



American Network of Community Options and Resources

---

# 2008 Direct Support Professional Wage Study

Data report on national entry-level and average wages, including state-operated institutions wage comparison

Prepared for the ANCOR National Advocacy Campaign  
by the Mosaic Collaborative for  
Disabilities Public Policy and Practice

## Acknowledgments

*We would like to thank the private and state providers and their staff in all fifty states who took the time to provide wage data on which this report is based. We would also like to thank the ANCOR staff for their support in gathering data from the state providers. Without the help of all the providers involved, the study could not be done, and we truly appreciate their support. We offer special thanks to the direct support professionals who provide the day to day services and supports for persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities throughout our nation.*

## T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Summary of Methodology &amp; Results</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>TABLE 1 – 2008 State Alphabetic Review of Wages</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>TABLE 2 – 2008 DSP Private Entry Wage</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>TABLE 3 – 2008 DSP State Entry Wage</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>TABLE 4 – 2008 Wage Percent Difference State vs. Private Entry</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>TABLE 5 – 2008 DSP Private Average Wage</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>TABLE 6 – 2008 DSP State Average Wage</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>TABLE 7 – 2008 Wage Percent Difference State vs. Private Average</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>TABLE 8 – State Minimum Wages</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>TABLE 9 – 2008 Private Provider Direct Support Professional Wage Comparison with Federal Poverty Level</b>

## ■ Executive Summary

Principal Investigators: Monalisa McGee-Trenhaile Ph.D., Jaimie Anderson-Hoyt MA

Medicaid is the largest source of financing for disabilities services in the United States. For people with disabilities and for those who provide their care, Medicaid serves as a safety net for the provision of services.



Medicaid is the primary funder for providers of intellectual and developmental disability services and directly tied to this are the wages paid to Direct Support Professionals.

For the people Direct Support Professionals serve, Medicaid is often the only source of financial assistance for health care. Medicaid plays a critical and foundational role for people with disabilities in providing coverage and access to services and supports.



Moving people with disabilities from institutions to the community began with the recognition that many persons with intellectual disabilities who were living in large public institutions did not belong there. Many states have reduced the number of people living in large institutions (16 or more beds) by allowing people to move to smaller community settings. This dramatic change forced states to change their service systems. However, there remains a nationwide discrepancy in the wages paid to Direct Support Professionals (DSPs) by state-run service providers and to DSPs performing the same work functions by private providers.

Direct Support Professionals (DSP) are healthcare professionals who provide "hands on" daily supports, training and habilitative services to persons with developmental and physical disabilities. This workforce is responsible for the health, safety and emotional support of the individuals being served. DSPs ensure compliance with state regulatory requirements for the delivery of these critical supports, as well as provider policies and procedures. For purposes of this study, DSPs employed by private providers are compared with those who work for State-Run programs.

## ■ 2008 Wage Data Analysis Overview

	DSP Private Entry Wage	DSP State Entry Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Entry	DSP Private Average Wage	DSP State Average Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Average
<b>AGGREGATE:<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$ 8.53</b>	<b>\$ 12.13</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>\$ 9.85</b>	<b>\$ 15.48</b>	<b>57%</b>

<sup>2</sup>The Aggregate is comprised of the average DSP private provider wages (entry and average) for all states. The states without state service providers were not included in the aggregate data for state entry wage and wage percentage difference.

State Medicaid programs have the primary responsibility for financing services that people with developmental disabilities rely upon for both institutional and community-based settings. In the past, Medicaid has been used to fund institutional care for people with disabilities. In response to the need for services in the home and community, Medicaid is changing. The Olmstead Supreme Court decision said that “institutional placement of persons who can handle and benefit from community settings perpetuates unwarranted assumptions that persons so isolated are incapable or unworthy of participating in community life,” and “confinement in an institution severely diminishes the everyday life activities of individuals, including family relations, social contacts, work options, economic independence, educational advancement, and cultural enrichment.”

The intellectual and developmental disability service industry has long structured itself on the presumption of a seemingly endless supply of low-income workers. Now that this decades-old presumption is no longer valid, unprecedented pressure is placed not only on the “formal,” paid health care delivery system, but also on family caregivers. We are in the midst of a paradigm shift which has immense implications for the future of services. Tied directly to this are the wages paid to the Direct Support Professionals.

ANCOR and the Mosaic Collaborative have worked together to develop the methodology for this survey which provides a snapshot of the discrepancy in the wages paid to Direct Support Professionals across the United States. It is our hope that this data will be considered when the critical decisions of how we will fund our most important resource, Direct Support Professionals, will be made. Quality of care and the future of developmental disability services are dependent upon decisions made now.

## ■ Summary of Methodology & Results

### **Target Population**

On April 24, 2008, the ANCOR Board of Directors finalized the initial research parameters for the 2008 DSP Wage Data Study. It was decided at that time the study would focus on identifying average cash, non-overtime wage paid to a Direct Support Professional, DSP, in a residential program in the private sector.

### **Research Parameters**

DSPs who have additional duties related to administration or shift supervision (variously called “coordinators,” “lead staff,” “house managers,” etc. were excluded from data compilation. *The focus of this study was based solely on the fundamental DSP position with no extra duties.*

Additional parameters for the data compilation included gathering four different averages for private and state DSPs: the starting DSP entry wage average and the overall DSP wage average, for each state. For starting wage, we reviewed wages paid to a new DSP who completed training and are fully qualified to work alone with a consumer (excluding “training” wage scales that some providers use during the initial round of DSP training/orientation). The overall training wage is intended to be just that – the overall average cash, non-overtime wage paid to all DSPs (performing the fundamental residential DSP job), regardless of tenure.

## Data Compilation – Phases One, Two & Three

Data compilation began April 24, 2008, with agreement from ANCOR leadership regarding the parameters mentioned above. **Phase One** began with a request from the six largest ANCOR private provider members of the research parameters agreed upon by the ANCOR board. **Phase Two**, for the purposes of enhancing validity, expanded information gathering with electronic and verbal requests to each of the ANCOR State Executives. As responses encountered some challenges, noted below, this phase was expanded to gathering information from providers outside ANCOR membership. There were no less than three sources cited per state and attempts were made to collect urban and rural wage data. **Phase Three** involved initial discussions regarding the discrepancy between the wages paid to DSPs of private providers who perform the same functions as DSPs who work for state service providers. We proceeded to perform a series of electronic research, e mail communication and telephonic contacts to compile this set of data.

## Challenges to Data Compilation

There were a variety of challenges to our methodology which may impact the validity of our data. Key to our process included provider responsiveness and antiquity of data. We understood that with many challenges providers face on a daily basis, data gathering is not a primary concern for some. Also, smaller providers, by the fact that some do not have the operational infrastructure, may have had additional issues related to identifying how they could gather this information in a comprehensive format.

## ■ Conclusion



There is an overall discrepancy in the wages of DSPs who work in private provider settings and who perform the same function as DSPs who are state direct care employees. The future of intellectual and developmental disability services hinges on the recruitment and retention of quality direct support professionals. Without these qualified staff no provider will be able to serve. In an effort to ensure there is consistent qualitative national data regarding direct support professional wages, we recommend this type of data analysis to be compiled on an annual basis.

