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INTRODUCTION TO THE PROFILES

School funding is both enormously important and extremely complicated. Large amounts of finance data are collected every year by districts, states, and the federal government. These data are used by scholars and organizations to produce volumes of reports and papers, which vary widely in terms of empirical rigor, often leading to conflicting conclusions. This can be frustrating for policymakers, parents, advocates, and other stakeholders.

The primary purpose of the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID) is to cut through this clutter. It is a collection of finance and resource allocation measures that is based on sophisticated and widely accepted methods, but is also designed to be easy for non-researchers to understand and use. The data, as well as user-friendly documentation, online data visualizations, and other resources are freely available to the public at the SFID website: schoolfinancedata.org.

Despite the emphasis on accessibility, the fact remains that downloading and analyzing datasets, as well as compiling and contextualizing results from a variety of different measures, can be difficult and time-consuming. The 51 one-page state profiles that follow pull together a selection of key measures into one place, and provide a succinct summary of each state’s (and D.C.’s) public K-12 finance system.

It is important to note that the latest year of data presented in the state profiles is 2016-17, which means the data predate the coronavirus pandemic and accompanying economic recession by a few years. It will be some time before we are able to publish the SFID data for a time period that reflects the impact of this crisis. In the meantime, it is important for policymakers and the public to examine and understand their school finance systems, even as they were prior to the pandemic. The features and performance of each state’s system will undoubtedly determine the severity and duration of the current recession’s impact on its school budgets, as well as its ability to withstand future economic crises.

Characterizing complex state finance systems parsimoniously is a challenge. The State Indicators Database (SID), which is the primary product of the SFID, includes approximately 130 variables measuring revenue and spending at different levels (e.g., federal, state, local), resource allocation (e.g., staff ratios, teacher pay), and other topics. The indicators are statistically adjusted for factors, such as regional wage variation and poverty, to allow for better comparisons within and between states (many of the indicators are available over the past 25-30 years).

Any attempt to include all or even most of these measures in a single profile would likely overwhelm many users. It is also unnecessary. Instead, the profiles focus on three “core” measures from the state database, which together offer an effective overview of the fairness and sufficiency of each state’s finance system:
1. **Effort**: how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on public K-12 education;
2. **Adequacy**: whether states provide districts with resources sufficient to meet common outcome goals;
3. **Progressivity**: whether states allocate more resources to districts serving larger proportions of disadvantaged children.

In the profiles, we provide descriptions of each of these three measures, and we try to present the data clearly and in context. This includes, for example, comparisons of each state with the nation as a whole, and, where possible, trends over time.

On the back of each profile you can find more detailed information about the indicators and notes about how they are presented and might be interpreted. This back page also lists the names of SID variables used, should readers wish to download and analyze the data for themselves. It is our hope that the profiles contribute to improving the quality and productivity of school finance debates and policymaking.
ALABAMA

Description: This profile of Alabama's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Alabama devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**FISCAL EFFORT**

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- **Alabama** effort 3.72%
- **U.S.** average 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Alabama spent 3.72% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.19 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Alabama's effort level ranks #18 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Alabama's highest poverty districts is $8,804 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($18,230), a difference of -48.3%.
- Districts in Alabama's second highest poverty quintile receive 31.1% less than the estimated adequate level.

**PROGRESSIVITY**

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Alabama is regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 16.7% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #44 in the nation [out of 50]).

www.schoolfinancedata.org
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Trust Distribution from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. For example, in the SFID, the federal government spending on elementary and secondary education is calculated using U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.

- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state had initially increased, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some state's profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort, year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5, one for each poverty quintile]): necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5, necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5, necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
**Description:** This profile of Alaska's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Alaska devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

### FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alaska effort</th>
<th>U.S. average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.45%</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In FY 2017, Alaska spent 4.45% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.91 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Alaska's effort level ranks #5 in the nation (out of 50).

### ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Alaska's highest poverty districts is $1,386 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($29,052), a difference of -4.8%.
- Districts in Alaska's second highest poverty quintile receive 15.3% more than the estimated adequate level.

### PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Alaska is progressive.
- High poverty districts receive 72.1% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #2 in the nation [out of 51]).
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users’ manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources (“Contextual Stats” table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau’s Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Revenue Crosswalk from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state until that year predated the Great Recession, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel include five separate variables: necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5, necm_ppcstot_q1—necm_ppcstot_q5, necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state’s system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).

- In the graph in the center panel, “low poverty” districts are those with 10 percent poverty, “medium poverty” districts have 20 percent poverty, and “high poverty” districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.

- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
**ARIZONA**

**Description:** This profile of Arizona’s public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Arizona devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**FISCAL EFFORT**

- **Fiscal Effort** is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

  - Arizona effort: 2.58%
  - U.S. average: 3.53%

  - In FY 2017, Arizona spent 2.58% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
  - This was 0.96 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
  - Arizona's effort level ranks #49 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

- **Adequacy** compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

  - Spending in Arizona's highest poverty districts is $13,857 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($22,120), a difference of -62.6%.
  - Districts in Arizona's second highest poverty quintile receive 53.9% less than the estimated adequate level.

**PROGRESSIONIVITY**

- **Progressivity** is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

  - School funding in Arizona is regressive.
  - High poverty districts receive 12.4% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #42 in the nation [out of 51]).

**CONTEXTUAL STATS**

- **Child (5-17yo) poverty rate (%):**
  - Arizona: 19.7%
  - U.S.: 17.3%

- **Public school coverage (%):**
  - Arizona: 90.2%
  - U.S.: 87.8%

- **Pct. revenue from state sources: 40.1%**
  - Arizona: 47.1%

- **Total enrollment (U.S. rank): 1,123,137 (13)**
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

**Non-SFID data sources** (*Contextual Stats* table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SID documentation and annual report; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the NECM (these figures are from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances); 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

**Fiscal effort**

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state continued to decline after the recession, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

**SID variables used:** effort, year

**Adequacy**

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

**SID variables used** (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
- predicted_slocrev0
- predicted_slocrev10
- predicted_slocrev20
- predicted_slocrev30

**Progressivity**

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressivity revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

**SID variables used:**
- predicted_slocrev0
- predicted_slocrev10
- predicted_slocrev20
- predicted_slocrev30

www.schoolfinancedata.org
**Description:** This profile of Arkansas’s public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Arkansas devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**FISCAL EFFORT**

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- **Arkansas effort:** 4.11%
- **U.S. average:** 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Arkansas spent 4.11% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.57 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Arkansas’s effort level ranks #10 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Arkansas’s highest poverty districts is $4,177 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($14,608), a difference of -28.6%.
- Districts in Arkansas’s second highest poverty quintile receive 21.6% less than the estimated adequate level.

**PROGRESSIVITY**

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Arkansas is neither progressive nor regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 1.9% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #19 in the nation [out of 50]).

**STATE SCHOOL FINANCE PROFILE 2016-17 SCHOOL YEAR**

**AR**

**Contextual Stats**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child (5-17yo) poverty rate (%)</th>
<th>21.2</th>
<th>17.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public school coverage (%)</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. revenue from state sources</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment (U.S. rank)</td>
<td>493,447 (33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progressivity trend (3/0), 2002-17**

- AR’s funding was more progressive in 2017 (1.9%) vs. 2002 (-6.8%).
- Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
NOTES ON DATA AND MEASURES
State School Finance Profiles 2016-17

General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) see SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Treasurys across from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state has been rising until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.
**Fiscal Effort** is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

California effort: 3.04%

U.S. average: 3.53%

- In FY 2017, California spent 3.04% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.50 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- California’s effort level ranks #40 in the nation (out of 50).

Effort in CA increased in the years before the “Great Recession’s” main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.58% in 2004 to 3.62% in 2009.

### Adequacy

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph, and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in California’s highest poverty districts is $13,588 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($24,356), a difference of -55.8%.
- Districts in California’s second highest poverty quintile receive 45.9% less than the estimated adequate level.

- In its highest poverty districts, California’s spending is 55.8% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.
- Adequacy in California’s highest poverty districts ranks #48 in the nation (out of 50).

### Progressivity

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in California is progressive.
- High poverty districts receive 14.2% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #7 in the nation (out of 51)).

CA’s funding was more progressive in 2017 (14.2%) vs. 2002 (-0.9%). Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
NOTES ON DATA AND MEASURES
State School Finance Profiles 2016-17

General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education.

