



ADEQUACY, EQUITY AND CAPITAL SPENDING IN MICHIGAN SCHOOLS

THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS
OF PROPOSAL A



The Education Policy Center
at Michigan State University

Chairman
W. Frank Fountain

Vice Chairman
Kent J. Vana

President
Earl M. Ryan

Treasurer
Jeffrey D. Bergeron

Board of Directors

Jeffrey D. Bergeron

Ernst & Young LLP

J. Edward Berry

General Motors Corporation

William M. Brodhead

Attorney At Law

Beth Chappell

Detroit Economic Club

Gary L. Collins

Collins Selections, Inc.

James G. Davidson

Pfizer Inc.

Terence M. Donnelly

Dickinson Wright PLLC

Randall W. Eberts

W. E. Upjohn Institute

David O. Egner

Hudson-Webber Foundation

Joshua D. Eichenhorn

Standard Federal Bank

W. Frank Fountain

DaimlerChrysler Corporation

Eugene A. Gargaro, Jr.

Masco Corporation

Ingrid A. Gregg

Earhart Foundation

Frank M. Hennessey

Hennessey Capital LLC

Marybeth S. Howe

National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois

Nick A. Khouri

DTE Energy

Daniel T. Lis

Kelly Services, Inc.

Michael H. Michalak

Comerica Incorporated

Irving Rose

Edward Rose & Sons

Amanda Van Dusen

Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone PLC

Kent J. Vana

Varnum, Riddering, Schmidt & Howlett LLP

Gail L. Warden

Henry Ford Health System

Jeffrey K. Willemain

Deloitte.

Louis Betanzos

Will Scott

Chairman
Daniel J. Kelly

Terence E. Adderley

Kelly Services, Inc.

Judith Bailey

Western Michigan University

Jeffrey D. Bergeron

Ernst & Young LLP

Rebecca M. Blank

University of Michigan

Beth Chappell

Detroit Economic Club

Mary Sue Coleman

University of Michigan

Keith E. Crain

Crain Communications Inc.

George H. Cress

United Bank & Trust - Washtenaw

Terry Daoud

Al Long Ford

Stephen R. D'Arcy

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

James N. De Boer, Jr.

Varnum, Riddering, Schmidt & Howlett LLP

Walter E. Douglas, Sr.

Avis Ford, Inc.

David O. Egner

Hudson-Webber Foundation

David L. Eisler

Ferris State University

Gerald D. Fitzgerald

Oakwood Healthcare Inc.

W. Frank Fountain

DaimlerChrysler Corporation

Mark Gaffney

Michigan State AFL-CIO

Ralph J. Gerson

Guardian Industries Corporation

Eric R. Gilbertson

Saginaw Valley State University

Roderick D. Gillum

General Motors Corporation

Alfred R. Glancy III

Unico Investment Company

David Handleman

Handleman Company

William R. Hartman

Citizens Banking Corporation

Frank M. Hennessey

Hennessey Capital LLC

Todd W. Herrick

Tecumseh Products Company

Joseph L. Hudson, Jr.

Hudson-Webber Foundation

Dorothy A. Johnson

Ahlburg Company

F. Martin Johnson

JSJ Corporation

Elliot Joseph

St. John Health System

Daniel J. Kelly

Deloitte.

David B. Kennedy

Earhart Foundation

Samuel Kirkpatrick

Patrick J. Ledwidge

Dickinson Wright PLLC

Edward C. Levy, Jr.

Edw. C. Levy Co.

Harry A. Lomason II

Alphonse S. Lucarelli

William L. Matthews

Plante & Moran PLLC

Kenneth Matzick

William Beaumont Hospital

Paul W. McCracken

University of Michigan

Glenn D. Mroz

Michigan Technological University

Mark A. Murray

Grand Valley State University

Donald R. Parfet

Apjohn Group LLC

Vice Chairman
Patrick J. Ledwidge

Michael Rao

Central Michigan University

Dean E. Richardson

Comerica Bank

Irving Rose

Edward Rose & Sons

Gary D. Russi

Oakland University

Roger Samuel

The Flint Journal

Nancy M. Schlichting

Henry Ford Health System

Lloyd A. Semple

Dykema Gossett PLLC

Mark Silverman

The Detroit News

Lou Anna K. Simon

Michigan State University

S. Martin Taylor

DTE Energy

Curtis J. Tompkins

Amanda Van Dusen

Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone PLC

Kent J. Vana

Varnum, Riddering, Schmidt & Howlett LLP

Brian C. Walker

Herman Miller, Inc.

Gail L. Warden

Henry Ford Health System

Richard E. Whitmer

Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Michigan

Jeffrey K. Willemain

Deloitte.

Larry D. Yost

Betty J. Youngblood

Lake Superior State University

◆

◆

ADEQUACY, EQUITY AND CAPITAL SPENDING IN MICHIGAN SCHOOLS

◆

THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF PROPOSAL A

◆

◆

DAVID ARSEN

Professor of Educational Administration
College of Education
Michigan State University

◆

TOM CLAY

Director of State Affairs
Citizens Research Council of Michigan

◆

THOMAS DAVIS

THOMAS DEVANEY

RACHEL FULCHER-DAWSON

Graduate Research Associates
The Education Policy Center
Michigan State University

◆

DAVID N. PLANK

Professor and Co-Director
The Education Policy Center
Michigan State University



Citizens Research Council
of Michigan



The Education Policy Center
at Michigan State University

◆

May 2005

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Despite a long tradition of local control, Michigan now has a state education system. Since the approval of Proposal A in 1994, decisions about how much to spend on educating students have been made in Lansing. One critical element of Michigan's public school system remains an exclusively local responsibility, however. The revenues for school construction and other capital spending come almost entirely from local property taxes, which must be approved by local voters.

