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).

- KS is a high effort state.
- In FY 2020, KS spent 3.88 percent of its economic capacity (GSP) on its K-12 public schools.
- This was 0.27 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.61 percent.
- KS’s effort level ranks #16 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 KS is relatively moderate.
- By the modest standard of U.S. average scores, 27.5 percent of KS students attend inadequately funded districts, which ranks #21 in the nation (out of 49).
- The typical KS student’s district spends 24.3 percent above adequate levels, which ranks #17 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 KS is severely unequal.
- Spending in KS’s highest-poverty districts is 12.3 percent ($1,800 PP) below the estimated adequate level, compared with 91.6 percent ($5,273 PP) above adequate in the state’s most affluent districts.
- This opportunity gap of -103.9 percentage points is ranked #37 in the nation (out of 48).

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, 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](http://SchoolFinanceData.org). The following are some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures they present:

**Fiscal effort**
- 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 and the aggregation of estimates from users' manual calculations, some estimates on the front side.
- The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure, as not all measures are available in all states.

**Statewide adequacy**
- The scores are calculated as a weighted average of z-scores (final averages expressed as percentile-equivalents, with a score of 50 = z-score of 0) of the following measures (weights in parentheses): 1) percent of students in districts with above adequate funding (22.5%); 2) statewide (% adequacy gap (22.5%); 3) GSP-based fiscal effort (15%); 4) personal income-based fiscal effort (15%); and 5) equal opportunity gap (Q5/Q1 difference in adequacy gap, in percentage points) (25%). State rankings may reflect differences in unreported measures.

**Equal opportunity**
- The data in this state profile are from the School Finance Indicators Database (SFID). The NECM calculates required spending based on the relationship between average differences between actual and required spending, and because federal stimulus funds ran out after 2011. 2012 is therefore a
- SFID datasets, tools, and reports, are freely available to download at: [SchoolFinanceData.org](http://SchoolFinanceData.org). The following are some general notes about the profiles, followed by descriptions and notes pertaining to the three types of measures they present:

**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 SFID. 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 provide larger absolute amounts of funding. Low effort states can put forth high effort as a pro rata percentage of their gross states, as compared with 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 provide larger absolute amounts of funding. Low effort states can put forth high effort as a pro rata percentage of their gross state products (GSP), which is defined as the sum of the value added by all industries within a state plus the value of goods and services imported into the state. The effort measures how much each state contributes as a percentage of its gross state product (GSP). The effort indicator is calculated as the ratio of state spending to GSP, multiplied by 100 to express it as a percentage of state GSP. 
- The table in the right panel shows the effort measure in terms of either: 1) the proportion of students in each state in districts with actual funding below estimated adequate funding levels to estimates from cost models of how much that district would have to spend in any year to meet the SFID's definition of adequate funding; or 2) the adequacy gap (percentage difference between actual and estimated adequate spending) for the typical student in each state. Based on these measures, each state is characterized as low, medium, or high effort. 
- In the first bullet of the left panel, we characterize each state’s effort level as low, medium, or high by sorting states from the highest to the lowest. 
- The regio....
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**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. 
- The table in the right panel depicts the adequacy measure in terms of either: 1) the proportion of students in each state in districts with actual funding below estimated adequate funding levels to estimates from cost models of how much that district would have to spend in any year to meet the SFID’s definition of adequate funding; or 2) the adequacy gap (percentage difference between actual and estimated adequate spending) for the typical student in each state. Based on these measures, each state is characterized as low, medium, or high adequacy. 
- In the first bullet of the left panel, we characterize each state’s adequacy level as low, medium, or high by sorting states from the highest to the lowest. 
- The regio....

**Equal opportunity**
- Equal educational opportunity is achieved in a given state when none of that state’s districts are substantially further above or below adequate spending levels than are other districts. In the SFID, we measure equal opportunity (OE) with the same NECM estimates used for statewide adequacy (see above), but in this case by comparing adequacy gaps (percentage difference between actual and estimated adequate spending) between the highest- and lowest-poverty districts in each state. That is, each state’s “opportunity gap” is the difference (in percentage points) between these two groups (district poverty groups are defined in terms of quintiles—e.g., the 20 percent highest-poverty districts compared with the 20 percent lowest-poverty districts in each state). Note that OE is conceptually independent of statewide/fiscal effort measures (e.g., a hypothetical state in which all districts are below adequate funding levels might still exhibit OE, so long as high- and low-poverty districts are inadequate by roughly the same proportions, whereas highly unequal opportunity might exist in a state in which funding is universally adequate, if high-poverty districts are more adequately funded than low-poverty districts. 
- OE estimates are not available for Vermont and Hawaii (adequacy estimates not available) and cannot be calculated for D.C. (single government-run district state). 
- In the first bullet of the left panel, we characterize OE in each state as follows: severely unequal (OE gap less than -75 points); highly unequal (OE gap between -30 and -75 points); moderately unequal (-75 to -30 points); mildly unequal (0 to -75 points); and equitable (OE gap less than 0). 
- The center panel figure presents average 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 comparison of gaps between different combinations of groups). The state (bars) and U.S. (blue diamonds) estimates in the graph are average differences between actual and required spending (weighted by enrollment), by district poverty quintile. Note, however, that poverty quintiles are defined by state, and so the state estimates may reflect differences in enrollment patterns. The U.S. average (blue diamonds) represent an approximation of the national situation. All axes ranges for this graph may vary by state. 
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