The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

Non-SFID data sources: ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from local sources across from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state remained relatively flat until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

- SID variables used: effort, year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
  - necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5
  - necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5
  - necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph on the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
COLORADO

Description: This profile of Colorado’s public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Colorado devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Colorado effort: 2.90 %
- U.S. average: 3.53 %

- In FY 2017, Colorado spent 2.90% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.63 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Colorado’s effort level ranks #44 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Colorado’s highest poverty districts is $6,648 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($16,431), a difference of -40.5%.
- Districts in Colorado’s second highest poverty quintile receive 30.3% less than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts; and 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Colorado is moderately progressive.
- High poverty districts receive 4.1% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #14 in the nation [out of 50]).

www.schoolfinancedata.org
NOTES ON DATA AND MEASURES

State School Finance Profiles 2016-17

General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources (*Contextual Stats* table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Tennessee dataset from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it *might* spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state continued to grow until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The definitions are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

www.schoolfinancedata.org
Description: This profile of Connecticut's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Connecticut devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

### FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- **Connecticut effort:** 3.59%
- **U.S. average:** 3.53%
- In FY 2017, Connecticut spent 3.59% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.05 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Connecticut's effort level ranks #22 in the nation (out of 50).

### ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Connecticut's highest poverty districts is $167 PP higher than the estimated adequate level ($17,452), a difference of 1.0%.
- Districts in Connecticut's second highest poverty quintile receive 107.2% more than the estimated adequate level.

### PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Connecticut is regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 11.9% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #41 in the nation (out of 50)).
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

• U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
• The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state had continued to decline over time, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
• Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

• The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of percentiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
• The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

• In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state’s system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
• In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
• The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progression in the typical state in a given year.
Description: This profile of the District of Columbia’s public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much D.C. devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

Fiscal effort is not calculated for the District of Columbia, as the state-level "economic capacity" denominators (e.g., GSP) are not available.

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph, and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in D.C.'s highest poverty districts is $3,743 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($22,763), a difference of -16.4%.
- Note: Due to the structure of D.C.'s school system, adequacy estimates are available only for the highest poverty quintile.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in D.C. is regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 16.7% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #45 in the nation [out of 51]).
NOTES ON DATA AND MEASURES
State School Finance Profiles 2016-17

**General**

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

**Non-SFID data sources** ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation and annual report for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from property taxes from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

**Fiscal effort**

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than those with lower capacity states, such as Mississipi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state to that year and, subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

**Adequacy**

Adequacy is typically defined as the amount to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year.

The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

**Progressivity**

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.

- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

**SID variables used**

- predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
- necm_predcost_q1 — necm_predcost_q5
- necm_ppcost_q1 — necm_ppcost_q5
- necm_enroll_q1 — necm_enroll_q5
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Description: This profile of Delaware's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Delaware devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

Delaware effort 2.79 %
U.S. average 3.53 %

- In FY 2017, Delaware spent 2.79% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.74 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Delaware’s effort level ranks #47 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table as percentage differences.

- Spending in Delaware’s highest poverty districts is $2,651 PP higher than the estimated adequate level ($12,591), a difference of 21.1%.
- Districts in Delaware’s second highest poverty quintile receive 25.8% more than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Delaware is progressive.
- High poverty districts receive 13.2% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #8 in the nation [out of 51]).
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General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

Non-SFID data sources (“Contextual Stats” table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Treasury; 4) districts from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state until that year had declined, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort; year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile): necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5; necm_ppcstot_q1—necm_ppcstot_q5; necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
**STATE SCHOOL FINANCE PROFILE**

2016-17 SCHOOL YEAR

---

**FLORIDA**

**Description:** This profile of Florida's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Florida devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

### FISCAL EFFORT

**Fiscal Effort** is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Florida effort: 2.93%
- U.S. average: 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Florida spent 2.93% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.60 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Florida’s effort level ranks #43 in the nation (out of 50).

### ADEQUACY

**Adequacy** compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Florida’s highest poverty districts is $4,273 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($13,202), a difference of -32.4%.
- Districts in Florida’s second highest poverty quintile receive 23.1% less than the estimated adequate level.

### PROGRESSIVITY

**Progressivity** is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts; and 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Florida is moderately regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 8.6% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #37 in the nation [out of 50]).

---
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NOTES ON DATA AND MEASURES
State School Finance Profiles 2016-17

General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Tax Revenue from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "cutpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state plummeted that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort, year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile): necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5; necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5; necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts. The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0; predicted_slocrev10; predicted_slocrev20; predicted_slocrev30; year
Description: This profile of Georgia’s public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Georgia devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**FISCAL EFFORT**

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

| Georgia effort | 3.58 % |
| U.S. average | 3.53 % |

- In FY 2017, Georgia spent 3.58% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.05 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Georgia's effort level ranks #23 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Georgia’s highest poverty districts is $7,458 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($17,400), a difference of -42.9%.
- Districts in Georgia’s second highest poverty quintile receive 35.0% less than the estimated adequate level.

**PROGRESSIVITY**

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Georgia is moderately progressive.
- High poverty districts receive 9.1% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #11 in the nation [out of 50]).

**Effort trends, 2004-17**

- Effort in GA increased in the years before the "Great Recession’s" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.70% in 2004 to 4.60% in 2009.

**Net change by period (% pts.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2017</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This was followed by a decrease of 1.02 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.
- GA's effort was 0.12 percentage points lower in 2017 than in 2004.

**Adequacy: GA vs. US average**

- In its highest poverty districts, Georgia's spending is 42.9% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.
- Adequacy in Georgia's highest poverty districts ranks #43 in the nation (out of 50).

**Progressivity trend (30/0), 2002-17**

- GA's funding was more progressive in 2017 (9.1%) vs. 2002 (4.9%).
- Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
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The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state peaked that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort, year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM determines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
  necm_preactcost_q1—necm_preactcost_q5, necm_ppcostq1—necm_ppcostq5, necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
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**HAWAII**

**Description:** This profile of Hawaii's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Hawaii devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**FISCAL EFFORT**

**Fiscal Effort** is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- **Hawaii effort:** 2.35 %
- **U.S. average:** 3.53 %

- In FY 2017, Hawaii spent 2.35% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was a 1.19 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Hawaii’s effort level ranks #50 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

**Adequacy** compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores.

Adequacy cannot be calculated for Hawaii, as the state consists of a single school district.

**PROGRESSIVITY**

**Progressivity** is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Hawaii is regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 16.7% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #46 in the nation [out of 51]).

**Contextual Stats**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child (5-17yo) poverty rate (%)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school coverage (%)</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. revenue from state sources</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment (U.S. rank)</td>
<td>181,550</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effort trends, 2004-17**

- Effort in HI increased in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.12% in 2004 to 3.59% in 2009.
- This was followed by a decrease of 1.25 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.
- HI's effort was 0.77 percentage points lower in 2017 than in 2004.

**Net change by period (% pts.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2017</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progressivity trend (30/0), 2002-17**

- HI's funding was less regressive in 2017 (-16.7%) vs. 2002 (-20.7%).
- Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
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General
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:
- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources (“Contextual Stats” table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) see SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from current sources from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort
Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state was highest that year and then subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy
Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
  - necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5
  - necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5
  - necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity
A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

Idaho effort 3.07%  U.S. average 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Idaho spent 3.07% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.47 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Idaho's effort level ranks #38 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Idaho's highest poverty districts is $6,072 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($13,560), a difference of -44.7%.
- Districts in Idaho's second highest poverty quintile receive 37.7% less than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Idaho is neither progressive nor regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 1.4% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #26 in the nation [out of 51]).
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Description: This profile of Idaho's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Idaho devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Effort in ID decreased in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.91% in 2004 to 3.74% in 2009.

Net change by period (% pts.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2017</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adequacy: ID vs. US average

Percent above/below adequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty quintile</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest poverty</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low poverty</td>
<td>-23.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium poverty</td>
<td>-29.9</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High poverty</td>
<td>-37.7</td>
<td>-22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest poverty</td>
<td>-44.7</td>
<td>-28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In its highest poverty districts, Idaho's spending is 44.7% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.

Adequacy in Idaho's highest poverty districts ranks #44 in the nation (out of 50).

PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATIONS

2011

Progressivity trend (30/0), 2002-17

- Idaho's funding was more regressive in 2017 (-1.4%) vs. 2002 (2.9%).
- Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
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The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

### Non-SFID data sources

- "Contextual Stats" table: 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from federal sources from the U.S. Census Bureau's Annual Survey of School System Finances. 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

### Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states have larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same effort.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state had increased through that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

### Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

### Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive (between +5% and -10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); and regressive (lower than -10%).
- If in the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

### Notes on data and measures

State School Finance Profiles 2016-17
ILLINOIS

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

Illinois effort 3.24 %
U.S. average 3.53 %

- In FY 2017, Illinois spent 3.24% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.29 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Illinois's effort level ranks #33 in the nation (out of 50).

