... 178.2
31 Fairfield City ..... 178.8
32 Three Rivers Local ..... 183.8
33 Oak Hills Local ..... 184.2
34 Cincinnati Public Schools ..... 185.7
35 Milford Exempted Village ..... 196.0
36 Lebanon City ..... 200.3
37 Mason City ..... 201.0
38 West Clemont Local ..... 209.2
39 Springboro Community Gity ..... 209.6
40 Southwest Local ..... 226.8

Exhibit H: Additional Administrator Compensation for Districts in the Eastern Cincinnati Conference (ECC). Please note: Information for Cincinnati Public Schools currently or previously in the ECC were not readily available.

This data was obtained via an open records request from the LCSD Treasurer.

|  | Superintedent and Treasurer |  |  | Other Administrators |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retirement Pick-up | Income Tax Pickup on Pick-up | Medicare Pick-up | Retirement Pick-up | Income Tax Pickup on Pick-up | Medicare Pick-up |
| District | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14.00\%STRS } \\ & 10.00 \% \text { SERS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.96 \% \text { STRS } \\ & 1.00 \% \text { SERS } \end{aligned}$ | 1.45\% | $\begin{aligned} & 14.00 \% \text { STRS } \\ & 10.00 \% \text { SERS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.96 \% \text { STRS } \\ & 1.00 \% \text { SRS } \end{aligned}$ | 1.45\% |
| Forest Hills | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Kings | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Lebanon | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Little Miami | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Loveland | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Milford | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| West Cermont | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Winton Woods | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Number Providing | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 1 |

## Links to Referenced Sites

Buckeye Institute: https://www.buckeyeinstitute.org/data/teacher_salary
2019-20 AASA Superintendent Salary \& Benefits Analysis:
https://www.aasa.org/uploadedFiles/AASA-Salary-\ Benefits-Non_membership.pdf
FY19 Cupp Report:
http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Finance-and-Funding/School-Payment-Reports/District-Profile-Report s/FY2019-District-Profile-Report

## Certified Staff Analysis:

https://www.lovelandschools.org/Downloads/Planning\ Commission\ Certified\ Teacher\ 
Salary\%20Review.pdf
Madeira City Schools Planning Commission Annual Salary and Benefits Study (March 2020):
https://www.madeiracityschools.org/userfiles/225/my\ files/final\ salary\ study\ report\  2020\%20.pdf?id=50470

STRS Definition of Pick Ups: https://www.strsoh.org/employer/reporting/pickup/types.html

## WCPO Article:

https://www.wcpo.com/news/local-news/i-team/curve-busters-retirement-pay-is-rising-for-top-tri-statesuperintendents

