

Michigan High Schools

DROPOUTS AND POORLY PREPARED STUDENTS NEGATIVELY AFFECT THE ECONOMY

- Over 32,400 students did not graduate from Michigan's high schools in 2010; the lost lifetime earnings in Michigan for that class of dropouts alone total over **\$8.4 billion**.¹
- Michigan could save as much as **\$750 million** in health care costs over the lifetimes of each class of dropouts had they earned their diplomas.²
- If Michigan's high schools graduated all of their students ready for college, the state could save as much as **\$126 million** a year in community college remediation costs and lost earnings.³
- Michigan's economy could see a combination of crime-related savings and additional revenue of about **\$280 million** each year if the male high school graduation rate increased by just 5 percent.⁴

HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE COMPLETION RATES NEED IMPROVEMENT

Michigan High School Graduation Rates (Class of 2007)

	State-Reported ⁵	U.S. Department of Education-Reported ⁶	Independently Reported ⁷
	75%	77%	78%

Michigan High School Graduation Rates by Race (Class of 2007)⁷

	Michigan	Nation
All Students	78%	69%
White	81%	76%
Black	+	51%
Hispanic	49%	55%
Asian	82%	79%
American Indian	48%	50%

Percentage of ACT-Tested Graduates Ready for College-Level Course Work in 2009⁸

	Michigan	Nation
English	56%	66%
Math	33%	43%
Reading	40%	52%
Science	25%	29%
All Four Subjects	19%	24%

Michigan College Graduation Rates⁹

	Four-Year Institution*	National Average*	Two-Year Institution**	National Average**
All Students	54%	56%	16%	31%
White	58%	59%	18%	32%
Black	28%	39%	10%	26%
Hispanic	50%	46%	12%	29%
Asian	68%	66%	15%	33%
American Indian	46%	38%	11%	27%

+Insufficient or no data reported

*Graduation within six years of entrance (Cohort from 2002–2008)

**Graduation within three years of entrance (Cohort from 2005–2008)

BUILDING AND USING COMPREHENSIVE STATE DATA SYSTEMS ARE CRITICAL TO DRIVING IMPROVEMENT


- Michigan has in place **8 of the 10 elements** recommended by the Data Quality Campaign (DQC) as the start of a robust P–12 longitudinal data system. To date, only 12 states have all 10 elements in place.¹⁰
- Michigan also has in place **1 of the 10 fundamental steps** recommended by the DQC in order to change the culture around how data is used to inform decisions on improving system and student performance. To date, no states have taken all of the fundamental steps.¹⁰

Visit <http://dataqualitycampaign.org/survey/states> for more information about which elements and actions Michigan has in place.



LITERACY IS AN UNDERLYING PROBLEM FOR MANY


National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Reading Scores for Michigan Eighth Graders in School Year (SY) 2008–09¹¹



Insufficient or no data was reported for other subgroups.

MOST STATE TESTS OVERESTIMATE STUDENT PROFICIENCY

Michigan Eighth-Grade Proficiency as Measured by Michigan State Tests and NAEP for SY 2008–09¹²



Nationwide, the average gaps between state- and NAEP-reported **reading** and **math** scores are **41 percentage points** and **32 percentage points**, respectively.

OVER THREE QUARTERS OF STATES HAVE ADOPTED COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS

Michigan is one of 48 states that participated in the development of common core state standards in English language arts and math. **It adopted the standards in June 2010.**

NEARLY HALF OF THE NATION'S DROPOUTS ARE CONCENTRATED IN LESS THAN 2,000 HIGH SCHOOLS

These high schools have an extremely low promoting power of 60 percent or less, meaning that only 60 percent or fewer of freshman progress to senior year on time. Promoting power is a good estimate of the school's graduation rate. Generally, these schools have high proportions of minority and/or low-income students.

	Number of Federally Reported High Schools ¹³ (SY 2007–08)	Number of High Schools with Low-Promoting-Power ¹⁴ (three-year average from 2006 to 2008)
Michigan	612	82
Nation	15,675	1,883

An additional **76 high schools** in Michigan have a promoting power between 60 and 70 percent.¹⁵

Over **one third** of the nation's low-promoting-power high schools were identified as making Adequate Yearly Progress during SY 2006–07.¹⁶

1. Previously unpublished update to Alliance for Excellent Education (Alliance), "The High Cost of High School Dropouts"; 2. Alliance, "Healthier and Wealthier," 2006; 3. Alliance, "Paying Double," 2006; 4. Alliance, "Saving Futures, Saving Dollars," 2006; 5. (For Federal Accountability Reporting) Michigan Department of Education, 2008; 6. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), "Public School Graduates and Dropouts From the Common Core of Data: School Year 2006–07 First Look", 2009; 7. Editorial Projects in Education Research Center, *Diplomas Count: 2010*; 8. ACT, "College Readiness by State 2010"; 9. Analysis of data from NCES Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, 2010; 10. Data Quality Campaign, 2009–10 Survey Results; 11. NCES, *Nation's Report Card: Reading 2009*, 2010; 12. NCES, *Nation's Report Card: Reading 2009*; NCES, *Nation's Report Card: Math 2009*, 2009; U.S. Department of Education, "EDFacts State Profiles," 2010; 13. NCES, "Numbers and Types of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools: School Year 2007–08," 2009; 14. Unpublished data from Everyone Graduates Center at Johns Hopkins University, 2010; 15. Analysis of data from Everyone Graduates Center and the NCES Common Core of Data; 16. Analysis of data from Everyone Graduates Center and the Council of Chief State School Officers' School Data Direct