**TABLE 1: 2008 Alphabetic Order of Wage Analysis**

	DSP Private Entry Wage	DSP State Entry Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Entry	DSP Private Average Wage	DSP State Average Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Average
Alabama	\$ 8.54	\$ 10.93	28%	\$ 8.71	\$ 14.01	61%
Alaska <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.00			\$ 13.38		
Arizona	\$ 8.83	\$ 11.98	36%	\$ 9.69	\$ 13.25	37%
Arkansas	\$ 7.00	\$ 9.59	37%	\$ 8.33	\$ 12.46	50%
California	\$ 8.35	\$ 15.65	87%	\$ 9.48	\$ 20.50	116%
Colorado	\$ 8.82	\$ 15.35	74%	\$ 10.30	\$ 22.20	116%
Connecticut	\$ 10.37	\$ 18.96	83%	\$ 13.64	\$ 22.93	68%
Delaware	\$ 9.33	\$ 10.00	7%	\$ 10.55	\$ 11.25	7%
Florida	\$ 7.62	\$ 8.45	11%	\$ 9.14	\$ 14.82	62%
Georgia	\$ 7.06	\$ 8.50	20%	\$ 10.79	\$ 11.00	2%
Hawaii <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.75			\$ 10.95		
Idaho	\$ 8.00	\$ 10.00	25%	\$ 8.91	\$ 14.00	57%
Illinois	\$ 8.19	\$ 13.95	70%	\$ 9.04	\$ 15.00	66%
Indiana <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.65			\$ 9.22		
Iowa	\$ 8.74	\$ 14.97	71%	\$ 9.99	\$ 18.43	84%
Kansas	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.35	54%	\$ 8.78	\$ 14.68	67%
Kentucky	\$ 7.44	\$ 9.42	27%	\$ 8.75	\$ 12.48	43%
Louisiana	\$ 8.52	\$ 8.75	3%	\$ 9.25	\$ 12.86	39%
Maine <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.85			\$ 9.90		
Maryland	\$ 8.81	\$ 10.16	15%	\$ 10.18	\$ 13.75	35%
Massachusetts	\$ 10.50	\$ 13.40	28%	\$ 12.18	\$ 15.17	25%
Michigan	\$ 7.67	\$ 14.45	88%	\$ 9.24	\$ 15.90	72%
Minnesota	\$ 9.20	\$ 15.22	65%	\$ 10.94	\$ 20.59	88%
Mississippi	\$ 7.00	\$ 12.36	77%	\$ 8.02	\$ 15.21	90%
Missouri	\$ 7.05	\$ 10.48	49%	\$ 8.00	\$ 11.30	41%
Montana	\$ 8.00	\$ 9.38	17%	\$ 8.98	\$ 12.59	40%
Nebraska	\$ 7.74	\$ 11.12	44%	\$ 8.28	\$ 14.75	78%
Nevada	\$ 8.16	\$ 14.53	78%	\$ 9.52	\$ 17.71	86%
New Hampshire <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.27			\$ 11.36		
New Jersey	\$ 9.99	\$ 13.81	38%	\$ 10.92	\$ 21.49	97%
New Mexico <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.02			\$ 8.83		
New York	\$ 9.50	\$ 14.75	55%	\$ 11.07	\$ 16.15	46%
North Carolina	\$ 7.00	\$ 11.00	57%	\$ 10.09	\$ 13.06	29%
North Dakota	\$ 8.07	\$ 10.84	34%	\$ 9.86	\$ 14.45	47%
Ohio	\$ 8.23	\$ 14.85	80%	\$ 9.59	\$ 16.35	70%
Oklahoma	\$ 7.71	\$ 12.10	57%	\$ 8.29	\$ 16.13	95%
Oregon	\$ 9.31	\$ 12.53	35%	\$ 10.28	\$ 14.95	45%
Pennsylvania	\$ 8.49	\$ 10.05	18%	\$ 10.43	\$ 12.01	15%
Rhode Island <sup>1</sup>	\$ 9.17			\$ 11.82		
South Carolina	\$ 8.54	\$ 12.96	52%	\$ 8.84	\$ 23.98	171%
South Dakota	\$ 8.97	\$ 10.81	21%	\$ 9.81	\$ 13.81	41%
Tennessee	\$ 7.67	\$ 11.19	46%	\$ 8.64	\$ 12.85	49%
Texas	\$ 7.51	\$ 12.00	60%	\$ 8.08	\$ 15.25	89%
Utah	\$ 8.14	\$ 10.70	31%	\$ 8.96	\$ 14.66	64%
Vermont <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.00			\$ 10.24		
Virginia	\$ 10.32	\$ 11.50	11%	\$ 11.11	\$ 15.03	35%
Washington	\$ 9.85	\$ 13.83	40%	\$ 10.18	\$ 17.84	75%
West Virginia <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.35			\$ 7.93		
Wisconsin	\$ 9.11	\$ 12.59	38%	\$ 10.31	\$ 14.85	44%
Wyoming	\$ 9.15	\$ 11.71	28%	\$ 11.58	\$ 15.18	31%
<b>AGGREGATE<sup>2</sup>:</b>	<b>\$ 8.53</b>	<b>\$ 12.13</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>\$ 9.85</b>	<b>\$ 15.48</b>	<b>57%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Lakin, C.; Braddock, D., Trends and Milestones – The 40th Anniversary of Deinstitutionalization in the United States: Decreasing State Institution Populations, (1967-2007) cites “Between 1967 and 2007 nine states reduced their state institution populations to zero (AK, DC, HI, ME, NH, NM, RI, VT and WV)”.

<sup>2</sup> The Aggregate is comprised of the average DSP private provider wages (entry and average) for all states. The states without state service providers were not included in the aggregate data for state entry wage and wage percentage difference.

**TABLE 2: 2008 Private Provider Entry Wage Analysis**

	DSP Private Entry Wage	DSP State Entry Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Entry	DSP Private Average Wage	DSP State Average Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Average
North Carolina	\$ 7.00	\$ 11.00	57%	\$ 10.09	\$ 13.06	29%
Arkansas	\$ 7.00	\$ 9.59	37%	\$ 8.33	\$ 12.46	50%
Mississippi	\$ 7.00	\$ 12.36	77%	\$ 8.02	\$ 15.21	90%
Missouri	\$ 7.05	\$ 10.48	49%	\$ 8.00	\$ 11.30	41%
Georgia	\$ 7.06	\$ 8.50	20%	\$ 10.79	\$ 11.00	2%
West Virginia <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.35			\$ 7.93		
Kentucky	\$ 7.44	\$ 9.42	27%	\$ 8.75	\$ 12.48	43%
Texas	\$ 7.51	\$ 12.00	60%	\$ 8.08	\$ 15.25	89%
Florida	\$ 7.62	\$ 8.45	11%	\$ 9.14	\$ 14.82	62%
Indiana <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.65			\$ 9.22		
Michigan	\$ 7.67	\$ 14.45	88%	\$ 9.24	\$ 15.90	72%
Tennessee	\$ 7.67	\$ 11.19	46%	\$ 8.64	\$ 12.85	49%
Oklahoma	\$ 7.71	\$ 12.10	57%	\$ 8.29	\$ 16.13	95%
Nebraska	\$ 7.74	\$ 11.12	44%	\$ 8.28	\$ 14.75	78%
Montana	\$ 8.00	\$ 9.38	17%	\$ 8.98	\$ 12.59	40%
Vermont <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.00			\$ 10.24		
Idaho	\$ 8.00	\$ 10.00	25%	\$ 8.91	\$ 14.00	57%
Kansas	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.35	54%	\$ 8.78	\$ 14.68	67%
New Mexico <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.02			\$ 8.83		
North Dakota	\$ 8.07	\$ 10.84	34%	\$ 9.86	\$ 14.45	47%
Utah	\$ 8.14	\$ 10.70	31%	\$ 8.96	\$ 14.66	64%
Nevada	\$ 8.16	\$ 14.53	78%	\$ 9.52	\$ 17.71	86%
Illinois	\$ 8.19	\$ 13.95	70%	\$ 9.04	\$ 15.00	66%
Ohio	\$ 8.23	\$ 14.85	80%	\$ 9.59	\$ 16.35	70%
California	\$ 8.35	\$ 15.65	87%	\$ 9.48	\$ 20.50	116%
Pennsylvania	\$ 8.49	\$ 10.05	18%	\$ 10.43	\$ 12.01	15%
Louisiana	\$ 8.52	\$ 8.75	3%	\$ 9.25	\$ 12.86	39%
South Carolina	\$ 8.54	\$ 12.96	52%	\$ 8.84	\$ 23.98	171%
Alabama	\$ 8.54	\$ 10.93	28%	\$ 8.71	\$ 14.01	61%
Iowa	\$ 8.74	\$ 14.97	71%	\$ 9.99	\$ 18.43	84%
Hawaii <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.75			\$ 10.95		
Maryland	\$ 8.81	\$ 10.16	15%	\$ 10.18	\$ 13.75	35%
Colorado	\$ 8.82	\$ 15.35	74%	\$ 10.30	\$ 22.20	116%
Arizona	\$ 8.83	\$ 11.98	36%	\$ 9.69	\$ 13.25	37%
Maine <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.85			\$ 9.90		
South Dakota	\$ 8.97	\$ 10.81	21%	\$ 9.81	\$ 13.81	41%
Wisconsin	\$ 9.11	\$ 12.59	38%	\$ 10.31	\$ 14.85	44%
Wyoming	\$ 9.15	\$ 11.71	28%	\$ 11.58	\$ 15.18	31%
Rhode Island <sup>1</sup>	\$ 9.17			\$ 11.82		
Minnesota	\$ 9.20	\$ 15.22	65%	\$ 10.94	\$ 20.59	88%
Oregon	\$ 9.31	\$ 12.53	35%	\$ 10.28	\$ 14.95	45%
Delaware	\$ 9.33	\$ 10.00	7%	\$ 10.55	\$ 11.25	7%
New York	\$ 9.50	\$ 14.75	55%	\$ 11.07	\$ 16.15	46%
Washington	\$ 9.85	\$ 13.83	40%	\$ 10.18	\$ 17.84	75%
New Jersey	\$ 9.99	\$ 13.81	38%	\$ 10.92	\$ 21.49	97%
Virginia	\$ 10.32	\$ 11.50	11%	\$ 11.11	\$ 15.03	35%
Connecticut	\$ 10.37	\$ 18.96	83%	\$ 13.64	\$ 22.93	68%
Massachusetts	\$ 10.50	\$ 13.40	28%	\$ 12.18	\$ 15.17	25%
Alaska <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.00			\$ 13.38		
New Hampshire <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.27			\$ 11.36		
<b>AGGREGATE<sup>2</sup>:</b>	<b>\$ 8.53</b>	<b>\$ 12.13</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>\$ 9.85</b>	<b>\$ 15.48</b>	<b>57%</b>