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Illinois's highest poverty districts is $4,299 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($17,569), a difference of -24.4%.
- Districts in Illinois's second highest poverty quintile receive 3.8% more than the estimated adequate level.

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Illinois is regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 27.2% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #50 in the nation [out of 51]).

THE CLASS rubric provides a succinct but informative overview of how much Illinois devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). *Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.*
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

**Non-SFID data sources** (*Contextual Stats* table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) see SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Tranfers Across from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it *might* spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

**SID variables used:** effort, year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

**SID variables used** (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):

- necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5
- necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5
- necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).

- In the graph on the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.

- The graph on the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

**SID variables used:** predicted_slocrev0 , predicted_slocrev10 , predicted_slocrev20 , predicted_slocrev30 ; year
**INDEANA**

**Description:** This profile of Indiana's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Indiana devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

### Fiscal Effort

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- **Indiana effort:** 2.85%
- **U.S. average:** 3.53%

#### Fiscal Effort
data trends, 2004-17

- Effort in IN increased in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.74% in 2004 to 3.77% in 2009.
- This was followed by a decrease of 0.93 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.

#### Adequacy

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Indiana's highest poverty districts is $4,412 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($14,889), a difference of -29.6%.
- Districts in Indiana's second highest poverty quintile receive 10.8% less than the estimated adequate level.

#### Adequacy: IN vs. US average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty quintile</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest poverty</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low poverty</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium poverty</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High poverty</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
<td>-22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest poverty</td>
<td>-29.6%</td>
<td>-28.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In its highest poverty districts, Indiana's spending is 29.6% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.
- Adequacy in Indiana's highest poverty districts ranks #29 in the nation (out of 50).

### Progressivity

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Indiana is neither progressive nor regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 0.7% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #22 in the nation [out of 51]).

#### Progressivity trend (30/0), 2002-17

- IN's funding was more regressive in 2017 (0.7%) vs. 2002 (10.7%).
- Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
General

The data in this state profile are from the **School Finance Indicators Database (SFID)**, a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SIDs), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SIDs: **fiscal effort**, **adequacy**, and **progressivity**. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: [schoolfinancedata.org](http://schoolfinancedata.org).

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). **Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.**
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SIDs variables used in each section of this profile.

**Non-SID data sources:**
- **"Contextual Stats" table:** 1) Child poverty (5-17 years) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from local taxes across from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it **might** spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forward lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- **U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.**
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state matched that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- **Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.**

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

- **SID variables used** (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables \([q1-q5]\), one for each poverty quintile):
  - **necm_predcost**: \(q1\) — **necm_predcost**: \(q5\)
  - **necm_ppcost:** \(q1\) — **necm_ppcost:** \(q5\)
  - **necm_enroll:** \(q1\) — **necm_enroll:** \(q5\)

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (using U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

- **SID variables used**:
  - **predicted_slocrev0**: \(\text{predicted_slocrev10}\); **predicted_slocrev20**: \(\text{predicted_slocrev30}\); \(\text{year}\)
IOWA SCHOOL FINANCE PROFILE 2016-17

Description: This profile of Iowa's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Iowa devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Effort in IA increased in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.58% in 2004 to 3.96% in 2009.

Net change by period (% pts.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2017</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adequacy: IA vs. US average

Percent above / below adequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty quintile</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest poverty</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low poverty</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium poverty</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High poverty</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest poverty</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
<td>-28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In its highest poverty districts, Iowa's spending is 10.2% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.

Adequacy in Iowa's highest poverty districts ranks #11 in the nation (out of 50).

Progressivity trend (30/0), 2002-17

IA's funding was more regressive in 2017 (-9.2%) vs. 2002 (1.2%).

Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
NOTES ON DATA AND MEASURES
State School Finance Profiles 2016-17

General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.

• Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users’ manual calculations.
• All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
• In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SID documentation and annual report. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

• The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
• The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

• In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state’s system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
• In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.

• SFID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year

www.schoolfinancedata.org
Description: This profile of Kansas’s public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Kansas devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**FISCAL EFFORT**

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Kansas Effort</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.82%</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In FY 2017, Kansas spent 3.82% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.28 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Kansas's effort level ranks #16 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Kansas's highest poverty quintile is $1,649 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($12,287), a difference of -13.4%.
- Districts in Kansas's second highest poverty quintile receive 7.6% more than the estimated adequate level.

**PROGRESSIVITY**

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Kansas is neither progressive nor regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 0.0% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #23 in the nation [out of 50]).

**STATE SCHOOL FINANCE PROFILE**

2016-17 SCHOOL YEAR

**KANSAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Stats</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child (5-17yo) poverty rate (%)</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school coverage (%)</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct revenue from state sources</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment (U.S. rank)</td>
<td>494,347 (32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effort, 2004-17**

- Effort in KS increased in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.72% in 2004 to 4.38% in 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Effort (KS)</th>
<th>Effort (U.S.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2017</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This was followed by a decrease of 0.56 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.
- KS's effort was 0.10 percentage points higher in 2017 than in 2004.

**Adequacy: KS vs. US average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Quintile</th>
<th>Actual spending PP</th>
<th>Required spending PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$9,175</td>
<td>$9,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$9,051</td>
<td>$9,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>$9,051</td>
<td>$9,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>$9,051</td>
<td>$9,051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In its highest poverty districts, Kansas's spending is 13.4% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.
- Adequacy in Kansas's highest poverty districts ranks #15 in the nation (out of 50).
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary component of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

General

The years in the profile refer to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.
Description: This profile of Kentucky's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Kentucky devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**FISCAL EFFORT**

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Kentucky effort: 3.62%
- U.S. average: 3.53%

This was 0.08 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

Kentucky's effort level ranks #21 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Kentucky's highest poverty districts is $7,128 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($16,992), a difference of -41.9%.
- Districts in Kentucky's second highest poverty quintile receive 29.5% less than the estimated adequate level.

**PROGRESSIVITY**

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Kentucky is neither progressive nor regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 1.6% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #20 in the nation [out of 50]).
State School Finance Profiles 2016-17

General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary component of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources: ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) see SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from non-tuition sources from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state continued that year's trend, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort, year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile): necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5; necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5; necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's school system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slcorev0; predicted_slcorev10; predicted_slcorev20; predicted_slcorev30; year
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**LOUISIANA**

**Description:** This profile of Louisiana's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Louisiana devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**FISCAL EFFORT**

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Louisiana effort: 3.28%
- U.S. average: 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Louisiana spent 3.28% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.25 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Louisiana’s effort level ranks #31 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Louisiana’s highest poverty districts is $5,079 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($16,681), a difference of -30.4%.
- Districts in Louisiana’s second highest poverty quintile receive 18.4% less than the estimated adequate level.

**PROGRESSIVITY**

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Louisiana is **neither progressive nor regressive**.
- High poverty districts receive 3.0% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #16 in the nation [out of 50]).

**STATE SCHOOL FINANCE PROFILE**

**2016-17 SCHOOL YEAR**

**CONTINUOUS STATISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child (5-17yrs) poverty rate (%)</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school coverage (%)</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct revenue from state sources</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment (U.S. rank)</td>
<td>716,293 (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effort in LA increased** in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.29% in 2004 to 3.77% in 2009.

**Net change by period (% pts.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2017</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This was followed by a decrease of 0.49 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.
- LA's effort was 0.01 percentage points lower in 2017 than in 2004.

- In its highest poverty districts, Louisiana's spending is 30.4% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.
- Adequacy in Louisiana's highest poverty districts ranks #30 in the nation (out of 50).

**LA’s funding was more progressive in 2017 (3.0%) vs. 2002 (-18.0%).**

- Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
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General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

**Non-SID data sources** ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Tranfers from the U.S. Census Bureau's Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state had increased during the “Great Recession”, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort, year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile); necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5; necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5; necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state’s system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
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MAINE

Description: This profile of Maine’s public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Maine devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

Maine effort 4.17 %
U.S. average 3.53 %

In FY 2017, Maine spent 4.17% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

This was 0.64 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

Maine’s effort level ranks #8 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

Spending in Maine’s highest poverty districts is $371 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($13,738), a difference of -2.7%.

Districts in Maine’s second highest poverty quintile receive 13.8% more than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

School funding in Maine is regressive.

High poverty districts receive 18.2% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #48 in the nation [out of 51]).
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The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education.

