HAWAI'I

Summary: This 2019-20 profile of Hawaii's public K-12 school finance system focuses on three core indicators from the School Finance Indicators Database: fiscal effort, statewide adequacy, and equal opportunity. On a weighted average of these three measures (see back), Hawaii scores out of 100, which ranks out of the 48 states with possible ratings.

FISCAL EFFORT

Fiscal effort is a measure of how much states devote to their schools as a share of their economic capacity (i.e., ability to raise revenue). Effort is calculated by dividing direct state and local K-12 expenditures in each state by its gross state product (GSP).

| Hawaii effort | 2.54% |
| U.S. average | 3.61% |

- HI is a low effort state.
- In FY 2020, HI spent 2.54 percent of its economic capacity (GSP) on its K-12 public schools.
- This was 1.06 percentage points lower than the unweighted national average of 3.61 percent.
- HI's effort level ranks #19 in the nation (out of 50).

STATEWIDE ADEQUACY

Statewide adequacy compares actual per-pupil (PP) spending in each state to district-level cost model estimates of the amount required to achieve the modest goal of U.S. average test scores. The graphs to the right indicate the percentage of students in districts where spending is below adequate and the funding gap (% above/below) in the typical student's district. The graphs include regional and national averages.

- Overall adequacy in HI is relatively .
- By the modest standard of U.S. average scores, percent of HI students attend inadequately funded districts, which ranks # in the nation (out of 49).
- The typical HI student's district spends percent adequate levels, which ranks # in the nation.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Equal opportunity is the comparison of adequacy between each state’s higher- and lower-poverty districts. The graph to the right presents adequate funding gaps by district poverty quintile (the blue diamonds are U.S. averages). The difference (in pct. points) between the lowest- and highest-poverty groups is a state’s “opportunity gap.”

- Educational opportunity in HI is .
- Spending in HI’s highest-poverty districts is percent ($ PP) the estimated adequate level, compared with percent ($ PP) adequate in the state’s most affluent districts.
- This opportunity gap of percentage points is ranked # in the nation (out of 48).

Adequacy gaps by outcome gaps

- HI’s opportunity gap contributes to a student outcome gap: the state’s highest-poverty districts (pink dot) score s.d. below its lowest-poverty districts (blue dot).

[Graph showing inadequate funding gaps in Hawaii public schools]

Adequacy in 10 largest HI districts

| Percent above/below adequate spending, ten largest HI school districts |
| HAWAII PUBLIC SCHOOLS |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child (5-17yo) poverty rate (%)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school coverage (%)</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent revenue from state sources</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment (U.S. rank)</td>
<td>181,088 (40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effort trend and capacity

- HI's 2020 effort level is 0.73 pct. points lower than it was pre-recession (2006).
- This net change in effort between 2006 and 2020 is ranked #50 in the nation.

On a weighted average of these three measures (see back), Hawaii scores out of 100, which ranks out of the 48 states with possible ratings.

Net change by period (% pts.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-12 recession (2006-12)</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-recession (2012-20)</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full period (2006-20)</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- HI's effort was lower than its 2006 level in 5 of 5 years between 2016-2020; had effort recovered to its 2006 level during these years, total 2016-2020 spending would have been $3.19 billion (28.7 percent) higher.
- HI is a relatively medium capacity state, with a GSP per capita ranked #21 in the nation.

[Graph shows K-12 fiscal effort trend, 2006-2020]
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, University of Miami School of Education and Human Development, and Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The primary product of the SFID is the State Indicators Database (SID), a state-level dataset containing roughly 125 variables. This profile focuses on three types of measures included in the SID: fiscal effort, statewide adequacy, and equal opportunity. The full SID dataset, along with accessible documentation of and data sources for all the measures presented in this profile, as well other SFID datasets, tools, and reports, are freely available to download at schoolfinancedata.org. The following are some general notes about the sources, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures they present:

- The years in the profile refer to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2022 is 2019-20).
- Estimates may differ slightly from previous profiles, as some measures are changed or improved each year, and all years are recalculated annually with updated data.
- Due to rounding, expenditure estimates from users' manual calculations vary slightly from those presented in the SID.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure, as not all measures are available in all years.
- Overall state scores: The overall scores reported at the top of the profile provide a very simple summary of states’ combined “performance” on the three core indicators featured in the profile. They do not represent comprehensive evaluations of states’ school finance systems. Each state is scored entirely relative to other states (i.e., rather than based on some absolute standard of “good” or “bad”), and the selection/weighting of components entails subjective judgments on the part of the SFID research team.