<sup>1</sup>Lakin, C.; Braddock, D., Trends and Milestones – The 40th Anniversary of Deinstitutionalization in the United States: Decreasing State Institution Populations, (1967-2007) cites “Between 1967 and 2007 nine states reduced their state institution populations to zero (AK, DC, HI, ME, NH, NM, RI, VT and WV)”.

<sup>2</sup>The Aggregate is comprised of the average DSP private provider wages (entry and average) for all states. The states without state service providers were not included in the aggregate data for state entry wage and wage percentage difference.

**TABLE 3: 2008 State Provider Entry Wage Analysis**

	DSP Private Entry Wage	DSP State Entry Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Entry	DSP Private Average Wage	DSP State Average Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Average
Florida	\$ 7.62	\$ 8.45	11%	\$ 9.14	\$ 14.82	62%
Georgia	\$ 7.06	\$ 8.50	20%	\$ 10.79	\$ 11.00	2%
Louisiana	\$ 8.52	\$ 8.75	3%	\$ 9.25	\$ 12.86	39%
Montana	\$ 8.00	\$ 9.38	17%	\$ 8.98	\$ 12.59	40%
Kentucky	\$ 7.44	\$ 9.42	27%	\$ 8.75	\$ 12.48	43%
Arkansas	\$ 7.00	\$ 9.59	37%	\$ 8.33	\$ 12.46	50%
Idaho	\$ 8.00	\$ 10.00	25%	\$ 8.91	\$ 14.00	57%
Delaware	\$ 9.33	\$ 10.00	7%	\$ 10.55	\$ 11.25	7%
Pennsylvania	\$ 8.49	\$ 10.05	18%	\$ 10.43	\$ 12.01	15%
Maryland	\$ 8.81	\$ 10.16	15%	\$ 10.18	\$ 13.75	35%
Missouri	\$ 7.05	\$ 10.48	49%	\$ 8.00	\$ 11.30	41%
Utah	\$ 8.14	\$ 10.70	31%	\$ 8.96	\$ 14.66	64%
South Dakota	\$ 8.97	\$ 10.81	21%	\$ 9.81	\$ 13.81	41%
North Dakota	\$ 8.07	\$ 10.84	34%	\$ 9.86	\$ 14.45	47%
Alabama	\$ 8.54	\$ 10.93	28%	\$ 8.71	\$ 14.01	61%
North Carolina	\$ 7.00	\$ 11.00	57%	\$ 10.09	\$ 13.06	29%
Nebraska	\$ 7.74	\$ 11.12	44%	\$ 8.28	\$ 14.75	78%
Tennessee	\$ 7.67	\$ 11.19	46%	\$ 8.64	\$ 12.85	49%
Virginia	\$ 10.32	\$ 11.50	11%	\$ 11.11	\$ 15.03	35%
Wyoming	\$ 9.15	\$ 11.71	28%	\$ 11.58	\$ 15.18	31%
Arizona	\$ 8.83	\$ 11.98	36%	\$ 9.69	\$ 13.25	37%
Texas	\$ 7.51	\$ 12.00	60%	\$ 8.08	\$ 15.25	89%
Oklahoma	\$ 7.71	\$ 12.10	57%	\$ 8.29	\$ 16.13	95%
Kansas	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.35	54%	\$ 8.78	\$ 14.68	67%
Mississippi	\$ 7.00	\$ 12.36	77%	\$ 8.02	\$ 15.21	90%
Oregon	\$ 9.31	\$ 12.53	35%	\$ 10.28	\$ 14.95	45%
Wisconsin	\$ 9.11	\$ 12.59	38%	\$ 10.31	\$ 14.85	44%
South Carolina	\$ 8.54	\$ 12.96	52%	\$ 8.84	\$ 23.98	171%
Massachusetts	\$ 10.50	\$ 13.40	28%	\$ 12.18	\$ 15.17	25%
New Jersey	\$ 9.99	\$ 13.81	38%	\$ 10.92	\$ 21.49	97%
Washington	\$ 9.85	\$ 13.83	40%	\$ 10.18	\$ 17.84	75%
Illinois	\$ 8.19	\$ 13.95	70%	\$ 9.04	\$ 15.00	66%
Michigan	\$ 7.67	\$ 14.45	88%	\$ 9.24	\$ 15.90	72%
Nevada	\$ 8.16	\$ 14.53	78%	\$ 9.52	\$ 17.71	86%
New York	\$ 9.50	\$ 14.75	55%	\$ 11.07	\$ 16.15	46%
Ohio	\$ 8.23	\$ 14.85	80%	\$ 9.59	\$ 16.35	70%
Iowa	\$ 8.74	\$ 14.97	71%	\$ 9.99	\$ 18.43	84%
Minnesota	\$ 9.20	\$ 15.22	65%	\$ 10.94	\$ 20.59	88%
Colorado	\$ 8.82	\$ 15.35	74%	\$ 10.30	\$ 22.20	116%
California	\$ 8.35	\$ 15.65	87%	\$ 9.48	\$ 20.50	116%
Connecticut	\$ 10.37	\$ 18.96	83%	\$ 13.64	\$ 22.93	68%
New Mexico <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.02			\$ 8.83		
Indiana <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.65			\$ 9.22		
Maine <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.85			\$ 9.90		
New Hampshire <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.27			\$ 11.36		
West Virginia <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.35			\$ 7.93		
Rhode Island <sup>1</sup>	\$ 9.17			\$ 11.82		
Alaska <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.00			\$ 13.38		
Vermont <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.00			\$ 10.24		
Hawaii <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.75			\$ 10.95		
<b>AGGREGATE<sup>2</sup>:</b>	<b>\$ 8.53</b>	<b>\$ 12.13</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>\$ 9.85</b>	<b>\$ 15.48</b>	<b>57%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Lakin, C.; Braddock, D., Trends and Milestones – The 40th Anniversary of Deinstitutionalization in the United States: Decreasing State Institution Populations, (1967-2007) cites “Between 1967 and 2007 nine states reduced their state institution populations to zero (AK, DC, HI, ME, NH, NM, RI, VT and WV)”.

