

MICHIGAN

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 Michigan'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

Michigan's inflation-adjusted education revenue grew from \$14,518 per student in 2002 to \$15,967 per student in 2020, a 10.0% growth rate that ranked 41st in the U.S. During this time, real spending on employee benefits grew by 54.4%—ranking 29th in the country—going from \$2,776 per student to \$4,286 per student. In 2020, Michigan had \$19,984,638,000 in total education debt, up \$2,546 per student in real terms since 2002.

TABLE 1: SPENDING TRENDS (2002-2020)

Category (Per Student)	2002	2020	Growth Rate	Growth Rank	2020 Rank
Revenue	\$14,518	\$15,967	10.0%	41	21
Support Services	\$4,877	\$5,056	3.7%	49	19
Instruction	\$7,015	\$7,535	7.4%	37	25
Benefits	\$2,776	\$4,286	54.4%	29	14
Capital	\$1,965	\$1,430	-27.2%	44	27
Total Debt	\$12,831	\$15,377	19.8%	32	6

FIGURE 1: REVENUE PER STUDENT BY FUNDING SOURCE (2002-2020)





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



ENROLLMENT AND STAFFING TRENDS

Between 2002 and 2020, Michigan’s student population declined by 13.6%. At the same time, the number of total public education staff decreased by 10.7%, with teachers decreasing by 14.2% and non-teachers decreasing by 7.7%. The average inflation-adjusted teacher salary in the state went from \$76,064 in 2002 to \$63,568 in 2020, a -16.4% growth rate that ranked 49th in the U.S.

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

Category	2002	2020	Growth Rate	Growth Rank	2020 Rank
Enrollment	1,730,669	1,495,925	-13.6%	48	10
Total Staff	214,894	191,891	-10.7%	47	11
Teachers	98,849	84,838	-14.2%	49	12
Non-Teachers	116,045	107,053	-7.7%	46	10
Average Teacher Salary	\$76,064	\$63,568	-16.4%	49	15

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





FIGURE 4: TEACHER SALARY GROWTH VS. REVENUE PER STUDENT GROWTH (2002-2020)




NAEP TRENDS

Between 2003 and 2019, Michigan's 4th grade NAEP reading scores decreased by one point (-0.2%), ranking 36th in the U.S., while its 4th grade math scores grew by zero points (+0.2%), ranking 45th. During this time, the state's 8th grade reading scores decreased by two points (-0.7%), ranking 30th in the U.S., while its 8th grade math scores grew by four points (+1.4%), ranking 25th.

TABLE 3: NAEP SCORES (2003-2019)

Subject	4th Grade			8th Grade		
	Score Growth	Growth Rank	2019 Rank	Score Growth	Growth Rank	2019 Rank
Reading	-1	36	32	-2	30	28
Math	0	45	42	4	25	28

FIGURE 5: NAEP SCORE GROWTH VS REVENUE PER STUDENT GROWTH¹



LOW-INCOME NAEP TRENDS

Between 2003 and 2019, Michigan's low-income 4th grade NAEP reading scores increased by five points (+2.6%), ranking 16th in the U.S., while its 4th grade math scores grew by four points (+1.9%), ranking 33rd. During this time, the state's 8th grade reading scores increased by three points (+1.3%), ranking 15th in the U.S., while its 8th grade math scores grew by eight points (+3.0%), ranking 16th.

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

Subject	4th Grade			8th Grade		
	Score Growth	Growth Rank	2019 Rank	Growth	Growth Rank	2019 Rank
Reading	5	16	32	3	15	21
Math	4	33	44	8	16	34

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).

FIGURE 6: NAEP SCORE GROWTH VS REVENUE PER STUDENT GROWTH (LOW-INCOME STUDENTS)¹