The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users’ manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

### Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put far lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state (state budget divided by GSP) increased briefly that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

### Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

#### SID variables used: effort, year

### Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

#### SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0, predicted_slocrev10, predicted_slocrev20, predicted_slocrev30, year
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**MARYLAND**

Description: This profile of Maryland's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Maryland devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

### Fiscal Effort

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>U.S. average</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland effort</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In FY 2017, Maryland spent 3.48% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was 0.05 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland's effort level ranks #26 in the nation (out of 50).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adequacy

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- In Maryland's highest poverty districts is $3,577 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($18,549), a difference of -19.3%.
- Districts in Maryland's second highest poverty quintile receive 4.2% more than the estimated adequate level.

### Progressivity

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Maryland is moderately regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 7.3% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #35 in the nation [out of 50]).

---

**STATE SCHOOL FINANCE PROFILE 2016-17 SCHOOL YEAR**

**CONTINGENT STATISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>U.S. average</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child (K-12yrs) poverty rate (%)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school coverage (%)</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. revenue from state sources</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment (U.S. rank)</td>
<td>886,221 (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Effort in MD increased in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.31% in 2004 to 3.91% in 2009. MD's effort was 0.17 percentage points higher in 2017 than in 2004.*
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- **Fiscal effort**
  - Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.
  - U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
  - The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "cutpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state continued to rise until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
  - Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

- **Adequacy**
  - Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.
  - The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
  - The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

- **Progressivity**
  - A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.
  - In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
  - In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
  - The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
Massachusetts's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Massachusetts devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**Fiscal Effort** is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Massachusetts effort: 3.08%
- U.S. average: 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Massachusetts spent 3.08% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.46 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Massachusetts's effort level ranks #37 in the nation (out of 50).

**Adequacy** compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Massachusetts's highest poverty districts is $1,985 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($17,983), a difference of -11.0%.
- Districts in Massachusetts's second highest poverty quintile receive 63.0% more than the estimated adequate level.

**Progressivity** is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Massachusetts is progressive.
- High poverty districts receive 11.9% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #9 in the nation [out of 51]).

**Adequacy: MA vs. US average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty quintile</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest poverty</td>
<td>113.1%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low poverty</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium poverty</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High poverty</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>-22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest poverty</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
<td>-28.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In its highest poverty districts, Massachusetts's spending is 11.0% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.
- Adequacy in Massachusetts's highest poverty districts ranks #12 in the nation (out of 50).
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

**Non-SFID data sources** (*Contextual Stats* table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) see SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from taxable sources from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it *might* spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that how high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state had increased until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort, year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile): necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5; necm_ppccstot_q1—necm_ppccstot_q5; necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year

www.schoolfinancedata.org
Description: This profile of Michigan's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Michigan devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Michigan effort 3.45%
- U.S. average 3.53%

In FY 2017, Michigan spent 3.45% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

This was 0.08 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

Michigan's effort level ranks #28 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Michigan's highest poverty districts is $6,847 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($16,176), a difference of -37.7%.
- Districts in Michigan's second highest poverty quintile receive 12.0% less than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Michigan is moderately regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 9.6% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #39 in the nation [out of 50]).
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

### Non-SFID data sources

- (“Contextual Stats” table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Treasury across from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

### Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state declined until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- **SID variables used:** effort, year

### Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- **SID variables used** (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
  - necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5
  - necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5
  - necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

### Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- **SID variables used:** predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
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Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

Minnesota effort: 3.70%
U.S. average: 3.53%

In FY 2017, Minnesota spent 3.70% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

This was 0.17 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

Minnesota's effort level ranks #19 in the nation (out of 50).

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

Spending in Minnesota's highest poverty districts is $2,020 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($15,282), a difference of -13.2%.

Districts in Minnesota's second highest poverty quintile receive 12.0% more than the estimated adequate level.

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

School funding in Minnesota is progressive.

High poverty districts receive 31.5% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #4 in the nation [out of 51]).

Effort in MN increased in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.57% in 2004 to 4.08% in 2009.

This was followed by a decrease of 0.37 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.

MN's effort was 0.13 percentage points higher in 2017 than in 2004.

In its highest poverty districts, Minnesota's spending is 13.2% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.

Adequacy in Minnesota's highest poverty districts ranks #14 in the nation (out of 50).

MN's funding was more regressive in 2017 (31.5%) vs. 2002 (36.9%).

Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

**Fiscal effort**
Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort indicates how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forward lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "cutpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state continued to rise until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort, year

**Adequacy**
Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
  - necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5
  - necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5
  - necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

**Progressivity**
A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0; predicted_slocrev10; predicted_slocrev20; predicted_slocrev30; year
Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Mississippi effort: 4.14%
- U.S. average: 3.53%

In FY 2017, Mississippi spent 4.14% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

- This was 0.60 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Mississippi's effort level ranks #9 in the nation (out of 50).

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Mississippi's highest poverty districts is $10,050 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($19,152), a difference of 52.5%.
- Districts in Mississippi's second highest poverty quintile receive 39.9% less than the estimated adequate level.

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Mississippi is neither progressive nor regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 2.2% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #18 in the nation [out of 50]).

In its highest poverty districts, Mississippi's spending is 52.5% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.

Adequacy in Mississippi's highest poverty districts ranks #46 in the nation (out of 50).

MS's funding was more progressive in 2017 (2.2%) vs. 2002 (-3.3%).

Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

**Non-SID data sources** (*Contextual Stats* table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from local taxes (across from the U.S. Census Bureau Annuity Survey of School System Finances); 4) state total public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

**Fiscal effort**
Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it *might* spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state had already increased, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

**Adequacy**
Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintile state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

**Progressivity**
A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low-medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

**SID variables used**
- effort, year
- necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5; necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5; necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5
- predicted_slocrev0; predicted_slocrev10; predicted_slocrev20; predicted_slocrev30; year
MISSOURI

**Description:** This profile of Missouri's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Missouri devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Missouri effort: 3.42%
- U.S. average: 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Missouri spent 3.42% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.11 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Missouri's effort level ranks #29 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Missouri's highest poverty districts is $3,999 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($13,989), a difference of -28.6%.
- Districts in Missouri's second highest poverty quintile receive 12.5% less than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Missouri is regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 18.6% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #49 in the nation [out of 50]).

www.schoolfinancedata.org
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users’ manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

Non-SIFD data sources (“Contextual Stats” table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau’s Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SID documentation (for sources used for coverage estimates); 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from local sources (except for the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances); 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forward lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state had increased until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

SID variables used: effort; year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
- necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5
- necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5
- necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

SID variables used: predicted_slopeq0 ; predicted_slopeq10 ; predicted_slopeq20 ; predicted_slopeq30 ; year
These comparisons are presented, by district, to achieve national average test scores. The center graph is the percentage of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education. This was 0.34 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%. Montana’s effort level ranks #13 in the nation (out of 50).

**Adequacy** compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences). Spending in Montana’s highest poverty districts is $4,446 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($17,988), a difference of -24.7%. Districts in Montana’s second highest poverty quintile receive 2.3% more than the estimated adequate level.

**Progressivity** is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts. School funding in Montana is moderately regressive. High poverty districts receive 6.6% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #32 in the nation [out of 50]).

MT’s effort was 0.49 percentage points lower in 2017 than in 2004. In its highest poverty districts, Montana’s spending is 24.7% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average. Adequacy in Montana’s highest poverty districts ranks #22 in the nation (out of 50).

**Progressivity trend (30/0), 2002-17**

MT’s funding was less regressive in 2017 (-6.6%) vs. 2002 (-9.6%). Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

**Non-SFID data sources** ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

### Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state had already flattened by that year and, subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

### Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

### Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
NEBRASKA

**FISCAL EFFORT**

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Nebraska effort: 3.87%
- U.S. average: 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Nebraska spent 3.87% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.33 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Nebraska's effort level ranks #14 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Nebraska's highest poverty districts is $350 PP higher than the estimated adequate level ($12,115), a difference of 2.9%.
- Districts in Nebraska's second highest poverty quintile receive 22.4% more than the estimated adequate level.

**PROGRESSIVITY**

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Nebraska is progressive.
- High poverty districts receive 29.0% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #5 in the nation (out of 51)).

**CONTEXTUAL STATS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child (5-17yo) poverty rate (%)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school coverage (%)</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. revenue from state sources</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment (U.S. rank)</td>
<td>319,194 (37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education.

The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the National Center for Education Statistics; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state until that year continued to rise, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort, year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile): necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5; necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5; necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year

www.schoolfinancedata.org
Description: This profile of Nevada’s public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Nevada devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

Nevada effort 2.96 %
U.S. average 3.53 %

Effort in NV increased in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 2.91% in 2004 to 3.57% in 2009.