<sup>2</sup> The Aggregate is comprised of the average DSP private provider wages (entry and average) for all states. The states without state service providers were not included in the aggregate data for state entry wage and wage percentage difference.

■ **TABLE 4: 2008 Percentage Difference of State vs Private Provider Entry Wages**

	DSP Private Entry Wage	DSP State Entry Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Entry	DSP Private Average Wage	DSP State Average Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Average
Louisiana	\$ 8.52	\$ 8.75	3%	\$ 9.25	\$ 12.86	39%
Delaware	\$ 9.33	\$ 10.00	7%	\$ 10.55	\$ 11.25	7%
Florida	\$ 7.62	\$ 8.45	11%	\$ 9.14	\$ 14.82	62%
Virginia	\$ 10.32	\$ 11.50	11%	\$ 11.11	\$ 15.03	35%
Maryland	\$ 8.81	\$ 10.16	15%	\$ 10.18	\$ 13.75	35%
Montana	\$ 8.00	\$ 9.38	17%	\$ 8.98	\$ 12.59	40%
Pennsylvania	\$ 8.49	\$ 10.05	18%	\$ 10.43	\$ 12.01	15%
Georgia	\$ 7.06	\$ 8.50	20%	\$ 10.79	\$ 11.00	2%
South Dakota	\$ 8.97	\$ 10.81	21%	\$ 9.81	\$ 13.81	41%
Idaho	\$ 8.00	\$ 10.00	25%	\$ 8.91	\$ 14.00	57%
Kentucky	\$ 7.44	\$ 9.42	27%	\$ 8.75	\$ 12.48	43%
Massachusetts	\$ 10.50	\$ 13.40	28%	\$ 12.18	\$ 15.17	25%
Wyoming	\$ 9.15	\$ 11.71	28%	\$ 11.58	\$ 15.18	31%
Alabama	\$ 8.54	\$ 10.93	28%	\$ 8.71	\$ 14.01	61%
Utah	\$ 8.14	\$ 10.70	31%	\$ 8.96	\$ 14.66	64%
North Dakota	\$ 8.07	\$ 10.84	34%	\$ 9.86	\$ 14.45	47%
Oregon	\$ 9.31	\$ 12.53	35%	\$ 10.28	\$ 14.95	45%
Arizona	\$ 8.83	\$ 11.98	36%	\$ 9.69	\$ 13.25	37%
Arkansas	\$ 7.00	\$ 9.59	37%	\$ 8.33	\$ 12.46	50%
Wisconsin	\$ 9.11	\$ 12.59	38%	\$ 10.31	\$ 14.85	44%
New Jersey	\$ 9.99	\$ 13.81	38%	\$ 10.92	\$ 21.49	97%
Washington	\$ 9.85	\$ 13.83	40%	\$ 10.18	\$ 17.84	75%
Nebraska	\$ 7.74	\$ 11.12	44%	\$ 8.28	\$ 14.75	78%
Tennessee	\$ 7.67	\$ 11.19	46%	\$ 8.64	\$ 12.85	49%
Missouri	\$ 7.05	\$ 10.48	49%	\$ 8.00	\$ 11.30	41%
South Carolina	\$ 8.54	\$ 12.96	52%	\$ 8.84	\$ 23.98	171%
Kansas	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.35	54%	\$ 8.78	\$ 14.68	67%
New York	\$ 9.50	\$ 14.75	55%	\$ 11.07	\$ 16.15	46%
Oklahoma	\$ 7.71	\$ 12.10	57%	\$ 8.29	\$ 16.13	95%
North Carolina	\$ 7.00	\$ 11.00	57%	\$ 10.09	\$ 13.06	29%
Texas	\$ 7.51	\$ 12.00	60%	\$ 8.08	\$ 15.25	89%
Minnesota	\$ 9.20	\$ 15.22	65%	\$ 10.94	\$ 20.59	88%
Illinois	\$ 8.19	\$ 13.95	70%	\$ 9.04	\$ 15.00	66%
Iowa	\$ 8.74	\$ 14.97	71%	\$ 9.99	\$ 18.43	84%
Colorado	\$ 8.82	\$ 15.35	74%	\$ 10.30	\$ 22.20	116%
Mississippi	\$ 7.00	\$ 12.36	77%	\$ 8.02	\$ 15.21	90%
Nevada	\$ 8.16	\$ 14.53	78%	\$ 9.52	\$ 17.71	86%
Ohio	\$ 8.23	\$ 14.85	80%	\$ 9.59	\$ 16.35	70%
Connecticut	\$ 10.37	\$ 18.96	83%	\$ 13.64	\$ 22.93	68%
California	\$ 8.35	\$ 15.65	87%	\$ 9.48	\$ 20.50	116%
Michigan	\$ 7.67	\$ 14.45	88%	\$ 9.24	\$ 15.90	72%
New Hampshire <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.27			\$ 11.36		
Alaska <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.00			\$ 13.38		
West Virginia <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.35			\$ 7.93		
Indiana <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.65			\$ 9.22		
New Mexico <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.02			\$ 8.83		
Rhode Island <sup>1</sup>	\$ 9.17			\$ 11.82		
Vermont <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.00			\$ 10.24		
Maine <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.85			\$ 9.90		
Hawaii <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.75			\$ 10.95		
<b>AGGREGATE<sup>2</sup>:</b>	<b>\$ 8.53</b>	<b>\$ 12.13</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>\$ 9.85</b>	<b>\$ 15.48</b>	<b>57%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Lakin, C.; Braddock, D., Trends and Milestones – The 40th Anniversary of Deinstitutionalization in the United States: Decreasing State Institution Populations, (1967-2007) cites “Between 1967 and 2007 nine states reduced their state institution populations to zero (AK, DC, HI, ME, NH, NM, RI, VT and WV)”.

<sup>2</sup> The Aggregate is comprised of the average DSP private provider wages (entry and average) for all states. The states without state service providers were not included in the aggregate data for state entry wage and wage percentage difference.

