## MARYLAND

Faced with an unprecedented set of challenges in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, public education is at a crossroads. To be sure, much has changed since 2020 when the COVID-19 pandemic swept the nation, but pre-pandemic trends provide policymakers with a critical anchor for navigating post-pandemic decisions. This section provides a snapshot of Maryland's K-12 public education resources and outcomes so that policymakers are better equipped to make critical choices that will shape generations to come. Looking forward, they should use this information to ask important questions like what their goals are for students and whether resources are being deployed toward those aims.

## SPENDING TRENDS

Maryland's inflation-adjusted education revenue grew from $\$ 14,135$ per student in 2002 to $\$ 18,581$ per student in 2020 , a $31.4 \%$ growth rate that ranked $13^{\text {th }}$ highest in the U.S. During this time, real spending on employee benefits grew by $71.2 \%$-ranking $23^{\text {rd }}$ in the country - going from $\$ 2,357$ per student to $\$ 4,035$ per student. In 2020, Maryland had $\$ 5,585,613,000$ in total education debt, up \$2,936 per student in real terms since 2002.

TABLE 1: SPENDING TRENDS (2002-2020)

| Category (Per Student) | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | Growth Rate | Growth Rank | 2020 Rank |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Revenue | $\$ 14,135$ | $\$ 18,581$ | $31.4 \%$ | 13 | 14 |
| Support Services | $\$ 4,143$ | $\$ 5,296$ | $27.8 \%$ | 26 | 16 |
| Instruction | $\$ 7,522$ | $\$ 9,783$ | $30.1 \%$ | 11 | 13 |
| Benefits | $\$ 2,357$ | $\$ 4,035$ | $71.2 \%$ | 23 | 16 |
| Capital | $\$ 1,579$ | $\$ 1,933$ | $22.4 \%$ | 20 | 13 |
| Total Debt | $\$ 3,209$ | $\$ 6,145$ | $91.5 \%$ | 11 | 35 |



FIGURE 2: K-12 TOTAL SALARY \& BENEFITS (2002-2020)


## ENROLLMENT AND STAFFING TRENDS

Between 2002 and 2020, Maryland's student population grew by $5.7 \%$. At the same time, the number of total public education staff grew by $22.0 \%$, with teachers increasing by $14.3 \%$ and non-teachers increasing by $31.1 \%$. The average inflation-adjusted teacher salary in the state went from $\$ 69,674$ in 2002 to $\$ 73,444$ in 2020, a $5.4 \%$ growth rate that ranked $12^{\text {th }}$ in the U.S.

TABLE 2: ENROLLMENT AND STAFFING TRENDS (2002-2020)

| Category | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | Growth Rate | Growth Rank | 2020 Rank |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enrollment | 860,640 | 909,404 | $5.7 \%$ | 25 | 20 |
| Total Staff | 99,282 | 121,158 | $22.0 \%$ | 11 | 18 |
| Teachers | 53,774 | 61,485 | $14.3 \%$ | 14 | 18 |
| Non-Teachers | 45,508 | 59,673 | $31.1 \%$ | 13 | 18 |
| Average Teacher Salary | $\$ 69,674$ | $\$ 73,444$ | $5.4 \%$ | 12 | 8 |

FIGURE 3: ENROLLMENT AND STAFFING TRENDS (2002-2020)
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NAEP TRENDS

Between 2003 and 2019, Maryland's $4^{\text {th }}$ grade NAEP reading scores increased by one point ( $+0.5 \%$ ), ranking $28^{\text {th }}$ in the U.S., while its $4^{\text {th }}$ grade math scores grew by five points (+2.4\%), ranking $25^{\text {th }}$. During this time, the state's $8^{\text {th }}$ grade reading scores increased by three points ( $+1.1 \%$ ), ranking $10^{\text {th }}$ in the U.S., while its $8^{\text {th }}$ grade math scores grew by two points (+0.9\%), ranking $31^{\text {st }}$.

## TABLE 3: NAEP SCORES (2003-2019)

|  | 4th Grade |  |  | 8th Grade |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Subject | Score Growth | Growth Rank | 2019 Rank | Score Growth | Growth Rank | 2019 Rank |
| Reading | 1 | 28 | 25 | 3 | 10 | 17 |
| Math | 5 | 25 | 33 | 2 | 31 | 29 |

FIGURE 5: NAEP SCORE GROWTH VS REVENUE PER STUDENT GROWTH ${ }^{1}$


## LOW-INCOME NAEP TRENDS

Between 2003 and 2019, Maryland's low-income $4^{\text {th }}$ grade NAEP reading scores increased by six points (+3.0\%), ranking $14^{\text {th }}$ in the U.S., while its $4^{\text {th }}$ grade math scores grew by eight points (+3.9\%), ranking $15^{\text {th }}$. During this time, the state's $8^{\text {th }}$ grade reading scores increased by five points ( $+2.2 \%$ ), ranking $9^{\text {th }}$ in the U.S., while its $8^{\text {th }}$ grade math scores grew by five points (+1.8\%), ranking $25^{\text {th }}$.

TABLE 4: LOW-INCOME NAEP SCORES (2003-2019)

|  | 4th Grade |  |  | 8th Grade |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Subject | Score Growth | Growth Rank | 2019 Rank | Growth | Growth Rank | 2019 Rank |
| Reading | 6 | 14 | 39 | 5 | 9 | 40 |
| Math | 8 | 15 | 46 | 5 | 25 | 47 |

1 It should be noted that NAEP scores and revenue are inherently different in their potential for growth and shouldn't be expected to move in perfect unison (e.g. a $10 \%$ increase in funding shouldn't be expected to result in a $10 \%$ improvement in NAEP).
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