Period | Effort % NV | Effort % U.S.
--- | --- | ---
2004-2009 | 0.65 | 0.35
2009-2017 | -0.60 | -0.56
2004-2017 | 0.05 | -0.21

This was followed by a decrease of 0.60 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.

Adequacy: NV vs. US average

Percent above / below adequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty quintile</th>
<th>Nevada %</th>
<th>U.S. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest poverty</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low poverty</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium poverty</td>
<td>-21.8</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High poverty</td>
<td>-25.5</td>
<td>-22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest poverty</td>
<td>-42.8</td>
<td>-28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In its highest poverty districts, Nevada’s spending is 42.8% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.

Adequacy in Nevada’s highest poverty districts ranks #42 in the nation (out of 50).

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

School funding in Nevada is regressive.

High poverty districts receive 32.2% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #51 in the nation [out of 51]).

www.schoolfinancedata.org
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education.

The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources: ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) see SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Teachers Workload survey (FY 2016-

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state increased until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintile state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10; predicted_slocrev20; predicted_slocrev30; year
NEW HAMPSHIRE

Description: This profile of New Hampshire's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much New Hampshire devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

New Hampshire effort 3.69 %
U.S. average 3.53 %

In FY 2017, New Hampshire spent 3.69% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

This was 0.16 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

New Hampshire's effort level ranks #20 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

Spending in New Hampshire's highest poverty districts is $2,019 PP higher than the estimated adequate level ($11,883), a difference of 17.0%.

Districts in New Hampshire's second highest poverty quintile receive 66.0% more than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

School funding in New Hampshire is regressive.

High poverty districts receive 17.9% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #47 in the nation [out of 51]).

www.schoolfinancedata.org

STATE SCHOOL FINANCE PROFILE
2016-17 SCHOOL YEAR

NEW HAMPSHIRE SCHOOL FINANCE PROFILE 2016-17

(\text{SCHOOL} \times [b_1 + b_2 \times \text{State} + b_3 \times \text{LaborMarket} + b_4 \times \text{Finance} + b_5 \times \text{PopulationDensity} + b_6 \times \text{Enrollment} + b_7 \times \text{INDICATORS} + b_8 \times \text{DATABASE} + e)

\text{STATE CONTEXTUAL STATISTICS}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>NH</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child (17yo) poverty rate (%)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. revenue from state sources</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment (U.S. rank)</td>
<td>180,888 (41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- **Non-SFID data sources** (*"Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Tax Models tool from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

### Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state rose until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- **SID variables used**: effort, year

### Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- **SID variables used** (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
  - necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5
  - necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5
  - necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

### Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state’s system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- **SID variables used**: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
Description: This profile of New Jersey's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much New Jersey devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**NEW JERSEY**

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>New Jersey effort</th>
<th>U.S. average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In FY 2017, New Jersey spent 4.61% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 1.07 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- New Jersey's effort level ranks #3 in the nation (out of 50).

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in New Jersey's highest poverty districts is $934 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($19,467), a difference of -4.8%.
- Districts in New Jersey's second highest poverty quintile receive 59.4% more than the estimated adequate level.

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in New Jersey is moderately progressive.
- High poverty districts receive 6.5% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #12 in the nation [out of 50]).
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary component of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

Fiscal effort
Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- The U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state declined until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy
Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

Progressivity
A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive (revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts); moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
NEW MEXICO

Description: This profile of New Mexico's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much New Mexico devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

New Mexico effort 3.82 %
U.S. average 3.53 %

In FY 2017, New Mexico spent 3.82% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

This was 0.29 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

New Mexico's effort level ranks #15 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right table panel (as percentage differences).

Spending in New Mexico's highest poverty districts is $14,524 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($25,062), a difference of -58.0%.

Districts in New Mexico's second highest poverty quintile receive 38.4% less than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

School funding in New Mexico is moderately regressive.

High poverty districts receive 6.8% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #33 in the nation [out of 51]).

NM's funding was more regressive in 2017 (-6.8%) vs. 2002 (-2.2%).

Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary component of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users’ manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Tax Foundation; 4) from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state was at its lowest in this year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort; year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
  - necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5
  - necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5
  - necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
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FISCAL EFFORT

Effort trends, 2004-2017

Effort in NY increased in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 4.28% in 2004 to 4.69% in 2009.

Net change by period (% pts.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>NY</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2017</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was followed by a decrease of 0.23 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.

NY's effort was 0.18 percentage points higher in 2017 than in 2004.

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in New York's highest poverty districts is $55 PP higher than the estimated adequate level ($21,387), a difference of 0.3%.
- Districts in New York's second highest poverty quintile receive 76.7% more than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSION

Progressivity trend (30/0), 2002-2017

NY's funding was more progressive in 2017 (3.3%) vs. 2002 (-25.1%).

Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

### Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “cutpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state peaked in that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

### Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

### Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in estimated state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts); moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

### Variables used

- **Fiscal effort**
  - effort, year
- **Adequacy**
  - SID variables used: effort, year
- **Progressivity**
  - SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0; predicted_slocrev10; predicted_slocrev20; predicted_slocrev30; year

---
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Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

North Carolina effort 2.72%
U.S. average 3.53%

In FY 2017, North Carolina spent 2.72% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

This was 0.82 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

North Carolina's effort level ranks #48 in the nation (out of 50).

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

Spending in North Carolina's highest poverty districts is $6,059 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($15,157), a difference of -40.0%.

Districts in North Carolina's second highest poverty quintile receive 27.1% less than the estimated adequate level.

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts; and 2) zero poverty districts.

School funding in North Carolina is neither progressive nor regressive.

High poverty districts receive 2.5% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #17 in the nation [out of 51]).
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.
FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- North Dakota effort: 3.26%
- U.S. average: 3.53%

In FY 2017, North Dakota spent 3.26% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

This was 0.28 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

North Dakota's effort level ranks #32 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in North Dakota's highest poverty districts is $2,477 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($18,135), a difference of -13.7%.
- Districts in North Dakota's second highest poverty quintile receive 13.4% more than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts; and 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in North Dakota is regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 15.2% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #43 in the nation [out of 51]).
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation and sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from property taxes, state aids, and other revenues from the 2017 Census; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state had increased until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much capacity that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); regressive (between -3% and -10%); and more regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.

- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

www.schoolfinancedata.org
Description: This profile of Ohio's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Ohio devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Ohio effort 3.75%
- U.S. average 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Ohio spent 3.75% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.22 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Ohio's effort level ranks #17 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Ohio's highest poverty districts is $4,706 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($16,509), a difference of -28.5%.
- Districts in Ohio's second highest poverty quintile receive 1.0% less than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Ohio is progressive.
- High poverty districts receive 21.6% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #6 in the nation (out of 50)).
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General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table):
1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from tuition and services from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put fewer resources into education than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state continued to rise until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

SID variables used: effort, year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
- necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5
- necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5
- necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0.; predicted_slocrev10.; predicted_slocrev20.; predicted_slocrev30.; year
These comparisons are presented, by state, to achieve national average test scores. Oklahoma's highest poverty quintile receive 30.4% less than the estimated adequate level.

In its highest poverty districts, Oklahoma's spending is 41.1% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.

Adequacy in Oklahoma's highest poverty districts ranks #40 in the nation (out of 50).

School funding in Oklahoma is neither progressive nor regressive.

High poverty districts receive 0.8% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #25 in the nation [out of 51]).

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

Oklahoma effort 3.05 %
U.S. average 3.53 %

This was 0.49 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

Oklahoma's effort level ranks #39 in the nation (out of 50).

High education. Economic capacity directly revenue than zero poverty districts.

In FY 2017, Oklahoma spent 3.05% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

This was 0.49 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

Oklahoma's effort level ranks #39 in the nation (out of 50).

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

Spending in Oklahoma's highest poverty districts is $6,050 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($14,713), a difference of -41.1%.

Districts in Oklahoma's second highest poverty quintile receive 30.4% less than the estimated adequate level.

In its highest poverty districts, Oklahoma's spending is 41.1% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.

Adequacy in Oklahoma's highest poverty districts ranks #40 in the nation (out of 50).

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

School funding in Oklahoma is neither progressive nor regressive.

High poverty districts receive 0.8% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #25 in the nation [out of 51]).

New state and local education funding is a result of higher progressivity in 2017 (-0.8%) vs. 2002 (5.8%).

Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users’ manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- **Non-SFID data sources** (“Contextual Stats” table): (1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; (2) SFID documentation and sources used for coverage estimates; (3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES) Finance Survey (2015); (4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “cutpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state predated that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state’s system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

Some additional notes and variables:
- **SID variables used:** effort; year
**OYRONG**

**Description:** This profile of Oregon's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Oregon devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

### Fiscal Effort

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- **Oregon effort:** 3.21%
- **U.S. average:** 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Oregon spent 3.21% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.32 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Oregon’s effort level ranks #34 in the nation (out of 50).

### Adequacy

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Oregon’s highest poverty districts is $5,998 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($16,422), a difference of -36.5%.
- Districts in Oregon’s second highest poverty quintile receive 24.2% less than the estimated adequate level.

### Progressivity

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Oregon is neither progressive nor regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 1.3% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #21 in the nation [out of 51]).

### Effort Trends, 2004-17

- Effort in OR increased in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.31% in 2004 to 3.55% in 2009.
- This was followed by a decrease of 0.34 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.
- OR's effort was 0.10 percentage points lower in 2017 than in 2004.

### Adequacy: OR vs. US average

**Percent above / below adequate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty quintile</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest poverty</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low poverty</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium poverty</td>
<td>-16.2</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High poverty</td>
<td>-24.2</td>
<td>-22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest poverty</td>
<td>-36.5</td>
<td>-28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In its highest poverty districts, Oregon's spending is 36.5% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.
- Adequacy in Oregon's highest poverty districts ranks #35 in the nation (out of 50).

**Change in Average CLASS Dimension Scores**

- Low poverty: teacher-candidates seem to excel in classroom organization – 4.64% in 2004 vs. 5.02% in 2017.
- Medium poverty: behavioral engagement increases from 4.35% in Administration 1 to 4.91% in Administration 2.
- High poverty: positive regard for learning increases from 3.49% to 3.9%.

**Teacher-candidates**

- Teacher-candidates excelled in areas ranging from behavior management to efficient use of instructional time to an absence of negativity in their interactions with students. These results at first glance seem to reflect classroom management. While it is possible that programs have progressed, whatever the reasons for this mismatch, valid and reliable observational data becomes all the more important to better capture a candidate's actual performance.

**Notes:**

- For more on this, see The Science of Learning.
- Teacher-candidates excel in classroom organization – 4.64% in 2004 vs. 5.02% in 2017.
- Low poverty: behavioral engagement increases from 4.35% in Administration 1 to 4.91% in Administration 2.
- Medium poverty: positive regard for learning increases from 3.49% to 3.9%.

---

**www.schoolfinancedata.org**
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from private sources from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) state total public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
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**PENNSYLVANIA**

**Description:** This profile of Pennsylvania's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Pennsylvania devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**FISCAL EFFORT**

**Fiscal Effort** is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Pennsylvania effort: 3.93%
- U.S. average: 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Pennsylvania spent 3.93% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.39 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Pennsylvania's effort level ranks #12 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

**Adequacy** compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Pennsylvania's highest poverty districts is $4,446 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($17,081), a difference of -26.0%.
- Districts in Pennsylvania's second highest poverty quintile receive 27.3% more than the estimated adequate level.

**PROGRESSIVITY**

**Progressivity** is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Pennsylvania is **neither progressive nor regressive**.
- High poverty districts receive 0.5% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #24 in the nation [out of 50]).

---

**CONTEXTUAL STATS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child (1-14yo) poverty rate (%)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school coverage (%)</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. revenue from state sources</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment (U.S. rank)</td>
<td>1,727,497 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Effort trends, 2004-17**

- **Effort in PA increased** in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 4.10% in 2004 to 4.20% in 2009.

**Net change by period (% pts.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2017</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This was followed by a **decrease** of 0.27 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.
- PA's effort was 0.17 percentage points lower in 2017 than in 2004.

**Adequacy: PA vs. US average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty quintile</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest poverty</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low poverty</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium poverty</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High poverty</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>-22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest poverty</td>
<td>-26.0</td>
<td>-28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In its highest poverty districts, Pennsylvania's spending is 26.0% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.
- Adequacy in Pennsylvania's highest poverty districts ranks #24 in the nation (out of 50).

---

Visit [www.schoolfinancedata.org](http://www.schoolfinancedata.org) for more information.
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation and annual report; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Revenue Sources from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “cutpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state bottomed out that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs and other SFID tools and reports, and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
**RHODE ISLAND**

**Description:** This profile of Rhode Island’s public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Rhode Island devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

### FISCAL EFFORT

**Fiscal Effort** is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- **Rhode Island effort:** 4.22%
- **U.S. average:** 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Rhode Island spent 4.22% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.68 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Rhode Island’s effort level ranks #6 in the nation (out of 50).

### ADEQUACY

**Adequacy** compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Rhode Island’s highest poverty districts is $3,591 lower than the estimated adequate level ($18,391), a difference of -20.1%.
- Districts in Rhode Island’s second highest poverty quintile receive 59.6% more than the estimated adequate level.

### PROGRESSIVITY

**Progressivity** is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Rhode Island is **moderately regressive**.
- High poverty districts receive 4.6% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #29 in the nation [out of 51]).

---

**STATE SCHOOL FINANCE PROFILE 2016-17 SCHOOL YEAR**

**Rhode Island**

**Description:**

This profile of Rhode Island’s public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Rhode Island devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

- **Fiscal Effort** is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).
- **Adequacy** compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).
- **Progressivity** is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

**Rhode Island effort:** 4.22%

- **U.S. average:** 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Rhode Island spent 4.22% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.68 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Rhode Island’s effort level ranks #6 in the nation (out of 50).

**Adequacy** compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Rhode Island’s highest poverty districts is $3,591 lower than the estimated adequate level ($18,391), a difference of -20.1%.
- Districts in Rhode Island’s second highest poverty quintile receive 59.6% more than the estimated adequate level.

**Progressivity** is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Rhode Island is **moderately regressive**.
- High poverty districts receive 4.6% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #29 in the nation [out of 51]).
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.
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FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

South Carolina effort 4.17 %
U.S. average 3.53 %

SOUTH CAROLINA

Description: This profile of South Carolina's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much South Carolina devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in South Carolina's highest poverty districts is $6,240 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($17,090), a difference of -36.5%.
- Districts in South Carolina's second highest poverty quintile receive 21.0% less than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in South Carolina is moderately progressive.
- High poverty districts receive 5.9% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #13 in the nation [out of 51]).

Effort trends, 2004-17
- Effort in SC increased in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 4.37% in 2004 to 5.10% in 2009.
- This was followed by a decrease of 0.93 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.
- SC’s effort was 0.20 percentage points lower in 2017 than in 2004.

Net change by period (% points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2017</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In its highest poverty districts, South Carolina's spending is 36.5% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.
- Adequacy in South Carolina's highest poverty districts ranks #34 in the nation (out of 50).
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The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

General

The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.

Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.

All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.

The total number of states assigned rankings vary slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.

In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the National Center for Education Statistics Survey of Public School Finance; 4) state total public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.

The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state declined until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.

Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

SID variables used: effort, year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).

The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):

- necm_predcost_q1 — necm_predcost_q5
- necm_ppcost_q1 — necm_ppcost_q5
- necm_enroll_q1 — necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).

In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.

The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
SOUTH DAKOTA

Description: This profile of South Dakota's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much South Dakota devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

South Dakota effort 3.03 %
U.S. average 3.53 %

* In FY 2017, South Dakota spent 3.03% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
* This was 0.50 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
* South Dakota's effort level ranks #41 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

* Spending in South Dakota's highest poverty districts is $5,738 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($17,259), a difference of -33.2%.
* Districts in South Dakota's second highest poverty quintile receive 6.5% less than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and 2) zero poverty districts.

* School funding in South Dakota is moderately regressive.
* High poverty districts receive 4.7% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #30 in the nation (out of 51)).

Effort in SD increased in the years before the "Great Recession"s main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.19% in 2004 to 3.29% in 2009.

Net change by period (% pts.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2017</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was followed by a decrease of 0.26 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.

SD’s effort was 0.16 percentage points lower in 2017 than in 2004.

In its highest poverty districts, South Dakota's spending is 33.2% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.

Adequacy in South Dakota’s highest poverty districts ranks #32 in the nation (out of 50).

SD’s funding was more regressive in 2017 (-4.7%) vs. 2002 (-3.8%).

Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education.

The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary component of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

Non-SFID data sources: ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation and sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from local property taxes from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state remained relatively flat until that year, then subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort; year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year.