**TABLE 5: 2008 Private Provider Average Wage Analysis**

	DSP Private Entry Wage	DSP State Entry Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Entry	DSP Private Average Wage	DSP State Average Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Average
West Virginia <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.35			\$ 7.93		
Missouri	\$ 7.05	\$ 10.48	49%	\$ 8.00	\$ 11.30	41%
Mississippi	\$ 7.00	\$ 12.36	77%	\$ 8.02	\$ 15.21	90%
Texas	\$ 7.51	\$ 12.00	60%	\$ 8.08	\$ 15.25	89%
Nebraska	\$ 7.74	\$ 11.12	44%	\$ 8.28	\$ 14.75	78%
Oklahoma	\$ 7.71	\$ 12.10	57%	\$ 8.29	\$ 16.13	95%
Arkansas	\$ 7.00	\$ 9.59	37%	\$ 8.33	\$ 12.46	50%
Tennessee	\$ 7.67	\$ 11.19	46%	\$ 8.64	\$ 12.85	49%
Alabama	\$ 8.54	\$ 10.93	28%	\$ 8.71	\$ 14.01	61%
Kentucky	\$ 7.44	\$ 9.42	27%	\$ 8.75	\$ 12.48	43%
Kansas	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.35	54%	\$ 8.78	\$ 14.68	67%
New Mexico <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.02			\$ 8.83		
South Carolina	\$ 8.54	\$ 12.96	52%	\$ 8.84	\$ 23.98	171%
Idaho	\$ 8.00	\$ 10.00	25%	\$ 8.91	\$ 14.00	57%
Utah	\$ 8.14	\$ 10.70	31%	\$ 8.96	\$ 14.66	64%
Montana	\$ 8.00	\$ 9.38	17%	\$ 8.98	\$ 12.59	40%
Illinois	\$ 8.19	\$ 13.95	70%	\$ 9.04	\$ 15.00	66%
Florida	\$ 7.62	\$ 8.45	11%	\$ 9.14	\$ 14.82	62%
Indiana <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.65			\$ 9.22		
Michigan	\$ 7.67	\$ 14.45	88%	\$ 9.24	\$ 15.90	72%
Louisiana	\$ 8.52	\$ 8.75	3%	\$ 9.25	\$ 12.86	39%
California	\$ 8.35	\$ 15.65	87%	\$ 9.48	\$ 20.50	116%
Nevada	\$ 8.16	\$ 14.53	78%	\$ 9.52	\$ 17.71	86%
Ohio	\$ 8.23	\$ 14.85	80%	\$ 9.59	\$ 16.35	70%
Arizona	\$ 8.83	\$ 11.98	36%	\$ 9.69	\$ 13.25	37%
South Dakota	\$ 8.97	\$ 10.81	21%	\$ 9.81	\$ 13.81	41%
North Dakota	\$ 8.07	\$ 10.84	34%	\$ 9.86	\$ 14.45	47%
Maine <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.85			\$ 9.90		
Iowa	\$ 8.74	\$ 14.97	71%	\$ 9.99	\$ 18.43	84%
North Carolina	\$ 7.00	\$ 11.00	57%	\$ 10.09	\$ 13.06	29%
Maryland	\$ 8.81	\$ 10.16	15%	\$ 10.18	\$ 13.75	35%
Washington	\$ 9.85	\$ 13.83	40%	\$ 10.18	\$ 17.84	75%
Vermont <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.00			\$ 10.24		
Oregon	\$ 9.31	\$ 12.53	35%	\$ 10.28	\$ 14.95	45%
Colorado	\$ 8.82	\$ 15.35	74%	\$ 10.30	\$ 22.20	116%
Wisconsin	\$ 9.11	\$ 12.59	38%	\$ 10.31	\$ 14.85	44%
Pennsylvania	\$ 8.49	\$ 10.05	18%	\$ 10.43	\$ 12.01	15%
Delaware	\$ 9.33	\$ 10.00	7%	\$ 10.55	\$ 11.25	7%
Georgia	\$ 7.06	\$ 8.50	20%	\$ 10.79	\$ 11.00	2%
New Jersey	\$ 9.99	\$ 13.81	38%	\$ 10.92	\$ 21.49	97%
Minnesota	\$ 9.20	\$ 15.22	65%	\$ 10.94	\$ 20.59	88%
Hawaii <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.75			\$ 10.95		
New York	\$ 9.50	\$ 14.75	55%	\$ 11.07	\$ 16.15	46%
Virginia	\$ 10.32	\$ 11.50	11%	\$ 11.11	\$ 15.03	35%
New Hampshire <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.27			\$ 11.36		
Wyoming	\$ 9.15	\$ 11.71	28%	\$ 11.58	\$ 15.18	31%
Rhode Island <sup>1</sup>	\$ 9.17			\$ 11.82		
Massachusetts	\$ 10.50	\$ 13.40	28%	\$ 12.18	\$ 15.17	25%
Alaska <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.00			\$ 13.38		
Connecticut	\$ 10.37	\$ 18.96	83%	\$ 13.64	\$ 22.93	68%
<b>AGGREGATE<sup>2</sup>:</b>	<b>\$ 8.53</b>	<b>\$ 12.13</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>\$ 9.85</b>	<b>\$ 15.48</b>	<b>57%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Lakin, C.; Braddock, D., Trends and Milestones – The 40th Anniversary of Deinstitutionalization in the United States: Decreasing State Institution Populations, (1967-2007) cites “Between 1967 and 2007 nine states reduced their state institution populations to zero (AK, DC, HI, ME, NH, NM, RI, VT and WV)”.

<sup>2</sup> The Aggregate is comprised of the average DSP private provider wages (entry and average) for all states. The states without state service providers were not included in the aggregate data for state entry wage and wage percentage difference.

**TABLE 6: 2008 State Provider Average Wage Analysis**

	DSP Private Entry Wage	DSP State Entry Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Entry	DSP Private Average Wage	DSP State Average Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Average
Georgia	\$ 7.06	\$ 8.50	20%	\$ 10.79	\$ 11.00	2%
Delaware	\$ 9.33	\$ 10.00	7%	\$ 10.55	\$ 11.25	7%
Missouri	\$ 7.05	\$ 10.48	49%	\$ 8.00	\$ 11.30	41%
Pennsylvania	\$ 8.49	\$ 10.05	18%	\$ 10.43	\$ 12.01	15%
Arkansas	\$ 7.00	\$ 9.59	37%	\$ 8.33	\$ 12.46	50%
Kentucky	\$ 7.44	\$ 9.42	27%	\$ 8.75	\$ 12.48	43%
Montana	\$ 8.00	\$ 9.38	17%	\$ 8.98	\$ 12.59	40%
Tennessee	\$ 7.67	\$ 11.19	46%	\$ 8.64	\$ 12.85	49%
Louisiana	\$ 8.52	\$ 8.75	3%	\$ 9.25	\$ 12.86	39%
North Carolina	\$ 7.00	\$ 11.00	57%	\$ 10.09	\$ 13.06	29%
Arizona	\$ 8.83	\$ 11.98	36%	\$ 9.69	\$ 13.25	37%
Maryland	\$ 8.81	\$ 10.16	15%	\$ 10.18	\$ 13.75	35%
South Dakota	\$ 8.97	\$ 10.81	21%	\$ 9.81	\$ 13.81	41%
Idaho	\$ 8.00	\$ 10.00	25%	\$ 8.91	\$ 14.00	57%
Alabama	\$ 8.54	\$ 10.93	28%	\$ 8.71	\$ 14.01	61%
North Dakota	\$ 8.07	\$ 10.84	34%	\$ 9.86	\$ 14.45	47%
Utah	\$ 8.14	\$ 10.70	31%	\$ 8.96	\$ 14.66	64%
Kansas	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.35	54%	\$ 8.78	\$ 14.68	67%
Nebraska	\$ 7.74	\$ 11.12	44%	\$ 8.28	\$ 14.75	78%
Florida	\$ 7.62	\$ 8.45	11%	\$ 9.14	\$ 14.82	62%
Wisconsin	\$ 9.11	\$ 12.59	38%	\$ 10.31	\$ 14.85	44%
Oregon	\$ 9.31	\$ 12.53	35%	\$ 10.28	\$ 14.95	45%
Illinois	\$ 8.19	\$ 13.95	70%	\$ 9.04	\$ 15.00	66%
Virginia	\$ 10.32	\$ 11.50	11%	\$ 11.11	\$ 15.03	35%
Massachusetts	\$ 10.50	\$ 13.40	28%	\$ 12.18	\$ 15.17	25%
Wyoming	\$ 9.15	\$ 11.71	28%	\$ 11.58	\$ 15.18	31%
Mississippi	\$ 7.00	\$ 12.36	77%	\$ 8.02	\$ 15.21	90%
Texas	\$ 7.51	\$ 12.00	60%	\$ 8.08	\$ 15.25	89%
Michigan	\$ 7.67	\$ 14.45	88%	\$ 9.24	\$ 15.90	72%
Oklahoma	\$ 7.71	\$ 12.10	57%	\$ 8.29	\$ 16.13	95%
New York	\$ 9.50	\$ 14.75	55%	\$ 11.07	\$ 16.15	46%
Ohio	\$ 8.23	\$ 14.85	80%	\$ 9.59	\$ 16.35	70%
Nevada	\$ 8.16	\$ 14.53	78%	\$ 9.52	\$ 17.71	86%
Washington	\$ 9.85	\$ 13.83	40%	\$ 10.18	\$ 17.84	75%
Iowa	\$ 8.74	\$ 14.97	71%	\$ 9.99	\$ 18.43	84%
California	\$ 8.35	\$ 15.65	87%	\$ 9.48	\$ 20.50	116%
Minnesota	\$ 9.20	\$ 15.22	65%	\$ 10.94	\$ 20.59	88%
New Jersey	\$ 9.99	\$ 13.81	38%	\$ 10.92	\$ 21.49	97%
Colorado	\$ 8.82	\$ 15.35	74%	\$ 10.30	\$ 22.20	116%
Connecticut	\$ 10.37	\$ 18.96	83%	\$ 13.64	\$ 22.93	68%
South Carolina	\$ 8.54	\$ 12.96	52%	\$ 8.84	\$ 23.98	171%
Indiana <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.65			\$ 9.22		
New Mexico <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.02			\$ 8.83		
New Hampshire <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.27			\$ 11.36		
Maine <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.85			\$ 9.90		
West Virginia <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.35			\$ 7.93		
Rhode Island <sup>1</sup>	\$ 9.17			\$ 11.82		
Hawaii <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.75			\$ 10.95		
Vermont <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.00			\$ 10.24		
Alaska <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.00			\$ 13.38		
<b>AGGREGATE<sup>2</sup>:</b>	<b>\$ 8.53</b>	<b>\$ 12.13</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>\$ 9.85</b>	<b>\$ 15.48</b>	<b>57%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Lakin, C.; Braddock, D., Trends and Milestones – The 40th Anniversary of Deinstitutionalization in the United States: Decreasing State Institution Populations, (1967-2007) cites “Between 1967 and 2007 nine states reduced their state institution populations to zero (AK, DC, HI, ME, NH, NM, RI, VT and WV)”.

