Oregon 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).

- OR is a high effort state.
- In FY 2020, OR spent 3.98 percent of its economic capacity (GSP) on its K-12 public schools.
- This was 0.37 percentage points higher than the unweighted national average of 3.61 percent.
- OR's effort level ranks #15 in the nation (out of 50).

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 OR is relatively moderate.
- By the modest standard of U.S. average scores, 24.7 percent of OR students attend inadequately funded districts, which ranks #18 in the nation (out of 49).
- The typical OR student's spending 14.9 percent above adequate levels, which ranks #23 in the nation.

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 OR is highly unequal.
- Spending in OR’s highest-poverty districts is 1.7 percent ($225 PP) above the estimated adequate level, compared with 32.4 percent ($3,045 PP) above adequate in the state’s most affluent districts.
- This opportunity gap of -30.7 percentage points is ranked #9 in the nation (out of 48).

OR’s 2020 effort level is 0.51 percent points higher than it was pre-recession (2006).
- This net change in effort between 2006 and 2020 is ranked #3 in the nation.
- OR’s effort was lower than its 2006 level in 0.52 percent points in the nation.
- OR is a relatively medium capacity state, with a GSP per capita ranked #27 in the nation.

Statewide spending is below estimated adequate levels in 40 of the 196 OR districts with available data.
- Closing all these negative gaps would require $271.9 million in new funding.
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, with accessible documentation of and data sources for all the measures presented in this profile, as well other SID datasets, tools, and reports, are freely available to download at 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:

• The years in the profile refer to the spring semester of the school year (e.g., 2020 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, percentages and dollar amounts are not necessarily additive.
• The total number of states assigned rankings varies slightly by measure, as not all measures are available in all states.

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 profiles. 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.

• 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) percentage of students in districts with 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 ranks may reflect differences in unrounded scores.

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 (EO) as a function of the following variables:

• EO 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 EO in each state as follows: severely unequal (EO gap less than -75 points); highly unequal (EO gap between -30 and -75 points); moderately unequal (EO gap between -30 and 30 points); and fairly equal (EO gap less than 30 points).
• 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 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 state by state, and so the state estimates, while not identical to the U.S. estimates, do reflect differences in state definitions.

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 populations, such as New York and California, can put forth lower effort than lower capacity states, such as Mississippi and Alabama, but still provide a higher percentage of their capacity toward K-12 education (due to income and size). In this regard, the SID’s fiscal effort indicator is available in the SID, but not all states might use the effort indicator.

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 SID. The NECM calculates required spending based on the relationship between outcomes and costs 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 use of the SFID’s Cost Database (OCD); many 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). Statewide adequacy estimates for the 10 largest urban school districts are U.S. Census Bureau estimates of school enrollment, and can be interpreted as a poverty-weighted test score for each group of students. The states are 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.

Statewide adequacy

Accurately defines 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 SID. The NECM calculates required spending based on the relationship between outcomes and costs 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 use of the SFID’s Cost Database (OCD); many 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). Statewide adequacy estimates for the 10 largest urban school districts are U.S. Census Bureau estimates of school enrollment, and can be interpreted as a poverty-weighted test score for each group of students. The states are 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. The regio...