The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile): necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5; necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5; necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state’s system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph).
- The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
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TENNESSEE

Description: This profile of Tennessee's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Tennessee devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

Tennessee effort 2.84%
U.S. average 3.53%

In FY 2017, Tennessee spent 2.84% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

This was 0.70 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

Tennessee's effort level ranks #46 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

Spending in Tennessee's highest poverty districts is $3,680 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($12,666), a difference of -29.1%.

Districts in Tennessee's second highest poverty quintile receive 18.3% less than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

School funding in Tennessee is neither progressive nor regressive.

High poverty districts receive 1.9% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #27 in the nation [out of 50]).
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education.

The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- **Non-SFID data sources** ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forward lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the right table because effort in the typical state continued to rise, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort; year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
  - necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5
  - necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5
  - necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph).
- The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slocrrev0; predicted_slocrrev10; predicted_slocrrev20; predicted_slocrrev30; year
Description: This profile of Texas's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Texas devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Texas effort: 3.33%
- U.S. average: 3.53%

In FY 2017, Texas spent 3.33% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

This was 0.20 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

Texas's effort level ranks #30 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph, and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Texas's highest poverty districts is $11,499 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($20,663), a difference of -55.6%.

- Districts in Texas's second highest poverty quintile receive 37.1% less than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSION

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Texas is moderately regressive.

- High poverty districts receive 6.8% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #34 in the nation [out of 51]).

Net change by period (% pts.)

- Period: 2004-2009
  - TX: 0.31
  - U.S.: 0.35
- Period: 2009-2017
  - TX: -0.78
  - U.S.: -0.56
- Period: 2004-2017
  - TX: -0.48
  - U.S.: -0.21

This was followed by a decrease of 0.78 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.

TX's effort was 0.48 percentage points lower in 2017 than in 2004.

In its highest poverty districts, Texas's spending is 55.6% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.

Adequacy in Texas's highest poverty districts ranks #47 in the nation (out of 50).

TX's funding was more regressive in 2017 (-6.8%) vs. 2002 (-6.0%).

Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

Non-SFID data sources (*Contextual Stats* table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from local sources across from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forward lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state had declined until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- **SID variables used**: effort, year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- **SID variables used** (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
  - necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5
  - necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5
  - necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's school finance system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph on the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- **SID variables used**: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
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**FISCAL EFFORT**

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- **Utah effort** 3.09%
- **U.S. average** 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Utah spent 3.09% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.44 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Utah’s effort level ranks #36 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Utah's highest poverty districts is $3,934 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($11,109), a difference of -35.4%.
- Districts in Utah's second highest poverty quintile receive 26.9% less than the estimated adequate level.

**PROGRESSIVITY**

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Utah is progressive.
- High poverty districts receive 55.3% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #3 in the nation [out of 51]).

**Effort trends, 2004-2017**

- Effort in UT increased in the years before the “Great Recession’s” main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.50% in 2004 to 3.81% in 2009.

**Adequacy: UT vs. US average**

- **Percent above / below adequate**
  - Low poverty: -11.7 / 23.2
  - Low poverty: -16.5 / 6.2
  - Medium poverty: -24.7 / -6.3
  - High poverty: -26.9 / -22.1
  - Highest poverty: -35.4 / -28.2

- In its highest poverty districts, Utah's spending is 35.4% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.
- Adequacy in Utah's highest poverty districts ranks #33 in the nation (out of 50).

- **Progressivity trend (30/0), 2002-2017**
  - UT’s funding was more progressive in 2017 (55.3%) vs. 2002 (42.8%).
  - Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
NOTES ON DATA AND MEASURES
State School Finance Profiles 2016-17

General
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

Non-SFID data sources:
1) Child poverty rates (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) see SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from state sources from the As of the U.S. Census Bureau's Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort
Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state until that year increased, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile.

Adequacy
Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

Progressivity
A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
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Description: This profile of Vermont's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Vermont devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Vermont effort: 5.13%
- U.S. average: 3.53%

In FY 2017, Vermont spent 5.13% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

This was 1.59 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

Vermont's effort level ranks #1 in the nation (out of 50).

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Vermont's highest poverty districts is $376 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($14,983), a difference of -2.5%.
- Districts in Vermont's second highest poverty quintile receive 32.7% more than the estimated adequate level.

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Vermont is moderately regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 4.8% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #31 in the nation [out of 51]).

VT's funding was more regressive in 2017 (-4.8%) vs. 2002 (3.9%).

Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education.

The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID.

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

Progressivity is a measure of the extent to which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.
**STATE SCHOOL FINANCE PROFILE**

**VIRGINIA**

Description: This profile of Virginia’s public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Virginia devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

### Fiscal Effort

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virginia effort</th>
<th>U.S. average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.46%</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In FY 2017, Virginia spent 3.46% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.07 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Virginia's effort level ranks #27 in the nation (out of 50).

### Adequacy

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Virginia’s highest poverty districts is $3,662 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($15,087), a difference of -24.3%.
- Districts in Virginia’s second highest poverty quintile receive 10.5% less than the estimated adequate level.

### Progressivity

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Virginia is moderately regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 8.6% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #36 in the nation [out of 50]).

### Contextual Stats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>VA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child (S-17yo) poverty rate (%)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school coverage (%)</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. revenue from state sources</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment (U.S. rank)</td>
<td>1,287,026 (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effort in VA increased** in the years before the “Great Recession’s” main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.38% in 2004 to 3.60% in 2009.

**Net change by period (% pts.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>VA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2017</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This was followed by a decrease of 0.14 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.
- VA’s effort was 0.09 percentage points higher in 2017 than in 2004.

**In its highest poverty districts, Virginia’s spending is 24.3% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.**

**Adequacy in Virginia’s highest poverty districts ranks #20 in the nation (out of 50).**

---

www.schoolfinancedata.org
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the National Center for Education Statistics; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in the table because effort in the typical state increased that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintile state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

www.schoolfinancedata.org
WASHINGTON

Description: This profile of Washington's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Washington devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- Washington effort: 3.11%
- U.S. average: 3.53%

In FY 2017, Washington spent 3.11% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.

This was 0.42 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.

- Washington's effort level ranks #35 in the nation (out of 50).

Effort trends, 2004-17

- Effort in WA increased in the years before the "Great Recession's" main impact on K-12 funding, going from 3.30% in 2004 to 3.38% in 2009.

Net change by period (% pts.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2017</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was followed by a decrease of 0.27 percentage points between 2009 and 2017.

- WA's effort was 0.19 percentage points lower in 2017 than in 2004.

ADEQUACY

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Washington's highest poverty districts is $6,742 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($18,069), a difference of -37.3%.
- Districts in Washington's second highest poverty quintile receive 24.1% less than the estimated adequate level.

Adequacy: WA vs. US average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty quintile</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest poverty</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low poverty</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium poverty</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High poverty</td>
<td>-24.1</td>
<td>-22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest poverty</td>
<td>-37.3</td>
<td>-28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In its highest poverty districts, Washington's spending is 37.3% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.

- Adequacy in Washington's highest poverty districts ranks #36 in the nation (out of 50).

PROGRESSIVITY

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Washington is regressive.
- High poverty districts receive 10.8% less revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #40 in the nation [out of 51]).

Progressivity trend (30/0), 2002-17

- WA's funding was more regressive in 2017 (-10.8%) vs. 2002 (-3.7%).
- Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Truex survey from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “outpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state continued to grow until that year, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts. The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
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WEST VIRGINIA

Description: This profile of West Virginia's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much West Virginia devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**FISCAL EFFORT**

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

West Virginia effort: 4.04%
U.S. average: 3.53%

- In FY 2017, West Virginia spent 4.04% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.50 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- West Virginia's effort level ranks #11 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in West Virginia's highest poverty districts is $1,472 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($12,866), a difference of -11.4%.
- Districts in West Virginia's second highest poverty quintile receive 2.9% more than the estimated adequate level.

**PROGRESSIVITY**

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts; and 2) zero poverty districts.

- In its highest poverty districts, West Virginia's spending is 11.4% below the adequate level, compared with a -28.2% U.S. average.
- Adequacy in West Virginia's highest poverty districts ranks #13 in the nation (out of 50).

- WV's funding was more regressive in 2017 (-4.0%) vs. 2002 (1.7%).
- Since 2002, funding in the typical state (red line) is generally neither progressive nor regressive.
General
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

Fiscal effort
Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In typical state budgets, the denominator is GSP, which is calculated by dividing the sum of all incomes earned in the state by the total number of people living in the state.