<sup>2</sup> The Aggregate is comprised of the average DSP private provider wages (entry and average) for all states. The states without state service providers were not included in the aggregate data for state entry wage and wage percentage difference.

**TABLE 7: 2008 Percentage Difference of State vs Private Provider Average Wages**

	DSP Private Entry Wage	DSP State Entry Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Entry	DSP Private Average Wage	DSP State Average Wage	Wage % Difference State vs Private Average
Alabama	\$ 8.54	\$ 10.93	28%	\$ 8.71	\$ 14.01	61%
Alaska <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.00			\$ 13.38		
Arizona	\$ 8.83	\$ 11.98	36%	\$ 9.69	\$ 13.25	37%
Arkansas	\$ 7.00	\$ 9.59	37%	\$ 8.33	\$ 12.46	50%
California	\$ 8.35	\$ 15.65	87%	\$ 9.48	\$ 20.50	116%
Colorado	\$ 8.82	\$ 15.35	74%	\$ 10.30	\$ 22.20	116%
Connecticut	\$ 10.37	\$ 18.96	83%	\$ 13.64	\$ 22.93	68%
Delaware	\$ 9.33	\$ 10.00	7%	\$ 10.55	\$ 11.25	7%
Florida	\$ 7.62	\$ 8.45	11%	\$ 9.14	\$ 14.82	62%
Georgia	\$ 7.06	\$ 8.50	20%	\$ 10.79	\$ 11.00	2%
Hawaii <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.75			\$ 10.95		
Idaho	\$ 8.00	\$ 10.00	25%	\$ 8.91	\$ 14.00	57%
Illinois	\$ 8.19	\$ 13.95	70%	\$ 9.04	\$ 15.00	66%
Indiana <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.65			\$ 9.22		
Iowa	\$ 8.74	\$ 14.97	71%	\$ 9.99	\$ 18.43	84%
Kansas	\$ 8.00	\$ 12.35	54%	\$ 8.78	\$ 14.68	67%
Kentucky	\$ 7.44	\$ 9.42	27%	\$ 8.75	\$ 12.48	43%
Louisiana	\$ 8.52	\$ 8.75	3%	\$ 9.25	\$ 12.86	39%
Maine <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.85			\$ 9.90		
Maryland	\$ 8.81	\$ 10.16	15%	\$ 10.18	\$ 13.75	35%
Massachusetts	\$ 10.50	\$ 13.40	28%	\$ 12.18	\$ 15.17	25%
Michigan	\$ 7.67	\$ 14.45	88%	\$ 9.24	\$ 15.90	72%
Minnesota	\$ 9.20	\$ 15.22	65%	\$ 10.94	\$ 20.59	88%
Mississippi	\$ 7.00	\$ 12.36	77%	\$ 8.02	\$ 15.21	90%
Missouri	\$ 7.05	\$ 10.48	49%	\$ 8.00	\$ 11.30	41%
Montana	\$ 8.00	\$ 9.38	17%	\$ 8.98	\$ 12.59	40%
Nebraska	\$ 7.74	\$ 11.12	44%	\$ 8.28	\$ 14.75	78%
Nevada	\$ 8.16	\$ 14.53	78%	\$ 9.52	\$ 17.71	86%
New Hampshire <sup>1</sup>	\$ 11.27			\$ 11.36		
New Jersey	\$ 9.99	\$ 13.81	38%	\$ 10.92	\$ 21.49	97%
New Mexico <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.02			\$ 8.83		
New York	\$ 9.50	\$ 14.75	55%	\$ 11.07	\$ 16.15	46%
North Carolina	\$ 7.00	\$ 11.00	57%	\$ 10.09	\$ 13.06	29%
North Dakota	\$ 8.07	\$ 10.84	34%	\$ 9.86	\$ 14.45	47%
Ohio	\$ 8.23	\$ 14.85	80%	\$ 9.59	\$ 16.35	70%
Oklahoma	\$ 7.71	\$ 12.10	57%	\$ 8.29	\$ 16.13	95%
Oregon	\$ 9.31	\$ 12.53	35%	\$ 10.28	\$ 14.95	45%
Pennsylvania	\$ 8.49	\$ 10.05	18%	\$ 10.43	\$ 12.01	15%
Rhode Island <sup>1</sup>	\$ 9.17			\$ 11.82		
South Carolina	\$ 8.54	\$ 12.96	52%	\$ 8.84	\$ 23.98	171%
South Dakota	\$ 8.97	\$ 10.81	21%	\$ 9.81	\$ 13.81	41%
Tennessee	\$ 7.67	\$ 11.19	46%	\$ 8.64	\$ 12.85	49%
Texas	\$ 7.51	\$ 12.00	60%	\$ 8.08	\$ 15.25	89%
Utah	\$ 8.14	\$ 10.70	31%	\$ 8.96	\$ 14.66	64%
Vermont <sup>1</sup>	\$ 8.00			\$ 10.24		
Virginia	\$ 10.32	\$ 11.50	11%	\$ 11.11	\$ 15.03	35%
Washington	\$ 9.85	\$ 13.83	40%	\$ 10.18	\$ 17.84	75%
West Virginia <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7.35			\$ 7.93		
Wisconsin	\$ 9.11	\$ 12.59	38%	\$ 10.31	\$ 14.85	44%
Wyoming	\$ 9.15	\$ 11.71	28%	\$ 11.58	\$ 15.18	31%
<b>AGGREGATE<sup>2</sup>:</b>	<b>\$ 8.53</b>	<b>\$ 12.13</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>\$ 9.85</b>	<b>\$ 15.48</b>	<b>57%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Lakin, C.; Braddock, D., Trends and Milestones – The 40th Anniversary of Deinstitutionalization in the United States: Decreasing State Institution Populations, (1967-2007) cites “Between 1967 and 2007 nine states reduced their state institution populations to zero (AK, DC, HI, ME, NH, NM, RI, VT and WV)”.