Fiscal effort

Fiscal effort indicates how much of a state’s total economic capacity goes toward K-12 schools. It is calculated in the SFID by dividing direct state and local K-12 expenditures by either Gross State Product (GSP) or aggregate state personal income. Both of these are measures of a state’s economic capacity. In this sense, effort measures how much each state contributes as a percentage of how much it might contribute. 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 generally the two are positively related (i.e., as a means of differentiating between low/inadequate funding states that do and do not have the capacity to increase revenue.

- U.S. effort averages are unweighted and do not include Vermont in any year (effort not available in 2018-20 due to data irregularities), so as to keep a consistent set of states across all years. In the first bullet of the left panel, we characterize each state’s effort level as low, medium, or high by sorting states into three roughly equal groups using terciles. Note that even seemingly small changes or differences in effort levels represent large revenue amounts, as the denominators are entire state economies. Note also that 2006 is the first year in which we can calculate GSP-based effort, as quarterly GSP estimates are not available before that.
- The table in the right panel presents the center-panel graph, with a focus on effort trends before and after the 2007-09 recession. The 2006-12 period (the “K-12 recession”) is highlighted in the table (rather than, say, 2006-09) because the direct impact of the recession on K-12 funding in the typical state persisted for a few years after the “official recession” ended, and because federal stimulus funds ran out after 2011. 2012 is therefore an apt starting point for assessing states’ reinvestments (or lack thereof). Trends, however, vary by state.
- In the third bullet of the right panel, below the table, we present a “thought experiment” of sorts, in which we calculate how much additional total state and local spending each state would have had to spend between 2006 and 2012 had it spent at its 2006 level, the hypothetical additional spending is: (i) the hypothetical additional funding estimates do not include years in which 2016-20 funding would have been lower under states’ effort levels.
- In order to provide a sense of states’ capacity, we characterize each state’s GSP per capita as small, medium, or large by sorting states into three roughly equal groups using terciles.

Statewide adequacy

Adequacy is typically defined as the extent to which the amount of funding for schools is sufficient for students to reach a minimum/acceptable level of educational outcomes. Our adequacy estimates compare each district’s actual spending levels to estimates from cost models of how much that district would have to spend in order to achieve national average test scores (i.e., “required” or “adequate” spending). We express statewide adequacy in terms of either: 1) the proportion of students in each state in districts with actual funding below estimated adequate levels; and 2) the adequacy gap (percentage difference between actual and estimated adequate spending) for the typical student in each state. All these estimates are from the National Education Cost Model (NECM), which is part of the SFID. The NECM calculates required spending based on the relationship between outcomes and cost factors such as regional wage variation, district size, and student characteristics. Note that this model and the data it uses are necessarily imperfect, and estimates should be viewed with appropriate caution. For more information about the NECM, see the SID user’s guide. Some of the estimates presented in this section of the profile can be calculated using SID variables, whereas others (e.g., the district-by-district estimates in the right panel) require the use of the SID Cost Database (DCD); many but not all SID adequacy measures (all of which have variable name beginning with necm_; are aggregations of DCD estimates. The full DCD dataset (going back to 2009) is also publicly available at the SFID website (2020 estimates will be released in early 2023).

- The first bullet of the left panel, we characterize statewide adequacy as follows: high (federal funding in the lowest 15 poverty districts compared with the 20 percent lowest states), moderate (federal funding in all but the lowest 15-20 percent low-poverty districts), and low (federal funding in all but the lowest 20 percent poverty districts). State rankings may reflect differences in unrounded scores. For 2006, only the left panel shows the full state rankings. For 2019-20, there is no state with adequate funding levels in any poverty quintile.
- The center panel figure presents adequate funding gaps for all five quintiles in each state (although opportunity gaps as we define them for the purposes of this profile use only the highest- and lowest-poverty groups, this graph permits comparisons of gaps between different combinations of quintiles). The state bars (and U.S. (blue diamonds) estimates in the graph are average differences between average actual and required spending (weighted by enrollment), by district poverty quintile. Note, however, that poverty quintiles are defined by state, and so the bars for some states are U.S. averages (blue diamonds) represent an approximation of the national situation. Aside ranges for this graph may vary between states.
- The right panel presents, by district poverty quintile, adequacy (difference between actual and required spending) expressed in dollars per pupil (horizontal axis) by average student testing outcomes expressed as the difference from the national average in standard deviations (vertical axis). The other markers (circles) in the plot are other states’ district poverty groups (color coded in the same manner, but with more transparent markers to allow for clear viewing of this state’s markers). The difference in student outcomes is presented in the highest- (Q5) and lowest-poverty (Q1) estimate is presented in the first bullet, below the plot, and can be interpreted as a poverty-based student achievement gap in this state.