Adequacy
Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

Progressivity
A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.
**Description:** This profile of Wisconsin's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Wisconsin devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

**FISCAL EFFORT**

Fiscal Effort is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- **Wisconsin effort:** 3.50%
- **U.S. average:** 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Wisconsin spent 3.50% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was 0.03 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Wisconsin's effort level ranks #25 in the nation (out of 50).

**ADEQUACY**

Adequacy compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Wisconsin's highest poverty districts is $4,111 PP lower than the estimated adequate level ($16,229), a difference of -25.3%.
- Districts in Wisconsin's second highest poverty quintile receive 9.2% more than the estimated adequate level.

**PROGRESSIVITY**

Progressivity is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts; and 2) zero poverty districts.

- School funding in Wisconsin is moderately progressive.
- High poverty districts receive 9.1% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #10 in the nation [out of 51]).

**Data Source:** School Finance Indicators Database.
General

The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education.

The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org.

Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

- The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
- Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
- All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
- In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.
- Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) SID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from the Triplicate returns from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances; 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state’s economic capacity; in the simplest terms, how much “money” does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

- U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
- The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the “Great Recession” of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the “cutpoint” in the table because effort in the typical state had already reached its high point, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states’ profiles.
- Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.
- SID variables used: effort; year

Adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID’s primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state’s actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts’ labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
- The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.
- SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile): necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5; necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5; necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity

A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

- In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
- In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
- The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.
- SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
WYOMING

**Description:** This profile of Wyoming’s public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity. These three measures provide a succinct but informative overview of how much Wyoming devotes to its public schools, the fairness of its system, and whether its funding levels are sufficient to meet common outcome goals.

### FISCAL EFFORT

**Fiscal Effort** is the amount a state spends directly on K-12 education as a percentage of its total "economic capacity," which we measure here in terms of Gross State Product (GSP).

- **Wyoming effort**: 4.74%  
  **U.S. average**: 3.53%

- In FY 2017, Wyoming spent 4.74% of its economic capacity directly on K-12 education.
- This was a 1.20 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.53%.
- Wyoming’s effort level ranks #2 in the nation (out of 50).

### ADEQUACY

**Adequacy** compares actual state and local per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to the estimated amount required to achieve national average test scores. These comparisons are presented, by district poverty quintile, in the center graph (in $), and in the right panel table (as percentage differences).

- Spending in Wyoming’s highest poverty districts is $6,001 PP higher than the estimated adequate level ($11,904), a difference of 50.4%.
- Districts in Wyoming’s second highest poverty quintile receive 65.3% more than the estimated adequate level.

### PROGRESSIVITY

**Progressivity** is the degree to which states provide greater resources to districts serving higher need students. The center graph is the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between: 1) low (10%), medium (20%), and high poverty (30%) districts and; 2) zero poverty districts.

- **School funding in Wyoming** is progressive.
- **High poverty districts** receive 92.8% more revenue than zero poverty districts (this level of progressivity ranks #1 in the nation (out of 50)).
NOTES ON DATA AND MEASURES
State School Finance Profiles 2016-17

General
The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID), a collection of public K-12 school finance and resource allocation indicators published annually by researchers from the Albert Shanker Institute and the Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The purpose of the SFID, which draws on data from a dozen sources, is to provide sophisticated yet accessible school finance data and analysis to policymakers, journalists, parents, and the public. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 130 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, adequacy, and progressivity.

The full SID dataset, along with full documentation and other SFID tools and reports, are freely available to download at: schoolfinancedata.org. Some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures presented in this profile:

• The years in the profile refer either to the fiscal year or to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2017 is 2016-17). Note that the latest data in this profile (2016-17) predate the coronavirus pandemic by 3-4 years.
• Due to rounding, changes and differences published in this profile may vary slightly from users' manual calculations.
• All poverty data used in the SFID and presented in these profiles is from the U.S. Census Bureau.
• The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure (as indicated), as not all measures are available in D.C. and Hawaii.
• In order to facilitate replication or further analysis, the notes below include the names of SID variables used in each section of this profile.

• Non-SFID data sources ("Contextual Stats" table): 1) Child (5-17 years) poverty (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program; 2) see SFID documentation for sources used for coverage estimates; 3) percent of total (FY 2017) revenue from property taxes across from the U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of School System Finances, 4) total state public elementary and secondary school enrollment (Fall 2016) from the 2018 Digest of Education Statistics, published by the National Center for Education for Statistics.

Fiscal effort
Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state's total resources or capacity are spent directly on K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing total state and local expenditures (direct to education) by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state income. Both of these denominators are measures of a state's economic capacity, in the simplest terms, how much "money" does a state have? In this sense, effort measures how much each state spends as a percentage of how much it might spend. The former denominator (GSP) is used in these profiles, but the two are highly correlated, and the income-based effort indicator is available in the SID. Bear in mind that high capacity states with larger economies, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still produce the same revenue.

• U.S. average effort is unweighted and can be interpreted as effort in the typical state in a given year.
• The table in the right panel summarizes the graph in the center panel, with a focus on effort trends before and after the "Great Recession" of the late 2000s (comparing this state with concurrent changes in the U.S. average). 2009 is the "outpoint" in this table because effort in the typical state would have continued to decline, and subsequently declined. Trends, however, vary by state, as is evident in some states' profiles.
• Note that even seemingly small changes in effort levels can translate into large changes in spending, particularly in high capacity states.

• SID variables used: effort; year

Adequacy
Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a given level of educational outcomes. The SFID's primary measure of adequacy compares, by poverty quintile, a state's actual current state and local spending levels to estimates from models of how much that state would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores in the prior year. The 2016-17 estimates in this profile are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on factors such as districts' labor costs, structural characteristics (e.g., size), and the students they serve. For more information about the NECM, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

• The district poverty categories (e.g., lowest, low, medium, high, highest) are defined in terms of quintiles (i.e., 20 percentile increments).
• The U.S. average adequacy percentages (the difference between actual and required spending) in the right panel table are calculated using averages of actual and required spending across all states, by poverty quintile, weighted by enrollment. Note, however, that the NECM defines poverty quintiles state-by-state, which means that the U.S. averages should be interpreted as an approximate snapshot of the national situation.

• SID variables used (each of these three sets of variables include five separate variables [q1-q5], one for each poverty quintile):
  necm_predcost_q1—necm_predcost_q5;
  necm_ppcost_q1—necm_ppcost_q5;
  necm_enroll_q1—necm_enroll_q5

Progressivity
A progressive school finance system is one in which districts serving larger shares of disadvantaged students (all else equal) are allocated more resources than their counterparts serving lower proportions of these students. In this profile, progressivity is calculated by comparing adjusted state and local revenue between districts with (U.S. Census) child poverty rates of zero to those with higher poverty rates (i.e., 10, 20, and 30 percent). In addition to child poverty, revenue is also adjusted for labor market costs, population density, and district size, all of which affect the value of the education dollar. For more details on the calculation of adjusted revenue, as well as alternative approaches to measuring progressivity, see the SFID documentation and annual report.

• In the left panel (first bullet), the progressivity of each state's system is classified based on the percentage difference in adjusted state and local revenue between high (30%) and zero percent poverty districts (this is also the figure presented in the bottom bar of the center panel graph). The designations are as follows: progressive revenue in high poverty districts is at least 10% greater than that in zero poverty districts; moderately progressive (between +3% and +10%); neither progressive nor regressive (within three percentage points of zero); moderately regressive (between -3% and -10%); regressive (lower than -10%).
• In the graph in the center panel, "low poverty" districts are those with 10 percent poverty, "medium poverty" districts have 20 percent poverty, and "high poverty" districts have 30 percent poverty. Once again, the figures in the graph are percentage differences in adjusted state and local revenue between low/medium/high poverty districts and zero poverty districts.
• The graph in the right panel presents the trend in percentage difference between high (30%) and zero poverty districts, both for this state and on average across the U.S. The U.S. averages are unweighted and can be interpreted as 30/0 progressivity in the typical state in a given year.

• SID variables used: predicted_slocrev0 ; predicted_slocrev10 ; predicted_slocrev20 ; predicted_slocrev30 ; year
\[(\ln) \text{SCHOOL} = b_0 + b_1 \text{State}_i + b_2 \text{LaborMarket}_{ij} + b_3 \text{CWI}_{ij} + b_4 \text{FINANCE}_{ij} + b_5 \text{PopulationDensity}_{ij} + b_6 \text{Enrollment}_{ij} + b_7 \text{INDICATORS}_{ij} + b_8 \text{Scale}_{ij} + b_9 \text{Poverty}_{ij} + b_{10} \text{SchlType}_{ij} + b_{11} \text{DATABASE}_{ij} + e\]