<sup>2</sup> The Aggregate is comprised of the average DSP private provider wages (entry and average) for all states. The states without state service providers were not included in the aggregate data for state entry wage and wage percentage difference.

**TABLE 8: Effective Minimum Wage Rates for Workers Covered by FLSA**

	May 25, 2007	July 24, 2007	Jan. 1, 2008	July 24, 2008	Jan. 1, 2009	July 24, 2009
<b>UNITED STATES</b>	<b>\$5.15</b>	<b>\$5.85</b>	<b>\$5.85</b>	<b>\$6.55</b>	<b>\$6.55</b>	<b>\$7.25</b>
Alabama	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Alaska	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.25
Arizona	\$6.75	\$6.75	\$6.90	\$6.90	\$7.05	\$7.25
Arkansas	\$6.25	\$6.25	\$6.25	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
California	\$7.50	\$7.50	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00
Colorado	\$6.85	\$6.85	\$6.98	\$6.98	\$7.14	\$7.25
Connecticut	\$7.65	\$7.65	\$7.65	\$7.65	\$7.65	\$7.65
Delaware	\$6.65	\$6.65	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.25
Florida	\$6.67	\$6.67	\$6.80	\$6.80	\$6.95	\$7.25
Georgia	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Hawaii	\$7.25	\$7.25	\$7.25	\$7.25	\$7.25	\$7.25
Idaho	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Illinois	\$6.50	\$7.50	\$7.50	\$7.75	\$7.75	\$8.00
Indiana	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Iowa	\$6.20	\$6.20	\$7.25	\$7.25	\$7.25	\$7.25
Kansas	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Kentucky	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Louisiana	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Maine	\$6.75	\$6.75	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.25
Maryland	\$6.15	\$6.15	\$6.15	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Massachusetts	\$7.50	\$7.50	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00
Michigan	\$6.95	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.40	\$7.40	\$7.40
Minnesota	\$6.15	\$6.15	\$6.15	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Mississippi	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Missouri	\$6.50	\$6.50	\$6.62	\$6.62	\$6.77	\$7.25
Montana	\$6.15	\$6.15	\$6.25	\$6.55	\$6.70	\$7.25
Nebraska	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Nevada	\$6.15	\$6.33	\$6.33	\$7.03	\$7.03	\$7.73
New Hampshire	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$6.50	\$6.55	\$7.25	\$7.25
New Jersey	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.25
New Mexico	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$6.50	\$6.50	\$7.50	\$7.50
New York	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.25
North Carolina	\$6.15	\$6.15	\$6.15	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
North Dakota	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Ohio	\$6.85	\$6.85	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.15	\$7.25
Oklahoma	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Oregon	\$7.80	\$7.80	\$7.95	\$7.95	\$8.15	\$8.15
Pennsylvania	\$6.25	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.15	\$7.25
Rhode Island	\$7.40	\$7.40	\$7.40	\$7.40	\$7.40	\$7.40
South Carolina	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
South Dakota	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Tennessee	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Texas	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Utah	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Vermont	\$7.53	\$7.53	\$7.67	\$7.67	\$7.85	\$7.85
Virginia	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Washington	\$7.93	\$7.93	\$8.08	\$8.08	\$8.27	\$8.27
West Virginia	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Wisconsin	\$6.50	\$6.50	\$6.50	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25
Wyoming	\$5.15	\$5.85	\$5.85	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$7.25

Source: U.S. Department of Labor. Inflation projections based on CBO estimates.