The value of taxable property varies dramatically across school districts. In 29 of Michigan's wealthiest districts the per pupil value of taxable property is more than \$500,000. In 75 districts, in contrast, the per pupil value of taxable property is less than \$100,000. In six districts including Detroit the per pupil value of taxable property is less than \$50,000. The residents of school districts where the value of taxable property is low must pay very high rates of property tax to raise relatively small amounts of capital. Citizens in wealthier school districts can raise far more capital while paying significantly lower property tax rates. As a result, students in many poor school districts must cope with aging or inadequate educational facilities.

Capital spending is the unfinished business of Proposal A. Leaving responsibility for capital spending at the local level perpetuates wide variation in the quality of educational facilities provided for students in Michigan's public school system. Ensuring that all Michigan children are able to attend schools that meet minimum standards of adequacy and equity will require a larger state role in financing capital expenditure. This is especially true in the poorest school districts, which can no longer provide adequate school facilities for local children without state support.

CAPITAL STOCK

The current value of capital stock in Michigan's public school system is approximately \$32.6 billion. This number includes the value of all school buildings and related infrastructure, including athletic facilities. This amounts to approximately \$20,000 for every pupil enrolled in Michigan's public school system.

Capital assets are not evenly distributed across Michigan school districts, however. In Michigan's central city school districts the average value of capital assets per pupil is approximately \$15,000. In contrast, the value of capital assets per pupil in high-income suburbs is two-thirds higher, at approximately \$25,000. The value of capital assets per pupil in Michigan's other suburban and rural districts falls roughly midway between the state's central cities and high-income suburbs.

UNMET NEED

The value of unmet capital need in Michigan's public school system is approximately \$8.7 billion. This amounts to about \$5,000 for every pupil enrolled in Michigan's public schools, or approximately 25 percent of the current value of the capital stock in the system. The average need in the poorest districts is more than twice as large as the average need in the richest districts, but there is unmet need for capital spending in all categories of school districts, from the poorest to the richest.

The per pupil need for capital spending is greatest in Michigan's fifteen urban school districts. Approximately one-third of the total need for capital spending is found in these districts. Nearly 25 percent of the total need in Michigan is found in five low-income central city school districts: Battle Creek, Detroit, Flint, Muskegon, and Saginaw. Substantial unmet need is also found in middle-income suburbs and in low-income rural districts, but in both of these cases the number of districts involved is many times larger. In the case of the middle-income suburbs the number of students involved is substantially larger as well.

TAX EFFORT

The unmet need for capital spending would be even greater in Michigan's poorest school districts if the residents of these districts were not already taxing themselves at rates nearly three times as high as rates in Michigan's richest districts. The average millage rate in the poorest 20 percent of school districts is nearly three times higher than the average rate in the richest 20 percent of districts. Tax effort is especially high in central cities. Leaving the responsibility for financing unmet need at the local level would require citizens in Michigan's poorest school districts to pay property tax rates four times higher than those paid by citizens in Michigan's wealthiest districts in order to provide adequate facilities for local students.

FISCAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

There are several policy alternatives that the State might adopt to increase adequacy and equity in the way school construction is financed in Michigan. The range of policy options extends from minor modifications of current policies to a complete assumption by the State of responsibility for financing school facilities. A comprehensive state response to the problem of school facilities funding will almost certainly represent a blend of multiple approaches.

The main alternatives discussed in the report include:

- Modifying the School Bond Loan Fund

The SBLF now allows school districts to take advantage of the state's high bond rating to lower the cost of new bonds, and to extend the repayment period on bonds approved by local voters. The SBLF could be modified to further extend the repayment period, or enhanced to provide additional support by forgiving SBLF interest payments, subsidizing the revenue yield of locally-levied mills, or providing direct grants to local school districts for capital projects.

- Direct State Financing of Selected Projects

The State could issue bonds to raise the amounts necessary to finance the construction of adequate educational facilities in targeted school districts. Criteria for participation might include a combination of existing facility conditions, compliance with state standards for school construction, local tax effort, and the ability of a district to finance capital spending needs locally.

- Facility Financing Grants

The State could provide per pupil foundation grants to support capital spending, in addition to the foundation allowance provided for operations. Facility financing grants could be provided on either an equalizing or a non-equalizing basis, to both traditional school districts and public school academies.

- District Power Equalization

A power equalization program would subsidize the per pupil yield of each mill on the local property tax at a minimum guaranteed level. Under a power equalization program, districts with taxable value per pupil below the minimum guarantee would receive a state subsidy to make up the difference between the guaranteed yield and the district's

actual yield per mill of tax. The subsidy would be calculated as the millage rate times the difference between the taxable value per student guarantee and the actual taxable value per student times the number of pupils.

- State Assumption of All Facility Financing

The State could pay off the existing debt of local school districts and issue state bonds to finance future projects. Full state assumption of the responsibility for financing facilities would be the most direct and effective way to complete the unfinished business of Proposal A.

No matter which alternative is chosen, increasing the State's role in facilities financing will require additional resources. On the very conservative assumption that capital investments have a useful life of 30 years, financing bonds at 5 percent interest to satisfy all of Michigan's unmet capital need would cost the state's taxpayers approximately \$540 million per year. This would add less than 5 percent to the amount that taxpayers now spend annually to support the operation of Michigan's public school system. By rearranging existing debt and using statewide revenue sources, significant improvements in the equity and adequacy of Michigan's facilities financing policies can be accomplished with relatively small changes in the overall level of taxes.