**TABLE 9: 2008 Private Provider Direct Support Professional Wage Comparison with Federal Poverty Level**

	DSP Private Entry Wage	Gross DSP Private Entry Wage Annualized (Benefits Not Included)	Federal Poverty Level for a Family of Three (Mother with Two Children)	Difference of DSP Entry Wage and Federal Poverty Level for a Family of Three	% Difference for Entry	DSP Private Average Wage	Gross DSP Private Average Wage Annualized (Benefits Not Included)	Federal Poverty Level for a Family of Three (Mother with Two Children)	Difference of DSP Average and Federal Poverty Level for a Family of Three	% Difference for Average
Alabama	\$ 8.54	\$ 17,763	\$ 17,600	\$ 163	0.93%	\$ 8.71	\$ 18,116	\$ 17,600	\$ 516	2.94%
Alaska	\$ 11.00	\$ 22,880	\$ 22,000	\$ 880	4.00%	\$ 13.38	\$ 27,830	\$ 22,000	\$ 5,830	26.50%
Arizona	\$ 8.83	\$ 18,366	\$ 17,600	\$ 766	4.35%	\$ 9.69	\$ 20,155	\$ 17,600	\$ 2,555	14.52%
Arkansas	\$ 7.00	\$ 14,560	\$ 17,600	\$ (3,040)	(17.27)%	\$ 8.33	\$ 17,326	\$ 17,600	\$ (273)	(1.55)%
California	\$ 8.35	\$ 17,368	\$ 17,600	\$ (232)	(1.32)%	\$ 9.48	\$ 19,718	\$ 17,600	\$ 2,118	12.04%
Colorado	\$ 8.82	\$ 18,345	\$ 17,600	\$ 745	4.24%	\$ 10.30	\$ 21,424	\$ 17,600	\$ 3,824	21.73%
Connecticut	\$ 10.37	\$ 21,569	\$ 17,600	\$ 3,969	22.55%	\$ 13.64	\$ 28,371	\$ 17,600	\$ 10,771	61.20%
Delaware	\$ 9.33	\$ 19,406	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,806	10.26%	\$ 10.55	\$ 21,944	\$ 17,600	\$ 4,344	24.68%
Florida	\$ 7.62	\$ 15,849	\$ 17,600	\$ (1,750)	(9.95)%	\$ 9.14	\$ 19,011	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,411	8.02%
Georgia	\$ 7.06	\$ 14,684	\$ 17,600	\$ (2,915)	(16.56)%	\$ 10.79	\$ 22,443	\$ 17,600	\$ 4,843	27.52%
Hawaii	\$ 8.75	\$ 18,200	\$ 20,240	\$ (2,040)	(10.08)%	\$ 10.95	\$ 22,776	\$ 20,240	\$ 2,536	12.53%
Idaho	\$ 8.00	\$ 16,640	\$ 17,600	\$ (960)	(5.45)%	\$ 8.91	\$ 18,532	\$ 17,600	\$ 932	5.30%
Illinois	\$ 8.19	\$ 17,035	\$ 17,600	\$ (564)	(3.21)%	\$ 9.04	\$ 18,803	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,203	6.84%
Indiana	\$ 7.65	\$ 15,912	\$ 17,600	\$ (1,688)	(9.59)%	\$ 9.22	\$ 19,177	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,577	8.96%
Iowa	\$ 8.74	\$ 18,179	\$ 17,600	\$ 579	3.29%	\$ 9.99	\$ 20,779	\$ 17,600	\$ 3,179	18.06%
Kansas	\$ 8.00	\$ 16,640	\$ 17,600	\$ (960)	(5.45)%	\$ 8.78	\$ 18,262	\$ 17,600	\$ 662	3.76%
Kentucky	\$ 7.44	\$ 15,475	\$ 17,600	\$ (2,124)	(12.07)%	\$ 8.75	\$ 18,200	\$ 17,600	\$ 600	3.41%
Louisiana	\$ 8.52	\$ 17,721	\$ 17,600	\$ 121	0.69%	\$ 9.25	\$ 19,240	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,640	9.32%
Maine	\$ 8.85	\$ 18,408	\$ 17,600	\$ 808	4.59%	\$ 9.90	\$ 20,592	\$ 17,600	\$ 2,992	17.00%
Maryland	\$ 8.81	\$ 18,324	\$ 17,600	\$ 724	4.12%	\$ 10.18	\$ 21,174	\$ 17,600	\$ 3,574	20.31%
Massachusetts	\$ 10.50	\$ 21,840	\$ 17,600	\$ 4,240	24.09%	\$ 12.18	\$ 25,334	\$ 17,600	\$ 7,734	43.95%
Michigan	\$ 7.67	\$ 15,953	\$ 17,600	\$ (1,646)	(9.35)%	\$ 9.24	\$ 19,219	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,619	9.20%
Minnesota	\$ 9.20	\$ 19,136	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,536	8.73%	\$ 10.94	\$ 22,755	\$ 17,600	\$ 5,155	29.29%
Mississippi	\$ 7.00	\$ 14,560	\$ 17,600	\$ (3,040)	(17.27)%	\$ 8.02	\$ 16,681	\$ 17,600	\$ (918)	(5.22)%
Missouri	\$ 7.05	\$ 14,664	\$ 17,600	\$ (2,936)	(16.68)%	\$ 8.00	\$ 16,640	\$ 17,600	\$ (960)	(5.45)%
Montana	\$ 8.00	\$ 16,640	\$ 17,600	\$ (960)	(5.45)%	\$ 8.98	\$ 18,678	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,078	6.13%
Nebraska	\$ 7.74	\$ 16,099	\$ 17,600	\$ (1,500)	(8.53)%	\$ 8.28	\$ 17,222	\$ 17,600	\$ (377)	(2.15)%
Nevada	\$ 8.16	\$ 16,972	\$ 17,600	\$ (627)	(3.56)%	\$ 9.52	\$ 19,801	\$ 17,600	\$ 2,201	12.51%
New Hampshire	\$ 11.27	\$ 23,441	\$ 17,600	\$ 5,841	33.19%	\$ 11.36	\$ 23,628	\$ 17,600	\$ 6,028	34.25%
New Jersey	\$ 9.99	\$ 20,779	\$ 17,600	\$ 3,179	18.06%	\$ 10.92	\$ 22,713	\$ 17,600	\$ 5,113	29.05%
New Mexico	\$ 8.02	\$ 16,681	\$ 17,600	\$ (918)	(5.22)%	\$ 8.83	\$ 18,366	\$ 17,600	\$ 766	4.35%
New York	\$ 9.50	\$ 19,760	\$ 17,600	\$ 2,160	12.27%	\$ 11.07	\$ 23,025	\$ 17,600	\$ 5,425	30.83%
North Carolina	\$ 7.00	\$ 14,560	\$ 17,600	\$ (3,040)	(17.27)%	\$ 10.09	\$ 20,987	\$ 17,600	\$ 3,387	19.25%
North Dakota	\$ 8.07	\$ 16,785	\$ 17,600	\$ (814)	(4.63)%	\$ 9.86	\$ 20,508	\$ 17,600	\$ 2,908	16.53%
Ohio	\$ 8.23	\$ 17,118	\$ 17,600	\$ (481)	(2.74)%	\$ 9.59	\$ 19,947	\$ 17,600	\$ 2,347	13.34%
Oklahoma	\$ 7.71	\$ 16,036	\$ 17,600	\$ (1,563)	(8.88)%	\$ 8.29	\$ 17,243	\$ 17,600	\$ (356)	(2.03)%
Oregon	\$ 9.31	\$ 19,364	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,764	10.03%	\$ 10.28	\$ 21,382	\$ 17,600	\$ 3,782	21.49%
Pennsylvania	\$ 8.49	\$ 17,659	\$ 17,600	\$ 59	0.34%	\$ 10.43	\$ 21,694	\$ 17,600	\$ 4,094	23.26%
Rhode Island	\$ 9.17	\$ 19,073	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,473	8.37%	\$ 11.82	\$ 24,585	\$ 17,600	\$ 6,985	39.69%
South Carolina	\$ 8.54	\$ 17,763	\$ 17,600	\$ 163	0.93%	\$ 8.84	\$ 18,387	\$ 17,600	\$ 787	4.47%
South Dakota	\$ 8.97	\$ 18,657	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,057	6.01%	\$ 9.81	\$ 20,404	\$ 17,600	\$ 2,804	15.94%
Tennessee	\$ 7.67	\$ 15,953	\$ 17,600	\$ (1,646)	(9.35)%	\$ 8.64	\$ 17,971	\$ 17,600	\$ 371	2.11%
Texas	\$ 7.51	\$ 15,620	\$ 17,600	\$ (1,979)	(11.25)%	\$ 8.08	\$ 16,806	\$ 17,600	\$ (793)	(4.51)%
Utah	\$ 8.14	\$ 16,931	\$ 17,600	\$ (668)	(3.80)%	\$ 8.96	\$ 18,636	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,036	5.89%
Vermont	\$ 8.00	\$ 16,640	\$ 17,600	\$ (960)	(5.45)%	\$ 10.24	\$ 21,299	\$ 17,600	\$ 3,699	21.02%
Virginia	\$ 10.32	\$ 21,465	\$ 17,600	\$ 3,865	21.96%	\$ 11.11	\$ 23,108	\$ 17,600	\$ 5,508	31.30%
Washington	\$ 9.85	\$ 20,488	\$ 17,600	\$ 2,888	16.41%	\$ 10.18	\$ 21,174	\$ 17,600	\$ 3,574	20.31%
West Virginia	\$ 7.35	\$ 15,288	\$ 17,600	\$ (2,312)	(13.14)%	\$ 7.93	\$ 16,494	\$ 17,600	\$ (1,105)	(6.28)%
Wisconsin	\$ 9.11	\$ 18,948	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,348	7.66%	\$ 10.31	\$ 21,444	\$ 17,600	\$ 3,844	21.85%
Wyoming	\$ 9.15	\$ 19,032	\$ 17,600	\$ 1,432	8.14%	\$ 11.58	\$ 24,086	\$ 17,600	\$ 6,486	36.85%
<b>AGGREGATE:</b>	<b>\$ 8.53</b>	<b>\$ 17,744</b>	<b>\$ 17,600</b>	<b>\$ 144</b>	<b>0.82%</b>	<b>\$ 9.85</b>	<b>\$ 20,482</b>	<b>\$ 17,600</b>	<b>\$ 2,882</b>	<b>16.38%</b>

Alaska and Hawaii's federal poverty level were not included in the aggregate of the Federal Poverty Level columns.



American Network of Community Options and Resources  
*Providers Offering Quality Supports to People with Disabilities*

The American Network of Community Options and Resources is a nonprofit trade association representing and advocating on behalf of the more than 800 private providers of services and supports for nearly 500,000 Americans with disabilities that employ over 400,000 direct support staff in 49 states and Washington, D.C.

ANCOR's efforts in the area of public policy, federal legislative and regulatory initiatives, judicial results, state-level initiatives and the culling of leading practices have uniquely positioned it as the national presence for private providers. Congress and federal agencies turn to ANCOR as the authority in our profession.



The Mosaic Collaborative for Disabilities Public Policy and Practice works with international and research partners on projects that will promote full inclusion of people with disabilities around the world.

The Mosaic Collaborative's purpose is to inspire a new movement towards quality of life for people with disabilities, their families and those who support them by researching pressing issues facing people with intellectual and developmental disabilities and providing solution-oriented recommendations for policymakers.



The Mosaic Collaborative for Disabilities Public Policy and Practice  
4980 S. 118th St.  
Omaha, NE 68137-2220  
<http://www.mosaicinfo.org/advocacy/collaborative/>